

FEDERATION CYNOLOGIQUE INTERNATIONALE (AISBL)

13, Place Albert 1er, B - 6530 Thuin (Belgique), tel : ++32.71.59.12.38, fax : ++32.71.59.22.29, internet: <http://www.fci.be>

Mars 23rd 2015

Minutes for the FCI Breeding Commission February 13th 2015

Mercure Hotel Dortmund Messe & Kongress, Strobelallee 41, Dortmund, Germany

Present:

Name	Country
Astrid Indrebø	Norway (president)
Yvonne Jaussi	Switzerland (vice president)
Nick Schwab	Luxembourg
Roger Vanhoenacker	Belgium
Tom Borkowski	Poland
Larisa Galiaskarova	Russia
Nora Takácová	Slovakia
Janne Orro-Taruste	Estonia
Luis Gorjão-Henriques	Portugal
Frederic Maison	France
John Wauben	Netherlands
Peter Friedrich	Germany
Birgitte Schjøth	Denmark
Annica Uppström	Sweden
Inga Cerbule	Latvia
Maria Ceccarelli	Italy

Secretary for the commission meeting, in absence of dr. Kirsi Sainio:

Kristin H. Aukrust, Norway

Guests

Svetlana Nazarikhina	Russia (translator)
Maigorzata Supronowicz	Poland

Excused

Dr. Kirsi Sainio (Finland), Mrs Zeljka Fon Zidar (Slovenia), Mrs Margit Brenner (Austria), Mrs Louis Wilson (South Africa) and Mr San-Der (Taiwan) had informed that they were not able to attend the meeting this year.

Other delegates that were not present at the meeting:

Mr Erodotos Neufytoy (Cyprus), Mr Lemo Niksa (Croatia), Dr Miklos Levente (Hungary), Mrs Mrs Colette Muldoon (Ireland), Mr Cesar Calderon (Peru), Mr Lokodi Zsolt (Romania), Mr Stelio Rossini (San Marino), Mrs Punjarat Trikamol (Thailand) and Galina Kalinichenko (Ukraine).

The delegates were all told to inform the FCI secretariat (via their national kennel club) if the information given on the FCI list of delegates is incorrect.

Opening of the meeting

The president opened the meeting at 9.00 and welcomed all the delegates. She thanked especially VDH for all the help in arranging this meeting and the excellent dinner the previous evening.

It was a great pleasure to welcome Dr Gregoire Leroy, FCI Scientific Commission, who had kindly offered to give a lecture on the laboratory Wisdom Panel concerning DNA breed identification. Both the delegate of Scientific Commission and Standard Commission as well as Breeding Commission were present to enjoy this very interesting lecture.

Before the lecture, all the delegates of the three commissions gave a short presentation of themselves. After the lecture and some brief discussion, the Scientific and Standard Commissions went to attend their joint meeting.

1. Approval of the agenda

Added points to miscellaneous:

A few days before the meeting, three points had been added to the agenda:

- 8.1. *Mating of two dogs of the hairy variation of Peruvian hairless (Denmark)*
- 8.2. *Breed specific instructions regarding exaggerations in pedigree dogs (BSI) (issue 6/2014) – updating from the delegates*
- 8.3 *Breed specific breeding strategies (Issue 5/2013) – updating from the delegates*

Three additional issues were put on the agenda at the start of the meeting:

- 8.4. Request form breed club of Slovakia regarding German spitz (Slovakia)
- 8.5. Recognition of new nationally recognized breeds (Switzerland)
- 8.6. Changing of registration numbers of imported dogs (Sweden)

Prior to closing the meeting, another issue were put on the agenda:

- 8.7 New EU rules: puppies less than 16 weeks are not allowed to be exported/imported (Netherland)

The president strongly encouraged the delegates to be active to put issues on the agenda before the meeting, at latest at the date given in the invitation letter to the next meeting – “Call for issues”. It is of great importance that the delegates can prepare for the issues and discuss the issues with their kennel club prior to the meeting!

2. Minutes from the last meeting

Minutes from Riga, May 31st 2014

Decision: The minutes were approved.

3. Annual report from Breeding Commission 2014

Decision: The annual report written by the president was approved.

Activity report from FCI Breeding Commission 2013-2013

Decision: The activity report written by the president was approved.

4. Results of the last session

Proposals from Breeding Commission to FCI General Committee as well as to the FCI General secretariat after the 2014 meeting in Riga was sent out with the agenda.

The proposals from the commission were considered by the General Committee in November 2014, and here are the results:

4.a. Registration of imported dogs that would have been registered with limited registration (not allowed for breeding) if they were born in the country where they are imported (amendment in the FCI Standing Orders, art.5)

Proposal from Breeding Commission: Standing Orders, art 8.5 should be change to (the proposed addition to text is bold and underlined): Any member or contract partner can refuse to (re)-register in its studbook, **or register with limited registration not to be used for breeding**, a dog suffering from hereditary defects or featuring defects which go against Art 2 in the Statues or a dog which does not comply with the rules of selection defined by the member or contract partner in question.

This proposal was sent to GC after our meeting in Helsinki 2013, but was turned down by GC. At the Riga-meeting of BC, all the delegates agreed to send it once more to GC with more background material. If FCI do not take action in this matter, the governments might do it. This will probably not be beneficial for the dog world.

The Breeding Commission is very satisfied that the FCI board now has decided to approve the proposal; the point will be on the agenda of the next General Assembly in 2015.

Some of the delegates expressed their concern regarding how the issue will be presented at the general assembly; they were concerned that maybe GA will not understand the importance of the proposal.

Decision: The delegates were strongly encouraged to "lobby" towards the delegates of to GA, especially those representing their own country.

4.b. The use of FCI approved kennel names

The issue was first raised by Finland in 2013.

Proposal from the Breeding Commission to the General Committee 2014:

The following should be added in Art 9.4 of the Standing Orders:

The proposal was: *FCI approved kennel names should only be used on litters registered in the stud book of the national kennel organizations.*

This proposal was also sent to GC after our 2013-meeting in Helsinki. *GC decision:* The proposal is found still unclear and the Committee sees no difference with the previous resolution (proposed by the same commission) adopted by the General Assembly in 2013 (Art.9, 4 c) of the FCI Standing Orders.

At the Riga-meeting, the delegates pointed out that it is the opinion of the BC that the present Art 9.4.c do not cover our proposal. The point of the proposal is that a breeder with an FCI recognized kennel name **are not allowed to use this FCI recognized kennel name** on unregistered puppies (meaning puppies that are not registered in the stud book of the national kennel organization), when selling the puppies or announcing them for sale, or register them with unofficial pedigrees in unofficial registries.

GC decision November 2014: "The Board keeps understanding that the decision made by the General Assembly in 2013 is correct and covers the point raised by the Breeding Commission. It "protects" the breeds recognised at national level only as they are allowed to have the FCI logo on their pedigrees. In addition, unregistered puppies do not get pedigrees. »

Decision: It was decided that BC will not take further action in concerning this issue now. It might be raised again if some kennel clubs still have a problem with this issue.

4.c. DogWellNet

Decision of BC 2014: *The FCI Breeding commission supports the work of the international partnership of Dogs and the DogWellNet.com to enhance dog health, well-being and welfare and human-dog interactions across the global dog community, and request to FCI to be an active partner in the partnership, both ideologically and financially. The Breeding Commission also stresses that we should not only point out problems and issues concerning the pedigree dogs but all dogs, also dogs without a pedigree. The problems are the same in all dogs.*

The Board of GC has reported back to BC that they take our note of the comments. A letter has been sent out to all FCI members that FCI has decided to be an active part of this important project (Enclosure 5).

Decision: BC applauds this.

4.d. Addition of coat texture and colour and sizes in the (export) pedigrees.

The BC proposal: *The coat, colour and size should be added in the three generations pedigree, including the export pedigrees. This is of uttermost importance especially when crossbreeding between closely related breeds and varieties.*

GC decision: The board agrees, and the FCI Breeding Rules will be amended.

Later correspondence with Yves De Clercq (15.01.2015): The sentence "*The coat, colour and size should be added in the three generations pedigree, including the export pedigrees*" would be suggested to be added to Art 8 in FCI Standing Orders; this will be decided by the General Assembly. De Clercq writes that this may have a huge impact on the daily life of the national kennel clubs, so it is better that they approve it.

BC discussion: This is an important issue, however it might also be very difficult and costly for the national kennel clubs to implement. Furthermore this is not relevant for all breeds. The BC is therefore concerned that it is premature to send this to the General Assembly. However, since it is an important issue the BC suggests that the wording is changed so that it applies to the breeds where it is relevant.

It is also a concern regarding how the colours are to be defines, and at what age the size should be defined.

Decision: The president will contact De Clercq and suggest a new wording:

The coat, colour and size should be added in the three generations pedigree, including the export pedigrees, for breeds listed in the circular "FCI general and breed specific guidelines about crosses of breeds and breed varieties".

4.e. Owner's name on the pedigree – or separate owner's certificate

BC decision: *Proposal to the GC that FCI Standing Orders, Art 8.8 and 8.9 should be changed: if the export pedigree does not include the information about the owner, there must be a separate owner's certificate:*

Art 8.8 (the proposed changes are bold and underlined): each dog of a litter has to be provided with only one export pedigree, which must should include the name of the owner of the dog; if the name of the owner is not written on the pedigree, there must be a separate owner's certificate issued by the national kennel organisation.

Art 8.9 (the proposed changes are bold and underlined): For each dog registered with an FCI member or contract partner and then exported, the national canine organisation that last registered the dog shall certify the transfer of the ownership to the new owner by stating his name and address on the export pedigree or by a separate owners' certificate.

The Board agrees. The point will be on the agenda of the next General Assembly in 2015.

4.f. Stud book initials in registration numbers

The Breeding Commission agreed to ask the FCI Secretariat to send a circular to remind the national kennel organisations that is of uttermost importance to add the studbook INITIALS to the registration numbers, as stated in Standing Orders, Art 8.3.

The Board agrees. A circular will be issued.

5. Strategies on DNA-tests

The Scientific Commission of NKU (Nordic Kennel Union) has worked out a strategy on DNA-tests in dog breeding, approved by the commission meeting in Iceland November 2014.

The availability of genetic tests for different diseases in dogs has increased dramatically in recent years. For breeders and dog owners, the utility and accuracy of these tests are often difficult to assess. Even though DNA tests offer new opportunities as a tool for breeding, they also imply new questions and challenges. The fact that a genetic test is available for a disease in a breed does not automatically mean that the test is accurate or appropriate to use as basis for breeding decisions. The Scientific Committee of the Nordic Kennel Union (NKU/VK) would like to stress that genetic testing in dogs should be used with common sense and caution. The points described in the document should serve as guidelines for breeders and dog owners regarding the use of genetic tests.

Astrid Indrebø gave a presentation of the document, which was sent out with the agenda.

BC discussion:

BC was happy with the presentation; the information given in the document is of great value.

Updating from the delegates:

Belgium informed that the Flemish government have mandatory DNA-testing of a list of breeds.

Netherlands informed that they are not allowed to breed with unhealthy dogs, an animal rights group have said that French bulldog is not healthy – court case? The outcome of this case is very important, for if this goes through, other breeds will follow.

Switzerland: The government has made a decision not to ban any breeds. All breeders of dogs, which includes both pedigree dogs and mixed breeds, is responsible for their breeding. They have to be able to document their dogs and their offspring, and prove that they do what they can to avoid and reduce problems.

The kennel clubs all agreed that we only should breed healthy dogs, however it is our responsibility to marked that one should focus on unhealthy dogs, not unhealthy breeds.

The national kennel clubs must take action.

An international statement should be made, which the national kennel clubs can show to the Governments and others that we are working on an international basis.

We have different breeds for different functions “Dogs fit for original function” – functional in modern society.

It should be focused on all dogs, not only pedigree dogs.

BC decision:

The president will make a proposal for a statement, based on the NKU-document. The statement will be sent to the delegates after the meeting. The delegates are asked to use these statements in their own kennel club/breed clubs regarding the use of genetic tests in dog breeding. The statements should also be available on the FCI web-site.

Statement (made by the president after the meeting and sent to the delegates for approval. The statements were approved):

The FCI Breeding Commission fully support the document made by the NKU Scientific Commission (NKU/VK) regarding the use of genetic tests in dog breeding. We want to highlight the following statements from the NKU/VK-document, and encourage the kennel clubs and breed clubs to make it available to all dog owners:

1. *The genetic testing in dogs should be used with common sense and caution.*
2. *A dog showing clinical symptoms of a serious disease should not be used for breeding – regardless of genetic test results.*
3. *There is a need for further efforts from the international dog community to support dog breeders and owners with respect to validation and guidance on the use of genetic tests.*
4. *The FCI Breeding Commission advice against the use of genetic tests for conditions where the inheritance is unclear.
Tests for diseases that are influenced by many genes should be applied only in cases where evidence based on scientific publications has established that the mutation(s) cause a significant and defined risk of disease, and provided that the disease is of clinical relevance in the breed concerned.*
5. *The FCI Breeding Commission are reluctant to promote the use of multi-tests and combination test packages currently available.
This position is based on shortcomings in validation and/or relevance for some of the mutations in the package as well as the potential negative consequences on the overall breeding goal that uncritical use of genetic tests are likely to cause.
Instead, it should be recommended to the breeders and dog owners to test for the specific mutation(s) that are relevant in the current breed, provided that these tests are validated.*
6. *The FCI Breeding Commission would like to emphasize the importance of breeders and/or dog owners carefully evaluating the usefulness and accuracy of a genetic test before it is performed. Only use the tests that are properly evaluated and for conditions of clinical relevance in the breed.
No dog, or any other living creatures, are completely free of disease mutations. Uncritical use of DNA tests may in the worst case result in negative effects on the breed's health and gene pool.
Please contact your breed club or kennel club for more information if you are doubtful.*
7. **General statement**
The FCI breeding commission fully supports the following statements from the Scientific Commission of the Nordic Kennel Union, concerning the general policy regarding the application of genetic tests in dog breeding.
 - a. *Genetic testing are excellent tool in breeding for improved health provided that the tests are reliable, relevant and used wisely.*
 - b. *Breeders and dog owners should carefully evaluate the benefits and consequences of a genetic test before it is applied.*
 - c. *A one-side or exaggerated focus on DNA test results may result in an increase risk that other important conditions or characteristics are overlooked.*
 - d. *We would like to emphasize that the breeding program should be based on the prevalence and severity of various health issues rather than on the availability of genetic tests.*

- e. *If a disease does not constitute a clinical problem in the breed and/or the genetic test is not validated or accurate, it is better to refrain from the testing of the dog. Otherwise, there is a risk of excluding potential breeding animals and decreasing the genetic variation, based on uncertain or false grounds.*
- f. *Keep in mind that dog breeding is about more than specific diseases and genetic tests that even though they are many they do not give the entire picture*

6. Limited registration

Based on a suggestion from Slovakia, it was decided on our last meeting that the commission should make a document with criteria for limited registration: The limited registration as a term should be determined. We should give some type of guidelines what this is, what it means, who is the one that decides what dog goes to the limited registry.

BC decision 2014: We should write these criteria as recommendations. These should be added to the recommendations. It is also true that at the time of registrations, there may be a dog or parents that are healthy, but then later the parents turn out to be unhealthy. The secretary and the president will formulate a proposal to be discussed in our next meeting.

The president had made a proposal, which was sent out with the agenda.

The proposal was presented by the president and discussed among the delegates.

BC decision

The proposed guidelines for limited registration was approved, with some changes, and is to be sent to FCI for approval and publication on their web-site. The document should then also be published on DogWellNet. The delegates are encouraged to publish the guidelines on the webpage of the national Kennel clubs.

The final version is presented at the end of this Minutes

7. Future issues for Breeding Commission

We need a general discussion concerning issues that should be discussed in our future meetings. The delegates must be active in presenting issues to the commission. The delegates were encourage you all to prepare issues and thoughts, so that we get a good discussion on this subject. We are an important commission with a lot of responsibility for future breeding and animal welfare.

Decision:

- *Breeding for function- what more can we do?*
Maria Ceccarelli (Italy) together with John Wauben (Netherlands) will make a presentation for the commission next year.
- It might be beneficial with a joint meeting of the presidents of Show and Judge Commissions, may be also the Scientific and Standard commission? The judges commission should take the initiative. John Wauben (president of Judge Commission) will follow up the issue.
- Breeding for longlivity should be on the agenda in a later meeting, and prepared by one of the delegates.

8. Miscellaneous

There were seven issues added to the agenda under “Miscellaneous”.

The president strongly encouraged the delegates to be active to put issues on the agenda, at latest at the date given in the invitation letter to the next meeting – “Call for issues”.

It is of great importance that the delegates can prepare for the issues and discuss the issues with their kennel club prior to the meeting!

8.1. Mating of two dogs of the hairy variation of Peruvian hairless (Denmark)

The issue has been send in by Denmark shortly prior to the meeting, and sent to the delegates: A breeder in Denmark wants to breed between two Peruvian hairless dogs of the coated variety. Due to the breed standard, DKK must refuse to give permission to this breeding. This is a very small breed in number, and it would be beneficial for the genetic variation in the breed to allow also mating between two dogs of the hairy variation. The hairless mutation gene is lethal in homozygote specimens.

This issue has been discussed, on general and specific basis, in several BC meetings.

The president had made a summary of **BC history concerning the matter.**

Breeding Commission 2009

21.3. Peruvian Hairless (Finland) (2009)

21.3.2 The hairy variation – Peruvian hairless

The mutation that causes the hairlessness in Peruvian hairless is semi-lethal, and it is impossible to breed these dogs without the hairy wild type individuals. This mutation is the same as in Chinese crested and Mexican hairless; in these breeds the hairy variation is recognized by the breed standard.

The Commission proposal:

The commission recommends that the hairy variation of Peruvian hairless should be recognized in the breed standard and registered if the parents are registered by FCI/national canine organisation. The issue should be forwarded to the Scientific Commission and the Standard Commission for further action. The procedure made for the Mexican hairless by the Mexican Kennel Club should be followed.

Results from the Meeting in General Committee, February 2010 :

Peruvian Hairless Dog

The proposal has to be considered via the Kennel Club Peruano, as provided for by the FCI Statutes, Art.2g.

Breeding Commission 2010

Breeding Commission decision 2010: We will send a new proposal about this to the General Committee

Proposal: If the Peruvian Kennel Club is not willing to accept the hairy variation of Peruvian hairless, the commission will again propose to the General Committee to accept the hairy variation of the breed. This is of great importance of the health of this breed, as it is impossible to breed the hairless dogs without the hairy variation of the breed. The commission encourages FCI to inform the National Kennel Organisations that the hairy variations in Peruvian hairless should be registered normally.

Decision of the FCI General Committee: Y.De Clercq informs that the KCP (Peru) has sent a new standard the day before. It will be forwarded to the standards commission.

Breeding Commission 2011

The issue was discussed. There have also been some changes made to the Mexican Hairless breed standard. The Peruvian Hairless standard is more or less adopted from the Mexican Hairless standard.

The Commission decision: it was agreed that we wait for the new standards both for the Peruvian and for the Mexican Hairless.

Breeding Commission, 2012:

9. Approval in breed standards of coat, colours and anatomical features that it genetically impossible to avoid in order to breed what is accepted in the breed standard

Breeding Commission has in 2010 and 2011 discussed the standard of the Peruvian Hairless Dog (Perro sin pelo del Perú), where the hairy variation was not excepted in the breed standard. We were informed in 2011 that KCP has sent a new standard to FCI, which has been sent to the FCI Standard Commission. So far the new standard is not available in fci.be, but hopefully will include the hairy variation.

Peruvian hairless is not the only breed where the standard excludes healthy dogs that is genetically impossible to avoid in order to breed dogs that are accepted in the standard. What about Rhodesian (or Thai) ridgeback were dogs without a ridge is disqualified, although ridgeless dogs in most cases will be born when breeding ridgeback dogs? The gene for ridge is dominant, and it is known that dogs that are homozygote for this gene has a higher risk for dermoid sinus (*Hillbertz NHC, Andersson G. Autosomal dominant mutation causing dorsal ridge predisposed for dermoid sinus in Rhodesian ridgeback dogs. J Small Animal Practice 2006; 184-188*).

When breeding harlequin Grand danois, merle will appear in the litter. Nevertheless, merle is a disqualifying coat colour in this breed.

Should the Breeding Commission propose to GC, on general basis, that the breed standards should accept coat, colours and anatomical features (like the ridgeless dogs) that has to appear in a breed in order to breed what is preferred by the standard, as a variation (type) within the same breed? The BC discussed this matter.

Dr Peter Friedrick from Germany informed that ridgeback dogs might be banned by the government if the ridgeless dogs are not equally accepted.

A ridgeless variation of Ridgeback could be called Rigdeless.

Proposal to General Committee: It is genetically impossible to breed naked dogs without having the hairy variation, or harlequin without getting the merle colour – or healthy ridgebacks without having ridgeless dogs.

Therefore coat, colours and anatomical features that genetically has to appear in a breed in order to breed what is now preferred in the standard (i.e hairless, ridgebacks), should be equally accepted in the standards; the standards must be changed to achieve this.

General Committee – October 2012/February 2013:

Proposal from BC: Approval in breed standards of coat, colours and anatomical features which are genetically impossible to avoid in order to breed what is accepted in the breed standard

Decision of GC: The proposal is referred to the FCI scientific commission and **the breeding commission is asked to draw a complete list of the breeds concerned.**

Breeding Commission 2013

4. List of breeds with individuals which are genetically impossible to avoid in order to breed what is accepted in the breed standard

As a result of our last meeting, the General Committee asked the Breeding Commission to make a complete list of the breeds concerned.

Decision: The commission agreed on the following list to be equally recognized in the breed standard:

- Ridgeless dogs in breeds where only ridge is accepted in the standard

- Rhodesian ridgeback
 - Thai ridgeback
- Coated type in breeds where only naked dogs are accepted
 - Peruvian hairless dog.
The breed standard is being changed, and will follow the same principles as the Mexican Hairless standard concerning the coated type. But will it be equal recognized?
- Merle in breeds where harlequin is accepted
 - Grand danois – Germany is changing the standard

General Committee decision April 2014:

Breeds with individuals which are genetically impossible to avoid in order to breed what is accepted in the breed standard (“equally recognized”)

GC decision: List of breeds requested by the General Committee: the list of breeds is transmitted to both, standards and scientific commissions, for further study and possible proposals. Some breeds sometimes include dogs with disqualifying faults whereas it is impossible, genetically, to avoid these incorrect dogs to produce offspring which meets the breed standard of the breeds in question (ex : Rhodesian Ridgebacks without a ridge).

The Scientific and Standard Commissions informed us that the issue has not yet been sent from FCI Secretariat to their commissions for further actions. It was decided that AI will ask the General Secretariat to forward the list and the issue to these commission, as decides by GC.

The BC had again a discussion concerning breeds with individuals which are genetically impossible to avoid in order to breed what is accepted in the breed standard:

Germany has a principal problem with ridgeless ridgebacks. Risk of dermatoid sinus increases with homozygote ridge gene. The risk of dermatoid sinus can be effectively reduced and maybe also avoid if ridgeless dogs are equally recognised in the breed standard and used for breeding.

Unwanted/disqualifying colours should be kept out of the discussion, as they are possible to avoid when breeding for the correct colours. One exception is the merle colour of Great dane, which is genetically impossible to avoid when breeding harlequin. The breed standard has already been changed to accept the merle colour.

The general statement is important. Why exclude many healthy dogs from breeding?

John Wauben, president of the FCI ShowJudges Commission, informed that there is a proposal from this commission to allow the standards to be overruled due to health. John Wauben will send the proposal to Astrid Indrebø. It was discussed if we should make a joint proposal, maybe together with the Scientific and Standards Commission (see Issue 7 – joint meeting). This is a long term work. The delegates agreed that we must cooperate to take steps in the right direction, or else the public will “kill” us for what they think is stupid policy.

BC decision concerning the Peruvian hairless:

A new standard was made in 2013 where the hairy variety was recognized and allowed used for breeding, but only to hairless dogs. Further action is left to the Standard Commission to decide.

8.2. Breed specific instructions regarding exaggerations in pedigree dogs (BSI) (issue 6/2014)

BC DECISION 2014: The Breeding Commission fully supports the NKU Breed Specific Instructions (BSI) regarding exaggeration in pedigree dogs; BSI is fundamental in the work of preventing unhealthy breeding. The BC encourage all kennel clubs to work according to the BSI guideline. The BC encourage FCI to publish the NKU-BSI on their web-site and to work for similar instructions within all FCI countries.

BC fully support the FCI document from the judges commission regarding “Dogs fit for function”.

An updating from the delegates concerning the progress of BSI in their kennel club:

Italy: The BSI has been explained in the national breeding commission. The Italian Kennel Club agrees on document, working on making it valid in Italy.

Latvia: The Nordic document & British document has been translated into Latvian. There has been several seminars on the issue. Have raised awareness. Some judges, however, say they are sceptical; they find the document to be valid for breeding, not for judging.

Sweden: Have used BSI since 2009, and use it on all shows. BSI is presented to the judges prior to every show. SKK now have more than 10.000 BSI-reports from the judges. In 2013, reports from 88% of all BSI-breeds were filled out at the shows. SKK find BSI to be a very beneficial program. They stress that it is a recommendation, not a rule. They now see fewer dogs with problems of the breeds listed in BSI on the dog shows.

Denmark: The Danish Kennel Club has worked with judges-education to avoid exaggeration since end of 90's. They now use Nordic BSI. It is a recommendation, not a request. Most judges use it. They think it is a good program, and have seen progress.

Switzerland: Have started to educate judges, and have had several seminars for judges. Have shown the SKK video, and are focusing on the brachycephalic problems. They are now trying to evaluate test for brachycephalic breeds. In Switzerland they know that no breeds will be forbidden, so they see no problem with list of high-risk breeds. They work specially with brachycephalic breeds because they are in focus in media among other reasons. Every dog has to do a character test, has to have a health-certificate before breeding. This goes for all breeds.

Germany: They are working on instructions for all breeds, and do not accept a special focus on high-profile breeds. Have breed specific tests for breeding (breathing, behaviour). Started breathing-tests for French bulldogs 8 years ago, have seen big improvement. Breeders now very happy with this (sceptical at first).

Netherlands: They have developed their own BSI, developed together with judges and breed clubs. Judges fill out form. There is, however, not consistent answers from judges. F.eks: say no problem in bulldogs, or say they have seen problems but does not want the breed to be on the list. They are not sure they will continue due to the non-reliable answers from judges. Need more education for judges on how to handle this. It is important that this is a program for all kennel clubs, we need to educate judges in all countries. Should be better coordinated between countries.

France: Breed clubs has big power for selection of dogs. They can do what they want, but the kennel club monitors them. The clubs are asked to focus on main problems of the breeds. Results of health-tests are printed on pedigrees (max 3 diseases chosen by breed club). Breed clubs must find solutions by themselves, force does not work. Does not use BSI on shows, use them in meetings.

Portugal: Educate judges and have seminars about breeds. Do not have specific instructions.

Estonia: The Nordic BSI is not officially implemented, but judges have unofficially been asked to follow them. It is voluntary.

Slovakia: The BSI-concept has been introduced, and it is more welcomed by breeders than by judges. The national Breeding Commission has submitted proposals, but have been turned down. Need more education of judges, and are working on it. Slovakia has finished the translation of document.

Russia: Same problem as in Slovakia. They are translating the Nordic BSI document into Russian. They have to work with education of judges, and have has some seminars with judges. The breeders are okey with BSI, easier to work with than the judges.

Poland: Presented NKU BSI twice in their official magazine, and introduced the BSI document to their judges committee. Have problems with some molosses breeds. They have no seminars/workshops for judges, and have problems how to reach all judges. Judges have had meetings, but no lectures. Some judges are looking for health matters, and some are not. There is a big need for seminars and education.

Belgium: Judges are aware of Nordic BSI. Every dog has to pass some sort of confirmation or abilitytest, after 9 months, before breeding. Dogs will not be allowed for breeding if they have problems. They are also checking for disqualifying faults. This is done by a judge.

Luxembourg: BSI is used as a recommendation. Have judges seminars and education.

Norway: Has had several judges seminars to introduce and discuss the BSI. The judges are happy for the BSI, and has contributed to the list of the specific breeds. The responsibility of the judges concerning risk of health problems due to exaggeration of breed specific features in the show ring has been highlighted in the judge education for many years. The BSI document and report form has been used at international shows since September 2014, and there is put special focus on the BSI issues on all shows in Norway.

8.3 Breed specific breeding strategies (Issue 5/2013)

BC decision 2013: FCI should encourage every member and contract partners to make breed specific breeding strategies in cooperation with the breed clubs. Information about the SKK RAS-project and other similar national projects should be available on the FCI Web page or on the platform suggested by the FCI Working Group 2012: The FCI Dog Health, Well-Being and Welfare Initiative

Updating from the delegates concerning the work with Breed specific breeding strategies in their kennel club

The following countries have Breed specific breeding strategies: Sweden, France, Netherlands, Denmark, Estonia, Norway and Switzerland

Some other countries have them for national breeds, or breed clubs are working on their own without the involvement of the kennel club.

8.4 Request from breed club in Slovakia regarding german spitz (Slovakia)

The Slovakian Kennel Club have a problem that Pomeranians imported from America are too big, and are switched to small spitz. This is a problem since it is changing the anatomical features of the small spitz. Is it possible to do anything?

Decision:

Breeders that import dogs from the US should themselves be aware of the problem. The Slovakian Kennel club should talk to the German breed club first, and at a later stage the standard commission might be involved.

8.5 Recognition of new nationally recognized breeds (Switzerland)

Switzerland raised the following questions: How can we handle these new breeds when we know that FCI do not encourage new breeds? Might be different in different countries? The breeds can be registered in another country if the country recognizes the breed.

There are now stricter rules for recognition of new breeds (new varieties, not new breeds. Difference between old not recognized breeds and new breeds).

It is up to national kennel club, not really up to BC.

Decision:

The BC is concerned that this gives a precedent to other national kennel club to recognize other breeds made from existing breeds. But this is up to the national kennel clubs to decide.

8.6 Changing of registration number of imported dogs (Sweden)

Sweden find it very important that dogs keep their registration numbers throughout their life. Norway is the only country that do not give an imported dog a new registration numbers, and Sweden support this.

It is a problem when the same dog has more than one registration number, when calculating inbreeding coefficients, health indexes etc.

Discussion: The delegates agrees, but it would be a problem in other countries to keep the original registration number, due to difficulties with the computer systems.

Decision:

The BC recommends to the kennel clubs to keep the original registration number on imported dogs. If the present computer system does not support this, it should be integrated in the future new systems. The delegates will inform their national kennel clubs about this recommendation.

8.7 EU- puppies are not allowed to move before 3 months of age (Netherlands)

The issue was raised by John Wauben, Netherlands: FCI should make a resolution to the EU government to make it possible to import/export puppies less than 3 months.

The background for the new EU rules is first of all based on an attempt to reduce the risk of contagious diseases due to import/export of "street dogs" and commercial puppy farms etc.

Lativa informs that their kennel club has sent letter to government to ask for exceptions from this new rule. Among the arguments are: It is scientifically proven that the main socialisation period is from 3-14 weeks. The fact that puppies can not be imported prior to 16 weeks limits the opportunity of the puppy to adapt to its new environment, and can be considered to be a welfare problem. It might increases the risk of behaviour problems and lead to euthanization. Inga Cerbule will translate this letter to English, to be distributed to the delegates.

Estonia informs that they are in the same process.

Information given after the meeting (the issue was not prepared in front of the meeting, because it was raised at the meeting, given no time to prepare the issue):

The Norwegian Kennel Club (NKK) has sent a letter to the government on this matter (Mars 2014). NKK fully support the action taken against illegal import of young puppies, especially puppies sold via dog traders and puppy farms as well as “street dogs”. The new law will be helpful in reducing the risk of contagious diseases being imported to our country.

To maintain the genetic variation in dog breeds, import of dogs are of major importance. The new law will make import more difficult for the serious breeders. It is a lot of work to socialise puppies from 8 to 15 weeks in a proper way, and we are afraid that conscientious breeders in other countries will refuse to sell puppies to Norway due to this new law. It is not beneficial for a young puppy to be kept in a kennel with little socialisation until 15 weeks old. It is of uttermost importance for a puppy to be well socialised at early age; this is basic for the future welfare of the dog.

We encourage the government to make an exception from the new rule to allow, based on application of the new owner and statement of the breeder, import of puppies from countries with no cases of rabies the last (10) years (“countries free of rabies”), registered in the national kennel club in the country where it is born. NKK will undertake the responsibility to control all the import papers prior to register the puppy to our register. It will then be possible to avoid the import of puppies from dogs traders as well as import of street dogs less than 3 months old.

The government has answered (Mars 2014) that EU now do not permit to discriminate between countries due to the situation of contagious diseases; the same rules must be valid for all countries. If we permit to import unvaccinated puppies less than 3 months, we must accept puppies from all countries, not only the “rabies free countries” as has been done up to now. Chapter 6 gives an opening for making exception on individual basis in special cases, but at the moment it is still unclear what these “special cases” might be.

It is clear from the information from the Norwegian government that if a country allow import of puppies less than 3 months to be imported, they have to allow this from all EU-countries. It was informed at the BC-meeting that Austria has given an exception to the rule, which probably means that they allow import from all countries. The Austrian delegate was, however, not present at the meeting.

Each country can give exceptions, but only on individuals - not general exceptions from certain countries.

Decision:

The president should write a proposal to the FCI to take this up with the EU, and Janne Orro-Taruste will ask FECAVA to do the same. The BC are very concerned about the new EU-rule saying that dogs cannot be imported/exported before 3 months of age. This is a welfare problem for the dogs and can increase the risk of behaviour problems due to the lack of opportunity for the puppy to adapt to its new environment. We ask the board to put this on the agenda immediately.

Due to a completely work overload, the president has had no time to make a proposal to GC prior to their final date of sending issues to their meeting. The president suggests that a proposal should be sent to the European section of FCI.

The preliminary minutes has been sent to the delegates that were present at the meeting, and no one has disagreed.

Follow up: The following proposal has been sent to FCI European Section (Mars 23rd, 2015):

FCI should take actions against the new EU law that do not permit puppies less than 3 months to be imported to EU countries

The FCI Breeding Commission has decided to ask the FCI European Section to take actions against the new EU law that that do not allow the individual member countries to give permission to import puppies less than 3 months, unvaccinated against rabies, from rabies free countries.

Until late 2014, it was up to the individual countries to decide whether or not to give a permission to import puppies that were less than 3 months of age and unvaccinated against rabies. It was up to the government of the different countries to decide from which countries they would allow such import ("rabies free countries").

The background for the new EU rule is, to our knowledge, based on an attempt to reduce the risk of contagious diseases due to import/export of "street dogs" and from commercial puppy farms etc. The FCI Breeding commission fully support actions against such import to reduce the risk of contagious diseases, but we find it very unfortunate that this new rule will exclude any import of healthy puppies less than 15 weeks of age. This will be of major disadvantage for the socialisation of the young puppy and might have great impact on the future welfare of the dog.

To maintain the genetic variation in dog breeds, import of dogs are of major importance. The new law will make import more difficult for the serious breeders and dog owners. It is a lot of work to socialise puppies from 8 to 15 weeks in a proper way, and we are afraid that conscientious breeders will refuse to sell puppies abroad due to this new law. It is not beneficial for a young puppy to be kept in a kennel with little socialisation until 15 weeks old. It is of uttermost importance for a puppy to be well socialised at early age; this is basic for the future welfare of the dog.

We encourage the FCI European section to take actions to make it possible for the national governments to make exception from the new rule. It should be allowed to import unvaccinated puppies less than 3 months, based on an application from the new owner and a statement from the breeder, from countries with no cases of rabies the last 5-10 years ("countries free of rabies"). To allow such import, the condition should be that the puppy is registered in the national kennel club (or the breed club commissioned by the national kennel club to register dogs and issue pedigrees) in the country where it is born. The national kennel club to where the puppy is imported should undertake the responsibility to control all the import papers prior to register the puppy to their register. It will then be possible to avoid import of puppies from dogs traders as well as import of street dogs less than 3 months old.

As we understand the new rule, EU do *not permit to discriminate between countries* due to the situation of contagious diseases; the same rules must be valid for all countries. If a national government permit to import unvaccinated puppies less than 3 months, the country will have to accept puppies from all EU countries, not only the "rabies free countries" as has been done up to now. This will result in a much higher risk of importing contagious diseases, compared to the rules we have had until now. Consequently, most countries do not permit any import of puppies less than 3 month of age.

It is of major importance for the organized dog-Europe that FCI now take action in this matter, to help dog breeders and dog owners in Europe, and to show the member countries the strength of FCI as a the largest dog organization in the world, working for dog welfare and genetic diversity in pedigree dogs.

9. Date and place for the next meetings (2016, 2017)

2016: The Norwegian Kennel Club has kindly invited to host the next meeting in Oslo, Norway – May 28th

2017: The Russian Kennel Club has kindly invited to host the BC meeting in 2017. 27-28th of May in Moscow. (27 = Saturday)

10. Closing of the meeting

The meeting was closed at 17.00

Before closing the meeting, the president thanked the VDH for the gift to all the delegates – the very interesting book “Dogs in motion” (by Fischer and Lilje) – and for the brilliant service during the meeting.

Criteria for limited registration – guidelines

recommended by the FCI Breeding Commission, Dortmund February 13th, 2015

1. The definition of limited registration in this document is **“not allowed for breeding”**. A dog registered with limited registration will be issued an FCI pedigree, but the remark “not to be used for breeding” will be printed on the pedigree. This remark must also be available in the kennel club database, and be included in the data with open access for the public if such a database is available.

If a dog with limited registration is used for breeding, the offspring cannot be registered in the studbook of any FCI member country or contract partner, unless the limited registration has been rescinded by the kennel club who established the limited registration.

When the term “national kennel clubs” is used in this document, it includes the breed clubs commissioned by the national kennel club to register dogs and issue pedigrees.

2. Who can decide to register a dog with limited registration?

- The national kennel club who issue the original pedigree
- Import of dogs: The national kennel club to where the dog is exported
(Accepted by the General Committee meeting, November 2014, to be on the agenda of the General Assembly 2015, Standing Orders Art. 8.5)
- The breeder of the dog can ask the national kennel club to register a puppy with limited registration when applying for registering. The breeder can NOT chose to add limited registration to a pedigree after the ownership of the dog has been transferred to a new owner
- The owner of the dog can ask the national kennel club to register his/her dog with limited registration

3. Who can rescinded (remove) a limited registration of a dog?

FCI International Breeding Rules, Art 15: *A limited registration can only be rescinded by the national canine organisation that has established it.*

4. Criteria for issuing limited registration (examples):

4.1 - Background - FCI International Breeding Rules:

1.1: *These FCI breeding regulations apply directly to all FCI member countries as well as the contract partners. This means that breeding may only be carried out with pedigree dogs which have a sound temperament, are healthy in functional and hereditary terms and are registered with a studbook or register (appendix) recognised by the FCI. In addition, they have to fulfil the requirements specified by the relevant FCI member or contract partners.*

1.2: *The only dogs which are considered to be healthy in hereditary terms are those transferring breed standard features, breed type and temperament typical of that breed without displaying any substantial hereditary defects which could impair the functional health of its descendants. The members and contract partners of the FCI are required in this regard to prevent any exaggeration of breed features in the standards which could result in impairment of the dogs' functional health.*

1.3: *Dogs with eliminating faults such as e.g. unsound temperament, congenital deafness or blindness, hare-lip, cleft palate, substantial dental defects or jaw anomalies, PRA, epilepsy, cryptorchidism, monorchidism, albinism, improper coat colours or diagnosed severe hip dysplasia may not be bred.*

4.2 Registration of puppies with unhealthy parents

The national kennel club can register with limited registration puppies from parents with severe hip dysplasia and/or elbow dysplasia, inherited severe eye diseases like PRA, congenital deafness, unsound temperament, severe respiration problems or other eliminating fault, whether or not mentioned as examples in Art 1.3. in FCI International Breeding Rules.

4.3 Matador breeding and heavy inbreeding

Background - Art 3, FCI Breeding Strategies: *To preserve, or preferably extend, the genetic diversity of the breed, matador breeding and heavy inbreeding should be avoided. Mating between siblings, mother to son or father to daughter should never be performed. As a general recommendation no dog should have more offspring than equivalent to 5% of the number of puppies registered in the breed population during a five-year period. The size of the breed population should be looked upon not only on national but also on international level, especially in breeds with few individuals.*

4.3.1 Matador breeding

Limited registration can be used to prevent matador breeding.

Some national kennel clubs has registration restrictions concerning the number of offspring/litters from a single dog (male or female), to avoid decrease of the gene pool. If this limit number is exceeded, a limited registration can be used on these offspring.

4.3.2 Inbreeding

Limited registration can be used to prevent heavy inbreeding.

Some national kennel clubs has registration restrictions concerning heavy inbreeding. Example: The Code of Ethics, Norwegian Kennel Club (NKK), Art. 2: *Mating between siblings, mother to son, father to daughter or combinations with equivalent inbreeding coefficient must not be performed. Breeding between half siblings or combinations with equivalent inbreeding coefficient should be avoided. The inbreeding coefficient is calculated based on a 6 generations pedigree; for imported dogs the calculation should be based on the available pedigree information in 4-6 generations.*

If the inbreeding coefficient of a litter is equal or exceed 25%, based on a six generations pedigree, NKK will register the puppies with limited registration.

4.4 Dogs with hereditary diseases or functional disabilities

The breeder and/or owner can ask the national kennel club to put limited registration on a dog that suffers from hereditary diseases or functional disabilities, included those mentioned above.

Some insurance companies will pay a compensation if a dog, insured as a breeding dog, cannot be used for breeding because it suffers from a severe inherited disease. The insurance company can in that case demand that it is put a limited registration on the dog before compensation is paid.

The national kennel club can, without a request from the owner, put a limited registration on a dog that is suffering from severe hereditary diseases or function disabilities, included those mentioned above.

DNA-tests: A dog who is homozygote for a severe disease with autosomal recessive or homozygote/heterozygote for a disease with dominant inheritance can be registered with limited registration.

4.5. Dogs with disqualifying faults

The national kennel club can, with or without a request from the breeder and/or owner, put a limited registration on a dog with disqualifying faults, such as disqualifying coat colour, according to the rules of the national kennel club.