



**MINUTES OF THE KENNEL CLUB SHOWS LIAISON COUNCIL MEETING HELD
ON TUESDAY 23 APRIL 2024 AT 11.00AM IN CONFERENCE ROOM 1, THE
KENNEL CLUB, CLARGES STREET**

PRESENT:

Mr S Bennett	Midlands
Ms A Benoist*	North East
Mr N Bryant*	South East and East Anglia
Mrs A Cawthera-Purdy	General and Group Championship Shows
Mrs GC Chapman	South East and East Anglia
Miss J Cutler	South East and East Anglia
Mr T Johnston*	Scotland
Mr P McClure*	North West
Miss J McLauchlan*	North East
Mr A Moss	North West
Mr M Ord*	North East
Mr J Purnell	North West
Mrs C Smedley*	General and Group Championship Shows
Miss F Snook*	South/South West
Mr J Stubbs*	General and Group Championship Shows
Miss S Thomson*	Scotland
Mrs J Walmsley	South/South West

* Attended via Microsoft Teams

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mrs H Kerfoot	Chief Canine Health, Events and Activities Officer
Miss D Deuchar	Head of Canine Activities
Mr J Winnington	Breed Shows Team Manager
Miss T Newson	Senior Breed Shows Team Officer
Miss R Mansfield	WDA Committee Secretary

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CAWThERA-PURDY

ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1. Apologies had been received from Mr P Davies, Mr K Greenland, Mrs TL Harrison, Mr J McCreath, Mrs I McManus, Mr A Paisey, Mr N Price, Mrs D Rose, Mr N Salisbury, Mrs D Stewart-Ritchie, and Mr M Sanders.

ITEM 2. TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 25 APRIL 2023

2. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 25 April 2023 were approved as an accurate record.

ITEM 3. RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS/MATTERS ARISING

3. The Council noted the following results of recommendations from the previous meeting.

a. Completing of Certificates

Proposal: That if requested by the judge, the steward may complete but must not sign certificates.

Outcome: The proposal and necessary regulation amendment had been referred to and recommended by the SEC and subsequently approved by the Board effective from 1 January 2024.

b. Baby Puppy Classes

Proposal: That baby puppy classes be introduced at any breed club shows.

Outcome: The proposal and necessary regulation amendment had been referred to and recommended by the SEC and subsequently approved by the Board effective from 1 January 2024.

c. Junior Certificate of Excellence/Junior Award (non-CC)

Proposal: That a new award be introduced for breeds not allocated championship status.

Outcome: The proposal was considered by the SEC and the Board and was currently progressing in line with the development of the Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system.

4. The Chair praised the Council for its work on progressing proposals and getting them approved by the Board.

ITEM 4. PROPOSALS

- a. Proposed amendments to Regulations F(1)26.c and F(1)26
Proposed by Mr A Paisey

F(1)26.c

~~“Consequently, selection of Best Puppy in Breed, Best Puppy in Group and Best Puppy in Show must follow the selection of Best of Breed, Best of Group and Best in Show respectively.”~~

(Deletions struck through)

F(1)26

“Where a Best Puppy in Show competition is scheduled the Best Puppy in Show is a puppy which has been declared Best Puppy in Breed or Best Puppy in Group. A puppy is a dog of 6 and not exceeding 12 calendar months of age on the first day of the show. **The selection of Best in Show must follow the selection of Best Puppy in Show and Best Veteran in Show (if scheduled) respectively**”.

(Additions in bold)

5. Mr Paisey and Mr Bennett wished the Council to consider an amendment to the above regulations so that Best in Show was the last competition of the day, concluding a show. Mr Bennett, along with the office presented the proposal on behalf of Mr Paisey in his absence and Mr Stubbs seconded the proposal.
 6. It was suggested that the amendment would improve dog welfare by reducing the length of time younger/older dogs were required to be at the show. It was also hoped that it would create a larger audience for Best Puppy or Best Veteran in show and an improved audience for Best in Show. It would also remove any ambiguity on which exhibits were eligible for Best in Show.
 7. A query was raised as to whether if a puppy were to win Best of Breed and Best Puppy in Breed then compete for Best Puppy in Group and did not win whether it would be ineligible for Best in Show as a beaten dog. It was confirmed that this would not be the case as Best Puppy was a separate competition and the beaten dog regulation had been removed previously.
 8. A query was raised as to whether it would need to be the same judge for BPIS, BVIS and BIS. It was clarified that it would be up to the societies to decide that, and it could potentially be the same for all three challenges.
 9. It was raised that should the judge be the same for all three challenges it could potentially mean that exhibits that had not won the BPIS or BVIS challenge may then not stay for BIS due to having already competed under that judge and not been awarded. It was thought that this was a potential negative of the amendment but was not significant enough to reject the proposal.
 10. Accordingly, the Council voted and unanimously **recommended** the Show Executive Committee to consider the above regulation amendments.
- b. Proposed addition to the Code of Best Practice for Judges and Stewards
Proposed by Mr A Moss

11. Mr Moss wished the Council to consider an addition to the above document to include that it was the steward's responsibility to give out promotional materials with the prize cards as directed by the society. Mr Purnell seconded the proposal.
12. A view was expressed that the distribution of leaflets or flyers was an effective way to make money for clubs via sponsorship. However, it was noted that it was not currently written into the code of best practice that it was expected of stewards and as such there was a small minority who felt that 'the club may be getting paid for it, but they aren't paying us for it'.
13. A concern was raised as to whether making it mandatory to hand out materials would mean losing stewards, particularly as it could be considered difficult to fill the role currently and the reason for the proposal was that stewards had been declining to hand out leaflets. However, it was felt that only a minority of stewards were declining when asked to carry out the task and it should not cause too much of an issue.
14. It was briefly discussed whether there should be sanctions if stewards did not wish to hand out the promotional materials, but the Council were firmly against that idea. While it was appreciated that shows relied on sponsorship from companies and The Kennel Club should try and support that, the Council would not wish to make it mandatory.
15. It was also felt that societies should be supportive of their stewards and where possible consider offering a small amount of money, lunch, car park and/or camping passes as encouragement.
16. It was clarified by Mr Moss that the intention of the proposal was to formalise an already existing practice which would help show societies if they were requested by sponsors to hand out promotional materials. The Council agreed that something should be included in the Code of Best Practice but there was concern about the use of the word 'responsibility'.
17. It was suggested to soften the wording and that the existing wording in the Code of Best Practice, section 11.12, be amended as follows:

When placed in order of judge's awards – give out prizes, **and any promotional materials as provided by the society.**
(Addition in bold.)
18. Mr Moss proposed the above amendment and Mrs Cawthera-Purdy seconded it. The Council was in agreement with the suggestion and **recommended** the Show Executive Committee to consider the change to the document.
19. It was noted that the wording from the Code of Best Practice also appeared in regulation F(C)2.c.(2) and therefore it was noted that should the Show Executive Committee support the change the following amendment should also be made within the regulations.

Regulation F(C)2.c.(2)

TO:

When placed in order of judge's awards – give out prizes, **and any promotional materials provided by the society.**

(Addition in bold.)

- c. Proposed addition of Best Veteran in Show regulations
Proposed by Mr A Moss

20. Mr Moss wished the Council to consider adding Best Veteran in Show (BVIS) to the regulations. Best in Show (BIS) and Best Puppy in Show (BPIS) were regulated for whereas Best Veteran in Show and any other 'best in show' competitions were not. Mrs Walmsley seconded the proposal.

Best Veteran in Show

Championship shows and breed club open and limited shows

At championship shows and breed club open and limited shows where a Best Veteran in Show competition is scheduled the Best Veteran in Show is a Veteran which has been declared Best Veteran in Breed or Best Veteran in Group. A Veteran is a dog of 7 years or more on the first day of the show.

General and group championship shows.

Best Veteran in Breed

A Best Veteran is declared from the Veteran breed classes. Where Veteran classes are not classified in a breed, Best Veteran in Breed can be declared from any Veterans entered in any breed classes.

Best Veteran in Group

Best Veteran in Group and subsequent Veteran group placings must be selected from: -

- 1. Those Veterans declared Best Veteran in Breed**
- 2. The Veterans declared Best Veteran from the Any Variety Not Separately Classified classes in each group**
- 3. The Veteran declared Best Veteran from the Any Variety Imported Breed Register classes in each group**

General open and general limited shows

At those shows where a Best Veteran in Show competition is scheduled the Best Veteran in Show is the exhibit which has been declared best from the Any Variety Veteran classes scheduled. A Veteran is a dog of 7 years or more on the first day of the show.

(Additions in bold)

(Effective TBC)

21. It was thought that there was currently confusion from show to show as to which dogs could be declared Best Veteran in Breed and subsequently Best Veteran in Group and Best Veteran in Show. A suggestion was raised that the competition become an 'opt in' at shows with exhibitors being fully aware of what classes they needed to enter if they wished to progress within the Best Veteran competition. It was thought to be much easier for judges and stewards to sort out on the day of the show with them not having to go through each class hunting for potentially eligible Veterans.
22. General open and limited shows did not have the scope of classification to allow for Veteran classes in all breeds but many schedule Any Variety (AV) group Veteran classes (e.g. AV Gundog Veteran) from which a Best Veteran in Show could ultimately be declared.
23. It was clarified that the intention was not to make it mandatory to hold BVIS but to standardise the regulations for when it was scheduled, replicating what was the normal practice for BPIS. It was noted that this was not reflected in the proposed wording and Mrs Chapman proposed to add 'if scheduled' to the proposal. Mr Moss seconded the suggestion. It was further noted that the proposal was mainly relevant to general and group championship shows, rather than breed club shows or general and group open shows.
24. A query was raised regarding the proposed regulations stating that only dogs that had competed in veteran classes would be eligible for BVIS noting that to replicate the BPIS regulations, the proposal should state that to be eligible to challenge for BVIB a dog could be entered into any breed class and not only the Veteran class. It was proposed by Mrs Cawthera-Purdy that the regulations should therefore replicate the BPIS regulations, confirming that veterans should be able to come from any class. While it was appreciated that the introduction of the regulation may make it harder for stewards, it was thought that it would be better for the exhibitors. The proposal was unanimously seconded.
25. It was suggested that in order to identify the appropriate regulation wording to replicate the BPIS regulations the office would work with Mrs Cawthera-Purdy and Mr Moss to create wording to submit to the Show Executive Committee. It was noted that this would mean the regulations may come into effect in 2025 if approved as opposed to waiting for the next Council meeting which would be spring 2025.
26. There was concern raised by the office that adding BVIS regulations would work for general and group championship shows but not for open shows. It was suggested that the regulation for BVIS should be introduced for general and group championship shows.
27. It was proposed by Mr Moss that for general, open and limited shows that the proposal listed on the agenda be used. It was felt that this was similar to the current process that shows undertook and would be less confusing for competitors. Miss Cutler seconded the proposal.

28. It was agreed that the office, Mr Moss and Ms Cawthera-Purdy would collaborate and formulate an amended regulation that would mirror the BPIS regulations and it would be submitted to the Show Executive Committee for consideration.
- d. Proposed amendment to Regulation F(1)22.d – Best Puppy in Show
Proposed by Mr A Moss
29. Mr Moss requested the Council consider an amendment to the above regulation to introduce an interval for judging Best Puppy in Show (excluding single breed championship shows) starting to provide more opportunities for judges to judge Best Puppy in Show. The proposal would bring the appointment on an equal footing with Best in Show. Mr Stubbs seconded the proposal.

F(1)22.d.

“(4) Judges for Best Puppy in Show (excluding single breed championship shows)

(a) There must an interval of not less than 9 calendar months between appointments to judge Best Puppy in Show at a championship show.”

(Additions in bold)

(Effective TBC)

30. It was noted that currently there was no timeframe restriction on when a judge could judge Best Puppy in Group and/or Best Puppy in Show, therefore the same judge could judge multiple shows consecutively. Whereas for the ‘main’ group and Best in Show there was a time interval in the regulations. The Council agreed that this was not an ideal situation.
31. The office informed the Council that should it wish for this to be included in the regulations, it would not be currently possible for Kennel Club systems to accommodate the checks needed to manage it. It could be proposed to be added to the list of requirements to be developed into the system however, there was an extensive list of items that had been requested. It would therefore be highly unlikely to happen in a short timeframe as items were prioritised for development. It was highlighted that it would need to be a manual process in the interim, which would add an element of risk and human error as well as additional staff resourcing.
32. The Council thanked the office for the information and appreciated the timeframes for implementation on the Kennel Club systems but felt that it was the Council’s responsibility to progress items that had been brought to its attention.
33. A discussion followed on whether it was necessary to regulate the judging timeframe or whether it would be possible to make it a recommendation to clubs and societies. However, it was ultimately decided that if it were only a recommendation to clubs and not a regulation then it would not be able to be policed and penalised if not adhered to. That would then create issues if a judge did not adhere to the recommendation.

34. The Council ultimately **recommended** the proposal as worded above for consideration by the SEC.
- e. Proposed amendment to Regulation F(1)11.b.(11) - Veterinary cover
Proposed by Miss S Thomson
35. Miss Thomson requested the Council consider an amendment to the above regulation so that shows where a vet wasn't present were only required to list vets local to the venue and not have a specific vet on call.

F(1)11.(11)

Catalogues

"For shows at which a veterinary surgeon is not present, **a note to state the club hold a list of local veterinary practices** including the name, address and telephone number of the veterinary practice ~~on call~~"

(Additions in bold, deletions struck through)

(Effective TBC)

36. Miss Thomson explained that the suggestion had arisen due to it becoming more difficult for show societies, particularly in Scotland, to find a local vet that was willing to be on call. Mrs Chapman seconded the proposal.
37. The office raised concerns around the welfare of dogs should the regulation be amended. Should an emergency occur at a show it would be quicker to have the information of a veterinary practice that would be available rather than having to ring a number of practices to find one that was available. It was strongly advised by the office that it was the societies' responsibility to ensure they were doing their best to provide accurate and helpful information for exhibitors in a potentially stressful situation. It was noted that there was no requirement for the exhibitor to use the suggested vet and they could use an alternative should they wish. However, it was felt that having the information readily available was beneficial to all involved.

Mrs Smedley left the meeting.

38. A number of personal experiences of the difficulties of finding a veterinary practice to be on call for a show were recounted. However, it was ultimately felt that considering the reason for needing a vet on call would be an emergency, it was better for the show society to spend the time finding a suitable vet, even if they were further away from the venue, to save time should an emergency occur. The exhibitor would still have the option to choose a vet that was in a better location for them personally, taking into account distance and direction towards their home.
39. A vote was taken and by a small majority the proposal was not recommended to be progressed to the Show Executive Committee.
40. The Council requested that the office consult with the health team to bring the concern of access to vets to their attention. The office agreed to raise the

matter with the health team but was unable to guarantee what action would be taken.

f. Proposed amendment to Special Beginner class definition.
Proposed by Miss F Snook

41. Miss Snook requested the Council consider amending the Special Beginner definition to clarify the eligibility to compete in the class. The Council was aware that there was a considerable amount of confusion as to who could enter the class. Miss Cutler seconded the proposal.

‘For Owner, Handler or Exhibit not having won a Challenge Certificate or Reserve Challenge Certificate, or for those breeds not allocated Championship Status, Best of Sex or Reserve Best of Sex at a Championship Show, **with their own dog.**’
(Additions in bold)

42. Miss Snook explained that currently, if a novice handler were to handle a dog for someone during judging for a Challenge Certificate (CC) and that dog were to win either the CC or Reserve CC, then that handler would become ineligible for Special Beginners, even if they only held the dog’s lead during the challenge.
43. The Council agreed that it was thought that this was not the intention of the current definition but there were concerns that the proposal as worded would allow experienced handlers to be permitted to enter the Special Beginners class due to never having owned their own dog.
44. A suggestion was made that a statement be added to the definition to clarify that all breeds someone had handled should be counted when considering eligibility for the class, even if it was a different breed to the dog that they were considering entering into the class. It was agreed that some exhibitors were deliberately ignoring the regulations and it was stressed that it should be reported if noticed at a show.
45. The office informed the Council that a similar discussion item had been submitted to the Breeds Liaison Council for consideration at its meeting in June. It was suggested that, as there was concern on the current wording, the Council work with its colleagues on the Breeds Liaison Council to come up with a solution.
46. The Council was in agreement with the suggestion and would contact the Breeds Liaison Council regarding the matter.
- g. Proposed amendment to Regulations F(1)26.d.(2)(b) and F(1)27.b.(1)(b)
Proposed by Miss J Cutler
47. Miss Cutler requested the Council consider amendments to the above regulations so that, where Any Variety Not Separately Classified (AVNSC) classes were scheduled for sub-groups e.g. AVNSC Dachshund, AVNSC

Poodle etc. at general open shows, the dog/puppy declared 'best' be eligible to compete in the relevant group/puppy group, without first having to challenge against the winner of AVNSC classes for that group eg. AVNSC Hound, AVNSC Utility. It was noted that currently, the 'best' from the AVNSC group classes must challenge the 'best' from the AVNSC sub-group classes, with only the winner of the challenge progressing to group competition. Mr Bennett seconded the proposal.

F(1)26.d.(2).(b)

"The puppy declared Best Puppy from the Any Variety Not Separately Classified classes in each group **and any puppies declared Best Puppy in any relevant AVNSC sub-group classes.**"

F(1)27.b.(1).(b)

"The best dog from the Any Variety Not Separately Classified classes in each group **and any dog declared Best Any Variety Not Separately Classified in any relevant Any Variety Not Separately Classified sub-group classes.**"

(Additions in bold)

(Effective TBC)

48. It was explained that the intention of the proposal was to encourage more entries from breeds that did not have separately classified classes and were often reluctant to enter AVNSC. It was also hoped it would prevent disappointment for those declared Best AVNSC who would assume that they were eligible for the group but could find themselves beaten by the winner of an AVNSC sub-group breed before the group took place.
49. It could also allow more dogs the chance to qualify for Crufts at premier open shows or to earn points for the Show Certificate of Excellence. It was noted that there was a relatively small number of recognised 'sub-groups' that the amendment would apply to.
50. A brief discussion occurred but it was not felt that the proposal, as it was currently worded, captured the intent of the suggestion. There was a concern that the wording was too broad and could potentially lead to unintended consequences, such as the gundog group 'subgroups' eg. Spaniel or Retriever being considered as being included. However, it was considered that a potential solution could be to refer to variety breeds (which are granted automatic approval for judging) classes in the regulation as opposed to sub-groups.

Mr Stubbs left the meeting.

51. The Council was not in favour of the proposal as it stood however was in agreement with the principle. It therefore requested Miss Cutler work on the wording and bring it back to a future meeting.

ITEM 5. DISCUSSION ITEMS

52. The Council noted that no discussion items had been received.

ITEM 6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

53. The office reminded the Council of the correct way for breed clubs to submit their judges via the online form. It was highlighted that the form could be found on the website here - <https://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/forms/single-breedsub-group-championship-show-judges-nomination-form/>. It was requested that Council representatives encourage breed clubs to use the form.

ITEM 7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

54. The Council noted that the date of the next meeting would be confirmed in September 2024.

55. The meeting closed at 13.35pm.

**MRS A CAWThERA-PURDY
CHAIRPERSON**