



MINUTES OF THE FIELD TRIALS LIAISON COUNCIL MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY 16 MAY 2019 AT 10.30 AM IN THE
BOARDROOM, THE KENNEL CLUB, CLARGES STREET

PRESENT

Mrs M Asbury	Dukeries (Notts.) Gundog Club; Scottish Field Trials Association
Mr P Askew	East Anglian Labrador Retriever Club; Utility Gundog Society; Eastern Counties Retriever Society
Mr G Bird	Golden Retriever Club; Yellow Labrador Club
Ms C Bridgwater	Essex Field Trial Society; Meon Valley Working Spaniel Club
Mr K Byron	Suffolk Gundog Club; Cambridge Field Trials Society
Mr D Capel	Midland Gundog Society; Coventry & District Gundog Society
Ms C Carpenter	Bristol & West Working Gundog Society; Hungarian Vizsla Club
Mr J Castle	Golden Retriever Club of Scotland; Moray Firth Spaniel and Retriever Club
Mr S Chant	Weimaraner Club of Great Britain; Weimaraner Association
Mr S Charlton	Yorkshire Gundog Club; Tyne Tees and Tweed Field Trial Association
Mrs M Cox	Cornwall Field Trial Society; West of England Labrador Club; The Spaniel Club
Mr S Crookes	South Western Golden Retriever Club; Northern Golden Retriever Association; Eastern Counties Golden Retriever Club; Flatcoated Retriever Society
Mr S Cullis	Arun & Downland Gundog Society; Southern & Western Counties Field Trial Society
Mrs D Harrison	South Eastern Gundog Society; Guildford Working Gundog Club; International Gundog League
Mrs J Hay	Golden Retriever Club of Northumbria; Yorkshire Golden Retriever Club
Mr P Highfield	East Midland Gundog Club; Dove Valley Gundog Working Club; Leicestershire Gundog Society
Mr A Hopkins-Young	Midland Counties Field Trial Society; Cocker Spaniel Club
Mrs S Jenkins	West Dartmoor Working Gundog Club; Westward Gundog Society
Mrs A Johnson	Italian Spinone Club of Great Britain; Norfolk and Suffolk Field Trial Club
Mr R Johnston	Ulster Retriever Club; Labrador Retriever Club of Northern Ireland
Mr J Kean	The Pointer Club of Scotland; Northern Counties Pointer and Setter Society
Mrs F Kirk	International Gundog League Pointer and Setter Society; English Setter Club
Mrs W Knight	Eastern Counties Spaniel Society; London Cocker Spaniel Society
Mrs S Kuban	German Longhaired Pointer Club; German Shorthaired Pointer Club
Mrs B Kuen	Chiltern Gundog Society; Mid Norfolk Gundog Club
Mr H Lane	Cheshire, North Wales and Shropshire Retriever and Spaniel Society; West Midland Field Trial



	Society; Welsh and English Counties Spaniel Society
Mr R Major	Large Munsterlander Club; Brittany Club of Great Britain
Mr W Megaughin	Ulster Gundog League; Craigavon Gundog Club
Mr J Organ	Welsh & English Counties Spaniel Club & Shropshire Gundog Club
Mr T Rigby	German Wirehaired Pointer Club; Worcestershire Gundog Society
Mr C Scott	English Springer Spaniel Club of Scotland & Gamekeepers National Association
Mrs H Smith	Pointer Club; Mid Herts Gundog Club
Mr P Smith	Antrim & Down Springer Spaniel Club; Mid Ulster Gundog Association; English Springer Spaniel Club of Northern Ireland
Mr S Smith	Wiltshire Working Gundog Society; English Springer Spaniel Club of Wales
Mr M Stanbury	Duchy Working Gundog Club; North Devon Working Gundog Club
Mr P Turner	Ulster Golden Retriever Club; Northern Ireland Gundog, Field & Show Society
Ms S Whyte	Lincolnshire Gundog Society; Northumberland and Durham Labrador Retriever Club; Midland Counties Labrador Retriever Club; Yorkshire Retriever Field Trial Society
Mr F Wright	United Retriever Club; Labrador Retriever Club of Wales; Usk Valley Working Gundog Club

IN ATTENDANCE

Miss K Broers	Kennel Club Field Trial Secretary
Miss D Deuchar	Senior Manager - Governance & Education
Mrs A Mitchell	Senior Committee Secretary - Working Dog Activities Team
Miss C Welch	Officer - Working Dog Activities Team

ITEM 1. TO ELECT A CHAIRMAN FOR THE TERM OF THE COUNCIL

1. Mr Highfield was proposed and seconded as Chairman for the term of the Council. There being no further nominations, Mr Highfield was duly elected.
2. Mr Highfield wished to record the Council's appreciation of Mr Taylor's services to the Council during his six years as Chairman.

IN THE CHAIR: MR P HIGHFIELD

ITEM 2. TO ELECT A VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR THE TERM OF THE COUNCIL

3. Mrs S Jenkins was proposed and seconded as Vice-Chairman for the term of the Council. There being no further nominations, Mrs Jenkins was duly elected.



ITEM 3. TO ELECT COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES TO THE FIELD TRIALS COMMITTEE FOR THE VARIOUS SUB GROUPS EFFECTIVE FROM JUNE 2019 TO MAY 2022

4. The Council considered the election of representatives for each of the four sub-groups to the Field Trials Committee.
5. Mr Highfield, in his capacity as Chairman of the Council, automatically became a representative on the Committee, and would represent the Retriever sub-group. Following a ballot, Mrs Harrison was also elected to represent the Retriever sub-group.
6. Following a ballot, Mrs Jenkins and Mr Organ were elected to represent the Spaniel sub-group.
7. Mrs Asbury and Mr Kean were elected to represent Pointers and Setters.
8. Mr Chant and Mr Major were elected to represent HPRs.

ITEM 4. PRESENTATION TO THE COUNCIL ON KENNEL CLUB STRUCTURES AND PROCEDURES

9. The Council received a presentation on the Kennel Club and Liaison Council structure and procedures, and the role of Council representatives.

ITEM 5. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

10. Apologies were received from Mrs N Ackerley-Kemp, Mrs H Bradley, Miss C Calvert, Ms S Chichester, Mrs C Clarke, Ms A Faulds, Miss J Hurley, Miss V Stanley, and Mrs J Venturi-Rose.

ITEM 6. TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 27 JUNE 2018

11. The minutes from the meeting held on 27 June 2018 were approved as an accurate record.

ITEM 7. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING AND RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS PASSED TO THE FIELD TRIALS COMMITTEE

12. The updated Results of Recommendations document was noted by the Council (**Annex A to the Minutes refers**)
13. The Council also noted that a one-off meeting had taken place on 30 May 2018 between a small working group of 'A' Panel judges together with representatives from the Field Trial Committee, with the objective of clarifying the interpretation of a number of specific regulations relating to Retriever trials. The Council was informed that the interpretations agreed at the meeting had been published in the winter issue of the Field Trials Newsletter, and would be circulated in the near future to all Panel Retriever judges and Field Trial secretaries.



ITEM 8. PROPOSALS FROM SOCIETIES

Judges nominated to judge at a Spaniel Championship

Eastern Counties Spaniel Society

14. The proposal was presented by Mrs Knight on behalf of the Society, which wished to propose that judges nominated to judge at a Spaniel Championship should have competed in trials within the last 5 years. The proposal was seconded by Mr Organ.
15. The Council noted that existing criteria stated that a nominee must have been an 'A' Panel judge for a minimum of three years at the time of nomination and must not have judged the relevant championship within the previous three years at the time of nomination. However it was not of the view that this was sufficient, and it wished to ensure that judges of the Championship had up to date knowledge gained by having competed at trials within the previous 5 years.
16. A vote took place and, by a majority, the proposal was **recommended** for approval.

ITEM 9. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Attendance at J Regulations seminars

17. Tay Valley Gundog Association, Lothian & Borders Gundog Association, and Strathmore Working Gundog Club noted that the Kennel Club had changed the criteria for existing 'A' and 'B' Panel judges and from 1 January 2022 all judges must attend a Kennel Club Judges' Training Programme seminar on Kennel Club J Regulations for the appropriate sub-group and must pass the examination. It wished the Council to request how to address any issues arising as a result of some judges not wishing to take the examination, and to consider ways in which these issues may be minimised.
18. Unfortunately Ms Faulds, who had planned to present the item, was unable to be present. Mr Castle presented the item, together with a similar item submitted by Moray Firth Spaniel and Retriever Club, which, whilst acknowledging the desirability of education in all areas of gundog activity, wished to request that the Council explore other options in order to avoid the potential loss of Panel Judges and the consequent loss of considerable knowledge and expertise within the discipline.
19. The Council wished to express its disappointment that the requirement for Panel judges to take and pass the examination had been introduced by the Kennel Club with little or no consultation. There was considerable concern that some judges may not wish to take the examination and as a result would be lost to the discipline. This may in turn lead to a shortage of judges, particularly in areas such as Scotland and Northern Ireland, which would cause difficulties for societies.
20. It acknowledged the importance of judges having a full and up to date knowledge of the J Regulations, but it was also of the view that this should not override the need for judges with a good understanding of dogs, game, and fieldcraft.
21. It was emphasised however that the seminar, and the examination, were aimed solely at ensuring that judges had a full understanding of the J Regulations, and that there was no intent to tell them how they should judge.
22. A suggestion was made that a two-tier approach may be taken whereby lists of judges for each Panel would be published, and would indicate whether or not a specific judge had passed the examination. This would enable clubs to select judges in the full knowledge of whether or not they had done so. However there was some concern that such a system may be overly complex, and that it would not encourage 'A' Panel judges to take the examination.



23. Another suggestion was that 'A' Panel judges may be sent a copy of the seminar script which they may read at their leisure, and then take the examination without having to attend the full seminar. This would allow them to take the examination whilst acknowledging that their experience and knowledge did not require them to attend the full seminar. It was noted that seminar scripts for all four sub-groups were already available for download from the Kennel Club's website via the following link:

<https://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/training/judges-education/field-trial-judges-training/training-seminars-for-field-trial-judges/>

24. In order to address the concern that some experienced judges would be reluctant to attend a seminar, it was suggested that the examination should be made available online, as some judges may be happy to undertake it in the privacy of their own homes.
25. Alternatively, test sessions may be set up in locations such as the Kennel Club office in London, the Kennel Club Building at Stoneleigh, and the Emblehope Estate, to which 'A' Panel judges may be invited in order to take the examination.
26. Having discussed the matter fully, the Council wished for its views to be referred to the Field Trials Committee for review and further consideration, with particular reference to its concerns regarding the potential loss of experienced and knowledgeable judges.
27. A query was raised as to whether competitors, who were required to sign an entry form stating that they were aware of the J Regulations, should also be required to attend the seminar. The Council noted that many societies encouraged their members to do so.
28. On a separate note, a query was raised as to why amended regulations came into force on 1 January each year when the trialling season began on 2 February. It was agreed that a change in the effective date for new or amended regulations should be referred to the Field Trials Committee for consideration.

Mock examination papers

29. The Labrador Retriever Club, represented by Mr Cullis, wished to suggest that in view of the requirement for all Panel Judges to have passed the J Regulations examination, the Kennel Club should put a mock Judges' Examination paper on its website which would enable judges to familiarise themselves with the format of the examination and the type of questions which would be asked. It anticipated that doing so would give judges confidence and would encourage them to take the examination.
30. The Council was advised that the seminar scripts were already available online for any judges or competitors wishing to read them, and that plans were in hand to place a number of mock questions onto the Kennel Club's website in order to provide potential candidates with an idea of the 'look and feel' of the examination, and to reassure them that it was not unduly demanding.
31. The Council was highly supportive of such dummy questions being available online.
32. It was also highlighted that facilities were in place to assist any candidates with conditions such as dyslexia or other difficulties. Such candidates may be given extra time to take the examination, or would be provided with an independent reader to read questions to them.

Refusal of entries

33. Ms Whyte, representing Yorkshire Retriever Field Trial Society, requested the Council to discuss the circumstances under which an entry may be refused. The Society



particularly wished to address concerns regarding the possibility of anti-field sports campaigners entering trials and thus receiving draw information which gave details such as meet location and time.

34. It was noted that in relation to the right to refuse entries, non-members of a society must be treated in the same way as members, as described in the Kennel Club's advisory document on the exercise of the right of societies to refuse entries to Kennel Club licensed events.
35. The Council was understanding of concerns that detailed information regarding trials may fall into the hands of anti-field trialling campaigners. Although there had not been any serious incidents involving such campaigners, it agreed that it was prudent to consider precautions may be taken to prevent such incidents occurring.
36. Noting that societies were not obliged to send schedules to non-members, it was suggested that it may be possible for a society to implement a vetting process prior to sending a schedule to a non-member.
37. A further suggestion was that non-members would be required to provide names of a proposer and seconder on their entry form which would enable the society to reassure itself that the entry had been made by a genuine competitor. It was agreed that this would be a helpful measure with the slight amendment that in order to avoid any confusion with an application for membership, the entry form would require the names of two suitable individuals who could vouch for the person submitting the entry.
38. Accordingly, the Council requested that the suggestion be referred to the Field Trials Committee for consideration as a means of preventing unsuitable individuals from entering trials.

Clarification of Regulation J(A)4.b.

39. The discussion item was presented by Mrs Carpenter on behalf of Bristol and West Working Gundog Society and the Hungarian Vizsla Club. The clubs sought clarification on Regulation J(A)4.b. For all Sub-groups Required to Retrieve, which stated:

'Judges at Open Stakes and Championships should ask their guns not to shoot directly over a dog when it is already out working on a retrieve. In other stakes, Judges should ask their guns not to shoot when a dog is already out working on a retrieve unless by so doing, they are certain there would be no chance of distracting the dog from its task.'
40. The clubs were of the view that the Regulation required revision in the interests of clarity, as it was unclear whether the final sentence, after the comma, included Open Stakes and Championships. There was some concern that Novice dogs may be put at a disadvantage at an Open Stake or Championship as they may be more easily distracted than an experienced dog.
41. The Council was sympathetic to the views expressed by the clubs, and it accepted that it was not desirable for guns to be put into the position of making a split-second decision as to whether or not to shoot over a dog which was out working. However it was of the view that the issue may be adequately addressed via the pre-trial briefing in which the judges may direct guns not to shoot over dogs out working, especially at Novice trials.
42. Accordingly it did not support any amendment being made to the existing Regulation.

Review of Regulation J(A)4.e.



43. Mrs Carpenter, representing Bristol and West Working Gundog Society and the Hungarian Vizsla Club, requested that the Council review Regulation J(A)4.e. which stated:
- 'Handlers should be instructed where to try from and be given reasonable directions as to where the game fell. If the dogs tried fail to complete the retrieve, the Judges should search the area of fall and, if they find the game, the dogs tried, save in exceptional circumstances, will be eliminated. However, should a dog or dogs prove to have been tried in the wrong area they should not be so penalised.'
44. The clubs wished to raise concerns that where all of the judges were out looking for a bird, dogs may be left unattended and may run in without being witnessed by any of the judges. It was suggested that a review of this regulation be carried out to state that either dogs were to be put on leads, or that a judge must remain with the dogs. It was anticipated that this would make the procedure clear and would ensure that should a dog run in, it may be marked accordingly.
45. The Council noted that the Regulation stated that 'the Judges should search the area of fall' but did not require that all of the judges should do so, thereby allowing for one or two judges (in a 3 or 4 judge system) to remain to supervise the dogs. However it acknowledged that due to the distances involved at some trials, it may not be possible for one judge to effectively supervise all of the dogs as they may not all be clearly visible from one standpoint.
46. The Council was in full agreement that some clarification was required but after discussion it concluded that an amendment to the Regulation was not required. However it requested that guidance which had been issued some time ago via an article written by Mr G Cox, and published in the Field Trials Newsletter, should be republished.
- Use of All Aged Stakes as an extra tier of qualification for Retriever Open Stakes
47. The discussion item was presented by Mr Cullis on behalf of the Labrador Retriever Club which wished to suggest the use of All Aged Stakes as an extra tier of qualification for Retriever Open Stakes in order to reduce the number of dogs entering.
48. It was clarified that the suggestion would only refer to Retrievers and would not apply to other sub-groups.
49. The Council was not of the view that such a step would be a positive one, and did not consider that it would provide any benefit. Accordingly, it was not supported.
- Swapping of places in draws
50. Mr Cullis, on behalf of the Labrador Retriever Club, wished to suggest that in order to prevent unnecessary journeys and to reduce the carbon footprint of the discipline, competitors should be able to swap their place in a draw with another who had a run in another part of the country, on the same day, provided that both competitors were members of both clubs.
51. The Council was of the view that doing so would be logistically problematic for field trial secretaries, and that there would be difficulties in ensuring that both competitors were appropriately qualified for the trials for which they were swapping places. Further, it was acknowledged that many competitors enjoyed travelling to different locations.
52. The discussion item was not supported.

Entry to Field Trials and Working Tests



53. Chiltern Gundog Society, represented by Mrs Kuen, wished to suggest that it should be made mandatory that entries for field trials and working tests must be made online only, as online services currently available made the entry process easier and less time consuming.
54. Concerns were raised that such a step would have a highly detrimental impact on competitors who were based in those areas of the country which did not have good access to broadband, or to those who did not have access to computers. It was considered that removing the facility for paper-based entries would be unfair and unduly restrictive on those who wished to continue to use them and that the imposition of a requirement to use online systems would be discriminatory.
55. The Council was unanimous in not supporting the discussion item.
- Game falling in close proximity to a dog
56. Mrs Jenkins presented the discussion item on behalf of Westward Gundog Society, which wished to seek the views of the Council as to whether, in the situation where game that had been shot and, on its trajectory, struck a dog and remained in close proximity of (i.e. touching) the dog, the dog should be eliminated if it picked the bird without having to move as it would if making a retrieve.
57. The Society was of the view that in such a situation, the dog should be credited for adding to the bag, as the bird would not then be used for another dog as a retrieve. This may not be classed as a retrieve, but would allow an indication of the quality of a dog's mouth when the bird had been checked for damage.
58. The Council agreed that it was not possible to be prescriptive on the issue as the circumstances would be different in every case. It concluded that the J Regulations could not cover every potential scenario and that the decision as to whether to eliminate the dog, or to credit it with a retrieve, should be at the discretion of the judge, using his or her knowledge and experience and taking into account all of the individual circumstances.
59. Accordingly it did not support the discussion item.
- Number of Spaniel trials
60. The discussion item was presented by Mr Askew on behalf of the Utility Gundog Society.
61. The Council was requested to discuss the possibility of imposing a restriction on the number of Spaniel trials of the same denomination taking place on the same day, due to concerns that filling the card for such stakes was causing difficulties. It wished to suggest that a minimum distance/travel time should be considered before a licence was granted for a stake on the same day, or that the number of dogs be reduced from 16 to 12.
62. The Council was sympathetic to the predicament of societies which found themselves in this position, and accepted the desirability of maintaining a high standard at all trials, which was not always possible where there had been difficulties in filling the card. However it raised concerns regarding the imposition of a blanket ruling on a minimum distance due to regional differences. It also noted that in many cases, clubs were reliant on grounds to offer dates and it was often not possible for a club to schedule a trial on a date of its own choice.



63. It was hoped that in some cases it may be possible for such clashes to be avoided by means of communication between field trial societies but it acknowledged that it was not always possible to do so.
64. Field trial secretaries were encouraged to make use of the online Field Trial diary which was updated on a weekly basis in order to avoid clashes. It was anticipated that the implementation of the Kennel Club's new database, due to go 'live' by the end of 2019, would provide a facility for dates to be viewed online in real time which it was hoped would be a valuable resource for field trial secretaries.
65. The database would also provide a facility for applications for licences to be made online.
66. In view of the discussion, the Council concluded that imposing any restriction on dates of trials would not be a positive step, and it did not support it.

ITEM 10. EVALUATION FORMS

67. The Council noted guidance from the office regarding the way in which evaluation forms relating to co-judges should be completed by Panel judges, and the way in which they were used to make decisions about a judge's progression on to the next Panel.
68. The importance of completing such forms fully, and providing the maximum amount of information, was emphasised, as this was vital in making a clear assessment of a judge's suitability to progress.
69. The Council noted that a facility for completion of evaluation forms to be completed online was available for those wishing to make use of it. The form may be found at:

<https://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/activities/field-trials-working-gundogs/field-trial-judge-evaluation-form/>

ITEM 11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

70. The Council noted that the next meeting would take place in June 2020. The exact date would be confirmed in due course.

ITEM 12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Safety at field trials

71. Mrs Bridgwater wished to raise the issue of safety at field trials, following an incident at which three people had been injured whilst attending a trial and which had been the subject of a court case and considerable interest from the press.
72. The importance of the highest standards of safety was emphasised, with adherence to etiquette and good practice being vital for all concerned.
73. Clubs were reminded of the necessity to keep their health and safety policies under constant review. Detailed risk assessments should be in place for each individual trial which took into account the specific circumstances and how any risks may be mitigated. A generalised risk assessment form may be used as a basis, but it must be adapted for each specific event. The Kennel Club provided a standard template for this purpose. **(Annex B to the Minutes refers).**
74. In response to a query regarding insurance, it was clarified that societies were responsible for ensuring that appropriate insurance was in place. The Kennel Club



could not provide specific advice regarding insurance, but the Council was advised that Hiscox was the Kennel Club's preferred supplier, and could offer suitable insurance for field trial societies.

75. The Council was of the view that it would be helpful for the Kennel Club to issue guidance on the issue of health and safety at trials. It agreed that the Field Trials Committee should be requested to consider doing so, with advice from the Kennel Club's legal department.

Preference in draws

76. A query was raised regarding preferences in draws. It was noted that the Kennel Club had recently issued guidance stating that all members of a society must be treated equally when carrying out draws, and it was clarified that clubs should amend their own rules, where necessary, to reflect this.

The meeting closed at 1.10 pm

MR P HIGHFIELD
Chairman

THE KENNEL CLUB'S MISSION STATEMENT

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



Annex A to the Minutes

UPDATED RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FORWARDED TO THE FIELD TRIALS COMMITTEE FROM THE FIELD TRIALS LIAISON COUNCIL HELD AT THE KENNEL CLUB ON 27 JUNE 2018

Proposals from societies and individuals

1. Guildford Working Gundog Club
Proposed by Mrs Harrison, seconded by Mrs Venturi Rose

Proposed amendments to Regulations J4.a, J7.i.(1), J(B).2.(b) and K2.(c).(2)

The Committee noted that the Council's recommendations were made in light of the challenges of getting runs in Open Retriever Stakes and that under the terms of the proposal, the maximum number of permitted competitors in a One-day Open Retriever stake would be increased to 16. This would be an optional maximum which would not be mandatory, and clubs may make the decision as to the number of competitors based on the likely availability of game, noting that it was important to ensure that there was sufficient game to provide adequate opportunities for the dogs to be tested.

The Committee was in agreement with the Council's views, and accordingly, recommended the amendments for approval. The following amendments were subsequently approved by the Board:

Regulation J4.a(2):

TO:

(2) One-day Open Stakes - maximum ~~42~~ **16**, minimum 10.
(Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold.)
(Effective 1 January 2019)

Regulation J7.i.(1):

TO:

(1) Retrievers

A First, Second, Third or Fourth in a 24-Dog Open Stake. First, Second or Third in a ~~42-Dog~~ **One-day** Open Stake.

(Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold.)
(Effective 1 January 2019)

Regulation J(B).2.(b):

TO:

(b) One-day Open Stakes: maximum ~~42~~ **16**, minimum 10.
(Effective 1 January 2019)

Regulation K2.(c).(2):

TO:

(2) Retrievers

(a) A dog placed first in the Retriever Championship.

(b) A dog which gains two first awards in 24-dog Open Stakes under three different Panel A Judges.



- (c) A dog which gains a first award in one 24-dog and one ~~42-dog~~ **One-day** Open Stake under three different Panel A Judges.
- (d) A dog which gains a first award in three ~~42-dog~~ **One-day** Open Stakes under three different Panel A Judges.

In a 24-dog Stake there must be no fewer than 20 runners and in a ~~42-dog~~ **One-day** Stake no fewer than 10 runners. For a dog to be entitled to the title of Field Trial Champion one of its wins must be in a Stake open to all breeds of Retriever. (Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold.)
(Effective 1 January 2019)

The Committee, and subsequently the Board, also approved the following consequential amendment to Regulation J(B)3.(e):

Regulation J(B)3.(e):

TO:

(e) Where the Trial is to be run under the three judge system, the dogs should be split equally, and in numerical order, between the three judges, i.e. 1,2,3,4 with the right hand judge, 5,6,7,8 with the middle judge and 9, 10, 11 and 12 with the left hand judge in a ~~42-dog~~ **One-day** stake and 1-8, 9-16 and 17-24 in a two day. Dogs should then rotate from right to left so that the dogs under the left hand judge in the first round should be seen by the right hand judge next and so on. The rotation should continue until a run-off when numerical order will resume.

- 2. Guildford Working Gundog Club
Proposed by Mrs Harrison, seconded by Mr Highfield

Proposed amendment to Regulation J7.k

The Committee acknowledged that the proposed amendment was minor in nature and that clarification was necessary in order to remove any ambiguity, in relation to preference in the draw for All Aged stakes. It recommended for approval the following amendment which was subsequently approved by the Board.

Regulation J7.k

TO:

All Aged Stakes may be restricted by any conditions determined by the society (See J3.d(2)). In all cases members' dogs **which meet the conditions of entry** should take preference in the draw.
(Insertion in bold)
(Effective 1 January 2019)

Discussion items

- 3. Yorkshire Retriever Field Trial Society

Discussion item: Style of handling

The Society sought clarification as to whether a judge had the right to enforce his or her handling techniques or preferences onto a competitor, and how the issue may be addressed by the Kennel Club.

It was agreed that the matter should be referred to the Field Trial Judges Sub-Group for further consideration as to how it may be addressed, and appropriate guidance subsequently disseminated to all Panel and Non-Panel judges.



The Field Trial Judges Sub-Group had agreed that judges should not impose their own style of handling on to the handler, or impose any penalties due to the competitor's style of handling, unless the handling was in breach of J Regulations.

Guidance will be published in the Spring issue of the Field Trial Newsletter.

4. Golden Retriever Club of Northumbria

Discussion item: Judges Assessment Forms

The Club had sought the views of the Council on the possibility of non-Panel and 'B' Panel judges completing assessment forms on their co-judges if they wished to comment on their experience of judging alongside them. The suggestion was made in view of concerns that, in some instances, non-Panel and 'B' Panel judges had felt intimidated by their senior judges, and were concerned that this could lead to their non-progression onto either the 'B' or 'A' Panel.

It was noted that in such circumstances the junior judge may make a report in the trial's Incident Book should he or she feel the conduct of the senior judge was not acceptable. However it was suggested that it would be preferable for a specific form to be available for use by junior judges, which may be used to supply feedback, positive or negative, on the senior judge. It was also suggested that should the office receive a set number of adverse reports concerning a particular judge, the matter should be referred to the Field Trials Committee for consideration as to whether any action was necessary.

The Council's suggestion was referred to the Field Trials Committee which did not support the suggestion of the use of a specific form to be used by junior judges. It was of the view that in the instance of a non-Panel judge wishing to raise an issue in relation to an 'A' or 'B' Panel judge the Incident Book should be utilised.

5. United Retriever Club

Discussion item: J Regulation booklet

The Club wished to suggest that a copy of the current J Regulations booklet should be sent automatically to every field trial panel judge, free of charge.

The Council did not support the discussion item, but agreed that a reminder should be placed in the Field Trials Newsletter to all judges that they should ensure they were familiar with the current J Regulations prior to each judging appointment, and that these were available for download at no cost.

With the agreement of the Field Trials Committee, suitable guidance will be published in the Spring issue of the Field Trials Newsletter.

6. Cambridge Field Trial Society

Discussion item: Errors in draws

The Society requested clarification regarding the correct procedure to be followed where an accidental error was made by a club when conducting the draw for a field trial, such as competitors having been omitted from the draw, competitors having two entries in the first draw, or preferences having been incorrectly entered. It was clarified by the office that the Kennel Club was not prescriptive on these issues as long as the regulations had been adhered to, and that club committees had discretion as to how to proceed, based on the circumstances. The Kennel Club office was available to provide



guidance on the matter but it was noted that the final decision lay with the club committee as a whole.

With the agreement of the Field Trials Committee, suitable guidance will be published in the Spring issue of the Field Trials Newsletter.

7. Northumberland & Durham Labrador Retriever Club

Discussion item: Number of Council meetings

The Club requested that the Council discuss whether, in order for the Council to truly represent the trialling community, and to be more effective at a grassroots level, it should meet twice a year instead of once. It was suggested that the Council could consider a reduction of size if necessary for cost reasons. The Council did not support the suggestion for reasons of practicality, but considered ways in which its time may be used in an effective manner.

The office was requested to publish suitable guidance in the Field Trials Newsletter as to the remit of the Council and the criteria for submissions to the agenda, and how the Council should be used to ensure its maximum effectiveness.

With the agreement of the Field Trials Committee, suitable guidance will be published in the Spring issue of the Field Trials Newsletter.

8. Northumberland & Durham Labrador Retriever Club

Discussion item: Incident Book

The Club wished to suggest that the Kennel Club rename the Incident Book for use by the field trialling community, and that it publish an article on its purpose, giving examples on how and when it can be used. The matter had been raised due to concerns that many within the field trialling community were unaware of the existence of the Incident Book, or its purpose.

The Council did not conclude that it was necessary for the Incident Book to be renamed, but it was agreed that an item would be placed in the Field Trials Newsletter drawing the attention of clubs, judges and competitors to the existence of the Incident Book and the way in which it should be used.

With the agreement of the Field Trials Committee, suitable guidance will be published in the Spring issue of the Field Trials Newsletter.

The Council is also invited to note that the following new Regulation, will come into effect on 1 January 2020 with regard to the completion of the Incident Book:

Regulation J5.

g. Incident Book

A copy of the Kennel Club Incident Book, containing details of any incidents occurring at the trial, must be submitted to the Kennel Club within 14 days.



Annex B to the Minutes

GENERIC RISK ASSESSMENT FOR FIELD TRIALS

A) Possible Hazards:

1. Personal injury resulting from the intended or accidental discharge of a shotgun, driven or falling game, noise or blast.
2. Slips and falls on ground that may be wet, uneven, sloping or marshy.
3. Hazards associated with the crossing of water courses, hedges and fences, other natural and man-made obstacles. Whether shooting, beating, picking-up, competing or members of public present.
4. Injury resulting from direct contact with barbed wire, thorn hedges, low branches or other naturally occurring or constructed features of the landscape and from livestock that may be alarmed or disturbed.
5. Hazards associated with the use of vehicles on private land or public highways.
6. Hazards associated with being in the vicinity of machinery on private land or public highway. This is to include crop spraying activities and chemicals that may be associated with this operation.

At risk are:-

- Persons using shotguns (referred to as Guns) and their companions.
- Persons employed or Volunteers or Competitors that collect and retrieve shot game with dogs.
- Those Volunteers, Officials and Judges who are present to run the Field Trial.
- Drivers of vehicles, On-lookers and Members of the Public.

B) Code of Practice to be observed by all persons taking part or watching an authorised Field Trial:

1. The Chief Steward will brief all present before moving off. A copy of this Risk Assessment will be displayed within the registration area.
2. Vehicles provided to transport Guns, Competitors and Officials must be suitable for the purpose and the terrain that is to be encountered. Adequate seating must be provided. Dogs will not be allowed in the driving compartment of the vehicles. The driver of each vehicle must be acquainted with the route and terrain over which they are to travel and be aware of the other vehicles in the party.
3. All persons involved should wear suitable non-restrictive clothing, adequate to provide protection from the elements and stout water resistant footwear.



4. All Guns must be competent at handling shotguns in a safe manner and must be in possession of a valid shotgun certificate, and have Public Liability Insurance.
5. Shotguns and ammunition must not be left unattended under any circumstance. Guns must keep their weapons in a covered slip until arrival at their allocated position.
6. A shot should only be taken when it is safe to do so. Guns must be aware at all times of the proximity of those closest to them: other Guns, The Red Flag, Picker up, Officials, Judges, Competitors and Members of the Public; the location of public footpaths, bridleways, highways and livestock in the vicinity.
7. In the event of an emergency the trial will be suspended immediately and all weapons must be unloaded and placed back in the covered slip. Should this occurrence be caused by the involvement of persons that are opposed to the activity the Organiser in consultation with the Chief Steward and Judges must arrange to vacate the ground without the need for confrontation.
8. All members of the party must respect the property on which they are invited guests, be aware of the local terrain and any likely hazards and conduct themselves in a friendly and environmental way.
9. Members of the Public and Competitors that are not in line must stay behind the **RED FLAG** at all times and obey the instruction of Officials or Members of the Estate staff.
10. Everybody involved must keep away from agricultural machinery, although it will not normally be working in the areas where the field trial is taking place.

If this code of practice is observed, the risk to human health and safety during this authorized activity are deemed to be LOW.