



AGILITY DOG ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALIA LTD

ABN 83 070 415 040

Provisional Draft of the Agility Regulations – Feedback Update

25 members provided feedback on the Regulations, thank you all. You will be provided with a separate acknowledgement of your submission by ADAA's Secretary together with a copy of this Feedback Update. All of the feedback received has been considered by your Board of Directors and a number of changes are being made to the Provisional Regulations. Whilst these have been agreed in principle, the wording has not yet been finalised and will be provided to members as soon as possible.

The majority of those who provided feedback objected to the inclusion of Not-For-Competition, primarily as they felt that it was unfair to not allow food but to allow use of toys or other rewards. There were however some responses supporting the inclusion of Not-For-Competition (NFC). On the basis that some members may not have responded on this topic as they were happy with the inclusion of toys in the NFC, the Board has decided to provide a further opportunity for all members to provide feedback on this aspect. This feedback will be considered by the Board prior to finalising the Regulations. Members are reminded that they are expected to use appropriate language and not make disparaging remarks about other Members, Judges or the Board of Directors.

Submissions on whether you wish to have the proposed Not-For-Competition included in the Regulations, or totally excluded, may be sent to ADAA's Secretary secretary@adaa.com.au on or before Tuesday 23 May 2006.

Feedback can also be forwarded by post to:

The Secretary
ADAA Ltd
PO Box 2212
Gailes Qld 4300

Cathy Slot
Chairman
11 May 2006

ADAA Vision

To be recognised internationally and within Australia as a leader in the promotion and development of the global sport of Agility

ADAA Mission

We want to provide a service that supports all members in pursuing Agility as a safe and fun sporting activity, from a local community to an international level. We are going to achieve this by:

- Listening to the needs of members
- Promoting competitions
- Training judges
- Quality rulebook
- Support to affiliated clubs and groups
- Promote growth of the sport
- Development of skills
- Relationships with like bodies
- Effective communication

Summary of Member Feedback

The following is a representative sample of the feedback from Members. In some cases, a number of members lodged feedback along similar lines, in others it was received from one member. All feedback was given due consideration by the Board.

Topic	Member Comment	Board Feedback
International standards	<p>Why should ADAA follow International Standards? Why can't ADAA set its own standards? Remember why this organisation was formed in the first place</p>	<p>ADAA's motto has always been "Promoting International Agility, the Global Dog Sport". ADAA is affiliated with the International Federation of Cynological Sports and takes into consideration all Agility rule changes throughout the world. ADAA was originally established in 1994 for the specific purpose of conducting Agility in line with international standards and not to significantly diverge from those standards. Whilst there are differences between some rules of the various international organisations, there are rules that are common across all organisations.</p>
Fun atmosphere	<p>It is important for ADAA to keep growing and changing but not to the detriment of one of the key factors that makes ADAA different from the rest which is having fun. I have found competing at ADAA events to be fun, friendly and highly supportive of all dogs and their handlers On a finishing note... I enjoy doing agility... competing with my dogs and the social side of things, but the fun is being taken out of agility with all of these very pedantic rules coming into force.</p>	<p>The Board believes the changes proposed increase the ability of more people and their Dogs to have fun in Agility, especially through the Regular Programme. Many people, worldwide have fun participating in Agility within their capacity. The Board has identified that there are Regulations in place, especially those surrounding Elimination, the intent of which was to discourage certain things which Handlers, over time, have ignored. The Board acknowledges its role (either directly or through its Judges training programme) in allowing this to occur and has agreed that these may not be in the best interests of the Member, their Dog and/or the long term future of ADAA and its Competitions.</p>

<p>Consultation</p>	<p>It is apparent to me that these rules are coming into force on the 1st of July even though there has been no consultation from members. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on these draft regulations and hope that my comments will be received in the spirit in which they are intended.</p>	<p>21 Members took the time to make submissions on the Agility Regulations. All of these were considered by the Board in arriving at the Provisional Regulations. The Board has considered the feedback on the Provisional Regulations and has agreed on further changes that will be made prior to finalisation, in addition to the feedback currently being sought from Members on Not-For-Competition.</p>
<p>Dismissal</p>	<p>We are now having to think about everything we do and what the consequence will be...will I be dismissed if I do this, will I be dismissed for the whole night, from both rings etc.</p> <p>I am totally against the introduction of the Dismissal rule. A handler has paid their fee should be allowed to run their dog up to the MCT Agree [<i>with Dismissal</i>]</p> <p>If your dog runs off the field, does this mean that the judge will ask you to leave the course</p>	<p>When the Agility Regulations were originally drafted (in 1994), it was anticipated that Members would not purposely engage in any behaviour that would result in Elimination. This is not the case (and again the Board acknowledges its role in this increasing trend).</p> <p>Dismissal has been retained for those things that the Board considers may affect subsequent Competitors, the running of the Competition and/or are unacceptable at a Competition. The Board has reviewed and amended those things that will result in Dismissal and Elimination with these criteria in mind.</p> <p>The Board has amended this Regulation so that if a Dog runs off the field and interferes with another Dog the Competitor will be Dismissed and asked to leave the course. If the Dog runs off the field and subsequently comes back without interfering with another Dog, the Competitor will be Eliminated and may continue, until the Maximum Course Time.</p>
<p>Fouling the ring</p>	<p>A dog will be Eliminated for “Dog fouling the ring”. I do not understand why this merits only Elimination rather than Dismissal. Fouling the ring can unfairly cause multiple other dogs to be disadvantaged</p>	<p>Whilst the Board agreed that multiple Dogs are affected by a Dog fouling the ring, it is often something outside the control of the Handler and does not present a danger to other Competitors or the Judge. Therefore it has been decided to leave this within the auspices of Elimination</p>

Lifting Dog	<p>I was wondering the reasoning behind instant dismissal for the handler lifting the dog off the ground</p> <p>As far as I can remember, this has only occurred because of a possible injury to the dog, or to stop the agility ‘game’ with a dog.</p> <p>Of all the other competitors, I saw many picking up their dogs for various reasons, including and not limited to, removing them from the ring as they were toileting, stacking their dog back on contacts, and removing them from the ring as they had lost their focus and drive.</p> <p>By including this in the dismissal clause, I personally feel I will not be able to have full control over my dog.</p>	<p>The Board acknowledges that there are many reasons for a handler to pick a dog up however there has been an increasing incidence of Handlers doing so to apply punishment when their Dog has not performed to their expectation (dropping hurdle bars, missing a contact). The Board took into account the feedback given and that there are situations in which lifting a Dog can also be for the safety of the Dog and has now included this under Elimination and it will monitor the situation for the next edition of the Regulations.</p>
Dismissal for the Day	<p>I would argue that each Judge is entitled to make the decision for their own ring, not to have it mandated that the action decided on by one judge must be imposed on the other judge present, and on the conduct of his/her ring.</p> <p>Then there is the bit that the judge can dismiss the handler from that ring, that even, the whole night or from both rings!! How does something that happens in Ring 1 affect Ring 2? Yes dismiss the handler if the offence is bad eg verbally abusing the judge/dog etc but for lifting a dog up for sniffing and then judge having the power to dismiss that competitor from both rings for the whole night.</p> <p>The regulations state that you will be dismissed for using toys, having visible toys training aids. There are some people that run with mobile phones, pedometers etc attached to the waist ban of their shorts/pants. Are these counted as training aids?</p> <p>I believe that dismissing a handler for the rest of competition for using food in the ring is complete unwarranted.</p>	<p>The Board has agreed that difficulties can arise when one person makes a blanket decision that affects a Competitor in all rings, therefore a Judge may Dismiss a Handler from the Judge’s ring and events only. However, there are circumstances in which a Handler/Owner should be excused from the Competition, for example physically abusing a Dog. The Board has made provision for a decision to be made by the Judges on the day, plus an executive from the Club/Group holding the Competition. This is to ensure that the decision is made with due consideration of the facts.</p> <p>Using food in the ring as a reason to Dismiss a Handler was included because it was anticipated that Competitors would choose to ignore Dismissal, as they do now for Elimination. This has been removed but has been replaced by “blatant disregard of this Regulation”.</p>

Contact Equipment Faults	<p>I can see why the changes has been made with regards to the a-frame and having a dog touch the ground with any foot before they touch the down contact area as it would be a huge impact on the dog's front end if this was the way they consistently did the a-frame</p> <p>I personally could see that a large striding dog could easily stride over the dog walk contact area and touch one or both front feet on the ground and then bring their back feet into the contact area. I don't see that this is a safety issue with the angle for the dog walk being much less than the a-frame</p> <p><i>Agree [with the Provisional Regulations]</i></p>	<p>The wording is in line with previous versions of the Regulations (except the 7th Edition) and in line with all similar overseas organisation. No change will be made to the Provisional Regulations.</p>
Maximum Course Time	<p>Agree a good idea</p>	
A-Frame heights	<p>I think that it is unfair that the toy height changes only applies in the RP</p>	<p>The Board notes that Toy Dogs within the IP only compete against Toy Dogs (including Starters and Elementary) and that Members can choose to compete within the RP in order to avail themselves of the lower height should they feel that is appropriate for their Dog. No change will be made to the Provisional Regulations.</p>
Table	<p>I would like to express my concern that the Toy Regular table is still the same height as all other RP dogs at 300 mm</p>	<p>This is currently under consideration by the Board. We are looking at ways to be fair to all Competitors without increasing Club equipment requirements.</p>
Weavers	<p>The rules have always stated the poles need to be 550 mm apart measured from centre to centre, however poles that are 600 mm from centre to centre are acceptable. So if 600 mm is acceptable, and no-one is using 500 mm, why do we still have it in the regs?</p> <p>Starters Weave Poles Amend to read "Maximum one (1) Course Fault..., at least six poles whether consecutive or not have been attempted..."</p>	<p>To the Board's knowledge, the vast majority of ADAA affiliated Clubs (including the NSW equipment trailer) use weave poles with poles 550 mm apart.</p> <p>There is a minimum of 10 poles in Agility Tests (which means only 5 poles have to be completed), however the wording on Starters Weave Poles has been changed to clarify that half of the poles need to be completed, consecutive or not.</p>
See-Saw	<p>Thank you for keeping in the Regs the information on how to weight the See-Saw</p>	

Titles	<p>Next to the heading of each certificate or in the description of the certificate I think the colour of the certificate should be listed I'd like to see the AATD title expanded to AATD2, e as per other titles Love the addition of jumping cards for Starters/Elementary Love the addition of the jumping title</p>	<p>New Tables have been included that give the colour of each certificate. The Board has not done this as we want to encourage those with their AATD title to partner with Handlers with newer (untitled) Dogs. If the Board was to include expanded AATD titles then it is envisaged that Handlers will be looking to always form the best team possible.</p>
Placings for Games	Very good change	
Dog Registers	Agree	
Performance Programmes	Agree	
Judging	<p>It is the judges responsibility to do the best they can, which they do It states in that section that it relates to dogs wearing collars, handlers with food etc but it also says “but not limited” to which leaves it very open for a member of the JMC to come in and “advise” the judge on basically anything. I also think that if the JMC is a competitor in the same event that they can no longer be considered impartial. You don't see the sideline refs in a football game actually playing on the field as well. Certainly if a member of the JMC notices a breach – such as turning up at the starting box wearing a bum-bag – they should very quickly pass this information on to the Judge – hopefully, the JMC member would also instantly draw the Handler's attention to this while still in the starting area if at all possible. However once the information is given to the Judges it should be at the Judge's discretion what action (s)he takes. At a later date, at a Judges' meeting, full discussion and if necessary advice and coaching should be given to assist any Judge who may have had problems in this area.</p>	<p>The Board and the Judges Management Committee agree that ADAA's Judges do a great job, often in difficult conditions (hot, wet etc). The Board is reviewing this Regulation to ensure that appropriate management protocols are in place without undermining, or being perceived to undermine, the authority of the Judge at a Competition.</p>

	<p>If the member of the JMC considers it a serious enough breach that they need to bring it to the Judges attention then surely it should happen as soon as possible. To help try and prevent these issues occurring I'm wondering I if it may be possible for the marshal for the event to look for things that may be considered breaches and to remind the handlers of their need to comply with the rules. Maybe clubs could display some sort of laminated sign to remind Competitors to make sure that they remove their dog's collar, are wearing the correct type of footwear.</p> <p>My understanding has been that the judge in the ring is the one that makes the decisions and that that judges decision is final...yes...if there is a safety issue then let the JMC step in, otherwise let the judge in charge make the decisions and let the competitors have faith that that judge knows what they are doing</p>	
Stewards	<p>If we can't trust people that are helping at our competition, who can we trust? It's hard enough to get helpers at competitions and ADAA is making it harder</p> <p>Having organised competition for the last 5 years I know how hard it is to find people who are willing to volunteer to help with scribing and scorekeeping and with the proposed change on this one it now seems as if it will be just about impossible. I believe the reason that there are two people at the table scoring and scribing is to prevent any change of cheating so it seems to me as if this rule change may cause more problems than it actually would solve.</p>	<p>The Board's decision to change this Regulation was not about trust, and whether or not people have done the wrong thing, it was about ensuring that an innocent family Member could not be put in the situation of being the recipient of an allegation. It is the process of being the recipient of an allegation, and not whether or not the person is ultimately declared innocent, that concerns the Board.</p> <p>The Board feels that people will step up, as they have in the past when there someone else isn't available and their event cannot continue without Stewards.</p>

Stewards	<p>Suggestion Amend the reg to state something on the lines that a family member etc can complete the scoresheets but may not scribe. This clause then begs the question...can family members judge their own dogs or dogs that are run by other family members or live under the same roof? To me and many others if there was going to be an incidence where family favouritism was involved, it would more likely occur here than at the scribe table.</p> <p>In the event of an odd complaint this should be investigated (perhaps by the JMC) with due respect given to both sides and on a case-by-case basis. I do not believe that complaints of this nature are all that common</p> <p>The continuity of having the same people at the desk for the night would have to make life easier for the judge.</p>	<p>Judges and Stewards must be aware of potential conflicts of interest and this is being addressed by the Board prior to releasing the Agility Regulations.</p> <p>A complaints process will be included in the Regulations however the Board considers that it is much better to avoid a situation where a complaint may arise that.</p> <p>The Board encourages Clubs to consider appointing people who are able to Steward for the whole Competition (after appropriate training).</p>
Classes	<p>I still don't see the need to allow non titled dogs enter Open events if you are looking to increase the speed of event, stop the inexperienced handlers/dog running in open events.</p> <p>Agreed. I don't like seeing dogs in Open who can't pass elementary</p>	<p>The Board has noted that the size of Competitions significantly varies. For smaller Competitions, especially where less events are offered (eg only one ring), a Club may wish to allow non-titled Dogs to enter these events. Also, experienced Handlers with their new Dog are often quite capable of successfully participating in Open events. This allows Clubs to determine the most appropriate situation for them and their Members given the number of expected entries.</p>

<p>Regular Programme</p>	<p>I am concerned that there will be increasing scope for handlers to switch their dogs from the IP to RP in order to more easily secure titles, placings and prizes</p> <p>Apart from the obvious aims of extending the competitive life of individual dogs, and easing injured dogs back to fitness I feel that Regular will grow in relevance and importance within an increasingly urban society where local council regulations can restrict many households to a single dog. Without control we may have a situation where young, fit, healthy dogs are competing on the same level as the older, the incapacitated, the recovering entrants.</p> <p>My concern with the regular programme is that there are some dogs who are competing that should not be allowed to do so for health reason. A couple of the dogs competing in the regular programme could be conceived as cruel to an outsider. Is there anyway this could be avoided? Maybe ADAA could enforce a yearly health check that is performed by a vet with a checklist of what is acceptable and what is not.</p> <p>Closer reading of the new rules has left me disappointed. I refer to the fact that while Maxi and Mini Regular dogs and compete in Team Games by jumping at their usual height (550 mm and 250 mm), Regular Midi dogs are to be handicapped by being asked to jump at a greater height than is normally laid down for them (550 mm instead of 400 mm). Regular Toy dogs (if there are any of them, and I have not noticed any competing) will also be disadvantaged. I would ask the Board to consider some alternative that allows Regular Midi dogs to compete in Team events at their normal height of 400 mm</p> <p>The new jump height of 150 mm in the RP and lower A-frame for both the IP (MX/MD) and the RP (MN/TY) are welcome changes too, as are the extensive expansions to both the Junior and the Regular Programmes</p>	<p>The Board is happy to encourage Members to participate in the Regular Programme. Whilst it may have, in the past, been perceived that the RP is for older/less fit Dogs, that is not the Board's intent. Members should choose this option based on their Dog's structure, height to weight ratio, the Handler's fitness and/or Handler's preference to have a longer time on course. Members with Dogs on the RP are not considered inferior and it is purely a choice that they make.</p> <p>The Board, too, is concerned that some Handlers/Owners do not appear to consider the long-term well-being of their Dog when competing. The Board considered that a yearly health clearance would not achieve the desired purpose and will continue to consider options.</p> <p>The Board considered, at length, the various options and decided that it will maintain Team Games on the Combined Programme as per the Provisional Agility Regulations. An AATD title is not a prerequisite for any of the Regular Programme titles and before entering any class, Members should make sure it is appropriate for their Dog.</p>
--------------------------	---	---

<p>Combined Programme</p>	<p>I feel that allowing both regular and international dogs to compete in the same programme lessens the titles associated with this programme with the dogs competing in the IP, it increases the changes of injury to the dog and creates a difficult transition from starters to intermediate</p>	<p>The Board agreed that a Maxi Dog should be given the opportunity to negotiate a lower jump height in Elementary and Starters so that Dogs are not over-faced in their initial Competitions. This principle was applied to all Classes to allow Dogs to develop experience and confidence. Owners/Handlers have the facility to manage their Dog's jump height be "moving the Dog up" a Class (eg a Dog 490 mm to enter Maxi Class) in order to maintain jumping form or to gain experience before the Dog moves up to Intermediate Tests/Events. Reference to this is included in the Provisional Regulations.</p>
<p>Tyre</p>	<p>I'd like the tyre put back into the Starters/Elementary class</p>	<p>This has been excluded so that a Dog is only ever presented with a Tyre set at one height. The Tyre is the only obstacle that requires the Dog to "aim" versus hurdles which the Dog can over jump without colliding with the obstacle.</p>
<p>Standards</p>	<p>I think with the new reg's there are too many standards now and it is over complicated. I see no need to add the Combined Programme. People have enough problems filling out the entries now, once these regs are released I think for some members it will be just all too hard and you will lose entries. I don't see it as an improvement. I also think that all of these standards and class combinations do not make it very easy for the trial secretary to put together a schedule. I guess I'd like it simplified</p> <p>I think the Combined Programme will prove to be a welcome addition to our schedules; especially the Jumping Tests at Elementary and Starters Standard (that's nice) and it's also a good idea to increase the difficulty of the Starters courses</p>	<p>The Board has released sample events to Clubs/Groups to simplify the process.</p>
<p>Junior</p>	<p>Can clear round certificates earned by juniors be used for more than one title</p> <p>I like calling Junior Elementary JE and RE alike...makes more sense</p> <p>Love the addition of the junior handler awards</p> <p>Love the addition of the junior JHOT card</p> <p>Junior Handler Owned –It's about time Junior Handlers used their own trained dogs</p>	<p>Juniors may be eligible to receive two Certificates in each class they enter.</p> <p>If they are handling their JHOT Registered Dog, and achieve a clear round they will receive a JHOT Certificate PLUS a Clear Round Certificate for the class they have entered (in any Programme). The JHOT Certificate can only be used towards their JHOT Title.</p>

<p>Not for Competition/Food in the Ring</p>	<p>I have always loved the fact that ADAA has allowed people to make the choice of eliminating their dog and making the competition ring a much more rewarding place for their dogs. I don't think that taking away the option to train in the ring will stop people from entering dogs before they are ready to compete (which is I believe part of the boards reason for this change) but in fact we will see more people trying to yell and scream at their dogs to get them around a course. I also do not like the fact that the rule change discriminates against the food motivated dogs. I think it should either be that you can use whatever you want to reward in the ring (whether it be NFC or whatever) or nothing.</p> <p>ADAA's philosophy is rich in the doctrine of click and reward with food being pushed as a primary conditioner. I do not believe that food should be suddenly withdrawn from the training programme. Suggestion Food rewards will only be allowed in Starters and Elementary events but will be strictly restricted to rewards that do not crumble such as tape or dry sausage type foods that require the handler to physically break a piece off. The handler will obtain the judges approval for the type of food reward to be used and the food reward will be carried in one piece in the competitors hand whilst in the ring. I would just like to say that I think one of the best new rules included in this edition is the exclusion of food in the ring. Toys on the other hand are of great benefit and certainly do not interfere with the dog/s competing after run. I have no problem with this at all. These 2 "draft" rules seem to have been well thought out and will be of great benefit to all competitors, and no dog will be disadvantaged, which I believe is the "name of the game". I also like the NFC rule too. A really good idea, and one I fully support.</p>	<p>It was never envisaged that Handlers would choose to ignore Elimination. Again the Board acknowledges its role in this increasing trend by not highlighting this as an issue previously through the Agility Regulations. The Board also acknowledges that some Handlers enter their Dog in Competition before it is ready.</p> <p>The reason for excluding food is that it disadvantages others Dogs when it is dropped on the ground. Under the Provisional Regulations, no Dog is able to achieve a Clear Round Certificate if the Handler indicates that they want to be able to use a reward (ie Not-For-Competition) irrespective of whether or not they actually use the reward. Within NFC, the only rewards that can be used are those that will not disadvantage subsequent Competitors.</p> <p>Yes ADAA's training has always been, and continues to be, rich in reinforcement (food or play). However Competition was always intended as a venue for Handlers and Dogs to test their level of understanding and skill.</p>
---	---	---

	<p>I totally agree that food being dropped in the ring is becoming a major problem and I have one of those dogs that when there is food will apply the brakes immediately and continue sniffing until he has found all the dropped food...however by saying that competitors are now allowed to only tug as a reward is discrimination.. The ruling should either be anything is allowed or nothing is allowed.</p> <p>In relation to not being able to treat a dog with food in the ring, I am very strongly opposed to this as some dogs are not toy motivated and are therefore setting them up for failure. While I realise that if food is dropped in the ring it can be detrimental to other dogs, however why can there not be a ring set aside for competition whereby treating is allowed and the other ring be for more stricter competition. If ADAA does decide to not allow any food treating in any rings, then I would prefer not to also allow treating with toys either.</p> <p>What would happen if between placing your entry for a not-for-competition round and the event your dog improved and you wanted to try to run the course? Would there be provision for changes? NFC – is one of the reasons that a lot of NSWelsh people start doing ADAA. The fact that they can reward (toy) in the ring for their young dogs. Thanks for leaving that in. We had been given word that it was out!!</p> <p>I don't agree with this, trials should not be for training. If it is to be, keep it to Elementary class only</p>	<p>Within Not-For-Competition only, Handlers are able to use any reward that cannot disadvantage a subsequent Competitor, it is not limited to tugging.</p> <p>The Board is happy to encourage Clubs/Groups to separately run mock Competitions or, as one Queensland Club recently called it, a SOCK (Sort Out Competition Kinks) in which Handlers can reward their Dog.</p> <p>The Board acknowledges that some Dogs do not play with toys however decided to give all Handlers the opportunity to participate in a Competition situation in which they can reward their Dog. If this something that the majority of Members don't want, or for those with Dogs that don't play with Dogs, don't want their fellow Handlers to have access to, then the Board is happy to listen.</p> <p>Handlers would be able to change their entry to/from Not-For-Competition until the point that they enter the Start Area by informing the Scribe/Scorekeeper.</p>
Food at the end of the run	I have no problems at all with this rule, but feel that firm guidelines are needed for its implementation, as a judge's interpretation of what constitutes "the immediate confines of the course" may differ.	Judges will be asked to clarify this in their Judge's brief

<p>Start Area</p>	<p>Currently a lot of competitors get their dogs ready while the previous competitor is still on course. I believe that this new rule will stop people from standing near the start area and getting their dogs ready and that people will wait until the last possible second before going in there. What if someone is standing behind the box practicing their stays with food or a toy but not actually setting their dog up for the start? How would a judge know whether to judge them or not? Like the start area being marked. Stops people walking close behind you with their dog tugging just before you run. Designating an area as being free from all dogs except the dog about to compete seems an excellent idea – it would allow the dog and the handler a few seconds to focus free from immediate distractions. However, not allowing tug toys or food in now contributes to this objective. We have a start line for a reason – it is the official line whereby once the dog or handler crosses it, judging commences. There are also some clubs that don't have sufficient room on their fields to allow for a 4.5 m start area....what happens to these clubs? Can there be clarification of the Start area allowed and not allowed particularly to the word “garment”. Is the wearing of a warming coat, or cooling vest, allowed within this Start Area?</p>	<p>The Board will clarify judging of the Start Area</p> <p>Judging has always commenced when the Handler is in the “ring”. This now clarifies at what point the Handler is under the Judge’s control. The Board (and Judges) have identified that the Start Area is currently one of the biggest problems for dropped food.</p> <p>This will be dealt with in Judges training and in discussion with Clubs.</p> <p>The Board is currently clarifying what the Dog may, or may not, wear within the Start Area.</p>
<p>Dog wearing collar</p>	<p>Could I ask that this be clarified while it is waiting its turn in the Start Area</p>	<p>The Board has decided that a Dog may enter the Start Area on collar and lead, the Agility Regulations will be amended accordingly.</p>
<p>Gamblers</p>	<p>I believe there should be a mandatory reduction in the work away distance for mini/toy dogs. Suggestion Add a clause on the lines of all gamble work away distances must be reduced by 1 m for the mini/toy dogs</p>	<p>The Board has decided that the current requirements do not mandate Judges provide the same distance for all Classes and the minimum 2 m should be maintained.</p>