

**MINUTES OF THE GENERAL MEETING OF THE LABRADOR BREED COUNCIL HELD IN THE
BOARDROOM OF THE KENNEL CLUB AFTER THE AGM ON 17th APRIL 2014**

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

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. No objections noted so Mrs Walton permitted to observe.

2. Matters Arising.

2, 13(1) Mrs Carpanini of LRCW asked what had happened regarding the request that Bolo Pads and Slight Wave of coat to be added to the breed standard as permissible. The council agreed the proposal and after some discussion it was agreed that the Hon Secretary would write to the Kennel Club to ask if they would consider adding both into the Labrador Breed Standard.

Proposed by LRCW and Seconded by MCLRC All in favour.

3. Breed Liaison Council Representative Report

Firstly I must give you some disappointing news concerning the Item put forward by the Golden Retriever Clubs. This was that if the Working Gundog Certificate was obtained on game and awarded in all sections it would allow for the removal of the Sh from the title of a Show Champion. As I reported last year this proposal was supported by the Kennel Club Breeds Liaison Council and forwarded to the Field Trial Sub-committee. Apparently the FT Sub Committee have decided that the WGC is not an appropriate assessment to facilitate the amendment of a Show Champion's title. As the WGC is an unregulated stand-alone assessment which tests the partnership between handler and dog in a working situation whereas the Show Gundog Working Certificate tests for working instinct only and is regulated. Also the assessors of the WGC are no longer limited to Panel Judges.

Quite a number of relevant items have been discussed at the two meetings held in May and November of last year.

A proposal by the Southern Golden Retriever Society concerning the manufacture of Stud Book numbers by the transfer of dogs between owners for the purpose of acquiring 3 stud book numbers was discussed. Although the Kennel Club put out a press release in March 2012 regarding multiple transfers of ownership the Council agreed that whilst this had raised awareness of the issue it was uncertain whether the minority which it had been aimed at would take notice. Whilst this behaviour was not technically against Kennel Club Regulations The Council agreed that such unsporting behaviour went against the spirit of the regulations and needed to be addressed further by the Kennel Club. This proposal was supported and was referred onwards. Subsequently the General Committee felt that any regulation would be difficult to police. Therefore they did not support

further action but would continue to rely on Breed Clubs to bring to its attention those individuals who attempt to circumvent the requirements.

The discussion item put forward by this Council was responded to by Mr Nick Bryce Smith. He outlined the qualifications required for a person to be eligible to attend a Judges Development Programme (JDP) Breed Seminar and Breed Assessment. He explained that the JDP's panel of assessors were breed specialists and that the assessment was a very demanding process. The Office confirmed that judges who have obtained a JDP Credit are exempt from Kennel Club Regulations which require them to be included on a breed council B list in order to judge more than 5 classes. It was also confirmed that it was not Kennel Club policy to seek Breed Council opinion for these judges. However Breed Councils were encourage to place such judges on their judge's lists. To find out who these people are Clubs should refer to the Kennel Gazette where they are listed.

We put forward three proposals to be discussed at the November meeting and I will read these out together with the relevant minutes.

Proposed: Labrador Breed Council

The Labrador Breed Council would ask that the Kennel Club consider re-negotiating a full Reciprocal Agreement with the Kennel Club of Pakistan which would ensure that all dogs would only be able to obtain registration in Pakistan on production of a UK export pedigree.

Minute

1. Mrs Walton on behalf of the Labrador Breed Council, explained that although the Kennel Club has a reciprocal agreement with the Kennel Club of Pakistan it had concerns that the agreement was not being adhered to fully and that registrations had taken place without the correct paperwork being obtained. Mr Lambert informed the Council that the Kennel Club is unable to deal with the matters where only circumstantial evidence is available, substantiated evidence must be provided. The Council agreed that in the absence of sufficient evidence, no further action could be taken and recommended that the proposal be withdrawn.

The Office confirmed that further information on reciprocal agreements can be found in the Q Regulations.

Proposed: Labrador Breed Council

The Labrador Breed Council is concerned at the high cost of the form that needs to be completed for each eye test that is carried out. It is understood that the cost to the eye panellist is £8.65 per form which even applies when a form is spoilt. This cost is, of course, passed on to the owner. Would the Kennel Club please contact the British Veterinary Association (BVA) and ask the reason for such high printing costs, especially when the forms aren't even serial numbered.

Minute

1. Mrs Walton, on behalf of the Labrador Breed Council, explained that owners are encouraged to have all their breeding stock health tested and that for many breeds this involved several different health checks, all of which were costly. The Labrador Breed Council expressed its concern that, particularly in the current economic climate, the rising cost of eye tests would deter owners from

having their dogs tested. The Council noted that the current cost of the Kennel Club BVA eye test was £51 per dog and that the BVA charged Veterinary Practices £8.65 for its service. However it was pointed out that this was not the physical cost of producing the form but was simply the method employed by the BVA to provide income to cover the costs of running the scheme. Furthermore the Kennel Club receives no income from the KC/BVA health schemes.

Mr Lambert informed the Council that the Kennel Club met with the BVA regularly to discuss the scheme and that the Kennel Club always emphasised the importance of keeping fees to a minimum. The Council noted the General Committee of the Kennel Club had recently agreed to publish ECVO eye scheme results on the online Health Test Results Finder and registration certificates since the scheme is already recognised by the KC. In addition to this the Council were advised that other health schemes, not administered by the BVA, were currently under consideration. Having considered the proposal fully, the Council agreed that it wanted to show its support to the Kennel Club for attempting to tackle the problem of rising eye scheme costs and unanimously supported the proposal.

Mr Lambert offered to broach the issue of owners being charged for spoilt papers at the next BVA meeting, in order to seek clarification on this point.

(This is due to be considered by the Dog Health Group – Genetics and health screening sub group at its next meeting. I have not heard the result of this yet.)

Proposed: Labrador Breed Council

The Labrador Breed Council requests that the Kennel Club look at the timing of the assessment of upcoming Championship Show Judges. We suggest that this be moved from the first Championship Show and be replaced by an assessment at a Breed Club Open Show.

Minute

19. Mrs Walton, on behalf of the Labrador Breed Council, explained that assessing judges prior to awarding Challenge Certificates (CCs) would provide constructive feedback to aspiring judges and avert problems and bad practice at Championship Show level.

1. The Office reminded the Council of the Kennel Club's A2 judge's approval route, which already met the proposal's criteria because it required an aspiring judge to be assessed on three separate occasions in advance of receiving a Challenge Certificate appointment. The Council discussed the proposed requirement to be assessed at Breed Club Open Show level and was of the view that it would be difficult for judges of minority breeds, which scheduled very few shows, to progress further. The Council noted that the A2 process not only allowed candidates to be assessed at Breed Club Open or Limited shows but also General Canine Society Open shows, General or Group Championship shows (non CC appointments), seminars, special award classes and mock classes.

A discussion ensued about the lack of available evaluators/assessors. The Office explained that assessing judges is important and in order to maintain the highest possible standards only the most seasoned judges in a particular breed may carry out assessments/evaluations. The list of Assessors provided by the Kennel Club is made up of the most experienced judges in that breed, and who have judged recently. The Office advised the Council that it was unable to remove names from the list

unless it was notified that the person no longer wished to be included, or if the person was deceased or retired. However, in the event that a breed had been unable to appoint an evaluator they should notify the Judges Department at the Kennel Club who would endeavour to appoint a Group Judge where possible. Similarly if an A2 assessor or first time CC Evaluator had been unavailable to carry out the assessment the Club could put forward an alternative name for the Kennel Club to consider.

Having considered the proposal fully the Council agreed that the A2 process more than met the requirements of the proposal and therefore the proposal did not receive the Council's support.

The Kennel Club has asked for help in keeping their directory of Championship Show judges up to date and asked if someone could check through this and notify them of any people on them who had retired or died those that have retired must write in and tell them. They also wish to keep the Kennel Club Evaluator List up to date and asked that they be notified of those that do not wish to be included on this or had died. They stressed that the person who did not wish to be included should write in themselves stating this.

The May meeting has been cancelled due to lack of proposals. Any items for the November meeting should be with me by the 26th August.

4. Breed Council KC Representatives & Health Sub Committee Report

Apologies: None received. Clarification required from the Labrador Club of Scotland on who their representative should be as Margaret Brown is no longer on their committee or attends the health sub-committee meetings.

Attendance: Janet Cole Fiona Braddon, Marion Hopkinson (Chairman) Caron Morton Lynda Heron, Joy Venturi Rose, Penny Carpanini

Minutes of the last meeting: The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

Matters arising:

The chairman expressed the opinion that the main LBC agenda item submitted by Northumberland & Durham LRC which was clearly a Health matter should have come to the Health Committee first. That was the correct route so that it could be discussed by all the Breed Club representatives first and a decision made as to whether to make a proposal from the whole LBC HSC.

Lynda Heron (LH) responded saying that because there had been no HSC meetings before the agenda was closed for LBC meeting it was a good way to test opinion of all breed clubs and allow open discussion at the LBC meeting.

The breed survey needs an introduction to say what it is about and what it will be used for. Anonymity was discussed. It was decided to make it anonymous but give the option at the end to provide contact details if wished. The additional of a Pet name that was matched to year off birth could help to highlight any anomalies or repeated entries. **LH will contact the KC to follow up on their offer to circulate via email to registered owners. The addition of a part to notify sudden death was also discussed and agreed to be added.**

The letter written to KC asking them to not allow breeding between two parents neither of whom were DNA tested for GPRA was not responded to. However, it was confirmed that the KC are now operating the system of writing to anyone who has bred an affected litter (as per the Dachshund precedent). Anecdotally, the meeting heard of examples, where Labradors affected by GPRA are sometimes diagnosed by ophthalmological referral vets who were not on the BVA/KC eye panel. These cases are not automatically entered into the KC/BVA eye scheme and therefore not added to breed data. **It was agreed a letter to be sent to the KC and copied to the RCVS and BVA would be drafted by Joy Venturi Rose (JVR) and circulated to the committee for comments.**

JVR will put an introduction and link on a variety of facebook sites directing them to the Breed Council web site health section and the breed health co-ordinators. Stating we are always happy to answer questions from breeders or owners in the UK. Information that we have access to experience and are elected by breed clubs should also be made. In addition, a closed facebook site just for our committee was agreed. We could use the text facility to deal with issues through the year and only have a second meeting for specific very important issue/s. LH

Please could all health committee members ensure that changes to contact details i.e. email addresses or where members prefer a different one to be used that they contact Joy or Marion with the information. All documents will be sent as a word and PDF document so everyone can open them. (It is also possible to download a free internet programme called open office to allow the user to open word documents using the most recent issues of the software).

Comments on Elbow and Hip Scoring Advice. The BVA/KC advice and information for breeders and owners is now thought to be too prescriptive for breeders having to tackle lots of other health conditions as well as type, temperament, inbreeding co-efficient etc. The statistical relevance of Mean Median and Mode in a non norm referenced population is also an issue. Estimated Breeding Values data was also discussed. Discussion on best time to XRAY and variance of results was also discussed. The group considered that later was often better. A study comparing results of radiographs taken at both 1 and 2 years of age would be interesting. A comparison between the ISDS and the KC and on how they approached the management of health issues was made. It was agreed that a letter expressing the groups disquiet regarding the BVA/KC advice on elbow and hip scores as above would be written. **JVR to draft a letter and circulate.** It needed to be scientifically factual so would take a while to write to best effect. The group felt that in some cases the breeders who were testing were going to be unnecessarily penalised whilst those that did not test would not be so constrained by what they bred from. **Lynda Heron would further research her contacts for the evidence base for elbows.**

The group felt that we should continue to press for more rigor in PRA testing even though we are not listened to. **An initial letter was drafted for the chairman to circulate.**

Feed back to Breed Council

Elbow Dysplasia Scheme. There was no majority in favour of making elbow scoring compulsory for ABS. The HSC recommend leaving it as desirable and will review this decision in light of further evidence collected by HSC members particularly the comparison between results of Xrays and CAT scans. There were also a number of environmental factors to consider regarding the development of elbow dysplasia.

PRA (as above)

BVA/KC Hip article disquiet (see appendix). A letter was required as above.

(recent updates to the BVA web site information now seem to render this letter un-necessary)

Regarding coat colour other breeds had obviously been involved with the development of these non standard colours and this meant there was potential for introducing yet more inherited diseases into the Labrador breed pool.

The Health Strategy and roles specification agreed from the last meeting are to go on the web site.

The group questioned what the future of the Labrador Club of Scotland might be in relation to the UK KC and the breed council and health committee if the country voted for independence.

The committee supported a voluntary system of recording DNA results on the mate select web site.

Re-election of the health committee representatives is due in 2015

5. Correspondence

a) BC approval of A1 Judges by Penny Carpanini

After discussion of the proposal it was agreed that this would go back to the breed clubs to discuss and bring back to the meeting next year with a proposal if required to change the way we approve judges on to the A1 lists.

MCLRC & 3RLRC state that they discuss their open show judges after they have judged and they keep records so when this person's name comes forward they can look back to see what they have said. MCLRC advised they have an assessment form they complete on each of their open show judges. It was requested that this template is circulated to the clubs.

It was also mentioned by the Hon Secretary that we really need to look at our judges criteria due to the kennel club sending out information that they would like us to bring our list's criteria in to line with theirs.

b) Letter from Jack Vanderwyk.

Every club thought this was a very well written document to the Kennel Club and that we supported him with what he had sent.

c) Letter from Lesley Dantennes

This letter was discussed and agreed with the contents.

It was agreed that these have been covered within the proposal of the LRC.

6. Hon Secretary wishes to propose:

The Labrador Breed Council Secretary to instigate the arrangement of a meeting with a representative of the Kennel Club Judges Sub-Committee to establish the following:-

- What do the KC Judges Subcommittee feel are the current failings of the Labrador Breed Council Criteria?
- Where would the KC like to see the criteria?

- Why does the judges subcommittee disregard the comments of the Labrador Breed Council?
- If common ground was achieved what considerations to Breed Council comments do the Judges Sub-Committee actually make?
- Would the judges subcommittee give clear guidance on what comments they would take on board when approving or rejecting a judge's suitability for awarding CC's?

After discussion it was agreed that the Breed Council Secretary would write to the Judges Sub Committee and express our concerns, and also try and arrange a meeting to discuss the items above. All agreed.

7. N&DLRC wish to propose:

- a) We propose that Elbow Scoring be moved from "recommended" to "required" on the Assured Breeder Scheme list of Health Tests
Note: This would restore this test to the position of several years ago and can only be a contribution to the improvement of the breed

A vote was taken Yes 4 No 6 Not Carried.

- b) We propose that, in any mating, Assured Breeder Scheme members will be required to ensure that one parent is DNA tested clear for PRCD1 or one parent is hereditarily clear for PRCD1
Note: PRCD1 testing has been available for over 10 years and we consider this proposal would now ensure that blindness from this debilitating disease, to have become a condition of the past

A vote was taken Yes 9 No 2 Carried.

- c) We propose that the Kennel Club record SD2 (Skeletal Dwarfism) results
Note: SD2 is a serious problem primarily in working lines and it is believed that the identified gene is more widespread than initially thought. Publication of results and availability of information regarding tested dogs may help people who wish to breed away from the problem, to do so

A vote was taken Yes 6 No 5 Carried.

- d) We propose that Labrador Breed Council adopt a standard group of health tests. If a dog or bitch or both parents of a litter meet the criteria set, then breed club members could claim, for the individual or litter that "I am a member of xxxxxx Labrador Breed Club and this dog/bitch/litter meets Labrador Breed Council Health Testing Standards". We consider this would a tool to help puppy buyers, easily identify responsible and caring breeders
- If adopted by Labrador Breed Council, then we consider it would be possible to develop a simple logo followed by name of Breed Club
 - The logo and statement would then become known as a quality standard approved by Labrador Breed Council
 - Anyone claiming this status or using the logo must be a member of a Breed Club
 - Members of Breed Clubs could use the logo/statement when advertising stud dogs, bitches and litters
 - This will discourage misleading statements such as 'fully health tested'

- This proposal does not identify what these tests should be and this should be for discussion by Labrador Breed Council

FOR DISCUSSION

The list of standard health tests could be:

Stud Dogs and Breeding Bitches:

Hip score below breed average

Clear elbows

Current clear eye certificate

One parent tested for PRCD1 or hereditarily clear for PRCD1

Litter

Both parents meet the above criteria

A vote was taken Yes 1 No 9 Not Carried.

- e) We propose a review of Labrador Breed Council Judges Lists

Note:

- i. Judges who may not be judging regularly should be contacted and asked if they are still happy to accept appointments

All agreed Carried.

8. MCLRC wish to propose:

- a) That the criteria for inclusion on to the A3 list reverts back to '100 dogs entered or 80 dogs present and judged'

After discussion the proposal was withdrawn.

- b) MCLRC would like to endorse all aspects of Mr Vanderwyk's open letter concerning the three Labrador Retriever colours and the Stud Book keeping of these colours. Any deviation from the original standard would be deemed to be a crossbreed.

This item was dealt with under correspondence.

- c) MCLRC would like to thank the Breed Council Secretary for updating the judge's lists and would like to propose that this is an annual commitment.

This was agreed by all.

9. LRCW wish to propose:

- a) The Labrador Club of Wales is concerned by the appointment of overseas judges at General Championship Shows, who are not known as Labrador judges or enthusiasts. Our proposal is that these judges should be assessed at their first judging appointment for the breed, as any British judge would and that they should be made aware of the necessity of supplying critiques within one month of judging. All judges who officiate overseas from Britain have to adhere to FCI rules and we feel that FCI judges should adhere to our rules and standards when judging here.

After a discussion and an explanation that the proposal related to the non-submission of critiques as all judges awarding CC's for the first time are assessed. A vote was taken Yes 13 No 0 Carried.

NILRC would like to add that they had been made aware that Dr James had not sent a critique to the dog papers for a show that he judges in Ireland.

- b) On another subject, we would like to distribute a discussion document at the Breed Council meeting regarding the appointment of A3 list judges. This document is to be taken away by delegates, to be discussed at their own committees and brought back for discussion at the Breed Council meeting in 2015. (The document is attached)

This item was discussed under correspondence

10. NWLRC wish to propose:

- a) Can the council confirm that the NWLRC's Limit show counts as a Breed Club show for the purposes of applying for the A3 list? Apparently this was agreed some years ago but the LBC's criteria has not been updated.

This item was discussed and it was explained to the members of the breed council that the limit show would not help the judge towards the Kennel Club Criteria for giving CC's.

A vote was taken Yes 8 No 1

- b) A sub-committee oversee the formation of a standard training package for Judging Seminars. This to include a panel of trainers, teaching materials and panel of assessors. This would enable clubs to arrange a venue and then approach the LBC who would in turn provide the above.
After a discussion it was agreed that the Kennel Club already have a training package for giving seminars.
- c) LBC to approach the KC in order to clarify the legal standing of a KC owner registration certificate as proof of ownership.

After discussion it was agreed that the Kennel Club Registration already states the proof of ownership.

11. LRC wish to propose:

After the recent letter that was sent to us regarding registration of non- standard colours we would like to insist that The Kennel Club only register black, yellow and chocolate (liver) as standard colours. Any additional colour should be recorded as 'colour not recognised by KC'. This would follow the precedent set for the registration of pugs and would mean The Kennel Club should register, for example; 'silver - not KC recognised', 'charcoal - not KC recognised' and 'champagne not KC recognised' etc.

This way a more true reflection of the colour is recorded whilst conveying that it is not an accepted colour for the breed by The Kennel Club.

After discussion it was agreed that the Hon Secretary would write to the Kennel Club requesting that the Kennel Club start to register Labradors as above. All Agreed

- 12. 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
Mrs Leigh Lesley	12	1	
Mrs Alison Scutcher	12	1	
Mrs Lesley Dantinnnes	13		
Mr Ken Roberts	6	3	4

Non Breed Specialist's

	For	Against	Abstain
Mr H T Lehtinen	7	5	1
Mr Richard Bott	13		
Mrs Pam Blay	11	1	1
Mr R Oliveira	1	9	3

13. 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
Mrs M Young

Three Ridings LRC would like to nominate Mrs P Gill & Cotswold & Wyevevorn LRC would like to nominate Mr P Woolf for the Roll of Honour list.

This was agreed by all.

14. Any Other Business by the discretion of the Chair

No other business

15. Date and Venue of next meeting

9th April 2015 at The Kennel Club

Karl would confirm

Vote of thanks to the chair

4.00pm meeting closed.