
Minutes of the Extraordinary General Meeting of Dogdance International e. V. on Saturday, March 9th 2019 from 11:00 h to 18:30 h at the Mercure Hotel Frankfurt Airport Dreieich, Eisenbahnstr. 200, 63303 Dreieich

Item 1:

Welcome and opening of the meeting, election of the meeting leader, the election leader, and the vote counter

11:04 h Welcome by the 2nd Chairwoman Debra Bénard (DB) and thanks to the assembled members.

Katharina Henf (KHF) welcomes the meeting and introduces the individual board members: Fruszina Wilhelm (FW), Debra Bénard (DB), Jana Lorenz (JL).

KHF deals with the assembly order. As an election helper Anette Söll (AS) is proposed. There are no objections from the plenum. There are no further suggestions. AS is unanimously elected as an election helper.

DB is proposed as the chairman of the meeting. There are no objections from the plenary. There are no further suggestions. DB is unanimously elected as the chairman of the meeting.

This is followed by the presentation of the interpreters and transcribers. Susanne Holzmann and Ann Kristin Deutschmann introduce themselves.

KHF points out that the meeting should be recorded with an audio device. The recording is created exclusively for the record keeping. Subsequently, the recording is destroyed by the protocolants. This is followed by a vote on the audio recording. Unanimously, the audio recording of the meeting is approved for the transcribers.

KFH also refers to the assembly rules, the list of participants and the rules on individual speeches. The speaking time is 60 seconds. The meeting will be accompanied by two interpreters for the foreign participants. The meeting will end exactly at 18.30 and not beyond, because the booking for the interpreters is a timed order and some of the long-term visitors must arrive on time to the plane.

Item 2:

Determination of the proper invitation and quorum of the general meeting

DB takes the floor, points to Item 2 and asks KHF to lead through this meeting point. KHF takes the floor and states that the invitation to the Extraordinary General Meeting has been duly issued in accordance with the statutes.

KHF notes that the General Assembly has a quorum and no guests are present but all meeting members are members of the association.

Item 3:**Annual report of the Board**

DB notes that the annual report is basically the same as the previous year's report. DB refers to an update, which was created on November 6, 2018 (a contribution by Carmen Schmid).

DB also refers to another update on the website by KHF, JL, FW and DB dated 16 January 2019.

DB notes that the question of online voting has to be discussed. This must be stated in the statutes. Accordingly, this will be taken up under Item 5 again.

There are no objections or comments on the part of the members.

The annual report is approved.

Item 4:**Cash report of the treasurer for the financial year 2018**

The Treasurer JL reports:

Appendix 1: Report of Treasurer Jana Lorenz**Begin: Questions of the members (part of the cash report):**

JL explains that the DDI has been provided with a tournament floor by animonda petcare GmbH. This is not the property of the DDI e.V.. The club may use the floor in own tournaments but animonda petcare GmbH can rent it also to third parties. The costs mentioned in the cash report "Rent storage room" refer to the rental costs of the storage room in which the floor is kept.

Melanie Felix (MF) would like to know if there is general access to the warehouse and if the costs are generally profitable.

JL points out that the objection is legitimate, but that question is not in her responsibility in presenting the cash report. The responsibility lies with the board.

Heike Vetter (HV) inquires whether the issue of sales tax liability mentioned by JL can be averted.

JL explains that it is possible to avert the problem. For this, the revenue in the fiscal year would have to be lower than € 17,500. Every year this limit has to be re-examined. However, tax avoidance does not always make sense, because in this case this would mean a permanent loss of income.

The sales tax that would be payable on the license booklets could be paid from the revenue per license booklet of € 15.00. It would also be possible to increase the license fees by the amount of the VAT. This decision is the responsibility of the board.

Sponsorship money is unproblematic, since the sales tax on sponsor's funds with the sponsor (as for example Animonda Petcare GmbH) are tax-deductible. There is no disadvantage.

(End: questions of the members (part of the cash report))

Axel Weber (AW) takes the floor and asks to discharge the treasurer JL and supports her request for individual relief.

Jessy Lang (JeLa) asks to explain what it means if a board member is not relieved.

JL explains that the work of each individual members of the Executive Board will be declared in order to be approved by the members. If board members are not relieved, nothing else happens.

Claudia Moser (CM) would like to know whether it is about the discharge of the Executive Board regarding the financial decisions or a general discharge of the Board.

JL explains that she is looking for a discharge on her work as a treasurer. This not only includes direct employment as a treasurer, but also the decisions she made with the Board. The discharge of the members of the Executive Board is about relieving the individual work of the individual Board member.

Carmen Heritier (CH) points out that in the event of non-discharge of a member of the Board, he or she can be held liable accordingly. She also notes that she is not an expert in the field, but would like to express her concerns about tax liability.

DB notes that two things are mixed on this topic:

The annual report of the Executive Board was approved. The discharge of the cash audit is in the foreground. DB indicates that the topic may be important under TOP 5.

DB points out that the focus is on the annual report and the financial results of the association.

KHF corrects that the conclusion of the TOP is the discharge of the board.

This applies to all the above points.

KHF notes that now a vote must be made on whether a single relief should take place. If an application there is made, the vote must be made accordingly.

KHF: Individual approval of the Executive Board members for the financial year 2018 is being voted on.

Appendix 2: List of members present

Discharge of Jana Lorenz (Treasurer) for the financial year 2018:

In favour: 42 members

Against: 0 members

Abstentions: 1 member

43 total votes

Hereby Jana Lorenz is discharged.

Discharge of Fruzsina Wilhelm (Assessor) for the financial year 2018:

In favour: 41 members
Against: 0 members
Abstentions: 2 members 43 total votes

Hereby Fruzsina Wilhelm is discharged.

Discharge of Debra Bènard (2nd Chairwoman) for the financial year 2018:

In favour: 36 members
Against: 0 members
Abstentions: 7 members 43 total votes

Hereby Debra Bénard is discharged.

Discharge of Katharina Henf (Secretary) for the financial year 2018:

In favour: 41 members
Against: 0 members
Abstentions: 2 members 43 total votes

Hereby Katharina Henf is discharged.

KHF notes that the discharge of former 1st Chairwoman Carmen Schmid is required.

Discharge of Carmen Schmid (1st Chairwoman) for the financial year 2018:

In favour: 4 members
Against: 34 members
Abstentions: 5 members 43 total votes

Hereby Carmen Schmid is not discharged.

KHF concludes Item 4.

Item 5:

Discussion of the current situation of the DDI e. V.

e.g. Relationship of the DDI e. V. to VDH e. V. and other clubs

e.g. Application of the DDI e. V.-Regulations

DB notes that Item 5 is an extensive item and there are some applications. Under Item 6, the discussion on the individual applications should be carried out in even more detail.

KHF takes the floor and notes that the situation of the association, including the situation of the members among each other was difficult in the past year. A lot of time and energy was invested.

This also applies to the members having resigned. She asks to acknowledge this fact despite all the problems.

KHF continues to note that there are some topics with many controversial opinions on the table to discuss. KHF refers to her personal concern that she wants to know what the path of the DDI e.V. should be in the future, as her own work with the Executive Board also depends on it. The DDI e.V. is very important to her, but there are some issues that need to be discussed currently.

For example, KHF refers to the sponsoring of animonda petcare GmbH under the leadership of former board member Carmen Schmid.

Other things/decisions are existent, these are as follows:

- What amendments to the Articles of Association will be made until the 2019 Annual General Meeting in order to prevent any problems arising for the future?
- How will cooperations look in the future in terms of National Opens and qualifications (eg. Crufts)?
- When is a tournament a DDI e.V. tournament? How will rules violations be handled in the tournament organization in the future?
- How are license book entries made and how are the head judges chosen? Are compulsory memberships a subject of DDI e.V?

KHF emphasizes that the board is aware of the explosive nature of the issues and that the board always takes this into account. A vote on all requests is considered necessary. It does not make sense to just vote on some of these topics.

Sandra Schneider (SSn) generally notes that she is in favor of the DDI e.V., wishes that peace will return in the future, that the club positions itself clearly to shield itself. As far as the Crufts qualifications are concerned, she considers a debate with the DDD e.V. (Dogdance Deutschland e.V.), the VDH e.V. (German Kennel Club) and DVG e.V. as meaningful. Clear lines should be drawn without creating conflicts.

CH notes some background information: In 2015, DDI e.V. cooperations with the VDH e.V. and FCI were sought. The Dogdance Society Switzerland (GDS) was founded with CM and Marianne Rentsch (MR) as Board members. GDS is member association of the SKG. The SKG is the Swiss national representative of the FCI. Until 2018 one could start at sports tournaments only with one (1) half-breed. As a result of a cooperation with the club since 2018 it is allowed to start with several half-breeds in sports. However, if a pedigree dog achieves the same amount of points as a mix, the pedigree dog takes the higher ranking. There is already a cooperation with the SKG through the GDS.

CH further explains: In 2016, AW wanted to cooperate with the VDH e.V., possibly also through a bridge association like in Switzerland to solve the problem of the FCI World Cup qualification. When these cooperations failed, and CS wanted to continue working on this, he had them granted with reservations. CH notes that she is a member of the new Dogdance Deutschland e.V.. As part of her engagement there, she received inquiries from Slovakia and Italy - these requests warn that there can be problems if one strongly positions himself against the FCI. As for the sponsors, she notes that some are in favour of cooperations with VDH e.V. and the FCI. She warns and advises to be careful. From Belgium, she reports via Luc Daems, the members follow the discussions there online. All countries that are FCI affiliated will have problems competing at DDI e.V. tournaments, as they are no longer allowed to start, if the DDI e.V. openly opposes the FCI.

Finally, CH notes that the DVG President confirms in writing that the DDI e.V. license booklets and the DDI e.V. Regulations are recognized within VDH/DVG. Now it's about thinking how DDI e.V. deals with this offer.

Katrin Heimsath (KH) suggests using the meeting to formulate a clear vision for the club. Based on the individual visions of each individual member. Of course, this also includes the distribution of engagements, and also includes an order for the Board to approach other clubs for possible further cooperation. KH also encourages the creation of working groups. Within these, more concrete goals can be discussed within the framework of a dialogue. These should take place outside the General Meeting.

FW confirms her consistency with some contributions and reaffirms KH's proposal, which can help find a way to continue to uphold the club's commitments and values. FW notes that the DDI e.V. dogdancer in Hungary want to cooperate with the FCI's national representative, as the Hungarian tournaments can take place at its big exhibitions and entries for Crufts works so well. FW emphasizes the urgency to find a way to cooperate with the FCI and at the same time preserve the values of the club. FW underlines that the conflicts must be eliminated.

CM follows the previous speakers and affirms the idea of working groups. CM further notes that cooperation is important and must be done in a certain way.

CM notes that there was no precise mandate for the form of cooperation within the Board and the association due to failed communication in both directions. Basically, CM is not opposed to cooperation, as there are issues such as Crufts qualifications and WC qualification as well where in case of doubt, the national representation of the FCI is entitled to make the entries. The members want to know how this is handled.

DB supports the suggestion of KH and advocates that the members of the DDI inform the Board of their opinions and wishes.

Katrin Stiller (KS) notes that the cooperation must take place, even if there is no consensus on all points. However, this is necessary for the dogdancers. KS emphasizes that a solution must be found so that the members from other associations also take part in the cooperations, working groups and talks.

KS criticizes the lack of trust in the responsible persons. There was no reaction from the responsible persons on information in question. KS further criticizes the lacking communication.

DB summarizes the members' contributions and highlights transparency as a necessary criterion for the future of the DD e.V.. This transparency is required on the part of everyone (Board and members). DB thanks KH for the working group idea and the idea for cooperation. DB refers again to the ability of all members to write down ideas and pass them on to the Board.

CM asks for a clarification on the existing contacts with the VDH e.V., so that all members come to the same level as far as the projects/cooperations are concerned. CM notes that the members of the DDI e.V. must know about the cooperations and also have to know what Dogdance Deutschland e. V. has started so far. To date, this is unclear.

KS wants surveys, such as those for the minimum age class 3, to be conducted. These votes may be an orientation for the Board, but they do not have to be mandatory. In this way, the Board can see what is currently relevant for the members.

FW comments that she has contact with the FCI and is also FCI judge. The contact with the VDH e.V. was insofar as she was requested as a judge. This is also important in order to be able to continue the competitions for their Hungarian club, which belongs to another system. These contacts are important in order to continue to have tournaments and to get a ring at the dog shows of the national representation of the FCI in Hungary. Further information and contacts with the VDH e.V. did not exist from her side.

KHF points out that the question of CM is primarily aimed at the extent to which the Board had contact with the VDH e.V.. KHF finds it difficult to categorize the situation and the contact of all board members, because at the board meetings the cooperation with the VDH e.V., respectively the FCI was never an issue. Also in the renewed review of the minutes of the board meetings could find nothing in this regard. There were other topics at the board meetings. A board meeting on the subject had to take place at the request of Jana Lorenz, after the events had come to a head, but this was interrupted due to technical problems and was problematic anyway. The cooperation is difficult. All concrete content on the cooperation that came out was not first-hand information from CS, but was brought to KHF through third parties or was publicly available. There was only a mail contact with KHF in CC between MF and CS, where CS had used wordings like "it's not safe" etc. The very specific information that the VDH e.V. wants to hold its own German championship KHF got to know via Facebook and Instagram.

KHF mentions the following facts in relation to the cooperation:

- At the exhibition and fair in Dortmund, a DDI e.V. tournament will take place, on which the VDH e.V. wants to select the team for the FCI World Championship and the VDH e.V. wants to appoint its own German champion in dogdance, although the DDI e.V. has its own German championship, the German Open. According to the current state of knowledge, the VDH e.V. apparently wants to hold the country qualification for Crufts 2020 at the tournament in August in Leipzig. The latter information has only been known for 2 days.
- KHF refers to the former chairwoman Carmen Schmid (CS), which could be the only one to have more information.
- JL has no information. DB also has no information or contacts to VDH e.V.

Beate Lambrecht (BL) would like to ask again for understanding whether there was a cooperation between the VDH e.V. and the DDI e.V..

KHF confirms that there were no direct talks between the Board of DDI e.V. and a VDH e.V. representative.

Melanie Felix (MF) emphasizes that as a member she attaches great importance to being treated with more transparency as a DDI e.V. member. The communication between DDD e.V. and DDI e.V. she considers as questionable. In addition, events advertised as DDI e.V. tournaments should also remain DDI e.V. tournaments and follow the rules of DDI e.V.. MF points out that this application will also be discussed later.

JL notes that a communication with CS since October was only for cashiers business. CS said at the time: There is nothing to talk about. There is nothing ripe for decision.

FW encourages communication and emphasizes that the DDI e.V. must give a clear picture. The meeting is therefore of great importance from her point of view. For future meetings, it is important that the club can then show something and present a common line. First, an unanimous communication must take place. Then a cooperation can take place.

SSn picks up the point from CM and asks that information that exists on the part of the Board, already be communicated at the time of the meeting.

CH notes that she is here as a member of the DDI e.V., not as DDD e.V. member. CH further notes that she is in the DDD e.V. as it acts as a link. Therefore the DDI e.V. does not have to do things that it is not allowed to do - such as the FCI World Cup qualification.

GDS is the role model. On Facebook, the social media icame to a boil. Many no longer feel welcome in the club and have left. For the organization of the event in June, CH notes that she has no helpers. The members criticize how people are treated under the DDI e.V.. CH says that the VDH e.V. has been interested in cooperating since the World Cup in Leipzig, which was the trigger for that.

CH says she is a member of SV (Schäferhundeverein). Within this membership and within the Dogdance Commission, she can represent the interests there. CH calls rumors circulating in social media a big problem.

DB notes that she had no contact with the VDH e.V. because she does not speak German and therefore VDH e.V. is not interested in her.

KHF asks to end the discussion at this point and continue later given the tight schedule and the advanced time.

KHF asks members to sign up for lunch. Lunch will be announced between 14:00 and 15:30. A meal costs 8.50 € per person. After that the International Freestyle Competition at Crufts can be watched together.

Item 6

First block of votes on proposals submitted by the members according to the statutes

DB redirects to Item 6 and thus to the first block of votes on the statutorily submitted proposals of the members.

Item 6.1:

Proposal 1

***Appendix 3: Proposal to supplement § 9 of the statutes by the following article
Katrin Heimsath***

KH: Lack of confidence of the members in the work of the Board was the reason for this motion. The loss of trust took place i.a. because of the fact that our former 1st chairwoman was at the same time the chairperson of another Dogdance club whose goals are partly not in line with the goals of the DDI e.V.. There was therefore a conflict of interest, which led to the loss of confidence.

On the Board of the DDI e.V. are very dedicated people who sacrifice their free time to serve the association. It is particularly hurtful to question their integrity and loyalty. Individuals should be protected from such attacks by not having a conflict of interest. Then we also have better starting points for factual discussions. For the chairman of Bayern Munich is not at the same time the chairman of Schalke, in politics it is exactly the same - important offices are free of any conflicts of interest. That's why it's important that our Board members, as well as people with important roles, are free of conflicts of interest. That should also be in the statutes. Anyone who works for us as a Board member may not do Bboard work in another club that is in a potential conflict of interest with ours. The same applies to judges. That should be put up for discussion here.

MF likes the idea good and would like to implement it as proposed so that future conflicts of interest can be avoided.

Regina Gerson (RG) approves the proposal, but first of all, one has to agree on a clear definition of conflicts of interest.

SSn finds a clear definition difficult, so she advocates a flat-rate. For our Board members it should generally not be possible to work in another club as a Board member, regardless of whether this club works closely with the DDI e.V. or not.

MF agrees with SSn.

FW thinks it is important to decide which positions these are. She was contacted by a judge from Austria, who is involved in the board of a dog breeding club and now worries whether she can organize competitions in the future and represent Austria in the DDI e.V., as she is also a member of the FCI.

KH: Defining a conflict of interest is certainly very difficult, so I have chosen the appropriate wording in my motion. It would not be expedient to say that a Board member may not perform Board work in another club of any kind. For example, it is clear that a swimming club is not in conflict with dogdance. The wording must make it clear that it is not about club work in general, but about points of contact with other dogdance clubs. Judges are not functionaries because they do not take a central decision-making role. It is about important items that further develop the objectives of the association and thereby shape the club life. A judge does not do that, maybe even more a judge trainer or a judge who works in a decision-making body.

CM finds the application very useful, but she also sees the problem with the phrase "conflict of interest". She advocates a simple and unambiguous definition, namely that DDI e.V. board members are not allowed to sit in another dogdance club on the Board. This would avoid a conflict of interest in the inner circle. All other functions such as judges and additional work in the club are not affected because they have no representative function and decision-making function.

Manuela Galka (MG) also advocates the restriction "in another Dogdance club" to ensure reasonable discussions within the various Dogdance clubs. Until now, communication was a problem. Thus, the basis for discussion is much larger and you can get results faster, which can be explained to the members properly.

SSn likes the formulation of CM. You can be in another club, but you can not take on Board activity. For example, you can be a member of the VDH e.V., but you must not take on a supporting function there - so no double Board activity in the field of dogdance.

Sonia Scheurer (SoSch) asks if this rule should only refer to the dogdance area or to the entire dog sport area. An example to stimulate consideration: Should any "Svler" (Member of a Schäferhundeverein) in the DDI e.V. Board?

DB is of the opinion that a consensus has been reached here: Board members may not hold any other Board posts in another club. She refers to the DDI statute, Article 5, paragraph 4, which states: "Members are expressly allowed to join any other club or to start tournaments hosted by other, including foreign, clubs."

MG advocates that board members should not be on the Board in any other dogdance club. (To the message of SoSch) An "SVler" would certainly not be the first chairman or elected to the DDI Board, because they usually do not dogdance. A membership in another club is fine, but please no Board member in two Dogdance clubs - or in two dog sport clubs.

Doris Mensch (DM) asks what Dogdance is or what it all counts. For example, a lap dog with music or tricks with music - is that dogdance?

KHF does not quite agree with the phrase "dogdance club". It's about Dogdance matters, it's about clubs that deal with Dogdance. At least that's what she understood from the application.

CM is clearly against a rule that refers to all dog sports clubs. Such a broad regulation would be neither controllable nor meaningful. CM agrees with the objection or formulation proposal of KHF. The scheme should apply to clubs that deal mainly or partially with Dogdance and its organization. In two such clubs you should not be on the Board.

RG finds it difficult to exclude any clubs. It would be better for the DDI e.V. to define: What do we want? What are our interests? It should be agreed upon that conflicts of interest should be avoided. We probably will not be able to answer these questions today. Maybe we can postpone that?

KHF would not stand behind it when it comes to differentiate herself from a club in terms of membership. It is about significant activities in the club, not about membership the latter would be very fatal. But it's a conflict of interest if you're a Board member in two clubs that deal with the same topic.

KHF initiates a vote on this motion and asks whether it should be put to the vote as it is or

whether it should first be adapted in terms of content.

SSn requested that the original wording be rejected and that Claudia's wording be included: "Associations and organizations dealing with Dogdance ... (microphone is passed on)

KH reads the new wording: "Board members and officials can not simultaneously be a Board member or officer in another club that deals with Dogdance or part of it. If a member of the Board takes over a corresponding office or a functionary performs a corresponding function in another association, this is considered as a resignation from the current office or the current function at the DDI e.V.."

SSn would like to add that membership in another club is not affected.

Britta Kalff (BK) asks for the definition of the word "function" or "functionary". Does this mean the judge's responsible representative?

CH says that, in principle, she would be affected by this rule as she, like CM and KHF, has done her work in judicial training. Is this a function or not? She asks for a definition.

CM claims that the scheme is limited to Board members only. So that only Board members may not be on the Board of another club. An extension to functionaries would go too far. Otherwise one would have to look into other topics e. g. the judges training, if the same regulation comes into play. This should be handled separately.

JeLa requested to remove the passage "in parts", because otherwise you would have to narrow down which club it is. She proposes the phrase "who deals mainly with dogdance".

FW finds it important to define the positions in other clubs. It may be that e. g. a member of the FCI is approaching us and wants to take a position on the Board. It may also be that someone wants to be on the DDI e.V. Board, who is on the Board of a smaller local club. It must be clear what should be excluded here from the Board.

KS understands by "function" that the entire Board should not have double occupancy, but also leading positions such as judicial training should be included in the regulation.

MF asks if it is not possible to summarize functionaries with "persons who take over tasks from the Board", i. e. in principle like judicial training.

SSn thinks of "function" also of her job. She would probably also come into conflict if she would take over the membership of another club. She finds it important that at least not the same function in another club is taken over. Otherwise, data will go through that should not pass.

DB brings the discussion back to KH's application. It requires flexibility, because it is not the same if someone is on the FCI Board or on the Board of a smaller club, such as e. g. her club in France. Therefore, a flexibility clause is needed in the proposal. In addition, these situations must be decided individually. DB asks if all members know what now is being voted on.

Heike Vetter's (HV) opinion is, that officials are not equal to Board members. She finds the application good and would accept it and limit the regulation to Board members. Officers provide the Board with maximum advice, they are ultimately not involved in the vote. There are still a lot of posts to be filled and she is not sure if the DDI e.V. has so many members devoting their free time to only confining themselves to Board members who only want to be active in DDI e.V.. Most people who are involved in dog clubs are broad-based and active multiple times. People should not be "wasted".

AW says that KH has just rewritten the motion, but did not mention the last important sentences. It has to be decided what constitutes a conflict of interest at all?
Namely: "The assessment whether the statutes or objectives of an association are in conflict with those of the DDI e.V. is up to the Executive Board. Its decision can be brought to a vote at the request of the person concerned at a subsequent General Meeting to vote.
"So you can check the case from case to case - that would be a kind of control body.

MF finds it just as important for a functionary as a judge's trainer that a judge trainer in the DDI e.V. is not also a judge trainer in the DVG e.V., that does not work in her eyes. It would be important to her to include the officials as well.

CM: With the provision read out by AW that the Board is competent to make decisions, conflicts of interest could well be avoided in other offices. The decision as to who can train judges must be made. The question is whether it must necessarily be in the articles of association or whether it would be enough to restrict the amendment to the Board members and that at functionary offices or member administration the Board decides and maybe even that decisions are sanctioned by a members opinion survey.

Certain offices have to follow certain rules. Nevertheless, this could be done on the basis of this amendment of the statutes, without any functionary office having to be included in this regulation. So there would be more flexibility and at the same time you would have the assurance that information is not shared.

FW says it is not about conflicts of interest with regard to judge's training but rather about the confidentiality of information, e. g. whether contents of the training are passed on to other clubs. This is not a conflict of interest but rather the question of whether e. g. judges respect or recognize different rating systems. That is something completely different and does not have to be included in the statutes.

KHF proposes to reformulate the application. The word "functionaries" should be deleted and only the word "Board members" should remain. In addition, the wording "whose statutes or objectives are in conflict with those of the DDI e.V." should be taken out and be replaced by "significantly or partly concerned with dogdance". It is being voted on.

Variante 1: Members of the Executive Board can not simultaneously be a member of the Executive Board of another association that deals significantly with Dogdance (...).

Variante 2: Members of the Executive Board can not simultaneously be a member of the Executive Board of another association that deals with dogdance, either in whole or in part.

Variant 3: I am against both.

KHF asks if this choice is acceptable to the members.

SSn: The original application must first be rejected.

KHF opens the vote on the rejection of the original request.

In Favour: 0 votes

Against: 42 votes

Abstentions: 1 vote

43 total votes

The application is rejected.

KHF: Now we will vote on the variants.

Variant 1: Members of the Executive Board can not simultaneously be a member of the Executive Board of another association that deals significantly with Dogdance (...).

Variant 2: Members of the Executive Board can not simultaneously be a member of the Executive Board of another association that deals with dogdance, either in whole or in part.

Variant 3: I am against both.

In favour of 1: 14 votes

In favour of 2: 25 votes

In favour of 3: 2 votes

Abstentions: 2 votes

43 total votes

Variant 2 is accepted.

RG asks if that means they can not sit on the board in their local club, which has the same interests as the DDI e.V.. That was the reason why she voted against it.

MG has understood that you may be in another dogdance club on the Board and member of the DDI e.V., but not on the Board of the DDI e.V..

KHF tries to clarify the problem with an example. Suppose she is a member of a regional association, e. g. in Kiel - Agility, Dogdance, Obedience, Rally Obedience, Longing or similar and would like to get involved there on the Board. Is this in conflict with the DDI e.V.?

Plenary: Yes

KHF gives another example. Suppose she is a treasurer in a dog sports club in Kiel, where only regional decisions are made. Then she should not be on the DDI e.V.Board anyway.

Where is the conflict?

FW: Basically, a conflict of interest with a very specific German dog sports club should be avoided. This should not be about smaller regional clubs. The problem is that a clear definition of the clubs that are meant is required in the statutes.

KS says that the DDI e.V. is an international club and there are also international FCI sub-clubs. It is not about the small local clubs, but about the big international ones. For example, GDS Board member should not be in the DDI e.V. Board.

CH proposes that Board members must make public in which clubs they are currently or newly involved. This is about CS, who revealed it at the time. She suggests that Board members must disclose other activities in dog sport clubs. The decision would then have to be approved by the rest of the Board. And who says what is local and what is not local. She thinks you have Dogdance Deutschland e. V. in mind here, but this club is Germany-wide currently not legally active and to be seen as a local dogsports club within the DVG e.V..

CM proposes a new wording: "Members of the Board of Directors can not simultaneously be a member of the Board of Directors of another association that is involved, in whole or in part, in the organization of dogdance at national or international level. If a board member takes over a corresponding office in another club, then this is regarded as a resignation from the current office in the DDI e.V.. Susceptible offices of the other Dogdance clubs must be disclosed before the election." "Further obligations in other clubs must be disclosed before a vote" could still be added. Or say that at on a national or international level, the smaller regional or local associations are excluded from it.

SSn says that defining a "small" or "big" club is incredibly difficult to formulate. It was already known from CS that she is on the Board in both clubs, but one did not know in which one. You did not know the dimensions and what she makes of them in the end. It would go with most with this request that this does not happen again. However, one must also ask the question, if such a thing would be possible, if someone in a supposedly smaller association on the board, who may also have a place somewhere.

Birgit Röschard (BR) asks if the regulation would apply to her under the wording, because she is President of the Basel Dogdancer, a very small local club.

(disorderly confusion)

AS does not agree with SSn because she did not know before the election that CS is on the Board in another club. She did not even know the club, let alone who sits on the Board and what goals the club has. One should know everything in advance.

KH: It would not be about putting a spoke into those members wheels who want to get involved in a smaller club. Therefore, the formulation of CM with "national" and "international" is good, which is actually very clearly defined. However, it should also be taken into account that work on the Board is time, commitment and work. Can somebody really succeed in time to be

chairman in two clubs? Can someone really represent us properly? Therefore, they find the disclosure of the offices very desirable. Because if someone is responsible for the member administration, that would not be as time-consuming as board work. KH would stay with the formulation of CM and request a new vote.

Nina Neumann (NN) adds that "national" is also every small regional club. If a national tournament is advertised, then not only clubs from a certain circle may participate, but also all other German clubs. Therefore, the phrase "national" is not legally correct, because that means every other little dogdance club.

KHF proposes to agree on the content and then commission a working group with the formulation proposal, which will work out the wording within two to four weeks. For this one would first have to revise everything that has been decided so far. That the original application by Katrin Heimsath was rejected may be so.

KHF opens the vote to annul the previous vote on the two wording variants.

| | | |
|--------------|----------|----------------|
| In favour: | 36 votes | |
| Against: | 2 votes | |
| Abstentions: | 5 votes | 43 total votes |

KHF: There are still ten minutes left to clarify the contents. What can be recorded?

CM makes a final wording suggestion: "Board members can not simultaneously be a Board member of another association that cares significantly or partially for the organization of dogdance at national or international level. Offices of regional and local associations are not affected, but these should be disclosed before the election." For her, the difference between "national" and "regional" is clear. For example, DDD e.V. claims to organize Dogdance in Germany, Dogdance Switzerland looks after dogdance in Switzerland as a whole, while Dogdance Basel does not claim to offer Dogdance throughout Switzerland, but only in Basel.

RG is of the opinion that the first formulation (that no conflict of interest may exist) is actually the clearest, if one had previously defined the interests of the DDI e.V.. Then you would not have to discuss which clubs should be excluded. First, you definitely need to know what the goals of the DDI e.V. are, before all other discussions are conducted. She fears that you would otherwise come with the other applications in the same discussion chain.

MF finds it very important to discuss this point, because it went wrong last time, when it was thought that the interests of the DDI e.V. were implemented and that in the end this was not the case.

Janina Roden (JR) states that in recent years, regulations and statutes have been already created. Those rules must be adhered to. You do not have to redefine anything.

(Applause)

SSn agrees. If you want to exclude clubs to prevent conflicts of interest, then behind it should be a clear line. She likes the formulation of CM with the explicit mention of "regional" and "local". She asks to vote and possibly consult a lawyer.

CH agrees with JR, but nevertheless there is a cooperation with a club that does not respect these statutes. You have to keep thinking.

KHF adds that it is only about the Board of directors.

CH says that GDS is a member of the SKG and the SKG prefers race dogs to half-breeds if they are equal in points. That is not compatible with the DDI e.V. statutes.

KHF stresses that it's all only about the office doubling.

(Incomprehension, DB asks for silence.)

SSn understand what CH means. She agrees that within the SKG there are individual rules that by their very nature do not necessarily conform to the statutes of the DDI e.V. Therefore there would be the DDI e.V. regulations and the GDS. But basically, it's the same thing, no matter if you call it "national," "local," and so on. Also the Board of the GDS should not be on the Board of the DDI e.V., because one agrees nevertheless. Whether it is now DDD e.V., GDS o.o. Name, is actually no matter, because it is about the conflict of interest. She still finds the wording too vague.

DB closes the discussion, which has been going on for over an hour to keep the agenda. A working group is tasked with the formulation.

KHF sums up that the discussion leads to one thing: one does not want one of the national Kennel clubs to have Board members or office doubles in the DDI e.V.. In the case of Item 8, she would like to propose a working group that works out various amendments to the statutes. If one could agree on one line, the working group could also devote itself to the new formulation. The protocol states that one does not want GDS or DDD e.V. Board members to be DDI e.V. Board members at the same time, and comparable constructs, as mentioned from several sources. KHF regret that they did not come to a correct result or a formulation. She suggested postponing the decision on the wording and instructing a working group to formulate it. She asks if this could be the goal and opens the vote.

Vote on adjourning the subject and

In favour: 38 votes

Against: 3 votes

Abstentions: 2 votes

43 total votes

KHF says that the problem is named but not decided. A time frame for the wording working group is set out in Item 8.

The event will be interrupted for lunch.

(Lunch until 15:30)

15.33 h Renewal of the meeting by DB.

DB notes that some things have already been discussed in the morning. The remaining 3 hours in the afternoon should be used effectively as the meeting has to be finished punctually at 18.30. DB asks to push through the agenda as much as possible and asks for compliance with the following rules:

15 minutes should suffice per application to discuss the topics of the agenda as far as possible within 2.5 hours, other further topics will be discussed under Item 10 in the remaining 30 minutes.

If an application is not passed or discussed, it will be put online for discussion, adjourned or reopened at another meeting of the members.

DB decides to determine the votes on the applications of the members.

Item 6.2 + Item 6.3:

Proposals 2 + 3

Appendix 4: *Proposal 2 Composition of the Management Board*

***Proposal 3 Defining the tasks of the individual members of the Board
both Claudia Moser***

Proposal 2:

CM explains her request for the extension of the Board. The Board should persist in its basic constellation, only be extended in the form of an extended Board. Amendments and resolutions are decided by a joint Board, including an extended Board. The extension amounts to one more person per Board member number.

CM notes that its application also concerns the descriptions of the Executive Board (6.3).

The board consisting of DB, FW, KHF and JL supports the proposal and considers it a good idea, as the Board members themselves want to be assigned responsibilities and tasks clearly.

CM further explains that an extended Board can help to increase the overall stake in decisions for those involved in the DDI e.V.. Through an expansion of the Board, the Board can receive information from other countries in more detail. For example, FW cooperates with the association in Hungary, it is difficult to obtain information there, the politics in the respective countries are not always clear.

CM is convinced that an extended Board normally can also bring in more people. Additional functions can be taken over by the extended Board. This ensures that each country has at least one vote, regardless of how the Board is composed.

FW comments and supports the proposal, in which she points out her own difficulties: as a member from another country, it is often difficult to apply the DDI e.V. rules there. By an enlarged executive committee, the association can increase its international radiance and, moreover, act more inclusive, as the countries outside of Germany thereby obtain a vote.

HV also supports the proposal, but asked for an explanation of how countries could be included. She notes that in the past Italy, Switzerland and Austria did not or almost not took part in the meetings.

HV criticizes active participation and contributions to the general meetings. She endorses the idea of a country representative belonging to the extended Board.

CM responds to the objection by saying that it is difficult for the other countries to join in, but she hopes to find one representative per country to help with the country's inclusion. It has been difficult in the past to get information on both sides. The point now is to show that the club is international and internationally represented.

Certainly not all countries will be represented, but so members can also come from other countries.

JL addresses a question to CM and asks what should happen if the countries do not provide a representative, referring to the functioning of the extended board.

JL would like to know if the extended board should have voting rights.

KHF notes that it makes sense to find a substantive agreement, the wording of the change itself should be postponed. She notes that the wording must be chosen so that the board can act, even if a country is not represented. She asks for a vote on the motion.

JL notes that it should be noted that the (extended) board is complete even if individual countries do not want to send a representative.

KHF asks for a vote on whether an extended board should be introduced and thus a change in the statutes should be made. In this extended board should be country representatives. Detailed explanations follow at a different time.

In favour: 41 votes
Against: 0 votes
Abstentions: 2 votes

43 total votes

The application is accepted.

DB refers to application 6.3 by Claudia Moser on the roles of the Executive Board.

Proposal 3:

CM notes that it only makes suggestions about which tasks are important. She makes this an open discussion and is open to suggestions

JL describes her own post and asks to complete it in relation to her obligations. She suggests that the individual members show what they are doing in terms of content on the board to get a description of the positions.

KHF suggests a similar direction and notes that this should not be a change in the statutes. KHF considers it important to make the individual offices flexible, in accordance with the competencies of the individual members of the Executive Board. The office should not be carved in stone. The office is to be adapted to the Executive Board.

BK finds it difficult to assign a definitive role to the office and refers to the translations that are made in English and German. She believes that the task of translation is not necessarily the responsibility of the 2nd Chairman, as language skills should not be tied to an office. She notes that there is a risk that nobody will be able to fill the office anymore due to a lack of knowledge.

HV notes that, if this aspect is taken into account, it is obsolete that German and English are mandatory in order to hold office.

SSn notes that the club is international, the current board also communicates in English. As soon as the international aspect is to be taken up, and this is the case with an extended Board, it is necessary for all Board members to speak English. She refers to the problems associated with a lack of language skills and considers the prerequisite of language skills as meaningful.

FW points to the end of the application, which states that board members can also ask for help and seek help for a translation. There is some flexibility in her opinion.

DB notes that the translation work is tremendous and she herself was partially overwhelmed by it. She notes that appropriate translation systems have not been supportive and the work has been extensive. DB advocates that certain language skills in English are necessary, but not mandatory

CM reiterates the inclusion of the point in the translation work and points out that the Board must work, i. e. that each member must have the information in English and German. The translator who intervenes slows down the board's ability to act. A member on the board has the obligation that the translations are made in a timely manner.

CM notes that the work of the Board can be limited if it is stipulated that all written and spoken characters must have a command of English.

Treasurers have certain skills. CM points out that just as well a board member must have special

language skills. She points out that it is not necessarily the 2nd Chairman who must have this ability.

DB notes that this may be a guideline on the responsibilities of the Board, which the Board members assume.

KHF notes that it is again about substantive issues, the board will discuss the idea, the tasks will be distributed and on the homepage once again clarify which responsibilities exist.

KHF puts the request to the vote whether a job advertisement should be created promptly and published on the website.

| | | |
|--------------|----------|----------------|
| In favour: | 43 votes | |
| Against: | 0 votes | |
| Abstentions: | 0 votes | 43 total votes |

The application is accepted.

KHF raises the objection that initially the application via the extended executive committee (application 6.2) must first be rejected in the exact wording. A new vote is necessary to vote on the exact wording of CM's motion on the enlarged executive committee.

| | | |
|--------------|----------|----------------|
| In favour: | 0 votes | |
| Against: | 42 votes | |
| Abstentions: | 1 votes | 43 total votes |

The original application is rejected.

There will be a vote on the exact wording of CM's application for the job description of the individual members of the Executive Board.

| | | |
|--------------|----------|----------------|
| In favour: | 0 votes | |
| Against: | 43 votes | |
| Abstentions: | 0 votes | 43 total votes |

KHF notes that the job posting should be published on the website, it is necessary to agree on whether the board members can get help to perform their duties, this concerns any tasks such as the newsletter, etc. KHF notes that the primary responsibility it is the responsibility of each member of the Executive Board to carry out the work correctly.

HV would like to know to what extent financial expenses play a role.

KHF replies that in case of doubt the Board decides on it. In this case, a Board member requests help and asks for financial support as the cost of some assistance is XY. The Board agrees.

JL notes that the board always needs to be informed as soon as someone is assigned a task. The Board must have the right to veto if the competences of the helping person are called into question.

CM notes that the sentence in the application needs to be expanded: all board members can get help. The main responsibility lies with the member. Additional assistance must be decided on the board.

In favour: 43 votes
Against: 0 votes
Abstentions: 0 votes 43 total votes

The application is accepted.

At this point, DB initiates a change in the agenda and asks that the election of the members of the Executive Board be preferred. She proposes to look at motion 7, the election of the board.

Item 7:

Elections

You can choose from the following offices:

- 1st Chairman/Chairwoman
- 2nd Chairman/Chairwoman
- Treasurer

KHF notes that it is first necessary to vote on a change in the agenda.

CM argues that this should have been done at the beginning of the session.

DB submits the application that **Item 7** be brought forward to **Item 6, Proposal 6.4**.

In favour: 43 votes
Against: 0 votes
Abstentions: 0 votes 43 total votes

The application is accepted.

KHF notes that JL and DB will resign from office on today's assembly day. A send-off of both Board members is therefore necessary. KHF asks to insert the send-off of the board members as in-between-item.

KHF also thanks the treasurer JL on behalf of the members for her work.

JL receives applause. As a thank you from the ranks of the members a gift is presented.

KHF would like to say thank you on behalf of the members of the 2nd Chairwoman DB for her work. DB gets a round of applause. As a thank you from the ranks of the members a gift is presented.

KHF stresses that the past few months have not been easy, the club had to struggle with some unrest. KHF is reluctant to blame anybody, she notes that there is much to do in the club. Reliable and consistent board work is essential to once again take a good course.

KHF notes that no one has addressed the Executive Board regarding succession to the offices. To make sure that the club could get some kind of leadership, she got around and talked. A team of five people has come together, which would like to offer to lead the club for a year until 2020 in quiet lanes.

KHF emphasizes that the transitional Board should not be elected for 2 years, but should be used for 1 year. Of course, the members may make further suggestions for possible Board members, she emphasizes.

KHF notes that 5 members agree to run the club until next year and work together as a team.

She makes clear that the interim Board is an offer.

The following members are available for the interim executive board in the following positions:

KHF offers to give up the post of secretary and to take over the office of the 1st chairperson.

She suggests AW because of his experience as 2nd Chairman.

FW wants to remain part of the team and continue to take on the position of Assessor.

For the office of the secretary SSn has offered her acceptance. She has been responsible for member administration in the past.

Manuela Galka offers herself for the most difficult job as a treasurer, JL has offered to support her with her experience and her professional background in office.

KHF reiterates that their proposal is an offer. She sees the advantage in directing the club back into quiet lanes.

DB takes over the moderation of the vote.

DB inquires whether there are any further suggestions for the post of 1st Chairman/Chairwoman. There are no further suggestions.

DB puts Katharina Henf to vote for the office of the 1st Chairwoman.

In favour: 41 votes

Against: 0 votes
Abstentions: 2 votes 43 total votes

Thus, Katharina Henf is elected as 1st Chairwoman. KHF accepts the election.

DB inquires whether there are further proposals for the office of the 2nd Chairman/Chairwoman. There are no further suggestions.

DB puts Axel Weber to the vote for the office of the 2nd Chairman:

In favour: 38 votes
Against: 1 votes
Abstentions: 4 votes 43 total votes

This Axel Weber is elected as 2nd Chairman. AW accepts the election.

DB inquires if there are any more suggestions for the post of Secretary. There are no further suggestions.

DB puts Sandra Schneider to vote for the office of Secretary:

In favour: 42 votes
Against: 0 votes
Abstentions: 1 votes 43 total votes

So Sandra Schneider is elected Secretary. SSn takes the election.

DB inquires whether there are further proposals for the office of Treasurer. There are no further suggestions.

DB puts Manuela Galka to vote for the office of Treasurer:

In favour: 42 votes
Against: 0 votes
Abstentions: 1 votes 43 total votes

Thus Manuela Galka is elected as Treasurer. MG accepts the election.

KHF puts to the vote that the board of directors will take over the chairmanship until the annual General Meeting in 2020.

(1 member left the room.)

In favour: 40 votes
Against: 0 votes
Abstentions: 2 votes 42 total votes

FW is in office and remains in office. There will be a round of applause for FW.

SoSch makes sure and asks if FW remains in office for a year.

KHF confirms this and states that this will be the case until the annual General Meeting 2020.

(The absent person is back in the room.)

DB asks for another change to the agenda. She asks for a vote on the amendment of the statutes in order to decide on the election of the Board. DB goes into the revision of the statutes on which is to vote. DB emphasizes that this is not the actual wording. She notes that KHF will explain more about it. DB asks to change the order of the agenda.

It is followed by a vote on whether to continue with Item 8.

In favour: 42 votes

Against: 0 votes

Abstentions: 1 votes

43 total votes

Item 8:

Vote on the revision of the statutes of Dogdance International e. V.

KHF explains that in the long term certain changes should be promoted. In this context, there is also the possibility of online voting for members for discussion.

KHF notes that this requires two steps.

1. In the context of the General Meeting, it must be agreed that a change of the statutes should take place.

2. If a change in the statutes is to be made, the amended statutes must be approved at the next General Meeting.

KHF notes that the changes are discussed individually.

KHF proposes that the exact wording of the amendment to the statutes be worked out as part of a working group. The amended version of the statutes can thus be submitted to the tax office and district court as quickly as possible in advance.

KHF notes that the members will be dealing with the rough content and the items that are to be changed. She gives an example: the online elections. Following the decision, she notes, the working group can elaborate on this.

KHF asks to first vote on the fact itself and the question of whether the statutes should be changed in the points to be decided.

SSn comments on the online elections and the associated amendment of the statutes:

SSn notes that online voting is a major concern for her, that this is a difficult topic. Within the framework of the GDPR, the issue is made even more difficult. The change can be included in the statutes. SSn further notes that how and whether a change occurs is another question. SSn notes that she must first seek legal advice. SSn notes that it must be established that no one can vote on behalf of another. A log-in is necessary. The forum must be safe beyond that. Second and third transfer may not be possible. SSn emphasizes further difficulties: The member software has its own ID, which is stored in their system and nobody should know it or approach this ID. The member IDs would have to be incorporated into the forum as part of the security measures or through the platform where the online voting takes place. This is associated with a considerable administrative effort. She stresses that a lawyer must support her. Also with regard to the question of whether a membership decision is possible online, without that a General Meeting is convened. The effort is worth it, according to SSn, when the assembly and voting can run online.

KHF complements and puts into focus, whether in the context of an online vote, an assembly would then continue to take place, such as in Germany, Austria and Switzerland. She says that it is questionable who will appear to the meetings then. If only a few members still appear, this is an unreasonable demand for the Board.

KHF raises the question of whether meetings can also take place online. She notes that the downside is that you would not see one another when discussing.

KHF notes that in the future the annual General Meeting could be held online, including online voting. In the future, the discussions should be carried out in specific regional assemblies, such as at tournaments. Individual meetings can be held throughout the year. How these should be done is up for vote. A supervisor may be regionally responsible for the discussion guidance and protocols. This is an easy way to solve the problem that you do not see each other.

CM considers the proposal basically a good idea. She questions whether it is possible to complete online membership meetings and everything related to them.

SSn confirms that it is technically possible.

KHF puts the amendment to the online voting for voting:

| | | |
|--------------|----------|----------------|
| In favour: | 38 votes | |
| Against: | 1 votes | |
| Abstentions: | 4 votes | 43 total votes |

Thus, the amendment to the statutes for online voting is decided.

KHF also puts the amendment to the Articles of Association regarding the possibility of an extended Executive Board to the vote.

| | | |
|--------------|----------|----------------|
| In favour: | 40 votes | |
| Against: | 0 votes | |
| Abstentions: | 3 votes | 43 total votes |

Thus, the amendment to the Articles of Association with respect to an extended Executive Board has been decided upon.

KHF asks for a vote to amend the statutes regarding critical office duplications.

KHF notes that the exact wording of the change will be decided at the next General Meeting. The text must be mentioned in the invitation.

| | | |
|--------------|----------|----------------|
| In favour: | 43 votes | |
| Against: | 0 votes | |
| Abstentions: | 0 votes | 43 total votes |

Thus, the amendment to the statutes in relation to critical office doubling is decided.

KHF inquires whether there are any further requests for possible changes to the statutes.

KH refers to the topic Board members and related trust. She proposes that the Articles of Association be amended so that the transfer of the Executive Board's offices will be a smooth transition, including a smooth handover, so that part of the Board members will be re-staffed in one year and another part of the Chairpersons in another year.

AW notes that this will shorten the term of office from three to two years. There are no further comments.

HV asks for clarification regarding the frequency of elections.

KHF declares that offices are re-elected every year - not all, only part of the Board. In the following year, the other part of the Executive Board is re-elected.

KHF adds to the advantage that by this way the sovereignty can be passed on.

RG notes that it has just been decided that the Board is only in office for a year and suggests that this vote be postponed.

KHF asks that the amendment to the Articles of Association be resolved now, as the administrative burden of changing the Articles of Association is complex and refers to the effort concerning the fiscal authorities.

CH notes that this is an extraordinary meeting, so not all members are present. CH asks to return to the members' requests.

CM agrees with CH and says the amendment to the Articles of Association can not be made until the next annual General Meeting.

JL notes that the procedure for changing the statutes is done in two steps. First, it is decided that a change of the statutes should be made. In the second step, the wording of the amendment to the Articles of Association is resolved. The second step can only be carried out at the next annual General Meeting, because with the invitation to the General Meeting the change of the statutes has to be sent in the form of a synopsis. It compares the old wording of the statutes and the new wording of the statutes. This is how each member can follow the change.

JL notes that the decision now is about something to be changed. According to JL, the exact wording can only be decided upon at the next general meeting. JL adds that if the wording is not accepted, the amendment may not be possible. If that is the case, the point at issue must be corrected.

DB takes the floor and points out that the discussion should not continue. There are already some important results achieved. DB notes that members want to see the results in black and white.

MF asks once again whether the amendment to the Articles of Association will take 3 years to complete unless the change is decided upon at the current General Assembly.

JL replies that the next board has not been elected for three years. If e.g. in the coming year, a change of the statutes will be decided, the following year in the general meeting the amendment of the statutes including the wording will be decided, then the 3 years are not set for the next executive committee. JL asks to keep the two things apart, they have nothing to do with each other.

KH asks if the general assembly is still scheduled for June. According to her, the commissioning of the working group, which formulates the amendment to the statutes, is linked to this, so that it can be voted on during the General Assembly.

KS wants to know if the procedure at the tax office is associated with costs.

JL denies, the tax office costs nothing, but at the district court under certain circumstances.

KHF notes that last week the decision was made that the General Meeting in Vilters can not take place, because the appointment takes place in June at the same time as a tournament of the Hundesportfreunde Eltmann. The board has decided this.

CH as the organizer asks that the costs incurred now be borne by the fact that the hall must be paid, the deadline expires on 15 February.

(1 member leaves the room.)

DB orders to return to the agenda and the 15-minute rule.

CM proposes that a working group should be given the wording. The working group will present its results at the next ordinary General Meeting.

DB confirms that a working group will be launched. The members of the working group will be decided further after the meeting.

KHF announces that the working group will have about one year until the next annual General Meeting in 2020. Thus, the working group also has sufficient time to draw up corresponding amendments to the Articles of Association.

DB redirects to Item 6.4 and asks CH to present her application shortly.

Item 6.4:

Proposal 4a

***Appendix 5: Limiting the use of the DDI Regulations and the DDI Judges
Carmen Heritier***

CH wants everyone to realize the implications of this aspect, because many members believe that the regulations should not be made useful to everyone. She requested that this question be put to the vote (online survey). It also affects other countries that have already contacted her. One would like to discuss it, but she asks to include this question in the online survey

MF says that the application is actually about the fundamental question: how much of the DDI e.V. regulations can be changed in order to be able to designate a DDI e.V. tournament as such? In her opinion, a DDI e.V. tournament either complies 100% to the rules or it is not a DDI e.V. tournament.

(Applause)

KHF argues that the application deals with two aspects, including: a. o. whether a DDI e.V. judge should also judge other tournaments. No counter-motion was filed, so they assume that a DDI e.V. judge should continue to judge other tournaments (e.g. Nordic Championship). She knew of no change that this should no longer be possible.

MF says the DDI e.V. does not tell anyone what to do. It is clear that DDI e.V. judges may judge other tournaments. Even the DDI e.V. sometimes invite international non-DDI e.V. judges. The DDI e.V. is very open in this regard. That and whether it runs so well equally on the DVG e.V. side, you could ask, yes, but these are discussions, which must be held between the DDI e.V. Board and the DDD e.V. Board.

FW asks CH if an agility judge of the FCI can only judge FCI tournaments.

CH would like to clarify this point. She briefly discusses the past discussions on Facebook and boycott calls.

The right way is to discuss such issues in the General Meeting in order to position themselves and define the interests of the DDI e.V.. This question will arise sooner or later and has already come up, also as far as the judges are concerned. Her request was an attempt for a positioning. The fact that people from the DVG e.V. or VDH e.V. are no longer allowed to judge the DDI e.V. is not the case on the part of the DVG e.V. and VDH e.V., she has this in writing and signed by the DVG e.V. and that is indefinite. She has the feeling that some are against it, but the large mass does not know that. There are many things done that theoretically contradict the statutes. Say that yourself do not discriminate, but then send DDI e.V. judges to the World Cup. That's ok, but again not. One must position oneself concretely and not measure with two different measures.

CM generally finds the idea of a member survey very meaningful in order to obtain a broad opinion. She takes up the point of CH (that DDI e.V. judges, who have been listed at the DVG e.V. and VDH e.V., may continue to judge the DDI e.V.) and says that this information was not known to all. You only have experience from other sports. If you had this information in writing, that would be nice. She thinks that the DDI e.V. board should have such discussions, but it is equally important that the members have the relevant information.

(Discussion continues between CM, CH and others without a microphone.)

CM is of the opinion that it is now possible to sit down together and have these discussions. Everyone has to have the same information, then nothing stands in the way of cooperation.

KHF tries to shorten the discussion. She opposes an online survey in the current wording, even if she is in principle for an online survey. She prefers that the next Board sits down with the DDD e.V. Board and first clarify the facts, then you can vote. The application indirectly implies that some members are against judges being allowed to judge other tournaments. She has never articulated that, nor has she filed any application in that direction. The DDI e.V. was of the opinion that his judges are allowed to judge all tournaments, that is an important liberal opinion of the association.

(CH speaks without microphone.)

Andrea Lewis (AL) says she is one of those who were overrun six months ago. She had addressed directly the DDD e.V. Board, with several emails, but she never got a reply or information and therefore did not know whether and what agreements there were with the DVG e.V.. She was very outraged and disillusioned about the cooperation between the DDI e.V. and DVG e.V.. And she will not vote on a members survey on that topic, because she can not judge the things as long as she has no information. (Applause) That's why she's sitting here because she's not against something in principle. She wants more information.

MF is of the opinion that so far there has been no specific information. One knows only what the DVG e.V. has announced itself or what one has learned from other sports. The first judges, who have been listed at the DVG e.V. (in other dog sports), have been in charge, have trained the judges for the DVG e.V. and these judges were then allowed to judge only for the VDH e.V. and not even private events, according to MF. She thinks that the regulation in respect to Dogdance in the DVG e.V. will also come into effect in this way. And what Carmen said was nice, but before she doesn't see this in writing, she says nothing.

KS agrees that you need information before you vote. The consequences of non-transparency have been seen in the past, so the whole thing is so cooked up. She once again takes up the topic of "boycott calls" and adds: "It was not about the fact that the judges are not allowed to judge other tournaments, but because the affected tournament was advertised as a DDI e.V. tournament and , with the announcement of the VDH e.V.- German championship, no longer complies with the regulations of the DDI e.V.. To judge an alleged DDI e.V. event with a somewhat modified regulation was not acceptable.

RG asks how the DDI e.V. positions itself against the judges of the club, if for example, the VDH e.V. or FCI would not allow judges to judge anywhere.

CM says you have two points to vote here. On the one hand, whether the rules should be changed, on the other hand, whether one should limit the judges. So far, this was not the case, it was the individual decision of each judge, whether he / she judges at another tournament. This was never a problem. The regulations clearly stipulate that DDI e.V. judges can judge internationally and judges of other clubs can judge DDI e.V. tournaments, although limited in quantity per tournament, but in her opinion that would be sufficient. The DDI e.V. should not limit itself, but should take a clear position, which rules should apply in a DDI e.V. tournament. She advocates that the new Board should first clarify the facts, then pass this information on to the members and then conduct a comprehensive online survey to position the DDI e.V..

KHF says that they must vote on CH's application in the exact wording. She asks who is in favor of making an online survey with the three points as CH has suggested.

(One person has already left the room)

In favour: 2 votes

Against: 4 votes

Abstentions: 36 votes

42 total votes

The application is rejected.

KHF proposes to amend CH's application and vote again.

JL requests that Carmen Heritier's application be supplemented. She asks the members whether an online vote on this topic should take place without question formulation.

(disorderly discussion)

JL changes her objection and asks the members whether an online survey of the members about a regulation of the judges is wanted.

(Word contributions without microphone)

KHF: It's about the fundamental question of whether we want to limit the judges.

DB asks if the vote is about conducting an online survey to limit judges internationally.

Answer from the plenary: Yes

CH considers the time for such a survey to be wrong, since the emotions are still so "cooked up" that no factual idea is made of what extent that has. People would not do the interview on the basis of factual facts. In the case of a survey, a) first all members should be provided information with a future perspective and b) should calm down before the poll because the hurt feelings and prejudices would influence the opinion very strongly at the moment. One risked, with the result of such a survey to "run in the wrong direction".

(Applause)

CM proposes to vote on a proposal to the Board that this information gathering must be done until the next General Assembly and that an online survey will be conducted based on this information.

(CH and KHF speak without microphone.)

KHF summarizes the discussion: The basic tenor of the discussion has shown that the members should be included in an online survey regarding the limitation of the judges and the regulations after the facts are available. She asks CM to formulate the application accordingly.

CM submits the request that the board be obliged to obtain information about the judges' assignments and the use of regulations by other associations before the next General Meeting and that they then have to conduct an online member survey on these topics.

KHF initiates the vote.

In favour: 39 votes
Against: 0 votes
Abstentions: 3 votes

42 total votes

The application is accepted.

DB asks CM if she would like to continue with their application 4b or give MF and AW the opportunity to present their applications.

CM wants to continue with her application 4b. DB agrees.

Item 6.4:

Application 4b

Appendix 6: Tournament organization
Claudia Moser

CM justifies her request. There have been many discussions in the last few months, because tournaments advertised as DDI e.V. partly included other classes as well. She is in favor of a clear regulation, so that the DDI e.V. can also determine when it is not a DDI e.V. tournament and therefore no entry in the license booklet may be made, or when exemptions may be granted. According to the DDI e.V. regulations, only starters with a license booklet are eligible to start at DDI e.V. tournaments. Picking the best parts of the regulations on the part of the organizer is a no go, because you can't use 99% of the regulations and change the rest, if you do not like a passage. Either 100% of the regulations apply, in particular with regard to the starting authorization of the participants, selection of the judges and offer of the different classes, or it is simply not a DDI e.V. tournament. But you can not just change passages of the regulations and then announce the tournament as a DDI e.V. tournament. She is applying for a change of the statutes, so that the board can intervene in such situations.

JeLa agrees, but you should not forget what CM wrote in her request for discussion regarding the fun-contests, which are not part of the regulations and have always been taken as an exception rule.

CH finds CM's application quite conclusive, which is why she herself applied for an online survey to be able to discuss exactly such matters. Again, she finds an online survey appropriate and fair. AW is of the opinion that in this case a change of the statutes is not appropriate, because the statutes have to do with the association and not with the execution of tournaments. CM's application was due to a change in the regulations and the organization manual.

KHF is of the opinion that CM actually does not apply for anything new. So far, a DDI e.V. tournament must implement the DDI e.V. regulations. For example, there has recently been a tournament with two pillars in the ring, which was a pure fun tournament. She knew about it as a Board member. In the announcement it was to explicitly mention beforehand that there are two pillars. She would not have voted for it in an official tournament. She mentions a conversation with FW about Italian compulsory program classes. In Italy, there are probably tournaments in which mandatory elements from Dogdance are queried. But you do not have to do this in order to be able to participate in a DDI e.V. tournament, so theoretically the DDI e.V. could not care less. KHF also organizes tournaments herself, where they do half a day of rally dogdance and the other half day dogdance, with only the dogdance part counting as DDI e.V. tournament.

Actually, the discussion deals with the announcement of a very specific not DDI e.V. tournament, which states that the results of the tournament can be entered in the DDI e.V. license book and / or in other license books. KHF asks, why there is a DDI e.V. license book, if the entry can also be made in other license books? If you start on a DDI e.V. tournament, it must be entered into the DDI e.V. license book for the sake of fairness. If the VDH e.V. enters the tournament in his license book, she is not interested. But a DDI e.V. license booklet must document completely, at which DDI e.V. tournaments one started. A "or" is not there, an "and" maybe.

KHF gives another example, which happened 10 years ago in Osnabrück. The organizer of a tournament had not announced that fun classes are not rated. Since the judges still wanted to award the trophies, the audience should decide by applause. The judges gave only the explicit

indication that they did not make the decision. For the organizer there was a requirement for the following year that there should be no applause. KHF believes that mistakes have been corrected over the years. She also does not find the applausometer perfect, but it was just a compromise solution and was already over 10 years ago.

KHF asks in the round: Why should you refrain from registering a DDI e.V. tournament in the DDI e.V. license book? If, according to regulations, a judging team decides who is the head judge, why should the organizer be able to override it and appoint the head judge himself? The regulations must be adhered to. If exceptions to the regulations are intended, why not ask the board first? Why would that be decided and then advertised? You can always ask questions or make applications, but in this case this was not done.

CM does not necessarily provide for a change of the statutes, it could also be a change in the regulations. Exemptions must be approved by the Board. If you do not want to or can not adhere to the DDI e.V. regulations, you must apply to the Board. The Board then discusses and makes a decision behind which you can stand as a Board and justify this. CM cites the tournament in Dortmund as an example: The tournament was advertised on the one hand as a DDI e.V. tournament, with all DDI e.V. classes, plus the extra qualification class for the World Cup on a separate day - that would have been ok. But in the announcement was: When registering, VDH e.V. members are preferred. It is not clear, whether that applies only for the class 3 WC Quali or for the whole tournament? The latter would be a violation of the organizer against the DDI e.V. regulations. CM argues for a kind of list for the organizer with specifications for a DDI e.V. tournament, then the Board could act better.

KH agrees with CM. Some organizers ignore the DDI e.V. regulations due to ignorance or intent. If it was previously known or subsequently became known, the Board should have the obligation to seek contact with the organizer. Should the organizer show no insight, there should be consequences. Otherwise, the DDI e.V. rules would be just as valuable as the paper on which they are printed. Rules must be binding.

SSn believes that everything is already regulated. Because if it is not a DDI e.V. event, then there is simply no sponsorship and you should not register the event in the DDI e.V. License booklet. The Board should comment on this more precisely. If it was known before, organizers should be reminded, if it is not changed, the event should be denied as a DDI e.V. event.

KS proposes to forward such tenders directly by e-mail to the Board in order to relieve them.

AW is of the opinion that you do not have to create more work and send e-mails. The announcements were indeed visible online, as he was the 1st Chairman of the club and an Admin of the HP, who puts the tournaments online, he also looked the organizers over the shoulder. You could already control that.

DB closes the discussion.

KHF reads Part 1 (Amendment of the statutes) of motion 4b (Claudia Moser) and starts the vote

In favour: 25 votes
Against: 1 votes
Abstentions: 16 votes 42 total votes

KHF reads Part 2 (Change of Regulations) of Motion 4b (Claudia Moser) and starts the vote.

In favour: 34 votes
Against: 0 votes
Abstentions: 8 votes 42 total votes

DB closes the vote on motion 4b (Claudia Moser) and heads over to Item 6.4 motion 4c (Melanie Felix).

Item 6.4:

Proposal 4c

Appendix 7: Change of Regulations - Tournament according to DDI e.V. Rules Melanie Felix

MF submits her application. She justifies point 3 of her application by the fact, that DDI e.V. members should originally report one day earlier to have an advantage.

However, the regulation was meanwhile used so that organizers preferred VDH e.V. members and awarded the remaining seats to DDI e.V. members. The regulation was thus actually exploited against the DDI e.V. and Melanie advocates a ban on organizers to specify independently starting rows.

According to AW, this is obviously a rule change. To current regulations, the status of the statutes will be decided by the Board. One would not need to discuss further here, as in the previous application. His request, which actually wanted to change this, should be postponed to the next General Meeting due to time constraints. At this point, however, no decision could be made that would be viable.

DB asks AW if he suggests forwarding the 5 sub-items of the application to the Board and allowing them to decide. She suggests to vote on it.

AW says voting at this point is not necessary, because the regulations also say so. He requests that his own application be postponed.

DB leads over to Item 9 and thus to the second block of voting on the proposals of the members. It continues with Item 9.1 and Proposals 6a-c (Sandra Schneider).

Item 9.1:

Proposals 6a, 6b, 6c

**Appendix 8: *Proposal 6a Revision of judicial training*
Proposal 6b Restructuring of the judges responsibility
Proposal 6c Training of existing judges
all Sandra Schneider**

SSn states that the applications for revision of judicial training were made by a body established at the last General Assembly. This is the right way to advance judicial training. SSn would like to vote directly on it.

FW is of the opinion that this point does not belong to an extraordinary General Meeting, but rather to an ordinary General Meeting.

CM understands FW's objection. The problem is that there is still no fixed date for a next General Meeting. She assumes that a decision will be taken in the second half of the year. The current judicial training is suspended until the end of 2019. The existing judges are confirmed until the end of 2019. After that you either have to pause again, or by then you have judges who have not attended further education for four years or no new judges. Or you can do it in half a year to determine the new judge training. But the matter is very extensive with many new posts to fill. CM proposes to at least vote on proposal 6b (restructuring the judge's responsibility), so that at least the body can be put into effect. You can vote on the rest later or you can conduct a member survey in a timely manner. But if you wait until the middle or end of the year, nothing will change until 2020.

KHF asks whether applications 6a and 6C should be withdrawn and that they should only vote on application 6b.

CM prefers to accept all three applications. SSn adds that it is actually a Board decision. DB summarizes that the Board should deal with the 3 applications.

CM suggests that the Board should decide on it. Before that, however, an online survey should be carried out, on the basis of which the decision should then be made.

KHF summarizes that the applications will be withdrawn and the modified motion will be made to allow the Board to make a decision based on a member survey.

DB leads over to the discussion suggestion of CH.

CH requests to postpone her discussion. (It is assumed.)

DB redirects to Item 9.2 and Proposals 7a to 7c.

Item 9.2:

Proposals 7a, 7b and 7c

**Appendix 9: *Proposals for Senior / Handicap Assessment by Sieglinde Bruns,
Britta Kalff and Judith Loy***

KHF asks for a short report from the judges representative before voting.

CM summarizes that the omission of content and difficulty among the judges was perceived as pleasant. On the one hand, judges find the two criteria the two most difficult rating points for seniors and handicap classes. On the other hand, they should have perceived positive changes in the dances regarding how the starters constructed the dances in order to point out the abilities of the dogs. CM had received no negative feedback from the judges. She had also exchanged not with starters, but with judges.

BK thinks that one should artificially limit the difficulty but not the creativity. It should not necessarily be deleted both points. As compensation, team work should be doubled, then the senior class would not have to be artificially "rummaged", so that the groups are scored equal with the maximum points possible.

MG have also talked to many starters who are basically for it. This makes the class more enjoyable and contributes to the fairness of the starters to their dogs. Many starters believe that this arrangement is a great relief. You can still bring in creativity and focus on the essentials. MG thinks the level of difficulty and content can be taken out.

FW believes that this scheme encourages people to compete with their dogs for as long as possible. It often takes place in seniors classes that instead of the competition, the competition deals with who has the oldest dog or the one with the most disabilities. FW does not like that and it is also in contrast that recently it was agreed to let young dogs under the age of three years not compete in class 3. If a dog is not fit enough to show some content and / or difficulty, why should he start in an official class?

DB agrees with FW. It was suggested to make an exception for dogs suffering from patella. The principle on which the decision was made was that there should be no special treatment for certain restrictions. The same principle should also be applied in this situation. The provisions of the seniors and handicap class should be retained in the current form.

KHF asks if this matter should be resolved by means of an online survey. The appropriate choices would be worked out and then presented online.

DB says that unfortunately the rest of the agenda will not be possible anymore. However, a pattern has been adopted that motions are forwarded to the Board for decision.

CM requests that it be decided to hold an ordinary General Meeting this year.

AW suggests that they also like to take place in the second half of the year.

KHF carries out the vote.

(2 members have already left the assembly)

In favour: 40 votes
Against: 0 votes
Abstentions: 0 votes 40 total votes

The application is accepted.

KHF has voted to postpone Proposals 8 and 9 to the next General Meeting.

In favour: 40 votes
Against: 0 votes
Abstentions: 0 votes 40 total votes

DB thanks AS for counting the votes.

KHF thanks the members and closes the meeting.

18.30 h the meeting is closed.

Appendix 1: Cash report**Cash report for the financial year 2018**

Dear DDI members,

To the tasks as a treasurer it belongs to the members at the annual general meeting report about the finances of the association to reimburse.

This is the report for the financial year 2018.

At the end of the financial year 2018, there was a bank balance of € 23,341.10. With a start of the year of € 15,310.51, there is a positive difference of € 8,030.59. This is composed as follows:

Overall, it generated revenue of € 28,145.00.

These are divided as follows:

Membership fees: € 6,680.00

Royalties: € 1.504,00

sponsorship monies received: € 19,900.00

and other: € 61,00 (overpayments of membership fees, which should not be refunded despite demand)

Spending totaled € 20,114.41.

These are divided as follows:

Costs for tournaments:

forwarded sponsorship: € 10,453.45

Trophies: € 1.242,00

Rent storage room: 3,142.80 (for 3 years)

Software and Internet costs: a total of € 1,627.72

Installation and Configuration Forum: € 1.011,50

running member software: € 129,16

Service maintenance Homepage: € 214,20

Running Internet costs: € 272.86

reimbursed fees Judicial training: € 1.000,00

License books: € 667.98

Cost of the general meeting: € 540,00

refunded telephone costs: € 486.75

- Postage: € 436,14

Advertising costs: € 343.12 (DDI Banner)

Notary fees: € 34.51

Account maintenance fees / return debit fees: € 134.96

Other: € 4,98 (reimbursement for package tape)

In addition to the report given to this point, I would like to take individual positions separately and explain them.

Posts:

At the beginning of the year 2018 until May a large amount of unpaid membership fees due was demanded. This resulted in additional payments for previous years amounting to € 2,410.00. In addition, of course, the payment behavior of the members for the current year was much better. There could be payments for 2018 contributions amounting to € 4,130.00 to be recorded. Nevertheless, more than 100 members have not yet paid their contribution for 2018.

Basically, there is still a need for optimization in the area of membership fees. I would therefore like to say that our members have to wait until the due date 31.03. receive a message via our e-mail distribution list. In addition, should be warned consistently.

Sponsorship:

In 2018, the association received sponsorship funds from animonda petcare gmbh of € 18,000.00 and Uelzener Versicherung € 1,900.00. At the beginning of January 2018, € 5,000 was already received for the old year 2017.

The sponsorship funds of Uelzener Versicherung were passed on in full to the organizers of the tournaments in Munich and Stuttgart.

The sponsoring funds of animonda petcare gmbh were passed on in the amount of € 8,353.45.

Funds of € 297.58 were not paid until 2019.

This results in a credit balance of € 9,148.97.

Fees for judicial training:

In total, 15x judge fees for the year 2018 and previous years have not been requested so far. These are still expected costs of € 1,500.00.

Outstanding commitments / payments:

The company arSito Design has the service fee for the homepage for the second half of 2018 in the amount of

€ 214.20 only invoiced in January 2019. In addition, attorney fees for legal advice in 2018 were also billed at the beginning of 2019. These costs will burden the result 2019.

Next I would like to give the following comments for the future.

Intended use:

As a non-profit recognized association we are obliged to act selflessly. This means that we must always use our financial resources in a timely manner for statutory purposes. This happens when

the funds are used within two financial years after the cash inflow. For the first time this year the association achieves a significant net profit for the year. This means that the funds will not be used in the current financial year or in the first months of the following year.

Sales tax liability:

In 2018, the limit of § 19 UStG (Small Business Regulation) was exceeded for the first time. I.e. the revenue exceeded the limit of € 17,500.00. If the limit is exceeded again in 2019, then the club is subject to VAT from 01.01.2020. This means that for certain revenue in the intellectual realm of the association (licenses, sponsorship) sales tax is payable. The non-profit area will remain VAT exempt.

Audit:

The cash audit by our cash auditors Judith Loy and Denise Nardelli revealed no complaints. No changes or suggestions will be made for future club work. The cash auditors recommend the full discharge of the board

The cash audit report is available to me as a fax. The original will be sent to me in the next few days.

The 2018 Review Report is attached to this report. Are there any questions about this cash report?

Questions from members

If there are no further questions or further explanations, I would ask for discharge of my person for the financial year 2018 if I acknowledge the cash report.

Usually I ask at this point for the discharge of the entire board. For the first time I do not do this. I ask for individual relief because in 2018 I did not fully agree with the entire work of the Executive Board. This concerns exclusively the work of the former first chairman Carmen Schmid. Because of that, I resigned from my office as a treasurer in October 2018.

I would like to emphasize that the other members of the Board, namely Debra Benard, Katharina Henf and Fruzzi Wilhelm, are not meant. I would like to thank you for your cooperation in 2018.

Hollnseth, March 8, 2019

Jana Lorenz

Appendix 2: List of Participants

Because of the data protection basic regulation in Germany the list of participants is not published. There were 43 voting members initially present.

Appendix 3: Proposal 1 (Katrin Heimsath)**Proposal to include an additional article in § 9 of our Statute**

Board members and officials may not be board members or officials of other organizations whose statute or goals are in conflict with the statute or goals of the DDI. If a board member or an official takes a corresponding office at another organization, this step will be interpreted as resignation from his or her office at the DDI. The board is responsible for evaluating whether a statute or the goals of another organization are in conflict with those of the DDI. The person in question may request that the membership votes on the board's evaluation at a general meeting.

Reasons:

Board members as well as members who take over roles for the DDI (e. g. training of judges) are representing the interests of the members, both internally and externally. They are decisively responsible how dogdance develops within the DDI and how the goals of the organization are met. It is often necessary to find compromises and solutions. People who are involved in this process must be free of conflicts of interest which could occur while holding an office at another organization. This is important

- a) for a trusting teamwork in the DDI
- b) for the protection of the people involved
- c) for the protection of DDI's goals

The members must be confident, that board members and officials make decisions in the interests of DDI. This rule will eliminate possible conflict of interests, board members and officials can't be accused of dishonest intentions and reach solutions in an unbiased discussion. Decisions are only as trustworthy as there is confidence in the decision-makers. Therefore, there should be a corresponding article added to the statute which protects the decision-makers and the goals of our organization.

Appendix 4: Proposal 2 (Claudia Moser)

New structure of the DDI-Board

Explanation:

One problem with our board members ist, that due to different numbers of members in the DDI-countries it most likely always be the case that there are certain countries that will have a higher number of board members than others.

Due to that in the past there had been the unfortunate appearance, that the DDI is mainly organised in Germany and Switzerland (the countries where there is the biggest number of members). But other countries that might be as active but so far don't have as many members don't have so much of a voice when there are any decisions and development of the DDI.

Also due to the recent events I believe that it would be sensible to have more than just 5 people involved in important decisions regarding our club.

Therefore I would like to suggest a rule or statutory chance on how the board is composed.

There would be, as before, the **Main Board**, as before consisting of the five usual posts.

New there would be an **extended Board**, consisting of one person per Country.

As before the mainboard will deal with the normal jobs of the club. But for any decision regarding the statutes, the rules or any other decision with farreaching significance the full board (main and extended board) will vote together.

This would ensure, that important decisions are not only made by a smallnumber of people and there would also be an international validation.

Also it could been sured, that the topics and discussions that were discussed in the main board would be forwarded via meeting protocolls to all members of the extended boards so all countries remain informed.

In return I hope that the members of the extended board collect topics and problems in their countries and inform the main board so that the flow of information works both ways.

Text of the proposal:

The DDI Board of the DDI new consists of two parts which together form the complete board.

Part 1: Main Board (Chairman / Vice-Chairman / Treasurer / Secretary / Assessor

Part 2: Extended Board (1 member per DDI-Country)

Proposal 3 (Claudia Moser)

At the moment there are no clear „jobdescriptions“ with rights and duties defined.

Also someposts do not have any specific function.

Therefore I propose that all five posts in the board get clearly defined assignments.

Basic condition for all board posts would be in my view:

Mandatory English, English writing ideally

No official post in another club/ association that has opposite or divergent goals to those of the DDI

Chairman / Chairwoman:

Administration of the DDI

Representation of the clubsinterests

Call the boardmeeting and itsadministration

Call the membershipmeeting and itsadministration

Vice-Chairman/Vice-Chairwoman:

Translation of all protocalls and informations in German and English, to enable good communication and flow of information within the board and the club

Secretary:

Writing the protocols of the boardmeetings

Writing the protocols of the membership meeting

Treasurer:

Accounting, Budget

Payments

Paying out the sponsoring budgets

Assessor:

New Media-Responsible

Publishing the board meetings decisions

Networking

Over view over the Newsletter

Publishings on the website

All board members can involve additional persons in some of their work (for example to do the Newsletter, etc) but the main responsibility remains with them, so they must ensure that the work is done correctly.

Appendix 5: Proposal 4a (Carmen Heritier)

Limitation of using DDI rules and DDI judges

I sincerely propose that it should be discussed in how far our rules and judges can be made available to other people, clubs or institutions. In the past, this wasn't an issue at all, but now it seems to have risen due to the newly founded German club that wants to cooperate with the FCI. My personal opinion is to keep our DDI as open-minded and barrier-free as possible. I would like to propose that this item should be discussed and voted for by all members and not just a small amount at this extraordinary meeting. So if Online-Voting is still not possible, I would like to suggest that the issue shall be treated just like the question with the age of class 3 dogs - via an online survey.

Limitations, yes or no?

If we limit our rules and judges to the DDI, the following things are not possible anymore:

- Judges judging the OEC, the Nordic Championships, the World Cup or any other event of another club/institution. Or judges have gained an excellent reputation worldwide and have driven the sport forward in the DDI direction. This would be a shame.
- No more competitions organised by small dogclubs or any person that is member of a dog club other than the DDI.
- no more participation of foreign teams whose mother country organises Dogdance under FCI rules (e.g. Belgium) if the DDI openly opposes the FCI.
- In the past, small deviations from our rules have been accepted, such as that specialised funclasses were ranked or that a Pro-DD test with settlements was accepted (Italy) alongside our rules. Now, in Germany, there is one deviation that only allows DDI members or members of literally any FCI club (could be sports, could be breedclub, whatever) to compete at this very specialevent. This probably only concerns a handful of dogdancers. Yet it has caused much trouble. The thing is that beforehand, such deviations were accepted, now members are troubled by them. This means that either we allow deviations in general or we don't. Otherwise we would need a working party that defines how such deviations are treated for each and every competition. This would begin with ring size, incorrect ring barriers, pillars in the ring and end with questions like „is it possible to offer ABC (anything but collies) classes or breed-specific classes such as the BAM (a very prestigious agilityevent just for border collies.) or mixed-breed classes?

So, I propose that all members are able to decide via online voting (or if not possible via online survey) which of these 3 versions they prefer:

1. The DDI will keep its open-mind and aim to be a club whose rules and judges can be made available to everyone wanting to organise a competition.
2. The DDI will only allow rules and judges to be „used“ by DDI members that aren't in anyway members of another dogclub.
3. The DDI will establish a workingparty that decides for each competition individually before it takes place.

Appendix 6: Proposal 4b (Claudia Moser)**Proposal Competition Organisation (to point 5 of the invitation)**

Use of the DDI-Rules when organising a competition

As before any organiser should get the possibility to organise a DDI-Competition or DDI-Qualification-Tournament, but to be allowed to call it a DDI-competition, certain rules must be fulfilled:

- Competitors are only allowed if they have a DDI-Record-Booklet
- The complete set of Rules are applied, especially:
 - Choice of judges (max. 1 Non-DDI-judge at the judges table)
 - Anyone can compete (no membership in a club necessary)
 - All classes are offered complying with the DDI-rules
 - The package-rules apply unless the organiser has a exemption granted by the DDI-board
 - Any other points?

Proposal 1: Change of statutes

To be able to promote a competition as a DDI-competition, the organiser must comply to the DDI-rules and the organising handbook.

Any exemption rules must be approved by the board.

Proposal 2: Change of rules

Clear definition of the points that must be complied, to organise a DDI competition must be included in the rules.

Appendix 7: Proposal 4c (Melanie Felix)

I would like to submit a motion for change of regulations.

Due to the new situation of several Dogdanceclubs, in my opinion the following requirements for hosting a DDI tournament should be stated in the regulations:

1. A DDI tournament must already be clearly recognizable in the tender as a
Tournament according to DDI regulations. □
(In my opinion, the DDI logo should be included in the announcement and registration and scores, in addition, I would find it good if at least 1 DDI banner must be installed on the tournament.) □
2. The DDI regulations apply in this case for all Dogdance classes of the event, no individual classes can be excluded. □
I consider these points to be very important, as it is often very difficult at the moment as a starter to recognize at first glance whether the advertised Dogdance tournaments are DDI tournaments or not.

In addition, I believe that we should ban the rule that DDI members are allowed to report one day earlier. Unfortunately, we have now noticed how this originally thought as an advantage for the DDI members train is now used by other clubs against us (see VDH DM). I think the rules should be roughly the following:

3. On DDI tournaments, all starters are equally entitled to report. Organizers may not make a starting place based on club membership or other criteria. Exceptions may be made here only on qualifying tournaments for class 3 starters, and in principle for helpers and judges of the tournament, for these starters may give it an earlier registration date. □
4. Tenders of certain title competitions (DM, Qualis or other titles) can only be awarded at tournaments under DDI regulations, if they have been previously advertised at the DDI and have been accepted by the board of directors). □
5. Furthermore, from my point of view, the title "German Champion" in both the FS and the HTM should be officially awarded by the German Open by the DDI.

Appendix 8: Proposal 5 (Axel Weber)**Application for the amendment of the regulations:**

Herewith I submit the motion that the regulation of the regulation change by the executive committee (see statute § 10 (6), introduced and adjusted at the MM 2016) be withdrawn and the members as before may submit motions for amendments to the regulation to the GM, which then will also be discussed and agreed there.

Reason:

The Board's introduction of the amendments to the Regulations was based on many years of the experience, that requests from members to the MM on this subject often made the agenda very voluminous.

With the introduction of the new change mode, these discussions were disconnected from the MM and more time was available to deal with the further applications.

Critical comments before the vote on the procedure were amongst others the necessary confidence in the board, to conduct the discussions and the vote for the changes in the regulations in the interests of the members. This was granted by the members at the MM 2016 to the former board and thus the procedure was introduced and a change in the statutes was necessary.

Through the events in the club since the MV 2018 and in discussions with other members, I have the impression that the responsibility for 5 people is simply too large and a change in the rules by majority vote of the membership is better accepted and thus has less potential for conflict. Due to the competition with other Dogdance clubs, DVG and VDH / FCI, we would have a healthy return to the direct way of member participation in thinking about and controlling the regulations, which clearly differentiates us from the other systems.

Suggestion to discuss 1 by Carmen Heritier**Questions regarding judges (to be discussed, no proposal)▫**

Sadly, I have come across several behaviours of judges that, I think, need to be discussed and made public. (Note: I have contacted those judges myself and then informed the board.)

- 2 judges have not only tried to boycott a competition that uses DDI rules, but have stated that it should not take place at all
- 1 judge has massively attacked 2 members of the board, once in a large Whatsapp group, and several times publicly on Facebook

The same judge has openly lied on Facebook about fellow judges.

What happens to those judges? Are misbehaviours simply tolerated? I know that there's our judges' code of ethics and that judges can be admonished - but how do organisers know and how many warnings need to be issued till a judge is no longer a judge? I think this whole system should be made more transparent.

Moreover, I have noticed that judges living in Germany have been accepted to judge DDI competitions without being a DDI judge. Do we have clear rules for that? Is it then also acceptable that a RocknDog judge judges a DDI competition? We should treat everyone the same here.... And most of all, our members should know and/or be included in thoughts about that.

Appendix 9: Proposal 6a (Sandra Schneider)**Request for revision of judicial education****(6a) Application 1: Extension of judicial education (shadow judge)**

Previously: Attending a judges workshop, then shadow judging at least 50 Fun and 30 official routines. This completes the judges education and you can be released as a judge.

New judges education multi-stage process:

1. Completing 2 webinars with theory as the basis for the judges workshop
2. Study regulations
3. Judgesworkshop
4. Each prospective judge is assigned an instructor
5. Guided shadow judge
6. Self-controlled shadow judge

Detailed explanation of the multi-stage process:**Webinars:**

Before a judge's workshop can be visited, participation in at least 2 webinars becomes mandatory. So you have more time for practice and detail questions in the judges workshop. The regulations have to be studied independently; in the course of the judicial training the prospective judge will be questioned.

Judges workshop continues to take place according to a proven system.

As soon as a prospective judge signs up for training, he is assigned an instructor. The trainer accompanies the aspiring judge during the entire training and is available to answer any questions. Instructors are judges with the appropriate experience who are willing to assist future judges. In each country, there must be at least one instructor, who can also accompany several budding judges. So there is always a contact person if questions arise during the training.

Guided shadow judge

For larger tournaments (quality tournaments are compulsory) at least 1 judge will be assigned for the intensive supervision of the judges. The tournament organizer must organize appropriate divisions with the head judge. Different classes will then be looked at and discussed directly with the supervising judge, so questions can be asked during the routine and the points awarded can be discussed and explained in detail. This is intended to ensure the quality of the judges and make the training a lot more attractive than before. After the guided inferior judge there will be an exchange with the instructor to inform him about the level of education of the judge.

The previous amount of shadowing remains and is counted also in the guided shadow judging. If the minimum number of shots has been reached, the trainer gives the judge responsible a recommendation as to whether the candidate should be released or whether there are still some shortcomings that would recommend further shimming. The instructor then exchanges with the budding judge and it is discussed together how many more assignments are still to be recommended as a judge, which classes should be made up or where in theory there is still catching-up demand.

The instructor will then give the judge responsible the OK to release the new judges if they have reached the level of a trained judge.

The additional shadow judging can also take place via videos in exchange with the instructor, especially in classes that may not be often available regionally (seniors, groups, trio, quartet)

The aim is to achieve a uniform level of education and to keep the quality of the judges high. A judge must, for example, be able to look at the health aspects, to recognize gait patterns, to read the expression of a dog, to recognize species specific how different the individual elements can be evaluated, to interpret music in other languages and to record and process countless other details during a routine. In addition comes the extensive knowledge of the regulations that every judge should have. At the speed of how our sport is currently developing, the previous training is no longer extensive enough and there is no exchange about the quality of a judge. Currently, a judges level is released, even if it is far from the standard aimed at each judging and completely different than our guide here. There is no possibility of a directing influence, which makes the uniform judging ever more difficult and leads more and more often to the dissatisfaction of starters or even to the avoidance of individual judges.

(6b) Application 2: Restructuring of the judge's responsibility

So far, we have in the DDI a person who is elected as the judge responsible by the members. This person is responsible for regulatory changes concerning judging, the judicial training and coordination of other judges' trainers, the release of new judges, the exhortation of judges in case of violations of the Judicial Code, the updating and extension of workshop materials. This is a very large task for a person, especially since then the human aspect is added if someone with this one person does not get along too well.

Judge Responsibility new split by a panel

1. Judges responsible for the coordination as usual and responsible for training and the standard in judging.
2. From each country there is a representative in the body to represent the interests of the respective country and to be involved in the exchange.
3. Country or region managers are appointed to have contact persons in the vicinity.
4. Changes to the regulations are decided by the committee
5. Violations of the Code of Conduct are dealt with by the Panel and issued by the country's representative
6. Panel must be regularly in exchange, at least once a year for all to define a common booth and to compare the current state. (For example, at the Judges' Congress see application 3)
7. Appointment as a judge instructor

Detailed explanation of the application for a panel

Judge in charge:

Claudia Moser has been responsible for the training of judges for many years and is rewarded with the trust of the members at each election and elected by a large majority. That and her many years of knowledge, know-how and experience make her an indispensable part of the

responsibility for the judges. Due to the size of the association and the steadily growing interest, especially abroad, it becomes increasingly difficult to manage the coordination as an individual. Not least because the administrative effort is getting bigger. That is why Claudia should be able to devote herself above all to her core competence and that is clearly our standard in judging and developing the training and further education basics.

Panel:

The main body is composed of 5 experienced judges (from 5 different countries) and is elected to this GM. This body is responsible for general judicial training and its organization. The extended body consists of one judge per DDI country (where there are trained DDI judges). This is responsible for changes to the regulations and their implementation in each country. For Germany, there should be 2 seats in the extended body, at least for northern Germany and southern Germany. Judges who are interested in getting active can apply to sit on the panel. If there are no volunteer candidates, the judges who have already been authorized for judicial training in the respective country are requested. Suitable judges are thus requested by the judge's representative. Furthermore, the committee is supported by administrative posts (EDP, mail coordination, releasing judges, etc.)

These are also named by the Judge' in charge as these posts require close cooperation.

Members of the panel may not simultaneously take over or perform educational activities in other clubs. This applies in particular if the other club does not comply with the DDI statutes or if they are not affiliated with the DDI.

Basics for application are:

1. - Minimum 1 year experience as a judge
2. - Good command of English as the main language on the board will be English
3. - Must have experience as a starter

Region Representatives:

Contact persons for judges, trainers, tournament organizers, starters etc.

Do not necessarily have to sit on the committee or be judicial instructors. It is only about the direct contact and the opportunity to inform about judiciary issues or to submit complaints.

These will then be forwarded to the committee accordingly.

The aim is to ensure a uniform standard across countries.

Members of the panel regularly exchange and work on the issues, issues and concerns they are approaching. So everyone is up-to-date and improvements can be made or positions can be defined more clearly.

In addition, the training can be extended to focus.

These measures are intended to ensure a certain standard that also works across national borders and that changes can be implemented everywhere as quickly as possible and not only every two years at further workshops.

The committee should also be informed regularly with newsletter-like circulars if there are innovations or definitions to unclear points. The flow of information must become faster and less complicated.

(6c) Application 3: education of existing judges

So far participation in a judges workshop at the latest after 2 years.

Judge education also in several stages:

1. 1 webinar per year (basic topics or advanced topics)
2. Judges exercise quiz
3. Judges Workshop
4. monthly discussion round (forexample in the new forum)
5. JudgesCongress, detailed explanation of the multi-stage process:

1. Webinars with the basic topics in German and English

- a. Rating
- b. Deductions
- c. Disqualifications
- d. Healthpoints
- e. Seniors / Handicap

2. Webinars with extended topics in German and English

- a. Body language in general / stress signs in the dog
- b. Racial science and special breed-typical body language / movement types
- c. Gait analysis, gait school
expandable as needed

Webinars will be published on www.dogi-box.com, free for all judges, and for all other Dogdancers also available, but with costs. Any money generated can then be reinvested in further webinars with external specialist speakers.

Judges practice quizzes

Online questionnaires to fill out yourself as a practice opportunity with detailed questions. Here no examination situation arises however a learning effect. There may be questions about the rules, sequences from a choreo with questions about whether situations are recognized correctly, excerpts from gait images, etc. The quiz can always be supplemented with current topics and should show the current state of the judge. The evaluation receives only the respective judge for their own overview and assessment if and where there is need for training. **Judgesworkshops continue to take place according to a proven system.**

Monthly discussion round

Every month there is a current topic from the committee (question, video, tournament experience) On which can and should be discussed. In order to catch current issues, it is necessary for judges to provide feedback to the panel or judge-in-charge when there were discussions in tournaments or decisions were ambiguous. Changes can also be discussed here or requests for changes can be submitted by all judges. Only with a good exchange can all needs be taken into account and all pages illuminated. The more judges participate, the more interesting the discussions become and the more views can be shed light on. This also helps to illuminate topics in webinars more precisely if e.g. on issues of uncertainty prevails. Also, there is such an overview where the focus can be in other countries and whether certain issues arise only in

individual countries.

Judges Congress

Every year, a judicial congress is held, which is obligatory for the committee and is offered to all other judges and judges as an addition. The Congress is organized by a member of the panel. This also ensures that each country is equivalent to maintaining the judiciary. The judges' congress is intended to ensure that the committee meets annually in person to exchange views. Furthermore, it should give the opportunity to take a closer look at individual topics and, if possible, make them attractive with guest speakers. The themes of the congress will then be made available as webinars for all judges.

Since the congress should be mandatory for the committee and the travel costs can be very high depending on the exporting country, the financing must be finally clarified here. Either there is the re-financing via webinars, or corresponding fees for volunteers. There should be a budget framework for each congress that is supported by the DDI as long as the financial resources are available. Therefore, the Congress is optional in this application and the feasibility is to look at each with the treasurer and need an annual application and release depending on whether the financial resources are available.

The aim is to support existing judges in continuing education and to facilitate personal further education. The exchange should also be promoted more, only together we can achieve a good standard and educate each other. The webinars should make it easier to stay up to date. So far, changes have sometimes been delayed or not properly addressed to other judges, especially across countries. In the workshops there is sometimes too little time to pass on changes, to deal with current topics, to work in a practical way and to train new judges.

Appendix 10: Proposals 7a-7c

Proposal 7a by Sieglinde Bruns:

Dear DDI Board,

because I don't know who I have to address, you all receive this Mail.

I hereby submit an application for the upcoming members meeting on 09.03.2019.

I ask for that difficulty and content in seniors and handicap classes should not be considered. Also as an extension of the previous trial procedure.

Sincerely,

Sieglinde Bruns

Proposal 7b by Britta Kalff:

Hereby I request that in senior class (official) the factor DIFFICULTY will be removed permanently from the scoring. I think that this will be beneficial to the health of our seniors and also supports the purpose of this class. At the same time the points in the category TEAMWORK could be taken into account twice. I think this category should get more value in senior class. The factor CONTENT should remain in the scoring, because the creativity and versatility of seniors should not be limited.

Proposal 7c by Judith Loy:

Dear Carmen, dear Board of Directors of the DDI,

Unfortunately, since the original regulations regarding the senior class had to come back into force, I would like to put a motion to the board or to the general meeting for a vote:

(a) I ask for an experience report from the provisory amendment of the regulations

(b) I request to amend the regulations as follows:

When evaluating the seniors, the criterion difficulty and content should be excluded to protect our older dogs.

Thank you for your commitment and effort, all of which you put into our sport!

Kind regards

Judith

Appendix 11, Proposal 8 (Verena Verones)

As treasurer and administrator for the memberships of the GDS (Gemeinschaft Dogdance Schweiz), I would like to request a optimisation of the collaboration between DDI and GDS

1. I would like to be informed about decisions of the DDI in a written form and timely manner.

2. New registrations of members (there are over 70 members in the GDS, after all) was always carried out via e-mail to the corresponding registration office of the DDI. However, neither the new member nor the GDS ever received any notification of acceptance or rejection of the new membership. I therefore request that each new acceptance or rejection of a member is communicated by e-mail to both the member and the treasurer of the GDS.

3. As treasurer of the GDS I claim to receive on request insight into the member list of the DDI, of course while respecting all aspects of the privacy policy. Checking the requirements for registration for tournaments is only possible with the insight of such an up-to-date list. Before the right of access to such a list is granted, I am willing to sign a confidentiality agreement, that is obliging the treasurer of the GDS to maintain silence on the knowledge of memberships in the DDI.

Zollikofen, February, 27th 2019

Verena Verones

Appendix 12, Proposal 9 (Silvia Stadler)

Dear DDI Board,

I hereby request that my application for membership be reconfirmed at the DDI in the General Assembly on March 9, 2013 in Dreieich.

On 03.01.2019 I got the message that I was rejected as a member. Unfortunately, there was no reason, so I can only speculate why I was rejected. Also to my request with a reason to send was not responded.

It's also not clear if I was rejected by the entire board or just by a board member.

Yours sincerely

Silvia Stadler, Konstanz, 01.02.2019