1. There is no central database of dogs subject to dog controls notices (DCNs) so it is likely that only the officer issuing the notice and the recipient of the notice will be aware of it. This has arisen partly because the Act pre-dated compulsory microchipping legislation and it could easily be resolved by making it a requirement for all dogs subject to DCNs to be identified on the relevant microchip register.

2. Enforcing a DCN is difficult as any breach creates a criminal offence hence requiring corroboration which is often not possible. A lot of dog control problems occur outwith normal working hours when monitoring is resource-intensive.

3. If a breach is reported to the procurator fiscal it can take considerable time to progress to court; in the meantime the non-compliant dog-owner can continue to flout the DCN causing a breakdown in the public's confidence in the DCN system. A simpler way to penalise breaches would be appropriate and more likely to be successful against those owners who ignore a DCN. The ability to seize the dog when a notice is breached, apply a fixed penalty notice and recover any costs would encourage compliance. The breach could still progress to a criminal case if it were serious or repeated; this process would fit well with the current stray dog legislation.

4. Regular inter-agency meetings between the Police, LAs and Procurators Fiscal would be helpful to ensure effective joint action.

5. There may be scope for the re-introduction of dog licensing for a fee set at a level sufficient to discourage impulse buying of dogs. Pending consultation on the scope and mechanics of such a licensing scheme it might also discourage puppy farming and illegal importation of dogs.