



MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE AGILITY LIAISON COUNCIL
HELD ON THURSDAY 8 JULY 2021 AT 10.00 AM
VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS

PRESENT

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

IN ATTENDANCE

Miss D Deuchar	Head of Canine Activities
Miss C McHardy	Manager - Education, Training, and Working Dog Activities Team
Miss R Mansfield	Senior Officer - Working Dog Activities Team
Mrs A Mitchell	Senior Committee Secretary - Working Dog Activities Team

IN THE CHAIR

MR M CAVILL

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

1. The Chairman opened the meeting by welcoming all present to the final meeting of the current term of office, noting that for those not re-standing for election it would be their last meeting as a Council representative.

ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. Apologies were received from Mr S Chandler, Mrs Y Croxford, and Miss R Sargent.



ITEM 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3. The minutes of the meeting held on 11 February 2021 were approved as an accurate record.

ITEM 3. MATTERS ARISING/RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

4. The Council noted that the Board, at its meeting on 13 April 2021, approved the following amendment:

Regulation H(1)(B)3.

TO:

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

(Insertion in bold)

(Effective 1 January 2022)

5. Proposed amendment to Regulation H(1)(B)3.j.
The Council was advised that the Activities Committee, at its meeting on 18 March 2021, noted the above proposal which specified the number of poles which may be used in a standard class. It accepted the principle of the recommendation, however, it had noted that the Council would be considering separately whether there was any necessity to amend the dimension size of weave poles. As the regulation also contained dimensions relating to the size of weave poles, it was agreed that it would be preferable to make a single amendment to cover both issues rather than two separate amendments. Accordingly, consideration of the proposal was deferred by the Committee until the Council had discussed the matter further.
6. The Council noted that, following confirmation of Board approval of the amended Regulation relating to tolerances, the Equipment Panel would consider the matter and provide recommendations to the Council at its meeting in January 2022.
7. Proposed amendment to Regulation H(1)9.a.
The Activities Committee had also noted the amendment to the above regulation which had been proposed in order to provide greater flexibility to show organisers in respect of ring sizes. However, Mr Cavill, in his role as Chairman of the Council, had requested that the recommendation be withdrawn and referred back to the Council for further consideration in view of concerns that the proposed wording may contain ambiguities relating to the use of enclosed outdoor arenas. The Committee noted that a proposal would be resubmitted following the Council's July meeting.
8. A revised proposal submitted by Mr Tait was considered, together with a table which provided further details of the way in which the regulation would be applied. The proposal was seconded by Mrs Gardner.
9. The Council was of the view that the wording used in the proposal was clear, and that the ring sizes specified within it would address the original issue of providing show organisers with as much flexibility as possible.



10. There was some concern that the proposed minimum size of 450 square metres for an indoor ring was too small, but it was accepted that specifying a larger minimum size would effectively preclude the use of some venues which would not be helpful to show organisers. It was hoped that organisers would provide rings of 600 square metres or more where it was practical for them to do so.
11. It was also suggested that competitors should be prepared to pay a higher cost of entries for shows held indoors with larger rings, in recognition of the increased costs of hiring suitable venues. This was noted but it was accepted that such a measure may not be popular with competitors.
12. After careful consideration, the Council **recommended** the amendment for approval, as follows:

Regulation H(1)9.a.

TO:

- a. Test area shall have a suitable surface and measure a minimum of 32m x 32m for outdoor venues rings. ~~Indoor venues may be smaller but must be appropriate to the size of the test.~~ **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)

13. The Council discussed whether the guidance table which had supported the proposal should be made available for reference on the Kennel Club website. It was acknowledged that the revised regulation itself was sufficiently clear and further guidance for show organisers should not be required. However it was agreed that the document should be published as an annex paper to the minutes of the meeting. Accordingly, it is attached as **Annex A to the Minutes**.
14. It was also highlighted that show secretaries should advise judges of the ring size allocated to them, in advance of the show. Training for judges also included advice that they should ask show secretaries for this information should it not have already been provided to them.

Activities Health and Welfare Sub-Group

15. As Mr MacDonald was no longer able to represent the Council on the Sub-Group, the Council had wished to nominate Mr Tait to undertake the role. The Committee had noted the recommendation, which was subject to approval by the Dog Health Group at its meeting on 16 June 2021.
16. The Council noted that Mr Tait's appointment to the Sub-Group had been approved by the Dog Health Group, and subsequently by the Board, at its meeting on 30 June 2021.

Covid-compliant shows

17. The Council noted that the Committee had considered whether it would be permissible for classes to be run in the following manner:

A ring would be set up for use in two classes without any changes to the equipment in between. The two different courses would be marked with the obstacles numbered in different colours,



such as red for one, and blue for the other. Six competitors would walk the course and then run it, using the first set of numbers and would then vacate the area. A second group of six competitors would then walk the course, using the second set of numbers, and would then run it.

18. The Committee had accepted that this would allow for two cohorts of six competitors to use the same set-up, which would be helpful to show organisers, and raised no objection to classes being conducted in this way.
19. The Council welcomed the Committee's views. It was hoped that in the near future it would be possible for shows to be run without the necessity for special Covid measures but in the meantime it was helpful for show organisers to have as much flexibility as possible.

Capping of entries

20. At its previous meeting, the Council had noted that Regulation H(1)(A)12 had been relaxed until 31 December 2021 to allow for a minimum capping limit of 50 dogs for a standard class. It had suggested that an option to cap entries should be extended to cover Kennel Club qualifiers and championship classes, as a temporary measure, in order to assist societies to be able to plan Covid-compliant championship shows.
21. However, the Committee had been of the view that care should be taken to protect the integrity of prestige events, and for this reason, it did not support the Council's suggestion. Further, it was hopeful that restrictions currently in place due to Covid-19 would soon be lifted and that shows would be able to proceed as normal without the need for special measures. The Council accepted the Committee's views on the issue.
22. A suggestion was made that the facility to allow for a minimum capping limit of 50 dogs for a standard class should be made permanent. It was noted that doing so would necessitate a formal amendment to H Regulations, and it was agreed that a suitable proposal may be submitted for inclusion on the agenda for consideration by the Council at its next meeting.

Long Jump

23. At its previous meeting, the Council had considered a discussion item relating to the standardisation of the number of long jump units for each height, and to set a maximum length per height. The objective of the proposal was to provide a more consistent approach to the use of the obstacle for agility judges, with simplified and up to date guidance that better represented what the obstacle was intended to test.
24. The Council had noted that feedback from competitors indicated general support for the principle of Mr Ellis' suggestion, and it was in agreement that it warranted progression, subject to resolution of some concerns.
25. A formal proposal had now been formulated by Mr Smith, on behalf of the Equipment Panel, in collaboration with Mr Ellis, which addressed the Council's concerns. The proposed amendment to Regulation H(1)(B)3.f. was proposed by Mr Smith and seconded by Mr Dornford-Smith.
26. It was noted that a reference to an 'overall maximum length' had been included in relation to medium and small dogs. It was accepted that the inclusion of the word 'maximum' was an error and that it should be removed. Subject to this, the Council was unanimous in its support for the amendment, which was accordingly **recommended** for approval as follows:

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

TO:

Long Jump—Each unit a minimum length of 1.2m.



Large Dogs - to comprise ~~3 to 5~~ **5** units, the overall length to be between ~~1.2m~~ **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 ~~3 to 5~~ **4** units, the overall length to be between 1m and ~~1.3m~~ **1.2m**. The height of the front unit to be 127mm and the height of the rear unit to be ~~381mm~~ **305mm**. Medium Dogs - to comprise ~~3 to 4~~ **3** units, the overall ~~maximum~~ 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 ~~305mm~~ **229mm**. Small Dogs - To comprise ~~2 to 3~~ **2** units, the overall ~~maximum~~ length to be between 400mm and ~~500mm~~ **600mm**. The height of the front unit to be 127mm and the height of the rear unit to be ~~229mm~~ **170mm**. Marker poles with a minimum height of 1.2m shall be used, these should not be attached to any part of the obstacle.
(Deletions struck through. Insertions in bold.)

27. It was also agreed that the Judges Guide to Agility Equipment would be updated to reflect the original wording on the discussion item regarding the number of units at each height:

Small dogs – 2 units (Units 1 & 2) - length 400-600mm
Medium Dogs – 3 units (Units 1, 2 & 3) - length 700-900mm
Intermediate Dogs – 4 Units (Units 1, 2, 3 & 4) - length 1.0-1.2m
Large Dogs – 5 Units (Units 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5) - length 1.3-1.5m

ITEM 4. ACTIVITIES HEALTH AND WELFARE SUB-GROUP

28. The Council noted a written report from Mr Tait following the Sub-Group's meeting on 15 April 2021. Mr Tait had attended the meeting as a guest pending approval of his membership of the Sub-Group by the Dog Health Group.
29. Mr Tait reported that the meeting had been very interesting and had highlighted the amount of work carried out by The Kennel Club in the interests of ensuring canine safety and welfare. However there had been delays in implementing some planned research programs due to Covid-19.
30. It was highlighted that research had been undertaken into the long jump and the scale in working trials, and the resulting forces on participating dogs, and it was suggested that it may be helpful to undertake similar research into forces on dogs on the up section of the A-frame.
31. Research into fitness and heart rate recovery had been delayed but it was hoped that this would resume in the near future. It was noted that the intention had been to carry out research using dogs which were part of Agility Team GB but it had been suggested to the Sub-Group that dogs competing at lower grades should also take part. This would help to ensure that dogs of different levels of fitness would be included.
32. Discussion on social forums often included references to the provision of a warm up jump for agility competitors, although it was unclear whether this would provide any significant benefit. The Sub-Group had noted that this may be a suitable topic for research.
33. All members of the Council were requested to notify Mr Tait of any further topics for potential research, and it was agreed that the issue should be placed on the Council's next agenda for further discussion.



ITEM 5. REPORT FROM THE EQUIPMENT PANEL

34. The Council noted that at present there was very little activity on the part of the Panel, but that it was intending to carry out a review of the H Regulations to assess whether any simplification was possible in view of the Board's approval of the amendment to Regulation H(1)(B)3. which specified tolerances for obstacles. In particular, a proposal relating to the specification for weave poles would be submitted to the Council at its next meeting, once consultation had taken place with equipment manufacturers.

Remit of the Panel

35. The Council reviewed a proposed revised remit for the Equipment Panel, as follows:

The Equipment Panel acts as an advisory group on matters related to agility equipment. It will:

- Review any new equipment for Kennel Club approval prior to use
- Review any modifications of design or materials for equipment currently in use for Kennel Club approval prior to introduction of modified design
- Review currently approved equipment to ensure specifications are still relevant in today's agility arena
- Consider concerns raised by the agility community in relation to equipment
- Monitor equipment issues raised in incident books
- Hold discussions with equipment manufacturers
- Report to the Council at meetings

36. The Council was in full agreement that the revised remit was clear and comprehensive and approved it for use.

ITEM 6. REPORT FROM THE AGILITY GOVERNANCE PANEL

37. The Council noted a report from the Agility Governance Panel, and discussed the issues raised.

Measurers

38. A review of existing measurers had been carried out by Mrs Gardner. This had included an analysis of the number of existing measurers and their distribution, details of the need for more measurers (including senior measurers) and what additional support would be needed for measurers. A copy of this review was provided to the Council, and was noted.
39. It was highlighted that a budget for the recruitment and training of new measurers had been approved by the Board at its meeting on 30 June 2021. The office would liaise with Mrs Gardner and Miss Olden to progress the matter. Advertisements would be issued by the office in the near future, and would include references to any specific geographical areas where there was a particular shortage of existing measurers. Following this, an assessment session would take place at The Kennel Club Building at Stoneleigh.
40. It was agreed that in the case of measurers on the Isle of Man, re-assessments for previous measurers may be carried out via remote means, in order to facilitate the process without the necessity for applicants to travel to the mainland.
41. A query was raised as to whether assessments via remote links would also be permissible for applicants in Northern Ireland, as there was an urgent need for measurers there. It was agreed that should previous measurers wish to re-apply for the role, re-assessment may be carried out remotely in the same way as for the Isle of Man.



42. In response to a query as to whether all measurers included on the current list were active, the Council noted that Mrs Gardner had contacted all of them and concluded that most were actively carrying out measuring. In some cases, measurers had good reasons for not being currently active but hoped to return to doing so in the near future. A suggestion was made that measurers be contacted every twelve months to confirm that they wished to continue in the role, but it was acknowledged that such a process would require significant office resources and was therefore not practical.
43. A further suggestion was made that all measurers should be required to submit an annual return to the office, which would detail measuring sessions undertaken, and would allow for the office to track relevant activity. Mrs Gardner offered her services to monitor the annual returns and to follow up on any which were not received in a timely manner. It would also be possible to clearly identify any measurers who were not active, although it was hoped that any measurers not wishing to continue in the role would notify the office accordingly.
44. It was also reiterated that measurers must advise the office of any measuring sessions, and must also ensure that the office was informed should a session be cancelled. Results must be submitted to the office within 14 days of the measuring session taking place.
45. A suggestion was raised that a requirement should be put into place whereby a measurer should also be actively competing in agility, however this was not supported as it was not considered necessary.
46. The office undertook to progress the issue of measurers with Mrs Gardner. Miss Olden also volunteered to assist.

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

47. The Council noted that no issues had been raised with the Judging Panel since the Council's previous meeting.
Activities Judges Sub-Group
48. The Council noted a written report from Mr Jolly, following the meeting of the Activities Judges Sub-Group which took place on 22 April 2021. The main issues highlighted were as follows:
Accredited Trainers
49. It was anticipated that the Annual Seminar for Accredited Trainers would take place at the Kennel Club Building at Stoneleigh in the autumn. This would include a run through of the current two-day Agility Judges seminar as a refresher for Accredited Trainers for agility, which would ensure consistency of delivery of content.
50. The Sub-Group had noted that there was a small backlog in assessing potential candidates for the role of Accredited Trainer for agility. It was currently considering the possibility of carrying out assessments of new Accredited Trainers via remote means.
Guide for Agility Judges and Stewards/Judges Guide to Agility Equipment
51. The Sub-Group was in the process of reviewing the full content of Guides for Judges and Codes of Practice for all activities disciplines.
52. The Council noted that there had been some complaints that the current Judges Guide to Agility Equipment, which was available on the Kennel Club website, contained out of date information, which was a cause for concern. However the Council was advised that the Judging



Panel was working on production of a single updated guidance document which would combine the existing Guide for Agility Judges and Stewards and the Judges Guide to Agility Equipment. However as this was a large document and the review was proving to be time-consuming, assistance was sought in carrying out the necessary work.

53. A suggestion was made that it would be helpful to form a small working group to progress the project. The Council was in full agreement that this would be a positive step, and agreed that the group should consist of Mr Cavill, Mrs Gardner, Mrs Hawkswell and Mr Tait. Advice and input would also be sought from other individuals as deemed necessary by the working group.
54. Input from the agility representatives serving on the Activities Judges Sub-Group (Mr Jolly and Mr Huckle) would also be welcome, and it was agreed that a draft of the revised document would be submitted to the Sub-Group for review at its meeting on 18 November 2021, and that it should therefore be with the office by the end of October 2021. This would then be circulated to all Council members with a view to a finalised document being available by the end of the Council's current term of office i.e. by the end of 2021.
55. In the short term, the Council accepted that there was an urgent need to issue a revised version of the Judges Guide to Agility Equipment, and it was agreed that Mr Smith would carry out the necessary review, and would submit details of any necessary revisions to the office by the end of July.

Minimum standards for Competition Managers/Chief Stewards

56. The Sub-Group had previously noted that there were currently no regulations specifying a minimum standard for Competition Managers for agility, and it had wished to recommend that such standards should be introduced for the discipline. It noted that at many shows the person appointed as Competition Manager did not compete in agility, but was appointed due to the provisions of Regulation H(1)9.c. which stated that the competition manager must not enter for competition a dog which was recorded in their ownership or part ownership, or work a dog at that show. Many competitors were unwilling to give up the opportunity to compete and therefore would not accept an appointment as competition manager.
57. The Sub-Group was in full agreement that set criteria should be in place for competition managers in order to ensure that they were competent to undertake the role, and it had requested that the views of the Agility Liaison Council should be sought. Accordingly, the Council was invited to consider a proposed new Regulation which would state that a competition manager should be aware of their responsibilities, should have competed in agility, and have knowledge of the current regulations.
58. A range of views was expressed on the matter. There was some support for the principle of the proposal, although there was some discussion as to the necessity for a competition manager to have competed in agility. There were also concerns that the imposition of criteria may result in the appointment of competition managers who may fulfil the criteria but may not have a sufficiently broad range of skills which were sometimes required when undertaking the role. In addition, as noted earlier, there was a concern that many competitors were already reluctant to give up competing to take on the role, and that imposing further criteria may make it very difficult for show organisers to find individuals willing to do so.
59. It was also highlighted that there were potential difficulties in defining 'have competed in agility' as this term could be interpreted as applying to an individual who had only competed on a single occasion. Further, it was acknowledged that there were different skill sets involved in competing in agility and in running a show. For these reasons the Council did not support the inclusion of any requirement to have competed in agility as part of the criteria. However a suggestion was made that the criteria should include a requirement for a competition manager to have passed the Regulations and Judging Procedure examination.



60. It was emphasised that a competition manager must be completely impartial, have a good understanding of H Regulations, and be able to identify potential issues on a course which may compromise the safety of handlers or dogs.
61. Although in agreement with the principle of setting clear and specific criteria for the role, after careful discussion, the Council concluded that there should be a clearer definition as the precise role and responsibilities of the competition manager, and that until this was in place, it would not be helpful to introduce a regulation which set specific criteria for the role. It was anticipated that the revised Guide for Agility Judges and Stewards, as discussed earlier in the meeting (paragraphs 51-55 refer), would include such a definition, and that once this had been completed, the Council would reconsider the issue with a view to making a firm recommendation to the Activities Judges Sub-Group.

Criteria for new agility judges

62. The Council's views were sought by the Sub-Group regarding the principles of a discussion paper in relation to suggested criteria for new agility judges, the main points of which were as follows:
- **Minimum standard of previous experience for Agility Judges**
Introduction of additional criteria for new agility judges to ensure that they had relevant practical experience before starting on their judging careers, and to establish a hierarchical judging framework.
 - **Categories of Judges**
Introduction of a tiered approach to judging, with newly qualified judges being restricted to certain levels until they had more judging experiences or more competitive experience. There would be four categories of judge - Novice, Open, Premier and Championship.
 - **Support, mentoring and development**
Mentoring would become mandatory and there would also be ongoing support and development opportunities for judges.
63. There were mixed views on the matter, with some concerns raised that it may prove difficult for aspiring judges in areas such as Northern Ireland to fulfil all of the proposed criteria at each level. It was accepted that caution was required in ensuring that the requirements were not unduly onerous as this may prove discouraging.
64. There was also a view that such measures were not necessary, as many show secretaries were already aware of which judges were experienced and which were not, and that the proposed criteria would result in the process of appointing judges becoming unduly complicated. There was also a concern at the suggested requirement for judges to have competed at certain levels, as the skills required to run a dog were not necessarily the same as those required to judge. Some individuals did not compete but were capable judges.
65. Others were of the view that the principle of introducing such criteria would be a positive step, subject to consideration of finer details at a later stage. However, it was emphasised that judges were volunteers and that caution was necessary to ensure that any criteria were not unduly rigorous or complex. A query was also raised as to whether the mentoring framework currently in place would be sufficiently robust to support the introduction of mandatory mentoring.
66. This led to a brief discussion regarding the current position in relation to mentoring, in that mentors were not permitted to compete in a class for which they were acting as mentor. This



measure had been introduced at the request of the Accredited Trainers but it was suggested that this should be reconsidered. This was noted.

67. It was clarified that if introduced, the proposed criteria for judges would not be applied retrospectively and that judges would remain qualified at their current level.
68. After careful consideration, the Council concluded that the introduction of a structured program of progression for judges would be a positive step, and would allow them to progress stage by stage, gaining relevant experience at each step, which would equip them to carry out appointments at higher levels. Accordingly it wished to record its support for the principle, but with the proviso that more work was necessary in formulating the details, taking into account the views which had been expressed by the Council. It was noted that it may be possible to produce a proposal whereby new criteria were introduced in stages rather than all at one time.
69. It was agreed that the Judging Panel would continue to develop the criteria and would submit an updated item for discussion at the Council's next meeting.

ITEM 8. INTERNATIONAL AGILITY FESTIVAL

70. The Council noted that plans were in hand for The Kennel Club International Agility Festival, due to be held on 12-15 August 2021, but were all subject to potential change at short notice should circumstances dictate.

ITEM 9. AGILITY TEAM GB

71. The Council noted that the following events had been cancelled by the organisers:
 - The Junior Open Agility World Championships (JOAWC) due to be held 15–18 July 2021 in Portugal.
 - European Open Agility Championship due to be held 22–25 July 2021 in Portugal
 - FCI Agility World Championships due to be held in Estonia 23–26 September 2021.
72. The Open Showcase online event took place on 25 April 2021, however in view of the above, the Pre-Selection qualifier and Agility World Championships try-outs which were due to take place 30–31 May 2021 and 10–11 July 2021 respectively had also been cancelled.

ITEM 10. PROPOSALS FROM SOCIETIES/PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS

73. No proposals had been received.

ITEM 11. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Championship judges

74. Mr Hallam wished the Council to consider concerns regarding the pool of judges available to undertake appointments at championship level. In particular it was highlighted that the current list of approved judges included a number who had retired from judging championship classes, or who were no longer actively involved in the discipline. Further, it appeared that very few new



judges were coming forward for assessment in order to become approved to judge at this level. As a result there was some concern that there were reduced options for show organisers to select from when appointing judges for championship classes.

75. The office advised the Council that all championship judges had been contacted in order to confirm that they were happy for their details to be published on The Kennel Club's Find a Judge service, when it became operational, although there was a concern that it appeared that not all championship judges had received the relevant contact from the office. This was noted by the office and would be investigated. It was hoped that those judges who no longer wished to undertake judging appointments would advise the office accordingly and that this would be helpful in ensuring that the information provided via the service was as up to date as possible. It would include information on a judge's past and future appointments (including height) which would be helpful to show secretaries.
76. It was also noted that there were a number of potential championship judges awaiting assessment. This process had been delayed as a result of Covid-19, but it was hoped that more potential judges could come forward in the near future.
77. The Council did not consider that any further action was necessary at present.

Reporting of incidents at agility shows

78. Mr Tait, on behalf of Ms C Harding, wished to suggest that any show official, judge, ring manager, or other individual making an entry into the Incident Book should receive a confirmation email from The Kennel Club within 42 days of the show.
79. The Council was reminded that under the terms of Regulation H8.f., a copy of the Incident Book must be submitted to The Kennel Club within 14 days of the show. Normal practice was for the office to issue an acknowledgment of receipt to the show secretary within six weeks of receipt. It was accepted that there had been one occasion where this had not taken place, due to an error, and in this case an apology had been made to the club concerned.
80. The Council agreed that it was important for competitors or officials to understand what to expect when reporting an incident. It was clarified that where an incident recorded in the Incident Book was marked as having been resolved on the day, The Kennel Club would not take further action (unless the incident was serious in nature), and no acknowledgement would be issued to the person who had made the entry. Where an incident was investigated by the office, the person making the entry would be contacted in order to request a witness statement.
81. The office wished to issue a reminder that anyone wishing to contact the office to lodge an incident report which was not recorded in the Incident Book at the time of the show should do so by email to agility@thekennelclub.org.uk and not by post. Show organisers were also reminded that at present Incident Books should be sent to the office via email in order to ensure a timely response.
82. In response to a query, it was confirmed that the procedures used by the Scottish Kennel Club were independent of those used by The Kennel Club.

ITEM 12. REVIEW TIMETABLE

83. The Council noted the current review timetable which provided a three-year rolling programme of reviews and proposal timeframes from each of the Panels.



ITEM 13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Activity Register

84. The Council noted with concern that there were currently delays in registering dogs on the Activity Register, as a result of which some dogs were unable to compete, or to undergo measuring.
85. It was advised that the office was aware of the issues and every effort was being made to resolve them. In the meantime breeders/owners were advised to commence the registration process as early as possible.

Bitches in season

86. The Council's attention was drawn to activity on social media in relation to whether it should be permissible to compete at agility shows with a bitch in season. The matter was not discussed further but it was noted that any relevant proposals or discussion items may be submitted for consideration at the Council's next meeting.

Retiring Council members

87. Mr Cavill, in his role as Chairman of the Council, wished to thank all those who had served on the Council during its current term of office, especially those who were standing down: Mr Chandler, Mrs Croxford, Mrs Gardner, and Miss Olden. Mr Cavill himself was also standing down.
88. A vote of thanks was given to Mr Cavill for all of his work on behalf of the Council.

ITEM 14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

89. The date of the next meeting would be confirmed in September 2021.
90. Once announced, the deadline for submissions would be strictly adhered to and no late submissions would be accepted.

The meeting closed at 1.05 pm.

MR M CAVILL
Chairman

THE KENNEL CLUB'S MISSION STATEMENT

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



Annex A to the Minutes

Ring sizes

Acceptable ring size special and standard classes for various venues	Minimum Square metres	Minimum side	Recommended Sq metres
Indoor arenas	450 square metres	15 metres	600 square metres
Enclosed, constructed outdoor manege/arena single ring	600 square metres	20 metres	800 square metres
Enclosed, constructed outdoor manege/ surfaced arena multiple rings	600 square metres	20 metres	800 square metres
Outdoor space Grass areas included areas with stock fencing paddocks etc	1024 square metres	32 metres	Recommended no larger than 1400 Sq metres
Acceptable ring size for Championship and Premier events for various venues	minimum Square metres	minimum side	Recommended Sq metres
Indoor arenas	800 square metres	20 metres	800 square metres
Enclosed, Constructed outdoor manege/arena single ring	800 square metres	20 metres	800 square metres
Enclosed, Constructed outdoor manege/ surfaced arena Multiple rings	800 square metres	20 metres	800 square metres
Outdoor space Grass areas included areas with stock fencing paddocks etc	1024 square metres	32 metres	Recommended no larger than 1400 Sq metres



Annex B to the minutes

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



THE KENNEL CLUB

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

Mar-21



**ALC 08.07.21
Annex C to the Minutes**

I would firstly like to thank all the ALC representatives and KC office for everything they have done for the last 3 years through some very difficult times and embracing and adapting to a new way of working and meeting.

This is probably a rare occasion, or certainly in my time on committee that we have a few regional representatives standing down from the council for a number of reasons and I would like to thank them all for everything they have given to both the council and their regions for a number of years.

Lesley Olden has decided that after 30 plus years on ALC that it's time to hang up her boots. In Lesley's words 'Back in the 80's I was asked to sit on the ALC, it was felt they had too many men on it and needed a woman, who was competing at the top with an unbiased opinion, and apparently I fitted the bill.' This was just after winning Olympia in 1986.

Lesley has been fundamental in the decisions that have shaped agility over what is probably a longer period than most of us have even owned dogs and has represented the committee as both Vice and Chair of ALC and sat on the Activities Committee for a period of time.

Over this period Lesley has been actively involved in a number of committees that has seen key changes;

- Dog heights from 2 to the current 4.
- Grades from 2 to the current 7.
- Jumps lowered
- Rubber contacts.
- The Working Party to introduce Championship Status to Agility, way back in 1999
- The Measuring Process from scratch.

Lesley is not the only one standing down this term. Simon Chandler joined the council in 2010, Yvonne Croxford and Jackie Gardner in 2013 and also myself in 2013.

I think it is fair to say that all have actively and whole heartedly supported the ethos of the council and have helped shape its current format and strategy and have contributed heavily to improving the safety of agility through obstacle specifications, consideration of dog safety, judges' education and introduction of working panels.

It is unfortunate that we are losing in excess of 69 years of experience and knowledge of the workings and history of the Council, but I'm sure those that are re-standing and those that are new to council for the next term will continue the good work and I am sure I can say that all of us that are standing down are not going anywhere and are always available for a chat over a coffee/beer at proper shows again soon.

Many thanks to all.

Martin Cavill