

MEMORANDUM

DATE: 18 February 2012
TO: ECSCA Board of Directors
FROM: Barbara A. Penny/AKC Delegate
RE: **AKC Delegates Board Report – December 2011 Delegates Meeting**

The December Delegates Meeting was held in conjunction with the Eukanuba National Championship in Orlando, FL on Friday, the 16th with the Standing Committee Meetings held the prior day on Thursday, the 15th. I attended the Parent Club, By-Laws and Canine Health Committee Meetings that day as well as the Delegate Caucus.

There were four (4) major discussion points meaningful to the ECSCA: 1) AKC Board Candidates for Class of 2016; 2) the Group Realignment proposal; 3) the 3-Pt. Major Reserve proposal, and 4) the controversial changes to the Spaniel Hunt Test. The proposal for the Group Realignment will be voted on at the March 2012 Delegates Meeting in addition to the Board election. The 3-Pt. Major Reserve proposal has been withdrawn by the Progressive Dog Club, which has submitted it for consideration. This would allow the proposal to be modified to permit Parent Clubs to “opt out” of the provision, if the Parent Club is not interested in participating

AKC BOARD CANDIDATES Class of 2016

The AKC Board Candidates vying to fill 3 vacancies include the following line-up of delegates:

1. William J. Feeney, Sir Francis Drake KC
2. Thomas Powers, KC of Beverly Hills
3. Lynn Worth-Smith, Vizla COA
4. John L. Ronald, Samoyed COA
5. Patricia A. Cruz, Heart of the Plains KC
6. Robert A. Schroll, Clarksville KC (TN)
7. Larry Sorensen, Dachshund COA

GROUP REALIGNMENT PROPOSAL

The Realignment Committee resubmitted its revised proposal at the September 2011 Delegates meeting and it was discussed at this meeting. A memorandum from this Committee is attached as **Exhibit A**. As the Board determines which breeds comprise each group and we can only advise the Board as to our feelings about our particular placement, the division of the Sporting Group is attached as **Exhibit B**. The AKC.org website has the full division for reference. **Exhibit C** reflects the concerns regarding the judges approval process and **Exhibit D** is a reprint of the FAQ.

In an effort to address declining entries at conformation shows and to make the show experience more inclusionary rather than exclusionary and elitist, the AKC has again proposed a Realignment initiative. With its revision of the process for accepting new breeds, the AKC feels that it is inevitable that the

current group size will become unmanageable in the future. Anticipating this and realigning the groups to accommodate the new breeds as they gain full recognition and begin appearing at our events, the Realignment Committee is proposing a revision which would not require revisiting in 3, 5 or 10 years. The Committee's intent is to align breeds that are similar in conformation, structure or function. The **Sporting Group**, for instance, has been split into two (2) groups – **Group 1: Pointer & Setter** and **Group 2: Retriever & Spaniel**. If no change is initiated, the current Sporting Group size of 29 is projected to expand to 39 by 2014.

There are currently 185 breeds (or varieties) in the list of approved breeds, with 14 in Miscellaneous. Breeds that are accepted into Miscellaneous will most likely get admitted to the Stud Book in a 1-3 year time frame. While there are FSS breeds that may never go further, those in Miscellaneous will progress to gain approved status. To provide historical perspective: in 2001 (11 years ago), there were 159 breeds and 9 in Miscellaneous (all of which were given full approval). Similarly in 2006, there were 165 breeds with 6 in Miscellaneous. Thus in the last 10 years the AKC has added 26 breeds to the approved list. With the current breeds in Miscellaneous, the AKC projects a list of at least 200 approved breeds within the next several years.

The implementation of this revision has been estimated at 3 years, so in reality, the soonest a change would effective would be **mid-2015**.

Such a significant realignment does not come without its downsides. The AKC acknowledges the concerns expressed by show-giving clubs regarding additional costs and length of show. The clubs control the actual costs based on the awards it selects. Should the club award rosettes, the estimated cost to encompass the additional groups would be \$35-50 per group, which should be absorbed by additional entries. Prizes or trophies are also at the discretion of the show-giving club; however, neither rosettes and/or prizes are required by AKC rules. As for the potential for prolonging the show, the administrative time to move these additional groups in and out of the ring(s) should be limited to 5 to 10 minutes with the option of groups being judged concurrently. On the up side, additional entries from more opportunities for ribboning due to this Realignment could also equate to longer shows, which is not seen as a negative in this regard. The AKC feels that winning gets exhibitors hooked on the sport and coming back with future entries, contributing to the positive health and growth of our sport.

As for the judges approval process, the AKC has developed a package which relaxes some of the requirements and will enable judges to attain approvals on a compressed time frame. What this does, however, is place the onus squarely on the parent clubs to improve their judges education programs to ensure that their Best of Breed placements are worthy of representing their breed in the group ring to negate the comments being made about quality issues.

3-PT. MAJOR RESERVE

This amendment was brought forward by the Progressive Dog Club and will be voted on at the next Delegates Meeting in March 2012. This proposal would create a new three-point major for the dog designated Reserve Winners Dog and the bitch designated Reserve Winners Bitch at one National Specialty each year, specified by the AKC Breed Parent Club. The AKC Board has not made a recommendation on this proposal.

This proposal came before the AKC Delegate body back in 2003 that would give a **Parent Club at their National Specialty only the ability to give RWD/RWB a 3-pt. major when their sex had at least double the entries present necessary for a 5-pt. major.** The final vote at that time was 1-2 pts. shy of the 2/3rds majority required to pass the amendment.

The main objection voiced at the time was that defeated entries historically do not receive points. Fast forward to 2012 where a shifting of attitudes has become evident in wanting to give recognition to excellent examples of our breed. An example of this is the Grand Champion title, which can be earned despite being “defeated” by BOB or BOS. An illustration of the inequity of the circumstances is the scenario of the National Specialty where there were 64 dogs competing for Winners. This was considerably more than two times the dogs need for a 5-point major. RWD went home without any points and despite defeating 63 dogs. The following weekend, RWD showed at an all-breed show and won 4 points as WD defeating 12 dogs.

The Delegates Dog Show Rules Committee, however, opposes this amendment voicing the rationale that a Nat’l Specialty is not significantly different from an all-breed show. This Committee is also of the opinion that there is no significant difference in a Nat’l Specialty held in conjunction with an all-breed show. The Delegates Parent Club Standing Committee, however, rejects both arguments and completely endorses this amendment because they feel it positively promotes the Parent Club National Specialty. The Parent Club Committee takes particular umbrage with the Dog Show Rules Committee for weighing in negatively on a proposal that they so strongly endorse. This amendment is meant to address the inequality of the circumstances, elevate the status of a Nat’l Specialty reserve win and reward and recognize a dog for an exemplary win. This amendment is being heavily promoted within the Delegate body and has the full endorsement of the Parent Club Committee.

SPANIEL HUNT TEST UPDATE

Over objections registered by several breed clubs, which included the ECSCA, the AKC Board voted to approve participation of the Curly and Flat Coated Retrievers in the upland and water hunt tests. This decision did not involve a Rule Change or require any action by the Delegate Field and Hunt Test Standing Committee, so therefore did not come to the attention of the Delegate body.

The rationale expressed by the Board was basically as follows:

- The inclusion of the retrievers was not at the exclusion of the spaniels;
- The Hunt Test is pass/fail; therefore, there would be no impact on the performance of another dog’s ability to pass or fail the test;
- No advance notice was necessary because there was no impact on spaniels by the inclusion of the two (2) retriever breeds;
- The perception that it might ultimately affect the hunting style of spaniels was considered;
- An Advisory Committee was discussed.

DELEGATES DECEMBER 2011 MEETING

1. Chairman's Report
2. President's Report:
3. Treasurer's Report
4. Amendment Action

1. Chairman's Report from Ron Menaker: Important Milestones

- **11th Annual AKC/Eukanuba National Championship** – record entry of 4,975 with over 1,328 (35%) of the entry participating in the Bred-by Exhibitor competition;
- **Obedience** celebrating its 75th Anniversary
- **Conformation**
 - **Grand Champions:** 2,000 + dogs have earned various levels (bronze, silver, gold, and platinum)
 - Introduction of **Owner Handler** series with awarding of Best Owner Handler
 - 6,900 breeders participating in **Breeder of Merit** program to ensure growth and quality of our registry
 - **Agility** added two new titles – the “Time to Beat” titling class and the Preferred Agility Champion title, celebrated its 1,000,000th entry, and won the Gold Medal in the World Championship in France
 - New **Lure Coursing** event, open to all breeds, offering 3 new titles
 - 1,600 **Therapy Dogs** certified
 - **Meet the Breeds NYC** drew over 40,000 visitors and 176 breed clubs
 - Now over 600 **Responsible Dog Ownership (RDO) Day** events with record-setting Canine Good Citizen tests performed
 -

2. President's Report from Dennis Sprung: Update Report on Conformation Show Moratorium

The moratorium was initiated last February 2011 by the AKC Board because the perceived drop in conformation entries had raised the question and concern within the fancy that there were simply too many dog shows. It was determined up front that despite some clubs experiencing higher entries and some were seeing a drop in theirs, the aggregate of all shows across the country indicated a decline in the average entries per show. Finding majors was also a considerable problem.

There were recommendations for change with the lifting of the moratorium made by the AKC Staff at the November Board Meeting. Extensive data were collected from past events concerning entries, distance between events, distance exhibitors traveled, and the impact of specialties. The moratorium was lifted with restrictions specific to specialty clubs, group clubs and all breed clubs that restrict new clubs in saturated areas and permit new clubs to form in underserved areas. The divisions were realigned based on the data collected in order to allow a more equitable opportunity for majors. These changes restrict the formation of new clubs where needed and allow growth in underserved areas.

3. Treasurer's Report from Jim Stevens: New York Office Lease

Always a controversial subject for discussion, Jim Stevens addressed this issue, providing a current update to clarify circulating misinformation.

There are two key factors:

1. The current New York office lease has a 20 year term and expires at the end of 2018. So the remaining lease term is 7 years. The current annual rent for this location is \$1.2 million, lease terms are restrictive and essentially preclude subletting the space.
2. The difference in the cost per square foot between the New York and Raleigh office leases is less than \$13. This amounts to approximately \$430,000 per year in rent expense. Although this is not an insignificant amount, there are many benefits associated with having the headquarters location.
 - a. Broad exposure to the media (not available in Raleigh) is the most critical – opportunities to appear on national television with minimal advance notice which generate a significant amount of beneficial media exposure for the AKC;
 - b. To purchase the equivalent television exposure and related publicity, the estimated cost (calculated by a media tracking service) would have been \$9.7 million for last year alone;
 - c. The headquarters proximity to potential corporate sponsors and licensees has been advantageous in increasing revenue base (critical in a time of declining registrations), which has more than offset the incremental rent expense for the headquarters;
 - d. In the event of a disaster at the Raleigh locations, the New York office offers business continuity for key Raleigh personnel;
 - e. Adverse managerial, financial and operational consequences from the potential loss of key personnel not interested in relocating out of New York

At the time this lease was executed, the AKC did use a consultant with extensive real estate experience in selecting this location and negotiating the lease. In assessing the current situation, vacating this space today would not save money, but instead incur a very significant expense. It is the intention of the AKC to explore its future options sufficiently in advance of the expiration date of this lease. Management's intention is to perform a comprehensive review in 2016 to assess the feasibility of combining AKC's two offices into one location in the future when the current lease expires.

4. Amendment Action

The one proposed amendment voted on at this Delegates Meeting was to **Chapter 7, Section 1** of the *Rules Applying to Dog Shows*, which would eliminate the prohibition of a person connected with dog food, dog remedy or kennel supply companies in the capacity of solicitor or salesman, from becoming an AKC judge.

There was not two-thirds in the affirmative and the amendment was not adopted. The ECSCA voted against adoption of this proposed amendment.

The next Delegates Meeting will be held March 12-13, 2012 at the Sheraton Newark Airport Hotel, Newark, NJ.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara A. Penny
AKC Delegate

EXHIBIT A

GROUP REALIGNMENT PROPOSAL

Memorandum for AKC BOD and AKC Delegates

Subject: Group Realignment - The time has come

In October, 2007, the AKC Board of Directors appointed a committee to evaluate the existing alignment of breeds within the seven variety groups and determine if a different alignment would better serve the Sport.

In 2009, the committee reported its recommendations to expand the number of groups from seven to ten and to move breeds from the current groups to the new groups. The proposal was scheduled to be voted on at the March 2010 Delegate meeting.

At the March, 2010 Delegate meeting, the Committee recommended that the proposal be referred back to the BOD, as additional information had rendered a vote premature. The BOD subsequently referred the action back to a re-formed Realignment committee, which began its work in 2010.

In accomplishing its task the Realignment Committee met in person, via conference call and through email coordination. In its study, the committee considered the current groupings, the previous comments from all stakeholders, the development of AKC record keeping and event management software, the numbers of breeds in the recognition pipeline and AKC plans for streamlining the breed recognition process, and the parallel work of the AKC Judging Approval Process committee. A composite of Frequently Asked Questions (and Answers) that provide detail is included in this summary. Significant changes in the Groups include splitting the Working Group into three groups, the Hound Group into two groups and the Sporting Group into two groups. A listing of proposed Groups as well as a suggested composition is included in this summary.

Note that this is a two-step process. The first step will be the approval by the Delegate Body for the addition of four groups. The Board of Directors will then be tasked with the placement of breeds within those groups. It is expected that the reasoned input of the fancy will be an integral part of the placement. The committee recommends the addition of four groups to the listing currently in place (7 groups). This change which requires Delegate approval to amend Chapter 3, Sections 1, 15, 17, 18, 19 and 20, and Chapter 6, Section 3 of the Rules Applying to Dog Shows. Concurrently, the committee notes that it may be useful to remove the reference to the number of groups from all of the above sections, except Chapter 3, Section 1.

In addition, Chapter 2 of the Rules Applying to Registration and Discipline refers to the number of groups, and would require Delegate approval to amend.

The committee, by submission of this report, requests the Board of Directors of the American Kennel Club, in accordance with Article XX of the Bylaws of the American Kennel Club, propose and submit the necessary amendments to the Delegate body, to be read at the December, 2011 meeting of the Delegate Body, published in two issues of AKC Gazette, and voted upon at the March, 2012 meeting of the Delegate Body.

Respectfully submitted,
The Realignment Committee

EXHIBIT B

Proposed Sporting Groups

The Groups – projections with breeds currently in the Groups, Miscellaneous Class *and Foundation Stock Service* (numbers based on inclusion of new breeds and some movement within the groups, as some breeds are recommended for reassignment)

Group 1: Sporting – Pointers & Setters (18 breeds)

Bracco Italiano
Brittany
Drentsche Patrijshond
Pointer
Pointer (German Shorthaired)
Pointer (German Wirehaired)
Portuguese Pointer
Setter (English)
Setter (Gordon)
Setter (Irish)
Setter (Irish Red & White)
Small Muenstenlander Pointer
Spinone Italiano
Stabyhoun
Vizsla
Weimaraner
Wirehaired Pointing Griffon
Wirehaired Vizsla

Group 2: Sporting - Retrievers & Spaniels (21 breeds/varieties)

Barbet
Koolkerhondje
Lagotto Romagnolo
Retriever (Chesapeake Bay)
Retriever (Curly-Coated)
Retriever (Flat-Coated)
Retriever (Golden)
Retriever (Labrador)
Retriever (Nova Scotia Duck Tolling)
Spaniel (American Water)
Spaniel (Boykin)
Spaniel (Clumber)
Spaniel (Cocker) ASCOB
Spaniel (Cocker) Black
Spaniel (Cocker) Parti-color
Spaniel (English Cocker)
Spaniel (English Springer)
Spaniel (Field)
Spaniel (Irish Water)
Spaniel (Sussex)
Spaniel (Welsh Springer)

EXHIBIT C

Tentative -Group Realignment Judging Procedure (submitted by the AKC Judges Operations Department)

How will the group realignment affect the approval of judges?

There are presently an adequate number of approved judges to judge all breeds currently admitted to the registry and groups as they are currently aligned, and, therefore, there will be an adequate number of approved judges after breeds are realigned.

Following is staff's proposal to approve group judges to accommodate the realignment of breeds to be finalized pending Board approval. It is a one time adjustment to the pool of AKC judges that is a necessary expedience but in no way suggests that the historically high quality of the AKC group and best in show judging pool be diluted by relaxing present policy and lowering standards for group approval. The opportunities proposed are not intended to provide a shortcut to group approval or to be the first step in the eroding of requirements to judge groups.

Where it is indicated that additional breeds are to be applied for, there will be no restrictions regarding judging status. That is to say, judges with provisional status in some breeds may apply for these needed breeds. Further, provisional status for breeds applied for during the adjustment window (from implementation date two year anniversary) to maintain group judging status should not inhibit regular application progression.

Considering the publicity the proposed realignment has received and the latest proposed time line (earliest possible implementation on January 1, 2015), judges will have nearly five years (until January 1, 2017) to acquire breeds to maintain group approval. There will be no restrictions limiting the number of breeds or status of judges applying for breeds needed to maintain approved status granted by virtue of this adjustment.

- **Sporting Groups** All judges approved to judge the Sporting Group as it is presently composed are already approved (or will automatically be approved) to judge all of the breeds in both new Sporting Groups. In addition, those judges not approved for the entire Sporting group but are approved for all currently recognized breeds in either the proposed Sporting – Pointer & Setter or Sporting – Retriever & Spaniel groups will automatically be approved to judge that respective group.

- **Hound Groups** All judges approved to judge the Hound Group as it is presently composed are already approved to judge all of the breeds in the new Scent Hound Group.

All judges approved to judge the Hound Group as it is presently composed will be eligible to judge the Sight Hound Group for two years following realignment but will not be eligible to judge the Italian Greyhound classes in the breed. If they do not gain approval for Italian Greyhounds in the two year window, they will lose the approval for the Sight Hound Group. Judges not eligible to judge the Hound Group as currently comprised but eligible to judge all breeds in the proposed Scent Hound or Sight Hound Group will be eligible to judge that respective group following realignment.

There are presently 230 judges approved to judge the Hound Group. 104 (45%) of them are already approved for Italian Greyhounds.

- **Working Group** All judges approved to judge the Working Group as it is presently composed will be eligible to judge the Working - Utility Group for two years following realignment but will not be eligible to

judge the Dalmatian classes in the breed. If they do not gain approval for Dalmatians in the two year window, they will lose the approval for the Working - Utility Group.

All judges currently approved to judge the Working Group as it is presently composed will be eligible to judge the Working –Molosser Group.

In addition, all judges currently not approved to judge the Working Group, but are eligible to judge all of the individual currently approved breeds in the proposed Working – Utility and/or Working – Molosser Groups will be eligible to judge that respective group.

- **Hound Group** All judges currently approved to judge the presently composed Working, Non-Sporting and Herding Groups and judges approved to judge any combination of eleven breeds that will compose this new group will be eligible to judge the Working-Spitz Group for two years following realignment. However, they will not be eligible to judge any breeds for which they are not specifically approved in the classes. If they do not gain approval for the balance of the breeds in the two year window, they will lose the approval for the Working - Spitz Group.

There are presently 256 judges approved to judge the Working Group. 97 (38%) of them are already approved to judge Dalmatians.

- **Terrier Group** All judges approved to judge the Terrier Group as it is presently composed are already or will be approved to judge all of the breeds in the Terrier Group following realignment.

- **Toy Group** All judges approved to judge the Toy Group as it is presently composed are already or will be approved to judge all of the breeds in the Toy Group following realignment

- **Non-Sporting Group** All judges approved to judge the Non-Sporting Group as it is presently composed are already or will be approved to judge all of the breeds in the Non-Sporting Group following realignment

- **Herding Group** All judges approved to judge the Herding Group as it is presently composed are already or will be approved to judge all of the breeds in the Herding Group following realignment.

- **General** There is presently one breed in the Sight Hound Group, one breed in the Working - Utility Group and twelve breeds in the Working – Spitz Group that may ultimately jeopardize group judging status. However, there is a two year post realignment window added to the notice from whence the realignment is approved for sincere judges to qualify. Provisional status restrictions would be waived, so judges could apply for these breeds at any time.

For all groups following realignment, judges eligible for all currently approved breeds in a group will be eligible to judge that respective group.

- **Best in Show** Effective with the implementation of the realignment of groups, judges already approved to judge Best in Show will remain eligible to judge Best in Show. Thereafter, only judges approved to judge two groups will be approved to judge Best in Show.

The Delegate Realignment Committee has finalized the proposal for Group Realignment. The 2 documents attached (both PDF files) are:

1. The Proposal and Q&A;
2. The Committee suggested placement of breeds within the groups.

We will be presenting the proposal to the AKC Board of Directors for consideration, in order to have it read to the Delegate Body in anticipation of a vote at a subsequent meeting. The major change from our previous work is the additional split of the Working Group into three. The recognition of many new breeds into that current group, as well as those anticipated to be added in the fairly near future, warrants the split.

There are two important things to keep in mind. First, the only thing that the Delegate body will be called upon to vote is the additional groups (along with their designations). If that change is approved, the Board of Directors will have the responsibility of making the actual group assignments for the breeds. The attached listing is the Committee's initial recommendation for that assignment. In the end, however, it will be up to the Board to populate the groups.

We consider our listing to be evergreen. That is, we expect that the Board will take into consideration, reasoned recommendations from the Parent Clubs and from the fancy. We will make your comments known to the Board to aid in their deliberations. It is important to understand that it will be at least two to three years before the changes come into play.

We hope that you will take the time to read the proposal and make your thoughts known. With that in mind, we have included a link below to a Comment Form for your use.

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/viewform?formkey=dDJjMG9pQ3MyZEpGay11dWp1QzQ0OFE6MQ>

Please use it and have your voice heard. We will try to address any questions and will continue to keep everyone informed as this progresses. Thank you for your interest and participation in the process.

The Realignment Committee

EXHIBIT D

REALIGNMENT FAQ

Why realign the groups?

The proposed Group Realignment will

- Align breeds that are similar in conformation, structure or function
- Improve judges' education by building on similarities
- Accommodate new breeds within the groups
- Increase entries/enhance exhibitor experience by providing additional opportunities for group placement
- Improve spectator understanding of dog shows

Why now, when the proposal two years ago was set aside?

A number of factors influenced the decision to postpone the Realignment Initiative. Most of those issues are now resolved, or are on parallel timelines to implement solutions. Revision is inevitable, or the current scheme becomes unmanageable.

With entries declining, how can AKC justify enlarging the number of Groups?

AKC recently revised the process for accepting new breeds. As these breeds gain full recognition, and begin appearing in our events, the current groups will become unmanageable. Additional groups bring additional positive competitive opportunities for our exhibitors.

If we do nothing what happens to sizes of the Groups?

As of 7/1/2011	<u>Current</u>	<u>2014</u> Projected (adding Miscellaneous)
Sporting	29	39
Hound	28	41
Working	28	42
Terrier	29	31
Toy	23	25
Non-Sporting	20	23
Herding	26	38

Can't we just divide fix the large groups and avoid moving other breeds around?

Incremental solutions only solve half of the problem, but not at half of the cost. After reviewing the comments from the previous proposal, and understanding the impact that new breeds will have, the committee felt that a comprehensive revision now would mean we should not have to revisit the groups in 3, 5 or 10 years.

What's different about this proposal?

A major concern with the 2008 proposal was that the projected size of the working group was not addressed. This proposal answers that concern.

How long will this take to implement?

Current estimate is 3 years from approval to implementation. Assuming approval would occur in/before mid-2012, implementation would be mid-2015.

How do these groups align with other organizations?

There was no attempt to mirror any other organization's structure. There are similarities - and differences - to FCI and others.

What input do Parent Clubs have in this process? Will they have opportunity to determine what which group their breed is assigned?

The committee took into consideration the previous comments of all stakeholders. Cogent, well-supported Parent Club inputs will be given due weight by the AKC BOD in placing breeds into groups. In the long term, however, the groups will be based on an overall plan to enhance the Sport.

Eleven groups?

Group 1: Sporting - Pointer & Setter

Group 2: Sporting - Retriever & Spaniel

Group 3: Scent Hounds

Group 4: Sight Hounds

Group 5: Working – Utility

Group 6: Working – Molosser

Group 7: Working – Spitz

Group 8: Terriers

Group 9: Toy

Group 10: Non-Sporting

Group 11: Herding

- Sporting group: Divided into Pointer/Setter and Retriever/Spaniel breeds by considering both physical form and function
- Hound group: Divided into Sight and Scent by function and the physical characteristics related to each.
- Working group: Divided into Working-Utility (multi-purpose breeds which vary in ancestry and function), Working-Molosser (generally dogs of the Mastiff type) and Working-Spitz (breeds which have common physical characteristics and ancestry).
- Terrier Group: Unchanged
- Toy Group: Toy Group: one breed moved to another group and one breed added.
- Non-Sporting Group: Based on similarity of form and function, Spitz-type breeds were moved to Working-Spitz. Non-Sporting name is retained.
- Herding Group: Several breeds moved to other groups. Remainder of composition unchanged.

With this many groups won't shows take longer? The administrative time to move additional groups in and out of the ring(s) should not add more than five to ten minutes. Groups can also be judged concurrently. Of course, more entries resulting from realignment could mean shows would become longer---and that would be a good thing.

How much more will this cost for AB clubs?

The club determines actual costs based on what it decides to award. Should the club opt for rosettes, estimated pricing is \$35-\$50 per each additional group. Prizes are also at the discretion of the show-giving club. Note: Rosettes and/or prizes are not required by the Rules.

How will realignment affect the approval of judges?

AKC has developed a favorable package for judging approval which relaxed some requirements and enables judges to attain approvals on a compressed time frame.

What about existing group clubs?

When realignment is implemented, Group Shows may only offer competition for breeds in the new groups. A breed or variety may only be eligible to compete in one group and that would be the new group to which it is assigned. Existing Working, Hound, Sporting and Non-Sporting clubs eligible to hold AKC events at the time of implementation, may concurrently hold shows for the two new Sporting or Hound Groups, the three new Working Groups, and the Non-Sporting Group may hold shows for the Non-Sporting and Working-Spitz groups. There may be no inter-group competition, nor Best in Show at these events. When a club offers competition within the new groupings, they would be treated as two separate, but concurrently held, Group Shows. There are currently nine approved Sporting, eighteen approved Hound, ten approved Working and seven approved Non-Sporting Group Clubs.