

**SUMMARY AND TRANSCRIPT OF CONFERENCE CALL  
CFA BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
MAY 14, 2013**

**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.

Awards Committee Report .....	(2)
Central Office Report .....	(4)
Club Applications .....	(3)
Club Membership List Deadline Proposal .....	(10)
Distribution of Household Pet Results by Central Office .....	(12)
Emergency Support Disbursement.....	(5)
Experimental Show Format Request.....	(9)
Interpretation of Show Rule 20.06.....	(6)
Judging Program .....	(1)
Motion for Exception to Show Rule 25.13 – Rolandus Union .....	(8)
Motion to Reconsider Show Rule 25.13 re: percentage of CFA judges at shows .....	(7)
Proposal to Encourage New Exhibitors to Become Club Members .....	(11)
Regional Assignments .....	(15)
Show Scheduling – Steel City Kitties .....	(14)
World Show Date.....	(13)

**Secretary's Note:** The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. met on Tuesday, May 14, 2013, via teleconference. President **Jerold Hamza** called the meeting to order at 9:00 p.m. with the following members present:

- Mr. Jerold Hamza (President)**
- Mr. Mark Hannon (Vice-President)**
- Carla Bizzell, C.P.A. (Treasurer)**
- Ms. Rachel Anger (Secretary)**
- Ms. Sharon Roy (NAR Director)**
- Ginger Meeker, Ph.D. (NWR Director)**
- Ms. Carissa Altschul (GSR Director)**
- Mrs. Loretta Baugh (GLR Director)**
- Mr. Michael Shelton (SWR Director)**
- Ms. Kathy Calhoun (MWR Director)**
- Mrs. Tracy Petty (SOR Director)**
- Mrs. Kayoko Koizumi (Japan Regional Director)**
- Mr. Pauli Huhtaniemi (Europe Regional Director)**
- Roger Brown, DVM (Director-at-Large)**
- George J. Eigenhauser, Esq. (Director-at-Large)**
- Mr. Richard Kallmeyer (Director-at-Large)**
- Mrs. Carol Krzanowski (Director-at-Large)**
- Mr. Darrell Newkirk (Director-at-Large)**

**Also Present:**

- Edward L. Raymond, Jr., Esq., CFA Legal Counsel**
- Donna Jean Thompson, Director of Operations**

**Not Present:**

**Mr. David White (Director-at-Large)**  
**Mrs. Annette Wilson(Director-at-Large)**  
**Roemann Fulkerson, Director of Marketing and Public Relations**

**SUMMARY**

**(1) JUDGING PROGRAM.**

**Ms. Anger** moved to grant an exception to Judging Program Rule, Section II, Paragraph A.6. and allow an applicant from Thailand to be exempt from “continuous” participation as a club member. Seconded by **Mr. Newkirk, Motion Carried.**

**Chair Mrs. Baugh** moved that the seminar held in March 2013 in Tokyo Japan will count towards continuing education credit. Seconded by **Mr. Newkirk, Motion Carried.**

**Chair Mrs. Baugh** moved to accept the following advancements:

**Advance to Approval Pending Specialty**

<i>Li Ling Chung (Chloe)</i>	<i>Causeway Bay, Hong Kong</i>	<i>LH – 2<sup>nd</sup> Specialty</i>	<i>17 yes</i>
<i>Yuko Nozuki</i>	<i>Hokkaido, Japan</i>	<i>LH – 1<sup>st</sup> Specialty</i>	<i>17 yes</i>

**Advance to Approved Specialty:**

<i>Chika Hiraki</i>	<i>Chiba, Japan</i>	<i>SH – 1<sup>st</sup> Specialty</i>	<i>17 yes</i>
---------------------	---------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------

**Advance to Approved Allbreed:**

<i>Cathy Dinesen</i>	<i>Leawood, Kansas</i>		<i>17 yes</i>
----------------------	------------------------	--	---------------

**(2) AWARDS COMMITTEE REPORT.**

**(a) Star Awards**

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

**(b) Retroactive BOD Service Pins**

**Mr. Shelton** moved to approve the recommendations of the committee for 2013 recipients of the Star awards, and approve engraving and delivery of BOD service pins for those individuals who are entitled to them but did not receive them. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.**

**(3) CLUB APPLICATIONS.**

The following club applications were presented for acceptance:

- NEW ENGLAND MEOW OUTFIT (NEMO) (Region 1). **Ms. Roy** moved to accept. Seconded by **Mrs. Meeker, Motion Carried.** Hannon, Eigenhauser, Altschul and Baugh voting no.
- UK CAT FANCIERS (Region 9). **Mr. Newkirk** moved to accept. Seconded by **Ms. Anger, Motion Carried.**
- CHINA SUPER STAR CAT FANCIERS (International Division, Asia – China). **Mr. Newkirk** moved to accept. Seconded by **Ms. Anger, Motion Carried.** Altschul voting no. Petty abstained.

**(4) CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT.**

**(a) Time Frame for Implementation of Grand of Distinction Award**

No action items were presented.

**(b) Club Retirement – Lord Baltimore**

No action items were presented.

**(c) Show Format Request – Cat Fashion Club (International Division – Israel)**

Tabled.

**(d) Request to grant exception to Show Rule 9.04 for International Shows**

Amnesty was granted for confirmed grands up to today that did not earn points under more than 2 judges.

**(5) EMERGENCY SUPPORT DISBURSEMENT.**

Tabled.

**(6) INTERPRETATION OF SHOW RULE 20.06.**

Tabled.

**(7) MOTION TO RECONSIDER SHOW RULE 25.13 RE: PERCENTAGE OF CFA JUDGES AT SHOWS.**

**Ms. Anger** moved to reconsider the December 4, 2012 motion to increase the percentage of judges at CFA shows that are CFA-licensed. Seconded by **Mr. Newkirk**, **Motion Failed**. Newkirk voting yes. Anger abstained.

**(8) MOTION FOR EXCEPTION TO SHOW RULE 25.13 – ROLANDUS UNION.**

**Ms. Anger** moved to grant an exception to Show Rule 25.13 for the Rolandus Union show to be held in Kiev, Ukraine, on November 16/17, 2013, to allow the use of up to 50% guest judges at its 8-ring show. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser**, **Motion Carried**. Altschul and Petty voting no.

**(9) EXPERIMENTAL SHOW FORMAT REQUEST.**

**Mrs. Baugh** moved to allow France Cat Fancier to have a 3-day show on November 9-11, 2013 with a maximum of 12 rings. Seconded by **Mrs. Meeker**, **Motion Carried**. Altschul voting no

**(10) CLUB MEMBERSHIP LIST DEADLINE PROPOSAL.**

No action items were presented.

**(11) PROPOSAL TO ENCOURAGE NEW EXHIBITORS TO BECOME CLUB MEMBERS.**

No action items were presented.

**(12) DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD PET RESULTS BY CENTRAL OFFICE.**

Central Office will email scanned copies of Household Pet results to the regional Household Pet scorers.

**(13) WORLD SHOW DATE.**

The World Show will be the 4th weekend in November (November 23/24, 2013) at the Suburban Collection Showplace in Novi, Michigan.

**(14) SHOW SCHEDULING – STEEL CITY KITTIES.**

**Mrs. Baugh** moved that Steel City be allowed to have the second weekend in February as their traditional date. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Failed.** Shelton, Baugh, Hannon, Roy, Calhoun, Koizumi, Eigenhauser, Kallmeyer voting yes.

**Mrs. Baugh** moved that Steel City be allowed to have the second weekend of February as their traditional date, and that the format be restricted to a maximum of 8 allbreed rings (i.e., 8 AB, 4 SP) unless different approval is givens. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.** Anger, Bizzell, Newkirk, Altschul, Krzanowski, Petty, Roy and Koizumi voting no.

**(15) REGIONAL ASSIGNMENTS.**

The policy regarding determination of regional assignments is as follows:

*While the “region of residence” for regional awards isn’t determined until the first full show weekend in January, it’s never too early to insure that the regional designation listed on your show entry form and in the catalog is correct. The boundaries of Regions 1 -7 set forth in the CFA Constitution follow state lines in most instances, but each of those regions contains at least one state and/or province which is divided along a longitudinal or latitudinal boundary. The Internet has made it easy to determine the longitude or latitude of an address. Exhibitors residing near a longitudinal or latitudinal regional boundary should confirm their region of residence by looking up the coordinates of their address at <http://itouchmap.com/latlong.html> .*

## TRANSCRIPT

**Anger:** Would you like me to call the roll? **Hamza:** In a second. I just want to say a few things before we get started. I had a procedure yesterday where I had some injections into my spine, so I'm in a fair amount of pain tonight. I would appreciate if everybody kept things on point and tried to stay focused, so we can move things right along. I'm going to try to hang with it. If I can't, Mark, I'll just say I'm done and you can move right along, but I'm going to try to stick with it. Like I said, if everybody just tries to stay focused, and if we don't wander too much, I think we can get through this. Go ahead Rachel, call the roll please. **Anger:** Sure. Jerry Hamza. **Hamza:** I'm here. **Anger:** Mark Hannon. **Hannon:** Here. **Anger:** Carla Bizzell. **Bizzell:** Here. **Anger:** Rachel Anger is here. Sharon Roy. **Roy:** Here. **Anger:** Ginger Meeker. **Meeker:** Here. **Anger:** Carissa Altschul. **Altschul:** Here. **Anger:** Loretta Baugh. **Baugh:** Here. **Anger:** Mike Shelton. **Shelton:** Here. **Anger:** Kathy Calhoun. **Calhoun:** Here. **Anger:** Tracy Petty. **Petty:** Here. **Anger:** Kayoko Koizumi. Pauli Huhtaniemi. **Huhtaniemi:** Here. **Anger:** 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 has a business commitment tonight. No David. And Annette Wilson may be joining us later. Annette, you're not on now, are you? Ed Raymond. **Raymond:** Here. **Anger:** Donna Jean Thompson. **Thompson:** Here. **Anger:** Roemann may join us later. Is Shino Wiley on? Is there anyone whose name I have not called? OK, we're all set. Thank you.

**(1) JUDGING PROGRAM.**

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

**List of Committee Members:** *Norman Auspitz – Representative on the CFA Protest Committee; Mentor Program Administrator; Domestic Training and File Administrator;*  
*Pat Jacobberger – Education Chair*  
*Ellyn Honey – Domestic Training and File Administrator*  
*Rick Hoskinson – Domestic Training and File Administrator*  
*Jan Stevens – Domestic Training and 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 Vanwongerghem – European Liaison; Application Advisor – Europe*

---

**Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:**

*The Judging Program Committee has received a note of appreciation from Pam Bassett for her advancement to Approval Pending Allbreed.*

**Baugh:** Before we do the judges that are coming up for advancement, I just have a couple real quick things. I forwarded a note to Rachel. We got a thank you note from Joan Miller to the board and the Judging Program Committee for her elevation to Emeritus status. She wanted to know if she could come to functions, and I said absolutely, she was always more than welcome.

**Current Happenings of Committee:**

*The Judges Workshop will be held Thursday, June 27<sup>th</sup>. The breeds being discussed are Abyssinian, Maine Coon and Somali. The Judging Program Committee will be meeting at the Annual and will be discussing pertinent agenda items.*

**Continuous Club Membership Issue:**

*Mrs. Donna Isenberg received a request from an applicant in Thailand to ask the Board of Directors to make a ruling on a continuous club membership issue. Judging Program Rule, Section II – Requirements for Applying to the Judging Program – Regions 1-9, Paragraph A.6. states:*

6. An applicant must present a letter from at least one CFA member club which verifies a record of not less than five (5) years of active continuous participation as a club member. ...

The applicant had continuous membership in a club which was accepted in June of 2007, but was dropped in June of 2011 for reasons beyond his control. He is currently a member in another club in Thailand and is asking if the 4 years in his previous club can count towards his club requirement, since it was not possible for him to have continuous participation in a club that was dropped before he was able to complete the 5 year requirement. He goes on to mention a large number of grand champions, divisional winners and personal recognition he has received from CFA.

**Action Item:** Grant an exception to Judging Program Rule, Section II, Paragraph A.6. and allow this particular applicant from Thailand to be exempt from “continuous” participation as a club member.

**Hamza:** The first item on tonight’s agenda is the Judging Program. Loretta? **Baugh:** Can everybody hear me OK? <yes> OK. You have the report in front of you. We had a request from someone in Thailand. I think it is pretty well spelled out. The applicant is currently a member of a club in Thailand and is asking if the 4 years in the previous club can count, since there was no possibility for club membership during the time frame when there was not a club. Even though it wouldn’t be continuous, when the person is ready to apply, it will be 5 years; it just won’t be continuous. **Anger:** This is Rachel. I would make a motion that we accept that. **Newkirk:** I’ll second it.

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

**Action Item:** Adopt the following proposed Judging Program Rule revisions.

The JPC has seen an increase in interest in the CFA Judging Program from individuals licensed in other associations. Our current requirements do not offer any type of opportunity for individuals who are licensed in independent associations, associations which CFA does not recognize, to come to CFA other than to come in as a brand new judge. The JPC is attempting to create a process to enable these licensed judges to come to CFA and to maintain the quality of the Judging Panel. Upon acceptance of this revision, a slight change in Show Rules 25.02c., will be required.

<b>SECTION IV – REQUIREMENTS FOR LICENSED JUDGES WITH GUEST JUDGING EVALUATIONS APPLYING TO THE CFA JUDGING PROGRAM</b>	
<b>Existing Wording</b>	<b>Proposed Wording</b>
8. Successfully guest judged a minimum of eight (8) CFA shows. Evaluation forms are provided by the Judging Program and must be on file with the Judging Program Guest Judges File Administrator for the eight (8) shows.	8. <u>a.</u> Successfully guest judged a minimum of eight (8) CFA shows. Evaluation forms are provided by the Judging Program and must be on file with the Judging Program Guest Judges File Administrator for the eight (8) shows.  <u>b.</u> <u>Judges who are licensed by Independent Associations (not recognized by CFA) must have successfully guest judged a minimum of twenty</u>

	(20) CFA shows. Evaluation forms are provided by the Judging Program and must be on file with the Judging Program Guest Judges File Administrator for the twenty (20) shows.
--	--

**SECTION XI – INTERNATIONAL DIVISION**

<b>Existing Wording</b>	<b>Proposed Wording</b>
<p><b>3. REQUIREMENTS FOR GUEST JUDGES TO THE CFA JUDGING PROGRAM</b></p> <p>a. Invitations from CFA clubs for non-CFA Judges are subject to the approval of the CFA Judging Program Committee and may be considered only by Approved Allbreed, Approval Pending Allbreed or Approved Specialty Judges whose license from an accepted association is on file with the Judging Program Committee and who have been actively judging with their parent association for a minimum of five (5) years. Individuals may guest judge for CFA a maximum of five (5) times per show season and a maximum of two (2) times per club, per show season. A Judge may only judge the level at which they are licensed.</p> <p>c. A Guest Judge Evaluation Form will be completed by the club and mailed to the Judging Program Committee within thirty (30) days of the show.</p>	<p><b>3. REQUIREMENTS FOR GUEST JUDGES TO THE CFA JUDGING PROGRAM</b></p> <p>a. Invitations from CFA clubs for non-CFA Judges are subject to the approval of the CFA Judging Program Committee and may be considered only by Approved Allbreed, Approval Pending Allbreed or Approved Specialty Judges whose license from an accepted association is on file with the Judging Program Committee and who have been actively judging with their parent association for a minimum of five (5) years. Individuals may guest judge for CFA a maximum of five (5) times per show season and a maximum of two (2) times per club, per show season. A Judge may only judge the level at which they are licensed. <u>Judges who are licensed by an Independent Association (i.e. not recognized by CFA) will be permitted to guest judge for CFA upon furnishing proof of a minimum of five (5) years judging experience.</u></p> <p>c. A Guest Judge Evaluation Form will be completed by the club and mailed to the Judging Program Committee within thirty (30) days of the show. <u>The ability of all individuals to guest judge for CFA is predicated on receipt of positive guest judge club and exhibitor evaluations. Receipt of negative evaluations is considered to be grounds for refusal to grant permission for future Guest Judge assignments. CFA clerking experience is highly encouraged. At a minimum, completion of the CFA clerking test on line with a passing grade is required. Guest judges are expected to have a thorough knowledge of CFA mechanics and awards. Failure to satisfactorily mark the judges book, hang the correct ribbons and figure a mechanically correct final will be cause for future guest judging assignments to be denied. Guest judges should officiate on the second day of a two day show to enable observation of performance by CFA judges in attendance who have officiated on the first day.</u></p>



**Hamza:** Go ahead Loretta. **Baugh:** OK, the second item is one I wanted to bring up for discussion. We have had a lot of interest in the Judging Program from people in the International Division and in Region 9, and we have an issue with the fact that our requirements only allow us to accept people as guest judges from associations that we have an agreement with. Some of these people are interested in guest judging for CFA, but they can't because of their requirements and they don't meet our requirements to recognize them. We were trying to come up with a way where we could give these people an opportunity to prove themselves to CFA. One of the things we had come up with was to allow them to guest judge if they had been judging for a minimum of 5 years in their association, and to markedly increase the number of assignments that they would need to have before there would be any possibility of their coming to CFA.

**Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead Mark. **Hannon:** I've got a concern about this. One of the things that sets CFA apart is the quality of our judges, and if we're going to allow judges that work for an association that we don't even recognize, I'm really concerned with the quality of what we're going to be bringing in as guest judges. **Hamza:** Now we're dealing with – my concern is this. We're dealing with such a wide variety of unfamiliar associations. I think we really need to have some sort of study. Loretta, I mean, is there any kind of qualitative research or is there anything other than just an idea that's been done? **Baugh:** No. Basically, as I said, some of the other associations aren't interested in letting people come to CFA. There are judges that are interested in coming over and at least giving us a try and they can't. The only way that they could come into CFA would be to come in as somebody who has never judged before, and we were trying to find a way to give them a chance to prove themselves, which is why we went to so many guest judge assignments before they would be able to even be considered coming over. There is interest in doing something like this. It's just a matter of, is it something we want to pursue, and it was brought to our attention, so we needed to bring it forward. **Hamza:** So, what you are talking about are individuals from other associations who might be interested in coming into CFA as a judge? **Baugh:** Eventually yes. They can't guest judge for us because we don't recognize their association, is what it boils down to. **Hamza:** So, what they really want to do is, they want to join us. **Baugh:** Yeah. We want to give them an opportunity to prove themselves by guest judging, but we don't recognize their association at this point, so they can't guest judge for us. It's a catch 22. **Hamza:** I understand that, but are we looking for a mechanism maybe to have a way for judges from other associations come into our Judging Program maybe, with maybe a couple extra points because they have handled in another association? Not necessarily a more open door, but maybe with some credit because they have handled cats. **Baugh:** Yeah, it's some way to give them – a way of saying, “yeah, the door is open, but you are going to have to prove yourself.” It's difficult to find a way to prove themselves to us when they can't guest judge, and that was what we had come up with. We're certainly open to suggestions, but there is interest in people wanting to come to us, but they have been judging for a very long time and they don't really want to have to come in as somebody who has never judged before, so we are trying to find a meeting ground here, if there's a possibility of doing that. This is why I brought it in for discussion. We can up with this idea, but certainly it was just the first thing that we could think of. **Anger:** This is Rachel. **Newkirk:** Darrell. **Hamza:** Darrell and then Rachel. Go ahead Darrell.

**Newkirk:** I've got a couple of points I would like to make. Is there a reason that we haven't been provided with a list of acceptable associations that are on our books? **Baugh:** Well, I think the list has been understood for quite some time. I mean, it's those that are involved with the World Cat Congress. There are a number of smaller associations that are in place that we don't recognize. [**Koizumi** joins the conference] **Newkirk:** Alright, and my other point is, right

now, for the ones we recognize, they only have to do 8 shows. They are limited to 5 shows a year with the rule that you guys put in, so if you make them do 20 shows, that's going to be at least 4 years. I doubt that anybody would even be interested in giving a commitment for 4 years to do that, when they can just judge at their other shows. The independent clubs – and Pauli can probably address that better than most of us can – but a lot of times these are cat clubs, basically, that function as an organization, and they have judges and they put on shows. So, I'm not concerned that there wouldn't be quality judges coming in from those. They are going to be evaluated. I don't understand why there has to be so many evaluations. We will know within 5 shows if they are any good or not, and to make them do 20 and draw it out over 4 years, it just seems ridiculous to me. **Baugh:** Darrell, I would to point out, this is a suggestion. I wanted to get something going. This is certainly open to discussion and to modification, even if it's even something we want to do, I guess is what we were trying to find out. **Newkirk:** Is the WCF part of the World Cat Congress? **Baugh:** Yes. **Newkirk:** OK.

**Hamza:** Rachel. **Anger:** I have a form that we previously used, from 2010. I don't know if the Judging Program is still using it. It's called *CFA Judging Program Guest Judging Process*. In that, we have a list of the approved associations. I don't know if that is understood or made public, but I am glad to send it out. I don't know if that has been revised or amended in the last 3 years, but this was the list that the former Judging Program kept. If that would be helpful, I could send it out. **Baugh:** The only addition to that, I believe, would be the Canadian Cat Association. **Anger:** No, they are on there.

**APPROVED FOREIGN ASSOCIATIONS:**

*All current members of the World Cat Congress with the exception of any Association home based in the United States. (TICA) (ACFA)*

*WCC Members are:*

<i>FIFE</i>	<i>Federation Internationale Feline</i>
<i>TICA</i>	<i>The International Cat Association</i>
<i>WCF</i>	<i>World Cat Federation</i>
<i>ACF</i>	<i>Australian Cat Federation</i>
<i>NZCF</i>	<i>New Zealand at Fancy</i>
<i>CCC of A</i>	<i>Co-Ordinating Cat Council of Australia</i>
<i>GCCF</i>	<i>Governing Council of the Cat Fancy (UK)</i>
<i>SACC</i>	<i>South African Cat Council</i>
<i>CFA</i>	<i>Cat Fanciers Association</i>

*Other Associations accepted are:*

<i>Waratah</i>	<i>Australia</i>
<i>Catz Inc</i>	<i>New Zealand</i>
<i>RUI</i>	<i>Ukraine</i>
<i>LOOF</i>	<i>France</i>
<i>CCA</i>	<i>Canadian Cat Association</i>

**Anger:** My other question is, is the Judging Program supporting this, or are they just bringing it forward on a request? **Baugh:** We have talked about it and basically it's the sort of thing, if it's something we want to go forward with. That's what we're trying to find out. There is support for it, but the question is whether or not it is something we need to go forward with. **Newkirk:** Is there interest from judges? Is that why it's being brought up? **Baugh:** Yes, yes. There is interest from independents. **Altschul:** This is Carissa. **Hamza:** Go ahead Carissa. **Altschul:** I have a real concern about just saying, somebody has, oh, 20 years' experience but if

they have 20 years' experience essentially as part of a cat club and maybe judged 1 show a year with we don't know how many cats and we don't know what quality, instead of them coming in as guest judges, why could they not come in and do a couple training assignments? Then we could have a CFA judge be able to evaluate the decisions without being able to influence the points? I have a real problem with judges coming in from an association we don't have an agreement with, and being able to give points from the very beginning. Why not just let them be evaluated? **Hamza:** Go ahead George. **Eigenhauser:** Not quite as strong as Carissa, but I too have a real problem with sheer numbers of assignments, because in their own association, we really don't know how well they are doing. I would look for some more objective criteria. We talked about producing a mechanics test that we could use for multiple purposes. We also have our judges' test. These are, more or less, objective criteria that we could put in place as part of the process to say, "within a certain period of time, you must have passed the mechanics test within a certain period of time and you must have passed the judging test or attending a judging workshop or something in CFA." I know they already have in here passing the clerking test, and that's a good start. I would like to see things like that, rather than just raw numbers of assignments. A lot of times, with these assignments, you get these evaluations back and they are all just straight across the board all passing grades. That doesn't really tell you anything. I would like to have some objective testing measure that we could use to pick the ones that we ought to fast track and the ones that we don't need to. **Hamza:** What I am observing is that we're dealing with a very different paradigm than maybe even 3 or 4 years ago, where CFA has become far more international and we really don't have any methodology to deal with the new reality that we're looking at, so I think we need to come up with a new criteria. What we really need to do is figure out a way to make sure that we maintain CFA's standards, and yet not miss opportunities at some new judges, especially overseas where we are growing and we're having new judges may create more opportunities for CFA. So, we need to develop some sort of criteria that makes sense and that allows us to scrutinize opportunities and to make sure that we're not compromising CFA quality. **Baugh:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Baugh:** This is Loretta. If the board is interesting in pursuing this, this is what we really need to know – that there is interest there and if we can come up with a mechanism that will work, that's what we need to do. This doesn't necessarily have to be what it is, but if there's interest in pursuing it, then we can do that and come up with different suggestions. If we're not interested in figuring out a way to bring these people in, then we don't want to do that. So, this is really what we're looking at. **Hamza:** I think we have to look at it. I think it's important that we come up with a mechanism, but I think equally important is that the mechanism insures that the quality of CFA judges is consistent with what people expect from CFA. **Anger:** This is Rachel. **Baugh:** That was why we went with so many. **Hamza:** Go ahead Rachel. **Anger:** Thank you. I am a little confused. If we don't recognize their association, how can they be approved to guest judge for us? 20 times? My second point is, even our own judges that take a leave of absence and come back after a certain number of years have to take our refresher course, and these are judges that we know and that have a long history of judging with CFA. So, I would like to see this more on a case-by-case basis, where we have a special policy or procedure written up, not so much as a rule. Perhaps it could have its own section, but it would really have to be a specialized program where someone wouldn't just read our rules and say, "oh, I qualify, I can go to CFA." **Hamza:** I agree with that. I think that when you start saying "guest judging 20 times", I think that you end up creating a disservice situation. It's not going to be an off-the-rack thing. You are probably going to have to customize it, to get what you really want. **Baugh:** I think that if people are aware of the fact that there is a potential to open the door, is what we're looking for. That's really just what we're trying to do, and we can come up with something on an individual basis with some criteria before they would come over. That's basically what we're looking for – if there's a possibility of

opening the door to these people, we can come up with different criteria. **Hamza:** It's like Darrell said. If you've got somebody who has an international reputation and they are talented, they are not going to want to spend 8 years trying to get into CFA. **Baugh:** Right, right. **Hamza:** We're not going to want to do that to somebody who has that kind of talent. I think we need the flexibility to be able to evaluate somebody. On the other side, if somebody is vastly inexperienced, we also need the ability to say, "Well, we think you need to go through the program. You seem to be able to handle cats well, but you don't understand our standards so you are going to need to do X, Y and Z through the Program." **Baugh:** Based on the discussion, I will withdraw this but it gives me at least the ability to say that we can be working on something, so if people ask, we can get something worked on and get it passed at one of the meetings. Then we have some basic criteria to work with. Just so we know there is a potential to open the door. **Hamza:** I guess what I'm hearing, and I'm agreeing, is that we need to be able to be flexible enough to work with people, but also address board members' concerns that we don't compromise the quality that CFA needs. **Baugh:** Right. **Hamza:** OK.

### **Tabled.**

**Baugh:** I have two other quickies. I got an email from Ulla with the club in Sweden. She is questioning who is responsible for the cost of the visas for judges coming from Russia and the Ukraine. She said it costs just as much to bring them over with the visa as it is to bring in U.S. judges, and she wants to know if that's the club's responsibility or the individual judge's responsibility. **Bizzell:** It's the club. **Newkirk:** Yes, it's the club's responsibility. The show rules state that they have to pay all expenses. That's what it says. **Baugh:** She just wanted to verify that the visa belongs to the club and I told her I would verify it. **Newkirk:** She contacted me and I said, "Ulla, that's part of the expense of getting there. That's just like the airline ticket." I said, "if you want the judges to pay –", I mean, when I went to Russia it was \$325. I know it's a lot of money, but I shouldn't have to pay that. **Baugh:** I just wanted to verify, because she asked me to get a specific yes or no from the board, so I've done it. **Hamza:** It's right in the show rules, isn't it? **Baugh:** It doesn't specifically address visa. **Hamza:** I thought it talked about all expenses. **Baugh:** Yeah, it says all expenses. I just to be able to tell her that that is part of the expense. **Hamza:** OK. **Baugh:** Then I have one other real quickie. A real quick thing. **Huhtaniemi:** This is Pauli. **Baugh:** Go ahead Pauli. **Huhtaniemi:** It's not only visa. The Russians and Ukrainians need insurance, a different insurance. This is something that the club needs to cover, too. **Hamza:** Yeah. The clubs are responsible for all costs associated with judging. **Baugh:** Right. I think she wanted to hear it from the board itself, because she doesn't want to believe the rest of us. Well, some people are like that.

**Baugh:** In March, we had a breed seminar over in Tokyo, in conjunction with the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of CFA in Tokyo. Prior to that, we had a breed seminar also in January. When the seminar in March was discussed, Wayne and Patty did not feel that – Wayne didn't feel and Patty agreed – that we should give credit for that seminar. I was over there and it was very well done. A number of the judges asked if they could get credit. I contacted Patty when I got back, and I told her what my thoughts were – that they should. It was well done and we had a lot of judges over there working. Patty came back and said, "well, if we're going to give the judges points, we should also be giving certificates of recognition to the participants." I said to go ahead and do it, and she wasn't comfortable doing it without the board saying it was OK, because we're reversing what we had said. **Anger:** This is Rachel. **Hamza:** Go ahead Rachel. **Anger:** I apologize. I'm not following, because there was no write-up or pre-notice. The part where this wouldn't count must have slipped by me. I didn't understand that. Why wouldn't it have

counted? **Baugh:** I think that they felt it was too close to the one that was being done that was an official Judging Program Committee school. **Hamza:** Were you at both of them? **Baugh:** No. I was at the one in March, but the one in January was well attended, as well. The feeling was that if they wanted to go to a school, they could go to the school in January. **Newkirk:** How many breeds did they do in January, Loretta? **Baugh:** I would have to look up the report. You and I were both there at the one in March. **Newkirk:** I know. **Baugh:** There really isn't any reason not to have done that. **Newkirk:** I was surprised when I got a certificate, because I was told that it wasn't going to count. So, it's interesting that you bring this up, because that was one of my questions – were the participants going to be counted? If you're going to give the judges credit, I don't see how you can deny the participants credit. **Baugh:** Precisely. I agree with you. **Hamza:** Was the quality there in March? **Newkirk:** Oh my God! **Baugh:** Yes, without question. **Hamza:** Then, does anybody have any objection to it counting? <no> Alright, so why don't we just – **Baugh:** OK, I'll make a motion that the seminar in March count. **Newkirk:** I'll second it.

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

**Baugh:** OK, thank you.

**Acceptance/Advancements:**

*The following individuals are presented to the Board for advancement:*

**Advance to Approval Pending Specialty**

<i>Li Ling Chung (Chloe)</i>	<i>Causeway Bay, Hong Kong</i>	<i>LH – 2<sup>nd</sup> Specialty</i>	<i>17 yes</i>
<i>Yuko Nozuki</i>	<i>Hokkaido, Japan</i>	<i>LH – 1<sup>st</sup> Specialty</i>	<i>17 yes</i>

**Advance to Approved Specialty:**

<i>Chika Hiraki</i>	<i>Chiba, Japan</i>	<i>SH – 1st Specialty</i>	<i>17 yes</i>
---------------------	---------------------	---------------------------	---------------

**Advance to Approved Allbreed:**

<i>Cathy Dinesen</i>	<i>Leawood, Kansas</i>	<i>17 yes</i>
----------------------	------------------------	---------------

**Hamza:** Anybody got anything else? **Eigenhauser:** I have a question. **Hamza:** Go ahead George. **Eigenhauser:** When we go back into open session, are we going to see the results on the judges vote? **Hamza:** We can do that if Rachel has it. **Baugh:** Oh, it's done. I'm sorry, I thought I had mentioned that. **Hamza:** Alright, we're in open session. Go ahead Loretta. **Baugh:** All of the advancements were approved unanimously. Thank you. **Hamza:** Yay. Congratulations.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Loretta Baugh,  
Committee Chair

(2) **AWARDS COMMITTEE REPORT.**

(a) **Star Awards**

**Committee Chair:** Michael Shelton  
**List of Committee Members:** Carissa Altschul, Dennis Ganoe, Mary Kolencik,  
Geri Fellerman

---

**Current Happenings of Committee:**

*The committee has discussed the nominees for 2013 CFA Star Awards.*

*The CFA Star award is intended to recognize individuals for outstanding service to CFA. It is impossible to list all of the types of service that would merit consideration for this award, but may include public outreach, rescue, fund-raising, donation of professional services, etc.*

*Additional guidelines:*

- 1. All individuals are eligible.*
- 2. There is no limit to the number of individuals who may be recognized in a given year.*
- 3. This is not merely a length of service award, for example, for judges or clerks.*
- 4. This is not intended to recognize service for which compensation was received at market rates.*
- 5. Service at the national level is given more consideration than at the regional level, as the Regions already give out service awards of various types.*
- 6. Individuals may be recognized in more than one season. The first award for an individual will be a Bronze Star; a second award will be a Silver Star; a third award will be a Gold Star.*

[EXECUTIVE SESSION]

(b) **Retroactive BOD Service Pins**

*Additionally, the committee was tasked with determining whether any current or former BOD members did not receive Service Pins in recognition of their service to the CFA BOD. Sixteen individuals were contacted regarding this issue, to determine if they had received pins they were entitled to and, if not, whether they desired to receive the pins. They were given a deadline of May 17 to respond.*

*There are currently pin blanks in stock at CO which can be sent back to the manufacturer to have the appropriate engraving added. This would be the fastest way to get the appropriate pins produced and out to the recipients. Obtaining new pins would probably take 2-3 months to have a new die produced and the pins manufactured.*



**Action Items:**

*Approve the recommendations of the committee for 2013 recipients of the Star awards.*

*Approve engraving and delivery of BOD service pins for those individuals who are entitled to them but did not receive them.*

*Respectfully Submitted,  
Michael Shelton, Chair*

**Hamza:** Mike, do you want to move into open session on the retroactive BOD service pins? **Shelton:** That's fine with me. I have no horse in that particular race. **Hamza:** The "beat a dead horse" race? **Shelton:** There were some emails that went out to the board list. Apparently, some people did not get their pins for board service time over the last few years and I was asked, on behalf of the Awards Committee, to kind of contact all the people who may or may not have received the pins, find out if they did receive the pins, and if they didn't if they wanted them. I sent emails out to 16 people a couple of weeks ago with a deadline of May 17<sup>th</sup> to respond. I've gotten response back from 11 of those people. There have been requests for pins. The picture there is like the one we would use. It says clerk instead of board member, and I just wanted to get approval to get those sent out and engraved, so that we can get them out and get this program back up to date. **Eigenhauser:** Second.

**Hamza** called the motion. **Motion Carried.** [Krzanowski leaves the conference]  
**Shelton:** I'll get you the list, Donna Jean. **Thompson:** OK, thank you. **Shelton:** And I just want to make it clear, based on one or two emails, this is only based retroactive pins that were missed. I haven't done anything about people who would be coming up for awards at this year's annual, for 2013. **Thompson:** I have that list already. **Shelton:** OK.

(3) **CLUB APPLICATIONS.**

*Committee Chair: Liz Watson*

---

**Hamza:** Rachel, is Liz going to come on? **Anger:** Yes. She should be calling in right about now. **Hamza:** While we are waiting for Liz, Donna Jean, you want to go to your Central Office Report? [**Watson** joins the conference] Well, here she is. Liz, are you there? **Watson:** I am here. [**Krzanowski** joins the conference] **Hamza:** Why don't you proceed with Club Applications? **Watson:** Alright. I have three clubs; one from Region 1, one from Region 9 and one from the International Division – China. I presume everyone has read this.

**Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:**

*Presented new clubs applying to the CFA to be approved by the Board.*

**Current Happenings of Committee:**

*Three clubs were pre-noticed in April for membership. They are:*

*New England Meow Outfit (NEMO), Region 1, Sharon Roy, Director*

*UK Cat Fanciers, Region 9, Pauli Huhtaniemi, Director*

*China Super star Cat Fanciers, International Division, Richard Kallmeyer, Chairman*

***New England Meow Outfit (NEMO)***

***Region 1, Sharon Roy, Director***

*The constitution and by-laws are in order. There are twenty four members. Many members are members of other clubs. This is an allbreed club that wishes to produce shows in New England. The dues have been set and if disbanded, the monies will go to CFA. This club was pre-noticed and a negative letter has been received on the club. I have included that along with the Secretary's response and additional supporting letters. The Regional Director supports this club.*

**Watson:** The first one is the New England Meow Outfit, known as NEMO. The Regional Director is Sharon Roy. There was a negative letter and I included that in the packet, plus there was the Secretary's response and the supporting letters. So, I guess it's up for discussion.

**Hamza:** Sharon, do you want to make a comment on this, since it's in your region? **Roy:** I don't know how much conversation is going to go on about this, and I question whether some of it should be in closed session, really only because there are so many really nice people in this club that are relatively new, that I don't want to see a lot of hateful things get said about the club beforehand. **Hamza:** Why don't we go into closed session for a minute here, just in case things might be said that pertain to particular people.

[EXECUTIVE SESSION]

**Hamza:** OK, we're back into open session. Go ahead. Does anybody have any comments or questions on the New England Meow Outfit? **Hannon:** Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead Mark.

**Hannon:** I think I've been on this board longer than any other current board member, and I



received more negative input on this club than any club in my 15 years on this board. I mean, people are really upset. Sharon herself has commented to me numerous times that the clubs in New England are dying. People don't come up here to shows. Therefore, a lot of the clubs have stopped putting on shows. We have dearth of shows. Now we have a club coming in where we know there's a problem in getting entries. If the existing clubs can't do it, why do we think that a new club is going to be able to come in and produce shows? The club secretary has stated she is willing to underwrite the loss on these shows. That's fine for the time being, but at some point she may go away and her money may go away. At that point, it becomes a paper club for somebody. I just can't believe that this is going to be a viable club for the duration. I think it's just going to be a very short-term thing where they put on a couple shows and, as Sharon has pointed out, most of the people that belong to this club belong to other clubs. There's no real need for another club up there. **Hamza:** OK. Sharon, on the record, do you have anything you want to say? **Roy:** No. I had told Iris I would go along with the club, based on the fact that she had gotten all these people together, but I also had told her originally that most of these people did belong to other clubs, and there were 2 or 3 clubs in New England that had very open membership. But, they wanted a chance to try something different. The other thing you've got to think about is, is the only purpose of the club to have a show? That's the other thing to consider. **Hamza:** I just have a quick question. It may or may not be relevant. Does this club have – well, how much of this club membership list is unique? Do you know? **Anger:** This is Rachel. I was just going to comment on that. Five of these members say they have no other club affiliation. One of them is a CFA judge – that doesn't belong to another club? I thought that was a little strange, but 5 of these individuals claim no other club affiliation. **Hamza:** OK. I looked at the list and I know that some of them belong to other clubs, but living in Region 4 I didn't know how many were unique to this club. Does anybody else have any other questions? Can I get a motion? **Roy:** So moved. **Meeker:** Second.

**Hamza** called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Hannon, Eigenhauser, Altschul and Baugh voting no. **Hamza:** Would the no's please state their name? **Hannon:** Mark. **Eigenhauser:** George. **Altschul:** Carissa. **Baugh:** Loretta. **Hamza:** Congratulations.

### ***UK Cat Fanciers***

#### ***Regional 9, Pauli Huhtaniemi, Director***

*The constitution and by-laws are in order. There are twenty members. Seven members are members of other clubs. This is an allbreed club and they wish to put on two shows a year in the United Kingdom. The dues have been set and should the club disband, monies will be donated to a welfare organization. This club was pre-noticed and no negative letters have been received. A letter of support is included. The Regional Director supports this club.*

**Hamza:** The next club is the UK Cat Fanciers. Go ahead, Liz. **Watson:** This is a club that came in and I think there has been a lot of work put into this club. They've got 20 members. I received no negative letters, but I have to state that Rachel last week sent me a letter that was sent in by the club in Denmark that was a negative letter. I never received it, so I let my report stand as it is, that no negative letters were received. They had to be in by the 22<sup>nd</sup>. That was dated the 21<sup>st</sup>. I guess I will leave it to the board, whether they want to table this or go on with it. **Anger:** This is Rachel. **Hamza:** Go ahead Rachel. **Anger:** The email was actually addressed to both of us. Liz didn't get it for some reason. I went ahead and provided that letter in the report for the reason Liz mentioned. Also, when I read the letter, I felt that their complaints were frivolous. Someone wanted to get in touch with their club secretary and I explained to this person

that wanted to reach the secretary that we have an anonymity in our association and that I would contact the secretary and tell them you are looking for her. He said that was fine. She was on vacation, and apparently from the time he starting looking until she responded, it was 8 days. He thought that was reason to write a letter of complaint, basically. He goes on to state other things. The club has not had an opportunity to review that letter and respond, so I am repeating what Liz said. It's up to the board if we want to table it or go forward, considering the letter without merit. **Hamza:** I'm far more excited to have a presence in England, to be perfectly honest. Pauli, do you have any comments here. **Huhtaniemi:** I fully support the club. I see there are a lot of troubles to get people involved from England. That's why they have a lot of members from outside, who are willing to help the club to have some ground there. They have a plan in the next 2 years, this club will be run all by English people. I fully support this club. **Newkirk:** Jerry, it's Darrell. **Hamza:** Go ahead Darrell. **Newkirk:** The whole time that I was the ID chair, we had wisps of hope that we might get a club in the UK. Leann has worked her bottom off to get this all together. I would say something about the negative letter, but I will just be silent about that. They are out there to try to get CFA in England. I think there's a couple of TICA clubs in England already, if I'm not mistaken. Pauli, do you know? **Hamza:** I think this is so much positive, and there's really no substance to the negative letter. I don't see any reason to hold this vote up. Does any board member see any reason to hold this vote up? **Newkirk:** No, and I move that we call the question. **Anger:** This is Rachel. I second.

**Hamza** called the motion. **Motion Carried.** **Hamza:** It is my great pleasure to welcome the UK Cat Fanciers to CFA.

### ***China Super Star Cat Fanciers***

#### ***International Division--Asia (China) Richard Kallmeyer, Chair***

*The constitution and by-laws are in order. There are twenty members. No member is a member of another club. This is an allbreed club that wishes to put on a show in China twice a year The dues have been set and should the club disband, monies will be donated to an organization consistent with the guidelines of CFA This club was pre-noticed with no negative letters received. The International chair supports this club.*

**Hamza:** Liz, the China Super Star Cat Fanciers. What a name. I like that. **Watson:** There are 20 members. No member is a member of another club. Everything was in order. The International Chair supports this club, so I will leave it up to you. **Kallmeyer:** I support it. Actually, it's a person who was very active in CFA, put on probably 8 or 9 shows in Shanghai and is returning to the fold. There was an event 4 years ago at the awards show in Shanghai that turned somewhat violent and caused this person to leave the fancy, but now she is returning. I definitely support it. **Hamza:** Any questions? **Altschul:** This is Carissa. **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Altschul:** Are we going to have a new China club or 3 every single meeting? This seems to be what we're having. I'm just kind of curious. Yes, there are a lot of people in China, but I'm looking at the show reports and I'm not seeing a lot of new cattery names from one show report to another. **Kallmeyer:** I think you're going to find that there's probably going to be a show every weekend beginning in September, probably to the end of the show season. Very significant. One of the people is actually talking to the owner of 60 shopping centers in China, and they want a show in each shopping center. **Hamza:** Just statistically, the projection is that by the year 2022, that half of the world's middle class is going to reside within China. So, let me just say that again. By 2022, half of the world's middle class is going to be within the borders of China. So, if we look at that, there's a good chance that if we're lucky and we play our cards

right, there will be a CFA show every weekend – maybe 2 or 3 CFA shows every weekend – in China. **Altschul:** What report are you quoting? **Hamza:** What's that? **Altschul:** You said that projections are by 2022, half of the world's middle class will be in China. I was just curious what your source was. **Hamza:** I read that in the Wall Street Journal about 3 or 4 months ago. I'm sure that's not an uncommon statistic. **Kallmeyer:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Yeah Dick, go ahead. **Kallmeyer:** I can send Carissa or anybody else who wants the McKinsey study report on the new emerging class. It's definitely – besides India – in China, very significant. Several hundred million people moving into the middle class by that time. **Hamza:** You know, one of the things in investing, one of the hottest funds on Wall Street, is called a bric fund, and it's the emerging demographics. It stands for *Brazil Russia India and China*. If you would send that to her, Dick, that would save me. **Kallmeyer:** Sure. If anybody else wants it, let me know. **Anger:** This is Rachel. **Hamza:** Go ahead Rachel. **Anger:** Just a quick comment. I'm there maybe once a year, but I have to say it's a phenomenon what they have going on over there. They are young people, they're super enthusiastic, they're really serious about their cats and devoted to the fancy, and they really love CFA. Actually, I was kind of disappointed there was only one club from China coming forward this time. The growth over there is just explosive. It's got to be up to us to maintain a presence over there. I think that's an important income stream for CFA. **Hamza:** I think that if we play our cards right, we'll see parity at some point with the continental U.S., with multiple regions in China and multiple show weekends with counts. It will be a parity situation. That's what we're looking for. We've always claimed that we're an international organization, and there is real growth opportunity there. Anyway, as we get sidetracked, I need a motion and a second for the China Super Star Cat Fanciers. **Newkirk:** So moved. **Anger:** Second. **Petty:** Wait. **Hamza:** Somebody wants to wait? Who is waiting? **Petty:** This is Tracy. I'm trying to ask a question. **Hamza:** Go ahead Tracy. **Petty:** Who was the person that was involved in some violence years ago? **Meeker:** We're in open session. **Hamza:** Can we do that after the vote and maybe in closed session please? **Petty:** Here's my follow-up question. It doesn't really matter to me who the person was, except I would like to know if it's one of the officers, but do we have any reason to be concerned that bringing this club in will invite more violence in CFA in China? **Kallmeyer:** No. In fact, I think it's turning around quite a bit. That and other actions we can talk about in closed session.

**Hamza** called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Altschul voting no. Petty abstained. **Hamza:** Congratulations to the China Super Star Cat Fanciers. Welcome to CFA.

### **Future Projections for Committee:**

*Process and submit new club applications for consideration by the Board.*

### **Time Frame:**

*May, 2013 to Board teleconference in June, 2013.*

### **What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:**

*All new clubs that have applied for membership*

*Respectfully submitted,  
Liz Watson, Chair*

**Hamza:** Thank you so much, Liz, for joining us and helping us grow our CFA. **Watson:** OK. Thank you. Good night. **Hamza:** Have a good evening. Good night.

#### **(4) CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT.**

*Committee Chair: Donna Jean Thompson*  
*List of Committee Members: Kristi Wollam – Administrative Assistant*

---

##### **Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:**

*The end of the Show Season has arrived and brought with it all the activities necessary to close out the old and ring in the new. Central Office is very busy with these activities.*

*The Annual Amendments and Resolutions have been placed on the web site:*

*<http://www.cfa.org/Portals/0/documents/org/2013amendments.pdf>. The Official Meeting Notice for the Annual Meeting and Club copy of the Amendments and Resolutions will have been mailed Friday May 10<sup>th</sup>.*

*Jodell Raymond and Donna Jean Thompson were asked to prepare a cost analysis report on the verification of the Grand of Distinction award.*

##### **Current Happenings of Committee:**

*This morning (5/8/13) the end of year results were received and the downloading and emailing of the files to the regions had begun. Once complete the formatting and creation of the Regional Award Certificates will begin. Our goal is to have those certificates in the hands of or on the way to the Regional Directors by the time of the Board Meeting May 14<sup>th</sup>.*

##### **Future Projections for Committee:**

*Continue the ongoing preparations for the Annual Meeting June 28, 2013 in Vancouver, Washington.*

##### **Action Item:**

#### **1. *Consideration of Time Frame for Implementation of the Grand of Distinction Award.***

**Thompson:** The first thing on my list was the time frame for the implementation of the Grand of Distinction Award. At this point in time, hopefully you have all had a chance to at least briefly review it. We are moving forward with it. The only thing that was of concern was moving ahead to have the scoring of it implemented in the old computer. I know of 3 people who are contemplating being first to accomplish the feat. There may be more. There are only 3 that I'm aware of; 1 that had contacted me personally and 2 that Mark had spoken to me about. I'm sure there may be others. I don't think there will be that many, and I hope it's not an overwhelming amount, and that we should indeed wait until we can get the programming of this on the new system, rather than the \$1,300 to \$1,500 it may cost to set it up in the old system. **Shelton:** Jerry, this is Mike. **Hamza:** Go ahead Mike. **Shelton:** Donna Jean, I hope to have something for the June meeting in the Awards Committee report, where we had settled on costs and things like that, so this is good to have the report you put together here, because it will save us some time and we won't have to go over all this again, but that was my goal; to hopefully have all this stuff in place that we can present, to have the board approve the fees because that's the way the show rule is written. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead Mark. **Hannon:** It's my understanding, Donna Jean, that as these cats qualify, you will process them. Even though we

may not have the new computer system up yet and we may not have it programmed, you're going to have the owners provide the Central Office the shows at which they qualified – where they made those 30 finals in 3 seasons – and that the Central Office staff will then manually verify that. Is that correct? **Thompson:** That's correct. We have a form. It needs a couple little tweaks. So, you're saying, "OK, keep on going." We're ready to put it in force. **Hannon:** I just wanted to make sure that everyone understood we weren't holding up the awards. We're holding up the programming. **Thompson:** Oh, no. No. **Hamza:** I'm not sure we want to hold up the programming for \$1,500 either. We made a commitment to these people and we need to make sure that we're catching everybody who deserves it. Donna Jean, I'll have to talk with the IT people. We need to follow through on our commitments. **Baugh:** This is Loretta. I have a question. **Hamza:** Go ahead Loretta. **Baugh:** Are people using previous seasons, rather than starting in 2012-2013? Was that the plan or do they have to start with shows in this current season? **Thompson:** The two previous. 2011-2012 plus the current one. **Hamza:** This current season [2013-2014] would be the qualifying season, but it would take – **Baugh:** This would be the third season? **Hamza:** Right, right. **Shelton:** The show rule was written that you can't consider anything before 2011-2012 because we didn't want somebody coming back and saying, "I did it in 1973, 1974 and 1975" and put that burden on Central Office to go track that stuff down. **Baugh:** So, 11-12, 12-13, 13-14. OK, that's what I wanted to verify. **Shelton:** Theoretically, as soon as somebody hits 30 finals this year, they can claim it. **Baugh:** Right. OK, thank you. **Kallmeyer:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Yeah Dick. **Kallmeyer:** There might be a semi-manual way to do this. We could take the show results and kind of sort them by cat names and figure it out that way. So, there may be another work-around until we get the final system, but it's certainly feasible. **Hamza:** What I need is, Dick, why don't you set up a conference call with me, you and James for like Thursday. Really, it's easy to figure, because if a cat makes 30 finals a season, it should trigger a search. **Kallmeyer:** And don't forget, we have basically a record for every final, points earned for every final per cat, so it's just a matter of gathering that information. **Hamza:** There will be certain exclusions, so it shouldn't be that hard. **Kallmeyer:** It could be an Excel-type thing that we could do, so it's not infeasible. **Hamza:** Right, right. You would have exclusions. Any cat that was not shown a previous season would be excluded, and that would probably exclude most cats. It actually would be a fairly simple thing. Maybe not, but we'll talk about it. **Kallmeyer:** Yeah.

## 2. *Club Retirement*

*Club Name: Lord Baltimore Cat Club*  
*Members moved away and loss of interest by the remaining members.*

**Hamza:** OK Donna Jean, let's go to the next one. **Thompson:** This is the retirement request from Lord Baltimore Cat Club. **Hamza:** Is this required constitutionally that we retire these clubs? **Thompson:** Basically, it's a nicer way of saying "resigning". **Hamza:** I understand that, but is it a requirement that you bring it to the board? **Raymond:** No, it's not Jerry. **Hamza:** We'll do it this time, but from now on, just retire them. **Thompson:** OK. We'll just automatically send them an acceptance. **Hamza:** Right. If they want to fold in a club, I don't see why it needs to come to the board.

## 3. *Show Format Request*

*Club Name: Cat Fashion Club – Israel*  
*Show Date: November 2, 2013*  
*Location: Israel*

*The original request was to hold a four ring show with CFA Judges. They would judge the CFA Show in the morning and then the ASC show in the afternoon. Having several questions about the requested format I asked for additional information which was received and was presented to the board.*

**Thompson:** Next is a show format request, which came in on fairly short notice. The club in Indonesia wants to have their CFA show with 4 judges, and have that show judged in the morning. In the afternoon, they would judge for the ASC, which is the Alliance of Super Cats, and it's apparently their organization in Indonesia. I asked for some additional information which she responded with in a letter. I put out some requests for some additional information and I haven't received responses yet, because I still have some questions about this situation and also I explained to her that we had some amendments and resolutions coming before the Annual meeting that might weigh heavily on their request. **Kallmeyer:** Donna Jean? **Thompson:** Yes? **Kallmeyer:** It's not Indonesia, it's Israel. **Thompson:** Right. Oh, I'm sorry. That was my fault. I'm trying to decide if I want to go to Indonesia or not, and I can't make up my mind. **Hamza:** There's a big difference, you know. Just so you know. **Thompson:** There is a big different. I'm sorry. **Hamza:** So, basically, you really don't have the complete picture yet on this format request, so why don't we hold this over until, I guess, the Annual unless something comes up in the meantime. **Thompson:** I would like to have a little more information on this Alliance of Super Cats. **Newkirk:** Are they still affiliated with FIFe or not? **Thompson:** No. **Newkirk:** That was the question I had. **Bizzell:** They are actually a fairly new organization and as of the first weekend of March when I was in Russia, there was an ASC show as part of that show. I understand they only have like one judge, so they rely heavily on guest judges, obviously, if they are going to have a show. **Hamza:** They have one judge in the whole organization? **Bizzell:** That's what I understood, yes, at that time. **Newkirk:** I'm looking on the internet and they have a Super Cats Merry Christmas '12, and it was January 7-8, and it's a TICA judge and another TICA judge. **Raymond:** Jerry, this is Ed. **Hamza:** Go ahead Ed. **Baugh:** When are they talking about doing this? **Hamza:** Go ahead Ed. We've got time. **Raymond:** This violates the "in conjunction with" prohibition in the constitution. **Hamza:** Alright. So anyway, you know what? This needs to be held over until after Friday at the Annual anyway. **Newkirk:** Well, we've got Wayne T judging the show, according to this, in Minsk the 27-28 of April, 2013. Was Wayne there? It says Wayne Trevathan, Allbreed CFA, USA. **Bizzell:** Are we talking about him judging the Super Cats show or in conjunction with? **Newkirk:** It's Minsk Spring of Belarus, and it says Minsk ASC cat show. **Bizzell:** Right, but that's not 2 cat shows on the same day using the same judges. That's what we're talking about. We've had other CFA judges judge the Super Cats shows. **Baugh:** I know Wayne was in Belarus. **Newkirk:** At the Super Cats show? **Bizzell:** Right. **Hamza:** You know what, Donna Jean? Let's table this. Actually, this should be tabled until Sunday. That gives you a chance to get more information. **Thompson:** OK. Yes, because I didn't realize Wayne had participated in the ASC. I sent out an email to him which he hasn't responded to yet, but I'm sure he will. **Newkirk:** His email got hacked, apparently.

#### **4. Request to Grant Exception to Show Rule 9.04 for International Shows.**

*Show Rule #9.04 reads: "Points must be won under at least three (3) different judges."*

*I became aware last week that cats in the International Division have been granding with only two rings, which is technically in violation of this show rule as written. I then realized the scoring software was never updated to disallow granding and/ or make me aware of this.*

*Show Rule #9.04 was written to avoid a cat from granding that could follow one or two judges around for all of their points. The International Division grands do not fall into this situation.*

*If I was aware and had been checking all year, can you imagine the mayhem it would have caused - me trying to contact the people to tell them their cat really did not grand after all. Most likely all would not understand or just ignore and think they had a grand. Communication can often be challenging with the international exhibitors.*

*The grand point requirements have been raised for the new show season but will still allow for some 2 show grands. Attached are the CH/Open counts from the last season, which will show the high count of grand points available at their shows.*

*I would appreciate if you could exclude the International Division or suggest a workable solution to Show Rule #9.04.*

*Thank you,  
Shirley*

**Hamza:** OK, let's move on. **Thompson:** Shirley put in this request. It's a request to grant an exception to Show Rule 9.04 on international shows. This was in the scoring of grand champion points. Apparently, the computer was not programmed to maintain judges to qualify – 3 different judges to qualify for your grand championship, and we have granted grand champions to a number of cats who received qualifying points but only under 2 judges. This was brought to her attention and this is why she is asking. As the growth continues over there, we're getting more and more points, and she added to me this afternoon that a show held over there this past weekend has 73 champions. **Hamza:** Let me get this straight. She wants to make this – based on what? **Thompson:** The rule required that cats had to have won their points under at least 3 different judges. **Hamza:** Right. That's the rule. **Thompson:** OK. The HP is programmed for these various rules, but apparently was not reprogrammed for there to be 3 judges, so it did not call this to her attention when she put the points in for granding. **Hamza:** How long has this been going on? **Kallmeyer:** Three years. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead Mark. **Hannon:** This happened with a cat that I granded more than 15 years ago. It had gotten all its points under 2 judges. I was amazed when I received a grand certificate. I contacted Tom Dent at that point and notified him, and he had Shirley check and Shirley was amazed that yes, indeed, a cat can grand with only two judges giving it the points. I mean, it was not at a one show situation, and they assured me more than 15 years ago – Shirley and Tom – that the computer would be reprogrammed to catch this in the future. Here we are 15 years later and the problem still exists, and Shirley didn't know it existed? She knew more than 15 years ago it existed. **Hamza:** This [omitted] me off. I don't want to grant an exception, I want to fix the computer. **Meeker:** So, what do we do with the cats that have granded? **Hamza:** We obviously can't fix those, because we would have to go back 15 years and take Mark's grand away. **Meeker:** I certainly wouldn't vote for that. **Altschul:** This is Carissa. **Hamza:** Just think of all the DMs we would have to take back. **Altschul:** This is Carissa. **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Altschul:** I understand that we can't go back and take away grands, but can we do something to make sure that in the future they double check this, so we don't have a bunch of cats who are not having to get 200 points, granding in 2 rings, in the future? **Hamza:** Under 2 judges. It's not 2 rings. You know what, Dick? Let's bring this up on Thursday, too. Here's what I've got to figure out. I've got to figure out what the fix is. **Kallmeyer:** We already talked to James. We probably couldn't do it with the HP system, but it's already being embedded into the new system. **Hamza:** I knew that. **Kallmeyer:** It's one of those things, and we're kind of stuck with it now. **Eigenhauser:** George here. **Hamza:** Go ahead



George. **Eigenhauser:** How many grands are we getting that are granding this quickly? Are we talking about this has happened to hundreds of cats, or this has happened to 2 or 3 cats? **Hamza:** I suspect it's not common. I don't think it's quick; I think it's fairly rare that you would grand under 2 judges. **Altschul:** I think it's happening a lot in Asia. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Hannon:** It's getting points from 2 judges. It could be a purple ribbon. **Hamza:** Right, right. **Hannon:** So you could get most of your points under one judge due to finals and the other judge would just be a purple ribbon. When this happened to me more than 15 years ago, Shirley said she couldn't believe that at least 1 other judge hadn't given my cat a purple ribbon and a point, but nobody had. **Kallmeyer:** Dick here. **Hamza:** Go ahead Dick. **Kallmeyer:** For Asia, this could happen – at least the last show season, because you needed 75 points to grand. If you had 73 champions in one right, it's not that unusual. At least we did raise the points to 125 in those countries. Shirley's estimate was probably in the order of 15-20 that it could have happened over the past couple years in Asia. The could be some in the U.S. too, we don't know. More likely overseas, though. **Hamza:** It's not a rampant situation. Alright. **Eigenhauser:** Can we just agree to grant amnesty for the ones up to today, and then instruct the Central Office to count to 3 in the future? **Hamza:** Yes. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead Mark. **Hannon:** That's not what I'm hearing. What I'm hearing is, we're going to wait until the new computer system. **Hamza:** No, we're going to have to manually check. I'll take care of it. It's just got to be done. It's got to be manually done or the show rule has to be changed. We can't arbitrarily enforce our show rules. **Kallmeyer:** Again, I know a way we can do this relatively easy, Jerry. We can talk about it. **Hamza:** On Thursday, OK.

**What will be Presented at the Next Meeting:**

*We will continue to submit requests, questions, and problems that may require Board action and/or input.*

*Respectfully Submitted,  
Donna Jean Thompson*

**(5) EMERGENCY SUPPORT DISBURSEMENT.**

*This is a proposal for an Emergency Support Disbursement for those very rare times that either a club or a judge finds themselves in a financial bind.*

*Recently, a club had a judge become ill on the way to the airport for their show. Consequently, the judge was immediately hospitalized and unable to make it to judge. The club asked Central Office for help in finding one of the three available judges for that weekend to replace the judge. Due to the short time frame, the airfare was far more than the club had available without some form of immediate financial assistance. Fortunately, one of the available judges was able to use their accumulated airline mileage to partially offset the \$800+ airfare.*

*Since we have an aging judge pool, any overseas emergency could require that insurance deductibles, pharmaceuticals, dressings etc., be paid in the prevailing country's currency, therefore supporting the need for the Regional Director's involvement.*

*These are just a couple of many examples for the need of an Emergency Support Disbursement from CFA.*

*The club or person needing the financial assistance would be required to contact a Regional Director, or their assigned agent, for the ESD. In turn, the RD or their assigned agent, will be responsible to produce any required documentation for the disbursement.*

*It will be easier to deal with 9 RD's rather than with each club or judge.*

*Thank you for your supporting this request.*

**Hamza:** #5. This is going to be a late night, folks. **Ginger:** **Meeker:** I'm going to make this quick. If everybody has read the proposal that was brought to me by a regional member, I would just like to move that we put \$5,000 of the money that we allotted to club support into an emergency disbursement fund. Bob Johnston is willing to administer it. The emergency requests would go through the RDs and I think that this is something whose time has come. It just makes sense. I think, Jerry, didn't we put \$15,000 into that fund? **Bizzell:** We put \$50,000 into that fund. **Meeker:** \$50,000? OK, then I would ask for \$10,000 of that to be put into an emergency support disbursement fund, and then I can work with Bob to set up criteria. **Hamza:** I want to see the criteria. I think this is premature. I would like to see the criteria before we fund it. I would like to see the program before it gets funded. Go ahead George. **Eigenhauser:** I would like to remind people that clubs are separate entities from CFA and our judges are independent contractors, so we should be interfering financially only in the most extreme of conditions, where somebody is really like stuck in the middle of nowhere and we have to rescue them, so I would say that this pool needs to be extremely narrowly construed and very tightly written, so we're not becoming the guarantor of club finances. **Meeker:** Exactly. It was designed to help a club that, let's say on Friday morning their judge ends up in the hospital and they have a \$1,500 air fare to bring in an alternate judge. **Eigenhauser:** That's their problem. **Hamza:** I also think there's insurance that they can buy. **Eigenhauser:** They can buy travel insurance, they can buy insurance against a hurricane shutting down the show. They should be insuring themselves. CFA should not be insuring the show. **Hamza:** Right. I agree with that. I think that we can go to our insurance carrier, and I think we can find a policy where they can pick it up relatively inexpensive. Ed, are you there? **Raymond:** Yep, I'm here. **Hamza:** Let's talk to – isn't it time we negotiate insurance anyway? **Raymond:** Yes, I think it should be right around now or the

beginning of June. **Hamza:** We ought to see if when we negotiate the club insurances, I'm betting that for like an extra \$10 per show license, we can get the clubs emergency insurance for such a thing, like travel insurance. I bet they have a package like that. Don't you think they might? **Raymond:** They probably do for things like a hurricane shutting down a show. I'm not sure that they're going to have insurance for a judge becoming sick at the last minute and a club having to pay air fare for somebody new at the last minute, but we can ask. **Hamza:** I'll bet they have some sort of – and we can always develop a pool. I agree with George. It needs to be very narrow and I would like to see a program. **Eigenhauser:** Our show rules already have a procedure. If a judge can't make it and a club can't get a substitute, then we portion out the entry fee and make a partial refund. You don't have to spend an arm and a leg to substitute a judge at the last minute. There are other options. **Hamza:** Right, OK. Anyway, I would just like to sit down with the insurance company and see what – usually, that kind of insurance is real cheap, in the event of a hurricane or something, or acts of God, which is part of this. I know it's not the whole thing. **Meeker:** OK, that's fine. I just wanted to bring this forward because many of the clubs are feeling that unless it's for advertising for a show, they're not really being supported, so I'm just bringing it to everybody's attention. I think the insurance would be an excellent idea. Thank you.

**(6) INTERPRETATION OF SHOW RULE 20.06.**

***Entry Clerk's Position:***

*As I stated to Mark, numerical order does not imply or mean consecutive order. You may wish it to mean that, but it is not the definition of numerical order. With cat breeding and showing declining and being under attack from so many sides, we do not need to fight amongst ourselves.*

*As Mark stated: "it makes life easier to have a 6x6 in one catalog and to let folks keep the same number both days". It's easier for the exhibitors to remember their cat(s) number(s) in 6x6 shows. It's easier for ring clerks to sex cards. It's the same effect of a cat being absent for judges, master clerks and show scoring, thus causing no extra work for them. So, again, what's the problem?*

...

*Every year we have resolution after resolution come up at the annual to update show rules so that there's no question that black is black and white is white. It's because of things like this, that this happens in many cases. Do we really need the show rules to read like a legal document with all that fancy attorney language? I'm sure that can be arranged if you want it, but is it really needed? I thought CFA was trying to simplify them, not make them more complicated.*

*Let me attack this from another angle: There's certainly nothing in the show rules that state that the catalog numbers have to start with one. Even if, and I mean hypothetically if, the catalog numbers were sequential, but started, at say, 100 and went up from there. Would that be violating show rules? Maybe we need a show rule about that too? Something to the effect of:*

*20.06 All entries must appear in numerical order in the printed catalog that is required at shows held under these rules. Catalog numbers must start at one and be numbered sequentially except for catalogs containing listings for two back to back shows in which case there can be gaps in the numbering so that cats may be assigned the same number in each of the shows.*

*Of course to avoid any confusion, the actual verbiage would have to be ten pages (or more) using lots of "where for" and "where as" (s) and lengthy definitions covering all possible interpretations of "one", "sequentially", "gaps", what is "two back to back shows", etc. (just kidding - hopefully).*

*I personally agree with simplifying the show rules, but then uncommon sense gets in the way. I guess that's why we keep having show rule resolutions at every annual adding a word here and few other words there without really changing anything. Maybe we should go back to the good old days when we only had four ring two day shows and catalogs were typed by hand. Oh sorry, things were simpler then and the show rules a lot smaller. I guess we can't go back.*

*Oh well, I guess we do need that resolution. When's the deadline for this year's annual? Oops, too late for this year. What a coincident!*

*Well, I guess it can come up from the floor. Just not as effective.*

\* \* \* \* \*

***CFA Attorney's Position:***

*I was asked to interpret the meaning of Show Rule 20.06. I did so after considering that each day of a 6x6 is a separate show, cats are traditionally numbered consecutively in the catalog, and most importantly, the CFA Board reached a similar interpretation years ago when the format was still experimental. If the Board wishes to revisit its interpretation, it is certainly free to do so. Likewise, if a club wishes to propose a show rule amendment, it is free to do so.*

**Hamza:** #6 is interpretation of Show Rule 20.06. Mark. **Hannon:** I hope that what I submitted is a good explanation of the situation. My understanding is, there are two entry clerk softwares being used; one that Clinton Parker created, and one that Steve Thieler created. The bulk of our shows are using one of those two softwares. One of them allows the cat to keep the same number both days of a 6x6, and it achieves that by skipping numbers. If kitten #2, or the second kitten in the catalog, was only entered one day, it would not be numbered the other day. It would just skip the number. The kitten numbers would go 1, 3, 4, 5 if kitten #2 was not entered the second day, whereas with the other software, the numbers change the second day because the kittens that are entered are the only ones that are counted. Ed has interpreted the current show rule which says, *all entries must appear in numerical order* to mean that one of those softwares is in violation of the show rule because it skips numbers. The creator of that software responds that 1, 3, 4, 5 is in numerical order. **Eigenhauser:** No, it's not. **Hannon:** But by allowing the software that skips the number so that you keep the same number both days, it makes it easier for the show to run smoothly the second day because people are not listening for Saturday's number and not realizing that Sunday's number is different, or forgetting that it's different. It means that the clerks don't have to go back and re-sex all the cards for the second day. It makes the whole show run smoother, and I don't understand why we're saying that one of these programs is not following the show rules. I think we should allow for that, because I think that that particular software actually makes life a lot easier for these shows. **Kallmeyer:** Jerry, Dick here. **Hamza:** Go ahead Dick. **Kallmeyer:** I just point out, it doesn't matter for our scoring purposes either way, so it's not an impediment or a detriment. **Hamza:** Ed? **Raymond:** Yes. As Mark said, I interpreted "numerical order" to mean consecutive. That has been the historical way that shows are numbered, and in talking with George there was a motion before the board a number of years ago that was done via email when the format was still experimental, and the first club who wanted to put both days of a 6x6 into the same catalog, it was approved but there was apparently some determination that each show needed to be numbered sequentially. **Eigenhauser:** Consecutively. **Raymond:** Consecutively. **Eigenhauser:** Originally, when we did the format, we required physically separate catalogs, just so we didn't have to run into this problem. When we finally allowed clubs to combine catalogs, it was with a specific understanding that the cat would get a number each day, based on, if you're the fifth entry, you're cat #5. You shouldn't be cat #5 if you're the first entry. **Hamza:** Yeah, there's a certain sense to the other way. **Hamza:** I understand that. I understand that. **Eigenhauser:** But, in theory, they're two separate shows. **Hannon:** We also used to say they couldn't hang the rosettes on Sunday from Saturday's show. We changed that, too. I don't see what harm there is in allowing this. **Hamza:** You know what? I know what's going on here. Let's kick this out until June. **Hannon:** For what purpose? What are we going to do between now and June? **Hamza:** I want to think about a couple things, and I want to be able to talk about this with – here's what I want to think about. I want to talk to Dick and I want to see – eventually, and I really believe this, I really believe that in the end CFA is going to end up running this program anyway. So, I want to look at it from that standpoint. I'm not really caring about it from a third-party business standpoint. I need to care about it from a CFA standpoint. **Baugh:** This is Loretta. **Hamza:** Go ahead Loretta. **Baugh:** I believe that this has happened several times and I know it was a question that was raised in one of the shows in our region. When I contacted Central Office, it didn't seem to be an issue with the scoring. Is that correct, Donna Jean? **Thompson:** Yes. I asked Shirley about it and she said it was not a problem for the scoring. **Baugh:** Based on that, I agree with Mark. I think it's just easier for the clubs. **Newkirk:** Me, too. **Hamza:** OK. **Hannon:** So, are you tabling it and we're moving on? **Hamza:** Yes. **Hannon:** OK.

(7) **MOTION TO RECONSIDER SHOW RULE 25.13 RE: PERCENTAGE OF CFA JUDGES AT SHOWS.**

*At the October 6/7, 2012 teleconference, a proposal was presented to decrease the percentage of CFA guest judges at CFA shows (see Attachment A). It was stated that 90% of the clubs in Region 9 support the change. The basis for this statement is not disclosed. The board was not provided with data, poll results or statistical information.*

*At the December 4, 2012 teleconference, a show rule proposal was presented and voted on (see Attachment B).*

*There are currently 33 Region 9 clubs. Letters in support of rescinding this rule have been received from 18 clubs in Region 9 – more than 50% of the Region 9 clubs (see Attachment C).*

*Abyssinian Breed Council Europe  
Aurora Cat Club  
Benelux  
Cats N Cats  
Chatte Noir  
Cleopella  
Club Felino Espanol  
Dutch Purrpuss  
Edelweis  
European Shorthair CC  
Feline Fanciers of Benelux  
Golfo dei Poeti  
Moscow Cat Club  
Nika Feline Center  
Rolandus  
Sophisto Cats  
Spanish Cat Club  
Swedish Cat Paws*

*These clubs state that the recent changes will create a hardship for Region 9 clubs that will affect the growth of CFA and the survival of their clubs. Please refer to Attachment C for the details of their request to reconsider Show Rule 25.13.*

**Action Item:** *Reconsider the December 4, 2012 motion to increase the percentage of judges at CFA shows that are CFA-licensed.*

*If the above action item carries, the following motion is to be considered: Reinstate Show Rule 25.13, as it appeared in the 2012-2013 CFA Show Rules.*

**Hamza:** 7 and 8. **Anger:** This is Rachel. **Hamza:** Yeah. **Anger:** #7 came about because of a flood of letters that were submitted, signed by 18 clubs from Region 9 that wanted us to revisit the rule that we implemented about the percentage of CFA judges at CFA shows. **Hamza:** Before we get started, I want to talk a little bit about these two things. You know, as a board, we can implement rules, and maybe they work and maybe they don't work, and it's our right to revisit them and decide if they work or if they don't work. That would be 7, but if we decide that this rule works, what we don't have a right to do is, we don't have a right to treat Region 9

different than the rest of the other 8 regions. Region 9 has a Regional Director, and it stopped being an International Division. It has a Regional Director, so if we decide that 7, if this is a good rule, if this show rule has merit for all of CFA, then it has merit for all of CFA. So, having said that, we need to look at it – it may not be a good rule for all of CFA. I think that when we look at 7, that’s what we have to consider. So, go ahead Rachel. **Anger:** The point that they made is that in the United States, we have a pool of over 100 judges, and they gave us a list of the 8 judges that live there that are “local”. Based on that information, they stated that it would be a hardship for them to have to fly judges in from the United States in order to make their quota. When we have a show here in Michigan, we don’t have to fly judges in from another continent in order to make our ratio of CFA judges. That is what they are pointing out. **Baugh:** This is Loretta. **Hamza:** Go ahead Loretta. **Baugh:** OK. The Judging Program Committee supports the rule that we passed for several reasons. One of the most critical is the fact that when we have discussed this with the International Division, every board meeting that I can remember when Europe was part of the International Division – we didn’t have a Region 9 – there was an ongoing, every meeting complaint about the guest judges, that they were not happy with them and we needed to do something, and that people came to CFA shows to be judged by CFA judges, and the intent in this is to raise the level of CFA shows in Region 9 to the rest of CFA, and that was the purpose of doing this. This passed unanimously at the December meeting. To me, it’s a benefit to CFA and we haven’t even given it a chance to see if it will work or not. Thank you. **Hamza:** I have a question. Does anybody remember how this worked in Japan? **Baugh:** I don’t think anybody from the board now was around when that happened. **Eigenhauser:** I think Japan became a region in what, 94? **Hamza:** They must have crossed the same bridge. **Kallmeyer:** We didn’t use guest judges there, did we? **Hannon:** I didn’t think so, either. I think they always flew in CFA judges. **Anger:** This is Rachel. At that time, they had 2 and 4 ring shows. Now, we’re talking about 6x6’s. **Hamza:** The bane of CFA. **Altschul:** This is Carissa. **Hamza:** Go ahead Carissa. **Altschul:** It’s their choice to do a 6x6. They can do a 6 ring show and not have to fly in so many. It’s their choice to do a 6x6. It’s their choice to do a 10 ring show. Nobody forces them to do that. I’m not buying the hardship angle. **Baugh:** This is Loretta. I have another comment, as well. **Hamza:** Go ahead Loretta. **Baugh:** The other concern, also, is when we are giving what are now regional awards, when we are having 50% of our judges be guest judges, we’re having 50% of our points being awarded by non-CFA judges. That can have a definite influence on the standings and which cats are being awarded over there. I think that’s another reason to keep it the way that we’ve passed it. **Newkirk:** Loretta, that doesn’t add up. Not all the shows have 50% guest judges. There’s a lot of shows over there where there’s only CFA judges. **Baugh:** But there are those that do have it.

**Hamza:** Pauli? I want to hear from Pauli. **Baugh:** Yeah, let’s hear from Pauli. **Hamza:** Pauli, this is your region. **Huhtaniemi:** I do understand the problem with the guest judges. As long as I’ve been involved with CFA, we always have complaint against judges. If you go to shows and ask the local exhibitors what they think about the judges, I always heard that, “oh, it’s fun to have the CFA judges, and it’s OK to have 1 maybe 2 guest judges, but not all of them.” I very much have the feeling that if I go to a CFA show, I want to see the CFA judges. The guest judges is a spice. If there is more than 2, if there is 50% guest judges, I think I’m not going to the show. In this show season, we saw that there were some shows that were at 50% guest judges, and those shows failed, so I think even the clubs are now thinking for economic reasons we should postpone the rules, I’m still very much in favor to keep the new rules valid, and like somebody else said, I don’t see that if we have a problem it costs much more to have 8, 10 or maybe 12 judges judging for the show, so I would limit the number of the rings, not the number of guest judges. **Hamza:** So, Pauli, now you’ve got to represent your region, but what you’re

saying is that you support this rule for Region 9. **Huhtaniemi:** I do understand the clubs. There are many clubs who have changed their minds, but still I don't see the need for this change. As long as I've been involved with the CFA, we always have had complaints about the guest judges, and I don't feel that 50% of guest judges is still a CFA show. It's something different. The guest judge is just spice and I would limit – this is my personal opinion – I would limit the number of rings to make the shows profitable, not to increase the rings with the same amount of entries. CFA has changed here in Europe. Like 5 years ago we had maybe 2 shows a month, from October to April. Now we have a show every week and sometimes we have 3 shows in a weekend, so this has changed. When I think about the economic situation, we have a show in March and we have all 6 judges from the States, and we are still doing fine with the show. So, I don't know. This is a complicated thing to do. I am very much in favor for limitation for the guest judges.

**Newkirk:** This is Darrell. **Hamza:** Go ahead Darrell. **Newkirk:** I oppose this, and Pauli just made a good point. There are 8 CFA judges over there. That's the only local judges they have. If there are 3 shows on a weekend, where are the judges going to have to come from? The United States, and everybody that judges – I think Rachel and Loretta and everybody knows, the air fares are going up. It's hard to get an air fare under \$300 anymore. It's hard to get an air fare over to Europe for under \$850, and if you're talking about summertime, you can't get one for under \$1,100 or \$1,200. The clubs cannot afford that, so you're going to see the clubs stop putting on shows and there's not going to be any growth in Europe. **Hamza:** Why can't they put on smaller shows? I don't understand this in general, even here. Why is everybody putting on 12 ring shows? I think, really, that's not the best route anyway. **Newkirk:** I agree with you, but I think their logic is, or the logic is here by many clubs, is that if you put 12 rings on, you double the cost but you only have to go one weekend, so you don't have to go the following weekend to a show. **Hamza:** Yeah, and I think it's hurting CFA in general. **Newkirk:** I don't disagree with you, Jerry, but you do the math. If there are 3 shows and let's just say it's 3 6-ring shows. That's 18 judges. There has to be – you do the math. You can do 2 [guest judges] at each one, so you've got to fly at least 5 more judges in from the States to make the quota. **Altschul:** If they're having 3 shows on a weekend, maybe those clubs need to pick a better weekend. Even clubs in the United States have to consider, we look at a weekend and we look at the available judges, you get the list from CFA and you go, "oh, a lot of the judges are already taken, maybe we should look at a better weekend." Sometimes clubs don't think about that and they end up having to pay higher air fares here. There's certain areas in the States where you can't get an air fare for less than \$800.

**Hamza:** Anyway, I don't want to discourage – I want to get the CFA product out there. I want clubs to be happy, but the whole reason for this is to encourage the use of what we feel is a better product – the CFA product and the CFA way. So, we're trying to actually walk a fine line here. What we did is, we passed this rule that was meant for all of CFA, and it turns out, Europe being part of CFA, this is a little tough on Europe. So, again, I say the same thing I said before, I wonder how Japan got through. Maybe it was just because it was a different time. **Newkirk:** The money flows like water over in Japan. For years. For years. I mean, they bought judges expensive gifts when they went over there. You don't get that when you go to Europe. You get your hotel, your meals and a trip back to the airport to get home. It's a whole different financial situation. **Hamza:** It's a different time. I get it. **Newkirk:** It was a different time. It was a totally different time. The problem is, if this was phased in say over 5 years, so we got more guest judges, more judges transferring over to CFA, and we had a pool of 15 or 20 judges over there, then this wouldn't be a hardship. We've only got 8 judges over there. That's what the hardship



is. So, I just don't think it's fair to them. CFA will pay in the long run. That's what I'm trying to tell you, because the expense is going to negatively impact the region. **Meeker:** Jerry, this is Ginger. **Hamza:** Go ahead Ginger. **Meeker:** It's profoundly unfair to our American clubs. Our American clubs only have X number of judges available, and we really don't have access to any other judges to bring in American guest judges. When Region 9 asked to become a region, they made it very clear that they didn't want exceptions. **Newkirk:** That's not true. **Meeker:** Darrell, if my clubs are trying to put on a show and they are paying a \$600, \$700, \$800 air fare from the east coast, they don't have any other organization locally from which they can get a guest judge. **Newkirk:** Well, we can change that. The board can change that. We can allow guest judges from TICA to come over here, and ACFA. We do it for Canadian Cat Association. **Meeker:** OK, but I don't see that being an easy or quick process. **Newkirk:** OK. **Hamza:** Alright, let's move. Let's do something, because I sense that – we have 7 and 8, and they're distinctive, so why don't we deal with 7, which I think will be easier to deal with, and then go to 8. 7 is a motion to reconsider Show Rule 25.13.

**Anger:** And this is Rachel. As the person that was asked to present this, may I make a closing argument, to be the devil's advocate? Very briefly. **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Anger:** They wanted me to point out the statement that was in the discussion, that at least 90% of the people in Region 9 support this. Perhaps they have changed their mind, although what we got response from in this presentation were clubs, and that is what is our membership in CFA – the clubs. **Eigenhauser:** Rachel? **Anger:** Yes. **Eigenhauser:** I don't know the situation in Europe, so names don't really mean a lot to me. Are these show-producing clubs or not? The 18 in the complaint. **Anger:** Well, I don't judge over there, in western Europe, but all these I checked on our list of active clubs, clubs in good standing, and they are clubs in good standing. **Eigenhauser:** But are they show-producing clubs. **Anger:** I see these clubs on our show schedule as putting on shows. There's one or two in here that don't ring a bell for me. **Baugh:** I would like to answer that. **Newkirk:** If you will give me a minute, I'll go through and tell you which ones are. Or Pauli can. Pauli can do it. **Baugh:** Yeah, Pauli should know. **Huhtaniemi:** Yeah, there is actually one club which is not listed in Region 9. It's in some of the other regions. That's Pam DelaBar's club. **Newkirk:** Which one? **Huhtaniemi:** Sophisto Cats. **Altschul:** This is Carissa. Sophisto Cats is Pam DelaBar's club. It's technically still a Region 3 club. **Anger:** But she lives there, and it's in good standing. **Hannon:** The question was, how many are show producing, not how many are in that region. **Hamza:** He's just saying what he recognizes. That's all. **Newkirk:** Chatte Noir, Cleopella, Club Felino Espanol, Dutch Purrruss, Edelweis I think put on a show, European Shorthair is a fairly new club that's put on shows, Feline Fanciers of Benelux puts on shows, Golfo dei Poeti puts on shows. She backed out, but she's now putting on another show. I don't know about Moscow Cat Club. Nika does, Rolandus does. We talked about Sophisto Cats. Spanish Cat Club does, and so does Swedish Cat Paws. Almost all of these are show-producing clubs. **Hamza:** There's also political connections between those clubs, but it doesn't matter. I understand what's going on here, but listen. I mean, George, what's your point? **Eigenhauser:** I was just curious. I was wondering how many of these clubs actually have a stake in this and how many are just paper clubs mouthing off. **Hamza:** OK. **Huhtaniemi:** We don't have paper clubs here in Europe. Almost every club is a show-producing club. **Newkirk:** Yes. **Eigenhauser:** There's a Region 3 club on the list, too. **Hamza:** These clubs are all pretty politically connected, but anyway – **Baugh:** Keep in mind – Jerry, keep in mind that there is still the opportunity to ask for an exemption. **Hamza:** That's right. Here's the thing. This has to be viewed as a CFA – we passed this – how long ago did this pass? **Baugh:** December. **Hamza:** December. So, I mean, we've tried it now. Like I said, it may not be good for CFA or it may be good for CFA. This has come back around. Here it is May, so 5, almost 6 months later we get a

chance to look at this. As I recall, Darrell was never in favor of this. So, you've been fairly consistent, Darrell. The other thing we have to look at is that their own Regional Director is still in favor of this. Dick, you're part of the ID out there. How do you feel about this? **Kallmeyer:** We have a different situation. We don't have that many local guest judges, especially in Asia. So, I think there should be a high CFA content there, because we don't have alternatives. If you're bringing a judge from Australia, it's costing you almost the same as U.S. **Anger:** This is Rachel. This rule doesn't apply to the ID. It's only Regions 1 through 9. **Hamza:** I know. I'm just wondering how, what the feeling is for the future out that way. I'm just trying to get a feel for things. Anyway, the other question is that for the other 8 regions, I mean, how do you guys feel? I guess the feeling is that everybody should have to live by the same rules, is what I've been hearing. **Eigenhauser:** Or apply for a waiver. **Hamza:** Anyway, like I said, here we are at 11:11. Does anybody else have anything to say about reconsidering Show Rule 25.13? **Bizzell:** This is Carla. **Hamza:** Go ahead Carla. **Bizzell:** I wouldn't be able to support a change to the show rule, since we just printed and sent them out. However, I certainly wouldn't discourage a club for coming to ask for an exemption, if they can really show hardship. It sounds like these particular clubs feel like they show hardship. **Hamza:** I agree that on a case-by-case basis, they should go to their Regional Director and have the Regional Director present it to the board. **Anger:** This is Rachel. So, there is my action item. Can I so move on my action item? **Hamza:** Yes, please. **Anger:** So moved. **Newkirk:** I'll second.

**Hamza** called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Newkirk voting yes. Anger abstained.

## ATTACHMENT A

**CFA EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING  
OCTOBER 6/7, 2012**

**Action Item:** Approve change to Show Rule 25.13

Show Rule 25.13	
Existing Wording	Proposed Wording
<p><b>25.13</b> For Championship, Kitten, Premiership and Veteran classes, a CFA judge (at least Apprentice) or approved guest judge must be used. No more than 50% of the judges at any CFA show may be guest judges. For Household Pet classes it is permissible for a club to use a Trainee.</p>	<p><b>25.13</b> For Championship, Kitten, Premiership and Veteran classes, a CFA judge (at least Apprentice) or approved guest judge must be used. No more than 50% of the judges at any CFA Show <u>in the International Division and 25% of the judges at any CFA show in Regions 1-9</u> may be guest judges. For Household Pet classes it is permissible for a club to use a Trainee.</p>
<p><b>RATIONALE:</b> Between the CFA Judges residing in the European division, along with the regular CFA judging panel, the consensus is that there are enough judges to decrease this requirement to 25% This request has the support of 90% of Region 9. This also falls in line with FIFe and WCF etc. The impression presented of the judging panel and CFA specifically is much better with licensed CFA judges officiating.</p>	

[from Sunday] **Hamza:** Loretta, did we not have something that you had from judging yesterday that we deferred? **Baugh:** Yes, we do. I sent out a revision to the wording this morning, because I got a frantic email. It's a show rule change to 25.13. Our current show rule says, *No more than 50% of the judges at any CFA show may be guest judges.* We would like to see this changed to say that *No more than 50% of the judges at any CFA Show in the International Division and 25% of the judges at any CFA show in Regions 1-9 may be guest judges.* At least 90% of the people in Region 9 support this. **Hannon:** Who is that? **Hamza:** That's Loretta. Loretta, we can't hear a word you're saying. I don't know if everybody else can. **Wilson:** We can hear, but we can't understand. **Eigenhauser:** About half way through you became muffled. **Baugh:** OK. This should be better. OK, I'm sorry. Changing the requirements. Currently it's 50% guest judges allowed. We would like to change it to 50% in the International Division and 25% at shows in Regions 1 through 9. Pauli supports this. 90% of the clubs in Region 9 support it. It falls in line with FIFe, WCF and other associations over there. **Kallmeyer:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Yeah. **Kallmeyer:** Yeah, I would like probably a change to that. First of all, if we do 75%, that means we would require 7-1/2 judges and I don't think we want to get into which of our judges are a half. But also, I think on international, I would like to see 60% and we can also modify it to round up, so if we had 7-1/2, it would be 8 judges and 60% of a 4 ring show in the international would really require 3 judges. I think it should be more than a half. In international, we have a lot of shows where there's an incredible amount of color changes and I think we need a stronger CFA influence for those shows, so I would like to see 60% and 75% with a restriction that you round up to the nearest integer. **Baugh:** So, you want us to change it to read *60% of the judges in the International Division must be CFA judges, and 75% must be for Regions 1-9.* That is fine. It's better even than what we were looking at. We would like to support that change. **Phillips:** Remember, that's the maximum number of guest judges? 60%, or is it 60% of – **Hamza:** You're reading it backwards. **Raymond:** At least. **Baugh:** The requirement. OK, the requirement would be that a minimum of 60% of the judges at shows in the CFA International Division, and a minimum of 75% in Regions 1-9 must be CFA judges. We're turning it around. Rather than saying how many guest judges we allow, we're saying how many CFA judges we require. **Phillips:** OK. **Hamza:** Darrell. **Newkirk:** In my opinion, I don't think this rule should be changed. I'll tell you why. RUI is a club that puts on a couple shows a year. They use half of their judges and they use half CFA judges. It has worked out very well for them. It's been a training ground for a lot of their judges who go on to guest judge for us in other parts of Europe. The logic used, because we need CFA judges, because there are color changes, I will give you a good example. Last weekend, CFA registered a Siberian as a red/cream and white Siberian. Now, that's impossible, because cream is the dilution of red,

OK? CFA registered this kitten. Two judges had judged this kitten before it got to me and nothing was done, so the logic of our CFA judges recognizing colors and patterns and stuff I don't think is a good, logical answer to make this change. Personally, I don't think that this is a real issue. Now, we have had issues where guest judges have not functioned up to snuff, as they used to say when I was a kid. Now, that's a function of just somebody coming here and learning how to judge our shows. Now, most of those people haven't clerked or done anything, so they come in, you know, totally green handed, don't know how our rules operate. However, I thought the board had consented that these would be dealt with on an individual basis. Now, if that's the rationale for trying to make more CFA judges in the show hall, then I don't think that's another reason to change the rules. So, my personal opinion is, I don't think this rule is causing a tremendous amount of issue. **Hamza:** I think, to be clear, and this is for you, Loretta, isn't the philosophy behind this to ensure that CFA judges have – I mean, CFA shows have a majority of CFA judges? **Baugh:** Yes, and as you probably remember when we've had the meetings with the International Division, there has been a great deal of consternation over the performance of the guest judges, especially in Region 9. Everybody that I've spoken to in Region 9 supports this. Pauli supports it. Yes, we realize it's going to be a problem for the RUI group, but I think that the rule needs to benefit the majority of the people, and the majority of the people over there want this. **Kallmeyer:** Loretta, couldn't the board at least pass a resolution for RUI as a special exception? **Baugh:** That's not a problem. **Hamza:** Alright. George. **Eigenhauser:** I'm looking at this from a different angle. We've had some discussion now about how we count fractional parts of a person. Can we just get away from the math and just say, for a 4-ring show it's got to be this many CFA judges, for a 6-ring show it's got to be that many CFA judges, and not make people do math and then have to figure out how to round fractional people? **Hamza:** That would be fine. I don't mind things being clearer than unclear. Mark. **Hannon:** I think one of the reasons people come to CFA shows are for the CFA judges. If we're going to have a show where there's a heavy percentage of the judges are not CFA judges, we've not given them as much a reason to come. They could see those same judges in FIFe or the independent associations. They are coming to us because they like our format, but because also they like our judges. They think the quality of our judges is good. **Hamza:** Loretta, is your hand up? **Baugh:** No, I'm sorry. I can take it off. **Hannon:** Take off her hand? **Hamza:** We're taking her hand right off. I guess before we go forward, we need to do some sort of straw polling anyway to see if the majority of this board thinks that we need to have a majority of CFA judges at CFA shows, and so this is very informal. Everybody who thinks that we should increase the percentage – **Eigenhauser:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Yeah George. **Eigenhauser:** There's actually another point of view, and to me it depends on the show size. On a 10 ring show, I would feel differently about maybe being one off one way or the other on whether it's 50% or not than I would at a 2 ring show. **Hamza:** Again, we can go to what you proposed and come up with numbers for each format. **Eigenhauser:** What I'm saying is, it may be a different number for different formats for me. I would be maybe more comfortable with going over 50% at a 10 ring show than I would at a 2 ring show. **Hannon:** Can we just have a straw poll if we want to maintain the status quo, or whether we want to discuss it? **Hamza:** We can approach it that way. I mean, you know, let's do a straw poll. Everybody who wants to maintain the status quo – yes means you want to maintain it, no means you don't. So, yes votes? <Newkirk> No votes. <everyone else> So, we obviously have – what's going to happen here is we're not going to write the show rule today, but we're going to talk about how we want it. George, since you're the one who feels like you want numbers, do we – I don't think – well, where do we want to start it? A 2 ring show? We haven't seen one of those. **Phillips:** You see them in the ID. Believe me. Places like Thailand and Singapore. Korea, Kuwait. **Hamza:** Alright, so a 2 ring show. Is 50/50 a reasonable minimum? **Eigenhauser:** Yep. **Hamza:** OK, that's easy. 4 ring show, which is also we're only dealing with – it could change, but right now, most of those are in the ID. **Baugh:** Jerry, the other issue that we have is, in Regions 1-9 and the International Division, we only want to require this for Regions 1-9 because we realize there's issues in the International Division with having the smaller shows. The proposal we had was that it would be 1-9. **Hamza:** You know what? Here's what I'm going to do. I'm going to kick this back to you, George and Monte, for December. **Baugh:** Me too, please. **Eigenhauser:** And Dick. **Hamza:** Pardon? **Kallmeyer:** And Dick. **Hamza:** And Dick, too. That's fine. Anybody else? **Baugh:** And Loretta. **Hamza:** You're you. **Eigenhauser:** You're you, Loretta. **Hamza:** I meant, Loretta, Monte, George and Dick. Is that good? **Baugh:** OK, that's good. **Hamza:** So, we'll bring it back in December and hopefully it will be something more substantial that we're voting on. **Baugh:** The consensus definitely is, we want to do something, so that's good. We appreciate that. Thank you.

## ATTACHMENT B

**CFA BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
DECEMBER 4, 2012**

*Increase the percentage of judges at CFA shows that are CFA-licensed*

Show Rule 25.13	Show Rules Committee																																								
Existing Wording	Proposed Wording																																								
<p>For Championship, Kitten, Premiership and Veteran classes, a CFA judge (at least Apprentice) or approved guest judge must be used. No more than 50% of the judges at any CFA show may be guest judges. For Household Pet classes it is permissible for a club to use a Trainee.</p>	<p>For Championship, Kitten, Premiership and Veteran classes, a CFA judge (at least Apprentice) or approved guest judge must be used. <del>No more than 50% of the judges at any CFA show may be guest judges.</del> For Household Pet classes it is permissible for a club to use a Trainee. <u>Depending on the show location, the number of judges that must be CFA judges at the show are as follows:</u></p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Regions 1-9</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">International Division</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">No. of Rings</th> <th style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">CFA Judges</th> <th style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">No. of Rings</th> <th style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">CFA Judges</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2-3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2-3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4-5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4-5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8-9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">9-10</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10-11</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">11</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">12</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">12</td> <td style="text-align: center;">9</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>As used above, 11 or 12 rings constitutes two 5 or more ring shows at the same location on the same weekend, sponsored by one or more clubs.</u></p>	Regions 1-9		International Division		No. of Rings	CFA Judges	No. of Rings	CFA Judges	2-3	2	2-3	2	4-5	3	4-5	3	6	4	6	4	7	5	7	5	8	6	8-9	6	9-10	7	10-11	7	11	8	12	8	12	9		
Regions 1-9		International Division																																							
No. of Rings	CFA Judges	No. of Rings	CFA Judges																																						
2-3	2	2-3	2																																						
4-5	3	4-5	3																																						
6	4	6	4																																						
7	5	7	5																																						
8	6	8-9	6																																						
9-10	7	10-11	7																																						
11	8	12	8																																						
12	9																																								
<p><b>RATIONALE:</b> At the October Board meeting, there was a committee developed to revise this rule to require a higher percentage of CFA judges at CFA shows than the current 50 percent. From the e-mails of the Committee, the above consensus was reached. A concern was raised regarding the RUI association, and a possibility of writing in an exemption for them. The Show Rules Committee recommends that be handled on a case by case exemption by the Board rather than writing a specific exemption for one club into the actual rule text.</p>																																									

**Phillips:** OK. Next one is 25.13. That was the one we had a committee decide how many CFA judges would be required at a CFA show, as opposed to having 50% can be guest judges. The only thing I did for the committee report is add odd numbers of rings, because we do have shows that license 7 and 9 and 11 rings every now and then. So, this is basically the same table.  
**Baugh:** This was the consensus of everybody that discussed it, yeah. **Hamza:** OK. Any comments on this? **Baugh:** I make a motion that we accept it, as worded. **Hannon:** Second.

**Hannon:** I have a question. In Regions 1 through 9, we have a number for 12 rings but we don't in the International Division. **Baugh:** Yes we do. **Phillips:** Yeah we do. **Baugh:** It's there. **Phillips:** What happened was, 11 was on [regions] 1-9 and 12 is on the other side. **Hamza:** You see it, Mark? **Hannon:** Yeah, but why didn't we just make it the same for everything?  
**Baugh:** So you could ask the question. **Phillips:** That's not the way we wrote it up, but I understand your point. **Baugh:** It's understandable. **Hannon:** It's not that different in the right hand column for the International Division. I don't understand why we just didn't do the numbers in the first 2 columns and leave it at that. **Hamza:** Alright. Assuming Monte rewrites it with symmetry. **Phillips:** Well, here is the kicker. Where the problem comes is 9 versus 8. If you look at the International Division for 12 rings it's 8 versus Regions 1 through 9 it's 9. **Baugh:** Right, and that was done because of the 75% and the 60%. International Division we talked about doing 60%, whereas we would try to get 75% for Regions 1 through 9. That's why those numbers are

different. That's what was recommended when we talked about it. That's why there's 2 sets of numbers. **Hamza:** Look, this works. We have a motion and a second. **Hannon:** OK, call the vote.

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



**(8) MOTION FOR EXCEPTION TO SHOW RULE 25.13 – ROLANDUS UNION.**

*At the October 6/7, 2012 teleconference, a proposal was presented to decrease the percentage of CFA guest judges at CFA shows (see Attachment A). In the discussion regarding that proposal, Rolandus International Union (RUI) was specifically called out as being entitled to an exception to this proposal.*

*At the December 4, 2012 teleconference, a show rule revision was adopted to increase the percentage of CFA-licensed judges at CFA shows (see Attachment B). Within the rationale was an acknowledgment of the concern raised for RUI shows, as well as the committee's consideration of writing an exception for RUI. In the end, the committee felt that this should be handled by the board on a case-by-case basis, since we don't write specific club names into the show rules.*

*RUI is a registering body in Ukraine and is also a CFA club. RUI was instrumental in introducing CFA to Europe (particularly Eastern Europe) and continues to be a strong force in the promotion and development of CFA in that area of the world, and into Russia. Recently, RUI added several shows in different cities in Ukraine. They produce a Yearbook and have used the CFA Yearbook as a model, always promoting CFA. RUI has a stable of judges that are young and talented frequent CFA guest judges, without which CFA WOULD NOT EXIST in that part of the world. Unlike some other frequent guest judges, many of these RUI frequent guest judges have attended our judging schools, clerking schools and Annuals. Please check out their website: <http://rolandus.org/eng/index.html>*

*You may ask, why don't they just roll into CFA and all of their judges become CFA judges? I do not know the answer to that question, because I don't live there and I am not a part of their culture. RUI offers a few breeds that CFA does not, and a few styles that CFA does not have. While I cannot speak to their business plan, RUI has depended on the 50% rule to continue to host CFA shows for almost two decades. In fact, for the many years that CFA did NOT have a 50% rule in place, RUI used 50% CFA judges because they considered it an honor to do so. The economy has not improved since then. From a current financial perspective, RUI will not be able to continue to put on CFA shows if we increase their show budget by the several thousands of dollars it will take to bring in additional CFA judges and we will lose this stronghold in this part of eastern Europe.*

*As the reference to RUI in the rationale may have been the determining factor for some of the board support, I would hope that we will now honor that caveat which was specifically spelled out to prepare the board for this very situation. RUI has been a strong supporter of CFA since the 1990's and now they are asking us for a little support in return.*

*RUI makes its request based on the following statements:*

- 1. We have 15 judges of RUI for judging on CFA Show (see Attachment C). At a limit of 25% only a few judges will be able to judge CFA Show.*
- 2. RUI has good judges and we want for them to judge for CFA. Some of our judges have become or will become CFA judges. RUI has a strong judging school and it seems to me that exception for RUI judges 50x50 mutually beneficially both for CFA and for RUI. For this reason particularly we ask you to support us in addressing CFA.*

3. *RUI judges who would transfer from RUI to CFA would have to become guest judges for their original organization and they would have to ask permission to judge on their own shows. This particular requirement stopped many of our judges."*
4. *46 CFA shows took place in the last show season in Europe. 8 AB CFA judges in Europe, it is enough?*
5. *We don't want expansion of other organizations in Ukraine which aggressively comes to Ukraine now.*
6. *We have a serious judging school, which consists of:*
  - (a) *General lessons on felinology and anatomy, including principles and terminology of standards creation.*
  - (b) *Lessons about breeds. The CFA Judges' Education Committee allowed to use their materials in training our judges. RUI President presented the whole set of lessons to Wayne Trevathan on breeds that are not recognized in CFA but recognized in RUI.*
  - (c) *Four lessons on genetics, written on the basis of Jean-Paul Maas' book "Cats' genetics made easy. The heredity of coat and eye colours."*
  - (d) *Two lessons on breeding.*

*RUI judges in training methods essentially differ from FIFe, WCF and other systems' judges. RUI judges are ready to judge CFA shows, that is why we ask for permission for RUI judges. They can start as the guest judges only on CFA Cat Show in Kiev. If from 15 judges that we have we would be able to use only a few on CFA shows that would push them away from CFA with time.*

*MOTION: Grant an exception to Show Rule 25.13 for the Rolandus Union shows to be held in Kiev, Ukraine, on November 16/17, 2013 and March 15/16, 2014, to allow the use of up to 50% guest judges at their 8-ring shows.*

**Hamza:** Now, Rachel, go ahead to #8, motion for exception for Rolandus Union. **Anger:** Alright. I put together a write-up on this and gave to the board Rolandus's reasons for wanting the exception for their two shows that are listed here. Basically, they feel as though their judges are not just regular guest judges, but that they are held to a higher standard because they go to our clerking schools, some of them have gone to our judging school, and they are very proud of their judging panel. They have held shows for almost two decades, based on the 50% rule when it was in effect. There were years when we had no percentage of required CFA judges, and they still had their 50% of CFA judges that they used. They always supported CFA and are now asking for us to support them. They would like to go forward with the business plan that they have been using, to produce successful shows that draw a tremendous gate, that are a stronghold in that area of eastern Europe. There is my motion at the end, to grant an exception to Show Rule 25.13 for Rolandus, for their November 2013 and March 2014 shows, to use up to 50% guest judges. **Baugh:** This is Loretta. **Hamza:** Loretta. **Baugh:** OK. They must think this has already passed, because I have been told that it's already on their website in Russian that they had 8 judges for their show in November, 4 of which are guest judges. So, they are being somewhat

presumptuous. But, beside that point, I asked [name omitted] if this is a group that would need to have an exemption. I'm not opposed to making exemptions if there's a real need, but [name omitted] tells me this is the most affluent club in all of Region 9 and she couldn't believe that they were asking for an exemption, because she said they have lots of money. And I have gotten a lot of complaints specifically about the RUI association, and that their purpose of putting on shows is not to help CFA, but to help themselves. [Roy leaves the conference] I have gotten a lot of comments about that and I finally have something in writing that I submitted. I don't have a problem doing an exemption for a group that really needs it, but I just don't see a need here. Thank you. **Anger:** This is Rachel. **Hamza:** Hang on for a second, Rachel. Did somebody else want to talk? **Eigenhauser:** George wanted to talk. **Hamza:** OK George, and then Rachel. Go ahead George. **Eigenhauser:** I was just going to say one thing. A lot of clubs plan their shows more than a year in advance. Both of these shows are within the next 10 months, so if we grant this exemption, what we're really doing is giving recognition to the fact that sometimes you can't just turn on a dime just because a show rule changed. This gives them a little bit of time to transition, a little bit of time to plan ahead, but although we're talking about two shows, we are talking about two shows within less than a year. We're basically just giving them a little transition period to get up to speed. I don't see that there's any harm in doing that. I'm sure that some of the judges they have for next March's shows, they have been planning on for a while. I just don't see that there's a problem letting them kind of move into it gradually. A year is not that big a deal. **Petty:** This is Tracy. **Hamza:** Go ahead Tracy. **Petty:** I have a concern with this group in that they've made it clear they want to transition their judges to be CFA judges, and [inaudible] if allowing their larger percentage of guest judges makes that happen faster, I feel like we are kind of already fast tracking them, so I have a concern with maybe if we do consider this, I don't think these guest judgments should count towards applying to the CFA Judging Program. **Newkirk:** Based on what? **Petty:** What do you mean? I don't understand what you're asking. **Newkirk:** If you went to the Annual Meeting and went to the breed seminar and we just all of a sudden decided it didn't count for you, that doesn't make any sense to me. **Petty:** If we grant an exception, then I don't think these should count, if we're giving a larger percentage of judges freer access to CFA. **Newkirk:** We allow a certain amount of guest judges, so who is going to pick which ones get to count and which ones don't? **Petty:** Maybe none do. **Hamza:** You know, this is, again, I want to stay on point. You know, maybe – here's the problem I have. I just don't like to see different parts of CFA being treated differently, but on the other hand, it is a new show rule and you like to give people a chance to be able to switch gears. **Baugh:** Jerry, this is Loretta. **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Baugh:** Could we make a compromise and exempt them from the November show? **Hamza:** And expect them to comply in March. That's what I was thinking. **Baugh:** That's a good compromise. **Hamza:** I think it is, especially with a club that seems to have money. **Baugh:** I could support that without a problem. **Hamza:** Or something even incremental. Give them the exemption for March and maybe have them come up half way for the next show and then expect fully compliance by the show after that. **Anger:** This is Rachel. **Baugh:** We're talking two shows. I was saying OK for November and then they would have to come up to compliance by March, is what I would be looking for. **Hamza:** That seems reasonable. Go ahead Pauli. **Huhtaniemi:** I would be willing to give exception to any club who had problems to get local judges in their shows. That's not the case with the Ukrainian club, because I asked directly from the club if they have tried to invite any of the European judges, and they said that this is not the issue, so I contacted the European judges and 5 of them have already replied that they have never received invitations for November or March. But anyway, I am willing to support a compromise to give the 50% for the November show. **Bizzell:** This is Carla. **Hamza:** Go ahead Carla. **Bizzell:** I am also willing to support the compromise, and I will say they have their site up and they do have the November show listed with 4 CFA judges and 4

guest judges. The March show, they show 3 CFA judges and the rest are TBA of the 8. **Hamza:** Does anybody not think that's reasonable, to give them the compromise for November and tell them we expect them to comply by March. **Anger:** This is Rachel, still. **Altschul:** This is Carissa, sorry. **Hamza:** Go ahead Carissa. **Altschul:** We originally passed this in December. They had enough lead time to make the change. They just assumed that they would get their way and went ahead and planned the show. So, I would have a problem with the compromise because I don't see why we are treating this one club specially and nobody else. **Anger:** This is Rachel. **Baugh:** Nobody else has asked for an exception. **Anger:** Exactly, thank you. **Altschul:** They will. **Hamza:** And, you know, I think that seeing as it just passed, I think that we would be in similar circumstances compelled to offer a similar window. I think the compromise also does another thing. I think it lets any other clubs know that this window is only open a certain amount of space. So, it does do two things; it shows that we're not going to be mean spirited, and that we're here to service and help the people we represent, but we're also here to insure the CFA product and to enforce our rules. It sends that message, as well; that we're here to give you enough time to get on your feet and to comply. **Anger:** This is Rachel. **Hamza:** Go ahead Rachel. **Anger:** I think the compromise is a workable solution. We can't say when they planned their show. I'm not judging that show so I don't know when they contracted their judges. It may have been years ago, so we can't say that they just boldly did it and said, "we're defying you." There's no evidence of that. In the rationale – I just want to point out the rationale of the rule we passed where we specifically said, *A concern was raised regarding the RUI association*, and so on and so forth. This was also mentioned repeatedly in the discussion about RUI and their unique situation. So, I would like to go ahead and amend the motion that I made in the report, to delete the March so for the time being. So, the motion would be to grant an exception to Show Rule 25.13 for their show in Kiev, Ukraine, on November 16/17, 2013 and allow the use of up to 50% guest judges at their 8-ring shows. **Eigenhauser:** Second. **Hamza:** I think that's not enough. I think that the motion has to be tied with them being in compliance by March for the March show. **Eigenhauser:** If we don't grant them an exemption for March, then they are bound by the rules already. **Hamza:** OK. Well, but I just want it to be made clear. I understand, but I thought that part of the logic was to send a message that we expect compliance in the future from everybody. **Anger:** That was your logic. And, part of the rationale was that we would take it on a case-by-case basis. That was instrumental in it passing. **Baugh:** Is this not in open session? They can read the minutes and know that we have a rather strong feeling that they need to be in compliance by March. **Hamza:** Rachel already made the motion, so we need a second. **Eigenhauser:** I did.

**Hamza** called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Altschul and Petty voting no. **Anger:** So, was that Altschul and Meeker voting no? **Meeker:** No, Meeker voted yes. **Anger:** And Petty. So, Altschul and Petty voting no. Thank you.

## ATTACHMENT A

**CFA EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING  
OCTOBER 6/7, 2012**

**Action Item:** Approve change to Show Rule 25.13

Show Rule 25.13	
Existing Wording	Proposed Wording
<p><b>25.13</b> For Championship, Kitten, Premiership and Veteran classes, a CFA judge (at least Apprentice) or approved guest judge must be used. No more than 50% of the judges at any CFA show may be guest judges. For Household Pet classes it is permissible for a club to use a Trainee.</p>	<p><b>25.13</b> For Championship, Kitten, Premiership and Veteran classes, a CFA judge (at least Apprentice) or approved guest judge must be used. No more than 50% of the judges at any CFA Show <u>in the International Division and 25% of the judges at any CFA show in Regions 1-9</u> may be guest judges. For Household Pet classes it is permissible for a club to use a Trainee.</p>
<p><b>RATIONALE:</b> Between the CFA Judges residing in the European division, along with the regular CFA judging panel, the consensus is that there are enough judges to decrease this requirement to 25% This request has the support of 90% of Region 9. This also falls in line with FIFe and WCF etc. The impression presented of the judging panel and CFA specifically is much better with licensed CFA judges officiating.</p>	

[from Sunday] **Hamza:** Loretta, did we not have something that you had from judging yesterday that we deferred? **Baugh:** Yes, we do. I sent out a revision to the wording this morning, because I got a frantic email. It's a show rule change to 25.13. Our current show rule says, *No more than 50% of the judges at any CFA show may be guest judges.* We would like to see this changed to say that *No more than 50% of the judges at any CFA Show in the International Division and 25% of the judges at any CFA show in Regions 1-9 may be guest judges.* At least 90% of the people in Region 9 support this. **Hannon:** Who is that? **Hamza:** That's Loretta. Loretta, we can't hear a word you're saying. I don't know if everybody else can. **Wilson:** We can hear, but we can't understand. **Eigenhauser:** About half way through you became muffled. **Baugh:** OK. This should be better. OK, I'm sorry. Changing the requirements. Currently it's 50% guest judges allowed. We would like to change it to 50% in the International Division and 25% at shows in Regions 1 through 9. Pauli supports this. 90% of the clubs in Region 9 support it. It falls in line with FIFe, WCF and other associations over there. **Kallmeyer:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Yeah. **Kallmeyer:** Yeah, I would like probably a change to that. First of all, if we do 75%, that means we would require 7-1/2 judges and I don't think we want to get into which of our judges are a half. But also, I think on international, I would like to see 60% and we can also modify it to round up, so if we had 7-1/2, it would be 8 judges and 60% of a 4 ring show in the international would really require 3 judges. I think it should be more than a half. In international, we have a lot of shows where there's an incredible amount of color changes and I think we need a stronger CFA influence for those shows, so I would like to see 60% and 75% with a restriction that you round up to the nearest integer. **Baugh:** So, you want us to change it to read *60% of the judges in the International Division must be CFA judges, and 75% must be for Regions 1-9.* That is fine. It's better even than what we were looking at. We would like to support that change. **Phillips:** Remember, that's the maximum number of guest judges? 60%, or is it 60% of – **Hamza:** You're reading it backwards. **Raymond:** At least. **Baugh:** The requirement. OK, the requirement would be that a minimum of 60% of the judges at shows in the CFA International Division, and a minimum of 75% in Regions 1-9 must be CFA judges. We're turning it around. Rather than saying how many guest judges we allow, we're saying how many CFA judges we require. **Phillips:** OK. **Hamza:** Darrell. **Newkirk:** In my opinion, I don't think this rule should be changed. I'll tell you why. RUI is a club that puts on a couple shows a year. They use half of their judges and they use half CFA judges. It has worked out very well for them. It's been a training ground for a lot of their judges who go on to guest judge for us in other parts of Europe. The logic used, because we need CFA judges, because there are color changes, I will give you a good example. Last weekend, CFA registered a Siberian as a red/cream and white Siberian. Now, that's impossible, because cream is the dilution of red,

OK? CFA registered this kitten. Two judges had judged this kitten before it got to me and nothing was done, so the logic of our CFA judges recognizing colors and patterns and stuff I don't think is a good, logical answer to make this change. Personally, I don't think that this is a real issue. Now, we have had issues where guest judges have not functioned up to snuff, as they used to say when I was a kid. Now, that's a function of just somebody coming here and learning how to judge our shows. Now, most of those people haven't clerked or done anything, so they come in, you know, totally green handed, don't know how our rules operate. However, I thought the board had consented that these would be dealt with on an individual basis. Now, if that's the rationale for trying to make more CFA judges in the show hall, then I don't think that's another reason to change the rules. So, my personal opinion is, I don't think this rule is causing a tremendous amount of issue. **Hamza:** I think, to be clear, and this is for you, Loretta, isn't the philosophy behind this to ensure that CFA judges have – I mean, CFA shows have a majority of CFA judges? **Baugh:** Yes, and as you probably remember when we've had the meetings with the International Division, there has been a great deal of consternation over the performance of the guest judges, especially in Region 9. Everybody that I've spoken to in Region 9 supports this. Pauli supports it. Yes, we realize it's going to be a problem for the RUI group, but I think that the rule needs to benefit the majority of the people, and the majority of the people over there want this. **Kallmeyer:** Loretta, couldn't the board at least pass a resolution for RUI as a special exception? **Baugh:** That's not a problem. **Hamza:** Alright. George. **Eigenhauser:** I'm looking at this from a different angle. We've had some discussion now about how we count fractional parts of a person. Can we just get away from the math and just say, for a 4-ring show it's got to be this many CFA judges, for a 6-ring show it's got to be that many CFA judges, and not make people do math and then have to figure out how to round fractional people? **Hamza:** That would be fine. I don't mind things being clearer than unclear. Mark. **Hannon:** I think one of the reasons people come to CFA shows are for the CFA judges. If we're going to have a show where there's a heavy percentage of the judges are not CFA judges, we've not given them as much a reason to come. They could see those same judges in FIFe or the independent associations. They are coming to us because they like our format, but because also they like our judges. They think the quality of our judges is good. **Hamza:** Loretta, is your hand up? **Baugh:** No, I'm sorry. I can take it off. **Hannon:** Take off her hand? **Hamza:** We're taking her hand right off. I guess before we go forward, we need to do some sort of straw polling anyway to see if the majority of this board thinks that we need to have a majority of CFA judges at CFA shows, and so this is very informal. Everybody who thinks that we should increase the percentage – **Eigenhauser:** Jerry? **Hamza:** Yeah George. **Eigenhauser:** There's actually another point of view, and to me it depends on the show size. On a 10 ring show, I would feel differently about maybe being one off one way or the other on whether it's 50% or not than I would at a 2 ring show. **Hamza:** Again, we can go to what you proposed and come up with numbers for each format. **Eigenhauser:** What I'm saying is, it may be a different number for different formats for me. I would be maybe more comfortable with going over 50% at a 10 ring show than I would at a 2 ring show. **Hannon:** Can we just have a straw poll if we want to maintain the status quo, or whether we want to discuss it? **Hamza:** We can approach it that way. I mean, you know, let's do a straw poll. Everybody who wants to maintain the status quo – yes means you want to maintain it, no means you don't. So, yes votes? <Newkirk> No votes. <everyone else> So, we obviously have – what's going to happen here is we're not going to write the show rule today, but we're going to talk about how we want it. George, since you're the one who feels like you want numbers, do we – I don't think – well, where do we want to start it? A 2 ring show? We haven't seen one of those. **Phillips:** You see them in the ID. Believe me. Places like Thailand and Singapore. Korea, Kuwait. **Hamza:** Alright, so a 2 ring show. Is 50/50 a reasonable minimum? **Eigenhauser:** Yep. **Hamza:** OK, that's easy. 4 ring show, which is also we're only dealing with – it could change, but right now, most of those are in the ID. **Baugh:** Jerry, the other issue that we have is, in Regions 1-9 and the International Division, we only want to require this for Regions 1-9 because we realize there's issues in the International Division with having the smaller shows. The proposal we had was that it would be 1-9. **Hamza:** You know what? Here's what I'm going to do. I'm going to kick this back to you, George and Monte, for December. **Baugh:** Me too, please. **Eigenhauser:** And Dick. **Hamza:** Pardon? **Kallmeyer:** And Dick. **Hamza:** And Dick, too. That's fine. Anybody else? **Baugh:** And Loretta. **Hamza:** You're you. **Eigenhauser:** You're you, Loretta. **Hamza:** I meant, Loretta, Monte, George and Dick. Is that good? **Baugh:** OK, that's good. **Hamza:** So, we'll bring it back in December and hopefully it will be something more substantial that we're voting on. **Baugh:** The consensus definitely is, we want to do something, so that's good. We appreciate that. Thank you.

## ATTACHMENT B



**CFA BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
DECEMBER 4, 2012**

*Increase the percentage of judges at CFA shows that are CFA-licensed*

Show Rule 25.13	Show Rules Committee																																								
Existing Wording	Proposed Wording																																								
<p>For Championship, Kitten, Premiership and Veteran classes, a CFA judge (at least Apprentice) or approved guest judge must be used. No more than 50% of the judges at any CFA show may be guest judges. For Household Pet classes it is permissible for a club to use a Trainee.</p>	<p>For Championship, Kitten, Premiership and Veteran classes, a CFA judge (at least Apprentice) or approved guest judge must be used. <del>No more than 50% of the judges at any CFA show may be guest judges.</del> For Household Pet classes it is permissible for a club to use a Trainee. <u>Depending on the show location, the number of judges that must be CFA judges at the show are as follows:</u></p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Regions 1-9</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">International Division</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">No. of Rings</th> <th style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">CFA Judges</th> <th style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">No. of Rings</th> <th style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">CFA Judges</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2-3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2-3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4-5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4-5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8-9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">9-10</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10-11</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">11</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">12</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">12</td> <td style="text-align: center;">9</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>As used above, 11 or 12 rings constitutes two 5 or more ring shows at the same location on the same weekend, sponsored by one or more clubs.</u></p>	Regions 1-9		International Division		No. of Rings	CFA Judges	No. of Rings	CFA Judges	2-3	2	2-3	2	4-5	3	4-5	3	6	4	6	4	7	5	7	5	8	6	8-9	6	9-10	7	10-11	7	11	8	12	8	12	9		
Regions 1-9		International Division																																							
No. of Rings	CFA Judges	No. of Rings	CFA Judges																																						
2-3	2	2-3	2																																						
4-5	3	4-5	3																																						
6	4	6	4																																						
7	5	7	5																																						
8	6	8-9	6																																						
9-10	7	10-11	7																																						
11	8	12	8																																						
12	9																																								
<p><b>RATIONALE:</b> At the October Board meeting, there was a committee developed to revise this rule to require a higher percentage of CFA judges at CFA shows than the current 50 percent. From the e-mails of the Committee, the above consensus was reached. A concern was raised regarding the RUI association, and a possibility of writing in an exemption for them. The Show Rules Committee recommends that be handled on a case by case exemption by the Board rather than writing a specific exemption for one club into the actual rule text.</p>																																									

**Phillips:** OK. Next one is 25.13. That was the one we had a committee decide how many CFA judges would be required at a CFA show, as opposed to having 50% can be guest judges. The only thing I did for the committee report is add odd numbers of rings, because we do have shows that license 7 and 9 and 11 rings every now and then. So, this is basically the same table.  
**Baugh:** This was the consensus of everybody that discussed it, yeah. **Hamza:** OK. Any comments on this? **Baugh:** I make a motion that we accept it, as worded. **Hannon:** Second.

**Hannon:** I have a question. In Regions 1 through 9, we have a number for 12 rings but we don't in the International Division. **Baugh:** Yes we do. **Phillips:** Yeah we do. **Baugh:** It's there. **Phillips:** What happened was, 11 was on [regions] 1-9 and 12 is on the other side. **Hamza:** You see it, Mark? **Hannon:** Yeah, but why didn't we just make it the same for everything? **Baugh:** So you could ask the question. **Phillips:** That's not the way we wrote it up, but I understand your point. **Baugh:** It's understandable. **Hannon:** It's not that different in the right hand column for the International Division. I don't understand why we just didn't do the numbers in the first 2 columns and leave it at that. **Hamza:** Alright. Assuming Monte rewrites it with symmetry. **Phillips:** Well, here is the kicker. Where the problem comes is 9 versus 8. If you look at the International Division for 12 rings it's 8 versus Regions 1 through 9 it's 9. **Baugh:** Right, and that was done because of the 75% and the 60%. International Division we talked about doing 60%, whereas we would try to get 75% for Regions 1 through 9. That's why those numbers are

different. That's what was recommended when we talked about it. That's why there's 2 sets of numbers. **Hamza:** Look, this works. We have a motion and a second. **Hannon:** OK, call the vote.

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

## ATTACHMENT C

List Judges AB RUI for working as guest-judge CFA (for Wayne Trevathan)

	Judge	Category	City, Country	Tel	E-mail
1	Anna Bondarenko	AB RUI	Kiev, Ukraine	+38-067-375-38-55	<a href="mailto:bona-dea@ukr.net">bona-dea@ukr.net</a>
2	Olga Grebneva	AB RUI	Kiev, Ukraine	+38-044-227-18-15	<a href="mailto:og@rolandus.org">og@rolandus.org</a>
3	Svetlana Brodskaya	AB RUI	Sumy, Ukraine	+38-0542-33-22-79	<a href="mailto:moonsweet@rambler.ru">moonsweet@rambler.ru</a>
4	Elena Gnatkevich	AB RUI	Kiev, Ukraine	+38-044-483-01-47	<a href="mailto:lg@rolandus.org">lg@rolandus.org</a>
5	Dmitry Gubenko	AB RUI	Cherkassy, Ukraine	+38-093-651-95-20	<a href="mailto:dmitriygb@gmail.com">dmitriygb@gmail.com</a>
6	Olga Korotonozhkina	AB RUI	Kiev, Ukraine	+38-044-713-27-44	<a href="mailto:ok@rolandus.org">ok@rolandus.org</a>
7	Maria Koretskaya	AB RUI	Odessa, Ukraine	+38-0482-40-44-27	<a href="mailto:shaparack@rambler.ru">shaparack@rambler.ru</a>
8	Natalia Matskevich	AB RUI	Nikolaev, Ukraine	+38-097-257-65-60	<a href="mailto:sherry-club@mail.ru">sherry-club@mail.ru</a>
9	Peter Paul Moormann	AB RUI	Amsterdam, Netherlands		<a href="mailto:almoor@xs4all.nl">almoor@xs4all.nl</a>
10	Elaine Podprugina	AB RUI	Kramatorsk, Ukraine	+38-050-609-06-67	<a href="mailto:for_helen@mail.ru">for_helen@mail.ru</a>
11	Victoria Pohvalina	AB RUI	Moscow, Russia	+107-095-457-01-25	<a href="mailto:pohvalina@mail.ru">pohvalina@mail.ru</a>
12	Olga Rakitnyh	AB RUI	Kiev, Ukraine	+38-044-332-40-86	<a href="mailto:or@rolandus.org">or@rolandus.org</a>
13	Inna Shustrova	AB RUI	Moscow, Russia	+107-495-404-65-95	<a href="mailto:innin88@yandex.ru">innin88@yandex.ru</a>
14	Tatiana Slizhevskaya	AB RUI	Kiev, Ukraine	+38-067-440-24-21	<a href="mailto:roslicat@meta.ua">roslicat@meta.ua</a>
15	Andrew Ustinov	AB RUI	Kiev, Ukraine	+28-044-529-69-80	<a href="mailto:ustinov@rolandus.org">ustinov@rolandus.org</a>

**(9) EXPERIMENTAL SHOW FORMAT REQUEST.**

**Action Item:** *France Cat Fancier request permission to organize experimental 3 days show on November 9-11, 2013 with max format 3 x 6 ring one-day-show (or 10 rings back-to-back format show + 6 ring one-day-show).*

*Weekend is National holiday weekend in France and also Monday is National holiday. If permission is granted, club will try to seek one or more CFA clubs to co-work for this special show.*

**Hamza:** OK, #9 is Pauli, experimental show format request. **Huhtaniemi:** Yes. France Cat Fanciers are wishing to have a 3-day show with maximum 18 rings, and they are planning to seek some other clubs to organize the show. This is a long holiday weekend in France.

**Eigenhauser:** And they are going to use all CFA judges, right? **Huhtaniemi:** I think they have always used CFA judges from America at the France Cat Fanciers show. **Baugh:** You have here, *or 10 rings back-to-back and then 6 ring one-day*, so we're talking 16 or 18 rings, correct?

**Huhtaniemi:** Yes, that's correct. The maximum is 6 ring shows, 3 times 6 ring one day shows. That's the maximum. They might go lower if they cannot get judges. **Hamza:** You know, it kills me. We were just talking about how we can't get 18 judges, 18 CFA judges in Europe, and then the very next agenda item is 18 judges in Europe. Silly Jerry. **Huhtaniemi:** There is a huge local exhibitor pool, so most likely all French shows are going to be quite nice and successful.

**Hamza:** I was just being sarcastic. Don't pay any attention. **Newkirk:** Which club is putting it on? Is this Samir and Guy? **Huhtaniemi:** Yeah, it's Samir and Guy. **Newkirk:** Well then, there you have your answer, because there's a lot of judges won't go over there and judge for them.

**Altschul:** This is Carissa. **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Altschul:** I don't really like the door that this is opening. First, granting yet another exception to Europe, Region 9, who is supposed to comply with all the other rules of the other 8 regions. If we allow this, then we're going to have monster shows that won't happen here in the U.S., and I just don't think it's healthy for our cats and in some cases it's not healthy for the humans. I don't like the idea. I'm sorry, creativity is great, but this is not the right way to go. **Baugh:** This is Loretta. **Hamza:** Go ahead Loretta. **Baugh:** I would be more comfortable with – I don't have a problem with a 3-day show, but I do have a problem with 6 rings each day. I think we do have to consider the cats. I think they can do the same type of show with less rings. If they did 4 a day, that would be 12 rings, which would be equivalent to a 6x6. **Hamza:** I have a real problem with going past 12 rings on a weekend.

**Baugh:** I do, too. **Eigenhauser:** I do, too. **Baugh:** I think 4 rings a day would be fine. They can still do 3 days. **Hamza:** I agree. If they want to string 12 rings out over 3 days, I have no problem with that, but I'm reluctant to open up a CFA format of more than 12 rings on a weekend. **Altschul:** When we had the International show that was 3 days long and our cats only went into 6 total rings over the 3 days, I generally could not show my cats the weekend after that because they were completely worn out. It didn't make any sense, because they only went into 6 total rings, but something about the 3 day format. I actually started not showing the weekend before it, too, because I would have cats that came home so tired that they would not eat after that show, and so I'm just saying, I've seen cats at 3-day shows. They do not do well. That's my concern – the cats. **Hamza:** Personally, I think from a business standpoint, one of the worst things that ever happened to CFA was the 2-day, 6x6 format. **Baugh:** Absolutely. **Hamza:** I shudder to think of adding a third day and another 6 rings. I don't even want to imagine what that would do. **Baugh:** We took 3 cats to the World Show and they had no problem coming through it. As I said, I would limit it to 12 rings. I can live with that. I just don't want to go beyond that. I agree with you. **Meeker:** Me, too. **Hannon:** Let's vote. **Hamza:** Pauli, what do you want to do?

It sounds like you are only going to get 12 rings over 3 days. Is that acceptable? **Huhtaniemi:** I need to talk with the club about that. They specially requested this format. **Hamza:** Why don't you bring it back to them and tell them that the board is willing to give them 3 days, but only 12 rings. **Huhtaniemi:** I will do that. Thank you. **Hamza:** OK. **Altschul:** Jerry, I don't think you can say the board is willing to do that when you haven't taken a vote. Some people said they are OK, but we've got to at least take a vote to see if the board is in favor of that. **Hamza:** We can do that. Somebody make the motion and we will vote. **Baugh:** I make a motion we allow them to have a 3-day show with a maximum of 12 rings. **Meeker:** I second.

**Hamza** called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Altschul voting no. **Hamza:** There you go, Pauli.

## **(10) CLUB MEMBERSHIP LIST DEADLINE PROPOSAL.**

*Many clubs meet this deadline by submitting a list they know will not be accurate when their own club's subscription deadline comes up. So they submit whatever they have to meet the CFA deadline.*

*If that is an approved way of handling the problem, then we suggest that the deadline wording can be expanded as follows:*

*February 1, 2013† . . . Club fees & membership list must be received in CO by this date for a club to be eligible to vote for CFA Officers and Regional Directors. A provisional membership list can be sent based on the position in December and can be updated at any time.*

**Hamza:** OK, the next one is also Pauli. **Huhtaniemi:** Yes. It's from Cat Fanciers of Denmark. They have a conflict on their own constitution with the CFA constitution. Members deadline is the last day of February. Are you there? **Hamza:** Yes. I can hear you. **Huhtaniemi:** OK. I just lost my connection for a second. They want to add text in the official reminder form – the reminder from Central Office. They want to add the last line in my proposal there. I think this doesn't need to be changed. I just want to ask the board's advice for this, because I think membership lists can be updated anytime with the Central Office, but I just wanted to hear what the board thinks about this. **Eigenhauser:** George here. **Hamza:** Go ahead George. **Eigenhauser:** I actually get this question a lot. People say, "We can't send in our membership list in December because our membership runs in February. We can't send our officers in December because we have our elections in March." I try to explain to them as clearly as possible that the membership list and officer list that's required in December is whatever is in effect in December. It's a snapshot of that moment in time, and if later on in the year you have an election and have new officers, then you submit an updated list to CFA. The actual requirement that it be in, in December, is constitutional. We can't change that, but how we explain it, we can. I do think maybe educating the membership a little bit about, you know, if you do happen to have your elections in February or March or April or whatever, you still have to get your officers list in, in December, but then you update it so CFA has current information about your club. I don't know that this is necessarily the best wording, so what I would like to do is maybe get Ed and Donna Jean involved in this, in terms of how we put this out, because I want to make sure we don't say something that's inconsistent with the Constitution. Maybe we can publish it in a little better way so the clubs understand that you take a snapshot in December and then, as you hold elections or replace officers throughout the course of the year, then you send CFA updated information as it becomes available. **Hamza:** You know, George, I have often thought about, it would be good for us to put together. Donna Jean, you know, this would be good for Kristi to put together. Just a little one-page FAQ for clubs. Just something that does clarify things, like deadline things. You know, *Frequently Asked Questions*, like what George just said. Like, when my dues need to be paid, my club membership list is due, what does that mean? Just a list of club duties that should go out once a year. Maybe it's in an email, what it means. There's a lot of things that are constitutionally driven that aren't always real clear. If we could just get a FAQ sheet that we send out once a year and it just goes over all these things – these snapshots in time. Ed, maybe you can help, too, because some of it is confusing. Like, some people don't understand that you only need 10 members to create a club. You don't need to maintain a membership list of 10 members through the history of the club. That can change over time. Things along those lines. **Raymond:** Jerry, I would be glad to help. As far as this particular proposal, if the word *provisional* were dropped, what is being asked – the change to be made on the reminder form – I would be OK with it. The constitution doesn't mention a provisional

membership list. It actually talks about a complete membership list, so I don't want to introduce a new term. **Hamza:** Right. I agree. I think we're just looking for clarification. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Eigenhauser:** Maybe we could put the word *current* in there. *A current membership list ... and rather than say can be updated at any time, should be updated.* I don't think we need to discuss this as a board. I just think that some sort of an explanation would be helpful to people. I'm not really happy with this one, but I don't think the board needs to actually draft it here and now. **Hamza:** I agree. That's why I said, really, this should come from Kristi's desk and it should be just like I said – an FAQ sheet that comes out once a year, just because clubs change secretaries and presidents, it should go out once a year. Ed, as a part of a deadline sheet that goes out once a year that covers when your dues should be and when your membership list – all the things that club secretaries or presidents, the dates and deadlines they should know about and what they mean. **Raymond:** That's where this comes from, actually. **Hamza:** OK. I know. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead Mark. **Hannon:** I usually do notes on these meetings and tomorrow I have a newsletter going out, so I was going to put notes in the newsletter. I can certainly highlight this particular discussion and the fact that when we're talking about the yearly list that has to go to CFA, that's the current list and, as the membership list or the officers get updated throughout the year, clubs should notify CFA at that time and not wait until the end of the year. **Hamza:** Right, and that can be done electronically, as well. **Hannon:** Yeah. **Hamza:** So they can just email or fax an updated list any time of the year, to coincide with their elections and such. **Huhtaniemi:** That's excellent. **Hamza:** OK.



**(11) PROPOSAL TO ENCOURAGE NEW EXHIBITORS TO BECOME CLUB MEMBERS.**

***Suggestion to CFA Board from Cat Fanciers of Denmark AGM 10th March 2013-03-13***

*Usually the suggestion comes first followed by the motivation. But to make the idea easier to explain, first comes a little story!*

*At the meeting a potential new member of the club came before the start time so she could ask us about CFA and our club. So here is an impression of the Q & A session.*

---

*Charlotte: I have imported a cat from France and it is CFA registered with a Certificate of Registration. What do I do with that?*

*CFD: Tony can show you the online information and how to contact Central Office to transfer the ownership from the breeder to yourself.*

*Charlotte: Good. I also would like to register a cattery name in CFA. Is that possible?*

*CFD: Same answer.*

*Charlotte: And I suppose if I want to show and breed from the cat I can do that?*

*(I will wait until the meeting is finished as Tony suggested and sit with him at his computer to find out more.)*

*Charlotte: So if I pay a subscription to join CFD then I will be allowed to do all those things?*

*CFD: You do not have to join CFD or any CFA member club to do them.*

*Charlotte: Surely that can't be right!*

*CFD: Yes it is!*

- *Anyone with a CFA registered cat can transfer ownership – just send the form and pay the fee to CO in Orlando.*
- *Anyone can register a CFA cattery name – just send the form and pay the fee to CO*
- *Anyone can enter a cat in a CFA show – just send the form and pay the entry fee to the show club.*
- *Even the show points can be recorded for a non-CFA registered cat – just send a special form and pay the fee to CO.*
- *Anyone with a CFA registered cat can register kittens – just send the form and pay the fee to CO.*

*Charlotte: So what benefit do I get from paying the CFD subscription right now? Would you refuse to help me if I didn't?*

*CFD: You can stay for the meeting and vote. Of course we will help you no matter what you decide!*

\* \* \* \* \*

*So Charlotte paid her subscription, enjoyed the meeting and had some useful input for us. After the meeting she spent another hour with us and while online with Tony made all the arrangements she needed for her cat. Success story, but it raised some questions which led to us wanting to suggest some useful changes to CFA's administrative procedures.*

*As far as we can see, there is nothing in the CFA constitution or rules to prevent the suggestions from working, neither are there any privacy issues.*

*Our general idea is to positively encourage people to join a CFA member club at the same point in time as they undertake actions such as those described above. To that end it would be very beneficial to clubs if the potential member can be referred to them in the process of completing the various forms. The suggestions below are specifically intended for Region 9. Although of course for all regions there is no way in CFA to find new owners and catteries.*

### **Suggestions**

- 1. For the Transfer form – when CO acknowledges the transfer then in that email/letter could be inserted the contact address for the nearest CFA member club with a suggestion that the new owner gets in touch for the services that being a club member can offer.*
- 2. For the Cattery Name form – add a box to the form that asks for the name of the CFA member club that the applicant belongs to. "If you are not a member, then write NONE" Add a phrase like "We will inform your club, or the nearest club if you have none, of your new cattery name and ask them to add you to their contact list."*
- 3. For a new registration of litters or cats, add to those forms a similar box as 2. above.*
- 4. For all show entry forms, add a similar box for the member club name. Nothing else is needed as the owner has already shared their details with the benching club and the Entry Clerk will see the box. A CFD example is at <http://cfa-eur.dk/basic-showentryform.html>*

*Maybe it will also be necessary to add something to the effect that "By submitting this application I understand that the local club for my region will be put into contact with me". But that is perhaps making more of it than is sensible.*

*In any event, making these simple changes will ensure that the local club will know of a new potential member in the vicinity ☺ After that, it is up to the club to turn the applicant into a new member if they are not already. Or maybe just take the opportunity to send congratulations and perhaps a Christmas card!*

**Hamza:** #11 is also Pauli. **Huhtaniemi:** Yeah, it's me again. Again, a letter from Cat Fanciers of Denmark, and they want to add a different kind of box in the transfer form, cattery name form, the litter registration form and also the show entry form, and this box would allow somebody from Central Office or the entry clerk to send the contact information of the nearest club. The main purpose is to gain more club members and offer the CFA services through the club. **Hamza:** You know, I'm not laughing because it's funny, I'm laughing because, politically, what a land mine. It's probably not as complex in Europe as it is here. Is this something we should give the RDs to do? **Hannon:** No, we should give it to Pauli to do, since it's really applicable mainly in Europe. I don't think it's something we would want to implement necessarily here in the United States. **Hamza:** It would be tough, I think. **Eigenhauser:** George here. **Hamza:** Go ahead George. **Eigenhauser:** Basically, while it's a good concept, I like keeping things simple. You shouldn't have anything on the litter registration form that isn't necessary to registering a litter. It shouldn't be used for other political purposes, whether it's to get people involved in clubs or get people involved in other activities, because then it just opens up a whole new can of worms. We should have all of our forms with the minimum information, as simple as possible, but maybe when we send out a new cattery name to somebody, we can include a little note about how to get a hold of your RD and getting involved in clubs, but I just don't think it belongs there. **Hamza:** I think the better idea would be to encourage clubs, when they put on shows, to have sign-up sheets. I think that's probably the better way to do that. **Huhtaniemi:** I agree with that, yeah. **Baugh:** We have some clubs that have mailing lists and they email information out. AKC does that. After the dog is 8 years old, I'm still getting emails from the AKC. **Hamza:** Actually, on the club level, they are so savvy, media-wise.

**(12) DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD PET RESULTS BY CENTRAL OFFICE.**

*With more regions scoring HHP's, and scoring out of region shows, it is becoming difficult for regional HHP scorers to get reliable results from all of the shows. They have to rely on exhibitors to send reports. I would like to have CO distribute HHP results of all shows to each of the regional HHP scorers.*

*This could be accomplished by scanning the HHP pages of the master clerk catalog from each show and emailing them to the scorers, using contact information supplied by the RD's. This would not require CO to score the shows, check names and/or reg numbers, or take any other action regarding these results.*

*HHP exhibitors pay the same \$2 per entry surcharge that all other exhibitors do, a portion of which is intended to cover the costs to CO of scoring the shows. They are currently not getting anything in return for that portion of the surcharge, and this is a small request to allow for more reliable regional scoring of HHP's.*

*Action Item: Approve authorizing CO to email scanned copies of HHP results of licensed shows to the regional HHP scorers.*

**Hamza:** OK, #12. That's Michael Shelton. Go ahead Michael. **Shelton:** Yes, it is. This is something that has come up as more regions are scoring Household Pets and scoring out-of-region shows for Household Pets, that it's become difficult to get results. All I would ask for this is that Central Office take the Household Pet pages out of the master clerk's catalog, scan them and email them out to all the Household Pet scorers. They don't have to score them, they don't have to check names, they don't have to check numbers, they don't have to check the extremely limited mechanics, nothing. Just scan them and email them out. Household Pet exhibitors pay the same dollars as everybody else does, and right now they're not getting anything for that portion of the surcharge that's supposed to cover scoring. I don't think this will take a lot of resources to do. **Hamza:** Dick? **Kallmeyer:** Yeah, I'm here. **Hamza:** What do you think? **Kallmeyer:** It's just operational in Central Office. Somebody assists Shirley in that initial packet thing, so it would just be seeing what their time was. I think if you had the emails of the Household Pet scorers, they probably could scan it and get it off relatively simple. **Hamza:** Michael, what are you thinking about, doing it this season? **Shelton:** This season would be ideal. We haven't missed too many shows. **Hamza:** Donna Jean, would you see if we could get that done with the shows that have already happened so far? **Thompson:** OK. Having seen this, I already gave some thought to it, and I think we can accomplish this. The one thing I would only ask is that perhaps the scoring be done on the shows for the Championship, Kitten and Premiership classes, and then we can go back and scan and send these out. A lot will depend on how many shows are on a weekend and how much work needs to be done. **Hamza:** He's not even asking for them to be scored, he's just asking for you to scan the pages to the regional scorers. Right, Michael? **Shelton:** Right. We don't expect Central Office to do anything as far as – **Hamza:** He just wants the pages scanned. **Shelton:** Nothing needs to be done with the results. **Thompson:** I understand that, and I know we can get it done. I just want to be sure we have a little bit of freedom with it, if we have a week that has a great number of shows on it. **Shelton:** And I understand that if you're looking at setting priorities and prioritizing cats when it comes to scoring shows, that you score the pedigreed cats first, make sure that's all done, and then take the time to do the scanning and emailing. I don't think that's an issue. **Hamza:** What I need to have the RDs do is make sure that Shirley has the email address of all the HHP scorers in your region. **Baugh:** Jerry, I have a question. **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Baugh:** The clubs in Region 4 voted to scored Household Pets this

season on a trial basis, to see what it does to our entries. I do have a question. In order to be scored, do these cats have to be registered? **Hannon:** No. **Baugh:** Is that a requirement or not? **Hannon:** No. **Shelton:** That's up to the individual regions. This isn't covered in show rules and it's not a CFA function. **Baugh:** OK. That's what I wanted to know, because that question was raised. OK, thank you. **Hamza:** It's better if they are. **Shelton:** It certainly makes it easier, so they don't have 17 different Fluffies. **Baugh:** I think they should be, in order to be scored, but that's my personal opinion. **Hamza:** It gives them a number and makes it easier for whoever is doing your scoring. **Meeker:** Jerry, this is Ginger. **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Meeker:** Michael, did you have a procedure for, like between Regions 2 and 5, where we're scoring for the other region? **Shelton:** My take on that was that we would be scoring Region 5 cats in Region 2 shows, and you would score Region 2 cats in Region 5 shows, but we would still be doing the scoring the same way we have been. That's one thing that drove this proposal, is that we may not have – we may only have one Region 5 exhibitor who goes to that show in Region 2 in northern California or wherever it is, and we need a reliable way of making sure the results get back to our Region 5 scorer. **Meeker:** But if it's a Region 2 show, the Region 2 scorer is going to get the sheet and she would be responsible for sending that to the Region 5 scorer, correct? **Eigenhauser:** No. **Shelton:** That's one way we could be doing it, but that's not what this proposal is. **Eigenhauser:** This is to have Central Office do it. **Shelton:** This proposal is to have Central Office do it so it helps everybody, because we have had Region 1 Household Pets come out to San Diego. **Baugh:** So, you want Central Office to send the sheets for all the shows to all of the scorers? **Shelton:** That's the intent of this, yes. **Baugh:** That wasn't clear. **Shelton:** Somebody could really quickly scan it and see there are no Region 5 cats there and throw it out. **Kallmeyer:** Actually, that's easier for Central Office. They would just have a distribution list and send everybody everything. **Hamza:** It's just a matter of putting it together once and sending it to everybody. **Baugh:** Right, OK. That makes sense. **Hamza:** That makes perfect sense. Do you understand this, Donna Jean? **Thompson:** Yes, I do. **Hamza:** Okie dokie. And you know what, Dick? Let's bring this up to James, too. I think James could probably put that distribution list together relatively easy. **Kallmeyer:** Yeah. **Hamza:** It could be something that Shirley could flip over to James, and James could just put it up once a week.

(13) WORLD SHOW DATE.

**Hamza:** World Show date, Michael. **Shelton:** I would just like to know if there is one. **Hamza:** There is one. The good news is that it's going to be the 4<sup>th</sup> weekend. Since Ed did a lot of work on this with Rich Mastin, I will let Ed speak to the board. Go ahead Ed. **Raymond:** As Jerry mentioned, the show date will be the 4<sup>th</sup> weekend in November. The facility is the Suburban Collection Showplace in Novi, Michigan. Rich and I visited the facility last week, did a walk-through, met with the decorators. Very nice people, easy to work with. We're getting good deals from them. A brand new hotel is being constructed as we speak, scheduled to open in August. We've already talked to them about a commitment for 100 rooms that they will allow cats in. There are also a lot of other hotels within a 2 mile radius, and lots of restaurants around there. **Hannon:** Is the hotel connected? **Raymond:** Pardon me? **Hannon:** Is the new hotel connected to the facility? **Raymond:** Yes, it is. **Shelton:** Just to make sure there's no confusion, that is November 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup>? **Bizzell:** Yes, that's the 4<sup>th</sup> weekend. **Shelton:** We've had issues with that sometimes before. I just want to make sure. **Hamza:** Just so you folks know, I insisted that this year, wherever we went – that's why it took so long – one of the issues we had in the past was that everything was a la carte and one of the things I wanted to make sure of is that wherever we went, that everything was a complete deal, that we weren't paying for everything piecemeal and that is one of the things that we were able to procure here. I am confident that even though we have it down in the budget as a \$22,000 loss, I am confident that it's going to come in better than that. One of the other things I'm going to do is, I'm going to keep the show committee very small so that we have better control over it. I think we're going to have a good show. It's going to be very similar to last year, but I think the results as far as the financial outcome is going to be better, but I think it's going to be as fun and as classy as last year's show was. I'm pretty optimistic. **Baugh:** Jerry, if I could add, the Suburban Showplace in Novi is only about 1/2 hour from the Detroit airport. Nobody has to go near Detroit. It's the facility that used to be the Novi Expo Center. It's changed hands several times. Mid-Michigan used to put their shows on there. They would have tens of thousands of people through the door. With proper advertising, the gate is there. That's a very, very popular facility and, as you said, there's plenty of restaurants and hotels around. It should be a very good location. **Hamza:** I'm pretty excited about it. I think it's going to be a heck of a thing for CFA. You know, it took time. We took our time and I think our efforts are going to be rewarded. **Raymond:** There is also a craft show there that weekend, in another part of the hall, that attracts 6,000 to 8,000 mostly older female visitors. So, there's some good chance of gate. **Baugh:** Some cross-over, yeah. **Hamza:** What are you trying to say, Ed? **Raymond:** It's our target market, Jerry. **Hamza:** Oh, OK. **Baugh:** Watch it, Jerry. **Hamza:** It's a nice facility. We went and just made sure it was still the facility we remembered, and it still is. **Anger:** And there is an enormous mall across the highway. Twelve Oaks Mall. **Baugh:** Oh yeah. Yep. **Newkirk:** Are we going to see a proposal at the June meeting? **Hamza:** Yes. One of the things I'm going to do in the June meeting is, we're going to, like on Wednesday, I'm going to try to get some people together and we're going to talk about format and stuff. At some point, maybe Thursday or at some point in June, we're going to come up with a format and vote on all that. One of the things we've got to talk about is format. We'll be able to talk about it. There's always issues. Last year, everybody thought that all the specialty rings favored the shorthairs heavily, so we're going to have to talk about if it was fair enough or maybe make a few changes. So, we'll come up with a proposal and we'll give the board a chance to tweak it. The main thing we're going to do now is, we know the square footage we have to work with and a few of us are going to sit down and see how to lay it out with the square footage we have and how many rings are going to fit in there ideally, and try to work backwards from the space we have. **Newkirk:** I saw people with their tongues hanging out when they came to the

rings last year. **Hamza:** The upside to that is, we know that if we get the cart concession, we can probably make some money. [laughter]

**(14) SHOW SCHEDULING – STEEL CITY KITTIES.**

*Steel City Kitties is asking to hold their show in the Pittsburgh area the second weekend in February.*

*Since this is would be their 3rd time on this weekend, they are asking for it to be their traditional date.*

*This was noticed on the CFA News previously, so I'm not sure if it needs to be noticed again. There was some objection, which I am sure hasn't changed. It wasn't put on the April agenda because it was such a full meeting, but the club does need to know if they can move forward or not. They have a deposit on their show hall and need a decision.*

*Thanks, Loretta*

**Hamza:** OK, the last item is the show scheduling, Steel City. **Baugh:** Steel City is requesting to hold their show. **Hamza:** There is one more item, too, but we'll do Steel City. Go ahead. **Baugh:** Steel City is requesting to hold their show on the 2<sup>nd</sup> weekend in February in Pittsburgh. They've had 2 years. This will be the third. They would like it to be their traditional date. Anybody that read Mark's response to the club in North Carolina [in a private email to the club and the board], I think he put all the arguments out there succinctly. All the shows were held last year, and everybody made out OK. Pittsburgh's entries were down and North Carolina's entries were up – not to where either club wanted them to be, but everybody made out OK. Steel City would really like to have a commitment for this date. **Petty:** This is Tracy. **Hamza:** Go ahead Tracy. **Petty:** It's not just Carolina Sophisticats that are opposing this. There are several other clubs that have written oppositions, as well. I would like to point out one thing if we do allow Steel City Kitties to have this date, up to this point we have put restrictions on them, or at least last year they had a restriction that they weren't allowed to do more than, I think it was 8 allbreed rings. Presumably, that restriction would go away. We don't know how that would play out. The show was originally allowed under, I think, a misperception. We ignored the 500 mile rule and we're just perpetuating that mistake. I don't think this club should be allowed to use that weekend. They can find another weekend. **Newkirk:** This is Darrell. **Hamza:** Go ahead Darrell. **Newkirk:** This will be one of the few times I agree with Tracy. I agree with you. **Hamza:** The diplomacy is just overwhelming tonight. **Newkirk:** Hey, I have to get up at 5. **Hamza:** I know, I know. Anything else? Go ahead. I'm trying to wrap this up. **Baugh:** This is Loretta and I do want to say that, as Mark pointed out, any clubs looking for a new date in our region has to take into consideration shows in 5 regions. It is very, very difficult for me to find a show date for a club on any weekend. This is a major market for CFA, as well. **Hamza:** It's Pittsburgh. CFA has to have a presence in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. It just needs to be figured out. It's a major market. Anyway, anybody else got anything? Alright, can I get a motion? **Baugh:** I make a motion that Steel City be allowed to have the second weekend in February as their traditional date. If you want to put restrictions on the format, I don't have a problem with that but I'm not going to do it. **Hamza:** Let's make the motion this way first. Can I get a second? **Eigenhauser:** I'll second.

**Hamza** called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Shelton, Baugh, Hannon, Roy, Calhoun, Koizumi, Eigenhauser, Kallmeyer voting yes. **Hamza:** Alright, let's count the no's. **Anger:** Rachel. **Bizzell:** Carla. **Newkirk:** Darrell. **Altschul:** Carissa. **Krzanowski:** Carol. **Huhtaniemi:** Pauli. **Brown:** Roger. **Hamza:** Are you counting them, Rachel? **Anger:** Yes. I have Rachel, Darrell, Carol, Carissa, Pauli and Roger. Am I missing someone? **Bizzell:** Carla. **Petty:** Tracy.



Did you get me? **Anger:** Petty, OK. **Meeker:** Ginger. **Anger:** So, Anger, Newkirk, Bizzell, Krzanowski, Altschul, Huhtaniemi, Brown, Petty, Meeker. Nine. That's 9 no votes. That would be a fail.

**Baugh:** Then I will make another motion; the same motion, but with a restriction of 8 allbreeds and 4 specialties, if they are going to do a 12 ring show. **Eigenhauser:** Second. **Bizzell:** Are we voting on just for this one year or are we voting that this would be a traditional date? **Baugh:** They don't want to have to fight, to have the weekend every year. If you want to put a restriction on the format on a yearly basis, we can do that. **Petty:** For this year or for all years? **Baugh:** I can do it either way. They really want to have the date. Every time they have to sit and wait to try and find whether they can have the show, they don't know if they can keep their deposit on the show hall or when they have to let them know, so what they really wanted was to have the traditional date. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead Mark. **Hannon:** I don't think we can give them an 8 allbreed limit in perpetuity. I think if we're going to do it maybe for next year, but we don't know what the future is going to hold. These other shows that are that weekend may disappear. **Eigenhauser:** Then they can come back for a change. **Hannon:** This is so unique. We're just doing it because it's less than 500 miles? We don't limit any other club to how many allbreed rings they can have. **Baugh:** Can we modify it and say they can have the show date as their traditional date, and that they would have to have approval of their format? That way, they know they have the date. **Calhoun:** This is Kathy. Can I just ask a question here? **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Calhoun:** Just real quick. I thought when a club had a show in the same place, weekend X, two years in a row, it became their traditional date. I didn't know they had to come back another time. **Newkirk:** We voted it without letting them have it. **Baugh:** We agreed to that so they could have the show, because they weren't going to be allowed to have it. For this particular club. **Calhoun:** Alright, thank you. **Baugh:** I move that they be allowed to have the second weekend in February as their traditional date, and that the format for the show would need to be approved each year. I don't know how else to do it, to let these poor people have their show. **Eigenhauser:** No, we don't want to take this up every year. **Baugh:** Well, put a max of 8 allbreeds on and they can request a – I don't know what to do. **Hamza:** Here's what you do, Loretta. Let's extend it another year. They're going to have to come back next year. I don't know how this board can keep knocking Pittsburgh out of a weekend. It's like a top 20 market. **Baugh:** The thing is, what we really want is, they want to have the weekend. If it means having to come back, I don't want to not vote for them to have the weekend as a traditional weekend if it means coming back next year to have the format approved or we restrict the format for the next year, I don't care. I just want to be sure they have the weekend. That's what they want and that's what they are requesting, because they never know. They would love to be able to go into the show hall and hand them a deposit for next year and know they are going to have the show and plan it out. They're very frustrated, too. I don't know, what do you want me to say? **Hamza:** Make whatever motion you want. I don't know what to do. I think what you should do is just get them their show hall this year and just something will shake out eventually. You will eventually find another date for them, or something will move off this date and they will eventually get it. **Petty:** There are several clubs opposing them having that date at all, under any format. **Baugh:** Well, the two clubs in this region – one is in March and the other club is the following weekend. I have a problem with clubs wanting to control what happens on weekends other than their own. **Newkirk:** But we've used that criteria before. It was One Fine Day objected to a show the weekend before theirs. **Hamza:** And that's not right. It doesn't make it right. Whoever does things, I would never have thought that was right. You can't do that. **Newkirk:** We did it. **Hamza:** I know I wouldn't have agreed to it. **Newkirk:** You don't vote, so it doesn't matter what you think. It matters what the other 19 of us think, because you don't vote. **Hamza:** I know

that. That's what I said. I don't vote anyway. **Baugh:** But he can have an opinion. **Hamza:** To say that I'm going to protect my club on what happens the weekend before or the weekend after, I mean, you know, that's a crazy protection. **Baugh:** OK. I am going to make the motion that the club be allowed to have the second weekend of February as their traditional date, and that the format be restricted to 8 allbreeds unless different approval is given – 8 allbreeds and 4 specialties. **Eigenhauser:** 8 allbreeds max. They can have fewer. **Baugh:** Yeah, max of 8 allbreeds unless permission is given to go beyond that. I don't know what else to do. **Hannon:** That's the best you can do. **Hamza:** Can I get a second please? **Eigenhauser:** I did, second.

**Hamza** called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Anger, Bizzell, Newkirk, Altschul, Krzanowski, Petty, Roy and Koizumi voting no.

**Hamza:** Rachel, count the no votes. **Anger:** I have Anger, Bizzell, Newkirk. **Altschul:** Altschul. **Krzanowski:** Krzanowski. **Petty:** Petty. **Hamza:** How many was that? **Newkirk:** I think there were more than 7. It sounded like there were fewer yesses than no's to me. **Petty:** Right. You need to count the yesses. **Anger:** OK, so the yes votes are? **Eigenhauser:** George. **Baugh:** Loretta. **Kallmeyer:** Dick. **Shelton:** Mike. **Brown:** Brown. **Calhoun:** Kathy. **Hannon:** Mark. **Anger:** Eigenhauser, Baugh, Dick, Mike, Roger, Kathy and Mark. **Meeker:** Ginger. **Anger:** Ginger, thank you. **Huhtaniemi:** And Pauli. **Anger:** And Pauli is a yes? **Hamza:** And Mark. **Anger:** That's 9 yes, 6 no. We're still missing 2. **Baugh:** Mark. Mark was a yes. You didn't get him. **Anger:** Yeah, I got him as part of the 9. Yep. That passes.

**Hamza:** Alright, I think that's it. I'm surprised we made it through. I thought it would take us longer. Does anybody have anything else they would like to bring up? **Petty:** This is Tracy. **Hamza:** Go ahead Tracy. **Petty:** I would like to know what the status is on this 500 mile rule. Since we have just voted to ignore it, is it a suggestion or what are we doing with it? **Hamza:** It's a guideline. It's a guideline. You adhere to it when you can. Here's the idea. The idea is to try to make things work. It's to try to make as many people happy as we possibly can. It's much harder in the east than it is in the west. Population densities are much thicker in the east. We have two landlocked regions in the east. We have Region 4 and Region 6. You know, Regions 1 and 7 have got the ocean on one side, so it's easy for them to get separation. Regions 4 and 6 are surrounded by regions on all sides. It's much harder for those regions to get separation, so the idea is, these are guidelines and you try to make as many people happy as you can. It's not always easy. I always say in my businesses, it's not always easy. Problems are easy to come by. What's harder to come by are solutions, so what we try to do is, we try to work towards solutions. The idea when it comes to scheduling for CFA – and you have to look at the big picture – is, we don't want to give up major markets for CFA. We want to try and get CFA into every market we can. When we lose CFA in a major market, we've lost something for CFA as a whole. That's the thing. I don't care what region it is. You've got to look at your biggest cities in CFA in your region, and if you're not in your top 20 cities in your region, if there's not a show in your top 20 cities in your region, as regional director you should look at the top 20 markets you have, and you should insure that you're in each of those markets, and if you're not, you've got to ask yourself why. That's our obligation, is to make sure that we have a presence in those markets and that the clubs in those markets are marketing CFA responsibly. That's how we're growing. **Petty:** Actually, Charlotte is a major market. **Hamza:** Pardon? **Petty:** Charlotte is a major market, and we've just put the last show in Charlotte in danger. **Hamza:** You don't know that. Look, we just restricted their format. We just restricted the format in Pittsburgh. Charlotte has no restriction. **Baugh:** They had more entries than Pittsburgh did last year. **Hamza:** And Pittsburgh had a restriction last year. There's no reason in my mind, there's no reason both shows can't do

well. Here they are both in major markets. Charlotte is the #3 market in America. There's no reason in my mind that both those markets can't go on the same weekend and not do well. I can tell you that I've played both those markets in my show business career with various artists and done very well. Those are both markets that should be able to garner gate.

(15) **REGIONAL ASSIGNMENTS.**

*While the “region of residence” for regional awards isn’t determined until the first full show weekend in January, it’s never too early to insure that the regional designation listed on your show entry form and in the catalog is correct. The boundaries of Regions 1 -7 set forth in the CFA Constitution follow state lines in most instances, but each of those regions contains at least one state and/or province which is divided along a longitudinal or latitudinal boundary. The Internet has made it easy to determine the longitude or latitude of an address. Exhibitors residing near a longitudinal or latitudinal regional boundary should confirm their region of residence by looking up the coordinates of their address at <http://itouchmap.com/latlong.html> .*

**Hamza:** Regional Assignments. Ed, you wanted to talk about that. **Raymond:** As you know, each of the regions has at least one regional boundary that is defined by latitude or longitude. It recently came to our attention that Central Office had a policy, when exhibitors were “close” – and I’m making air quotes because that’s an undefined term – to a longitudinal or latitudinal boundary, they got to choose which region they wanted to be in. That violates the constitution. Part of the reason for that was the difficulty in finding a specific address using a paper-based atlas in the past. There are any number of websites now that allow you to put a street address into them and it will give you the coordinates, latitude and longitude. This has come up with one individual already. We don’t know how many others there might be. Central Office doesn’t have a way of tracking these, but we wanted to put out an announcement that was sent to you as part of Donna Jean’s Central Office report tomorrow in the newsletter urging folks who live close to the boundary to check their address and make sure they’re using the right region of residence as they’re entering shows. **Hamza:** Did all the RDs get this? <yes> OK, alright. **Meeker:** And it’s going out in the newsletter, right Mark? **Hannon:** Donna Jean, didn’t you put that in your report? **Thompson:** Yes. **Hamza:** And Donna Jean, you have instructed the office personnel that this policy that was in place was against the constitution, and they are not to mention it anymore? **Thompson:** Yes. **Baugh:** I’ll put this to the regional list tomorrow, too, and probably all the RDs should do theirs, as well. **Hannon:** What I’ll do is, it’s in Donna Jean’s Central Office report in tomorrow’s newsletter and I’ll also include it in my notes from tonight’s meeting, which will also be in the newsletter. So, it will be twice in the newsletter. I don’t know if the RDs need to repeat it. **Baugh:** OK, that’s good. **Hamza:** I just want to mention that in one of the regions, it has gotten to be kind of ugly, and I don’t know if any of you other RDs have got situations where somebody is on the line, but we’re actually in a really, I don’t know, what would you call it? A hotly debated situation right now, Ed? **Raymond:** It’s an emotional situation. **Hamza:** That’s probably better terminology. Anyway, lovely technology. We know exactly where you live now.

**Hamza:** Anybody got anything else? Alright, everybody. You were great tonight. I know it was tough and grueling. Thank you very much.

Meeting adjourned at 12:19 a.m. EST.

Respectfully submitted,  
Rachel Anger, Secretary