

Information Document regarding upcoming changes to Agility and Jumpers Competition regulations

This document is designed to inform members of the agility community of upcoming changes expected to be implemented on July 1st 2010.

This document has several sections, in an effort to keep everyone fully informed and to hopefully answer any questions.

- **Summary of Submissions** – this section summarises the submissions received from the agility community up until January 28th 2010. This section was written by a person outside the NZKC AC, who has professional experience in the writing of summaries of submissions. The writer of this section read all the submissions received and provided an objective summary to the NZKC AC. The NZKC AC also read all submissions and independently identified the same common issues as identified in this summary.
- **Summary of Regulation Changes** – this section is a plain English summary of the regulation changes recommended by the NZKC AC. The decisions regarding regulation changes were made by the NZKC AC after many major discussions both by email and face to face, and reflect where possible the issues identified as common from the summary of submissions. This section does not contain the actual new wording that will be made to the Agility Regulations. It was agreed by the NZKC AC in the interests of publishing this summary document as quickly as possible to the agility community, to do so without the full Regulation rewrite, as it will take a considerable amount of time to ensure that all regulations that need to be changed are. New Agility Regulations will be available as soon as this process is complete.
- **Summary of how to implement the Separate Height Competition** – this summary document was written with the assistance of a very experienced show secretary outside of the NZKC AC, to help clubs implement the new regulations at their competitions. It is the summarised and simpler version of the next section. It is simply a suggestion and clubs can take ideas from it as they need or want.
- **Suggestions for Show Secretaries of how to implement the Separate Height Competition** – this is a more involved document for show secretaries to refer to should they want to, which will help with the organising of future events. Again this is simply a suggestion. Show Secretaries can continue to organise the events in any way they wish, within the regulations.

Timeline

(as previously published to clubs and on the dogagility website):

1. Extension of consultation period from November 23rd 2009, to January 28th 2010 for the general public. Any submissions or feedback from regional meetings that the committee members have attended, will be read and discussed as they are submitted, during this time. **COMPLETED**
2. **February 1st 2010**– NZKC Agility Committee meeting, where the full committee will discuss at length any issues that have come up from the consultation period and possible solutions. A report of this meeting will be published in the normal way as soon as possible after the meeting. **COMPLETED**
3. **February 2nd – February 28th** – Heights subcommittee compile all the discussion points from the Agility Committee meeting and produce a final regulation document which will be sent to the Agility Committee for approval. This timeframe is a guideline only. It could be completed earlier. **DOCUMENT COMPLETED – REGULATIONS TO BE COMPLETED**
4. **March 1st – March 30th**– Document made available to the public for comment. This could be made available earlier, should the subcommittee complete its process quicker. **CURRENT**
5. **April** Executive Council meeting – document presented and approved
6. **July 1st 2010** – regulations come into effect.

Summary of Submissions

Prepared by Shane McGhie

Introduction

This document summarises the submissions made to the paper identified as *Introduction of a fourth height to New Zealand Agility*, dated October 2009. The paper was initially sent out asking for submissions to be sent to the NZKC Agility Committee by 23 November 2009. The time period for submission was subsequently extended to 28 January 2010. The extension of the time period appears to have generally overcome concerns regarding the time for making submissions. Some submissions received still question the introduction of the significant changes, without further consultation methods.

During the initial and extended submission period a total of 61 submissions were received. These range from emails supporting the proposal in total, to multi page documents detailing support and opposition for certain aspects of the proposal, including very detailed alternatives, and also included one submission that provided a summary of the results of a survey completed by 113 individuals, although this did not include the names of the people who completed the survey so the number of respondents is not substantiated. It is known that some of the survey respondents also made a personal submission. Four of the submissions provided a record of discussions held following championship events, two of which identified the persons making the statements. Three of the submissions were made on behalf of a club, although the names of the club members supporting the submission were not listed. Personal submissions were also received from members of these clubs, and the aforementioned survey was also generated to assist in the submission of one of these clubs.

The geographic spread of respondents (individual submissions only) was:

- Upper North Island 55%
- Lower North Island 21%
- South Island 21%
- Unknown 3%

The submissions received from individuals equates to 10.5% of those who voted in the 2009 Agility Committee election and approximately 4% of those registered as having an interest in agility.

The summary that follows does not attempt to identify individual comments made in submissions, nor does it attempt to scientifically present the data submitted. The summary will identify clear trends in opinion and matters raised by a number of submitters that are not within the scope of the proposal, but are relevant to the issues under consideration. Many of the matters raised are linked to each other, meaning that consideration of one cannot be made without reference to one or more of the others.

The issues have been separated into obvious categories for ease; however, this should not be construed as meaning that they can be read in isolation.

Micro Class

It is clear from the submissions received that the introduction of a micro class should occur as soon as practically possible.

There were several submissions that questioned the height at which a micro dog should be set. Some suggested 300mm, as opposed to the 350mm suggested in the proposal. The reason given for the lower height for this class was to allow the very small dogs attending clubs a chance to be able to compete.

Competition Split by Height

It was also very clear from the submissions received that any changes in the height defining classes, and/or the heights dogs in each class are required to jump, must also be accompanied by the introduction of competition split by height. While submissions were received from some people opposed to split competitions, they were outnumbered by those supporting splits by 5 to 1.

A number of those supporting splits suggested a criterion for splitting that was at or somewhere near the number required to obtain a Challenge Certificate. The issue of whether clubs running Championship competitions should be required to split or allow clubs the choice was not clearly answered through submissions.

Change to the 3 current height divisions

A number of submissions provided very detailed information on the height at which each class could be separated. While a small number of submissions supported the changes proposed in its entirety, and there was no dispute that a micro class should be introduced, a considerable number of submitters questioned the height separating mini, midi, and maxi. Much of the argument revolved around some minis having to jump higher, midis and some existing maxis jumping lower, the larger breeds jumping too high, and the inequity that that would cause.

It was clear from the submissions that raised this issue that the heights defining the classes should be considered at the same time as the decision to split competitions by class, and that when this occurred each jumping height can be considered on the basis of safety alone, without having to confuse it with an attempt to gain equity.

A number of submissions suggested that heights chosen to separate the classes should ensure that the more athletic breeds such as BC and Heading dogs should be primarily in one class, with the smaller dogs and large breeds in their own class.

Safety Concerns

Some submissions questioned the evidence to back up the proposed heights that the various classes would jump. These submitters are not convinced that there is enough

evidence to support the changes proposed. One submission suggests a full trial with half of the dogs jumping lower and the other half jumping the existing height. Others suggest that such a significant change should not occur until more research is completed. Other submissions were in approval of the proposed changes.

Changing jumps

By far the majority of submitters that raised this point did not see the need to modify the existing jumps that clubs presently own. The view of these submitters is that it would be very costly to modify the jumps and that the existing jumps can provide the heights that will be safe.

A number of submitters questioned whether the existing jumps are in fact unsafe.

Dog measurement system

A significant number of submissions questioned the method and practice of measuring dogs. The primary area of concern was the accuracy of the technique used and the consequential effect that this may have on which class an already measured dog will end up being in.

It is suggested that if new class heights are established either all dogs, or at least dogs within a certain range of the height cut-off, be remeasured.

It is also suggested that ultimately a new, more accurate form of measurement be introduced.

Other matters

The submissions raised a number of matters that do not fit comfortably within any of the major headings.

Many submitters suggest that any changes should occur only when they have been trialed over a period of time. The time period suggested ranged from 6 to 12 months.

A number of submitters suggest the introduction of a new qualifying system, where dogs can move through the grades and to higher levels of achievement by gaining points, rather than the present win system.

One submitter suggests the introduction of a handicap system based on a time handicap.

Results of Survey

It was difficult to fully integrate the results of the survey of 113 individuals into the summary of results, and indeed as an unknown number of those survey respondents also made a personal submission the impact of a double count of individual opinion is not known. Some of the questions can however be correlated with specific parts of the

proposal and therefore provide an indication to either confirm the views expressed in the individual submissions, or to identify a difference in view. The vast majority of outcomes in the survey confirm the majority views expressed in the individual submissions.

The survey results:

- Are inconclusive in the matter of dog safety and jump height.
- In terms of fairness concluded that “*the proposal will improve fairness for some.. but make it less fair for others*”.
- Confirm the view of the vast majority of submitters, that the introduction of a micro class is supported.
- Question the present height measurement method.
- Are inconclusive on the issue of dog height categories.
- Confirm the view of many submitters, that the existing lugs on jumps should be utilised.
- More than half support some change to jumping heights (in addition to the introduction of micro) but not necessarily that contained within the proposal.
- Support a split competition by height if major changes also occurred to the dog height classes.
- Support a split of joint classes if the numbers do not allow for each individual class to split .e.g. micro/mini combined plus midi and maxi separately, or micro/mini combined plus midi/maxi combined.
- Support a trial period before any of the changes are confirmed.

Summary of Regulation Changes

The following regulation changes are in plain English. They will form the basis for the necessary regulation changes.

Dog Heights

The following changes to dog height groups, including the introduction of a micro class.

Micro – 0 - 325mm
Mini – 326mm - 430mm
Midi - 431mm - 520mm
Maxi - 521+mm

Reasons for these changes:

The introduction of a micro class will allow those dogs previously physically unable to compete, to do so. The desire for this class was identified strongly in submissions.

The height cut offs were identified near or around these figures in the submissions as suitable ranges. Submissions identified the previously suggested micro range of up to 300mm as too small and 350mm as too tall, for instance. Significant submissions also suggested the height cut off of 520mm for midi as a suitable range to include most border collies.

The changes to all dog height cut offs ensure that the smaller dogs of each current height group, that are struggling to jump due to their body shape and/or the height they are asked to jump (very small minis, stockier very small midis), will be jumping at ratios more acceptable.

The changes to the midi/maxi dog height cut off in particular, will have the impact of placing a significant number of the border collie, working dog, faster agile breeds into the one height class (midi). This was identified in the submissions as a way of improving equity. This also improves the competition for the heavier, less agile, very large breeds that will remain in the maxi class. With the drop off at the smaller end of the midi class into the minis, the majority of the stockier smaller dogs will not be disadvantaged either by this change.

The midi and maxi classes will now be more evenly spread, reducing the numbers in the maxi class, again improving the competition for the very large dogs.

Impact of this change:

All dogs can be re-measured if desired. **All** dogs that will be jumping in a lower height class than they are now, **MUST** be re-measured before being able to compete (for most this will mean that their dog will need to be re-measured before the 1st of July). In plain English, this means that if after the regulation changes come into effect, a dog moves from being a maxi dog to a midi (for example), they must be re-measured before they can compete. This can be done from February 21st 2010.

Any dog that after being re-measured, finds it should be in a height class that will require it to jump higher than it currently does, will not be required to change height classes.

Equipment Heights and Lengths

In general the current maximums are to be retained. After discussion it was agreed to shorten the maximum length of the long jump for all heights, as a safety issue.

	Micro	Mini	Midi	Maxi
Hurdle Height	300mm	380mm	570mm	675mm
Hoop height to base of aperture	200mm	300mm	450mm	550mm
Long Jump	600mm	800mm	1100mm	1600mm
Long Jump elements	2	3	4	5
Brush Jump	300mm	380mm	570mm	675mm
Spread Jump front bar	250mm	300mm	380mm	570mm
Spread Jump rear bar	300mm	380mm	570mm	675mm
Spread Jump spread	200mm	300mm	450mm	600mm

Reasons for these changes:

It was identified strongly through the submissions that clubs did not want to incur any extra expenses in regards to changing jump heights. Therefore the maximums are to

remain the same (with the inclusion of a micro maximum), with the exception the long jump which was identified as needing to be shorter for safety reasons.

Note that the height of the hoop has reverted to the height at base of the aperture, so as to ensure larger diameter hoops do not touch the ground for the smaller height divisions.

Impact of these changes:

Clubs will need to ensure that they have a micro height available for all hurdles, spreads and hoops. For some clubs who have lugs lower than the maximum for micro, they may choose to retain these lugs as their micro height, as the measurement is only a maximum. Hoops will need to be adjusted where they do not have a setting to meet the above measurements.

Split classes

Events will be split into separate competitions based on dog height groups. Until numbers improve, the micro and mini groups will compete together.

The number at which a club must split the competitions will be 15. If all dog height groups (with the micro and mini groups being considered as one) have 15 dogs or more in them, then the competition **MUST** be split for that class.

If in any one class, a dog height group has less than 15 (with micros and minis being considered one group) then there will be no split at all for any heights and all the class will compete together.

Reasons for these changes:

It was strongly identified in the submissions that the fairest way to ensure the highest degree of equitability in competition is for dogs to compete within their own height class. Submissions particularly identified perceived unfairness with minis competing against bigger dogs, and large breeds competing against more agile breeds.

It was also strongly identified that any changes made to dog heights should be made in conjunction with the possibility of split classes.

The submissions also strongly advocated setting an acceptable number of dogs for a split completion to occur. The 15 dog cut off was chosen as this is the same for Challenge Certificates to be awarded at, under the current regulations, so it is deemed an acceptable number of dogs for a competition.

These changes will ensure that there will be more even numbers of dogs across the height groups, so dogs will not need to compete against such high numbers in some areas of New Zealand. In other areas of New Zealand, competition numbers may remain the same. This will provide a degree of perceived equity geographically, that some people identified in their submission as a concern.

At this stage with such a small number of micros being identified, it was decided to place the micro and minis in one group for the purpose of competition. If at any show micro and mini each have 15 or more dogs entered in the class, then they also split and compete in separate competitions.

There were some suggestions that clubs should be able to choose whether or not to split, however it having been established that 15 is an acceptable number for a competition and to award a challenge certificate, meant splitting at this number needed to be a mandatory requirement. It also provides competitors with certainty as to the basis of competition that will be on offer.

Similarly, it was decided that there would be no split competition if all three groups did not achieve 15 dogs, because to do so would leave one group with insufficient numbers to make an acceptable number for a competition, and it would be inequitable to split one group away and merge the remainder.

Impact of these changes:

Clubs will need to rethink their organization of their competitions. To help with that, the NZKC AC asked an experienced show secretary to write a guide to implementing these changes. Two sections regarding this are included in this document.

Many clubs will have experience with splitting competitions from the previous requirement to split when numbers exceeded 100, and will be able to draw on this experience to cope with these changes.

Measurement of dogs

Until at least the end of 2010, 2 measurers must be present for every new measurement including the remeasures. This can be 2 official measurers, or an official measurer and either a Senior Judge or an NZKC AC member. They are to work together and agree on any dog's final measurement.

All dogs (including maxis) need a certificate with their height in millimetres.

As previously stated earlier in this document, all dogs can be re-measured if desired. **All** dogs that will be jumping in a lower height group than they are now, **MUST** be remeasured before being able to compete (for most this will mean that their dog will need to be remeasured before the 1st of July). In plain English, this means that if a dog, after the regulation changes come into effect, moves from (for example) being a maxi dog to a midi, they must be remeasured before they can compete. The NZKC AC will give a blanket approval for any dog for revocation of measurement certificates (under regulation 10.1.3.5) from February 21st 2010, until January 1st 2011, to enable this to happen.

Any dog that after being remeasured, finds it should be in a height group that will require it to jump higher than it currently does, will not be required to change height groups.

Reasons for these changes:

There was a very strong trend identified in the submissions that the current method of measuring dogs is not consistent or accurate.

The NZKC AC has agreed to look at alternative forms of measuring at the next meeting after further research and data has been collated. Should an alternative form of measuring be found to be viable, it would not be introduced until at the earliest January 1st 2011. In the meantime, changes needed to be made to the current system to ensure better accuracy. Introducing the requirement of having two measurers (as above) helps with this.

Some measurers have not been providing certificates, and this has caused problems when owners are trying to find out what their dog's height is. Measurers have been reminded of the need to provide certificates, to avoid any confusion or distress in the future.

Any dogs which under the new regulations, are able to jump in a lower height group need to be remeasured in the interest of fairness to all. Insisting on a remeasure will pick up any measurements that were not done accurately in previous years.

If a dog is remeasured and is found they they are actually taller than what their initial certificate says, will still not be disadvantaged as they will remain in the same height group as they always were in. An example of this would be a dog that in 2005 measured 422mm and so was jumping at midi height. The dog under the new regulations would become a mini. However after a remeasure it is found the dog is actually 435mm so cannot jump as a mini, but will stay in the midi group like it always was. This does not put this dog at any disadvantage due to the new regulations, but in fact gives it an accurate measurement which improves fairness to all other competitors as well.

Any dog that is found to be significantly taller than their initial measurement, so much so that it means that they will have to jump in a higher group, will not be asked to do so, in fairness to the dog and its safety. An example of this would be a dog that is currently jumping at mini, being remeasured as a midi. It will continue to jump as a mini. The NZKC AC sees this as being an extremely rare occurrence, if at all. This regulation also eliminates any fear owners have of getting their dog remeasured in case it disadvantages their dog.

Impact of these changes:

New measurement certificates will be produced for all remeasures and new dogs measured after February 21st 2010. Previous measurement certificates for dogs not requiring a remeasure will still be valid.

Some owners **MUST** have their dogs remeasured before competing in a lower height group.

Some owners may choose to have their dog remeasured. The NZKC AC would recommend that these owners in consideration to others and the measurers, allow dogs that **MUST** be measured do so first.

Some owners may need to get their dog remeasured so that they can have a certificate produced. This will need to be completed by January 1st 2011.

Measurers will experience a very busy period particularly leading up to July 1st 2010. If non essential measures are left to later, this will help.

The NZKC AC will ask measurers to identify possible problems with meeting new measurement requirements in regards to having two approved measurers present, and will source new measurers in particular areas if needed.

New regulations in regard to dogs needing to be measured by two approved people, will come into effect on February 20th 2010, to allow enough lead in time for the full height regulation changes coming into effect on July 1st 2010. This essentially means that dogs measured from February 21st 2010 will not need to be remeasured again prior to any other regulation changes taking place on July 1st 2010. This includes dogs being compulsorily remeasured prior to July 1st, to enable them to compete in a lower group (as identified previously in this section).

Any owner that needs a compulsory remeasure of their dog, that fails to do so by July 1st 2010, can still do so after this date, until January 1st 2011, but may not compete with this dog at the lower height group until the measurement has taken place. After this date, owners will need to apply to the NZKC AC under regulation 10.1.3.5

Safety of the Dog:

Owners can opt for their dog to compete in a height group one higher than their measured height group. Owners wishing to do this, choose to do so for the competing life of the dog. Owners must apply to the NZKCAC and if approved, a new certificate will be endorsed by the NZKC AC, stating the height group that the dog will compete in. If the Owner at some stage wishes to change back to the measured height group a certificate or letter from a vet or suitable canine therapist will need to be presented to NZKC AC so that it can assess whether or not approval should be given.

Reasons for this change:

Some handlers may feel that their dog maintains a better jumping arc over a higher jump and will sustain more injuries from jumping at an increased speed over lower jumps.

The NZKC AC envisages that there will be few owners who will seek approval for this and will not significantly impact on the fairness of competition.

Large and heavier dogs

Although there are no new regulations specific to larger dogs, it is felt that the regulation changes to dog heights, split competitions and subsequent smaller classes, help this group significantly in regards to equity of competition. Previous regulation changes in regards to hoop and tunnel sizes have also helped these groups in recent times.

The NZKC AC have agreed to also look further into the validity of lowering the maxi jump height to perhaps the midi height (while still maintaining split competitions), to help with the longevity of the dog's competing life. This was a suggestion made by some in their submissions.

Trial Periods

Some submissions suggested the use of a trial period for these changes. Constitutionally this is simply not possible. In an effort to address this concern, the NZKC AC has agreed to relook at these changes (and all major changes made by the NZKC AC) after one year to assess their implementation and practice. The review of these regulations will occur at a NZKC AC meeting, on or around July 1st 2011. As has always been the case, the agility community is welcome to communicate their ideas, suggestions or concerns to the NZKC AC on any matters, and should do so before any review date. All reviews will be done on or around the 1st of January and the 1st of July each year, to keep in line with the policy of major changes being made only twice a year.

Future Directions:

The NZKC AC will continue to research alternative techniques for the measurement of dogs, and the possibility of maxi dogs jumping midi heights.

A review of the regulation changes contained in this document will be made on or around the 1st of July 2011.

Summary Document of How to Plan an Event with the Split Height Competition Regulation

Prepared with the assistance of Kirstin Graves

Height Split Regulation

When there are 15 or more dogs in each of the three height categories; maxi, midi and micro & mini combined, in a class, then the competition for that class must be split by height. This means that instead of dogs of all heights running together in a single class, say novice, there are three separate competitions for novice – novice micro/mini, novice midi and novice maxi. If any one of the height categories has less than 15 dogs, then the class is not split into separate height competitions.

If Micro and Mini each have 15 or more dogs entered in the class, then they also split and compete in separate competitions.

Determining if a Height Split is Likely

When receiving entries for Champ events you will be able to determine prior to the date of the event whether height splits are required, however this is only a limited time beforehand, and this won't work for ribbon trials where entries are received on the day. To estimate in advance whether a height split will be required, an Excel file is available to help you determine if a height split is likely.

If you don't have the Excel software, the estimate can be calculated manually.

Calculating this information will help you to plan a little better for your event.

Running Order

The introduction of split height competition does not impact on running orders, as all height divisions will continue to run on the same course, under the same judge.

Ordering Ribbons

Remember that the Agility Committee recommends that ribbons go to at least 10% of entries. So if there are 100 entries in a class, ribbons should go to at least 10th place. This rule continues to apply when the height competition is split. Here is an example of how it should be applied:

Jumpers C class – 163 total entries

Size	Entries	Ribbons to 10%
Micro/Mini	34	1 st to 3 rd
Midi	59	1 st to 6 th
Maxi	70	1 st to 7 th

This means you are providing 16 ribbons, which is 10% of the entry number, and the same number of ribbons that would have been provided if the competition was not split by height.

A little more planning will be required when ordering ribbons with the new height split rule. If you have completed the estimate suggested previously, you will have an idea of whether you are likely to split or not, and can assess the options for purchasing ribbons.

Prize Money

As with ribbons, prize money simply needs to be spread evenly throughout the height splits. An Excel file is available to help you calculate the split of prize money that should apply between the height divisions. If you don't have the Excel software, this can be calculated manually.

Sponsor Product

How much product you ask your sponsor for will depend on the relationship you have with your sponsor. If you have a really good relationship with the sponsor, you may feel comfortable asking them to provide the same level of sponsorship, but more of it to cover the split classes.

If you are not comfortable doing this, explain to your sponsor how the competition has changed and ask for their product to be provided in smaller packages (so it can be either be spread over split class winners in need or combined if splits aren't required). This means it doesn't cost the sponsor more.

To help sell this to your sponsor, let them know that their product will now be spread over more winners, rather than just a select few, which gives more people access to trying the product, and therefore using their product. Also, some sponsors provide product specifically cater for different sized dogs, meaning they can now provide appropriate product for the different height divisions.

Dog World Schedule

The event schedule published in the NZ Dog World will need to change a little to allow for possible split height competitions. Here are some suggestions for your gazette entry:

- Advertise whether or not you expect height splits in classes (as this may be a factor in people deciding whether or not they wish to attend the event). Obviously you will need to word this as an "expectation", not a truth.
- Instead of listing ribbons to x place, indicate ribbons to approx 10% in all classes, whether split or not. Alternatively you could say Ribbons awarded to the top 3 places in each class and to a minimum of 10% in all classes if you wanted to ensure a minimum ribbon placing.
- Instead of listing prizes to x place, indicate prizes to approx top x% (5 – 10% would be the likely range).
- Consider your closing date in regard to ribbon ordering as mentioned previously.

Graduation Points & Challenges

The same rules apply for graduation points as they do now, but they only apply to the number in the class when split, if there is a height split.

Example

Starters – no height split, 89 dogs so 1st receives Win and 2nd receives 1 point.

Novice – height split

- Micro/Mini – 35 dogs so 1st receives Win
- Midi – 69 dogs so 1st receives Win
- Maxi – 77 dogs so 1st receives Win and 2nd receives 1 point

The number of Challenge certificates to be provided is determined in the same way; that is,

- if the class is not split, the number of Challenges is based on the total number of dogs in the class
- if the class is split, the number of Challenges is based on the number of dogs in each height division.

Help is at hand

Most importantly, this is a new situation for NZ Agility and there are likely to many questions as we work through implementing the new regulations. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to ask the Agility Committee – we are here to help.

Suggestions for Show Secretaries on
How to Plan an Event with the
Split Height Competition Regulation

Prepared with the assistance of Kirstin Graves

Height Split Regulation

When there are 15 or more dogs in each of the three height categories; maxi, midi and micro & mini combined, in a class, then the competition for that class must be split by height. This means that instead of dogs of all heights running together in a single class, for example novice, there are three separate competitions for novice – novice micro/mini, novice midi and novice maxi. If any one of the height categories has less than 15 dogs, then the class is not split into separate height competitions.

Examples

Class	Total Dogs	Micro	Mini	Micro/Mini combined	Midi	Maxi	Split?
Starters 1	98	5	10	15	39	44	Yes
Starters 2	92	3	10	13	37	42	No
Jumpers C	202	22	31	53	82	95	Yes
Senior 1	58	3	5	8	28	22	No

Remember that at an event with multiple classes, it is possible you have to split the class from one event (the “1” class) but not the class from the next event (the “2” class). So as depicted above, Starters 1 will be split into separate height competitions because all three height categories have 15 dogs or more in them, while Starters 2 will not be split as the micro/mini height category has less than 15 dogs.

If Micro and Mini each have 15 or more dogs entered in the class, then they also split and compete in separate competitions, for example:

Class	Total Dogs	Micro	Mini	Midi	Maxi	Split into 3?	Split into 4?
Starters 1	148	15	20	59	54	No	Yes
Starters 2	143	13	20	60	50	Yes	No

Determining if a Height Split is Likely

When receiving entries for Champ events you will be able to determine prior to the date of the event whether height splits are required, however this is only a limited time beforehand, and this won't work for ribbon trials where entries are received on the day. To estimate in advance whether a height split will be required, an Excel file has been provided to you in association with this document to help you determine if a height split is likely. All you will need is last year's height numbers for each class¹.

If you don't have the Excel software, the estimate can be calculated manually. Obtain the numbers in each height in your event from the previous year¹. As a rough estimate, 37% of existing mini dogs will become micro, 27% of midi will become mini, 38% of maxi will become midi². For example in the table below the *last year* column details the numbers in the Starters class. The *estimate this year* column indicates the estimated numbers for this year:

¹ This information can be obtained from last year's catalogue, the database from which the event results were maintained, or the ribbon trial entry register.

² Percentages are national averages - some areas may have a higher proportion of a particular height for example, less mini/micros in provincial areas, more mini/micros in metropolitan areas, so this is a guideline only

Size	Last Year	Estimate this year
Micro		=23 x 37% = 9
Mini	23	= 23 - (23 x 37%) + (19 x 27%) = 20
Midi	19	= 19 - (19 x 27%) + (75 x 38%) = 42
Maxi	75	= 75 - (75 x 38%) = 47

Based on this estimate, assuming similar entry numbers to the previous year, it is very likely that a split will be required.

This information will help you to plan a little better for your event.

Running Order

The introduction of split height competition does not impact on running orders, as all height divisions will continue to run on the same course, under the same judge.

Ordering Ribbons

Remember that the Agility Committee recommends that ribbons go to at least 10% of entries. So if there are 100 entries in a class, ribbons should go to at least 10th place. This rule continues to apply when the height competition is split. Here is an example of how it should be applied:

Jumpers C class – 163 total entries

Size	Entries	Ribbons to
------	---------	------------

10%		
Micro/Mini	34	1 st to 3 rd
Midi	59	1 st to 6 th
Maxi	70	1 st to 7 th

This means you are providing 16 ribbons, which is 10% of the entry number, and the same number of ribbons that would have been provided if the competition was not split by height.

A little more planning will be required when ordering ribbons with the new height split rule. If you have completed the estimate suggested previously, you will have an idea of whether you are likely to split or not. If you think it will be close as to whether or not you have to split, options for purchasing ribbons are as follows:

1. For a Champ event, speak to the ribbon supplier and determine the last date on which you can confirm the order. If the date is within four weeks of the event, consider closing entries a little earlier, just before the confirmation date, so you only need to order what is required.
2. Take a risk and order ribbons in accordance with your estimate of whether heights will be split or not. If you are wrong, then let competitors know on the day and post their ribbons after the event.
3. Order two sets of ribbons, one in case you have to split and one if you don't. Order the ribbons without the date or the height class printed on them, so the set that isn't used can be retained and used in the future. For example,
 1. if you expect 75 entries in a class, and estimate 31 maxis, 30 midis and 14 micro/minis, you could order:
 - 1st to 3rd ribbons which cover maxi (if split required)
 - 1st to 3rd ribbons which cover midi (if split required)
 - 1st to 2nd ribbons which cover micro/mini (if split required)
 - 4th to 8th ribbons (if split not required - which when matched with the 1st to 3rd ribbons not used from above gives a full set 1st to 8th)
 2. If you expect 150 entries in a class, and estimate 68 maxis, 52 midis, 16 minis and 14 micros, you could order:
 - 1st to 7th ribbons which cover maxi
 - 1st to 5th ribbons which cover midi
 - 1st to 3rd ribbons which cover micro/mini (if not split, or just mini if split required)
 - 1st to 2nd ribbons which cover micro (if split required)

Prize Money

As with ribbons, prize money simply needs to be spread evenly throughout the height splits. The Excel file provided to you in association with this document will calculate the split of prize money that should apply between the height divisions.

If you don't have the Excel software, you can use the following formula to work this out:

Number of entries in height division ÷ total entries for class x total prize money = prize money for height split

In the following example, \$150 has been allocated as prize money for the class, and 100 entries were received.

Not split by height:

Placing	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th
Prize money	\$50	\$40	\$30	\$20	\$10

Split by height

Height		Mini/Micro			
No of entries	20				
Prize money for height split	$20 \div 100 \times 150 = \30				
Placing	1 st	2 nd			
Prize Money	\$20	\$10			
Height		Midi			
No of entries	36				
Prize money for height split	$36 \div 100 \times 150 = \54				
Placing	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	
Prize Money	\$24	\$15	\$10	\$5	
Height		Maxi			
No of entries	44				
Prize money for height split	$44 \div 100 \times 150 = \66				
Placing	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	
Prize Money	\$30	\$20	\$10	\$6	

Note: once you have determined how much prize money to allocate to the class, you can spread this across the placings however you desire. For example, in the Micro/Mini example above, you might like to give \$15 for 1st, \$10 for 2nd and \$5 for 3rd or just \$30 for 1st.

Note: if your club prefers to provide non monetary prizes instead of cash, provide smaller trophies or prizes that can be spread across the split classes.

Sponsor Product

How much product you ask your sponsor for will depend on the relationship you have with your sponsor. If you have a really good relationship with the sponsor, you may feel comfortable asking them to provide the same level of sponsorship, but more of it to cover the split classes.

However, most clubs will not be comfortable doing this. If you are one of these clubs, explain to your sponsor how the competition has changed and ask for their product to be provided in smaller packages (so it can be either be spread over split class winners in need or combined if splits aren't required). This means it doesn't cost the sponsor more - the same value of sponsorship can be provided, just in smaller packages. So if, for example, your sponsor used to provide you with five 10kg bags of dog food for 1st place,

ask them to give you ten 5kg bags instead, or however many bags you need to cover all your first places. Then if the heights are not split, you can provide multiple bags to the top placings.

To help sell this to your sponsor, let them know that their product will now be spread over more winners, rather than just a select few, which gives more people access to trying the product, and therefore using their product. Also, some sponsors provide product specifically cater for different sized dogs, meaning they can now provide appropriate product for the different height divisions. We expect all sponsors will see the positive in this.

NZ Dog World Schedules

The event schedule published in the NZ Dog World will need to change a little to allow for possible split height competitions. Here are some suggestions for your gazette entry:

- Advertise whether or not you expect height splits in classes (as this may be a factor in people deciding whether or not they wish to attend the event). Obviously you will need to word this as an “expectation”, not a truth. For example: *Based on last year’s entry numbers Novice, Intermediate and Jumpers C classes are expected to incur height splits.*
- Instead of listing ribbons to x place, indicate ribbons to approx 10% in all classes, whether split or not. Alternatively you could say Ribbons awarded to the top 3 places in each class and to a minimum of 10% in all classes if you wanted to ensure a minimum ribbon placing.
- Instead of listing prizes to x place, indicate prizes to approx top x% (5 – 10% would be the likely range).
- Consider your closing date in regard to ribbon ordering as mentioned previously.

Graduation Points & Challenges

The same rules apply for graduation points as they do now, but they only apply to the number in the class when split, if there is a height split.

Points are awarded as follows:

No of dogs entered*	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th
0-75	Win					
76-100	Win	1				
101-150	Win	2	1			
151-200	Win	3	2	1		
201-250	Win	4	3	2	1	
251-300	Win	5	4	3	2	1

Example

Starters – no height split, 89 dogs so 1st receives Win and 2nd receives 1 point.

Novice – height split

- Micro/Mini – 35 dogs so 1st receives Win
- Midi – 69 dogs so 1st receives Win
- Maxi – 77 dogs so 1st receives Win and 2nd receives 1 point

The number of Challenge certificates to be provided is determined in the same way; that is,

- if the class is not split, the number of Challenges is based on the total number of dogs in the class
- if the class is split, the number of Challenges is based on the number of dogs in each height division.

Help is at hand

Most importantly, this is a new situation for NZ Agility and there are likely to many questions as we work through implementing the new regulations. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to ask the Agility Committee – we are here to help.