

Agility Council Discussion Item

KC Height Classification Panel

- To consider issues relating to jump heights, including health and welfare issues, and to consider ways of determining optimum jump heights for all dogs dependent upon height and conformation. Also to consider issues related to dog heights and measuring.
- How many heights are practical for a KC Show.

At the last council meeting it was obvious there were too many options and lack of support for any option. The Height panel have reduced the options to simplify the process.

There are 3 options to choose from.

1. Current KC Height specification, no change

Category	Jump Height	Dog Height
Current		
Large	650	Over 430
Large LHO	550	Over 430
Medium	450	Between 350 - 430
Medium LHO	350	Between 350 - 430
Small	350	Under 350
Small LHO	250	Under 350

2. Proposal for discussion

Category	Jump Height	Dog Height
Possible using 125% rule		
Large	600	No change
Medium	450	No Change
Small	300	No Change

3. Proposal for discussion

Category	Jump Height	Dog Height
Align with FCI		
Large	600	No change
Medium	400	No Change
Small	300	No Change

Plus offer LHO for large at 500, until the official heights change with FCI.

Evidence to back up this discussion document.

Current height situation with LHO is causing many issues and concerns. It gives us potentially 6 heights, some shows are not scheduling LHO at all, many are only allocated to certain classes.

There seems to be 2 views to LHO :-

1)

1. People see it as cheating where handlers are using it to progress up the grades quicker.
2. People have mixed views on whether they should have combined or separate results.
3. It gives an unfair advantage to dogs running at LH.
4. Many top handlers like it as their dogs go even faster.

2)

1. LHO assists breeds that are large but don't necessarily have the confirmation to clear the obstacles.
2. It opens Agility to a wider spread of breeds. (even though agility is not suitable to all breeds).
3. Some handlers will only attend shows where LHO is scheduled, and in some cases no longer attend KC Shows.
4. Removing LHO does take away the opportunity to bring in new dogs or reintroducing injured dogs at the lower height.

Logistic impact if major changes of new heights are introduced to our current number:-

1. Significant workload to re measure 1000's of dogs.
2. Time to introduce major changes would be significant to allow re measuring.
3. Opens many issues on measuring that we are dealing with now.
4. Some handlers will not want to move to a new height.
5. This could impact the premier events.
6. Equipment manufacturers would be impacted.
7. Introduction schedule would need to be created to cater for the changes
8. Impact on shows and show processors.

All Proposals above

- This does not require any re measuring.
- No impact on shows or processors.
- Minimal impact on equipment suppliers
- Uses some of the findings from the research but there is no evidence of dogs being injured due to the heights being jumped.
- Aligns more to other country heights bringing continuity across regions.
- Removes the issue of handlers missing LHO runs due to the class sometimes being very small.
- Currently grade progression is easier running at LHO due to size of classes.
- Removes the view that it is cheating to run at LHO to gain an advantage.
- Removes the requirement for dogs to move to a new height, could be a major impact on premier events and the sizes of the classes.
- The size of UK shows makes it logistically difficult to introduce extra heights.
- Any significant changes will require a major update of current rules across all areas.
- No change will address all issues for certain dogs or breeds.

This is a discussion document to gain support from the current council in January with a view to draft a proposal for the next meeting.

Assumptions

- Acceptable to drop the large height
- LHO may not be required for all heights
- This will still not allow all dogs to compete and is more based on 80/20 rule
- There may be a gap for micro dogs but all the above is open to discussion.

Agility Liaison Council

18.01.18

Item 10.a

Annex H