



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WORKING TRIALS LIAISON  
COUNCIL HELD ON THURSDAY 4 FEBRUARY 2021 AT 10.30 AM  
VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS**

**PRESENT:**

Mrs P Bann	Essex Working Trials Society
Miss J Carruthers	North East Counties Working Trials Society
Mr D Craven	Yorkshire Working Trials Society
Mr M Drewitt	New Forest Working Trials Society
Mr B Gilbert	ASPADS Working Trials Society
Mr N Hines	Lincolnshire German Shepherd Dog & All Breeds Training Society
Mrs J Howells	Hampshire Working Trials Society
Mr M Lewindon	Surrey Dog Training Society
Mrs D Ling	East Anglian Working Trials Training Society
Ms L Marlow	Southern Alsatian Training Society
Mr G Martin	Midland Counties German Shepherd Dog Association
Mr C Taylor	British Association for German Shepherd Dogs
Mr J West	Wessex Working Trials Club
Mr J Wykes	Leamington Dog Training Club

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Mr M Beazley	Chief Executive Officer
Miss D Deuchar	Head of Canine Activities
Miss C McHardy	Manager - Education, Training, and Working Dog Activities Team
Miss R Mansfield	Senior Officer - Working Dog Activities Team
Mrs A Mitchell	Senior Committee Secretary - Working Dog Activities Team

**IN THE CHAIR: MR B GILBERT**

**NOTE: any recommendations made by the Working Trials Liaison Council are subject to review by the Activities Committee and The Kennel Club Board, and will not come into effect unless and until Board approval has been confirmed.**

1. Mr Beazley and Miss McHardy were welcomed to the meeting, and both introduced themselves.

**ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

2. Apologies were received from Mrs J Holt, Mrs K Herbert, Mr B Russell, and Mr N Sutcliffe. Mr D Robertson was not present.

**ITEM 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

3. The minutes of the meeting held on 23 January 2020 were approved as an accurate record.

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

4. The Council noted that the following amendments to I Regulations were approved by the Board at its meeting on 7 April 2020:

Regulation I(B)13

**TO:**

The missing person, protected consistent with safety, ~~should~~ **must** remain motionless **in a seated or standing position** out of sight of the handler, but ~~should~~ **must** be accessible on investigation to the dog when 'winded'. **The protected steward must not be lying down.** The judge should satisfy himself that the dog has found the person and has given warning spontaneously and emphatically without being directed by the handler. A dog that bites the hidden person must be heavily penalised. (Deletions struck through. Insertions in bold)  
(Effective 1 January 2021)

New Regulation I26i

**TO:**

**Patrol Dog stake judges must, before commencement of the Patrol Dog test, provide Working Trials Managers with sufficient detail of the tests, the risks arising from them and measures to manage those risks, to be included within risk assessments completed in respect of the events.**

(Insertion in bold)

(Effective 1 January 2021)

5. A query was raised in relation to the above amendment, in respect of the situation where a Working Trials Manager did not have a thorough understanding of PD stakes. It was emphasised that, in such circumstances, he or she should call upon the expertise of other suitably experienced individuals. Where there were any concerns as to the safety of a test set by a judge, the matter should be discussed with the judge

and if not resolved, the concerns should be noted in the trial's Incident Book.

Risk assessments

6. At its previous meeting the Council had noted a draft risk assessment document, for use on a generic basis by any host society, with the proviso that it must be updated as appropriate for the circumstances and environment at each trial, with careful consideration being given to each element and the associated level of risk, and ways in which such risks may be minimised.
7. The Council now noted the contents of a review of the risk assessment which had been carried out by Ms A Tohme. Miss Tohme had been requested to undertake the review in her capacity as a health & safety professional, as well as being a championship working trials judge.
8. A number of points were raised in respect of the risk assessment:
  - A concern was raised that it did not include any reference to Covid-19. It was likely that there would be a necessity for relevant measures to remain in place for some time, and consideration of the risk of infection should be included. In particular, Government guidelines highlighted three risk areas: fomite transmission, aerosol generation and gatherings. Trials should be reviewed in respect of how they were run, and suitable measures identified to manage such risks identified.
  - The website should strongly emphasise that the document was a template, and that each event and test must be risk assessed in isolation and on its own merits.
  - Risk assessments must be very clear, and should clearly state what must, or must not, be done.
9. It was also suggested that Ms Tohme should be requested to review the risk assessment produced by the PD Stake Panel, which did contain details of Covid-19 risks, and which could be incorporated into the generic document.
10. A point was noted in respect of the control measure listed under 'Heavy lifting of equipment' which stated 'Persons expected to be responsible for their own welfare and not lift anything beyond their capability.' It was clarified that although welfare issues were the responsibility of the Trial Manager, individuals should make it clear if they were unable to undertake a particular task. It was hoped that all individuals attending a trial would be aware of their own safety and welfare, and conduct themselves accordingly.
11. A query was also raised with regard to use of the phrase 'Lone workers with issues'. It was clarified that this related to lone workers experiencing a problem during the trial, rather than to any specific medical or physical

conditions relating to the individual. It was agreed that the phrase was misleading and that the words 'with issues' should be deleted.

12. The above comments were all noted, and it was agreed that Mr Gilbert and Mr Lewindon would update the document, with assistance from Ms Tohme and the office. Subject to these agreed amendments, the document was approved for publication on The Kennel Club's website, subject to review by the Activities Committee.

#### Lock outs

13. It was highlighted that the Activities Committee, at its meeting on 19 March 2020, noted the Board's view that the continuance of the custom and practice of including a 'lock out' in the Patrol section of working trials should be discontinued. As requested by the Board, the PD Stake Panel had been advised of the Board's views. A proposal from the PD Stake Panel was discussed later in the meeting (paragraphs 26-31 refer).

#### Clarification of judges' responsibilities

14. At its previous meeting, the Council was advised that Miss Carruthers would be submitting proposals for amendments to I Regulations, with the objective of clarifying and simplifying the responsibilities of judges. These proposals were discussed later in the meeting (paragraphs 62-75 refer).

#### Out of sight stays

15. The issue of out of sight stays had been discussed by the Council at its January 2020 meeting. Subsequently, the Activities Committee, at its meeting on 19 March 2020, had been advised of the Council's wish that no changes should be made to stays within working trials, although relevant provision should be made within the risk assessment for each event.
16. The Council noted that the Committee was in agreement that no changes should be made in respect of working trials.

### **ITEM 4. ACTIVITIES HEALTH AND WELFARE SUB-GROUP**

17. The Council noted a written report from Mr Gilbert on the work of the Sub-Group following its meetings on 13 January 2020 and 14 September 2020.
18. It was pleased to note that the practical part of the jumping study at Nottingham Trent University (NTU), funded by The Kennel Club, had taken place during August 2020. The volunteers who had been recruited via Mr Martin and the Liaison Council Equipment Panel were thanked, and the assistance provided by NTU staff and Dr Boyd (chair of the Activities Health and Welfare Sub-Group) was also gratefully acknowledged.

19. Over 20 dogs representing five different breeds had participated. All dogs were weighed, and their heights recorded. They then completed the scale at different heights (6ft, 5.5ft and 5ft), and three jumps over the long jump at 9ft, 8ft and 7ft. Five cameras captured the dogs' motion to allow for research into joint angles and body position, and a pressure pad on the landing side provided information on how the pressure was spread over all four of each dog's feet.
20. Analysis of the data, which included approximately 400 videos, was underway and good progress was being made. It was not possible to provide any further details until evaluation of videos and pressure mat results had been carried out, but an update would be provided in due course.

**ITEM 5.      ACTIVITIES JUDGES SUB-GROUP**

21. The Council noted the following update from the Activities Judges Sub-Group meeting which took place on 18 November 2020:
22. Mr S Ford and Mrs J Meekings had retired from the roles of Accredited Trainers and therefore a vacancy had arisen for both a PD and a TD trainer. The office had issued an advertisement inviting applicants.
23. Subsequently, five responses had been received, and the office, together with Mr Gilbert, was in the process of deciding how best to assess the applicants, given the current Governmental restrictions in place relating to Covid-19.
24. The Council also noted that the 'Requirements of a Working Trials Judge' film had been launched on The Kennel Club Academy and was available for viewing. Development of the Working Trial Regulations and Judging Procedure examination was in hand and it was hoped that it would be launched on the Academy in the near future. [**Afternote:** it was subsequently confirmed that the examination was now 'live' and available on the Academy.]

**ITEM 6.      REPORT FROM THE PD STAKE PANEL**

25. The Council noted a written report from the Panel. A number of issues were highlighted:
  - A draft risk assessment for the PD stake, including the Patrol round, had been approved by the Panel.
  - The Panel had made enquiries with two insurance companies and had provided them with a detailed description of the Patrol round exercises, and a statement that risk assessments would be

undertaken before the exercises. Both insurance companies had confirmed that they would be happy to cover the trial.

- The Panel had considered equipment used by protected stewards and had submitted a number of proposed amendments to regulations, with the objective of improving safety. These were discussed later in the meeting (paragraphs 51-61 refer).
- The Panel was also looking at the marking of exercises, and whilst not wishing to make marking too prescriptive, was of the view that some regulations could be clarified and made less open to interpretation.
- Over 70 PD stakeholders had been interviewed by telephone, including Trial Managers, PD judges, Accredited Trainers, protected stewards, protected stewards' trainers, and PD competitors. The feedback received had been summarised and circulated to all who took part. Ongoing consultation would take place, and the data received would form a large part of the PD Stake Panel's future work.
- 18 protected stewards, protected stewards' trainers, judges and stewards from a large geographical area would be contributing to the formulation of the national protected stewards training days/weekends, which would be rolled out across the country. The Panel would encourage Trial Managers, judges, stewards and competitors to attend these training sessions.
- An initial PD Helpers weekend had been arranged for early summer 2020, but had been cancelled due to Covid-19.

#### Lock outs

26. Following a request by The Kennel Club Board, the matter of lock outs was reviewed by the PD Stake Panel, and it wished to propose the following amendment to Regulation I26(f), with the objective of enhancing safety.

Regulation I26(f):

**TO:**

~~Where a person is working more than one dog in the PD Stake, the judge must not prevent any competitors from watching the Patrol Round.~~  
**Judges must not prevent competitors from watching others in the Patrol round, with the exception of quartering the ground, which may be a 'lock out'. However, where any competitor is working more than one dog, other competitors must be allowed to watch the entire Patrol round.**

(Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold)

27. The Panel was of the view that judges, protected stewards, societies and competitors had a shared responsibility for the safety of those taking part

in trials, and that it was important that competitors had an opportunity to plan how they approached tests. This would reduce the possibility of risks due to handlers not understanding what was expected of them, and would also provide them with an opportunity to withdraw from the test if they wished to do so.

28. The necessity for absolute fairness for all handlers and dogs was strongly emphasised by the Council, and it was suggested that where there was no lock out, a run through should be provided to ensure that the first handler was not at a disadvantage. Doing so would also minimise risks by ensuring that every handler was aware of what to expect during the test. It was proposed by Mr Martin, and seconded by Ms Marlow, that a stipulation that where there was no lock out, a run through must take place, should be included within the amended regulation.
29. However, a concern was raised that run throughs, although desirable, were not always possible for practical and logistical reasons, such as a lack of helpers, and that making them compulsory may place undue pressure on Trials Managers. This was noted.
30. It was highlighted that under the terms of the proposal, a lock out would remain permissible for the 'quartering the ground' exercise. A query was raised as to whether the lock out would also apply to the 'search and escort' exercise, and to the 'defence of handler'. It was clarified that these exercises did not have to take place as part of the 'search and escort' exercise, however it was suggested that the amended regulation could state that for the purposes of a lock out, 'quartering the ground' may include these exercises. It was proposed by Ms Marlow and seconded by Mr Martin that the wording should read as follows: '...with the exception of quartering the ground, search and escort, and defence of handler...'
31. The issue having been carefully considered, the Council agreed to **defer** further consideration of the proposal and requested that it be referred back to the PD Stake Panel with a view to a revised proposal being submitted, which took into account the points raised above.

**ITEM 7.      REPORT FROM THE PROGRESSION PANEL/  
EQUIPMENT PANEL**

32. The Council noted a written report which covered issues which had been referred to both the Progression Panel and the Equipment Panel. The report had been combined due to crossovers between matters relating to the two Panels.
33. Two polls which sought views on 'Should CD open be mandatory?' and 'Should Introductory Stake remain in its current format?' had been frozen

until such time as trials were up and running again and it was possible to gather opinion from as many people as possible.

34. It had not been possible for the Panels to make any further progress as to consideration of what may replace the Introductory Stake if final results indicated the desire to remove it from the schedule.
35. The Equipment Panel wished to consider standardising the construction of the clear jump, to ensure consistency. This would be considered once the results of the research regarding the scale and the long jump being undertaken at NTU were available (paragraphs 18-20 refer).

Proposed amendment to Regulation I18(c).

36. It was agreed that the proposal should be discussed in conjunction with the proposal submitted by Mrs Holt which appeared later on the agenda (paragraph 76 refers), as the two proposals were connected.
37. The proposal to amend Regulation I18(c) had been submitted following a discussion item at the Council's previous meeting. Under the terms of the proposal, the necessity to qualify in all sections at a trial would be withdrawn, but competitors would be able to qualify having attained the 80% overall mark as it currently stood. As long as the competitor attained the qualifying mark they would not have to attempt all exercises to do so, and would be required to nominate to the judge which exercises they wished to omit, if they wished to do so, prior to commencement of their round.
38. The proposal was that this would only apply to open trials, and for a trial period of three years which would allow for evaluation of its impact, such as the number of new individuals coming into the sport and the exercises which were being omitted.
39. It was anticipated that the proposed amendment may encourage new competitors into working trials, especially those that had concerns about certain elements such as jumps or stays, whilst allowing for working trials to remain in their current format with all exercises to be attempted for competitors wishing to do so.
40. A concern was raised that removing the requirement for all exercises to be attempted would not be beneficial, and that, for example, a competitor could qualify for UD without ever having undertaken a down stay or the scale. Such competitors would also experience considerable difficulty upon qualifying for championship stakes due to a lack of experience in some exercises.
41. It was also suggested that adopting the measure would represent a lowering of standards, which was not desirable, and it was not clear whether it would be effective in attracting additional competitors into the discipline.



42. However, there was also some support for the proposal, particularly in view of the suggested three-year trial period, and that championship stakes would not be affected.
43. Prior to reaching any conclusion, the Council went on to discuss the proposal submitted by Mrs Holt, as follows:  
  
Amalgamation of marks for control and agility sections – proposed amendments to Regulations I(A)9a, b, c, & d
44. Unfortunately Mrs Holt was unable to attend the meeting in order to personally present her proposal. It was seconded by Mr Martin.
45. Under the terms of Mrs Holt's proposal, amendments would be made to Regulations I(A)9a, b, c, & d whereby the marks for the control and agility sections of Intro, CD, UD, WD and TD open trials would be amalgamated, with the proviso that competitors would have the option of declining any exercise or part exercise.
46. Mrs Holt was of the view that the proposal would retain the important original requirement that a dog should demonstrate its obedience, fitness, and the ability to use its nose. Further, the flexibility would attract more newcomers to trials, and also allow experienced handlers to continue to compete with older dogs which had become less agile. Mrs Holt wished to suggest that the proposal, if accepted should be introduced on a three-year trial basis at the end of which a full review may be carried out.
47. Whilst noting the intent of both proposals was to attract new competitors, the Council acknowledged a concern that significant changes to the discipline were being proposed without adequate evidence to suggest they would be effective in achieving this objective. A suggestion was made that such evidence should be sought by means of a survey amongst those who competed in other disciplines as to why they did not compete in working trials.
48. However there was also a view that although the proposed changes may not be a complete solution, they would be a positive step nonetheless.
49. At this point a seconder was sought for the proposal to amend Regulation I18.c. However no seconder was available so no vote took place on this proposal.
50. Mrs Holt's proposal for amendments to Regulations I(A)9a, b, c, & d, having been seconded earlier in the discussion, proceeded to a vote, but by a majority, was not supported by the Council.

## ITEM 8. PROPOSALS FROM SOCIETIES/PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS

### Proposed new Regulations I(B)18.a, b, and c.

51. The Southern Alsatian Training Society, represented by Ms Marlow, wished the Council to consider the following three new Regulations. Although all three were closely related, the Society wished each to be considered as a separate proposal.
52. The proposals had been discussed with the PD Stake Panel, and were part of the work being done (along with risk assessments) to enhance safety. They were intended to standardise equipment used in order to ensure, as far as possible, the safety of protected stewards and dogs.

### **New Regulation I(B)18.a.**

53. Ms Marlow proposed the amendment and it was seconded by Mrs Ling.
54. There was some discussion regarding the provision of protective clothing suitable for use where smaller dogs were competing, and whether it was necessary to state that provision should be made for dogs of all breeds and sizes. It was emphasised that there was no intention to exclude any size or type of dog from participating in working trials, but it was also acknowledged that it was not feasible to expect a judge, or a society, to provide a range of equipment suitable for every size of dog. It was anticipated that the specification for sleeves to have a tapered edge would provide a degree of flexibility to accommodate dogs of varying sizes, but would not cater for very small dogs.
55. It was proposed by Mr Lewindon that the proposed wording be amended to state that 'Sleeves must be suitable for all dogs entered.' This was seconded by Ms Marlow.
56. Following a vote on the original proposal and on the revised version, by a majority, the Council **recommended** for approval the following amendment:

Regulation I(B)18.a.

**TO:**

#### **Patrol Dog - Equipment and Protective Clothing**

- a. The judge must either provide the equipment or check its suitability. Sleeves must have a tapered edge, and a jute cover, and must be suitable for all dogs entered. The cover must not be brand new, nor frayed. There must be a hand grip inside the sleeve. Close weave covers must not be used. There must not be external buckles, or a joint in the sleeve which leaves a gap. The sleeve must not be obscured by clothing or anything else. Puppy sleeves may not be used. 'Scratch pants' which protect the helper from dogs' nails may be worn. The sleeve must be accessible should the dog bite.**

(Insertion in bold)

**Proposed new Regulation I(B)18.b.**

57. The new Regulation was proposed by Ms Marlow and seconded by Mr Martin.
58. The Council was in agreement that the proposal was a sensible one, and by a majority, **recommended** it for approval:

Regulation I(B)18.b.

**TO:**

**b. For Quartering the ground, Search and Escort, Recall from protected stewards, and Pursuit and Detention of protected stewards, protected stewards must wear a sleeve as described in the Equipment and Protective Clothing regulation on the right arm.**

(Insertion in bold)

**Proposed new Regulation I(B)18.c.**

59. The amendment was proposed by Ms Marlow and seconded by Mrs Ling.
60. In response to a query regarding the proposed light-coloured jute area on the sleeve, it was confirmed that the area would cover the wrist to the elbow, as a target area for the dog. This led to a concern being raised that this would effectively make the target area for the dog smaller, and that a dog missing this target area may be unfairly penalised. It was suggested that the light-coloured area should extend from wrist to shoulder, but it was highlighted that the objective of the target area was to minimise risk to protected stewards. It was also emphasised that it would be for the judge to assess the dog's work and to mark accordingly.
61. A vote took place, and by a majority, the following amendment was **recommended** for approval:

Regulation I(B)18.c.

**TO:**

**c. For the Test of courage, protected stewards must wear a sleeve on the right arm as described in the Equipment and Protective Clothing regulation, or a 'bite jacket' with a light-coloured jute area on the right arm. Items used in the Test of courage must be designed to be non-injurious to the dogs, with no sharp points or hard objects inside any sacks used.**

(Insertion in bold)

Proposed amendments to Regulation I(B)5, 6, 7, 9 & 10

62. Miss Carruthers, on behalf of the Accredited Trainers for working trials, requested the Council to consider a number of amendments to I Regulations which were formulated following the Accredited Trainers Annual Seminar in October 2019. The amendments were proposed with the objective of clarifying and simplifying the responsibilities of judges.

**Regulation I(B)5.**

63. The proposal was seconded by Mr Lewindon.
64. Under the terms of the proposal, the regulation would state that the dog must (rather than should) be recalled from the 'down' or 'sit' position.
65. A concern was noted that should the proposal be implemented, a dog which anticipated the recall may be awarded a zero mark, which was not desirable or intended.
66. Miss Carruthers accepted that the concern was a legitimate one, and withdrew the proposal.

**Regulation I(B)6.**

67. The proposal stated that 'the dog must sit in front of the handler' and a similar concern was raised as above, in that the wording may result in a dog being given a zero mark which was not the intention. For this reason Miss Carruthers agreed that the wording should be amended to state 'the dog should sit in front of the handler'. The revised proposal was seconded by Mr Hines.
68. A vote took place and the Council unanimously recommended the amendment for approval:

## Regulation I(B)6.

**TO:**

6. Retrieve a dumb-bell.—The dog should not move forward to retrieve nor deliver to hand on return until ordered by the handler on the judge or stewards' instructions. The retrieve should be executed at a smart pace without mouthing or playing with the dumb-bell **and the dog should sit in front of the handler**. After delivery the handler will send the dog to heel on the instruction of the Judge or Steward. Extra commands shall be permitted in the Introductory stake.

(Insertion in bold)

**Regulation I(B)7.**

69. The current Regulation stated that 'At this point in the TD or PD stakes the judge or steward shall instruct the handler to redirect the dog. Miss Carruthers proposed that the word 'shall' be replaced by 'must'. Ms Marlow proposed a revised amendment to state that 'the judge or steward will (rather than must) instruct the handler...' Miss Carruthers was in agreement, and the revised amendment was seconded by Mr Martin.
70. The Council was in agreement, and accordingly, it unanimously **recommended** the following amendment for approval:

## Regulation I(B)7.

**TO:**

7. Send away and directional control.—The minimum distance that the judge shall set for the send away shall be 18.288m (20 yds) for the Introductory stake and the CD stake and 45.72m (50 yds) for all other stakes. In the Introductory stake the maximum distance that the judge shall set for the send away shall be 45.72m (50 yds). The TD and PD stakes shall also include change of direction or directions of a minimum of 45.72m (50 yds). When the dog has reached the designated point or the judge is satisfied that after a reasonable time the handler cannot improve the position of the dog by any further commands the dog should be stopped in either the stand, sit or down position at the discretion of the handler. At this point in the TD or PD stakes the judge or steward ~~shall~~ **will** instruct the handler to redirect the dog. In all stakes, whilst the judge should take into account the number of commands used during the exercise, importance should be placed upon the handler's ability to direct the dog to the place indicated. (Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold).

**Regulation I(B)9.**

71. Mr Gilbert proposed a revision to the amendment submitted by Miss Carruthers. The revised version would state that 'The dog will be ordered to 'speak' and cease 'speaking' on the instruction (rather than command) of the judge. This was seconded by Mr Hines.
72. A query was raised as to whether the requirement for the dog to walk at heel during this exercise constituted a two-part test. It was clarified that the exercise as outlined in Regulation I(B)9 was a single exercise.
73. Following a vote, the Council **recommended** for approval the following amendment:

## Regulation I(B)9.

**TO:**

9. 'Speak on command'.—The judge will control the position of the handler in relation to the dog and may require the handler to work the dog walking at heel. If the dog is not required to walk at heel, the handler may place the dog in the stand, sit or down. The dog will be ordered to 'speak' and cease 'speaking' on ~~command~~ **the instruction** of the judge or steward who may then instruct the handler to make the dog 'speak' again. 'Speaking' should be sustained by the dog whilst required with the minimum of commands and/or signals. Continuous and/or excessive incitements to 'speak' ~~shall~~ **must** be heavily penalised. This test ~~should~~ **must** not be incorporated with any other test. (Deletions struck through. Insertions in bold).

**Regulation I(B)10.**

74. The proposal was seconded by Mrs Ling.

75. The Council was in agreement that the proposed amendment was a sensible one, and accordingly it unanimously **recommended** the following for approval:

Regulation I(B)10.

**TO:**

10. Agility.—the descriptions below should be followed for agility:

- a. No part of the clear, long jump or scale equipment to be traversed by the dog shall be less than 914.4mm (3ft) wide nor be in any way injurious to the dog. ~~The tests shall be followed in any sequence decided by the judge Clear Jump, Long Jump, Scale, commencing with Clear Jump.~~ **The test must commence with the clear jump and then be followed in any sequence of the long jump and scale.**
- e. The scale should be a vertical wall of wooden planks which must be grooved, or chamfered along their bottom edge, to assist the dog. Slats are not permitted. The top surface of the scale may be slightly padded. The handler and dog ~~should~~ **must** approach the **face of the** scale at a walking pace with the dog at heel.

(Deletion struck through. Insertions in bold).

Amalgamation of marks for control and agility sections – proposed amendments to Regulation I(A)9a, b, c, & d

76. The above proposal, submitted by Mrs Holt, was considered earlier in the meeting (paragraphs 44-50 refer).

Proposed amendment to Regulation I24.a.

77. Ms Marlow presented the proposal on behalf of Southern Alsatian Training Society, noting The Kennel Club's statement that due to Covid-19, it was not necessary for any activity to schedule a full range of classes at present.
78. A one-stake (CD) Championship Trial held by the Southern Alsatian Training Society on 18 October 2020 had been widely supported, and the Society was of the view that providing a permanent option for clubs to hold single-stake championship trials would give them flexibility to hold smaller trials where they were unable to run larger events, due to land availability or other constraints. Under the terms of the proposal, the provision would apply only to CD, UD and WD stakes.
79. The Council acknowledged that the proposed measure would be helpful to societies wishing to run working trials during Covid-19, where governmental restrictions were in place, but it also accepted that it would be beneficial on a more long-term basis.

80. It was suggested that the wording be amended to remove the word 'however'. This was proposed by Ms Marlow and seconded by Mr Lewindon.
81. A short discussion took place regarding the possibility of multiple single stake trials taking place on the same day. It was acknowledged that caution was necessary to ensure that a championship stake held by one club did not detract from entries at another, to the detriment of both.
82. A suggestion was made that, in order to avoid any such issues, wording should be added to the proposed amendment to state that single-stake trials could only take place provided there were no championship TD or PD trials taking place at the same time. This amendment was proposed by Ms Marlow and seconded by Mr Craven.
83. A vote took place on the revised amendment, and the following was unanimously **recommended** for approval:

Regulation I24.a Management  
**TO:**

Societies must schedule one other tracking stake in addition to the working trial certificate stake. **Societies may schedule a single Championship CD, UD or WD stake, provided there is no Championship TD or PD stake on the same dates.**  
 (Insertion in bold)

Proposed amendment to Regulation I(B)1.

84. Mr Wykes wished to propose an amendment to the above Regulation, in view of concerns regarding a practice which had been observed recently during the chase exercise, whereby the protected chase steward puts out his protected right arm as the dog catches up with him thus giving the dog an easy bite. In such circumstances the dog would make contact with the arm without having to slow down, and as a result may be swung around whilst airborne. Mr Wykes was of the view that this represented a risk of serious harm to the dog.
85. Under the terms of the proposal, an additional statement would be included within Regulation I(B)1. Method of Handling as follows: 'At no time should the protected right arm be presented to the dog.'
86. The Council acknowledged that the objective of the proposal was a positive one, however a discussion took place as to whether the matter should be covered elsewhere in the I Regulations, or whether it should be considered to be a training issue and addressed via that route.
87. It was also accepted that a protected steward may put their arm out in the heat of the moment for their own protection, and therefore the proposed regulation would be impossible to enforce. It was also suggested that in some circumstances there may be less risk to the dog

where a controlled swing may reduce its momentum, rather than it being blocked.

88. The Council was supportive of the principle of the proposal, and agreed that it should be progressed, however it **deferred** further discussion pending consideration by the PD Stake Panel of the points raised above. The matter would be placed on the agenda for the Council's July meeting.

#### **ITEM 9. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

89. No discussion items had been received.

#### **ITEM 10. FIVE YEAR STRATEGY**

90. The Council was invited to consider the Five Year Strategy document and to discuss how it may be implemented.
91. A query was raised in respect of the item regarding raising awareness about the availability of training for working trials. It was noted that The Kennel Club website had recently been updated, but there was a concern that information relating to working trials was not easy to find for those with a potential interest, and that it was not immediately apparent that the section entitled 'Events and Activities' contained relevant information. It was clarified by the office that the term 'sport' could not be used, as working trials (and other Kennel Club activities), did not fit the legal definition of a sport.
92. The Council was advised that the Find a Club function on the website was not currently in operation but it was hoped that it would be fully available within the next few months. It would provide details of clubs offering relevant training services within a selected radius from the enquirer's home area.
93. A concern was raised that at present there was no link to Find a Club within the working trials section of the website, and the office undertook to investigate this.
94. Further, there was a concern that the use of Find a Club had previously resulted in clubs being listed as having an interest in working trials where this was not the case, which was frustrating to anyone attempting to identify a local training club. It was emphasised that the system was reliant on the information provided by clubs.
95. A brief discussion took place as to how the discipline could promote itself more effectively, in view of concerns that there was little awareness of its existence among the dog owning community. A suggestion was made that working trials clubs could approach local pet training clubs in order



to raise awareness, although it was noted that in one case where this had been attempted, despite some interest being generated, handlers had been reluctant to train their dogs to jump.

96. A suggestion was made that a small sub-group be formed to consider issues relating to publicity and promotion of the discipline, however this was not progressed.

## **ITEM 11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### Suspension of regulations due to Covid-19

97. The Council was requested to consider whether it was necessary to consider any suspensions of I Regulations which would assist clubs to run working trials during the Covid-19 pandemic. At present the only regulation which had been suspended was that relating to single-stake trials, which had been discussed earlier in the meeting (paragraphs 77-83 refer). The Council was not of the view that there was a necessity to suspend any other regulations at present.
98. It was highlighted that there was a high degree of flexibility from the office where it was necessary for clubs to make changes to dates or venues at short notice due to Covid-19, although there were still difficulties in issuing printed licences.
99. Advice was available on The Kennel Club's website in respect of Covid-19, and guidance would continue to be issued based on Governmental directives and guidelines. This may be found at:

<https://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/events-and-activities/resumption-of-licensed-events/>

### The Bloodhound Club

100. A letter had been received from Mr Sutcliffe, representing the Bloodhound Club, raising concerns in respect of amendments to Kennel Club I Regulations implemented in 2020 and 2021.
101. In Mr Sutcliffe's absence, it was noted that the matter had been addressed by the office, and no further discussion was necessary.

## **ITEM 12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

102. The Council's next meeting would take place on 6 July 2021. Any items for the agenda must be submitted by 7 April 2021.

The meeting closed at 1.35 pm.

**MR B GILBERT**  
**Chairman**

**THE KENNEL CLUB'S MISSION STATEMENT**

**'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'**

## 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  
 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  
 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  
 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  
 Essex Working Trials Society  
 Scottish Working Trials Society  
 ASPADS Working Trials Society  
 Welsh Kennel Club