

MINUTES OF THE KENNEL CLUB AGILITY LIAISON COUNCIL MEETING
HELD ON 22 JANUARY 2015

PRESENT:

Mrs Y Croxford	Midlands
Mrs J Gardner	Midlands
Miss J Lewis	North East
Mr I Mallabar	North East
Mrs P Baltes	North West
Mr M Hallam	North West
Mr R McAleese	Northern Ireland
Mrs O McShane	Scotland
Mr S Chandler	South East and East Anglia
Mr J Gilbert	South East and East Anglia
Mr C Huckle	South and South West
Miss L Olden	South and South West
Mr M Cavill	Wales

IN ATTENDANCE:

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

IN THE CHAIR: Miss L Olden

1. The Chairman reminded the meeting that all Council discussions should remain confidential until the minutes were released, and that all decisions made were the collective responsibility of the Council as a whole.

ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. No apologies for absence had been received.

ITEM 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3. The minutes of the meeting held on 17 July 2014 were signed by the Chairman as an accurate record.

ITEM 3. MATTERS ARISING/RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

4. The Council noted that at its meeting on 7 October 2014, the General Committee approved the following changes to the regulations, with effect from 1 January 2015:

- (i) Amendment to Regulation H(1)(A)4. – Standard Class Equipment
- (ii) Amendment to Regulation H(1)10.e. (Competing) – the use of mobility aids and the carrying of food
- (iii) Amendment to Regulation H(1)(D)9.e. – use of silent toys
- (iv) Insertion of new Regulation H(1)(B)5.(22)(Marking) – traversing of equipment

Recognition of Agility as a sport

- 5. It was noted that the General Committee had supported the Council's wish to pursue the recognition of Agility as a sport, and that it had requested the Council to formulate a proposal which would allow for the recognition of handlers rather than dogs, so that a suitable approach could be made to the Sports Council.
- 6. It was confirmed that a previous approach had been made to the Sports Council which had at the time indicated its requirement for the achievements of the handler, rather than those of the dog, to be recognised.
- 7. One suggestion was that a handler could be recognised as a Champion in his or her own right at the point at which he or she handled a dog to its Agility Champion status. Another suggestion was the introduction of a points system to establish 'leading handlers' in different categories such as 'leading Novice handler' or 'leading Championship handler'. Points could be accrued either at a single separate competition or over the course of a number of competitions. A further suggestion was that the status of, for example, a Grade 7 handler could be recognised as an achievement in its own right. It was highlighted that any title awarded to a handler should be meaningful, and one to which handlers should aspire.
- 8. The Council acknowledged that it would be necessary to give careful consideration to this issue to ensure a robust and workable system which would be of long-term benefit to Agility.
- 9. It was noted that the Kennel Club's IT system did not currently recognise the achievements of handlers and that there would therefore be an IT implication to the development of any proposal on this issue.
- 10. It was agreed that any further suggestions should be emailed to the office and that the issue would be given further consideration at the Council's meeting in June.

Development of Kennel Club Agility – Formation of Working Party

- 11. An outline paper had been prepared in respect of the development of the business case for a results database. It was acknowledged that further developments on this matter were dependent upon further development of the Kennel Club's plans to update and develop its IT systems. A copy of the paper had been made available to those responsible for the planned IT upgrades.

Multiple Licences

- 12. It was confirmed that the Activities Sub-Committee was in the process of considering the issue of multiple licences and whether an increased tariff should be applied to clubs applying for a number of licences.

ITEM 4. CANINE ACTIVITIES IT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

13. The Council received a presentation from the office regarding proposed IT improvements for Canine Activities with particular reference as to how a number of processes would be streamlined/adapted as the Kennel Club became ever more electronic. These processes included Guarantors, Annual Returns, online payment options, 'E-Licences' and online applications for new activity types.
14. It was confirmed that Mr Thomas, on behalf of the office, had received a copy of the paper which had been prepared by members of the Council in relation to the proposed results database.
15. The Kennel Club would be working with those organisations responsible for providing a results service in order to investigate the possibility of automatic input of results into the Kennel Club's records.

ITEM 5. REPORT FROM THE EQUIPMENT PANEL

16. The General Committee had recently approved the formation of the Equipment Panel but as yet no matters had been referred to it.

Collapsible Tunnel

17. Discussion of the collapsible tunnel (Item 8.g on the agenda) was brought forward as it was agreed that this was a matter for consideration by the Equipment Panel. Mrs Croxford was thanked for preparing suggestions relating to construction of the collapsible tunnel in order to minimise any risk to the health and safety of dogs, noting that there had been a number of incidents over the last year where dogs exiting the collapsible tunnel had got caught up in the cloth at the exit and had come out on their side or back.
18. It was agreed that consideration should be given to a number of aspects of the tunnel, including the dimensions at the entrance to the solid part of the tunnel, width of cloth at the exit, the type and weight of fabric used, and the length of the cloth part of the tunnel. The Council was also of the view that the colour of the cloth should also be taken into consideration as use of a dark colour may contribute to some dogs being fearful. Consideration should also be given to the way in which the cloth was staked down.
19. It was accepted that it would be advantageous if testing of various options could be carried out in conjunction with equipment suppliers in order to ascertain the most appropriate parameters for the construction of the collapsible tunnel, and it was agreed that the Equipment Panel should progress this course of action and report back to the Council in due course.

Remit of the Equipment Panel

20. It was confirmed that the remit of the Equipment Panel should include any issues relating to the poor maintenance of equipment.

Use of metal cradles for tunnels

21. It was noted that the Kennel Club had already made a recommendation that metal cradles should not be used for securing tunnels, and a statement to that effect would shortly be published on the Kennel Club's website.

ITEM 6. ACTIVITIES HEALTH AND WELFARE SUB-GROUP

22. The Council noted a report from Mr Croxford on the progress of the Activities Health and Welfare Sub-Group following a meeting on 29 October 2014.
23. It was noted that Regulations relating to withdrawal or removal of dogs from events across all activity disciplines had been amended to allow for a dog to be prevented from competing if, in the opinion of the show management or a veterinary surgeon, it should not compete due to concerns about its health. The Regulation relating to agility was H14. If a judge had concerns regarding the fitness of a dog, the show management should be informed and if appropriate a decision would be made to remove the dog.
24. It was noted that all judges at the International Agility Festival had been provided with an incident form on which any injuries occurring in his or her ring were to be reported. A suggestion was made that this form should be provided for judges at all shows and this was agreed. The form would be available for societies to download from the Kennel Club website.

Use of slatted surfaces

25. The Council was requested to consider the feasibility of asking equipment suppliers to manufacture equipment using rounded-off slats in the light of the Sub-Group's view that if the slats were less prominent there would be less potential for injuries to occur.
26. The Council did not consider that there was a major issue with slats as the majority of shows were now using rubberised equipment, but accepted that wood and sand surfaces were still permissible and were still in use at some shows.
27. It was acknowledged that there was no specific data available regarding injuries caused by slats, but the Council agreed to recommend that where possible slats should be rounded off as a precaution in order to minimise risk.
28. This led to a brief discussion as to whether there was any requirement for surfaces to be slatted now that rubberised surfaces were increasingly common. It was accepted that this was a separate issue and not part of the request under discussion. However it was raised that the use of slats was a safety issue as it was believed that they were used by dogs to differentiate between the dog walk and the see-saw.

Warm up and Preparation before competition

29. The Council considered whether shows should be required to provide a warm-up jump in the interests of the health and welfare of dogs.
30. The Council accepted the principle that dogs should be warmed up before competing but had a number of concerns regarding the compulsory introduction of a warm-up

jump. Such a jump could be distracting to competing dogs if placed close to other rings, especially if noisy toys or clickers were used, or where queues formed. It would be necessary for the show organisers to allocate a helper to supervise use of the warm-up jump. It was also highlighted that allowing dogs to negotiate a single jump may not be effective in helping them to warm up.

31. The Council was of the view that it would be preferable to issue guidance to competitors on ways to prepare their dogs for competition. It was noted that seminars were available which provided training for competitors on this issue, and that suitable advice should also be provided as part of the FAQs section on the Kennel Club's website.

Kennel Club Code of Practice for Owners and Handlers with Dogs Taking Part in Canine Activities

32. The Council noted the above document which had been approved by the General Committee. The document was aimed at everyone participating in canine activities and would be distributed as widely as possible so as to reach the maximum number of people.
33. It was noted that although the Code was stated to be voluntary, Kennel Club Regulations stated that those taking part in Kennel Club licensed/approved events were expected to maintain and abide by the highest standards, in accordance with Kennel Club Rules and Regulations and appropriate Codes of Conduct. This represented a contradiction which would be clarified in due course.
34. There was some concern regarding the item which stated that Training Instructors should have appropriate training and accreditation, but it was unclear who should decide what constituted 'appropriate' training and who would provide such training.
35. It was also noted that the document stated that handlers who had cause for complaint about the actions of others should speak to the Show Secretary. The Council considered that it may prove to be unduly onerous to secretaries should they be expected to deal with complaints about the behaviour of competitors, however it was clarified that Show Secretaries would only be responsible for reporting matters occurring at a show.
36. Under the section headed 'Events and Facilities' the document stated that dogs should have access to water and shelter at all times. It was clarified that this would be the responsibility of owners not of show organisers.
37. Overall the Council was supportive of the document's intentions but expressed reservations regarding the specific points as outlined above.
38. The document would be referred to the Activities Sub-Committee for further consideration. Council members were asked to notify the office of any further concerns.

ITEM 7. PROPOSALS FROM SOCIETIES/PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS

Proposed Amendment of Regulations H(1)(B)2.a.b.c. (Height Limit for Dogs) and H(1)(B)3.a. (Hurdle)

39. Mr Huckle presented the proposed amendment, which was proposed by Wrexham Dog Agility Club. It was seconded by Mr M Cavill.
40. The Regulation amendment was proposed in order to allow for the introduction of a fourth height category for 'Intermediate' dogs measuring over 430mm (1ft 5ins) and measuring 510mm (1ft 8.1ins) or under at the withers, and for the introduction of a fourth hurdle height of 550mm (1ft 9.65ins) for Intermediate Dogs.
41. It was noted that the introduction of a fourth height had been raised as a discussion item at the Council's meeting in January 2013 and that the Council had supported the need for extensive research for all hurdle heights. It had been agreed at that time to refer the matter to the Activities Health and Welfare Sub-Group to progress the matter. As a result, research work had been undertaken. This research was still ongoing and was due for completion in December 2015.
42. The Council accepted that it was likely that the General Committee would wish to consider the results of the research before approving any changes to Regulations regarding hurdle heights.
43. The Council considered the feedback which had been received from area meetings. A number of points of view had been expressed, and it was acknowledged that there had been some support for the proposal from those attending meetings. However, others had been of the view that no changes should be considered until the research was complete, at which point a review of all heights should be undertaken. The Council emphasised the importance of taking into account the welfare of all dogs competing in agility and not just those of a particular size.
44. It was noted that the original concerns about heights had related to health and safety of competing dogs, and the Council's view was that this issue could not be addressed without evidence to support any proposed changes. There was some concern that a lowered height could result in some dogs jumping at greater speed which in itself had the potential for health and safety concerns, but it was anticipated that the ongoing research would be helpful in addressing this issue.
45. After considering all of the feedback received, the Council agreed the principle of a review of current hurdle heights but agreed to **defer** any decision until the current research, which was investigating all hurdle heights, was complete and the results available.

Proposed amendment to Regulation H(1)(A)3.b.

46. Mrs Gardner presented the proposed amendment which was proposed by Shrewsbury & District Dog Training Club. It was seconded by Mr M Hallam.
47. This regulation amendment was proposed to allow for the height of the dog walk to be reduced in special classes aimed at older and/or inexperienced dogs. The Council noted that the regulations already allowed for a lower height A-ramp and reduced

length long jump in special 'any size' classes, and that it was currently permissible for Limited Shows to offer a reduced height dog walk in special classes. It supported Ms Jones' view that a reduced height dog walk would benefit the type of dogs which were entered into these classes at Open Shows, and the following amendment was **recommended** for approval:

Regulation H(1)(A)3.b.

TO:

Where special classes are classified for older and/or inexperienced dogs, the height of the hurdles, ~~and~~ the A-ramp, **and the dog walk**, and the length of the long jump, may be reduced below the dimensions specified in these regulations, in which case such dimensions must be included in the class definition in the schedule.

(insertion in bold, deletions struck through)

Proposed amendment to Regulation H(1)(B)3.k.

48. The proposed amendment was presented by Mr Hallam on behalf of Mr N Robson. It was seconded by Mr Chandler.
49. Mr Robson's view was that the weaving poles were one of the primary obstacles used in agility and jumping courses and considered that in the interest of consistency the number of weaving poles used should be the same each time the dog negotiated them. Mr Robson was concerned that dogs were currently able to progress without ever having to successfully complete a set of 12 weaving poles.
50. The Council accepted that at many shows, courses only included 6 weaves and there was some concern that some Grade 1-3 dogs were not able to negotiate 12 weaving poles. A suggestion was made that courses for Grade 1-3 dogs should include a set of 12 weaving poles but that this should be optional for dogs of Grade 4 and above. It was acknowledged that some judges and competitors liked to have the option of having two sets of 6 weave poles within a course.
51. Following discussion of various options, a vote took place and the proposal was not supported. However, it was agreed that a revised proposal could be considered at the Council's next meeting in June 2015.

Proposed Amendment of Regulation H 28.a.(9) (Disqualification and Forfeit of Awards)

52. The proposed amendment was proposed and presented by Mr Cavill on behalf of the Welsh Agility Community. It was seconded by Mr Huckle.
53. The Regulation, which provided for a dog to be disqualified from any award if it was proved to have been handled by the scheduled judge's spouse, immediate family or resident at the same address, came into effect on 1 January 2012. Mr Cavill was of the view that its introduction had posed problems for show societies who had experienced difficulties in appointing judges who wished to restrict which classes they were willing to judge as their spouse or other family member may wish to compete at the same show. Some experienced judges had withdrawn from judging as a result of the introduction of the Regulation, which created additional problems by reducing the pool of judges. Mr Cavill noted that there was no current restriction on judges who in

some cases may be professional agility trainers, judging their own students or club members.

54. The Council accepted that difficulties in appointing judges did exist as a result of the Regulation being in place, and as a result some shows were experiencing planning problems, particularly as judging appointments were arranged well in advance of a show.
55. It was acknowledged that all judges should be judging impartially and honestly according to Kennel Club Regulations regardless of their relationship to the competitor, however there was a risk of the perception of bias occurring in respect of a competitor being judged by his or her spouse or family member. There was also some concern that there may be some ambiguity in the proposal to allow judges to judge spouses or family members in some classes but not in Championship classes.
56. However, it was accepted that agility judging was based on time and accuracy and that judging was not subjective. Agility judges were not able to determine a result to the same degree as in some other disciplines.
57. The Council's view was that the agility community had worked within the current Regulation since 1 January 2012 but due to the resulting difficulties experienced by show organisers, it considered that the Regulation should be amended to allow for a judge to judge dogs handled by his or her spouse, immediate family or resident at the same address as the scheduled judge other than in Championship Classes and Kennel Club sponsored events, which would include Discover Dogs, Crufts and Olympia qualifiers.
58. Accordingly, it supported the proposal with the proviso that the term 'Kennel Club sponsored qualifiers' be replaced by 'Kennel Club sponsored events' and **recommended** for approval the following amendment:

Regulation H 28.a.(9) (Disqualification and Forfeit of Awards)

TO:

a. A dog may be disqualified by the General Committee from any award whether an objection has been lodged or not, if proved amongst other things to have been;

- (9) Handled by the scheduled judge's spouse, immediate family or resident at the same address as the scheduled judge **in Championship Classes and Kennel Club sponsored events**. This shall not apply to a judge appointed in an emergency.

(Insertion in bold)

ITEM 8. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Championship Agility Classes – Mr J Gilbert

59. Mr Gilbert requested that the Council discuss the number of entries in Championship Agility classes which in recent years had increased to such an extent that at some shows it was almost unmanageable for only one judge to officiate. Mr Gilbert submitted a suggestion that Agility should adopt a merit points system similar to that used for Obedience Championship classes. Mr Gilbert suggested that where the

entry for Championship Agility exceeded 170, it would be reduced to 170 by a ballot, based on a system of merit points, and conducted by the society/show processor.

60. There were some reservations regarding the implementation of a points system, including a concern that it would encourage handlers to attend a number of shows in order to accumulate points, which may not be financially viable for some competitors. There may also be a welfare issue for dogs competing at a high number of events. It was also highlighted that such a system would require detailed record keeping which some competitors might find onerous.
61. Mr Gilbert was thanked for his suggestion but the Council did not support the introduction of a system of merit points, however it did agree that an alternative solution to the issue of high numbers in Championship classes should be sought.
62. A number of other suggestions were considered such as the possibility of having two Championship Agility Certificates for the same size available on the same day, noting that a similar policy had recently been introduced for breed shows. However it was clarified that the policy relating to breed shows was only applicable under certain circumstances where two shows were sharing a venue. It was not anticipated that a similar policy could be applied to Agility shows at present.
63. Another option was that in the case of a high entry being received for a Championship Agility class, the show society could consider splitting the class and appointing an additional judge. At present, Regulations did not allow for a Championship class to be split.
64. An alternative was to allow for the original judge to judge the agility round with a separate judge being appointed to judge the jumping round. After consideration the Council considered that was the best option as it represented a simple solution and constituted a relatively minor change to current practice.
65. The Council accordingly agreed the principle that should the number of entries for a Championship class exceed a set figure, for example 215, show organisers may appoint a separate judge for the jumping round. The office would prepare a formal proposal for consideration at the Council's June meeting.
66. The Council also considered whether there should be some form of qualification required for entry into Championship classes. It was agreed that two proposals should be submitted to the next Council meeting, one of which would propose criteria for qualification for Grade 7 handlers to enter Championship classes. The other proposal would review the progression criteria for progression from Grade 6 into Grade 7. Mrs Croxford and Mr Chandler agreed to prepare relevant proposals.

Identification of vehicles at Agility Shows – Ms D Gilmour

67. Ms McShane presented the discussion item on behalf of Ms D Gilmour who requested that the Council discuss the suggestion that agility competitors display some form of identification in their vehicle whilst competing at a Kennel Club Agility Show. Ms Gilmour's suggestion was that competitors should be required to display their competitor number on the dashboard of their vehicle which would allow the show

management to easily identify and contact a competitor should it be necessary to do so.

68. It was noted that competitors could be required to supply details of their vehicle registration number with their entry, and that entry processors would then be requested to supply a list sorted by registration number to show organisers.
69. The Council supported the intention of Ms Gilmour's suggestion but noted that there were practical difficulties. Not all shows had tannoy systems, and a number displayed on the dashboard would be easily covered by a sun screen placed across the windscreen.
70. It agreed that shows should be encouraged to be able to identify the owners of vehicles but this should not be compulsory.

Bitches in season at agility competitions - Ms B Bay

71. Mr Chandler presented the item on behalf of Ms Bay, who had requested the Council consider whether bitches in season should be allowed to compete at agility competitions run under Kennel Club special licences. Ms Bay's concern was that owners of bitches could not predict when the bitch would come into season and may be unable to compete at an event for which they had qualified.
72. It was noted that Crufts was a licenced agility show and was not run as a special event so Ms Bay's suggestion was only relevant to Discover Dogs and Olympia Finals.
73. The Council considered whether bitches in season should be allowed to compete at all events rather than just at Olympia, but was of the view that this would not be fair on owners of male dogs. A suggestion was also made that a system similar to that used by the FCI at the World Championships could be implemented, whereby bitches in season were placed at the end of a running order in order to minimise the distraction to other competing dogs, but this was not considered to be practical.
74. The Council did not support the suggestion.

Use and colour of the tyre – Miss J Orrell from West Lakeland Dog Training Club and Mr A Gillibrand, an individual

75. The item was presented by Mr Hallam on behalf of Miss Orrell and Mr Gillibrand who requested that the Council consider use of the tyre, with particular reference to whether it was a safe obstacle and whether the use of a 'breakaway tyre' should be considered. The Council was also requested to consider the colour of the tyre and whether a green tyre was sufficiently visible to dogs.
76. It was noted that the tyre was often used at the beginning or the end of a course but the Council was unaware of any particular reason for this being the case and was of the view that there was no reason why it could not be used in other parts of a course.

77. The Council did not consider itself qualified to address the issue of the colour of the tyre or any other obstacle, and accordingly agreed that this matter should be **referred** to the Activities Health and Welfare Sub-Group for further consideration.
78. It was noted that some overseas shows made use of a 'breakaway' magnetic tyre which would break on contact. It was agreed that the Equipment Panel should be asked to make further investigations regarding the breakaway tyre and to report back to the Council at its June meeting.

Declining entries in Grades 1 & 2 – Mr M Tait

79. The item was presented by Mr Huckle on behalf of Mr Tait who wished to raise a concern regarding declining entries, especially in Grades 1 & 2. Mr Tait's view was that that early closing dates were restricting entries, and that setting a maximum time limit of 30 days before the show would allow people more opportunity to enter shows as they were more likely to be aware of work and other family commitments within the time frame suggested.
80. The Council noted that there was currently a wide variation in closing dates, with some shows closing 6-8 weeks before the show date, whereas others closed much closer to the show date.
81. After a brief discussion, the Council did not perceive there to be an issue with closing dates and did not support the item.

Judging Up Contacts – Mr M Tait

82. This item was presented by Mr Huckle. Mr Tait was concerned that improving training methods had resulted in an increase in the speed of dogs over the A Ramp, the See-Saw and the Dog Walk, and as a result many judges experienced difficulty in judging both contacts. Mr Tait wished to suggest that it should be permissible for a dog to traverse over, but not necessarily make contact with, the up contact, and that this would not be faulted. However for safety reasons a dog getting on from the side of the obstacle would incur faults.
83. The Council expressed a concern that introduction of this practice may result in dogs being encouraged to jump high onto the obstacle, and this would present a safety issue.
84. A suggestion was made that the up contact area could be increased in size, but this was not considered to be practical. Alternatively, up contact judges could be appointed at all shows in order to address the difficulty of judges not being able to see both ends of each obstacle, however, it was accepted that this would not be desirable or practical.
85. The Council's view was that contacts were a fundamental aspect of agility which should not be compromised.

Collapsible Tunnel – Mrs Y Croxford

86. This issue had been discussed earlier in the meeting during Item 5 (paragraphs 17-19 refer).

Ratio of jump height to dog height for small dogs – Ms K Adams

87. Ms Adams had requested the Council to consider the situation regarding the smallest dogs taking part in agility in relation to the ratio of jump height to dog height.
88. The issue of jump heights had been fully discussed during item 7 (paragraphs 40-45 refer).

ITEM 9. FIVE YEAR STRATEGY

89. The Council noted the items on its five year strategic plan. Two issues were highlighted for discussion.

To evaluate the permitted number of licences issued per show society (Item d.)

90. The number of licences issued, especially to Listed Status clubs, was considered to be an important issue, together with the number of classes permitted at such shows as there were repercussions for class progression when classes were small or when competitors were able to compete in a high number of classes at one show. There was also a concern regarding the welfare of dogs competing on every day of a 7-day or 10-day show although it was accepted that competitors could not be prevented from competing as much as they chose.
91. There was some support for the number of licences to be limited and for a pricing structure which would incorporate a scale of charges according to the number of licences granted. It may also be possible to limit the number of classes for which a dog would be eligible at any one show. However it was acknowledged that a higher licence fee would have limited impact on those organisations generating significant income from running a number of shows.
92. It was agreed that this issue should be placed on the list of topics on the five year strategic plan.
93. There was also a concern about shows being run under licences 'borrowed' from other clubs. Any such instances should be reported to the office for further investigation and, if appropriate, referral to the Activities Sub-Committee.

To improve the standard of judges; consideration of tougher requirements to become eligible to fulfil an appointment, or possible creation of a new level of judge such as "Premier Judge".(Item f.)

94. A query was raised as to the definition of a 'Premier Judge'. It was confirmed that this referred to a judge who had undertaken additional training beyond that required of a new judge, but who had not yet attained Championship show judging status. However, on consideration, the Council was not of the view that it was necessary to have different titles for judges at different levels and it was agreed that this item should be removed.

ITEM 10. JUDGES WORKING PARTY (WTOA)

95. The Council noted a report from Mr Huckle on the progress of the Judges Working Party following its meetings on 3 July 2014 and 11 November 2014.

96. The following issues were highlighted:

Mentoring of First Time Agility Judges

97. The new mentoring system had been rolled out by the office and new judges would receive a letter inviting them to participate for their first three judging appointments.

Continuing Professional Development of Existing Judges

98. There had been considerable progress on this issue and it was intended that the scheme would be rolled out early in 2015.

Refresher (Update) Training

99. All existing judges were encouraged to attend the Requirements of an Agility Judge seminar or a specific refresher, but were not required to take the examination if they did not wish to do so.

Judging Procedure and Course Designs

100. The presentations were in the process of being reviewed and updated with the aim of reducing the information on general show management as a result of which there would be more time available for the Course Design and Practical Judging element.

Accredited Trainers

101. The office would be collating a list of the Accredited Trainers, to allow the Judges Working Party to review the geographical location and the seminars delivered by the existing trainers to try to ensure a good geographical spread across all areas.

ITEM 11. INTERNATIONAL AGILITY TEAMS

102. The Council noted a report on Team GB's attendance at the 2014 European Open Championships and World Championships. Team GB was congratulated on its achievements.

ITEM 12. INTERNATIONAL AGILITY FESTIVAL

103. The Council noted a report on the arrangements for the Kennel Club International Agility Festival, due to be held on 13-16 August 2015.

ITEM 13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

104. A suggestion was made that a Platinum Agility Warrant be introduced, in addition to the existing bronze, silver and gold. It was agreed that a proposal could be considered at the Council's next meeting.

ITEM 14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

105. The date of the next meeting had originally been scheduled to take place on 2 July 2015 but it would be necessary to revise this date. A revised date would be set as soon as possible. [**Afternote:** it was confirmed that the next meeting would take place on 13 July 2015 and any items for the agenda must be submitted by 14 April 2015.]
106. There being no further matters to discuss the meeting closed at 14.50 pm.

MISS L OLDEN
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.”

Agility Liaison Council Representatives
1 January 2013 – 31 December 2015

Listed below are the Area Liaison Council Representatives that can be contacted should further information be required on any of the items.

SCOTLAND

Mrs Olwyn McShane, 3 Littlemill Cottages, Littlemill, Rankinston, East Ayrshire, KA6 7HJ
Email: olwynmcshane@googlemail.com

NORTHERN IRELAND

Mr Ronnie McAleese, 27 Dermott Walk, Comber, Newtownards, County Down, BT23 5NU
Tel: 02891 878125 Email: ronnie@patchagility.com

WALES

Mr Martin Cavill, 15 Gerbera Drive, Rogerstone, Newport, NP10 9JD
Tel: 07866 438719 Email: martin.cavill@yahoo.co.uk

NORTH WEST

Mrs Pauline Baltes, 45 Well Orchard, Bamber Bridge, Preston, Lancs. PR5 8HJ
Tel: 01772 494852 Email: pabq@blueyonder.co.uk

Mr Mike Hallam, Hollins View, Leek Road, Bosley, Macclesfield, SK11 0PP
Tel: 01260 223190 Email: m.hallam@btconnect.com

NORTH EAST

Mr Ian Mallabar, Evenwood House, Low Westwood, NE17 7PZ
Tel: 01207 565774 E-mail: ian.mallabar@btinternet.com

Miss Jen Lewis, 22 Dick's Garth Road, Menston, Ilkley, LS29 6HF
Tel: 01943 871134 / 07946 387011 Email: freymordogs@yahoo.co.uk

MIDLANDS

Mrs Jackie Gardner, 17 Middlesmoor, Wilnecote, Tamworth, B77 4PL
Tel: 07787 686806 Email: jackiegagility@hotmail.com

Mrs Yvonne Croxford, Shade Cottage, Coventry Road, Wigston Parva, Hinckley, LE10 3AP
Tel: 01455 220245 Email: MeisterMansion@aol.com

SOUTH EAST & EAST ANGLIA

Mr Simon Chandler, 16 Hawth Hill, Seaford, East Sussex, BN25 2RW
Tel: 07772 670086 E-mail: sjabbaman@aol.com

Mr John Gilbert, Keba Cottage, 100 Bedford Road, Barton-le-Clay, Beds, MK45 4LR
Tel: 01582 882366 E-mail: faldoagility@aol.com

SOUTH & SOUTH WEST

Mr Chris Huckle, Kingswold, Glenmore, Roborough, Devon, EX19 8TE
Tel: 01769 560190 Email: chris.huckle@kingswold.com

Miss Lesley Olden, Birchwood House Cottage, Sherfield English, Nr Romsey, Hants, SO51 6FF
Tel: 01794 323037 E-mail: lesleysolden@btinternet.com