

PROPOSAL FOR 2028 FCI RULES CHANGE

TYRE

FCI Agility Rules, Art. 5

Tyre:

Aperture diameter: 50 cm to 60 cm. Height of aperture centre from the ground: L: 80 cm – I: 70 cm - ~~M and S: 55 cm.~~ **M: 60 cm and S: 50 cm.**

Argument: Dogs has to jump the size appropriate to their body, performing similar jump (movement) as on the hurdle.

Attention: Necessary to be changed in the Obstacle Guidelines as well.

DISTANCES AND COURSE DESIGN

FCI Agility Rules, Art. 4 COURSES 4.1 GENERAL

- The overall course length is determined by the number of obstacles used and by the course design. ~~The actual length of the course must be between 100 m and 220 m and,~~ Depending on the class, require dogs to traverse at least 15 obstacles but no more than 22. No less than 7 of the obstacles must be jumps. A standard competition set must contain at least 14 hurdles.
- The minimum straight-line distance between consecutive obstacles **must not be less than 6m** ~~distance on the dog's path between consecutive obstacles must not be less than 5m.~~ The maximum straight-line distance between consecutive obstacles **must not be more than 8m** ~~7m and the maximum distance on the dog's path between consecutive obstacles must not be more than 9m.~~ All distances should be measured from the nominal point that the dog leaves the obstacle to the nominal point that the dog arrives at the next obstacle. For hurdles, these are centres of the bars. For a tunnel, contacts, weaves, etc. it is the nominal entry/exit points of those obstacles.

Argument: When measuring the distance between obstacles in a straight line, there is no ambiguity in the interpretation of the measurement or any deviation. A distance of 6 to 8 m measured in a straight line is objectively applicable to all dog size categories. If this requirement is maintained, there is no need to specify a maximum course length, as the course will naturally be longer or shorter depending solely on its design. Therefore, the total course length may be measured only for the purpose of determining the Standard Course Time (SCT).

- The spread hurdle, tyre, **wall** and long jump must always be placed to allow a straight approach from the previous obstacle.

FCI Agility Rules, Art. 4 COURSES 4.2 FCI course design

Courses must be built using obstacles that conform to designs approved by the FCI. When building the course, the judge uses these obstacles at his discretion. The following obstacles should be at the judge's disposal:

14 hurdles with poles, 1 tyre, 1 wall, 1 dog-walk, 1 A-frame, 1 see-saw, weave poles, 1 long jump, 4 tube tunnels (**one of these must be 3 - 4 meters long**). **This is maximum of the obstacles to be used at the course.**

Argument: This amendment serves only to clarify the interpretation of the rules.

JUDGING

FCI Agility Rules, Art. 6.2 h)

Weave poles

The first pole must be to the left of the dog, the second on the right and so on.

Each incorrect entry is penalised with a refusal, even when the dog approaches from the side (5 faults). For further errors a dog is ~~only~~ penalised ~~once~~, with a fault (5 faults). Every mistake must be corrected immediately, ~~or the dog can be taken back to~~ **from the** the beginning. Back-weaving (more than 2 gates) results in elimination.

The obstacle must be completed correctly before negotiating the next obstacle; failure to do so results in elimination on the next obstacle.

Argument: This amendment simplifies the rule, making it easier for competitors and spectators to understand, while also simplifying its application and enforcement by judges.

REFUSALS

No refusals in the rules, with exception of the specific obstacle refusal, i.e. weaves entry, dog returns from the tunnel, dog runs through the jump under the bar etc.

We propose eliminating the judging of refusals in agility caused by movement of the dog. We believe that the concept of agility as a sport derived from show jumping is outdated.

Due to the complexity of the current regulations, refusals are presently the most problematic and subjective aspect of the rules. If refusal judging based on movement or



on the line of the dog is removed, any less efficient movement around the course will still affect the result, but only as a loss of time.

This approach would simplify judging, reduce subjectivity, and improve consistency in the application of the rules.

As we have been informed that Croatia intends to submit a comprehensive proposal in the same spirit, we do not consider it necessary to submit a detailed proposal at this stage.

However, should Croatia ultimately decide not to submit its proposal, we are submitting this proposal as a precaution. At the request of the FCI Agility Commission, it can be supplemented with detailed rule wording and specific amendments to the relevant articles.

DOG'S HEIGHT CATEGORIES

As we have been informed that some FCI member countries intend to submit proposals to amend the size categories, we are submitting only a general proposal for such a change at this stage.

We reserve the right to support the proposal submitted by one of these countries as presented, or, during the discussion on the specific size categories, to submit concrete amendments of our own.

We are taking this approach in order to avoid overburdening the FCI Agility Commission with multiple proposals where this is not procedurally necessary for an efficient decision-making process.

Should no member country submit such a proposal, we will, at the request of the FCI Agility Commission, either submit a more detailed proposal or withdraw this proposal.

Prague, 2026 June 29th

Karina Divisova
Chairman of the Board
Czech Agility Club

