

MINUTES OF THE KENNEL CLUB AGILITY LIAISON COUNCIL MEETING
HELD AT THE KENNEL CLUB ON 14 JULY 2016

PRESENT:

Mrs Y Croxford	Midlands
Mrs J Gardner	Midlands
Mr K Smith	North East
Mr M Hallam	North West
Mrs S Hawkswell	Scotland
Mr C Huckle	South and South West
Miss L Olden	South and South West
Mr S Chandler	South East and East Anglia
Mr I McDonald	South East and East Anglia
Mr M Cavill	Wales

IN ATTENDANCE:

Miss D Deuchar	Senior Manager, Canine Activities Governance
Miss R Mansfield	Specialist, Working Dog Activities Team
Mrs A Mitchell	Committee Secretary, Working Dog Activities Team

GUEST:

Dr J Boyd	Nottingham Trent University (item 4 only)
-----------	---

IN THE CHAIR: MR M CAVILL

ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1. Apologies for absence had been received from Mr A Dornford-Smith, Ms J Harker and Mrs P Baltes.

ITEM 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

2. The minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2016 were approved as an accurate record.

ITEM 3. MATTERS ARISING/RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3. No recommendations had been made by the Council at its previous meeting.

Recognition of Agility as a sport

4. The Council noted that no progress had been made in respect of the pre-application to be submitted to the Sports Council. The office reminded the Council that its assistance was required in completing the pre-application document, and it was agreed that Mrs Croxford would liaise with the office to provide assistance.
5. It was noted that Agility had recently been recognised as a sport in Finland and it was agreed that the office should consult with the Finnish Kennel Club as to the way in which this had been achieved, as its experience may be of use in preparing the pre-application to the Sports Council.
6. It was reiterated that the objective of gaining recognition was to provide access to potential funding and grants from the Sports Council itself, and from local authorities and from the National Lottery, for use in providing training and other facilities. It was acknowledged that there was a potential difficulty in that the Kennel Club recognised the achievements of the dog rather than the handler, but that the aim of carrying out the pre-application process was to assess the likelihood of a full application being successful. It was noted that the initial approach related only to England as there were separate Sports Councils for Ireland, Scotland and Wales.

ITEM 4. ACTIVITIES HEALTH AND WELFARE SUB-GROUP

7. The Council noted a report from Mr D Jolly on the progress of the Activities Health and Welfare Sub-Group following its meetings on 27 January and 1 June 2016.

Funding for Research Projects

8. It was noted that the General Committee had approved funding for research projects relating to Activities disciplines, and that the Sub-Group had been requested to suggest suitable projects for approval by the Kennel Club Charitable Trust.

Research Issues

9. The Council noted that a number of future areas of research were under discussion by the Sub-Group, with the following being particularly highlighted:
 - Investigation of jumping speeds and how they were affected by differing jump heights and distances.
 - Analysis of forces on a dog turning after a jump.
 - Long jump in agility.
 - Rapid deceleration to a stop after negotiating obstacles in Working Trials and in particular:
 - Long jump in Working Trials (noting that data could not be extrapolated from the results of research into the long jump in agility as there were differences between the two disciplines).
 - Scale in Working Trials. The Working Trials Liaison Council was to be requested to provide specific details of what issues were to be investigated and how the research should be framed.

Numbers of participants

10. The Sub-Group wished to draw the attention of the Council to a report which detailed how many competitors took part in different disciplines over the course of a typical weekend. The Sub-Group considered that the information provided a valuable context to the number of injuries reported.
11. The numbers were as follows:
 - Agility: approximately 4,000
 - Working Trials: approximately 100 (not 190 as shown in the agenda papers)
 - Obedience: approximately 1,000
 - Heelwork to Music: approximately 150
12. It was clarified that the figure of 4,000 for Agility related to the number of dogs taking part rather than to competitors or runs.
13. The Council highlighted the importance of reports being lodged, via the Incident Book, of any serious injuries occurring at shows, in order to ensure that constructive action could be taken if necessary. A query was raised as to whether incident report forms, as used at the Kennel Club's International Agility Festival, were routinely provided to judges. The office confirmed that this was not the case and that judges were not currently obliged under the terms of H Regulations to complete the form. However, should show organisers wish judges to do so, provision for this could be included within judging contracts.
14. It was agreed that a reminder regarding the reporting of incidents, and the use of the incident report form by judges, would be placed within The Scribe.

KC Guidelines for the Management & Training of Dogs Taking Part in Canine Activities

15. The Council noted that use of the finalised version of the above document had been approved by the General Committee and was available on the Kennel Club's website at:
http://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/media/742852/guidelines_2016_for_owners_and_handlers_with_dogs_taking_part_in_canine_activities.pdf
16. It was noted that a Press Release had been issued to draw the document to the attention of all competitors.

Dog Activity Injury Survey

17. The Council noted that the survey was ongoing, but that there were difficulties in gathering adequate meaningful data. The Sub-Group was hoping to obtain data from a range of sources including veterinary surgeons, specialists in canine sports related injuries, and possibly from insurance companies.

Veterinary Assessments at Prestige Agility Events

18. The Council was advised that the Sub-Group remained strongly in support of veterinary assessments at Prestige Events (Crufts, Discover Dogs, Olympia and the Kennel Club International Agility Festival) to ensure that the Kennel Club was perceived as taking a positive stance on the health and welfare of competing dogs. As

a result, the Sub-Group had recommended that there should be a canine veterinary surgeon in attendance at all Prestige Events and, that as a minimum, spot checks should be carried out. Any such assessments would be carried out under the provisions of Regulation H14.

Canine Sports Science Seminar

19. It was noted that the Kennel Club's Canine Sports Science Seminar would take place on 27 November 2016 at the Kennel Club Building at Stoneleigh. The office was currently in the process of confirming speakers.

Current research

20. The Council received a research update on Canine Jump Kinematics from Dr J Boyd (School of Animal, Rural and Environmental Sciences at Nottingham Trent University).
21. Dr Boyd was thanked for a very interesting and informative presentation.

ITEM 5. JUDGES WORKING PARTY (ACTIVITIES)

22. The Council noted a written report from Mr Huckle on the progress of the Judges Working Party following its meeting on 19 April 2016.

Kennel Club Academy

23. The Judges Working Party had received a presentation on the Kennel Club Academy. Although a great deal of development work remained, it was clear that there would be a number of benefits to judges in all disciplines.
24. It was intended that over time a number of educational videos would be made available via the Academy over all disciplines. At present most of the content related to breed showing but it was clarified that resources relating to any discipline may be added at any time, and that any suggestions for inclusion were welcome. These may include, for example, videos demonstrating good or bad judging practice. All Council members were encouraged to submit any suggestions to members of the Judges Working Party (Mr Huckle, Mr Jolly, and Mr Partridge).
25. It was noted that there was a charge payable by users of the KC Academy.
26. The Council expressed its support for the ongoing development of the Academy which it viewed as a positive resource, both for new and aspiring judges, and for existing judges who wished to refresh and update their knowledge.
27. A query was raised regarding the status of existing judges who had never undertaken the Agility Regulations and Judging Procedure examination. At present such judges had 'grandfather rights' and were not required to have passed the examination. However some concern had been expressed regarding judges who did not appear to be fully aware of the H Regulations, and it was suggested that it may be desirable to implement a requirement for all judges to pass an assessment at regular intervals, for example, every five years.

Open Book Examination

28. The Training Board had not supported the introduction of an Open Book examination as it had not considered this to be a positive step. However, it had made some suggestions as to how training for agility judges could be improved, which included combining the existing two agility seminars into a single seminar, and use of the Kennel Club Academy to assess knowledge prior to the seminar. This would allow for more time to be spent during the seminar on practical judging issues.
29. However, due to concerns about the integrity of results of online examinations, formal examinations would continue to take place at seminars.

Mentoring of First Time Agility Judges

30. The Council was advised that the mentoring programme was running well, and offered valuable support to new judges. Potential mentors were reminded that they did not have to be present at a competition to support the judge although this was preferable.

Continuing Personal Development of Existing Judges

31. The Council noted that there had been some progress on the Continuing Professional Development of existing judges, and that the first assessments had taken place and had been well received by all involved. However, the uptake had been rather disappointing.
32. The Council was of the view that Continuing Personal Development was a valuable part of ensuring professional standards of judging, and it was hoped that all Accredited Trainers would become involved in the process, noting that it was currently voluntary. The Judges Working Party had clarified that Accredited Trainers could carry out assessments at shows at which they were competing, however they should not assess a judge of a class in which they were competing. It was hoped that this would lead to a greater number of judges being assessed.
33. It was accepted that although a valuable exercise, carrying out assessments could be time-consuming and there was some concern that Accredited Trainers were being expected to carry out an increasing number of duties.
34. It was noted that the matter would be discussed at the Annual Accredited Trainers Seminar in October 2016, and would then be given further consideration by the Judges Working Party at its meeting in November 2016. The Working Party would also discuss the suggestion that all Championship judges should also be permitted to assess existing judges, on a voluntary basis.
35. The office also confirmed that the status of any Accredited Trainers who did not meet the current criteria was currently under review. The Judges Working Party was of the view that there was no necessity to recruit additional Accredited Trainers at present, but the matter would be reviewed again.
36. Information on all Accredited Trainers was available on the Kennel Club website.

Judges Guide to Agility Equipment

37. It was noted that the above guide had been updated.

ITEM 6. REPORT FROM THE EQUIPMENT PANEL

38. The Council noted a document confirming the formal remit for the Equipment Panel, which was as follows:
- The Equipment Panel comprised 5 members of the Agility Liaison Council.
 - It was the first point of contact with equipment manufacturers for approval of any new equipment.
 - It was the first point of contact with equipment manufacturers for approval of any modifications to currently approved equipment.
 - It would review currently approved equipment to ensure that the specifications were still relevant in today's agility arena, and to ensure that all equipment was safe to use.
 - It would take instructions from the Kennel Club to look at and advise regarding any concerns raised by the Agility Community.
 - It would report back to the Agility Liaison Council at its twice-yearly meetings.
39. It was noted that no new equipment had been referred to the Equipment Panel, however it was anticipated that two equipment manufacturers would be submitting proposed designs for a breakaway tyre in the near future.
40. A query was raised as to whether, where a breakaway tyre was used, it should be in use in all rings at the same show. It was clarified that there was no evidence to suggest that the non-breakaway tyre was unsafe and that although there had been feedback indicating that the same type of tyre should be in use at all rings at a show, this was not mandatory. However it was strongly recommended that in the interests of the safety and welfare of competing dogs, if a breakaway tyre was used in one ring, the same design should also be used in other rings. It was acknowledged that there were logistical difficulties in imposing a time limit by when use of the breakaway tyre, rather than the existing tyre, should be mandatory and there were mixed views as to whether such a time limit should be put into place.
- Timing
41. A suggestion was made that the Equipment Panel should investigate issues in respect of the reliability of timing systems. It was acknowledged that problems with timing equipment may arise from the way in which individual agents or suppliers maintained their equipment, and that should show organisers experience any difficulties, they should contact the supplier concerned. Judges may also report any issues regarding timing via the show's Incident Book.
42. It was agreed that a reminder should be issued to equipment suppliers, via The Scribe, that any equipment supplied must be fit for purpose and must conform to the equipment contract with the show society.
43. A suggestion was made that Mrs Gardner and Mr McCartney arrange meetings with equipment suppliers in the interests of developing strong communication links and to gather ideas for the future. The Council was of the view that this would be a positive step and it was agreed that the Equipment Panel should proceed with making the necessary arrangements, in liaison with the office. The Kennel Club Building at

Stoneleigh would be a suitable venue for such a meeting but it was noted that the building was normally fully booked at weekends.

Collapsible tunnel

44. The Council considered a proposed amendment to Regulation H(1)(B)3.i. The proposal had been made for a number of reasons including the health and welfare of dogs competing in agility, taking into account research data and recommendations submitted by Mr I Mallabar and research carried out at Nottingham Trent University.
45. It was noted with interest that a number of overseas governing bodies were taking steps to amend the design of the collapsible tunnel by shortening the chute.
46. A discussion took place as to whether it would be possible to include a stipulation within the H Regulations that the obstacle should be positioned with a straight approach and straight exit. However it was accepted that there were inherent difficulties in formulating a wording which would cover every eventuality, and that it may be preferable to address the issue by means of judges training and education. It was suggested that a video regarding use and positioning of the collapsible tunnel be placed on the Kennel Club Academy. It was agreed that this was an excellent suggestion.
47. The Council discussed the proposed amendments to Regulation H(1)(B)3.i. in detail. It **recommended** for approval the following:

Regulation H(1)(B)3.i.

TO:

~~Collapsible Tunnel—Diameter: 609mm (2ft) minimum. 762mm (2ft 6ins) maximum. Length 3.048m (10ft) minimum. Circular of non-rigid material construction. It must have an entrance of rigid construction with a depth of at least 457mm (1ft 6ins) that can be fixed or weighted to the ground. Minimum entrance height 483mm (1ft 7ins) clear (with suitable padding), if entrance has a floor this must have a non-slip surface.~~

Rigid Entrance

The entrance must be of rigid construction which can be weighted or fixed to the ground. The entrance lead edge must be padded, there must be no sharp protrusions or obstructions within the overall build. The rigid area must consist of a flat base with a non-slip surface and a rounded top. The entrance dimensions should be: Height - 609mm (2ft), Width - 609mm (2ft), Depth - 609mm (2ft) excluding padding. These should be the internal measurements.

Fabric Chute

Construction Material

Constructed from lightweight, slightly rigid, non slip, water resistant material. Light colours should be used and all seams should be external to the chute. The chute exit must be pegged, with anchor tabs to the exit to create a flat floor. Distance between tabs 550mm (22ins). If the tunnel cannot be pegged, it must be secured in an approved manner.

Measurement

Length of chute to be 1830mm (6ft) with a tolerance of 51mm (2ins).

Entrance circumference to match the diameter of the rigid exit and the exit to gradually flare to a circumference at least 203mm (8ins) greater than the entrance.

(Deletions struck through. Insertions in bold.)

48. It was agreed that the above amendments, which were proposed for safety reasons, should come into effect from 1 January 2017, if approved.

ITEM 7. REPORT FROM THE GRADING PANEL

49. An initial report from the Grading Panel was noted. This comprised background data obtained from show processors and from shows. It was acknowledged that the accuracy of the data could not be guaranteed due to factors such as inaccuracies in records, and the difficulties of identifying dogs which were no longer active, and the number of dogs which were entered on a Not for Competition basis. However, every effort had been made to allow for these anomalies.
50. The Council noted the analysis of the available data which indicated that there was a clear distinction between the grading profile for large dogs and that of small and medium dogs. It appeared that, for Large dogs, the highest proportion were competing in Grade 3, whereas for Small and Medium dogs, the highest proportion were competing in Grade 7. Across all three heights it appeared that only a small proportion were competing in Grade 2.
51. It was agreed that it would be necessary to define a desirable profile i.e. the proportion of dogs competing in each grade, before considering what steps could be taken to achieve it. It would also be necessary to take into account a number of variable factors and to consider whether Small, Medium and Large dogs should all conform to the same profile or whether there should be different profiles for each size.
52. It was acknowledged that a 'typical pyramid' model (with the lowest grade containing the highest proportion of competitors) could not be applied as many dogs did not commence competing in Grade 1. For this reason it was likely that the largest group would be Grade 3.
53. The research already undertaken had produced a good database which would allow for further analysis to be carried out. As more data was added, the effect of any anomalies would be reduced and the level of accuracy would improve.
54. The Grading Panel would continue to add data from shows and further reports would be provided at future meetings of the Council.
55. Mrs Hawkswell was thanked for the considerable amount of work involved in preparing the report which was considered to be a very valuable document which would greatly assist in carrying out further analysis and recommendations for the future.

ITEM 8. PROPOSALS FROM SOCIETIES/PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS

Minimum Distance between jumps

56. Miss Olden presented the proposal, which had been submitted by Miss C Harding in view of research undertaken by Nottingham Trent University, and of concerns regarding the health and welfare of dogs competing in agility. It was seconded by Mr Hallam.
57. It was proposed that the minimum distance be increased between obstacles that the large dog was required to clear, from 2.7/3.6 metres, to 5 metres. Miss Harding had also provided alternative proposals which covered distances between any two jump obstacles, and between non-jump obstacles and jumps. An additional proposal had been submitted which would stipulate a maximum distance of 7 metres between obstacles.
58. The Council considered the various elements contained within the proposal on an individual basis.
59. It noted that there was widespread support within the agility community for an increase in the minimum distance between obstacles to 5m for large dogs. There was some discussion as to whether a similar provision should also be made for small and medium dogs. There were mixed views on this issue, with some support for a minimum distance of 5m applying to all dogs, whereas others were of the view that the minimum distance for small and medium dogs should remain at 3.6m. After careful consideration, the Council agreed that a minimum distance of 5m should apply across all three height categories.
60. The Council went on to discuss whether the minimum distance should apply to all obstacles or just those that the dog was required to clear. After a vote, it was agreed that it should apply to all obstacles.
61. It was also of the view that the reference to minimum distance applying when the following obstacle was placed at 90 degrees or more to the preceding one was not relevant and should be removed from the existing Regulation.
62. The Council was keen to ensure that standards of course design should constantly improve as judges became more aware of the risks of injury and how to keep them to a minimum. It was highlighted that a flowing course would keep the necessity for strong deceleration to a minimum and would therefore reduce the potential for injuries occurring.
63. In respect of maximum distance between obstacles there were mixed views. There was some support for a maximum distance in order to ensure that courses did not become excessively long, however, there was also a concern that imposing any maximum may be unduly prescriptive. A key factor was that there was no evidence to suggest the necessity to impose a maximum distance between obstacles based on health and welfare grounds. It was agreed that there was currently no rationale for the suggestion and that it should not be discussed further as part of the proposal under consideration. However, it was confirmed that the Council may discuss the

issue again at a future meeting should an evidence-based rationale be provided for its consideration.

64. A revised proposal was submitted, and following a vote, the Council **recommended** for approval the following:

Regulation H(1)(B)1a.(3) – Design

TO:

The course should require a dog to traverse at least 10 obstacles, but not more than 20 and all jump obstacles should be the same height. ~~Obstacles~~ **All obstacles** which the dog is required to clear should have a minimum of ~~3.6~~ **5m** (~~4 yds~~ **5.5yds**) between centres ~~except that this may be reduced to 2.74m (3yds) when the following obstacle is placed at 90 degrees or more to the preceding one.~~

65. It was agreed that the amended Regulation, if approved, should come into effect as soon as possible as safety and welfare issues were of major importance.

ITEM 9. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Leaving the ring after deliberate elimination or fouling in the ring

66. Mr Smith wished the Council to discuss whether an item should be added to the Code of Conduct to state that handlers should leave the ring after they had deliberately eliminated themselves, or if their dog had fouled in the ring. The issue had been raised due to concerns that some handlers were completing the course after elimination and in some cases were even renegotiating a number of obstacles.
67. It was accepted that there were difficulties in establishing whether a handler had deliberately eliminated himself or herself, but it was highlighted that the judge was in control of the ring and their own discretion should apply. Should the judge be of the view that a handler was taking an excessive amount of time, or was practicing in the ring, the handler should be asked to leave the ring.

ITEM 10. FIVE YEAR STRATEGY

68. The Council noted the items on its five year strategic plan.
69. It was agreed that detailed consideration would be given to the five year plan at the Council's meeting in January 2017. It was noted that any additional items proposed should be meaningful and should include details of how they may be achieved and a time scale.

ITEM 11. INTERNATIONAL AGILITY FESTIVAL

70. The Council noted a report on the arrangements for the Kennel Club International Agility Festival, due to be held on 11-14 August 2016. Some changes had been made to scheduling at the event, and it was noted that a review would be carried out afterwards.

ITEM 12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Measurers

71. The office provided a report on the current number and geographical distribution of Measurers.
72. It was noted that those Measurers who had not been reaccredited may no longer undertake measuring with effect from 1 July 2016. Those who had not been successful in their reassessment, or who had not attended a reassessment session, were at liberty to reapply should they wish to do so.
73. An advertisement requesting applications for measurers had been issued by the office. The Activities Sub-Committee would consider the overall number of measurers required.
74. There was a concern that in some offshore areas there were currently no Measurers which may be problematic for local competitors. It was confirmed that every effort would be made to fill vacancies on those areas.
75. A number of queries were raised regarding the new Regulations whereby the height category of any dog may be subject to a challenge, and to an additional measurement being required. There was some concern that the Council had not been consulted on the issue prior to implementation of the revised Regulations. It was suggested that a more systematic approach may have been preferable, such as checks being made on the height category of dogs winning Championship classes or Crufts qualifiers, however it was accepted that such an approach would be unfair as it would not be applicable to dogs at all levels of competition.
76. It was confirmed that all Championship judges had been notified of the amended Regulation and the way in which it should be applied. It was highlighted that where a judge was requested to make a challenge to the height classification of a dog, he or she was not obliged to do so.
77. In reply to concerns that the new Regulations were causing difficulties for show secretaries, it was confirmed that should a judge wish to request an additional measure on a dog, a report should be made in the Incident Book at a show. The matter would be followed up, post show, by the office, with no necessity for any direct involvement by the show secretary.
78. It was confirmed that there was no charge for the additional measurement. It was also highlighted that a dog may only be subject to one additional measurement, and that no further measurement would be permissible.
79. A query was raised as to whether, where an additional measurement had taken place and a dog reclassified, any check would be made on which measurers had carried out the original measurement(s) of the dog. It was confirmed that there were no plans to do so. However, should there be a clear and obvious concern regarding particular measurers, the office may investigate.

80. A further query was raised as to the situation where a dog had qualified to compete at Crufts at one height, but had been reclassified into a different height. It was confirmed that guidance on this issue would be provided in due course.
81. It was confirmed that all dogs selected for the Agility Team GB squad would require an additional measurement.

Lower Height Option

82. In response to a query, it was confirmed that it was possible to progress into all classes via wins at the Lower Height Option with the exception of Championship classes, for which four wins at Full Height in either Grade 6 or Grade 7, at least 2 of which must be gained in agility classes, were required.
83. A query was raised regarding the walking of courses, noting that Regulation H(1)(B)1. stated that 'competitors will be allowed to walk the course set at the height the dog is to negotiate without their dog(s) before the class begins. Hurdles will be raised / lowered during the course walking time if multiple heights are offered within the same class.' The Council was unclear as to the necessity for the raising or lowering of hurdles where multiple heights were offered, and wished to suggest that in the interests of simplicity, competitors should walk the course set at the height category into which their dog was measured. It was agreed that the suggestion would be referred to the Activities Sub-Committee for consideration.
84. It was also noted that the Sub-Committee would be requested to consider an amendment to H Regulations to cover the way in which classes should be split where Lower Height Option was offered.

Incident Book

85. The Council was advised that the office was in the process of drafting a Press Release which would provide guidance on the correct use of the Incident Book. It was confirmed that reports should be made in the Incident Book of any occurrence at a show that was in any way out of the ordinary, even where the society concerned did not consider that any further action was necessary. Such reports may prove to be valuable in the event of subsequent developments.
86. It was highlighted that should any individual wish to make a report in the Incident Book, the show secretary had no authority to refuse to allow them to do so.

Communications

87. A concern was raised in respect of the issue of communications and how information relating to agility was made available to the agility community. It was highlighted that a number of communication routes were available such as the Kennel Club website, social media pages, and YouTube, but it still appeared that information was not reaching all interested parties. One particular issue was highlighted relating to the difficulty of locating and downloading current Regulations from the website. It was suggested that a link be placed on the website to a list of any updates and amendments. There was also a concern regarding the difficulty of locating specific Press Releases. The Council was of the view that it would be very helpful for all information which may be required by a judge, or a competitor, to be located in one place.

88. The office agreed to investigate whether it was possible for any improvements to be made.

ITEM 13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

89. The date of the next meeting would be confirmed in September 2016.

90. There being no further matters to discuss the meeting closed at 16.05 pm.

M CAVILL
Chairman

THE KENNEL CLUB'S STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

“To raise the relevance of the Kennel Club in the eyes of the public at large, dog owners and those who take part in canine events, so as to be better able ‘to promote in every way the general improvement of dogs.’ This objective to be achieved through:-

- Ensuring that the Kennel Club is the first port of call on all canine matters.
- Improving canine health and welfare.
- Popularising canine events focusing on the retention of existing participants and the attracting of new.
- Achieving a widening of the Kennel Club membership base.
- Encouraging the development of all those concerned with dogs through education and training.
- Encouraging more people to provide input in the Kennel Club’s decision making process.”