

Dear Board,

I find the minutes of 2017 very concerning.

These minutes are not a correct representation of what has been said in the meeting.

1.

I requested a correction of the **minutes 2016 point 9**, regarding the statement:

Bern has opened the possibility that the universities can hand over blood samples to the Union and they can save the data for example on a server owned by the Union.

I miss the rectification in this years minutes: "Bern did not indicate they are prepared to hand over blood samples to the ILU"

2.

In regards to point 7. **Breeding problems in the Union / Report of the Health Committee.**

I object to parts of the discussions that took place being spotlighted, other parts left out or misinterpreted:

A.

I do not recall the general meeting saying the leonberger is "healthy". It was suggested by some delegates that leonbergers are healthier than some breeds. Neither was it said that the breed has no serious problems. In fact bone cancer, hemangiosarcoma cancer and heart problems were specifically mentioned as concerning and deserving future study.

B.

The following remark is an incomplete reflection of what I said:

Wilma Kroon thought that Vetsuisse Bern could be contacted because it sent a health questionnaire a few months ago.

It is certain that the Vetsuisse in Bern will not share the findings of the completed questionnaire replies with the Union.

My suggestion was to encourage owners to send updates of their dogs health (of whom universities Bern/Minnesota have DNA samples) using the online questionnaires provided by them. Although the private names of people and dogs remain confidential, we can ask for updates similar to the LPN/LEMP updates. This would help to keep track of certain diseases becoming more or less prevalent in our leonbergers.

C.

I do not recall being said that:

the Health Committee failed to contact the persons ect ect.

In fact this part of the minutes seems a personal view and incorrect representation of assignments and agreements concerning the task and working methods of the Health Committee.

In this matter I fully support the open letter to the board sent by ex health committee member Sharon Springel d.d 15-11-17

D.

I also strongly object to the following sentence:

She also would like to have suggestions for the replacement of Jane Wall, who does not longer participate in the exchange of emails in the health committee.

In order to protect the confidentiality and reputation of HC members I specifically did NOT mention names. I indicated that the HC had not received responses from 2 members for some time and is therefore seeking 2 replacements.

3.

In regards to point 11 **Miscellaneous**

A.

In the section of the minutes regarding the use of Mean Kinship I detect a screening (if not a censoring) in the minutes. I miss all remarks made explaining why M.K. is an asset. I mentioned that breeders, like always, still need to do their homework and Mean Kinship is an additional tool, next to tools like health screening DNA tests and appearance.

The accompanying analytical report will provide insight of geographical overview, concentration of family groups and the red, yellow and green zones as mentioned in the video.

I also miss the suggestion from a delegate to start with a trial/pilot . Which was acknowledged by the chairman as a possibility.

It was agreed that a limited trial could proceed

B.

Natalia Romanova said she wonders if this is really a useful tool, you already have other tools in the same area. It is also doubtful whether Pieter Oliehoek is the right person, the video was disappointing, also not specific for Leonberger and he could market this video for every other breed.

I miss in the minutes my response by mentioning his degrees in Genetics and Programming as well as his recognition in the Dutch Kennelclub , where on a regular basis he gives seminars for breeders. The genetic Diversity video is not "his" video. It is the property of the International Leonberger Union and was produced by the health committee with the support of the board. Suggestions that the video is "marketed" are disingenuous.

For further remarks about the video I refer to and support the open letter to the board sent by ex health committee member Sharon Springel d.d 15-11-17

C.

Lastly I did not say:

Anita Treichler and Sharon Springel had not officially thanked in last year's minutes last when leaving the health committee for the many work they have done.

What I said was that I regretted not seeing a proper thank you to both in the 2016 minutes for their hard work and dedication in the Health Committee and an acknowledgment for the enormous time, travel and own money that was involved.

The president noted this and said that thanks for their efforts would be included in this years minutes. I note that this has still not been done in these minutes

Best Regards
Wilma Kroon