



THE KENNEL CLUB

AT Risk Assessment Comments

Hi, I have looked through all 4 docs and these are my main observations

1 KC RA based on high/medium/low = if we posit that the vast majority of assessments will be conducted by untrained personnel, then in order to assist them to come to a realistic assessment, they will need assistance with regard to definitions of the three Risk Ratings. As in the Word Documents

High = Harmful eg (Broken Limb or Non-permanent incapacity), hospitalisation,
Medium = Slightly Harmful ie any injury that requires first aid,
Low = Minor Harm ie Cuts, abrasions and minor skin or eye irritations, etc.

The above deliberately omits scenarios of “major” or “extreme” harm which would reflect permanent disability/fatality as we are participating/organising a sporting event which does not require persons to have extraordinary gifts/strengths or involve the use of machinery etc in all stakes bar PD

I would recommend that a definition such as the above be included in the paperwork to make it as accessible as possible

The vast majority of hazards (excluding the agility section and PD stake) really come under “life skills” as opposed to conditions peculiar to a Working Trial and not encountered elsewhere such as a regular walk in the country side etc. Therefore as we discussed, a matrix more than 3 x 3 is generally not necessary.

I would replace the modal verb “should” with “must” as this removes the “discretion” of the judge eg “must not obscure protective equipment”. Risk Assessments must be very clear, you either must do something, or must not do something; end of. Not “well you should really do x but if you cannot then y will do” as this increases the amount of subjectivity of not only the risk assessor but also the judge and manager. *NB note that the wording has undergone a subtle but important alteration in the Word Documents*

This particular design lacks a space for the printed name of the assessor, signature of the assessor and date; another control would be to insist on the signature of the judge/trials manager in the appropriate sections eg not all TMs are going to be au fait with the PD stake. This would force TMs/judges to review the assessment and agree that they also are happy to accept the residual risk.

2 Amended KC Exel RA based on the 4 x 4 matrix.

See my tweaks, however it may be a good idea to elaborate on Lone Workers with Issues and give examples, eg partially deaf etc? Or just mention issues generally such as poor mobile phone signal?

Previous comments re must v should and spaces for printed names, dates, signatures of both RA and TM/Judge?

Working Trials Patrol Dog Risk Assessment Parts 1 and 2

Although many of the points I have made previously have been put in place in these documents, again I would highly recommend that “should” be changed to “must” remain motionless in Quartering the Ground section as again over the years this is one of the main bones of contention in the PD test where far from being motionless over the years I have observed protected stewards spitting water, firing a water gun, throwing cans, scarves, balls all of which means that they cannot possibly “remain motionless”.



All police, patrol and sports dogs are trained to carry out a “stand off” if and when a “protected steward” does not flee, or stops fleeing from a dog, and remains motionless in order to minimise the risk of them being bitten unnecessarily whilst the dog alerts the handler to the position/location of “protected stewards”.

If, however, a “protected steward” uses anything that could be construed, by the dog, as a weapon against it or attempts to overpower the handler this exercise then becomes either a “Test of Courage” or part of the “Search and Escort” whereupon the dog will be expected to engage the “protected steward” in the defence of itself and/or its handler as is expected and desired.

In order to maximise the safety of the “protected stewards” and clarify what behaviour is expected and desired from the dog(s), there is absolutely no room for confusion in either training or testing because, as this section goes on to state, “ *A dog that bites the hidden person must be heavily penalised*”.

I am not really sure about the following

Protected stewards will not be placed in locations or positions where access, egress or presence in that position involves risks of injury.

Nothing in life is risk free

What about

Protected stewards will not be located where their access, egress or posture increases the probability of an injury.?

Somewhere on the document probably the “intro” one with the matrix maybe mention something about risk creator v risk taker or just the former?

Is the judge who sets the PD test is essentially the risk creator and must recognise this and it is the protected stewards, handlers who are risk takers

It has been implied in the Risk Landscape Section but may be a little too ephemeral for some?