

# The KarltonINDEX™

Measuring progress in the health of our dogs

## 2013

March 31<sup>st</sup> 2013

Compiled by Philippa Robinson

# Contents

<b>Section</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Findings</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Concluding Remarks</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2013 Scoring by breed in alphabetical order</b>	
<b>A</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>F</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>G</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>H</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>I</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>J</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>K</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>L</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>M</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>N</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>O</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>P</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>R</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>S</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>T</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>W</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Y</b>	<b>26</b>

# Introduction

“Are you satisfied with the speed and scale of response from the dog-breeding community and veterinary profession in acting to resolve the issues raised in your excellent report?”

Anne McIntosh MP, Chair of the Environment and Rural Affairs Committee, 17<sup>th</sup> October 2012

The above was one of the opening questions put to Professor Sir Patrick Bateson when he was called as a witness to the EFRA inquiry into dog control and welfare in 2012. His reply was that “some breeders had not responded” though he failed to identify which. Prompted by a question on whether the pedigree dog-breeding community is too insular to respond to welfare problems arising from breeding practices his answer was “yes and no”(EFRA Dog Control and Welfare Report, 2013). It is perhaps not his fault that his replies were so equivocal because as Professor Steve Dean, Chairman of the Kennel Club, points out in his witness testimony “dog breeders are not one amorphous group of people” (EFRA, 2013).

The Karlton Index has developed a framework that attempts to provide clearer cut answers to questions around the speed and scale of response on health and conformation issues relating to dog breeding whilst at the same time acknowledging that the constituency of breeders is far from cohesive or amorphous. It was established in an attempt to identify which sets of breeders were responding effectively to health and welfare issues and which were not. The project’s power lies in its capacity to score any breed or breed type consistently and in so doing provide a useful comparative benchmark. Its power as a diagnostic tool goes even further than that because it pinpoints limits to the “spheres of influence” of its breeder-constituency subjects. Thus identifying the harder to reach problematic areas of dog breeding that will require a stronger multi-agency response i.e. a response that goes beyond the scope of either breed clubs or the Kennel Club. In this way it has much to offer the field of canine health and welfare and hopefully much to offer the dogs themselves, by accurately identifying and targeting the groups of breeders that are failing dogs the most.

The findings in this report relate to the application of the Index to a very specific cohort of breeders, those that are members of the Breed Club system which itself is part of the Kennel Club system. The findings provide insight into the level of meaningful activity to be found in that group of breeders and provide some indication as to the speed and scale of their responses to the health and welfare issues flagged up by the Bateson Inquiry (2010). It was first applied to the pedigree dog breeding communities in September 2011.

## Methodology

The framework has four dimensions and is scored as follows:

Karlton Index Framework	Maximum Points Available 100
LEADERSHIP and HEALTH STRATEGY	20 points
COMMUNICATION and ENGAGEMENT	20 points
PARTICIPATION	20 points
IMPACT	40 points

The complete framework can be found in Annex 1. The method of scoring was the same in both September 2011 and March 2013, save for two subtle shifts in emphasis. The first shift relates to the Leadership and Strategy dimension and the second to the Communication and Engagement dimension.

One of the most significant developments in this field since 2011 is the introduction of the Kennel Club's Health Improvement Strategy toolkit, launched in September 2012 (The Kennel Club, September 2012). It was, therefore unfair to penalise breed clubs for not having a health strategy in place at this time given they would only have had six months to familiarise themselves with this groundbreaking resource and put it into practice. Consequently, in 2013, points were awarded on the basis of how ready the breed communities appeared to be to adopt and develop such a strategy in the near future.

It also seemed sensible to reflect the findings of the EFRA inquiry, in particular the suggestion made to accelerate progress in health and welfare issues through better co-ordinated research and data gathering (EFRA, 2013 paragraph 115). Consequently, additional points are awarded in 2013 for breed club collaboration with other clubs, research bodies, and veterinary specialists, including one point awarded for work of this nature done at international level.

Scoring involved the following steps:

Creation of a spreadsheet database of health information relating to 187 pedigree dog breeds  
Collection of health related data for each of those breed groups taken from:

- The Kennel Club website
- Breed club websites
- The British Veterinary Association and Animal Health Trust websites
- International breed websites
- Kennel Club publications
- Breed club publications

That evidence was then scored against the framework for each breed.

Scores were then moderated through both an internal and external process. Two external independent moderators were involved this time, who reviewed the scores of one high scoring and one middle scoring breed. Their conclusions were then used to benchmark the other breed scores.

The scoring began on February 5<sup>th</sup> 2013 and was completed on March 20<sup>th</sup> 2013.

As with all methodology, this has its limitations and anomalies. The scores on some criteria are subjective, in the main there is only one person scoring, data available through web sites may not be comprehensive nor easily verifiable, and the assumptions on which the framework is based may not have been sufficiently tested. However, all that being acknowledged, there is no doubt that the approach does provide invaluable insight into breed club activities on health, does expose the significant challenges faced by breed communities in tackling these difficult issues, and now that the scoring has been done more than once provides valuable tracking of the pace of progress. Feedback from stakeholders also pinpoints its considerable potential as a driver of shared learning and understanding.

Furthermore, fuelled by welcomed engagement with the project by the Kennel Club, breed clubs themselves and other researchers, future development of the methodology has the potential to overcome all of those limitations.

**The project is entirely self funded by the researcher and is independent of any canine health and welfare stakeholder.**

**WEBSITES CITED WERE LAST ACCESSED BETWEEN February 5<sup>th</sup> 2013 and March 20<sup>th</sup> 2013**

# Findings

Of the 187 breeds scored, 184 were included in the 2011 index. Of those 184, 154 have scored more in 2013 than in 2011. Factoring in the subtle shifts in scoring as outlined above, which would amount to a maximum of four points, 109 breeds have increased their scores by 5 or more and 52 breeds have increased their score by 10 points or more.

Granted there may be many underlying reasons for improved scores, such as more information available on breed club websites, or increased skill of the researcher in locating relevant information. However, there is no doubt that these increases do highlight the fact that more and better information on health and conformation issues is available within the Kennel Club system than was the case just eighteen months ago. What is more, many higher scores relate to increased activity on important aspects of breed health such as health surveys, collaborative research, tighter testing protocols, publication of survey results and education and awareness programmes.

## Top Scoring Breeds 2013

Table 1 outlines the top scores for 2013 and Chart 1 lists the breeds that are now scoring more than 30 on the Index.

Breed	Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	Impact	TOTAL
Dachshund	20	18	9	8	55
Flatcoated Retriever	15	15	7	8	45
Irish Wolfhound	16	14	8	4	42
Irish Setter	12	14	6	8	40
Bernese Mountain Dog	10	12	11	6	39
Leonberger	16	13	10	0	39
Irish Red and White Setter	12	11	7	8	38
Otterhound	14	15	8	0	37
Staffordshire Bull Terrier	12	14	7	4	37
English Springer Spaniel	15	12	6	4	37
Labrador	14	10	9	4	37

Table 1 Top Scoring Breeds 2013

Notable achievements in these breeds include:

- The [Dachs-Life 2012 survey](#) conducted by the [Dachshund Breed Council](#) which is just one part of the breed's comprehensive approach to its health agenda
- The [Cause of Death survey](#) and [group study](#) being conducted by the [Flatcoated Retriever Society](#), just two strands of their widening health agenda
- The strong team work of the [Irish Wolfhound Health Group](#) and their promotion of health testing
- The growing body of collaborative research work in Irish Setters as typified by the announcement of the [project into bloat](#)
- The [International Breed Seminar](#) hosted by the Bernese Mountain Dog Club of Great Britain
- The [international collaboration](#) of the Leonberger Club and their commitment to open registries, likewise the [international dimensions](#) to the work of the Otterhound Club
- The [breadth and depth of analysis of health data](#) being done by the Staffordshire Bull Terrier health team
- The professional collaboration between breed clubs in English Springer Spaniels ([the English Springer Spaniel Club](#) and the [Southern English Springer Spaniel Society](#))

Each breed now scoring more than 30 (Chart 1) can demonstrate a strong and impressive narrative on their approach to health and conformation issues.




Chart 1 Top 25 Breeds

This list includes representation from all Kennel Club groups, save the toy. It also includes representation from the most popular breeds, Labrador, Golden Retriever, English Springer Spaniel, and from breeds with tiny UK based populations such as Otterhound and Finnish Lapphund. Three breeds on the list are from the High Profile Breeds (HPBs), German Shepherd, French Bulldog and Neapolitan Mastiff. The diversity of this group illustrates commitment to improving breed health is broad. There is exemplary good work to be found in all on this list which will feature in the individual breed summaries to follow in the coming weeks.

## Breeds with the Highest Score Increases

The second iteration of the Karlton Index provides comparative scores with eighteen months ago. The list of breeds that increased their score by 16 points or more in that time (Chart 2) is revealing. 8 breeds come from the High Profile list. It would be unfair to assume that the HPBs on this list are only there because of the additional scrutiny applied to them. Increased scores for breeds like the Bloodhound, French Bulldog, Neapolitan Mastiff, German Shepherd are based on information recently published that relates to work dating back to before they were given their high profile status.




Chart 2: Breeds whose scores increased by 16 points or more

Notable achievements in these breeds include:

- Publication of health survey results by the [Association of Bloodhound Breeders](#) and in turn the application of that analysis into a published health strategy
- The take-up of the [French Bulldog health scheme](#) and increased compliance with their health testing protocols lead by the [French Bulldog Club of England](#)
- Strong and determined leadership by the health team in the [Neapolitan Mastiff Club](#) as illustrated by the [breadth of their work on health](#) in recent years

- The creation of new and superb web based health resources in [Beagles](#), [Basset Hounds](#) and the [Lancashire Heeler](#)
  - <http://www.beaglehealth.info/>
  - <http://www.bassetsrus.co.uk/>
  - <http://www.lancashireheelers.org/>
- The continuing work of the [Great Dane Breeders and Owners Association](#) in raising levels of engagement in their health agenda
- Mention must be made too, of the [Chinese Crested Dog Club](#) for the progress they have made on widening their approach to health. Also, though not on this list, missing out by just a couple of points is the [British Pekingese Club](#), which means between these two breeds the Toy group is represented in this progressive work.

Some on this list such as Irish Wolfhounds and Staffordshire Bull Terriers expressed concerns that they had been unfairly scored against the Index in 2011 and were much more active on health than their previous scores suggested. Inevitably, with any scoring framework tensions like this will arise. The ethos underpinning the project is one that welcomes feedback on both content and process and acknowledgement of, and investigation into, contested scores adds to the learning and development of both the researchers and the researched.

But an outstanding feature of this list is once again the diversity, more evidence suggestive of a widespread commitment to improving breed health within the Kennel Club system.

### **Low Scoring Breeds**

62 breeds scored fewer than 10 points. Of those, the following breeds registered a score of zero in 2013. This is for a variety of reasons. In some cases it is because there is no recognised breed club, for others it is because there is no online information available on their approach to health and for some it is technical difficulties with their websites. It should also be pointed out that for many of these breeds the number of registered dogs is tiny. However in the case of the Bichon Frise, the King Charles Spaniel, the Yorkshire, West Highland White and Kerry Blue terriers there are breed club web sites and there are significant numbers of registered dogs to warrant a better and more visible approach to health.

Anatolian Shepherd Dog  
 Australian Terrier  
 Azawakh  
 Basset Bleu de Gascoigne  
 Bergamasco  
 Bichon Frise  
 Cirneco D'ell Etna  
 Foxhound  
 Hamiltonstovare  
 Kerry Blue Terrier  
 King Charles Spaniel  
 Kooikerhondje  
 Mexican Hairless  
 West Highland White Terrier  
 Yorkshire Terrier



## Concluding Remarks

Amongst the recommendations made by the EFRA report into Dog Control and Welfare was this:

**“Whilst we recognise that the Kennel Club and some breed clubs have taken steps to address the consequences of Breed Standards on the health of some pedigree dogs, progress has been slow and many problems remain. Those involved in breeding dogs, including the Kennel Club, breed clubs and individual breeders, must redouble their efforts to eradicate health problems caused by conformation to Breed Standards.”**

(EFRA, 2013 section 126)

Margins of improvement shown in scores for 2013 are significant in a large number of breeds demonstrating a real appetite for progress. If those involved in these breed clubs do redouble their efforts over the next eighteen months there is no doubt the UK could be on the brink of genuinely exciting and impressive work in the realm of pedigree dog health and welfare. Barriers preventing lower scoring breeds from demonstrating the same levels of progress need to be explored.

The good news for breeds at both ends of the Karlton Index scale is an increasing level of available support from many of the relevant stakeholders for example:

- The [Health Survey](#) and [Health Improvement Strategy](#) toolkits produced by the Kennel Club (2012)
- Additional resources such as the support provided by the High Profile Breed Co-ordinator funded by the Kennel Club
- The [Kennel Club Charitable Trust](#) which works closely with breed clubs on a range of projects and invests in Vet Compass (see below)
- Provision and analysis of more detailed health data provided by the BVA and the Kennel Club's health team
- Continuous improvements to online information through the Kennel Club website such as the recently launched [MyKC Service](#)
- The increasing body of data being collated by the [RVC Vetcompass](#) project (funded by a number of stakeholders) which in turn is recruiting more and more veterinary practices for the purposes of better data collection
- Increased collaboration from international breed and kennel clubs as exemplified by the [dog health workshop](#)
- World class research programmes to be found in the UK's veterinary schools and universities and institutions such as the Animal Health Trust.

Whilst it is right to ask all those involved in breeding dogs to redouble efforts to reduce suffering and welfare issues caused by imprudent breeding practices there is a very strong case to suggest all relevant stakeholders should consider redoubling their efforts to support them. Especially given the fact that the progress demonstrated by breed clubs is achieved entirely by volunteers who have access to limited resources. Pro-active breed clubs will state, time and time again, that they could achieve more with more. For that reason, the location and distribution of available resources to support improved canine health and welfare should be reviewed as a matter of urgency to ensure that breed clubs can capitalise on their gathering momentum. Such a review should not be limited to the Kennel Club.

Progress identified in this report relates only to the breed clubs within the Kennel Club system. Very many questions have been asked of that constituency and there is ample evidence to demonstrate they are giving a better account of themselves and their actions on dog health. In fact their very

accountability through the Kennel Club system makes it relatively easy to score them against a framework like The Karlton Index.

An important line of further inquiry would be to apply the Index to breeders outside the breed club system and breeders outside the Kennel Club system to see how their progress compares with this. It is certainly feasible to apply the scoring to breed groups such as “labradoodle”, “cockapoo” and so on, as was done in 2011. Whilst the lack of accountability of breeders outside the Kennel Club makes scoring much more problematic it should still be done. Indeed, it could be part of a valuable process of making the unaccountable accountable.

Returning to conclusions that can be drawn from this exercise there is clear evidence of a strengthening collective commitment to canine health and welfare across the majority of breeds within the Kennel Club/breed club system. Whether the pace of progress will satisfy all critics of pedigree dog breeding is yet to be established, however, the opportunity to speed it up, given appropriate investment of relevant resources has never been greater. Furthermore, the majority of breed clubs have no issue with being subject to fair and transparent scrutiny and are eager to do even more given more resources. But subjecting them each to this level of scrutiny also reveals the limitations to their spheres of influence and their limited powers to sanction bad breeding practices.

Having high expectations of the Kennel Club and breed clubs is wholly justifiable and expecting them to put in place the right tools, approaches, skills and knowledge to deliver exceptional levels of canine health and welfare is fair. Especially as, for many, it is that system which caused the issues in the first place. Confidence in their ability to transform dog breeding is growing. But if their influence remains with an elite only, where does that leave the very many dogs bred outside their system? How can all dogs and dog breeders be reached? To secure progress for all dogs, all parts of that composite group of breeders have to be tackled and that will take broader collective effort. As will, tackling health and welfare issues allied to the other side of the socio-economic exchange of acquiring a dog, the whims and questionable preferences of so many puppy buyers.

### **Scoring 2013**

A list of scores for all breeds follows, listed in alphabetical order. Narrative summaries of the scores for each breed will be published on line at [www.thekarltonindex.com](http://www.thekarltonindex.com) during April and May 2013. More detailed feedback for any breed is available through the project, free of charge, just contact [philippa@thekarltonindex.com](mailto:philippa@thekarltonindex.com).

# A

		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
<b>Affenpinscher</b>	2011	4	4	4	0	12
	2013	5	5	4	0	14
<b>Afghan Hound</b>	2011	4	0	1	0	5
	2013	2	2	1	0	5
<b>Airedale Terrier</b>	2011	3	2	2	0	7
	2013	5	4	3	4	16
<b>Akita</b>	2011	4	3	2	0	9
	2013	3	5	4	4	16
<b>Alaskan Malamute</b>	2011	6	6	2	0	14
	2013	6	6	3	0	15
<b>American Cocker Spaniel</b>	2011	4	3	1	0	8
	2013	4	5	2	0	11
<b>Anatolian Shepherd Dog</b>	2011	0	0	2	2	4
	2013	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Australian Cattle Dog</b>	2011	5	4	2	0	11
	2013	6	4	3	0	13
<b>Australian Shepherd</b>	2011	6	4	4	0	14
	2013	10	6	8	0	24
<b>Australian Silky Terrier</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	0	1	0	0	1
<b>Australian Terrier</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Azawakh</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	0	0	0	0	0

# B

		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
Basenji	2011	2	0	1	0	3
	2013	1	0	1	2	4
Basset Bleu de Gascoigne	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	0	0	0	0	0
Basset Fauve de Bretagne	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	5	1	0	0	6
Basset Griffon Vendeen	2011	2	3	0	0	5
	2013	11	7	2	0	20
Basset Hound	2011	4	3	0	0	7
	2013	14	12	2	0	28
Bavarian Mountain Hound	2011	2	2	0	0	4
	2013	4	3	2	0	9
Beagle	2011	5	4	2	0	11
	2013	10	10	6	0	26
Bearded Collie	2011	5	5	4	0	14
	2013	11	12	7	4	34
Beauceron	2011	2	2	2	2	8
	2013	2	2	2	2	8
Bedlington Terrier	2011	6	5	3	0	14
	2013	9	8	4	0	21
Belgian Shepherd Dogs	2011	6	5	4	4	19
	2013	5	7	5	4	21
Bergamasco	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	0	0	0	0	0

		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
<b>Bernese Mountain Dog</b>	2011	9	9	8	4	30
	<b>2013</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Bichon Frise</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>2013</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Bloodhound</b>	2011	0	0	1	0	1
	<b>2013</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Bolognese</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>2013</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Border Collie</b>	2011	7	7	6	0	20
	<b>2013</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Border Terrier</b>	2011	8	6	2	0	16
	<b>2013</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Borzoi</b>	2011	3	2	0	0	5
	<b>2013</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Boston Terrier</b>	2011	0	2	2	0	4
	<b>2013</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Bouvier des Flandres</b>	2011	0	0	3	0	3
	<b>2013</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Boxer</b>	2011	6	3	4	0	13
	<b>2013</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Bracco Italiano</b>	2011	7	6	2	0	15
	<b>2013</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Briard</b>	2011	9	8	6	4	27
	<b>2013</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>29</b>

		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
<b>Brittany</b>	2011	4	0	3	0	7
	<b>2013</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>
	<hr/>					
<b>Bull Terrier</b>	2011	5	5	0	0	10
	<b>2013</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>
	<hr/>					
<b>Bulldog</b>	2011	2	4	0	0	6
	<b>2013</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22</b>
	<hr/>					
<b>Bullmastiff</b>	2011	3	2	1	0	6
	<b>2013</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>

## C

		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
<b>Cairn Terrier</b>	2011	4	4	0	0	8
	<b>2013</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>28</b>
	<hr/>					
<b>Canaan Dog</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>2013</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>
	<hr/>					
<b>Canadian Eskimo Dog</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>2013</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>
	<hr/>					
<b>Catalan Sheepdog</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>2013</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>
	<hr/>					
<b>Cavalier King Charles Spaniel</b>	2011	4	5	4	0	13
	<b>2013</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>28</b>
	<hr/>					
<b>Cesky Terrier</b>	2011	8	6	0	0	14
	<b>2013</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24</b>
	<hr/>					
<b>Chesapeake Bay Retriever</b>	2011	4	4	4	0	12
	<b>2013</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12</b>
	<hr/>					
<b>Chihuahua</b>	2011	0	2	0	0	2
	<b>2013</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>
	<hr/>					
<b>Chinese Crested</b>	2011	0	0	2	0	2
	<b>2013</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>
	<hr/>					
<b>Chow Chow</b>	2011	0	0	4	0	4
	<b>2013</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>26</b>

		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
<b>Cirneco d'ell Etna</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>2013</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Clumber Spaniel</b>	2011	5	4	6	4	19
	<b>2013</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Cocker Spaniel</b>	2011	7	7	4	4	22
	<b>2013</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Collies Rough and Smooth</b>	2011	6	5	3	2	16
	<b>2013</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Coton de Tulear</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>2013</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Curly Coated Retriever</b>	2011	5	4	3	0	12
	<b>2013</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>18</b>

## D

		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
<b>Dachshund</b>	2011	15	15	6	4	40
	<b>2013</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Dalmatian</b>	2011	4	4	3	0	11
	<b>2013</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Dandie Dinmont</b>	2011	7	6	2	0	15
	<b>2013</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Deerhound</b>	2011	4	6	0	0	10
	<b>2013</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Dobermann</b>	2011	8	7	4	0	19
	<b>2013</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21</b>

	Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL	
Dogue de Bordeaux	2011	4	3	2	0	9
	2013	5	3	4	4	16

## E

	Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL	
English Setter	2011	5	5	4	4	18
	2013	8	10	4	4	26

English Springer Spaniel	2011	10	9	4	0	23
	2013	15	12	6	4	37

English Toy Terrier	2011	4	3	0	0	7
	2013	8	5	0	0	13

Entlebucher Mountain Dog	2011	New Entry in 2013				
	2013	2	1	0	0	3

Estrela Mountain dog	2011	0	0	3	4	7
	2013	4	4	3	4	15

Eurasier		New Entry				
	2013	4	3	3	0	10

## F

	Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL	
Field Spaniel	2011	7	6	4	0	17
	2013	10	6	6	4	26

Finnish Lapphund	2011	7	6	7	0	20
	2013	11	15	7	0	33

Finnish Spitz	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	6	1	0	0	7

Flatcoated Retriever	2011	9	8	6	0	23
	2013	15	15	7	8	45

Fox Terriers	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	1	2	0	0	3



		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
Foxhound	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	0	0	0	0	0

French Bulldog	2011	4	3	2	0	9
	2013	13	15	7	0	35

## G

German Longhaired Pointer	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	0	0	1	0	1

German Pinscher	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	6	6	0	0	12

German Shepherd Dog	2011	4	2	7	4	17
	2013	12	13	7	4	36

German Shorthaired Pointer	2011	0	0	2	0	2
	2013	2	1	2	4	9

German Spitz	2011	7	6	3	0	16
	2013	7	9	6	0	22

German Wirehaired Pointer	2011	9	11	5	0	25
	2013	10	12	5	0	27

Giant Schnauzer	2011	11	9	5	0	25
	2013	11	11	4	4	30

Glen of Imaal	2011	4	4	2	0	10
	2013	8	5	2	0	15

Golden Retriever	2011	8	7	8	4	27
	2013	12	12	8	4	36

Gordon Setter	2011	4	5	4	0	13
	2013	7	3	6	4	20

		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
<b>Great Dane</b>	2011	6	6	3	0	15
	<b>2013</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Greater Swiss Mountain Dog</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>2013</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Greenland Dog</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>2013</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Greyhound</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>2013</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Griffon Bruxellois</b>	2011	5	4	0	0	9
	<b>2013</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>

## H

		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
<b>Hamiltonstovare</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>2013</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Havanese</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>2013</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Hovawart</b>	2011	3	2	4	0	9
	<b>2013</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Hungarian Kuvasz</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>2013</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Hungarian Puli</b>	2011	6	6	5	2	19
	<b>2013</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Hungarian Vizsla</b>	2011	11	12	7	0	30
	<b>2013</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Hungarian Wirehaired Vizsla</b>	2011	9	8	6	0	23
	<b>2013</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>

# I

		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
Ibizan Hound	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	1	0	0	0	1
Irish Red and White Setter	2011	8	6	8	4	26
	2013	12	11	7	8	38
Irish Setter	2011	9	7	5	5	26
	2013	12	14	6	8	40
Irish Terrier	2011	2	2	0	0	4
	2013	1	1	0	0	2
Irish Water Spaniel	2011	6	6	4	2	18
	2013	8	7	4	4	23
Irish Wolfhound	2011	7	9	5	0	21
	2013	16	14	8	4	42
Italian Greyhound	2011	6	4	0	0	10
	2013	6	4	0	0	10
Italian Spinone	2011	8	7	6	4	25
	2013	12	12	6	4	34

# J

		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
Japanese Akita Inu	2011	6	3	2	2	13
	2013	7	4	2	0	13
Japanese Chin	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	3	1	0	0	4
Japanese Shiba Inu	2011	4	2	0	0	6
	2013	0	0	2	0	2
Japanese Spitz	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	3	2	0	0	5

# K

		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
Keeshond	2011	7	7	4	0	18
	2013	13	11	6	0	30
Kerry Blue Terrier	2011	2	2	1	0	5
	2013	0	0	0	0	0
King Charles Spaniel	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	0	0	0	0	0
Komondor	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	0	0	3	0	3
Kooikerhondje	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	0	0	0	0	0
Korthals Griffon	2011	1	2	0	0	3
	2013	4	1	2	0	7

# L

		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
Labrador	2011	8	7	9	4	28
	2013	14	10	9	4	37
Lagotto Romagnolo	2011	1	1	2	0	4
	2013	4	3	2	0	9
Lakeland Terrier	2011	5	4	2	0	11
	2013	9	9	3	0	28
Lancashire Heeler	2011	4	5	2	0	11
	2013	11	14	3	0	28
Large Munsterlander	2011	5	5	3	2	15
	2013	8	1	7	4	20
Leonberger	2011	12	12	8	0	32
	2013	16	13	10	0	39

		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
Lhasa Apso	2011	3	2	0	0	5
	2013	3	2	0	0	5

Lowchen	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	0	0	1	0	1

## M

		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
Maltese	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	9	2	0	0	11

Manchester Terrier	2011	2	1	0	0	3
	2013	4	2	2	0	8

Maremma	2011	2	0	2	0	4
	2013	5	2	3	4	14

Mastiff	2011	5	6	3	0	14
	2013	11	8	3	0	22

Mexican Hairless	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	0	0	0	0	0

Miniature Bull Terrier	2011	6	6	3	0	15
	2013	8	5	3	0	16

Miniature Pinscher	2011	2	2	0	0	4
	2013	3	2	0	0	5

Miniature Poodle	2011	0	0	3	0	3
	2013	1	1	3	0	5

Miniature Schnauzer	2011	6	5	3	0	14
	2013	11	6	4	0	21

# N

		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
Neapolitan Mastiff	2011	3	3	1	0	7
	2013	14	12	6	0	32
Newfoundland	2011	9	8	7	4	28
	2013	12	11	8	4	35
Norfolk Terrier	2011	4	3	0	0	7
	2013	12	11	4	0	27
Norwegian Buhund	2011	3	4	2	0	9
	2013	7	4	3	4	18
Norwegian Elkhound	2011	4	3	3	0	10
	2013	8	5	2	4	19
Norwich Terrier	2011	4	3	2	0	9
	2013	5	5	2	0	12
Nova Scotia Duck Toller	2011	7	7	5	0	19
	2013	7	4	7	0	18

# O

Old English Sheepdog	2011	4	5	4	4	17
	2013	8	9	7	4	28
Otterhound	2011	7	7	4	0	18
	2013	14	15	8	0	37

# P

Papillon	2011	2	2	0	0	4
	2013	7	5	0	0	12
Parson Russell Terrier	2011	2	0	2	0	4
	2013	3	1	4	0	8
Pekingese	2011	4	3	0	0	7
	2013	9	8	4	0	21
Pharaoh Hound	2011	3	3	0	0	6
	2013	3	3	0	0	6

		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
Pointer	2011	0	0	2	0	2
	2013	6	1	3	0	10
Polish Lowland Sheepdog	2011	2	3	5	2	12
	2013	11	12	5	4	32
Pomeranian	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	4	2	0	0	6
Portuguese Podengo	2011	8	7	3	0	18
	2013	8	7	3	0	18
Portuguese Water Dog	2011	5	5	3	0	13
	2013	5	5	3	0	13
Pug	2011	0	2	0	0	2
	2013	7	6	1	0	14
Pyrenean Mountain dog	2011	3	3	2	0	8
	2013	3	3	2	4	12
Pyrenean Sheepdog	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	0	4	0	0	4

## R

Rhodesian Ridgeback	2011	3	3	2	0	8	
	2013	3	6	4	4	17	
Rottweiler	2011	6	6	5	2	19	
	2013	8	3	5	4	20	
Russian Terrier	Black	2011	3	3	1	0	7
		2013	7	5	3	0	15

## S

Saluki	2011	1	1	0	0	2
	2013	9	6	2	0	17

		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
<b>Samoyed</b>	2011	7	5	3	0	15
	<b>2013</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Schipperke</b>	2011	8	6	2	0	16
	<b>2013</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Schnauzer</b>	2011	5	6	2	0	13
	<b>2013</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Scottish Terrier</b>	2011	0	2	0	0	2
	<b>2013</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Sealyham Terrier</b>	2011	0	3	0	0	3
	<b>2013</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Shar Pei</b>	2011	4	2	0	0	6
	<b>2013</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Shetland Sheepdog</b>	2011	3	4	2	0	9
	<b>2013</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Shih Tzu</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>2013</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Siberian Husky</b>	2011	3	3	4	2	11
	<b>2013</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Skye Terrier</b>	2011	8	7	3	0	18
	<b>2013</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Slovakian Roughaired Pointer</b>	2011	5	5	2	0	12
	<b>2013</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Soft Coated Wheaten</b>	2011	10	12	6	0	28
	<b>2013</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>34</b>



		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
<b>Spanish Water Dog</b>	2011	11	10	7	0	28
	2013	12	9	7	0	28
<b>St Bernard</b>	2011	5	4	4	0	13
	2013	12	8	5	0	25
<b>Staffordshire Bull Terrier</b>	2011	7	7	4	0	18
	2013	12	14	7	4	37
<b>Standard Poodle</b>	2011	6	5	4	0	15
	2013	7	5	4	0	16
<b>Sussex Spaniel</b>	2011	7	4	2	0	13
	2013	10	6	4	0	20
<b>Swedish Vallhund</b>	2011	0	0	3	0	3
	2013	3	3	3	0	9

## T

<b>Tibetan Mastiff</b>	2011	0	0	3	0	3
	2013	6	3	3	0	12
<b>Tibetan Spaniel</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	2013	1	2	2	0	5
<b>Tibetan Terrier</b>	2011	6	6	4	0	16
	2013	8	7	4	4	23
<b>Toy Poodle</b>	2011	0	0	2	0	2
	2013	3	1	2	0	6

## W

<b>Weimaraner</b>	2011	8	6	4	0	18
	2013	9	8	4	4	25
<b>Welsh Cardigan Corgi</b>	2011	0	2	2	0	4
	2013	3	4	2	0	9

		Leadership	Communication and Engagement	Participation	IMPACT	TOTAL
<b>Welsh Pembrokeshire Corgi</b>	2011	Not scored in 2011 for technical reasons with web site				
	<b>2013</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Welsh Springer Spaniel</b>	2011	2	2	3	0	7
	<b>2013</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Welsh Terrier</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>2013</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>West Highland White Terrier</b>	2011	2	2	0	0	4
	<b>2013</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Whippet</b>	2011	8	7	0	0	15
	<b>2013</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>

## Y

<b>Yorkshire Terrier</b>	2011	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>2013</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## References

Animal Health Trust [www.aht.org.uk](http://www.aht.org.uk)

Bateson Inquiry Report 2010 <http://breedinginquiry.files.wordpress.com/2010/01/final-dog-inquiry-120110.pdf>

British Veterinary Association website [http://www.bva.co.uk/hip\\_scheme.aspx](http://www.bva.co.uk/hip_scheme.aspx)

EFRA Reports 2013

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmselect/cmenvfru/575/57502.htm#evidence>

## The Kennel Club

Health Improvement Strategy Toolkit 2012

<http://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/download/13823/bhcbreedhealthimpstrat.pdf>

Health Survey Toolkit 2012

<http://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/download/13822/bhcsurveystoolkit.pdf>

MyKC Services 2013

<http://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/item/4823/23/5/3>

Online resources <http://www.the-kennel-club.org.uk/services/Default.aspx>

The Kennel Club Dog Health Group Annual Report 2012

The Kennel Club Charitable Trust <http://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/charitabletrust>


Royal Veterinary College Vet Compass <http://www.rvc.ac.uk/VetCompass/>

# ANNEXE I

## The KarltonINDEX™

Measuring progress in the health of our dogs

### The Framework



- **The Leadership dimension** sets the foundation for health improvement in a breed. It identifies resources in terms of time, people and funding. It sets objectives for improving health, based on scientific data and research. It should be broad in its scope and include both genetic and conformation issues.
- **Communication and engagement** focuses on how the above agenda is communicated to breeders, vets and pet owners. Also how those groups are encouraged to support the health agenda.
- **Participation** is about the levels of take-up in activities to deliver the health strategy (e.g., reducing COI, health screening, DNA testing).
- **IMPACT** measures the impact the above approach is having on dog health and welfare (e.g., less exaggerated conformation, lowering the breed average COI, lowering the prevalence and severity of genetic diseases).

Scoring the Dimensions

**LEADERSHIP and HEALTH AGENDA Total 20 points**

Element	Evidence	How this benefits the dogs
Comprehensive breed health strategy	<p>Clear health and welfare objectives, broad in scope, evidence based, with consideration given to the following:</p> <p>Genetic diversity including out crossing, if necessary.</p> <p>Breeding objectives to eliminate deleterious physical traits.</p> <p>Breeding objectives to reduce the incidence in inherited disorders.</p> <p>Prioritisation of genetic diseases.</p> <p>Plans to report and record health conditions.</p> <p>Plans to tackle existing conditions.</p> <p>An open health registry.</p> <p>Limitations on number of times a 'popular sire' may be used.</p> <p>Ethics of mating and whelping.</p> <p>Enlisting the help of a canine geneticist.</p>	<p>Modern genetics dictate that a good breeding strategy is one that is balanced and proportionate. Focusing on eliminating one condition can give rise to other genetic problems. An effective breed health plan needs to be broad in its scope to benefit the breed as a whole, and future generations of dogs.</p> <p>An evidence based agenda and advice from a canine geneticist will ensure that the most beneficial strategy is deployed and the best use made of health testing/screening. A further benefit will be in the development of effective medical treatment for affected dogs.</p> <p>Increasing genetic diversity is vitally important in securing healthy future generations and should not be seen as a last resort. Regular scientific outcross programmes will help to prevent new diseases from developing.</p>
Co-ordination and management of that strategy	<p>Named KC Health Co-ordinator.</p> <p>A Health Committee reflecting a broad range of breed experience.</p> <p>Clearly defined individual roles for the committee.</p> <p>Available contact details of committee members.</p> <p>Calendar of health related activities.</p>	<p>A strong and committed health committee provides the best chance of success in breed health improvement. The team should include a representative for pet owners, those who work their dogs, and those involved in breed rescue as well as core breeders. This will ensure that key information reaches a wider audience.</p> <p>It is understood that much work done within breed clubs is voluntary. This can work well but it may be advantageous to include people with some professional experience, as well as making use of a wider network of volunteers.</p>
Resources	<p>Appropriate budget to fund health activities</p> <p>Sufficient time allocated</p>	

**Communication and Engagement Total 20 points**

Element	Evidence	How this benefits the dogs
Communication of health strategy	<p>Number of ways this is communicated via websites, articles, events.</p> <p>Clarity and simplicity of information.</p> <p>Regular updates of information.</p> <p>Integrity of the information.</p> <p>Breadth of audience (e.g., show breeders, pet owners, vets, non show breeders).</p> <p>Communication is two way.</p> <p>Health information is gathered from a wide range of sources.</p>	<p>Having identified what needs to be done to improve breed health, it now needs to be communicated to a wide audience, including pet owners and non affiliated breeders. This is made very easy with internet communications.</p> <p>Starting relevant health screening and testing quickly benefits all concerned. Effective communication will support breeders by informing their breeding decisions, pet owners in their choice of dog, and vets to enable them to develop effective treatments.</p>
Engagement with health strategy	<p>Number and range of collaborative initiatives and partnerships.</p>	<p>Developing collaborative partnerships with other breed clubs within the breed, other breeds, and the relevant scientists will be mutually beneficial through shared learning and access to data both nationally and internationally.</p>
Communication of updated health data	<p>Publication of health survey results.</p> <p>Development of open health registries.</p> <p>Publication of test results.</p> <p>Publication of numbers of DNA submissions.</p> <p>Timely notification of new health issues/developments.</p>	<p>Genetic mutations can occur at any time, trends can shift quickly and breakthroughs can be sudden. So any communication strategy has to be regularly updated.</p>

<b>Participation Total 20 points</b>		
<b>Element</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>How this benefits the dogs</b>
Breadth and depth of participation	<p>Participation in relevant health surveys.</p> <p>Participation in health testing/screening/breeding protocols.</p> <p>Supply of DNA samples for research.</p> <p>Number of post mortems.</p> <p>Publication of COIs.</p> <p>Monitoring use of 'popular sires'.</p> <p>Take-up of breeder accreditations.</p>	<p>What is more soul destroying than a breeding strategy that very few breeders follow? This happens all too often and the breed as a whole suffers.</p> <p>This dimension will calculate the levels of participation in the strategies identified for the breed. Credit will be given to those breeds which implement the strategies as widely as possible. The real benefit of this will be seen in future generations of healthier dogs.</p> <p>Open participation will encourage the support of a critical mass of breeders so that ethical breeding practices become the norm rather than the exception.</p> <p>Wider open participation will help to eliminate puppy farmers whose non participatory stance will set them apart from the rest.</p>

<b>IMPACT Total 40 points</b>		
<b>Element</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>How this will benefit the dogs</b>
Improvements in health	<p>Elimination of conformational abnormalities.</p> <p>Greater genetic diversity for individual dogs and breed as a whole.</p> <p>Reduction in the incidence of genetic disease.</p>	<p>Self evident.</p> <p>Every breed fit to live the normal life of a dog.</p> <p>Every breed enjoying a robust genotype.</p> <p>Every breed seen to be tackling genetic health conditions.</p> <p>Every dog born given the best chance of a long and healthy life.</p> <p>Even with all of the above, living things being what they are, health problems will occur. But breeders who follow all of the above will be able to say, 'I did everything in my power to safeguard the health and welfare of our dogs'.</p> <p>This is all the dogs can ask and all that any of us can ask.</p>