

Huw Irranca-Davies MS
Deputy First Minister and Cabinet Secretary
for Climate Change and Rural Affairs
By email

9 October 2025

Dear Huw,

Financial implications of the Prohibition of Greyhound Racing (Wales) Bill

The Committee considered the financial implications of the Prohibition of Greyhound Racing (Wales) Bill (the Bill) at its meeting on 1 October 2025.

We note that the Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA) estimates that the Bill would result in a net administrative saving of £11,000 over the five-year appraisal period from 2027-28 to 2031-32. To assist its scrutiny of the financial implications of the Bill, the Committee asks you to provide further information in response to the questions outlined in the annex. We would be grateful for a response by 14 November 2025.

I am copying this letter to the Culture, Communications, Welsh Language, Sport, and International Relations Committee.

Yours sincerely,



Peredur Owen Griffiths MS, Chair of the Finance Committee

Croesewir gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg neu Saesneg. | We welcome correspondence in Welsh or English.

Annex:: Issues for consideration

Establishing the costs and benefits of the Bill

1. The Bill and Explanatory Memorandum were laid before the Senedd ahead of the Greyhound Racing Ban Implementation Group's Report and workplan, which is due this Autumn. Why have you taken this approach and how might the Implementation Group's Report impact on financial implications of the Bill?
2. What role has the Greyhound Racing Ban Implementation Group played in the preparation and review of the Regulatory Impact Assessment?
3. What specific evidence have you used to estimate the financial implications of the Bill and how have you engaged with stakeholders in deriving your estimates?
4. Why have you adopted a five-year appraisal period for the financial implications of the Bill?
5. What are the current annual costs incurred by relevant public bodies in Wales—including law enforcement, regulatory agencies, and any other stakeholders—in monitoring, investigating, and responding to issues relating to greyhound racing activities?

Specific costs associated with the policy proposals

6. The RIA notes nearly two-thirds of respondents to a public consultation supported a phased ban. How has this been reflected in the Bill and your estimate of its financial implications?
7. All quantified costs in the RIA relate to staff time to prepare bilingual guidance and for communicating the ban, but these do not include senior officials' oversight of the guidance or publicity material prior to their publication, or any non-staff costs. How confident are you that your estimates of the financial implications of the Bill are complete and accurate; how have you tested the reasonableness of your approach and the assumptions you have adopted in the calculations?
8. What is the estimated cost of the Greyhound Racing Ban Implementation Group and why has this not been included in the RIA?
9. The RIA does not quantify the financial loss to the only greyhound racecourse in Wales, Valley Greyhound Stadium. You note Valley does not publish full accounts but what steps have you taken to obtain financial information about its operation, including the consequences for its contract with Sports Information Services for live streaming of racing?
10. Will the owner of Valley Stadium be entitled to any compensation following the ban?

11. What assessment have you made of the impact of the ban on those directly or indirectly employed in the industry, as well as on the wider economy?
12. What consideration have you made of the approach taken to estimate the financial implications of the Bill in Scotland?
13. While noting the Bills differ, the Financial Memorandum for the Bill in Scotland includes a range of costs for rehoming retired greyhounds (an estimate of which you say would be “speculative”) and for prosecuting the small number of cases expected each year (you assume the cost of enforcement would be zero). On the basis of what evidence have you made different assumptions for these costs?

Methodology and approach to quantifying the benefits of the change

14. You say the “prohibition is expected to deliver a range of social, cultural, and animal welfare benefits” but you quantify only the cost-saving from a reduction in correspondence from individuals and stakeholders calling for a ban on greyhound racing. What benefits are likely to arise from the Bill and why have you not quantified them?
15. What methodology have you used to support the stated environmental benefits arising from the Bill?
16. What engagement have you had with Valley Greyhounds Limited about the future use of the stadium or land for alternative uses?

Post-implementation review

17. Your post-implementation review says the Bill will be reviewed no later than five years after it has come into force. However, the RIA notes some benefits may be long-term in nature. What factors will you use to determine whether the Bill has been successful?
18. How has the cost of the post implementation review been reflected in the RIA?