

PROPOSED REVIEW OF BLOODHOUND TRIALS RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR ENTRIES/QUALIFICATIONS

Over the last six years there has been a decline in entries for Bloodhound Trials. In May of 2014 there was a meeting at the KC between the KC and the liaison officers of both clubs to discuss a review of regulations. It was agreed at that meeting that a further review should take place in 2017, but this did not occur.

Both clubs have had difficulties in the past few years with changes to their committees; they have also had to cope with various changes brought about by the KC.

Currently entries for the lower stakes at Trials have been poor. I have looked at Catalogues that I have to hand, most of them being ABB catalogues and one from the Bloodhound Club (BC), the rep from the BC may be able to provide additional information re numbers of entries at their trials.

October 2016, ABB, Mindrum, Northumberland,
Novice 3
Junior 3
Intermediate 6
Senior 3

March 2017, ABB, Hoddam, Dumfriesshire,
Novice 1
Junior 3
Intermediate 4
Senior 3

October 2017 ABB, Tibthorpe Yorkshire,
Novice 0
Junior 4
Intermediate 6
Senior 4

February 2018 Bloodhound Club, Lincolnshire,
Novice 0
Junior 4?
Intermediate 5?
Senior 2

March 2018, ABB, Cotswolds,
Novice 3
Junior 3, (one from overseas)
Intermediate 7
Senior 5

Currently 1st and 2nd from Novice and Junior go up; I do not think that we can run with this any longer. The higher stakes will become top heavy, in particular the Intermediate Stake.

There are three ways of looking at this, we re-instate the Nomination Procedure for the Novice and Junior Stakes only. Intermediate stays as first only going up into the Senior Stake. (Tickets belong to the KC)

First prize only goes up from Novice and Junior Stakes.

You could look at numbers and consider the following, 8 entries and only First prize goes up, 9 or more entries first prize and second prize go up.

I have discussed this with the current Bloodhound reps who sit on the WTL Council, they both agree we should look at this issue, and there is a preference for the return of the Nomination procedure for the Novice and Junior Stakes.

Point of Interest

Cotswolds 2008, Novice 19, Junior 7 of which 3 were nominations, Intermediate 3 of which 1 was a nomination, Senior 9 of which 1 was a nomination (this should not have been accepted).

Cotswolds 2012, Novice 17, Junior 6, Intermediate 6, Senior 4.

Nominations were brought about 40 years ago to help stakes low in numbers so that it was a worthwhile stake for a judge to judge. Members do not have a right to Nominations, a good committee is quite capable of controlling nominated entries, nominated entries are returned if the stake is full of hounds from first placed winners.

HOW THE NOMINATION PROCEDURE WORKS

Bloodhounds may be nominated in the stake immediately above that for which they are entered, if they have previously gained a second prize in the stake for which they are entered in the trial.

Acceptance of nominations will be at the discretion of the Trial Secretary and subject to the hounds having completed the stake for which they are entered in the trial. Members do not have a right to a nomination. Hounds having gained a second prize in the stake for which they are nominated shall become eligible to enter that stake at future trials.

The second place gained in the stake for which they are nominated would also give them a nomination to the higher stake, this can only happen from Junior to Intermediate.

There is to be no nomination from Intermediate stake to the Senior Stake, only the winner can go from the Intermediate Stake to the Senior Stake, the ticket stake should only have the best hounds.

It is possible that if a hound was able to nominate throughout the stakes it could get through to the senior Stake without having won a first prize.

I would like to see a more balanced number of entries in the lower stakes as this is relevant to the development of new judges. Both clubs have a good in-house criterion for the development of judges, unfortunately as the entries stand at present, up and coming judges are not seeing a sufficient number of hounds. It may well be that the Clubs or the KC set a figure as to how many hounds they must judge as part of their development.

I do feel that the nomination procedure would attract more entries, it works very well providing it is managed properly, two bites of the cherry, the clubs need to boost their income and are hesitant to put up entries due to the cost of living, travel and accommodation.

Controlling Nominations

If there are more nominations than places, do we return all nominations with the entry fee: (this is what happened in the past.)

Do we ballot the nominations and the first ones pulled out acquire the vacancies, then returning the unlucky ones along with their entry fee;

Questions from entrants:

Can we nominate in case someone does not turn up on the day? NO

Can the stake be run over two days to accommodate nominations? NO

Can we tag the nominations onto the end of the day? NO

Miss L Pogodzinski