

Lepahn, 17th May 2022

**Invitation for annual general members meeting 2022**

Dear members,

Katharina Henf  
Grellenkampswiese 8  
24211 Lepahn  
DeutschlandTel. +49 (0) 170 70 422 62  
Email [k.henf@dogdance.info](mailto:k.henf@dogdance.info)

We are looking forward to our third virtual general members meeting with you. Since we have made such good experiences in the last two years, we are convinced that we will again successfully hold our general meeting with you online via ZOOM Cloud Meetings.

The planned schedule is similar to last year:

**Friday, May 20, 2022, 6 p.m. - 8 p.m. - Discussion evening in German****Saturday, May 21, 2022, 6 p.m. - 8 p.m. - Discussion evening in English****Sunday, May 22, 2022, 10 a.m. - 4 p.m. - General Meeting (break from 12:30 p.m.-1:30 p.m.)**

The discussion evenings can be used for preliminary discussion of the individual agenda items of the annual general meeting. Participation in the discussion rounds is **NOT** a prerequisite for attending the AGM.

Like last year we are trying to provide direct translation into English for the AGM, the meeting itself will be held in German.

Applications for additions to the agenda can be submitted in writing to the board of directors up to one week (**May 15, 2022**) before the meeting, so that the board can still put them on the agenda (§ 10 Para. 3 of the articles of association).

Two important elections are pending: the election of the 1st chairperson and the election of the secretary. Unfortunately, I can no longer run for the position of the first chair, but I will of course continue to be available to help the DDI e.V. Nina will be happy to continue working on the board. We already have ideas about how to proceed in terms of personnel, but if you would like to run for one of the positions, you can of course do so at any time. We would be grateful if you would inform us of your wish for a candidacy now, as we would like to enter the individual points of agenda as best as possible for the operators of the professional voting tool. From a purely legal point of view, however, short-term candidacy in the assembly is also possible.

Planned agenda:

**Agenda item 1** Welcome of the members

**Agenda item 2** Opening of the General members Meeting

Election of the chair of the meeting

Presentation and approval of the concept of the virtual annual general meeting

Determination of proper invitation

Determination of the quorum

Approval of the agenda

**Agenda item 3** Reports of the board

General report of the board of directors for the past year

Treasurers report

Cash Auditors report

Questions about the annual reports

Discharge of the board

**Agenda item 4** Report of the Advisory Board

Report of the license booklet issuing office

Report of the representative of the membership administration

Report of the judges representative

Report of the Public Relations Officer

Report of the representative for the organization and coordination of events

**Agenda item 5** Acknowledgements

**Agenda item 6** Board elections

- 1st Chair

- Secretary

**Agenda item 7** Election of cash auditors

**Agenda item 8** Proposals of the members submitted in accordance with the statutes (in the attachment)

**Agenda item 9** Miscellaneous

**Agenda item 10** Closing words of the Board

For the technical implementation, we need a registration for participation relatively early, so that all relevant data can be entered. Of course, as always, short-term participation will also be possible, but the less data we have to change in a short time, the better.

We look forward to a constructive exchange and a profitable meeting.

Katharina Henf

First Chairwoman of the Board



Dogdance International e.V.

1. Vorsitzende des Vorstandes

[www.dogdance.info](http://www.dogdance.info)

Katharina Henf  
Grellenkampswiese 8  
24211 Lepahn  
Deutschland

Tel. +49 (0) 170 70 422 62  
Email [k.henf@dogdance.info](mailto:k.henf@dogdance.info)

## ITEM 8.1

Motion by Sabine Bräuniger

To add to the description of the start classes: Beginner, Training class, Open, Class 0 with regard to outfit, concept and evaluation-reward.

Reason:

More and more often it is noticed that the class "Open" is confused with the training class. Often a suitable outfit or concept is missing and the start in the Open class is used to "play nice" in the ring.

In order to promote the sport of dogdance, these performances are not optimal for spectators. Moreover, it is frustrating for the teams who prepare their fun start with a lot of love and creativity. Some will ask themselves if their performance is not "overdressed". I understand the Open classes to differ from the official classes only in the ranking and that in these classes it is allowed to work with rewards. May! Not must!

Some time ago, after a Fun Open performance, I was told by a judge: "You have rewarded so little, you should start in the official classes from now on". At that time, however, I was not ready to compete with other teams and mainly wanted to have fun with my dog without having to put myself under pressure to perform. My thoughts were then: a. not to start anymore (why should I interrupt the flow with treats when the dog does it happily without a reward?) or b. to start officially (which was not an alternative at that time, as we were not yet ready to completely do without rewards in the ring AND I was not yet ready to compete with others) I decided to continue to start Fun, but always with the feeling "I am not allowed to be here anymore".

Class 0 is supposed to be a preparatory class for the official classes. It is still allowed to work with rewards. It is not a must! If the frequency of rewards is included in the assessment, then it should rather be the case that the less rewards are given, the better the assessment should be than vice versa.

I think it would be useful to expand the definitions of the individual classes and to clearly formulate

- a. in which classes matching outfits and concepts are desired
  - b. how in class 0 the frequency of rewards are evaluated
  - c. what is expected or not expected in the training class. (e.g. no costume, no concept, etc.).
1. i hereby request that the board, in consultation with the judging panel, publish a more detailed description of the Fun-Trainee class.

I hereby request that the Judges' Committee, in consultation with the Executive Committee, discuss again the influence of rewards for the dog in class 0 on the evaluation of the teams. The result should be published in a timely manner.

## ITEM 8.2

Motion by Sandra Schneider

### Motion 1

The test phase for class 0 will end this year. In my experience, Class 0 has been very well received, and many competitors are happy to have the opportunity to prepare their dog even better for the change to Class 1. I therefore propose that class 0 be included in the regulations as an official class.

#### Proposal 1b

The number of starts is with 3 starts too few and with the often early entry dates also difficult to plan. Therefore, I propose an extension of the current number of starts to one of the following 3 examples:

A. 5 starts possible in class 0

B. 7 starts maximum, with 2 promotion points you have to change to class 1.

C. 5 starts maximum, with 2 promotion points you have to change to class 1.

Personally, I would prefer variant B for the reason that we have already anchored in the regulations that one can move up to the next class with 2 promotion points and must do so with 7. So if I give a class 1 starter 7 possibilities to stand on the podium without having to move to the next higher class, I can also give an unsure starter 7 possibilities to start in class 0 if he is right in this class (he has to start in class 1 if he is ready for it after the promotion points).

### Proposal 2

Compensation flat rate for judges who do not need overnight accommodation (campers). This topic has already been discussed several times and no solution has yet been found that is fully correct for all. However, as fuel prices are currently going through the roof, the actual costs exceed the pure km/flat rate by far.

In addition, I would like to state in the regulations (so far only in the Orga handbook) that the judges' remuneration is divided according to German tax law (tax allowance) as follows:

- Travel expenses per kilometre 0.30€ /km (as of 2022)
- Accommodation of the judges according to the proposal of the organiser, if a judge would like a better hotel, the surcharge must be paid by the judge (planning security for the organiser).
- Catering for the judges (breakfast, lunch/dinner) by arrangement.
- For campers a flat rate of 20€ will be paid if the organiser does not cover camping costs.
- For judges who provide their own meals, a lump sum will be paid:

Arrival and departure day 14€

Full days (24 hours) 28€ (These costs will be deducted or waived if the judge is provided with at least 1 meal by the organiser).

The exact amounts may be adjusted if the tax law changes.

Judges are required to properly account for their expenses, a waiver of expenses is not desirable in the sense of equality. Car pooling can be arranged, but there is no entitlement to it.

### **Item 8.3**

Motion by Heike Vetter

For the upcoming general meeting I would like to make the following motion:

If the classes FS0 and/or HTM0 are offered at a show, 3 off.judges should be used for judging.

Up to now it was up to the organiser whether 2 or 3 judges were used.

I feel it is very respectful towards the competitors if a complete team of judges evaluates the performance here as well!

I also think that it should not make any difference to the starters in the evaluation in which class they start.

For the judges, it brings the advantage of the usual third grading, which has already proven to be very valuable over many years.

Thank you very much for your effort and for putting forward my suggestion.

Kind regards

Heike

Heike Vetter, Hallgarten

### **ITEM 8.4**

Motion by Inka Burow and Katrin Heimsath

Dear Board,

We had submitted a motion via WhatsApp to Katharina on Saturday during the judges' training. The following is the ordinary motion.

It is requested that the word "physical" in the passage "physical overstrain or endangerment of health" (6.3.5.) be deleted.

Reason: A visible psychological overtraining of the dog should be able to lead to disqualification in the same way as physical overtraining.

Best regards

Inka and Katrin

## **ITEM 8.5**

Motion by Claudia Moser

Dear Board, dear General Assembly

I would like to submit the following motion for discussion and election.

Part 1:

Adjustment of the fun score sheet

In the judging sheet for the fun classes, an additional field should be added, on which the starters (on a voluntary basis) can enter for which class their feedback should be formulated. This will allow the judges to be more specific in their oral and written assessment of the respective level and the skills required there and to give the teams even more concrete feedback.

And the starters can also get feedback for the level of their current class but also feedback for their next higher class to get more information about where they can still improve.

Part 2

The practical implementation at the tournament still needs to be discussed:

- Does the organiser have to ask for this information in advance and write it on the slips of paper?
- Will the information be collected on the day of the show during registration and then passed on to the judges?
- Do the starters give this information to the judge when entering the ring?

Proposal text:

A new column will be added to the judging sheet for the fun classes, in which the starting team can enter its level (e.g. FS1 or HTM2...). This entry is voluntary. If the field remains empty, the judges will give their feedback according to their assessment of the individual team.

The information about the level of the teams will be passed on to the judges as follows.... (see part 2 of the application).

## Item 8.6

Motion by Inka Burow

Dear Board,

I would like to bring the following motion to the upcoming membership meeting:

It is requested that the following sentence be added to our regulations under point 2. general information and regulations:

"In case of disputes regarding the regulations, the officially published German version of the regulations shall prevail and be the only relevant version."

Justification: Due to translation errors or inaccuracies in the translation, it is possible that different interpretations of the regulations are possible. In my opinion, this is currently the case with the "active touching" (6.2.6. German version). At least in the English and French version of the rules, "anfassen" is translated as "berühren" (touching, contact avec le chien), which, unlike the German "anfassen", which can only be done with the hands, also includes touching with other parts of the body.

I also move:

It is requested that the wording "Aktives Anfassen" (6.2.6) in the German regulations be changed to: "Active touching".

Justification: At least in the English and French version of the rules, "anfassen" is translated as "berühren" (touching, contact avec le chien), which unlike the German "anfassen", which can only be done with the hands, also includes touching with other parts of the body. Thus, in my opinion, deliberately pushing the dog with the leg, for example, when moving sideways in heelwork, is not punishable in the German rules, but according to the English or French version it is.

## ITEM 8.7

Motion by Sandra Roth

Extension to include International Opens

"National and International Opens (e.g. German Open, DDI Open / World Cup etc.).

At the National Opens and International Opens, the participants will be ranked according to their points achieved, irrespective of their nationality.

At the National Opens a ranking of the national teams of class 3 (HTM and FS separately) of the organising nation can be made.

The exact modalities of the national and international title awarding will be decided in close.

The exact modalities for the awarding of national and international titles will be defined in close consultation between the Executive Committee and the organisers and published at the time of announcement.

National clubs or the DDI e.V. itself may award national titles.

Addition of "International Open" to 10.3

Re 10.1

Recommendation:

- Qualification for national championships: end of 1st or beginning of 2nd quarter of the year.
  - Application to organise qualifications for supra-regional championships to be submitted to the Executive Committee by 1.1. of the previous year to the Executive Committee (e.g. application for qualification on 06./07.04.2024 should be submitted by 01.01.2023).
  - Staging of the National Opens: end of the 3rd or beginning of the 4th quarter of the year.
  - Application for the National Opens must be submitted by 30.06. of the previous year.
  - If no applications have been received by the deadline, the deadlines may be extended by the Executive Committee.
- extended by the Executive Committee.



## ITEM 8.8

Motion by Lucrezia Pireddu

- Considering the high subjectivity of judges to review discipline from different aspects, especially regarding penalties, it is believed that the definition of how penalties are to be counted in more precise numbers in the regulation could lead to more consistent scores: vocalisations, animal health, incorrect use of costume and/or props, improper handling of the dog in the ring, manipulation of the dog, as the results tables of the competitions held to date show, there are considerable subjective differences in the allocation of penalties.

- is requested to add the rule that judges cannot review first degree relatives.
- For handlers under 16 years of age, the obligation of the junior class is requested.
- To set a deadline for the validation and publication of new judges on the DDI website after the submission of certificates attesting to the completion of shadow judging.
- To avoid the overlapping of more than one competition on the same day, competition organisers are requested to check the DDI calendar before setting a new date Competition submission and publication on the DDI website only after publication.
- Requested a regulation regarding the selection for the OEC, better separated from the general regulation, so that it can be as detailed as possible:
- How and when to apply for the organisation.
- Criteria to be met for the organisation
- Assignment criteria to candidates by the DDI
- THE CLASSES 3 (FS AND HTM) PARTICIPATING IN THE SELECTION MUST BE JUDGED BY AT LEAST 3 OUT OF 4 FOREIGN JUDGES.

Thank you

Lucrezia Pireddu

## ITEM 8.9

Motion by Stephanie Possanner (Austria)

(Submission after deadline, vote on whether this motion is still to be dealt with on the agenda)

Motion:

I hereby move that the points required for a team to get a promotion point from Class 1 to Class 2 be reduced to 140 points. The background is that we see in Austria and our eastern neighbouring countries that more and more choreos are shown in class 1 that have such a high technical standard - especially under the category difficulty - that I and many others believe that this actually sensible regulation is developing in the wrong direction. Competitors in our area take it as a signal that "higher, further, more difficult" is now required, which of course goes against the principles of the DDI, especially in this low class. We therefore think that we do not want to support this trend and request that the points be reduced to 140. The number of points required for a promotion from class 2 to class 3 remains unaffected by this motion.

If the motion can no longer be accepted, I would like to just have it discussed on Friday. Of course we as judges can also counteract this trend, but this weekend has shown that judges are too divided on how to do this in their scoring and we see some time pressure here to protect dogs in entry classes.

Kind regards  
Stephanie