

**MINUTES OF THE KENNEL CLUB AGILITY LIAISON COUNCIL MEETING**  
**HELD ON 17 JULY 2014**

**PRESENT:**

Mrs Y Croxford	Midlands
Mrs J Gardner	Midlands
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
Mrs A Mitchell	Committee Secretary, Working Dog Activities Team

**IN THE CHAIR:                      Miss L Olden**

**ITEM 1.        APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1. Apologies for absence had been received from Miss J Lewis.

**ITEM 2.        APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

2. The minutes of the meeting held on 22 January 2014 were signed by the Chairman as an accurate record.

**ITEM 3.        ASSURED BREEDER SCHEME PRESENTATION**

3. The Council received a presentation by Mr B Lambert, Health and Breeder Services Manager, on the progress of the Assured Breeder Scheme.

**ITEM 4.        MATTERS ARISING/RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amendments to Regulations

4. The Council noted that at its meeting on 15 April 2014, the General Committee approved the following changes to the regulations, with effect from 1 January 2015:

- i. Amendment to Regulation H18.a. (Approval of Judges) – to allow individuals to apply for approval to award Championship Agility Certificates, without having been nominated by a Championship society first.
- ii. Amendment to Regulation H(1)(B)3 (Obstacles) – definition of approved obstacles.
- iii. Amendment to Regulation H(1)2 – definition of Agility.

#### Agility Equipment Specifications

5. The Council noted that the Activities Sub-Committee had approved the specimen letter which may be used by show societies for their contracts with equipment suppliers to ensure that agility equipment would meet the correct specifications in line with the Kennel Club 'H' Regulations. The document was now available to download from the Kennel Club website.

#### Recognition of Agility as a Sport

6. The Activities Sub-Committee had supported the Council's request that the Sports Council be approached once again to request the eligibility criteria for official recognition of agility as a sport so that the option could be considered in the future. It was acknowledged that progression of such an application would involve a great deal of work, but the Sub-Committee was of the view that it would be worthwhile. The Council noted that a report would be produced once feedback had been received from the Sports Council.

#### Registered Clubs - Formation of Working Party

7. In response to the Council's request to form a Working Party whose remit would be to try to improve protection for registered clubs and develop incentives for competitors to support these clubs, the Sub-Committee had requested a more detailed proposal in respect of the remit and funding of the proposed Working Party. It was clarified that a Working Party was defined as being an official group, funded by the Kennel Club and with minutes taken by the office.
8. The Sub-Committee was of the view that registered clubs must address problems themselves and the Council agreed that there was little that could be done by the Kennel Club.
9. It was noted that private training clubs had some advantages over registered clubs in that they could often offer more flexibility which was attractive to handlers. However, the cost of attending a registered club was generally lower which made them attractive to those with several dogs. It was highlighted that registered clubs had the option of publicising their services in order to attract new members.
10. One major issue was that of a number of registered clubs ceasing to run shows. Others were continuing to run shows but were facing financial difficulties due to reduced entries as a result of competing shows. The Council discussed the possibility of introducing a new regulation which would prevent two shows from being held in the same area on the same day. The office confirmed that no such regulation currently existed but that market forces were allowed to apply. However a formal proposal could be considered at the next meeting of the Council.

11. The Council was of the view that the Kennel Club should address the issue of shows being run on a commercialised basis and the effect on shows run by registered clubs. It was noted that many Listed Status clubs were running shows, and a suggestion was made that only registered clubs should be allowed to do so. It was acknowledged however that this would be a backward step and the suggestion was not supported.
12. It was noted that some research and discussion had been carried out by members of the Council following its previous meeting but no proposals had been forthcoming as a result. Those who had carried out the research were thanked for their efforts. However it was decided not to proceed with the formation of a Working Party.

#### Development of Kennel Club Agility – Formation of Working Party

13. The Sub-Committee had considered the Council's request for formation of a Working Party whose remit would be to develop a business case for a results database. The Sub-Committee considered that the same comments applied as to the request for a Working Party to discuss the role of registered clubs, and requested a more detailed proposal in respect of the remit and funding of the proposed Working Party.
14. It was agreed that Mrs Baltes, Mr Cavill, Mrs Croxford and Mrs Gardner would prepare a paper for submission to the Sub-Committee, noting that the development of a results database would be a significant project and would require adequate resources.

#### Standard Class Equipment – Mr M Bacon

15. At its meeting in January 2014, the Council discussed the issue of the Weaving Poles and some contact equipment sometimes being omitted in standard classes, and considered the possibility of enforcing their use in order to ensure that dogs were required to negotiate more challenging obstacles before being able to progress through the higher grades. Mr Bacon had prepared a proposal, as requested by the Council, for further consideration, which was presented by Mr Huckle. Mr Chandler proposed the amendment which was seconded by Mr Cavill.
16. It was noted that some indoor venues did not allow pegging or staking of equipment but it was accepted that it was possible to obtain equipment which did not require pegging.
17. It was unclear as to whether there had been a previous regulation stating that two pieces of contact equipment had to be used in a standard Agility class. The office agreed to ask the Library to check, but it was accepted that it would be preferable to frame the regulation to state that a standard Agility class should contain all three items of contact equipment.
18. It was noted that the proposed amendment allowed for compulsory equipment to be omitted in the event of mitigating circumstances which would allow the judge to use his or her discretion in the case of, for example, extreme weather conditions.

19. A vote took place and the Council **recommended** by a majority approval of the following amendment:

Regulation H(1)(A)4.

**TO:**

Standard classes may be scheduled for Agility Shows, as Agility classes or Jumping classes. ~~Agility classes to include contact obstacles and Jumping classes when there are no contact obstacles.~~ All standard classes must contain the Weaving Poles obstacle. Standard Agility classes must contain the following elements: "A Ramp", Dog Walk and See-Saw. In the event of mitigating circumstances (i.e. adverse weather conditions) at a show a Judge, with the full agreement of the Competition Manager, may alter the compulsory equipment as deemed appropriate at the time. Any alteration to the equipment must be reported by the show management to the Kennel Club within 14 days of the date of the show. With this proviso classes are defined as follows:

(Amendments underlined)

Minimum Ring Sizes for Indoor Shows – Mrs J Gardner & Mr J Gilbert

20. Further to the Council's meeting in January 2014, Mrs Gardner and Mr Gilbert requested that it discuss the matter of ring sizes for indoor venues. However research carried out prior to the meeting had indicated little support from other members of the Council for a minimum ring size to be specified.
21. It was agreed that if a minimum ring size was specified, it may be necessary for clubs to reduce the width of walkways which could present a health and safety issue. In addition, such a regulation may force clubs to abandon their existing venues in order to find larger ones. The difficulty of finding suitable venues was acknowledged, and it was agreed that it would not be desirable to place such a burden on clubs.
22. It was accepted that clubs should ensure that rings were of adequate size to fit in all the equipment but that no change to regulations was necessary.

Measuring

23. At the Council's meeting in January 2013 it had been agreed that the office would undertake a review of measuring but it was noted that due to staff shortages this had not as yet taken place.
24. It was agreed that a thorough review was essential and all present were asked to give the issue consideration and to advise the office with suggestions which would be collated and, in due course, presented to the Activities Sub-Committee. It was noted that the Sub-Committee would not allow advertising for more measurers to take place until the review had been carried out.
25. One suggestion was that the measuring process should be redefined as being categorisation rather than measuring, as the main objective of the process was not to record the height of the dog but to place it into the small, medium or large category.
26. It was noted that a list of measurers was available from the Kennel Club website but that it may contain names of measurers who were no longer active. It was confirmed

that the list was under review and that measurers would be contacted by the office to check whether they wished their names to remain on the list.

## **ITEM 5. ACTIVITIES HEALTH AND WELFARE SUB-GROUP**

27. The Council noted a verbal report from Mr S Croxford on the progress of the Activities Health and Welfare Sub-Group following a meeting on 21 March 2014.

### Minimum distances between jumps

28. The meeting was joined by Mr S Croxford and Mr G Doyle representing the Activities Health and Welfare Sub-Group. It was explained that the Sub-Group reported directly to the Dog Health Group but received guidance on the prioritisation of issues under investigation from the Activities Sub-Committee. The Sub-Group objectives were quite broad and extended to examining health and welfare issues relating to Obedience, Agility, Rally, Heelwork to Music, and Working Trials. Amongst a number of issues currently under consideration, the Sub-Group had been asked to prioritise the issue of dogs jumping as an area which merited investigation. As part of research into this subject a study was carried out on behalf of the Activities Health and Welfare Sub-Group at the Kennel Club International Agility Festival in 2013.
29. This particular piece of research had looked specifically at the spacing between jumps. Data had been collected on how dogs jumped obstacles placed at different distances (3.6m, 4m, and 5m) apart, and the results analysed.
30. The Council received a presentation from Mr Doyle on the initial findings of this specific research. The results of the study were to be presented to a Canine Science conference in July 2014. As the information will be in the public domain it was felt that the Council should be aware of the content. The findings of the research will be presented to the agility community in an appropriate format in due course.
31. Mr Doyle explained that the research represented a small but important piece of work. A small number of studies had been undertaken previously by other research groups but had been carried out on small numbers of dogs (11 and 9) and had taken place in unfamiliar environments for the dogs taking part. The research at the International Agility Festival had included 95 dogs which had been assessed in a competition environment with which they were familiar and comfortable.
32. Initial analysis of the resulting data focusing upon the 59 large dogs had been carried out. Further analysis of medium and small dogs was ongoing.
33. The analysis undertaken in respect of large dogs had suggested that where the jumps were placed further apart, the dogs tended, on average, to jump over a longer distance, taking off earlier and landing later. As a result the dog's trajectory was flatter as the distance between jumps increased. This means that they were landing at a less steep angle, approximating a more glancing impact, than a direct impact, which would lessen the impact force of landing. Further analysis of these results was ongoing.

34. Additionally, the neck, shoulder and back angles were evaluated at take-off and landing. It was found that dogs have a more acute neck angle during take-off and landing when obstacles are closer together. Also, dogs have a more acute back angle when landing over obstacles that are closer together. For example there was an average increase of 24 degrees in neck angle when landing after 3.6m, compared to a 5.0 m spacing. This meant that the head was moved backwards towards the back by a large amount. It was stressed that the results were averages and that there were variations in the results for individual dogs.
35. It was noted that the research confirmed that the neck and back angles were different, but did not confirm any potential effect on the dog, harmful or otherwise, as this had not been in the scope of the research. It was however suggested that a more extreme angle had the potential to put the dog into a non-optimal position. It was emphasised that the information obtained from the research should be applied with care, however it was probably possible to say that extreme neck angles were not desirable. Other implications of modifying the distance between jumps remained unknown.
36. The research had indicated that experienced dogs tended to jump longer.
37. It was noted that there was a possibility that increasing distances between jumps could result in a dog moving more quickly, with a potential health issue where the dog was required to decelerate or turn for the next obstacle. However, research had not been carried out which could specifically confirm this.
38. It was acknowledged that jumping was a complex skill involving a wide range of factors and that caution should be applied when making assumptions based on limited information. It was accepted that many dogs competing in agility were collies or collie crosses, and that therefore much of the analysis had been carried out on such dogs, although other breeds were also included in the research. However, a wide range of breeds took part in competitive agility and it would be important to consider the implications of variations in the height, weight and conformation of different dogs.
39. The Council discussed the findings of the research and concluded that there was insufficient evidence at this stage to recommend a change of regulation in terms of the minimum distances between jumps. However it looked forward to receiving further information in due course.
40. It was accepted that judges were free to design courses using a 5m distance between jumps without any regulation change being made, should they wish to do so.
41. A query was raised as to whether there were any plans to carry out research into jump heights. It was noted that the research presented to the Council had originated as a result of discussions regarding the way in which dogs actually jumped, and whether they would jump differently at different heights. The Activities Health and Welfare Sub-Group had plans to investigate this issue further but it was emphasised that it would be essential to carry out any such research with care and that caution should be applied in setting up new research. Every study had faults and limitations and it was not possible to completely avoid these. For example, it may be problematic to obtain consistent results from a dog required to jump over heights with which it was not familiar or experienced.

42. The Activities Health and Welfare Sub-Group would continue to investigate this and other issues prioritised for it by the Activities Sub-Committee, and was working to an agreed timetable.
43. As part of the ongoing programme of research studies into the subject of jump heights it was noted that a grant of £7000 had been secured from the Kennel Club Charitable Trust for further research into jump heights to be carried out by the Royal Veterinary College.
44. Mr Croxford emphasised that the objective of the Sub-Group was to review scientific evidence relating to the welfare of dogs involved in sporting activities, but that so far only small steps had been taken. However, the research was ongoing.
45. It was accepted that ongoing research would provide objective and unbiased data but would not in itself provide specific answers. It would be a matter for the Council and the Activities Sub-Committee to draw conclusions and make decisions based on the information provided from the research.
46. It was acknowledged that funding would be required for any ongoing research. The Council noted that Mr Doyle and his colleagues (Dr Boyd, Dr Pullen, Miss Birch) had carried out a great deal of work in their own time and using their own resources. The Council wished to express its gratitude for this but accepted that in the longer term it would not be tenable for this group to continue with their research without adequate resources and support. It was acknowledged that it would be necessary to present a strong business case to the Kennel Club for the necessary funding. Mr Croxford explained that the business case would need the support and approval of the General Committee of the Kennel Club.
47. A suggestion was made regarding the possibility of obtaining funding from the agility community and those present were requested to give thought to the matter. It was explained that funding further research supported by the Kennel Club might be made easier if the Agility community was also seen to be supporting it financially. If financial support could be generated in this way it might be possible to make an application to the Kennel Club Legacy Fund for matched funding. Commercial sponsorship would also be a potential source of funding but it was acknowledged that it would take time and effort to generate it.
48. Mr Croxford stated that he would welcome any suggestions from members of the Council to assist the furtherance of research.
49. It was noted that the initial findings of the research were being presented at a scientific conference and would therefore be in the public domain. However it was essential that the findings were presented to the agility community in an appropriate format and that this would be made available in due course.
50. Mr Croxford and Mr Doyle were thanked for their presentation. The Council was appreciative of the amount of work that had gone into it. The Council also wished to express its support in the strongest terms for the work of the Activities Health and Welfare Sub-Committee, and for the continuance of scientific research.

Sand and paint surfaces

51. The Council was requested to consider whether a sand and paint surface was still acceptable or whether all contact equipment should have rubberised surfaces. The Sub-Group had noted that a sand and paint surface was still used by some clubs but this was becoming less common, and that many dogs were now used to rubberised surfaces.
52. The Council was of the view that although it was preferable for a rubberised surface to be used at shows, it should not be compulsory and it did not consider that any change to regulations was required.

Dimensions of dog walk and see-saw

53. The Sub-Group had noted that at present the regulations did not specify a fixed width for the dog walk or the see-saw and that this may be between 10 inches and 12 inches. The Council was requested to consider whether it wished to set a standardised width for both obstacles.
54. The Council was not against the introduction of a fixed width for the dog walk and the see-saw but did not consider there was a necessity for any amendment to regulations at present.

**ITEM 6. FIVE YEAR STRATEGY**

55. The Council noted that the Activities Sub-Committee agreed with the principle of establishing an Equipment Panel to liaise with manufacturers and suppliers of agility equipment, and to address any concerns. Consideration was given as to who should sit on the Equipment Panel and what its future responsibilities and objectives should be.
56. There was some discussion as to whether it would be desirable for a representative of one of the equipment manufacturers to sit on the Equipment Panel, with the representative being appointed each year from a different manufacturer, to ensure fairness. There was a view that such a representative would have good information on developments such as new materials and designs which would provide a useful input into the work of the Panel. However, it was also considered that appointing such a representative would give one manufacturer an advantage over others for the course of the year and it was agreed that no manufacturer should be represented.
57. It was agreed that the Equipment Panel should consist of five people, all to be members of the Council, and based in different areas of the UK. It was agreed that the following people should form the Panel:

Mr M Cavill  
Mr S Chandler  
Mrs J Gardner  
Mr M Hallam  
Mr I Mallabar

58. It was noted that the Panel should seek professional advice as necessary. Its objective would be to review the introduction of new agility equipment (materials used, structure or style) and to act as a point of reference for suppliers wishing to discuss potential new innovations or developments. Any contact from manufacturers received by the Kennel Club regarding such issues would be referred to the Equipment Panel, and its recommendations would then be considered by the Activities Sub-Committee.
59. The intention was not for the Panel to be pro-active in examining issues relating to equipment or for it to investigate concerns raised by members of the public, although it may be asked to address concerns raised by members of the Council. It was not thought that it would be necessary for meetings of the Equipment Panel to be held, but that its members could communicate electronically or by telephone as necessary.

## **ITEM 7. PROPOSALS FROM SOCIETIES/PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS**

### Proposed Amendment to Regulation H(1)10.e. (Competing)

60. Mrs McShane presented the proposed amendment, which was proposed by Mr Hallam on behalf of Mrs C Keith. It was seconded by Mr Mallabar.
61. Mrs Keith wished to draw to the Council's attention the fact that there was currently no stipulation which prevented handlers carrying training aids, leads, and toys whilst the dog was under test although it was custom and practice not to do so. The regulation was currently worded to state only that food should not be carried in the hand or given to the dog in the ring.
62. The Council agreed the principle of the proposal but did not consider that the wording should allow the judge discretion to allow food or toys in the ring, however it did wish to make allowance for those handlers requiring the use of a mobility aid.
63. A revised amendment as follows was proposed by Mr Gilbert and seconded by Mr Chandler, and was **recommended** for approval:

### Regulation H(1)10.e. (Competing)

#### **TO:**

Food shall not Except for mobility aids, nothing shall be carried in the hand or while the dog is under test and food shall not be given to a dog whilst in the ring - elimination.

(Amendments underlined)

64. It was noted that at Limited Shows, in Special Classes, silent toys may be carried. It was agreed that the office would formulate an equivalent amendment to Regulation H(1)(D)9.e. for consideration by the Activities Sub-Committee.

### Proposed insertion of new Regulation H(1)(B)5.(22)(Marking)

65. Mrs McShane proposed the amendment on behalf of Mrs C Keith. The proposal was seconded by Mr Mallabar. There was currently no regulation which prevented handlers traversing over, under or through any piece of equipment. Mrs Keith suggested that the amendment was required to ensure that there was better clarification for judges and in the interests of health and safety for both the dog and

handler. Mrs Keith's view was also that the insertion would also ensure better consistency in judging practice.

66. The Council noted that putting a hand through the weaves, for example, to assist a dog, was not considered to be traversing.
67. It supported the proposal and by a unanimous vote, **recommended** approval of the following amendment:

Insertion of new Regulation H(1)(B)5.(22)(Marking)

**INSERT:**

Handler traverses over, under or through any piece of equipment – elimination.  
(Insertion underlined)

Proposed Insertion of new Regulation H(1)(B)1.a.(9) (Courses)

68. Mr Huckle proposed an amendment to the above Regulation on behalf of Mrs Rawstorne, who was of the view that jump poles of a single colour tended to blend in with the background making it difficult for the dog to adjust its depth perception when attempting to negotiate the hurdle. This had led to a concern that as a result some dogs were not able to assess the position of the obstacle correctly and were consequently at risk of injury. Mrs Rawstorne suggested that if the poles were of two contrasting colours this would assist the dogs' ability to perceive the depth and placement of the obstacle and would thus prevent potential injuries to dogs.
69. The Council noted the contents of a paper provided by Mr Croxford on behalf of the Activities Health & Welfare Sub-Group on this issue, for which he was thanked. It accepted that there was no evidence to draw a conclusion as to whether colour or contrast was relevant to the ability of a dog to perceive an obstacle clearly. The proposal was not seconded and therefore no amendment to the Regulations was recommended at this stage, however it was agreed that the issue should be referred to the Activities Health and Welfare Group for further advice.

## **ITEM 8. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Obstacle Positioning within Course Design – Mrs D Hedger

70. Mrs Hedger, an individual, had requested that the Council discuss the positioning of obstacles preceding contact equipment which could cause the dog to ascend the piece of equipment at an angle. Mrs Hedger considered that it had become an area of concern for many competitors, especially since the introduction of rubberised contact surfaces where it was perceived to be safer to have angled approaches towards contact equipment because the dogs had a better grip.
71. It was accepted that the issue of the placing of obstacles was already covered in the judging education programme and the Council reiterated that this would continue to be the case. Should competitors have concerns regarding the safety of a course such concerns should be reported to the show management. If the matter is not resolved then it should be noted in the Incident Book and further investigations carried out by the Kennel Club if necessary.

72. The Council was not of the view that there was a necessity for a change of regulation regarding the positioning of obstacles.

Review of Equipment Manufacturers and Suppliers – Mrs D Hedger

73. The Council was requested by Mrs Hedger to discuss the possibility of regulating the safety and design of agility equipment supplied by equipment manufacturers. Mrs Hedger's dog had fallen from the dog walk and was caught under the hind leg by one of the securing nuts, resulting in the dog undergoing soft tissue surgery. The Council noted the circumstances of the accident and agreed that the matter should be referred to the Equipment Panel for review.

Restricting Grades within Combined Classes – Mr K Smith

74. Mr Smith, an individual, requested that the Council discuss the possibility of restricting standard combined classes to a maximum of four grades. It was his view that a standard combined 1-7 class caused difficulties for the judge in setting a course design appropriate for the level of test, and that it was also difficult to set an appropriate course time that would be effective for dogs in both the lower and higher grades.
75. The Council discussed the suggestion but was not of the view that there was any issue arising from combined classes, and it did not consider that there was any necessity for restrictions to be placed on the number of grades which could be included in a combined class.

**ITEM 9. INTERNATIONAL AGILITY FESTIVAL**

76. The Council noted a report on the arrangements for the Kennel Club International Agility Festival, due to be held on 7-10 August 2014.
77. The Council noted that the number of entries for the Large Championship class had exceeded the number allowed for any one judge in a day. The Sub-Committee had agreed to the appointment of a separate judge for the large Jumping class as it was considered to be an exceptional situation. It was accepted that a judge accepting an appointment to judge a Jumping class under such circumstances would remain eligible to award Agility Certificates later in the year.
78. The Council's views were requested on the wider issue of the numbers of dogs competing in a Championship class. After a brief discussion it was agreed that a formal proposal to cover this issue in the future would be brought for consideration at the next meeting of the Council.
79. The Council acknowledged that there were a high number of dogs reaching Grade 7 resulting in high entries in Championship classes.
80. It was noted that this was a complex issue meriting detailed consideration and it was agreed that the matter should be discussed further at the next meeting of the Council when any further suggestions could be considered.

## **ITEM 10. INTERNATIONAL AGILITY**

81. The Council noted a written report from Mr Laker on the Performance Weekend held on 26 and 27 April 2014.
82. The Council wished to note its support for the work Mr Laker was doing in managing the British team, and wished the team luck for the forthcoming International events.

## **ITEM 11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### Hazardous equipment

83. A concern was raised in respect of the change in Regulations regarding the see-saw and whether this piece of equipment, even when conforming to the Kennel Club's requirements, could potentially become hazardous in adverse weather conditions, for example, lifting in a high wind. It was noted that all equipment should be fit for purpose. Competitors concerned about safety issues should log their concerns in the show's incident book and if necessary any such issues could be referred to the Equipment Panel for further consideration.

### Running under a judge appointed in an emergency

84. A situation had arisen at a show where the services of a reserve judge, who had not been named in the schedule, were required. The partner of the judge had been advised that he could not run his dog in the class being judged by his partner. It was confirmed that this was incorrect and that in the case of a judge appointed in an emergency, it was permissible for a dog to be handled by the judge's partner or by a family member.

### Water jump

85. The Council was requested to consider the issue of a water jump which had caused concern to a competitor at a show. The jump included a large 'W' shape at either side and there was some concern that this could be hazardous for a dog which failed to negotiate the jump correctly and could be injured by the 'W'. The Council did not recommend that any action be taken.

### Weave poles

86. A query was received as to whether it should be mandatory at shows for twelve weave poles to be used at all times rather than six, in the interests of consistency and of ensuring that dogs progressing through the classes were capable of negotiating twelve weaves. It was agreed that the matter could be discussed at the Council's next meeting, either as a firm proposal or as a discussion item.

### Collapsible tunnel

87. The collapsible tunnel was discussed in the light of concerns that dogs were exiting from it with heads wrenched back, falling over and twisted, and that this represented a health and welfare issue. It was agreed that there were two areas of the collapsible tunnel which should be considered, the width of the entrance and the length of the tunnel and the cloth. Mrs Croxford agreed to formulate a formal proposal for consideration at the Council's next meeting.

Training in the ring

88. It was noted that at a recent show a judge had allowed people to train their dogs in the ring. It was highlighted that although this had not taken an excessive amount of time, it was nonetheless demonstrating a lack of respect for judges and the other competitors. It was clarified that all competitors were expected to attempt the course.

**ITEM 12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

89. The date of the next meeting would be advised in September.
90. There being no further matters to discuss the meeting closed at 15.05 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](mailto:olwynmcshane@googlemail.com)

**NORTHERN IRELAND**

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

**WALES**

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

**NORTH WEST**

Mrs Pauline Baltes, 45 Well Orchard, Bamber Bridge, Preston, Lancs, PR5 8HJ  
Tel: 01772 494852 / 07803 261808 E-mail: [pabq@blueyonder.co.uk](mailto:pabq@blueyonder.co.uk)

Mr Mike Hallam, Hollins View, Leek Road, Bosley, Macclesfield, SK11 0PP  
Tel: 01260 223190 / 07711 058910 E-mail: [m.hallam@btconnect.com](mailto:m.hallam@btconnect.com)

**NORTH EAST**

Mr Ian Mallabar, Evenwood House, Low Westwood, NE17 7PZ  
Tel: 01207 565774 E-mail: [ian.mallabar@btinternet.com](mailto: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](mailto:freymordogs@yahoo.co.uk)

**MIDLANDS**

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

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

**SOUTH & SOUTH WEST**

Mr Chris Huckle, Kingswold, Glenmore, Roborough, Devon, EX19 8TE  
Tel: 01769 560190 Email: [chris.huckle@kingswold.com](mailto: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](mailto:lesleysolden@btinternet.com)