



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE AGILITY LIAISON COUNCIL HELD ON  
THURSDAY 4 JULY 2024 AT 10.30AM IN THE BOARDROOM, CLARGES  
STREET**

**PRESENT**

Ms J Bale	South East/East Anglia
Ms T Davies*	North East
Mr A Dornford-Smith	Northern Ireland
Mrs J Gardner	Midlands
Mr J Hallam	South/South West
Mr M Hallam	North West
Ms S Hawkswell*	Scotland
Mrs E Laing-Kay*	North East
Mrs S Robinson*	Wales (Up to paragraph 74)
Miss R Sargent	North West (From paragraph 59)
Mr M Tait*	South/South West
Ms D Tedds	Midlands

\* Denotes attendance on Teams.

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Miss D Deuchar	Head of Canine Activities
Miss C McHardy	Manager – Education, Training, and Working Dog Activities Team
Ms R Mansfield	Committee Secretary – Working Dog Activities Team
Ms H Byrne-Ingle	Administrator – Working Dog Activities Team

**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.**

**IN THE CHAIR      MR M HALLAM**

**ITEM 1.      APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1. Apologies had been received from Mrs E Bostock.

**ITEM 2.      APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2. Ms Bale expressed confusion over whether it had been decided whether 'half-and-half' tunnels could or could not be used. The minutes stated that the 'half-and-half' tunnels could not be used but Ms Bale felt that the minutes should be changed to say, 'should not be used' as a phasing out period had been agreed. However, it was clarified that what was in the minutes was what had been said at the meeting and could not be amended in the minutes. Ms Bale accepted the decision and requested that it be made clear that those types of tunnels should be phased out as soon as possible. It was also noted that the regulations would be changing from 1 January 2025, and the 'half-and-half' tunnels would not be permissible.
3. No other comments were made, and the minutes of the meetings held on 18 January 2024 and 22 February 2024 were approved as an accurate record.

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

4. The Council noted that the Board, at its meeting on 8 May 2024, approved the following amendments to H Regulations:

Regulation H(1)(B)3.c

**TO:**

Rising Spread Jump – A maximum of 2 single jumps as in item a-(Hurdle) placed together to form a double spread, there must be no more than 2 elements to this obstacle. The top bar on the first hurdle must be 400mm for Large Dogs, 300mm for Intermediate Dogs, 300mm for Medium Dogs and 200mm for Small Dogs. The maximum spread to be: Large Dogs – 550mm, Intermediate Dogs – 475mm, Medium Dogs – 400mm, Small Dogs – 300mm. There must be only one pole on each hurdle. The feet of the side supports (wings) should not be interlocking but touching and must not be out of line by more than 75mm.

**The back pole must be 1.5m in length. The front pole must be 1.4m in length.**

(Insertion in bold)

(Effective 1 January 2025)

Regulation H(1)(B)3.i

**TO:**

Pipe Tunnel – This obstacle ~~should~~ **must** have a diameter ~~of a minimum~~ of 600mm and ~~should~~ **must** be a minimum of 3m in length. The tunnel may only curve in a single direction. **The inner surface of the tunnel must have the same finish throughout.**

(Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold)

(Effective 1 January 2025)

Regulation H(1)(B)3.j

**TO:**

Weaving Poles – The number of poles should be six or twelve. 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 of 35mm. 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.

**The base must be of a rigid construction and poles must be made from a plastic pipe.**

(Insertion in bold)

(Effective 1 January 2025)

Regulation H(1)11.e

**TO:**

e. Except for mobility aids, nothing shall be carried in the hand while the dog is under test and food shall not be **carried in the hand or** given to a dog whilst in the ring. Competitors are prohibited from wearing bags or leads whilst under test – elimination.

(Insertion in bold)

(Effective 1 January 2025)

Regulation H(1)(D)9.e

**TO:**

e. Silent toys may be used in the ring, at the discretion of the organisers, but must be used with consideration for other competitors. Except for mobility aids or silent toys, nothing shall be carried in the hand while the dog is under test and food shall not be **carried in the hand or** given to a dog whilst in the ring – elimination.

(Insertion in bold)

(Effective 1 January 2025)

Code of Best Practice for Agility Judges and Stewards and Guide to Agility Equipment

5. The Council noted that the above document had been completed and was now available on The Kennel Club website: <https://kc-media-production.azureedge.net/media/mvvotg44/wt94-code-of-best-practice-for-agility-judges-and-stewards-2024-1.pdf>

Competition Manager's role

6. The Council noted that the proposed regulations for the role of competition manager recommended by the Activities Committee had been approved at the Board's meeting on 8 May 2024. Additionally, references to competition manager in the regulations had been changed to show manager as that was the more commonly used terminology.

Amendment to Regulation H(1)10.e

**TO:**

**e. The society shall appoint a Show Manager whose name must be announced in the schedule, and who** ~~The competition manager~~ must not enter for competition a dog which is recorded in their ownership or part ownership or work a dog at the agility show.

**The person appointed must be aware of their responsibilities as laid out in the Instructions as to the Duties of Agility Show Managers Annex.**

(Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold.)

(Effective 1 January 2025)

New Annex H(1)(E)

**TO:**

**INSTRUCTIONS AS TO THE DUTIES OF AGILITY SHOW MANAGERS**

**1. Experiences and Qualifications**

The Show Manager should have a sound knowledge of the Kennel Club Rules and H Regulations.

**2. Responsibilities**

- a. To ensure that competitors and judges abide by the Kennel Club Rules and H Regulations.
- b. To act as decision maker in all matters relating to the Kennel Club Rules and H Regulations for the duration of the show.
- c. To fully document all decisions and actions taken in relation to the H Regulations in the show's Kennel Club Incident Book.
- d. To support the show management team in the smooth running of the show.

**3. Duties**

- a. In the event of extreme adverse weather conditions at a show a judge, with the full agreement of the Show Manager, may omit any compulsory equipment as deemed appropriate at the time. Any alterations must be recorded in the show's Kennel Club Incident Book and be reported, by the show management, to the Kennel Club within 14 days of the date of the show.
- b. Should a judge be prevented from completing a class which has already started, the Show Manager shall decide what action is to be taken. Guidance is covered in the Code of Best Practice for Agility Judges and Stewards.
- c. The Show Manager in conjunction with the show management must act to remove a dog from the show under the conditions of the Removal of Dogs from Competition Regulation.
- d. If there are any concerns over the suitability of a course the Show Manager must consult with the relevant judge, and if available Accredited Trainers, and agree the proposed course of action
- e. Any complaints or matters arising at the show should be referred, in the first instance to the Show Manager, who may consult with other members of the show management before taking appropriate action. All incidents, even if they are resolved on the day of the show, must be recorded in the Kennel Club Incident Book and be

**reported, by the show management, to the Kennel Club within 14 days of the date of the show.**

(Insertion in bold.)

(Effective 1 January 2025)

H9.c.(1)

**TO:**

On the front cover or title page, the name of the society, the type, venue and date of the Show as described on the licence and any additional title for which prior permission has been given by the Board of the Kennel Club; the secretary's name, a contact address and telephone number and the name of the ~~competition~~ **show** manager, and the date of closing of entries.

(Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold.)

(Effective 1 January 2025)

H24

**TO:**

In the absence of any agreement to the contrary, the liability of the sponsor(s) for any class or classes at an agility show shall be limited to making good any deficiency between entry fees received and any prize money paid out. The ~~competition~~ **show** manager must intimate the amount of sponsorship due within one calendar month of the close of the competition and the sponsor(s) must pay this amount within 14 days of receipt of such notice. If the sponsorship is not paid within the specified time the ~~competition~~ **show** manager must report the matter to the Kennel Club.

(Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold.)

(Effective 1 January 2025)

H(1)5.a.

**TO:**

**5. Marked running orders Championship Class** – The show society must publish a marked running order containing the following:-

- a. On the front outside cover or title page, the name of the society, the type, venue and date of the show as described on the licence and any additional title for which prior permission has been given by the Board of the Kennel Club; the secretary's name, a contact address and telephone number and the name of the ~~competition~~ **show** manager.

(Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold.)

(Effective 1 January 2025)

H(1)(A)4.

**TO:**

4. Standard classes may be scheduled for agility shows, as agility classes or jumping classes. All standard classes must contain the weaving poles obstacle. Standard agility classes must contain the following elements: 'A Frame', 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~~ **show** manager, may omit any item of compulsory equipment as deemed appropriate at the time. Any omission from 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:  
(Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold.)  
(Effective 1 January 2025)

H(1)(B)1.a.(2)(iv)

**TO:**

(iv) In the event of extreme adverse weather conditions at a show a judge, with the full agreement of the ~~Competition~~ **Show** Manager, may omit any compulsory equipment as deemed appropriate at the time. Any omission to the equipment must be reported by the show management to the Kennel Club within 14 days of the date of the show.  
(Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold.)  
(Effective 1 January 2025)

7. It was noted that due to the change of wording in the regulations from 'competition manager' to 'show manager' to reflect the more commonly used title, the Code of Best Practice for Agility Judges and Stewards and Guide to Agility Equipment would need to be amended. The office would action that along with the regular end of year updates.

#### Collapsible Poles

8. At its last meeting the Council had noted that the Equipment Panel had recommended the collapsible poles available from Performance Agility and Galican for approval.
9. The Council had recommended a trial period for the new equipment to ensure there were no unforeseen issues and had put the suggestion forward to the Activities Committee for its views.
10. The Activities Committee had agreed a trial period and had recommended that the collapsible poles only be used on the back jump of the rising spread obstacle. The Committee's recommendation was approved by the Board at its meeting on 8 May 2024.  
(**Afternote:** A post had been issued on The Kennel Club's agility Facebook page, after the meeting, to inform the agility community of the trial period.)

#### Special Events

11. At its last meeting the Council discussed special events and the lack of clarity around when permission to hold a special event should be applied for. It was agreed that there was some confusion over the regulation and had agreed to put the matter to the Activities Committee for review.
12. The Council noted that the Activities Committee discussed the matter at its meeting held on 21 March 2024 which agreed that wording to clarify the regulation was required. Proposed amendments were submitted to its meeting on 19 June 2024 and would be considered by the Board at its meeting on 16 July 2024.

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

13. The Council had not received a report from Mr Tait following the Sub-Group's meeting on 25 April 2024, as he had not been able to attend the meeting. However, Mr Tait informed the Council that the Sub-Group had been disbanded and incorporated into a new health group called the Health Advisory Group (HAG).
14. The new group would provide advice on policies, activities, and operations where dog health or welfare was affected and would provide oversight for the promotion of dog health. Mr Tait would be part of the Expert Panel Reference Group and would be consulted on topics related to agility.
15. It was queried whether the HAG would continue with existing areas of research which had been requested by the Council. The office was unsure what the process would be for ongoing work as the new group was not under its remit, but the Group would have sight of past minutes of the AHWSG.

**ITEM 5. REPORT FROM THE EQUIPMENT PANEL**

16. The Council noted the report from the Equipment Panel. Mrs Bale explained that the panel had not been in receipt of many equipment incident report forms and that was an area for improvement. Discussions had been held with the office about putting the form online and it was hoped that could be actioned quickly.
17. Equipment reports received via the incident book in the office had been provided to the Equipment Panel for review and the office was thanked for its commitment to doing so in a timely manner. Incidents were reviewed by the panel and a summary of actions taken was sent back to the office for each one.
18. Common themes noted were tunnel securing during the beginning of the competing season, mostly due to the wet weather but it had been noted that judges had done their best to peg the tunnels effectively. It was raised again that it would be useful to have a document available with hired equipment on the correct way to set up the equipment and the Equipment Panel had it as an action to make the request of the equipment suppliers to provide one.
19. It was noted that not all clubs used equipment suppliers and used their own equipment, particularly in Northern Ireland, and as such more thought was needed on how to include those clubs in the communications to suppliers. It was agreed that Mr Dornford-Smith would be included in emails around any equipment issues so he could disseminate them to Northern Ireland clubs.  
Membership of the Panel
20. Mrs Bale requested additional members to be added to the Panel in order to cover the UK more effectively.

21. The Council noted the current members of the Equipment Panel:

Mr M Hallam  
Mrs Bale  
Miss Sargent  
Mr Tait

22. It was suggested that Mr Dornford-Smith be added to the Equipment Panel to improve the service to Northern Ireland competitors and clubs. The Council agreed to the addition. It was also suggested that to cover the North of England that Ms Davies be added to the panel. The Council agreed that she would be a sensible addition.

Long Jump Proposal

23. At its last meeting, the Council discussed additional wording for the long jump regulation to ensure the obstacle was as safe as possible for dogs. The Council agreed that the regulation should be amended in line with the recently amended wording for the wall obstacle.
24. Concerns were raised regarding the differentiation between the elements in the equipment, noting that where different colours were used, some dogs appeared to be clipping the obstacle. It was speculated that it could be due to there being less definition between sections. The Equipment Panel agreed that it should be an area for consideration but there needed to be some evidence submitted to support the investigation. However, it was requested that the regulation as proposed be discussed.
25. The Council considered the proposal and subsequently **recommended** the following regulation amendment:

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

**TO:**

Long Jump—Each unit a minimum length of 1.2m. Large Dogs - To comprise 5 units the overall length to be between 1.3m and 1.5m. The height of the front unit to be 127mm and the height of the rear unit to be 381mm. Intermediate Dogs – to comprise 4 units, the overall length to be between 1m and 1.2m. The height of the front unit to be 127mm and the height of the rear unit to be 305mm. Medium Dogs - To comprise 3 units the overall length to be between 700mm and 900mm. The height of the front unit to be 127mm and the height of the rear unit to be 229mm. Small Dogs - To comprise 2 units the overall length to be between 400mm and 600mm. The height of the front unit to be 127mm and the height of the rear unit to be 170mm. Marker poles with a minimum height of 1.2m shall be used, these should not be attached to any part of the obstacle.

**The units must be constructed of an impact-absorbing material & weighted at the base for stability. Each unit should be of uniform depth and a consistent shape.**

(Insertion in bold.)



26. It was suggested that the regulation come into effect from 1 January 2025. There was some concern that it did not give equipment suppliers long enough to make the change, but it was felt that the topic had been on the Council agenda for a while, and it should not come as a surprise that the equipment would be changing to be in line with the new wall regulation. The Council agreed that the Activities Committee should be requested to consider making the regulation effective from 1 January 2025.
27. The Council requested the Activities Judges Sub-Group to consider some guidance for judges regarding when the long jump sections were nudged together but did not fall to ensure consistency and clarity. Mrs Gardner agreed to bring it to the Sub-Group's attention.

Removal of Wishing Well & Water Jump from List of Approved Obstacles

28. The Council considered the Panel's suggestion to remove the wishing well and water jump obstacles from the list of approved obstacles at Kennel Club licensed shows. It was felt that it was a shame to lose them from the list of obstacles, but it was felt it was better for the safety of the dogs.
29. The Council **recommended** the following regulation amendments:

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

**TO:**

~~Water Jump—The overall spread should be: Large Dogs—between 1.2m and 1.5m. Intermediate Dogs—between 1m and 1.3m. Medium Dogs—between 700mm and 900mm. Small Dogs—between 400mm and 500mm. A low hurdle or brush, with a maximum height of: Large Dogs—550mm, Intermediate Dogs—450mm, Medium Dogs—350mm, Small Dogs—250mm may be placed in front of the water. Marker poles with a minimum height of 1.2m, should be placed at all 4 corners, these should not be attached to any part of the water jump. (Deletion struck through.)~~

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

**TO:**

~~Wishing Well—This obstacle will be of stable construction and will be able to be fixed to the ground. To ensure the safety of the dog, it will have no sharp edges. Should a design be utilised which involves a removable centre section then the resultant corners must be rounded or padded. It will have a roof of which the bottom will be no less than Large and Intermediate Dogs—1500mm, Medium Dogs—1220mm, Small Dogs—950mm from the ground. The roof must not project beyond the width or depth of the base. It will have a displaceable top bar the height of which will be: Large Dogs—600mm, Intermediate Dogs—500mm, Medium Dogs—400mm, Small Dogs—300mm. The minimum space from the top of the bar to the top of the base will be Large Dogs—160mm, Intermediate Dogs—155mm, Medium Dogs—150mm, Small Dogs—105mm. The overall width of the base will be between 900mm & 1400mm. The depth of the base which the dog jumps will be a maximum of Large Dogs—550mm, Intermediate Dogs—475mm, Medium Dogs—400mm, Small Dogs—300mm.~~

(Deletion struck through.)

Regulation H(1)(B)5.a.(2)

**TO:**

~~Wishing Well – a dog should be faulted if it touches the base or dislodges the pole.~~

(Deletion struck through.)

Regulation H(1)(B)5.a.(4)

**TO:**

~~Water Jump – must be cleared without contact with the water.~~

(Deletion struck through.)

### Start and Finish Gates

30. At its last meeting, the Council discussed increasing the distance at which the timing gates may be placed from the tyre, when it was used as the last obstacle, to 40cm.
31. The Council considered a proposal from the Panel to include an amended list of obstacles allowed at the finish of a course in the regulations:

Regulation H(1)(B)1.a.(7)

**TO:**

Electronic timing gates – The only obstacles allowed at the start ~~and finish~~ of a Standard Agility or Jumping Course are; Hurdle, Wall, Spread Jump, Brush Jump, Long Jump, Tyre, ~~Wishing Well~~, Pipe Tunnel.

**The only obstacles allowed at the finish of a Standard Agility or Jumping Course are; Hurdle, Wall, Spread Jump, Brush Jump, Long Jump, Pipe Tunnel.**

The electronic timing gates should be positioned within 30cm in front of the first obstacle and within 30cm after the last obstacle. The distance between the electronic timing gates should be no less than the width of the hurdle wings, or in the case of the Wall, within the pillars. For the Long Jump, Tyre, ~~Wishing Well~~ and Pipe Tunnel, the timing gates should be placed as close as possible to the outside edge of the obstacle without impeding the dog's natural path. N.B. This regulation should also apply if manual timing is used in conjunction with start/finish poles.

(Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold.)

32. There was general consensus from the areas that not allowing the tyre as the final obstacle was not ideal as it restricted course design. However, it was noted that the reason for the change was sound, in that timing gates should be protected.
33. It was agreed that there was not sufficient support for the proposal and the Equipment Panel should review the situation again and come up with a solution that did not restrict the number of obstacles that could be used as the finish obstacle.

Brush Jumps and Fillers

34. The Council noted that the Panel was currently reviewing if there was a way to create a safe alternative to the brush element on the Brush Fence and was also looking into the use of wooden fillers on standard jumps.
35. The Council noted that the review was ongoing with the intent for it to form a part of a review of the standard hurdle as a whole at the next meeting.

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

36. The Council noted a report from the Agility Governance Panel.

Micro Height

37. The Council noted a tabled report from the Panel on initial data gathering to investigate the need for a micro height.
38. A survey had been conducted primarily through Facebook groups as well as being circulated by some clubs. The expectation was that each response was to be about an individual dog that was in the small height category, that had either been measured or would be. There were 854 responses with 657 believed to have been from different respondents. There was work to be done on cleaning up the data.
39. It was suggested that the new Health Advisory Group be asked to aid in the research as it would understand the conformation of small dogs better and could advise.

Grading Review

40. The Council noted a verbal report on the progress of the grading review from the Panel. The report highlighted a number of variables that needed to be taken into account while undertaking the review, such as the introduction of the intermediate height, increased number of retirements from agility due to the covid pandemic etc.
41. It was proposed that the grading review should result in the following:
  - A pyramid structure as dogs move up the grades with fewest dogs in the highest level.
  - A grading system and class structure that allows dogs to compete over appropriate courses and beat peers to progress.
  - A protected level for those handlers starting out in agility, so they are presented with appropriate courses and competition.
  - Guidelines, courses etc. that promote the standardisation of requirements at each level in terms of skill and speed.
  - A class structure that promotes and encourages success at every level.
  - Dogs only being eligible for championship status when they have proven their ability to compete against their peers in the highest grade.

- Maintenance of the warrant system with increased promotion of the value of those awards.
42. It was suggested that when looking at bringing about the pyramid structure, that it would be useful to consider when dogs have been retired, as it could skew the data. Additionally, dogs often progressed to grade 7 and stayed there for a significant amount of time before retiring, which would also affect the data. It was stressed that the review should result in what was right for agility and that may not be a pyramid scheme. The Panel agreed that the review would take that into account.
43. The Council thanked the Panel for their work and looked forward to seeing further results at the next meeting.

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

44. The Council noted a report from the Judging Panel. The Panel continued to look at CPD of judges, judges' contracts and how to ensure judges were up to date with judges' education. Other areas for consideration were appropriate course design which tied in with the grading review and the number of runs a judge could judge in one day, which was on the agenda later in the meeting.
45. The Council noted a report from Mrs J Gardner on the Activities Judges Sub-Group meeting held on 9 April 2024.
46. It was noted that the Code of Best Practice for Agility Judges and Stewards and Guide for Agility Equipment had been well received with many positive reviews. It was reiterated that the document would only be updated once a year by the office in line with regular updates.
47. Mentoring and CPD of judges was an ongoing discussion within the Sub-Group. An online resource for CPD was being considered, potentially using Zoom. It would be discussed at the Accredited Trainers' Annual Seminar at the end of the year.
48. The course time matrix was also in discussion and being reviewed, noting that there had been a lot of feedback from shows on confusion around whether it was up to date and compulsory. It would also be discussed at the Annual Seminar.

**ITEM 8.      PROPOSALS FROM SOCIETIES/PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS**

- Proposed amendments to Regulations H(1)9.a and H(1)(B)1.a.(1)
49. The Council considered two proposals which amended the regulations relating to outdoor ring size. Both proposals suggested a change to the ring size as follows:

Test area shall have a suitable surface and ~~measure a minimum of 32m x 32m for outdoor rings.~~ **must be a minimum of 1024 square metres. Each side of the ring being a minimum of 30m for outdoor rings.**

50. And:

Test area shall have a suitable surface and measure a minimum of ~~32m x 32m for outdoor rings.~~ **1000 square metres where one side should be a minimum of 25 metres for outdoor rings.**

51. On consideration of both of the proposals, it was felt that the second one, which had been proposed by Miss J and Mrs L Slade, would in fact reduce the overall size of the ring, and as such did not achieve the desired outcome. As such, the Council did **not recommend** that proposal.

52. There was a discussion on the first proposal which was submitted by Lune Valley Dog Training Club, and it was agreed that keeping the square meterage as proposed was preferable but there was concern over the 30m minimum for the side of the ring. In order to keep the 1024 square metres it was proposed by Mr Tait to change the 30m to 26m to allow for greater flexibility for show organisers when setting out rings. Mrs Bale seconded the proposal.

53. There was concern that the change would allow for odd shaped rings as, with the current wording, each side of the ring could be a different length. It was felt some wording needed to be added to ensure that rings could only be square or rectangular. The office agreed to formulate some wording to resolve the issue.

54. The Council voted on the amended proposal and **recommended** the following for approval:

Regulation H(1)10.a

**TO:**

Test area shall have a suitable surface and ~~measure a minimum of 32m x 32m for outdoor rings.~~ **must be a minimum of 1024 square metres. Each side of the ring being a minimum of 26m for outdoor rings. All rings must be square or rectangular.** Indoor rings are recommended to be 600 square meters but must be a minimum of 450 square metres with no one side measuring less than 15m. For outdoor all weather arenas of one or more rings that are enclosed by structure, fence or permanent barrier each ring is recommended to be 800 square meters but must be a minimum of 600 square metres with no one side measuring less than 20m. All indoor and outdoor all weather permanently enclosed rings for Prestige Events and/or Championship classes must be a minimum of 800 square metres with no one side measuring less than 20m. The ring area includes space for officials, including the scrime and ring party, but where possible the ring tent should be outside the ring area.

(Deletions struck through. Insertions in bold.)

Progression to the Championship Class Final – Regulation H(1)9

55. At its last meeting, the Council considered a discussion item on the above matter which received support for progression. The Council considered a proposed amendment to the above regulation so that the winner of each qualifying round automatically qualified for the final, providing that they competed in both rounds. Mrs Gardner seconded the proposal.

New Regulation H(1)9.b

**TO:**

**The winner of each round will be invited to the final, in addition to the top 50% of the entry, up to a maximum of 20 dogs from the combined results of the two qualifying rounds, making the final a maximum of 22 dogs. If the winner of either of the two qualifying rounds are in the top 50% of the entry, up to a maximum of 20 dogs, then the 'win on spot' will not transfer down to the 2<sup>nd</sup> placed dog. The winner of each round must have competed in both qualifying rounds.**

(Insertion in bold.)

(Subsequent paragraphs to be renumbered.)

56. It was queried whether allowing the winner of each round into the final was in keeping with the ethos of the championship final if those dogs got into the final with multiple faults, or even an elimination in one round. However, it was also appreciated that it could make handlers try harder in the second round if they thought they had a chance to get to the final.
57. It was agreed that there was general support from the regions and as such a vote took place and the Council **recommended** the regulation for approval. It was agreed that the dog that had won the jumping round would run first in the final and the dog that had won the agility round would run second, unless it had qualified through the normal route, in which case it would be in the standard running order.

*Miss R Sargent joined the meeting.*

Proposed amendment to Regulation H(1)10.g

58. The Council considered a proposal from Mr Tait to amend the above regulation which would reduce the number of individual runs a person could judge in one day. Miss Sargent seconded the proposal.

Regulation H(1)10.g.

**TO:**

The maximum number of individual runs a person shall judge on one day is 450 **for up to 2 classes**, excluding unforeseen eventualities such as re-runs. **For each additional class, the number of dogs should be reduced by 25 dogs, for 10 classes or more there shall be a maximum of 250 dogs.** Where Championship Class entries exceed 200 an additional previously approved championship judge must be appointed for the jumping round. Reserve judges may enter dogs for competition at the show but may not compete if called upon to judge. Show committees must appoint sufficient judges for the expected entries.

(Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold.)

59. There appeared to be general support from judges for the need to reduce the number of runs a person could judge, however it was not felt that the proposal as it stood was the correct solution. A number of show organisers, particularly those with smaller shows and winter shows, had concerns about the additional work that would be needed in obtaining judges. It was agreed that the issue of long days came not necessarily from the number of runs, but from the number of classes, course changes and course walking a judge was required to do in a day.
60. The Council took a vote on the proposal as it was stated on the agenda and did not recommend it for approval. It was agreed that if Mr Tait wished to he could bring back an alternative proposal to a future meeting.

Proposed amendment to Regulation H28.a.(9) Disqualification and Forfeit of Awards

61. The Council considered a proposal from Mr M Cavill to amend the above regulation to permit judges to judge a dog handled by a spouse, immediate family member or resident at the same address in all classes at Kennel Club licensed shows, with no exceptions. It was noted that it was proposed that the regulation regarding dogs owned by the judge remained unchanged. All Council members seconded the proposal.
62. The Council was in agreement with the proposal and unanimously **recommended** the following regulation amendment for approval:

Regulation H28.a.(9)

**TO:**

A dog may be disqualified by the Board 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 is resident at the same address as the scheduled judge. This shall not apply to a judge appointed in an emergency.~~

(Deletions struck through.)

(Subsequent paragraphs to be renumbered.)

Proposed addition to Regulation H(1)10. Management

63. The Council considered a proposed addition to the regulations, submitted by Ms M Meade, to prevent smoking and vaping from occurring in or around the rings. Mrs Tedds seconded the proposal.

New Regulation H(1)10.d

**TO:**

**No smoking or vaping in or within 10 metres of the rings or during queuing.**

(Insertion in bold.)

(Subsequent paragraphs to be renumbered.)

64. A discussion occurred on how it would be possible to police the regulation if it was brought into effect. It was felt that specifying a distance from the ring would be hard to manage and would not achieve the desired effect. It was agreed that the issue was etiquette around the show ground. It was felt that consistency across all shows was needed and as such a regulation was the correct avenue. Mrs Tedds proposed alternative wording to ensure that smoking or vaping was not permitted around the show:

New Regulation H(1)10.d

**TO:**

**No smoking or vaping in or within the ring area.**

(Insertion in bold.)

(Subsequent paragraphs to be renumbered.)

65. Mrs Gardner seconded the proposal. The Council voted on the reworded proposal and unanimously **recommended** it for approval.

Proposed amendment to Regulation H(1)(B)2.d. Reintroduction of Lower Height Option for small dogs.

66. The Council considered a proposed amendment to the above regulation, submitted by Mr Tait, which would allow for a Lower Height Option for small dogs that handlers believed would measure under 30cm. The Council noted that there would be combined results for all small dogs and prestige events would not have the Lower Height Option. Tyre and long jump specifications would remain unchanged.

Regulation H(1)(B)2.d.

**TO:**

**Small Dogs – For dogs measuring 350mm or under at the withers. Where an owner believes their dog would measure 300mm or under at the withers, the hurdles and wall will be reduced to 20cm in height. Results for all small dog classes will be combined. Tyre and long jump specifications will remain the same. The Lower Height Option would not be available in Prestige Events.**

(Insertion in bold.)

67. There was no seconder for the proposal and as such it was not discussed further.

Proposed amendment to Regulation K3.d Agility Warrants

68. The Council considered a proposed amendment to the above regulation, submitted by Ms J Wood, relating to the allocation of warrant points for clear rounds.

Regulation K3.d

**TO:**

Points will also be awarded for clear rounds within the course time as follows:

Standard Agility Classes 2 points

Standard Jumping Classes 1 point



Where less than 10 places are awarded in any class a competitor obtaining a clear round not in the places will be awarded the points applicable **up to and including third place and thereafter** for a clear round in that class, i.e. 2 points for an agility class and 1 point for a jumping class.  
(Insertion in bold.)

69. In Mrs Bostock's absence, Mrs Bale proposed the amendment and Ms Davies seconded it. A brief discussion followed however there did not appear to be much support for the proposal. A vote was taken, and the proposal was not recommended for approval.

## **ITEM 9.      DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### Show Management Best Practice

70. Mr J Hallam wished for the Council to discuss the implementation of show management best practice. There used to be a show management course for new secretaries which had been created to promote The Kennel Club's best practice in organising agility shows, covering all aspects of administration, planning and health and safety and venue selection. Mr Hallam wished to determine whether there was a need to bring the course back and to discuss what should be included.
71. It was noted that there were a number of new secretaries and changing committees for clubs organising agility competitions, and it could potentially be beneficial to have a resource for them to access to facilitate the organisation.
72. The office confirmed that there used to be an in person show management seminar but due to various restructures over the years, it had been discontinued. It was on the list of resources to be created on The Kennel Club Academy but there had been other priorities to complete first. It was hoped that something could be arranged for 2025.
73. The documents for the seminar were still available and a new area on the website had just been created for club and society management, so there were resources currently available for new secretaries to utilise in the absence of a specific resource. However, the Council was in agreement that a dedicated resource on the Academy would be beneficial and it was decided that Mr J Hallam would liaise with the office, and specifically the Academy team, to work on creating the resource.

*Mrs Robinson left the meeting.*

### Distance between contact obstacles

74. Mr J Hallam wished for the Council to discuss adding wording to the Code of Best Practice for Agility Judges to avoid placing two contact obstacles one after the other. It was suggested that it would be added to the document under the safe placement of obstacles section.

75. The Council was in agreement that two contact obstacles should not be placed in sequence and requested that the Activities Judges Sub-Group be asked to include some wording in the Code of Best Practice for Agility Judges. It was also requested that if any judge was seen to be placing contact obstacles in sequence then they should be entered into the incident book.

Fenced Rings

76. Ms K Parker wished for the Council to discuss whether all rings should be fenced at agility competitions.
77. The Council briefly discussed the suggestion, however, there was no support for the idea that all rings should be fenced. It was noted that rather than solving problems around dogs leaving rings, it created different problems, such as the ability for handlers to quickly recover their dogs should they get through the fencing.

Distance between obstacles

78. Mrs C Webster wished the Council to discuss whether wording should be added to the regulations regarding distances between obstacles on a course that may not be part of a single sequence.

*Mrs Robinson left the meeting.*

79. It was noted that the request for discussion had come following an incident at a show where it could have been the placement of the obstacles that caused the accident. However, there had been no further incident reports from the same course and it was felt that, while the issue should be looked at, it was not necessarily the best course of action to introduce a specific regulation. It was thought that to do so could come with unintended consequences such as not being able to place a tunnel under a dog walk.
80. It was suggested that the issue could be dealt with through the judges' education route. It was requested that the agility Accredited Trainers and Activities Judges Sub-Group look into the situation and come up with some guidance and education for judges.

Online Incident Book

81. Mrs Bale wished for the Council to discuss whether the Incident Book should be made available as an online form. The office informed Mrs Bale that it was something that was being considered but due to various legal considerations, it was not possible to do so yet.
82. Mrs Bale also requested that the equipment report form be adapted to an online form and hosted on The Kennel Club website. The office agreed that it would be a simple exercise and would liaise with Mrs Bale to get it actioned.

**ITEM 10. STRATEGY DOCUMENT**

83. At its last meeting, the Council agreed that the existing strategy document was not actionable or realistic and needed a major review. It was agreed that a reviewed document would be brought to the Council's next meeting.
84. However, on consideration of the ongoing governance review being undertaken by The Kennel Club it was not felt that the strategy document could be updated until that had been completed.

**ITEM 11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

IKC Grade Equivalence

85. Mr Dornford-Smith requested an update on the item that had been put forward to the Activities Committee from the Council at its last meeting, regarding grade equivalence between the Irish Kennel Club and The Kennel Club. The office informed Mr Dornford-Smith that the topic had been discussed by the Activities Committee and it was of the view that the issue was confined to a small number of competitors and was not an issue for the wider community. As such the Committee did not recommend any further action.
86. Mr Dornford-Smith wished it to be documented that he did not agree with that evaluation of the situation and that it was a recurring issue for Northern Ireland and competitors from the Republic of Ireland. It was stressed that the Activities Committee had discussed the situation at length and had not felt action was necessary. However, if Mr Dornford-Smith felt strongly that a solution was needed then he could revisit the topic at the next meeting. It was agreed that Mr Dornford-Smith would meet with the Governance Panel to try and come up with a solution that could be brought back to the next meeting.

**ITEM 12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

87. The Council noted that the date of its next meeting would be announced in September 2024.
88. The meeting closed at 15.20pm.

**NOTES:**

1. The Kennel Club will reimburse standard rail fares to all representatives attending the meeting, from their addresses as recorded at The Kennel Club. Claim forms will be available at the meeting.
2. Those resident in Northern Ireland or Scotland may apply in advance for authority to substitute shuttle air travel for standard rail fare, although it is requested that tickets are booked well in advance to take advantage of any reduction in fares.

3. Please give advance notice of matters to be raised under Any Other Business. This assists the office if research is required. These items are discussed at the discretion of the Council Chairman.
4. Kennel Club Liaison Council Regulations state that The Kennel Club will bear the cost of all reasonable and externally incurred costs connected with a Council, if agreed in advance. Therefore, representatives should apply to The Kennel Club for approval of any costs they may wish to claim prior to the expense being incurred.

***THE KENNEL CLUB'S STRATEGIC AIMS***

- *Champion the wellbeing of dogs*
- *Safeguard and enhance the future of pedigree dogs, addressing breed-associated health issues*
- *Protect the future of dog activities together with our grassroots network*
- *Become relevant to more dog owners to increase our impact*
- *Deliver an excellent member experience and widen our community*
- *Ensure we are financially secure and sustainable*