



**MINUTES OF THE AGILITY LIAISON COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY
16 JANUARY 2025 AT 10.30AM VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS**

PRESENT

Ms J Bale	South East/East Anglia
Mrs E Bostock	South East/East Anglia
Mr A Dornford-Smith	Northern Ireland
Mrs J Gardner	Midlands
Mrs D Tedds	Midlands
Mr J Hallam	South/South West (until paragraph 112)
Mr M Hallam	North West
Mrs S Hawkswell	Scotland
Ms T Davies	North East (from paragraph 46)
Mrs E Laing-Kay	North East (not present between paragraphs 57-72)
Mrs S Robinson	Wales
Miss R Sargent	North West
Mr M Tait	South/South West

IN ATTENDANCE

Miss D Deuchar	Senior Manager Canine Activities
Miss A Morley	Activities Liaison Manager
Mrs E Osborne	Activities Liaison Advisor

**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. TO ELECT A CHAIR FOR THE TERM OF THE COUNCIL
EFFECTIVE FROM JANUARY 2025 TO DECEMBER 2025**

1. Mrs Gardner nominated Mrs Tedds as chair, seconded by Ms Sargent. There being no other nominations, Mrs Tedds was duly elected.
2. Mrs Tedds expressed her wish for the term chairperson to be used instead of the previous term of chairman.
3. The Council noted that Committee elections would take place in May 2025 and passed its thanks to Mr Hallam for his time and work as the previous chair.

IN THE CHAIR MRS D TEDDS

**ITEM 2. TO ELECT A REPRESENTATIVE ONTO THE ACTIVITIES
COMMITTEE EFFECTIVE FROM JUNE 2025 TO MAY 2028**

4. Mr Tait nominated Mrs Gardner to act as representative on the Activities Committee, seconded by Ms Sargent. There being no other nominations, Mrs Gardner was duly elected.
5. The office confirmed that current members of the Council would remain in office as agreed until the end of the extended term in December 2025.

ITEM 3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

6. No apologies for absence had been received.

ITEM 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

7. The minutes of the meeting held on 4 July 2024 were approved as an accurate record.

ITEM 5. MATTERS ARISING/RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

8. The Council noted that the Board, at its meeting on 18 November 2024, approved the following amendments to H Regulations:

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

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.)

(Effective from 1 January 2025)

Removal of Water Jump and Wishing Well

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.)~~

~~(Effective 1 January 2025)~~

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.)~~

~~(Effective 1 January 2025)~~

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.)~~

~~(Effective 1 January 2025)~~

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

TO:

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

~~(Deletion struck through.)~~

~~(Effective 1 January 2025)~~

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

9. The Council noted a slight amendment made by the Activities Committee to clarify when the winners of each round would compete in the final round.

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. The winner of the jumping round will run first in the final, the winner of the agility round will run second in the final. 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 2nd placed dog. The winner of each round must have competed in both qualifying rounds.

(Insertion in bold.)

(Subsequent paragraphs to be renumbered.)

(Effective 1 January 2025)

Regulation H(1)10. Management

New Regulation H(1)10.d

TO:

No smoking or vaping within the ring area.

(Insertion in bold.)

(Subsequent paragraphs to be renumbered.)

(Effective 1 January 2025)

Amendment to Regulation H(1)10.a and H(1)(B)1.a.(1) Test area

10. The Council noted that the Activities Committee discussed the proposed amendments to regulations H(1)10.a and H(1)(B)1.a.(1). After some discussion, a query was raised as to whether 26m was too low. Subsequent to the Agility Liaison Council agenda being issued an amendment was made to the order of the wording and the following wording has now been agreed:

Regulation H(1)10.a

TO:

All rings must be square or rectangular and the test area shall have a suitable surface ~~and measure a minimum of 32m x 32m for outdoor rings.~~ **Outdoor rings must be a minimum of 1024 square metres with no one side measuring less than 30m.** 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.)

(Effective 1 January 2025)

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

TO:

All rings must be square or rectangular and the test area shall have a suitable **surface. Outdoor rings** ~~measure a minimum of 32m x 32m for outdoor rings. must be a minimum of 1024 square metres with no one side measuring less than 30m.~~ 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 scime and ring party, but where possible the ring tent should be outside the ring area. (Deletions struck through. Insertions in bold.)
(Effective 1 January 2025)

11. The Council noted the amendment to regulation H4.e regarding the minimum age of dogs entered Not For Competition. This had been recommended by the Obedience Liaison Council. The Activities Committee agreed that the regulation amendment should be recommended for approval across all activity disciplines.

Amendment to Regulation H4.e

Regulation H4.e

TO:

e. Only dogs of 18 calendar months of age and over on the day of competition are eligible for competition at Kennel Club licensed agility shows. However, societies may accept Not for Competition entries at their discretion. ~~Dogs four months and over are eligible to enter Not For Competition.~~ **Dogs 12 weeks and over are eligible to enter Not for Competition.**
(Effective 1 January 2025)

Regulation H(1)4.and H28.a.(7)

12. The Council noted that the Activities Committee discussed a proposed amendment to Regulation H(1)4 regarding whether a person could judge/compete during the show at which the special event was being held and then compete/judge at the special event when it was held after the show had closed. The Activities Committee and subsequently the Board amended the Regulation as follows:

Regulation H(1)4.

TO:

Societies are required to apply for permission to hold Special Events – Applications should be submitted to the Kennel Club by email at least six weeks before the start of any qualifying heats for the event. Special Events are designated as any activity-related event which cannot be included on the schedule of a normally licensed show/trial/competition due to

being invitational and therefore not open to all competitors, or which are not being held at a licensed show. Where competitors qualify for a final via heats held at that and other shows/trials/competitions, special event permission must be sought for the final whether it is held in conjunction with a licensed show/trial/competition or as a separate standalone event. This would not apply where all of the heats are held at the same show/trial/competition at which the final is held.

The regulations relating to the disqualification and forfeit of awards will apply to these events, **except that a person may judge/compete at the show at which the Special Event is held and compete/judge at the Special Event, provided it is taking place once the main show/trial/competition has closed.**

(Insertion in bold.)

(Effective 1 January 2025)

13. Whilst considering the above Special Event regulation, it was considered that the above amendment could be applied where qualifiers for a final were held at the same show/trial/competition but on different days. It was confirmed that an amendment to the regulations would allow for a judge to compete in a final if they had qualified on a previous day at the show/trial/competition. The Activities Committee and subsequently the Board approved the following amendment:

Regulation H28.a.(7)

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:

- (7) Judged by their registered owner or handled in the ring by a judge at that competition. This shall not apply to dogs owned by a judge appointed in an emergency, **or where a judge has been appointed to judge on the day of a semi-final / final but has qualified for that semi-final / final. The qualifiers must have been held on a different day to the final at the same show and the semi-final / final must be held after the show has closed.**

(Insertion in bold)

(Effective 1 January 2025)

14. The Council noted that following the regulation amendment requiring all large dogs to be measured, the office suggested an amendment allowing obviously large dogs to be measured prior to attaining the age of 15 months. This was supported by the Activities Committee and subsequently approved by the Board.

Age for Measuring Large Dogs

Regulation H(1)(B)4.(2)

TO:

Dogs competing in small, medium, or intermediate height categories must be measured for competition and must be at least 15 months old before their first measurement. **Large dogs that are, in the official measurers' opinion,**

obviously over 500mm (prior to reaching 15 months of age) can be measured. Competitors must ensure that their dog is measured prior to their first competition and that the dog's Agility Record Book has been signed and dated by the measuring officials.

(Insertion in bold)

(Effective 1 January 2025)

15. The following regulations suggested by the office, which have been approved by the Board, relate to when an appeal may be permitted, and to provide further clarity when handler information may be required.

Objection Regulation Amendments

Regulation H29

TO:

Penalties

The Board shall have power to impose any of the following penalties upon any person for any breach of Kennel Club Regulations subject to a right of appeal, notice of intention of which must be lodged within 14 days from the date on which the decision is given and subject to the prescribed appeals process as shall be determined by the Board from time to time.

- a. Warn
- b. Censure/Reprimand
- c. Apology directive (Conduct Regulation or the Control of Dog Regulation)
- d. Fine
- e. Award disqualified

In addition, the Board may make the following directives;

- f. A dog's registration record may be marked 'incident recorded'
- g. A dog's registration record may be endorsed 'not eligible for entry in any event held under Kennel Club Rules and Regulations, nor any unlicensed event recognised by the Kennel Club.'

The right of appeal against directives f) and g) listed above extends to an appeal on the finding of fact of a deliberate dog bite only, but does not extend to an appeal against those directives f) and g) in terms of cancellation or modification of such directives if there is a finding of fact of an intentional dog bite.

In the event of any fine not being paid, or non compliance with any apology directive issued within the time stipulated by the Board, then that person may, at the discretion of the Board, be dealt with as if a complaint under Kennel Club Rule A11 had been lodged and proved to the satisfaction of the Board.

For complaints of conduct whether at a licensed event or on social media, in addition to a warning issued - a short term fixed period of refusal of entry/attendance at Kennel Club licensed events may also be imposed in accordance with procedures to be published from time to time to implement this regulation.

(Insertion in bold)
(Effective 1 January 2025)

Regulation H11

TO:

The owner, exhibitor, handler or other person in charge of a dog at Kennel Club licensed events must at all times ensure that the dog is kept under proper control whilst at the licensed venue, including its environs, car and caravan parks and approaches. This Regulation applies before (at any time during the set up period at the venue), during the event and afterwards (at any time during the breakdown of the event). The mating of bitches within the precincts of the competition, as stipulated above, is forbidden

An exhibitor or competitor should ensure that contact details for any handler are available and must be provided upon request in any investigation of a breach of this regulation by such handler.

(Insertion in bold)
(Effective 1 January 2025)

Regulation H(1)11.a

TO:

No person shall carry out punitive correction or harsh handling of a dog at any time ~~within the precincts of the show~~ **whilst at the licensed venue, including its environs, car and caravan parks and approaches.**

(Deletions struck through. Insertion in bold)
(Effective 1 January 2025)

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

16. The Council noted that the Board did not approve the amendment to the above regulation to allow a judge to judge a spouse, family member or dog resident at the same address as the scheduled judge.
17. A query was raised as to whether the Board's meeting on 18 November 2024 was the next meeting after the Agility Liaison Council Meeting on 4 July 2024.
18. The office confirmed that the recommendations from the July Council meeting needed to be considered by the Activities Committee at its September meeting and those were then reviewed by the Board at its November meeting.
19. The Council wished to note the importance of the recommendations being put forward to the October Board meeting to give sufficient time for publication to the agility community and its stakeholders.
20. Mrs Hawswell commented on the clarification needed in the regulations regarding progression to the championship class final. It was noted that

Regulation H(1)9 had been amended but was now contradicted by regulation H(1)(A)11.c. The office acknowledged that regulation H(1)(A)11.c had been missed previously and would work to get that removed from online versions of the regulation booklets. It was noted that the regulation would be removed from the July yearbook, however, the regulation booklets had already been published, and it would not be possible to get those changed. The Council requested that championship judges were made aware of the regulation change in the meantime.

ITEM 6. REPORT FROM THE EQUIPMENT PANEL

21. The Council noted the written report from the Equipment Panel. It was confirmed 29 equipment reports from 15 shows had been received and reviewed.
22. Ms Bale raised that the Equipment Panel should be copied into any communication sent to suppliers from the office to ensure they remained aware of the situation.
23. A discussion was had about the standard of equipment at the recent Kennel Club International Agility Festival and whether the contract with the current supplier was coming to an end. It was confirmed that with the recent takeover of First Contact by Naylor's Agility the contract would continue.
24. The office confirmed that it had been in contact with Naylor's and they were aware of the previous issues with equipment. It was noted that this was under review to improve the quality and ensure all of the equipment meets the updated regulations.
25. The Council raised the need for improved communication to allow any identified issues to be resolved promptly.

Collapsible Poles

26. An update on the current collapsible poles trial was provided. The Equipment Panel confirmed that of the limited feedback received the comments were very mixed.
27. Common themes included the consistency of the equipment as the poles varied in design, size and weight which could be having an impact on the number of incidents. The issue of unregulated training was also raised as a potential contributing factor to equipment-based incidents overall, with a concern that some dogs were being asked to compete before being appropriately trained on the equipment used.
28. The Council considered as to whether the trial should continue or if an alternative method of evaluation should be considered. Overall, the Council agreed that there was limited evidence or feedback to support the argument for or against the trial continuing. The Council was made aware of an incident

where a dog had received significant injuries whilst negotiating a collapsible pole.

29. After a vote as to whether the trial should continue or not, it was agreed that the trial should come to an end and be referred back to the Equipment Panel to consider other options.

Incident book returns

30. The Council considered a proposal from the Equipment Panel to amend the regulations so that incident books were returned to the office regardless of outcomes or if no incidents were reported, allowing the Equipment Panel to build a full picture of incidents happening at shows.
31. It was noted that the current regulations could be interpreted that the incident book should be returned after every show and recognition that, if made mandatory, this could add additional pressure to the office due to the number of licenced shows. Requiring a return from every show, even without notable incidents, could deter shows from opting not to return certain incidents.
32. Mrs Bostock proposed the following regulation amendment, seconded by Mr J Hallam. Following a vote on the proposal, the majority were in agreement and **recommended** the following regulation amendment.

Regulation H8.f.

To:

A Kennel Club Incident Book, containing details of all incidents occurring at the show, a copy of which must be submitted to the Kennel Club within 14 days. **A return must be submitted even if no incidents were recorded at the show. Resolved incidents must also be included.**

(Insertion in bold.)

Removal of width range for Dog Walk and See-Saw

33. A proposal to remove the width range for the seesaw and dog walk was proposed by Ms Bale and seconded by Mrs Bostock. Ms Bale had conducted recent investigations as part of the Equipment Panel, where she personally measured a number of dog walks and found no evidence of variation. It was clarified that the tolerances as stated in the current regulation H(1)(B)3 remained for all equipment.
34. The Council voted unanimously in their decision to **recommend** the following regulation changes.

Regulation H(1)(B)3.l and H(1)(B) 3.m.

To:

l. See-Saw—This obstacle will consist of a plank firmly mounted on a central bracket. ~~The length of the plank must be 3.66m. The width must be 295mm minimum and 305mm maximum. The plank must be 3.66m in length and 300mm in width.~~ The height of the central bracket measured

from the ground to the top of the plank 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.

m. Dog Walk—A walk plank of approximately 1.2m measured from the ground to the top of the plank, with firmly fixed ramps at either end. The planks must be 3.66m in length and ~~300mm a minimum of 254mm and a maximum of 305mm~~ in width. The last 914mm from the bottom of each ramp should be a different colour to indicate the area with which the dog should make contact. Each ramp should have a non-slip surface, and anti-slip slats at intervals but not within 152mm of the start of a contact area.
(Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold.)

ITEM 7. REPORT FROM THE AGILITY GOVERNANCE PANEL

35. The Council noted the written report from the Agility Governance Panel.

Micro Height

36. Work was to continue in respect of what a micro height could be, including gathering data on heights used in other countries.
37. Previous discussions amongst the regions had suggested competitors wished to see this as a category in its own right, and not a lower height option within the small category. Any proposal should include qualifiers and Championship status. The Governance Panel would continue to research and bring back any updates in the future.

Grading review

38. The Council noted a proposal from the panel, seconded by Mrs Tedds, regarding a revised grading system.
39. A lengthy discussion took place on the proposal. It was noted that there had been general support for an overall review of grades through previous engagement and discussions across the wider agility community, but that the majority of regions disagreed with the proposal with a general consensus that, in its current state, it was too complicated and confusing.
40. The Council did feel that several elements of the proposal were seen as positives such as reducing the limbo period between grades and identification of the level combined classes would be set at. Some regions also considered competitors moving up the grades on clear rounds as a benefit to those with more slow and steady dogs. They also felt that a reduction in grades could help support the introduction of a micro height in the future.

41. There was also some discussion in respect of the previous changes to progression through grades and the COVID break, which could mean some competitors and dogs running on a 3rd grading system. The Council also noted the need to consider the wider impacts on show organisers, particularly with the reduction of limbo periods.
42. The Council considered that the large number of show licences being issued in conjunction with many classes at some shows and very low numbers was having a significant impact on the speed of progression.
43. It was queried whether the number of licences issued could be reviewed by region and the office clarified that this had the potential for significant financial impact for the Kennel Club.
44. Following a vote, the Council unanimously agreed to **not recommend** the proposal.
45. It was agreed that the issue of a grade review should be referred back to the Governance Panel for further consideration and discussion. The Council noted that any proposal or discussion item coming back in the future would need to take into account other potential recommendations such as micro height and be simplified to provide better clarification and appeal to a wider audience.

Ms Davies joined the meeting.

Microchip numbers

46. The Council considered a proposal to include mandatory documentation of dogs' microchip numbers during measurement sessions, with details submitted to the Kennel Club on the measuring return form.
47. The amendment was proposed by Mrs Hawkswell and seconded by Miss Sargent. It was suggested that by adding microchip numbers to the measuring spreadsheets when submitted, the number would be stored in a central database at the Kennel Club. This could help deter multiple registrations if the height could also be recorded against individual Microchip numbers.
48. It was acknowledged that this would be a relatively simple addition for the measurers but there was potential for accuracy errors with long microchip numbers needing to be manually added to spreadsheets.
49. A further discussion was had around the potential of scanning dogs at events and whether the standard could be set at Crufts and the London International Horse Show.
50. The Council voted on the proposal for microchip numbers to be added to the measuring form and unanimously **recommended** it for approval.

Measures Code of Best Practice

51. The Council noted the amendments to The Kennel Club Code of Best Practice for Measuring Agility Dog Heights to cover the regulation changes from January 2025.
52. The document was due to be distributed to measurers and it was noted the information was also on the website. The office confirmed the document would need to be version controlled before it could be issued.

Show Organisers Panel Proposal

53. The panel raised the potential for a Show Organisers Panel to be created, with the aim to enhance consultation with clubs.
54. Mrs Tedds suggested that this could help to enhance the Agility Liaison Council by understanding the potential impact discussion items or proposals could have on show organisers.
55. A wider discussion was held in respect of a potential review of the current panels in order to assess how they were working and how they could be improved to engage with the wider community. The Council also felt that it would be beneficial if there was an Agility Liaison Council rep on the Prestige Events Committee to ensure two-way communication.
56. It was agreed that a Show Organisers Panel would likely be set up post review of the current panels. Mrs Tedds agreed to lead this with Mrs Gardner and Ms Bale included.

Mrs E Laing-Kay apologised that she needed to leave the meeting due to other commitments.

57. It was requested that, the office issue confirmation as to who was on which panel. Subsequent to the meeting, the panels were confirmed as follows:

Governance Panel

Mrs S Hawkswell (Chair)
Mrs J Gardner
Miss R Sargent
Mr J Hallam
Mr M Tait
Ms E Bostock

Equipment Panel

Ms J Bale (Chair)
Mr M Hallam
Miss R Sargent
Mr M Tait
Mr A Dornford-Smith

Ms T Davies

Judging Panel

Mr M Tait (Chair)

Mrs J Gardner

Mrs S Hawkswell

Mrs E Laing-Kay

Mr M Tait

Mr J Hallam

ITEM 8. REPORT FROM THE JUDGING PANEL AND OTHER JUDGING ISSUES

- 58. The Council noted the report from the Judging Panel.
- 59. The Council also noted a report from Mrs Gardner on the Activities Judges Sub-Group Meeting held on 24 October 2024. It was noted that the maximum number of dogs judged in a day per judge would not be looked at until the grade review was completed.
- 60. The Council welcomed work on CPD for judges, recruitment of additional judges' trainers and reviewing the judges training material.
- 61. A revised course time matrix was being worked on but was awaiting data from processors to progress this.

ITEM 9. PROPOSALS FROM SOCIETIES/PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS

Proposed amendment to Regulation H(1)(B)1.(3).

- 62. The Council considered a proposal from Mr Tait to amend the below regulation which would reduce the maximum distance between the centres of consecutive obstacles. Miss Sargent seconded the proposal.

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

To:

Design—The course should require a dog to traverse at least 15 obstacles but not more than 20 and all jump obstacles in any class should be the same height. All obstacles should have a minimum of 5m and up to a maximum of ~~40m~~ **8m** between centres of consecutive obstacles using the straight line centre-to-centre method.

(Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold.)

- 63. There were mixed views for the need to reduce the distance between obstacles with the supporting research rationale document aimed primarily at the A frame only.

64. It was mentioned that the previous regulation of 10m was not scientifically tested and that there was a big disparity between the 5m and 10m currently stated in regulations. While the majority did agree in principle with the reduction of distance, the Council believed that this may be more appropriate if the regulation was aimed solely at the A frame and did not include other obstacles.
65. It was highlighted that this was primarily a judges training issue and that safe approaches could be covered further in judges training and with more appropriate guidance. The Council had a discussion about the balance between education and legislation – it was hoped that forthcoming changes to judges training and mentoring would facilitate better course design.
66. The Council voted on the proposal, and following a majority vote, did **not recommended**.
67. It was agreed to refer the item to the Judges panel for consideration of an alternative proposal relating more specifically to the A frame.

Proposed amendment to Regulation H(1)(B)4.(2)

68. The Council considered a proposal submitted by Mr Dornford-Smith and seconded by Mr Tait regarding an amendment to the below regulation, allowing dogs registered with recognised overseas Kennel Clubs to compete without undergoing additional measurements.

Regulation H(1)(B)4.(2)

TO:

Kennel Club Registered dogs competing in small, medium, or intermediate height categories must be measured for competition **at an official Kennel Club measurement session** and must be at least 15 months old before their first measurement. Large dogs that are, in the official measurers' opinion, obviously over 500mm (prior to reaching 15 months of age) can be measured **at an official Kennel Club measurement session**. Competitors must ensure that their dog is measured prior to their first competition and that the dog's Agility Record Book has been signed and dated by the measuring officials.

(3) Competitors with dogs registered with a recognised overseas Kennel Clubs may use this measurement in Kennel Club competitions.

A list of recognised overseas Kennel Clubs is published by the Kennel Club.

(Insertions in bold)

(Subsequent paragraphs to be renumbered.)

69. The Council noted that 'recognised overseas Kennel Clubs' was the standard wording used by the Kennel Club in similar situations and the office would need to publish a list of those on the website. It was also clarified that the

Irish Kennel Club would be considered under the title of Overseas Kennel Clubs despite its land border with the UK.

70. It was noted that the regulation change would not affect the majority, but it was hoped that an update to this would be reciprocated by other recognised overseas Kennel Clubs. However, the office confirmed that this was not something that could be requested or guaranteed.
71. The office confirmed that overseas measuring records were already accepted and there was no requirement in place for overseas dogs to be measured to compete in the UK.
72. The Council voted and the majority agreed to **recommend** the proposal.

Mrs E Laing-Kay rejoined the meeting.

Mr A Dornford-Smith

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

73. The Council considered a proposal from Mr Dornford-Smith, seconded by Mr J Hallam which would allow dogs registered with recognised overseas Kennel Clubs to compete at the equivalent grade in the UK.
74. A short discussion was had by the Council and the office confirmed that there was a comparison table relating to Overseas awards and gave the example of FCI grade 3 coming in at grade 6 in the UK. The Council requested copies of the comparison table which was subsequently emailed over following the meeting.
75. A vote was taken on the proposal, and the Council **recommended** the following amended regulation for approval.

Regulation H(1)(A)9.

TO:

For Kennel Club Registered dogs, only first prizes and points gained in standard classes at Kennel Club licensed agility shows may be used for progression through the classes (A dog is only eligible for one grade). In defining the eligibility of the owner or handler for grade 1, the two wins and points progression referred to in the definition apply only to one dog and not an accumulation of dogs.

Dogs registered with recognised overseas Kennel Clubs may use this grade in Kennel Club Licensed Agility Shows. A list of recognised overseas Kennel Clubs is published by the Kennel Club.

(Insertions in bold)

ITEM 10. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Maximum tunnel passes

76. Mr Tait had requested the Council discuss adding wording to the Code of Best Practice for Agility Judges to allow a maximum of 5 tunnels per course to be negotiated in a standard Agility or Jumping class.
77. There was some debate as to whether more than 5 tunnel passes was too physically demanding on a dog and whether it was excessive use of one piece of equipment. A brief discussion was had about the issue and whether it was felt to be of such a concern at the current time. The majority felt that the matter was more of a judges training issue and therefore such regulation was unnecessary with the potential for the same arguments being applied to many other obstacles.
78. It was emphasised that in some cases, if the entry was safe and appropriate and the equipment was fit for purpose, multiple tunnel passes could be motivational for a dog and that this should be treated no differently to the use of other skills.

White Dogs

79. Mr Harrison had requested the Council discuss adding wording to the Code of Best Practice for running a white dog to ensure the safety of dog's lines prior to handlers walking the course and allowing the judge to make any necessary adjustments. It was suggested it would be permissible for them to ask one or more handlers and their dogs to run the course prior to it being walked. Neither the handler nor the dog should compete in any of the height classes for that specific course.
80. It was considered that the use of a white dog in those situations may not be practical, prolonging a judge's day and had the potential to be abused in certain cases. It was mentioned that it would be difficult for show managers to keep track of who was running the courses. The Council also noted that whilst white dogs were used at the European Open, it did not believe that many changes were made to the courses following this.
81. There was mention of prestige events and whether allowing a white dog could give the first competitor an opportunity to see how the course ran as well as helping with setting up courses and with judge's routes.
82. The Council considered that the negatives would outweigh the positives in this situation and agreed not to progress any further with the matter.

Multiple repetitions of an obstacle within a course

83. Ms Lane requested the Council discuss limiting the number of times a hurdle could be used within a course to twice, with a maximum of once for the long jump, wall and tyre respectively.
84. It was acknowledged that this had been brought before the Council previously in a similar format and had been rejected. It was felt that some obstacles, such as a single hurdle posed less of a risk in multiple passes than

other obstacles such as the wall or tyre and the item grouped all equipment together.

85. Overall, this was not supported by the Council, particularly for single hurdles although it was noted that it could be more relevant to obstacles such as the wall, long jump or tyre. The Council agreed that this was more a subject for education above regulation and should be considered by the Activities Judges Sub-Group as part of the CPD training.

Variety of obstacles within a jumping course

86. Mrs Wingate-Wynne requested the Council discuss the mandatory inclusion of one or more alternative obstacles such as the tyre, spread, wall or long jump in addition to the standard hurdles, tunnels and weaves. The Council agreed that, while there was definitely appeal in seeing a variety of obstacles in jumping courses, this should be advisory and not mandatory.
87. It was noted that there would be a number of implications for making the suggestion mandatory such as the potential impact on course design for judges, particularly when using smaller indoor rings. The Council also considered the impact on equipment suppliers with the potential need for more equipment to be transported to shows.
88. Overall, it was agreed that this would not be supported as a proposal, but the Council would like it to be reviewed by the Activities Judges Sub-Group to consider if this could be added to the Code of Best Practice for judges.

Timing errors in competition results

89. Mr Brown requested the Council discuss whether the process of recording times needed improving.
90. The office confirmed that the matter of No Time had been discussed with the Activities Judges Sub-Group and an update was issued via the Kennel Club's agility Facebook page and shared to the Kennel Club Agility Judges page on social media. The update included the statement that no dog should be winning or be placed in a class without a time recorded. The social media update regarding this was issued on 3 December 2024 and read as follows:

No time being recorded - reminder of the rules

The Kennel Club is aware that there has been an increased incidence of No Time being recorded at agility shows recently, with some dogs gaining wins and places with no time being recorded. Judges are reminded of Regulation H(1)(B)5.b. which states: "Actual time will be recorded and rounding up or rounding down is not permitted."

Therefore, judges and competitors are advised that if no time has been recorded the dog cannot feature in the awards going forward, it is also not permissible for a dog to be allocated the course time. Judges are advised to check class results before closing a class and if a dog with no time recorded

is likely to feature in the awards, then a re-run should be offered. If the handler refuses to accept the re-run they will be deemed to have withdrawn.

91. A discussion was had about what part scribes play in the recording of no times. Emphasis was put on the fact that scribes were volunteers so additional enforced training may discourage those who would otherwise take up the role. It was thought that the issue had been exacerbated due to an option to record 'no time' which was available on one show processors system.
92. However, the Council noted that it may be beneficial to support scribes with optional learning material which could encourage more volunteers to the role. Ms Bale confirmed that the Equipment Panel was happy to look into this further.

Long jump

93. Mr Tait requested the Council discuss amending the length of the long jump from a variable range to a fixed length. There was a mixed view across the regions, with some agreeing with the fixed length, particularly at the minimum distance, and others voicing a large percentage of judges preferred the variable length as it allowed for some adaptation to suit concerns such as the different grades, weather, ground condition and arena sizes.
94. It was recognised that variable measurements were not used for other obstacles, which may support the proposal to remove them for the long jump.
95. It was thought that a fixed length for this particular obstacle may encourage further questioning of courses and criticism of judges so if the regulation were to change then a tolerance would be needed to protect judges from this.
96. Overall, after a lengthy discussion, there was little support for the item, and it was agreed to not progress it further.

Change of height

97. Mr Hoffman requested the Council discuss unmeasured dogs that were currently competing in the large height category be allowed to partake in the measuring process retrospectively, thus allow them to compete in the intermediate height category where appropriate.
98. One of the reasons discussed was that a number of dogs competing at large were not brought forward for a measure when Intermediate height was introduced in the UK. This was allegedly due to the selection process for Team GB at that time which may have prevented those dogs from being eligible to compete internationally. Subsequently an intermediate height has been introduced internationally.
99. It was noted that there were now some dogs who compete at intermediate in Europe but large in the UK. This highlighted a concern that this could have an

impact on the welfare of those dogs being asked to jump higher than would be recommended.

100. Opening measuring up to those currently competing in large and which had not had a previous measure would enable owners to prioritise their dogs welfare.
101. The Council had a detailed discussion as to whether there should be a mandatory rule that 'all dogs should be measured' including those who had competed at large prior to January 2025 but had not been through the measuring process.
102. While the office acknowledged the welfare aspect of this, competitors had been told on a number of occasions they would not need to get a dog measured if they competed at large prior to 1 January 2025. There was also concern over the vast backlog of dogs that would need to be measured should a mandatory blanket regulation be introduced which would put unnecessary strain on an already stretched team of measurers.
103. The Council voted on the various options including not allowing dogs who had competed without being measured prior to January 2025 to come forward for a measure, a compulsory measure for all competing dogs who had not previously been measured or an option to allow dogs not previously measured to come forward for a measurement.
104. The Council supported a recommendation that any dog not previously measured should be allowed to come forward for a measurement. This final chance to be measured should be available for a limited period only.
105. In addition, the Council recommended the guidelines be bought in as soon as possible on the grounds of improved welfare. Large dogs which had never been measured should be able to present for measuring and, if measured intermediate, to drop to the lower height category immediately but still be subject to a second measure as per usual measuring processes.
106. Dogs that had measured Large prior to the introduction of the Intermediate height measuring would also be allowed to come forward for a measure. This would be treated as a first measure.
107. It was noted that awards would still remain for those who did drop down a height category because of this but qualifications for any Kennel Club final or semi-final would not, and the dog would need to requalify at the lower height. It was also acknowledged that this guidance would need to include dogs measured at large prior to the introduction of the intermediate height.

Practice rounds

108. Mr Amor requested the Council discuss the addition of practice rounds at Kennel Club licensed agility shows. It was suggested by the Council that

practice rounds could increase revenue for show organisers and it was noted that other disciplines, such as Rally and Heelwork to Music, already offered this at their competitions.

109. The Council acknowledged that, while practice rounds were seen elsewhere in other disciplines, show organisers were responsible for the safety of competitors and dogs at their shows and judges were responsible for the safety and wellbeing of dogs within their rings. Practice rounds could pose a potential risk for dogs being in the ring too soon when they were not at a level of training that enabled them to compete safely.
110. It was noted that the use of practice rounds also had the potential to add to the length of a Judge's day and switching between practice and competition rounds may put additional stress onto judges and ring parties.
111. The Council agreed that practice rings were offered by some shows and may be an option for some shows to avoid unnecessary delays on classes.
112. The discussion item was not supported by the Council so would not be taken further.

Mr J Hallam left the meeting.

Crate areas and leaving dogs unattended

113. Mr M Hallam requested the Council discuss the regulation introduced in January 2024 that prevented crates from being left near or around rings and promoted the use of designated areas for those in the vicinity.
114. It was noted by several regions that the crate areas were working well, and that it had stopped the issue of crates being left close to rings and in impractical locations.
115. However, it was raised that not all shows were offering the facility currently and that in some instances where it was offered, it was not in practical locations which made moving between areas of the show (i.e. between toilets, rings and crate area) substantially more difficult. It was noted that this could have a greater impact on those with disabilities.
116. It was suggested that show organisers could be encouraged as to more practical thinking or better implementation of providing crate areas and how far they were from key areas, such as ring tents and toilets. It was noted that the incident book could be used to alert show organisers to the issue of impractical crate areas, particularly if people felt they were disadvantaged and that this could help to make changes if needed.
117. On request of the Council, the office confirmed that a reminder could be issued on the requirement of crate areas and the new regulations surrounding this.

ITEM 11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Young Kennel Club Qualifiers

118. Mrs Tedds raised that the Young Kennel Club 2026 Crufts qualifiers had still not been announced by the Young Kennel Club team and that junior handlers were still unaware as to whether they had qualified for Crufts 2025 in March. Due to the nature of Young Kennel Club an early notification of qualifications was important for informing their respective school/educational supplier. In addition, late notification could have an impact on people who needed to book accommodation and make travel arrangements.
119. The office advised that all societies should now have been updated as to whether they have a qualifier for Crufts 2026 and that updates had now been issued by the Young Kennel Club team with regards to what days the classes were due to be held at Crufts. It also advised that a new Young Kennel Club manager has been employed by the Kennel Club and that this should hopefully lead to improvements in the Young Kennel Club sector.
120. It was mentioned that some of the Scottish Kennel Club Societies had not yet received news regarding their qualifiers and the office confirmed it would look into this.

Terms of Office

121. Further clarification was sought on the terms of office for the Council members. The office confirmed that the current term of office runs until December 2025 and that elections would be held this year for the Council's new term of office starting in January 2026.

ITEM 12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

122. The Council noted that the date of its next meeting would be 18 June 2025 and would take place in person at the Kennel Club in Clarges Street.

123. The meeting closed at 16.45pm.

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*