



**MEETING OF THE WORKING TRIALS LIAISON COUNCIL TO BE HELD
AT 10.30 AM ON TUESDAY 7 JUNE 2022 AT 10.30 AM IN THE
BOARDROOM, THE KENNEL CLUB, CLARGES STREET - AGENDA**

ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

ITEM 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2022 (copies previously distributed).

ITEM 3. MATTERS ARISING/RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- a. The Board, at its meeting on 5 April 2022, approved the following amendments to regulations:

Regulation I(B)1 Method of Handling

TO:

1. Method of handling.—Although implicit obedience is necessary, dogs and handlers must operate in as free and natural a manner as possible; persistent barking, whining, etc. in any exercise other than location of person or speak on command should be penalised. The handler must not have food or a toy on their person whilst the dog is being tested. **As far as reasonably practical, competitors should not watch any dog working the nosework in the same stake, prior to competing.**

(Insertion in bold)

(Effective 1 January 2023)

Note: the wording for the amendment was amended slightly by the Activities Committee from 'competitors must not watch any dog...' (as recommended by the Council) to 'competitors should not watch any dog...' having noted that that it was often necessary, for reasons of logistics and timing, for competitors to be making their way to areas of the trial whilst the nosework round was being worked by another competitor, and that in doing so they may pass the nosework area. It was acknowledged that it was custom and practice in such circumstances that competitors would not take the opportunity to closely observe the nosework round in order to gain any unfair advantage.

- b. Amendment to the minutes

The Committee noted that the Council had approved an amendment to the minutes of its meeting held on 6 July 2021, which now read:

'The Council noted that two reports, from a veterinary surgeon and a physiotherapist, on the effects of bitework technique on dogs, had been circulated by Mr Lewindon to Council members prior to the meeting. However, it was noted that the reports had not been independently commissioned, and therefore they were not discussed further.'

- c. Selection of judges for the Kennel Club Working Trials Championships

The Committee noted the Council's wish for an amendment to the time frame for the selection of judges and the request for host societies to come forward. It accepted that for any other working trial, host societies would select their own judges, but in the case



of the Championships host societies had no input or control over the selection of judges, and as a result there was a potential for issues to arise.

The Committee was in agreement with the views expressed by the Council, and approved the change in the timeframe whereby in future, judges would be appointed prior to issue of the request for host societies to come forward.

d. Working trials research

Discussion on the outcome of the research, and associated proposals and discussion items are included on the agenda under item 8.

ITEM 4. ACTIVITIES HEALTH AND WELFARE SUB-GROUP

The Council is invited to note a written report from Mr Gilbert on the work of the Sub-Group following its meeting on 4 April 2022.

(Annex A refers – to follow)

ITEM 5. ACTIVITIES JUDGES SUB-GROUP

The Council is invited to note a verbal update from Mr Gilbert following the Activities Judges Sub-Group meeting on 5 May 2022.

ITEM 6. KENNEL CLUB WORKING TRIAL CHAMPIONSHIPS

The Council is invited to note a verbal update on the results of the ballot for judges for the Kennel Club Working Trial Championships 2024.

ITEM 7. USE OF FIREARMS

The Council is invited to receive a presentation from Mr S Jenkinson (Access and Countryside Advisor to the Kennel Club) on legal issues relating to the use of firearms during Kennel Club licensed events.

ITEM 8. WORKING TRIALS RESEARCH

At its meeting on 13 January 2022, the Council considered the main recommendations made in the report, which were:

- From the findings, it is recommended that consideration be made about the scale being lowered from 6ft to 5ft 6 ins. Whilst lowering to 5ft would further reduce the impact on joints and landing force, this in turn encourages the dogs to 'jump' rather than 'scale', changing the nature of the obstacle.
- There is evidence to suggest that shortening the length of the long jump may be of benefit to the dogs. Whilst not formally measured as part of the study, the capacity of the dogs to avoid overjumping the shorter distances suggests a sudden reduction of the long jump distance does not appear to impact dogs experienced in jumping a 9ft long jump.

The Council was in broad support of making changes to the obstacles, subject to feedback from the working trials community which would form an important part of the decision-making process.

A number of proposals and discussion items have been submitted in respect of this issue, and in the interests of clarity these are listed together below.



In order to aid the discussion, representatives are requested to gather feedback from the clubs they represent prior to the meeting as to whether they are in support of changes being made to the obstacles, and if so, which of the various approaches put forward would be the most appropriate, noting that some are very similar.

- a. ASPADS Working Trials Society Mr B Gilbert
Proposed amendments to Regulation I(B)10.g
The society wishes to propose amendments to Regulation I(B)10.g to reflect the conclusions of the report on the jump study on the sizes of the long jump and scale, i.e. shorten the long jump to 8ft and lower the scale to 5ft 6 ins.

Proposal 1 – long jump

- g. Jumping heights and lengths:
(2) CD and UD stakes:
(b) Long Jump—
Dogs not exceeding 254mm (10in) at shoulder 1.219m (4ft)
Dogs not exceeding 381mm (15in) at shoulder 1.828m (6ft)
Dogs exceeding 381mm (15in) at shoulder ~~2.743m (9ft)~~ **2.438m (8ft)**
- (3) WD, TD and PD stakes:
(b) Long Jump ~~2.743m (9ft)~~ **2.438m (8ft)**
(Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold)

Proposal 2 – Scale

- g. Jumping heights and lengths:
(2) CD and UD stakes:
(c) Scale—
Dogs not exceeding 254mm (10in) at shoulder 914.4mm (3ft)
Dogs not exceeding 381mm (15in) at shoulder 1.219m (4ft)
Dogs exceeding 381mm (15in) at shoulder ~~1.828m (6ft)~~ **1.676m (5ft 6in)**
- (3) WD, TD and PD stakes:
(c) Scale ~~1.828m (6ft)~~ **1.676m (5ft 6in)**

(Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold)

- b. Leamington Dog Training Club Mr J Wykes
Proposed amendments to Regulation I(B)10.g
Leamington Dog Training Club wishes the Council to consider a proposal to change the height of the scale and the length of the long jump in line with the jump study recommendations.

It proposes that the maximum height of the Scale be lowered from 6ft to 5ft 6ins., and that the maximum length of the Long Jump be reduced from 9ft to 8ft.

Rationale

To bring the jumps in line with the recommendations from the jump study conducted by Nottingham Trent University and to improve safety for the dogs.

- g. Jumping heights and lengths:
(2) CD and UD stakes:
(b) Long Jump—
Dogs not exceeding 254mm (10in) at shoulder 1.219m (4ft)
Dogs not exceeding 381mm (15in) at shoulder 1.828m (6ft)



Dogs exceeding 381mm (15in) at shoulder ~~2.743m (9ft)~~ **2.438m (8ft)**

(3) WD, TD and PD stakes:

(b) Long Jump ~~2.743m (9ft)~~ **2.438m (8ft)**

(Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold)

g. Jumping heights and lengths:

(2) CD and UD stakes:

(c) Scale—

Dogs not exceeding 254mm (10in) at shoulder 914.4mm (3ft)

Dogs not exceeding 381mm (15in) at shoulder 1.219m (4ft)

Dogs exceeding 381mm (15in) at shoulder ~~1.828m (6ft)~~ **1.677m (5ft 6in)**

(3) WD, TD and PD stakes:

(c) Scale ~~1.828m (6ft)~~ **1.677m (5ft 6in)**

(Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold)

- c. North West Working Trials Society Mrs J Holt
Proposed amendment to the height of the scale

In order to reduce the risk of injury to jumping dogs coming off the scale, the above Society proposes that the height of the Working Trials scale should be reduced to 5ft 6 inches as recommended by the recent jump survey and to be in line with other dog sports who have already taken similar steps to reduce any risk of injury on their equipment.

- d. Wakefield Dog Training Club Mr D Craven
Proposed amendments to Regulation 1(B)10

(i) The club wishes to propose that the height of the scale be reduced from 6ft to 5ft 6ins as recommended by the Kennel Club jump study.

Rationale

Reducing the height will be beneficial in reducing the risk of injury and extend the longevity of dogs competing in Working Trials.

(ii) The club also proposes a reduction in the length of the long jump from 9ft to 8ft.

Rationale

Reducing the length will be beneficial in reducing the risk of injury and extend the longevity of dogs competing in working trials.

- e. Scottish Working Trials Society Ms L Cottier
Proposal to reduce the height of the scale to 5 ft 6ins

The Society (SWTS) wishes to propose that the current scale height of 6 ft is reduced to 5 ft 6ins, with a caveat that further research be conducted, either in a practical or desktop manner (or both), to identify potential risks posed by the scale under working trials conditions.

Rationale

SWTS initial preference was to submit a proposal for a type of A Frame, but the society recognises that this requires more time and research with regards any risks, costs, manoeuvrability and any other factors raised. Due to this, the reduced scale is the only alternative option available to attempt to reduce the risks from the current scale.

A study undertaken via The Kennel Club - Carter and Williams (2021) - investigated peak vertical forces and joint angles involved when performing the 6ft scale. Upon



reviewing this study, the Society considers that it is evident that in isolation it provided insufficient evidence to accomplish the task at hand.

The most significant limitations are related to the study conditions. The most important aspect to note with all research is that the study conditions should replicate the real world situation to as great a degree as possible. The results can then be extrapolated directly to the situation we want to investigate; in this case to WT dogs in training and competition. The use of a sand/fibre mix surface (developed to reduce the peak force velocity (PVF) in equine athletes) will have significantly reduced the PVF and altered carpal angles determined during this study in WT dogs.

In addition, it appears that the coefficient of friction (horizontal force) has not been considered in the study conditions and it is likely that the dogs experienced less traction than they would in WT conditions. This would be influenced by the setup of the landing pad, overlying mat and the surface beneath these as the reduced traction on this surface would alter joint angles.

Jumping a scale under these study conditions is highly likely to produce significantly different values than those obtained on grass or the wider varied working trials conditions.

f. Equipment and Progression Panel

Proposal to reduce the length of the long jump to 7ft

With regards to the Working Trials jump study, alongside other scientific research that has been sourced, the Panel wishes to propose that the long jump is reduced to 7ft. This proposal is made to reduce the risk of injury to an acceptable level.

Rationale

Anecdotally it is reported by owners that the long jump is the first obstacle that the dog seems to have issues with when an injury is about to present clinically.

Data relating to the range of motion at the shoulder joint in the working trials jump study demonstrated that more extension occurred, and hence joint compression, when landing over the 9ft long jump compared to the 7ft or 8ft. The study reports that there is evidence to suggest that shortening the length of the long jump may be of benefit to the dogs.

Basic physics and accepted principles regarding mechanism of injury shows that reducing its length would reduce the impact forces experienced. 8ft, in our view, and based on the available research, is not enough to reduce the risk by much if at all, hence 7ft was the option put in a recent poll, along with it remaining at 9ft. The poll resulted in 72 votes for keeping the long jump at 9ft and 275 to reduce it to 7ft.

There were many additional comments supporting the 7ft reduction as opposed to any other length, recognising this as still being an obstacle to test the dog's fitness, agility and ability but being more beneficial to the dogs' health and welfare.

g. Equipment and Progression Panel

Discussion item - A frame & further jump research

The Equipment & Progression Panel requests the Council discuss the recent poll result which showed overwhelming support for the A Frame (known as the 'A' Ramp in agility) (236 votes) in preference to the 6ft scale (66) and 5 ft 6ins scale (71). The scale has been the subject of years of discussion amid concerns that the risk of injury to the dog is high.



Other canine sports, and also equine sports that use jumps continually assess their safety and make changes to reduce the risk of injury. The police dog sections, on whose work working trials is based, also have replaced the scale as it is currently known.

The Panel wishes to continue consideration of the A Frame and similar obstacles. It believes this is part of an evolving piece of work and ongoing process to ensure any risks from the jumps, including the scale (even if reduced), and long jump (if not reduced to 7ft), are at an acceptable level, especially with regards WT conditions, as recommended by the authors of the recent study.

Part of this work could include further research to compare and contrast the scale and A-frame at a University specialising in biomechanics or a meta analysis / desktop study of the available data by an expert in biomechanics and kinetics/kinematics.

Note: North West Working Trials Society has also requested that the Panel consider designing an A frame which would perhaps incorporate a scale/ height of 5ft 6 ins, which would further reduce the element of risk on landing but would retain an exercise which retained the element of challenge.

The Society notes that the design would need to take into account:

- The safe construction and gradient of ramps
- The cost involved which should be realistic (the sides of present scales could potentially be used)
- Ease of transport
- If the ramps could be flexible in gradient it would be useful for training purposes and/or could be lowered to be used in lower stakes if required

ITEM 9. REPORT FROM THE PD STAKE PANEL

There is nothing to report from the Panel at the time of agenda issue.

ITEM 10. REPORT FROM THE PROGRESSION PANEL/ EQUIPMENT PANEL

- a. The Council is invited to note a report from the Panel, and to consider issues arising from it.
(Annex B refers)
- b. Long Jump
The Panel has submitted a proposal to reduce the length of the long jump to 7ft. As there are a number of other proposals relating to the long jump, this is included on the agenda under item 7.f.
- c. A frame & further jump research
The Panel has submitted a discussion item in relation to potential introduction of an A Frame in preference to the 6ft scale or 5 ft 6ins scale. This is included on the agenda under item 7.g.
- d. Proposal to remove the Steadiness to Gun exercise
The Panel wishes to propose the removal of the Steadiness to Gun exercise with the proviso that, if approved, it cannot be implemented until reallocation of marks has been agreed.

Regulation I(B)8



TO:

~~Steadiness to gunshot.— No gun test will be held in buildings, or other confined areas, nor will shotguns be used at working trials. Guns used must be constructed to fire blanks only. Prior warning must be given to the handler, who will be instructed to work the dog 'heel free', or leave the dog within a controlling distance and where the handler has sight of their dog. The dog must not be provoked by excessive display of the gun, nor should the gun be pointed at the dog or handler except in Group IV Patrol. Any sign of fear, aggression or barking must be penalised. This test must not be incorporated into any other test.~~

(Deletion struck through)

Rationale

This is submitted with consideration of the safety, liability and practicality of firing and carrying a blank firing gun.

Over the past few years, two polls have been carried out in respect of the exercise.

In 2019, the poll asked the question – “Do you want the Gun Test to remain in Working Trials”? The results showed Remain – 36 Remove – 62 No preference – 22. Despite the poll result, members of the Council chose to keep the exercise, a move that was subjected to a great deal of criticism afterwards from many working trial enthusiasts.

A further poll was carried out in in 2021 with the question to keep or remove the Steadiness to Gun exercise. The results were: keep – 167 votes; remove – 187.

Feedback has been received that some working trial competitors, judges and trials managers feel uncomfortable about having the responsibility of the gun within their vehicle or on their person, should it be stolen or lost. It was also highlighted that training the exercise in a suitable area, and also when competing at a trial, where the gunshots will not alarm local residents or livestock, can prove problematic.

Current laws state that any imitation firearm cannot be carried in a public place without lawful authority or good reason. Dog training or proceeding to/from a training session count as good reason but having it in a pocket simply because the person has forgotten to put it away would not be a lawful excuse.

It should only be used on private land with the permission of the landowner. Concerns have been raised recently by a landowner that his fields (used for a working trial) are classed as public due to a public footpath running through them.

The Metropolitan Police Service has recently stated that illegal workshops have been set up in a number of areas to change blank firing pistols into live-firing guns and make ammunition to fit them. They have confirmed that they are looking into changes in legislation to make possession of blank firing pistols either illegal or placed under tighter controls. Some UK athletics clubs have already agreed to stop using certain kinds of starting pistol after talks with police.

The Panel cannot see how it is justifiable to keep the use of the gun in trials in light of the above concerns.

e. Proposal - further research

The Council is requested to consider a proposal from the Equipment Panel that further research in the area of Working Trials should be conducted. The purpose of this research would be to obtain data in relation to impact and joint stress experienced by working trials dogs. This data can be used to determine if the scale or long jump should be altered or replaced to adequately protect the health and welfare of the dogs.



(Annex C refers)

- f. Discussion item – reallocation of marks from the Steadiness to Gun exercise if removal is agreed.

If the proposal to remove the Steadiness to Gun is agreed, the Panel wishes the Council to discuss the way in which the 5 marks are reallocated.

Rationale

This discussion item is submitted to allow for the reallocation of the 5 marks currently allocated to the Steadiness to Gun. A poll was held in 2019 which asked the question 'If the Gun Test is removed, where would you want the marks to be reallocated?'

The results were:

Add To New Element	52
Heelwork	19
“A” Recall	19
Don't reallocate marks	11
Sendaway	4
Retrieve	3
Sit Stay	2
Different Noise	2
Add to scale	1
Temperament Test	1

Other suggestions raised at the time were –

UD Stake – Add recall; Add elementary speak

WD Stake – Add elementary speak

TD Stake – Add retrieve; alternative retrieve (judge's article)

All stakes – Down on recall; emergency stop; Style marks in C&A i.e. the overall style on how handler works the dog similar to those in the square; Recall in UD/WD and instant down recall in TD; Put all 5 marks on the square each article is 8 plus style 8.

The Panel encourages Council representatives and working trials enthusiasts to discuss this issue prior to the meeting to facilitate a productive discussion at the meeting.

- g. Proposal to amend Regulation I(B)10.(b) (Clear Jump)

The Panel wishes to propose the following amendment.

Regulation I(B)10.(b)

TO:

The Clear Jump should be so constructed that it will be obvious if the dog has exerted more than slight pressure upon it. **All poles, bars and fillers must be easily displaced by the dog.** The rigid top bar **should be round and** ~~may be fixed or rest~~ **within in cups or on top of dowels** and the space below may be filled in but the filling should not project above the bottom of the top bar. **There should be a further bar approximately halfway below. No further bar is required if the jump is lower than 3ft.** Appreciable pressure exerted by the dog on the clear jump shall be considered to be a failure.

(Insertions in bold. Deletions struck through)

Rationale

Some hurdles currently have a fixed top bar which increases the risk of injury to the dog if it knocks the jump when negotiating it. This proposal reduces the risk of injury with a top bar that is easily displaced if the dog hits it. Having a further bar



approximately halfway below allows a consistency in the construction of the Clear Jump used at trials.

h. Discussion item - progression through the stakes of small dogs

The Panel requests that the Council discuss the difficulties which it perceives in allowing small dogs to work right through the stakes to TD (not PD), and to discuss the possibility of reduced jump heights for smaller dogs as are currently available in the lower stakes.

The Panel is aware of the current difficulty of the dog having sight of its handler at the other side of the scale (and vice versa) and this will need to be looked into further. However, if all other elements of each stake were undertaken in the same manner as other dogs, and the scale issue rectified, then consideration could be given to changing the current rules accordingly.

The Panel would welcome constructive feedback, both positive and negative.

i. Discussion item - Introductory Stake and CD Open Stake

The Equipment & Progression Panel requests that the Council discuss making the lower stakes more beginner friendly.

Feedback has been received that new handlers find it daunting when competing against experienced handlers in the Introductory Stake. CD open stakes tend to have low entries and currently have the same exercises as CD championship stakes.

The Panel is looking into the eligibility of the handlers and dogs in the Introductory stake and are considering whether CD Open could be more beginner friendly. CD Championship would also be reviewed and general constructive feedback with regards encouraging newcomers to compete will be sought.

This review will commence after potential jump reductions are discussed and confirmed. In the meantime, the Panel would welcome feedback and comments from the Council.

ITEM 11. PROPOSALS FROM SOCIETIES/PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS

a. Southern Alsatian Training Society

Ms L Marlow

Proposed amendment to Regulation I25.d.

At the Council's previous meeting, at the request of Southern Alsatian Training Society, the Council considered whether qualifications to judge should be simplified, with particular reference to the requirement for judges for a CD stake at a championship working trial to have judged all groups in at least two working trials, and whether this should be reduced to any combination of one nosework round and one control round at CD open or UD open, plus having qualified CDEx or above. The Council accepted the society's concern that, if societies had separate judges for nosework and control in open trials, it could be a difficult and lengthy process for a judge to be offered the required appointments and to gain the necessary experience to progress. The majority were in support of the simplification of qualifications to judge and it was agreed that a suitable proposal should be submitted.

Accordingly, the Council is requested to consider the following proposed amendments to Regulation I25.d.:

Regulation I25.d.

TO:



d. Societies must be satisfied that the following minimum conditions have been met for the first appointment of judges for C.D., U.D. and W.D. stakes at a championship working trial:

- (1) For C.D. Stake—Must, **as a minimum**, have judged all groups in ~~at least two open working trials~~ **a C.D open or U.D. open trial or above**, and have as a handler qualified a dog **C.D.** 'Excellent' ~~in a Championship C.D. Stake or higher stake above~~.
- (2) For U.D. Stake – Must, **as a minimum**, have judged all groups in ~~U.D., W.D., P.D. or T.D. stakes at two Open Working Trials~~ **a U.D. open trial or above**, have judged C.D. **Excellent**, ~~stake at a championship working trial~~ and have as a handler qualified a dog **U.D.** 'Excellent' ~~in a Championship U.D. stake or above~~.

Rationale:

Societies may find it difficult to promote or find new judges given the current requirements, as some trials have separate judges for nosework and control rounds.

In stating 'as a minimum' Societies can use their discretion as to whether a prospective judge is suitable.

b. Bloodhound Club

Mr N Sutcliffe

Proposed amendment to Regulation I(C)1

At the Council's previous meeting, Mr Sutcliffe advised the Council of his intention to submit a proposal for consideration at its next meeting in relation to the regulation which required handlers at Bloodhound trials to drop their leashes within 200 yards of the line up on the run in to the end of the line. The requirement for them to do so came into effect on 1 January 2020.

Accordingly, the Bloodhound Club wishes to propose an amendment to Regulation I(C) in order to remove the sentence requiring that the leash must be dropped before a judge can consider the hound to have made a satisfactory identification.

Regulation I(C)1 Bloodhound Working Trial Certificates

TO:

A Kennel Club Bloodhound Working Trial Certificate may be awarded to a Bloodhound winning a senior stake ~~without assistance~~ at a Championship Bloodhound Trial if it has clearly identified the ~~runner~~ **line-walker, without assistance**, to the satisfaction of the judge or judges. ~~Handlers who choose to work/hunt their hounds leashed must drop their leash within a minimum of 200 yds/183m of the line up, so that a natural identification takes place that is free from any handler interference.~~ A hound will be considered to have made a satisfactory identification if it is seen to approach and clearly select the ~~runner~~ **line-walker** from a group of three people at the end of the line. Judges may award a Certificate of Merit in all stakes to any hound not being placed which has given a good performance.

(Insertion in bold. Deletion struck through)

Rationale

Although an identification is more impressive if the hound runs straight into the line-walker, the last 200 yards are part of the line where different hounds can be compared for concentration, vigour and endurance. The handler can hardly interfere in the identification before the last 5 metres. Although it is unnecessary to include another sentence in item 1, the three people are two metres apart, so the handler can easily see, if he/she is approaching. If the handler enters the space within 4 metres, subject to the discretion of the judge, then the identification is forfeited. From that distance the judge or assistant can easily see and hear whether there is interference from the handler by voice, leash or manoeuvres, whether the hound is still on a leash or not. This removes any subsequent complaint about the leash being dropped within 200 yards.



Other minor changes have been proposed in the interests of clarity:

- Lines are walked not run so the use of 'line-walker' is considered to be more appropriate than 'runner' which may be subject to confusion with the judge's assistant.
- The words 'without assistance' have been moved so that it makes it clearer that both the winning line and identification receive no interference.
- The Senior Stake only has one Judge, though he/she may leave an Assistant to report back on the finish, and since the decision of the Judge is final, the words 'or judges' have been deleted.

Safety issues

Although line-walkers may remain in the field in Novice Stake, by Senior Stake, the line-walker will often go to their vehicle, to shelter until the hound is in view. Even if they wait in the field, their scent is circulating all the time, and may drift to the road. Entering the field with the two others at an angle can mitigate the tendency for the hound to continue hunting past the line-up, even searching around the line-walker's vehicle. Although this may be sufficient for the judge not to award first prize, the judge should have the discretion to allow the hound to be brought back to the line-up, even on the leash, so long as the handler does not approach within 5 metres of any person.

ITEM 12. DISCUSSION ITEMS

No discussion items, other than those included on the agenda under item 8, and those submitted by the Equipment and Progression Panel have been received.

ITEM 13. FIVE YEAR STRATEGY

At its previous meeting, the Council expressed a concern that the existing strategy document was rather static in nature, and it agreed that Miss Cottier would review the document with a view to including specific and actionable points, with timeframes. This would make the strategy dynamic in nature, allowing for progress to be made.

Accordingly, it is requested to review the revised document.
(Annex D refers)

ITEM 14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Please give at least two weeks' advance notice of matters to be raised under Any Other Business as this assists the office if research is required. These items are discussed at the discretion of the Chairman.

ITEM 15. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the Council's next meeting will be announced in September 2022.



NOTES:

1. The Kennel Club will reimburse standard rail fares to all representatives attending the meeting, from their addresses as recorded at The Kennel Club. Claim forms will be available at the meeting.
2. Those resident in Northern Ireland or Scotland may apply in advance for authority to substitute shuttle air travel for standard rail fare, although it is requested that tickets are booked well in advance to take advantage of any reduction in fares.
3. Please give advance notice of matters to be raised under Any Other Business. This assists the office if research is required. These items are discussed at the discretion of the Council Chairman.
4. Kennel Club Liaison Council Regulations state that The Kennel Club will bear the cost of all reasonable and externally incurred costs connected with a Council, if agreed in advance. Therefore, representatives should apply to The Kennel Club for approval of any costs they may wish to claim prior to the expense being incurred.

THE KENNEL CLUB'S MISSION STATEMENT AND STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

'The Kennel Club is the national body which exists to promote the general improvement, health and well-being of all dogs through responsible breeding and ownership' *This is to be achieved through:-*

- **Promoting The Kennel Club as the leading national organisation for referral and advice regarding all canine related matters.**
- **Encouraging the responsible breeding of pedigree dogs.**
- **Encourage the responsible ownership of dogs.**
- **Facilitating the breeding of healthy dogs**
- **Promoting the positive benefits of dogs in society.**
- **Promoting and regulating canine activities and competitions.**
- **Providing opportunities for education and training through Kennel Club led initiatives.**
- **Investing in canine health and welfare.**
- **Engaging with the wider dog owning audience/fraternity.**



Liaison Societies for Non-Championship Working Trials Societies

Working Trials Society

Australian Shepherd Club of the United Kingdom
 Aveley Obedience & Working Trials Society
 Avon Working Trials Training Society
 Aylesbury Canine Training Society
 Banbury & District Dog Training Society
 Billingshurst Dog Training Club
 Birmingham & District German Shepherd Dog Association
 Central Bernese Mountain Dog Club
 Chipping Norton & District Dog Training Club
 Cynllan Lodge Dog Training Club
 Deveron Dog Training Club
 Donyatt Dog Training Club
 East Riding Working Trials Society
 Grampian Gundog Club
 Haslemere & District Dog Training Club
 High Peak Dog Training Society
 Hucknall & District Canine Training Society
 Lochaber & District Canine Society
 Midlands Border Collie Club
 Mid Wales Working Gundog Society
 National Australian Shepherd Association
 Newlands Working Dog Society
 North of England Weimaraner Society
 Northants & Bedfordshire Working Trials Dog Training
 Northern Alsatian & All Breeds Training Society
 Northern Newfoundland Club
 Portland Dog Training Club
 Rough & Smooth Collie Training Association
 Scottish Kennel Club
 Six Counties Working Trials Society
 Slovakian Rough Haired Pointer Club (Provisional)
 South Devon Agility & Dog Training Club
 South Leeds Working Trials Dog Training Club
 Spanish Water Dog Club (Provisional)
 Spey Valley Dog Training Club
 Sporting Irish Water Spaniel Club
 Stonehouse Dog Training Club
 Wakefield Dog Training Club
 Weimaraner Club of Great Britain
 Weimaraner Club of Scotland
 Working Belgian Shepherd Dog Society
 Ynys Mon Dog Training Society

Representative Society

Yorkshire Working Trials Society
 Essex Working Trials Society
 Wessex Working Trials Club
 ASPADS Working Trials Society
 Leamington Dog Training Club
 Southern Alsatian Training Society
 Leamington Dog Training Club
 ASPADS Working Trials Society
 British Association for German Shepherd Dogs
 Welsh Kennel Club
 Scottish Working Trials Society
 Wessex Working Trials Club
 Yorkshire Working Trials Society
 Scottish Working Trials Society
 Surrey Dog Training Society
 North West Working Trials Society
 Midland Counties German Shepherd Dog Association
 Scottish Working Trials Society
 Midland Counties German Shepherd Dog Association
 Welsh Kennel Club
 Icen German Shepherd Dog Club
 Surrey Dog Training Society
 North East Counties Working Trials Society
 ASPADS Working Trials Society
 Yorkshire Working Trials Society
 British Association for German Shepherd Dogs
 Poole & District Dog Training Society
 Leamington Dog Training Club
 Scottish Working Trials Society
 North West Working Trials Society
 Yorkshire Working Trials Society
 Poole & District Dog Training Society
 Yorkshire Working Trials Society
 Lincolnshire German Shepherd Dog & All Breeds
 Scottish Working Trials Society
 North West Working Trials Society
 British Association for German Shepherd Dogs
 Yorkshire Working Trials Society
 Essex Working Trials Society
 Scottish Working Trials Society
 ASPADS Working Trials Society
 Welsh Kennel Club