

**SUMMARY AND TRANSCRIPT OF CONFERENCE CALL
CFA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
JULY 21, 2011**

Secretary’s note: This index is provided only as a courtesy to the readers and is not an official part of the CFA minutes. The numbers shown for each item in the index are keyed to similar numbers shown in the body of the minutes.

Call Meeting to Order	(1)
Committee Chair Appointments	(3)
Debate Options Regarding How Our Registration Rules are Used With Imported Cats.....	(7)
Discuss “Perks” for the Household Pet Recording; Follow-Up Discussion on the Record/Register Issue.....	(4)
Household Pets at the National Show	(11)
Individual Membership	(12)
Insurance Coverage.....	(10)
Judging Program	(2)
Novice Issue.....	(5)
Policy to Re-Justify 8-Generation Pedigrees	(8)
Spotlight Award Follow-Up	(6)
Transparency and Use of Board List.....	(9)
Update on 2015 Annual	(14)
Update on Alliance	(13)

Secretary’s Note: The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers’ Association, Inc. met on Thursday, July 21, 2011, via teleconference. President **Jerold Hamza** called the meeting to order at 9:00 p.m. with the following members present:

- Mr. Jerold Hamza (President)**
- Ms. Joan Miller (Vice-President)**
- Ms. Rachel Anger (Secretary)**
- Mrs. Carla Bizzell (Treasurer)**
- Sharon Roy (NAR Director)**
- 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)**
- 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. Darrell Newkirk (Director-at-Large)**
- Mr. David White (Director-at-Large)**
- Mrs. Annette Wilson (Director-at-Large)**

- Edward L. Raymond, Jr., Esq., CFA Legal Counsel**

Not Present:

- Mrs. Kayoko Koizumi (Japan Regional Director)**

SUMMARY

(1) **CALL MEETING TO ORDER.**

No action items were presented.

(2) **JUDGING PROGRAM.**

Chair Mrs. Baugh moved to approve the following action items, reserving the right to vote no:

1. Remove from the current Judging Program rules: SECTION II – INITIAL APPLICATION TO JUDGING PROGRAM #16. REQUIREMENTS FOR APPLYING TO THE JUDGING PROGRAM – INTERNATIONAL DIVISION. Entire section a-h. **Mr. Newkirk** seconded the motion. **Motion Carried.**

2. To grant the following advancement:

Advance to Apprentice:

Pamela Bassett – SH Second Specialty 17 yes

(3) **COMMITTEE CHAIR APPOINTMENTS.**

The following committee chair appointments were made:

- **Ms. Anger** moved to appoint Karen Lane as Co-Chair of the CFA Feline Youth Education Program. **Mr. Newkirk** seconded the motion. **Motion Carried.**
- **Mr. Newkirk** moved to accept the resignation of Bethany Colilla-Clark as Co-Chair of the Clerking Program, with regret. **Mr. Eigenhauser** seconded the motion. **Motion Carried.** Anger voting no.
- **Mr. Newkirk** moved to accept the resignation of Mark Hannon, and for the appointment of Kathy Durdick, as Chair of the Website Committee. **Mrs. Meeker** seconded the motion. **Motion Carried.**

(4) **DISCUSS "PERKS" FOR THE HOUSEHOLD PET RECORDING; FOLLOW-UP DISCUSSION ON THE RECORD/REGISTER ISSUE.**

Mr. Newkirk moved that the fee for the recording of Household Pets be set at \$13, not the \$17 that was quoted earlier. **Mr. Eigenhauser** seconded the motion. **Motion Carried.** Miller voting no.

(5) **DISCUSS THE NOVICE ISSUE.**

No action items were presented. A proposal will be written by **Mr. Eigenhauser** to expand the novice class to include the other regions.

(6) **SPOTLIGHT AWARD FOLLOW-UP.**

No action items were presented. The Regional Directors will take responsibility for the project.

(7) **DEBATE OPTIONS REGARDING HOW OUR REGISTRATION RULES ARE USED WITH IMPORTED CATS.**

No action items were presented.

(8) POLICY TO RE-JUSTIFY 8-GENERATION PEDIGREES.

Mr. Eigenhauser moved to ask any breed council that has a pedigree requirement beyond 5 generation for importation to place on their ballot this year, (a) whether they still want it, and (b) whatever the reason they have for wanting it, would there be a circumstance where they would accept a DNA test in lieu of the multi-generation requirement? **Dr. Brown** seconded the motion. **Motion Carried.** Wilson voting no.

(9) TRANSPARENCY AND USE OF BOARD LIST.

Mrs. Krzanowski moved that the board list be used for discussion and bouncing ideas around, but unless an emergency situation exists, or something that's critical to the business of CFA, that the final discussion and vote would be done at a regularly scheduled teleconference or board meeting. **Mr. Eigenhauser** seconded the motion. **Motion Carried.** Shafnisky, White, Brown and Baugh voting no.

(10) INSURANCE COVERAGE.

No action items were presented.

(11) HOUSEHOLD PETS AT THE NATIONAL SHOW.

No action items were presented. Household Pets will be judged in all 10 rings.

(12) INDIVIDUAL MEMBERSHIP (FOLLOW-UP TO PROPOSAL #1).

No action items were presented. A legal opinion was provided by the CFA Attorney.

(13) UPDATE ON ALLIANCE.

No action items were presented.

(14) UPDATE ON 2015 ANNUAL.

No action items were presented.

TRANSCRIPT

(1) CALL MEETING TO ORDER.

Hamza called the meeting to order at 9:00 p.m., EST. Rachel, why don't you call the roll call. **Anger:** I will. Jerry Hamza. **Hamza:** Yeah, I'm here. **Anger:** Joan Miller. Joan not here yet. Rachel Anger is here. Carla Bizzell. **Bizzell:** Here. **Anger:** Sharon Roy. **Roy:** Here. **Anger:** Ginger Meeker. **Meeker:** Here. **Anger:** Ann Caell. **Caell:** Here. **Anger:** Loretta Baugh. **Baugh:** Here. **Anger:** Mike Shelton. **Shelton:** Here. **Anger:** Alene Shafnisky. **Shafnisky:** Here. **Anger:** Mark Hannon. **Hannon:** Here. **Anger:** Kayoko Koizumi. I haven't heard from her. Roger Brown. **Brown:** Here. **Anger:** George Eigenhauser. **Eigenhauser:** Here. **Anger:** Dick Kallmeyer. **Kallmeyer:** Here. **Anger:** Carol Krzanowski. **Krzanowski:** Here. **Anger:** Darrell Newkirk. **Newkirk:** Here. **Anger:** David White. **White:** Here. **Anger:** Annette Wilson. **Wilson:** Here. **Anger:** Before we begin, since this is going to be a madhouse, I just want to remind everybody, please wait until you're called on. Don't just blurt out your statement. It's probably best to keep your phone on mute because when we have coughing and dogs barking and train whistles blowing, it makes transcription impossible. So, if your statement is important, then wait until you can make it; otherwise, we're just going to blot out each other and the phones will

cancel everyone out. **Hamza:** I'll call on you. Everybody will have a chance to speak.

Raymond: Hey Rachel, this is Ed. I'm here, too. **Anger:** I am so sorry Ed. Is there anyone else on the call who's name I have not mentioned? Thank you.

(2) **JUDGING PROGRAM.**

Hamza: OK, first up on tonight's agenda is the Judging Program advancements. Loretta, go ahead. **Baugh:** OK. I have actually two things. I have the advancement and then I have an action item.

JUDGING PROGRAM COMMITTEE REPORT - July 2011

Committee members and duties:

Committee Chair: Loretta Baugh – Letters of Complaint; Board of Directors Meeting Reports; General Communication and Oversight

List of Committee Members:

Norman Auspitz – Representative on the CFA Protest Committee; Judging Program Rules and Updates; Mentor Program Administrator; Domestic Training and File Administrator

Pat Jacobberger –Education Chair

Ellyn Honey – Domestic Training and File Administrator;

Rick Hoskinson – File Administrator

Jan Stevens – File Administrator; Secretary (keeps all files/records and compiles for Board report)

Donna Isenberg – New Applicants (inquiries, queries, follow ups, counseling); May teach Judging Application Process at Breed Awareness & Orientation School, Application /Advisor Coordinator

Wayne Trevathan – Japan and International Division Trainee and File Administrator; guest judge (CFA judges in approved foreign associations, licensed judges from approved foreign associations in CFA)

Peter Vanwonderghem – European Liaison

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

At the Annual, the JPC was able to have a meeting to discuss ideas and changes to provide our trainees with better education and training

The JPC will have our own spot on the CFA web site. We will be able to load applicants' information electronically. The BOD wants to verify that applicants have agented and exhibited appropriately and according to the Judging Program rules.

We discussed asking the Board to remove the special section that is in the requirements allowing for ID applicants to apply to judge in the ID only. That will be requested at the July Meeting. This section was put in place for Europe and has NEVER been used. It was not intended for use in any other area of the International Division and consequently needs removal.

Action Item: Remove from the current Judging Program rules: SECTION II – INITIAL APPLICATION TO JUDGING PROGRAM #16. REQUIREMENTS FOR APPLYING TO THE JUDGING PROGRAM – INTERNATIONAL DIVISION. Entire section a-h.

Baugh: If we take them in the order that the report is, the action item is first, and that was to remove the section of the Judging Program requirements that specify that a judge can become an international judge only. I would like Dick to address this if you would, because I know that he and Wayne have talked extensively about this. Would you be willing to do that, Dick?

Kallmeyer: Yes. The original proposal I guess was really set up for Europe where there was an existing judging community that we could take advantage of. In Asia, there's really not, so it doesn't make sense that we bring in an international judge that would qualify, just becoming a certified clerk, and then they would be ready to judge. They just don't have the background experience. That's pretty much my observations.

Baugh: That's pretty much what Wayne indicated, too. Darrell, do you have anything to add to that? [Miller joins the conference]

Newkirk: No, I don't have anything else to add, but I talked to Rachel [sic, Loretta] and to Wayne briefly about it, and I can understand their concerns, and I agree with them that we should take that out.

Baugh: So, I have a standing motion to remove that section.

Newkirk: I'll second it.

Hamza: Is everybody understanding what section that section is referring to?

Miller: No, Jerry. This is Joan. I just got on, because I had a call that came in.

Baugh: There's a section in the Judging Program requirements, Joan, that will allow someone to come in as an international judge only. That was originally put in for Europe, where there's an existing fancy, and the fact that Europe is becoming a region, we wanted to remove that.

Miller: Right, OK. I understand.

Hamza: So, we have a motion. Do we have a second?

Newkirk: I seconded it.

Hamza called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

Current Happenings of Committee:

In line with Europe's advancement to an official Region, Peter Vanwonderghem has been brought on board as the JPC European Liaison. Peter is uniquely qualified to assist as a representative for Europe. He is the only one of our European Judges who came through the full Judging Program. This is now what the applicants will be doing.

Peter will be assisting Donna Isenberg in the application process and will work with Pat Jacobberger and Wayne Trevathan in developing and strengthening the Judging Program in Europe. Peter will be assisting non-affiliated judges in meeting education/performance requirements to guest judge and to fulfill requirements to become CFA Judges.

The JPC is currently working on application requirements for individuals active as judges in a Domestic Association and also application requirements for individuals currently judging in an International Association. Changes were discussed at our meeting and online, and will be presented to the Board at the August meeting. We are working on organizing the requirements sections so that they are easier to understand – having a section for each category: 1) Traditional applicants (Regions 1-9); 2) Judges from Domestic Associations wishing to become CFA Judges; and 3) Judges from International Associations wishing to become CFA Judges. We

Hamza: Yes, she is. I had talked to her about the possibilities earlier, and she is. **Newkirk:** OK. I'll make the motion. **Eigenhauser:** Second.

Hamza called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Anger voting no. **Hamza:** We'll accept Bethany's resignation, with regret.

Website. Hamza: Mark had expressed wanting to get out from underneath the website. I had approached Kathy Durdick at this point, since the website seems to be taking on a lot, especially in the coming days. I think that at least for now we should try out the website as its own committee, and I would like to recommend to the board that we make Kathy the Chair of the Committee. She has expressed wanting to have Ginger Meeker as the board liaison.

Newkirk: I'll make the motion, Jerry. **Meeker:** I'll second it.

Hamza called the motion. **Motion Carried. Hamza:** Congratulations to Kathy. As long as we're talking about the website, I don't know if anybody has noticed, but she has – I'm not even sure if there's any broken links left as we speak. Do you know, Mark? **Hannon:** I don't know. She has made tremendous progress with that, and she's put a lot of effort into it. It's one thing to find out that there's a link that's broken, but then trying to find the correct place to link to takes time. **Hamza:** I knew that before I left, she was under 150, and at the rate she was going, she's probably just about zipped up. If you haven't noticed any positive changes in the website, you haven't been looking. **Meeker:** Yeah, it looks much better. **Miller:** It does, and one of the things I noticed is the newsletter now has a button prominently for subscriptions. **Hannon:** We added that within the last couple days. **Miller:** Yeah, I saw that. That's really good. **White:** I did notice a few broken links Jerry, today, on the online catalog but I did send those to Kathy, so I'm sure they will be cleaned up. **Hamza:** Like I said, it went from 800 to wherever it is now. I can't wait until we get into her plan of attack next. Once she's got all the physical problems repaired, that she's going to go into an intuitive design for the website. She's also started working with the computer team, with aligning the new system up with the website. So, things are starting. **Krzanowski:** I just have a question. Who is handling the CFA email these days? What I mean is the email that goes to the CFA website. **Hamza:** It's being split up between Kathy and Michael. **White:** Recently, since we've had someone hired in Alliance, Ohio, Michael is working with Donna. So, Donna's going to take full responsibility. I guess she's our receptionist currently? **Hamza:** No, Lisa is the receptionist. **White:** OK, so Lisa. **Hamza:** And that's who he's working with is Lisa on it. To answer the question, Carol, it's coming through Michael and he is trying to distribute them to – if they are CFA-related, to Lisa. **Krzanowski:** If we have a question, should we contact Michael? **Hamza:** As far as? **Krzanowski:** If I want to find out what's happened to some of the mentoring emails. I haven't gotten any lately, so I'm wondering. **Hamza:** Yeah. Call Michael and tell him that if there are mentoring emails, they come through to you. It's my understanding that most of the emails that come through the website are junk. **Hannon:** He said spam. **Hamza:** Yeah. We're getting spammed to death, so you know, as we move forward – the other thing, Carol, is you may want to have a mentoring page. **Krzanowski:** There was a mentoring page. There was a mentoring application, but I have no idea where it is. **Hamza:** You may need to just send Kathy Durdick an email, just saying, you're the mentoring chair and you would like to see the page worked on and actually have a link on the page that goes directly to your email. **Krzanowski:** That's what was supposed to happen when I took over the committee. The reason I'm asking is, it was never changed. I don't know what happened. **Hamza:** Kathy is really good at responding to emails and she is excellent at doing what she says she's going to do. **Krzanowski:** OK. I'll get in touch with her. Thank you. **Hamza:** I think that will go a long way toward your cause. **Hannon:** If I could just say, she spends, as did Karen, a tremendous amount

of time just doing daily maintenance things, such as Carol just mentioned – where’s the link to the mentoring program? That is taking up most of her time, so she’s had very little time to devote to changing the look and feel of this website. She told me her next major project was going to be to fix the navigation, now that she’s gotten the broken links under control, and so those of us who would like to see the front page look better or whatever, she’s got to put all that on hold because she’s doing so much maintenance. I know for example Pat Jacobberger sent her 60 PowerPoint presentations on various breeds that she needed put up for the Judging Program, and all that takes a lot of time and she’s only a part-time employee. **Hamza:** Right. It’s my hope, though, once things get fixed, more and more of her time will be – she and I had discussed it. We knew that right from the beginning, the majority of her time was going to go toward fixing broken things. **Hannon:** I bring it up because if people say something to a board member, I want the board members to know what’s going on so they can respond that she is spending a lot of her time right now just doing the daily maintenance stuff, and that we hope to get to the point in the next couple months where we can see some dramatic changes in the appearance of the site, but they need to be patient. **Hamza:** Right, and if you haven’t noticed an incredible difference in the site, you’re not looking. I mean, I haven’t come across a broken link in a long time. I know David, you said you came across two, but I haven’t heard of any since then in awhile. Certain things like the breed pages, they’re unbelievable. **Caell:** I looked at the exhibitor page, and I was really impressed with how organized it was. **Hannon:** She redid that page for us nicely. **Caell:** It’s wonderful. **Newkirk:** On the Fanc-e-Mews, there’s no link to any of the articles at all on there. **Hannon:** Part of the problem is, Fanc-e-Mews hasn’t been updated since, I believe Karen told me, November. Nobody is doing it. **Miller:** It’s gone. **Hannon:** Fanc-e-Mews may be gone, because there’s nobody maintaining it now that Karen’s gone. She was doing that as a personal project. **Newkirk:** OK. Then maybe they ought to take the link off, then. **Hannon:** Right. I agree. **Hamza:** You’re right. Some of the stuff is going to come down. It’s an extremely large website as it is. **Hannon:** So, maybe Ginger should say something to Kathy about taking that down. **Meeker:** I will. I’m making a note right now. **Hamza:** Just tell her she can yank it off. **Meeker:** OK. **Miller:** And can you ask her to yank it off of CatsCenterstage, too? **Meeker:** Take that link off CatsCenterstage, too? **Miller:** Um-hmm. **Meeker:** Consider it done. **Miller:** Thanks. **Meeker:** You’re welcome.

(4) **DISCUSS "PERKS" FOR THE HOUSEHOLD PET RECORDING; FOLLOW-UP DISCUSSION ON THE RECORD/REGISTER ISSUE.**

Hamza: Now that we have taken care of the chair requests, next on the agenda is to discuss the perks for household pet recording, and people wanted a follow-up discussion the record/register issue. Let’s start with the record/register issue. Is there any conversation that needs to be had at this point about record and register? **Hannon:** I thought we voted on this, even though we’ve gotten some feed-back since. **Hamza:** Yeah, that’s what I’m saying, but it is on the agenda and I just wanted to – I don’t want somebody to say, well, you skipped over it. I think we’re at a place where it seems everybody can live. **Meeker:** Jerry, the only thing I would point out is, there was an online survey. Lots of folks seem to be discouraged that – when I say “lots of folks”, they are essentially Household Pet exhibitors that are on a household pet list and really are quite concerned that the word “register” was not used. They are feeling like it’s not a true, equal feed at the table. **Miller:** I would like to address that, Jerry. **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Miller:** Well, first of all, in the constitution it says, ... *improvement of CFA recognized breeds of cats, the registering, recording or identifying by number or by other means the names and/or pedigrees of cats and kittens.* So, we’re certainly within our rights by the constitution. I think some people have said, “we were expecting to be using registry instead of recording”, but we are

within our rights in the constitution, and I am a little bit skeptical of the survey because it was probably mostly Household Pet people, and some of them are not aware of the impact of the word “register” related to pedigrees, so I think that the gist of what was disturbing to me is that people feel that they don’t have the same status or that for some reason they’re second class, and I don’t think that that has anything to do with the word. I think we need to work hard to make people that are showing Household Pets feel that they are important, that their cats are important, but I don’t think the word should be tied into the feeling that they evidently have. I think that’s what came out for me. We’ve got to do something to make people more happy with the Household Pets, and be aware of what they want and what they would like to have. **Hamza:** And not knowing the method, I’m not sure that it was – you know, surveys are funny things. I would have preferred that it was done by a neutral party. **Miller:** That’s right, but I mean there are many, many repercussions if we were to use the word “register”. We have our Rules for Registration that would be impacted, we have a public PR factor that I think people that have, say, a Russian Blue look-alike or a Maine Coon look-alike. Lots of people I know say they have a Maine Coon. They show me their Maine Coon on their cell phone and it’s nothing like a Maine Coon. It’s a pointed cat with short hair, and they say, “oh, but the shelter said it was a Maine Coon.” Well, if they get a registration number, then that I think is not good for PR. There are just lost of things. We need to differentiate between registration and recording or identification or whatever we want. **Hamza:** You know, Ginger, we’re going to find out, they’re going to be able to vote with their pocketbooks now. **Hannon:** When do you think we’re going to be in a position to start the recordings? Has anything in the last couple weeks changed? **Hamza:** I think we’re probably looking at September 1st. We have – I am going to Alliance all week next week and at some point I will send the board a final proof on the certificate, and once we get that done, it’s going to take a week to 10 days to get them printed. We have the model in the computer system, but I want to make sure that we’re able to do what we’re currently doing before I start adding things to what we’re currently doing.

Newkirk: This is Darrell. I would like to make a motion, because we never did set the fee for the recording of the Household Pets, so I would like to make a motion that that be set at \$13, not the \$17 that was talked about. **Hamza:** OK. You know – **Caell:** I was talking with some of my constituents in the region today about this very issue. There are a lot of people who think of the word “register” and they think all we want is the money. They don’t see anything in it for them, so we need to do some type of, I don’t know. Lowering the rate I think is a good start. **Hamza:** We have some things that I’m working on that once we launch the program, we can dovetail with it. For instance, I’m pretty sure we can get the 60 day free health insurance. We can get other perks through our sponsors for this. I would like to see this program succeed. Darrell, before we talk about price, here’s some things. If we go with the standard certificate like we do for everybody else, the \$13 is fine. If we decide to go to a bigger certificate that incorporates the cat’s picture into it, \$13 may be a little low. **Shafnisky:** Jerry, this is Alene. **Hamza:** Yeah. **Shafnisky:** I know we had talked about it a little bit at the Annual and I’m hoping that this is still in the works, but I’m not sure if this isn’t a little premature, only because we were discussing possibly getting our sponsors to chip in product and different offers that we could tie in with the recording, and that might help them better justify what we’re going to go through, because also if they send product, the mailing costs will be a little bit higher, as well. **Hamza:** And it depends on, you’re right. It’s a catch 22, because I can’t really – we’re talking with sponsors, but I can’t really ask them to commit until we have it up and running. **Shafnisky:** And that’s why I thought discussing the price might be premature, to try to set it today. **Hamza:** We could easily say \$13 just for the small certificate that you all looked at. That can work. We can cover our costs with that. **Newkirk:** This is Darrell. **Miller:** We could possibly offer to people various tiers. **Hamza:**

Well, that's also a possibility. Darrell, go ahead. **Newkirk:** Yes, and could someone remind Joan that you need to be recognized before you talk? **Miller:** I'm sorry, OK. **Newkirk:** You weren't signed on when Rachel made the announcement, but you need to be recognized before you talk. Anyway, what I wanted to say was that, you know, we have to have some price so that we can advertise this program as we start out. If we want to offer a larger certificate with a picture, then that can be an additional thing that we can add on later on, once that's available, but right now all we're talking about is recording the Household Pets and giving them a certificate. That's what I think our initial launch should be, and that's why I'm thinking the \$13 will be more palatable to people that want to register [sic, record] their Household Pets. I think if we charge \$17, I think most of the people aren't going to do it. **White:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Hang on everybody. George, go ahead. **Eigenhauser:** It wasn't George. **Hamza:** Oh, who is it? **White:** This is David. **Hamza:** David, go ahead. **White:** I thought one of the driving forces behind this was primarily so we, CFA, could start recording I guess shows and track for e-point purposes, for scoring and be able to provide, you know, information to the regions for regional awards. Wasn't that originally the driving force behind this? **Hamza:** No. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** Yeah, go ahead Mark. **Hannon:** We've not discussed that at all. We were going to provide the numbers to the owners of the cats, and we were going to continue with the volunteers doing the scoring and the volunteers could be provided that number to help them in the scoring, but it wasn't even going to be mandatory; it was up to the owner of the cat whether they wished to record the cat and whether they wished to provide the number to the person that's doing the scoring. **Roy:** Jerry, this is Sharon. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Sharon. **Roy:** One of the things that was brought up to me was that if CFA was really serious about registering or recording Household Pets, we have a lot of current Household Pet exhibitors that feel that even \$13 when they're talking about 3 or 4 cats that they may have is – maybe for an introductory couple months we even reduce that. Even if we go to half price or \$10 for the first couple months, it would be a draw to get those regular people and then it will show some really nice numbers. **Hamza:** You know, I am hesitant to offer discounts when it may insult our core business, which is pedigreed cats. **Shafnisky:** Jerry, this is Alene. **Hamza:** Yeah, go ahead Alene. **Shafnisky:** My thought is, now that I hear Darrell and I think about some of the things Joan said, it might be a good idea to just start that \$13 because then we can show our sponsors how many we have, but also – now I just lost my train of thought. What was it? We definitely had never talked about scoring them at the regional level, but – Sharon, I apologize. What was the last thing you just said? **Hamza:** Discounting for multiple cats. **Roy:** Discounting for multiple cats – **Shafnisky:** What if we did it the opposite way and we said, OK, we're going to offer instead the equivalent of a multiple cat discount, so instead of saying we'll knock off the price in the front end, we'll do it in the back end. We'll say your first cat might be \$13, and if you register 3 of them we'll give you \$10 for the next two? That might help them, because it's only a one-time fee. **Hamza:** Again, I'm really hesitant in doing something – look, we're a registry of cats. That's where our primary income comes from. I just, you know, \$13 to me seems like a reasonable fee. I hesitate very seriously in doing something for an unproven class of cats and not doing it for our major constituency. I know the idea is to entice them. I'm more inclined, folks, to entice them by giving them perks, by going out and getting them maybe a free microchip or a reduced microchip. I'm more into being able to package services with the registrations [sic, recordings]. **Newkirk:** Jerry, it's Darrell. **Hamza:** Yeah, go ahead, Darrell. **Newkirk:** That seems like a wonderful thing that we could do for the pedigreed cats, as well. **Hamza:** As far as what? Offering discounts? **Newkirk:** Perks. **Hamza:** We're working on the perks for everybody. We don't want to mess with our revenue stream. We're not really out of the woods yet, folks. We're working very hard to come up with, you know, with things to improve our business plan. Anyway, let's stay a little focused here. Darrell, I don't have a problem with \$13, as long as it's understood, \$13 is for the recording with the

smaller slip that I showed you folks. **Newkirk:** That's fine. **Hannon:** That's the same size as what we get now, when we register a pedigreed cat? **Hamza:** Yes. **Meeker:** Jerry, this is Ginger. I think where some of the confusion came in is, I think the board was sent copies of both documents to review. **Hamza:** Well, we did. We wanted – **Meeker:** Both the certificate and the one that would incorporate a picture. **Hamza:** Yes, I agree, but in my mind it would be, as far as being a salesman, I think that a Household Pet person might want to have a picture of their cat on a piece of paper that was suitable for framing, but we can address that. We can have a two-tiered system. **Meeker:** Absolutely. **Hamza:** We can make the first one \$13 and say, once we analyze costs, I may say to you folks, it needs to be \$18 or \$20 if we add the picture, depending on the quality of however it ends up being. You know, we've got to just make sure we're not losing money on anything we do. **Miller:** Jerry, this is Joan. **Hamza:** Yes, Joan. **Miller:** Just having been to a show last weekend where there were Household Pets and also even, well, there were some pedigreed cat breeders that were showing Household Pets. They can't even describe their cat. To me, it seems like all of these certificates should have a photograph, as well as a description. It's just amazing how they call it a gray tiger or whatever, and that's about all they know. **Hamza:** Well, since it's going to their house, and we don't have a standard for Household Pets, I can't – it adds a lot of cost if we incorporate a picture into the recording, the certificate, and the higher the quality, the higher the cost.

Brown: Jerry, this is Roger. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Roger. **Brown:** I'm working on a Pet Passport and we're trying to find a corporate sponsor that would assist with the printing costs. The Pet Passport would include the cat's picture, it's DNA profile, a microchip number and also a history of immunizations, paying particular attention to the rabies immunization for foreign travel. **Miller:** That's great. **Brown:** This could be offered at a reduced cost for those cats that are either recorded or registered. **Hamza:** OK. Well, that would certainly help out with the picture aspect of things. Anyway, not to get too sidetracked here, Darrell has a motion that charges \$13 for a standard size certificate. **Eigenhauser:** Second, George.

Hamza called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Miller voting no. **Miller:** I feel it should be a photograph. **Hamza:** The motion carries. As a sidebar, Joan, we will work up, as soon as we get on our feet with the first part, we will work up a cost on the bigger one that can include a photograph. At that point, it will be a little more money but we can offer a choice to the people. They can do A or B or who knows? Down the road, there may even be C and D. **Newkirk:** Jerry, this is Darrel. **Hamza:** Yeah, go ahead, Darrell. **Newkirk:** Has anyone come up with an application process for the recording of Household Pets? **Hamza:** As far as a form? **Newkirk:** A form, yes. **Hamza:** We're working on the forms right now, and it will be very similar to the forms we currently use. **Newkirk:** I'm just saying, this would be a wonderful thing, especially where there are big Household Pet entries, that someone from the club have the applications there so that people can get their cats registered [sic, recorded], and at that point in time, the color description – they can go to one of the judges and help with the color description. **Miller:** That would be great. **Hamza:** Yes, that's a good idea. As I get my feet on the ground after this move and this computer system, and it's probably going to be late Fall, I'm going to really work hard at marketing CFA in the show halls, and I think that is a wonderful idea. **Meeker:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Ginger, go ahead. **Meeker:** What I was hoping to do is, at some point if there was the ability to register [sic, record] the Household Pet directly online, that I would bring my laptop. **Hamza:** There is going to be. There's going to be that ability. **Meeker:** That's wonderful. I'll sit there and register [sic, record] Household Pets for two days. I think it's a real strong way to support our exhibitors and, you know, people in the gate that are coming through that want to

participate. **Hamza:** It would be great to dovetail with adoption events at shows. They have somebody sit there and say, “for an extra \$13 Fluffy can be registered [sic, recorded] with CFA.”

Hamza: Next on the agenda is the novice issue. **Hannon:** We didn’t finish with the Household Pets. What’s on the agenda is the perks, and all we talked about was the recording of them. We didn’t get into the perks. **Hamza:** My understanding is, perks would be whatever we can get corporate sponsors to give along with that. Is that not it? **Hannon:** Didn’t Ginger put this on? **Meeker:** I did, and I would agree to put this off for another. We have a huge agenda tonight, and I think we need to move on to other things. As long as we’ve got the recording process in pace and the price established, I think that gives us a good start. **Hamza:** And I would hate to cover perks without – you know, when the program is up and running, we’re going to have a lot of options. I think that would be the proper time to talk about it. **Hannon:** OK.

(5) **DISCUSS THE NOVICE ISSUE.**

Hamza: Before we get to the novice issue, I want to make something very clear. We’re in the middle of – and David and some other people who have been part of this IT process can tell you that this has been a huge undertaking. Anything that’s going to change the way we do business, especially when it comes to a rule level or an administration level, has got to be on hold until we can tell you that we’re ready to deal with new issues. **Hannon:** Well, the novice issue I didn’t think was going to be in effect until May 1st anyway. **Hamza:** Yeah, that will be OK. I just wanted to say that in case some people thought – it’s also, just to put in the back of your minds, it could have serious impact on when show – if we decide to change show rules, it may affect when that can happen. **Newkirk:** This is Darrell. Be more specific. **Hamza:** Anything – right now we’re working very hard on getting the computer system to do and follow the current rules of CFA. We don’t really have – every time we change something, it takes a lot of time at this point to do that to the programming, and it looks like we’re going to be in this process until – what do you think, David? Halloween? **White:** I think that’s a fair assessment. **Newkirk:** This is Darrell. We already have novices in the show rules. **Hamza:** No, I’m not talking about – what I’m talking about is – what’s happening now is fine, but if we said, for instance, we wanted to expand the novices into the other regions, if we wanted to do that, you know, before the beginning of next year, that might be a problem. **Hannon:** We can carry on this conversation with that understanding. **Hamza:** Yes. So, who put this on the agenda?

Eigenhauser: George here. I just want to say that I really am getting excited about the idea of expanding novices to include the other regions. I think that, you know, for a long time we’ve kind of taken the U.S. for granted, maybe, and I think it’s time that we start thinking in terms of marketing ourselves against the other associations here, and a “try before you buy”, letting somebody come to one show as a novice, I think would be a great way to get new people in the door, and it’s a win/win. At the very least, we’re going to get an entry fee out of them. Some club somewhere is going to get an entry fee and CFA is going to get \$2 off the top of that, and if they don’t ever register with CFA, well, you know, at least we tried. But, I would really like – I’m hearing a buzz that people are getting excited about the idea of expanding novices to go global with it. I think that’s something we should seriously explore. **Newkirk:** This is Darrell. **Hannon:** Can we just agree to do that and move on? **Eigenhauser:** We would have to turn it over to the Show Rules Committee. **Hamza:** Well, there’s more to it than just that. We need to, at least in theory, agree with the parameters of it. You know, is it a one-time shot? What’s the mechanism that we’re going to enforce? **Miller:** Jerry, this is Joan. **Hamza:** Yeah, go ahead Joan. **Miller:** I like also the idea of the novices in America, and I think a one-time is perfect. I can recall a number of years ago some exhibitors from another association came with an open

Ragdoll in the days when Ragdolls in CFA were brand new, but they had been accepted in other associations. They were so excited to get a best cat in my ring. They couldn't believe it, and now they are heartily showing CFA, and I think that one show made a difference. They had to go through a lot to get their cat registered in CFA properly, but just think what we could do if we just allowed someone to come to one show with their beautiful cats from other associations.

Hamza: I agree, but I think what needs to be ironed out here is how we go about it. One time and then do they get the opportunity to register their cat in CFA and keep the points – **Miller:** Yes, absolutely. **Hamza:** – and keep the points they received at that show – **Miller:** Right.

Hamza: – and all of that. George, why don't, since you're excited about it, I like people to get excited. Why don't you come up with a mechanism and do it for us? Can you do it by the next meeting? **Eigenhauser:** Sure. **Hamza:** OK, great. Anybody else have anything to say about novices? I think we all agree that it's worth exploring. OK, good.

(6) SPOTLIGHT AWARD FOLLOW-UP.

Hamza: Spotlight award follow-up. I just want to say, and Dick, I don't know if you want to add that it agrees, but the action this board took before we went to Asia had a positive impact. I think finally some people who maybe were not taking this board seriously are now taking it seriously. I think that we may have headed off a lot of trouble that was waiting for us down the road. In saying that, I look at this as more of a regional issue, but I at least want to make sure that we don't reward people who have had recent prior acts of bad behavior. Who wants to take the lead on this? **Shafnisky:** Jerry, this is Alene. **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Shafnisky:** I think we've come up with a pretty good draft to start with. My only concern is, has there already been a guilty finding? I'm a little worried that we're talking about this in open minutes. **Hamza:** There was. There was. I don't want to mention. It can be in open minutes. People – it is what it is. We won't mention specific names, but people were under consideration for the award who had been found guilty at the June board meeting. **Baugh:** Jerry, this is Loretta. **Hamza:** Yeah, go ahead. **Baugh:** All of the regions have had their awards ceremonies. We've had the Annual. We don't need to have this in place until the Spring. My suggestion is, there is somebody working on this. We could try to beat around it tonight, but let's come in with a solid plan and look at it, instead of sitting here trying to spin our wheels and we don't even know what we're going to end up with. There's plenty of time. **Hamza:** Well, I have seen some of the work done, and it looks like it's heading in the right direction. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Mark. **Hannon:** Sharon had posted, I believe it was to the regional directors' list, that she thought we should put this out and get comments. I don't know at what point Alene thinks this is going to be ready to go out, but I think we need to do that at some point and get it circulated and get some input. **Shafnisky:** Jerry, this is Alene. **Hamza:** Yeah, go ahead. **Shafnisky:** The only problem with that is, you know, when you're sending it to the masses, you're going to have 15 people editing the same paragraph and then how do you decide which one to go with? So, I think although good input is welcome, we have to be careful that it's not being asked for the entirety of CFA to approve it before we pass it along. **Hamza:** Well, in my mind, and maybe I'm wrong, but it seems like this is an issue that really falls squarely in the lap of the regional directors. I think this is something that needs to be worked on, on the regional directors' list, and then be brought to the board as a whole, and if it makes sense, I'm sure this board will adopt it. **Hannon:** What are you saying in regard to going out and getting input from the masses? **Shafnisky:** It sounds like it would be at our discretion. **Hamza:** Yeah. I think that you need to have something that is close to what you want it to be before you start getting input. **Roy:** Absolutely. **Hamza:** I think the further away you are, the less focus you're going to be able to get when it comes to going to the masses for input. If you say, "here's what we are pretty much going to go with, do

you see any flaws in it?”, I think you’re going to find that’s probably a little shorter way around the barn. **Roy:** Jerry, this is Sharon. **Hamza:** Yeah, go ahead Sharon. **Roy:** I think that’s a good idea. I think Alene will get it so that those of us that are regional directors agree to it, and then send it out and say, “this is what we decided, no guarantees that we’ll change it, but if you have any ideas, we’re certainly open to suggestion.” **Baugh:** This is Loretta. That raises the question, how are we going to put this out? We certainly would have to use the newsletter, I think. I don’t think we want to use the CFA list. **Hamza:** No. The CFA list – let me interject this here. **Eigenhauser:** On or off the record? **Hamza:** For the record. In my mind, it seldom represents the feeling of the masses of this organization. It seems to be, and I refer to it as the lunatic fringe. It seems to be the people who think they can shout over and make other people feel poorly, that if they shout the loudest it makes their point more valid. That isn’t the case. If we’re going to, as a board, have something to disseminate to the people of CFA, you know, either the newsletter or the version of the CFA-News, and I love that version, by the way – I think those are the proper venues for us to put out things that are official. **Baugh:** That’s what I was driving at. **Hamza:** As long as we’re at this, George had brought up a point about the Yahoo CFA news group. **Hannon:** Rachel has already sent a post to that group, saying we’re not using that anymore. **Hamza:** OK, very good. I just wanted to make sure we covered that. **Hannon:** Yeah, we did. **Caell:** Jerry, this is Ann. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Ann. **Caell:** I want to make a comment about the Spotlight Award. I’ve been reading everybody’s revisions of the criteria and everything, and I think we’re pretty close to pulling it all together. It seems like a lot of the RD’s are in agreement with the criteria, so I think if we can tweak it a little bit and then decide amongst ourselves, the regional directors, to put it out on the CFA newsletter at that point and get some final feed-back and discussion from the constituents. **Hamza:** And make sure you guys put your email addresses on it, so you can get the feed-back directly. **Meeker:** That was as subtle as a train wreck.

(7) **DEBATE OPTIONS REGARDING HOW OUR REGISTRATION RULES ARE USED WITH IMPORTED CATS.**

Hamza: I’m taking this to mean how some people use foreign pedigrees to sort of come around our rules. Is that basically – who put this on the agenda? **Shafnisky:** This is Alene. I think I was the first one to bring it up, but it sort of changed its form a little bit, because my intention was just to at least get everyone thinking about general policy, but it has come to involve some specific issues that actually will need to be resolved. **Hannon:** Rachel, did you put this on? I’m thinking Rachel might have put this on, based on input from a variety of people. **Anger:** This is Rachel. **Hamza:** Is this something where we’re going to start talking about specific cats? **Hannon:** Yes. **Hamza:** So, this would be better left for closed session? **Hannon:** Yes.

(8) **POLICY TO RE-JUSTIFY 8-GENERATION PEDIGREES.**

Hamza: And the next one, *Policy to Re-Justify 8-Generation Pedigrees*, is that dovetailing into that discussion? **Hannon:** Not really. **Eigenhauser:** I don’t think so. **Hannon:** George brought that one up. **Eigenhauser:** You know, one of the things that really seems to be a nightmare in Central Office is dealing with these super-generation requirements that some breeds have, to import cats. It often means piecing together multiple certified pedigrees from multiple different sources, and there should be a sunset law that says, you know, maybe a breed had a reason for it once, but every few years we’re going to revisit it and say, you know, “Do you still want to keep that requirement in place? Is there still a need to keep that requirement in place? Is there a DNA test that will get you around the need for that requirement?”, rather than just have these multi-generational requirements go on for eternity. So, what I would like to propose is that

we ask any breed that requires more than 5 generations to import a cat, to put an item on their ballot this next time around, you know, “#1, do you still need it?, #2, is there a reason you still need it, or is it just, you know, ‘I don’t like those cats’, or is there a specific gene you’re trying to keep out that we might be able to some day test for, and whether you would consider a DNA test, in lieu. If a breed council can’t vote to keep it, then let it drop back and make things a little easier for Central Office. But, I think that ultimately we should be pushing the breed councils, that unless there’s really a good, good reason to do it, we should have a standard rule for registering cats in CFA, and not have, “except this breed is 8” or “this breed is whatever”. **Hamza:** And there are, and we’ll talk about it when we go into closed session when we debate on some of the specific cat problems, because there are some potentially very, very – how to say it diplomatically – there are some very far-reaching potential problems that we’re finding, now that we’re visiting our past in a way with the computer system, and some of these problems are not correctable, I guess is the best way to put it. **Miller:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Yeah. **Miller:** This is Joan. I have one thing I think should be in open session, and that is, in looking at the Rules for Registration again, we really don’t say exactly how you count the generations. We don’t say whether the cat itself is a generation, or the sire and the dam are generation #1. I think that’s something that should be inserted in our Rules for Registration, so it is clear. **Hamza:** If you’re born, you’re a generation. **Miller:** Yeah, but that’s not how – I know that’s not how the Abyssinian breeders have always considered it. **Hamza:** How they count, it doesn’t matter. I mean, when you talk about, you know, the next generation, that’s your children. **Wilson:** This is Annette. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Annette. **Wilson:** I think the reason that the cat to be registered is not counted as a generation is for the same reason that when someone orders a certified pedigree from CFA, the cat that is registered is not counted as a generation, so when you order a 3-generation pedigree from CFA on a registered cat, you get 14 ancestors. That basically has been the convention that’s applied to the registration by pedigree. **Hamza:** And is that what other registering bodies do? Like AKC and American Quarter Horse? **Wilson:** My guess is that there’s a whole variety. **Hamza:** OK, because it was always my understanding that if you’re born, you’re the latest generation. **Shafnisky:** Jerry, this is Alene. I can tell you that ACFA did not count the cat being registered as a generation. **Hannon:** Where are we going with George’s discussion on re-polling the breed councils to re-justify? **Eigenhauser:** George again. I know it’s been at least 6 years since the last time we did it. **Hannon:** Are you making a motion? **Eigenhauser:** I’m making a motion that we ask any breed council that has a pedigree requirement beyond 5 generation for importation, place it on their ballot again this year, (a) whether they still want it, and (b) whatever the reason they have for wanting it, would there be a circumstance where they would accept a DNA test in lieu of the multi-generation requirement? **Brown:** This is Roger. I’ll second.

Hamza called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Wilson voting no.

Hamza: The other thing in this particular item, it adds a great deal of work and cost to go past – every generation we add increases our cost. You know, we may even want to consider in the future to charge more per generation. **Baugh:** I think we’re going to have to. We shouldn’t be losing money doing this. **Hamza:** I can, I will do some sort of, next week I’ll ask to figure just a rough time analysis on the, what the additional cost is, so if a breed insists on an 8-generation pedigree for their registrations, maybe a 5-generation should cost X, 6 cost Y, 7 cost Z and so on. **Eigenhauser:** George here. **Hamza:** Go ahead, George. **Eigenhauser:** I just want to say, I’m very uncomfortable with that, because essentially what we’re doing is, we’re saying the people who want to impose this extra burden aren’t going to be the ones paying for it. The breed council members that want to keep these other cats out and put on a multi-generational requirement to

keep those other cats out will be succeeding even more if we make it more expensive for those cats to come in. **Hamza:** There's always backlash. **Eigenhauser:** But still, the fundamental core principle here is, the people that want it should pay for it. **Hamza:** That's what I'm talking about it. **Eigenhauser:** No, no. The people that want the multi-generation requirement, not the person doing the registering. **Hannon:** How do you know they're not the same? **Eigenhauser:** They could very well be, but if the breed council as a whole says, "we want 8 generations", then the breed council as a whole should bear the cost. **Shelton:** This is Mike. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Mike. **Shelton:** Speaking to that real quickly, in most cases, most of the people who are registering from foreign pedigrees, which is where this goes to, are people who are bringing in cats from overseas that are going to be, not exclusively but to a large extent, European exhibitors who are just getting into CFA, whereas the people who are voting on this are long-time breeders, long enough to have been in a breed council, who are less likely. They're not eliminated from needing to do this from time to time, but they're less likely to be registering cats this way. **Hamza:** I think that, and I want to say this in open session. I think that there are some issues that are going to arise, looking back, that are maybe going to have enough power in them to persuade these breeds that want to go back 8 generations, to maybe change their mind because it may have just the opposite effect of what they think it's going to have. **Newkirk:** Jerry, it's Darrell. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Darrell. **Newkirk:** Can Annette tell us which breeds require 8 generations? I know Abyssinian is one of them, and Siamese is one. **Hamza:** Do you know that off the top of your head, Annette? **Wilson:** Say that again, please? **Hamza:** He wants to know how many breeds require more than 5 generations. **Wilson:** Give me a minute. I'm trying to pull up the Rules for Registration on the website and it says it's damaged, so I'm going to forward it from my other computer, and I'll get back to you. **Shelton:** This is Mike. I've got the list in front of me. **Wilson:** Alright. **Miller:** I have it in front of me, too, Jerry. **Shelton:** Abyssinian, Burmese, European Burmese – **Hamza:** Hang on, Mike. Mike would you start again, slower this time? **Shelton:** Abyssinian, Burmese, European Burmese, Russian Blue and Siamese are the only ones that still require 8. **Anger:** This is Rachel. The European Burmese does not require 8. That's just from a domestic North American registry. Only 5 generations are required from all other world registries. **Shelton:** OK, yeah. I'm just reading off the one note that I pulled off the Rules for Registration. **Newkirk:** Didn't the Burmese go back to 5 in February? **Miller:** Yes, that's right. **Anger:** Yes, they did. **Hamza:** And there's nobody that requires anything between 5 and 8? **Hannon:** No. I think some require less than 5. **Shelton:** There are a number that are less than 5. **Hamza:** Right, I know that. I just couldn't recall if anybody required 6 or 7. **Hannon:** No. **Hamza:** So, there's essentially 4 breeds. **Shelton:** But that may also point out that this would need to be updated on the website, because I printed this from the website today, and it's dated August 2010. **Hamza:** There's another note for you, Ginger. **Meeker:** Another note to Kathy. **Hannon:** That's something the Breeds and Standards Committee should deal with Kathy on. **Meeker:** Yeah, OK. Annette, you'll do that? Or Rachel? **Wilson:** We'll take care of it. **Meeker:** Thank you. **Hamza:** OK. Are we done with 8-generation pedigrees, since we have it going on the appropriate councils' ballots? **Eigenhauser:** George here. We're done with that portion. It's just, you know, do we still need to go back to the closed session item. **Hannon:** If we're going to talk about specific cats, yeah. **Hamza:** Well, we need to address – item 6 has got some things we have to talk about. **Eigenhauser:** On the other hand, on item 6 I'm not fully up to speed on it. The last time we ran into it with a longhair Exotic, it seemed like we got the information in dribs and drabs. This time, Alene pointed out in her most recent email that there's still some unanswered questions here. **Hamza:** We're not going to resolve it tonight. **Hannon:** What we said in June at the board meeting was, we would discuss it in the August conference call. **Hamza:** We may not spend a lot of time on it, but there are some things we have to be ready for. **Hannon:** Alright. Let's move on to 8. **Hamza:** OK.

(9) **TRANSPARENCY AND USE OF BOARD LIST.**

Hamza: Transparency and Use of Board List. **Eigenhauser:** That was me again. You guys saw my email on the board list, how unhappy I was. **Hannon:** And on the CFA list. **Eigenhauser:** And on the CFA list, but specifically on the board list, first when I asked you guys to wait for a regular meeting to discuss the Household Pet issue, and then the motion gets made, seconded and called on a Friday. **Hannon:** The holiday weekend. **Eigenhauser:** Holiday weekend. We don't have a legal way to vote on the board list. It is not authorized by our constitution. It is not authorized by New York law. We use that list primarily for communication, but we do vote on it with this gentlemen's understanding that we'll then ratify it at our next meeting and make it legal retroactively, and that's how it gets along. But, fundamentally, it is not a board meeting and I would like us to have a policy that says, "the board list is for communicating to, within and among the board members, and for handling votes on matters that are time sensitive enough that it would be inappropriate to wait for the next board meeting, telephonic or otherwise." But, I don't think we should be conducting routine, open session matters on a closed list. I think that is an inappropriate way for us to conduct our business. **Krzanowski:** Jerry, this is Carol. May I speak? **Hamza:** Yeah, go ahead Carol. **Krzanowski:** I agree with George on this, and this is especially true now that we have these monthly teleconferences that are recorded. There's really no need for us to vote on issues that aren't an emergency situation, on our board list. So, I would like to see business on our list limited to emergency-only or just discussion, and any voting take place only at our teleconference meetings or a regular board meeting. **Hannon:** Is that a motion? **Krzanowski:** I'll make a motion to that effect. **Eigenhauser:** George, second.

Wilson: This is Annette. I have some discussion. **Hamza:** Well, go ahead Annette, because I'm not ready to close this discussion. **Wilson:** Thank you. I would like to know what consists of "discussion" on the board list then, because that's the reason I was told we couldn't discuss it, that I went to the CFA list and the other list, so I guess I thought that would be absolutely the appropriate place to ask a question or discuss something that might be coming up at a meeting. **Hamza:** Let me interject something here, and it's a problem I have. You know, when I got elected, one of the things that was a little disturbing is that somewhere along the line this board took over the day-to-day operations of CFA. **Hannon:** That happened before you got elected. **Hamza:** Yeah, I understand that. Well, there's a responsibility when the board did that, that input needs to be at times – and it may not be an emergency situation, but it needs to be – one of two things is going to happen here, folks, and so you're going to have to decide. This can go back to the way it was, where this board knows nothing and is not notified of board decisions as they come up, that happen between the monthly meetings. You can't run a business day to day and say, "well, we're not going to discuss it and we're not going to deal with it until the following month." The responsibility lies with us. This board took over the day-to-day operation of CFA. We can't – one of two things is going to happen; you're going to be out of the loop, or you're going to be in the loop, and you need to decide which. It's nice to say that we shouldn't be doing things, but the reality is, especially right this minute, we are so deeply immersed in things that affect our future on a minute-by-minute basis, to try to close the CFA board list down because there are pressures – let me explain something first. Disclosure and transparency, what that means is that we inform our constituency of our decisions and our actions when they've been made. They elect us to represent them on the board level. We don't have a responsibility to keep giving them minute-by-minute updates on what's happening. Businesses can't run that way. I refuse to pander to this need for – you know, we have an obligation to run this business, and at such a time when we have the money and the ability to hand back over the day-to-day operations

to an executive director, which I'm hoping in 2 or 3 years down the line, and they will be forced to make these decisions. Our constituency will know less about the day-to-day business of CFA than they do now. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** I think that it's important that this CFA board list continues to be an open discussion. Annette, what you brought to the CFA list should have been posted to the CFA board list. You know, it's irresponsible for us not to sit together in a place where we can come up with a general consensus in a responsible way to create responsible policies for the continuation of this organization. **Eigenhauser:** Yeah, but I want to point out that neither my original suggestion nor Carol's motion have suggested we shut down this list. **Hamza:** Well, but what it does, though, is it takes away the ability to make decisions that aren't critical. **Eigenhauser:** It has no ability to make decisions. **Hamza:** Well George, that's just – you know, I understand that in law, but in theory it doesn't. **Hannon:** It's the theory that doesn't work in reality. **Hamza:** But in reality, we do make decisions and we ratify them later, and we do make decisions that have an impact in the time frame we need them to happen. **Eigenhauser:** If there is a time frame that we needed to have it, then we'll do it within that time frame. The motion does not preclude that. **Hamza:** Well, you know what? It does preclude – then who defines – I want to be able to come to the board and say, "I would like this decision here shortly because it impacts a business decision or impacts a policy that is non-emergency, but it's important. Look, as long as we're running the day-to-day operations of this organization, a 30 day window can be huge. **Eigenhauser:** And as long as 10 board members agree that it's urgent, you'll get your vote. What's the problem? You're taking a very narrow view of what this board is capable of doing, and of our understanding of how a business operates. **Hamza:** I'm actually trying to protect this board's participation and decision making, and I'm trying to not have repeated what's happened in the last 6 years. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Mark. **Hannon:** The concern that I'm hearing and I think I'm reading on the CFA list is, we make motions, we vote on them and then we publish the motions, but they miss all the discussion; whereas at a normal board meeting, unless it's in executive session, they have the benefit of the discussion so they understand the vote, and in this case they don't understand the vote because they've missed the discussion. **Shafnisky:** Jerry, this is Alene. **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Shafnisky:** I agree with Mark that that is the issue, that they want to see the discussion and there's a question of us putting our opinions out there publicly, but I also think the discussion taking place on the board list will allow us to do a whole lot more and to understand each other's positions a whole lot better than if we were to say, "wait until the monthly board meeting", when we all are suddenly trying to explain, for example, our own positions on requirements for an 8-generation pedigree. We would be having 12 hour board meetings once a month and never be speaking in between. Yes, it cuts out some of the discussion, but I believe that it benefits CFA as a whole because we do get to talk more and if there is something like in this situation, particular cats' names need to be mentioned to understand the point, we don't have to worry about transcripts being in closed or open session. **Hamza:** And it does allow us to build a consensus in a way where we're not afraid of what we say and do. That's an important process. **Meeker:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Go ahead, Ginger. **Meeker:** I really feel that it's important that we have a way to discuss with each other in an open and learning atmosphere. Because I feel a certain way about something at the start of the discussion does not necessarily mean I'm going to feel the same way at the end of the discussion because I've had input from a lot of other people that I respect, and that leaves me open to learn and change my mind. If the list is closed, or every discussion goes out and is made public, I think that will dampen the enthusiasm for learning and being candid, and having that kind of group consolidation that to this point has really kept us amiable and working together. **Hamza:** The other issue, and it's a likely reality, is if we go this direction, what we do is, what's going to happen is, we're going to push things underground and that's not what I'm sure our constituency wants. They don't want to have board members calling each

other privately to do what should be done in a forum in front of all of us. I don't want to see something that's going to fractionalize us, and when we have a discussion on something – you know, George, I understand what you're saying. **Eigenhauser:** No, you clearly don't. I have never said – **Hamza:** No, I clearly do. You're pissed off because – **Eigenhauser:** You guys are talking about, well, if we publish what's on the board list. I've never said to do that. The motion isn't to do that. That's not at all what's being suggested. What's being suggested is, use the board list for discussion, use the board list to have private contact with each other, but if we keep publishing that we took action in that private venue, then that's the problem. The problem isn't the discussion. The problem isn't the dissemination of the information. The problem isn't working together. The problem isn't fine-tuning things until we get it right. The problem is, taking a final, binding vote on it on the list and then everybody asks, "why wasn't this brought up in open session?" **Hamza:** You know, the risk is, as I said earlier, minute by minute we run the operation of CFA, and the risk is that we will suffer as an organization if we can't make timely decisions that may not be emergencies. We could lose opportunities. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** I don't have any problem with disclosing. Maybe we do what the Supreme Court does when we have a vote online – we vote with an explanation and we publish that. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Hannon:** There was a specific instance that caused George to bring this up. I think it was register vs. record of the Household Pets, and the question that George asked was a valid question – why was that something that had to be handled then? Why couldn't we have waited until tonight to discuss that, when it would be in an open session with minutes taken? That's just an example of the type of thing I think George and Carol are suggesting that we don't have to vote on the board list, on that sort of thing. If there's something that we need to handle for the day-to-day operations of CFA, then we can do that. Am I right, George, in interpreting it? **Eigenhauser:** Thank you, Mark. I felt like I was speaking Greek here, because everybody seems to be taking it a different direction. That's all I'm asking.

Krzanowski: Yes, and I agree. **Hannon:** If it can wait, then let's wait. **Krzanowski:** You hit the nail on the head with that. **Eigenhauser:** And if it can't wait, just simply say, "it can't wait" and if you get 10 people to agree it can't wait, it's done. **Newkirk:** This is Darrell. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Darrell. **Newkirk:** I agree with George 100% and I think that he is correct in that Robert's Rules does not allow us to make any voting on that list. You have your attorney on here. I think you should get his input. **Hamza:** No, I get that. You know, I have no objections to, if you guys want, we can get rid of the board list. **Newkirk:** Nobody is suggesting that, Jerry. No one has suggested that. **Krzanowski:** We are not suggesting to get rid of the board list. We need the board list for valid discussion of issues as they come up. **Meeker:** Jerry? **Krzanowski:** The actual voting on things such as, well, the example of the Household Pet register vs. record, that was not an issue that had to be decided immediately. We could discuss it among ourselves, put it on the agenda for our monthly teleconference, and then have our final discussion and vote then, which would be recorded. **Meeker:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Yeah. **Meeker:** I think that the Household Pet issue was time sensitive, because it involved some of the stuff that Computan was doing with computer language and certificate design, in order to have it ready. **Eigenhauser:** That is not done now. **Meeker:** Yeah, it is. **Eigenhauser:** And it won't be done for awhile. **Hamza:** Well, it is done now, George. **Meeker:** It is done. **Eigenhauser:** We haven't seen it yet. **Hamza:** The module is in place. It's written. **Eigenhauser:** We didn't even have the fees until tonight. **Meeker:** We didn't have the fees, but we have the language on the certificate. **Hamza:** But you don't understand. **Meeker:** I would like to finish. One thing that I felt very strongly about was, I got the strong sense, George, that you wanted to do away with the list when the comment was made about the dirty jokes. **Eigenhauser:** No. **Meeker:** And that we could just delete everything. That was my understanding. **Eigenhauser:** No, and I thought I was very clear that I'm not against people talking on this – the list. I keep calling it "this list". We're not on that list

now. People can talk on that list, discuss, shoot ideas around, bounce them around. I don't care. I was trying to be humorous. I was trying to be light hearted. **Meeker:** Well, I didn't get it as humorous. I'm sorry that I missed your humor. I got the very strong feeling that you wanted the list to go away and when I said back, "how else do we communicate?", the response I got was, "well, if you want to send dirty jokes, that's where you can send them." **Eigenhauser:** No, my response was, "you can send anything you want on the list, it's open, it's free, it's for anything you want –" **Meeker:** OK, I misunderstood. **Eigenhauser:** " – except taking a vote." That's the only thing I don't think we should be doing on that list is taking a vote, unless 10 board members think it's urgent enough that it couldn't wait until a regular meeting. **Meeker:** OK. Then, I apologize for misunderstanding the intent of your email, I appreciate your humor. **Baugh:** This is Loretta. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Loretta. **Baugh:** OK. The whole Household Pet register/record issue was getting extremely divisive on the list and I didn't make the motion, but I'm wondering if perhaps the motion was made to get this thing done and get it to rest. Once we made that vote, everything calmed down and if something like that is getting more divisive by the hour, it's something we needed to act on. **Hamza:** I can say this – I only call the votes, but I can tell you that I was more than happy to call that vote because it was becoming, it was damaging. The conversations weren't productive. It was resorting to – you know, in my mind, the hardest thing was that we had already decided this in February, and it had somehow reopened and I wanted not to have it be open. I wanted to put an end to what, in my mind, was absolutely unproductive. I mean, people were calling each other names. We were getting very heated over an issue that was decided in February over one word, and I absolutely think that was the appropriate thing to do. To let it fester until now would have served no useful purpose. **Eigenhauser:** You could have made that point, and if 10 board members agreed, it would have been decided. At least it would have been – **Hamza:** George, I hear you, so why don't we – does anybody have anything meaningful to say before we call the vote? **Meeker:** What are we voting on? **Baugh:** Can you restate the motion? **Hannon:** Carol's motion. **Meeker:** Carol, can you restate your motion? **Krzanowski:** I'm trying to remember. **Eigenhauser:** Did Rachel write it down? **Krzanowski:** I didn't write it down. Did Rachel write it down? **Hamza:** Is Rachel still here? **Anger:** Rachel's still here. I have it, and it's on the tape. I can play it back if you want it exactly. **Krzanowski:** It was to the effect that the list be used for – I'll make a new motion; that the list be used for discussion and bouncing ideas around, but unless an emergency situation exists, or something that's critical to the business of CFA, that the final discussion and vote would be done at a regularly scheduled teleconference or board meeting. **Eigenhauser:** And I still second.

Hamza called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Shafnisky, White, Brown and Baugh voting no. **Hamza:** Do we have all the no's? **Hannon:** The no's that I got were Loretta, Alene and David White. **Brown:** And Roger. **Hannon:** And Roger, OK. **Miller:** And Ginger, I thought. **Hannon:** Ginger, are you voting yea or nay? **Meeker:** I voted yea. **Hamza:** OK, motion carries. [Note: the correct vote was subsequently confirmed by the CFA Secretary]

(10) INSURANCE COVERAGE.

Hamza: Insurance coverage. **Bizzell:** That would be me. I brought this up for a couple of reasons. One reason is that Scott Allen typically gives a presentation at our annual meeting every two years. He was scheduled to come, or we tried to schedule him to come this year and he was unable to come. He sent his presentation forward, but we did not review that at the meeting. I just wanted a couple of updates here. We do not have the final numbers for our post move insurances, but it appears to be coming in \$7,000 or so less than our current coverage, just as a benchmark. One thing he has brought up is that he thinks we need to revisit our directors' and

officers' protection limits. Right now we're at \$1 million split 19 ways. He's suggesting we look at going to \$2 million or \$3 million. I talked to him today, and he thought \$2 million was reasonable. **Hamza:** What's the increase in cost? **Bizzell:** It's going to be about \$2,500. He didn't have actual quotes, but that's what he thought it would be. **Hamza:** Before we vote on this, Carla, I would like you to get – I want you to confirm the cost and I want you to give it to Rich and see if he can shop it around. **Bizzell:** OK. **Hamza:** That's a lot of money for an additional million dollars worth of coverage. **Eigenhauser:** Yeah, but it's for 19 people. **Bizzell:** I would be happy to do that. I did send him forth to actually get some quotes for us. He's been out of town for a few days, so I couldn't get it before the meeting. **Hamza:** Just to mention this to the folks here, I increased my liability through my homeowner's once I got elected and I think I picked up an extra \$5 million or \$6 million worth of insurance for \$60 a year. **Bizzell:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Yeah. **Bizzell:** You might want to check that. If it's an umbrella policy, it will not cover this sort of risk. **Hamza:** I'm through Travelers and they did it. It does cover this. **Bizzell:** OK, as my insurer could not provide me a product to purchase. **Hamza:** Like I said, I'm with Travelers. It probably depends on who you're with. **Eigenhauser:** It also depends on what state you're in, because insurance regulations and policies differ from state to state. **Hamza:** Right. If you can get it on your own, it's probably a good idea, but anyway, I just want to shop that around. **Bizzell:** OK. Scott said he could come to the next annual meeting if we wanted him there. He asked where it was, and I told him, "well, it was in Hawaii". But, if Quincy, Massachusetts made him happy, we would be happy to have him there. That's pretty much all I have. Again, I don't have a final number because we're waiting for the completion of our fire escape and sprinkler system, which we believe will reduce our costs a bit more. **Hamza:** OK. And the fire escape is supposed to be in the end of next week. **Bizzell:** OK. I knew it was pretty soon. **Hamza:** It's pretty much made. They've just got to bolt it to the building.

(11) HOUSEHOLD PETS AT THE NATIONAL SHOW.

Hannon: Household Pets, National Show. **Hamza:** Who added this to the agenda? **Hannon:** I might have. I don't recall specifically doing it. **Shafnisky:** I actually did, but Mark, go ahead. **Hannon:** There was a question about what we're doing there, because during the conference call with the show committee, my notes indicated we said they would be judged in all 10 rings for the same entry fee as the other cats, and then Beth Cassely said that she heard from the show manager that they would be judged in one ring and I don't know if she meant one additional ring or just one ring in total, but there seemed to be some confusion in regard to how we were going to handle the Household Pets at the National Show. **Shafnisky:** This is Alene. I think we had been told in the early discussions that because of the potential for a 500 show that might fill, we were looking at a stand-alone ring, so Beth was probably reacting to what I had said a few months ago. **Hannon:** Jerry, what's your thought on this? **Hamza:** You know, I don't want to exclude them. **Shafnisky:** Jerry, if I can add, I've got a local rescue that is more than willing to bring cats all the way over from Illinois way that will be adoptable at the show and they will enter them and show them as Household Pets, as they normally do in our region. They're willing to participate in that. **Hamza:** I'm not sure I want to encourage that, either, because if it's people who are showing Household Pets in CFA, I want those people. We're going to set up a situation for the shelter cats. We're going to have a goal of trying to get 100 cats adopted, so I'm not sure they need to be in the show. I would hate to take a spot away from somebody who is wanting to, you know, bring their pedigreed cat that's actually thinking about trying to get a regional or national win, to facilitate a spot for a rescue cat when we're going to do a lot of things to help that cat find a forever home. **Meeker:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Yeah. **Meeker:** That whole write-up that I did that was going to be the pilot project at the National Show

involved rescue cats being in the competition to earn the rosettes. That's the whole point of that proposition. **Hamza:** And we may want to bring in a ring for the rescue cats. We've got canyons of space here, and maybe in such a way that every rescue cat gets a rosette. **Meeker:** Oh, that would be cool. **Miller:** Jerry? **Eigenhauser:** Something like, "I was a winner at the CFA National Show". **Hamza:** Right. **Eigenhauser:** That might help them get adopted. **Hamza:** Anything we can do to help that. **Meeker:** Yeah, the rosettes make a huge difference. **Hamza:** Like I said, we can run a ring just for those folks and make sure they get a nice, big rosette like George said. I think that would be great. **Hannon:** So, we're also going to have Household Pets in all 10 rings? **Hamza:** Yes, but not rescue cats. **Miller:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Yeah, Joan. **Miller:** I have a signed contract saying that I'm to judge Household Pets. My understanding was that I was going to be the only judge for Household Pets and so I was working on a very elaborate program for that, so I need to know what's going on as far as the proposed – I had wanted to spend a lot of time on the Household Pets, I wanted to include some of the rescue cats as almost an educational platform. **Hamza:** Alene, how strong are the Household Pets? I don't imagine people are going to be coming a long way to show Household Pets. **Shafnisky:** Definitely no. We don't have that many participants, and the majority of the participants we do have are usually doing it in combination with trying to find homes for cats. A lot of the cats they have placed go on to go to a few shows. I can tell you they were very excited about attending this show and showing some of the cats that were available for adoption, so I'm not sure. It seems like there's a lot of confusion over this issue. **Hamza:** Would they be happy with one ring where every cat gets a rosette? **Shafnisky:** The majority of the ones that I spoke to said that a stand-alone ring would be acceptable, it's not preferable, but it certainly would be acceptable because it would still get them some exposure. **Miller:** Jerry, can I make a comment? **Hamza:** Yeah, go ahead Joan. **Miller:** Having done a lot of educational programs using the rescue cats, we do that at San Diego, also having handled them at the Mayor's Alliance and at many other shelters, not all of the shelter cats and rescue cats want to be shown. In fact, it can be very negative for some of them. What I like to do is pick the ones that show well, and then that's kind of used as an example of how wonderful these cats are and how they potentially are good. I think that that portrays the rescue cats in the best way possible, is to pre-select them and have a good example of different colors and patterns. The idea that there are lots of cats that are showable and really, you know, very, very adoptable but sometimes if you bring a cat up that's hissing and spitting and ornery, it doesn't do much for the rescue groups, really. I think it has to be carefully thought out. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Mark. **Hannon:** But I think on the other side, we have people who consistently show Household Pets. They're not rescue cats, they are owned, and a lot of those people own pedigreed cats and they're showing both. I don't want to close them out by saying, "you can only show your Household Pet in one ring". Probably a lot of them would be willing to travel to Indy with their pedigreed cat and would like to bring the Household Pet, but they're not going to do it for one ring. They want to show them in all the rings. **Newkirk:** This is Darrell. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Darrell. **Newkirk:** I agree with Mark. I think that those people who show their Household Pets in the neighboring regions around Region 6 and 4 are going to want to bring their cats. I don't think we should shut them out. As far as shutting out the purebred entry, they just need to get their entry in early and make sure they get themselves a spot. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Baugh:** It's Loretta. **Hamza:** OK Mark, then Loretta. **Hannon:** This past weekend with Garden State, which consistently has been one of the largest shows in the country, and they had an entry in the 350's. I think we need to be realistic. The entries are dropping and you may need those Household Pets. You may not get 500 pedigreed cats entered in that show. **Miller:** Jerry, can I speak? **Hamza:** After Loretta. **Baugh:** I just have a question. I have a scenario. The cat's a rescue cat on Saturday morning and gets adopted. Does it then become a Household Pet for the rest of the show? **Miller:** Sure. **Hannon:** It's not entered in the

10 rings already, though. It has to be pre-entered in the 10 rings. **Baugh:** I can see people not being happy about that either. OK fine. **Hamza:** I think we need to open it for Household Pets. **Miller:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Go ahead, Joan. **Miller:** OK. I don't see anything wrong with opening it up for Household Pets. If they really would like to come, I think that's no problem. It wouldn't interfere at all with the plans that I might have for education, because I would have more time than, say, the judges of the rings, so I could still do education, I could still focus on rescue cats or do whatever else is needed, so I'm totally happy with that. **Hamza:** OK, great. **Hannon:** We need to get it on the flyer, we need to tell the rosette chair. **Miller:** Yeah, we have to tell people. **Hamza:** I will do. **Newkirk:** Do we have a flyer yet, Jerry? **Hamza:** We're waiting on a flyer from Kat. So, it should be. We're going to have a meeting in the upcoming week and hopefully the flyer should be done by then because I've been pushing on it. **Miller:** Oh, Jerry, one other thing. **Hamza:** Yeah, go ahead. **Miller:** The other thing that could be a possibility that we've done at pet fairs is that once the judging is over on Sunday, if you could schedule the Household Pets relatively early, then I could perhaps spend time using the winners, the top winners, as an educational forum. You would do that on a Sunday afternoon. I mean, there could be many things that could be done. If they want to be scored in all rings, and again, are they going to be scored? I guess they are, but anyway, if they're going to be shown in all the rings, then we could do a final presentation of the top cats to the audience as an educational format. I would be happy to do that, too. **Hamza:** OK. Rachel, would you add that on your – would you just take notes so that when we have our next National Show meeting. **Anger:** Got it, thanks. **Hannon:** Is that next week? Because I'm getting questions and I don't have answers. **Hamza:** Yeah, yeah. I'm going to try to do one on either Tuesday or Wednesday. We'll see what's good for everybody. **Miller:** Jerry, Joan again. **Hamza:** Yeah, go ahead. **Miller:** I really do need to have a coordinator for the education and some other details about set-up, and I would like to be present on the committee call if you talk about education. **Hamza:** OK. Rachel, you want to write down coordinator? **Anger:** Got it. **Shafnisky:** Jerry, this is Alene. Also, if you want to loop me in maybe as a liaison, just because I know sort of the locals who exhibit Household Pets, and maybe I can be of some help in resolving sort of the best way to handle this so that they don't feel short changed, and Joan can get the educational program going. **Hannon:** Maybe we could do that at the beginning of the conversation, so we don't tie them up the whole night. **Miller:** That would be wonderful. **Caell:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Yeah. **Caell:** This is Ann. I'm going back to your initial question about how many Household Pets would be attending the National Show. I know that in our region we have an awful lot of Household Pet people who do travel and go outside of the region, so I would anticipate lots of cats coming from Region 3, along with their pedigree owners, perhaps, and also non-pedigreed cats. So I just think that Darrell's idea, and Mark's, about having them in every ring is what will work. **Hamza:** I'm leaning that way, too. I think the more, the merrier. **Shelton:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Yeah. **Shelton:** Even from Region 5, I've had people talk to me who say they were seriously considering driving out to Indy with their Household Pets, and they only have Household Pets. They do not have pedigreed cats. **Hamza:** Oh, good. Good. **Shelton:** But not for one ring. They'll do it for 10, but not for one. **Caell:** They can pick up everybody along the way. **Shelton:** They could rent a bus. **Hamza:** That would be fun. The magic bus. That would be lovely. You know, I said when we did this show that the emphasis was going to be on fun, and I want to make sure we follow through with that, so that's great.

Hannon: You had some executive session stuff you wanted to do tonight? **Baugh:** Before we do that, Jerry – **Hamza:** What's that? **Baugh:** Before we do that, this is Loretta. There's a couple things. Can we do the results of the judge's ballot before we go in to executive session? **Hamza:** If it's ready we can. **Baugh:** Rachel? **Anger:** Let me see here. I have votes from everybody but Sharon and Roger. **Baugh:** OK. Well, while they're voting, I have two other

things. I got a note from Beth Cassely and she said the Fairgrounds in Indianapolis is still waiting for a deposit. **Hamza:** OK. Well, we were waiting for Carla to get back from Australia. Carla, would you just send them their deposit. **Bizzell:** OK. I guess someone on the committee can tell me who would get the check and everything. I don't have a checkbook. It will need to come from Central Office. **Hamza:** Yeah. Get a hold of Beth or I could forward you it. I've got a copy of the contract. I've just got to figure out which one of my offices I'm going to tomorrow.

(12) INDIVIDUAL MEMBERSHIP (FOLLOW-UP TO PROPOSAL #1).

Hamza: #11, individual membership. Who put this on the agenda? **Anger:** At the June board meeting, you asked me to put it on the agenda. Yeah. **Hamza:** That means I did it. **Shelton:** So, what do you want to talk about, Jerry? **Hamza:** You know, I guess we need to – the fact that it made the agenda, we need to figure out a way to see what the membership – we need to take the temperature of the membership on this item. **Shafnisky:** Jerry, this is Alene. I actually had a comment as to that, and it was one of the things that I think frustrated people at the annual. Many of us were completely blindsided when it was ruled out of order because of New York law, and quite frankly, I'm still not aware of the provisions of New York law for non-profits that made the particular rule change out of order. I think it would be helpful if there was an explanation as to how the law and the alterations to the constitution, as provided, could be changed so that we might actually go ahead and reformulate it and then do a litmus test with that, so maybe Ed can give us an explanation. **Hamza:** It's my understanding that that was just the first defect. If you're – you know, Ed, I know we don't want to address every one of them here and now, but – **Shafnisky:** Right, and I'm not suggesting that you do it all now. I just think maybe it would be helpful to have a write-up that we can then disseminate and say, "look, these are some of the problems. Understand that we're seriously considering it. We're taking seriously the people who were promoting this and, you know, we want to get it into a format that can at least be voted on by the delegation. **Hamza:** The other problem with this is that there's no one solution that's going to allow this to happen overnight. When you vote at the annual, you know, with a constitutional change it takes place the following day unless otherwise stated. This is something that has probably got to be phased in over years. We have – you know, we've been a club-oriented organization from the beginning and everything we do – you know, this is, this changes the core of who we are. I was thinking that maybe we take a straw poll of the clubs. The amount of work it would take to do something like this is mind boggling. To even go down this road in a serious manner, I think at some point we would have to at least ask; maybe, like I said, take a straw poll of the clubs sometime in the future, because if it is something we're going to consider seriously, a resolution at the annual is going to be very, very difficult to put together something that's going to work. **Miller:** Jerry, this is Joan. **Hamza:** Yeah, go ahead Joan. **Miller:** Well, I don't see it as a major change in CFA's structure, which is based on a club membership. The way I recall it, and I don't have it in front of me, that the proposal from some of the clubs, I think it was the first proposal, had to do with adding an element to CFA and it was not a voting thing, which I think was the hang-up always before, that we would go either club voting membership or an individual voting membership. That wasn't what it was all about. It was an additional thing. The clubs would still be the voting members. There would be certain privileges given to the other members, the individual members, similar to how we have breed council individual members and we have catteries that are registered, which are pretty much individual, so it's not that it is unheard of in CFA to have individuals that are participants that are recognized. I see it similar to a breed council membership, really. It's just an addition. They would not be able to vote, but they would be able to participate in discussion, perhaps, or whatever other outline. I forget the outline, exactly, of what it was. **Hamza:** Maybe I'm missing

something here, but I thought the whole impetus for the individual membership was to gain some say in the organization via voting. **Miller:** No, no voting. **Shafnisky:** I think it was, Joan. **Newkirk:** I think you're wrong, Joan. **Miller:** San Diego Cat Fanciers was one of the sponsors, and we discussed it thoroughly at our meeting, and I would never have gone along with that. I know that we talked about the fact that one of the differences about this proposal was that it would not be voting. I'm walking back to my office right now because I can get a hold of it. **Hamza:** Ed? Are you still on the call? **Raymond:** Yes, I'm here. **Hamza:** Didn't proposition 1 deal with empowering individual members? **Raymond:** Yeah. It was a bit confused. The rationale behind it was to empower individual members, but I think Joan is correct that they would be able to speak to the delegation at the annual meeting, but would not have a vote. **Miller:** Right. **Raymond:** That's my recollection. **Shelton:** This is Mike. I've got it here. Individuals would be empowered to vote for board members, but not for proposals at the annual. They could speak at the annual, but they could not vote. **Hamza:** They would be able to vote on elections for regional directors and the other officers. **Shelton:** And officers and Directors-at-Large. **Miller:** I didn't think that was in there. Wait a minute. **Hannon:** How about if somebody comes up with a proposal for the straw poll, so we don't do it tonight and somehow structure the poll. **Hamza:** And that's probably – **Miller:** Wait. This is Joan. I'm looking at it, too. I don't see anything about membership, and being able to vote for regionals. Where do you find that? What section? **Shelton:** It's on the second page of the proposal under Article VI, underlined right before *c. Candidates*. The paragraph above that. *Any individual member in good standing ... is eligible to vote for officers ...* **Miller:** Wait a minute. Which page was it? Page 2? **Shelton:** Page 2. **Hannon:** We don't need to take up time now to do this. **Miller:** Well, it may have been the other proposal, which was not the club proposal that I'm talking about. **Hannon:** We don't need to do this now. **Miller:** Yeah, OK. **Raymond:** There was only one proposal for individual membership that was on the ballot this time around. **Hamza:** Yeah, it was Proposal 1. Anyway, Mark, I will – as soon as things settle down with the move and Central Office, we'll figure out a way. It probably won't be until after the October meeting. **Newkirk:** Jerry, this is Darrell. **Hamza:** Yeah, Darrell. **Newkirk:** Can we have Ed just give us a little explanation of what part of New York law this violated? Because, I mean, is that why it was ruled out of order? **Hamza:** Yeah. **Hannon:** Maybe by email. Send us an email with it, so he has time to pull it together. **Raymond:** I've got it written up because I provided it to Jerry, so I'll find it and share it. **Hamza:** Yeah, email it and just know this, everybody on the board. That was just the first defect. There was probably – Ed, how deep did it go? 5 or 6? **Raymond:** There were others. I pretty much stopped when I found the first one that was the deal killer. **Hamza:** OK. **Newkirk:** The reason I'm bringing it up is because when I was sitting at the meeting, I'm like Alene. I was blindsided by this and I mean it came across as that we didn't want this to happen. **Hamza:** No, no. We actually – **Newkirk:** There should have been some explanation. That's what I'm saying. **Hamza:** The best explanation is the explanation I gave. It violated New York state law. When you get Ed's explanation, you'll understand why it wasn't read out, because your eyes will glaze over. It's just legalese. I didn't want to sit there and read legalese the very first thing off at the meeting. **Hannon:** Can we summarize #11 by saying that we're going to do a straw poll, it's going to be some months off before we can pull that together, and in the meantime Ed is going to email us the rationale for ruling this out of order at the Annual. **Hamza:** Fine. **Raymond:** OK.

Proposed Constitutional Amendment 1(PCA 1) must be ruled out of order based on the proposed amendment to Article IV, Section 6 which reads as follows:

Section 6 – Quorum

The presence of one-half (1/2) of the total members clubs registered at any Annual or Special Meeting shall constitute a quorum.

Rationale

As a New York not-for-profit corporation, CFA is governed by the New York Not-For-Profit Corporation Law. A by-law or constitutional provision that is inconsistent with the Not-For-Profit Corporation Law is void and unenforceable. [Sealey v. Am. Soc. of Hypertension, Inc., 10 Misc. 3d 572, 574, 809 N.Y.S.2d 421, 423 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2005) aff'd, 26 A.D.3d 254, 810 N.Y.S.2d 48 (N.Y. App. Div. 2006)]

N-PCL § 608(a) provides in relevant part that “Members entitled to cast a majority of the total number of votes entitled to be cast thereat shall constitute a quorum at a meeting of members for the transaction of any business...” CFA Constitution Article IV, Section 3 provides in relevant part that “At each Annual or Special Meeting of this Association, each member club that has been in good standing for not less than fifty (50) days immediately prior to such meeting is entitled to cast one vote....” Thus, pursuant to New York law (and the current constitutional provision), a quorum exists for a CFA Annual or Special Meeting when more than half of the member clubs that have been in good standing for not less than fifty (50) days immediately prior to such meeting are present.

If adopted, the proposed amendment to Article IV, Section 6 would be inconsistent with N-PCL § 608(a) because it would determine a quorum based on the number of member clubs registered for an Annual or Special Meeting rather than on the number of member clubs entitled to vote. Because this proposed amendment is part of PCA 1 and PCA 1 cannot be changed without violating the notice requirements of CFA Constitution Article XVI, PCA 1 must be ruled out of order in its entirety.

NOTE: I also think there are problems with the language of the proposed amendments to Article IV, Section 4, Article VI, Section 2(c) and Article IX subsection (a) but I don't believe it is necessary to spell those all out given the issue with the quorum requirement.

Miller: Jerry, can I just make one correction? **Hamza:** Yeah. I just wanted to say that I was incorrect when I said that San Diego Cat Fanciers had anything to do with this one. I was thinking of another one. I know we discussed it a lot, but I was wrong on that. I wouldn't want that in the minutes. **Hamza:** OK, so noted.

(13) UPDATE ON ALLIANCE.

Hannon: Is there a #13 you want to add, Jerry? **Hamza:** Yeah, we need to talk about the move and the new computer system. **Hannon:** Is this executive session? **Hamza:** No, this can be open session, then we'll go in after that. First off, Manasquan, our last day of operations is this coming Thursday. **Hannon:** A week from today? **Hamza:** Yeah, a week from today and the sale is pretty much set at this point. We are going to be closing on the 15th. We will have 15 days after we're done operating there to deal with whatever leftover furniture and equipment. We'll either offer it for sale to the new buyers, or have an auction in the parking lot and dispose of it

that way. Annette, are you on this call still? **Wilson:** Yes. **Hamza:** Sometime by the end of next month, we will have a figure for you to work with, for your new committee. **Wilson:** OK.

Hamza: So you can start working on that. The staff in Alliance is together. We are, the new computer system is, we are working with it. There are daily challenges. We started off with big problems and we're cycling down into smaller and smaller problems. I can't tell you exactly what's going to happen when we go live, but we think we've got a decent handle on it. David, do you want to interject anything at this point? **White:** No. The only thing I'll say is, we're very in tune and in touch on a daily basis with Computan and the committee members. Ginger has also been on many of the calls throughout the last several weeks, so we are making significant progress. One thing I will say, once we officially get everything up and running, the system itself is going to be very intuitive, easy to use. The registration process is extremely streamlined. I would say on average, as many of you guys know, it would take Central Office today 3-4 people to complete a registration, and several minutes to do so. During some of the parallel testing of putting through registrations, our folks in Alliance are able to complete a registration in less than 5 minutes. **Meeker:** That's one person. **White:** Yes, one person. **Hannon:** I thought when we got the new system up and running that the breeders were going to be able to register the whole thing online without human intervention. **White:** Right now, we're just working through the admin piece of it. Right now, the client portion of it, because we want to get our folks in Central Office familiar with the process, so as far as us going through those parallel testing, obviously since the client side's not ready or available, we're having our Central Office folks go through that process as an education for themselves, as well as test confirmation for us. **Hamza:** Actually, Mark, even when the client does it, it still has to be checked over by the administrative side, and if everything looks right they click a button and it goes through. **White:** It will be quicker. So, just like Jerry said – **Hannon:** I thought what we were told was that the breeder would be able to go online, fill in the information, click a button and they immediately have their number. That's what we were told at various town hall meetings. **Hamza:** And that's basically, that's what's going to happen. **Hannon:** But not if it's after hours and we have to wait until the next day for somebody to come in and verify those. **Hamza:** I think the number will be issued right away. I just think that, what happens is that they get, on the administrative side they get a notice that these registrations came through and somebody goes through and makes sure that it all makes sense. **White:** There will have to be an approval process, Mark, so there's some validation that we want to make sure takes place. For example, the end user goes online, submits a registration. What will happen is, it will actually show up on a dashboard saying, "you've got a registration", or whoever is going to be managing registrations, so they'll have visibility as registrations come in instantly, and they go into that particular registration, check a few things, make sure everything looks accurate, ensure that the payment went through, and then they click "approve" and it's done. **Hannon:** Alright, but if somebody in California on a Friday afternoon at 4:00 registers a cat, people in Alliance have already gone home. They're going to have to wait until Monday to get their number, when the staff comes back and verifies everything? **White:** If there's no one there, yes. **Hannon:** OK. Then we need to make that clear to people, because they've been told they will immediately get it. **Hamza:** We will. **Hannon:** Alright. While I'm on the subject – **White:** Which is better than the 2 or 3 weeks that they're waiting today, right? **Hamza:** One of the things we had to make sure of, Mark, is that we're trying to head off any kind of fraudulent registrations. **Hannon:** Can I ask another question? **Hamza:** Yeah. You can ask as many questions as you want. **Hannon:** At one point, we were planning to have several months with Bertha running and the new computer system running in parallel. Are we – I don't understand where we are in the new computer system process. Is that started up? Are we running it parallel? **Hamza:** We're running it parallel. What's happening every day is that New Jersey is faxing over the registrations and Alliance is registering the cats. What we had hoped to happen in

parallel is happening. We're finding errors almost daily and to Computan's credit, we're fixing errors in real time. **Hannon:** What's the process time now? I for example yesterday registered a litter and an individual cat. At what point will I be getting back the registration number? **White:** The one that you just submitted yesterday? **Hannon:** The one I submitted yesterday. What's the timing on processing of this? It went to New Jersey, it gets faxed to Ohio I'm just hearing now. **White:** It's still being processed the old way right now, so all incoming registrations that are submitted today and up until next week will continue to be processed out of New Jersey. For the parallel testing portion, that's what Jerry is referring to, then after they complete that registration then they're submitting that paperwork over to Alliance to go through the process on the new system. **Hannon:** We're closing that office in New Jersey on Thursday. At what point are we stopping New Jersey from processing registrations? Hopefully, not Thursday. **Hamza:** August 2nd will be – well, Thursday is the last day New Jersey will be processing applications. **Hannon:** But we're closing the office that day, right? That's what you said. **Hamza:** Well, we're closing it Friday, but that's the day we're backing up the old computer, shutting her down. We're also bringing the old computer to Alliance in case we run into some glitches where we can't – if something bad happens, we can always plug Bertha back in. **Hannon:** Does Michael know how to operate Bertha? Or do we have to bring Connie [Sellitto] out? **Hamza:** We have a national contract with some time left on it, I believe several months, with a company that maintains our COBOL system, and they're going to be the ones who are packing Bertha up and moving her to Alliance. **Hannon:** Does somebody there know how to operate her? Does somebody know how to make her work? **Hamza:** Yes. I mean, we'll have Shirley there and we will have, if we have to bring Shelly in, but that would be a nightmare scenario. **White:** And we have several New Jersey Central Office employees that have offered to assist if the need arises. Some are willing to travel to Alliance and some are willing to perform tasks remotely for a fee. **Hamza:** Let's hope it doesn't come to that. **Hannon:** If you're really comfortable that when we close the office in New Jersey next Thursday, that the Ohio people, equipment, etc. is in position to continue on. **Hamza:** Yes. We have – what's going to happen is, at the very minimum on that day, our customers will be able to do what they've been doing right now, except that things will be much quicker. Their registrations will be out way faster than they are now. We have a way to print them on an individual basis. We're not waiting to run big batches at a time, so if 20 come in today, 20 will go out today. We're not waiting to batch them up. As time goes on, here's the thing with this system. There's going to be a client dashboard. It's going to be the one place you go to, to get what you need to get done for CFA done. **Hannon:** Alright, so the client is anyone that needs a service from CFA? **Hamza:** Right. Our people. Eventually, it's probably not going to be there Thursday, but probably by the 1st of September people are going to be able to go to that dashboard. What's going to be there Thursday is, they're going to be able to register their cats, register their litters, all the things they can do now, but probably by the beginning of September, things that they're going to be able to do is put their credit card in and order pedigrees right online and print them out. They're going to be able to do ring reports, they're going to be able to do show reports. We are going to continue to add services, and they're only going to have to go to their dashboard. When they log on – **White:** - want to roll it out in a phased approach, so we want to make sure that the admin portion of the site, which is the Central Office side of the business, is fully functional, operational and we feel confident that the output is what we want to see, all the tables are being translated properly, all the BCS codes are correct, and then we'll start introducing the client side, which is going to look a little differently than it does today, so we want to make sure that we allow our constituents the opportunity to kind of get a preview before we officially launch it. **Hannon:** Are we going to put out a demonstration? **White:** We plan on putting up like a mock system for them, for review, so they can kind of see what it's like to, or what it's going to take to register a litter, register a cat and become familiar

with the site. **Hamza:** Are we going to get that up tomorrow or Monday, David? **White:** What's that? **Hamza:** When are we going to get that up? **White:** They're working on it now, so as you know, we had a major glitch today that – **Hannon:** Why don't we put out some sort of a CFA news announcement about this? **Hamza:** We're putting it up and we're going to try to get it to you, and we want to get it on the front page of the website. Some of the things that are very important – it won't work unless people update their browsers. If they don't have a fairly recent version of their browser, it won't work. **Hannon:** Maybe we could do some screen capture picture types of things to put in the newsletter, so people will know what to expect to look at. **White:** Yes, because it is – we're trying, because our goal is to make it look as similar, so there's not a dramatic change for everyone, because we know a lot of people have challenges dealing with change, so we want to try to minimize as much change as possible, but in a nutshell, it is going to be different. **Newkirk:** Is it going to be compatible with most of the current browsers that are available online? **White:** Yes. Internet Explorer, I want to say 7 and higher. Google. Chrome is a no. **Newkirk:** No? **White:** Nope. No Chrome. Firefox, so we'll have all that information readily available and we'll get that out prior to our launch, to allow people to prepare in the event that they have old computer systems that may not function properly with the new client side of the application. Most people have Internet Explorer 7 or higher today. I mean, if not, they can certainly go to the Microsoft website and download it for free. The only caveat is, if they have an extremely old PC, it may run extremely slow. **Hamza:** That's going to go much faster, too, once these applications build in. **Newkirk:** So, it's basically Internet Explorer and Firefox? **White:** Yeah. **Hamza:** You're going to be able to look at your whole – the system is based on people, not on cats, so you're going to be able to look at all your cats and see where you are in the system.

White: We won't officially load the actual database that we'll be working with moving forward until we close down Central Office which, by the way, Jerry, I don't know if you mentioned it, we do need to close the office down early next Thursday, because it does take 6 hours to retrieve the database, so we need to close by noon on Thursday to allow – **Hannon:** We should send a notice out about that. **White:** – Computan the 6 hours to take another snapshot of the database in preparation for the movers, who are coming in that evening around 8:30. **Hamza:** You know what I'll do, David? We'll have a recording up, telling people to call the Alliance number. **Hannon:** What about emails and stuff? We should probably just put a notice out. **Hamza:** You know what, Mark? We're going to come up with something for a newsletter for Monday or Tuesday, and it will have everything on there. We want to hit this. Also, I want to get on the front page of the website, you know, "our number and our address is – ". You know, actually, we've been getting some really nice feed-back from our new staff. Just so the people on this board know, they've really done a good job. **Hannon:** I had Kathy change on the Contact Us page the information to put all the – fax number, the phone number, the address and all for Ohio on there, so it's on the website but not on the front page. If you hit the Contact Us link, it takes you to the newest information. **Hamza:** And just to, you know, does anybody have any more questions on ending in New Jersey and starting in Alliance? **White:** Are we doing anything for the office staff next week? I know we had talked about having a lunch. Did we firm that up? **Hamza:** You mean, in – **White:** New Jersey. **Hamza:** I just got an email suggesting a pizza party or a luncheon. I think either would be appropriate. So, we're going to handle that. I don't think that requires board action. **Hannon:** I sent a copy of the last week's newsletter to all the staff in Ohio, so they feel a part of what's going on. **Hamza:** Good, good. You know, we had, like I said, I'm going to probably be living in Ohio the next several weeks.

(14) UPDATE ON 2015 ANNUAL.

Baugh: I had one other thing. The Great Lakes Region is hosting the CFA Annual in 2015 and we have contracted with the Sheraton Center – Downtown Toronto. It's right smack dab in the middle of everything. The only difficulty we had was the fact that in June in 2015, Toronto is hosting the PanAm Games. We have contracted the annual starting – through the week starting – we'll be in there from the 30th of June until the 5th of July. The board meeting will be on July 2nd, the Annual on July 3rd and the banquet on the 4th of July, which is in the constitution. We got a very good rate. I have to thank – immensely thank Rich Mastin and Pat from Helms-Briscoe. Rich is an incredible negotiator. I would have caved three times before he finally said OK. He had everything that we asked for and then some. But we're right downtown, smack in the middle of everything, \$121 a night guaranteed through 2015, and that was where we had our biggest problem in getting into Toronto was the fact that each hotel that we spoke to wanted to add a 3% to 5% increase per year, and Pat got these people to come through for us. It's similar to what you saw in Reston. Right across the street is the Eaton Centre and there's six miles of underground shops and restaurants right there. I think it's going to be a great facility. We're very excited about it, but I need you to notify, especially the regional directors, to notify your people that it's going to be a week later than normal. Any questions?

Hamza: Can we go? **Eigenhauser:** I move we adjourn. **Meeker:** Second.

Hamza called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

Meeting adjourned at 12:18 a.m. EST.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Anger, Secretary