



**MEETING OF THE FIELD TRIALS LIAISON COUNCIL HELD ON WEDNESDAY
12 JUNE 2024 AT 10.30 AM IN THE BOARDROOM, THE KENNEL CLUB,
CLARGES STREET**

MINUTES

PRESENT

Mrs M Asbury	Dukeries [Notts] Gundog Club; Scottish Field Trials Association
Mr G Bird	Golden Retriever Club; Yellow Labrador Club
Mr K Byron	Suffolk Gundog Club; Cambridgeshire Field Trials Society
Mr M Canham	North of Scotland Gundog Association; Lothian & Borders Gundog Association
Mr S Capstick	Three Ridings Labrador Club; Yorkshire Gundog Club; Cheshire, North Wales and Shropshire Retriever and Spaniel Society
Mrs C Carpenter	Bristol & West Working Gundog Society; Weimaraner Club of Great Britain; Wiltshire Working Gundog Society
Mr J Castle	Gamekeepers National Association; Moray Firth Spaniel and Retriever Club; Grampian Gundog Club
Mr M Clifford	Barton on Humber Gundog Club; Spaniel Club
Mrs M Cox	Cornwall Field Trial Society; West of England Labrador Retriever Club; North Devon Working Gundog Club; Coventry & District Gundog Society
Mr S Crookes	Northern Golden Retriever Association; Yorkshire Golden Retriever Club; Golden Retriever Club of Scotland
Mr S Cullis	Arun & Downland Society; Southern & Western Counties Field Trial 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 J Henderson	Scottish Gundog Association; Tay Valley Gundog Association; Strathmore Working Gundog Club
Mrs S Jenkins	West Dartmoor Working Gundog Club; Westward Gundog Society
Mrs A Johnson	Italian Spinone Club of Great Britain; Norfolk and Suffolk HPR Field Trial Club
Mr R Johnston	Ulster Retriever Club; Labrador Retriever Club of Northern Ireland
Ms F Joint	Labrador Retriever Club; Burns and Becks Gundog Club
Mr J Kean	Northern Counties Pointer & Setter Society; Pointer Club of Scotland
Mrs F Kirk	English Setter Club; International Gundog League (Pointer & Setter Society)
Mrs W Knight	Eastern Counties Spaniel Society; London Working Spaniel Society; Mid Sussex Working Spaniel Club
Mrs B Kuen	Chiltern Gundog Society; International Gundog League (Retriever Society); Mid Norfolk Gundog Club
Mr R Major	Brittany Club of Great Britain; Large Munsterlander Club
Mr S McGrath	Usk Valley Working Gundog Club; Dove Valley Working Gundog Club; United Retriever Club
Ms M McNally	Pembrokeshire Working Gundog Society; Duchy Working Gundog Club
Mr M Megaughin	Fermanagh Gundog Club; North West Ulster Spaniel Club
Ms P Pinn	Midland Counties Field Trial Society; Shropshire Gundog Society; Welsh & English Counties Spaniel Club
Mr R Proctor	Midland English Springer Spaniel Society; English Springer Spaniel Club
Mr A Rees	Carmarthenshire Working Gundog Society; Glamorganshire Field Trial Society

Mr S Richardson	East Midland Gundog Club; Midland Gundog Society;
Ms T Siwek	North Western Counties Field Trials Association Leconfield Working Spaniel Club; Western Counties & South Wales Spaniel Club
Mr P Smith	English Springer Spaniel Club of Northern Ireland; Antrim & Down Springer Spaniel Club; Mid-Ulster Gundog Association; Northern Ireland Working Cocker Club; Foyle Valley Working Cocker Club
Mr P Turner	Ulster Golden Retriever Club; Northern Ireland Gundog, Field & Show Society
Mrs J Venturi-Rose	Kent, Surrey & Sussex Labrador Retriever Club; Hampshire Gundog Society
Ms R Webster	Hunt, Point & Retrieve Gundog Association; Hungarian Wirehaired Vizsla Association
Mr T West	South West Scotland Gundog Association; Gordon District Gundog Club; Forth & Clyde Working Gundog Association
Ms S Whyte	Lincolnshire Gundog Society; Midland Counties Labrador Retriever Club; Northumberland and Durham Labrador Retriever Club; Yorkshire Retriever Field Trial Society
Mr N Wroe	Weimaraner Association; Hungarian Vizsla Club

IN ATTENDANCE

Miss K Broers	Gundog Events Manager
Miss D Deuchar	Head of Canine Activities
Miss G Hallisey	Events Coordinator
Mrs H Kerfoot	Chief Canine Health, Activities and Events Officer
Miss A Morley	Senior Officer – Working Dog Activities Team

GUEST

Mr J Bailey	Board Member and Field Trials Committee Chairman
-------------	---

Note: any recommendations made by the Field Trials Liaison Council are subject to review by the Field Trials Committee and The Kennel Club Board, and will not come into effect unless and until Board approval has been confirmed.

IN THE CHAIR: MR S RICHARDSON

ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Mr S Adams, Mr P Askew, Mr J Bailey, Ms C Bridgwater, Mrs C Brown, Miss C Calvert, Mrs C Clarke, Mr D Elliot, Mr J Goldsmith, Mr A Hopkins-Young, Miss J Hurley, Mr S Kimberley, Mrs V Stanley.

ITEM 2. TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 16 MAY 2023

1. The minutes of the Council meeting held on 16 May 2023 were approved as an accurate record.

ITEM 3. TO ELECT A COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE TO THE FIELD TRIALS COMMITTEE FOR RETRIEVERS EFFECTIVE TO MAY 2025

2. There were two nominations for the role of Retriever representative to the Field Trials Committee for the remaining term of the Council, effective to May 2025. The nominations were Mr S Cullis, proposed by himself, and seconded by Mr K Byron and Mr R Johnston, proposed by Mr S McGrath and seconded by Mr P Smith. A vote took place, and Mr Johnston was duly elected.

ITEM 4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING AND RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS PASSED TO THE FIELD TRIALS COMMITTEE (RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS)

3. The Council noted the Results of Recommendations document which had been circulated prior to the meeting.
- HPR Societies holding more than one open field trial.
4. The Council wished to highlight that there appeared to have been a divergence from a previously agreed proposal on the number of open stakes an HPR field trial society was able to hold in one season. The policy was detailed on the Results of Recommendations from the Field Trials Liaison Council meeting held on 16 May 2023 which was issued following the September Field Trials Committee meeting.
5. The Council had previously requested the Field Trials Committee establish a clear and defined route for HPR clubs to secure permission to host a second Any Variety HPR Open field trial.
6. However at its meeting in July 2023 the Field Trials Committee had approved the application by the German Longhaired Pointer Club to hold a second open field trial.

7. The Council therefore agreed that an explanation for the action should be requested from the Committee. The Council suggested that either the club which had been granted the permission should be asked to revoke its application, or to ask for a full explanation as to why applications submitted by other societies had not been approved. The Field Trials Committee was requested to review the decision.
8. There were no further requests for clarification and the Results of Recommendations document was approved.

Handlers with more than one dog

9. As noted within the Results of Recommendations document, the Retriever Field Trials Working Party had been working on analysis of data relating to the above subject. It was acknowledged that the Council had been offered the opportunity to submit any questions on the report prior to the meeting.
10. The Council was invited to share its views on both the report and the questions which had been addressed by the Retriever Field Trials Working Party, noting that the report had not been disseminated to all field trial competitors. The Council noted that the original discussion item had been raised in 2021 and was regarding the perceived unfairness of retriever draws.
11. The Council wished to thank the Retriever Working Party for its efforts in creating the report and recognised that a significant amount of energy and resources had gone into the compilation of the data and statistics. It was noted that five years' worth of records had been reviewed but one year had been discounted due to the Covid pandemic.
12. The Council held a lengthy discussion over the quality of the report, and whether the report was a guide to continue discussions or a final conclusion. It was noted that the Working Party had made its own recommendations on the report but the Council wished to query as to how the additional comments from Council would be incorporated.
13. It was noted that the data used to create the report had been drawn from the field trial draws, marked cards and results of open retriever field trials. It was noted that the original complaint raised by the Council in 2021 was regarding perceived unfairness in the draws, not in the cards, which could be distorted by withdrawals, overlapping trials and other factors. The Council was concerned that some of the figures presented may have been distorted due to competitors withdrawing from draws in which they were successful.
14. Views were expressed that the information could have been presented in order to favour one position, and the Council requested that it may be helpful to view the data in its raw form to be able to draw its own conclusions.
15. The Council agreed that a substantial amount of work had gone into the production of the report, however it was noted that the report covered many aspects, including strike rate, low entry numbers, number of entries per year and a comparison of the number of dogs entered by different handlers. The

Council agreed that some of the areas of the report were irrelevant to the original complaint. It was felt that the significant volume of statistics, charts and graphs were somewhat difficult to comprehend.

16. The Council acknowledged that an individual may have been drawn multiple times in any one draw due to the fact they were the handler for several different owners. However, it was agreed not every drawn position was then taken as a run and therefore the percentage of individuals actually handling multiple dogs in a trial was likely to be lower than the figures shown on a draw. The Council accepted that the data on who actually ran in any given trial needed to be taken from the marked card following the trial, and not taken from the draw alone.
17. The Council agreed that mathematically it stood to reason that a handler who ran multiple dogs would have a greater statistical percentage chance of getting a place in a draw than a handler who ran a single dog. However, it was highlighted that whilst the multiple dog handler had a higher chance of getting a run, an owner was actually disadvantaged, and their chance of gaining a run reduced when employing a multiple dog handler. This conclusion was supported by statistics taken from the report. However, it was considered that this statistic from the report was irrelevant, as the owners of dogs run by multiple handlers were still included in the draw and had the same opportunity of a run as all others entered.
18. The previously undertaken survey of members which had been conducted by five Retriever Field Trial Societies was quoted, whereby 80-90% of participants were in favour of multiple handling being restricted. The Council was concerned that those survey results reflected the perceived inequality from the grass roots participants, and that those opinions were not being taken into consideration by the report.
19. The Council wished the Committee to recognise the delicacy of the situation, issuing a plea to all involved that the value of all those who took part in trials should be recognised; not only the competitors but the secretaries, volunteers and helpers. The importance of recognising the opinions of those individuals was stressed, however it was agreed that a decision on the matter must be based on factual evidence and not hearsay.
20. A query was raised as to why the 'one dog one handler' regulation was removed from the J Regulations. It was believed that the change to the regulation had made an impact on retriever trials and an explanation from the Field Trial Committee as to why the regulation was changed was requested. The meeting regarding the 'one dog one handler' issue held in May 2022 was referenced, and it was noted that 40 A Panel judges had signed a petition requesting the regulation to be reinstated.
21. It was raised that implementing the one dog one handler regulation may not solve the perceived issue, that the application of the stipulation may only serve to restrict the opportunities for genuine owners who chose to employ a handler. It was noted that many of those genuine owners had contributed significantly to Field Trials as a whole. It was agreed that a small number of disingenuous

handlers were using multiple owners as a guise to run a number of their own dogs and gain a numerical advantage in draws.

22. It was agreed that no member of a society should ever be disadvantaged, whether or not they chose to employ a handler. It was agreed that field trials should be protected, and fair participation should be encouraged and available to all.
23. The Council also queried whether the handler for a particular dog was important to the outcome of a draw. Whilst the handler may be running two dogs in a trial, that handler could possibly be representing two separate owners, both of whom had been fortunate in gaining a place in the draw. Those owners who had gained a place in the draw would likely be fully paid members of the society and therefore should have the same opportunity as any other member, whether or not they choose to employ a handler.
24. The Council considered that societies should have the opportunity to implement a one dog one handler regulation at their own discretion, noting that the club should respect the fact that an owner may well be a member of the society.
25. The Council understood that a survey had been conducted by The Kennel Club following the Covid pandemic, regarding the reinstatement of events and activities.
26. The Council requested that a similar survey be produced by The Kennel Club which could be issued to all field trial societies to gather the views of field trial competitors on whether they wished multiple handling to be restricted. The office highlighted that the suggestion had previously been brought to Committee in 2021 which had led to the creation of the Retriever Field Trials Working Party.
27. A vote took place, and by a small majority, the Council was in support of the request to conduct an online survey of those participating in Retriever Field Trials, to establish whether societies should be given the discretion to reintroduce the One Dog One Handler regulation while reserves stood.
28. It was noted that the views of the Council would be presented to the Field Trials Committee at its next meeting.

ITEM 5. PROPOSALS FROM SOCIETIES

Proposed amendment to Regulation J6 Import Register Breeds – J6 Entries

29. The German Longhaired Pointer Club, represented by Mr Canham wished to propose an amendment to regulation J6 to make it clear which breeds were eligible to run in field trials if listed on the import register.
30. The proposal, which was seconded by Mr Major was made with the objective of clarifying which breeds were eligible to run in field trials, and to ensure that

judges were aware of which breeds' hunting styles they needed to be familiar with.

31. The proposal also highlighted that it would be useful to add an appendix in the J regulations that listed all eligible breeds, including import register breeds for the HPR sub-group.
32. The Council was invited to note that work to that effect was already in progress and lists of all eligible breeds for each sub-group had been created and included in the Field Trial Policy Document. Those eligible breed lists were also to be published on the website in due course. The Council agreed that publishing the information in the J regulations was consequently not necessary as the list of eligible breeds may need to be updated during a year, and the printed regulation booklets would not be able to immediately reflect those changes.

Draw Preference – Proposed Amendment to Regulation J6.e

33. The Westward Gundog Society, represented by Mrs Jenkins wished to propose an amendment to regulation J6.e whereby draw preference must be listed on the result of the draw.

Regulation J6.e

TO:

If entries or nominations exceed the number of permitted runners, the right to compete in a Trial shall be decided by ballot (subject to Regulation J6.i. which related to preference in the draw for open stakes). Societies must ensure that all eligible owners/members are given the opportunity of having their preferred dog entered into the first ballot (See J6.j). The society must publish the result of this ballot in full to all applicants. **This must include the draw preferences the dogs are entered under.** Where an online system, approved by the Kennel Club, has been used to take entries, the ballot must be carried out using the same online system, and the result forwarded to the Kennel Club at the same time that competitors are notified.

(Insertion in bold)

34. The proposal, seconded by Mr Major, was suggested to provide full clarity to all draw results as an entrant would be able to clearly see which part of the draw preference they had been entered into.
35. It was suggested that the draw preference would be listed next to the owner's/dog name, or that the owners/dogs would be listed under the relevant draw preference headings. It was noted the inclusion of draw preferences should apply to both open and novice draws, however it was agreed that it might not be possible for all aged trials due to the different entry requirements for those stakes.
36. A query was raised in regard to the additional administrative burden that may place on secretaries who would be required to add the additional information onto the draws they produced. However, it was noted some secretaries were already in the habit of detailing the information on their draws.

37. The Council agreed that whilst many secretaries were already undertaking the practice of including draw preferences on published draws, it was still possible for human error to play a part, either on the part of the secretary, or by the owner when entering their dog's details.
38. It was highlighted that many draws were now undertaken by online draw systems and the Council questioned whether those online systems were able to include the information on those draws performed via that method. The office clarified that the online draw systems were in the process of being reviewed and should the proposal be approved, the online draw systems would be asked to include the relevant information as necessary.
39. A vote took place, and by a large majority, the Council **recommended** the amendment for approval.

Three Judge System – J(B)3.(f)

40. The Golden Retriever Club, represented by Mr Bird wished to propose a new regulation which aimed to ensure that the three judge system was only used under exceptional circumstances.
41. There was no seconder for the proposal, and it was therefore not discussed further.

Amendment to Regulation J6.h – Preference in the Draw

42. Mr Bird, representing the Labrador Retriever Club of Wales requested that the Council consider an amendment to regulation J6.h. The proposal aimed to ensure a clear and transparent process when a club was holding two stakes of the same denomination in the same season.
43. When a society held two stakes of the same denomination in the same season, the current regulation stated that clubs or societies may grant preference in the draw for a second or subsequent stake to those members who had not been successful in the draw for the first stake. The suggested amendment for the regulation would state that clubs or societies must give preference in any subsequent draws to members that were not successful in the previous draw/s.
44. The amendment would prevent members and non-members alike from running in two or more trials in the same season, whilst other applicants were not offered a run at all should they not be successful in a draw.
45. There was no seconder for the proposal, and it was therefore not discussed further.

Walked-Up Certificate – Amendment to Regulation K2.c.(3)

46. The Yellow Labrador Club, represented by Mr Bird requested that the Council consider a proposed amendment to regulation K2.c.(3) whereby, before being granted the title of Field Trial Champion, a dog would be required to have been issued a walked-up certificate.

TO:

Before any Retriever is entitled to be described as a Field Trial Champion it must also have a Water, Drive **and Walked-Up** Certificate. The Water Certificate may, but not necessarily, be gained at a special water test. The special water test must have been conducted before two Panel judges, one of whom must be an A Panel, at one of the following: the Retriever Championship, a Field Trial Open Stake, or at a subsequent special test. (J(A)2 refers.) The Drive Certificate must be conducted before two Panel judges, one of whom must be an A Panel, at the Retriever Championship or a Field Trial Open Stake. **The Walked-Up Certificate must be issued by two Panel judges, one of whom must be an A Panel, at the Retriever Championship or a Field Trial Open Stake.**

(Insertion in bold.)

47. The proposal suggested that the introduction of a walked-up certificate would ensure that a dog had been fully tested on all aspects of its ability before it was awarded the title of Field Trial Champion. It was noted that heelwork and steadiness in line were two aspects where the society felt that dogs were not always being fully tested. It was noted that a dog could have been made up by winning only at driven trials where its heelwork or steadiness may not have been assessed.
48. The proposal was seconded by Mr Castle and the Council agreed there was merit in the introduction of a walked-up certificate to accompany the existing water & drive certification.
49. The Council wished to confirm the dates that a water test could be undertaken and regulation J(A)2 was noted, which detailed that “where a special water test is conducted for part qualification for the title of field trial champion it must be held between 1 September and 1 April inclusive.”
50. The Council agreed that the retriever was traditionally used in walked-up shooting and that the drive certificate had been introduced to ensure that those dogs being made up to field trial champions also possessed the requirement for steadiness.
51. A further discussion was held whereby the Council noted that some areas of the country only held driven trials, and that the introduction of a walked-up certificate may disadvantage competitors living in those areas as they may be required to travel significant distances in order to fulfil the requirement.
52. A vote took place and, by a majority, the proposal was **recommended** for approval.

ITEM 6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

HPR Judging

53. Mr Wroe presented the discussion item on behalf of the Weimaraner Association, the Hungarian Vizsla Club and the German Shorthaired Pointer

Club. The Societies wished the Council to consider issuing a notice to HPR judges via the Field Trials Newsletter to direct that judges at HPR trials should not stipulate, at the start of the Trial, that "Pointed Birds Only" are to be shot.

54. Following the presentation of the item the Council was advised that the matter had recently been discussed amongst HPR representatives at a separate meeting, and that the societies had agreed that the decision on whether to use only pointed birds would be left to the decision of the judges on the day. Therefore the matter was not discussed further.

Number of Spaniel Trials

55. Mrs Cox, representing the Cornwall Field Trial Society and Coventry & District Gundog Society, requested the Council to discuss how to alleviate the problem of too many spaniel (English Springer Spaniel & Cocker Spaniels) trials, and how to avoid a high number of spaniel trials being held in a short space of time in the forthcoming season.
56. The Council was presented with the statistics from last year's season which showed that 86 trials were held in November 2023. The Societies raised concerns that the high volume of trials being held in one month had contributed to a number of those trials being cancelled due to lack of entries.
57. It was also noted that the number of trials being held may also be negatively impacting field trial secretaries, as competitors may enter multiple trials but may not be able to take up all runs offered, leaving secretaries struggling to fill the cards.
58. The Council accepted that the issue concerned multiple clubs holding multiple trials.
59. The Council acknowledged that November was indeed a particularly busy month for all trials, however it was highlighted that in the previous year the number of trials was consistent with the number of trials that were held in 2023. It was therefore suggested that it was not, in fact, the number of trials, but instead a lack of competitors that was creating an impact on spaniel trials.
60. The Council accepted that it was not possible to estimate or predict the number of dogs that would be entered, or the demand from competitors for the number of trials held in one given season.
61. It was noted that the decline in the number of available early season rabbit trials had driven more clubs to hold trials later into the game bird shooting season, that is from September through to January.
62. It was recorded that when a trial had been booked using the online licence application form, the trial was only currently visible to other secretaries once it had been paid for by the hosting society. The office confirmed that work was ongoing towards getting all trials to be shown on the diary regardless of whether the stake had been paid for or not. The council also recognised that

the length of time for the office to accept the trial booking was only a minimal number of days.

63. The office highlighted the existing policies in place; whereby no two open cocker stakes could be booked on the same day unless the secretaries agreed.
64. Several of the Irish Council members clarified that the situation was slightly different in Northern Ireland, and that due to the lower number of clubs the secretaries were able to arrange their trials so that when two trials were held on the same day, both stakes would be filled.
65. It was suggested that the policies should be published to all secretaries via the website or in the Field Trials Newsletter to reduce overlapping trials where possible.

Preference in All Aged Trials

66. Mr Bird presented the discussion item on behalf of the Golden Retriever Club. It requested that the Council discuss whether preference conditions for All Aged Trials should be stipulated in the J Regulations rather than left to be determined by societies.
67. The Council considered that whilst the introduction of set conditions may be beneficial for the retriever sub-group, the introduction could penalise other breed groups.
68. The Any Variety Spaniel except for Spaniel [Cocker] and Spaniel [English Springer]) stakes were highlighted, as any proposed change to the All Aged regulations would negatively impact those trials. In addition, the Council's attention was drawn to HPR trials which also used specific preferences within their All Aged stakes and wished to continue to do so.
69. Noting this, the Council was not in support of the discussion item.

Restriction of trials per club

70. Mr G Bird presented the discussion item on behalf of the Yellow Labrador Club, which requested the Council to consider the introduction of a restriction on the number of retriever trials a club could hold in a year to; one novice, one open and one all-aged stake. The Society considered that limiting the number of stakes a club could hold in a season would ease the pressure on judges and officials arranging trials.
71. The Council contemplated whether there was a significant number of judges being booked for appointments by those clubs holding multiple novice and all aged stakes in one season. It was agreed that judges usually committed to a certain number of appointments each season, and one society utilising a large number of judges per year may disadvantage other societies who were then unable to find available judges.
72. It was noted that in the past societies were able to hold a 'non qualifying' open stake and it was considered whether those clubs holding multiple novice stakes

could add restrictions on some of those trials. That would mean that one or more of the novice trials held by the same society would not count towards preference in an open stake.

73. It was accepted that some clubs had multiple branches which were geographically spread across the country, and it was agreed that each of those club factions should be permitted to run their own trials. It was agreed that if the trials were being supported with entries then the holding of multiple trials permitted more handlers to be offered the opportunity of a run.
74. However, the Council did recognise that open stakes were heavily subscribed and that clubs holding multiple novice stakes may increase the number of novice winners, who would then only be able to enter open stakes, potentially leading to further congestion of those trials.
75. It was noted that the impact on open stakes should be considered in conjunction with potential future discussions surrounding the strategic plans for trialling in the future.
76. The Council concluded that whilst there were consideration factors, there would be no further action at this stage.

Flushing deer during a trial

77. Mrs Knight, representing the Eastern Counties Spaniel Society, requested the Council discuss the matter of deer being considered quarry at a trial. Should a spaniel be credited with a flush, if when hunting during a trial the dog moved or flushed a deer and remained steady.
78. The Council noted that this situation had occasionally arisen at trials and had been dealt with by the A Panel judges in varying ways, which had led to confusion amongst B and Non Panel judges.
79. The Council discussed the matter of non-quarry species, such as squirrels and livestock being encountered at trials and it was agreed that the experience of the A Panel judges at the trial would guide the situation.
80. It was agreed that the quarry species permitted for use at trials were not currently listed and the Council agreed that detail would be added to the seminar scripts.

ITEM 7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

80. The Council was invited to note that the next meeting would take place in June 2025. The exact date would be confirmed in due course.

ITEM 8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Dogs of Non Standard Colour

81. Mrs Joint wished to raise an item under Any Other Business on behalf of the Labrador Retriever Club and Burns and Becks Gundog Club.
82. The Labrador Retriever Club had recently had its schedule rejected by the office due to the inclusion of the statement that 'only dogs which conformed to breed standard colours would be permitted to run in trials' hosted by the society. The club wished to implore the Council to permit the inclusion of that statement on its schedules.
83. The historic nature of the society was noted, having been in existence since 1923, and the club wished to maintain its traditional entry requirements of only permitting breed standard specific colours to enter its trials.
84. The Council noted that the labrador retriever was not the only breed in which non-standard colours were being witnessed.
85. The Council noted that the breed standard was the guideline which described the ideal appearance, including the correct colour of a breed. However, it was accepted that non-standard colours were permitted to be registered on the pedigree register and had been agreed upon in consultation with the breed clubs. It was confirmed that dogs of non-standard colour were also permitted in the show ring.
86. The Council clarified that the policy specified that a dog could not be penalised based on its colour.
87. The Council wished the Field Trials Committee to review this policy and consider the statement 'only dogs which conformed to breed standard colours would be permitted to run in trials' be reinstated on the Labrador Retriever Club schedule.

Kennel Club Website

88. The Labrador Retriever Club and Burns and Becks Gundog Club, represented by Mrs Joint wished the Council to consider a statement listed on The Kennel Club website under 'New to Field Trials'. The statement reads "If you love the countryside and seeing dogs working as they were intended to, field trials may be perfect for you."
89. The club wished this statement to be revised and to guide people towards training days or working tests before field trials. The Council were in agreement and the office looked to amend this statement on the website.

Thanks to the Chairman

90. The Council wished to express its sincere thanks to its outgoing Chairman; Mr Richardson.

The meeting closed at 1.00 pm

MR S RICHARDSON
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*