

~ Proposed “Breeder’s List Program” ~ The Significant Changes with Explanation

The current Breeder’s List document was reviewed and revised by Carole Hachtel, Sandy Scudder, Bobbi Miller, Stacia White, and chairperson Bev Brown.

The goal in this revision was to update the program to a more concise and descriptive document, and better reflect GRCA’s recommended procedures. In other words, we wanted the EGRC breeders and the litters they present to the public to be ones that we, as a GRCA Member Club, could all be proud of. Although any breeder is free to breed as they see fit, EGRC has the right and responsibility to refer the public only to breeders and litters that conform to the highest standards of responsible breeding.

I’ve been asked “Who is going to police the List for ineligible litters and COE violations?” The answer is that no such position exists. But people tend to “find out stuff.” If someone has a litter, or their dog sires a litter outside the Breeder’s List Program, by accident or design, and doesn’t remove themselves from the List, they won’t automatically be checked on and found out. However, they are risking that someone will indeed find out and report it to the Board of Directors. They then will be removed from the List, which would require Board approval to return to the List. For them, I guess the question is “Do you feel lucky?”

Below are the significant changes made in this proposed revision with a brief explanation, when one should be useful. The section listed with each change refers to its section in the proposed revision.

1. Document Title: Changed the title from “Breeder’s List Guidelines” to “Breeder’s List Program”

The Breeder’s List elements were never meant to be optional, but the word “Guidelines” in the title tends to give that feeling. So that was corrected by a name change.

2. III. Breeder’s List Coordinator: Changed the name of the Breeder’s List “Administrator” to Breeder’s List “Coordinator.”

The title of “Coordinator” is the term that is often used instead of “Administrator” as is written in the current document. “Coordinator” seems to roll off the tongue easier than “Administrator,” so it was changed.

3. Breeder’s List Committee: Deleted this section.

This committee was phased out after a year or two and has proven not to be needed. Any issues that come up can be handled by the Board of Directors.

IV. BREEDERS LIST MEMBERS - This is a renaming and more appropriate reorganization of this collection of topics. Pertinent changes within the topics below are as follows:

4. C. Club Service: In section 2d under Club Service, the words “other than a Specialty committee” were deleted. 2d now reads “Member of an EGRC event committee.”

It was felt that being a member of the specialty committee merited at least the second level of club service (a minimum of two services). There didn't seem to be any reason to include all other event committees (agility, hunt test, WC/WCX test, tracking test, etc.) and leave out the specialty.

5. E. Code of Ethics:

- Replaced the EGRC Code of Ethics with the GRCA Code of Ethics.

With this change, EGRC would discontinue having a separate COE and instead, like many other Member Clubs, would simply follow GRCA's COE. This would have the added feature of having the governing COE for EGRC immediately up-to-date whenever changes are made to the GRCA COE. Otherwise, a new COE Revision Committee would need to be set up, and time allowed for review and getting it approved at a meeting with a quorum.

- In regard to agreeing to follow all elements of the GRCA COE, the following was added: “Failure to do so will result in their removal from the Breeders List by the Board. Any member of the Breeders List removed by the Board will require Board approval for reinstatement.”

The current document gives the now defunct “Breeders List Review Committee” the option of making a decision, with the ability to make binding decisions, or to pass the issue to the Board to review. Since the Review Committee was abandoned some time ago, any issues have been handled by the Board.

6. F. Ineligible Litters:

- Changed “should remove themselves from the Breeders List” to “must remove themselves from the Breeders List” when being part of an ineligible litter.

Using “should” implies choice, and it is was never meant to be a choice. It has always been an expectation, but was not stated that way. This clarifies that this is expected of the breeder, and not following the Program risks someone finding out and reporting it to the Board.

- Stud dogs are added to the Ineligible Litters section.

When it comes to breeding, the GRCA COE treats males and bitches the same, and holds them to the same standard. They are not referenced separately, but are all simply referred to as “dogs.” Owners of stud dogs carry the same responsibility as the breeder toward the health and welfare of litters their dog produces, and the health and welfare of the breed in general. When an EGRC Breeders List member uses their stud dog in a breeding that doesn’t fully fit the Breeders List Program, it’s likely that they might be tempted to refer callers to that litter, or may be suspected so by their peers. This requirement highlights the stud dog owner’s responsibility, and since it requires that they remove themselves from the List until the puppies have gone to their new homes, it removes that suspicion, founded or unfounded, and keeps what otherwise could be a divisive situation into a manageable one. It’s the same reason that a Breeders List member having a litter out of a bitch that doesn’t fully fit the requirements must remove themselves from the Breeders List, which is already in the current Breeders List requirements. It is the same responsibility to the breed, so it should be the same requirement.

- A time frame was added for voluntary removals due to an ineligible litter.

This allows an affected breeder/stud dog owner to know exactly when they are required to remove themselves from the Breeders List, and when they can return.

7. G. Sales Contract: Removed the mention of sample contracts.

It was felt that it was inappropriate for EGRC to offer sample contracts and that each breeder should acquire their own from outside sources.

8. Spay/Neuter Clause and Limited Registration were combined into a new section, H. Puppies and Dogs Not Intended for Breeding.”

Both Spay/Neuter and Limited Registration were listed separately as requirements. Since only one or the other could be used, these were combined under a new heading with and an either/or choice.

9. Limited Registration: Under this section, the exemption for puppies sold to Canadian obedience competitors was discussed. It was deleted.

This seems either to have been deleted from the CKC regulations, or just hasn’t been an issue. Any American resident can compete in Canada under an ERN number. Any Canadian competitor considering purchasing a puppy can review the current Canadian regulation and determine for themselves if this is an issue for them.

10. Litter Eligibility, Litter Announcement Application and Fee: Except for the “Application and Fee” part of this section from the current document, we could delete this entire section as it duplicates the requirements in the GRCA COE. The remaining “Application and Fee” became section V in the proposed revision.

This reduced the document from 7 pages to 4 pages.

11. VI. Policies and Procedures, D. Reinstatement: The requirement for a breeder to submit a copy of their contract for a Board review for reinstatement was deleted.

If the Board wishes to see their contract, they can ask for it at that time.