



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE AGILITY LIAISON COUNCIL HELD ON THURSDAY 11 FEBRUARY 2021 AT 10.00 AM VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS**

**PRESENT**

Mr M Cavill	Wales
Mr S Chandler	South East & East Anglia
Mrs Y Croxford	Midlands
Mr A Dornford-Smith	Northern Ireland
Mrs J Gardner	Midlands
Mr M Hallam	North West
Mrs S Hawskwell	Scotland
Mrs E Laing-Kay	North East
Miss L Olden	South & South West
Miss R Sargent	North West
Mr K Smith	North East
Mr M Tait	South & South West

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Mr M Beazley	Chief Executive Officer (up to Item 10)
Miss D Deuchar	Head of Canine Activities
Miss C McHardy	Manager - Education, Training, and Working Dog Activities Team
Miss R Mansfield	Senior Officer - Working Dog Activities Team
Mrs A Mitchell	Senior Committee Secretary - Working Dog Activities Team

**IN THE CHAIR**

**MR M CAVILL**

**NOTE: any recommendations made by the Agility Liaison Council are subject to review by the Activities Committee and The Kennel Club Board, and will not come into effect unless and until Board approval has been confirmed.**

**ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1. All members of the Council were present. It was noted that there was currently a vacancy for a representative for the South East & East Anglia area.
2. Mr Beazley and Miss McHardy were introduced to the meeting, and were welcomed. Mr Beazley gave a short summary of his professional background prior to joining the Kennel Club.

**ITEM 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

3. The minutes of the meeting held on 16 January 2020 were approved as being an accurate record.



### ITEM 3. MATTERS ARISING/RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- Amendment to Regulation H(1)(B)3.m. See-Saw
4. The Council noted that the Board, at its meeting on 7 April 2020, approved the following amendment:

Regulation H(1)(B)3.m. See-Saw

**TO:**

This obstacle will consist of a plank firmly mounted on a central bracket. The length of the plank must be 3.66m. The width ~~should be 254mm~~ **must be 295mm minimum** and 305mm maximum. The height measured from the ground to the top of the plank at the central bracket ~~should be 610mm minimum and 685mm maximum~~ **must be 610mm. The maximum distance from the pivot point to the top of the plank should not be more than 100mm.** The last 914mm from each end should be a different colour to indicate the area with which the dog should make contact. The plank should have a non-slip surface with no slats. The See-Saw must start to tip and then touch the ground between 2–3 seconds after a weight of 1 kilogram has been placed in the middle of the down contact area.

(Deletions struck through. Insertions in bold.)

(Effective 1 January 2021)

- Hartpury College and University
5. At the Council's previous meeting, it was agreed that an update would be provided as to issues currently being researched by Hartpury, with a view to suggestions being made as to other topics which may be suitable.
6. It noted an update provided by Dr Wills (Senior Lecturer at Hartpury). No agility-specific research projects were currently under way. In view of the difficulties of carrying out practical data collection due to Covid-19, students had been advised, where possible, to use questionnaires or existing datasets, and as a result no new experimental agility projects were being undertaken at present.

Eye testing

7. The Council had suggested at its previous meeting that it would be helpful for a facility for eye testing to be available at the International Agility Festival in August 2021. It was noted that planning for the event was ongoing, and that this included the provision of eye testing.

Measuring Panel

8. The Council noted that due to Covid-19, very little measuring had taken place since early 2020, and for this reason it had not been possible to complete the remit and rationale for a separate Measuring Panel. In view of the circumstances, it was agreed that this matter would be deferred for twelve months, but would be reconsidered by the Council at its meeting in January 2022, when Mrs Gardner would submit a report.
9. In the meantime, issues relating to measuring would continue to fall within the remit of the Agility Governance Panel.

Tolerances

10. At its January 2020 meeting, the Council agreed that a proposal should be submitted which would introduce set tolerances for the measurement of equipment. A proposal submitted by the Equipment Panel was discussed later in the meeting (paragraphs 22-24 refer).



#### Ring sizes

11. At its previous meeting, the Council had expressed general support for the principle of providing for a ring size for all venues (indoors or outdoors), with the objective of providing show organisers with more flexibility. However it was of the view that a minimum length of 25m for one side of the ring be specified to ensure that rings were not unduly long and narrow.
12. A proposal submitted by Mr Tait was discussed later in the meeting (paragraphs 56-63 refer).

### **ITEM 4. ACTIVITIES HEALTH AND WELFARE SUB-GROUP**

13. The Council noted a written report from Mr MacDonald following the Sub-Group's meeting on 14 September 2020. The main issues highlighted were as follows:
  14. **Measuring methods:** measuring methods would remain under regular review by the Sub-Group. It had been asked whether it would be possible for research to be conducted into potential variations into a dog's measured height through the course of a day, and under differing conditions. However, this would not be possible until such time as there was a method of measuring the height of a dog accurately and consistently.
  15. **Working trial research:** data collection for the research had been undertaken at Nottingham Trent University in August 2020. A number of dogs had been filmed whilst negotiating the long jump at a range of lengths, and over the scale at a range of heights. The results of the research would be issued in due course.
  16. **Fitness/heart rate recovery:** it was hoped that a research project into fitness and heart rate recovery would commence at Hartpury University as soon as it became possible to do so. It was understood that a research project had been carried out on the subject some time ago by Anja Westland and it was suggested that this may be relevant and should be accessed if possible.
  17. **See-saw:** the Sub-Group was keen to progress research into the absorption of forces on the see-saw, but as above, it had not been possible for students at Hartpury to progress any such project. Once it was possible to do so, it was hoped that the Sub-Group agility member and the Council would be able to assist in furthering the project.
  18. **Use of harnesses:** the use of harnesses by dog owners (not during competition), would remain on the Sub-Group's list of 'Opportunities for Investigation' and would be reviewed regularly. A query was raised as to whether research had been carried out by manufacturers of harnesses, but it was unclear as to whether this was available.
  19. **Kinetic forces on dogs:** the Sub-Group had considered a suggestion raised by the Council as to whether it would be possible to carry out research on the kinetic forces of dogs at a range of speeds as they negotiated contact obstacles such as the 'A' frame. The Council had also suggested that research regarding the effects of acceleration and deceleration on dogs would be of interest. The Sub-Group agreed that both were topics of interest and would be suitable for potential research at Hartpury University in due course.
- New member for the Sub-Group
20. As Mr MacDonald was no longer able to represent the Council on the Sub-Group, the Council was requested to nominate a new member to do so. Mr Tait volunteered to undertake the role, and noted the dates of the Sub-Group's meetings which were planned to take place in 2021. The appointment would be subject to confirmation by the Dog Health Group.



## ITEM 5. REPORT FROM THE EQUIPMENT PANEL

21. The report was presented by Mr Smith on behalf of the Panel.

### Tolerances

22. As discussed at the Council's meeting in January 2020, the Panel wished to propose an amendment to Regulation H(1)(B)3. to add a tolerance to obstacle measurements. The proposal was seconded by Miss Sargent.

23. The Council was in full agreement with the Panel's view that there were practical difficulties in manufacturing to precise sizes, and that materials used may expand and contract in different weather conditions. Further, it accepted that there were difficulties in making accurate measurements due to the environment in which agility competitions were held.

24. Accordingly, it **recommended** for approval the following amendment:

Regulation H(1)(B)3.

TO:

3. Obstacles.—The following obstacles meet with the approval of the Board of the Kennel Club. Any changes to current obstacles (such as materials used, structure or style) or any other new obstacles must be submitted for approval by the Kennel Club before being made available for use at its licensed events. **All measurements of 1000mm or under may have a tolerance of plus or minus 5mm and measurements of over 1000mm may have a tolerance of plus or minus 10mm.**

(Insertion in bold)

### New long jump

25. The Council noted that the Panel had approved a new foam long jump submitted by Mr Martin Reid, for use at Kennel Club licensed shows.

26. This led to a query as to whether the Panel's approval would cover all long jumps of the same design, or whether each manufacturer was required to seek approval on an individual basis. It was confirmed that where a manufacturer wished to implement a change in specification of an obstacle, approval must be sought. If the design was the same as that of an obstacle which had already been approved, there was no necessity for further approval to be sought.

27. It was also clarified that Regulation H(1)(B)3. stated that 'Any changes to current obstacles (such as materials used, structure or style) or any other new obstacles must be submitted for approval by The Kennel Club before being made available for use at its licensed events.' For this reason, the Equipment Panel was only required to approve equipment to be used at shows licensed by The Kennel Club, and not equipment used in training.

28. Mr Smith wished to request that the remit of the Equipment Panel be reviewed at the Council's July meeting, and it was agreed that this would be placed on the agenda.

29. A further query was raised as to whether equipment from a particular supplier conformed to Kennel Club specifications. It was agreed that a check would be carried out and if appropriate the matter would be raised with the supplier in question. **[Afternote: following a check, it was subsequently confirmed that the equipment did comply with Kennel Club specifications.]**



## **ITEM 6. REPORT FROM THE AGILITY GOVERNANCE PANEL**

30. The Council considered a report presented by Miss Hawkswell on behalf of the Agility Governance Panel.
31. **Kennel Club Code of Best Practice for Measuring Agility Dog Heights:** A revised version of the Code had been completed and passed to the office. It was confirmed that the review would be considered by the Activities Committee at its next meeting.
32. **Grading review:** In view of the lack of shows in 2020 due to Covid-19, there had been little activity in respect of the review, as there had been no opportunity for the collection of data. In view of this it was likely that the planned review would be delayed. However, this was not considered to be a cause for concern as, following grading changes already implemented, a moratorium was in place for any further changes until 2023. A brief discussion took place and the Council agreed that in view of the circumstances and loss of so many shows during 2020, it would be desirable to further delay the review until 2024, in order to allow adequate time for data collection. This process would commence as soon as it became possible to do so.
33. It was anticipated that when shows resumed, there would be an influx of dogs into Grade 2.
34. **Other priorities:** these would remain as follows:
  - Reviewing governance of agility within The Kennel Club
  - Development of Kennel Club agility results database
  - Reviewing scope and relationship between Regulations and guidelines, and a full review of the H Regulations to identify improvements needed in language, layout, duplication etc.
35. A query was raised as to whether an amnesty would be announced in respect of measuring, to allow owners to have their dogs measured later than would otherwise have been required under the provisions of the H Regulations. It was confirmed that an announcement regarding the suspension of Regulations would be made as and when approved by the Board.  
**[Afternote:** it was subsequently confirmed that competitors now had until 31 December 2021 to have second or third measurements carried out. However, dogs competing in small, medium or intermediate height categories must have had a first measure prior to competing for the first time.

## **ITEM 7. REPORT FROM THE JUDGING PANEL AND OTHER JUDGING ISSUES**

36. The Council noted a report from the Judging Panel submitted by Mrs Gardner.
37. Due to the lack of shows, there had been very little activity, and no incidents had been reported to the Panel.
38. The review of the Guide to Agility Equipment was still ongoing, and it was anticipated that it would be ready for submission to the Council at its July meeting.
39. The Panel was also in the process of developing a discussion paper in relation to suggested qualifications for new agility judges. This was particularly important in view of concerns that in some instances, inexperienced judges had been invited to judge at premier shows, and to judge qualifiers for prestige events. This was currently permitted within the H Regulations but was not considered to be desirable. A key area of the discussion would be the setting of parameters regarding the previous experience of the potential judge, such as stewarding or competing.



40. A suggestion was made that some form of Continuing Personal Development (CPD) should be required for championship agility judges to ensure that their knowledge remained up to date, and that a CPD workshop-style seminar may be a way of helping them to achieve this. This was noted.
41. The discussion document would be submitted to the Council at its July meeting.
- Meeting of Accredited Trainers for agility
42. The Council noted that no meeting had yet taken place, and that the following matters remained ongoing:
- Updating of Judges Assessment forms
  - Mentoring of new judges
- Activities Judges Sub-Group
43. The Council also noted a written report from Mrs Gardner following the meeting of the Activities Judges Sub-Group which took place on 18 November 2020.
44. The Sub-Group had agreed that the qualifications for the role of Show Manager at agility shows should be reviewed, with the objective of formulating a minimum competency requirement for what was a very important role. It was highlighted that all Kennel Club activities disciplines, except agility, already specified minimum competency levels for show managers/chief stewards, although it had been agreed that the requirements for chief stewards in rally should be enhanced. The matter would be progressed by Mrs Gardner, and by Mrs Bradley, on behalf of rally.
45. The Sub-Group had also reviewed the authority held by Accredited Trainers when at shows, and had agreed that they should be supported in circumstances where concerns were raised regarding a course.
46. This led to a query as to whether, in the absence of an Accredited Trainer, the opinion of a championship agility judge should be sought in the event of such a concern, and if so, if the authority of that judge would be supported in a similar way. However it was highlighted that Accredited Trainers underwent more extensive training, and were required to ensure that their knowledge was up to date. It was also accepted that some championship judges may not wish to be approached to assist in resolving issues arising at shows, and it may discourage them from undertaking judging appointments.
47. The Council noted that the online Regulations and Judging Procedure examination for agility was now easier to access than before. A concern was raised that some of the questions were inaccurate or ambiguous. It was confirmed that the office was already aware of the issue, which was being progressed following receipt of details from Mr Jolly, in collaboration with Mrs Gardner, on behalf of the Accredited Trainers.
48. It was also noted that the Code of Best Practice for Judges and Stewards was being reviewed via the Sub-Group, to ensure that any issues relating to the conduct of judges and the perception of impropriety and/or use of social media were adequately covered.

## **ITEM 8. INTERNATIONAL AGILITY FESTIVAL**

49. The Council noted a written report on the arrangements for The Kennel Club International Agility Festival, due to be held at Rutland Showground near Oakham on 12-15 August 2021. Planning was progressing and it was hoped that the event would be able to go ahead.
50. The main points were as follows:



- Rutland Showground had been secured up to and including 2023.
- Skinner's Field and Trial sponsored the International Agility Festival from 2019. A three year deal until 2021 was in place.
- The Olympia Quarter-Finals and Semi-Finals would no longer take place at the International Agility Festival, but would take place in September at Vale View Equestrian Centre.  
[**Afternote:** the position in regard to qualification for the Quarter-Finals and Semi-Finals would be reviewed by the Prestige Events Working Party later in the year.]
- Due to Covid-19, the schedule for the IAF would be released in May 2021
- First Place Processing would be handling all IAF entries as well as the live results at the show.
- First Contact would be the equipment supplier for all rings.

### **ITEM 9. AGILITY TEAM GB**

51. The Council noted a written report on the activities of Agility Team GB, provided by the office.

52. The main points were as follows:

- The 2020 Junior Open Agility World Championships (JOAWC), European Open Championships (EO) (due to be hosted by The Kennel Club), and the Agility World Championships (AWC) had all been cancelled due to Covid-19.
- Following the resignation of Mr Laker as Agility Team GB Manager, a new management team was now in place, with Mr G Derrett taking over the role of team manager.
- A new qualification process had been put in place which can be found on the Agility Team GB website <https://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/events-and-activities/agility/already-competing-in-agility/agility-team-gb/>.
- The 2021 Junior Open Agility World Championships and the European Open Championships were likely to be cancelled due to Covid-19, but planning for the Agility World Championships, due to take place in Estonia 23-26 September 2021 remained ongoing.

53. It was noted that the Agility Team GB Open Showcase was due to go ahead on 20 February 2021, with participation on an online basis. The event was only open to those with access to their own equipment and venue, and there was some concern that this may be unfair to potential participants who did not have such facilities available to them. The Council was also keen to ensure that there was no perception that participants wishing to be considered for the national team were being encouraged to break national government restrictions. [**Afternote:** it was subsequently announced that the Open Showcase had been postponed, and was now scheduled to go ahead online on 25 April 2021.]

54. These concerns were noted, and the office undertook to raise them with the Events team.

### **ITEM 10. PROPOSALS FROM SOCIETIES/PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS**

Proposed amendment to Regulation H(1)9.a.

55. Mr Tait wished the Council to consider a proposed amendment to the above Regulation in respect of ring sizes. He was of the view that the proposed amendment would allow greater flexibility for show organisers. For example, a minimum-sized indoor ring would be 25m x 18m but could be 30m x 15m. Both sizes, and any variations in between, would comply with the proposed Regulation. Similarly for outdoor rings, a range of sizes would be acceptable. This would also ensure better value for money for competitors.

56. The proposal was seconded by Mrs Olden.



57. A lengthy discussion took place on the matter. The Council was in support of the principle of the proposal, however there was a range of views as to the specific details to be included in the H Regulations.
58. The Council was in agreement that it would be helpful to set parameters for indoor rings, but was unclear as to whether the inclusion of a square meterage figure would be a positive step. It also wished to ensure that the revised Regulations would provide maximum flexibility to suit a wide range of venues, but without any possibility that rings could be overly long and narrow. However it was also necessary to ensure that revised ring areas were not unduly restrictive, as this may result in some indoor shows becoming unviable should it become necessary for them to reduce the number of rings they were able to provide.
59. The Council also considered the definition of an indoor ring, noting that the dictionary definition of 'indoor' related to the necessity for walls and a roof. It agreed that for the purposes of agility venues, indoor rings and those which may be defined as 'permanently enclosed', for example by a permanently fixed barrier or fence, such as an equestrian arena, should be subject to the same size requirements.
60. Having considered the matter carefully, the Council agreed that there should be no amendment to the existing Regulation in relation to outdoor rings, which would continue to state that such rings should measure a minimum of 32m x 32m. It also agreed that the Regulation should state minimum dimensions for indoor rings.
61. Mr Tait proposed a revised amendment, which was seconded by Mr Hallam.
62. A vote took place, and by a majority, the following amendment was **recommended** for approval:
- Regulation H(1)9.a.  
**TO:**
- a. Test area shall have a suitable surface and measure a minimum of 32m x 32m for outdoor venues **rings and 450 square metres for indoor or permanently enclosed rings.**  
~~Indoor venues may be smaller but must be appropriate to the size of the test.~~ **No side of an indoor or permanently enclosed ring may measure less than 15m. The ring area includes space for officials, including the scime and ring party, but where possible the ring tent should be outside the ring area.**  
(Deletions struck through. Insertions in bold)
63. A query was raised as to whether special provision should be made in respect of minimum sizes for indoor or permanently enclosed rings used for championship classes or for qualifiers for prestige events. It was agreed that Mrs Gardner would submit a suitable proposal to the Council at its next meeting.
- Proposed amendment to Regulation H(1)(B)3.j.
64. Ms E Wrench, represented by Mr Tait, requested the Council to consider a proposal to amend the above Regulation which related to weaving poles, with the objective of allowing competitors to have a better understanding as to what they may expect at competitions. Ms Wrench noted that no other obstacle had eight variations as to how it may be completed. It was also anticipated that it would be beneficial to the welfare of the dogs by ensuring that they were not required to over-perform a repetitive task.
65. The proposal was seconded by Mrs Olden.



66. The Council was in agreement that the proposal, which would ensure an even number of weaves, was a sensible one, and it was supportive of the principle. However it discussed whether there was a necessity for the inclusion of a maximum number of weaves on a course. It was hoped that judges' training would ensure that judges did not include an excessive number of weaves on a course, but that a stated maximum would ensure that this did not occur.
67. A query was also raised as to whether, if a maximum number was specified, it would have an impact on special classes which traditionally used a number of weaves.
68. An alternative suggestion was made that a maximum of 12 weaves should be specified, rather than 18 as suggested by Ms Wrench. A vote took place as to whether a maximum number should be included, and by a majority, the Council agreed that a maximum be included for standard classes.
69. A further vote indicated support for the maximum number to be 12.
70. Mr Tait proposed a revised amendment to state that 'the maximum number of weaves in a standard class is 12.' This would appear as the second sentence in the Regulation rather than at the end of it. This proposal was seconded by Miss Hawkswell.
71. A brief discussion took place as to whether the Regulation should state that the diameter of the poles should be 35mm, rather than between 32mm and 38mm as it currently did, but it was agreed no change should be made to this part of the wording unless or until the proposed amendment regarding tolerances which had been discussed earlier (paragraphs 22-24 refer) came into effect, at which point it would be possible to review the specifications for all equipment to take this into account.
72. A vote took place on the revised proposal, and the following amendment to Regulations was unanimously **recommended** for approval:

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

**TO:**

Weaving Poles—~~The minimum number of poles should be five and the maximum number 12.~~ **The maximum number of weaves in a standard class is 12.** They should be in a continuous line, as straight as possible and should be 600mm apart (between the poles). The poles must be of rigid construction and with a minimum height of 762mm and a diameter between 32mm and 38mm. The base must have support bars at the bottom of each pole and they must be positioned away from the side a dog would normally negotiate each pole.

(Deletions struck through. Insertions in bold)

## **ITEM 11. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

73. Retention of older handlers in the discipline  
Mr R Worner requested the Council to consider concerns that many handlers in higher age groups were no longer competing, and that as a result the discipline was becoming less inclusive. He was of the view that some handlers could no longer achieve the course times imposed by the current course time matrix, and that some such handlers were being discouraged from competing as they were often unable to achieve the satisfaction even of a clear round. No representative had been briefed to present the item.
74. Mr Worner suggested that it would be helpful if judges were given more latitude to add time over and above that indicated by the matrix, or that dual times may be set for each course, the



lower time being set using the current time matrix, and being a 'qualifying' time with results being eligible for progression and those between the lower and upper time being for clear rounds only. Mr Worner also suggested the instigation of a Veteran Handlers element within each of the grades and heights within the current grading system.

75. The Council noted Mr Worner's views, but feedback received from competitors did not indicate support for any special measures for older handlers, and accordingly the matter was not discussed further.

Long Jump

76. The item was presented by Mr Cavill, representing Mr N Ellis.
77. Mr Ellis highlighted that at present there was no consistent method of applying the Regulations of the obstacle to each height, with the possibility of a different number of units being used, with varying heights of units for the same height of dog.
78. He wished to suggest the standardisation of the number of long jump units for each height, and to set a maximum length per height. This would provide consistency and clarity with the regulations, and would help to ensure that the obstacle was used correctly by all judges. Further, he was of the view that specifying a number of units and a maximum length for the long jump at each height would reflect a progression across the four heights.
79. No change to equipment specifications would be required and thus such changes would be simple to implement.
80. Mr Ellis suggested the following number of units and lengths:

Small dogs	2 units (Units 1 & 2)	Length 400-500mm
Medium dogs	3 units (Units 1, 2 & 3)	Length 700-900mm
Intermediate dogs	4 Units (Units 1, 2, 3 & 4)	Length 1.0-1.3m
Large dogs	5 Units (Units 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5)	Length 1.2-1.5m

81. The maximum height of each unit would remain as defined within the existing Regulation H(1)(B)3.f., but a revised Regulation would also clarify the height of the second unit which was currently unstated:

Unit 1 - 127mm  
 Unit 2 - 153mm  
 Unit 3 - 229mm  
 Unit 4 - 305mm  
 Unit 5 - 381mm

82. The minimum length of each unit would remain at 1.2m and the marker poles would continue to be a minimum height of 1.2m.
83. The Council noted that feedback from competitors indicated general support for the principle of Mr Ellis' suggestion, and it was in agreement that it warranted progression, subject to resolution of some concerns, as outlined below:
- The proposed maximum length for Intermediate dogs was greater than the minimum length for Large dogs, which appeared inconsistent.
  - There was considered to be an unduly large difference between the maximum length of the long jump for Small dogs, and the minimum length for Medium dogs.



- The suggested height of 153mm for Unit 2 appeared to be too small, and it was suggested that a height of 173mm or 176mm would be preferable. It was also considered advisable to hold discussions with equipment suppliers prior to setting any specific height.

84. Subject to the above provisos, the Council was in agreement that a full proposal should be submitted for consideration at its next meeting. This would be formulated by Mr Smith, on behalf of the Equipment Panel, in collaboration with Mr Ellis.

## **ITEM 12. REVIEW TIMETABLE**

85. The Council noted the current review timetable which provided a three-year rolling programme of reviews and proposal timeframes from each of the Panels.
86. In view of the lack of shows during 2020 and the inability to gather data, it was agreed that time frames should be amended as follows:
87. **Grading Panel:** to allow time for adequate collection of data regarding the impact of changes already made, the timetable would be moved forward by two years.
88. **Equipment Panel:** Some background work could be carried out by the Panel in the coming year, but in view of the lack of competitions, the timetable would be moved forward by one year.
89. **Agility Governance Panel:** It was agreed that there was no reason to delay the planned review of measuring, and that Mrs Gardner would submit suggestions for consideration by the Council at its meeting in January 2022.
90. It was acknowledged that once shows were able to resume there would be a high demand for measuring. A suggestion was made that a dedicated measuring session be held at The Kennel Club Building at Stoneleigh, although there would be a cost to this. However depending on government restrictions in place at the time, and in view of the fact that the building was designated as an exhibition centre which may not permit its use for the purpose, it may be necessary to consider the use of other venues such as village halls.
91. It was accepted that measuring issues were high priority, and Mrs Gardner undertook to investigate the options available for measuring sessions, with assistance from Miss Olden and Miss Sargent.
92. It was agreed that there would be no change to the timetable for the Agility Governance Panel.
93. **Judging Panel:** in view of the lack of shows, the timetable would be moved forward by one year.
94. An updated timetable is attached as **Annex A to the Minutes**.

## **ITEM 13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### Submission of agenda papers

95. All members of the Council were reminded that they should ensure that any reports or similar documents for inclusion within agenda papers were submitted to the office in a timely fashion, on request. This would ensure that the agenda could be issued promptly and without delay.

### Regulations suspended due to Covid-19



96. A number of Regulations had already been suspended in order to allow show organisers to run Covid-secure shows. The Council was requested to advise the office of any additional suspensions which would be helpful to societies. Any such suggestions would be subject to review and approval by the Activities Committee.
97. **Covid-compliant classes:** One suggestion was that a ring may be set up for use in two classes without any changes to the equipment in between. The two different courses would be marked with the obstacles numbered in different colours, such as red for one, and blue for the other. Six competitors would walk the course and then run it, using the first set of numbers and would then vacate the area. A second group of six competitors would then walk the course, using the second set of numbers, and would then run it. It was agreed that this method of running Covid-compliant shows would be referred to the Activities Committee in order to assess whether it would be permissible.
98. **Capping of entries:** The issue of capping was raised. Noting that at present Regulation H(1)(A)12 had been relaxed to allow for a minimum capping limit of 50 dogs for a standard class, it was suggested that it may be helpful for this to be made permanent. It was agreed that this may be considered in the future.
99. A further suggestion was made that an option to cap entries should be extended to cover Kennel Club qualifiers and championship classes, as a temporary measure, in order to assist societies to be able to plan Covid-compliant championship shows. It was suggested that capping limits could be set on the basis of previous entries for those classes for each individual show to prevent them being set at too low a level. Further, in order to ensure complete fairness, where such a class was oversubscribed, a random draw should take place rather than accepting entries on a first come, first served basis which would be disadvantageous to some competitors.
100. It was agreed that the issue of capping for championship classes and Kennel Club qualifiers should be referred to the Activities Committee for further consideration.
101. **25 day rule:** The matter of the 25 day rule was also discussed, whereby in estimating the number of awards won, all wins up to and including 25 days before the start of the competition were to be counted when entering for any class. It was suggested that this should be reviewed with a view to temporarily removing this provision, or reducing the 25 day period, with the objective of allowing dogs to progress more quickly through the classes to make up for time lost in 2020 and 2021 when they had been unable to compete. A reduction in the 25 day period may also be helpful to show secretaries and show processors as it would reduce the number of changes to be made after the closing of entries, although conversely it may have the opposite effect by requiring show organisers to make a number of changes within a shorter period of time.
102. However there was some concern that any issues relating to progression should not be made at present until the impact of changes already made could be assessed and it was agreed no further action should be taken at present in respect of the 25 day rule.
103. **Regulations and Judging Procedure examination:** A query was raised in respect of Regulation H19.d. which stated that 'All judges must have completed and passed an agility judges examination on The Kennel Club Academy every five years since passing the Regulations and Judging Procedure examination. This Regulation is effective from 1 January 2022.' It was confirmed that the seminar and the examination were both available online free of charge, and that opportunities to take the examination had not been affected by the lack of classroom-based seminars. For this reason there were no plans to extend the current deadline beyond 1 January 2022 and judges were reminded of the necessity for them to ensure that they complied with the requirements of the Regulation.



104. It was also noted that for existing judges there was no requirement for them to attend the practical seminar, which was only available in a physical setting rather than in an online format.

Recognition of agility as a sport

105. It was highlighted that had agility been officially recognised as a sport, there may have been opportunities to claim for government grants to support it through the Covid-19 pandemic, and a brief discussion took place as to whether a further attempt to gain recognition should be made. However it was highlighted that two unsuccessful attempts had already been made, and that there had been no change in circumstances which was likely to result in a successful application being made.

Results database

106. The Council was advised that this issue remained ongoing, but would not be progressed in the foreseeable future due to other priorities relating to the Kennel Club's Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system.

Mrs Croxford

107. Mrs Croxford announced her intention not to stand for re-election as a member of the Council next year.

## **ITEM 14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

108. The Council's next meeting would take place on 8 July 2021. Any items for the agenda must be submitted by 9 April 2021.

**The meeting closed at 2.20 pm**

**MR M CAVILL**  
**Chairman**

**THE KENNEL CLUB'S MISSION STATEMENT**

**'The Kennel Club is the national body which exists to promote the general improvement, health and well-being of all dogs through responsible breeding and ownership'**



**Annex A to the minutes**

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
<b>Grading Panel</b>								
Evaluate								
Review Date						July		
Discussions					Dates moved due to lack of shows and data		January	
Proposal	April						April	
ALC Recommendation	July						July	
Activities Committee	September						September	
Implementation (if required)		January						January
<b>Equipment Panel</b>								
Evaluate								
Review Date					July			July
Discussions					Dates moved due to lack of competitions	January		
Proposal	April					April		
ALC Recommendation	July					July		
Activities Committee	September					September		
Implementation (if required)			January				January	
<b>Rule / Regulations /Governance</b>								
Evaluate								
Review Date			January			July		
Discussions			February			August		
Proposal			April			October		
ALC Recommendation			July			January		
Activities Committee			September			March		
Implementation (if required)				January			January	



## THE KENNEL CLUB

<b>Judging Panel</b>								
Evaluate								
Review Date		July			July		July	
Discussions	February		January		Dates moved due to lack of shows and data	January		January
Proposal	April		April			April		April
ALC Recommendation	July		July			July		July
Activities Committee			September			September		September
Implementation (if required)				January			January	

Mar-21