

**MINUTES OF THE GENERAL MEETING OF THE LABRADOR BREED COUNCIL HELD IN THE
BOARDROOM OF THE KENNEL CLUB AFTER THE AGM ON 11 APRIL 2013**

1. To approve Minutes of the General Meeting of the Labrador Retriever Council held on 11 April 2013:

A typing error was pointed out on page 2 of the Minutes and it was proposed to change the 'S' to a 'C' on the last line of item 4(b). Proposed by LC of Scotland and Seconded by LRC of Wales.

Minutes were then approved.

The Chairman asked if anyone had any objections to Mrs S Walton, Kennel Club Liaison Committee representative, sitting in on the meeting as observer

2. Matters Arising.

Item 13 LC of Scotland raised a point in item (2) Gary Johnson was mentioned but was not at the meeting. It was confirmed this was a misunderstanding and that the Secretary had spoken to Gary Johnson and was reporting his reply.

Item 13(1) The delegate from LRC of Wales asked should bolo pads be accepted if 'a slight wave of the coat' was to be accepted. The standard should be as it says and we should make changes to the standard to include 'a slight wave'. The delegate thought people were otherwise judging against the standard rather than with the standard.

It was not taken forward but was discussed at the last meeting to add "under general discussion including bolo pads"

Item 13(4) The club secretaries had been asked to get back to the Secretary with costs of Discover Dogs and so that it can be confirmed £50 from each club to the Breed Council would cover the costs, however, only 3 clubs replied. After some discussion it was agreed that £50 would stand and each Club should send the Secretary a cheque along with the subscription. This can either be two separate cheques or just one inclusive cheque with a note clarifying what the cheque represents.

Mr J Jackson of Three Ridings LRC informed the Council that he supplied about 500 copies when Franco won the Group and they had to beg the KC to do more copies.

3. Breed Liaison Council Representative Report

Good afternoon everyone. First I would like to thank you for asking me to be the Breed Representative for the next three years. You will be pleased to learn that elections within the Breed Liaison Council have occurred and I have been elected to attend the meetings as a delegate.

The KCBLC met once last year in May. Unfortunately, there were insufficient items for the Agenda to warrant a November meeting.

At the May meeting the proposal by the Golden Retriever Breed Council went through with the amendment put forward by this Council. The proposal now reads:-

‘That a Working Gundog Certificate obtained on game and awarded in all sections of the assessment should enable the “Sh” to be removed from the title of Show Champion and allow a gundog to be recognised as a full “Champion”, as is the case for the Show Gundog Working Certificate’

I understand that it was discussed at the Field Trial sub-committee last September but was deferred to their next meeting for further information. Due to staff changes at the Kennel Club it failed to appear on the Agenda for that meeting and is now on the Agenda for their 17th April meeting. If it should go through it will then go to the General Committee in June for their decision.

It was agreed that the proposal by the Rhodesian Ridgeback Breed Council concerning registration of puppies as ‘non-standard colour’ having an automatic **for life** endorsement **Progeny not eligible for registration** added to their registration documents should go forward to the General Committee for further consideration. The Committee was of the view that it was not appropriate to use the Kennel Club’s registration processes to prevent unscrupulous advertisements and therefore did not recommend approval of the Breed Council’s recommendation. However, the Committee did agree that continued work should be undertaken with the Pet Advertising Advisory Group of which the Kennel Club is a member to raise this particular concern with the various publications which accept advertisements for puppies.

The proposal for the introduction of a Champions Class at Breed Club limited, Open and Championship Shows has been approved (Effective January 2013).

With regard to the training of Novice judges the Kennel Club Training Board supported in principle the education of novice judges and had agreed that this topic was the subject of ongoing discussion. At our next meeting in May we are to receive a presentation on behalf of the Training board on education and training for aspiring Judges.

There are two proposals to be discussed at the next meeting of the Liaison Council both deal with dogs in the Stud Book. One states that for the purpose of inclusion on the A3 judges list and the requirement to have obtained three dogs in the Stud Book that a partnership would have to be in place for a minimum of two years prior to obtaining the Stud Book number. The other states that there is no KC ruling that covers the “manufacture” of a Stud Book Numbers by transferring of dogs between owners for the purpose of acquiring 3 Stud Book Numbers and whilst there is nothing technically wrong with this practice there is a ruling (within the Code of Best Practice for Judges) that covers the transferring of dogs between owners to circumvent judging requirements (owners can’t judge and show at the same event). It proposed that the Stud Book Number issue should also be similarly addressed within the Code.

In February Sussie sent to me a proposal put forward by the Labrador Retriever Club regarding the Judges Development Programme. It was aiming to raise the pass mark from 50% to 66% and a credit from 66% to 80% to allow them to be approved to award CCs in a breed. Having researched the

matter it would appear that when assessing prospective judges under this Programme no marks are awarded.

The aim of the Judges Development Programme is to develop a Kennel Club approved Judges experience of Breeds in their relevant group, particularly for those Breeds in which they do not currently award Challenge Certificates.

This will be undertaken by the provision of Judges Development Programme Breed Seminars which will provide the opportunity for discussion with Breed experts and hands on practice with dogs. It is an education programme of the highest level.

All Judges attending the JDP Breed Seminar will be given a JDP Certificate of Attendance.

In addition, the Programme will include the opportunity to undertake a Breed Assessment, where a 'Breed Credit' can be obtained.

A Breed Credit will only be awarded to candidates who the Panel of Assessors agree demonstrate an advance knowledge and insight of a Breed during the Assessment Process.

The way they assess prospective judges for a Breed Credit is by providing 5 exhibits, 1 excellent, 2 very good or good and 2 reasonable. The candidates are invited to examine these dogs and place them in order of merit. (The assessors will have previously agreed the correct order of placement and the reasons for this.) The candidates must then fill in a form critiquing each dog and justifying their placing. Four areas are examined.

1. Knowledge of Breed Standard and Breed Type
2. Ability to recognise each dog's merits and demerits
3. Ability to place the dogs in an appropriate order of merit using their knowledge of the Breed Standard
4. Ability to justify their placings

For these four areas the candidate will be awarded either, Very Good, Good, Basic or Poor. To be awarded a Breed Credit the candidate must gain a minimum of 'Very Good' in three of the categories and Good in one other.

Judges who have been through this programme and gained a Breed Credit do not need to be included on a Breed Council B judges list in order to judge more than 5 classes at Open Shows. Provided they have judged the appropriate number of classes or dogs their name does not need to be circulated round the Breed Clubs when they are seeking approval to judge the breed for the first time.

Sussie asked me to put forward an item for discussion concerning this which is now on the Agenda for the May meeting.

It reads

The Labrador Breed Council would like the Kennel Club to clarify the situation concerning judges who have taken part in the Judges Development Programme and been awarded a Breed Credit. It is not clear whether this means that they are able to judge 5 or more classes at Open Shows without being on a 'B' list or whether, if they fulfil all the other criteria for awarding Challenge Certificates, they go straight through to the Judges Sub-Committee to be passed to award CC's without their name having been circulated round the Breed Clubs for their opinion. This is of concern as at no time will their name have been circulated round the Breed Clubs. At present, to be placed on the Labrador Breed Council A judging list it is mandatory that a prospective judge's name be circulated round the Breed Clubs. Once their name is on the A1,2 or 3 list should they be offered a CC appointment then it is no longer necessary for their name to be circulated. It is recognised that these judges will be highly experienced in other breeds and will have awarded CCs on several occasions in these breeds. However, it is felt that there may be circumstances, known only to the breed, where it would be inappropriate for a judge to award CCs in that breed.

I will let you know the outcome of this discussion.

The closing date for Agenda items for the November meeting is 23rd August. So if you have anything you want to put forward please let me have it by that date.

Mr D Coode the delegate for LRC raised the point with regard to the marking on courses that National Gundog marked in percentage and not "Very Good, Good and Bad". Sheila confirmed there are no % marks in Kennel Club rules. MCLRC said they supported the National Gundog view. Mrs Venturi-Rose KSSLRC commented that the National Gundog percentages will have to be translated into VG, G and B.

The Chairman asked if we could go back to the KC and tell them that some clubs were doing % and some are doing "VG, G and B" and we would like clarification. Mrs Walton suggested she ask why they didn't use % rather than the rather fuzzy VG, G & B in the training of the assessors at the next Liaison Committee meeting (there was to be a presentation) as the Breed Council would like clarification, also who attends the presentation on behalf of clubs running JDP training programmes.

Mrs Carpanini the delegate for LRCof W queried if Mrs Walton was the person to ask about clarification of the standard ie. According to the standard bolo pads and waving coat are wrong but we are judging them right. What should we do? Mr D Coode the delegate for LRC said the Breed Council will have to write to the KC and speak to the Clubs

Thanks to Mrs Walton on behalf of the Breed Council.

23 August is the last cut off date for anything for the Liaison Committee.

4. Breed Council KC Representatives & Health Sub Committee Report

Mrs Hopkinson delegate for MCLRC gave a report from the Health Sub Committee. A copy will follow.

(1) Anyone who fails the GPRA test the KC will be writing to the owners and recommend how they should be breeding. This is being very successful.

(2) Unsuccessful in getting a two tier fee for registration if no health tests were carried out, but we will continue to pressurising. We feel a higher fee would be helpful in getting people to do the tests.

(3) DBB no progress. Will update us when there is something to report.

We have asked the KC for their policy regarding puppies who were clear from parents who were clear of CCM but were subsequently found to be carriers. They did send a booklet but it was found not appropriate and we have asked for a new one. We have not seen the new one and believe breeders were not consulted.

The delegate for KSSLRC said that since Mrs Hopkinson's report things had moved a little because of political change and there may be two tier registration. The KC have frowned upon registering puppies without any health tests on the parents.

"The KC should have a two tier system where they identify the dogs whose parents do not have the appropriate health certificates. (hips and eyes) and:

1. Have a different type of registration certificate.
2. Higher fees."

The proposal had gone twice to the KC – the first time no reply and the second produced a bland reply.

It was proposed we take on board what the health committee ask us to do. Everyone agreed and they were asked to take the proposals forward.

5. MCLRC proposals.

a) Agreed. Mrs Barker asked to add "and the field trial lists". Carried

b) and *page 3

The delegate for KSS said they did not want to dumb down but with low entries where will we get our future judges. The delegate for LRC of W suggested if entries rise we can reconsider numbers upwards.

The delegate for KSS had taken a census of championship shows for 2012 – the number entered less the absences of 24 shows:

Average entries were 66 dogs and 86 bitches.

Open show entries must be achievable and reflect championship entries.

Delegate from MCLRC said she did not think we should dumb down the experience of becoming judges. If they cannot do it in 2 shows make it 3 shows and they must have judged maybe 100 – 150 over 3 breed club shows.

Delegate from CWLRC said we must help people get through or they will start to refuse breed clubs that do not get a lot of people attend.

The delegate from EALRC agreed with MCLRC – why not 3 shows rather than 2 to get the numbers. It might not make a better judge but would give more experience. The delegate from Scotland agreed but made the point that some people found it hard to get 2 breed shows. He knew some people waited 3 years for a second appointment.

Mr Coode delegate for LRC made the point that the issue is about ability to judge dogs not numbers of clubs or entries.

The proposal is: 5(b)

For – 3

Against – 7

Not carried.

c) For – 12

Carried

d) Carried

e) There was some discussion around this subject as some clubs already donate. It was agreed that the original was not carried but an amendment would be accepted that it remains a voluntary contribution.

Proposed by Mrs Carpanini

Seconded by Mrs Cuthbert

Carried

6. LRCW Proposal.

a) LRCW suggested that a CH SH assessors should carry out the assessment. YLC thought that would not work as it would mean finding 20+ people willing to be assessors. LRCW that would depend on the number of shows, we need new judges and we must find a way. KSS said it was a requirement of the KC that they should be assessed at first championship appointment, and

therefore being assessed at an open show would not mean they would not get assessed at a championship show. Much discussion followed.

LCS commented that in Cocker Spaniels this is the current situation and they can be assessed 3 times before they do a CH SH.

LRCW - perhaps they are not good enough to judge CH SH and should be assessed at open shows first.

EALRC asked how would they be marked i.e. tick box questions, and LRCW confirmed as now.

The Chairman reiterated that we cannot change KC rules.

KSS said could we change the proposal to read "encouraged" rather than assessed. There followed some discussion

The Chairman said that we could not make amendment here. It must go back to the club. Therefore vote for proposal as it stands.

As the proposal stands: In favour – 7
Against – 3
Carried

It was also agreed that this proposal should be forwarded to the KC Breed Liaison Council for their consideration.

b) MCLRC – Do we want to pay someone to do this or a volunteer. If we want a professional site then we must pay a professional person. KSS said it cost £50 to have top of the range Moonfruit. Mrs Venturi-Rose would speak to Mrs Braddon. She could give more than one person editing rights. It would also suggested linking to another frontface with and a free link specifically for health people say on the bar that would take you straight through to health points.

The proposal was carried.

7. NDLRC explained that someone thought she was on the list of candidates for a seminar but didn't put an email address and therefore didn't get on the course, hence the proposal.

After discussion it was agreed this should be left to the individual clubs running the seminar.

KSS said the clubs have the right to refuse people entry to any events they run and have no obligation to give a reason and seminars should be the same.

Those in favour of leaving to the individual societies – 10
Against – nil

8. KSS explained. If a person wanted to be on 'C' list they think they should have judged some dogs re "criteria" should be changed to "minimum experience to be considered".

LRCW said that according to KC they do not have to do seminars at all, just take interest.

MCLRC thought that we should come back to this. Thought that 30 dogs is rather a lot for a novice.

Agreed to come back to it.

The proposal put by KSS at the top of page 3:

Those in favour – 8

Against – 3

Carried.

9.a) This is to try to bring into line dogs sent abroad and have a clear record of where they have gone. If KC issued export pedigrees then we would have a record of and when Labradors went. MCLRC suggested a reciprocal agreement between KC of Pakistan and KC of Great Britain. It was agreed to amend the proposal to include a "Reciprocal Agreement between Pakistan and Great Britain KCs"

For as amended – 10

Carried

YLC suggested this be put forward to Liaison Committee for all breeds. Agreed

b)

1. There was a discussion around this proposal during which Mrs Linda Heron confirmed that any statements she may have made were on her own behalf and not NSLRC and the Secretary confirmed that any conversations after the Chairman had closed the meeting were definitely not minuted.

The Chairman stated that the Kennel Club must police not the Breed Council.

It was agreed that there would be no vote as we are under the KC Code of Conduct.

2. LCS agreed to reword.

c) Already dealt with.

10. Mr D Coode LRC commented that all the evaluations are accepted but he happened to know that it was assessed in one evaluation that the judge had put up a number of "limping dogs" but this judge has been accepted. He had not seen a form but interestingly the field trial people want to

change it to give people some scope to do an evaluation. May be as Breed Council we could go through the liaison representative to review this form so people can assess judges properly.

The delegate from KSS said she had seen the form and doesn't know why it should be secret it is not data protected. If something was assessed against you , you are entitled to see it.

The Secretary confirmed that the form was not secret but the assessors are subject to confidentiality. If you fail the KC go to the judges in question and ask them to clarify and they look at it again.

Voting commenced at 3.30 + coffee

Results of A1	For	Against	Abstain
Mr Jan Roger Sauge	11	1	1 unknown
Mr Sven Sletterdal	7	3	3
Mr Ian Ganney	9	2	1
Mrs Celia Turner	6	5	1
Mrs Ann Moss	7	3	3
Mrs Margaret Woods	8	3	2
Mr Stephen Hollings	8	3	2

A3

Mrs Amanda Dean	10	2	1
-----------------	----	---	---

11. Roll of Honour

YLC proposed Mr Eric Gill

Carried unanimously

12. Any other business

C List of Breed Specialist Judges

Regarding hands on dog numbers. Amendments:

replace "To have attended a Labrador Retriever novice judging seminar and to have judged (hands on) 30 or more Labrador Retriever" with:

"to have attended a breed specific seminar and to have judged 10 (hands on) or more Labrador Retrievers."

C List of Non-Breed Specialist Judges

Amendments:

Replace “in another gundog breed” with “any other breeds”

The word “criteria” should be changed to “experience required for the consideration of a proposing club is”.

Those in favour: 12

Carried

b) Extended Breed Standard

MCLRC confirmed there had been a misunderstanding and had thought they had been asked to revise the breed standard with regard to cosmetic faults but then discovered this was not what was required, however they have put together a booklet which can be used as a template and used at seminars with an addendum at the end with pictorials re cosmetic faults.

There was general agreement that this would be a very useful tool but that it should go back to the Clubs to discuss.

It was suggested it might be put on the web site to be as a useful tool to be used by other countries as well as the US standard.

MCLRC said they would email a revised copy to each Club.

c) LRC pointed out that some people showing their dogs at a show were then doing a small amount of stewarding at that show and counting it as a full day stewarding. Also some people were not doing critiques. The Chairman comment that it should be reported.

d) (1) YLC requested that the size of our rings at Crufts should be a similar size as Goldens. Can they have the breed council’s support. **All in favour**

(2) We need to sort out what happens to judges who are disappearing off the list as they have not gone up to A list. Agreed they should remain on their original list.

(3) Wavy coat clarification – The secretary said it was carried last time that she should ask the KC to allow “a slight wave in coat” to be added but unfortunately this was not done. Letter was read from Richard Edwards not agreeing. MCLRC said Richard originally only wrote “OK by me”.

e) LCS had done a survey at a championship show on whether people wanted to drop benching and the results were – Keep – 72, drop – 26 and 27 indifferent.

13. The next meeting was arranged for April 10th 2014 at the Kennel Club

Karl would confirm

4.05 meeting closed.