

**MINUTES OF THE GENERAL MEETING OF THE LABRADOR BREED COUNCIL HELD IN THE
BOARDROOM OF THE KENNEL CLUB AFTER THE AGM ON 9th APRIL 2015**

1. To approve Minutes of the General Meeting of the Labrador Retriever Council held on 9th April 2014:

The minutes of the General Meeting were circulated. The minutes were proposed by Midland Counties LRC and seconded by Labrador Retriever Club of Scotland.

Minutes were then approved.

2. Matters Arising.

2, Midland Counties LRC asked what had happened regarding the request that Bolo Pads and Slight Wave of coat to be added to the breed standard as permissible. Karl Gawthorpe The Hon Secretary informed the meeting that he was waiting for Mrs Penny Carpanini to assist in compiling the letter so that the wording is correct before sending to the Kennel Club.

3. Breed Liaison Council Representative Report

The Chairman asked if anyone had any objections to Mrs S Walton, Kennel Club Liaison Committee representative, sitting in on the meeting as observer. No objections noted so Mrs Walton permitted to observe.

Midland Counties LRC proposed that the Breed Council Liaison Rep should be allowed to sit with in the meeting from the start, this will give the Rep a good feeling of the Breed Council, and this was seconded by Labrador Retriever Club of Wales.

All in Favour

Kennel Club Breeds Liaison Council Report to Labrador Breed Council – 09.04.2015

Good afternoon everyone. There was one Breed Liaison Council meeting held last year which was the November meeting. Unfortunately, the May meeting was cancelled due to lack of items for the Agenda.

Simon Luxmore, Chairman of the Judges Sub-Committee attended the November meeting and a large number of matters relating to judging were discussed.

Previously, the council had recommended 'That the Kennel Club re-evaluate the procedure when appointing first time CC Judges by taking account of the Breed Council's views on prospective Judges' It was explained that Breed Club opinion was always taken into consideration when deciding on the approval of a judge for a first time appointment; However, it was the quality of the information which was crucial in its deliberations. In particular, information must be objective and factual. It was agreed that the Office would provide some guidance on useful and meaningful opinion information. I am not sure if anything has filtered through yet but I will ask at the next meeting.

There was a proposal from the Welsh Corgi Pembroke Judge Sub Committee 'That all judges who wish to judge a new breed should have to complete the following before they are approved by the Kennel Club:

- Attend a breed appreciation seminar being run in compliance with the KC Code of Best Practice for the Running of a Breed Seminar and Judging Competence Assessment.
- 2. To study Breed Standards and specific breed literature and reference material as recommended by the breed club/council.
- Spend time observing the breed at shows and speaking to exhibitors about the finer points of the breed.

These were all approved by the Council and will be referred to the Judges sub-committee for further consideration.

Concerns were expressed in response to the 'A3 Judges List Guidance' which was recently issued by the Kennel Club. It was felt that requirements for the A3 Judges Lists had been altered without consultation with breed clubs. The decline in show entries meant that it was increasingly difficult for aspiring judges to accumulate sufficient numbers to achieve A3 status. However, there was also a concern that reducing the numbers required to qualify for an A or B judging list could lead to a reduction in the quality of judges being approved for such lists. Mr Luxmoore confirmed that the Judges Sub Committee had always assessed potential judges based on the Stud Book banding for each breed, which was derived from entry figures at Championship Shows. The figures were recalculated on an annual basis to reflect upward or downward trends in entries. The guidance issued by the Kennel Club was solely in the interest of clarity. It was explained that Breed Clubs may set their own criteria for judges lists and that it was not necessary for them to use the Kennel Club's Criteria but he confirmed that the Judges Sub-Committee would continue to use the Kennel Club's criteria when approving judges for the first time to award CCs.

Whilst Mr Luxmoore was present several items for discussion were raised. These included matters regarding training for Judges, amongst these the introduction of a 'Trainee Judge' system along with mentoring for the Special Awards Event Classes was suggested.

Also, the reciprocal arrangements for the approval of Championship Show Judges with the FCI (or any other overseas kennel body) were discussed. It was felt that the Kennel Club General Committee should be asked to ensure that the level of practical experience required of overseas judges for approval to award Kennel Club Challenge Certificates, is equivalent to the level required of domestic UK judges. Mr Luxmoore advised the Council that the JSC was currently working with the FCI regarding the mutual recognition of the judges. A final agreement is currently under consideration and this would provide clear criteria regarding what was required of FCI judges judging in the UK, however it would be up to the societies inviting overseas judges to ensure that they were suitably competent. There is a formal proposal to be discussed at the next meeting concerning this.

There were two proposals that should be noted. One from the Yellow Labrador Club which proposed that any changes to the F and J regulations are highlighted in either italic or bold text for the first year of inclusion in the Kennel Club Year Book. This was agreed unanimously and will be referred to the relevant committee Chairman. I will make enquiries as to its progress at the next Council meeting. The other is from the Irish Red and White Setter Club of Great Britain who proposed that in the interest of breed security, where out-crossing to another breed is recommended, a Development Register should be created by the Kennel Club. This was also passed

unanimously and will be forwarded to the Finance & General Purposes Sub-Committee at its next meeting. Should they agree this I wondered whether it would be helpful in respect of Silver Labradors.

The next meeting of the Liaison Council is on May 11 and there will be a meeting on the 19th November. If you have any proposals or items for discussion for this meeting can you please let me have them by the 28th August 2015.

4. Breed Council KC Representatives & Health Sub Committee Report

Marion Hopkinson gave the meeting information regarding GPRA, please see the information regarding this:

The Kennel club started a control 2014 scheme to enable those breeds with effective 'take up' of DNA tests to ultimately have a register that would be for clear or carrier only, for dogs with certain problems, this would (WE THOUGHT) be a for-runner to absolutely clearing GPRA from all **U.K. Kennel Club Registered Labradors**, (a potentially wonderful tribute to a kennel club at last creating a 1st for the eradication a real health problem in a numerically huge breed) we immediately applied to the scheme and asked for level 2 entry to initiate and monitor the progress we have in the dogs now tested clear for GPRA, plus the subsequent clear by parentage registrations, this breed has done so much in this particular problem and it is to the great credit of the many breeders who have diligently stuck to their guns on breeding the disease out of their own lines at no mean expense to themselves and their breeding programs – After months of waiting we have been told—**NOT AT THIS TIME!!** the reason being that-- we do not have "enough take up of the DNA". To explain this totally ridiculous answer it is the **PET BREEDERS AND PUPPY FARMERS** who do not 'TAKE UP' the DNA test and this big revenue market is the one the Kennel club have taken on board as their evidence of – non care on the breed-. WE asked that the kennel Club would apply an extra fee to those registering progeny from non tested parents – but no – the **only penalty that applies is to the assured breeders who already do all the right tests, the puppy farmers –pet breeders are exempt from any requirements at all--**

WE have protested and asked for a meeting with the health committee, This has yet to be arranged by the Kennel club. We can only conclude that REVENUE again is the main criteria or the potential loss of same, Marion

The Chairman (Richard Stafford) asked that all breed health matters should go thru the health committee first.

Breed Council Health sub-Committee meeting 7/4/2015 which took place before the full Labrador Breed Council.

The Kennel Club Clarges St London

Representatives present

Marion Hopkinson
Janet Cole
Linda Heron
Caron Morton
Fiona Braddon

Penny Carpanini
Apologies for absence received from Joy Venturi Rose
Absent Margaret Brown

Minutes of the last meeting

Still to be resolved -

- a. breed survey as discussed at previous meetings has been drafted by Linda Heron but is still pending due to an omission in procedure. This requires a KC mail shot but the request must come via the Health Committee co-ordinator (Joy or Marion)
- b. Awaiting news from Joy re the drafting of a letter to the KC re the changing technologies involved in diagnosing hip and elbow scoring. This is on hold.

Acceptance of the minutes proposed by P. Carpanini seconded by J.Cole

Matters arising

- a. debated the value to a breeding programme of using the estimated breeding values (EBV) as on the KC web site versus the current scoring for hips and elbows. We agreed that in principle the EBVs could be of great benefit when assessing whether to use a dog with a less than perfect score that comes from a previously good scoring line. However it was pointed out that the biased database, upon which the site is dependant, should be taken into consideration. It is known that many breeders don't submit obviously poor or less than good radiographs to the scheme because of the escalating very high cost and as all scores are mandatorily published now, selecting only good specimens for scoring. It was felt that this may compromise the accuracy of such a web site. It was agreed by the committee that we need clarification from the KC on how best to use this site. It was also agreed that we recommend that every breed club have a link to the KC's Health Matters for Labradors on their web sites to facilitate more breeders taking this seriously.
- b. Breed survey – see above.
- c. The Health Committee's views on the value and principles of the KC's Assured Breeder Scheme was debated at length. It was noted at the meeting that of the 6 reps present 3 were participants in the scheme and 3 were not. It was noted also that breeder's views of the ABS was one of the items on the awaited breed survey (see above). After discussion it was agreed that, from the breeder's perspective, the way the ABS is being promoted by the KC seems to be without reference to the well-being and correct breeding of pedigree dogs. It was felt that the bias is too much in favour of administrative paperwork and income and less in the interests of the caring breeder with the dog's interests being of even lesser importance than the buying public. This was the feeling of all the committee especially the 3 current ABS members following their own recent personal kennel assessments. However it was agreed that the public that are aware of the ABS scheme seem to have confidence in it and the KC is working towards making the media more aware of it.
- d. Hereditary Catteract in Labradors. The Health Committee have concerns with regard to the incidence, recording and importance in real terms of this condition to the long term breeding programmes of pedigree Labradors. This is in respect of the lack of data - numbers of affected dogs being bred from and the results to the progeny – ie: percentage affected. We also have no data on whether bilateral or unilaterally affected dogs are more at risk of the condition progressing to symptoms of blindness or even if it is inherited. There is no DNA test for H.C. so far due to the difficulty in finding a pattern. We feel that Breed Council should be aware that other countries are dealing with this issue differently from us in UK with the Germans and some Scandinavians having taken this condition off the EU eye certificate for dogs over 3 years of age. We are aware that this seems to affect more working bred Labradors than show bred dogs. This committee has concerns and request a letter to the KC/BVA for data to back the need of entering this condition on the eye certificate.

- e. Ditto Multifocal Retinal Displasia.
- f. GPRA. The Health Committee feel that there is more than sufficient data now to back the application for a mandatory G.P.R.A. health test certificate and/or DNA clearance to be required of both parents of every Labrador litter registration application to the KC. Repeated letters to the KC have met with refusal so far because of "too low an uptake of DNA tested dogs". This committee feels that this is one of the truly detrimental hereditary conditions that could probably be safely eradicated from the Labrador breeding pool now with little impact on registration numbers but can only be done with KC backing. We ask why the KC is so resistant to positive change and why they appear to be supporting uncaring breeders that do not test in favour of those that have paid the price for voluntary testing for "clear" stock. We are left yet again feeling that the KC is operating double standards.
- g. The Health committee request a face to face meeting with a significant member of the KC health committee with regard to the above mentioned condition but also with regard to drawing up a protocol for the investigation of "new" diseases and problems within the breed. We would like the AHT to be involved in these discussions as an interested yet separate body.
- h. Fit For Function Breed Watch. This committee is of the opinion that by and large we have a very healthy breed and already have in place sufficient checks and protocols to manage those that do not meet the required standards in so far as the show and working side of the breed goes. We do not support the KC's Fit For Function Breed Watch as results received and published are too inconsistent to be of value. However it should be noted that we have no jurisdiction over the majority of this hugely popular breed when the KC is prepared to register everything that purports to have a pedigree of however dubious a value with no health checks at all.
- i. The Labrador Breed Council Health sub-Committee was voted in for 5 years and is not interchangeable. Due to an administrative error selection of a new sub-committee will be postponed to next year.

Penny Carpanini.

5. Correspondence

Letter from the Judges department at the Kennel Club thanking me for the letter sent to Mr Luxmoore, but all it states is that the judges' sub-committee do take all information into account before passing a judge, but they look at their own criteria when passing judges and not the breed councils.

6. Midland Counties LRC wish to propose:

'All future applicants for the A3 judges list must have attended and passed the Advanced Breed Judging Seminar according to the Kennel Club's Code of Best Practice. A pass certificate must be produced with the CV'

After a discussion and explanations on all the Certificates that are required by the Kennel Club. It was also explained that the breed council questionnaire had been update to ensure that every candidate is aware of what certificates are required. The proposal was agreed.

- 7. Three Ridings LRC wish to propose for discussion: The concept of "designer dogs" is considered to be an increasing problem. Due to a lack of concern being expressed by breeders of pedigree dogs it may be seen by the general public that deliberate cross-breeding is now not only acceptable, but even results in healthier dogs, despite not being able to perform the health checks now available for those pedigree breeds. Three Ridings proposes that representatives of the Labrador Breed Council should meet with representatives from the Poodle Breed Council to discuss strategies with which to inform the

general public that so-called "labradoodles" and other such cross-bred dogs, are not "new designer breeds" but simply cross-breeds with combined names.

After a discussion within the meeting, The Yellow Labrador Club felt that it was none of our business and we should be trying to support Healthy Labradors.

IT was agreed by the meeting that The Labrador Breed Council could not get involved with this due to it being too large and really out of our control.

8. Health Sub Committee:

The Hon Secretary explained that he felt it appropriate to halt the nominations for the health sub-committee as it was imperative that the health sub-committee is working correctly for the breed.

It was agreed that the size of the sub-committee is adequate and representatives should be duly elected for a 5 year term.

The Health Sub-Committee comprises of 8 members, made up of 6 elected Health Representatives and 2 Kennel Club Health Representatives.

It was agreed that the Hon Secretary would email all breed clubs requesting nominations for the Health Sub-Committee with instruction that each nominated representative is also asked if they wish to stand as a KC Rep. If the Hon Secretary receives more than 8 nominations then a ballot will take place for the roles. Once 8 are duly elected, then there will be a further vote, if necessary, to elect the 2 KC Reps from within the 8 elected but only if more than 2 have expressed an interest.

It was also agreed that if a Health Representative resigns within their term, then the breed clubs are permitted to co-opt a new Health Rep for the remaining term.

9. Judge for Inclusion onto the Non Breed Specialist A3 List

	For	Against	Abstain
a. Mr Ed Casey	11		

10. Judges who awarded Challenge Certificates for the first time in 2013 to be considered for inclusion on the A1 lists, these to be voted on:

Breed Specialist's

	For	Against	Abstain
Mr Andy Metcalfe	10		1

Non Breed Specialist's

	For	Against	Abstain
Miss Becky Johnson	6	3	2
Mr M J Gadsby	7	4	
Mrs J M Miller	7	1	3
Mr P Berchtold	2	7	2

11. Roll of Honour List

The criteria for the list is the following, Senior Championship Show judges who have made a significant contribution to the Labrador breed, and who are now considered generally non-active in Championship Show Judging. The Person should still be living to be included on the list. (It's also pointed out that if a club puts forward a name then that club must be absolutely sure that the judge is in permanent retirement, retirement means judging and

also acting as referee) It is felt that the best place for the Roll of Honour List to be published was in Club Year Books.

Roll of Honour List to date:-

Mr E Gill
Mrs E Greenhalgh
Mrs D Johnson
Mr T Pascoe
Mrs P Woolf
Mr P Woolf
Mrs M Young

The Hon Secretary removed Mrs P Gill from the list, there being no other nominations.

12. Any Other Business by the discretion of the Chair

KSSLRC would like this AOB to be taken back to their committee's for discussion then this will be placed on the Agenda next year.

Labrador Breed Council AOB Item to be taken away by Breed Clubs to discuss

Scenario

At the URC Open Show there was much discussion regarding a yellow Flatcoated Retriever which was exhibited and is an unrecognised colour. The Kennel Club's advice on the day was that despite it being an unrecognised colour, it was registered with the Kennel Club therefore can be shown and it is expected that judges judge according to the breed standard.

The Flatcoated Retriever Standard says Black or Liver Only and the German Shepherd Standard refers to white as highly undesirable.

Discussion with possible view to a proposal

The KSS discussed the issue and felt there was some merit in considering amending the breed standard due to the frequent discussion regarding unrecognised colours.

The options discussed were:

- a. Wholly black, yellow or liver/chocolate only. Yellows range from light cream to fox red. Small white spot on chest permissible.
- b. Wholly black, yellow or liver/chocolate. Yellows range from light cream to fox red. Small white spot on chest permissible. Any unrecognised colour highly undesirable.
- c. Wholly black, yellow or liver/chocolate. Yellows range from light cream to fox red. Small white spot on chest permissible. Any unrecognised colour a disqualifying fault.

Mrs Fiona Braddon asked if the breed council would consider moving their meeting date away from the week of the Potomac, it was discussed and it was agreed that we would not move the meeting.
No other business

13. Date and Venue of next meeting

7th April 2016 at The Kennel Club

KSSLRC gave a Vote of thanks to the chair

4.00pm meeting closed.