

**TRANSCRIPT OF CONFERENCE CALL  
CFA BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
DECEMBER 21, 2010**

**Mr. Jerold Hamza (President)**  
**Ms. Joan Miller (Vice-President)**  
**Ms. Rachel Anger (Secretary)**  
**Mrs. Carla Bizzell (Treasurer)**  
**Ginger Meeker, Ph.D. (NWR Director)**  
**Ms. T. Ann Caell (GSR Director)**  
**Mrs. Loretta Baugh (GLR Director)**  
**Mr. Michael Shelton (SWR Director)**  
**Ms. Alene Shafnisky (MWR Director)**  
**Mr. Mark Hannon (SOR Director)**  
**Mrs. Kayoko Koizumi (Japan Regional Director)**  
**Roger Brown, DVM (Director-at-Large)**  
**George J. Eigenhauser, Esq. (Director-at-Large)**  
**Mr. Richard Kallmeyer (Director-at-Large)**  
**Mrs. Carol Krzanowski (Director-at-Large)**  
**Mr. David L. Mare (Director-at-Large)**  
**Mr. Darrell Newkirk (Director-at-Large)**  
**Mr. David White (Director-at-Large)**

**Edward L. Raymond, Jr., Esq., CFA Legal Counsel**  
**Shino Wiley, Japanese Interpreter**

**Roll Call.** **Hamza** called the meeting to order at 9:05 p.m., EST. **Hamza:** Rachel, call the roll please. **Anger:** Here's our roll call. Jerry Hamza. **Hamza:** Here. **Anger:** Joan Miller. **Eigenhauser:** Joan is going to be a few minutes late. **Anger:** Thanks. Rachel Anger is here. Carla Bizzell. **Bizzell:** Here. **Anger:** Ginger Meeker. **Meeker:** Here. **Anger:** Ann Caell. **Caell:** Here. **Anger:** Loretta Baugh. Was that Loretta? I guess not. Mike Shelton. **Shelton:** Here. **Anger:** Alene Shafnisky. No Alene. [**Baugh** joins the conference] Oh, there's Loretta. Thank you. Hi Loretta. **Baugh:** Hi. I'm here. **Anger:** Mark Hannon. **Hannon:** Mark, here. **Anger:** Koizumi-san. I heard you. Hello. **Koizumi:** Here. **Anger:** Roger Brown. **Brown:** Here. **Anger:** George Eigenhauser. **Eigenhauser:** George, here. **Anger:** Dick Kallmeyer. **Kallmeyer:** Here. **Anger:** Carol Krzanowski. **Krzanowski:** Here. **Anger:** David Mare. **Mare:** Here. **Anger:** Darrell Newkirk. **Newkirk:** Here. **Anger:** David White. **White:** Here. **Anger:** I heard Ed Raymond there. **Raymond:** Present. **Anger:** Is there anyone else who's name I have not called? Thank you.

**New Website.** **Hamza:** Good evening, everybody. First up on the agenda is the new website. Just so you know that by the time this call is done, you can go on there and there is a box that you can click on and put comments, complaints and/or errors you have found. We're going to use that to continue to improve the website and get it to where we need it to be. Does anybody have any questions on the website? **Eigenhauser:** This is George. I have a question. **Hamza:** OK, George. Go ahead. **Eigenhauser:** What does logging into the website get you? It's obviously not getting us over to the secure area. **Hamza:** It doesn't get you anywhere right now. There's going to be things that we can offer with the password. It was put in the design. We have the choice of taking it out. I have already instructed them that the capital lowercase number symbol is way too much and they have to pull back on it. I told them I would like to see at least 6

characters long and at least contain one number. **White:** Thank you. **Hamza:** I think that's enough. **Baugh:** I can tell you how to get to the secure website without any issues. You have to go into the actual – let me get it here. You go to the Press Room tab and the CFA Exhibitor page, and everything was there like it was before. You can go and log onto the secure site without any difficulty. It's just knowing how to get to where you need to go, to get to it. OK, if you got into the cfa.org and you click the Press Room tab. **Hannon:** Press Room? **Baugh:** It says "Press Room" tab across the top, one of the four or five things across the top, then go to the CFA Exhibitor page. Do you see CFA Exhibitor Corner, like we had before? Everything's on there that was on that page before. You can go to the Online Almanac or any of those places. You can't get to the schedule, but you can get to the Online Almanac. **Hamza:** Here's the deal with the website. It's beautiful. The bones of the website, the mechanics, are modern and it's wonderful and it's everything we need. Part of the problem is that we moved the old furniture to the new house, but we had some of the people who designed the old furniture doing some of the moving, so I guess that was to be expected. At this point, we need to evolve beyond that and one of the things I think was important, that we got live so that we were able to evolve beyond it. The requests are coming in fast, we're looking at all them and as you will see in the next few days, we will be responding to a lot of the errors and criticisms. I think by the New Year, the website will be in a stage where it's functional. Links are being connected. We had to sever links. There was no way to just transfer them over. They had to be severed and reconnected. We didn't have access to two servers at the same time. Even if we did, they wouldn't have helped with the links because at some point you've got to break them to reconnect them. **White:** Jerry, hi. This is David. **Hamza:** Go ahead, David. **White:** I haven't had a chance to read all the feed-back, but I was wondering, did anyone make a recommendation to expand the, I guess, the text box on each site? To me, it seems like it [cuts out] logistically a little cumbersome, at best, where some of the pages are kind of scrunched together and text lines are showing up underneath one another because it needs to be expanded. **Hamza:** You know, I haven't gotten that yet but it's an excellent point, and the board can feel free to make direct comments to Roeann or Karen, and they should be responding and at some point, maybe the next board meeting, we'll have the both of them on if it's warranted, if we're still at a point where we're not very happy with the direction we've come in. One of the things that I envision with the website is an exciting new look and feel. We have the way to get there. We just need the ideas to get there. We put the same folks who basically built the last website in charge of this website, and what we got was the same old, the same look with new lipstick and new eye shadow. I think we need more than that. **Hannon:** Jerry, this is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Mark. **Hannon:** Two comments. One, we were told to send comments to Roeann and, as you know, when you do that, you get an automated response that she's on vacation today and tomorrow. That's not going to generate a lot of good will with the people that are sending their comments, because they are frustrated, so she needs to take that automated response off. **Hamza:** Yeah, I'll call her after the meeting. **Hannon:** She is getting the emails, because she sent me a response but the first impression you get when you send her that email and get the automated response is very negative. **Hamza:** Yeah, I understand. She meant to take today and tomorrow off, but it ain't happening. She fully realizes that she has to work, so maybe she doesn't know that the auto-respond is there, but I'll call her after the meeting and let her know that that needs to come down from the net. **Hannon:** The second comment was, we had previously said, when we had that large photograph of the cute Japanese Bobtail near the top that we liked that and we wanted more pictures on the front page and less text. The response we got was, she took that picture away and she instead put up rotating banner ads for upcoming shows, which is of absolutely no interest to the general public. That should be someplace where the exhibitors see it and is so prominent, and all you get when you go to that is a listing of the judges and the entry clerks, so there's nothing there for the public. It's strictly for

the exhibitors. **Hamza:** Look, I agree that we need to bring a bigger focus on marketing into our website. Everything we do that interacts with the public, we have to think about, are we putting our best foot forward? Does it give enough pizzazz? Does it create interest? Does it draw your eye? We haven't had that and I agree that this front page doesn't do that, but then what's the solution? We need – see, the problem with this website, and Mark, you and I talked earlier about this, is that we considered it strictly an IT venture, and really it's just a little bit IT. The IT part of it keeps it working, but what it is, is a publication and it's a part of marketing, and we have never used those things, and those are the bigger parts of it, as a criteria for how this website works, so we need – as a board, we need to start thinking more forward and we need to somehow get to a point where we're making this exactly what you've stated, where it's appealing to the public and where it has some ease of use and intuitiveness to it. You know, I understand that those things are missing, but the mechanism of the website allows us to get anywhere we want, so we're only limited by ourselves, so from this point on, the only people we can blame for this website being limiting is ourselves. **Newkirk:** Jerry, it's Darrell. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Darrell. **Newkirk:** Who made the decision to launch the website with all these broken links and everything? **Hamza:** I made the decision to get it up on Monday. I knew that the links – no matter when we put it up, the links were going to be broken. There was no way to carry the old links from the old website over to the new website. I know that it was going to take about a day to [Miller joins the conference] reconnect the links, so it wouldn't have mattered how we did it. We were still going to have to break the links and reconnect them with the new website. **Hannon:** With hindsight, we might have put that out first and said, "the site is going live Monday, but be prepared, a lot of the links aren't going to be working Monday," so people would expect that, instead of getting all upset. **Hamza:** Well, what happened was [Shafnisky joins the conference] like everything else that can happen. We wanted to go live, you know, 6 or 7:00 in the morning Eastern time. We ran into problems with Exit 109. Does everybody know what Exit 109 is? <no> Exit 109 is the server in New Jersey that services Central Office and that we go through. We had problems with Exit 109 Monday morning, so what was meant to be a morning situation and where we were thinking that we would be able to, you know, join the new links up didn't happen until much later in the day, so even though we anticipated glitches, we didn't know exactly where they were going to come from. **Krzanowski:** This is Carol. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Carol. **Krzanowski:** I'm wondering, was any testing done on this site before it was made live, and I'm wondering what happened to the photographs in the winners section, because they are terrible. **Hamza:** You know what? That was just some sort of conversion problem. I'm not as technical as maybe David is, or some of the other people here. I just know that some things didn't translate the way they thought it would. Look, you know what? The problem here isn't that we put up a new website; the problem, is that the old website to the new website is so far apart technologically. We didn't just go from a website we had updated 2 or 3 years ago to a new website. This was a quantum leap. **Krzanowski:** This is Carol again. **Hamza:** Regardless of where we started, we were going to have glitches when we went live. I figure it is going to be relatively short lived. **Krzanowski:** OK, but I'm just wondering, was any testing done prior to the site being made live? That was my question. **Hamza:** Not a whole lot. We passed it along to the board and we had tried it on – you know, the problem is – well, it's not a problem. I can tell you that I did it on purpose. I figure the best beta testers were going to be the cat fanciers. You go on that list, they find everything wrong with everything and I figured, "well, let it go." We looked at it pretty good for a long time. I mean, you had access to the link for 3 or 4 days. **Hannon:** A lot of the links weren't working for us any better 3 days ago than they are today. We could see the front page and say, "gee, that looks pretty," and we could look at the show calendar, but a lot of the other links weren't working. **Hamza:** I knew the best way to get this going was to launch it and iron the problems out. That's just the best way to do it. It's up, it's mostly working. When you look at a site that's

400-something pages large, the problems that we're encountering are relatively few pages out of the total. I've been able to navigate around pretty good. I've noticed certain things that I'm not crazy about, but the things I'm mostly not crazy about isn't really technical, it's more design and functionality. **Shafnisky:** Jerry, this is Alene. I have a question. Why is it that the company making the cell phone covers was given one of the most prominent buttons on the front page? **Hamza:** I'm not sure about that. I know that we owe, we owe sponsors and people that we had worked out deals with. We owed them for what they had done. I'm not sure what bought priority, and I have some questions too, folks. You know, I – **Miller:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Yeah, go ahead. **Miller:** This is Joan. I've been in New York doing the Whiskers in Wonderland, so I haven't had a chance to look at it, but I did talk to Roeann and she insisted that there would be no commercial advertising on the home page. When I checked the site a couple of days ago before I left for New York, I did see advertising on the home page. Roeann said that's not supposed to be there, so I don't know. Are there ads on the front page? **Hamza:** There's the, what is it? A cover for an iPod, iPhone or a Blackberry? **Miller:** That's where I thought we were going to have wonderful pictures of cats. People want a cat site and not an iPhone site. **White:** The pictures of the cats are so small you can't even make them out. **Hamza:** I agree. Look it. The website is up, it's functional. It has a few glitches. I anticipate that those glitches will be gone by the beginning the year. There will probably still be lingering glitches, but every week there will be less and less. The problem is, we all agree that this is not the face we want for CFA. Is everybody in agreement with that? <yes> **Miller:** That's why I refused to vote on the darn thing before. **Hamza:** But the nice thing is, with this we have a website that will let us do what we want, so at this point it's up to this board to take the bull by the horns and get to where we want to go. **Meeker:** Jerry? **Hamza:** And to be honest with you, and Mark, I'm going to put you a little bit on the spot here, I had talked to Mark earlier today and asked him if he would consider taking the CFA website under the umbrella of Publications, because I know Mark would do a great job in bringing the changes that we want forward. Now, Mark hasn't committed to me yes or no, and I don't blame him because it's a big job. It's a big job. I mean, when you say yes, you're being responsible for doing what we haven't been able to do in the past. **Anger:** Can somebody mute their phone, please? It's very distracting from the speaker. Sorry. **White:** It sounds like you, Joan. **Miller:** Yeah, because I've been on the road all day. I'm pulling into a motel right now. I think I better hang up and then call in again. I'm just trying to get into the motel room, so I'll dial in again. **Meeker:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Ginger, was that you? **Meeker:** That was me. **Hamza:** OK. **Meeker:** I guess I'm going to take the bull by the horns here, and I think we really need to hire some really young, creative IT genius that loves cats, and that may be a way to solve this problem. You know, I think it's a multiple problem, but I don't see the people we have working on the project moving ahead. **White:** Jerry? **Hamza:** I think that Mark is capable of getting us to where we want to go. If you look at the Southern Region website, it's a nice website. If you look at the newsletter he has done, it's – I think that I could help Mark do this. There are certain people in our organization that – I'm trying really hard to be diplomatic. **Meeker:** It's not your strength, Jerry. **Hamza:** I think that I can facilitate the work. **Mare:** I don't think he has agreed yet to do it, has he, Jerry? **Hamza:** No, he hasn't, so everybody's got to tell him what a great guy he is. **Hannon:** One of the problems is, this is being recorded and it's verbatim minutes that are going out to the public, so we need to be careful what we're saying. **Hamza:** Right, I agree. Well, we can go into closed session right now if you think that's the way to go. I have been very careful, and it hasn't been all that easy. **Shafnisky:** This is Alene. I have another question that goes along with Ginger's suggestion. We also need to look toward to the future for this. We need to make sure that, let's say Mark does take it and decides not to run in 2 years. We need to make sure there is still someone who is just as competent and up to speed, so wouldn't it maybe make sense to hire someone? **Hamza:** We are going to hire – listen. Here's part of the problem. We are

going to hire, with the new computer system, a super geek. Somebody who's as good as Dennis at Computan. I know what I want. I want this guy that thinks in terms of Microsoft program, and can write and do these things. We aren't there yet. I have to, you know, we're going to start to segue into something else. We've closed on the building, we're going to start doing the renovation on the building the first week in January, but I don't anticipate office space at the very earliest, to be ready by the beginning of March. You can't hire somebody without a place for them to work. The other thing is, is that down the line if Mark decided not to run again, he would create, and what would be created would be a template that somebody else could follow. We don't have that template. As a matter of fact, we've never had that template. That's part of the problem. Our website has looked this way for, I don't know. Who's been in this? Probably since day one. **Anger:** Well, in all fairness, we did have a different web page for about a day. Does anyone else remember that? It was a very black-looking website. **Shafnisky:** I did actually like that one very much. **Anger:** Yeah, but I think that was a project that was, took a lot of people by surprise and we asked for the old website to be restored, and that's kind of where that ended. **Hamza:** This website we have is critical to the future of CFA. It's a Microsoft-based website. It's going to tie in with our computer system. Like I said, we're only handcuffed by our own imagination. We can do whatever we want. This is versatile and powerful. What we did is, we basically moved the old furniture from the old house into the new house, and what I hear everybody saying, and I'm in complete agreement, is that we want new furniture in the new house. So, it's up to this board to figure out where we get the new furniture. I know people say we need to hire, but I just want to remind people that we aren't sitting on huge surpluses of cash. Carla will talk about a brightening fiscal picture, but it's nowhere – we just started sailing away from the edge, so can we hire somebody for \$40,000 or \$50,000? The answer is no. **Miller:** I thought that TICA hired someone for that kind of money for their website, and it's beautiful. **Hamza:** Well, maybe TICA managed their money better than we did, Joan, but we had \$16,000 in the bank in August. I wish I had endless funds, because money makes most problems go away, but we're sitting here and we've got to be a fiscally responsible organization, and yet we have to solve our problems. I've always maintained that somewhere in the fancy are the people that we need, to do what we need done and I still believe that. Alright, somebody was talking. Actually more than one somebody, so who's next? **White:** This is David. I was just wondering. I'm looking at the site. Where's the comments section? **Hamza:** I was told it would be up momentarily. **White:** OK, so it's not there yet. **Hamza:** It should be on the front page, though, when it gets up. **Baugh:** I saw it a minute ago. **Newkirk:** This is Darrell. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Darrell. **Newkirk:** CFA Suggestion Box. It's on the left-hand side, but when you click on it, it makes you set up one of the email accounts. I can't remember what it is. **Hamza:** It may still be a work in progress. I'll look at it after the meeting. If it ends up looking too difficult – **Newkirk:** You just go in and set it up, instead of just, you know, opening up an email directly. It will eventually open up an email. Whatever Microsoft's email is. **Hamza:** Oh, Outlook Express? **Newkirk:** Outlook Express, thank you. I don't use that. Anyway, it set up my thing using my AOL address and I got an email up. I haven't tested it, though. **Hamza:** OK, well, it's there. We'll get the feed-back. The technical parts of this, I have no doubt that it will be right in a day or two. Computan is a professional company. A lot of things were checked beforehand. We knew that the website was going to run. Of course, some of the issues were just natural issues that, depending on what server you were with at your home and how often they update it, you weren't going to get a complete revision, in some cases, for a day or 8 hours or 4 hours, depending on who you use and how often they do their updates from their server. **Baugh:** Jerry, this is Loretta. Anybody that knows my husband knows that he is far from technically savvy. He found the site easy to use, which blew me away. He said, "yeah, it needs some tweaking", but he was very impressed with it and he wanted me to pass that on. **Hamza:** You know, and what we are is,

we're a hobby full of passionate people and we're also a hobby that has an average age that is older, and older people tend to resist change and tend not to like change, so we have some of those challenges, but I think in the end, as far as user ability, I think most people are going to like it. I agree there's some parts of this that really need to be worked. I didn't like the calendar section, and some of these it's just going to be a natural progression. You know, we had non-cat fanciers helping us get this together and, you know, we're used to certain things a certain way and I suspect that we're going to be moving some of those things back to a way that we're used to seeing them. But, here we're back to – maybe we – Rachel, I want to go into closed session for a little bit. Is everybody in agreement? <yes> Everybody understands that in closed session, any comments made and anything we say is not to be shared outside of the board, correct? <yes>

**Winners Ribbon Proposal. Hamza:** Have we exhausted talking about the website, or does anybody else have anything else they want to say? OK, the next issue on the agenda is Proposition 6. We seem to be hung up on some verbiage and it's important that we get this right by the February meeting because if we're going to implement this for the next show season, I believe that the February meeting would be the time to give it the OK. Does everybody agree with that? <yes> As I see it, we're changing the way we judge our cats to where we're allowing cats with a championship status and an open status to compete for grand championships. Is that correct? <yes> And where we're getting hung up in the verbiage is that, in a way, the open class has evaporated, even though we still have opens and we still have champions. But, there is no competing for championship anymore. It's a matter of making 6 undisqualified rings. **Hannon:** Monty's position is that we still have an open class and, while they're not competing for a blue, red and yellow ribbon, they are going through a pass or fail in each of the rings. He feels we still have an open class. **Hamza:** The other issue here is, no matter what we decide to change them, as the Artist Formerly Known as Price has found out, and people who made Kleenex and Xerox, is that when people begin calling something for a long enough time, it's almost impossible to change the way they refer to something. We want to make sure that we avoid confusion. Darrell, you were the most passionate about wanting to change the verbiage. Are you there? **Newkirk:** I'm here. **Hamza:** What do you suggest that we could put in place that wouldn't be confusing and would be something that would satisfy your notion of correctness? **Newkirk:** I don't know. I think I pretty much exhausted my opinions in prior emails. I can sort of see from their standpoint because there will be opens listed in the catalog, but the competitive classes are in the judges' books and there won't be any opens in the judges' books, and that's why in my opinion when you move the competition of opens into a class, the same class as the champions, even though they are listed in the catalog as opens, you have eliminated the open class, as far as I'm concerned. You haven't eliminated opens, and as I put in an email that I deleted tonight and didn't send to the board, an open is not synonymous with an open class. To me, it's illogical to have something in the show rules that doesn't compete in the judging ring. That's just my opinion. I mean, I'm assuming that since very few people have responded to this, either no one has an opinion or people disagree with me, I'm not sure which, but I mean I've lost my passion for it, so whatever people want to do, I'll go with. **Hamza:** We want to take the confusion out of this. Does anybody have a suggestion? **Shafnisky:** Jerry, this is Alene. I have to say that one of the reasons I haven't chimed in is because I do agree with Darrell and I see exactly what he's saying. What if we were to still leave in the definition of an open and then change the wording of championship class to be "open and championship class"? **Hamza:** It's still a championship class, because they're competing – **Shafnisky:** But it would include the cats with the title of open. It would be "class of champions and opens". **Hamza:** As far as the show rules, however we want to clarify this is fine. You know, in the show hall, people are going to still call their cats opens and champions so, you know, as long as we aren't confusing the issue in the show hall,

also we need to make this functional for the judges. We don't want them to have a nightmare come the first weekend of the show season, trying to figure out how to write in their books what's going on. **Mare:** Jerry, this is David. Could I speak? **Hamza:** Yeah, go ahead David. **Mare:** I just wanted to communicate to Darrell. I was on mute so I didn't get to say anything earlier. I totally agree with Darrell. I know he feels beaten down on this and, to some degree or another, I guess I do myself and I realize that sometimes we don't fight with the same passion when we feel this way, but I completely agree with Darrell and I would love to find some kind of terminology that would make that judges comfortable. I think that's quite important at this point. At any rate, thank you. **Hamza:** I agree. **Meeker:** Jerry? **Hamza:** The important thing is that nobody feels beaten down. This isn't a process where somebody wins and loses, this is a mechanical thing that we need to – it's new ground, we've never been here before. We need to try to work it out so that when it's implemented, it works from both sides of the judging bench, and so I can't believe that with all the words in the English language, we can't come up with a combination that satisfies both sides. Go ahead, Ginger. **Meeker:** I, too, agree with it being a semantics issue and if we could come up with a definition of championship class in that it's a competitive class that includes both cats having achieved the champion title and those open cats seeking the champion title. **Newkirk:** This is Darrell. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Darrell. **Newkirk:** I think that's been done, because if you read I believe it's 1.19c that describes the champion class, at the bottom of it they added a sentence that the opens compete in that class. **Meeker:** OK, then – **Newkirk:** I, too, agree with what Dick Kallmeyer said in a prior email, and that was to put under the very beginning where we define terms, I believe it's 1.04 and there's a definition for a benched champion, we could put the definition as Dick listed it as a benched open, because those cats are also going to be contributing to points for grand champion, and then we could actually eliminate the open class and then in c, 1.19c where it describes the champion class, it includes that the opens compete there, so what we would have, then, under classes would be novice, incorporate the wording of what an open is in the benched open that we would put in 1.04, and then remove the remainder of that section, subsection. I believe it's b, because I think novice is a, and then open class and champion class, so we would basically eliminate the open class, and we would go to novice to champion to grand and then the others that follow that. **Hamza:** Would it be too hard to incorporate what Darrell, the scenario Darrell just went through, and then have definition of an open class be a very closed thing. It actually is. Open class consists of 6 passing rings in a pass/fail situation. Then you still maintain the open class, because in a quasi-way, you do still have that open class because you are – but instead of competing, it's a pass/fail situation. Does that clarify this, or does it make it worse? **Miller:** It shouldn't be called an open class. It's an open status. I think "class" is the thing that's a problem. **Hamza:** Whatever those cats are, they are – I can see both sides of this, and I don't know how we draw a line to encapsulate both sides. **Eigenhauser:** Can I make a comment? **Hamza:** Go ahead, George. **Eigenhauser:** I have been the major contrary person on this and, you know, number one, that isn't what the delegates voted for, so if we stick with what Monty is proposing, if we go with what the delegates voted for, if enough people are unhappy about it, they can bring it up again in June. But, I disagree that a class is what appears on the judge's bench. A class is what we score as a class. What happens on the judge's bench is the starting point for our scoring process. It is not the ending point of our scoring process, and so basically we're talking about, you know, 5,000, 6,000, 10,000 exhibitors we have out there that think of opens as a class, even under this proposal, and we have 100 judges, maybe, who don't and I just don't really see that we need to bend the language and give them this song and dance about the difference between how many angels can dance on a head of a pin. We call it a status and we call it a title and we call it a process and we call it a category. We call it something different when there's already something in place that we don't have to dink around with, that we don't have to go through the show rules with a fine tooth comb to see

how many places we have to fix it and readjust it. We don't have to reinvent the wheel. Just put it in place the way that it's been incorporated into Monty's proposal and if the delegation is unhappy, they can put a proposal forward. If the judges are unhappy, they can put a proposal forward, but we don't have to beat it to death because of what I see as a fundamental concept, a half full/half empty argument. I see a class is what CFA scores; Darrell sees a class is what he separates out on the judging table. Let it go the way it is and let the delegation decide the issue.

**Hamza:** You see the glass half full, somebody else sees it half empty. I see half a glass. Having said that, if there's an easy way that we can, with a one-word change or two-word change, make everybody happy, I would rather have that happen, but if it can't happen, then we're going to have to do something else.

**Shelton:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Yeah. **Shelton:** This is Mike. One thing I would say, look at that 1.19b wording, there's text that has been added at the end that says, "opens are listed in the catalog as opens and in the judge's book as champions." What if it said, [inaudible due to feed-back and dog barking] I think if we reword that last sentence to say something along the lines of, "For the purposes of judging, the open class is a subset of the champion class" and to specify that that's only for purposes of judging that the open class is there so that we still satisfy the, when Central Office sees it, they are their own class, but they are only a subset of the championship class during judging, that might work. I'm also getting a terrible echo. I don't know if anybody else is.

**Hamza:** Yeah, me too. Somebody has got their – alright, it went away, so whoever was messing with their phone.

**Mare:** No, no. We all had it.

**Hamza:** You know what? Whoever is on speaker phone, you need to take it off because we're getting feed-back. There we go. You know, Mike, that's a lucid thought. Mark, what do you think of that addition?

**Hannon:** Well, Mary and Monty both said that if you take out the word "class", it's not just a matter of eliminating that one word. You've got to go back and rework a number of other show rules, and so they would be amenable to working that way. I mean, they feel strongly about the word "class", but if we decide we want to take out the word "class", they're willing to go back and re-do the various show rules that need to be done, such as the one Mike is just talking about.

**Hamza:** But like if Mike's wording comes in, doesn't that sort of take away the need for having to take that out?

**Hannon:** You would have to ask Darrell that, because he's the one that wants to take it out.

**Hamza:** But Mike's solution kind of solves both sides. Darrell, did you hear that?

**Newkirk:** Yes, I heard it. I'm OK with it.

**Hamza:** You know, this is sort of like, we're never going to get it perfect, but can we get it workable. It's something we want to go forward. George, did you hear what Mike said?

**Eigenhauser:** Yeah, but I don't have the show rules in front of me. I usually look them up online and they're not working on the new website.

**Hannon:** Maybe what Mike needs to do is send it to us in an email and then we can look at it.

**Hamza:** Alright. Mike, why don't you do that? Listen, as long as we keep in touch on this Proposal 6, I mean, to me over the whole big thing, we're at the fine detail point of it, so it seems like the work has been really good and what we have, we've got it mostly completed. We have this one little semantic issue and I have a feeling that this – you know, it will work itself out. When we go and we have it in the show hall, if there are any problems that arise, we know that we're going to have to go and address them. And also –

**Baugh:** Jerry, this is Loretta. Can I ask a question?

**Hamza:** Go ahead, Loretta.

**Baugh:** OK. I've skimmed this a number of times. I haven't read it word for word. Is there anywhere where the actual, the counting is addressed? Are these cats, all these cats counted as champions?

**Hannon:** For purposes of grand points, they are.

**Baugh:** They are, OK. So, all of the cats that are not grands in the show will count toward the grand count. [inaudible]

**Hamza:** You know, the other thing we may want to look at too. I don't know, has anybody thought about the inflation of points that this is going to cause? <yes>

**Shafnisky:** Jerry, this is Alene. I had a question, too. Is the Show Rules Committee looking at what's going to happen if, let's say an open goes to a show like Garden State and on Saturday goes into 4 rings and comes out with 215 points, grand points, what do they do for Sunday? I



mean, they are technically still going towards those 6 qualifying rings and people are going to wonder why it hasn't transferred to grand for Sunday. **Hamza:** If I read it right, it competes as a grand but doesn't count. **Hannon:** No, they have to go through 6 rings first. **Shafnisky:** That's the question is, how are we addressing that or are we addressing that in the show rules? I apologize if it is in there, but I haven't seen it yet. **Newkirk:** This is Darrell. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Darrell. **Newkirk:** Yes, it is addressed in the rules. They have to complete their championship before they can transfer to grand. **Hamza:** OK, there you go. **Baugh:** Do we need – this is Loretta. Do we need to look at the number of points we are requiring then, since we're going to have all these cats count? **Hamza:** I mean, it is going to add a tremendous amount of inflation. **Baugh:** It's going to add a huge number of cats, yeah. **Anger:** This is Rachel. **Hamza:** I would like to hear from the judges how they think this is going to affect it. **Anger:** Well, this is Rachel. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Rachel. **Anger:** Those points are going to be harder to earn, because you're competing with hypothetically twice as many cats for the same spot. Although, on the other hand, I am very much in favor of raising the points, but I don't think that's something that is within the board's power to do. That would be up to the delegates. **Baugh:** Something that needs to be looked at. We haven't raised the grand points in years. **Hamza:** If this adds, if this makes it so that cats are granding in 2 or 3 rings, then that clearly defeats the title of grand champion, which is supposed to be something that gives a cat a distinction above other cats for a breeding program. **Mare:** This is David M. Can I say something? **Hamza:** Go ahead, David. **Mare:** Going back to the example that was just presented a few moments ago, a cat goes to Garden State or some similar large show and qualifies in terms of points for grand, but by our rules must qualify as a champion first, and so it would have 2 more rings in the case that was just stated. Does it then instantly become a grand as it becomes a champion? What is the process? Is that how it works, how it would work? It already has it's points, tomorrow it finishes the 2 other rings to qualify as a champion. Is it now a grand immediately? **Hamza:** It would have to be. **Hannon:** So, you're saying that when it goes into the next ring, it transfers in that ring, the middle of Sunday afternoon? **Mare:** That's what I'm asking. **Hannon:** Jerry said it has to, and I'm questioning Jerry. **Hamza:** I mean, it becomes a grand, but the show rules can't let it compete as a grand that day. **Hannon:** OK, we agree on that then. You can't transfer mid-day. You would have to transfer – if you were at a 10-ring show and there were 6 judgings on Saturday and you went through 6 rings as an open and you got your 200 grand points, then Saturday night you could transfer for Sunday. But, if you hadn't been through 6 rings on Saturday, you can't. **Mare:** Why do we have the intermediate step of champion at all? **Hannon:** They wouldn't be a champion at all. They would get their champion certificate, congratulating Grand Champion So-and-So while earning its championship. **Mare:** I guess what I'm saying, Mark. I mean, I'm actually suggesting yet another solution to this problem because I've felt all along that we're solving the wrong problem. We're getting rid of the term "open" when we should have been getting rid of the word "champion". They are all competing for exactly the same points, and when they achieve it, they become a Grand. We decide how many they must achieve. Why are we making it so complicated? Why aren't there opens and grands? **Eigenhauser:** If I can respond, because a fair number of shows get a significant entry from opens that are never going to go beyond getting their championship. They're just going to be come champions. They want to be able to advertise they have CFA champion lines when they breed their cats. If we eliminate the title, we're going to eliminate the entry and that's why these proposals have always failed in the past, is because clubs are afraid of losing entries. That's why we keep the title, and we've always struggled to find that balance. Some clubs wanted to make it a more worthwhile title, and that was a solution to the problem. And some clubs wanted to eliminate the title, and that was a solution to the problem. And the compromise seems to have been, create a title with as little meaning as possible, and I know you find that awkward and I find it awkward, too. That's why I

spoke against the proposal on the floor, but that seems to be the compromise the delegation wants. They want to keep the title because it brings entries to the club. It brings in entries to CFA, because when you confirm your champion title, you spend \$15 or whatever we charge these days. **Hamza:** I do believe, David, I understand your point and it's logical. I believe that this proposition is as economically driven as anything else. I think people had a frustration going to their open show with the cost of showing nowadays and viewing it as something that just cost them money and didn't provide any kind of return. So, what may be logical to us doesn't translate economically in the show hall. Anyway, on Proposition 6, we're mostly in agreement, you know, with the noted frustration of some members on what appears to be in some ways a dumbing down of the process, but it was voted by the delegates and so we're bound to try to give them a solution that works. As long as we're talking about this, aside from the present wording issue, and to that end, Michael, you are going to put in an email what you just wrote and insert it into the rules in such a way as we all can look at it and see if it does bridge the gaps you think it bridges? **Shelton:** Yeah. I just sent that in the last 30 seconds. **Hamza:** Thank you very much. Are there any other issues with this proposal, so that when we get to the February meeting, we're not blindsided by something major that means that it can't be passed. Alright, we'll take it at that.

*Revise to read: "For the purposes of judging only, the open class is considered a subset of the champion class and opens count as champions."*

**Codes of Conduct.** **Hamza:** At the Regional Directors' meeting, we started down a path that was pretty interesting, and you know how things tend to work full circle, it comes to address people's desire for a fairer, more ethical fancy. It sort of came to – it also encompasses part of what I wanted to accomplish by having a Judges' Ethics Committee. We talked about having a code of ethics; not just for judges, but for everybody. **Anger:** This is Rachel. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Rachel. **Anger:** I am sorry to interrupt you, but perhaps you meant to say "code of ethics", but what we discussed was a "code of conduct" which is a slightly tweaked concept, but go ahead now that I have interrupted you. **Hamza:** OK, code of conduct. Some instances have arisen in the last couple weeks where we've had behaviors on spectators' [sic, *exhibitors'*] parts and judges' parts that may not have been as exemplary as we would hope CFA would have. We use conduct unbecoming [sic, *detrimental*] as a catch-all, and really sometimes it doesn't apply. You know, there are minor infractions and there are major infractions, so I guess what we had talked about was writing a code of conduct and corresponding penalties for violating certain codes, so as a board, how does the – let's have some input on going in that direction. **Baugh:** Jerry, this Loretta. The part that you spoke about when we started this discussion, and what I thought was an excellent point in the fact that, you know, it seems to be all or nothing with the conduct detrimental. One of the things we had talked about was, you know, in sports events, people are suspended for X number of games [inaudible] seem to be significant enough to have a penalty and you had mentioned possibly doing something where people would be suspended from a show or two or three or four, depending upon what type of conduct was inappropriate, and I thought that was a good springboard from where we started talking. **Hamza:** Yeah. I had mentioned that not everything is severe. I mean, maybe a minor infraction gets you suspended from two shows. So, I guess, is there, you know, does this board feel that this is a direction we should work in? **Miller:** Jerry, this is Joan. **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Miller:** Would this be – I know, I was at the meeting and I do think that we do have to have something that addresses mainly sportsmanship issues that are not necessarily covered in the show rules. I'm assuming that show rule violations would still be according to our regular discipline procedures. What we're talking about is beyond or aside from show rule violations. **Hamza:** Right, right. We're talking about –

**Miller:** People treating each other badly, people doing things that are impolite or outright nasty, or that show bad sportsmanship, correct? Is that right? **Hamza:** And things that are clearly missed in the show rules. I mean, how many times did we talk about a violation and we really don't have anything to hang our hat on, and we immediately go to the catch-all? **Miller:** Which is supposed to be reserved for very, very serious detrimental acts toward CFA and the entire cat fancy. **Hamza:** I agree. We sort of hit that situation when we had the breach of the internet security. For obvious reasons, I'm not going to go too far into that, but, you know, we had to use a bigger stick because there was no putter in the golf bag. **Eigenhauser:** If I can respond? **Baugh:** We're looking at inappropriate conduct, in addition to sportsmanship; things that perhaps happen at an event, or at an event that is held in conjunction with a show where an exhibitor or a judge has inappropriate conduct. We don't really have anything to come back at them with. **Hannon:** Such as a Saturday night hospitality event? **Hamza:** You know what, Mark? That's exactly right, because there are certain events that are extensions of CFA functions and it can't – you know, it has to be viewed as a part of CFA, even though it's not in the show hall. I don't know where we want to go there, but we certainly need to be able to address – you know, if somebody gets drunk at a club dinner and breaks a chair across somebody else's back, we can argue that's not CFA, but we all know that it has deep ramifications for the organization. **White:** So, why couldn't we just modify the current Code of Ethics for judges to be inclusive of that, instead of kind of branching off and creating something different? **Hamza:** Well, it's not just the judges. We're running into sportsmanship issues with the spectators. **Meeker:** You mean, exhibitors. **Hamza:** Yeah, exhibitors I meant. **Hannon:** That's what started the discussion last week. **Miller:** It should be judges or exhibitors. **Hannon:** Last week, it was exhibitors we were talking about. **Hamza:** Right. **White:** OK. **Brown:** This is Roger. Couldn't we grade them 1 through 4 and have a different – depending upon the grade, have a different punishment? **Hamza:** You know, what you're saying, Roger, is not far off the mark, but we have to define what types of behavior are a 1. See, what we need to do is, we need to develop a criteria and we need to develop broad headings that we can certainly fill in over time but that have enough bones now so that when we get certain issues, you know, we can take appropriate action. Not everything requires a fine or getting thrown out of CFA. Maybe somebody did something that's just stinky enough that they have a 1 or 2 show suspension. For a campaigner, that might be something they don't want to do. That may just slow them down enough. **Eigenhauser:** Can I toss in something? **Hamza:** Yeah, go ahead George. **Eigenhauser:** There are really two separate issues here, OK, and I want to be sure because I agree on one and I disagree on the other. Issue 1, should we better define some of these gray area things we're doing? Absolutely. The more we draw on generic things like conduct detrimental to the fancy or conduct unbecoming a soldier, every organization has some sort of a catch-all, you know, conduct unbecoming an officer. We all draw on these catch-all's, but it's really unfair because the way we report our disciplinary results is, we say, "this person is found guilty of violation of CFA Article XV, 4(g). Well, that doesn't tell the next person what kind of conduct we found to be detrimental to the fancy, to provide a warning for people not to do it again. I mean, whenever we ding somebody for something we consider conduct detrimental, we should be putting out rules saying, "you know what, doing a brute force attack against our website is conduct detrimental to the fancy." I mean, every time something like this comes up, we ought to be creating a rule so that people don't have to guess, and I do believe that we have over-used conduct detrimental to the fancy. I strongly disagree, however, that we're somehow punishing people because our rules require a specific punishment. None of our rules require any punishment. We've had people commit all kinds of violations where sometimes they get a slap on the hand and sometimes they get a letter and sometimes they get suspended for a few days. The CFA board is always free to set whatever level of punishment they feel is appropriate for the situation at hand. If we are punishing people

hard, that's not because the rules make us punish too hard, it's because we have chosen to punish so hard. **Hamza:** But, you know, in the law, George, you know that you're not going to get the electric chair for stealing a Snickers bar. I mean, there are rules written with punishments in a way – don't you think that if we spelled out classes of crimes like the government does and the punishment for those classes of crimes, that it would take the look that we were being arbitrary away? **Eigenhauser:** No. I think that CFA tends to be a very reactive, rather than proactive, organization. For us to produce the kind of body of work you're talking about is the kind of thing that we have full-time legislatures for. I think CFA is more along the lines of, you know, we found this specific thing to be conduct detrimental, so we add it to the list. And we find this thing to be conduct detrimental, so we add it to the list, but I think trying to specify in advance what we're going to punish people for, for crimes that haven't even been committed yet is extremely complicated for an organization our size. It consumes a great deal of time and accomplishes very little of benefit to the organization. **Hamza:** Well, AKC seems to have a rule book that maybe we ought to take a look at before we go further. **Eigenhauser:** And they are 10 times bigger than we are. **Hamza:** I know that. I know that, but their problems aren't 10 times bigger than ours. That's sometimes the problem with the size of organizations and the behavior of people, no matter, I mean, we can look on a club level and find bad behavior that would – **Eigenhauser:** Before we get into debating creating classes of crimes and creating even more complicated sentencing guidelines than we have now, the first step there is to define what conduct we don't want people to commit. That's the first step in any system of justice – define the conduct that you don't want people to commit. What is prescribed? If you want people to stay between the lines, you've got to tell them where the lines are. **Hamza:** I agree with that. I would be satisfied with that as a first step. **Eigenhauser:** And I think we should take that step and then step back and see how it's going. I really do think that trying to put together – I mean, even the sentencing guidelines we have, such as they are, the board rankles under them all the time because we run into situations where, “yeah, it says this, but these are nice guys and they work so hard in the fancy and we really shouldn't” – that always happens. **Miller:** I would like to say, I agree with George, and I also think that repetitiveness is important, and if we decide to just send, even send just a letter of reprimand but if someone does the same thing over again, then we step it up. I really think we would need to consider what the conduct is that we don't want and then decide on the punishment later. **Hamza:** Well, prior bad acts should always be considered. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Mark. **Hannon:** One of our problems is, we had recently a protest from overseas and we found the party guilty and we cited the particular part of the Constitution they were guilty of violating, but we really didn't tell the general cat fancy what this person did. **Eigenhauser:** Exactly. **Hannon:** We had last year, I think it was, there was one judge who filed a protest against another judge and there was a finding of guilty and people kept coming up to me as a non-board member last year saying, “what did this judge do?” Because we didn't say. I think we need to somehow let people know that this was something that was done for which we penalized somebody. They're not going to learn a lesson if they don't know what it is that was done wrong. **Hamza:** I agree with that wholeheartedly. You know, the only thing we have to be careful of is that we respect due process. **Hannon:** But once we found a party guilty, are we free to say that this is what the party did, rather than just “violating a certain section of the constitution”? **Eigenhauser:** We don't even need to do that. All we have to do is create a new rule: “Thou shalt not use a brute force attack against the CFA website.” Every time we find a specific conduct is conduct detrimental to CFA, we ought to put something on the CFA News – not naming names; we don't have to name names. I mean, we already have our punishment. We don't have to give them a public humiliation, too, but we ought to be able to post on CFA News, “you know what? The Board of Directors has decided Conduct A is no longer permitted in CFA, don't do it.” Because you're right, Mark. We really need to get this out or it doesn't act – I mean,

the purpose of having rules is, really, you want it to be self-enforced. We don't want to be going around being everybody's policeman. We want people to know what the rules are and most people, if they know what the rules are and they're clear, will follow them most of the time. That's how any system of justice works. You can't put a copy on every street corner. You have to count on a certain amount of voluntary compliance and the only way you're going to get that is if you tell people what it is you want them to do or not do. We've done a terrible job of doing that. **Hamza:** So, we know that that is Part B, and Part A is identifying behaviors we just don't want to see, so obviously that's going to take work. I had received an email from Alene, who said she would like to participate in the process. Who else wants to participate in this process? **Anger:** It's Rachel. I would do it. **Hamza:** OK. **Baugh:** Loretta also. **Hamza:** OK. **Eigenhauser:** And I've been doing it on and off for a long time. **Hamza:** Alright. So, we've got 4 people, two of which are attorneys. You know, you can figure out a name for yourselves, whether you want to call it the – **Miller:** The Conduct Committee. **Hamza:** The Conduct Committee is just perfect. **Shafnisky:** I prefer "the Polite Police". **Hamza:** Pardon? **Shafnisky:** I prefer "the Polite Police". <laughter> **Hamza:** Yeah, OK. Mr. Rogers will be on your poster. **Baugh:** Jerry, I do want to make a comment. You know, George's comment about the fact that we need to let people know what isn't acceptable, I think that's really what we are talking about doing. **Hamza:** Right. I think that's absolutely right. I think we need to draw the parameters of what we expect as far as behavior from exhibitors and from judges. If this comes off right, then maybe I don't need the judges' committee there. If we can create something where we can tell people on both sides of the bench how they should behave, you know, and what's expected from CFA, I think that's, I think that's important. We have two judges on the committee and we have two spectators. **Meeker:** Exhibitors. **Hamza:** Exhibitors, I know. You know what? My brain is chuck full. Well good. Is everybody in agreement that this is a good direction? <yes> Anybody disagree? OK, so we have something in the works that has the potential of making CFA a better place. **Eigenhauser:** I just want to caution people before we even get started on this project, is that it will always be a work in progress. There will always be something that comes up that wasn't anticipated. **Hamza:** That's the propensity of the human mind is to create a behavior we never conceived that could be enacted in a public place. **Eigenhauser:** None of us saw the way the website was going to be pushed. None of us had ever foreseen that, because it never happened before. Congress has been in session for 200 years now, and they still think there are laws that need to be passed. They haven't passed enough of them, so there will always be new things coming up. There will always be new angles. As show rules change, there will be new ways to try to work around them. There will always be that happening, so I don't want anyone to think in terms of, this is going to be a finished project ever. **Hamza:** No, this is probably a committee that will endure as long as CFA endures, but it's time for us to create these kinds of sportsmanship environments that – I think when I hear people complaining about stuffing and everything else, what they're really complaining about is, they really want a kind of sportsmanship, a camaraderie and a fairness to things, and we haven't been effective in doing that, and we also haven't been effective in identifying to the people what we expect for behavior, so I think, in fairness, this committee is long overdue.

**Update on Alliance. Hamza:** Next thing on the agenda is Alliance, Ohio. We closed on Friday. We are the proud owners of a 4-story building and the die is set for the future of CFA. Construction is going to begin in the first part of January. Our focus is to work on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor first so that we can start to assemble an office staff in March, and to do that we need to have office space that's suitable for employees. Any board members want to see the facility, all they have to do is let myself or Rich Mastin know and we'll work out either a set of keys to come to you in the mail, or somebody to meet you there to open it up. Does anybody have any comments

on Alliance? **Miller:** Do we have an architect lined up? Will we have a chance to see any plans or any schematics or anything that's going to happen? **Hamza:** We're working with – actually, the Foundation found a really good architect. **Miller:** OK. I know they're happy with their architect. **Hamza:** I don't know if Rachel or David or Carol wants to comment, but we liked everything we saw from him and I see no reason not to use the guy they found. He seems to be extraordinary. **Mare:** This is David. I think it's wonderful that we're using the same person for both ends of this project. I think it's excellent, and actually he was an associate of Jan Rogers, and she was the one that kind of pointed us toward him. At any rate, I think it's good that we're using one person for that. **Hamza:** He's professional, he's competent. As a matter of fact, we thought we were going to have to put a staircase in from the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor to the 1<sup>st</sup> floor that we were budgeting for \$50,000 and he thinks he may be able to get us out of that. **Mare:** With a rope? **Hamza:** No, actually through grandfather clauses and maybe putting an exterior fire escape in, or just a staircase from the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, which would be much less cost. So, he may end up saving us anywhere in the ballpark of \$25,000 to \$35,000. **Hannon:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Hannon:** You said you were planning to start work on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor the first part of January and you're talking about an architect. Is the architect going to have the plans ready for the first part of January, or are you going to be doing some things in January before you get the architect's plans? **Hamza:** We're going to be doing some things in January before we get them. You know, we know the ceilings are bad. We're going to be tearing the ceilings down, we're going to be taking the carpets out, we've got a bunch of broken windows and we're going to replace all the glass in the whole building, so we've got enough to keep us going until we get where we want to be. He's pretty good. If I'm not mistaken, I was told that he's almost done with the Foundation work and he'll know very shortly here in the next week or two about our work. I am so pleased with this guy. He is a pro. It's a pleasure to have found him. **Hannon:** Does he live there? **Hamza:** He lives in the Cleveland area and, you know, David, tell Jan I said thank you, because he really is a charm. For the property in New Jersey, we're going to run down some ground balls on people who may be interested in the property without a realtor and we're going to exhaust those options fairly quick. If we get a bit, that would be great; if we don't, we're going to just list it on the market. Any questions on Alliance or New Jersey at this point?

**Hamza:** OK, that brings us to the last thing – the state of CFA's finances as of today. Carla, you have the November finances. Have you disbursed them and have you disbursed Chuck Gradowski's commentary on them? **Bizzell:** Well, unfortunately my internet disbursement methodology has failed me today, so I can sit here and look at the numbers and talk to you about them, but I was able to get exactly one email out today before it went back down again. So, I've got the numbers we're at – about a \$27,000 loss for the year, which is an improvement over last month's financials. We are steadily making strides toward a break even, which would actually be pretty nice. We are still seeing a decrease in registrations. We're still running about 10% from last year to this year in reduction of registrations; however, we are ahead in ordinary income, based primarily on our raising of fees. So, that's still a little sobering to know that we continue to run behind in registrations, in litter registrations and related things, but we are doing better.

**Recap of Whiskers in Wonderland.** **Hamza:** So, Whiskers in Wonderland was a good event for CFA, Joan? **Miller:** Yes, it was, and I had dinner with Jane Hoffman after the whole event. She is the Director of the Mayor's Alliance. She is the top person there. She was extremely pleased, and she wants to do more with CFA. She would like to have us get back into the Madison Square Garden competitive arena. **White:** Joan, did she give a count of how many cats were actually adopted? **Miller:** Yeah, she did, but we're not absolutely certain. I would hate to have this quoted in the minutes, because she wasn't really sure, but a rough figure was about

135-145 at the event, about another 75 applications were taken for people that were going to go to the rescue groups or the shelters to pick up their cats, and then I think often if people think about it later, it's just the impact of the publicity and the numbers of people usually adds to their adoptions, so it was a major, major event for them. There were some things that worked really well and some things that didn't work all that well. We had a wonderful dinner, to talk about all those things and I have many thoughts that I would like to work with her later. She would like to – she liked the education very much. The only regret was that the volunteers were dying to listen to some of the talks and they couldn't because they had to be at their booths, so she's trying to figure out a way that maybe we can have a similar educational program, but with the volunteers able to listen. I don't know how we can do that, but anyway, the agility was wonderful. It was very tricky to handle some of the cats. They were frightened. Not a single one had their claws clipped. One of the things we talked about was making it a rule next year, if we do this next year, which she definitely would like to do, is to require all of the shelter cats to have their claws clipped. That would certainly be very good. There were just many details that we talked about.

**White:** Just to piggyback on Joan, as well, Royal Canin was present. Sharon Lund and her boss Brad, who are looking to work more closely with shelters, so they were equally impressed with the event, as well. **Hamza:** And just so everybody knows, this event was an offshoot from some of the difficulties we had from Meet the Breeds. It was our way of helping the Mayor's Alliance get whole again, after some of the difficulties they had with the dynamics of the Meet the Breeds with AKC and CFA and Mayor's Alliance, so we were glad to help. **Miller:** And also I talked to Roeann yesterday a couple of times, and I talked to her again today, and she is working with the Mayor's Alliance on a press release to report about the event. My friend Peter took lots of photographs. Unfortunately, the battery ran out, so we had to wait to get home and recharge the camera, so I haven't even had a chance to look at them myself because we've been on the road today. So, I think we should have some photos to have on the CFA website, Cats CenterStage, regional websites that are interested, too. **Hamza:** I'm glad it was a positive event for CFA.

**Hannon:** Did it cost us money? **Miller:** No. Well, yes. My air fare and expenses had to be paid. I had to come from California to do the education. I don't know what other costs. **Hamza:** Most of the other costs, Mark, were covered by sponsorships, so we had help there. **Miller:** I know that the Mayor's Alliance, Jane told me that they put \$60,000 into it. **Hamza:** Right. Almost nothing came out of CFA's expenses, except for maybe Joan's travel. **White:** Actually, the venue that we had this event is a venue that we had actually looked at for a potential CICC show [CFA International Show] in New York City, also, is the New York Pavilion. **Miller:** Metropolitan Pavilion, yeah. **White:** Metropolitan Pavilion. Personally, I wasn't too impressed. Joan, I don't know about you. **Miller:** I wasn't, either. I don't think it's large enough and it's not, it's just not in a location that I think is very desirable, frankly. **Hamza:** But, the good news is, we helped almost 200 cats find homes. **Miller:** Yeah, that was the real purpose. The other thing is that Jane had said that some of the groups, this is the largest coalition of rescue and shelter groups in the country and they have over, they have a \$23 million Maddie's Fund grant over a period of years for developing all kinds of inventive and innovative ways to find homes for cats, and this is just part of what they're doing, but Jane – oh gosh, I can't remember what I was going to tell you now. Oh my, OK. I'll think about it. I'm just tired from the trip. **Hamza:** Well, we thank you and David and Roeann for the work that went into this. **Miller:** Oh, one more thing that I do think about that I think is very important, that in the future whenever we have an event that is not a CFA event, that we all have something, whether it's badges or buttons or something that says we are CFA, because all of the other groups like Best Friends had their t-shirts and the Mayor's Alliance people were all dressed in red. Everyone was identified and you couldn't tell who was CFA. If every one of us that had been involved, like David was there and John was there and I was there, Peter was there, Jill was there, Jim was there – if we all had some

identification, it would have made it seem like CFA was everywhere, but we didn't. **Hamza:** That's an easy and inexpensive way to resolve it. **Miller:** Yeah, it really would have – a small thing but it would have made a difference, and the other thing that I couldn't think of before and now I've thought about it is, Jane had said that there were many rescue groups in the coalition that were very reluctant to be participating with CFA because of the fact that we are breeders and that sort of thing, and she said at the end of the event that the whole climate had changed. The rescue groups were thrilled with what we had to offer. It would never have been as interesting without the education and without the agility and that sort of thing, so it really did a lot for us. It ricochets all over the country when we have a positive event like this. It helps us, even in legislation, because there's a different perspective of breeders. There was lots of applause in my ring when I told them how CFA cares about all cats – feral cats, random-bred cats and pedigreed cats. They really seemed to respond to that, so there was this very nice, warm, positive feeling towards CFA. I think that was one of the most intangible but important results of this event. **White:** Joan did a fantastic job, as normal. Thank you, Joan. **Hamza:** We thank you. **Miller:** You're welcome. **Hamza:** You have the organization's gratitude.

**Club Marketing @ the Annual.** **Hamza:** There's only one more thing I want to bring up. It had been suggested that a good use of time on Friday morning would be to have a seminar – **Hannon:** At the Annual? **Hamza:** At the Annual, to have a seminar to teach clubs how to market themselves so that they could increase their gate, and to expand upon that, just to teach clubs how to become better business clubs. In order to do that, we would have to ask committees if they would be willing to yield their time at the Annual, so I guess what I would like to do is get a feel from the board on whether the committee chairs would be willing to, if they felt that it was important for them to address the membership. **Miller:** Now, who would have to be eliminated? **Hamza:** Nobody who doesn't want to be. I guess that's what we're asking here. **Miller:** On Friday? **Hannon:** What we're proposing, Joan, is that normally Friday morning at the Annual consists of committee reports while the tellers are counting the votes. **Miller:** Oh. Oh, oh, I see, I see, OK. **Hannon:** Then they come back in and announce the results, and then we go into the resolutions and amendments, so we're suggesting we cut back on a lot of the committee reports and just include them in the delegate booklet, rather than having a verbal presentation at the meeting itself. I mean, I would think that there would be some that would be important, such as Carla giving something about the financial situation for CFA, but a number of the others, really, you could accomplish what you need to in a written report. **Miller:** I think it would be important – legislation is never a report, it's always some way to educate our constituency and I think it's very, very important to have that one. But I think you're right. **Caell:** This is Ann. As far as the Club Marketing Committee is concerned, you know, we've got the questionnaire on the website and we've got all this information, Publicity and Media Kit, on the website but people are not accessing it as they should. They're hesitant to use some of the information on there because they're not comfortable with it. **Hamza:** Ann, what we're talking about would encompass a large part of the Marketing. **Caell:** Right, not just that but to get to the clubs, I think we do need to have a small spot perhaps to discuss this, put this in front of the delegates. **Hannon:** What I can suggest to you as well, Ann, is that perhaps you can write an article for *Cat Talk* or maybe give me something briefer for the newsletter and we could also hit them from those aspects. **Caell:** That's a possibility, too. OK. **Hamza:** Mark brought up a good point that we all need to remember. You now have two new vehicles to get ideas across, so if you're into something to help CFA, you have the *Cat Talk Almanac*, and you have the newsletter. By the way, today I saw an electronic draft of the *Almanac* and it's beautiful, so if you guys haven't subscribed, you ought to. **Hannon:** Right now, a lot of people can't subscribe because they haven't yet put up the ability to subscribe if you're already an online Almanac



subscriber. **Hamza:** Well, what we're doing is, I'm working out something and I'm hoping to have it in place tomorrow or the following day. We may have to manually take those down, so I'm trying to see if I can get Carol at Central Office to get her head around it, and if I can, you know – **Hannon:** I was told that Rich Mastin came up with something. **Hamza:** He did, and it works out really nice and simple. I just have to make sure that Carol Bertone has enough clear time to be able to handle that manually until we can get it integrated in the computer. We've run into problems with the new shopping cart. **Miller:** Jerry, on the marketing seminar, which I think is an excellent idea, would this be something that would be before the entire delegation? **Hamza:** Yes, absolutely. **Miller:** OK, that's very good. And would it be, would you be including people that have been successful, such as I know at San Diego, we have quite a marketing, I mean Sandy has done a great job. **Hamza:** We would definitely include some of the San Diego model. It's a good model. **Miller:** OK, and I just finished a new marketing package with Sandy, so we would have that to show, too. **Hamza:** Yeah. That would be definitely part of it. **Miller:** It's a package for sponsors. **Hannon:** I think it would be a better use of the delegates' time. **Miller:** I think it would be excellent. I think it would be very good, but I just do think there are a few committees that do need to have time. **Hamza:** Right, right. **Hannon:** We understood that from the first, when we came up with the suggestion. We just thought that a number of them, though, could be just as effectively dealt with other ways. **Hamza:** How does the rest of the board feel about this? **Meeker:** I agree. **Anger:** Great idea. **Shelton:** It's a great idea. **Hamza:** Alright, good.

**February Board Meeting Schedule.** **Hamza:** I have nothing further. Does anybody have anything they want to bring forward now? **Anger:** It's Rachel. **Newkirk:** Darrell. **Hamza:** OK, we'll go with Darrell first. **Newkirk:** I just would like to report that I sent a test message on the link for the CFA suggestion box, and I got an email back from Karen. So, that link is working, and it's up and fine. **Hamza:** Good. Rachel? **Anger:** I had a short question and something a little longer. I had a question about the agenda for the February meeting. People want to schedule their trips there. I just want to confirm that we're doing the Breeds and Standards section on Sunday, as we traditionally have in the past. **Hamza:** I was assuming that, because it was traditional. Does anybody have thoughts that run contrary to that? **Hannon:** Are we still planning to do a trip to the Dog Museum on late Friday afternoon? **Anger:** Yes. **Hannon:** We might want to open it up a little bit, since we have a number of breed council secretaries, etc., that might be available to go with us. **Caell:** Before we do, folks, I need to go. I'm visiting my family here on the east coast and I need to spend some time with them. So, Merry Christmas. **Hamza:** Alright, Merry Christmas Ann. **Miller:** I need to go, too. **Hamza:** OK, Joan. Merry Christmas to you. **Caell:** Merry Christmas to everybody. Bye bye. **Hamza:** OK, so, I guess, Rachel, we need to see if we can expand the trip to accommodate our guests. **Anger:** I will put that on the Breed Council Secretaries' list. **Hannon:** Do you have listing of which board members plan to attend? **Anger:** I do. **Hannon:** OK. **Miller:** Yeah, she sent that. **Anger:** OK, so we're going on that. I did sent a post to the CFA-News with some hotel information and dates and what have you, because I've been getting a couple requests, so people are planning to come and that's great.

**Action Item from October 2010 Club Report.** **Anger:** The second thing I want to bring up, in Liz Watson's board report for the October meeting, she had an action item that we skipped over, and it's a simple action item. I'm wonder if we can revisit it. **Hamza:** What is it, Rachel? **Anger:** <reads>.

**Action item:**

*In the spirit of “what we can do for CFA”, I would like to propose that clubs accepted after June, 2010 be required to submit a yearly report of the club activities for a period of five years after acceptance. This report would be due by June 1 and submitted to the New Clubs chairperson for inclusion in the June Board report.*

**Rationale:** CFA is its member clubs and as such they should be working to promote CFA. By asking for a report of club activities the Board can assess the success of each new club. It would be incumbent on Regional Directors, International chair and liaisons to offer hands-on assistance, if necessary, to these clubs so they can achieve their goals.

**Hamza:** OK. As of June 2011, this becomes effective? **Anger:** Right, so the clubs would begin to report this coming June. **Hamza:** Well, make the motion. **Anger:** So moved. **Eigenhauser:** I have a question. **Miller:** I have a question, too. **Eigenhauser:** I would like to hear the constitutionality, because once we make a club a club, they’re a club. There’s nothing in the constitution that allows us to mandate they submit any type of lists or reports or anything for the first few years, so I would like to know at least what the constitutional basis for this is. **Hamza:** Can we make it voluntary? **Miller:** We had a voluntary report system that was working for awhile, but it took a lot of follow-through. I know I had worked on that originally and we, Gary Veach had worked on it. Many of the clubs did follow through, but a lot of them didn’t. We didn’t have any way to have any leverage to get it done, and it just sort of fell apart, so the voluntary will work for awhile as long as a couple of people really stick with it. **Hamza:** It would be easier to keep track of new clubs than all the clubs. **Miller:** What do we do when someone says, “our club hasn’t done anything”? **Hamza:** There’s nothing we can do. I mean, it goes back to what George is saying; once you’re a club, you’re a club. It raises an interesting question. Again, we probably can’t do anything without a motion and the vote from the membership, but it would be very sensible that clubs that were, that are new are on a probationary period, and we ask them that they have to be functioning as a club and prove the functionality of the club – maybe having open membership and proving that they do some sort of event or service for CFA during the course of the year. **Eigenhauser:** I have a vague recollection that either the board proposed or the delegation proposed some sort of a reporting requirement when it would only apply to new clubs and I think it was actually board originated, and we let it die for some reason, but I do recall this idea came up once before, creating a tiered system that clubs elected a membership after a specific date would be held to a reporting requirement. That way, we wouldn’t get blow back from the existing clubs that don’t want to submit reports. **Hamza:** Does that sound familiar to you at all, Rachel? **Anger:** No, I think it was before me, but in the interest of time, I think that we should table her motion for now, and we’ll check that out, as well as the constitutionality, and if it’s possible, maybe we can bring it back up in February. But, she did want me to bring it forward and I have done that. So, I think we can all move on.

**Adjournment. Hamza:** Is there any other items that anybody would like to talk about before we end the meeting? Well, I just want to say that I wish everybody on this board a happy holiday, and good health and a prosperous New Year. **Anger:** This is Rachel. I did want to say one thing before we go. In light of the closing that we had this week and the new era that CFA is going to move into now, I would like to thank everybody that was involved in that, all the time they spent running back and forth to Alliance, Ohio, to check out the property and to get the deal closed, and to actually attend the closing. I know Jerry was instrumental, as was Ed and Rich, and I’m sure there’s other people that I’m not mentioning right here, but it was a huge effort and I, for one, am real excited about it. I’m sure everyone else feels the same, so I just want to say

thank you to everybody who was involved in that project. **Meeker:** Absolutely. **Hamza:** And Ed is on the line. He's been silent the whole meeting, but Ed has done so much work for the fancy, legal work for the fancy, and hasn't gotten any remuneration except our thanks. So, thank you so much, Ed. **Raymond:** You're welcome. **Anger:** Thank you, Ed. Excellent job. **Mare:** Thank you. **Hamza:** Hey everybody. You know what? Have a good time with the people you love. We'll do this again real soon. Merry Christmas.

Meeting adjourned at 10:59 p.m. EST.

Respectfully submitted,  
Rachel Anger, Secretary