

**SUMMARY AND TRANSCRIPT OF CONFERENCE CALL
CFA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SEPTEMBER 10, 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.

Breeds and Standards.....	(2)
Central Office Report.....	(4)
Chinese Website – Update.....	(8)
Club Applications.....	(3)
Judging Program.....	(1)
Legislative Update.....	(10)
Show Scheduling – Proposal for Adjoining Region Approval Only.....	(5)
Show Sponsorship – Contact Update.....	(9)
Travel Program.....	(6)
World Show – Update.....	(7)

Secretary's Note: The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. met on Tuesday, September 10, 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)
Ms. Rachel Anger (Secretary)
Ginger Meeker, Ph.D. (NWR Director)
Sharon Roy (NAR 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)
Mr. Pauli Huhtaniemi (Europe Regional Director)
Roger Brown, DVM (Director-at-Large)
George Eigenhauser (Director-at-Large)
Dennis Ganoe (Director-at-Large)
Carol Krzanowski (Director-at-Large)
Richard Mastin (Director-at-Large)
Annette Wilson (Director-at-Large)

Also Present:

Edward L. Raymond, Jr., Esq., CFA Legal Counsel
Donna Jean Thompson, Director of Operations
Roeann Fulkerson, Director of Marketing and Public Relations

Not Present:

Carla Bizzell, C.P.A. (Treasurer)
Mrs. Kayoko Koizumi (Japan Regional Director)
Richard Kallmeyer (Director-at-Large)

SUMMARY

(1) JUDGING PROGRAM.

(a) Applications

Chair Mrs. Baugh moved to accept following advancements:

Advance to Approved Allbreed:

<i>Jim Dinesen</i>	<i>16 yes</i>
<i>Irina Kharchenko</i>	<i>16 yes</i>
<i>Anne Mathis</i>	<i>16 yes</i>
<i>Irina Tokmakova</i>	<i>16 yes</i>
<i>Yanina Lukashova-Vanwonterghem</i>	<i>13 yes; 1 no (Altschul); 2 abstain (Wilson, Anger)</i>

(b) Judge Gift Policy Committee

Tabled.

(2) BREEDS AND STANDARDS.

(a) Status of Ballot Cycle

No action items were presented.

(b) Procedure for Proposals Appearing on “Affected Breed” Ballots

Co-Chair Ms. Anger moved that the Board direct the Exotic Breed Council to put the proposal presented by the Persian Breed Council on the Exotic ballot, with the stipulation that the Exotic Breed Council will have until September 20, 2013, to compose a rationale. Seconded by **Mrs. Meeker, Motion Carried.** Shelton voting no.

(3) CLUB APPLICATIONS.

Co-Chair Mrs. Krzanowski presented the following club application for acceptance:

- SOCIEDAD FELINA COLOMBIANA – International Division, South America.
Mrs. Krzanowski moved to accept. Seconded by **Mrs. Baugh, Motion Carried.**

(4) CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT.

Show Format Request: Grant the Cat Fanciers Club of Thailand an exception to Show Rule 25.13 for its show to be held in Bangkok, Thailand on December 21, 2013, to allow the use of up to 50% guest judges at its 2-ring show.

Tabled.

(5) SHOW SCHEDULING – PROPOSAL FOR ADJOINING REGION APPROVAL ONLY.

No action items were presented.

(6) TRAVEL PROGRAM.

No action items were presented.

(7) WORLD SHOW – UPDATE.

No action items were presented.

(8) CHINESE WEBSITE – UPDATE.

No action items were presented.

(9) SHOW SPONSORSHIP – CONTACT UPDATE.

No action items were presented.

(10) LEGISLATIVE UPDATE.

No action items were presented.

TRANSCRIPT

Hamza: I've gotten notice that there are some people who many not be here tonight. In my list of potential absentees, Carla, Dick, Koizumi and Annette. Ed is in Minnesota. He said he is going to try to call in. Ed, are you here? **Raymond:** I am here. **Hamza:** You are good scout. **Anger:** I think Annette is here, as well. **Hamza:** Annette, are you here? **Wilson:** I am here, yes. **Hamza:** Oh good. So, Carla, Dick and Koizumi will be absent for certain. Rachel, I'm showing that it's 9:01, so why don't you call the roll? **Anger:** Sure. Jerry Hamza. **Hamza:** I believe I'm here. **Anger:** I think you are, too. Mark Hannon. **Hannon:** Here. **Anger:** Rachel Anger is here. Carla Bizzell is not here. Ginger Meeker. **Meeker:** Here. **Anger:** Sharon Roy. **Roy:** Here. **Anger:** Carissa Altschul. **Altschul:** Here. **Anger:** Loretta Baugh. **Baugh:** Here. **Anger:** Michael Shelton. **Shelton:** Here. **Anger:** Kathy Calhoun. **Calhoun:** Here. **Anger:** Tracy Petty. **Petty:** Here. **Anger:** Koizumi is not here, is that correct? Pauli Huhtaniemi. **Huhtaniemi:** Here. **Anger:** Roger Brown. **Brown:** Here. **Anger:** George Eigenhauser. **Eigenhauser:** Here. **Anger:** Dennis Gano. **Gano:** Here. **Anger:** Carol Krzanowski. **Krzanowski:** Here. **Anger:** Rich Mastin. **Mastin:** Here. **Anger:** Annette Wilson. **Wilson:** Here. **Anger:** Ed Raymond. Is Ed on the call yet? **Raymond:** I am here. **Anger:** Donna Jean Thompson. **Thompson:** Here. **Anger:** Is Roeann Fulkerson on the call? Is there anyone whose name I have not mentioned? OK, 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
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 Vanwonderghem – European Liaison; Application Advisor – Europe

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

A thank you note was received from Jacqui Bennett for her advancement to Approval Pending Allbreed.

Current Happenings of Committee:

Donna Isenberg has uploaded Marilee Griswold's application for Shorthair 1st Specialty to FileVista. In addition, Doreann Nasin's application for Shorthair 2nd Specialty has also been uploaded.

As mentioned in the August JPC Report, the Committee has been working on re-wording and re-formatting Trainee, Advancement and Club Evaluation forms along with the JPC templates. You will note in the advancement reports that some of the ratings have changed. The reason for this change was due to a concern on an evaluation that supposedly had mechanical errors, but was not verified by the Master Clerk. The JPC thought it best to rework the form to reflect input from the Master Clerk and that signatures must only be affixed after the form has been completed. Please see attachment.

Future Projections for Committee:

The BAOS is set to be held in conjunction with the CFA World Show in Novi, Michigan. The school is scheduled for November 21-23, 2013. The flyer should be completed soon. Registration closes on November 3, 2013. Information can also be found on Facebook at

https://www.facebook.com/?ref=tn_tnmn#!/pages/CFA-Breed-Awareness-and-Orientation-School/191026980780

BAOS REQUIREMENT CLARIFICATION

Clarification of the BAOS attendance requirement was needed. Two of the current LH Approval Pending Judges are preparing their 2nd Specialty (SH) Applications. At the time of their acceptance to the program the requirement for BAOS attendance was within 5 years of application. They attended the SH School in November 2010.

The question was presented to the Board on Monday, September 2, requesting a consensus. Both individuals are working at the World Show. If additional BAOS attendance was required, this would impact their ability to attend the entire school in November.

The consensus of the Board, Tuesday, September 3, was that BAOS attendance within 5 years would apply to these people – they would be grandfathered under that policy.

Judging Program Application

Dmitriy Gubenko from Cherkasy, Ukraine has submitted his completed application as a Licensed Judge with Guest Judging Evaluations. He will be presented for acceptance as Approval Pending Allbreed at the October 2013 Board meeting.

(a) Advancements.

Advancements:

The following individuals are presented to the Board for Advancement:

Advance to Approved Allbreed:

<i>Jim Dinesen</i>	<i>16 yes</i>
<i>Irina Kharchenko</i>	<i>16 yes</i>
<i>Anne Mathis</i>	<i>16 yes</i>
<i>Irina Tokmakova</i>	<i>16 yes</i>
<i>Yanina Lukashova-Vanwonterghem</i>	<i>13 yes; 1 no (Altschul); 2 abstain (Wilson, Anger)</i>

* * * * *

Baugh: Rachel, do you think the thing about the European Burmese/Burmese situation last weekend should be in closed session or open? **Anger:** I think it could be open session. We're not naming any names. **Baugh:** That's what I thought, too. OK. **Hamza:** Just for the record, when somebody says we're not going to name any names, let's make sure we don't name any names. Go ahead. **Baugh:** There was a show in Russia – I can say that much – last weekend and a kitten, I believe it was, was in the judges' book as a Burmese and on Saturday, the judges were asked to – the cat was actually a European Burmese and they transferred it without any problem. On Sunday, one of the judges questioned whether or not they should be doing that, because Show Rule 28.14 specifically says, *A transfer from one breed to another breed is not allowed.* The issue over there is that we're the only association that has European Burmese and Burmese. It's really an education issue, because the breeders over there are not really aware of the fact that

we have two types of Burmese. Basically, the judges are looking for a consensus that allowing this type of transfer is within the spirit of the rule. Am I saying this right, Rachel? **Anger:** That's right. **Hamza:** So, they want to violate a show rule, in favor of education? **Baugh:** Correct. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** Mark go ahead. **Hannon:** I'm not quite sure why we have that show rule. It would seem to me – take Russia out of it – if it had taken place in this country and someone mistakenly entered the cat in the wrong breed, I don't understand why we wouldn't allow the judges to put it in the right breed. Maybe somebody shows both Devon Rex and Russian Blues, and they mistakenly wrote the wrong breed down because their mind was wandering or something. We wouldn't want to judge a chocolate-silver patched tabby and white Russian Blue. **Hamza:** That could be interesting. **Hannon:** It could be interesting, but it would be difficult to judge it by the Russian Blue standard. I don't understand why we don't want judges to transfer the cat to the correct breed. I've been around forever, but I don't remember why we put this in. Maybe it was because of entry clerks making lots of errors or something, I don't know, but it's to everyone's advantage to have the cat judged in the correct breed. All we're going to do is give the exhibitors a bad feeling if we're going to say, "sorry, you entered it in the wrong breed, good-bye." **Hamza:** Loretta? Hang on everybody. I just want to clarify something. Loretta, are you trying to change the show rule? **Baugh:** The judges on the judges' list felt that the interpretation should be that the spirit of the rule is, we have to educate and this is an error that was made inadvertently and actually, because of the fact that there is confusion over in other parts of the world between a Burmese and a European Burmese. Personally, I know this rule has been around forever. There was a time, years and years and years ago, even before my time and I've been in CFA for a very long time, when a cat could be shown – if three judges said it was a Siamese, it was a Siamese. This probably goes back to the point where, you know, "this isn't really a Siamese, it's something else." Or, as Rachel said, we can't say, "this looks more like a Chartreux than a British Shorthair" and transfer it to a Chartreux. It's an old, old rule. **Hamza:** Does somebody have that rule in front of them that can read it? **Baugh:** Yes. I can read you the rule. It's Show Rule 28.14 and it specifically says, *A transfer from one breed to another breed is not allowed.* Period.

Meeker: This is Ginger. I have a question. **Hamza:** Go ahead Ginger. **Meeker:** What if I'm entering my British Shorthair and I do the drop-down list and I hit Burmese instead, and nobody discovers it until we get to the show? **Eigenhauser:** George here. **Meeker:** I can't do a correction slip and change that? **Eigenhauser:** George here. **Hamza:** OK Ginger. George, go ahead. **Eigenhauser:** I think we're mixing apples and oranges here. There's a difference between a catalog correction and a judge looking at your tabby and going, "I don't see tabby stripes. I think this cat should be judged as a solid." There are certain things that are within the providence of the judge to change. "This cat looks like this color to me. It's not a silver, I don't see silver. I'm not going to call it a silver." That's what I think the kind of correction a judge makes. Catalog corrections are an entirely different animal, and this has nothing to do with catalog corrections. Judges shouldn't know what the parents of the cat are or what lines it's from, to be able to make an informed decision of what breed it should actually be, under our Rules of Registration. The judge is supposed to be making transfers based on what they see at the table, and if they see a cat that is entered as a smoke and they don't see smoke, they can ask the owner, "I don't see smoke. Do you want me to change it?" **Meeker:** Yeah, but that's for color, not a breed. **Eigenhauser:** But that's what I'm saying. That's what's allowed. What's allowed is for judges to change what they see on the table. What's on the registration slip and what's on the entry form the exhibitor fixes with a catalog correction. The judge doesn't fix it, the master clerk does. **Meeker:** OK. **Eigenhauser:** So, I'm not saying the problem can't be solved, I'm saying the judge isn't the person to solve it. **Hamza:** Let me hit you with this, George. Let's make it

more obvious. What if somebody brings a Persian to the show and says it's a Maine Coon? The judge isn't supposed to say anything? **Eigenhauser:** The judge can say what they want. Let's take it this way. What if it's a longhair Exotic and the judge wants to see a pedigree so they know it's a Persian? **Hamza:** No, you're going backwards on me. **Eigenhauser:** But that's what I'm saying. The judge should be judging the cat as it is entered. If you want to change how it's entered, that goes back to the master clerk, that goes back to a catalog correction. If you accidentally wrote Maine Coon instead of Persian, talk to the master clerk, do a catalog correction, tell all the judges. The judge can point it out, but the judge can't re-register a cat on the spot. **Hamza:** OK George. Usually you help me out, but you're not helping me here. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** Hang on Mark. I'm not done with George. So, in this situation, what are you talking about? **Eigenhauser:** What I'm talking about is that this isn't the judge's problem. The judge can point it out to the exhibitor, but the judge shouldn't make a transfer on the spot because the judge can't see the registration papers and know whether that cat was entered correctly and is entered correctly. The judge should send it over to the master clerk. There's a difference between changing breeds and changing colors. **Hamza:** So, your advice is to just ignore last weekend and go on? **Eigenhauser:** No. My advice is to educate the exhibitor and then send them over to do a catalog correction, but the judge shouldn't necessarily do it on the table. **Hamza:** Mark. **Hannon:** I've seen the absentee and transfer sheet from this show, and it reflects that kitten number – I won't tell you the number – was transferred from a Burmese to a European Burmese, OK? It was on the transfer sheet, so if you follow George's logic, then the judge did not transfer the cat from one breed to another. But, I understand the judge's position. If you read that show rule, a judge could easily take that position. I think we just need to clarify the intent of the show rule. We don't reprint the Show Rules until May 1st, but certainly Loretta can put something out on the judges' list saying that this is acceptable. At the point the exhibitor checks in, if they realize – and in this particular case, I was told that at least on Saturday, the master clerk went to each of the judges and talked to the judges about it. **Altschul:** This is Carissa. **Baugh:** Yeah, they did, but the judges still want some sort of a board clarification. **Hamza:** Well, they are getting it. Carissa, go ahead. **Altschul:** To the judges who are on the board, how often do you have a correction on the transfer sheet where a cat changes breed? Does it happen a lot? Is it something that happens that maybe this particular judge had no experience with it because it was very new, or is it something that happens a lot and we're dealing with a judge who just hasn't seen it before? **Baugh:** It doesn't happen often at all. **Hamza:** I've never heard of it. **Hannon:** And it was a very experienced judge. **Baugh:** Yes, very much so. **Wilson:** This is Annette. **Hamza:** Go ahead Annette. **Wilson:** I once made an error and entered one of my Russian Blues as a Devon Rex. I caught it in time, so I changed it with the master clerk and it wasn't a problem. I mean, I think this is just someone getting caught up in the semantics of the show rules taken out of the context of what it meant. We have a show rule that says – another show rule, don't ask me to quote the number – that says we can't show one breed as another breed (unless it's a longhair Exotic). So, it depends on where you look and what context you're using, and I think all we need to do is tell this judge that that means that the judge can't arbitrarily take it upon themselves to change the breed of a cat. So, if I'm judging Russian Blues and one looks more like a Korat, I can't transfer it to Korat. But, obviously if the cat was entered incorrectly, then someone can change that – not the judge. **Hannon:** I think that Loretta can make that clear on the judges' list and I'll put it in the notes and Rachel's got minutes coming out, so we've got a number of different ways we can provide that information. **Hamza:** So, I think we've cleared it up in a way that won't cause any kind of major controversy. **Baugh:** Thank you. **Hamza:** Is there anything else we should be discussing in open session? **Hannon:** Back to that one, I don't want that particular judge to think that we're being critical of that judge, because I agree with that judge, that if you read the rule, you could easily take that interpretation.

I think that tonight's meeting has clarified the board's interpretation of that rule. **Baugh:** Precisely. **Hamza:** I don't even know who that judge is, so I think most of the board doesn't have an idea to be critical about. **Hannon:** I didn't want that particular judge that cited the show rule to take offense. **Baugh:** I don't think that would happen. **Hannon:** I understand why that judge took that interpretation. **Hamza:** They did the right thing. They came for clarification. That was the absolute right thing to do.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Loretta Baugh
Committee Chair*

* * * * *

(b) Judge Gift Policy Committee

The Association recognizes that gifts are commonly presented to judges by clubs as a small thank you for officiating at the show. In order to prevent a conflict of interest, good judgment and moderation should serve as our guide. Giving or receiving a gift is not an appropriate activity if it creates a sense of obligation, puts a judge in a situation where he or she may appear biased or is done with the intent to improperly influence a judge's decision.

Cash and cash equivalents – Judges may never give or receive cash, however, they may receive gift cards, gift certificates, vouchers or other cash equivalents from clubs who have contracted their services to officiate at their shows if they do not exceed U.S. \$50 per gift.

Gifts from exhibitors at a show, given prior to, during or after the show, are not permitted as they give the perception of bribery.

Gifts are anything of value, including goods, services, and promises.

A thank you gift should never be expected, and the lack of a gift should in no way be considered a slight.

International Assignments – The Association realizes that as a World-wide Association we must be sensitive to cultural norms in different countries. In some cultures, the refusal of a gift may be considered an insult. If this occurs, you should accept the gift on behalf of CFA and consult with the Judging Program chair about how the gift should be treated. Gifts that are presented to all judges, and presented to the group after the close of the show are not restricted.

On the other hand, some countries consider any type of gifting as a form of bribery.

Hamza: Loretta, I think tonight we'll break you into two sections. I see that some of this is going to be in closed session, but part (b), I can't see why that can't be in open session.

Baugh: OK. **Hamza:** So, why don't you and Kathy – I view that as an important thing, so why don't you start with the judge gift policy? **Baugh:** OK. Kathy got some information from her company and then I contacted Annette, who sent me some information, as well. I put feelers out to both Suki Lee and Amanda Chang. Amanda got back to us. We tried to make this basic, but covering everything we thought it needed to. I sent it to Ed, he made a few minor changes and this is what we're proposing. It's certainly open to change or whatever. Hopefully, everybody

has read it. **Hamza:** I think that a start is better than nothing. **Baugh:** Right. That's what we thought, so we're open to comments.

Altschul: This is Carissa. **Hamza:** Go ahead Carissa. **Altschul:** The only thing that I saw that we're really going to have to make clear to exhibitors if it's going to be part of the policy is regarding that you cannot give a judge any kind of gift at a show. I'm assuming that even means if it's their birthday. I understand why. I'm not disagreeing with that, because it's the perception. Unless somebody really wants to change that, I think that's the thing we're really going to have to, at least for the U.S. exhibitors, really kind of get across to them that even if it's their birthday or if it's Christmas and if they are judging, that it's not appropriate to do it at a show. **Hamza:** I think we can get that across through the CFA News. I think we can make that clear. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead Mark. **Hannon:** It's not very satisfying to read this. You're not supposed to give gifts, but in certain places it's expected so you can give gifts. I would just rather see us go ahead and say "exhibitors can't give gifts". Clubs can give gifts if they give it to all the judges, and be done with it. **Wilson:** This is Annette. **Hamza:** Go ahead Annette. **Wilson:** I agree with Mark. In the second paragraph where it says "cash and cash equivalents", I'm not sure that this is necessary. Well, it's necessary but it doesn't actually say what gifts are OK. I agree, I think it needs to say that if a club gives judges gifts, it needs to be given to all the judges. I'm also a little uncomfortable with "exceeding \$50." I know that that's our corporate policy and it's an international policy, but a lot of the departments have a lower level of \$25 for gifts. Maybe we shouldn't get hung up on the dollar amount. Maybe it should start out with the sentence, *Gifts from exhibitors to judges are never appropriate.* **Baugh:** I like that. **Hamza:** Yeah, I like that too, Annette. I think that's where we wanted to go. Does anybody disagree? **Baugh:** No, I'm fine. **Hamza:** OK.

Calhoun: This is Kathy. **Hamza:** Go ahead Kathy. **Calhoun:** Just a couple things I just wanted to bring in. I know a lot of different companies have a lot of different levels. Actually, PepsiCo was as low as \$75 and went down from that, but I think part of what we were trying to include, and I actually like the idea that, if in fact this is voted in, that we make sure this includes no holiday gift giving, no birthday gift giving, no giving at shows. I think that there probably could be stronger language there, but that being said, judges are people and judges have friends, so if we want to say "outside the show hall" or something like that, but there will be circumstances where people will trade gifts as a personal thing in their lives. **Hamza:** That kind of gift giving should never be known in the show hall. If you and I are good friends, Kathy, and you come to my house for Christmas and stuff, there is nobody that's going to know about that in the show hall. **Meeker:** Do we need to include "show hotel"? **Hamza:** It should be so separate from the showing that it's beyond question. **Baugh:** Well, we do have a paragraph in here that probably needs to be up at the top and be emphasized more where it says, *Gifts from exhibitors at a show given prior to, during or after the show are not permitted.* This gifts the perception of bribery. **Ganoe:** This is Dennis. **Hamza:** Go ahead Dennis. **Ganoe:** Maybe that language should be in the same vein as when a judge is covered for travel, because we're covered from door to door by the show rules, and that may be what we need to put into this policy, as well. **Hamza:** Yeah, I like that, too. I like Annette's line, and that should be coupled with *from door to door.* I think that's pretty safe.

Hannon: This is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead Mark. **Hannon:** First of all, the \$50 threshold concerns me, because that sort of implies to some of the clubs reading this that a \$15 gift card really isn't appropriate; we should be giving something closer to \$50 based on this. I just don't want to see us mention a dollar figure. If a club wants to give every one of their judges a \$100

gift, why are we concerned as long as everyone is treated equally? I'm also concerned that this might just encourage people to mail their gifts to the judges and allegedly bribe them that way. I'm really concerned about this whole thing. I would rather us just say, it's inappropriate for exhibitors to give judges gifts and if clubs give gifts to their judges, then they should be provided the same gift or equivalent to all their judges. **Hamza:** Mark, there has to be a dollar amount, because we just had an overseas show where the judges were each provided with a very ridiculous gift that was worth way too much. **Altschul:** This is Carissa. **Hamza:** Go ahead Carissa. **Altschul:** So, Mark, if I can't mail a gift and I can't give it to them in person, that means if I have friends who are judges, I can never give them anything ever? **Hannon:** You are assuming it's a friend. My situation was, it's not a friend. It's just an exhibitor that is really trying to impress. **Altschul:** How are we going to determine that? I mean, how are you going to say, if I'm friends with this judge and not friends with that judge, and now are we going to try to legislate what happens in somebody's personal home? I understand what you're saying, but we should not make a rule we can't enforce. **Hamza:** I like the door to door thing, and I think we need to keep the dollar amount at \$50 or less. You can word it *a maximum of \$50*. To be honest with you, I've got to tell you something and I'm not going to mention any names, but a good judge friend of mine, when she retired, ended up giving a couple of my clubs all her judging gifts over the years to our raffle table, so the honest truth was that most of them weren't anything she could have used. **Hannon:** Judges have told me that they rarely get gifts anymore, and that's a concept from out of the past. I'm sure the judges on this board can address that. **Hamza:** If we just got rid of all gifts, whether they're from the club or otherwise, does that offend any of the judges here? <no> **Wilson:** It doesn't offend me. **Baugh:** Me either. I kind of to some degree like what Mark's saying, that it's inappropriate. If we did the inappropriateness from an exhibitor to a judge in the door to door thing and then left it open for gifts from clubs. **Hamza:** Can't we just get rid of it from the clubs, as well? When I talked to this judge who retired and gave me all their past judging gifts, most of the time it's more of a nuisance than anything. I know they appreciated it and stuff, but after years and years of judging – **Baugh:** We're not seeing that as much anymore. At least I'm not.

Wilson: At the last show I judged, the club gave donations to either the Winn Foundation or the Legislative Fund in the name of each judge, and gave each judge a certificate, so I would hate to see that discontinue. If the club can afford to do that, I think that's a nice thing to do, and I think it's nice that the judges acknowledge that in a final or something, and maybe it encourages other people to make donations, but I think this could be worded fairly simply. I think it needs to be clear as far as gifts from exhibitors in conjunction with a show are never acceptable, period. It doesn't have to be real detailed, and then it can say that clubs are neither encouraged nor discouraged – or something like that – or are not expected nor encouraged to give judges gifts in conjunction with the judges that are presiding at the show. However, should they want to either continue the practice or have a practice in place to do so, some suggestions are: donations to the CFA funds or gift cards not to exceed \$50 in value. **Hamza:** I love that. **Wilson:** If you give them some direction on what they could provide, because I'll tell you what. If you're somewhere and you get a Starbucks card for \$15, that's handy. I would use that, but I don't care if I get it or not. **Hamza:** I love those guidelines. I like the idea of either steering them into donating on behalf of the judges or a gift card of an appropriate denomination. I think that's excellent. **Calhoun:** This is Kathy. **Hamza:** Go ahead Kathy. **Calhoun:** What I'm seeing mostly, clubs may just give you a gift bag of snacks. They will do that a lot. They are things you can eat on the road and it's a token of appreciation. I think they like doing that, and sometimes you might get something in there like a little something that someone made. I think the days of extravagant giving are over anyway. Clubs are really struggling. **Hamza:** We just had within the

last 12 months judges get Montblanc pens worth over \$1,000 apiece. **Baugh:** Was that in this country or elsewhere? Just for curiosity. **Hamza:** It was offshore, but it doesn't matter. There has to be a limit. That's one of the reasons that sparked this. It can't happen anymore. It looks bad, it smells bad, it just gives a bad impression. My opinion is, those judges should have returned those pens. **Baugh:** But then the question is, at what point – and I'm not condoning this, but what I'm saying is, at what point does it become an insult to return it? What are we supposed to do? Where is that line? We also have that issue to deal with. **Hamza:** That's why we're going to set a \$50 limit. Then the judges don't have that moral quandary. **Calhoun:** I don't think that's the moral quandary. That just means that you have to give it back if you feel it's more than that. **Hamza:** Right, right. What I'm saying is, we alleviate the dilemma.

Hamza: So, I like the work you've done. **Baugh:** It's a starting point. It's just a starting point. **Hamza:** You've heard our feedback. Do you think you can get it all together for the October meeting, so we can vote on it? **Baugh:** Yes, no problem. What we'll do is, we'll send it out ahead of time to get some feedback, to be certain that we've covered everything. Right, Kathy? **Calhoun:** Yep. **Baugh:** And Annette, if you can make notes, I really like the verbiage that you are using. If you can forward it. **Wilson:** I won't remember it, but it will be in the minutes. **Baugh:** It will be in the minutes, that's right. OK, thanks. **Hamza:** Very good. **Wilson:** I'm sitting in my car at a cabin up north and it's very dark. **Baugh:** That's dedication. **Wilson:** Well, I'm not taking notes. **Hamza:** You know what? We don't blame you.

* * * * *

(2) **BREEDS AND STANDARDS.**

Committee Co-Chairs: Annette Wilson and Rachel Anger

(a) **Status of Ballot Cycle**

Hamza: Let's move on to Breeds and Standards, because Annette is sitting in her dark car and we want to get that done. Annette or Rachel, whoever wants to take the ball on Breeds and Standards. **Anger:** This is Rachel. Our first item is the status of the ballot cycle. This time around, we have 14 breeds coming forward with ballots. All of them except one (as of 5 minutes ago) have been sent to the breed council secretary for their review and approval. We have gotten 7 of them back with approval, so we are well along the way, despite a few hitches from some breeds that had further discussion in their councils. We had a request for an extension from one of the breeds and we saw no reason not to grant it, and that breed is now all set.

(b) **Procedure for Proposals Appearing on "Affected Breed" Ballots**

Following an executive discussion, **Anger** moved that the Board direct the Exotic Breed Council to put the proposal presented by the Persian Breed Council on the Exotic ballot, with the stipulation that the Exotic Breed Council will have until September 20, 2013, to compose a rationale. Seconded by **Meeker**, **Motion Carried**. Shelton voting no.

(3) **CLUB APPLICATIONS.**

Committee Chairs: *Liz Watson & Carol Krzanowski*

Hamza: Carol, do you want to do the clubs? **Krzanowski:** Yes, OK. I'm ready. Before I get into this, I just want to say that we do have a few clubs coming up for October. The CFA News announcement did go out and said that they were going to be considered at the September board meeting, which was obviously an error. I just wanted to put that in the record, that the three clubs that went out in the most recent announcement, will be considered in the October board meeting.

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

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

Current Happenings of Committee:

One new club was pre-noticed for membership (Attachment A). It is:

Sociedad Felina Colombiana, International Division, Richard Kallmeyer, Chairman

***Sociedad Felina Colombiana (Attachment B)
International Division--Bogota, Colombia, Richard Kallmeyer, Chair***

The constitution and by-laws are in order. There are twelve members. No member is a member of other clubs. This is an allbreed club and they wish to hold shows in Bogota and Medellin, Colombia. The dues have been set. This club was pre-noticed and no negative letters have been received. The International Chair supports this club.

Hamza: It's my understanding that we just have the one club from South America in this meeting? **Krzanowski:** Yes. That's the only club for this meeting. It's the Sociedad Felina Colombiana in the International Division, Colombia, South America. We're really pleased to get that application. We want to see more activity in South America. Their Constitution and Bylaws are in order and the dues have been set. Their constitution is good. They plan to hold shows in Bogota and Medellin in Colombia. The club was pre-noticed. No negative letters have been received, and the International Chair does support this club. **Hamza:** I was going to say, I had talked to Dick and he was in favor. Does anyone have comments? **Krzanowski:** I move that we accept this club for membership. **Baugh:** Second, Loretta.

Hamza called the motion. **Motion Carried.** **Hamza:** Congratulations and welcome to CFA. It's good to have a Colombian club, in addition to our South American clubs.

Meeker: Jerry? **Hamza:** Yes. **Meeker:** I would just like to make the comment that this last weekend at OCI, we had a gentleman from Colombia that attended our show. **Hamza:** Very good! **Meeker:** Yeah. He was very, very nice. People accepted him warmly, and he said he really hoped that CFA could be more active in South America so he didn't have to travel so far. **Hamza:** Here we go. I hope everybody notices that we've rapidly in the last 3 years become a much more international association. So, we truly are an international association. That's something to be really proud of.

Future Projections for Committee:

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

Time Frame:

September, 2013 to Board teleconference in October, 2013.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

All new clubs that have applied for membership

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Watson, Carol Krzanowski, Co-Chairs

(4) **CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT.**

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

Current Happenings of Committee:

Kitten season continues and while we have slowed a tad, we are still well within our 7-10 day return for registrations that have no problems.

Future Projections for Committee:

We are preparing for the World Show and Breed Council Balloting.

Show Format Request:

Club Name: Cat Fanciers Club of Thailand

Show Date: December 21, 2013

Location: Bangkok, Thailand

The club has a sponsor and show hall that will only allow 2 rings. Inadvertently, they contracted 1 CFA judge and 1 guest judge. The club honestly was not familiar with our guest judge rule and thought the 50% rule still applied. The club promised it will never happen again. This club has never created problems before with over 6 shows staged. The ID Chair is in favor of the exemption.

Action Item: *Grant the Cat Fanciers Club of Thailand an exception to Show Rule 25.13 for its show to be held in Bangkok, Thailand on December 21, 2013, to allow the use of up to 50% guest judges at its 2-ring show.*

Hamza: Another issue that is added to the agenda is the show in Thailand. Is everybody familiar with this? <no> Rachel? **Anger:** No, it came in after the deadline, and only to you, me and Loretta. **Baugh:** Jerry, I have the page in front of me if you want me to cover it. **Hamza:** Yeah, go ahead Loretta. I thought it went out. **Baugh:** Apparently not. There is a show being held in Thailand the week before Christmas. It's the Cat Fanciers Club of Thailand. They have a sponsor and a show hall that will only allow two rings. Inadvertently, the contracted one CFA judge and one guest judge. They are supposed to have two CFA judges. The club was not familiar with our guest judge rule and they thought the 50% rule still applied. They say it will never happen again. They have never created a problem in the past, with over 6 shows staged. Dick is in favor of granting them an exemption, to let them have one guest judge and one CFA judge at this show. They cannot add a third ring. I'll make a motion to that effect so we can discuss it. **Altschul:** This is Carissa. **Hamza:** Carissa, go ahead. **Altschul:** I think we have made it pretty clear what the new policy was. It's been published in the CFA News. It's not like it's trying to be hidden. Sympathies with the club, but just because you are foreign doesn't mean you're not held responsible for adhering to our rules. If we grant an exception here, then we're going to have all these other clubs who are going to go, "We need an exception. We need an exception." The rules are our rules and we need to stick by them. I think we have been recently, and we just need to stick with them. **Hamza:** You know, Loretta, here's what I want to do with this, because I didn't know the rest of the board didn't get to see this all. Since it's Christmas, I know that they are looking for something relatively quick. Is there a way we can get this to the

rest of the board? You guys don't mind if we handle this during the week. **Meeker:** Online?

Hamza: Yeah, online. And it gives everybody a chance to see it. **Baugh:** I have no problem with that, Jerry, but I do want to make a comment. When we passed this rule, it's something that went into effect May 1st. The Judging Program Committee was very strongly in favor of this because it gives us somewhat more control and we get more of our CFA judges at the shows. I personally – and I believe the Judging Program Committee agrees with me – I would rather grant an exemption, with the understanding that it's a one-time exemption, and the next time we expect the club to follow the CFA rules, rather than have them keep coming back at us, saying that this is unfair. I think if we can gradually get them into this, it's a far better way to go than to have to worry about going back to our old system with less CFA judges there. I think the purpose of the additional CFA judges is to benefit the association, and I would rather be a little bit lenient on a one-time basis per club, if necessary. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead Mark. **Hannon:** I thought when we passed this, we made it clear that we would entertain requests for exceptions. **Baugh:** Yes, we did. **Hamza:** We did, but Carissa is allowed to state her opinion. **Ganoe:** This is Dennis. I have a question. **Hamza:** Go ahead Dennis. **Ganoe:** Do we know when this club licensed their show or when they contracted the judges? Because if they were within the time period that we passed this and notification, that could play a part in how people perceive it. **Baugh:** That I don't know. **Hamza:** Here's what I would like to have happen, Loretta. I would like to put this out of this meeting and online, and that way you could actually answer those questions with the information. I thought everybody had the information on this, and I told Dick I would bring this to the meeting, but I didn't know that we were blindsiding the rest of the board and I never like to do that. **Baugh:** Neither do I. I didn't either. **Ganoe:** This is Dennis. I have to remember to let you know that I thought I hadn't heard about it, but when you said what it was, for the Thailand show with the 50% rule, then I remembered seeing something like that. I don't know if it was private or to the board. **Baugh:** I don't know who-all Dick sent it to. I just knew that I had it on my computer, so I volunteered to handle it. **Hamza:** But am I correct that most of you didn't know anything about this? **Meeker:** I knew about it. This is Ginger. **Baugh:** I knew about it. **Hamza:** But was it in File Vista? **Anger:** This is Rachel. I'm looking at an email from Dick that came in after the agenda went out. I thought we said we would bring it up in the Judging Program, but I could be wrong. **Baugh:** I don't remember that. **Hamza:** I had correspondence from Dick saying that I would bring it up at the meeting, but I also thought he was going to notice it, even though it was after the deadline. I just assumed, and you get in trouble making assumptions, that there would be some kind of back-up information for the board to look at. Like I said, I'm never comfortable with some board members not having – we've got a little bit of time. It's not dire, so Loretta, you don't mind putting it on the list with a little information, do you? **Baugh:** I'll get the information and then I'll get it out. As I said, I only brought it up because I was on my computer. I was not under the impression it was supposed to be a Judging Program item. **Hamza:** And it's only a 2-ring show, so I don't think it's going to take a ton of discussion. I think we can probably get through this and I can call the motion on Friday, maybe? **Baugh:** OK, I'll get it up tomorrow. **Hamza:** Alright, thank you.

Action Items:

Central Office has no Action Items for this month.

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*

Hamza: Donna Jean, do you have anything? **Thompson:** We don't have any action items for this meeting. **Hamza:** Anything else? **Thompson:** No, just a routine report. **Hannon:** I have a question. This is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Hannon:** In Donna's report, she indicated that the turn-around for the registrations was still within the 10 day period, although it has slowed some. For the record, for my News notes and for the minutes, can you explain what has happened to slow things down? **Thompson:** The quantity of work during kitten season. All those cats that had kittens in the spring and they are trying to get them registered for shows in the fall. **Hannon:** OK, because at one point you told us it had also to do with the fact you were registering the cats in both the old computer system and the new computer system, so it was double work. That's no longer the case? You're no longer double entering all those cats? **Thompson:** No. We weren't able to, due to the amount of work. **Hannon:** Is that going to have an impact on the new computer system when we get to roll it out? **Thompson:** James would have to give you that information. I think he is still pretty much planning on the end of October. **Hamza:** I have been keeping in touch with James on that. He's pretty confident that the new computer system – we haven't had any major glitches with the new system, so all the new programs are coming online nicely. He hasn't hit any major problems that he can't straighten out with Computan. He's pretty confident. **Hannon:** This is Mark again. I realize we're at a disadvantage because we don't have James or Dick participating in tonight's call, but the plan was at some point for the breeders to input their own information, rather than having Central Office staff retype the information. Is that something we're planning for the end of October, or at the end of October we're going to be using the new computer system but still utilizing the Central Office staff to input the data? **Hamza:** I don't know what his plans are. I know he's been running parallel on and off, and I don't know which modules he's exactly working on right at this moment. Go ahead Dennis. **Ganoe:** I did have a chance to talk with James about this, and we are generally on track for a switch-over towards the end of October to the new computer system. There will be both the opportunity for Central Office staff to enter the data, as they do now but into the new interface. There is also the opportunity to make that a web form, because it is a web-based application so that fanciers will enter their own information and it will go to Central Office for confirmation and verification, although they won't be entering the data themselves. **Hamza:** I have not seen the user module yet, Mark, but I'm told that it's very close to being able to be seen. As soon as James has a version of it that is ready to be seen, I'm going to ask him to forward it to the board. I guess we're real close with that.

Altschul: This is Carissa. **Hamza:** Go ahead Carissa. **Altschul:** I have two questions. Donna Jean, the first one is, all these registrations you've been doing during kitten season, are they on the old system or the new system? **Thompson:** The old system. **Altschul:** OK, and the second question is, [discussion goes to closed session, to cover a personnel issue]

[EXECUTIVE SESSION]

(5) **SHOW SCHEDULING – PROPOSAL FOR ADJOINING REGION APPROVAL ONLY.**

R1 would only vote for show changes in regions 4 and 7

R2 would only vote for show changes in regions 3, 5, and 6 (technically R2 and R6 share a border, but there are no shows in Montana or either of the Dakota's, so these two regions would likely never had a conflict... but since my suggestion is adjoining regions only...)

R3 would only vote for show changes in regions 2,4,5,6,and 7 (It might be easier to say R3 would only NOT vote for R1 shows)

R4 would only vote for show changes in regions 1, 3, 6, and 7

R5 would only vote for show changes in regions 2 and 3

R6 would only vote for show changes in regions 2,3,4, and 7

R7 would only vote for show changes in regions 1 3,4, and 7

However, if a club say in R2 had some sort of "global" concern about a show in R4, the R2 regional director could still bring that concern to the other RD's... I'm not really sure why any club in a non-adjoining region would be concerned about a show... but I suppose it's possible.

Hamza: Next up is Carissa, show scheduling. **Altschul:** I brought this up because I thought this was how I understood the rules, that we really only needed to talk to neighboring regions on our RD list when we are bring a new show up. If we could clarify this, it would really make our system go a little faster. It kind of seems silly when Region 7 has to vote on a show that's moving on the west coast. **Hamza:** That's true. It's only neighboring regions that are affected. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Calhoun:** This is Kathy. **Hamza:** Go ahead Mark. Let's talk one at a time, people. There's 18 of us on the call. Go ahead Mark. **Hannon:** During the period when I was regional director from 2010 to 2012, that was the policy and we only asked neighboring regional directors for their approval. Then, after that period, the regional directors tended to use the regional directors' list to send out these notices that somebody has asked for a change of date or a change of location. While the policy hasn't changed, the method of communicating it out did. So, I think maybe some regional directors misunderstood and thought, even though they weren't a neighboring regional director, that they should be commenting. It's my view that the regional directors who are not neighbors, it's strictly for information. If it doesn't impact you, you're not required to or even requested to comment on it. It's just neighboring regional directors. That was the policy that was established in 2010, and it has not been changed. **Meeker:** Mark, this is Ginger. **Hamza:** Go ahead Ginger. **Meeker:** What goes out on the CFA News list, though, is to every member of that list and it says if you have comments on this show, you contact your regional director. That's where a lot of this comes from, so that people in Region 2 think they should have input into Region 1. **Hannon:** But when they comment to the Region 2 regional director, that regional director should say, "we're really not a neighboring region and it doesn't impact us", unless you see something weird that really does impact them. **Meeker:** Mark, I agree, but their understanding is, if they give their feedback to the regional director, the regional director will take it to the other region for comment. I'm just saying, that's where part of this confusion comes from. **Hannon:** Do you want me to phrase the CFA News announcement so that it's clear that if you're in a neighboring region and it impacts

you, to contact your regional director? **Meeker:** Yes. Wonderful, thank you. **Calhoun:** This is Kathy. Can I be acknowledged? **Hamza:** Go ahead Kathy. **Calhoun:** I was the one that wanted to bring this to the board, because I think we should have clarification, but I also think that the assumption is made that the only valid reason that a show should not occur is geography, and that there are no other reasons. In fact, where we are, if that's what we're saying, this makes sense. If we're saying there could possibly be potentially other reasons, then it makes sense for a regional director to take a more holistic view. **Hamza:** I can't imagine anything else other than geography, to be honest with you. It has been a long-standing policy now that only the neighboring regions have input, so to make it more complicated would just be unnecessary. **Calhoun:** I don't think it makes it more complicated. I think all of the regional directors have been weighing in, so we have been doing that. Whether we've been adhering to the policy or not, it has been happening so it's not like we're adding something on. It may be that we're taking a level of complexity away. **Hamza:** You can certainly give your opinion, but unless you're a neighboring region, it's not going to have any weight. **Altschul:** This is Carissa. **Hamza:** Go ahead Carissa. **Altschul:** The main reason why I brought this up is, sometimes it takes a long time to get a response back from some of the regional directors. Some of them are judges and I know they have jobs and sometimes emails get lost and sometimes four requests come through in a day, and it's just kind of hard to keep track of what's going on. So, the reason why I asked for clarification on this is, for me, this doesn't really help me a whole lot because there's only one region that I don't have to get a vote from. But for other regions, I think it would just speed up the process a little bit. Instead of having to constantly go, "hey, I need you to vote on this", I just want a clarification on it. That's all I needed. **Hamza:** You're right, you don't have to wait for the region you don't touch. **Hannon:** Carissa, are you satisfied with this discussion? Did we answer your questions? **Altschul:** Yeah, that's where I needed to go. I was happy to just discuss it with the RDs, but Kathy wanted it to come to the board and so I have no problem with that, either. I just wanted to make sure that I don't have to wait for Region 1 to give me their vote anymore. It has not always been Region 1, so Sharon, I'm not picking on you. I just wanted it clear. So, as long as we're clear on that. **Hannon:** Are you happy with how this discussion took place, Kathy? Did we answer your questions? **Calhoun:** Yeah, just clarified. I think that there could be circumstances, and maybe what Jerry said doesn't mean that you don't have a voice, it just means that you don't have a vote. But say, like in 5, 6 and 4, I could be planning a 6x6 and Carissa could be planning a 6x6 and if Loretta is planning a 6x6, that's a lot of activity. So, Loretta wouldn't have anything to say about Carissa's except for a voice. Let me finish, let me finish. If that's the consensus, I'm fine with that. If that's the consensus, but we just need to be aware of what we're doing and I'm fine. **Altschul:** This is Carissa. **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Altschul:** Kathy, you know that Region 3 borders every region except Region 1, right? **Calhoun:** I was just using that as an example, Carissa. That was just an example. **Altschul:** I understand that example was 3 regions who are neighbors, but if I'm doing a 6x6 and they are doing a 6x6 in Region 1, it's not going to affect me. It's too far away. If Region 5 is doing a 6x6 and you're doing a 6x6, it's not going to affect you. The distances are too far apart. So, that's why we don't really need to have any input, because they're just too far. **Hamza:** OK. Here's the thing. Everybody should just understand that it can't hurt to keep the lines of communication open. You guys have your own local regional issues that you have to watch. Once in a while, you might have to hear what a neighbor has got to say, for nothing else, just to hear them out. Anyway, we've got a good chance of getting done at a decent hour tonight, so I'm going to move the agenda along.

(6) TRAVEL PROGRAM.

Previously, a travel program existed with Northwest Airlines. Points were earned by both the booking party (judges), and CFA. It is unclear what became of the program. Central Office has not found any information on the previous program.

Delta Airlines offers the Delta SkyBonus mileage program for corporate business travel. This program would allow CFA to earn points for future flights, based on judge travel. Please note that this process will have no impact on judges with their personal SkyMiles bonus programs. They will still receive the same points as they do currently. This process is only to provide CFA with points in addition to what the judges may already be receiving.

Other airlines offer similar programs. At this time, I am requesting permission to enroll CFA in the Delta SkyBonus mileage program, and any other airline bonus programs.

*Rachel Anger, Chair
Hotel and Travel Program*

Hamza: Travel Program, Rachel. **Anger:** Yes, thank you. I have an update from when this was tabled last month. I got a response from Allene, who mentioned that we did have the program in place and there were tickets to the Annual for Central Office staff that were purchased with the program. So, it was effective at one time and I would like to have permission to move forward, to apply for a Delta number and see if we can get some activity generated here so that we can transport our Central Office staff to Annuals and World Shows and other events. **Hamza:** The only thing I ask for that is, could you just coordinate that with Jodell? **Anger:** Yes, sure. **Hamza:** That's the only thing. If you do do that, I just want it somewhere so that we don't lose the information somewhere, and it's consistent from Annual to Annual. **Anger:** Of course, yes. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead Mark. **Hannon:** Rachel specifically mentions Delta. Is that the only airline that provides this? If United or American or some of the others have it, we ought to jump onboard with them, as well. **Anger:** I would be glad to do that. Delta is the carrier I am most familiar with and I researched their SkyBonus mileage program, so I'm more familiar with that than any of the others, but to get started and see how the process works, I thought I would start where I am best acquainted and go from there to America, United or whatever we have judges flying on. **Hamza:** Rachel, the one thing I just want to make sure of. The pitfall that we had with the program before, and I just want to bring it up was that last time CFA was involved in these programs, it couldn't be put in the organization's name and they ended up being put in a person's name. **Anger:** Really? OK. **Hamza:** When you go through that, just let us know how that's working out. **Anger:** I will let you know if it's not possible to enroll in the name of an organization. I don't think there's any benefit to CFA, having it in a person's name. **Hamza:** There wasn't last time, except for the person. **Anger:** Understood. **Eigenhauser:** George here. George has a question. **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Eigenhauser:** As I understand this program, the judges will still get their miles and CFA will get miles, so it's actually more miles than there were in the first place? Not simply allocating the judges' miles to CFA. Is that correct? **Anger:** Right. Nothing is affected for the judges. The points are allocated differently in the corporate partner program. CFA won't get mile for mile or the bonus for passengers with status. Just as a ballpark figure, if I earn 1,000 miles, CFA may earn 100. So, it's a percentage of what the judges earn. **Eigenhauser:** Then my follow-up question is, does this have to be limited to judges? Couldn't it be board members or other people flying on behalf of CFA to various events? Roemann flying or whatever – somebody flying to an event that happens to be going on Delta, could they participate in this program and earn miles for CFA? **Anger:** Certainly. Exhibitors

could do the same, too. It just requires providing the frequent flyer number. **Calhoun:** Rachel, this is Kathy. **Anger:** Yes. **Calhoun:** So, do you know the mechanics of how this would work? Say you were flying Delta. Is your number somehow tied to a subsequent number, so Delta knows you are affiliated with CFA? **Anger:** Whoever administers the program for CFA collects everyone's frequent flyer numbers. If I recall correctly, when it was done before, we got an email asking us to confirm that our partner would be CFA. Some people might have another partner, I don't know. They might have their own business that's getting the corporate partner rewards. **Wilson:** This is Annette. **Hamza:** Go ahead Annette. **Wilson:** Our company does that, because we use Orbitz for business. So, when I book travel, the company belongs to the partner programs and so it's automatic. If I provide CFA with my frequent flyer numbers, I'm not quite sure how the airlines would define that. **Hamza:** What airline are you with? **Wilson:** I use United and Delta. **Hamza:** Actually, this sounds like it might be worthwhile. I use United quite a bit and I wouldn't mind if I could give some residuals to CFA, so Rachel, it sounds like it's worthwhile to try to get this going. **Anger:** OK. I will follow through then. Thank you. **Hamza:** OK.

(7) **WORLD SHOW – UPDATE.**

Show Manager: Rich Mastin
Assistant Show Managers: Ed Raymond; Mark Hannon
Show Secretary: Rachel Anger
Show Treasurer: Teresa Sweeney

Hamza: Item 7 is World Show and I'm assuming that's Rich Mastin. **Hannon:** It's Rachel. **Hamza:** Rich can help you, too. So, the two of you jump in and help each other. **Anger:** One thing I did want to mention is that the hotel block at the facility is full, and Jodell is trying to negotiate a few more rooms. So, our block has sold out. Monte has the entries for the Red Show done, with 383 entries confirmed as of last night, and 3 agility entries. The Purple Show has about 400 entries, give or take 10, and Monte is starting to confirm those today. The preliminary floor plan is with the decorator and they will have it back to us within a couple of days for review and changes. We have some transportation arrangements coming up with reduced pricing for our exhibitors, where they can arrange for transportation online ahead of time. We're working on scooter pricing from a local company. I think Rich is making some progress on that. We're still trying to get into the Pet Expo. There has been a change of sponsoring entity for the pet show. The facility itself, the Suburban Showplace, is putting on the Pet Expo. They are not open for vendor contracts yet, for us to get our booth the weekend before the World Show. We are looking into hiring face painters for the kids. There are still sponsorships available that Lorna Friemoth is coordinating. She would love to have your sponsorship money for the show. Eve Russell met with the rosette guy at National Capital and saw some samples that she was really happy with, so I am looking forward to seeing the rosettes. We currently have three photographers lined up for the show. **Raymond:** Actually, we just got a fourth. **Anger:** Oh great. **Hannon:** Who was that? **Raymond:** Preston Smith. **Hannon:** Preston? OK. **Anger:** And that's our update. **Hamza:** That's a darn fine update. Anybody got anything else for the World Show?

Huhtaniemi: This is Pauli. **Hamza:** Go ahead Pauli. **Huhtaniemi:** About the points. Will the points from the World Show count also to other regions, like Region 9 and International Division? **Hannon:** Yes. **Hamza:** Yes Pauli, they will count. **Huhtaniemi:** OK, thank you.

Wilson: This is Annette. **Hamza:** Go ahead Annette. **Wilson:** Do we have a budget update? **Hamza:** We do, but the budget person is not here. Do you want me to have Carla send it to you when she gets back? **Wilson:** I think that would be nice, if we all saw where we were with the budget. **Hamza:** I saw something not too long ago. Rich, do you have that? **Mastin:** No, I don't have any updates to report from last month on the budget. There's no major changes thus far. As we get further into it with some finer details, we can make modifications. Right now, I want to stick to the original budget that we outlined a few weeks back. **Wilson:** OK. **Hamza:** Anything else on the World Show? Rachel, if you talk to Lorna, tell her my clubs want to sponsor a ring. **Anger:** OK. You better email her quick. They are going fast! **Hamza:** I'll try to remember to do it in the morning.

(8) CHINESE WEBSITE – UPDATE.

Project Chair: Dennis Ganoë
List of Committee Members: Kathy Durdick, Suki Lee, Chloe Chung

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Activities:

Many of our forms have already been translated into Chinese but they were only available by navigating through English. These forms have been collected into a separate page that can be accessed through a single click from the header of any CFA.ORG web page header. You can find that link as a Chinese Flag icon in the upper right of the header on our current web page. Unless you can read Chinese, you may not know what it says, but it is a repeat of the English names translated by humans. Thanks should go to Chloe Chung and Suki Lee for assistance with this phase of the project.

Current Happenings of Committee:

We are surveying both the Chinese community and Central Office operations for tips and instructions that would make all interactions flow smoother with our Chinese Fanciers.

Future Projections for Committee:

When additional content is available in English, we will get some volunteers in China or Hong Kong to translate the content into English and publish it to the Website. Additional notices will periodically be sent to our Chinese fanciers to alert them of increased resources.

Action Items:

There are no action items for this month.

Time Frame:

This project is an on-going project and new content will be added as it becomes available and is translated.

What will be presented at the next meeting:

Additional web content publication as it becomes available.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Dennis Ganoë, Chair*

Hamza: Dennis? **Ganoë:** Yes, sir. **Hamza:** You're up. **Ganoë:** I wanted to alert the board that the beginnings of the Chinese website have gone live on the CFA website. If you haven't found it, there's a little Chinese flag icon in the upper right corner of the header that appears on every website. This is a link that goes directly to a page that was translated into Chinese by Chinese people, so it's not machine translation. Right now on the page are links to the Chinese forms that we already had translated by other fanciers. I have the call out to fanciers in China and Hong Kong, as well as in contact with James and others at Central Office about what issues are being seen for registrations and what-not in Central Office from the Chinese. We

just need to get content written and then we'll get it translated and have it appear on the website. Dick and I spoke a little bit about this before he left for Shanghai. I have him making contact personal with people in Shanghai and China, as well. We are going to try and get the Chinese away from brokering their registrations. They tend to have one person who knows English fill out all the forms and send it in as a mass packet. We're going to try and get them down to individually doing it, like we do in the U.S. **Hamza:** Dennis, one of the things I would like to get going is, I would like to get at least some preliminary front page in Chinese like our front page, to attract the general public and direct them to shows in China. How difficult will that be? **Ganoe:** It won't be that difficult. There are some technical hurdles. I have already spoken with Kathy Durdick, our webmistress, about doing a subdomain for Chinese, similar to china.cfa.org or something like that, where the Chinese would go to that website and go to the specific things for them. We've discussed and sketched out what such a site would look like. I thought the biggest hit would be to get them to their Chinese forms without having to go through English first. So, we're directing them to that little icon in the upper right corner. We will obviously move towards more robust hosting, but little steps first. **Hamza:** What can I do to assist? I think that we have a great potential there. I really want to get a Chinese – even if it's just one page with our content on the front page. Something simple with our content and where we can put the upcoming shows on that front page and update it. What can I do to get something like that in place relatively quickly? **Ganoe:** If you want just machine translation, that can be done fairly quickly. If we want native translation, which I highly recommend, it would take writing it in English. Also, we need to probably enlist someone to be a Chinese webmaster, because Kathy is doing things blindly when it comes to the Chinese. I give her a Chinese and an English equivalent, and she makes the links basically by eye rather than knowing exactly what it says. **Hamza:** So, you would suggest us getting a domain in Chinese and then paying somebody to keep the page up, just a nominal fee? **Ganoe:** If we have to pay them, yes; but if we don't, if we can get someone to maintain it for us, that would be even better, where we don't have to pay. But if we do need to, I don't know what the cost would be. **Hamza:** I think it would be nominal. I don't know. While Dick is over there, we have a few fanciers who may be able to do it for nothing or nominally. If we could get Garfield involved, just a very basic page that could direct people to shows and just talk a little bit about CFA and maybe a breed a week or something. Just something to get our foot in the door there. I think in time it could get more sophisticated. I think that's how things go. **Ganoe:** Correct. Are you envisioning something like a Chinese website that is strictly for the Chinese? **Hamza:** Yes, absolutely. **Ganoe:** OK. Then we need to investigate what it would cost technologically and infrastructurally to do that. Hosting it in the U.S. would probably not be our most cost-effective way to do it. I will endeavor to research that for you. **Hamza:** Right off the bat it doesn't have to be very complex. It could be one page with a link to the U.S. page. In my mind, to start with, I'm thinking one or two pages with just basic information about CFA and where the shows are, and just some fun things for the general public so we get them into our show halls over there. Because we are growing so fast over there, I think it would be a disservice not to have something to direct people to in their language. **Ganoe:** Correct. There's also issues regarding the fact I had some words with Dick and he had heard from I think Donna Jean that we have a lot of champions that were never claimed. That's revenue we left on the table, so we need to get that word out. **Hamza:** I hate leaving money on the table. I agree. OK. You and I perhaps should have a conversation away from the board meeting. We don't need to keep everybody up. Any questions for Dennis on this?

Eigenhauser: George here. **Hamza:** Go ahead George. **Eigenhauser:** I have a small comment. We really need to be careful when we put the CFA forms up on the website, because they are still going up with the old New Jersey address. I was looking at the cattery name

application in Chinese, and the thing that leaped out to me is, 1805 Atlantic Avenue, P.O. Box whatever is still on there. As you are putting new forms up there, even if you can't read the Chinese, the part in English with our address, make sure that's right. Especially something like a cattery name application, they're not going to be used to dealing with us if they are a new cattery, so if it goes into oblivion, they are going to be lost forever. **Ganoe:** I will make sure we get those retranslated, because those were just links to the existing ones. We have never really tried to update the translations. We obviously have to do that. **Eigenhauser:** I'm almost thinking that if you find something with the old New Jersey address on it, the wrong address is worse than not having a form at all. If they don't have a form, they will contact us but if they have a wrong address, they'll never know it until they send it out and it never comes back. **Mastin:** Rich here. **Hamza:** Go ahead Rich. **Mastin:** Not as important as the address, but we also have forms out there with the old CFA logo that does not have the registered trademark. **Hamza:** You know what? I'm just writing a note to myself. I'm going to have James search all the files for anything with the New Jersey address and the old logos. The problem is that, as a function of being such an old organization, our website, we have so many pages. Even though we've tried to trim it down and trim it down, I still think we're up over 800 pages. So, I'm going to get with James and tell him that we're just going to have to scour these pages and make sure New Jersey doesn't show up anywhere and that any of the old logos without the R in the circle aren't out anywhere. There's really no other way than just to scour them. **Eigenhauser:** Of the Chinese forms, at least three of them have the New Jersey address. **Hamza:** That is so disheartening. **Ganoe:** This is why you publish this for people to see, so that you get more eyes on it. I appreciate all the comments. If anyone has any comments on the forms, how they need to be changed or updated, please ship them to me. I'll get them done. **Hamza:** OK. Alright, any other comments for Dennis? **Mastin:** Rich again. **Hamza:** Go ahead Rich. **Mastin:** Is there any way we can send all these pages and documents to be proofread by one, two or three people that are the same people, so they know what they're looking for? Not that I want to give anybody any more work, but when we do contract reviews, all contracts come through Ed and myself. I look at it from a business perspective, he looks at it from a legal perspective, and we cover it front and back and sideways and all different ways. We need to do the same thing when we're writing pages for websites or putting out documents to clubs or advertisements or what have you. That all has to be proofed before it goes out. **Hamza:** The problem, Rich, is that when we did the redesign of the site, it started off over 1,200 pages and it's been reduced greatly, but some of these pages never get looked at, to be perfectly honest with you. I mean, if we were to track some of these pages down, they just don't get hits. It's just such a big, big thing. I'm going to see if there's a way we can just search. I think it might be easier to go through and see if New Jersey is on things, because usually those are forms. I think the trademark is going to be far more difficult. **Ganoe:** Jerry, if I could interject something about the technology that Kathy has used. **Hamza:** Go ahead Dennis. **Ganoe:** Behind all the websites you see is a content management system, which is a searchable database that can be searched for text strings, whereas we wouldn't necessarily search the website itself. We would search the content management system, which is where content gets placed and stored and updated. It's actually independent of the website. The web pages read from that content management system and then produce a web page for view by your browser. That's our modern technology. Your idea of doing a simple one or two page would be easy if we didn't want to use it in the content management system, but if we still want to have it in the content management system so that it gets reviewed and updated, there's a little bit more overhead in engineering that. **Hamza:** Are you talking about the Chinese website or are you talking about looking for New Jersey and the trademark? **Ganoe:** Both. **Eigenhauser:** George here. **Hamza:** Go ahead George. **Eigenhauser:** Clicking around on our regular forms page, the cattery name applications in English have the correct address, but French, Russian and Spanish

all have New Jersey. **Hamza:** I think the problem is, George, to be honest with you, is we haven't paid enough attention to the other languages. **Eigenhauser:** Let me just say, I've been kind of pointing this out ever since we moved. I've been kind of a nag about it. Every 6 months I get a burr under my saddle. I looked at the forms, I contact them, I get feedback saying, "we can't fix it because we don't have the original source document and don't know how to fix it", and bla, bla, bla. I found a website online a while back that you can take a PDF file and essentially it's the equivalent of placing a sticker over it. You don't really edit the document, you just basically white out the wrong information and put the correct information, so you don't even need the original source document to fix these files. It's just a matter of somebody taking the time and going through the files, particularly on the forms page. Just go through them methodically top to bottom, one file at a time until you get all of them done. Yeah, it would be nice if we could do it global, all 800 pages, but at least on the forms page where we're directing people, and particularly things like the cattery name application where these are most likely newbies that won't understand when a file goes off into the ether. **Hamza:** Just for everybody to know, I've already sent James an email while we were discussing this, and I'm going to be talking with him in the morning to see what we can come up with for these two issues. Dennis, I'm going to tell Jodell to set up a conference call with me, you and James, and we'll talk about the Chinese thing probably later in this week. I'm thinking about Thursday. **Ganoe:** Just to let you know, Jerry, Thursday is my heavy day of meetings at work. Friday is much easier. **Hamza:** Alright. You and I will talk Friday. Even though Dick is out of town, I can still reach Dick. While he's in China, it might be a good idea for whatever you and I talk about, I can send to him and maybe he can help us. So, I'll tell Jodell to set up something with me, you and her on a Friday. **Ganoe:** OK. **Hamza:** If that's OK. Alright folks, I am going to try tomorrow to deal with the copyright and the New Jersey thing with James. I have sent him an email. I will talk to him mid-morning and I will also have him on the – well, I will be in Alliance for the October meeting. Any board members who would like to come to Alliance for the October meeting are welcome, as always in the past. For the new board members, we sit at the table in Alliance and we sit there while the rest of the board is on teleconference. It's kind of nice. It works out, so I hope that those of you who have come down in the past do it again. If you guys can let us know, we'll make the hotel reservations. The Holiday Inn is a nice hotel there. It's always good to have board members face to face, so like I said, think about it and try to get to Rachel or Jodell. I would like to see you guys in Alliance that first weekend. I just thought I would bring that up.

(9) **SHOW SPONSORSHIP – CONTACT UPDATE.**

Hamza: Up next is Rich Mastin with the show sponsorship contact. If you look, Rich put together a really good form for club applications for the sponsorships. Rich, go ahead. **Mastin:** Jerry, just for the record, I didn't create this form. It was created probably by Bob [Johnston] and Ann [Caell] probably tweaked it over the course of time. I just wanted to communicate to the board members that Ann is the contact for all club sponsorships, and not Bob. The document here is the application process. There is a sample of an email that she sent out to one of the clubs on their award. Her phone number is at the bottom of that and her email is within the application. That's all I had to report on that. **Hamza:** OK. I'm going to move on. I want to come back to club sponsorship, but I want to do it in closed session.

[EXECUTIVE SESSION]

(10) LEGISLATIVE UPDATE.

Hamza: Not on the agenda, but I would just like to, because of the timing, I would like to have George Eigenhauser at least read into the record some things. It was kind of an important day, as far as legislation goes. George, is there anything at this point you want to read into the record? **Eigenhauser:** Not so much read into the record. This isn't something that needs to be carved in stone, but it is something that I think needs to go out. We'll need to be aware. This morning, the USDA announced they had finally come to a conclusion about the proposed retail pet store rule that they have been working on for more than two years now. Their press releases are – they are trying to put as friendly a face on it as they possibly can, is what they are doing with the press releases. In the past, we found significant discrepancies between what the USDA says a rule says, and what the rule itself actually says. During the last go-around when they were first putting this out for comment, they actually went through four revisions of their Frequently Asked Questions file, as they corrected and re-corrected and re-corrected what they were telling people the rule said. So, the first word I want to put out to everybody is, we are aware of this, we are working on it. It's not time for anybody to panic. What we want to do is, go over it first and see what truly is in the new rule. So, we need to compare that to the existing, because a lot of times it will say, for example, "on subpart (a), subpart (b), subpart (i), change this sentence to that sentence." We've got to look at it in context to know what that means, so it's going to take a certain amount of time to sort through this. When we do, we're going to take our interpretation of it, along with any questions the fanciers may have sent us over the next few days, and try to set up a telephone conference with somebody at the USDA to try to iron out some of the finer points that there may be some disagreement on interpretation between us and what we're reading in the media and what we're reading on the USDA website. When we've done that, then I hope to be able to put out a how-to guide for fanciers; basically, how not to step on any land mines under the new USDA rule.

Eigenhauser: One of the things they have been touting recently is, they changed their definition of where the retail pet store is. In their original version, every single kitten buyer all the time would have to come to your cattery, and now they're saying as long as it's done at some business or residence or other place where the person can actually meet and interact with the animal before it's sold, then it wouldn't necessarily trip licensing. So, from what we've seen, that does need to be consistent with what's in the new rule, so that would, for example, allow us to still sell cats at cat shows. It would eliminate some of the problems we have with other situations.

Eigenhauser: What is still unclear and is very, very vague, both in their press releases and in what we've read of the rule itself is how they are going to compensate for things like co-owned animals. When the animal has been at your co-breeder's house for 5 years and you've never even touched it, how are they going to count that animal? They are still unclear about what they consider to be a breeding animal. They have announced that any animal capable of being bred is a breeding animal, which means we may wait until a cat is a year old to breed it, but if she's 6 months in heat, they may call it a breeding animal. So, there are a lot of little nuances that we need to work out.

Eigenhauser: I just wanted everyone to know we're working on it. We got an alert out right away to let people know that this is out there so the fancy knows we're working on it, but it's going to take a certain amount of time to digest, to talk to the USDA, to digest it some more before we give the fanciers a good list of do's and don'ts, and how not to get drawn into federal licensing and how to deal with the situation. If people have specific questions, we may not be

able to answer them, but go ahead and send them anyway and we'll put them in the hopper and eventually we will get back to you. We may not get back to you today or tomorrow, but we're going to work on this for a while until we have fully digested it.

Hannon: This is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead Mark. **Hannon:** George, who do you want those questions sent to? Because if they send them to you, they're going to get an "I'm out of the office" email back. **Eigenhauser:** Which is perfectly fine, because like I said, we're not going to be able to answer these in real time. **Hannon:** Alright. Now, you're going to Washington tomorrow. Are you meeting with the USDA or is there some other purpose? **Eigenhauser:** No. This is to meet with congressional representatives, which is actually the next place we would go, to deal with this anyway. Now that USDA has come up with their rule, we will communicate with them in terms of trying to nail down their interpretation of some of these grey areas, like what's a breeding animal and how you deal with co-owned animals, but in terms of actually producing a change, the next step would be for Congress to budget money to do this. That actually happens to be just coincidentally the people I'm going to be meeting with on Thursday night. It's Pet Night on Capitol Hill, where the Animal Health Institute invites all of the members of Congress, their staff, their spouses and their families to essentially a meet and greet. So, we will be interacting with Congressional staffers. Some congressmen generally show up. We don't see a lot of senators. Then, I will be meeting on Friday morning with members of the Animal Health Institute and with the co-sponsors of Pet Night who are kindred spirits and are likely feeling the same pain we are right now, and we'll be able to discuss a coordinated strategy for dealing with it. But, in terms of talking to the USDA, like I said, what I want to do is, people go ahead and send your questions. I can't guarantee we're going to get back to them in real time because we don't know all the answers yet, but if you send them, we'll put them together, we'll review it ourselves, and in those areas where we still have questions, we're probably going to set up a conference call with the USDA sometime next week or maybe even later, depending on how many questions we have and what their schedule allows, and try to come up with some concrete answers to these questions. So, my suggestion is to send it to me, cc Joan on it, because she may have some real time answers she can give, but don't be discouraged if you don't get an answer immediately. We don't know all the answers immediately.

Hamza: Thank you, George. One of the things, I know the veteran board members, this has been in their wheelhouse for a couple years now, and I spent a little bit of today looking it over – looking over this 91 page decision, and I'm sure glad George and his Committee are here to try to figure it out. I would encourage the new board members to try to at least get some sort of rudimentary handle on this. George, is there a way you can give the rest of the board the link that you sent me? **Eigenhauser:** I sent that to the board, I thought. **Hamza:** Well, good. Then, I encourage especially the new board members that haven't been following this all along from the beginning to really try to get your head around it, because I know that the membership is going to look to us for a little bit of guidance. Even though it's easy to pass them off to George, it's probably as well to be able to give some sort of advice. **Eigenhauser:** If I can interrupt for a second, I did not send the link to the board list. It got sent out in the CFA News. There are a couple of links in Joan's legislative alert that goes to the USDA news room. This morning, their Frequently Asked Question file was not up and running yet, it was under construction. I just checked it a few minutes ago and it is up and running now. However, I will warn everybody that during the comment period, the USDA Frequently Asked Question file was revised four times, because they kept finding errors. So, it's not the final word on anything, but it will give people some kind of an idea of what the USDA thinks they said. **Hannon:** Did you send that link to us earlier today, or is this something new you still need to send us? **Eigenhauser:** No. The link is in

Joan's alert. **Hannon:** That was to the press release, not the Frequently Asked Questions.

Ganoe: The link to APHIS is there. **Hamza:** It's on the same page, Mark. It just wasn't up earlier. **Eigenhauser:** When you link to it, at the top of the page there are 3 links. One is called *USDA Restores Important Check and Balance ...* and that's their press release. The second is *Questions and Answers*, and the third is the docket number. The *Questions and Answers* is what I call the fact file. It's the second link on the page that link takes you to. **Hannon:** OK.

Eigenhauser: The third link has their more detailed analysis of the final rule, and at the tail end of the analysis is the actual final rule itself. It's about 91 pages. **Meeker:** George, is there a separate section to go to, for definitions of the language? **Eigenhauser:** They think it's all clear.

Meeker: I would want to know their definition of "sight unseen". **Eigenhauser:** They have not defined that term. **Meeker:** OK. **Eigenhauser:** There are some terms that are terms of art within the rule. "Retail pet store" is something they have very definitely defined. That was the whole purpose of this – to define what "retail pet store" is, and there are a number of definitions that they have created within the new rule, some of which are changes to existing definitions, but other definitions are back in the rule as it existed before they even proposed these amendments. You have to remember, these are changes to an existing rule that's been around for 40 years, so there are still the existing rules. Anything that wasn't changed remains the same, and that's why it takes so long, because we have to take the pieces that have changed and plug them back into the original rule to see how they look in context. If you want to look at the ones that they specifically changed definitions in this go-around, then for those specific definitions, they are in the third link in the APHIS newsroom page, the one that calls itself *Docket No. 2011-2003*. That link takes you to a fuller analysis than the Q&A does, and it includes some of the definitions that they have used and, in particular, some of the definitions that they changed with this rule.

Meeker: You are saying "sight unseen" has not yet been defined. Is that correct? **Eigenhauser:** "Sight unseen" is not defined. "Breeding animal" is not defined. **Meeker:** OK, thank you.

Eigenhauser: Which is why we've got this grey area. They seem to be taking the position that if it's capable of reproduction, it's a breeding animal, whether you or I would ever breed it or not. So, that's one of the things or part of the basket of things that we're going to have to talk to the USDA when we get a list of questions, because we're not going to have a lot of opportunity to sit down and talk to them. We're hoping to get one good shot, so what we're going to do over the next few days is, take the questions people have, as well as the questions we have, put them all together and then try to set up a conference call with a representative of the USDA to try and get their interpretation. I want you to understand that when you ask a government agency for their interpretation of the law, that's not a defense to a violation of the law. It certainly would get you past any implication of malice or something, if you said, "I did everything they told me to." That wouldn't mean you didn't violate the rule, but it might mean that you wouldn't get heavy penalties for willful violations. To give you a guideline as to how well this worked, several years ago, an accounting firm called the IRS with some moderate tax questions and got the right information almost 2/3 of the time. That's one of the things we have to deal with here. The link in the alert that Joan sent takes you to their newsroom and then the top item in the newsroom is specifically about the retail pet store rule, and there are three links at the top of the page; one is their press release, one is their Frequently Asked Questions file and one is their analysis, and it does include the actual changes within the law, but it doesn't mean anything until you plug it into the law as it exists. I'm sorry, I keep using the word "law". This is a regulation, not a law, but it has the force of a law. **Hamza:** Alright, George. I'm sure that this picture will get bigger, if not come into focus. Anyway, let's move on to the agenda.

Hamza: Anybody got anything else, or was this enough? **Meeker:** I move we adjourn.
Hamza: Good night, everybody.

The meeting adjourned at 12:41 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Anger, Secretary