

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE RALLY LIAISON COUNCIL HELD ON
WEDNESDAY 15 JULY 2026 AT 9.30AM, VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS**

PRESENT

Mrs R Bradley
Ms T Butler
Dr K Daly
Mr A Dornford-Smith
Miss A Jackson
Mrs S Sanford

IN ATTENDANCE

Miss A Morley	Activities Liaison Manager
Miss T Collins	Obedience & Rally Liaison Advisor

GUESTS

Ms F McDonnell	Health & Breeding Manager (Item 2 only)
----------------	---

ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1. Apologies were received from Mr S Lindsey.

ITEM 2. HEALTH AND WELFARE

2. The Liaison Council received a presentation from Miss Fern McDonnell (Health & Breeding Manager) regarding health initiatives at the Royal Kennel Club.
3. The presentation covered the new Breeding for Health Framework, which aimed to safeguard the future of dogs. A brief outline was provided and it was noted that the new framework was informed by the community of breeders across a range of breeds.
4. It was noted that surveys conducted within the community had identified three core elements of the Breeding for Health Framework: Genetic Diversity, Conformation, and Breed-Related Diseases and Wellbeing. The full report and summary was available on the Royal Kennel Club website: [Breeding for health framework | The Royal Kennel Club](#).
5. The Royal Kennel Club endorsed and supported the principle that no dog should suffer at the extent of their conformation. It was explained that, in line with this principle, the Royal Kennel Club would be introducing a Nose to Tail Veterinary Assessment to assess extreme conformation and support breeders in breeding away from exaggerated conformational features in future generations. At the time of the meeting, 176 breed community members across 128 breeds had already taken part in the consultation stage. The

project would now to trials throughout the summer ahead of the planned introduction in November 2026.

6. It was questioned whether data would also be collected on crossbreeds to support improvements in their conformation too. It was confirmed that crossbreeds would be included and that the assessment criteria would apply to all dogs.
7. It was queried whether the Nose to Tail Assessments would examine whether a dog was capable of performing the function for which it had originally been bred. Whilst breeding for function was recognised as important, it was confirmed that it would not form part of the assessments, which would focus solely on conformation.
8. It was also confirmed that temperament would not form part of the Nose to Tail Assessments. However, dogs would need to display a suitable temperament to enable a veterinary assessment to be carried out effectively. Where a dog did not have a suitable temperament, it would be withdrawn from the assessment and that would be recorded for data purposes.
9. It was noted that temperament and mental wellbeing were important considerations and formed part of the Breeding for Health Framework. As temperament represents an important and substantial area of work, it would require a dedicated workstream and is planned for 2028.
10. The Royal Kennel Club was also in the process of establishing a Health Data Bank. The aim was to provide a single, easily accessible repository containing health data, scientific research and published literature relating to canine health.
11. The Liaison Council was informed that a new puppy buyer feedback process had been launched. Whenever ownership of a puppy purchased from a breeder had been transferred through the Royal Kennel Club, the new owner would be invited to complete a short feedback survey about their puppy buying experience. The process enables the Royal Kennel Club to provide feedback to breeders and identify opportunities to support breeders to improve the puppy buying journey from beginning to end.
12. It was highlighted that 80% of respondents so far had rated their breeder 10/10, which was very positive.
13. A breeder network community was being established. The network would comprise of experienced breeders who were willing to help support peers. Therefore, new breeders could be put in contact with experienced breeders, to help support them through the process and share their own personal experiences.

14. Miss McDonnell and the Health & Breeder Team welcomed any questions or challenges. Anyone with an interest in health or breeding were encouraged to contact the team via health@royalkennelclub.com.
15. The Health & Breeder Team regularly sought feedback and shared updates through its Facebook group, and anyone with an interest was welcome to join: [Dog Health & Breeder News | Royal Kennel Club | Facebook](#).
16. Miss McDonnell was thanked for her time and for providing an informative update on the Royal Kennel Club's health and breeding initiatives.

Miss McDonnell left the meeting at 10:04am

ITEM 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

17. The minutes of the meeting held on 4 February 2026 were approved as an accurate record.

ITEM 4. MATTERS ARISING AND RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

18. The Liaison Council noted that the Activities Committee, at its meeting on 24 March 2026, approved the following amendments to S Regulations from 1 January 2027:

Amendment to Regulation S(B)4.d – Run Offs

Regulation S(B)4.d

TO:

Tied scores for place awards - In the event that two or more dog/handler teams score an equal number of points, they shall be invited to participate in a run-off using a Bonus exercise appropriate to the level. The run off bonus should be stated on the course plan submitted to the Secretary and/or the Chief Steward. **Where none of the parties involved are available for the runoff, the order shall be decided at the discretion of the judge.**

(Insertions in bold)

(Effective 1 January 2027)

ITEM 5. ACTIVITIES JUDGES SUB-GROUP

19. The Liaison Council noted a written report from Mrs Bradley following the Sub-Group's meeting held on 7 April 2026.
20. It was requested that the community should be provided with more information about the yellow/red card system. It was confirmed that more information about the conduct system could be found on the website: [Conduct Complaints Yellow/Red card | The Royal Kennel Club](#).

ITEM 6. REVIEW OF CHAMPIONSHIP FRAMEWORK

21. The Liaison Council noted an update on the Rally Review. The community feedback had been largely positive with some suggestions for improvement, which would be incorporated. The Liaison Council intended to submit the framework to the first formal Rally Liaison Council meeting of 2027 with a view for implementation in 2028, allowing time for further engagement with the community.

Retaining Competitors

22. A concern was raised regarding how to protect existing competitions and encourage new individuals to organise competitions. It was noted that retaining competitors, particularly those competing at the higher levels, would be important in supporting the matter, as it was from that cohort that new competition organisers might emerge.
23. It was raised that the Rally Warrant provided a valuable means of retaining competitors, and the uptake of the warrants had continued to increase steadily.
24. The Liaison Council noted that 68 Rally Warrants had been awarded since its introduction in 2021. Since the update at the last meeting in February, a further eight Rally Warrants had been achieved.
25. In addition, 29 Rally Veteran Warrants had been awarded in total (14 Bronze, 11 Silver, 4 Gold). It was agreed that an awards update would be included annually as a standing item at the Liaison Council's first meeting of the year.

Information & Consultation Process

26. A concern was raised that some elements of the new framework had been read out of context, which had led to misunderstanding and incorrect information had been shared and discussed online. It was noted that some other Liaison Councils had already started undertaking in person meetings at shows and the Rally Liaison Council had already done so at Nuneaton Dog Training Club's competition. It was agreed that holding in person meetings at competitions would continue. Although, it was noted that with rally competitions being so widely geographically spread, it was difficult to access many of the competitions. Online seminars and presentations were suggested as a means of reaching more of the community overall.
27. It was suggested that the new process and Terms of Reference could be communicated more effectively to the community. An infographic would be published by the Royal Kennel Club and the Liaison Council could share it to help explain the consultation process.
28. It was also raised that members of the community had found it difficult to locate the meeting papers on the website. It was noted that the improved

accessibility of the regulation booklets had been well received, and it was queried whether a similar webpage and direct link for Liaison Council papers could be created. The office agreed to investigate the matter further.

ITEM 7. PROPOSALS

Proposal to Amend the Timeframe for Show Licence Applications

29. The Liaison Council considered an amendment to regulation S7 and S9.a, to return to the six week licence application timeframe for Rally competitions.
30. The change to six months was introduced on 1 January 2026, however concern had been raised regarding the impact of the timeframe on smaller Listed Status clubs.
31. From a survey issued by the Liaison Council, the responses showed that none of the rally societies wished the deadline for licence applications to remain at six months, with the majority of those organising new competitions requesting that the deadline should return to six weeks.
32. Although possible exemptions to the regulations were considered, returning to the six week deadline appeared to be the most viable option. Therefore, the following amendments were **recommended** for approval:

Amendments to Regulation S7 and S9.a

Regulation S7. Societies are required to apply for permission to hold Special Events

TO:

Applications should be submitted to the Royal Kennel Club by email at least six **weeks** ~~months~~ before the start of any qualifying heats for the event.
(Insertions in bold. Deletions struck through)

Regulation S9.a. Application to Host a Rally competition.

TO:

The application to hold a competition must be submitted to the Secretary of the Royal Kennel Club and must be accompanied by the appropriate licence fee at least six **weeks** ~~months~~ before the proposed date of the competition.
(Insertions in bold. Deletions struck through).

Proposals to add an option for where competitors may remove their leads in Level 2 Bonus Exercises

33. The Liaison Council considered a proposal which allowed an option for the handler to remove the dog's lead between finishing the course and starting the bonus exercise.

34. The proposal was suggested by members of the Rally community due to concerns that judges may be judging how a handler removed their lead rather than the performance of the exercise.
35. It was clarified that in addition to being able to remove the lead at the Bonus A sign, or drag the lead from the Bonus A sign, competitors would be able to remove the lead between the Finish and the Bonus exercise, if they wished to do so.
36. The community had been invited to note that under the new Rally framework all Level 2 Bonuses would be fully off lead, with the lead removed between the Finish and Bonus Start signs. It was considered that introducing the proposal as an option in the interim may be beneficial.
37. In a recent survey, the Rally community were asked if they would like the option to remove their lead before attempting the bonus. The survey received 70 responses, of which over 85% of the responses were in favour of introducing the proposal before the new framework.
38. It was noted that the proposal should not impact the planned changes to Level 2 bonuses in the new framework. Therefore, the Liaison Council **recommended** the following amendments to the regulations for approval:

Amendments to Regulation S(C). Exercises and Signs

Bonus Exercise 4

TO:

SIT - LEAVE DOG - CALL TO HEEL. This exercise requires two signs. At the first sign (A) the handler and dog stop with the dog sitting at heel. The handler may take the lead off or the dog may drag the lead. The handler walks to the second sign (B), which is placed approximately 2 metres from sign A. The handler will not turn to face the dog but instead, with his/her back to the dog, will call the dog to move to the heel position. The handler may turn his/her head slightly while cueing the dog to heel. The dog must come promptly and sit at heel. Once sitting, the exercise is considered complete.

The handler may also choose to remove their lead between the Finish and Bonus Start Signs.

NB: If this bonus is used at Level 3 or above there is no requirement to reattach the lead before attempting this bonus exercise.

(Insertions in bold. Deletions struck through)

Bonus Exercise 5

TO:

SIT - LEAVE DOG - TURN - RECALL - HANDLER FINISH. This exercise requires two signs. At the first sign (A) the handler and dog stop with the dog sitting at heel. The handler may take the lead off or the dog may drag the lead. The handler walks to the second sign (B), which is placed approximately 2 metres from sign A, turns and recalls the dog to the front position. The dog

remains in the sit whilst the handler moves left to take up the heel position. Once the handler has moved to the heel position, the exercise is considered complete. This is not a walk around exercise.

The handler may also choose to remove their lead between the Finish and Bonus Start Signs.

NB: If this bonus is used at Level 3 or above there is no requirement to reattach the lead before attempting this bonus exercise.

(Insertions in bold. Deletions struck through)

Proposal to Remove the Maximum Hoop Height

39. The Liaison Council discussed the proposal to remove the maximum height for a hoop, due to concerns raised by the community about the suitability of the hoop for taller dogs.
40. A concern had been raised that the hoops used for Rally competitions were sourced from Hoopers suppliers. Therefore, if the Hoopers organisations chose to change the equipment specification, it would leave Rally judges, trainers, and competitors with a time period where they were unable to purchase Rally compliant hoops.
41. A discussion regarding the possible recognition of Royal Kennel Club Hoopers took place. It was confirmed that surveys had been conducted with the wider public to provide feedback on the matter, however it would still take some time for recognition to be implemented, if that was what the community wished for. It was suggested that if Hoopers became a recognised discipline, the Rally hoop could be amended at the time to create an alignment between the activities.
42. However, there was still concern about retaining the maximum height. It was noted that the proposal had originally been submitted by the community, and the Liaison Council wished to act upon the community's input. Therefore, after some discussion, the Liaison Council recommended the following amendments for approval.

Regulation S16.h Facilities and Equipment.

TO:

h. For all jump exercises the jump may be replaced with a hoop. Hoops may be based or baseless and must be constructed in a safe manner. Hoops should measure **at least** 89-92cm tall, 85-90cm wide with feet protruding no more than 31cm either side of the hoop. Where conditions dictate, hoops may be pegged or held down by sandbags that do not impede the dog's entry or exit from the hoop.

(Insertions in bold. Deletions struck through)

Capped Classes Proposal

43. The Liaison Council considered a proposal to reduce the minimum amount of entries for capped classes from 40 to 20.
44. The Liaison Council had received feedback from the community that societies would benefit from additional flexibility and assistance to grow their competitions. It had been suggested that reducing the minimum capping level allowed societies to utilise more cost-effective venues without compromising the number of standard classes that they could run.
45. Regulation S5.c.(3) stated that if the number of entries received exceeded 40, the class may be equally divided (to within one dog) by a draw and the class was to be split into equal parts. Whilst there were no plans to reduce the number at which classes may be split, it was suggested that by reducing the minimum capping level to 20, it enabled societies to use a single competition ring to run multiple small classes.
46. From a survey of competition organisers in May 2026, the majority supported the increased flexibility offered by reducing the minimum capping level. The survey received 49 responses, representing an extremely high take up from the current competition organisers.
47. It was emphasised that the proposed change was to the minimum capping level only. Show organisers would still be able to set a capping level above 20, societies which capped their classes at 40 dogs would continue to be able to do so.
48. Therefore, the following amendment to regulation S5. Classes at Rally competitions was **recommended** for approval:

Amendment to Regulation S5.c.(3)

TO:

c. Capped classes

(3) The capping level must be set at a minimum of **40 20** entries received. There is no maximum level at which a cap may be set. Capped classes may be split ~~into two or more divisions~~ in accordance with Regulation S20**i**k.
(Insertions in bold. Deletions struck through)

Eligibility and Progression Proposal

49. The Liaison Council considered a proposal regarding class progression, which suggested that the handler and dog teams would remain in a Level until they gained their Excellent title. However, they would be able to choose to progress once they gained their Level title.
50. A survey regarding Rally class progression was conducted in September 2025, which received 120 responses. From reviewing the survey feedback provided, amendments to the S(A) regulations relating to Levels, Classes and Eligibility had been suggested.

51. It was queried whether the eligibility and progression were addressed in the new framework, and if any of the proposed amendments to the S(A) regulations would need to be changed again to align with the new framework.
52. It was confirmed that the same principles would apply to the new framework. Level 7 and Foundation would need to be added, but those additional levels would follow the same pattern.
53. It was noted that the suggestions regarding eligibility and progression had been raised repeatedly from the community. Therefore, the Liaison Council **recommended** the following amendments for approval:

Amendments to Regulation S(A)1. Levels

TO:

1. Levels
 Rally ~~handler/dog/~~**handler** teams compete in their lowest eligible class from Level 1 to Level 6; ~~t~~They may also compete at the subsequent level. ~~Progression to the next level does not require either wins or places. Progression is dependent upon gaining three Excellent scores, under three different judges, or six qualifying scores under four different judges.~~
 Levels 1 - 4 have a qualifying score of 175 ~~out of 200.~~
 Levels 5 & 6 have a qualifying score of 180 ~~out of 200.~~
In all levels a qualifying score of 190 or above equates to an excellent score.
~~Scores equivalent to these qualifying scores (or greater) earned at Limited Rally competitions do not count towards Progression, Rally Level titles or Excellent.~~
~~In all levels a qualifying score of 190 or above equates to an excellent score.~~
 (Insertions in bold. Deletions struck through)

Amendments to Regulation S(A)2. Veteran

TO:

2. Veteran
 Rally ~~handler/dog/~~**handler** teams where the dog is 7 years of age or older may compete in Veteran as well as, or instead of, their lowest eligible class. Veteran has a qualifying score of 175 ~~out of 200.~~
 A qualifying score of 190 or above equates to an excellent score.
 (Insertions in bold. Deletions struck through)

Addition to the Regulations as S(A)3. Validity of Scores

TO:

3. **Validity of scores**
Only scores equivalent to, or greater than, qualifying scores earned in standard classes at Open competitions count towards progression, rally titles, excellent titles and rally warrants. Scores earned at Limited Rally competitions do not count.
 (Insertions in bold. Subsequent regulations to be renumbered)

(Effective 1 January 2027)

Amendment and Renumbering Regulation S(A)3. Eligibility

TO:

2 4. Eligibility

a. Standard Level Classes

When entered for a competition in a standard level class, a dog must be entered at the level for which it is eligible. The dog may also, if desired, be entered in up to two additional classes including one further standard level class at the subsequent higher level. ~~one additional special class, or two additional special classes. A dog may be entered in special classes only, up to a maximum of 3 classes. Special classes do not count towards progression.~~ Once a dog has earned any level or excellent title, it is no longer eligible for any lower level.

b. Veteran classes

A dog which is 7 years old or over on the day of the competition may be entered in just the Veteran class. It may also be entered in Standard Level classes and special classes to a maximum of 3 classes in total.

c. Special classes

A dog may be entered in special classes only, up to a maximum of 3 classes in total. Special classes do not count towards progression, **titles or warrants.**

Level 1

- Open to all dogs which have not achieved a ~~Level 1 or Level 1 Excellent title~~ **or where their handler has not chosen to progress on a Level 1 title, except those that have achieved a title from a higher level.**

Level 2

- Open to all dogs which have achieved a ~~Level 1 or Level 1 Excellent title~~ **or where their handler has chosen to progress on a Level 1 title**, except those that have achieved a ~~Level 2 or Level 2 Excellent title~~ **from a higher level.** Dogs eligible for and entered at Level 1 may also enter at this level.

Level 3

- Open to all dogs which have achieved a ~~Level 2 or Level 2 Excellent title~~ **or where their handler has chosen to progress on a Level 2 title**, except those that have achieved a ~~Level 3 or Level 3 Excellent title~~ **from a higher level.** Dogs eligible for and entered at Level 2 may also enter at this level.

Level 4

- Open to all dogs which have achieved a ~~Level 3 or Level 3 Excellent title~~ **or where their handler has chosen to progress on a Level 3 title**, except those that have achieved a ~~Level 4 or Level 4 Excellent title~~ **from a higher level.** Dogs eligible for and entered at

Level 3 may also enter at this level.

Level 5

- Open to all dogs which have achieved a ~~Level 4 or Level 4~~ Excellent title **or where their handler has chosen to progress on a Level 4 title**, except those that have achieved a ~~Level 5 or Level 5~~ Excellent title **from a higher level**. Dogs eligible for and entered at Level 4 may also enter at this level.

Level 6

- Open to all dogs which have achieved a ~~Level 5 or Level 5~~ Excellent title **or where their handlers have chosen to progress on a Level 5 title**. Dogs eligible for and entered at Level 5 may also enter at this level.

Veteran

- Open to all dogs aged 7 years or over on the first day of the competition. (Insertions in bold. Deletions struck through)

Addition to the Regulations as S(A)5.

TO:

5. Progression

Progression is dependent upon gaining the required number of qualifying or excellent scores under the defined number of different judges. Dogs must progress upon gaining an Excellent title, the handler may choose to progress upon gaining a Level title, however, once a dog has progressed, it cannot return to the level that it progressed from.

(Insertions in bold. Subsequent regulations to be renumbered)

Trial Proposal to Enable Judges to Officiate and Compete on the Same Day

54. The Liaison Council noted that the trial period to enable judges to compete in Rally competitions on the same day that they were officiating had been fast-tracked to the Activities Committee for consideration. The proposal had been approved in principle, with guidance to be developed and issued to assist societies and judges.
55. It was noted that there was strong support for the idea from the Rally community. A trial period had been suggested to enable the Liaison Council to assess the impact of the relaxation of the regulation on Rally competitions.
56. The trial suspension would be a relaxation of rule S20I, an implementation date, along with separate guidance for each discipline, would be announced in due course.

Regulation S20.I states that:

Judges at a Rally competition must not enter for competition a dog which is recorded in their sole ownership, or handle a dog, at the competition at which they are judging. A dog recorded in part ownership with the judge may be

entered for competition in any part of a class other than the part which the judge is judging.

57. The data collected during the suspension period would be reviewed to assess the impact on show management and judges. If the data proved that the trial was successful, then a formal proposal to amend the regulation would be submitted and recommended for implementation.
58. It was noted that societies would be able to decline a judge's entry if the timetable did not allow sufficient opportunity for them to compete on the same day. In such circumstances, the society would be required to state in the invitation that judges would not be permitted to compete and provide the reason.
59. It was confirmed that a judge's entry could be declined if it would result in a class being split. For capped classes, the judges' entries would be considered after all other entries had been processed, if necessary. For those taking up the opportunity to judge and compete on the same day, judging must take priority.
60. A discussion took place as to the number of entries a judge could make without interrupting the flow of the competition day. A concern was also raised regarding the upcoming competitions that could be affected shortly after the trial commenced.
61. It was agreed that guidance would be developed outside of the meeting. The guidance would then be submitted to the Activities Committee for approval at its next meeting in September.

ITEM 8. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Judges Progression

62. The Liaison Council discussed a paper regarding possible changes to judges' progression. The paper set out suggestions to support both new judges and those progressing to higher levels by placing greater emphasis on practical education.
63. A concern was raised that introducing additional seminars for individuals wishing to judge at the higher levels could discourage people from progressing their judging careers. It was also noted that judges could incur additional financial costs in attending the seminars, particularly where travel would be required.
64. It was noted that new judges would still only be required to attend two seminars. It was hoped that it would not be unreasonable to ask existing judges to attend an additional seminar before progressing to judge at the higher levels. It was explained that this would update judges' knowledge in

line with the new framework and that the seminar would only need to be completed once.

65. It was further noted that Rally judges had historically been adaptable and receptive to similar changes.
66. A concern was raised that the community might have misunderstood what the Liaison Council was seeking to achieve. However, following some informal face-to-face discussions at competitions, it was believed that much of the community were in favour of the concept once it had been clarified, and there had been agreement that it would increase the standard of judging.
67. It was suggested that the Liaison Council work with the Accredited Trainers to hold more in person discussions at competitions or host webinar question and answer sessions with the community to clearly explain the suggestions.
68. There was a query over whether there would be sufficient resources and volunteers available to deliver the seminars across all geographical areas, ensuring they were accessible to all judges. It was confirmed that the Accredited Trainers were reviewing the matter and could recruit additional Accredited Trainers across a wider geographical area if required.
69. It was summarised that further communication and education would be provided to the community and that the Accredited Trainers needed to be involved moving forward.

Eligibility for Special Classes

70. The Liaison Council discussed whether clarification was needed to state that special classes were not restricted to dogs of 12 calendar months of age.
71. It had been raised that confirmation was required to clarify that dogs aged six months and over may compete in appropriate special classes, which did not include jump exercises, while maintaining the existing age restriction for classes that may involve jumps.

Regulation S2.b stated the following:

S2 Eligibility

b. Only dogs of six calendar months of age and over on the first day of the competition are eligible to take part in Level 1, 2, or 3 classes. Only dogs of 12 calendar months of age and over on the first day of the competition are eligible to take part in Level 4 or higher classes or special classes which incorporate jumps or similar exercises.

72. The Liaison Council recommended that schedules needed to clearly indicate where a special class may incorporate jump exercises and state that they were restricted to dogs over 12 months of age.

73. The recommendation was to ensure that schedules clearly identify classes where jumps may be included, therefore competitors could make informed decisions about their entry, aid course design parameters for judges, and help organisers to provide clarity in their schedules.

ITEM 9. FIVE-YEAR STRATEGY

74. The Liaison Council reviewed the Five-Year plan. It was agreed that Mrs Butler would update the document, with assistance from the Liaison Council, to align further with the Liaison Council's ongoing work.
75. A query was raised about the format of the document. The Liaison Council would consider the layout of the other discipline's five-year strategy documents when reviewing its own.

ITEM 10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

76. It was raised that a reminder was required for the community that in standard classes a place could be awarded to any team who had a recorded score and had not received a Non-Qualifying score for any of the reasons listed in regulation S(B).5.e.

Regulation S19.d also stated that:
In standard classes, rosettes and/or place cards may not be awarded to dogs that have received a non-qualifying score for any of the reasons listed in the non-qualifying scoring regulations.

ITEM 11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

77. The date of the Liaison Council's next meeting would be confirmed by September 2026.

The meeting ended at 11.45am

THE ROYAL KENNEL CLUB'S STRATEGIC AIMS

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