



THE KENNEL CLUB
Making a difference for dogs

ANNOUNCEMENT

MINUTES OF THE KENNEL CLUB AGILITY LIAISON COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 11 JULY 2007

PRESENT:

Mr D Ray	Midlands
Mr R Jordan	Midlands
Mr I Mallabar	North East
Mrs J Nero	North East
Mrs P Baltes	North West
Mr D Duncan	Northern Ireland
Mr P Elms	Scotland
Mr T Felstead	South East and East Anglia
Mr J Gilbert	South East and East Anglia
Mr T Griffin	South and South West
Miss L Olden	South and South West
Mr M Shaw	Wales

IN ATTENDANCE:

Miss D Deuchar	Team Leader – WTOA
Mrs Z Tharmasingam	WTOA Specialist

MR D RAY IN THE CHAIR

ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1. Apologies had been received from Mr Hallam from the North West.

ITEM 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

2. The minutes of the meeting held on 14 February 2007 were signed by the Chairman as an accurate record.

ITEM 3. MATTERS ARISING/RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3. Kennel Club International Agility Festival

The Chairman informed the Council that the Kennel Club International Agility Festival entries had increased by 30% for 2007, with over 550 caravans booked compared to 350 last year. The Chairman explained that extra judges would be required, due to the extent of the entries. It was noted that Mr Griffin, with the help of Mr Rodgers, would be organising the layout of the showground. The Council was requested to inform the office of the polo shirt sizes they required, as the order would be placed shortly.

5. The Council was informed that camping for Ring Mangers would be situated near their rings. The Chairman requested the Council consider judges for 2008, with all suggestions being forwarded to the office.
6. The Chairman explained that the results service, which was mentioned in previous months, was going to replace the manual scoring sheet. A laptop would be placed in each score tent, with a master laptop situated in the secretary's tent, to enable competitors to check their times. The feedback that had been received was very positive with many handlers volunteering for the training on Friday morning.
7. International Agility Competition
The Chairman advised the Council that, in addition to the Kennel Club providing funds for the International Agility Festival and Olympia, a further £25,000 would be available to fund international competitions. It was advised that due to the FCI World Championships being held in Finland in 2008, there would be insufficient funds to cover both the World Championships and the European Open.
8. The Council was requested to confirm which event it would prefer to support. It was noted that it would not be a permanent decision and therefore could change in future years. The Council was advised the office would confirm with the FCI that a team could be sent to the FCI World Championships even if it was not supported every year.
9. A number of options were discussed at length, with the majority of the Council wishing to support the European Open Championships, which would be held in Germany in 2008. However, the Council agreed that ideally it would prefer to attend both events if the funds were available, but felt an 'all breeds' Championships was preferable.
10. There were concerns whether a vet should attend the Championships, due to the extent of the budget. The Council felt that grooms should pay for themselves, as it was believed that the budget could be better utilised in other areas.
11. Following a long discussion, the Council agreed to recommend one Team for UK (including NI), with qualifiers to be held in the eight regions; Scotland, Northern Ireland, Wales, North West, North East, Midlands, South East & East Anglia and South & South West. The qualified dogs from each region would then attend a team selection day held in March/April. Each area representative for Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales would arrange his

own qualifier. The five English qualifiers would be organised by a working party.

12. The Council recommended that a working party should be set up to discuss the formalities of the event including how the five English areas would host their qualifiers, along with electing a team manager. This role would be advertised imminently, as none of the Council Representatives volunteered to be the overall team manager at the meeting. The following people would be invited to attend:

Mr Croxford
Mr Gilbert
Mr Griffin
Miss Olden
Mr Jordan

[Afternote: Following the meeting, Mr Gilbert volunteered to be the England and overall team manager. Mr Gilbert would arrange the qualifiers for England and the team selection day. This has been agreed for the 2008 Championships only.]

13. Proposed Amendment to Regulation H(1)10.e.
Mr Griffin, on behalf of Mr Partridge, a private individual, proposed an amendment to the above Regulation in relation to carrying toys in the ring. Mr Jordan seconded the proposal.
14. The Council noted that Mr Partridge had not reworded the proposal, previously submitted to the last Council meeting, as he believed his original proposed Regulation covered all the eventualities by explaining that nothing should be carried in the hand. However, it also gave the judge discretion to make the odd exception where it was deemed necessary for a person needing walking aids.
15. The Council still had concerns with the wording of the proposal. Many of the Council representatives did not approve the first line, which stated 'except with the express permission of the Judge' as they felt that would allow a judge to give permission for food or toys to be carried, but agreed with the rest of the proposal.
16. The Council voted not to support the proposal.
17. Proposed Amendment to Regulation H(1)(B).3.h.
Mr Mallabar proposed an amendment to the above Regulation, to update the specification of the wishing well for large dogs and to give a specification for small and medium dogs. Mrs Nero seconded the proposal.
18. The Council agreed that it was necessary for the wishing well to be updated for large dogs and a new one to be created for small and medium dogs. It was confirmed that the wording for the measurements should be in line with the

rest of the H Regulations, by stating the height of the dog before the measurement.

19. Following a unanimous vote, the Council **recommended** approval of the proposal.

FROM:

Wishing Well or Lych Gate - Wishing Well or Lych Gate – This obstacle will have a roof of which the bottom will be not less than 1.524m (5ft) from the ground. It will have a displaceable top bar the height of which will be between 550mm (1ft 9.6ins) and 650mm (2ft 1.6ins). The minimum width should be 813mm (2ft 8ins)

TO:

Wishing Well – This obstacle will be of stable construction and will be able to be fixed to the ground. To ensure the safety of the dog, it will have no sharp edges. Should a design be utilised which involves a removable centre section then the resultant corners must be rounded or padded. It will have a roof of which the bottom will be no less than Large Dogs - 1500mm, Medium Dogs - 1220mm, Small Dogs - 950mm from the ground. The roof must not project beyond the width or depth of the base. It will have a displaceable top bar the height of which will be between Large Dogs - 550mm & 650mm, Medium Dogs - 350mm & 450mm, Small Dogs, 250mm & 350mm.

The minimum space from the top of the bar to the top of the base will be 200mm or 150mm if the bar height is 250mm.

The minimum width of the top bar will be 800mm.

The overall width of the base will be between 1200mm & 1400mm. The depth of the base which the dog jumps will be a maximum of Large Dogs - 500mm, Medium Dogs - 350mm, Small Dogs - 250mm.

(Amendments underlined)

ITEM 4. PROPOSALS FROM SOCIETIES/PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS

20. Proposed Amendment to Regulation H(1)(B).3.k
Mr Ray, on behalf of Worcester Agility Society, proposed two amendments to the above Regulation with regard to the distance between the weaving poles and where the securing of pegs should be placed. Mr Mallabar seconded the proposal.
21. The Council discussed both parts of the proposal but felt that it should have been two proposals instead of one. Some representatives preferred the distance to be fixed compared to a range. It was also discussed that it would be beneficial for manufacturers but the Council was informed that a decision should not be based on the practicalities for suppliers. It was also queried whether the minimum distance between the poles should be centre to centre of the poles or the distance between the poles.

22. The Council agreed the principal of the proposal, but did not agree with the dimensions stated. After a unanimous decision the Council decided to refer the proposal back to Worcester Agility Society for rewording, with the recommendation to have a fixed measurement with a small tolerance. The Council also recommended that the proposal should be separated, and that two proposals should be put forward to the next Liaison Council meeting.
23. Proposed Amendment to Regulation H.18.a
Mr Ray, on behalf of Worcester Agility Society proposed an amendment to the above Regulation with regard to the minimum age for judges. Mr Jordan seconded the proposal.
24. Worcester Agility Society proposed that the minimum age for a judge should be 16 years old. They believed that it was inappropriate to see juniors under this age, judging adults. The Council was informed that on one occasion a 14 year old had been judging, and had received guidance from his father who had been scribing in their ring.
25. It was noted that there were at least three juniors under the age of 16 years old in the North West area, who actively judged and were considered very competent. It was queried, if there was a minimum age, then should a maximum age be introduced? However, the Council agreed that judges could make mistakes at any age. It was agreed that it was important for a judge to be confident and competent when accepting their judging appointment.
26. The Council was informed that no other discipline had a Regulation stating the minimum age but it was felt it was necessary in Agility due to the pressures involved from competitors. Some adult judges had stated that they felt intimidated by people watching from outside the ring and it was felt that a junior should not be placed in that situation. It was queried whether there was a minimum age for insurance purposes? The office informed the Council that the risk assessment stated that, under 16 years old was a child, 16-18 years old was a young person and over 18 years old was an adult.
27. Many of the Council representatives agreed that 18 years was a good minimum age to start a judging career, however, the majority of the Council recommended the minimum age to be 16 years old. The Council **recommended** an amendment to the proposal, stating that the Regulation would only include judging at Kennel Club Licensed Agility Shows. It would then enable juniors under 16 years old to judge at matches and inter club shows to gain experience. Mr Jordan proposed the amendment, which Mr Felstead seconded.

FROM:

Organisers of Agility Shows and/or Flyball Competitions must ensure that those invited to judge are competent to fulfil their engagement taking into account the nature of the competition.

TO:

Organisers of Kennel Club Licensed Open or Championship Agility Shows and/or Flyball Competitions must ensure that those invited to judge are competent to fulfil their engagement taking into account the nature of the competition. Minimum age of judges at date of judging to be 16 years old at Open or Championship Agility Shows.

(Amendment underlined)

28. Proposed Amendment to Regulation H(1)(B).3.a
Mr Mallabar proposed an amendment to the above Regulation relating to the variation in weight of poles. Mr Mallabar proposed that all poles should be weighted between 1kg and 1.5kg as he felt it would introduce consistency in weight.
29. The Council discussed the proposal, with the majority in favour of slightly heavier poles, however there were concerns as to how it could be monitored. Some areas queried whether a competitor could ask for a pole to be weighed, if it was blown off by the wind or knocked over by the dog.
30. It was also discussed that if the poles were weighted then it would need to be level across the pole to ensure that it did not move. The weight would also vary due to the different length of poles as a longer pole would obviously be heavier.
31. The Council agreed that there was a large variance of opinion, with regards to plastic or wooden poles, which could result in a large difference in weight. Following a vote, the Council did not support the proposal.
32. Proposed Amendment to Regulation H(1).9.f
Mr Griffin proposed an amendment to the above Regulation with regard to clarification of how to split a graded class. It was confirmed that a graded class must be split by grade.
33. The Council agreed that this was an important issue and following a unanimous vote, the Council **recommended** the amendment.

FROM:

Where classes are split, they must be split into parts of equal numbers (to within one dog). Splits must be conducted on a random basis. Competitors entered therein must be notified of all changes.

TO:

Where combined classes are split, they must be split into parts of equal numbers (to within one dog). Splits must be conducted on a random basis. Where graded classes are split, they must be split by grade. If a subsequent grade or single grade class is split, they must be split into parts of equal numbers (to within one dog). Splits must be conducted on a random basis. Competitors entered therein must be notified of all changes.

(Amendment underlined)

34. Proposed Amendment to Regulation H(1).9.f
The Chairman, on behalf of the Agility Measuring Working Party proposed an amendment to the above Regulation with regard to allowing a dog to be measured that was obviously over 430mm prior to 15 months of age. Miss Olden seconded the proposal.

35. Following a unanimous vote the Council **recommended** the proposal.

FROM:

Large dogs entered for competition must be measured before they compete at their first agility show, if they have not competed prior to 1 January 2006. Dogs must be a minimum of 15 months old before the first official measurement takes place. (Dogs incapable of being measured at the time they are presented to the measuring officials will not be eligible for competition until such time that the official measurement has been successfully carried out.)

TO:

Large dogs entered for competition must be measured before they compete at their first agility show, if they have not competed prior to 1 January 2006. Dogs must be a minimum of 15 months old before the first official measurement takes place. Dogs that are, in the official measurers' opinion, obviously over 430mm prior to reaching 15 months of age can be measured.
(Dogs incapable of being measured at the time they are presented to the measuring officials will not be eligible for competition until such time that the official measurement has been successfully carried out.)
(Amendment underlined)

36. Proposed Amendment to Regulation H(1)(B).4.(3)
The Chairman, on behalf of the Agility Measuring Working Party, proposed an amendment to the above Regulation in relation to second and third measurements. Mr Elms seconded the proposal.
37. The Agility Measuring Working Party put forward the proposal to enable measurers to strike out the second measurement in the Agility Record Book if, in their opinion, the dog was obviously over 430mm. It was also proposed that if the second measurement placed the dog in a different category to the first, then a third measurement must be carried out within two calendar months by two different measurers to confirm the dog's height.
38. The Council asked whether new measurers would be appointed, as it was felt that it could cause concerns due to the third measurement needing two different measurers. The Council was informed that if the proposal was supported then the number of measurers required would be discussed.
39. It was queried whether the two calendar months in which the third measurement must be carried out was too short, especially over the winter months, however the Council agreed the time allowed was sufficient.

40. Following a unanimous decision, the Council **recommended** the proposal.

FROM:

A second and final official measurement must be carried out on the dog between 12 and 24 months after the first.
(Delete underlined)

TO:

A second measurement must be carried out on the dog between 12 and 24 months after the first unless the dog is obviously over 430mm, in which case the official measurers can strike out the second measurement in the Agility Record Book. The dog cannot be reclassified into the lower height category retrospectively if the second measurement is not taken up within the 24 month period. If the second measurement places the dog in the same height category as the first, this will be the final measurement. However, if the measurement places the dog in a different category then a third measurement must be carried out within two calendar months by two measurers, both of which must not have measured the dog on a previous occasion. The dog's height category will be that confirmed by two out of the three measurements. The dog should compete in the original height category until the final decision has been made.

(Amendments underlined)

41. Proposed Amendment to Regulation H(1)(B).4.(10)
The Chairman, on behalf of the Agility Measuring Working Party proposed an amendment to the above Regulation in regards to the identification required to have a dog measured. Mr Felstead seconded the proposal.
42. The Agility Measuring Working Party put forward the proposal to ensure that microchip or ear tattoo numbers would take precedence over a photograph. The Council unanimously agreed to the proposal, with a minor amendment to the last sentence. The Council believed that if a microchip or ear tattoo number was not available then an identifiable photograph 'must' be used, instead of 'may' be used. Miss Olden proposed the amendment, which Mr Ray seconded.

FROM:

Dogs presented for measurement should be wearing a collar and must be under the control of the owner/handler. Dogs presented for measurement that cannot be controlled by the owner/handler will not be measured.

TO:

Dogs presented for measurement should be wearing a collar and must be under the control of the owner/handler. Dogs presented for measurement that cannot be controlled by the owner/handler will not be measured. Where a dog is known to have a microchip or ear tattoo this form of identification should take precedence over a photograph and should be used to confirm the identity of the dog. If this is not available, a clear identifiable photograph must be used.

(Amendment underlined)

43. Proposed Amendment to Regulation H(1)(B)4.(13)
The Chairman, on behalf of the Agility Measuring Working Party, proposed an amendment to the above Regulation with regard to changing the number of days from 90 days to 30 days, in which an owner/handler could appeal the measurement procedure.
44. Following a unanimous decision, the Council **recommended** the proposal.

FROM:

In the event of a dispute over the measuring procedure the Kennel Club will evaluate whether there are grounds for appeal. The owner/handler of the dog may appeal in writing to the Kennel Club, but must do so within 90 days of the disputed measure having taken place. Any appeal must be accompanied by a written statement from the owner/handler of the dog with a brief description as to the ground for the appeal and must be accompanied by the appropriate fee.

TO:

In the event of a dispute over the measuring procedure the Kennel Club will evaluate whether there are grounds for appeal. The owner/handler of the dog may appeal in writing to the Kennel Club, but must do so within 30 days of the disputed measure having taken place. Any appeal must be accompanied by a written statement from the owner/handler of the dog with a brief description as to the ground for the appeal and must be accompanied by the appropriate fee. (Amendment underlined)

45. Agility Measuring Working Party – Procedural Recommendations
The Measuring Working Party suggested a number of procedural recommendations, as detailed on the agenda. The Council agreed all the recommendations.
46. The Council clarified the situation regarding spot checks at shows. It was decided that it would be optional for societies. However it would be compulsory for societies that held Crufts qualifiers to perform spot checks. It was noted that a competitor could not be eliminated for failing to produce their agility record book, and that it was the WTOA Sub-Committee's decision on whether a penalty should be enforced.
47. Agility Measurers
The Council was informed that new measurers had been advertised for Norfolk, Hampshire and Bristol/Wiltshire. The Council reviewed the applications and selected the most suitable candidates. It was recommended to offer the positions to the following people:

Norfolk	Linda Kightley and Martin Spriggs
Hampshire	Maria Hembrow
Bristol/Wiltshire	Mike Bacon
Young Kennel Club	Raymond Morland

48. Due to Regulation H(1)(B)4.(3) being recommended, the Council discussed whether more measurers were required. It was recommended that one more measurer for Scotland and Northern Ireland be appointed.

ITEM 5. DISCUSSION ITEMS

49. Miss Olden, on behalf of Mr Glover, requested that the Council discuss the current rules for the Kennel Club Olympia ABC Agility Stakes. Mr Glover believed that the rules should be consistent with the Kennel Club Guide for Agility Judges and Stewards.
50. The Council agreed that it was not the judge's decision to determine whether a dog was a collie or collie cross. The Council recommended that the last sentence from the ABC Rule be removed, which stated that the judge's decision was final. Any decision should be made by the show society. It was suggested that the class definition should be amended to 'the competition is open to all dogs excluding Border Collies, Working Sheepdogs and their crosses. (Any Breed but Collies)'.
51. Show Managers
Mr Gilbert, on behalf of Suffolk Five Rivers Agility Club, requested that the Council discuss whether a Show Manager was allowed to run their dogs at agility shows. This matter had been briefly discussed as part of 'Any other business' at the last meeting.
52. The majority of Council representatives were against the idea of Show Managers competing with their dogs at agility shows, as it was felt they would not have sufficient time within their role. Therefore the Council did not support the Club's recommendation.
53. Score Tent
Mr Griffin requested the Council discuss whether a competitor was allowed access to the score tent to check their results. The Council was advised that there was no Regulation regarding access to the score tent.
54. It was agreed that competitors should be allowed to see their results, but should do so with good manners, showing politeness to the scorer. The Council recommended that the societies should manage the situation regarding access to score tents in an amicable way.
55. Agility Warm Up
Mr Shaw, on behalf of Mr Rees, requested that the Council discuss the need for a warm-up area at agility shows. The Council agreed it would be a good idea in an ideal world, however it was felt that it was not viable due to insufficient space at some agility shows. The Council felt it was the handlers' responsibility to warm up their dogs prior to competing and therefore did not support the recommendation.

56. Grading Structure for 1 and 2
The office requested that the Council discuss the wording of the Grade 1 and 2 classes. A lengthy discussion took place, with the Council split on their views and interpretation of the current wording. It was finally agreed that a grade 1 handler would be eligible to compete with a grade 2 dog and that a dog must win 3 separate jumping wins for the handler and dog to progress to the next grade.
57. Mr Gilbert would re-word the Regulation to reflect the Council's decision for the next meeting, as it was felt the Regulation was open to misinterpretation.

ITEM 6. JUDGES WORKING PARTY (WTOA)

58. Proposed Amendment to Hurdle Refusal in the Judge's Guide to Agility Equipment
Mr Griffin proposed an amendment to the hurdle refusal in the Judge's Guide to Agility Equipment as he felt a guide was needed to help judges. Mrs Nero seconded the proposal.
59. Following a unanimous vote, the Council recommended the proposal.
- FROM:**
Refusal if the dog runs under the bar, jumps the wing, or runs past the line of the wings or if the dog stops, or turns away when in a position to jump the hurdle.
- TO:**
It is usual to give a refusal if the dog runs under the bar, jumps the wing, or runs past the line of the wings or if the dog stops, or turns away when in a position to jump the hurdle. It may be that on occasions it is possible for the dog to run past the line of the wings in the normal course of its run, in such cases it is not usual to award a refusal. IN ALL CASES YOU MUST BE CONSISTENT WITH YOUR DECISIONS.
60. Mr Griffin informed the Council that 15 accredited trainers would be ready to carry out the Agility Course Design and Judging Seminar by the end of the year.
61. Mr Griffin explained that the minimum criteria required for first time Championship judges was under review. It was being considered whether a judge should be assessed prior to being approved, as an application form did not always reflect the experience required. Mr Griffin welcomed views from the Council Representatives.

ITEM 7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

62. Championship Qualifiers

The office had received a letter asking the Council to clarify the procedure with regard to whether a reserve could be taken forward if one of the top fifty percent withdrew. It was confirmed that fifty percent of the dogs entered would qualify for the final round of a Championship class.

63. The Council accepted this Regulation needed clarification as different solutions had been used by judges at different shows. It was discussed that the fifty percent of dogs qualified were the top dogs, however if one dog withdrew, would the next dog in line be accepted, it was queried whether it would still be the top 50% of entries, as stated in Regulation H(1)(A).10.b.

64. It was confirmed that the Regulation stated fifty percent of the entry would qualify for the final, up to a maximum of 20 dogs. The Council therefore agreed that a dog not in the top fifty percent could not be included in the final round.

ITEM 8. QUESTION TIME PANEL

65. The panel consisted of Mr Ronnie Irving – Kennel Club Chairman, Mr Bill Hardaway – Kennel Club Vice Chairman, Mr Stan Ford – WTOA Sub-Committee Chairman, Mr S Croxford – General Committee Member and Mrs Kathryn Symns – Executive - Canine Activities.

66. Mr Irving gave a presentation to the Council on the Kennel Club and its current projects. The Council was then invited by the panel to ask questions and raise any issues relating to the world of dogs.

67. The following topics were discussed:

Including Show schedules on the Kennel Club website
GCDS – Platinum level
International Agility Festival – Overseas competitors
Information on Stoneleigh Showground
FCI Worlds and European Open Agility Championships
Agility's perception of the Kennel Club
Agility floor surface for Discover Dogs and Crufts
Crufts Arena Area and Collecting Ring
Private Individual Agility Show licences

**[199.07]
ENDS**