



Written Evidence from the Cut the Chase Coalition

The Cut the Chase coalition welcomes the opportunity to provide further written evidence to the Culture, Communications, Welsh Language, Sport, and International Relations Committee following the evidence sessions on the Prohibition of Greyhound Racing (Wales) Bill which took place on the 23rd of October 2025. The information below offers some clarification and additional information on the points raised in the sessions.

The Greyhound Retirement Scheme

The Greyhound Retirement Scheme (GRS) was raised several times during the relevant evidence sessions. However, it was neither raised or mentioned that the full GRS - which currently sits at £420 per dog - is **not offered to organisations who campaign for an end to greyhound racing**. This includes members of our coalition and other animal welfare organisations, despite the fact that they play a highly important role in rehoming former racing greyhounds in Wales - including some of the 75 Valley-attached dogs that have been rehomed by the Wales Greyhound Partnership since February 2025. This is especially relevant as during the evidence session in question it was stated on several occasions that dogs arrive at rehoming centres in good health and/or uninjured. However, with some of these comments only relating to dogs covered by GBGB's rehoming scheme, this raises questions with regards to those not covered because the organisation in question calls for a ban on racing.

The three case studies below are relevant to dogs who have recently been surrendered to Greyhound Rescue Wales (GRW), for which **no GRS was received from GBGB** and ongoing veterinary treatment was necessary.

1. [REDACTED] years old, arrived at Greyhound Rescue Wales on the [REDACTED] 2025 having completed [REDACTED] races during their career, including races at the Valley. The dog had acquired a [REDACTED] prior to intake at GRW. On arrival, GRW were informed that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] after arrival and was prescribed ongoing pain medication by GRW's vet.
2. [REDACTED] years old, arrived at Greyhound Rescue Wales on the [REDACTED] after completing her last race at the Valley on the [REDACTED] 2025. During a routine health check, it was noted that her [REDACTED]. A follow-up consultation at GRW's vets confirmed that there was [REDACTED]. During her (unfunded) dental surgery, [REDACTED] was also noted and medication was prescribed

to [REDACTED] She is now waiting to be seen by a [REDACTED] to confirm as to whether any ongoing treatment costs will be required.

3. [REDACTED] years old, arrived at GRW on the [REDACTED] 2025 having completed her last race [REDACTED] at the Valley on the [REDACTED]. The dog had acquired a [REDACTED] during a race for which surgical intervention (the insertion of a screw) had taken place. However, the dog struggled to put weight on the joint, which had been splinted, on arrival at GRW and it was found that no bandage change had taken place for at least 10 days prior to intake. As the bandage was wet and dirty, pressure sores had started to develop, while her toes were also inflamed and sore. Following an X-ray at the vets a number of medications were subscribed to try and gain control of the pain. If this is not successful, the dog was to be referred for consideration of screw removal or to a pain clinic

While claims were also made that any neutering and/or dental work needed is often undertaken prior to greyhounds arriving in rehoming centres, Greyhound Board of Great Britain (GBGB)'s own website acknowledges that some neutering or dental work '[may be required](#)' once a dog is handed over to a charity or trust and that the GRS does not cover this.

'Shared responsibility'

The concept of 'shared responsibility' was raised on several occasions throughout the relevant evidence sessions. This implies that we as rehoming organisations are equally as responsible for the dogs leaving the racing industry as the industry itself, which we heavily dispute. The racing industry actively and purposely creates thousands of surplus dogs every year, [more than half](#) of which are taken in by trusts and charities to support its business model, as recognised by the committee during the relevant session. We do this, as professional animal welfare organisations, to protect the welfare of the dogs in question and give them an opportunity to find new homes once they are surplus to the industry's requirements. This does not equate to a 'shared responsibility' - in fact, the greyhound racing's undeniable reliance on our sector would be better described as a 'burden' on our industry, which is already facing significant pressure due to various factors. We want to make it explicitly clear that only the industry is responsible for the annual facilitation of surplus greyhounds - a responsibility that is not willingly 'shared' by ourselves, hence our calls for a ban on greyhound racing.

'Animal rights'

The phrase 'animal rights' and 'antis' was used several times during the relevant evidence sessions. According to GBGB's evidence, the publication of trackside statistics is not possible because tracks may be targeted by 'the animal rights element'. Members of the Cut the Chase coalition have not, and do not use, direct action such as attending or protesting at tracks as a campaigning tactic. Neither are we aware of any recent protest at the Valley. We therefore question this attempted justification for GBGB's refusal to publish trackside statistics, despite it being clear from the evidence session that this data is collected and exists. As GBGB refuses to publish trackside data, as covered within the relevant session, we have relied upon the data that is available to underpin our campaign and provide an evidence-based approach towards our calls for a ban. To clarify, all of the members of our coalition are animal welfare organisations who, between us, rescue, rehome and rehabilitate thousands of animals in Wales, and further afield, on an annual basis. By undertaking this work, we

relieve the burden on statutory bodies who would otherwise need to step in to help these animals - many of whom are among the most vulnerable in our society. As such, to dismiss us as 'animal rights', 'anti-racing' or 'political' organisations is both incorrect and misleading. We call for this to be recognised by the committee, all of whom will be familiar with the wide-reaching impact of our work in Wales.

'A good life' and injuries in racing greyhounds

During the relevant evidence session, Professor Madeline Campbell stated that, within the context of the Five Domains Model of Animal Welfare, "good lives are a life in which, from an animal's point of view, they have a substantially positive welfare experience taken across their lifetime and that allows for a discrete moment of negative welfare experience – e.g., if they get injured, provided that is treated appropriately and quickly by a vet, then they will still have good lives, substantially positive welfare experiences taken across their lifetimes."

While we agree that a good life is one in which, from the animal's perspective, there are predominantly positive welfare experiences, the suggestion that such lives compensate for expected negative welfare experiences is fundamentally at odds with the principles of the Five Domains approach. It is essential to recognise that the Five Domains Model is an assessment and monitoring framework, not a justification tool. It acknowledges the dynamic interactions between an animal's environment, nutrition, health, behavioural interactions (with people, other animals and the environment), and mental state – recognising that for every physical provision or impact there are likely corresponding emotional or subjective experiences that influence an individual's welfare. The model provides a structured means of exploring these interactions and their effects on an animal's overall mental state.

An animal's welfare status and quality of life are determined by the balance between positive and negative experiences; where positive feelings outweigh negatives, the animal may experience at least a life worth living. Crucially, the model is designed to minimise suffering and promote positive emotional states. It was never intended as an ethical justification for subjecting dogs to predictable harmful or avoidable negative experiences, such as those arising from greyhound racing. Injuries sustained during racing cause both short and long-term pain, leading to negative emotions and suffering. These harms are predictable, given the known risks of high-speed collisions, and preventable, as they could be mitigated through changes to track design, racing operations and dog management. Ultimately, greyhound racing creates conditions that predictably result in negative welfare outcomes, directly contradicting the Five Domains Model's objective to minimise suffering and maximise positive experiences. Referring to the Model in an attempt to justify such harm is therefore inconsistent with its intended purpose, and a misuse of its scientific and ethical foundations.

Types of injuries to dogs

Claims regarding the types of individual injuries to racing greyhounds, including that some may simply equate to a 'torn toenail', were made during the session. While it was not mentioned during the session, GBGB offers a breakdown of the

types of injuries dogs sustain whilst racing within its annual data as demonstrated [here](#). According to this data, of the 3,809 injuries recorded in 2024, there were:

- 718 hock injuries
- 566 wrist injuries
- 410 foot injuries
- 18 hind long bone injuries
- 104 fore long bone injuries
- 491 fore limb muscle injuries
- 1,031 hind limb muscle injuries
- 489 'other' injuries

UKAS Accreditation

UKAS describes itself as checking the checkers ("[About UKAS](#)"). Therefore, UKAS accreditation confirms that GBGB's inspection and licensing processes meet ISO 17065 standards for procedural competence, documented impartiality safeguards, and systematic record-keeping. It also verifies that qualified staff follow consistent procedures. UKAS accreditation does not verify welfare protection. It does not certify the accuracy of injury and fatality data, it does not review the welfare standards at tracks or kennels, and it does not review whether enforcement decisions are appropriate or rigorous. Whilst UKAS were described as questioning the work being done by GBGB, they are not questioning the welfare concerns that have been raised, rather they are questioning the processes assessors are following. UKAS accreditation is not synonymous with welfare protection, that is dependent on factors including standards and enforcement.

Time spent in trainers' kennels

The statistic referenced by RSPCA Cymru, which states that some dogs spend '95% of their time' in trainers' kennels was raised during the session. To clarify, this statistic was reported by the UK Parliament's Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (EFRA) Committee as part of its post-implementation review of the Welfare of Racing Greyhounds Regulations 2010 that apply to England published in February 2016. The reference for this statistic can be found [here](#).