



## **MINUTES OF THE KCLC BREEDS COUNCIL MEETING HELD VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS AT 11.00 ON 4 NOVEMBER 2020**

### **PRESENT:**

Ms C Boggia	Mr S Byrne
Mr S Collier	Mrs K Gorman
Mrs J Holgate	Mr T Hutchings
Mrs T Jackson	Mr E Paterson
Mrs P Marston-Pollock	Mrs J Sparrow
Mrs A Teasdale	Mrs B Thornley
Mr M Walshaw	Mrs S M Walton
Mr E Whitehill	

### **IN ATTENDANCE:**

Mrs K Mansfield – Kennel Club Secretary (item 4 only)  
Miss D Deuchar – Head of Canine Activities  
Mr A Marett – Senior Officer – Breed Shows Team (item 6 only)  
Mrs A Mitchell – Senior Committee Secretary  
Miss C Walsh – Officer, Breed Shows Team

### **GUEST**

Mr J Horswell (item 4 only)

**NOTE: any recommendations made by the Breeds Liaison Council are subject to review by the Show Executive Committee and The Kennel Club Board, and will not come into effect unless and until Board approval has been confirmed.**

The Chairman opened the meeting by welcoming all present. It was highlighted that this was the first Kennel Club Liaison Council meeting to be held via a virtual forum.

### **ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1. Apologies for absence were received from Mrs J Davie, Miss S Finnett, Mrs J Iles-Hebbert, Mrs P Jeans-Brown, Mrs J Morgan, and Mr T Schaanning-Ling.

### **ITEM 2. TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 22 MAY 2019 (MINUTES PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED)**

2. The minutes of the meeting held on 22 May 2019 were approved as an accurate record.



#### Matters arising from the previous meeting

##### Health screening information on registration certificates

3. Following an item raised by the Southern Newfoundland Club, the Council had wished to recommend that the spaces next to 'Health Screening – Kennel Club British Veterinary Association Schemes' and 'DNA Tests' on the registration document should not be left blank but should state 'None Recorded', or similar, if there was no test result to show.
4. However the Council noted that there had been a change in policy whereby in future no health results would be shown on registration certificates, as up-to-date results of health tests were now readily available on The Kennel Club website.
5. Some concerns were expressed that this was not a positive step and that it would be preferable for health results to continue to be shown on registration certificates, especially where efforts were being made by a breed to eradicate a health condition.
6. Providing such information was considered to be particularly important for puppy buyers who could be shown registration certificates for the sire and dam to demonstrate that appropriate health screening had been carried out. It was considered likely that some puppy buyers would not be sufficiently aware of resources available on The Kennel Club website, or where to find them, to enable them to carry out their own checks, leading to concerns that unscrupulous breeders may take the opportunity to exploit them.
7. It was acknowledged that it would be possible for breeders to print off information contained on The Kennel Club website and to provide this to prospective buyers to inform and reassure them regarding health testing. Breeders may also show original health certificates to puppy buyers, or provide them with copies.
8. The Council was advised that the change in policy whereby health testing information would no longer be shown on registration certificates was already in place and was not subject to review, and feedback from the Council was not being sought. However it nonetheless wished to record its concerns.
9. The Council suggested that a survey should be undertaken amongst the dog owning community to demonstrate opinion on the issue, with the results being submitted to The Kennel Club for consideration.
10. It was agreed that this would be progressed by Mrs Jackson and Ms Boggia, however approval from the Show Executive Committee would be required before any course of action could be taken.

##### Use of asterisks after a dog's name in the Breed Records Supplement and on The Kennel Club website

11. The Golden Retriever Breed Council had raised a concern regarding the publication of litters in the Breed Records Supplement where puppies were of either 'impure or unverified origins'. Such litters were published with the puppies' names marked by an asterisk(s) but no explanation as to the meaning of the asterisk(s).
12. The Council had agreed that the significance of the asterisks should be made clearer both in the BRS and on the Health Test Results Finder.
13. It noted that improvements had been made within the Breed Records Supplement, but that there was no clarity on the updated Kennel Club website as to the significance of an asterisk(s) after a dog's name.



14. Mrs Jackson informed the Council that the issue had been raised with the relevant department and it was hoped it would be addressed shortly. [Afternote: it was subsequently agreed that a note stating 'Where asterisks are shown after the registered name, this identifies a dog of either impure or unverified origins' would be added under details of the dog's record.]

### **ITEM 3. RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

15. The Council noted the following updates to recommendations from its meeting held on 22 May 2019:

**Proposed: Shetland Sheepdog Breed Council**

**The Shetland Sheepdog Breed Council proposed that the Kennel Club reviewed the illustrations on the Kennel Club's Breed Standard website and considered changing the artist's impressions to actual photographs.**

16. At its meeting held on 22 May 2019, the Council had given consideration to the above proposal and recommended it for approval. It was advised that illustrations and photographs now appeared on the 'About this breed' page for each breed on the new website.

**Proposed: Golden Retriever Breed Council**

**The Golden Retriever Breed Council wished to propose that the Kennel Club considered giving recognition to the attainment of a *Show Gundog Working Certificate* by adding 'SGWC' to the dog's name.**

17. At its meeting held on 24 May 2017, the Council received an update on the above proposal from the Field Trials Committee which did not support its recommendation for SGWC to be added to the dog's name. Mrs Walton, who represented the Golden Retriever Breed Council had thanked the Council for its support and expressed disappointment at the decision made by the Field Trials Committee.
18. The Council was pleased to note that the Field Trials Committee had now permitted the use of the letters 'SGWC' to be used after the dog's name on entry forms and in show catalogues. It was also confirmed that the letters may be used as part of the dog's name in any other appropriate manner, such as when referring to a dog in a club yearbook or other publication.
19. It was highlighted that in both of the above cases, results had been achieved as a direct result of action and recommendations from the Council and was evidence of the Council's ability to make positive changes. It was hoped that this would encourage others to submit proposals in future.

### **ITEM 4. PRESENTATION ON PROPOSED CHALLENGE CERTIFICATE ALLOCATION**

20. The Council received a presentation on the proposed Challenge Certificate allocation model for 2024-2028. A general announcement regarding the proposal was issued on 20 October 2020. This may be viewed at:

<https://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/media-centre/2020/october/the-kennel-club-plans-to-use-new-model-for-cc-allocation-from-2024-onwards/>



21. It was noted that feedback from the dog showing community had been positive. The Council shared that view, and welcomed the proposed new allocation, noting that it appeared to be fair and transparent.
22. Mrs Mansfield and Mr Horswell were thanked for their informative presentation. Both then left the meeting.

## **ITEM 5. PROPOSALS**

### Changes to the Council processes

#### Proposed by: Boxer Breed Council & English Setter Joint Judges Committee

23. A number of linked proposals were presented by Mr Hutchings and Mr Collier, representing the above organisations.
24. Mr Hutchings explained that the objective of the proposals was to update and reinvigorate Council procedures in order to ensure that it provided an effective channel of communication between breed clubs and The Kennel Club on all matters concerning breeds and Kennel Club strategic objectives. It was highlighted that at present there was a perception that it was overly bureaucratic and ineffective. For these reasons it was suggested that changes be made which would allow better communication and a speedier timeframe, and for the Council to use its expertise more effectively.
25. It was noted that on occasion, proposals or discussion items were submitted to the Council which did not fall within its remit. This may occur in situations where a society or an individual wished to address an issue of concern but was unclear as to where the query should be directed. In such cases, the office would advise the submitting individual or society that it would not be appropriate for the Council to discuss the matter, and would redirect the issue to the relevant department for a direct response.
26. A suggestion was made that the Council should be made aware of all items which had been submitted, by way of a list included with the agenda, regardless of whether they had been accepted for discussion. However it was advised by the office that caution was necessary in adopting such an approach, as it may lead to unhelpful and inappropriate discussion. It was further highlighted that on occasion items had been submitted which were of a confidential or personal nature, and that it would be highly inappropriate to circulate details of these.
27. It was accepted that there was some confusion as to the role of the Council and that it would be helpful to have more clarity as to its role and remit, which it was anticipated would stimulate the submission of appropriate proposals and discussion items.
28. A query was raised regarding ways in which grassroots competitors could become more aware of, and involved in, the workings of the Council. There was a concern that many were unaware of its existence or its role. It was emphasised that delegates should be as proactive as possible in raising awareness amongst those they represented and in stimulating discussion and the raising of topics for consideration by the Council. This may be carried out by means of meetings (which could be held via an online format, or physically, when possible) or by email consultations.
29. The specific proposals were addressed as follows:

**To allow specific breed representative / spokesperson attend Council meetings as a “guest” to present detailed complex proposals and support relevant debate on the proposal. This would be at the Council Chairman’s discretion and confirmed in writing at least one**



**calendar month prior to the meeting. A representative / spokesperson attending for this purpose will have no vote. The “guest” would also be able to attend the full meeting as an observer.**

30. It was highlighted that a facility was already available under the terms of Regulation P(B)4 which stated that:
- ‘Breed representatives may apply to attend a council meeting for a specific purpose. Such application, specifying the agenda item concerned, must be made in writing to the secretary, at least one calendar month before the date of the meeting. Attendance by breed representatives will be at the discretion of the Breeds Council chairman. A representative attending for this purpose will be present when the specific issue is being discussed and not for the whole meeting and will have no vote.’
31. The Council was in full agreement that on occasion it would be advantageous to allow breed representatives to attend meetings to present proposals, particularly where the issue concerned was complex in nature and there may be difficulties in adequately briefing a delegate to present the item and to answer questions on it.
32. It was acknowledged that breed representatives had attended Council meetings in the past under the terms of the existing Regulation as outlined above. However the Council wished to remove the proviso that representatives were not permitted to attend the whole meeting as it was of the view that it would be helpful for breed representatives to witness the way in which meetings were conducted, and that it would help them to understand the process.
33. It was drawn to the Council’s attention that doing so would require an amendment to Regulation P(B)4, and that any such amendment would be subject to consideration by the Show Executive Committee (SEC) and the Board, as it was not within the Council’s remit to make changes to regulations without such approval.
34. Noting the strong views of the Council on the matter, it was agreed that the SEC would be requested to consider the removal of the proviso that breed representatives may not remain for the whole meeting.

**For the Kennel Club to undertake a communication campaign to emphasise the role and benefits of the Breed Liaison Council to breed clubs/ individuals. Promoting a better understanding of the way in which the Kennel Club functions and encouraging breed clubs/individuals to use the Breeds Council for matters concerning breeds and Kennel Club Strategic Objectives.**

35. The Council was in full agreement that such a campaign, which could be carried out via the use of social media, would be helpful in promoting awareness of the Council, its role and remit, and the way in which it operated, and it **recommended** that this should be progressed.
36. The necessity for delegates to be proactive in liaising with the breed clubs that they represented was also reiterated.
37. A further suggestion was that a suitable article be included in the Kennel Gazette which would highlight the role of the Council and it was agreed that this would be a positive step. The office undertook to progress this, although it was highlighted that it would be necessary for such an article to highlight the work of all six of the Liaison Councils rather than the Breeds Liaison Council alone.

**To speed up the process making the Breeds Council more efficient, effective, and meaningful.**



38. The Boxer Breed Council & English Setter Joint Judges Committee noted that the current meeting timetable was covered by the 'P' Regulations. It wished to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that the timetable was originally introduced when most correspondence was done by post, which understandably took time to process. However, in view of modern methods of communication it was of the view that the existing timescales lead to lengthy delays and therefore apathy.
39. A revised timetable was therefore proposed, as follows:
- Notice of Council Meetings: 3 months prior to meeting date  
(currently 4 months)
  - Receipt of Agenda items: 1 month before the meeting  
(currently 3 months)
  - Agendas sent to delegates: 14 days prior to meeting  
(currently 2 months)
  - AOB items (chairman's discretion): 7 days prior to meeting  
(currently 14 days)
40. It was acknowledged that the 'P' Regulations, including the time frames, covered all of the Kennel Club Liaison Councils and the proposed changes would need to be considered by all six Councils, and if appropriate by the relevant Committees and then the Board.
41. It was also suggested that it would be helpful if notice of the meetings were sent direct to delegates as well as being published in the dog press and via social media.
42. One issue raised was the length of time between the meeting and the publication of the minutes. A suggestion was made that it should be permissible for feedback to be given by a delegate to an individual or society who had submitted a proposal or discussion item prior to issue of the minutes, in the interests of providing a timely response. However the office expressed some concern at doing so as it was important to ensure that all feedback given was consistent and in line with what had been agreed by the Council. The Council was assured that minutes were prepared and issued as quickly as possible but that the process included a number of internal and external checks, which were time-consuming, and the timeframe was also dependent on the availability of staff resources.
43. The same constraints were also applicable to the preparation of agendas, and the office wished to raise a concern that a 14-day timeframe between the deadline for receipt of items and publication of the agenda would be problematic, and would not allow adequate time for consultation and resolution of queries. Further, there was also a concern that issuing the agenda 14 days prior to the meeting would not provide delegates with adequate opportunities to consult with the breed clubs that they represented prior to attending the meeting. It would also not provide the office with adequate time to carry out necessary research in the case of complex issues so that details may be included on the agenda.
44. However, the Council remained of the view that implementation of the revised timetable would be greatly beneficial, and it was unanimous in **recommending** it for approval. It was reiterated at this point that the recommendation would be referred to the Show Executive Committee, and that to progress further, it would then also need to be supported by the other five Liaison Councils and the appropriate Committees.

Records on The Kennel Club website

Proposed and presented by Mrs T Jackson

45. Mrs Jackson wished to propose that The Kennel Club MyKC records be extended to show all Kennel Club awards achieved by a dog, including ShCM, Veteran Warrants, and ShCEX awards.





46. However it was noted that the new Kennel Club website, which had been launched subsequent to issue of the Council agenda, displayed all awards achieved by a dog.
47. No further discussion of the issue was therefore necessary.

Use of verbal critiques at breed club shows

Proposed: Cairn Terrier Working Party

48. The Cairn Terrier Working Party had wished to seek permission to give verbal as well as written critiques for each dog at breed club shows as was the custom at certain overseas shows. However, the Council was advised by Mr Walshaw that the Cairn Terrier Working Party wished to withdraw the item from the agenda and accordingly, no discussion took place.

Inclusion of DNA screening tests to Assured Breeders scheme

Proposed: Mr T Whitehill

49. Mr Whitehill wished to propose that, when a DNA screening test, (related to the health of a breed) had been added to The Kennel Club DNA Screening Scheme, it should automatically be added to the requirements for inclusion on The Kennel Club Assured Breeders scheme. The suggestion had originated with the Papillon Breed Council.
50. The objective was to reduce delays between the introduction of a DNA test and its addition to the requirements of the Assured Breeders scheme. Such delays could be significant in length, and could be reduced if the need to await a request from the relevant breed club or council was removed.
51. A concern was raised that in some breeds there were a number of DNA tests available but that it was not necessary for all breeding stock to be tested for every potential condition. In some situations the breed clubs did not support all the available tests as relevant for their breed and therefore Council was of view that it would not be desirable for it to be mandatory for assured breeders.
52. No seconder was available, and the proposal was not considered further.
53. However, it was highlighted that breed clubs or councils could apply to the Assured Breeders scheme to request that a test be added to the requirements for the breed in question. The office undertook to ascertain information as to the length of time that was normally required for the process. [**Afternote:** there is no set timeframe for addition of a test, as the process is dependent on a number of factors, such as whether or not a test is already recognised, and on the scheduling of the relevant meetings at which the request is considered. Such requests are considered by the Assured Breeder scheme sub-group and by the Dog Health Group, and are then subject to approval by the Board. In addition, where a DNA test is not currently published by the Kennel Club, it is necessary for it to be audited, and usually the sub-group requests the test is in place for at least 12 months before being put forward to be added as an initial recommendation on the scheme. If it is a completely different test to what is currently recognised (e.g. thyroid testing or heart testing for that breed) then the request is also considered by the Genetics & Health Screening sub-group to formally recognise the test. For these reasons the process may take some time to complete.]

## **ITEM 6. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

Dogs registered as 'colour not recognised'

Proposed: Yellow Labrador Club

54. The item was presented by Mrs S Walton on behalf of the Yellow Labrador Club.



55. The Club noted that recent changes to the registration of Labradors by the Kennel Club that were not black, chocolate or yellow could mean that dogs of a 'non-standard colour' or their offspring may be exhibited at shows. Whilst accepting the necessity to register such dogs, it was hoped that judges would not reward them in the show ring, however there remained a possibility that a dog of an unrecognised colour may gain its Stud Book number. The Club considered that this would be detrimental to the breed, and did not wish to encourage the breeding of 'champagne' or 'silver' Labradors for example.
56. The Council acknowledged that similar issues existed in other breeds and in some cases there were further concerns that some non-standard colours or coat patterns had health implications, such as merle-merle breedings having the potential to produce deaf puppies in some breeds.
57. However, it accepted that there was currently no mechanism under which dogs of a non-standard colour could be prevented from being exhibited, and in fact there had been cases where such dogs had received top awards.
58. One option may be to request that a facility for 'disqualifying faults' be included within a Kennel Club breed standard and Mrs Walton undertook to refer the suggestion back to the Labrador Breed Council for consideration.
59. Mrs Walton also raised a concern that when registering a litter via The Kennel Club's new website, silver, which was a non-standard colour, was the first option available from the drop-down menu. She was of the view that the option for non-standard colours should be at the bottom of the list of available options. The Council was advised that the matter would be referred to the Show Executive Committee to consider appropriate action. Should a breed club or council have such a concern it should contact the web admin team at The Kennel Club.

## **ITEM 7. JUDGES EDUCATION PROGRAMME (BREED SHOWS)**

60. The Council noted an update to the Judges Education Programme (Breed Shows) (**Annex A to the Minutes refers**). Mr Marett was available to answer any queries but none were raised.

## **ITEM 8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### Kennel Club website

61. It was highlighted that there were a number of issues arising from the launch of The Kennel Club's new website. Mrs Jackson advised the Council that she had raised a number of issues with the office.
62. It was confirmed that members of staff were dealing with all queries raised by users of the website as quickly as possible, and users were urged not to submit repeated emails or queries on the same topic as this was adding to the workload and was not helpful in resolving issues.

### Best Puppy awards

63. Mrs Walton advised the Council that she had received a query which related to the way in which the regulations relating to the awarding of Best Puppy in Group or Best Puppy in Show were framed. In particular it was suggested that an amendment to Regulation F(1)25 should be made whereby the word 'automatically' be removed from the following paragraphs, in order to clarify that the judge had discretion to select the puppy of his or her choice:





- a. Where the Best of Breed, Best of Group or Best in Show is a puppy it should automatically be awarded Best Puppy in Breed, Best Puppy in Group or Best Puppy in Show respectively.
  - b. Where the Reserve Best of Breed, Reserve Best of Group or Reserve Best in Show is a puppy it should also automatically be Best Puppy in Breed, Best Puppy in Group or Best Puppy in Show respectively.
64. The Council agreed that the matter would be best addressed via consideration by the Shows Liaison Council, and Mrs Walton was advised to suggest to the individual who had raised the query that a suitable proposal should be submitted to the Shows Liaison Committee, noting that its next meeting was due to be held on 7 April 2021.

### **ITEM 9. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

65. The next KCLC Breeds Council meeting would be held on 26 May 2021. Agenda items must be received by 25 February 2021.

The meeting closed at 13.25 with all present being thanked for their attendance and their contributions.



## ANNEX A TO THE MINUTES

### **Report on Judges Education Programme (Breed Shows)**

Following the resolution passed at the 2019 Kennel Club Annual General Meeting the Judges Competency Framework was placed on hold pending an independent review. The Independent Review Panel consisted of 16 members and met three times, with their recommendations presented to the 2019 Special General Meeting.

These proposals were placed before the KC Board and the following changes to the 'JCF' were agreed. Detailed Press Releases covering these issues were issued in early 2020.

<b>Renaming</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The name 'Judges Competency Framework' has been replaced by Judges Education Programme (Breed Shows).</li> </ul>
<b>Fees</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to the online resources will be free of charge and there will be no judging licensing fee payable. This will be reviewed after three years.</li> </ul>
<b>Running two systems in tandem</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The traditional judges approval and JEP systems will run in tandem for a minimum of five years, with a review after three years.</li> <li>Judges may choose to progress using either the traditional or JEP route on a breed-by-breed basis.</li> <li>'Grandfathering' will be available for judges listed on one or more breed club/council A3 list(s) or with a JDP credit, based on the KC's current mandatory criteria from 1 January 2021.</li> </ul>
<b>Hands-on experience</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A set minimum number of dogs judged, based on Stud Book Bands, will be required to progress to JEP Level 3.</li> <li>The minimum required numbers of dogs to be judged under the existing approval system has been reviewed, and some changes agreed.</li> <li>The types of shows/events which may be included when counting the number of dogs judged has been clarified.</li> </ul>
<b>Requirements of a Dog Show Judge exam</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The requirement for all judges to undertake a 'refresher' RDSJ exam every 5 years has been withdrawn, subject to review after three years.</li> <li>The requirement for judges previously approved to award CCs to attend a RDSJ seminar and pass the examination if designated as 'Not Currently Active' or subject to penalties related to a substantiated complaint or objection under the current approval system remains unchanged.</li> <li>Judges seeking approval to award CCs to their first breed, irrespective of their chosen approval route, must attend a RDSJ seminar and pass the examination.</li> </ul>
<b>'Eye for a Dog' assessment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 'Eye for a Dog' assessment in its present form has been withdrawn. Further consultation is being undertaken with a view to developing an alternative approach that retains the aims and objectives of the 'Eye for a Dog' concept whilst taking account of feedback obtained from previous experience.</li> </ul>
<b>Mentoring</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mentors will not be empowered to pass or fail candidates.</li> <li>Amended criteria for who can act as a mentor has been agreed.</li> <li>The form for completion by mentors has been reviewed.</li> <li>Any previously completed mentoring sessions will be valid.</li> <li>Progression to JEP Level 3 will require completion of a minimum of three mentoring sessions over a minimum of 12 months.</li> </ul>



## THE KENNEL CLUB

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mentors will be expected to provide constructive feedback to candidates to assist them with developing their understanding of the breed.</li> </ul>
<b>Observation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amended criteria for who can act as an observer has been agreed.</li> <li>A minimum number of dogs present for the observation to be valid (based upon Stud Book Bands) has been agreed.</li> </ul>
<b>Stewarding and critique writing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The requirement for judges to watch the stewarding and critique writing films remains, but the examination will be replaced by a quiz designed to allow a judge to check their level of understanding. There will be no pass/fail mark, the requirement is simply for completion of the quiz. This is now a requirement to progress to JEP Level 2.</li> <li>The requirement for 12 days stewarding has been reinstated. Two of these days must be completed as part of the revised Level 1 entry criteria with the remaining ten days to be completed prior to a judge applying for Level 3 status for their first breed.</li> </ul>
<b>JEP Level 1 criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level 1 criteria for all judges to be eligible to judge up to three classes of any breed (four if a puppy class scheduled) has been amended as follows:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimum of 5 years proven interest in pedigree dogs.</li> <li>Attend an RDSJ seminar but not mandatory to take and pass the examination but passing the exam will be required before progressing to judge more than the permitted minimum number of classes.</li> <li>Attend a Conformation and Movement seminar.</li> <li>Complete a minimum of two stewarding appointments.</li> <li>Existing CC judges qualify by virtue of that status and may register at JEP Level 1 for any breed</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Breed Appreciation Days/multiple-choice exams (MCE)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing MCEs are being reviewed to ensure they meet revised requirements.</li> </ul>

### Breed Education Co-ordinators

The Breed Education Co-ordinators (BECs) overseeing the implementation of the JEP are supported by the Canine Activities Team who are always on hand to answer questions and offer advice. A successful webinar was held in July 2020 which covered the above changes to the JEP and gave BECs an opportunity to ask questions. It is hoped that events such as this will be a regular feature and can be rolled out across other areas of the Kennel Club.

BECs are currently reviewing MCEs and working with their clubs to produce new lists of mentors and observers based on the amended criteria.

### Key dates

- From 1 January 2021, no one can judge unless they meet the new JEP Level 1 requirements (as listed above) or are previously approved to award Challenge Certificates. Otherwise, judges can accept appointments either in accordance with current Kennel Club regulations (i.e. completely outside the requirements of the JEP) or with the JEP requirements, once they have registered their online JEP account. In both cases, an exception can be made where a valid contract is in place prior to the date of this announcement (24 February 2020).
- From 1 January 2021 all breed clubs will be required to have involvement in organising at least one Breed Appreciation Day every two years and promote a minimum of two supported entry open shows every year.



- 'Grandfathering' nominations will be available for judges to self-submit questionnaires early in 2021

### **Online system**

The online JEP system is being developed as part of the wider Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system and is due to be launched during 2021.

Further details of all elements of JEP can be found at [www.thekennelclub.org.uk/jep](http://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/jep)

**ADRIAN MARETT**

**1 September 2020**