



**MINUTES OF THE KENNEL CLUB BREEDS LIAISON COUNCIL MEETING HELD  
ON TUESDAY 21 NOVEMBER 2023 AT 11.00AM VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS**

**PRESENT:**

Miss C Boggia	Mrs D Britten
Mr S Collier	Mrs J Collins-Pitman
Mr J Horswell	Mrs T Jackson
Miss SA Leslie	Mrs C Morgan
Mr E Paterson	Mrs J Sparrow
Miss S Taylor	Mrs A Teasdale
Mrs B Thornley	Mr M Walshaw
Mrs S Walton	

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Mrs H Kerfoot	Interim Chief Operations Officer (Canine Activities & Events)
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	Senior Working Dog Activities Team Officer

**IN THE CHAIR: MRS JACKSON**

**ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1. Apologies were received from Mr A Bicknell, Mrs D Ellrich, Mr T Hutchings, Mr R Kinsey, Mrs K Moores, Mrs J Morgan, Miss E Newton, Mrs J Piper, Mr K Pursglove, Mr D Roberts and Mr E Whitehill. Mr L Anness, Mr G Davies, Miss A Summers and Mrs M Swash were not present.
2. The Chair welcomed Mrs Collins-Pitman

**ITEM 2. TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD  
ON WEDNESDAY 25 MAY 2022**

3. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as an accurate record.

**ITEM 3. RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS/MATTERS ARISING**

4. The Council noted the following updates on outcomes arising from matters discussed at its previous meeting:

- a. Colour Watch

5. The Council was reminded that at its previous meeting it noted a summary regarding the introduction of a 'colour watch' system, which had received Board approval. The Council had raised a number of questions which the office undertook to provide responses for. The Council is invited to note responses were issued to delegates via email as follows:

- Question 1 - Whether there would be further education to puppy buyers regarding the colour of puppies.  
Answer 1 - The launch of Colour Watch will be supported by ongoing education, which is currently being scoped.
- Question 2 - Noting that there had been photos of dogs for sale which were of a concerning and highly likely non breed standard colours, on The Kennel Club's Find a Puppy service it was queried what action The Kennel Club was taking to mitigate this issue.  
Answer 2 - We have placed additional measures across any approval of images across the Find a Puppy website further to feedback on some examples shared on social media. Currently, our position to allow for NBS puppies to be advertised on our Find a Puppy website has not changed. However, we are planning enhancements to the Find a Puppy service which we hope will start to address concerns. In addition, and as advised to members at The Kennel Club AGM, we are working on developing a 'tiered registration' system which has captured much of the feedback from the working party's consultations with a number of breeds.
- Question 3 - If/when the Breed Standards and Stud Book Committee would be told that the ownership of 'Colour Watch' would sit within its remit.  
Answer 3 - The secretary of the Breed Standards and Stud Book Committee is aware of this issue and will discuss the necessary next steps accordingly.

- b. Partnership shows

6. The Council was reminded that at its previous meeting it noted its views on partnership shows were progressing through the relevant channels and that an update would be published and provided to the Council in due course.
7. The Council noted that an announcement was made on 20 October 2023 (<https://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/media-centre/2023/october/changes-to-partnership-show-regulations-in-an-effort-to-boost-entries/>).

- c. Amend critique regulation to include Kennel Club critique website

8. The Council noted that its proposal has been referred to the Show Executive Committee and the Judges Committee and was progressing through the relevant channels and that an update would be provided to the Council in due course.

**[Afternote:** Relevant amendments to regulations were published 3 January 2024 - [Changes to Show Regulations in 2024 | The Kennel Club](#) ]

#### ITEM 4. PROPOSALS

- a. **Proposed by: Mrs S Pounds-Longhurst**  
**Presented by: Mrs S Walton**

That the current regulation regarding the submission of critiques be amended as follows to include the requirement for judges to produce critiques for the first two placings in all classes in addition to all group and best in show placings:

F(1)20.d

“All judges at championship shows and open shows must produce a written critique for the first two placings in all classes **and all Group and Best in Show competition placings** ~~each Breed class~~ and will dispatch these to, at least one of the weekly United Kingdom canine journals.”

(Additions in bold, deletions struck through)

(Effective TBC)

##### **Rationale:**

- Given the many changes to the dog show scene in recent years the need to encourage entries and exhibitors was paramount and it was felt that this alteration would help support this aim
- Exhibitors really wanted to see critiques as they wanted to know what a judge thought about their dog and see it published in the public domain.

9. The proposal was seconded by Mrs Sparrow.
10. The Council noted that the matter had been a discussion item at its last meeting and that many judges already did this. After a short discussion noting the previous discussions, the Council was of the view that this was a good idea and should be **recommended** for consideration by the relevant Committees.

- b. **Proposed by: Mrs K Jackson**  
**Presented by: Mrs D Britten**

That the wording in the definition of classes for the sections detailing Maiden, Novice, Tyro, Debutant and Undergraduate be amended to (Minor Puppy, ~~Special~~ ~~Minor Puppy~~, Puppy and ~~Special Puppy~~, **and ANY class defined as Special excepted, whether restricted or not**).

(Additions in bold, deletions struck through)

**Rationale:**

- To clarify this requirement in one place as currently the mention of classes defined as special was in the overview of the definition of classes and had been overlooked by some
11. The proposal was explained by Mrs Britten on behalf of Mrs Jackson, it was noted that Mrs Jackson was the breed representative for Staffordshire Bull Terriers and that the breed wanted the amendment. A number of Council members expressed that they did not understand or see a need for the proposed amendment and a seconder was not found for the proposal.
  12. The Council noted that Staffordshire Bull Terrier was a numerically strong breed, and that the class definitions did not appear to negatively impact any other breed. It was noted that the proposal appeared to include wording that was already elsewhere in the regulations, and this could be perceived as confusing.
  13. The Council appreciated that as a breed the Staffordshire Bull Terrier appeared to be attempting to prevent their exhibitors from entering the incorrect class. A view was expressed that the breed would be better to do that via education to its exhibitors directly through breed clubs and experienced exhibitors rather than via a regulation amendment. It was noted that many newer exhibitors may not be overly familiar with the regulations or where to find the required information and therefore education from breed clubs would be advantageous.
  14. The office expressed a view that including duplication within the regulations often lead to additional confusion and should be avoided where possible.
  15. A suggestion was raised that Mrs Britten relayed the view of the Council to Mrs Jackson requesting that the breed clubs highlight the matter as relevant. It was suggested that this could be via show schedules or club newsletters.

**ITEM 5.      DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**a.      Presented by: Mrs S Walton**

That the current class definition for Undergraduate be amended as follows to bring it more in line with Graduate, Post Graduate, etc.

\* applies to championship and open shows only

\*\* applies to limited shows only

**UNDERGRADUATE**

\* For dogs which have not won a Challenge Certificate/ CACIB/CAC/Green Star or 3 or more first prizes at championship shows **in Undergraduate, Graduate, Post Graduate, Minor Limit, Mid Limit, Limit or Open Classes whether restricted or not** where Challenge Certificates were offered for the breed (~~Minor Puppy, Special Minor Puppy, Puppy and Special Puppy Classes excepted, whether restricted or not~~).

\*\* For dogs which have not won 3 or more first prizes at open or championship shows **in Undergraduate, Graduate, Post Graduate, Minor Limit, Mid Limit, Limit or Open Classes whether restricted or not** (~~Minor Puppy, Special Minor Puppy, Puppy and Special Puppy Classes excepted, whether restricted or not~~).  
(Additions in bold, deletions struck through)

#### **Rationale:**

- It would prevent confusion as some exhibitors believed they could still enter Undergraduate unless have they had had 3 Undergraduate class wins
- It would help to improve entries in the Undergraduate class
- Where Undergraduate was scheduled, it would help dogs in slower maturing breeds which may not be ready to go from the age classes to Graduate.

16. Mrs Britten advised the Council that the matter had been raised by Mrs Pounds-Longhurst the representative for Retriever (Golden). The Council expressed some confusion regarding the suggested amendments, it was noted that the current definitions were clear, and a view was expressed that perhaps people needed to consult the definitions of classes section of the regulations to establish the criteria for entry before entering classes.
17. A further view was expressed that it would seem like a sensible amendment to bring the Undergraduate class in line with the Graduate and Post Graduate class with regards to only counting wins in specific classes to 'win out' of the class. It was noted that the Undergraduate class was primarily scheduled for those numerically stronger breeds, and therefore this may not impact a large number of breeds. It was further noted that by amending the definition it was anticipated that more dogs would be eligible for entry into the class and therefore the class may see an increase in entries, and potentially societies that scheduled it.
18. A query was raised regarding the difference between a proposal and a discussion item. The office clarified, confirming that proposals could be recommended for consideration by the Show Executive Committee whereas discussion items were for discussion only. A view was expressed that this matter was in the wrong section of the agenda. The importance of delegates understanding the Council processes and communicating this with representatives was confirmed. The office advised that items for the agenda should, where possible, be well discussed by delegates with representatives

across all groups prior to submission to ensure that they were submitted appropriately. The Council thanked the office for explaining the process. The Chairperson confirmed that the full Council minutes were referred to the Show Executive Committee, which may pick up other matters at its discretion.

19. The majority of the Council was in agreement that this matter had been submitted for the incorrect item on the agenda as following discussion it had much support so may have been better as a proposal.
20. Mrs Walton, with the support of the office undertook to bring the matter back as a proposal for the next meeting.

b. **Presented by: Mr M Walshaw**

That the Breed Record Supplement (BRS) be made into an online format where you could specify breeds instead of the whole group.

**Rationale:**

- It was noted that the cost would be reduced but people would be more likely to purchase as they would just get their breed.
  - There would be cost savings for both sides and would be more environmentally friendly. E.g. Receiving the Terrier group specifically for Manchester Terriers, which is often one side of A4 paper.
21. Mr Walshaw explained the item, noting that most people who received the BRS appeared to scan the paper document and keep/store the information electronically, so it would be more efficient for all parties for the information to be distributed electronically.
  22. The Council expressed huge support for the idea, noting that many people did not have the space to store a lot of paper documents. A suggestion was raised that although it was an excellent idea for numerically smaller breeds, it should be optional, as some people may prefer paper or require more than one breed within the group. A query was raised as to whether there would be a cost for an online BRS, and if so, whether it would work out more expensive to purchase multiple separate breeds rather than the whole group. It was noted that if the item was to progress The Kennel Club would set the pricing and therefore no answer was able to be provided.
  23. The Council noted that this may also have environmental benefits as it would reduce printing and therefore paper usage. It was noted that The Kennel Club Journal was now an online document and therefore The Kennel Club had set a precedent for making documents online.
  24. It was noted that The Kennel Club held all information electronically and therefore it would seem reasonable that it would have the data in an electronic

format to be able to create an electronic document, however it was appreciated that the Council did not know the intricacies of The Kennel Club's systems.

25. Following the Council's support, the office undertook to advise the correct department of the Council's suggestion and views.

**c. Presented by: Mr S Lowthian**

That mandatory training days be scheduled at The Kennel Club building, Stoneleigh for judges awarding Challenge Certificates to breeds classified as Breed Watch category 3.

It was suggested that the training be specifically in relation to the requirements of a dog to pass the category 3 health check at general championship shows. It was further suggested that the content of the training should explain in finer detail exactly what constituted a pass/failure. It was felt that after a judge had attended the above, if an exhibit fails to pass a health check for any of the reasons covered during the training there should be some form of penalty.

26. Mr Paterson presented the item on behalf of Mr Lowthian, the representative for Bulldogs. It was noted that the agenda was incorrect in stating that Mr Lowthian would be presenting the item himself. A view was expressed that health checks were carried out by a veterinarian and therefore the judge being referred to the Judges Committee for penalty if a dog was to fail a vet check may remove trust in judges and may be a step too far.
27. The Council noted the view of the Bulldog representative was that breeders did a lot of work into health and that more could be done at shows to champion breed health. It was suggested that breed clubs had direct access to breeders and owners specific to each breed and must ensure that health was discussed during breed mentoring and Breed Appreciation Days for judges.
28. The office advised that the health team had reviewed the matter and offered support for the nature of the suggestions. It was noted that any penalty being imposed on Judges for reasons of health would be difficult. It was further noted that people had contacted the health team for assistance regarding reminding people of breed watch criteria in other breeds, and this had been successful. It was therefore suggested that the health team be contacted for any specific queries.
29. A view was expressed that a mandatory training day for each breed would be difficult to administer due to many variables including availability of judges. It was queried whether judges would be unable to accept appointments until a seminar had been attended. Strong concerns were raised as to how realistic this possibility was.

30. It was noted that some breed clubs send reminders regarding health and breed watch (category 3) points to judges with upcoming championship show appointments. It was further noted that currently there appeared to be inconsistencies with pass and fails between vets.
31. Overall, the Council noted that there appeared to be merit in the idea, but it needed further consideration by breed clubs. It was noted that breed health was paramount, and it was thought that education was key, the Council expressed that online training videos would be positive.

#### **ITEM 6.      ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

##### Start time of meetings

32. Mrs Sparrow queried whether online meetings could start at the earlier time of 10am as there was now no requirement to travel to/from London. An alternative view was expressed that 11am was a better start time and therefore should remain. The Council discussed the matter with the consensus being the start time of meetings should remain at 11am. Mrs Sparrow requested it was noted that she was unhappy with an 11am start time.

##### Slack Channel

33. Mrs Jackson reminded the Council that she had set up a slack channel to allow representatives to discuss matters between meetings. She shared her email address and requested that delegates email her to be added to the slack channel. It was noted that this may also be circulated to breed representatives to allow them to be added.

#### **ITEM 7.      DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

34. The Council noted the date of the next meeting was 5 June 2024, proposals for inclusion on the agenda should reach the Breeds Liaison Council Secretary by 7 March 2024.

The meeting closed at 12.25 pm with a vote of thanks to the Chair and the office.

**MRS T JACKSON  
CHAIRMAN**