
Minutes of the annual general meeting of the association Dogdance International e.V. on 05.05.2018 in the seminar room of Sport- und Ferienhotel Sonnhalde, Hochfirstweg 24, 79853 Lenzkirch-Saig:

TOP 1

Welcome and opening of the assembly, election of the meeting chairperson, elections administrator, minute taker and teller (for counting the votes)

15:04 Welcome by the 1st Chairman Axel Weber

Axel points to Friday evening's discussion, which he summarizes as profitable. There, according to his report, some of the topics of the applications were (pre-) discussed. Each member could have participated. Nonetheless, applications will of course be re-discussed during the meeting and questions can be asked.

Axel excuses Christine Szakacs as 2nd Chairman. She cannot attend for personal reasons because her partner had died of his serious illness the day before. Axel asks for a minute of silence.

Axel volunteers as chairman of the meeting. No objections from the plenum. No further suggestions.

Axel volunteers as an election administrator because he is not running for any office. No objections from the plenum. No further suggestions.

Axel proposes secretary Katharina Henf as minute taker for the meeting. No objections from the plenum. No further suggestions.

Axel proposes advisor to the board Claudia Moser as facilitator for the discussions. No objections from the plenum. No further suggestions.

Annette Söll volunteers as a teller for counting the votes. No objections from the plenum. No further suggestions.

TOP 2

Determination of the proper convocation and presence of a quorum of the meeting

Axel notes that the invitation to the annual general meeting was issued in accordance with the rules of the statutes of the association.

Axel notes that the general meeting therefore has a quorum.

TOP 3

Annual report of the chairman / board

Topic: Software / Membership Management

Axel: The new homepage has finally been completed, as it had been announced last year.

The experiences with the current software for member administration were not without problems, because the company that provided the software changed their name a few times and also changed the company headquarters. Therefore, all the data of the members have been lost and had to be gathered again tediously. The use of the old software was therefore too precarious for the board.

Treasurer Jana Lorenz reports: With Sandra Schneider's help (responsible for member administration) she finally got all the data back together, so that Sandra Schneider can finally tackle an economic member administration. There are now several software options that could possibly even link the bookkeeping and member administration, provided that there is a cloud option. Over the next few weeks, it would be possible to optimize the processes after a decision has been made, and in the future, mails to every member with up-to-date information could be sent out more frequently. In addition, it finally became clear, which contributions for memberships are still open, so that Jana could send out requests for payment and then reminders.

In this context, Jana Lorenz makes the request that the general meeting decides that members requested to pay who have not responded to the payment reminder in any way, are removed as members of the association. A list of names is available for examination, and will be attached to the meeting's minutes, as required by the statutes of the association. This application is thus inserted in the agenda between the applications.

Sandra Schneider: Currently we have 388 members, including 57 judges that do not have to pay for membership. Since reminders for payment were sent, 31 members quit, of which 13 asked to end their membership at the end of this year.

Topic: Cooperation with the "Verband für die deutsche Hundewesen e.V." (subsequently abbreviated as VDH e.V.) / the Fédération Cynologique Internationale (abbreviated as FCI)

Axel reports: During his presidency, there were no further attempts to cooperate with the VDH in the last year because he did not see any basis for cooperation based on his experience so far. Last year it was decided that the topic FCI World Championship Qualification will be continued as always (i.e. FCI WC qualification will be performed together with OEC qualification on a DDI eV tournament), because there was no exact knowledge about the future regulations of FCI / VDH. Only in the course of the year, appropriate regulations for the FCI WM were published, with the remark that only dogs with appropriate proof of descent (pedigree) or subsequent phenotyping by a FCI member-club may participate in the FCI-WM. In order to maintain contact and exchange with the VDH, Carmen Schmid took charge of hosting the FCI World Cup at the World Dog Show in Leipzig last year as a private person, not as a DDI official. The board was informed. Axel had only provided for a contact between Mrs. Bremer (VDH) and Carmen Schmid and sent a list of DDI e.V.- proven judges to Mrs. Bremer. He would like to point out that all further attempts of consolidation have not been made either by him or the rest of the board.

Debra Benard (DDI e.V. judge): Debra asks what the official criteria are for a DDI judge to judge a competition in countries connected with FCI, as she was asked to judge in France but then was

disinvited again because she is DDI not FCI. Marianne Rentsch (responsible for license booklets in the DDI e.V) explains that until now there were no official criteria for judging this type of tournaments. Carmen Schmid explains that she experienced similar things for the requested DDI e.V. judge Sonja Scheurer, and that this had to be clarified with the contact person of the respective country of the judge. She clarified this directly with Mrs. Bremer. The DDI e.V. had nothing to do with it.

Topic: Manual for the organization of tournaments

Secretary Katharina Henf reports that there have been many changes in the organization of tournament for the organizers since 2014, so together with her husband Thorsten Henf-Walter and in consultation with the advisor to the board and judges commissioner Claudia Moser, she dedicated herself to revising the organizer's handbook in which the notes from the annual general meeting of last year were incorporated. She tried to live up to all the experience of her work as a judge, active dog dancer and organizer of tournaments as widely as possible, and to present various solutions wherever possible. Some work to finalize everything still has to be done, then the new handbook will be put on the website. Since an English translation is missing, Petra Funk offers to translate the new manual.

TOP 4

Report of the treasurer, results of the cash audit 2017

Treasurer Jana Lorenz reports:

From the point of view of the treasurer, the year 2017 was similar to 2016.

in 2017 there were:

€ 12810 earnings

membership contributions (3240 €)

sponsoring money by Animonda and Uelzener insurance (7400 €)

Issuing license books (2170 €)

11671.89 € spending

tournaments, passed-on sponsorship money (6373.71 €)

internet and software cost (€ 2,902.24), only one time that high, because the new website was commissioned

judges' training reimbursements (800 €), so much too little, because actually many more judges could apply for a refund. Jana points out that she can be addressed in this regard.

creating the license booklets (776.48 €)

General Meeting room rental (472,50 €)

notary costs (25.41 €)

postage (9,49 €)

other (200 €)

bank account maintenance fees (112,60 €)

This results in a surplus of € 1138.11

The detailed report is attached to the minutes of the meeting.

-> Appendix 1: report of the treasurer Jana Lorenz

The books were presented to the two cash auditors Denise Nardelli and Judith Loy before the meeting. The books were examined with the result that the cash auditors could notify in writing that there had been no complaints. Judith Loy is also present and confirms this again.

Treasurer Jana Lorenz asks to approve the board, and thus the treasurer.

Of the 42 voting members attending the assembly (list attached), 41 are in the room at the time of the election.

-> Appendix 2: list of members that took part in the members meeting

Votes in favour of the approval: 37 members

Votes against the approval: 0 members

Abstentions: 4 members

Not in the room: 1 member

Thus, the board is approved.

TOP 5

Elections of the board of Dogdance International e.V.

TOP 5.1

Resignation of the President (1st Chairman) / Resignation of the Vice-President (2nd Chair)

Christine Szakacs wrote a letter to be read out in her absence:

"Dear Axel!

You resign and I thank you very much for the mutual respect and our common will to advance the association.

And most importantly: we could always trust each other. This is a basic requirement for being able to make a difference.

You were special for the association and for me. And that you, humble as you are, did not want to become an honorary president is okay. Nevertheless, you remain our honorary president of the hearts.

You gave the association a profile and also a character. With your expertise and know-how, you knew how to lead, to mediate, to rejoice together.

You knew when to say "yes" and you also knew when a "no" was right and appropriate.

You were simply a president with foresight, with modesty, with a big heart, with warmth, cheerfulness and wit.

Drink this bottle together with Heidi! We also thank Heidi for supporting you in the background and thus also everybody.

“After the game is before the game” (“Nach dem Spiel ist vor dem Spiel” – German saying). With you, Axel, I wish the association a good future president.

Christine Szakacs, May 2018 “

Carmen Schmid addresses Axel: In the course of Axel and Christine having really having the last meeting today as board members, Carmen addressed many members and organized a gift for both.

She gives Axel a box of French red wine, a gardening kit, a book about a special gardener, and a coupon for Fiskars (gardening tools).

Axel thanks everyone. He suggests that he will be happy to continue to update the website so that he will still be active for the club for a while longer.

Carmen Schmid presents the gift for Christine: a ballet book, a box of French red wine and a voucher. The gift will be forwarded to her.

Jessy Lang addresses Claudia Moser: She has also collected for a present and thanks Claudia for her work for the board, because she does not apply for re-election as an assessor, with a gift voucher and a bottle of champagne.

Claudia thanks all participants.

Axel reads out another letter from Christine:

"Resignation of Vice President of DDI e.V.

Dear board of DDI, Dear Axel,

I will resign from my position as Vice President of the DDI at the 2018's meeting on 5th May with the demission that I submitted for the end of the year.

First and foremost, I would like to thank President Axel Weber for the many years of good cooperation and I am already looking forward to a younger member taking over my position.

As a DDI judge and dogdance trainer, I will continue to work for dogdance, because I am still very enthusiastic about this creative dog sport.

From the bottom of my heart I wish the association good luck in all areas and for my successor I am always ready to help.

Best regards

Christine Szakacs "

TOP 5.2*Election President / 1. Chairperson*

Before the election, Claudia Moser wants to receive further information on Dogdance Deutschland e.V. (Dogdance Germany). In this newly founded association, which is a member of the DVG eV and therefore of the VDH eV, Carmen Schmid (a candidate for the chairmanship of the DDI e.V.) is first chairperson and for Claudia more information is relevant to make a choice.

Carmen Schmid: She explains that the primary aim of the association Dogdance Deutschland e.V. is to be a link between DDI e.V. and VDH e.V., in order to help the DDI e.V. with the dilemma to break its own statutes. This has to be done if someone wants to participate in a qualification for a FCI World Cup, because this is not possible for everybody and every dog and is therefore against the statutes of DDI.

[Note: for a better understanding of all non-attendants¹]

As the second goal, Carmen names the will to promote the dog sport dogdance in areas that the DDI e.V. cannot reach very well so far.

Claudia Moser: She says that she has just received the statute of this new association Dogdance Deutschland e.V., and thinks that some points in the wording are vague and inaccurate, which is why she wonders if holding two offices would make sense in the case of the election of Carmen Schmid as first chairwoman of DDI.

Carmen Schmid: She also says she considered whether holding two offices makes sense, but her goal is to protect transparency and the values of the DDI e.V., so she hopes for more security by holding both offices.

Annette Söll: She feels that she was taken by surprise. She wonders if the VDH e.V. can really be trusted. She asks for protection of the statutes of the DDI e.V. She is worried that the VDH will make concessions to recruit members and then later make their own rules. She needs some time to evaluate all this, but since people did not know about the club until very late, it is not possible in such a short time.

Carmen Schmid: She explains that the idea of founding Dogdance Deutschland e.V. in order to secure the DDI e.V. values was present for a few months, but all the discussions took more time in advance, which was not foreseeable. Only a few days before, the acceptance of DVG e.V., a VDH e.V. sub-association, was received by mail. She wanted to present the result of this work at the meeting. S

She says that she cannot promise that the values of the DDI e.V. will not be rated differently by the VDH e.V. in future, but she will try everything in her power, that the values and standards of the DDI e.V. will be protected.

Carmen Heritier: She is also a founding member of Dogdance Deutschland e.V., although she herself is extremely VDH-critical. She finds it extremely unfortunate that the possible election of Carmen

¹ Note: At the Friday evening's discussion it was suggested as a precise practice that qualifying for the Open European Championships (= OEC), so the open European Championship, which is NOT conducted by the FCI and is accessible for every team, will continue to take place in a DDI e.V. tournament. The club Dogdance Germany e.V. as FCI member club could then provide the German candidates for the FCI World Championships from this qualifier, according to the ranking in combination with the additional criteria of FCI for a proof of descent (pedigree). Thus, the need for some to participate in this event would be protected in a VDH e.V. compliant structure from any other arbitrary selection by the VDH e.V. by a possibly inexperienced party.

Schmid as the new 1st Chairwoman is now so strongly dependent on the chairmanship and the foundation of the association Dogdance Deutschland e.V., because one should not forget how much and intense she has worked for dogdance within the DDI e.V. in recent years and how much strength and time she has voluntarily put into the club.

Annette Söll: Her concern for the demand was neither to praise anyone nor to be hostile to anyone. She wanted to raise the doubts about holding two offices and wanted to express her surprise but she wants to reject Carmen Heritier's reproach that she doubts Carmen Schmid's performance. She wanted information and does not think that it is appropriate to promote candidates at this point.

Claudia Moser: She would like to point out some specific concerns about the articles of the association of Dogdance Deutschland e.V.. According to the statute of the association Dogdance Deutschland e.V., the club approves the existing regulations (DDI, OEC, FCI), but also reserves the right of recognizing further regulations that are not further defined in the statutes of the association. In her opinion, this point offers e.g. the VDH e.V. enough possibilities to act towards the disadvantage and harm of the DDI e.V.'s basic values, for example : the DDI e.V. regulations could only be changed at crucial points and used as a separate new regulation. Moreover, it is only in the statute that Dogdance Germany e.V. approves the specific regulations, not that the DVG e.V. or the VDH e.V. also approves them. She wants more assurance that they do.

Carmen Schmid: According to Carmen's statement, the DDI e.V. regulations had and should be specified because it was to be adopted completely and unchanged for Dogdance Deutschland e.V. in order to further expand the basic values of the DDI e.V. DDI and FCI regulations had to be specifically listed, because the access to the FCI WM, among other things, was part of the founding idea. But since Europe-wide development is not foreseeable internationally, it also wanted to keep the acceptance of other regulations open (for example, Nordic Championships or whatever (in the future) could still be planned). Carmen has recently received another response from the president of the DVG that he had no complaints for the DDI regulations. A call log about this telephone conversation, in which the DVG responsible person said this, exists. Lisa Andes, who is familiar with the structure of the VDH e.V., has advised Carmen on many issues. The only thing that would change for those currently in action at an FCI tournament would be that there is a list of the federation structure for examination that a judge needs to know.

Marianne Rentsch: She appreciates Carmen's work and achievement. However, not linked with her recent work, she also worries about problems with holding two offices, also with regard to Carmen's participation in the FCI Commission, to which she herself belongs, and which, among other things, works on special FCI regulations. She cannot report more about this because she had to sign a confidentiality agreement. For her, those two activities are incompatible. She herself also runs for the office as an advisor to the board for DDI e.V., and would resign her office in the FCI Commission, if she will be elected, because she considers both activities as incompatible.

Anke Opwis: Explains that she herself is a member of the IRJGV (for explanation: a VDH independent association) and she would violate IRJGV statutes in any cooperation with the VDH. Therefore, again the question of whether holding both offices could possibly be conflicting.

Petra Funk: For the topic of FCI World Cup it is good and right that the new association Dogdance Germany e.V. works together with FCI, and she trusts Carmen Schmid 100% that she will act in favour of the DDI e.V. statutes, also if she holds both offices.

Carmen Heritier: Her comment earlier was definitely not to be understood as a reproach against Annette Söll, but rather of a general nature, and she apologizes to Annette if she had the feeling of

being attacked. She does not see any problems with possibly holding two offices in the DDI e.V. and in the DD e.V., since, as a chairman, everyone is bound to the rules and the statutes, and therefore, has no opportunities to offend against those. She also asks why the same considerations and implementations that were made and solved in Switzerland, did not lead to such discussions.

Carmen Schmid: She specifically welcomes the discussion. Within the next three years, Carmen wants to see a certain tendency in the FCI Commission, so that she sees that everything is on the right way. Otherwise she will resign there: for example accessibility for everybody at international competitions.

Annette Söll: The concerns are not directed against certain people, but against the entire situation. She argues that in France, for example, there are frequent hostilities between DDI e.V. affiliated parties and FCI-affiliated dogdancers, for example by threatening to withdraw FCI licence and performance recording cards in the case of performing under foreign regulations. She demands more security, more protection for the DDI e.V..

Sonja Scheurer: She asks how certain Carmen is that the DVG e.V. / VDH e.V. is honest with her, because it seems utopian to her, with all of the previous experiences of Axel, that in other countries, and also in relation to other sports, that a collaboration can take place harmoniously.

Carmen Schmid: Since the cooperation regarding the organization of tournaments at VDH e.V. fairs has been well-organized for years, she is very confident. And to ensure this, she even sees benefits if the first chairman in both clubs is the same person.

Claudia: She reports that she is DDI e.V. member / board member and board member of the GDS (to explain: this is basically the Swiss counterpart to Dogdance Germany e.V., an association that cooperates with the FCI with regard to the FCI World Cup). That's why she has no problem in general with the linking function of an extra club in Germany. But in comparison: When the Swiss association was founded a few years ago, everything was communicated in advance, there was enlightenment, there were over 40 founding members. That was not the case when founding Dogdance Deutschland e.V., this happened secretly. In addition, she thinks working in three clubs is risky.

Carmen Schmid: She says she wanted to present Dogdance Deutschland e.V. at the meeting. How long the entire development of this idea finally had lasted, was not foreseeable. With that she wants to shorten the discussion and progress to the election.

Axel Weber also asks the second candidate for the office of the 1st Chairman to say a few words to the assembly.

Sensi Lopez introduces himself: He has been doing dogdance for some years and that he had been introduced to it by his partner Sonja Scheurer. He has already acted as a DJ, in the tournaments' offices, and also as a participant in several tournaments. From the very beginning Sensi liked the philosophy of dogdance: versatility, accessibility for everybody Sensi points out that the members themselves have many goals and desires that he wants to take care of rather than to promote his own goals. He regards himself as a representative of all members.

Judith Loy: Asks Sensi how he thinks about the whole discussion around the topic of cooperation with the VDH e.V., Dogdance Germany e.V. etc.

Sensi: He wants to act in the interests of all members, and he can only do this if he knows all the facts and opinions of the members in general and therefore will not immediately make a concrete statement.

Axel Weber now wants to move on to the election.

Katharina Henf: She asks for covert and secret voting for the board elections.

The election:

42 ballots have been received, all 42 ballots are valid:

28 votes are for Carmen Schmid

13 votes are won by Sensi Lopez

1 abstention

Carmen accepts the election.

16:51 break, 17:21 end of break

Topic 5.3 Election Vice-President / 2. Chairperson

Christine does not run for office anymore, Axel asks for suggestions, because no one has applied in advance.

Niki Dirnbacher suggests Debra Benard.

Annette Söll suggests Sensi Lopez.

Debra would accept the election.

Sensi would accept the election.

There are no further suggestions.

Debra introduces herself:

She is a judge since 2007, a dogdancer since 2000, lives in France. She is excited about the further development of dogdance and wants to contribute a lot.

42 ballots have been received, all 42 ballots are valid:

21 votes are for Debra Benard

20 votes are won by Sensi Lopez

1 abstention

Debra accepts the election: she is looking forward to bringing in the point of view from other country.

Topic 5.4: Election of treasurer

Jana Lorenz runs for re-election.

There are no further suggestions.

Jana introduces herself: She comes from Northern Germany, and works with numbers and finances as a profession. She would of course continue to fulfil her job as a treasurer conscientiously.

There are 42 ballots received. All are valid.

There are 41 ballots for Jana Lorenz and 1 abstention

Jana Lorenz accepts the election.

Topic 5.5.: Election of the secretary

Katharina Henf runs for office again.

There are no other candidates.

Katharina introduces herself. She has been acting in office since August, after Rainer Birkemeyer resigned from office, but so far there was not much to do, so she would be happy to contribute more in the future. She also comes from Northern Germany, has been a dogdancer for 20 years, judge since 2007, and thinks that a link between north to south meaningful for a profitable board work.

There are 42 ballots received, all are valid:

41 votes are for Katharina Henf

1 abstention.

Katharina Henf accepts the election.

Topic 5.6.: Election of Advisory Board

Claudia Moser does not run for office again.

Marianne Rentsch runs for office.

Marianne introduces herself: She lives in Switzerland and as a long-time dogdancer she is also a member of the FCI commission, however, as mentioned before, she would resign from this position in the event of an election to the board of the DDI e.V. because she feels that both offices can not be combined and linked.

Barbara Feldbauer announces that she wants to run for the office as advisory board as well.

Barbara introduces herself: Barbara comes from Southern Germany and is a long-time dogdancer. She sees her task as a mediator between different positions, because she is convinced that all those who are actively involved want to support the club and only want positive developments.

There are no other candidates.

Axel Weber says, that if Barbara will be elected, there is no person from Switzerland in the board anymore.

There are 42 ballots submitted, one of them is invalid, 41 are valid:

27 votes for Barbara Feldbauer

11 votes are won by Marianne Rentsch

3 abstentions

1 invalid vote

Barbara Feldbauer accepts the election.

Claudia Moser wants to leave the meeting after the results of the last election had been announced, because she feels left out. She believes that the entire election and the entire assembly was politically strategically planned and carried out. She feels that the elections are a hostile takeover and does not agree with the campaigning in advance.

[Note from secretary Katharina Henf: After Claudia Moser has left the room, a lively discussion began that, even with much effort, could not be recorded in writing. I asked the assembly if at this point in the minutes the note of a discussion with many very different positions within the lively discussion is sufficient, which was affirmed by all participants of the meeting.]

There are now only 41 voting members in the room.

Marianne Rentsch leaves the room, indicating that she will be back soon. Thus, only 40 voting members are present

This postpones the topics of the election of the Judges' Commissioner and the election for the Commissioner for Licenses to a later point of the meeting.

Topic 5.7: Elections of the functionaries: Judges' training, license books, membership administration, public relations, organization and coordination of events

Member Administration:

Sandra Schneider runs for re-election.

40 voting members vote.

40 votes are for Sandra Schneider

No dissenting vote

No abstention

Sandra Schneider accepts the election.

Representative / Public Relations:

Matthias Beirer announces that he will run for office. There is no further candidate.

40 voting members vote.

37 votes are won by Matthias Beirer

3 abstentions

No dissenting vote

Matthias Beirer accepts the election.

Three people leave the room. There are 37 persons with voting rights in the room.

Officer for the organization and coordination of events:

Carmen Schmid runs for re-election. There are no other candidates.

37 members vote.

33 votes are won by Carmen Schmid

4 abstentions

No dissenting votes

Carmen Schmid accepts the election.

Topic 5.8.: Election Cash auditor

Denise Nardelli has written that she wants to run for re-election in advance.

36 votes are won by Denise Nardelli

1 abstention

No dissenting votes

Denise Nardelli had stated in writing that she will accept the election.

Judith Loy also runs for re-election.

36 votes are won by Judith Loy

1 abstention

No dissenting votes

Judith accepts the election.

As it will be necessary to clarify what the elections for the Judge Commissioner and License Book Coordinator can look like in the following, there will be an early break, including dinner.

18:30 break

20:37 Resumption of the meeting.

Continuation of item 5: Election of officials:

It is noted that 3 members had to leave the meeting early. In addition, one person is missing.

As of now, 38 voting members are in the room.

Judge officer / r:

Claudia Moser: She announces that, despite the fact that many things have not happened as she thinks they should have, she is ready for new negotiations. In case of election, she is ready to keep this office. She talked to Carmen Schmid during the break.

This puts Claudia Moser for re-election.

37 votes are for Claudia Moser

1 abstention

Claudia Moser accepts the election.

Administrator for License booklets

Marianne Rentsch does not want to run again for this office.

Petra Funk: She says that in case Marianne Rentsch does not run again, she was asked to read out an application from Jessica Rolfini. Jessica Rolfini would like to run for the office.

-> Appendix 3: Jessica Rolfini

38 votes are for Jessica Rolfini

no dissenting vote

no abstention

Jessica Rolfini has stated in writing that she accepts the election.

TOP 6**Proposal by Claudia Wagstyl, Katja Pohlers, Anneke Freudenberger: Presentation – Patella issue**

(Original wording of the application)

“Hereby we want to make an application for the members meeting in May in Lenzkirch, that the various surveys/expertises concerning the patella topic, collected thoroughly by the vice chairwoman Christine Szakacs, may be presented to the meeting.

Rationale:

The surveys/expertises allow us to include more insight and knowledge. Since we find the Patella topic in dogdance, we should incorporate these surveys/expertises and think about how we want to deal with them during dogdance competitions, to permit fair play for all participants and to enable a harmonic cooperation between all participants (judges, teams, trainers) in the future.

The following supporters back the application:

Carmen Heritier, Christine Szakacs, Carmen Schmid, Cora Czermak, Petra Funk, Karin Baumann-Togni”

Axel Weber: A presentation on the topic was done at the evening discussion. Today at this point the paper of Daniel Schümperli will be handed around again. There is no "real" application, the members could actually vote on.

The plenum agrees with Axel.

-> Appendix 4: Presentation – Patella issue

TOP 7**Proposal by Britta Kalff: Prohibition of changing completed judging forms after the end of the class or tournament**

(Original wording of the application)

“This application results unfortunately from various observations. Filled in judgmentsheets have to be handed in after the start IMMEDIATELY at the receiving office or other official bureau and must NOT be altered anymore after closing of the respective class or the competition. If there are SEVERE discrepancies while filling the results, these could be discussed eventually together with the head judge of the competition and be corrected. (mistakes in writing, slip of the pen, writing 1 instead of 10). Unfortunately it was observed on various occasions that during reporting and after the sum-up of results points were altered. This is an unfair NOGO and increases rumors in favoritism/personal preference.”

Axel Weber: He notes that theoretically this application is not necessary, because the rules in this regard are already quite clear in the sense of Britta Kalff's application. Maybe, situations in which the tournament office could, for example, not read what one of the judges has written and therefore asked, were perhaps simply misunderstood.

The plenum agrees that the judges and the organizers should be reminded that the rule regarding the immutability of the scoring is valid and must be applied.

TOP 8**Proposal by Carmen Schmid: Cost of starts at the final for qualifications**

(Original wording of the application)

"I hereby request that in the future the costs for the finals in finals for OEC /WM qualifications as well as German Open / Crufts qualification be taken over by the DDI. In the past the costs for 10 to 12 starts in the final in freestyle have been covered by the organizer. If there are more than 20 teams, the class must be split according to rules. The best 5-6 teams of each group then meet in the final to decide the official qualification. A qualifier is in any case associated with considerable additional costs for the organizer: in addition to the extra costs for the 4th performance judge specified in the regulations, the organizer must therefore carry 10 -12 unpaid starting places. In addition, there will be double cup sets for the groups, because the cup set sponsored by the DDI will be awarded to the finalists.

Therefore, I apply for the future in the event of a final in freestyle and HTM the startup costs are borne by the DDI."

The proposal was withdrawn at the request of the applicant Carmen Schmid in the meeting.

A few keywords about the discussion in the assembly:

Carmen Schmid explains: Final starts are additional double starts, which are unpaid, since the starters only pay their first start when they register. Nobody knows who will be in the final at a championship. Therefore, the organizer has about 12 unpaid starts on the list. The pure start fees would approximately be 300 € for such an event.

Katharina Henf: She points out that this should not apply to any connection with an FCI World Cup, because we had previously discussed that this is not barrier-free and therefore not DDI e. V. compliant.

With Carmen Schmid's consent, the proposal is initially amended so that the wording instead of "OEC / WM Qualification" is changed to "in final runs at qualifying tournaments and championships, which are aligned according to DDI regulations."

It is discussed that it would be easiest if the organizer had to pay in advance (because there is not always and necessarily a final run, depending on the number of participants), and then he approaches the board.

As a final question it was discussed that it will be necessary to plan this within the budget for the current financial year, so that it is clear how much money there has to be to distribute money to all qualifiers, in all countries.

This really raises the question of the affordability of the application.

Jana Lorenz (Treasurer): She says that one single fiscal year cannot actually bear that amount of money in excess. The current bank account balance however can. A budget would have to be calculated for the current and future years.

Carmen Schmid: She thought of her proposal as a basis for discussion, but after hearing all the facts and the discussion, she decided to withdraw her application.

TOP 9**Proposal by Carmen Schmid: Sponsoring of Animonda at tournaments**

(Original wording of the application)

“All organizers of a Dogdance tournament according to DDI regulations can order at Animonda completely uncomplicated high-quality prizes, pockets with food cans for all starters and for the places 1-3 of all classes per 10 kg dog food and possibly a food container, as well as judges sheets, certificates and starter folders and the Animonda fence as a ring border sent for free. In addition, organizers of trade fair tournaments so far receive a financial compensation for trophies etc of max 400, - Euro, because there’s a bigger promotion effect Animonda. In consultation it has been found that Animonda assumes that all the organizers are DDI members, but this is not always the case. The sponsorship was negotiated by the DDI. Therefore I do not consider it fair that organizers, who are not members of the DDI, receive up to 400, - € cash, in addition to the use of the DDI infrastructure (e.g. judges, DDI Homepage to promote their tournament) and in addition to the property prices. Therefore, I request that the financial support is only granted to organizers who are also members of the DDI. In view of the amount of the financial contributions, the DDI - membership fee should probably be possible, and membership would also be an official appreciation of the DDI and its achievements.”

Jana Lorenz: She did some research back to the year 2015. Only organizers that are also members have received financial benefits. Sometimes several people organize a tournament together. In the future, from her point of view, it should be clear who exactly (one person) is the organizer.

Carmen Schmid: She had a different list. Therefore, there probably was a misunderstanding.

The plenum agrees that there should be a note in the Organizational Handbook that event organizers can contact the Board if they wish to receive sponsorship.

Axel Weber suggests that applications for the future can still be coordinated and decided on by the Executive Board.

The general assembly votes on the inclusion of a note in the Organizational Handbook. The note should be: Organizers have the possibility to apply for the payment of sponsorship money for their tournament according to DDI rules. The board will vote on the respective payout.

A member has left the room since the last vote. There are 37 voting members in the room.

36 votes for the amended proposal

0 votes against the amended proposal

1 abstention

Therefore, the amended proposal is accepted.

TOP 10**Proposal by Claudia Moser: Nomination of teams for international tournaments like OEC, WM, Crufts**

(Original wording of the application)

“The Organiser of the Qualification Tournaments (OEC, WC, Crufts) can announce the ranking after the competition. But the official nomination of the teams will be done only by the DDI. This also includes later nominations or changes in the team due to people withdrawing. Alternative- or

Additional Proposal: In countries where there exists an official DDI-Suborganisation (such as the GDS in Switzerland) this organisation can be doing the nominations in the name of the DDI.”

After discussion, the additional proposal is deleted from the application, however, it is supplemented by "The official nomination for DDI e. V. Relevant tournaments are always conducted exclusively by the DDI e. V., for the FCI World Cup and the Crufts participation by the respective FCI sub-organization. "

In the meantime, two members have entered the room again. There are 39 voting members in the room.

39 votes for the proposal (for the amended version of the proposal)

0 votes against the proposal

0 abstentions

Therefore the application has been accepted in a modified version.

TOP 11**Proposal by Claudia Moser: Nomination of team leaders for international tournaments like OEC, WM, Crufts**

(Original wording of the application)

“The Teamleader for the international competition will be officially nominated by the Board of the DDI (or it's Sub-Organisation of the country). The Teamleader can either be one of the participating teams but can also be selected outside the Team. People interested to become Teamleader for an international event can contact the Board of the DDI after the Team has been nominated.

Explanation: In previous years the teams that have qualified were usually announced directly after the qualifying competition. If there had to be changes, these were done directly by the teamleader or between the participants themselves. I believe, that the Teams should be offiically contacted and then nominated by the DDI (or its SubOrganisation). This ensures, that the whole selection process remains transparent and also makes sure, that only teams that are comply to the competition rules are entered. Also the entries should be handed in by the DDI (OEC and Crufts) or via the FCI-accredited Suborganisations (WC).

This proposal is handed in by Claudia Moser The board of the GDS (Community Dogdance Switzerland) supports this proposal.”

Carmen Schmid: She asks if the team has a say in the team leader's choice? (In other countries the team leader is called a coach) *Did I say that or is that a fact? Note Carmen*

There is a short discussion. The plenum decides that the wording as well as the original application should remain, namely that the executive committee ultimately chooses from starters and other applicants.

35 votes for the proposal

2 votes against the proposal

2 abstentions

Thus, the application is accepted.

TOP 12

Proposal by Petra Funk, Carmen Schmid, Niki Dirnbacher, Carmen Heritier, Cora Czermak, Sandra Schneider, Anneke Freudenberger: Reform of judge's training

(Original wording of the application)

“Instead of a single person an international board of judges takes responsibility – for each DDI member country one representative. The judges education procedure will become a two-staged process For new judges:

- *The well-established and accepted workshops will be offered.*
- *The also well-established shadow-judging will stay an important part of the education for new judges For already active judges the renewal of their status, which has to be done every 2 years, may be done by either*
- *Attending a standard workshop as it is possible today, or*
- *Attending the new judges congress, which will be taking place once a year. This congress is centrally organized. Besides standard subjects related to the DDI rules and judging this congress will allow for in-depth specializations. The judges congress also discusses adjustments and innovations regarding the rules. It can recommend these adjustments or innovations to the DDI steering board (Vorstand) for approval/decision.*

Rationale:

The judges workshops are being held since 2008 in nearly unchanged form and the main responsibility for these lies with one and the same person ever since. By now many judges have attended these workshop 3-5 times learning the same contents. The often thought of in-depth or specialisation workshops for experienced and advanced judges have never been offered. This drawback shall be ameliorated by the current proposal. The responsibility for this new judges congress as well as the tasks currently lying with the “responsible for the judges” will newly be taken up by an international board. Thus, the experience of our established judges as well as the creative diversity of personalities can be used in a fullfledged manner in the training and education of the judges as well as in the application of the current rules at our competitions.”

Petra Funk presents the idea based on meeting documents. She wants her ideas to be seen as a basis for discussion and she does not want to attack Claudia Moser as previous judges' commissioner, she only wants to present proposals.

-> Appendix 5: presentation to the proposal (TOP 12)

Barbara Feldbauer: She would like to make sure that this proposal is seen as a suggestion and not to annul the choice of judges' commissioner that has just been voted for. To remove the person in charge immediately with the acceptance of this application is not an option for her.

Niki Dirnbacher: She points out that the day before, the two applications under TOP 12 and TOP 15 were discussed together and should be treated together.

Claudia Moser: She thinks that a discussion about the future training of judges is sensible, which is why she made an application herself, which she had already presented thematically at the last annual general meeting. She is concerned that all the relevant topics can and will really be addressed at the congress.

Heike Vetter: She thinks the congress sounds sensible, but she asks how it could be done. In addition, the preparation/presentation was not available prior to the meeting. As the wording on page 1 is to be read, this is a concrete discontinuation of the office of the judges' commissioner according to the application and this is what she thinks is not right.

Debra Benard: She thinks that both applications for judges's education contain good items. She thinks that further drafting should be distributed. There are clearly several problems, and it is doubtful, that they can all be solved in one application.

Niki Dirnbacher: The wording in the application is different than in the presentation, she had not noticed that before. She now wants to bring together both applications for judges' training.

Marianne Rentsch: She criticizes the non-existent communication between Claudia and the applicants about the ideas for changes of the training and thinks that better communication should take place in the future.

Katharina Henf: Has several questions about the practical implementation. She asks why there should be only one country representative, although there are different numbers of judges in each country?

Claudia Moser: Says that there are already country representatives who were named two years ago.

Petra Funk: Thinks that a redeployment by percentage could be reconsidered.

Katharina Henf: She asks how the applicants want to decide who is allowed to teach and who not and also, she asks for the legitimacy of guest speakers.

Carmen Heritier: She says that the committee must decide on that matter.

Katharina Henf: She asks how it is decided where the congress should take place or who organizes the congress?

Petra Funk: She says that it is planned to do the congress in different places, so that everyone gets the chance to participate and does not have to drive too far. The committee is responsible for the organization.

Katharina Henf: She asks how the payment of the speakers would be organized or what cost of participation would be for the individual? The last further training was organized for 10 or 11 acting judges as a pure further training, so it came out relatively cheap and above it was regional and therefore quite uncomplicated.

Petra Funk: She says that the committee would have to do the calculations.

Katharina Henf: She asks how a congress and so many different people in charge can ensure that every judge works on their weaknesses. It seems easier to coordinate the relevant topics if only one person retains the overview.

Sonja Scheurer: She is worried that the distribution and the idea "Everyone teaches everyone" makes it even harder to find a common basic standard.

Anke Opwis: Ask why the judges should not decide among themselves, and why the meeting should do it, although most of the members do not really know anything about the matter.

Debra Benard: She says that she talked to Attila Szkukalek about the topic and he said:

1. The rules have to be clear, because then, some answers to different questions come naturally.
2. You should have a kind of chairmanship of different people who are responsible for interpreting the rules and then passing this interpretation on to individual countries.

Debra Benard also wants more uniformity in judging.

Marianne Rentsch: Judges' training has to focus first and foremost on quality assurance. That is the most important criterion.

Sandra Schneider: She does not want to exchange one person with seven others. Overall, however, some more people that decide on standards might be helpful. Standardizing in the hands of multiple people is better because there are more competent people to address and ask.

Anette Söll: Says that she has not been a judge for a long time, but has done a lot of shadow judging, because that has helped her a lot. She finds it rather difficult when so many people can decide because there are so many different opinions. Claudia has very straightforward opinions that she can always justify and represent well.

Axel Weber: He asks, whether it would not be better for the judges to decide among themselves?

Niki Dirnbacher: Suggests to separate the application for reform in a vote from the concrete drafting.

Barbara Feldbauer: She would like to see both proposals as a basis for discussion, on the basis of which one could carry out a new draft.

Carmen Schmid: She has heard many different ideas and opinions, so she can't vote on anything concrete today. Therefore, she asks for the composition of a committee, which combines and discusses both proposals.

Generally, there is approval from the plenum. Both by the applicants and the members present.

New wording for the proposal by Carmen Schmid:

"A panel of already existing judges' trainers plus some of the applicants of proposal TOP 8 (Petra Funk, Niki Dirnbacher, Sandra Schneider) plus Debra Bernard as the link to the board are working on a new proposal for the reform of judging until November 2018, which will be voted on at the MV 2019 . "

37 votes for the amended (new) proposal

0 votes against the amended (new) proposal

2 abstentions

TOP 13**Proposal by Marianne Rentsch: Running order in qualifying tournaments**

(Original wording of the application)

For qualifications (OEC/WC), the running order has to be drawn.

Rationale: To reach international standards, the running order for qualifications should be drawn, as it is practiced in major championships.

After a short discussion, the application will be supplemented by the following sentence:

"Double starters will be considered in the starting order according to common sense."

Two members had to leave the room. There are currently 37 voting members in the room.

37 votes for the amended proposal

0 votes against the amended proposal

0 abstentions

Thus, the supplemented proposal is accepted.

TOP 14**Proposal by Johanna Tischler: Minimum age for class 3**

(Original wording of the application)

"I hereby propose to amend the official Dogdance Regulations: Page 8 - Official Classes (in general) as second subitem: The minimum age for dogs to be eligible to compete in class 3 is 3 years on the day of the competition.

Reasons:

In social networks, but also in personal contact, we notice that there is a tendency to already train young dogs and puppies immoderately. This tendency is unhealthy and we should work against this trend. I would also like to mention, that especially teams in class 3 should be rolemodels. Many young and unexperienced teams overwhelm their dogs, because they try to equal the successful teams at championships, and they don't know that many tricks and tasks can be very unhealthy for puppies and young dogs."

After some discussion following the evening discussion round, the plenum decides to divide the proposal into two separate proposals. On the one hand it is necessary to decide on a minimum age for class 3 at all, on the other hand about the specific age, if a vote on the minimum age will be positive.

One member has come back to the room. There are 38 voting members in the room.

First, a vote will be taken on the distribution of the application.

38 votes for the request

0 votes against the request

Therefore, the proposal has to be distributed.

The first part of the application is discussed.

Should an age limit be introduced at all?

Petra Funk: Thinks that it is difficult to introduce a minimum age, because it may block a great puppy who makes a class 3 start without any problems.

Carmen Heritier: She thinks that the different life expectancy of different breeds of dogs has to be considered and she thinks that the phrase "on the day of the event" is difficult.

Axel Weber: He calls for a vote on the question:

Request: "Do we want to introduce a minimum age for starting in a class 3?"

21 votes for the request

9 votes against the request

8 abstentions

Thus, the application is accepted.

Now, the second part of the application is discussed.

Where should we set the age limit?

Johanna Tischler: Says that she would like to keep the 3 years on the day of the event (as stated in the original proposal), in line with a 15-month deadline already set for a start in an official class. Then a little less than two years are provided for a possible promotion to class 3.

Sandra Schneider: Because "on the day of the event" applies, she would suggest to count by year of birth, not by the year of the event, because that would be fairer.

Carmen Schmid: Thinks that due to the fact that it is 15 months as a fixed limit for the first official start, she thinks that 3 years as a fixed limit for class 3 is just right, which means "on the day of the event".

Petra Funk: Thinks that 2 years and 3 months (= 15 months plus one year) fits best because that would also be mindful for the dogs with shorter life expectancy.

Carmen Schmid: Says that nowadays, we can see many 8-10 year old dogs in class three, so from three years of age there would be still a long period of time for dogs to compete in class 3. A compromise might be 2 ½ years.

Heike Vetter: Says that for the big breeds, 3 years is no problem, despite lower life expectancy (in years) because they are late developers anyway.

Carmen Heritier: She has the open letter from our foreign members in mind and would like to know about their wishes. They might have other customs, so maybe 3 years may be a little late. Positioning is good, but preferably less than 3 years.

Brigitte Kaiser: Wants everybody to bear in mind that if someone is artificially forced to stay in class 2 for a long time, then others in this class will have lower chances.

Axel Weber: He supports Carmen Heritier's thoughts and suggests to consult the DDI members from other countries.

Katrin Häusler: It is important in her opinion that the message to take time in the training of the dog is carried into the countries at all.

Sandra Schneider: She offers to ask all members about it.

Petra, Claudia and many others support this idea.

Carmen Heritier: She has the idea to possibly increase the entry age for class 1.

A member survey (by Sandra Schneider) is universally accepted. The text for the survey will be prepared by the Executive Board in several languages until 30.06.18.

This adjourns the vote to the next general meeting.

Vote on the member survey and thus the adjournment of the decision on the minimum age:

37 votes for the member survey

0 votes against the membership survey

1 abstention

Therefore, the proposal is adjourned.

TOP 15

Proposal by Claudia Moser: Restructuring of the Judges' Training

(Original wording of the application)

"At last years Membership-Meeting, we discussed the need for a reorganisation of the judges education and the need to introduce a judges exam to maintain certain standards. I will try to explain how this could look like:

Webinars:

- Judging Points in Detail*
- Deductions & Disqualifications in Detail*
- Health of dog / Judging Seniors & Handicap-Classes*

These 3 webinars would be available to all judges or judges aspirants throughout the year. Once a year, those webinars can be changed or adapted if there have been any rule changes

Those main webinars would be done in German and English and could then be translated into the other DDI-Languages via the Judges Educators from these countries.

That way, all judges and aspirants would hear the same things and could if needed do their repetitions at any time.

Further webinars to additional topics could then in the future be added to the list as a way for the judges to keep learning and improving. Possible topics could be:

- *Knowledge about different breeds or dogs*
- *Body language in dogs / Learning to detect calming and Stress-Signals*
- *How to read different movement patterns in different breeds*

....

I have already contacted the owners of Dog-Ibox as an option for the Webinar-Hosting at a professional platform. There are other options too, and I will present those at the membership meeting.

Judges workshop

Open to everyone be it judges aspirant, trainers or just Dogdancers interested in understanding the judging process.

To attend before the workshop:

- *Webinars 1-4*
- *Reading the rules*
- *Reading the judges code of conduct*
- *Perhaps additional material being sent out before the workshop*

At the Workshop:

- *Judging Funklasses*
- *How does it work, Feedback-Rules*
- *How to correctly filling in the feedback-sheet*
- *How to give individual feedback if wished by the participant*
- *Practical training*
- *Judging official Freestyle Classes*
- *How does it work*
- *How to use a judges overview*
- *How to set a standard / How to judge the individual team*
- *Keeping the standard throughout a class, comparative judging*
- *Practical training*
- *Judging official HTM classes*
- *Possible options on how to take notes*
- *How to set a standard / How to judge the individual team*
- *Practical training*
- *Individual questions*

Further education for judges

*Having repeated the 3 basic webinars within the last 6 months before the workshop.
Having attended at least one additional webinar in the last 2 years*

At the workshop itself:

1 half day time to address individual questions and topics

1 half day practical training Funclasses (incl. Discussion and Feedback between the judges)

1 half day practical training official classes (incl. Discussion and Feedback between the judges)

1 half day discussion of changes and amendments in the rules, topics that need to be discussed, etc

Judges exam

As discussed at the last membership meeting, I have developed a concept for a judges exam. Due to having the judges education being done by several people in different countries we have the great development of having more and more judges in the DDI. At the same time, this also makes it harder for the judges to know each other, having time to confer and discuss judging with each other. This makes it harder to maintain a similar standard and point of view over all those DDI-Nations. This in my opinion makes it necessary to introduce a judges exam at the end of the judges education.

The exam should consist of a theoretical part as well as a practical part, to cover all aspects of a judges job.

In the theoretical part knowledge of rules and general knowledge about judging would be tested, in the practical part we would test, if the judges (aspirant) can judge different classes, different categories and class sizes.

To standardise the judges education and give all judges the same chance, I suggest, that the exam would be taken by all judges as well as the new aspirants after they have finished their shadow judging.

To minimise the risk decimating the momentary judges list, I would suggest, that the theoretical exam would be held first (either in the 2nd half of 2018 or the first half of 2019).

The practical exam would then be coming at a later stage, once the theoretical exams have been done.

If a judge would fail to pass either the theoretical or practical part, he could as an option just be put on hold (passive) until he has passed the Re-Exam.

Judges aspirants would only be put on the official judges list after having passed the exam(s).

The theoretical part could be done in the evening before a judges workshop oder further education workshop (max. 1.5-2hours).

Also offering some exam-dates the evening before some bigger competitions could be an option to make it easier and accessible for everyone to attend an exam without a lot of hassle.

This could be done at a nearby restaurant or even at the venue...

For the practical exam I have thought about a webinar-based option, where the examinant would show the video and the judges would hand in their notes like in a real competition. At the moment, I am still looking into possible options on how to manage the handing in of the notes.

*The advantage of holding the practical exam in that way would be, that it **doesn't involve a lot of** travelling as everyone could do it at home in front of their computer. In addition, there could be more judges take the exam at the same time.*

Also, the exam could be split in several parts and days, to keep the exam-times at a sensible length.

This could be a possible option:

- Date 1: Freestyle 3 – 15 participants

- Date 2: HTM 2 – 8 participants

Senior/Handicap class – 8 participants

- Date 3: Freestyle 1 – 12 participants

Quartett and Trio each 3 participants

Once the definitive layout of the exam has been fixed and has been approved by the committee of the DDI, I would develop the first draft and then test and go through it with the other judges educators from the other countries before the exams would be done for the judges.

This is only a „short“ overview about the exam, if there are more detailed questions and/or suggestions, I am happy to address these at the membership meeting.”

The application has already been treated together with item 12.

A member leaves the room. There are 37 voting members present.

TOP 16

Proposal by Heike Vetter: Application for supplementing the official DDI regulations

(Original wording of the application)

“Concerning the official class Freestyle and HTM, I propose an amendment of the requirements to start in the class Seniors & Handicap. Large breeds with a weight over 35 kg should be allowed to compete at an age from 6 years.

New text:

Seniors & Handicap Dogs from the age of 8, large breeds with a weight of 35 kg (and more) from the age of 6 and dogs with a handicap Rationale: Large and heavy breeds hardly can compete under the actual requirements concerning their age because many large and heavy breeds simply do not reach the required age (sorry but true!). With a reduced starting age there would be a new possibility for large breeds to facilitate a satisfying participation in official classes. Furthermore it might lead to a vivication in the class Seniors & Handicap”.

Sonja Scheurer: thinks that it is a great idea. But she wonders where exactly the limit is set and who should check the compliance (i.e. the weight).

Heike Vetter: Says she first thought about taking the height of the withers , but not every dog is comfortable with measuring. Weight is better to estimate. She would go by a rough estimate.

Niki Dirnbacher: says that one could also look up average breed weights.

Petra Funk: thinks that a rough estimate should be sufficient. She suggests an addition to the wording in the application: Instead of "breed", it should be "big dogs".

Sonja Scheurer: She would also be pleased with the estimate.

Debra Benard: Ask, why the age should not even be 5 years? She thinks that the application is sensible, but it may be better to reconsider the age limit.

Heike Vetter: Says that so far the limit has been 8 years. When writing the proposal, she just started her thinking from experiences with her dogs. Bernese Mountain Dogs have a life expectancy of 8 years. So she had the idea of the 6 years as a possible new limit.

Petra Funk: Says that she has made similar observations on the big breeds. She thinks 6 years as a new age limit are not unrealistic.

Katrin Häusler: 6 years are fine, because handicapped dogs are allowed to start earlier anyways.

Jana Lorenz: Says that a start in the Senior / Handicap class is optional, not a must. No one has to go to this class.

Katrin Häusler: wants everybody to bear in mind that maybe more than the weight as a criterion would be better, because you can also feed the dog "fat".

Heike Vetter: That could be a problem, because the rule applies that "once you start in senior class officially, you always have to start in senior class officially". So going back to "normal" classes is not possible. Therefore, it would be difficult if a dog would slim down again after "fat-feeding", and therefore will be under the limit.

Sandra Schneider: there is no problem at the moment, because people prefer to stay longer in the official classes 1-3, and do not go to the seniors' class artificially early.

The plenum decides to change one word in the application from "race" to "dogs".

37 votes for the amended proposal

0 votes against the amended request

0 abstentions

According to the statutes the board decides on rules. It will take this vote into account in the next change of regulations.

TOP 17

Proposal by Katrin Stiller: Setting up an official contact point for questions, problems, complaints from members

(Original wording of the application)

"As a longstanding member of the DDI, former DDI-judge, competitor and trainer, I have noted, that there is a clear contact missing, if members have questions, suggestions or problems and no-one really knows, who to contact. The goal of such a contact-station, that this person is collecting questions, proposals and possible complaints, then will be forwarding these to the Committee of the DDI if any questions or actions need to be discussed and then connects the members with the person in charge. This would also make sure the Committee of the DDI would be informed and could react quickly if necessary. Also this would in my opinion lead to members feeling more involved and feel that they have influence in the DDI."

Axel Weber: In recent years he has received many, many requests. As a result, he does not really see the need for an additional, single person as a pure contact person. Actually, each board member / officer fulfills this purpose.

Petra Funk: Suggests a clearer reference on the website that states who one can contact in which case.

The plenum agrees that the application will be amended to the extent that there won't be a new official, but in the future it will be specified on the website in more detail, which official has to be contacted for different matters.

37 votes for amendment of the application

0 votes against the amendment of the application

0 abstentions

The exact wording of the amended request is the following:

"The board takes care of a clear presentation of the exact tasks of the functionaries in order to be more responsive to the concerns, wishes and ideas of the members."

One member has returned in the meantime. There are 38 voting members in the room.

38 votes for the amended request

0 votes against the amended request

0 abstentions

Thus, the amended application is accepted.

TOP 18

Application by Barbara Feldbauer:

The application was withdrawn by the applicant before the meeting.

It is decided that **TOP 19 to 21** will be discussed together because they belong together in content.

TOP 19

Proposal by Melanie Felix, Katrin Stiller, Manuela Galka, Katharina Henf, Annette Soll, Britta Kalff, Sandra Roth, Torsten Henf-Walter, Anke Opwis, Jana Lorenz, Silke Janiszewski, Sandra Wuttig:

(Original wording of the application)

"Proposal to the members meeting of DDI Dogdance International e. V. to the classification of the cooperation between VDH/FCI and DDI as a substantial change in purpose, duties and activities of the association according to § 10 (6) of the statutes.

Excerpt: (Source: Homepage www.dogdance.info)

„DDI Dogdance International e. V. Was founded November, 14th 2009 Purpose of the founder members was to create a worldwide organisational structure, free of discrimination, barrier-free and without restricting their spontaneity, creativity and inventiveness of this canine sport. Constraints are only given by the Protection of Animals Act and especially by the liability to support and preserve the health of humans and dogs.“ liab ilit y Furthermore we want to refer to the fundamentals being laid down in the preamble of our statutes. Detailed Information and extensive explanations to this proposal specified in the appendix. We hereby propose, that a cooperation between VDH/FCI and DDI counts as a deviation from the general purpose of the statutes of the association, especially of the purpose firstly listed under § 2 (1) a. (discrimination- and barrier-free access to the competition sport dogdance) and therefore stands for a substantial change in purpose, duties and activities of the

association according to § 10 (6) of the statutes and is in this conjunction subject to § 10 (6) of the statutes' decision procedure (presence of 2/3 of the members for passing a resolution).

Appendix (Translation of the German wording)

Appendix to the application "on the classification of cooperation / cooperation with the Association for the German canine dog (VDH) e. V. / the Fédération Cynologique Internationale (FCI) as a substantial change of purpose, tasks and activities of the association according to § 10 Abs. 6 of the Articles of Association, at the general meeting of DDI Dogdance International e. V. on 05.05.2018:

Dear board, dear members,

For some time now we have been thinking and worrying about the development of our sport Dogdance. The basic idea a few years ago to found our association DDI Dogdance International e.V. was originally to "protect" our sport from the regulation by superordinate clubs (e.g. the VDH e.V. or the FCI), and to keep it open for everyone and every dog, which includes the casual organisation of and participation in tournaments.

To briefly explain the background:

The FCI with their country-affiliated member associations (in Germany, the VDH e.V.) was always a pure-bred breeding club, which took care of sports matters primarily related to the own pure-bred dogs. This naturally results in some content conflicts between sport and pedigree breeding. For us it is interesting, for whom the FCI is ultimately responsible, namely clearly the pedigree dogs bred within the FCI. That is the reason why FCI World Championships only accept dogs for which there are FCI breeding papers. This is a ultimately logical decision of the FCI, which must be accepted. The DDI e.V. could also offer a "closed" championship with specially defined access requirements, if it wanted to. Nevertheless, the question remains: Do we Dogdancers want that? Do we want to follow the monopoly position of the FCI in the area of dog sport in Europe, if it expressly announces international competitions only for specially bred (or later post-typed) dogs?

Back to the VDH, the association for the German dog business, that is connected to the parental association FCI: Maybe one or the other of you has seen how the dog sport Rally Obedience within the VDH e. V. developed. For all the others we want to provide a short summary: Before its VDH times, Rally Obedience was a sport that could develop through private starters and private tournament organizers, i.e. lone fighters. Over the years, RO successfully joined the dog sports clubs, and the question of judges training was getting louder. The DVG as a VDH member association took on the **judges' training and thus brought (fast) RO forward. But a short time later private organizers were** tired to host "official" RO tournaments because it was not allowed that trained judges judged outside VDH-affiliated clubs. Without official judges, however, starts cannot be noted to the performance maps, so the starters would have no opportunity to use the start as an opportunity for advancement.

The fear among the private starters grew that the participation in tournaments would soon no longer be permitted. Fortunately, there has not yet been a decision on this point for these starters, even though this is often the subject of discussion on many club websites and in the relevant forums and Facebook groups. But on a very important issue, which could also be very interesting for Dogdance, the first appalling application has now been made to the DVG parental organization: a member association demanded a **"VDH-companion dog examination" (Begleithundeprüfung), as an entry requirement for RO, as an adaptation to the VDH system, that this is considered as an entrance exam for (almost) all other sports. What will happen remains to be seen.**

What would the “Begleithundeprüfung” as a condition of entry for a sport like Dogdance mean? The dog would have to run an exam before his first tournament start in Dogdance,

...in which he would have to work concentratedly for about 15 minutes and could only be praised minimalistically and only verbally and only in certain places.

... in which he has to take an automatic basic position when the dog handler stops, so he has to sit down without a signal, which usually a dogdancer that wants a fluent performance does not necessarily train, at least not explicitly for dogdance.

... in which he has to learn exercises (sit, down, behaviour on the leash, ...), which are not required in principle in Dogdance, because so far we have worked in our sport INTENTIONALLY without compulsory elements.

In short, the dog handler would find it much harder to prepare the dog for an exam situation which is pleasant and relaxed, and he would have to practice things he simply does not need and which are sometimes more difficult than a simple Dogdance Fun start so far. We wonder who would want that. Not those who it would not bother (because they might need the Begleithundeprüfung for other sports anyways), but those who really want that for Dogdance? Agility starters and obedience starters are also, for the above reasons, to a great extent, annoyed of the exam they have to complete before they can run in the sport on tournaments that they actually want to do with their dog. Now that our sport fortunately grows and develops and that the FCI is already hosting world championships in dogdance, from our point of view, we have legitimate concerns about what happens if the VDH wants to integrate Dogdance as a tournament sport. For us, this integration would have significant disadvantages:

	DDI Principles	VHD Regulations
Requirements for tournaments	No requirements for fun classes Licence booklet of the DDI for official starts	Belonging to a VDH member club or association is mandatory at (almost all) exams / tournaments
Which dogs are allowed to take part in tournaments	EVERY dog (from the age of 8 months in fun classes) and every human, no matter what handicap they might have	Only dogs that have passed “Begleithundeprüfung” (not true for RO so far, application pending)
Is it possible to praise and treat the dog during tournament?	Yes, and it is specifically asked-for in Fun classes.	At the moment only at certain points at RO, but not at all at other sports.
Are there special classes for handicapped dogs?	Yes, Fun classes and even official classes.	No, (not more than senior classes (sometimes))
After you have to terminate official starts, can you finish with a positive playtime with the dog in the ring?	Yes, it is even desirable.	No (for almost all sports)
Who is allowed to organize tournaments?	Everybody (you don't have to be a member of the association) that meets the requirements of the DDI	VDH affiliated associations with approved „Fristchutzantrag“ and examination leader.
Who is allowed to participate in international competitions?	Each and every dog (of course, also cross-breeds) may participate in championships according to his performance class. In the DDI we decide on the basis of the best conditions for our dogs where the qualifying tournaments take place.	Only pedigree dogs with corresponding pedigree certificate of the FCI. The VDH must be informed in advance about every step of the organizer. Current sports usually include several exam results for a

		qualification.
--	--	----------------

We do not want to think the worst, but in the end, the current development can have severe consequences. It is not an evaluation of the VDH or the FCI in general, but only the question whether Dogdance for us / for you in these associations could have a future and to what extent we all strive for cooperation and especially what this would exactly look like, without losing our original goals.

Worst case, VDH starters are no longer allowed to take part in tournaments organized by a dissidence club (in this case of the DDI), otherwise they could, for example take the performance card of all dog sports carried out by them away from the starter (already a threat of the FCI in other countries). This, in turn, would mean that the organizers of DDI tournaments could not get enough starters together for a tournament and could not finance tournaments, making it unlikely that there would be fun starts. In addition, cross-breeds and dogs without pedigree and breeding documents have no opportunity to participate in international competitions.

By the way, for those who support the FCI World Championship because of the title "World Champion", we would like to pass on the news that applications will be submitted to the OEC this year to rename it to an open world championship. The OEC rules are completely in line with our principles, as all dogs are allowed to start here and there is no need for Begleithundeprüfung, pedigree or club membership and should, from our point of view, be more of interest to us all.

We simply want be sure that our principles remain, no matter what a development or cooperation with the VDH in the future will look like. We would therefore like to make a request that changes to the above-mentioned principles, including regarding our regulations, will not be possible only by decision of the Executive Board, but only through the vote of the DDI members. We hope that you agree with us, that the firm principle that ANY one can do dogdance and reward the dog in the fun classes, must not be changes and that you will all always support us in that matter."

TOP 20

Application by Jana Lorenz to the general meeting of DDI Dogdance International e.V. on 05.05.2018:

(Original wording of the application)

"I hereby propose that the membership of DDI is informed about the actual cooperation between VDH/FCI and DDI, existing or future. This concerns not only direct or indirect agreements by the board but as well commissioned persons. If there are proposals to the members meeting being made interconnected with the a. m. cooperation, existing or future, I propose to postpone these following to this proposition. For further decisions by the members meeting a complete information about the circumstances is essential.

Jana Lorenz, Katrin Stiller, Manuela Galka, Melanie Felix, Silke Janiszewski"

TOP 21**Application by Jana Lorenz to the general meeting of DDI Dogdance International e.V. on 05.05.2018:**

(Original wording of the application)

“Hereby I propose that concerning a cooperation between VDH/FCI and DDI, existing or future, an opinion poll amongst the members is held. The aim is to find out if the majority of the members wants this cooperation and if the board is authorised to follow this aim.

Jana Lorenz, Katrin Stiller, Manuela Galka, Melanie Felix, Silke Janiszewski“

Applicant Jana Lorenz notes that the application from TOP 20 (Information on cooperation with VDH e.V. / FCI) was already taken up in the evening debate on the evening before and today during the meeting. She refrains from further explanations on the subject.

Claudia Moser: She says she would like the statutes of the newly founded association Dogdance Germany e. V. to be attached to the minutes.

Carmen Schmid: She assures to do this. The statutes are currently downloadable from the homepage of Dogdance Deutschland e.V.

-> Appendix 6: Statutes of the club Dogdance Germany e.V.

Discussion about the proposal of TOP 19 (amendments to the basic statutes only by majority vote of 2/3 of the members)

Jana Lorenz: She explains that the application under TOP 19 is to be understood as reinsurance. It is important that an amendment to the statute in cases where the general principles / founding principles (discrimination and barrier-free access to the tournament dog sport Dogdance) should be touched from the outside or inside, cannot be done as usual by a simple majority of the members' collection, but classified differently. A change should only be possible with a 2/3 majority of the club members (as already positioned in the statute for other cases).

Vote on the application for item 19:

36 votes for the request

0 votes against the request

2 abstentions

Therefore the application is accepted.

For TOP 21, the applicant Jana Lorenz notes:

Because of the discussions and talks of the past few days it has become clear that Dogdance Germany e. V. will cooperate with the VDH e. V. and the FCI in the future, and thus the DDI e. V. does not pursue own efforts regarding cooperation with the VDH e. V. / FCI, a member survey will not be necessary. Therefore, a vote on this application is not required.

Special TOP A**Request by treasurer Jana Lorenz:**

"I hereby request that the general assembly approves that a member who has not responded in any way to the payment requests that have been sent out, will be excluded from the association."

Sandra Schneider: She points out that these people would not be disadvantaged by such an approach (list is attached).

38 votes for the request

0 votes against the request

0 abstentions

Therefore, the application is accepted.

-> Appendix 7: list of members, that didn't respond on payment request

TOP 22 Miscellaneous

Axel Weber concludes:

He asks for comments on TOP 22.

No comments from the plenum.

He thanks for the biggest annual meeting so far! Even though it was emotionally difficult at times, the meeting had found a successful conclusion.

Final words by Carmen Schmid:

She also thanks for the factual discussions of the last two days. She says she's available for questions and will be there tomorrow.

23:51 Assembly ends

Secretary Katharina Henf

Appendix 1: Report of treasurer Jana Lorenz (only in German)

Dogdance International e. V.

Anlage zum Kassenbericht für das Geschäftsjahr 2017

Liebe Vereinsmitglieder,

zum Ende des Geschäftsjahres 2017 ergibt sich ein Bankendbestand in Höhe von € 15.310,51. Bei einem Jahresanfangsbestand von € 14.172,40 ergibt sich ein Unterschied von € 1.138,11. Dieser setzt sich wie folgt zusammen:

Einnahmen von € 12.810,00

- aufgeteilt in - Mitgliedsbeiträge: € 3.240,00
- Lizenzgebühren: € 2.170,00
- erhaltenen Sponsorengelder: € 7.400,00

Ausgaben von € 11.671,89

- aufgeteilt in - Kosten für Turnier: weitergeleitete Sponsorengelder: € 6.373,71
- Software- und Internetkosten: € 2.902,24 (davon für die neu gestaltete Homepage: € 2.320,50)
- erstattete Gebühren Richterweiterbildung: € 800,00
- Kosten für die Ausgabe von Lizenzen: € 776,48
- Kosten für die Mitgliederversammlung: € 472,50
- Notarkosten: € 25,41
- Porto: € 9,49
- Kontoführungsgebühren/Rücklastschriftgebühren: € 112,06
- Sonstiges: € 200,00

Anmerkung zu den Sponsorengeldern: Die Sponsorengelder wurden vollständig weitergeleitet.

Anmerkung zu den erstatteten Gebühren für Richterweiterbildung: Erstattungen an die Richter/-innen für besuchte Richterweiterbildungen bzw. -workshops wurden entsprechend der von den Richtern/-innen eingereichten Erstattungsanträge vorgenommen. Zum 31.12.2017 sind noch Erstattungen in Höhe von insgesamt € 2.100,00 an 21 Richter/-innen ausstehend.

Die Kassenprüferinnen haben gegen den Kassenbericht keine Einwände erhoben. Aus diesem Grund bitte ich um Entlastung des Vorstands.

Lenzkirch-Saig, den 05.05.2018


Jana Lorenz

Appendix 2: List of Members, that took part in the members meeting 2018.

Because of the German data protection basic regulation the list of participants is not published.

Appendix 3: Jessica Rolfini

Lieber Vorstand des DDI
Liebe Teilnehmer der Mitgliederversammlung 2018

Als langjährige administrative Turnierhelferin und Mitorganisatorin stelle ich mich gerne für die Funktion der Lizenzverwaltung zur Verfügung. Leider ist es mir aufgrund eines unaufschiebbaren privaten Termins nicht möglich persönlich an der Mitgliederversammlung 2018 teilzunehmen. Ich stelle mich auf diesem Weg gerne als Lizenzverwalterin zur Wahl und nehme diese, im Falle meiner Wahl, sehr gerne an.

Herzliche Grüße
Jessica Rolfini

Aarau, 3. Mai 2018

Appendix 4: Presentation about Patella Issue (TOP 6) (only in German)

The presentation was removed due to memory space issues.
It may be obtained by informing the Executive Board

Appendix 5: presentation (proposal TOP 12)

Proposition for a reform of the DDI judges education

APPEAL FOR CANDIDATURES, MANAGING BOARD CHAIRMAN
Dogdance International
May 2018

Overview

- Board instead of one single person
- Two-staged training concept
- Justification of the reform proposal

Part One: International Board instead of one single person

- The position of the "judges responsible" will by acceptance of this proposal for the reform of judges education be substituted by an international board
- The board consists of one judge per member country and will be constituted after this members meeting
- Initial Proposal:

Deutschland: Carmen Huerter
Schweiz: Peter Funk
Österreich: Niki Denbacher

More representatives will be appointed by the board in cooperation with the managing board

- A member of the managing board is member of the judges board in order to facilitate communication and cooperation between both boards

Part Two: two-staged training concept

- Mandatory for new judges
 - The well established and accepted workshops will be offered.
 - The also well-established shadow-judging will stay an important part of the education for new judges
- For already active judges who want to renew their status, which has to be done every 2 years, may be done by doing one of the two:
 - Either: attending a standard workshop as it is possible today, or
 - Or: attending the new judges congress, which will be taking place once a year. This congress is centrally organized by the international judges board.

Judges congress: Surrounding conditions

- Takes place yearly
- One year in German, one year in English, such that participation for international colleagues is easily possible.
- Location and date will be decided on and communicated in good time; a first idea would be a rotation through member countries for example:
 - Germany 2019 (language German)
 - Italy 2020 (language English)
 - Switzerland 2021 (language German)
 - Hungary 2022 (language English)

Depending on training needs it may also be possible to hold two such events at different locations in the same year.

Judges congress: general process

- Duration: 2,5 days
- ca. 10-30 participants
- Location – desirably in close proximity to a dog training place and equipped with 2-2 seminar rooms allowing for both: theory and practice workshops
- Friday late afternoon: opening in plenum and starting workshops
- Saturday – theory and practice workshops
 - Depending on the venue, it may be possible to invite teams for a 2-hour training competition, where judges practice on site and discuss and analyse their results together
- Sunday – the morning should be reserved for the discussion of adjustments to the regulations and may result in recommendations to the managing board of DDI or their members meeting. The remainder of the day then is used again for theory and practice workshops. The judges congress ends with a common roundup which offers place for feedback, for improvements of future congresses

Judges congress: Contents

- Participating judges can propose topics for workshops and talks (which they will be actively holding) to the organising board. A call for contribution will be published 6 months before the respective event
- It is also possible to invite external speakers or instructors for specific topics, e.g. health issues, dance and expression or breed specifics
- During each congress there will be reserved time for discussions focussed on adjustments to the rules. It must still be clarified, how these possible adjustments will become part of the regulations. Either as recommendations to the steering board of DDI (current set up) or as proposal to the MV

Why a proposal for a reform?

Current model (since 2008 – in place since before the actual existence of DDI):

- Responsibility lies with one single person and since a few years, some others, which have been certified by this person.
- Each judge does have to attend a workshop or further training every two years in order to stay certified as judge. These trainings are offered by the responsible and also by the certified trainers.

Benefits:

- These proceedings guarantee that all judges get conveyed the same amount and type of knowledge from one source
- Training material is centrally managed and maintained
- Knowledge is consistently focussed in one hand

Why a proposal for a reform?

Continuation I

Disadvantages:

- Responsibility for training and contents lay with exactly one person. This may be very critical, as this person may not always be available (due to illness, accident or simply overwork)
- Currently the dates and locations for training/workshops are often communicated very late. This requires a timely and travel flexibility, that not all judges in need of re-certification and re-training can support and thus they are unable to do this.

Why a proposal for a reform?

Continuation II

Disadvantages:

- The contents of the workshops for new and advanced judges are always the same. The often thought of specific workshops with specific advanced subjects are nearly never offered.
- The responsibility of giving out warnings to judges and also possibly removal of judges status due to violations of the judges code of honour lies currently also with this single person and opens room for arbitrariness

Summary

- The proposition of the reform divides the workload and responsibility onto several shoulders.
- The proposed reform supports judges, which have done the standard workshops more than 2 times, to deepen and broaden their knowledge by means of specialized workshops.
- The proposed reform supports and requires that judges play a much more active part in their re-certification and in broadening their knowledge and skills by means of actively creating and forming contents of workshops and talks at the judges congress. Thus, the varied knowledge and experience from several sources makes discussions and exchange among judges more interesting and attractive.
- The proposed reform allows for more intense personal networking between judges and enhances the discussion and communication. Moreover, it forms a good basis for facilitating communication at competitions.

Appendix 6: Statutes Dogdance Germany e.V. (only in German)

„Satzung

§ 1 Name, Sitz und Geschäftsjahr

(1) Der Verein führt den Namen:

Dogdance Deutschland und hat seinen Sitz in 73663 Berglen.

(2) Er ist in das Vereinsregister des Amtsgerichts Stuttgart eingetragen

(3) Geschäftsjahr ist das Kalenderjahr.

§ 2 ZweckArt. 1 Name und Sitz

Der Verein Dogdance Deutschland ist ein Verein gemäß BGB mit Sitz am Wohnort des Präsidenten. Er strebt die Mitgliedschaft im "Deutschen Verband der Gebrauchshundsportvereine e.V.", kurz DVG an als kynologische Vereinigung, die sich auf eine bestimmte Ausbildung und Tätigkeit beschränkt.

(1) Zweck des Vereins ist insbesondere die Förderung der Hundesportart Dogdance im Funbereich sowie im Turnierbereich .

Er hat das Ziel individuell an den Hund angepasste Ausbildung im Sportbereich zu fördern und so das Potential des Hundes zu entfalten.

(2) Der Verein fördert die Ausbildung zu Begleithunden sowie verschiedenen Hundesportarten, insbesondere die Ausbildung in der Sparte Dogdance Heelwork to music und Freestyle.

Der Verein Dogdance Deutschland sorgt für eine angemessene Verbreitung von Dogdance Informationen, die im Interesse der Dogdancer sind.

(3) Dogdance Deutschland erkennt folgende Reglements an:

das Reglement des DDI für die Ausrichtung von Turnieren,

desweiteren das jeweils gültige Reglement der OEC und FCI-WM für die entsprechende Veranstaltung.

Weitere Reglements können per Vorstandsentschluss akzeptiert werden.

(4) Der Verein ist politisch und konfessionell neutral und verfolgt ausschließlich und unmittelbar gemeinnützige Zwecke im Sinne der gültigen Bestimmungen.

(5) Er ist selbstlos tätig und verfolgt nicht in erster Linie eigenwirtschaftliche Zwecke.

§ 3 Aufgaben

Mittel für die Erreichung des Vereinszwecks sind:

a) Erfahrungsaustausch und Beratung bei der Ausbildung von Hunden in allen Themengebieten, die die Sportart Dogdance betreffen.

b) Vermittlung der wichtigen Grundlagen für den Hund sowie der theoretischen Kenntnisse für den Menschen.

c) Die Unterstützung der Mitglieder bei der Organisation von Turnieren, Vorführungen , Trainings .

d) Allgemeine Werbeveranstaltungen durch Durchführung von Turnieren und sonstigen Wettkämpfen mit Hunden

e) Pflege der sportlich fairen Gesinnung und Verbundenheit der Mitglieder untereinander

f) Beachtung der Prinzipien der Tierschutzgesetzgebung.

§ 4 Mitgliedschaft

(1) Mitglied können alle natürlichen Personen werden. Die Anmeldung hat schriftlich zu erfolgen. Bei Minderjährigen ist die Zustimmung des Erziehungsberechtigten erforderlich.

(2) Über die Aufnahme entscheiden der 1. und der 2. Vorsitzende zusammen. Die Aufnahme kann dabei nur einstimmig erfolgen. Eine Ablehnung der Aufnahme ist dem Antragsteller schriftlich mitzuteilen. Eine Begründung für die Ablehnung kann nicht verlangt werden.

§ 5 Rechte der Mitglieder

Die Mitglieder haben das Recht, die Einrichtungen des Vereins in Anspruch zu nehmen und an allen Veranstaltungen teilzunehmen. Das Recht ruht, solange sich das Mitglied mit der Beitragszahlung im Rückstand befindet.

§ 6 Pflichten der Mitglieder

Die Mitglieder sind verpflichtet:

- a) folgen den die Richtlinien des Vereins und des "Deutschen Verbandes der Gebrauchshundsportvereine e.V." sowie deren Bestrebungen zu befolgen
- b) die Satzung und die Beschlüsse der Mitgliederversammlung zu beachten
- c) den Jahresbeitrag jeweils bis zum 01. April eines Jahres zu zahlen
- e) die Anordnungen des Vorstands zu akzeptieren
- f) die politische und konfessionelle Neutralität des Vereins und des "Deutschen Verbandes der Gebrauchshundsportverein e.V." zu achten
- g) die seuchenpolizeilichen Vorschriften bei Erkrankungen des Hundes oder begründetem Verdacht genau zu beachten
- h) eine Hundehalterhaftpflichtversicherung abzuschließen, sowie ihren Hund ordnungsgemäß schutzimpfen zu lassen.
- i) ihre Hunde in jeder Hinsicht verantwortungsbewusst zu behandeln und für einen gerechten und pfleglichen Umgang mit dem Tier zu sorgen.

§ 7 Verlust der Mitgliedschaft

Der Verlust der Mitgliedschaft tritt ein:

- a) durch den Tod des Mitglieds
- b) durch schriftliche Austrittserklärung in deutscher Sprache zum Schluss eines Kalenderjahres, wenn diese mindestens drei Monate vor diesem Zeitpunkt beim Vorstand eingegangen ist
- c) durch Ausschluss. Dieser erfolgt durch Beschluss des Vorstands, wenn das Mitglied gegen die Vereinsinteressen oder den Tierschutz verstoßen hat oder die Vereinspflichten nicht erfüllt hat. Dem Betroffenen ist eine Anhörung durch den Vorstand zu gewähren. Er kann eine Überprüfung des Vorstandsbeschlusses durch die Mitgliederversammlung verlangen.
- d) durch Beschluss des Vorstandes, wenn ein Mitglied bis zum 01.04. des Jahres und danach trotz zweimaliger, schriftlicher Mahnung seiner Beitragspflicht nicht nachgekommen ist.

§ 8 Organe des Vereins

Organe des Vereins sind:

- a) der Vorstand
- b) der Beirat
- c) die Mitgliederversammlung

§ 9 Der Vorstand; der Beirat

- (1) Der Vorstand besteht aus
dem / der 1. Vorsitzenden
dem / der 2. Vorsitzenden
dem / der 1. Schriftführer(in)
dem / der 1 Kassier(in)

Der Vorstand im Sinne des § 26 BGB besteht aus dem 1. und 2. Vorsitzenden. Jede Vorstandsmitglied im Sinne des § 26 BGB hat Einzelvertretungsmacht.

(2) Der Beirat besteht aus dem geschäftsführenden Vorstand i.S.d. § 9 Abs. 1 und 4 Beisitzern, soweit diese von der Mitgliederversammlung in der Jahreshauptversammlung gewählt wurden.

§ 10 Amtsdauer

(1) Die Vorstandsmitglieder werden von der Mitgliederversammlung in der Jahreshauptversammlung auf 2 Jahre gewählt. Die Wahl erfolgt durch Handzeichen, wenn nicht geheime Wahl beschlossen wird. Dies gilt auch bei Online Wahlvorgang. Eine Wiederwahl ist zulässig. Scheidet ein Vorstandsmitglied im Laufe des Geschäftsjahres aus, wird ein Ersatzmitglied kommissarisch vom Vorstand bis zur nächsten Jahreshauptversammlung eingesetzt.

(2) Die Tätigkeit des Vorstandes und des Beirates ist ehrenamtlich. Über die Vergütung von unmittelbar entstandenen Auslagen entscheidet der Vorstand durch Beschluss.

§ 11 Beschlüsse

Vorstand und Beirat tagen nach Bedarf. Über jede Sitzung fertigt der Schriftführer eine Niederschrift an. Beschlüsse werden mit Stimmenmehrheit gefasst. Bei Stimmengleichheit gilt der Beschluss als abgelehnt.

§ 12 Kassenprüfer

Zur Überwachung der Kassengeschäfte wählt die Mitgliederversammlung in der Jahreshauptversammlung zwei Kassenprüfer, von denen jährlich einer ausscheidet. Eine Wiederwahl ist erst nach zwei Geschäftsjahren möglich. Die Kassenprüfer haben das Recht, die Kasse jederzeit zu überprüfen, und die Pflicht, am des Geschäftsjahres eine Kassenprüfung vorzunehmen. Sie sind verpflichtet, der Mitgliederversammlung in der Jahreshauptversammlung ihren Prüfungsbericht schriftlich vorzulegen und erforderlichenfalls mündlich zu erläutern.

§ 13 Mitgliederversammlung

(1) Diese Versammlung darf auch online stattfinden. Zu Beginn des Geschäftsjahres ist vom Vorstand eine Jahreshauptversammlung mit einer Frist von 2 Wochen unter Angabe der Tagesordnung schriftlich einzuberufen.

(2) Die Tagesordnung muss enthalten:

- a) Verlesung und Genehmigung der Niederschrift der letzten Jahreshauptversammlung
- b) Jahresberichte der Vorstandsmitglieder
- c) Bericht der Kassenprüfer
- d) Entlastung des Vorstandes
- e) Wahl eines Kassenprüfers , fällige Wahlen des Vorstandes und des Beirates
- f) Information über den Jahresbeitrag, sowie die Aufnahmegebühr
- g) Verschiedenes

(3) Außerordentliche Hauptversammlungen sind mit gleicher Frist unter Bekanntgabe der Tagesordnung bei besonderen Anlässen oder auf Verlangen von einem Fünftel der Vereinsmitglieder einzuberufen.

(4) Jede ordnungsgemäß einberufene Versammlung ist beschlussfähig.

(5) Die Leitung der Versammlung hat der 1. Vorsitzende und bei dessen Verhinderung der 2. Vorsitzende.

(6) Satzungsänderungen müssen mit einer Mehrheit von zwei Dritteln der abgegebenen Stimmen

beschlossen werden. Beschlüsse wegen Auflösung des Vereins oder wegen Wechsel des Verbandes müssen mit einer Mehrheit von vier Fünftel der abgegebenen Stimmen beschlossen werden. Alle übrigen Beschlüsse werden mit einer einfachen Stimmenmehrheit gefasst. Bei Stimmgleichheit gilt der Antrag als abgelehnt. Die Abstimmung erfolgt durch Handzeichen, wenn nicht geheime schriftliche Abstimmung beschlossen wird. Jedes Mitglied hat eine Stimme. Das Stimmrecht kann von verhinderten Mitgliedern nicht auf ein anderes Mitglied übertragen werden.

(7) Über jede Versammlung ist vom Schriftführer eine Niederschrift anzufertigen. Die Niederschrift muss in der nächsten Versammlung gleicher Art von der Mitgliederversammlung genehmigt und vom 1. Vorsitzenden und vom Schriftführer unterschrieben werden. Bei Verhinderung des Schriftführers übernimmt ein vom Versammlungsleiter bestimmtes Mitglied die Abfassung der Niederschrift.

§ 14 Beiträge

(1) Der Vorstand legt den Jahresbeitrag und die einmalige Aufnahmegebühr fest. In diesem Beitrag müssen die Beiträge an den jeweils übergeordneten Verband und seine Gliederungen enthalten sein.

(2) Zahlung von Beitrag und einmaliger Aufnahmegebühr erfolgt bei allen Mitgliedern nur durch Bankeinzug. Dieser wird jeweils im ersten Quartal eines Kalenderjahres durchgeführt.

§ 15 Verwendung der Vereinsmittel

Mittel des Vereins dürfen nur für satzungsgemäße Zwecke verwendet werden. Die Mitglieder erhalten keine Zuwendungen aus den Mitteln des Vereins.

§ 16 Vergütungen

Es darf keine Person durch Ausgaben, die dem Zweck des Vereins fremd sind, oder durch unverhältnismäßig hohe Vergütungen begünstigt werden.

§ 17 Vermögen

Das Vermögen des Vereins muss bei einer öffentlichen und mündelsicheren Bank angelegt werden. Es ist jedoch dem Kassier gestattet, einen angemessenen Barbetrag zur Bestreitung der laufenden Ausgaben in der Kasse zu führen. Die Höhe dieses Betrags bestimmt der Vorstand.

§ 18 Rechtsstreitigkeiten

Für Rechtsstreitigkeiten zwischen dem Verein und einzelnen Mitgliedern sowie der Mitglieder untereinander ist das Amtsgericht oder Landgericht zuständig, in dessen Bezirk der Verein seinen Sitz hat. Übergeordnete Organe des jeweils übergeordneten Verbandes sind für solche Vereinsangelegenheiten nicht zuständig.

§ 19 Auflösung des Vereins

(1) Die Auflösung des Vereins kann nur eine Hauptversammlung beschließen, die mit einer Frist von mindestens vier Wochen zu diesem Zweck einberufen worden ist. Die Auflösung kann nur mit vier Fünftel Mehrheit der abgegebenen Stimmen beschlossen werden. Sofern die Hauptversammlung nicht besondere Liquidatoren bestellt, werden der 1. und 2. Vorsitzende gemeinsam vertretungsberechtigte Liquidatoren.

(2) Nach der Abwicklung fällt das noch vorhandene Restvermögen an eine Körperschaft des öffentlichen Rechts oder eine andere steuerbegünstigte Körperschaft, die im Sinne des Tierschutzes tätig ist, die es unmittelbar und ausschließlich für gemeinnützige oder mildtätige Zwecke zu

verwenden hat. Beschlüsse über die zukünftige Verwendung des Vermögens dürfen erst nach Einwilligung des Finanzamtes durchgeführt werden.

§ 20 Satzungsänderungen

Eine Änderung dieser Satzung ist nur möglich, wenn sie die Hauptversammlung mit zwei Drittel Stimmenmehrheit beschließt. Bei der Einladung zu der Mitgliederversammlung müssen die vorgeschlagenen Satzungsänderungen den Mitgliedern mitgeteilt werden.“

Anhang 7: Liste der Mitglieder, die nicht auf Zahlungsaufforderung reagiert haben

DDI Dogdance International e. V.		04.05.2018 lo		
Anlage zum Antrag über den Ausschluss von Mitgliedern an der Mitgliederversammlung 2018				
- offene Mitgliedsbeiträge 2016 und älter				
- per Mail gemahnt				
- keine Reaktion				
		offene Jahre		
271		2015	2016	2017
201		2015	2016	2017
204		2015	2016	2017
12		2015	2016	2017
134		2015	2016	2017
192		2015	2016	2017
101		2015	2016	2017
78		2015	2016	2017
110		2015	2016	2017
220		2015	2016	2017
263		2015	2016	2017
173		2015	2016	2017
264		2015	2016	2017
47		2015	2016	2017
218		2015	2016	2017
297		2015	2016	2017
186		2015	2016	2017
285		2015	2016	2017
198		2015	2016	2017
187		2015	2016	2017
102		2015	2016	2017
309			2016	2017
158		2015	2016	2017
265		2015	2016	2017
314		2015	2016	2017
22		2015	2016	2017
149		2015	2016	2017
289			2016	2017
16		2015	2016	2017
241		2015	2016	2017
153		2015	2016	2017
117		2015	2016	2017
304			2016	2017
161			2016	2017

**---Die Namen
wurden aus
Datenschutzgründen
geschwärzt.---**

**Geändert am
06.12.2018.
Es wurden keine
weiteren Änderungen
vorgenommen.
gez. Schriftführerin
Katharina Henf**

**---The names were
blackened for
privacy reasons.---**

**Changed on
06/12/2018.
There were no
further changes
made.
Signed secretary
Katharina Henf**