Geo-Sniffing: Scent, Context, Criteria, & Cues

A clarification for those familiar with trial-based scent work. This document is technical and only applies to trial based scent work and how it's affected by public facing scent work.

—----------

Trial-based nosework has done an excellent job standardizing odor work. Most concerns arise when those rules are applied outside their intended context. Geo-Sniffing is not trialing nosework. It is its own scent activity, designed for real-world, non-sterile environments, and aligns more closely with search and rescue or mantrailing than with trial-based scent sports.

Geo-Sniffing Materials

1. *Why Is Birch Used?*

Birch is detectable, consistent, and effective for dogs. During development, over 100 essential oils were evaluated; only two met all functional requirements, and both are also used in formal trial settings. Birch was selected because it is non-aversive to most dogs, not a food odor, unlikely to function as a wildlife attractant, and produces a stable, repeatable scent picture when paired with defined vessels and criteria. Using a familiar scent does not inherently cause confusion; confusion almost always reflects unclear stimulus control or reinforcement criteria rather than odor choice itself (Bouton, 2007; Hall et al.,2018).

TL;DR: The odor itself is not the issue — training criteria are. Odor selection was guided by functional constraints and real-world use.

2. *Why Is Wood Used?*

Trial organizations standardize container materials to ensure fairness and repeatability across teams. Porous materials, including wood, can retain odor for extended periods and are difficult to fully reset between runs, complicating odor history and search order fairness. Geo-Sniffing does not compare dogs or control search order, making wooden vessels appropriate for outdoor and public environments.

TL;DR: Wood is avoided in trials for fairness reasons — not because dogs can’t work it accurately.

Why Random Alerting Isn't An Issue?

1. *Birch Exists in the Environment*

Birch-related compounds occur naturally in a wide range of everyday materials, including cosmetics, household products, and wood furnishings. Dogs trained on birch do not alert indiscriminately to these sources because alert behavior is governed by task context and reinforcement criteria, not odor presence alone. Research demonstrates that dogs can discriminate against trained targets from non-target sources containing the same volatile compounds, highlighting that contextual learning—not odor chemistry alone—determines alert behavior (Cerreta & Furton, 2015).

TL;DR: Dogs encounter birch compounds every day and don't alert — because odor presence alone is not a cue to respond.

2. *Scent Picture & Criteria*

Geo-Sniffing is trained as a specific scent picture: odor combined with vessel, substrate, placement, and task context. Dogs are reinforced for meeting criteria, not for encountering odor alone (Bouton,2004; Lazarowski & Dorman, 2015). Dogs do not alert simply because odor exists; alert behavior occurs because the context and criteria signal that a response is required.

TL;DR: Dogs alert based on a trained scent picture and criteria. When criteria are messy, dogs may alert on irrelevant odor — that's a training issue, not a nose issue.

3. *Start and Finish Cues Matter*

Dogs should work only when cued to search, and alert behavior should only be reinforced within that search context. Clear start and finish cues place alert behavior under stimulus control and prevent alerts from transferring to non-search environments (Bouton, 2007). For this reason trial instructors encourage consistent leash, collar and cues.

TL;DR: Dogs offer what gets reinforced. If you reward a behavior without a cue, the dog will offer it constantly — across all dog disciplines.

4. *Trial Context vs. Geo-Sniffing Context*

Trial environments are intentionally sterile and controlled to ensure fairness between competitors. Dogs work under evaluation pressure, with judges present, other dogs nearby, controlled odor placement, and predictable pacing. Geo-Sniffing operates without judges, comparison, or scoring. Odor relevance is defined by search cues, vessel type, placement style, and reinforcement criteria rather than environmental exclusion.

TL;DR: Trials control the environment for fairness and have many contextual clues while Geo-Sniffing controls stimulus control and reinforcement criteria so dogs can work reliably in real-world environments.

5. Residual Odor and "Hot Zones"

Dogs do not alert simply because odor is present. Some dogs may attempt to alert on residual odor; **reinforcing that behavior is a training error**. Dogs learn non-response to residuals because reinforcement is tied to criteria, not odor presence alone.

TL;DR: If a dog alerts on residual odor, that behavior was reinforced somewhere — it's a training error, not an uncontrollable response.

6. Multiple Variants vs. Cocktail Training

Cocktail training produces a compound scent picture. Unless component odors are later separated and independently reinforced, the dog is responding to the learned compound cue rather than individual odors in isolation (Hall & Wynne, 2018; DeGreeff et al., 2020). Research shows that simply increasing the number of structurally related odor variants does not reliably produce broad generalization (Dorman et al., 2021).

TL;DR: Training odors together teaches the combination, not the individual components.

Generalization In Scent Work

Generalization is an important training goal in trial-based scent work, and many handlers invest significant time teaching dogs to work across odor variants and environments. However, when scent activities move out of sterile trial settings and into public, mixed-use environments, **generalization alone is not sufficient**. In these contexts, clarity of criteria becomes more important, not less. Handlers must define exactly when an alert is meaningful and reinforced only within those conditions. Geo-Sniffing shifts reliability from environmental control to handler precision, which is necessary when scent activities are made accessible to everyday dog owners.

TL;DR: Generalization still matters — but in public environments, handlers must tighten criteria instead of relying on sterile conditions.

Why Accessibility Matters

Geo-Sniffing was intentionally designed to lower barriers to meaningful scent engagement for everyday dog owners, not just competitive handlers. Sterile environments, specialized equipment, trial fees, and evaluative pressure exclude the vast majority of dogs and people

who could benefit from scent-based activities. By emphasizing clear criteria over environmental control, Geo-Sniffing makes scent work approachable and repeatable in real-world settings without diminishing the value of competitive sports.

TL;DR: Making scent activities accessible does not lower standards — it modernizes scent work so more teams can engage outside trial-only environments.

Likelihood of Encountering a Geo-Sniffing Pod

Geo-Sniffing pods are not placed randomly or ubiquitously in everyday walking environments. A dog is unlikely to encounter a pod unless the handler intentionally visits dog-friendly businesses, walks on participating public or private land, or regularly takes routes that move off the typical pedestrian path. Casual neighborhood walks, standard sidewalks, and routine outings do not present repeated or dense exposure. Because exposure is limited and context-dependent, concerns about frequent accidental encounters or constant alerting are largely theoretical. The likelihood of incidental contact is low, and when it does occur, trained criteria and start/finish cues prevent inappropriate responses.

TL;DR: Pods are not everywhere. Unless you seek them out in participating locations, your dog is unlikely to encounter one.

References

- Bouton, M. E. (2004). Context and behavioral processes in extinction.
- Bouton, M. E. (2007). Learning and Behavior.
- Cerreta, M. M., & Furton, K. G. (2015). Detection canine alerts using flowers releasing methyl
- benzoate.
- DeGreeff, L. E., et al. (2020). Generalization and discrimination of molecularly similar odorants in
- detection canines.
- Dorman, D. C., Foster, M. L., & Lazarowski, L. (2021). Training with Multiple Structurally Related
- Odorants Fails to Improve Generalization.
- Hall, N. J., & Wynne, C. D. L. (2018). Odor mixture training enhances dogs' olfactory detection.
- Lazarowski, L., & Dorman, D. (2015). Explosives detection by military working dogs.
- Moser, A. Y., Bizo, L., & Brown, W. Y. (2019). Olfactory generalization in detector dogs.