

Culture, Communications, Welsh Language, Sport, and International Relations  
Committee  
Senedd Cymru  
Cardiff Bay  
Cardiff  
CF99 1SN

22nd of October 2025

Dear Culture, Communications, Welsh Language, Sport and International Relations  
Committee,

I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to respond to the written evidence submitted by the Greyhound Board of Great Britain (GBGB) which accuses myself, and others, of making [‘highly misleading or wholly inaccurate claims’](#) during last week’s oral evidence session. I am writing to elaborate on, and clarify, comments made about my particular contribution.

1. And then we still don't have trackside statistics now” – Billie-Jade Thomas (RSPCA)

GBGB: This is not correct. Statistics for track injuries and fatalities are published in GBGB’s annual, independently audited data as required by DEFRA. This data has been published each year since 2018.

**Here I was explicitly and specifically referring to the lack of statistics relevant to individual tracks, hence the use of the word ‘trackside’ which can be [defined as](#) ‘of, relating to, or situated in the area immediately adjacent to a track’. Within this definition the word ‘track’ is singular as opposed to plural. It is entirely correct that GBGB does not provide any injury, fatality or retirement data broken down by individual tracks, despite its claims relevant to transparency.**

2. “But what this Bill is to achieve is to remove the risks, the welfare risks, the injuries, deaths, to dogs while they are racing, which is inherently dangerous.” – Billie-Jade Thomas (RSPCA)

GBGB: It is impossible to 'remove the risks' to any animal, whether this be a pet, a working animal or a farm animal. Risks can however be minimised, and that can only be achieved through proper regulation. GBGB has in fact done significant work to minimise risks through its long-term welfare strategy, A Good Life For Every Greyhound. By advocating for an unevidenced ban, the Cut The Chase coalition is in fact increasing the risks of poor welfare for greyhounds which may continue to be raced in conditions which are not under any scrutiny.

**I specifically state that the risks I am referring to here are relevant to 'to dogs while they are racing', as noted above. This evidence session - and the Bill it is relevant to - are both specifically focused around racing greyhounds - not pets, working animals or farm animals. As such, any rhetoric around any other type of animal is both irrelevant and deflective. It is undeniable that stopping greyhounds from racing would remove the risks associated with them racing. There are also other ways of minimising risks that have not been explored by GBGB such as researching the impact of running dogs in different directions or on tracks of designs and shapes that would be inherently less dangerous. The transfer of the Valley Greyhound Stadium from an independent track offered a clear opportunity for them to do so, but this was not taken, as mentioned by myself last week. Meanwhile, the remainder of the comment above beginning from 'By advocating...' is entirely hypothetical as there is no evidence to suggest that illegal greyhound racing may happen if a ban comes into force. As experts in the field of animal welfare, it is the RSPCA's firm view that a ban on greyhound racing will enhance animal welfare as banning greyhound racing will remove the risk of injury and fatality for a significant number of dogs each year.**

3. "There's a lack of transparency regarding the industry practices and enforcement of regulatory standards as well" – Billie-Jade Thomas (RSPCA)

GBGB: This is inaccurate. GBGB publishes a fortnightly report, the GBGB Calendar, which details any disciplinary action which has taken place due to breaches of GBGB's Rules of Racing. This details both the reasons for disciplinary action, and the outcomes which can range from fines and licence suspensions to permanent warning off from the sport. Likewise, all standards underpinning GBGB regulation are publicly available, including GBGB's Rules of Racing, the Code of Practice for Residential Kennels and the British Standards' Institute's (BSI) Publicly Available Specification (PAS) for greyhound trainers' residential kennels – PAS 251: 2017 – which underpins GBGB's UKAS accreditation.

**Here I am referring to the fact that there is a lack of transparency regarding industry practices and enforcement of regulatory standards, such as records of racetrack injuries to greyhounds and checks for banned substances. With most dogs bred, reared and educated on private properties outside of the UK - with the import of these dogs equating to an industry practice - there is little or no visibility of the whole life experience of greyhounds in the UK racing on GBGB tracks. Neither GBGB or UKAS publicly display injury data by racetrack (as outlined above), outcomes of**

**licensing inspections or residential kennel audits. Additionally, no evidence is provided to demonstrate how such information is collated and informs industry development to ensure meaningful changes are made. If collated, reviewed and actioned, such information could help to identify systemic trends across different jurisdictions and be used to take the steps necessary to improve the welfare of greyhounds.**

4. "Those regulations were actually introduced in 2010. They don't actually cover trainers' kennels, where greyhounds spend 95 per cent of their lives" – Billie-Jade Thomas (RSPCA)

GBGB: This highlights a clear misunderstanding of the levels of regulation in place to protect and promote the welfare of racing greyhounds. While the Government's Welfare of Racing Greyhound Regulations 2010 do not extend to trainers' kennels, GBGB's regulatory regime for trainers' kennels is accredited by the United Kingdom Accreditation Service – a Government body. As part of this accreditation, all kennels must have an annual inspection from independent auditors SCI as well as an annual veterinary inspection to ensure the welfare of the greyhounds. This is in addition to GBGB's UKAS accredited regulatory scheme for licensed stadia, which again is based on annual, independent inspections

**There is absolutely no misunderstanding here. I clearly state that the 2010 regulations relevant to England do not apply to trainers' kennels which, by GBGBs own admission as noted above, is entirely correct. It is important to note here there is no rebuttal from GBGB against me stating that some greyhounds spend 95% of their lives in trainers' kennels...**

5. GBGB: '...by anti-racing groups' (as featured in the conclusion)

**The RSPCA is not an anti-racing group. The RSPCA is the world's oldest and largest animal welfare charity.**

I hope that the above helps clarify any concerns around my contribution, all of which was given in good faith, as well as being correct and factual, as demonstrated above. I urge the committee to recognise this clear attempt at undermining myself and my fellow panellists who were invited by the committee to give oral evidence as part of a democratic process.

Yours sincerely,

Billie-Jade Thomas  
Senior Public Affairs Manager - Wales