

**SUMMARY AND TRANSCRIPT OF CONFERENCE CALL  
CFA BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
AUGUST 12, 2014**

**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.

Ambassador Program.....	(21)
Annual Manual .....	(17)
(a) Review .....	
(b) Discussion on CO Responsibilities Versus Regional Responsibilities .....	
Appointment of Board Liaisons.....	(11)
Cat Writers’ Association Request.....	(22)
Catteries of Distinction – Combining Catteries .....	(15)
Cattery Name Renewal Process .....	(16)
Club Name Change .....	(18)
Co-Owned Cat Registration Activity Tracker .....	(14)
Disciplinary Hearings and Results.....	(23)
Edelweiss Cat Club’s request for an in conjunction show .....	(10)
Executive Director Update.....	(8)
Finance Committee .....	(6)
IT Update .....	(7)
Judging Program Committee .....	(2)
Legislation Update .....	(20)
New Club Applications.....	(3)
Protest Committee .....	(1)
Reaffirmation of February 2015 BOD meeting dates.....	(12)
Rolandus Cat Club – Guest Judge Increase Request .....	(19)
Show Format Proposals .....	(13)
Show License Change for New Hampshire Feline Fanciers.....	(9)
Show Rules .....	(4)
World Show Update.....	(5)

**Secretary’s Note:** The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers’ Association, Inc. met on Tuesday, August 12, 2014, via teleconference. **President Mark Hannon** called the meeting to order at 9:00 p.m. with the following members present:

- Mr. Mark Hannon (President)**
- Mr. Richard Kallmeyer (Vice President)**
- Barbara J. Schreck, J.D., C.P.A. (Treasurer)**
- Ms. Rachel Anger (Secretary)**
- Mrs. Geri Fellerman (NAR Director)**
- Mrs. Pam Moser (NWR Director)**
- Steve McCullough, D.C. (GSR Director)**
- Mr. John Colilla (GLR Director)**
- Ms. Lisa Marie Kuta (SWR Director)**
- Ms. Kathy Calhoun (MWR Director)**
- Mrs. Jean Dugger (SOR Director)**

**Mrs. Pam DelaBar (Europe Regional Director)**  
**Roger Brown, DVM (Director-at-Large)**  
**George Eigenhauser, Esq. (Director-at-Large)**  
**Dennis Ganoë (Director-at-Large)**  
**Mrs. Carol Krzanowski (Director-at-Large)**  
**Mr. Richard Mastin (Director-at-Large)**  
**Ginger Meeker, Ph.D. (Director-at-Large)**  
**Mrs. Annette Wilson (Director-at-Large)**

**Also Present:**

**Edward L. Raymond, Jr., Esq., CFA Legal Counsel**  
**Verna Dobbins, Director of CFA Services**

**Not Present:**

**Mr. Edward Maeda (Japan Regional Director)**

## SUMMARY

### (1) PROTEST COMMITTEE.

**Chair Mr. Eigenhauser** moved to accept the Committee's recommendations on the protests not in dispute. **Motion Carried [vote sealed].** (See #23).

### (2) JUDGING PROGRAM.

**Chair Mrs. Wilson** had no action items.

### (3) CLUB APPLICATIONS.

The following club application was presented for acceptance on standing motion by **Co-Chair Mrs. Krzanowski**:

- TIANJIN CAT FANCIERS CLUB, International Division – Asia (Shenyang, China). Seconded by **Ms. Anger, Motion Carried.**

**Mrs. Krzanowski** moved to impose a moratorium on new clubs from the following areas of China until the February 2015 Board meeting: Shenyang, Beijing, Shanghai and Shenzhen/Guangzhou. At that time the situation will be re-evaluated to determine if the moratorium should be lifted or continued. Seconded by **Mr. Kallmeyer, Motion Carried.** Anger, Eigenhauser, Schreck, Kuta, McCullough, Moser, Fellerman, Dugger voting no.

### (4) SHOW RULES.

1. *How many days after the cat has achieved its last qualifying ring should CO wait to send out the delinquency notice, and how should that notice be sent? The SRC recommends 45 days, thus giving the exhibitor time to mail it to CO from overseas; and notification by both snail mail AND e-mail.*

**Mrs. Krzanowski** moved that the Show Rules Committee present a proposal at the October 2014 Board meeting to the effect that Central Office must send out delinquency notification of non-claimed championships and premierships 45 days after the close of the show by paper copy and email, effective for the 2015-2016 show season. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.**

2. *Can we extend the response time to 45 days, or would you like a different length? If a different length is decided, what should that length be?*

**Mrs. Krzanowski** moved that the Show Rules Committee present a proposal at the October 2014 Board meeting to the effect that the response time will be 45 days for the non-claimed championship and premiership delinquency notification. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.**

3. *The Board needs to establish the late filing fee amount (the Board needs to pick the amount, but the SRC feels it should be at least \$15.00 – the current amount for the claim form), and it needs to be put in the current price list.*

**Mrs. Krzanowski** moved that the Show Rules Committee present a proposal at the October 2014 Board meeting to the effect that a late filing fee of \$15 will be put into the fees section of the website. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.**

4. *The Board needs to decide if NC CH/PR cats will be able to retain, or forfeit, any points earned for national and regional awards, including breed awards. A time frame for points lost should be provided, i.e. forfeit points earned after last Qualifying Ring, or any other time frame until the filing of the championship claim form and fee. [NOTE: the entire show would be used for scoring purposes unless the cat transferred out of open on the second day of a two-day show, then only the first day would be used.]*

**Mrs. Krzanowski** moved that the Show Rules Committee present a proposal at the October 2014 Board meeting to the effect that regional and national points are forfeited until the filing of the claim form and fee. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.** Schreck and McCullough voting no.

5. *The Board should determine if, at some length of time with the Championship claim form and fee unfiled, the cat will have to forfeit all Qualifying Rings and return to a show as an Open; or continue to keep the QR it earned toward the CH/PR title and allow it to be claimed when the owner does send the form and fee, along with the late fee.*

**Mrs. Krzanowski** moved that the Show Rules Committee present a proposal at the October 2014 Board meeting to the effect that a cat will not forfeit the qualifying rings it earns if the claim form and fee have not been filed. Seconded by **Mrs. Meeker, Motion Carried.** McCullough voting no.

6. *Reduce, eliminate, or leave alone the current requirement in show rule 27.05c that a claim form must be filed within three years of the time the cat first attends a show and earns qualifying rings.*

**Mrs. Krzanowski** moved that the Show Rules Committee present a proposal at the October 2014 Board meeting to the effect that we eliminate the show rule which states that a claim form must be filed within 3 years of the time the cat first attends and earns a qualifying ring. Seconded by **Mr. McCullough, Motion Carried.**

(5) **WORLD SHOW UPDATE.**

**Chair Mr. Mastin** had no action items.

(6) **FINANCE COMMITTEE.**

**Chair Mr. Mastin** had no action items.

(7) **IT UPDATE.**

**Chair Mr. Ganoe** had no action items.

(8) **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR UPDATE.**

No action items were presented.

(9) **SHOW LICENSE CHANGE FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE FELINE FANCIERS.**

**Mrs. Fellerman** moved to grant an exception to Show Rule 12.04 and allow the New Hampshire Feline Fanciers to change its show license to add an allbreed ring, from 6 Allbreed/1 Specialty/7 HHP rings to 7 Allbreed/1 Specialty/8 HHP rings at its January 24/25, 2015 show in Dover, New Hampshire (Region 1). Seconded by **Ms. Anger, Motion Carried.**

**(10) EDELWEISS CAT CLUB “IN CONJUNCTION” REQUEST.**

**Ms. DelaBar** moved to grant the request of Edelweiss Cat Club to hold an in-conjunction show with FARUS on December 20/21, 2014 in Moscow, Russia (Region 9). Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.**

**(11) APPOINTMENT OF BOARD LIAISONS.**

**Mr. Eigenhauser** moved to approve the board liaisons, as presented. Seconded by **Mr. McCullough, Motion Carried.**

**Mr. McCullough** moved to approve the liaisons for those committees that are chaired by non-board members. Seconded by **Mrs. Krzanowski, Motion Carried.** DelaBar and McCullough voting no.

**(12) REAFFIRMATION OF BOARD MEETING DATES.**

No action items were presented.

**(13) SHOW FORMAT PROPOSALS.**

**Mr. Eigenhauser** moved that the Show Rules Committee present a proposal at the October 2014 Board meeting that would create a sliding scale on the number of minimum specialty rings to be required at shows, at the very least in North America, but look statistically at whether such a proposal would be workable in other areas, as well. Seconded by **Mrs. Moser, Motion Carried.** McCullough, Calhoun and Kuta voting no.

**Mr. Ganoë** moved for a board policy that no Super Specialty shows will be permitted after the weekend of February 28/March 1. Up until that date, others may be added to the list. Seconded by **Ms. Anger, Motion Failed.** Ganoë, Wilson, Moser and Fellerman voting yes.

**(14) CO-OWNED CAT REGISTRATION ACTIVITY TRACKER.**

**Mrs. Meeker** moved to accept the Cat Registration Activity Tracker program, as presented, and that she would work with the new Executive Director to get it in place. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.**

**(15) CATTERIES OF DISTINCTION – COMBINING CATTERIES.**

**Mrs. Meeker** moved to accept the Cattery of Distinction – combining cattery procedure, with a fee of \$75 to accomplish the procedure. Seconded by **Mrs. Krzanowski, Motion Carried.**

**(16) CATTERY NAME RENEWAL PROCESS.**

**Mrs. Meeker** moved to adopt the Cattery Name Renewal Process, as presented. Seconded by **Ms. Anger, Motion Carried.** Krzanowski, McCullough and Eigenhauser voting no.

**(17) ANNUAL MANUAL.**

**Mrs. Moser** moved that, starting in 2016, Central Office will take on all functions of the CFA Annuals, except the Thursday night hospitality which would be optional for the region, and the delegate bags. Seconded by **Mr. McCullough, Motion Failed.** McCullough, Moser, Fellerman and Kuta voting yes.

**(18) CLUB NAME CHANGE.**

**Ms. Anger** moved to approve the name change request of A1 Cat Academy (Region 8, Club 1114) to Nyanko Yokohama . Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.**

**(19) ROLANDUS CAT CLUB – GUEST JUDGE INCREASE REQUEST.**

**Ms. DelaBar** moved to grant an exception to Show Rule 25.13 for the Rolandus Cat Club shows (Region 9) to be held in Kiev, Ukraine, on November 15/16, 2014 and March 21/22, 2015, to allow the use of up to 50% guest judges at their 8-ring shows. Seconded by **Ms. Anger, Motion Carried.** Ganoë voting no.

**(20) LEGISLATION UPDATE.**

**Mr. Eigenhauser** moved to approve the legislative budget increase request in the sum of \$5,118.00. Seconded by **Mrs. Meeker, Motion Carried.**

**(21) AMBASSADOR PROGRAM.**

**Ms. DelaBar** moved that a committee consisting of Candilee Jackson, Pam DelaBar, Kathy Calhoun and Geri Fellerman bring a proposal to the board to revitalize the Ambassador Program. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.**

**(22) CAT WRITERS’ ASSOCIATION REQUEST.**

**Ms. Anger** moved to provide a small item for the CWA bags for the BarkWorld Pet Expo in Atlanta, Georgia on October 30/November 1, 2014. Seconded by **Mr. McCullough, Motion Carried.**

\* \* \* \* \*

**Ms. Kuta** moved that, due to the local fire marshal’s request, the aisles be wider than the original floor plan, the Santa Monica Cat Club is asking for permission to lower the entry limit from 325 to 275, at its August 23/24, 2014 show in Costa Mesa, California (Region 5). Seconded by **Mr. McCullough, Motion Carried.**

*Respectfully submitted,  
Rachel Anger, Secretary*

**(23) DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS AND SUSPENSIONS.**

**Disciplinary Hearings And Suspensions:** Cases that have been reviewed by the Protest Committee and for which a recommendation was presented to the Board. The following cases were heard, a tentative decision was rendered, timely notice was given to the parties, and no appeal and/or appeal fee was filed. Therefore, final disposition is as follows:

[to be provided when 30 day appeal period expires]

## TRANSCRIPT

**Hannon:** How many are on the call? **Anger:** I can call the roll if you would like.  
**Hannon:** OK, why don't you? **Anger:** OK, Mark Hannon. **Hannon:** Here. **Anger:** Richard Kallmeyer. **Kallmeyer:** Here. **Anger:** Barbara Schreck. Barb not on yet. Rachel Anger is here. Pam Moser. **Moser:** Here. **Anger:** Steve McCullough. **McCullough:** Here. **Anger:** John Colilla. **Colilla:** Present. **Anger:** Lisa Kuta. **Kuta:** Here. **Anger:** Kathy Calhoun. **Calhoun:** Here. **Anger:** Jean Dugger. **Dugger:** Here. **Anger:** Pam DelaBar. 4 in the morning Pam DelaBar not here? 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:** Ginger Meeker. **Meeker:** Here. **Anger:** Annette Wilson. **Wilson:** Here. **Anger:** Is Ed Raymond on the call? **Raymond:** Here. **Anger:** Is Verna Dobbins on the call? No Verna. Edward Maeda was not able to call in from Japan, unless he was able to get the number Kayoko used. So, Edward, you're not here, are you? Is there anyone on the call whose name I have not mentioned: **Schreck:** Barb Schreck. **Anger:** Oh good, thanks. **Hannon:** Alright. So, we are still missing Pam DelaBar and Verna. **Anger:** Correct. **McCullough:** What about John Colilla? **Colilla:** He's here. **Eigenhauser:** Who just came on? **DelaBar:** Pam DelaBar. **Hannon:** So, we are just missing Verna at this point and the next beep will hopefully be her, so let's get started. [Dobbins joins the call during executive session]

**Hannon:** Rachel wants to make a few comments for those of you who are new to our teleconference board meetings about how we proceed. Go ahead, Rachel. **Anger:** I would like to go over our teleconference procedures for the benefit of our new board members. If you would like to speak, you raise your hand to get Mark's attention by saying something like either, for instance, I would say "Rachel here" or "Mark?" If another person is called first, Mark might not have heard you because multiple voices on the speaker phones will cancel each other out, so you may have to make your request to speak again by saying something like "Rachel still here" or "second call for Rachel", something like that. Please do not blurt out your statement or cut off another speaker. There are up to 20 of us here on the call, and the tempo of the meeting can be easily disrupted. Unless you are speaking or waiting to speak, it is recommended that you keep your phone on mute by hitting \*6. It's a toggle, so \*6 on, \*6 off. If you have any doubt whether or not you are mute, everyone will tell you, don't worry about it. They will say, "you're on mute!" If your dog is barking or cat is meowing in the background, the dog or cat could easily cancel out the speaker. So, we can hear the dog barking but we can't hear the speaker speaking. I guess the best way to put it is, if your statement is important enough for you to want everyone to hear it, you need to wait until Mark calls on you. I'm pretty good at voice recognition, but I'm more concerned with you being given the floor before you speak. That's the only way we can get through our business. In summary, please wait to be called on and please keep yourself on mute while you are not speaking. That's it. I'm going to put myself on mute now. **Hannon:** OK, thank you Rachel.

**Hannon:** I had asked Ed to speak next with regard to Robert's Rules of Order and his interpretation of when the president can vote. Ed. **Raymond:** Robert's Rules provide that, while the president is entitled to vote, he or she normally maintains their impartiality by not voting unless their vote will change the results; i.e., they can break a tie, they can cause a tie, they can cause a 2/3 majority to exist or prevent a 2/3 majority from existing. That's in the case of a voice vote. When you have what Robert's calls a "secret vote" or a vote by ballot, the president is

allowed to vote because there is no impartiality to protect. His or her vote is not known unless it happens to be a unanimous decision, so really, for purposes of this meeting, things like judging advancements or acceptances to the Judging Program are done by a ballot and therefore Mark could vote if he wishes to. **Hannon:** Has anybody got any comments on that before we proceed? OK. So, I'm assuming then that nobody objects to Ed's interpretations of Robert's Rules and I will vote accordingly. Since there are no judges being voted on tonight – nobody is up for advancement and we're not voting on accepting anybody into the Program tonight, then I won't be voting unless it's a tie situation, OK?



(1) **PROTEST COMMITTEE.**

*Committee Chair: George J. Eigenhauser, Jr.*  
*Committee Members: Dick Kallmeyer, Betsy Arnold, Norman Auspitz,  
Joel Chaney and Pam Huggins*  
*Animal Welfare: Linda Berg;*  
*European Region liaison: George Cherrie*  
*Japan liaison: Kayoko Koizumi*  
*Judging liaison: Jan Stevens*  
*Legal Counsel: Ed Raymond*

---

**Brief Summation/Current Happenings of Committee:**

*The Protest Committee met telephonically on June 3, 2014. Participating were George Eigenhauser, Betsy Arnold, Pam Huggins, Norman Auspitz, and Linda Berg (with Joel Chaney joining the meeting in progress.)*

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

*Ongoing protest investigations and recommendations.*

*Respectfully Submitted,*

  
*George J. Eigenhauser, Jr.*  
*Protest Committee Chairman*

(2) **JUDGING PROGRAM.**

**Committee Chair:** *Annette Wilson – General Communication and Oversight; File Administrator*

**List of Committee Members:** *Larry Adkison – Guest Judges (CFA judges in approved foreign associations, licensed judges from approved foreign associations in CFA)*

*Rachel Anger – Ombudsman; Mentor Program Administrator; File Administrator (Region 9); prepares Board Report*

*Wain Harding – International Division Training Administrator and File Administrator*

*Beth Holly – Application Administrator (inquiries, queries, follow ups, counseling); Teach Judging Application Process at Breed Awareness & Orientation School*

*Donna Isenberg – Application Administrator (inquiries, queries, follow ups, counseling); Teach Judging Application Process at Breed Awareness & Orientation School*

*Pat Jacobberger – Chair, Judges’ Education subcommittee (Breed Awareness and Orientation School)*

*Jan Stevens – Trainee Administrator and File Administrator; Representative on the CFA Protest Committee;*

*Aki Tamura – Trainee Administrator and File Administrator (Region 8)*

*Wayne Trevathan – Member, Judges’ Education subcommittee (Breed Awareness and Orientation School)*

---

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

*As with the CFA Board, the Judging Program Committee has had a dramatic turn-over of personnel. We wish to sincerely thank the members of the Judging Program Committee who have served CFA, not only in the recent past but from our origins, who have guided the Program along to produce the best judges in the world. Thank you!*

**Hannon:** Judging Program, Annette. Are you there? **Wilson:** I’m here. **Hannon:** Do you have anything for open session, as opposed to closed session? How do you want to deal with this? **Wilson:** I don’t ever remember what’s open or closed. I don’t have any action items. **Hannon:** You don’t have anybody coming up for advancement or acceptance. **Wilson:** That’s right.

**Current Happenings of Committee:**

*Since the Annual, the new Committee personnel are all quickly getting up to speed so that no lapse of service will be experienced by anyone. Thanks to all for your patience during this*

transition period. Everything seems to be going smoothly. We are all very excited about the future and working together for everyone's success.

International/Guest Judging Assignments: Permission has been granted for the following:

**CFA Judges to Judge International Assignments:**

<b>Judge</b>	<b>Assn</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>City/Country</b>	<b>Date</b>
<i>Currle, Kenny</i>	<i>WCF</i>	<i>Excellent Cats</i>	<i>Moscow, Russia</i>	<i>09/07/14</i>
<i>DelaBar, Pam</i>	<i>WCF</i>	<i>Cheshire Cat Club</i>	<i>Odessa, Ukraine</i>	<i>11/29-30/14</i>
<i>Dodds, Nancy</i>	<i>WCF</i>	<i>Almaty City</i>	<i>Kazakhstan</i>	<i>11/22-23/14</i>
<i>Mathis, Anne</i>	<i>CCA</i>	<i>PAWSitive PAWS Cat Club</i>	<i>London, Ontario</i>	<i>10/19/14</i>
<i>Rogers, Jan</i>	<i>GCCF</i>	<i>Royal Melbourne Championship Show</i>	<i>Melbourne, Australia</i>	<i>09/26-10/1/14</i>

**Non-CFA Judges requesting permission to guest judge CFA shows:**

<b>Judge</b>	<b>Assn</b>	<b>CFA Show</b>	<b>City/Country</b>	<b>Date</b>
<i>Nazarova, Anna</i>	<i>WCF</i>	<i>Chatte Noir</i>	<i>Moscow, Russia</i>	<i>09/06-07/14</i>
<i>Pereira, Gerson Alves</i>	<i>FIFe</i>	<i>Cat Fanciers of Brazil</i>	<i>Taubate, Brazil</i>	<i>08/16/14</i>
<i>Pokhvalina, Viktoria</i>	<i>WCF</i>	<i>Chatte Noir</i>	<i>Moscow, Russia</i>	<i>09/06-07/14</i>
<i>Rumyantseva, Nadejda</i>	<i>WCA Nika</i>	<i>NE Cat Fanciers Club of China</i>	<i>Shenyang China</i>	<i>09/13-14/14</i>

**Pre-Notice of Application:** The following individuals are scheduled to be presented to the Board in October 2014 for acceptance:

*Laura Gregory (Longhair – 1<sup>st</sup> Specialty)  
Lutz, Florida*

*Jennifer Reding (Shorthair – 1<sup>st</sup> Specialty)  
Cypress, California*

**Acceptance/Advancements:** The following individuals are presented to the Board for acceptance/advancement:

*None.*

*Respectfully Submitted,  
Annette Wilson, Chair*

### (3) CLUB APPLICATIONS.

*Committee Chairs: Liz Watson and Carol Krzanowski*

---

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

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

*At the June meeting, the Board asked what information was included in the club welcome packet. We were already sending a fair amount of information, but we discovered that the acceptance letter did not include any specifics regarding the annual club fee and membership list requirement. With the help of Kristi Wollam at Central Office, we revised the acceptance letter to note this important requirement and include additional information that will help new clubs become lasting members of CFA.*

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

*One club was pre-noticed for membership. It is:*

- *TianJin Cat Fanciers Club, International Division; Richard Kallmeyer, Chairman*

#### ***TianJin Cat Fanciers Club International Division–Asia (Shenyang, China); Richard Kallmeyer, Chair***

*The constitution and by-laws are in order. There are fourteen members, and no member is a member of other clubs. This is an allbreed club, and they wish to hold shows in TianJin, China. The dues have been set. If disbanded the monies will go to a cat welfare agency. This club was pre-noticed and no negative letters have been received. The International Chair supports this club. This is a club that is re-applying as it was dropped from membership.*

**Hannon:** Carol, with Club Applications, go ahead. **Krzanowski:** We have one club to consider at this meeting. It's the TianJin Cat Fanciers Club in the International Division from China. Their constitution and bylaws are in order. There are 14 members. **Anger:** Carol, can I interrupt you? Someone needs to put their phone on mute. They are typing and every keystroke click is cancelling Carol out. So, unless you are Carol, please give Carol the consideration of putting yourself on mute so that she can present her report. Thank you. **Krzanowski:** Thank you Rachel. I should mention that this club was a member previously, but they were dropped in June because they did not submit the membership list or club fees. They did hold a show last year, so they did reapply for membership. We are in favor of accepting this group. The International Chair also supports this club. I will turn it over to Dick for any additional comments. **Kallmeyer:** Again, it's an area that we want to be in. TianJin is by the east coast of China, probably about 90 miles from Beijing. It's probably about 5 million. The club screwed up. Kristi and I were doing daily reminders for about 6 weeks before the club expired. Of course, the day after they contacted us and said, "what do we have to do?" I think we ought to let them back in. I think Pam Moser judged one of their shows last October. **Hannon:** Do you have any comments, Pam Moser? I don't hear anything from Ms. Moser. Carol, do you want to make a motion.

**Krzanowski:** Yes. I move that we accept the TianJin Cat Fanciers Club for membership. **Anger:** Rachel seconds. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion?

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

**Hannon:** Welcome the club back.

**Future Projections for Committee:**

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

**Action Item:**

*Impose a moratorium on new clubs from the following areas of China until the February 2015 Board meeting: Shenyang, Beijing, Shanghai and Shenzhen/Guangzhou. At that time the situation will be re-evaluated to determine if the moratorium should be lifted or continued.*

**Rationale:** *Due to the large influx of new clubs from China in the recent past, we now have enough show producing clubs to sustain current CFA activities in the above-mentioned areas. We continue to receive new club applications from China on a regular basis, and the International Chair feels that more new clubs are not warranted at this time. Rather than have additional new clubs apply only to be potentially denied, we feel a moratorium is an appropriate measure.*

**Hannon:** Carol, do you have something else? **Krzanowski:** Yes. I have an action item in the report, and that is to *impose a moratorium on new clubs from the following areas of China until the February 2015 Board meeting: Shenyang, Beijing, Shanghai and Shenzhen/Guangzhou. At that time the situation will be re-evaluated to determine if the moratorium should be lifted or continued.* The rationale is, <reads>. There's not enough growth and what we have at the present time is sufficient. Dick, would you like to comment further? **Kallmeyer:** I definitely agree with it. I think we're overbuilt out in certain areas, certainly Shenyang, based on the show-producing capability. It's not that we want to stop new clubs there, but we want to at least slow things down, let them develop clerks and master clerks and some of the infrastructure to catch up. **Ganoe:** I just have one question for Carol. Do we have any clubs that we know of that are going to apply from these areas between tonight and when they finally get the word that, if we place a moratorium, that it's in place? **Krzanowski:** To answer your question, yes we do have two clubs actually in the review process right now. One came in last month and there were a number of things wrong with their application. I've written to their secretary. As yet, I have not heard back. We did receive another application just last week. I haven't really had an opportunity to look that one over completely yet, so if we do pass this action item, I guess we would need to make a decision as to what to do with those two applicants. Those are the only two I'm aware of at the present time. We haven't heard anything about any forthcoming for the next board meeting, other than these two possibly. If they don't have their applications in order, they would not be presented. **Kallmeyer:** I point out that the two new clubs are in Shenyang, where we probably don't need any more clubs for a little bit. Part of the problem, too, is that I think one club is imploding. The vice-president, the treasurer and the secretary of the club all want to form their own club, so I think we ought to slow it down. **Krzanowski:** I think that the two applicants that are in review right now are both from the Shenyang province of China, so that's an area where

we feel we have enough clubs at the present time. **Eigenhauser:** I've always taken the position, and I think it's a good legal position to take, that a moratorium on accepting applications is not legal. The constitution gives clubs the right to submit applications. The board then has the discretion to accept or reject the application, but it does not give us the right to refuse to accept applications. If we turn down an application, the club then has the right to appeal that denial to the delegation. If we don't let them submit an application in the first place, we're not only eliminating their right to ask the board, we're short circuiting their constitutional right within our constitution to appeal it to the delegation. **Hannon:** But not in this case, George, because the proposed date is February, so in February we could accept applications and they could appeal at the next annual. There's not an annual between now and then. **Eigenhauser:** I'm talking about if we put a moratorium on accepting applications. **Hannon:** So am I, because the moratorium they suggested was until February, which means that we would accept applications for new clubs in February, and if we turned them down in February, they would have the opportunity to go before the delegates at the next meeting. **Eigenhauser:** If we're not accepting applications for February, how are we going to turn them down in February? **Hannon:** Maybe I misunderstood. I thought we weren't accepting applications until February. **Krzanowski:** That's right. **Eigenhauser:** If we don't accept applications in December and October, we can't hear them in February. So, what you're essentially telling people is, they can't submit applications for the February board meeting. **Hannon:** No, we would accept them for the February board meeting. Carol, tell us what's going on here. Would we accept them for consideration in February? **Krzanowski:** We could accept them for consideration. I can change the action item to actually state that we will accept applications for consideration in February but not before them. **Hannon:** If we accepted them for consideration in February, they could come back in April if we turned them down. **Krzanowski:** Yes. **Hannon:** And then they could go to the delegates in June. Does that make sense, George? **Eigenhauser:** Yes, but this is starting to get very complicated. **Hannon:** But you're not talking about this particular instance, you're talking as a generalization you don't think we should be making moratoriums. **Eigenhauser:** As a generalization, I believe that a moratorium is not permitted under our constitution. **Ganoe:** I think the right compromise here is, rather than calling it a moratorium, simply state a policy that we are going to hold off reviewing new applications until February. It's not a moratorium on accepting applications, it's just a statement by the board saying, "we're not going to review them again until February." **Eigenhauser:** I have a question. If the purpose of the moratorium is to discourage clubs from submitting applications because we already have enough clubs in that area, simply tabling them all to February doesn't accomplish that. **Raymond:** The constitution provides that once the satisfactory paperwork is submitted, it will be brought to the board at the next regularly scheduled board meeting. So, you can't delay it until February because there's a regularly scheduled board meeting between now and February. You can delay it until October. The other thing I think you can do is to make it known that the board will not look favorably upon applications received from these areas for some period of time. That's simply a statement of the board's opinion. If a club decides to roll the dice and submit an application anyway, I think the board still has to hear it at its next regularly scheduled meeting. You can define "regularly scheduled meetings" as only those where the board meets in person and not the telephonic meetings if you wish. I don't think, as George said, you can just impose a moratorium. **Krzanowski:** On the other hand, while it doesn't seem constitutionally correct to impose a moratorium, if the majority of the board is not in favor of continuing to accept numerous clubs from China, it's kind of futile to make them go through the effort, pay the fee for the application,

then only to be denied. So, if the general feeling of the board is that we need more clubs there and they will be accepted, then perhaps I should withdraw the action item. **Kallmeyer:** Mark, in the past, somewhere in the 90's, wasn't there a slow-down on clubs in Japan? **Hannon:** Yes. **Kallmeyer:** Do you remember that? I don't remember when it was but I vaguely remember. **Hannon:** Pam, do you remember? **DelaBar:** Yes, I definitely remember. **Kallmeyer:** When was it, Pam? **DelaBar:** At 4-something in the morning, you want me to remember when we had the moratorium? I do remember, though. **Calhoun:** I cannot remember the date, because I'm thinking through Nyquil, but I do remember we did this before and I don't recall that there were any negative repercussions because of it. **DelaBar:** I'm looking at the constitution. As I read it, it says, *The board shall, from time to time formulate guidelines for the acceptance of new clubs based upon such factors as proposed geographical area of operation and the affect the formation and acceptance on existing CFA member clubs.* I think that in going back in my fuzzy mind right now, I think that was the two areas we actually considered when we put the moratorium on accepting applications from Japan. That went on for approximately a year if I remember correctly, and that portion of the constitution has not changed. **Eigenhauser:** But I believe the portion of the constitution allowing for an appeal to the delegation was changed after that. **DelaBar:** I can remember a club of a person who used to live in the Midwest Region and then moved to the Southwest Region had a club that was turned down at a meeting, and we went through going to the delegation, and that club was accepted by the delegation, but those provisions have been in effect for quite some time, because that goes back to about 1990 or so when that action happened. **Hannon:** Any other comments? Carol, do you want to restate your motion? **Krzanowski:** I'm going to leave my motion as it is stated in my report: *Impose a moratorium on new clubs from the following areas of China until the February 2015 Board meeting: Shenyang, Beijing, Shanghai and Shenzhen/Guangzhou. At that time the situation will be re-evaluated to determine if the moratorium should be lifted or continued.*

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Anger, Eigenhauser, Schreck, Kuta, McCullough, Moser, Fellerman, Dugger voting no.

**Hannon:** Let's go with the no votes. Give your names to Rachel and she'll keep track. We'll see if that's the losing group. **Eigenhauser:** George. **McCullough:** Steve, no. **Schreck:** Barb, no. **Kuta:** Lisa, no. **Moser:** Pam, no. **Fellerman:** Geri, no. **Hannon:** Any other no's? **Anger:** Jean was a no? **Eigenhauser:** Could you read the no's please? **Anger:** Yes. Anger, Eigenhauser, Schreck, Kuta, McCullough, DelaBar, Fellerman, Dugger. Eight no's. **DelaBar:** Pam DelaBar here. I voted yes. **Hannon:** No, you voted no. **DelaBar:** It was the other Pam. **Moser:** Yes, the other Pam. **Hannon:** One Pam voted yes and one Pam voted no. **DelaBar:** Yes. **Anger:** OK, I have it. **Hannon:** That was 8 no's. Let's have the yesses then. All those who voted yes, please say your name so that Rachel can write it down. **Krzanowski:** Carol. **DelaBar:** Pam DelaBar. **Kallmeyer:** Dick. **Colilla:** John Colilla, yes. **Meeker:** Ginger Meeker, yes. **Wilson:** Annette Wilson, yes. **Anger:** I have DelaBar, Colilla, Meeker, Kallmeyer, Wilson, Krzanowski. **Calhoun:** Calhoun is a yes. **Mastin:** Rich Mastin is a yes. **Ganoe:** Dennis was a yes. **Anger:** DelaBar, Colilla, Meeker, Kallmeyer, Wilson, Krzanowski, Calhoun, Ganoe, Mastin. That's 9. **Hannon:** That's 9 yesses, 8 no's. Are there any abstentions? 9 and 8 is 17. Maeda and myself are not voting. Who else didn't vote. **Anger:** Roger. **Hannon:** Roger, how did you vote? [no response] Alright, so the motion carried. Do you agree, Rachel? Was it carried? **Anger:** I agree, 9 to 8. **Hannon:** OK, motion carried.

**Hannon:** Do you have anything else, Carol? **Krzanowski:** No, that's all I have. I would like to mention though that the two clubs in review, if they should get their documents in order prior to February, that I think we should move ahead and consider them, because they are already in the system. It will depend on whether they get their documents together in the correct order. Is that acceptable to everyone? **Hannon:** We can vote no.

**Time Frame:**

*August, 2014 to Board meeting October, 2014.*

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

*All new clubs that have applied for membership.*

*Respectfully submitted,*

*Liz Watson and Carol Krzanowski, Co-Chair*



**(4) SHOW RULES.**

**Committee Chair:** Monte Phillips  
**List of Committee Members:** Cathy Dunham, Kathy Gumm, Shirley Michaud-Dent,  
Alene Shafnisky

---

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

*Based on the request from the May 2014 Board meeting to provide rulemaking recommendations to the Board concerning show rules 27.05c and 28.01 (OLD RULES 8.05c & 8.06), we have prepared the following report. In bold, the report highlights each individual decision the committee is requesting so that a specific rulemaking can be proposed that addresses all of the issues that are currently a problem with these two rules.*

**Current Wording of Show Rule 27.05c and 28.01 (OLD RULES 8.05c & 8.06):**

***27.05c** - Requests for confirmation of Championship or Premiership must be made within three years of the date of the first show at which Qualifying Rings are achieved except where Championships or Premierships have been earned over a longer period. Such requests may be confirmed subject to the availability and verification by official show records. Exhibitors may validate Qualifying Rings achieved at a show whose date approaches the three year limit by contacting the Central Office in a timely manner providing the details of the award—name of show, date, and judge.*

***28.01** - Grand points for a cat that has completed requirements for Championship or Premiership will not be posted to a cat's record until the Central Office has received a Championship Claim form, appropriate fees, and confirmed that championship or premiership requirements have been met. In the case of cats that earned points with a temporary registration number, those points also will not be posted to a cat's record until the cat has received a permanent registration number. When the Championship or Premiership Claim Form has not been received by the Central Office, any wins earned by a cat otherwise eligible to compete as a Champion or Premier will be held in abeyance. For these wins to be counted, the exhibitor must respond to the written notice of delinquency issued by the Central Office within 20 days of the date of such notice. The response shall consist of a completed Championship or Premiership Claim Form, the confirmation fee and payment of a late filing fee. See current price list for applicable fees.*

**Interpretation and Issues Requiring Resolution:**

*This show rule addresses the situation where an exhibitor has earned the title of Champion or Premier, but has not yet claimed that title. The rule requires the exhibitor AND Central Office to take several actions, depending on what each other have done; however, this rule is not being followed by some exhibitors or Central Office staff. That is probably because many of the required actions are buried in the form of one paragraph. The first thing the Show Rules Committee (SRC) plans to do is revise the rule and put it into an a, b, c, paragraph format with each specifying an action to be performed in the chronological order that would be required, by whomever needs to perform that action (CO or exhibitor).*

*The rule specifies that grand points will NOT be posted to a cat's record until a valid claim form for the CH/PR title is received and confirmed by Central Office (CO), and in the interim, any points earned will be held in abeyance. However, as a result of the improper actions and misunderstanding of the rule, rather than holding points in abeyance for the Grand title, Central Office staff has, in some cases, sent Grand certificates for non-confirmed (NC) cats, and exhibitors believed that their cats were Grands, when they were not. Exhibitors may then rely on the receipt of a Grand certificate, or erroneously believe that once the Grand points were earned, the cat was eligible to be shown as a Grand, and go on and show the cat as a Grand, risking all points being voided (SEE Rule 34.01, old SR 3.01).*

*The next part of the rule requires the exhibitor to respond to the written notice provided by Central Office if the claim form has not been received. However, the rule does not say when such a notice should be sent, nor how. This is the first item where we request a decision. **How many days after the cat has achieved its last qualifying ring should CO wait to send out the delinquency notice, and how should that notice be sent? The SRC recommends 45 days, thus giving the exhibitor time to mail it to CO from overseas, and notification by both snail mail AND e-mail.***

*The next part of the rule states "For those wins to be counted..." the claim form must be submitted within 20 days of the issuance of the notice of delinquency. There are several problems with this statement. First, there is no time frame for the sending of the notice of delinquency (see above); second, the penalty is unclear. There is question over whether this means wins will simply not be posted (achieving Grand title, finals as a Grand, titles won showing as a Grand), or EVERY title and win will be revoked (Grand points earned, qualifying rings earned, both or neither). The SRC recommends that the Grand points will be voided if no claim form is received, but the time period to submit the form should be extended.*

*The second issue is the requirement of the exhibitor to respond to any notice within 20 days. That may be a problem for people living in China, Russia, or other overseas countries where the exchange of mail may take significantly longer than 20 days. We would like to extend that requirement to 45 days from the date the notice is sent, and also require that CO send the notice to the last address, both snail mail and e-mail, provided on the entry form where the cat achieved its last qualifying ring. That data field is in the show data disk for the show in question. **We are asking the Board to extend the response time, either to 45 days or a different length of time of the Board's choosing.***

*The last part of the rule specifies that the exhibitor must not only submit a valid claim form to keep those champion/premier points earned, but also must submit BOTH the fee for the confirmation AND a late filing fee. However, the CFA Price List doesn't list any late filing fee, even though it is specifically called for by this rule. **The Board needs to establish such a fee, and it needs to be put in the current price list.***

*This rule provides NO guidance on what happens subsequently to the regional awards points earned at any point in the process, especially if the cat was shown as a grand when it should never have been entered as a grand (technically, rule 34.01 would void the points earned in finals by the cat if it was shown as a grand, but it would not cover points earned while competing as an open or champion/premier. This would be a complex scoring issue. If the claim form were*

eventually filed timely, the Grand points would be awarded, so the cat could have been entered as a grand per the rules as those points would now count - but if the form were not filed timely, then the grand points would go away, the title goes away, and entering as a grand would result in points earned being voided). Currently, cats are earning national and regional breed/division wins as NC CH/PR. The problem here is that **SOME** of the points earned are currently valid – those earned while being shown as an Open/Champion/Premier. That is because there is no provision in this or any other rule that would void points earned if the cat is in its correct class. The Board needs to decide if this should change. The SRC believes there needs to be a decision on the status of regional/global awards points earned by NC CH/PR cats. There are three options here. Option 1, the unclaimed CH/PR loses all RW/NW points earned **AFTER** it received its last qualifying ring as an Open (the point it was eligible to be shown as a CH/PR). Option 2, the unclaimed CH/PR forfeits all RW/NW points earned, including those earned validly as an Open (before the cat became eligible to claim the title of a CH/PR). A third option is to not forfeit any RW/NW points, other than those which are invalid because they are improperly earned as a Grand, when the cat is not eligible for showing as a Grand. **The Board needs to pick which of these three options should be implemented. [NOTE: the entire show at which the cat earned its final qualifying ring would be used for scoring purposes unless the cat transferred out of open on the second day of a two-day show, then only the first day would be used. Also, there may be computer difficulties in revising scores for those cats that ultimately forfeit some and keep some points earned].**

Finally, the rule says nothing about what happens to those qualifying rings earned over whatever period of time that was required to earn them. The SRC believes the cat should keep its qualifying rings if claimed within the time period already specified in show rule 27.05c, but forfeiting them is an option. The Board needs to determine if a cat should ever have to forfeit all of their qualifying rings and return to a show hall at some point again as an Open, or keep those qualifying rings until the claim form and fee are received, with the requirement of a late fee and completing the requirements within the time specified in rule 27.05c. **Please pick - a) forfeit all qualifying rings – it will be like the cat never attended a show as an adult and has to start completely over; or b) keeps the qualifying rings it earned towards its CH/PR title, and only needs to claim them within the time limits of 27.05c to get credit for them.**

### **Show Rule 27.05c – Allows up to Three Years to Obtain CH/PR Title**

Show rule 27.05c allows an exhibitor up to three years from the first show at which a cat earns a qualifying ring to claim that cat's champion or premier title. While this may have been necessary back in the days when only one winners ribbon was awarded in a color class, that is not the case today. If a cat is of sufficient quality to obtain the title, it can almost always be obtained at one show, two maximum. As such, there actually may no longer be a need for this time-limit rule. The CO tracks all qualifying rings, and when a cat has earned the required number, places a temporary title on that cat (NC CH or NC PR). The replacement of winners ribbons with qualifying ring rules have been in effect now for three years, so the likelihood that there is a cat that still needs to use any winners ribbons as part of its need to claim a CH/PR title is slim to none. Alternatively, the Board may want to utilize this rule to indicate that qualifying rings will be lost if not claimed within the three year time frame. The current rule implies that, but never says it. **Depending on how the Board decides on the above options, the Board may also want to consider reducing or eliminating the time limit required to file a claim form from the first**

*show at which qualifying rings were earned to a shorter timeframe than the three years currently specified by this rule. Either way, the SRC will clarify that if the claim form is not filed within the specified period, if there is one, that the qualifying rings earned as an open will be lost.*

**Hannon:** I don't know how we're supposed to deal with the next one. Is Monte supposed to join the call, or Carol, are you handling it? **Anger:** This is Rachel. I am supposed to email him and I will do that now. **Krzanowski:** Yes. He wants to be on the call.

[from after Agenda Item #6] **Hannon:** Monte, are you with us? **Phillips:** Yes, I am. **Hannon:** Alright. Let us discuss Show Rules. The floor is yours. **Phillips:** Oh, we're there already. **Hannon:** We passed that and we came back to you, so the floor is yours. **Phillips:** I hope everybody has read my report, so I can just run straight to the action items.

### **Action Items:**

*For each of the issues highlighted with an option, choose which option should be used in the development of rulemaking to clarify show rule 28.01. In summary those options were:*

*1 – How many days after the cat has achieved its last qualifying ring should CO wait to send out the delinquency notice, and how should that notice be sent? The SRC recommends 45 days, thus giving the exhibitor time to mail it to CO from overseas; and notification by both snail mail AND e-mail.*

**Phillips:** Basically, this is a rule that was changed back in 2001 – 8.06. The old rule basically said that once you got your championship, 6 qualifying rings, you couldn't even enter your cat until you confirmed your championship title. That was changed when we went to cats that were allowed to transfer from the first day to the second day of a two-day show. So, that's where this rule got revised. Since then, all sorts of things have gone wrong. The first issue is that Central Office needs to send out a request saying, "hey, you got your championship/premiership title and you still haven't sent in your confirmation." We're proposing a 45 day period and at the end of 45 days, that's when Central Office would send out the notice and they would send it out both snail mail and email to the last address listed on the show entry form when it got its last qualifying ring. **Hannon:** And they have how many days in which to respond? **Phillips:** We'll get to that. Right now, it's 20 in the rules. **McCullough:** Would it not be more simple to put a button on the entry form, collect the \$15 upon entry and none of this would be a problem? The \$15 seems to be the problem. It would go directly to CFA like a surcharge that would go to pay for the confirmation, we'll have our money up front, it gets its qualifying rings, and whoever is sending out the confirmations says, "congratulations, you are now a champion or premier." We have our money and their number, no rules, no penalty, no punishment. **Ganoe:** Steve, I think you are trying to put a lot of work on an entry clerk that is already probably overworked. If we put a button or a check box on an entry blank, that's automatically adding a fee determined by someone other than the club – the board – for getting a confirmation. I don't think changing when the claim is made to when you enter the show is a solution at all. **Hannon:** Lisa, as an entry clerk, would you comment on this? **Kuta:** Sure. I would think that it would be an issue, especially knowing how difficult it can be with certain clubs to figure out the finances. Also, having a record of payment from the club passing over the money to CFA and marking it as for

the confirmation. Unless entries are centralized, I don't see this working and I do see it as just another thing to kind of get confused and adding more problems. I do have a question. Do we know how many cats, say each month, go over the 45 days, or is that in the report and I missed it? **Hannon:** The problem is, we weren't following the show rules and notifying people throughout the year and it wasn't until towards the end of last show season that this came up. Ginger, do you want to address that part of it? **Meeker:** When we got to the end of the season, we found a bunch of cats that were actually holding regional wins, breed wins, color wins that were designated as NC/CH, NC/PR, which means their title had never been claimed and some of them had even been competing as grands without having paid for the championship. I would also like to speak to Steve's point. The option is available on the website to claim your championship before the show. You can go on the website, click in that shopping cart section and prepay for the championship. As soon as the show is scored, you are automatically confirmed. So, that option is available. I don't think we need to add more work to the entry clerk. What this rule covers is the folks that go to one show, maybe never come back again, the cat had 6 qualifying rings and just sits there. **McCullough:** If they don't come back, what's the damage? **Calhoun:** The other thing, I think it would add a level of complexity to this. It's not a given that when a cat comes to a show to qualify that they are going to qualify. They may not. There may be a reason why they get disqualified in one or more rings, so that adds another level of complexity. Now, they may go to another show and qualify. **Hannon:** If they prepay, Kathy, it doesn't matter when they qualify. It's upon qualifying that they become a champion or a premier. **Calhoun:** And I agree with that. My comment was relative to putting it on the entry form, because if it's part of the entry fee, then they will have to pay it again for the next show that they may go to, to complete qualification. **McCullough:** [inaudible] number of the cat on the entry form. **Hannon:** Steve, I don't hear support for your proposal here. **McCullough:** Well, I have no support for punishing people for not making the deadline that Central Office missed. I think that's punitive and not helpful. **Hannon:** We didn't penalize people for that, but we're now telling the Central Office that if we follow Monte's proposed show rule change, that in 45 days we will contact the owner of the cat. Is that correct, Monte? **Phillips:** That's correct. **Hannon:** That's a problem that we have had issues with following in the past. **Kuta:** One thing I do as entry clerk is, if somebody is new or whatever, I look the cats up in Herman to see how many points they have or if they are unclaimed, and I often tell the person, "hey, go claim your championship, here's how to do it online." I wonder if there's an easy way of doing this, like some sort of system to find "aging" ones and then have some sort of automated way to do that and maybe take care of half the problem? I know some people will probably never go to claim it, but I think there's a lot of people who just either don't know or forget. **Ganoe:** Lisa, that is on the list of things to do. When this came up at the end of last year, we started talking about how we could get the system to keep track of those things. We came upon several instances where there's not a valid email address or the mail address comes back, so we have to take into account all the different possibilities of how to contact these people, with the idea that ultimately we are not going to get them all. So, it is on the list to be prioritized, which I need to talk with others about. It's coming up in my IT report about prioritizing projects, but we are aware that that's needed in the system. **Schreck:** You know, there is a form right there in the catalog at every show that people can fill out and send in, for those who are uncomfortable doing it online, and maybe just a reminder at the show. I don't think putting it on the form is going to help at all. However, we also do know there's some problems with the system right now and that's not cleared up as of this point, so I think until that system is working a little better, I would not be in favor of putting this rule in

place because it's just too hard to deal with at this time. **DelaBar:** Also, this is a rule basically written for your 48 contiguous states. Very few exhibitors from Europe are going to be mailing in any type of confirmation. One, we don't use checks over here. We do it by a debit transfer system. Secondly, in bringing up the NC thing, this "not claimed" is actually showing up on cats' registration certificates. Is that going to be fixed? **Ganoe:** Yes. [dogs barking] I will take that as an editorial comment. **DelaBar:** Secondly, with the timeframes involved personally right now, if we decided on a specific procedure to take, I would like to see it held off until our computer notification system is up and running. Basically, that's how people from my region are going to be able to respond, is online. **Phillips:** The reason we proposed 45 days was exactly because of the overseas cats. Originally, we were thinking of 30 but the Show Rules Committee said, "hey, what about people overseas?" It probably takes them an extra 2 weeks for the mail to get to the U.S., and that's why we proposed 45 days. **Hannon:** She's saying they are not going to send mail, they're going to do it online. **Phillips:** That's even better, because they can do it online anytime. To speak to a point Lisa made, I've already done my confirmations on every kitten. As soon as I register it, I do a confirmation. It's good for year, so if you get out at the right time, 7 months, no problem. **DelaBar:** We're still trying to attract people to CFA and get them to understand about championship claim forms. So, you're not going to be seeing automatic action like that yet. **Phillips:** Like I said, the concern we have right now is, we require Central Office to send out a notice but it doesn't tell them when to send it. We would like to at least give them a time frame. **Hannon:** I don't see any harm with the first part of Monte's proposal, which is to give the Central Office a time frame in which they should be following up. **Schreck:** The problem is, you can follow up from here to tomorrow, but if the system is not allowing it to go through, why are you sending out notices? If somebody goes online and tries to change it and it doesn't work, you're doing the effort for nothing. **Ganoe:** I will admit that the claim process has not been smooth in the past. Recent traffic between James, myself and our supplier have gone over this very carefully and we are confident that it is now working correctly. **Schreck:** It is not working correctly. Tim was there today and we had to do one of our cats manually. There's no global fix that works right now. If you have a premier that was shown as a whole cat, it will not let you put in that claim. **Hannon:** Is the claim working for the championship? **Schreck:** I believe it's working for the championship, but I don't know that for sure. I know that it is still not working for premier claims. **Ganoe:** Barb, if Tim is having difficulties with the system, it would behoove him to let me know so that I can report it correctly. I'm a little chagrined that he's not letting me know what problems he finds. **Schreck:** He had a conversation earlier with Dick, I think. **Ganoe:** Dick is not the IT chair. **Schreck:** Well, this is a personal situation that I'm reporting, then. **Ganoe:** Understood. **Hannon:** Monte? **Phillips:** The rule says it has to be sent, but it doesn't say when to send it. I don't have a problem with – **Hannon:** I thought it said the Central Office had to send it out within 45 days. **Phillips:** No. That's what I'm proposing. The rule doesn't say anything about when, it just says that Central Office will send a notice. Who knows when, a year? Two years? **DelaBar:** Why don't we take this in two parts? **Phillips:** I've got it in six parts. **DelaBar:** Yes, I noticed. The first part, the main question is, let's give an answer of when Central Office has to send this out, so Monte, make a motion that it has to be within 45 days. **Hannon:** Monte can't make the motion. Do you want to make the motion? **DelaBar:** Monte's liaison can make the motion that Central Office must send this out in 45 days. Then we can go on to the next point. **Krzanowski:** I will make that motion. **Eigenhauser:** George seconds. **Hannon:** Is there any more discussion on allowing us to put into the show rule 45 days after the show, if it's not claimed Central Office will follow up. **McCullough:** At the

close of the show date or when it's received in CFA? **Phillips:** The 45 days would start with the actual end of the show. That would be the day that starts the count. **Hannon:** Any other questions or comments? **Mastin:** I've got a question for Dennis. Is 45 days realistic? **Ganoe:** It depends upon whether you want the computer to do it or if you're going to put it on the staff to do these manually. I think 45 days for doing an automated system is a little aggressive. **Hannon:** Here's my suggestion – that we pass the rule and make it effective when the computer system is operating correctly for championship and premiership claims. **Phillips:** You guys are getting way ahead of me there. **Eigenhauser:** We're not passing a rule; we're asking Monte to create a rule for us to pass at some future date. **Phillips:** When I give you a full rule, I was under the assumption it was going to go into effect with the 2015 show season. **Eigenhauser:** Yes. We're way ahead of ourselves here. All he is looking for is guidance on how to pass a rule that we're going to consider. **Phillips:** Exactly. That's all we're looking for. **Hannon:** Alright, so next show season. Dennis, do you think this will be working by next show season? **Ganoe:** God, I hope so. **Hannon:** Alright then. We've got a motion on the floor and it has been seconded, that starting next show season, 45 days after the close of the show, if somebody has not claimed their championship or premiership, Central Office will send them a follow-up reminder. **Eigenhauser:** No. That's not the motion. The motion is, we're going to ask Monte to draft a rule saying that. **Phillips:** Right. You'll get the rule at the October board meeting. **Hannon:** OK. All those in favor of giving Monte some direction.

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

**Hannon:** Alright Monte, we expect to see a show rule in October.

*2 - Can we extend the response time to 45 days, or would you like a different length? If a different length is decided, what should that length be?*

**Hannon:** On to the next part. **Phillips:** The next point is response time. Right now, the rule requires a 20 day response time. We would like to extend that to 45, as well. Or, we can pick 30, as well. **Hannon:** But you are saying 45. Carol, are you making that motion? **Krzanowski:** Yes, I am making that motion. **Hannon:** A second, and then we can discuss. **Eigenhauser:** George seconds. **Hannon:** Let's hear comments. Who wants to comment on it? **DelaBar:** I would like to see 60 days on that, just because of the different response times and languages. Let me give you an idea what's going on. When official information comes out from CFA, I have right now 3 interpreters that are making sure people understand what they're getting. I have 2 for Russian and 1 for French and Spanish, so I want a little extra time to make sure these people don't get pitched out because of having to have an interpreter, since English is the official language of CFA. **Hannon:** One of my concerns is, when we get towards the end of the show season, somebody who may be getting an award could end up with a cat that's an NC cat. Let's say they are getting a regional or national kitten win and they go ahead and show the cat, and they forgot to claim it. They could be getting an award that says NC/CH or something. **Kuta:** Do we know how many cats this has affected? Also, why was 45 days chosen? **Hannon:** Ginger can answer the first part and Monte can answer the second part. Ginger, do you remember how many cats were affected at the end of last show season? **Meeker:** I sure do. It was 88. **Phillips:** The reason we had 45 days, again, was to allow time for people to mail from overseas. **Hannon:** We don't need to deal with that, according to Pam, because they're not going to be sending stuff through the mail overseas. **Phillips:** You're talking about Region 9. What about the International

Division, China, Korea, Kuwait, Guam? **Hannon:** Do they send stuff through the mail with a check? **Phillips:** That I don't know. **Hannon:** I'm asking Dick. **Kallmeyer:** Once in a while they do. What we find is that a lot of times they will package 50 or 60 registrations and throw everything in one package. **DelaBar:** But they are giving a credit card number for that. They're not writing checks. **Kallmeyer:** Sometimes they have a U.S. checking account. **Hannon:** I don't think it matters how they are paying for it. The question is, how long do we need to give them to snail mail stuff. Monte said he put the 45 days in so that people overseas could snail mail. You're saying that in Europe they don't snail mail. Dick is saying that they tend to bundle things in Asia and snail mail them. **Eigenhauser:** First of all, remember, all we're asking at this point is for Monte to draft a rule for us to look at in October, so if we pick 45 or 60 or 30 or 10 or 5 days, we can change our mind in October. All this will do is to give Monte guidance. Currently, the rule is 20 days, so we're more than doubling it. This isn't a new rule, this is extending the time to more than twice what it is now, so I really don't think we need to beat it to death today. Just give Monte a sense of the board and move on, and we can take it up in October if somebody decides 30 would be better or 60 would be better or whatever, but it's currently 20. That's probably too short. If we vote down 45, it goes back to being 20, so I think we're overcomplicating this. All Monte is looking for is a general sense. Do we want to extend it? Yes. Is 45 days the right ballpark? Probably. Would 60 be better? Let's fine tune it later. **Meeker:** I think everybody needs to remember that this came about because we had cats that did not claim championships and went on to enter additional shows as grand champions when they felt they had enough points, even though they hadn't claimed their championship or their premiership. They kept track of their points, when they hit the magic 75 or 200 or whatever their region or division happened to require. Even not claiming their champion or premier, they entered shows as a grand. This puts them in violation of other show rules. **Hannon:** Any other comments on Carol's motion? **McCullough:** These same people sending out these delinquency notices, are they the same ones who let this slip through the crack or do we have a new set of people? **Hannon:** We hopefully will have a new Executive Director on September 2 and we will leave it to her to get this accomplished. **McCullough:** Thank you. **Hannon:** Any other comments? Can we vote?

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

*3 - The Board needs to establish the late filing fee amount (the Board needs to pick the amount, but the SRC feels it should be at least \$15.00 – the current amount for the claim form), and it needs to be put in the current price list.*

**Hannon:** Monte, your next part. **Phillips:** The third issue says, a late filing fee is supposed to be paid if you don't file your championship and you wait to get the notice from Central Office. That's been in the rules forever. The filing fee in the past has actually been in the rule book before we took all the fees out, and it was exactly the same amount as the amount for the confirmation, so we're proposing a \$15 late filing fee to be put into the fees section of the website. **Hannon:** Carol, you want to make that motion? **Krzanowski:** Yes. So moved. **Eigenhauser:** Second. **Hannon:** Any discussion?

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

*4 – The Board needs to decide if NC CH/PR cats will be able to retain, or forfeit, any points earned for national and regional awards, including breed awards. A time frame for points lost*



*should be provided, i.e. forfeit points earned after last Qualifying Ring, or any other time frame until the filing of the championship claim form and fee. [NOTE: the entire show would be used for scoring purposes unless the cat transferred out of open on the second day of a two-day show, then only the first day would be used.]*

**Hannon:** Monte, next part. **Phillips:** Now we get to Ginger's point, and that has to do with the championship and premiership cats that have grand points that are held in abeyance. The rules are very clear in that respect. The current rule says basically the abeyance points – the grand points – go away if you don't file your claim form within the timeframe specified in the rule. They're gone. But, there's nothing that talks about national or regional award points, which gets to the issue of a complicated mess, because technically those cats that showed as a grand, all those were wrong entries and therefore all those points should have been voided for violation of Show Rule 3.01. They were entered in the wrong class. That's a mess. So, we would like to try to make it somewhat simple by saying basically that you forfeit the points earned after your last qualifying ring, period, if you haven't filed a claim form by 45 days. **Hannon:** If they picked up points in their qualifying rings and that still would get them a breed win, then that would be OK? **Phillips:** That would be OK. **Hannon:** But anything beyond that that they picked up would be voided? **Phillips:** Correct. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion? **Eigenhauser:** I don't understand this. **McCullough:** Steve doesn't understand it, either. **Eigenhauser:** I'm trying to figure out how we're forfeiting points after the last qualifying ring when the qualifying ring refers back to being an open. Everybody earns points after their last qualifying ring. In ancient times, you couldn't earn points until your last qualifying ring. **Hannon:** If you were an open and your cat was 7<sup>th</sup> best cat in the final, you picked up some [regional/national] points as an open. **Phillips:** Yes. You still do. **Eigenhauser:** We're only talking about regional and national points now, then. **Hannon:** Or breed points. **Eigenhauser:** We're not talking about champion and premier points. **Phillips:** Correct. Not champion and premier points. **Hannon:** If we voided the grand and we voided the regional win, they still might be 2<sup>nd</sup> best Lilac Persian in the region because of the points they picked up as an open. **Phillips:** Correct. **Hannon:** Is there anybody else now that doesn't understand what Monte is proposing? **Phillips:** We're talking regional/national award points, which come from 3 things; they come from finals, they come from best or second best of breed – **Eigenhauser:** In the judges' books, opens and champions are the same. **Phillips:** Central Office knows the difference. **Eigenhauser:** But I'm saying, for purposes of how they are judged on the table, the judge doesn't know whether they are an open or champion. **Hannon:** What's your point? **Eigenhauser:** My thought is that it doesn't matter whether they have reached the last qualifying ring or not for regional and national points. I would make the breaking point for not allowing them to earn regional and national points the first time they enter as a grand when they're not, rather than tying it to a qualifying ring, which determines their status as an open or champion, which the judge isn't judging. **Phillips:** That gets messy and I'll explain why. You would then be scoring the points for the national and regional awards, while you would be voiding the points for the champion; e.g., the grand points if they did not file a claim form by the end of the deadline. That's the rule right now. **Ganoe:** Monte and George, I want to propose a scenario and have you explain how the rule, as you propose it, would address it. I have a cat that I take to a show on the first of the month, gets its 6 qualifying rings. I then show it again the second and third weeks of that month and I make finals and earn grand points, but I haven't yet claimed my champion. I do that several more weeks until I get the notice from Central Office at 45 days that I haven't claimed it. I then immediately claim my title. What happens to the points that I earned between – **Phillips:** You keep it all. **Ganoe:** I keep it all. **Hannon:** The only people

who pay the penalty are the people who did not, within 45 days plus 45 days, submit their claim form. **Ganoe:** OK. So, if I continue to show but still don't claim, I'm basically in violation of entering my cat in the wrong category and I'm forfeiting all my points. **Phillips:** At the end of 90 days, that would be true. What you would lose then – right now, regardless of what we change – you would lose all those grand points. Every grand point you ever earned would be gone.

**Hannon:** In theory, not in practicality. **Phillips:** No, not in theory. That's exactly what rule 8.06 says right now. **Hannon:** I'm telling you that Central Office doesn't do it. **Phillips:** That means they are not following the show rules. I can't help you there. **McCullough:** Back to my question if we're getting new people. **Ganoe:** As far as showing and scoring goes, it's not a new person. It's Shirley. **Krzanowski:** I think the point that we're trying to clear up here is that the wording was rather vague in the show rules. It was kind of a mess, and Monte is just trying to get some direction to clear it up so that they are specific. It spells out what Central Office is to do, it spells out what the exhibitors are to do. He will come back with an actual rule for our October meeting.

**Hannon:** But he is also adding the price you will pay for not following the rules. You will lose your regional and national points. **Phillips:** I hate to say this, but if you read the rule, unless you have a degree in logic or at least have taken a few courses in logic, you may have difficulty understanding, from the way the rule is currently written, that if you don't file your claim form within that 20 days of notice, you're going to forfeit all your grand points. That's what the rule says, but you practically need a degree in logic to figure that out. **Hannon:** But you are going to spell it out real simple? **Phillips:** Very simple. **Hannon:** OK. **Phillips:** The question isn't the grand points, because that issue we've already got resolved in the rule. The question is the regional and national award points. There's nothing that talks about those. **Schreck:** As Treasurer, I think we ought to allow this if they would pay us a snappy fine, if they miss the deadline. We have a lot of people in the ID, we have language problems, and then we have some people in the U.S. who just forget to do things. So, I don't really like taking things away from people that they have won legitimately, or in their minds legitimately won points or an award of some kind. I think we need to find some way that they could correct the problem. **Meeker:** The point I would like to make is, we're looking at two different issues here. We first have to help Monte develop a clear, concise show rule. How that show rule is monitored and enforced in Central Office is a totally different issue and will be incumbent upon the new executive director. Thank you. **McCullough:** So, what if Central Office stubs their toe and they miss one or two here and there, and this gets on down the road. What's the penalty on CFA for not getting the notice put out? I mean, why are we putting all the onus on the exhibitor – fining them, penalizing them, ripping off their awards? What if Central Office just flat forget them and they are still sitting in an envelope in the basement for 2 months? **Hannon:** We faced that last year.

**McCullough:** Did you send them an apology and give them their certificate? **Hannon:** We gave them their award. **Phillips:** Here's the problem with the rule, Steve. If Central Office never sends them a notice, the clock never starts to void the wins. They are all held in abeyance forever practically. That's the grand points. Like I said, there's nothing that talks about the regional and national award points, so technically they would happily accrue right now because there's nothing that says what happens with those. **Meeker:** Up until we discovered this problem this year, those titles had been awarded and no one even knew what was going on. We're trying to fix a situation that's been in arrears for a number of years. So, I think we need to help Monte and give him all the guidance he needs to make a clear, succinct, easy-to-follow rule and then we'll work with the new executive director to make sure that the employees at Central Office understand and follow through and support the show rules. **Hannon:** I'm going to call the

question. **Phillips:** I hate to say this, but I've already lost track of what Carol's motion is.

**Hannon:** They lose their regional and national points.

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Schreck and McCullough voting no.

**Hannon:** Those last two were Steve and Barb, voting no? **Schreck:** Correct for me, yes.

**Hannon:** Steve, you voted against this? **McCullough:** Yes, I did. I voted against it.

*5 – The Board should determine if, at some length of time with the Championship claim form and fee unfiled, the cat will have to forfeit all Qualifying Rings and return to a show as an Open; or continue to keep the QR it earned toward the CH/PR title and allow it to be claimed when the owner does send the form and fee, along with the late fee.*

**Hannon:** Monte, back to you. **Phillips:** OK, point #5, and frankly I'm fine with leaving it the way it is. The question here is, should the cat also forfeit the qualifying rings it earns if it doesn't file a claim form within 90 days? Right now, the answer would be no. **Hannon:** Carol, are you making a motion? **Krzanowski:** Yes. I so move that we should not have a cat forfeit all the qualifying rings. **Hannon:** Is there a second? **Meeker:** I'll second it. **Hannon:** Is there discussion? **DelaBar:** Can you state your motion in the positive? **Krzanowski:** A cat would keep its qualifying rings earned, regardless of whether it filed a claim form timely. **Hannon:** Pam, is that alright? **DelaBar:** That works. **Hannon:** The wording works for you, OK.

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.** McCullough voting no.

**Hannon:** Steve did you oppose? **McCullough:** I did. **Hannon:** Alright, so Steve was the only negative vote, motion carried.

*6 – Reduce, eliminate, or leave alone the current requirement in show rule 27.05c that a claim form must be filed within three years of the time the cat first attends a show and earns qualifying rings.*

**Phillips:** The last issue has to do with rule 8.05c. Back in the good old days, when cats actually had to compete for winners ribbons, 8.05c was in place because cats sometimes would take more than 3 years to get that last winners ribbon. Under the current system of qualifying rings, every cat that's there who doesn't get disqualified is getting qualifying rings, so the likelihood of them taking 3 years to get their 6 qualifying rings (or 4, depending on where you are), is slim to none. This rule, by the way, has been in effect now for 3 years. We would propose just getting rid of rule 8.05c completely. It's not necessary anymore. **Hannon:** Carol, are you making the motion? **Krzanowski:** Yes. I move that we eliminate that show rule, that a claim form must be filed within 3 years of the time the cat first attends and earns a qualifying ring. **Hannon:** Is there a second? **McCullough:** Second. **Hannon:** Alright, you want to discuss? **DelaBar:** Yes. You're saying 8.05c. Here I'm reading 27.05c. **Phillips:** Now I'll put the clarification in. These rules are written to the revamp version. The revamp version has 2 rule numbers – 27.05c and 28.01. You will notice at the very beginning, it says *Old Rule – 8.05c and 8.06*. **DelaBar:** Not in the board report that I have. It says, *Reduce, eliminate, or leave alone the current requirement in show rule 27.05c*. **Phillips:** Go back to the very beginning of the Show Rules Committee report, second item, **Current Wording of Show Rule 27.05c and 28.01 (OLD RULES 8.05c & 8.06)**. **DelaBar:** That's where I was also getting to my point of, let's keep it

simple on our reports. Under Action Items, it should be stated, to eliminate whatever, OK?  
**Phillips:** It will be 27.05c then. **DelaBar:** OK. **Hannon:** Any other discussion?

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

**Time Frame:**

*At the current board meeting.*

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

*Based on the choices made for the above options at the August Board meeting, we will draft a revised rule for the October Board meeting to resolve the problems with Show Rule 28.01.*

*Respectfully Submitted,  
Monte Phillips, Chair*

**Hannon:** Monte? **Phillips:** I'm done.

**(5) WORLD SHOW UPDATE.**

**Committee Chair: Rich Mastin**  
**List of Committee Members: Rachel Anger, Mark Hannon, Jodell Raymond, Ed Raymond, Barb Schreck & Rich Mastin**

---

*Hampton Inn is under contract for; Judges, Central Office Team, Sponsors and BAOS.*

*Additional hotel contracts/blocks are being put in place for: Extended Stay, Staybridge, Sonesta, Motel 6, Homewood Suites and Hilton Garden. All hotels accepting pets with either refundable or non-refundable deposit.*

*Show licenses have been submitted.*

*Show flier may be available by the end of this week; was reported to be available by the end of July at the annual, delays with hotel contract agreements prevented us in having it done in time.*

*Entry Clerk Monte Philips.*

*Entries will be accepted on Monday September 29<sup>th</sup> at 4:00 Pm EDT and closing on Wednesday November 5<sup>th</sup> at 12:00 noon EDT*

*Entry Fees: All Fees paid in U.S. funds*

<i>1<sup>st</sup> Entry (includes catalog).....</i>	<i>\$69</i>
<i>2<sup>nd</sup> Entry (same owner).....</i>	<i>\$59</i>
<i>3<sup>rd</sup> &amp; Additional Entries (same owner).....</i>	<i>\$49</i>
<i>Agility Only Entry.....</i>	<i>\$30</i>
<i>Agility as additional (cat already entered).....</i>	<i>\$10</i>
<i>Extra half cage* (double cage for entered cat).....</i>	<i>\$30</i>
<i>Double Sales Cage.....</i>	<i>\$35</i>
<i>Groom Space (full cage space).....</i>	<i>\$35</i>
<i>Substitution Fee.....</i>	<i>\$15</i>
<i>End-of-Row (no charge for handicap).....</i>	<i>\$35</i>
<i>(Extremely Limited)</i>	
<i>Returned Check Fee.....</i>	<i>\$50</i>
<i>Payment received after Nov 19 but before start of show.....</i>	<i>\$50</i>
<i>Payment received after start of show.....</i>	<i>\$75</i>

*Photographers: Chanan, Larry Johnson and Tetsu*

*Check in: Tentatively scheduled for Friday November 21<sup>st</sup> 4:00 pm to 8:00 pm and Saturday November 22<sup>nd</sup> 6:30 am to 8:00 am*

*Show will start at 8:30 am both Saturday and Sunday*

*BAOS held at Hampton Inn*

*Respectfully Submitted,  
Rich Mastin, Chair*

**Hannon:** Let's move on to the World Show update with Rich. **Mastin:** You have the report in front of you. Does anybody have any questions? **DelaBar:** Hampton Inn now serves meals, or are there restaurants nearby? **Mastin:** There are restaurants in walking distance. They also serve a breakfast in the morning. **Hannon:** Any other World Show questions? **Ganoe:** Have you got all the information you need and support you need from Kathy Durdick for the web stuff? **Hannon:** Ed, do we have all the stuff we need for the flyer? **Raymond:** Kathy has the site set up and we have the link, so we have everything we need from her for the time being. **Ganoe:** OK, thanks.

[from after Show Rules Report] **Phillips:** The only other question I have is, did I miss the World Show update? **Hannon:** Yes. **Phillips:** Oh well. I'm getting questions like crazy about what's the show hotel, when are we going to open entries, and I keep telling them, "I don't know yet." **McCullough:** Call Rich. **Hannon:** Rich, why don't you address when we're going to start taking entries? **Mastin:** OK. I've got to pull out my paperwork. **Hannon:** Ed, do you remember? **Mastin:** I think it's September 29<sup>th</sup>, right? **Raymond:** That's correct. **Mastin:** September 29<sup>th</sup> at 4:00 p.m. Eastern. **Hannon:** The hotels, we should have that finalized within the next couple days. We're just finishing up the contracts. There's more than one hotel. There's no one hotel that has enough rooms, so we have a variety of hotels for people to stay at. **Phillips:** As long as we get it up on the blog in a week, I'll be happy.

<http://www.cfaworldshow.org/>

(6) **FINANCE COMMITTEE.**

*Committee Chair: Rich Mastin*  
*List of Committee Members: Chuck Gradowski, Ed Raymond, Barb Schreck*

---

*Central Office employees are scheduled to be converted to the State Exchange plans as of September 1, 2014. Insurance Rep (Chris Vanderzyden, Whitaker-Myers Benefit Plans) to meet with each employee to review options and expense. Going forward health insurance benefits will be available through the Exchange. Rationale: less expensive for the majority (far less for younger aged employees), plans have better benefits, some employees may be eligible for subsidies/tax credits, group plans are being based on age and insurance companies are projecting 13% to 18% increase in rates for 2015.*

*All annual hotel contracts are at Central Office available through Verna Dobbins with limited access and approval.*

*Discussing options to invest money sitting in the bank.*

*CFA Show Sponsorship requests submitted to Verna Dobbins and normally reviewed and approved within 24 hours. Delays in turnaround may be due to; incomplete information, show not licensed, missing contact information or show date(s).*

*Respectfully Submitted,  
Rich Mastin, Chair*

**Hannon:** While we are waiting on Monte, Rich, do you want to go to the Financial Committee Report? **Mastin:** Sure. One of the things that has been outstanding that needed to be finalized was the health insurance plans for the employees, and it was determined the best plan for the employees and CFA was to offer the exchange plans to each of the employees. A lot of this had to do with the cost for the individual plan, what was available in terms of the plan in comparison to what we currently had, and the increased price that is supposed to be coming down in January 2015 for all the different insurance carriers. One of the other benefits for the exchange plans was the subsidies and tax credits available to some of our current individuals, whereas they don't have that available to them under our plan. So, going forward, we will no longer offer an in-house health insurance plan. It will all be done through the state exchange. **Hannon:** Rich, I think it would be informative for the board to know how many people in the Central Office we were insuring. **Mastin:** I may need Verna to help me. I believe it was 4 individuals were insured at the present time through Central Office, one was out on their exchange and one was in the qualifying period. **Hannon:** OK, so we're talking about a minority of the employees that are involved in insurance through CFA. The others had insurance through other sources, right? **Mastin:** They either had insurance through other sources, and I believe one of them did not have insurance at all.

[discussion goes to Executive Session, due to specific employee coverages]

**Hannon:** OK, Dennis, IT Update. Rich, did we finish with the Financial? **Mastin:** The only thing I had left to report that was outstanding from the February board meeting, there was a request to have all the annual hotel contracts at Central Office available. Verna has those and they are available, with limited access with approval, so if the board members want to see it or have a need for it, I have no objection to allowing them to see it, but I don't know that we want to pass it on any further than the board members. That was all I had.



(7) **IT UPDATE.**

*Committee Chair: Dennis Ganoë, Dick Kallmeyer*  
*List of Committee Members: James Simbro*

---

**Hannon:** OK, Dennis, IT. **Ganoë:** OK, IT report. I did not submit a written one, so hang on. There's going to be a few statistics and some dates in this. If I could ask board members not to interject until I get done, and then we can cover your specifics, because we're all breeders and exhibitors, and this system affects all of us in different ways. My report comes from data I got from James this morning. I hope he shared that with you, Verna, because I hope none of this is a surprise to you at all. **Dobbins:** I'm listening, thank you.

**Ganoë:** In-house eCat litter registrations are proceeding. Right now, as you all probably know, we have 3 ways that they can submit a registration application: they can mail it in, which is the printed U.S. Postal Service; they can go onto the website eCat and submit it through the application that we have there; or they can go to the old cfa.org web forms and submit it. First, I will deal with eCat. eCat is just about current – “current” means that we are within our 10 day window. That's all that “current” means. It doesn't mean that if you submitted it this morning, it's done this afternoon. That may happen, but “current” in our service level agreement is 10 days, so we're within 10 days on eCat. The web forms I am told are processing July 24<sup>th</sup> submissions. That puts them about 2 weeks behind on the web forms. The snail mail that comes in U.S. Postal Service, I'm not really certain about these dates because I've got dates for 3 different people and I'm not certain why the dates are different between the individuals. The oldest date of the 27<sup>th</sup> of June is current processing date. The others are more recent than that. We are catching up. It is not going as fast as we hoped, but eCat still remains your best bet for registering cats and kittens. I'm told that the processing does not have major issues right now. There are minor issues and there are some outages. We switched the system to a different set of servers to improve our connectivity. CompuTan moved the system and the database optimizations to speed up our processing. We are monitoring that to make sure those changes come to fruition and we get faster processing speed.

**Ganoë:** National and regional scoring is moving along. We posted May 31/June 1 weekend and that was the first weekend that we have not had ePoint reporting problems with kittens. Most of our kitten scoring problems were with the split season idea, so that was the first one that went all the way through without any problems with kittens. We're still seeing sometimes problems with scoring a cat when they have had a color change during their scoring career. Sometimes they get reported twice. We are looking at that currently. Shirley is pretty much able to gain ground and is catching up. We do have some accessory reports that CompuTan has done for us so that Shirley can verify the data faster.

**Ganoë:** A few statistics about defects on the system. As of July 1<sup>st</sup>, we had about 100 defects that we found and had reported to CompuTan. They have closed about 2/3rds of them. The others remain open and we're actively searching to get them to focus on them. The focus is on our points reporting, certificate printing, the champion/premier confirmation and grand certificates, as well as getting the finance reports for Diane out as fast and as well as we can.

Typical turn-around time for our smaller issues is about 24 to 48 hours, the bigger priority issues are taking 1 or 2 weeks for us to get fixed.

**Ganoe:** We were also tasked with doing training. I have reports that registration training was offered and was given to several people, 2 hours total. Additional people are trained to handle simply the eCat registration. I'm not mentioning names, although I do have names of who was trained. I don't want to do that in open session. Online litters are mainly automatic, with only having to handle the help for review litters, which are those that have a non-breeder owned sire or other issues with the litter. We're finding that the Orientals when they have their outcrosses, especially with Bali/Javi, we have to handle all those manually. The old system did it that way, as well. We have trained people on confirmations and refresh training on the scanning for the scanner system.

**Ganoe:** Speaking of scanning, we are up and running with the scanning project. Kristi has been using it to scan in protest documents from the beginning, and we began using it for daily work scanning on August 7<sup>th</sup>. That required some additional training. When we have a couple weeks' worth of scanning done for when the work comes in, we will optimize it. That should happen later this month.

**Ganoe:** That was a lot to digest. Let's have it. **Hannon:** First, Verna, do you want to comment on any of this? **Dobbins:** No, I'm good. Thank you. **Hannon:** Alright. My first question would be about the eCat, where you're saying we're within 10 days but I thought we were processing that within 2. **Ganoe:** Our service level agreement is 10 days, so what we call it is "current". It usually happens within 1 or 2, maybe 3 days depending on when you filed it. I did one on a Friday evening and I just got it today. That's still current, even though it wasn't immediate. **Hannon:** My concern is, I don't want to put the word out it's taking 10 days to process eCat if it's really taking 2 or 3. **Ganoe:** It gets to be tricky when we try to manage expectations. If we say 1 or 2 days and then we slip, but we stay within our 10, are we managing the expectation of our customer correctly, when our agreement for them is to turn it around within 10 days? We often do it much faster, is what I'm saying, but we're current within our agreement on providing service. **Hannon:** Can we tell our customers – because they are asking all of us about this – that we are processing eCats within 10 days but frequently it's much faster? **Ganoe:** That is perfectly acceptable and correct. **Hannon:** So, that's how board members should respond when people ask. **Kuta:** Do we know what the error rate is on eCat? I've heard from a couple people in my region saying they made a mistake or CFA made a mistake. Do we know how many times this is happening and what the correction process is? **Ganoe:** I'm going to make a guess that I know who has been talking to you, and I believe that it was the aforementioned Oriental system, and Balinese/Javanese. **Kuta:** No, it's somebody else. **Ganoe:** OK. We have a lot of manual ones that have to be done. I can probably institute some statistical gathering on that, but at this point statistics is playing second fiddle to getting it caught up. **Hannon:** What she's talking about is errors. **Ganoe:** Correct. And are you talking about errors by the system or errors by the operator, because the breeder is actually entering the data. **Kuta:** Both. **Ganoe:** If they enter it incorrectly, do we call that an error on the system or an error on the entry? **Kuta:** I would say an error on the entry, but is it any more or less laborious to get that fixed? **Ganoe:** Actually, it's not any more laborious, because usually we send an email back to them saying, "This is what you did. If it is acceptable by the rules, we'll go ahead and do it as you entered it and we've got documentation of what was entered." If it was not according to the rules and we

can't complete it because data was entered incorrectly, we send that back by email right away.

**Kuta:** OK. **Hannon:** Anybody else have a question or comment? **Kallmeyer:** Point out, too, when you hear about errors, try and get the details so we can pinpoint what the problem is, because sometimes people think they are doing eCat but they are really doing online entry, which is not quite the same. It's a manual process, so try and track down the details and the person so we can investigate and find out the root cause for some of these things. One problem we have, too, is people condense a timeframe that something might have happened 3 months ago, and they will talk about it happening. We really have to tie down when and where and the details. **Kuta:** Thank you. I have been keeping a log and I've made people give me times and dates when they have them. I have about 10 open items for both eCat and the old system. Where is the best place for me or the person to submit them? **Hannon:** Verna, do you want to answer that question?

**Ganoe:** [support@cfa.org](mailto:support@cfa.org) **Hannon:** That's not necessarily true. Verna? **Dobbins:** Yes. **Hannon:** People that have errors. **Dobbins:** If they are having a lot of errors, I would say send them to me to investigate. **Hannon:** It may not be a computer error. It may be a human error, so sending it to [support@cfa.org](mailto:support@cfa.org) is going to send it to James. James may not be the right party. **Kuta:** Most of these are probably user error and confusion, so I am just trying to get them to document it in as clear a way as possible and write down exactly what they are hoping to get done, instead of just being angry. So, have them go to Verna, then? **Hannon:** Is that what you want, Verna? **Dobbins:** Send it to me. We will investigate it. **Hannon:** So, the answer for all of us, if people have a concern, is to contact Verna and Verna will investigate it and get back to them. **DelaBar:** I just want to say, thank you very much Verna. She has tracked down some problems from Region 9 and has gotten them resolved. I want to say publicly, thank you. **Dobbins:** My pleasure.

**Hannon:** Thank you for publicly thanking her. Dennis, do you have anything else? **Ganoe:** That's all I've got. I will talk with you later about priorities, but we can do that outside of the meeting.

(8) **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR UPDATE.**

**Hannon:** The next thing on the agenda is the Executive Director Update. My purpose of putting it in the agenda is just to get it into the minutes, so that we have it for historical purposes. All I want to do is reprint the data that was on the CFA News announcement indicating who was selected for the job and when she is reporting for work.



## CFA-News

July 28, 2014

The CFA Board of Directors is pleased to announce the appointment of Teresa Barry as Executive Director effective September 2, 2014. A resident of Masillon, Ohio, Ms. Barry comes to CFA with over 20 years in non-profit executive management. Her most recent position was serving as Chief Executive Officer for Meals on Wheels of Stark and Wayne Counties where she was responsible for setting the direction, vision and mission of the organization as well as engaging all funders and community stakeholders for a multi-million dollar not-for-profit agency. She held that position for 16 years and prior to that she served as the Executive Director for the same organization for six years. She worked with their Board of Directors, committee chairs, volunteers, and paid staff ... similar to what she will be required to do as CFA's Executive Director.

The position of Director of Operations was a temporary position created upon the departure of CFA's Executive Director in 2010 until such time as the Board hired a new Executive Director. Donna Jean Thompson was hired to fill the Director of Operations position in 2011. She understood it was a temporary position and it met with her own plans to retire several years later. Donna Jean's retirement is effective next Friday, August 2, 2014. We all wish Donna Jean well in

her retirement from the work world. She will continue to judge shows which means we will continue to see her at our shows and she will continue to enjoy handling and evaluating our cats.

Verna Dobbins has been promoted to the position of Director of CFA Services. In addition to performing in that role, she will run the office during the month of August after Donna Jean's departure until the arrival of our new Executive Director.



---

*A Publication of*  
**The Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc.®**

---

World's Largest Registry  
of Pedigreed Cats

---



**(9) SHOW LICENSE CHANGE FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE FELINE FANCIERS.**

*The clubs want to change their format for their January 24/25, 2015 show to add an allbreed ring. The show is licensed, so this change requires board approval.*

**Action Item:** *Grant an exception to Show Rule 12.04 and allow the New Hampshire Feline Fanciers to change its show license to add an allbreed ring, from 6 Allbreed/1 Specialty/7 HHP rings to 7 Allbreed/1 Specialty/7-8 HHP rings at its January 24/25, 2015 show in Dover, New Hampshire (Region 1).*

**Hannon:** Geri Fellerman has something about the New Hampshire Feline Fanciers.  
**Fellerman:** Yes, I do. New Hampshire Feline Fanciers has already licensed a show for January 24/25, 2015, and it was licensed as a 6 allbreed, 1 specialty, but they would like to add another allbreed ring, making it 7 allbreed, 1 specialty. **Hannon:** Because it's already licensed, it requires board action. **Fellerman:** Correct. **Hannon:** So, are you making a motion, Geri?  
**Fellerman:** I'm making a motion that we permit New Hampshire Feline Fanciers to add one allbreed ring to their already-licensed show. **Hannon:** Is there a second? **Anger:** Rachel seconds.  
**Hannon:** Is there any discussion. **McCullough:** I have a question. Are you going to extend it to 8 household pet rings, then, or is one judge not going to do household pets? **Fellerman:** I'm thinking that was a mistake and it should be 8 household pet rings. **McCullough:** OK. **Hannon:** Any other questions? **Meeker:** Yes, let me clarify. It's now 7 allbreed, 1 specialty, 8 household pet? **Fellerman:** Yes. **Meeker:** OK. Thank you Geri.

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

(10) **EDELWEISS CAT CLUB “IN CONJUNCTION” REQUEST.**

*Edelweiss Cat Club requests permission to hold an in conjunction show on December 20-21, 2014 Moscow, Russia. The other association is FARUS, which is a small, independent organization who split from the WCF in 1999, producing shows in Moscow and the eastern part of Russia.*



***Action Item:*** Grant the request of Edelweiss Cat Club to hold an in-conjunction show with FARUS on December 20/21, 2014 in Moscow, Russia (Region 9).

**Hannon:** Pam DelaBar, Edelweiss. **DelaBar:** Edelweiss has a show on December 20/21 in Moscow. They are holding this in the same facility as this organization, FARUS. What I can find out about FARUS is, it's a very minor association, it's not one of the main players when we have our large multi-association shows. I have been assured there is no exchange of judges. All they are doing is sharing the same facility to hold the show. **Hannon:** Do you support this? **DelaBar:** I will support this, and move that the board grant permission for this in-conjunction request. **Hannon:** Is there a second? **Eigenhauser:** George seconds. **Hannon:** Is there discussion? **Ganoe:** What is the rest of the European show schedule like around this date? Is it empty or is anybody going to be impacted? Any of the other clubs in your region, Pam? **DelaBar:** The show basically has already been approved. They were just waiting on whether it could be in conjunction. There is a show 2 weeks before. It's the big Grand Prix sponsored by Royal Canin, so if anybody is going to be negatively impacted, it would be Edelweiss. We now have a policy established within the region to where shows will not be granted within the same city or location unless there is a month's timeframe between the two shows. But, this was done prior to the region implementing that policy last week. Does that answer your question? **Ganoe:** If it meant that the only show within that is 2 weeks prior, which is the Royal Canin Grand Prix, yes it does. **Hannon:** Is there any other discussion:

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

**DelaBar:** Pam here. I just wanted to say that the board had approved an in-conjunction previously for Edelweiss with FARUS, but it was also with WCF at the same time. So, there is historical knowledge behind it. I'm sorry, I'm watching the sun come up, so excuse me. **Hannon:** I don't know what to say to that. **DelaBar:** I know.

## (11) APPOINTMENT OF BOARD LIAISONS.

*Traditionally, when a committee chair is not a member of the Board, the President appoints a Board member to serve as a liaison between the Board and that committee. I have listed below those committees with their liaison.*

*The list of committee chairs that was distributed in June had some vacant committee chairs. The list below includes an asterisk to show the newly appointed committee chairs and I will request ratification from the Board for those appointments at our August, 2014, Board meeting.*

Committee	Chair	Liaison
Ambassador Cats	Karen Lane	Mark Hannon
Animal Welfare, etc.	Linda Berg	George Eigenhauser
Awards	Mary Kolencik	Mark Hannon
Breeds & Standards	Melanie Morgan/Carla Bizzell	Annette Wilson
Community Outreach/Education	Joan Miller	Lisa Marie Kuta
Clerking	Cheryl Coleman	Carol Krzanowski
Credentials	Eve Russell	Rachel Anger
Experimental Formats	Sharon Roy	Ginger Meeker
Marketing	Lisa Marie Kuta*	
Ombudsman	Sharon Roy	George Eigenhauser
Publications (Yearbook)	Mark Hannon*	
Show Rules	Monte Phillips	Carol Krzanowski
YFEP	Cathy Dunham	Kathy Calhoun

**Hannon:** On the appointment of the board liaisons, part of that was also the appointment of some committee chairs that were not proposed back in June. One of them is the Marketing Committee and in June I asked for volunteers. Lisa kindly volunteered. Nobody else volunteered, so I appointed Lisa. The other was Publications and I'm leaving myself there since nobody else spoke up, so I need the board to ratify Lisa Kuta as the Chair of the Marketing Committee and myself as Chair of the Publications Committee. **McCullough:** I have a question. **Hannon:** Let's get the motion on the floor and then a second, and then discussion. **Eigenhauser:** I so move. **Hannon:** Second? **McCullough:** Second, Steve. **Hannon:** Alright. Steve, you have the discussion. **McCullough:** On the Marketing Committee, isn't that what Jodell's job is? **Hannon:** I have a problem with a paid employee being chairman of a committee, but to answer your question, yes, Jodell is doing marketing work. She would report to a committee chair, in this case Lisa. **McCullough:** If they disagree, who wins? **Eigenhauser:** The board. Ultimately, we're the final authority. **Hannon:** The same would be true of any committee where you've got an employee involved. **DelaBar:** Pam here. **Hannon:** We're talking about the appointment of these two committee chairs, right? **DelaBar:** No. I will hold my comments then. **Hannon:** If there's no other discussion, I'm going to call for a vote on appointing Lisa and myself to chair those two committees.

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

**Hannon:** Next, I would like a motion and a second for the liaisons for those committees that are chaired by non-board members and we'll follow that with discussion. Is there a motion?



**McCullough:** I make the motion. **Krzanowski:** Carol seconds. **Hannon:** Pam has discussion. **DelaBar:** Yes. The Ombudsman was created to be an independent means of somebody filing a complaint – not a protest – for resolution that is out of the normal processes of CFA. George is part of the Protest Committee that could be part of the processes that people want to go to an independent source to discuss. I think it would be not appropriate to have George as that liaison. **Hannon:** George, do you want to respond to that? **Eigenhauser:** Yes. First of all, I don't care. Whatever way it goes is fine with me, but I will say this. One of the things I have to do with protests is be a gate keeper to other committees. I get people contacting me wanting to do something with a contract dispute that we wouldn't handle as a protest, so I either send it to Linda Berg, where she keeps track of the sick cat complaints, or I send it to the ombudsman. So, I do a certain amount of being a gate keeper between the 3 committees, anyway. There is a certain amount of coverage between the 3 functions. We divide up the turf differently. Pam is right, they are not the same thing, but to some extent people need guidance to know which one to go to and I have traditionally served that role. But, the truth is, a liaison is a liaison, not a committee chair, and the real power behind the throne is Sharon Roy, who is still going to be the committee chair of that committee. Linda Berg is still going to be chair of Animal Welfare. The liaison exists to be the water carrier to carry their messages to the board, and if somebody else wants to do it, I'm fine with that. I don't care. **DelaBar:** My thought is perception, and people may not realize it but even the IRS has an ombudsman that is above and beyond, and reports directly to congress. So, the ombudsman, when I formed this back in 2004, basically was to come to the Executive Committee with some of these problems if they could not be resolved, so that's why I've just said that, perception-wise, having the chair of the Protest Committee might look a bit off and a bit not particularly in line with what the original intent of the ombudsman was to be. That's all. **Hannon:** Does anybody else have comments on this or any of the other committee liaisons? **Schreck:** What is YFEP? Is that an eye chart? **Hannon:** It's the Youth Feline Education Program. **Schreck:** Thank you. **McCullough:** I think it's a conflict of interest when a CEO is the liaison of two separate committees of which he is already doing. You are out promoting CFA being our ambassador, I think it would be a conflict of you being the Ambassador Cat liaison, where you would show them more favor than the ones that you wouldn't have otherwise. **Hannon:** OK. Any other comments on my being the liaison for the Ambassador Cats, or any of the other liaisons that are listed? OK, the way I'm going to handle this, we'll vote on the motion, which included George as the liaison for the Ombudsman and me as the liaison for the Ambassador Cat program. If you object to either of those, then vote no. If the motion fails, then we will address those two.

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.** DelaBar and McCullough voting no.

(12) **REAFFIRMATION OF BOARD MEETING DATES.**

- ❖ *August 12, 2014 – Teleconference*
- ❖ *October 4-5, 2014 – In Person, Central Office Board Room*
- ❖ *December 9, 2014 – Teleconference*
- ❖ *February 7-8, 2015 – In Person, CFAF Museum*
- ❖ *April 14, 2015 – Teleconference*
- ❖ *July 2-5, 2015 – In Person, Toronto*

**Hannon:** Next is the reaffirmation of the board meeting dates. The reason this is on there is, the dates that I published after the June meeting in my notes were, I believe, a Sunday and a Monday, rather than Saturday and Sunday. Rachel, do you have the actual dates of the February meeting? **Anger:** Right. It was February 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>, 2015. **Hannon:** OK, so rather than the dates that I gave, which would be the previous Sunday and Monday, so we have that now.

**(13) SHOW FORMAT PROPOSALS.**

*During the past several years the Board has tended to make Show Rule changes throughout the year. This has resulted in a printed set of Show Rules that is out-of-date since we only print revised Show Rules once a year to coincide with the new show season. Our constituents should be able to rely on the printed Show Rules as the most up-to-date set of rules. To the extent possible, I would like us refrain from making changes to the Show Rules during the show season. Let us do our best to make any changes effective with the next show season and to have our printed Show Rules reflect the current rules.*

*I submit the following for discussion at our August meeting so that any changes we would like to see can be forwarded to the Show Rules Committee chair, Monte Phillips, for him to incorporate into his proposals for the October Board meeting when we traditionally discuss changes to our Show Rules for the following show season.*

- A. ***Super Specialty Format.*** *We currently have this as an approved Experimental Format. The purpose of an Experimental Format is to give clubs a chance to try something new and provide the Board with feedback to help us decide whether or not to make it a permanent format. We initially limited this format to one show per Region and established a deadline of April 30, 2014. We later extended the use of this format both to more than one show per Region and beyond last show season. We did not, however, establish a new deadline. I propose we establish a deadline for this as an experiment.*

*We have not been receiving much feedback from some of the shows using this format; however, the feedback we have received is fairly consistent. Exhibitors, as a generalization, like the format since it gives them the opportunity for Specialty finals. As Monte Phillips mentions in his statistical look at last show season, only 11% of our rings were Specialty rings. Many of our shows have gone to a format with only Allbreed rings. Those showing a cat that the owner feels is unlikely to make AB finals opt to sit home or go to the shows and leave unhappy. This is not healthy for our organization. Our judges do not like the experimental format since it causes them to provide both AB and Specialty finals to the same cats judged in their ring. These finals also take more time to present which means the judge winds up waiting on cats who are in other rings or they have the cats in their finals and other judges wait on those cats for color class judging. Clubs are encountering additional expenses for the additional rosettes but some clubs feel obligated to provide this format in order to attract entries to their shows.*

*In Monte's article her further points out: "It is important to note that while there are 20 finals positions available in specialty rings, that number drops to 10 (or in rare cases, 15) in allbreed rings. This means that in Championship, the number of finals positions available has dropped from a high of about 25,490 positions to the current 15,390. That is a loss of over 10,000 final spots in just the last decade.*

*I believe there is a win/win solution. If we require every show to have Specialty rings, we can eliminate the attraction of the Super Specialty format and at the same time resolve the judges' criticisms. I am open to the number of Specialty rings at shows but I propose a sliding scale depending on the number of rings at the show. For example, a 6 ring show*

*may be limited to a maximum of four Allbreed rings. An 8 ring show might be limited to five Allbreed rings. Etc. Many of our clubs today feel they need as many AB rings as possible to attract entries and remain competitive with other shows; however, the lack of Specialty rings is costing our clubs entries. If we impose a limit on the number of AB rings at each show, it removes the incentive for clubs to eliminate the Specialty rings in an attempt to be competitive. Everyone benefits. The clubs potentially bring in more entries, more cats final, and the campaigners are on an even keel so none of them feels obligated to avoid shows with Specialty rings – every show will have Specialty rings and the campaigners will have no choice but to enter shows with Specialty rings.*

**Hannon:** Next is show format proposals, and I have several proposals there that I put out. Let's take the first proposal. Somebody refresh my memory what was the first proposal. **Anger:** Super Specialty format. **Hannon:** Alright. Can somebody make a motion in favor of that and second it, and then we can have a discussion about it? **McCullough:** I make a motion that we accept the Super Specialty format. **Anger:** Rachel seconds. **Hannon:** The feedback and I'm getting and the written reports are leading us to believe that the exhibitors really like this format. That's a generalization. There are some that don't, but as a generalization, they really like the format. When you ask them what they like about it, they like the fact that there are specialty finals, so what I'm proposing is that we have specialty finals as a requirement for every show, and that would satisfy those people that like specialty rings. [recording stops] **DelaBar:** ... third tier here in Europe and we need every bit of enticement to bring people in. My concern is that we have judges that are more than willing to come over to Europe to judge, but don't seem to be willing to help us grow. I would like to see this, and I have asked my clubs not to have all the rings be Super Specialty, but maybe pick out 2 or 3, or a max of 2 out of a 6 ring show have the Super Specialty, or split it among the rings where somebody is doing championship, somebody is doing premiership and somebody is doing kittens, to where it adds up to 2 full rings doing Super Specialty. This is an invaluable tool for developing areas. It gives us a chance to entice them to come try us, get hooked on us and then go through the work to come over and be registered with us. It's a perception and a recognition thing, and a real enticement for us. **Calhoun:** In the Midwest Region, this is really a big plus for the shows and the clubs. It's not only just another specialty ring, it's a win/win. Those people that are still coming that are looking for allbreed, they are not coming to the 4 and 2 if there is a 6 ring allbreed show out there, but they will still come to a show that's got Super Specialty rings, because the people that are looking for the big points – the campaigners and whatever – they have their rings, but the people that are not in that have their rings, as well, so it's a win/win. It's a win for the club and it's a win for the exhibitors. There are tons of judges out there that would be more than willing to do it. [recording stops] **Eigenhauser:** ... allbreed rings if you only have 4. I think we need to do it, but we need to do it in a way that we sell the fancy, because if the fancy doesn't like it, they are just going to overturn this at the next annual anyway, and they're going to go back to the way it was. We really need to look at a way to make sure that we have some specialty rings at our shows, and it's done in such a way that no club gets hurt by doing it. **DelaBar:** Having mandatory specialty rings really right now is a no-go and a killer in Region 9, where the Super Specialty concept definitely fits the bill, because you have the allbreed rings. When you have a lower amount of shorthairs that are going to be entered in the show, as opposed to the longhairs, the shorthair people feel that they just don't have a chance for the regional awards and for the recognition. It takes them quite a bit longer to get grand points and the other recognition that keeps people going in the system. That's why I'm saying in the U.S. this may be absolutely wonderful, but outside the U.S., I think that's

where you're going to have problems. **Hannon:** Can we then discuss the possibility of saying that in North America we'll have this, but we will have exceptions for Europe and Asia? **Ganoe:** What if we simply said a Super Specialty ring counts as one of their specialty rings?

**McCullough:** For judges training? **Ganoe:** Well, a Super Specialty is not necessarily where judges are going to train, but if you are requiring that an 8 ring show be limited to 5 allbreed rings, but then you say OK, those other rings can be Super Specialty. I'm not proposing that I would ever do that because I'm not in favor of the Super Specialty format at all. What if Super Specialty was just that – it was a specialty ring and then the addition was an allbreed final on top of it. **Schreck:** One of the problems with having it that way is that you would possibly have one ring that would do all of the Super Specialties. What the clubs here are doing in some shows is, they would have Ring 1 do the Super Specialty for champions, Ring 2 do the Super Specialty for premiers, Ring 3 for kittens, and so on. So, each ring would do only one Super Specialty final so as not to overburden the judges and have all the cats up in the ring at the same time. That kind of configuration seems to work the best, so if you did that, I don't know how you would be able to easily say, OK, it has two specialties or not. It would get complicated. **Hannon:** It doesn't address the issue of specialty judges because you would require that it be an allbreed judge doing that Super Specialty ring, since part of that final would be an allbreed final. So, you wouldn't be able to hire a single specialty judge. **Schreck:** That's if you would have all of the rings doing allbreed, but you might have 4 rings with the Super Specialty or however you split it up.

**Hannon:** But no matter what you still would not be able to use a single specialty judge. **Moser:** I happen to actually agree with George on this, because I think by requiring clubs to use specialty rings, then it makes it a clear playing field for everybody. For instance, all we're doing at this point is competing to see who can get the most allbreed rings out there so that they can get the entry, but if everybody has to adhere by the same rules – like if I am doing a 10 ring show, you have to have 3 specialty rings – then another show has to do the same. So, the competition is there for people to go to the show that has the most allbreeds, so I like the specialty rings.

**DelaBar:** As I said, it's fine for the 48 contiguous, but when you get outside the U.S. – **Hannon:** I offered that to you as an option. We can say, let's pass this for North America. We're not going to do anything right now, other than give Monte some direction to come back to us in October.

**DelaBar:** If that's put into the motion. I am open to that if it's put into the motion. Here in Europe, we have some formats coming up where we do have some people coming in from other organizations that, let's say, are just qualified for longhair at this point in time. We're creating that experience for them to do this and what I've seen in the U.S. in the past is, when you have a judge coming up in single specialty in a region, then they sort of make sure that they have those opportunities to help their people advance. **Hannon:** Dick, do you foresee a situation in Asia? Would they have Pam's problem? **Kallmeyer:** Yes. I think it would be something equivalent, because we have an imbalance between longhair and shorthair, and they really don't like the specialty rings. We have a definite problem for the new trainee judges coming up, but I probably agree with Pam for the ID, in general. **Eigenhauser:** Monte is a real numbers person and he is big on calculating entries and things like that. We already have some show rules that are different for different areas, depending upon different needs. Why don't we put the problem with Monte and say, the ID is expressing some concerns that it doesn't work, and there may even be a situation where some parts of the ID it works and some parts of the ID it doesn't, so let's send it to Monte with a recommendation that he tailor this to be thinking primarily of the North

American regions. **Hannon:** George, my reluctance to do that is, I want to first get a feel from this board whether they are willing to consider that for North America. I don't want Monte to go

to the trouble and say, no, we don't want to do that for North America, either. **Eigenhauser:** I'm saying that should be the motion. That way, we don't have Pam and Dick voting no because they are worried about what's going to happen. **Hannon:** Would you make that motion? Who made the motion that's on the floor? Rachel, do you remember who made the motion? **Anger:** Sorry, I was changing the batteries on my recorder, but I think it was Steve. **Hannon:** I'm asking that whoever made that motion and second it, withdraw it so that George can make a motion confining it to North America. Nobody remembers making the motion, so I'll say that it was withdrawn. **Eigenhauser:** For that matter, we don't know how Japan is going to shake out, either. So, my motion is, have Monte put together a proposal that would create a sliding scale on the number of minimum specialty rings to be required at shows, at the very least in North America, but look statistically at whether such a proposal would be workable in other areas, as well. **Hannon:** Is there a second for George's motion? **Moser:** I second it, Pam.

**Hannon:** Do we have any discussion on George's motion to limit it to North America? **Calhoun:** Limit what to North America? **Hannon:** Requiring a sliding scale of specialty rings, and that we stop holding the Super Specialties in North America. **Schreck:** I didn't hear anything about stopping the Super Specialty. **Meeker:** I would like to know how many are scheduled. I got a report from Sharon Roy that I was going to add in. They have added 3 shows to the original Super Specialty calendar that goes through February 28/March 1, 2015. **Hannon:** She told me last weekend that Jane Barletta's show in February in New Jersey was as far out as the permissions had been granted. **Meeker:** What she sent me this morning by email is that they have added November 8/9, Dayton Cat Fanciers (Region 4), December 13/14, Just Cat-In Around and CanUsa (Region 4), February 28/March 1, National Norwegian Forest Cat (Region 1). Is that Jane? **Hannon:** Norwegian Forest Cat is Jane. **Meeker:** OK. So, she has scheduled up to March 1, 2015, and her recommendation is that the Norwegian show should be the last sanctioned show using this format until the board decides on the format. **Hannon:** Alright. So, George's motion doesn't have anything to do with the Super Specialty. It has to do with requiring shows to have a sliding scale of specialty rings. Is that right, George? **Eigenhauser:** That is correct. That's all I talked about. **Hannon:** So, let us vote on George's motion dealing with specialty rings and having nothing to do with Super Specialty. **McCullough:** I have a question. What field are we trying to level out? I mean, if you are going to throttle the clubs back on what they can do for allbreed and specialty rings, we have to eliminate the World Show totally, because that's where most people gain all of their points for the show season. I'm one of the people who got my national win because of the World Show. Otherwise, I wouldn't have had a regional win. **Hannon:** What we can do is, this year's regional show is not impacted by this, because we're talking next show season. When we talk about next year's World Show, we can discuss what we want to do about their format. If we have this show rule in place, we either have to follow this show rule or we would have to make an exception. **Anger:** Remember, this is just a motion for Monte to write up a motion. We're not voting it in right now, right? **Hannon:** Correct, but I don't want to tell Monte to do it if a majority of this board is antagonistic towards that idea. I don't want him to waste his time. I'm not saying we are guaranteeing we're going to approve it, but if there's strong objection to it, I would like to see it now so we don't make him go through the exercise. **McCullough:** I make a motion we take a straw poll. **DelaBar:** There's already a motion on the floor. **Hannon:** Why don't we just vote on the motion, and if it passes, that is a straw poll. That's the indication. If it fails, then we don't have Monte go through the exercise. **Calhoun:** I almost feel like one thing is going to lead to another here. So, the proposal now is just to create a sliding scale that all clubs have to abide by, the provide X amount of

specialty rings. Is there anything subsequent? **Hannon:** This doesn't have anything to do with Super Specialties. We will address that after we finish with this motion. George's motion strictly talked about having a sliding scale of specialty rings required for shows in North America, and when Monte comes back to us with his proposal, we can fine tune as to how many of those specialty rings there are, but for now we're just giving Monte direction to give us a proposal.

**Kallmeyer:** Just point out, I just looked for the ID shows and it's a 2/1 ratio of longhair to shorthair. **Hannon:** Alright, but the motion is excluding the ID and Region 9 and Region 8. So, all those in favor of giving Monte that direction.

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.** McCullough, Calhoun and Kuta voting no.

**Hannon:** So, there are 3 no's. Monte will come back to us at the October board meeting with the show rules, giving us a proposal. Alright, now on the Super Specialties, at some point we have to say, this is an experimental format and it's time to stop the experimental format and make a decision on what we want to do here – make it a permanent format or whatever, but we just can't keep this forever in experimental state. Sharon is recommending that the shows scheduled February 28/March 1 be the last shows that have the experimental format, and then once we get the feedback from those shows, we make a decision what we want to do with this experimental format – make it permanent or whatever. Does somebody want to make a motion?

**Ganoe:** I move that we make it a board policy not to approve any more Super Specialty formats, other than what is already scheduled through February 28/March 1, until such time as the board can make a decision as to whether to continue the experiment as a permanent part of the show rules or abolish the experiment. **Hannon:** Is there a second? **Anger:** Second.

**Hannon:** Is there any discussion? **McCullough:** How will you ever get 6 months out in advance if you can't bring it to the board? If you want to have a specialty format, say, in September and you cannot bring it before the board until February, how will that ever pass? How will you ever license your show, because you're still on hold until somebody decides what to do at the board? **Hannon:** You're saying, if the show is already licensed and you want to add the Super Specialties and you need board approval to do that, we just do it through the board list. **McCullough:** Are we prohibited then, because of this rule? Or, is there going to be some gray area? **Hannon:** The motion was not to permit any additional shows beyond that date. Now, we can vote that down and say, *will permit additional shows up until that date.* **McCullough:** OK, I like that better. **Ganoe:** That was the intent of my motion, Mark. **Hannon:** Dennis' motion is that no Super Specialty shows will be permitted after the weekend of February 28/March 1. Up until that date, others may be added to the list. Is that correct, Dennis? **Ganoe:** That is my motion. **Hannon:** So you are satisfied, Steve? **McCullough:** Yes. **Calhoun:** [inaudible – someone having an off-conference telephone conversation with a non-Board member] **Hannon:** Kathy, can you repeat that? **Calhoun:** I thought I was overhearing something else going on. There's a club, I believe COWS in the Midwest Region, is seriously considering a Super Specialty. They had Super Specialty in the past. I don't know what the status of it is from a license perspective, but I would feel very – **Hannon:** What is the date of their show? Is it after March 1<sup>st</sup>? **Calhoun:** Yes. The third weekend in April. **Hannon:** Alright, then you would want to vote against this motion. **Colilla:** [inaudible – someone having an off-conference telephone conversation with a non-Board member] I have the same problem. **Hannon:** Who is speaking? **DelaBar:** Somebody is not on mute. **Colilla:** I have the same issue for the first weekend in April. I have already contracted judges for Super Specialty. I was getting ready to ask permission for it.

**Hannon:** According to Sharon, you do not have permission. She has not given permission to anyone beyond February 28/March 1. **Colilla:** I haven't asked for it yet. I just figured I would get a shot at it. **Hannon:** You can't ask judges until you get Sharon's approval. **DelaBar:** I know we have clubs that are coming in for Super Specialty after that date. Therefore, I will be voting against this, but I don't have our newest revised show schedule in. Christiano was working on that, to bring everything up to date, so I don't want a cut-off at this point in time. **Anger:** If we were to pass a show rule on March 1<sup>st</sup>, if I understand the wording of the motion correctly, is that going to leave us enough time to get that printed in next year's show rules? **Hannon:** No. We wouldn't make the decision until after March 1<sup>st</sup>, because we would want those evaluations on those shows to help us make a decision. The show rules are printed in late February/early March because they have to be distributed in April so that they arrive before May 1<sup>st</sup>. **Anger:** I would not like to see any rules adopted that are not going to be in the printed rules. **Schreck:** I don't know why we have to cut off the experimental format, just to evaluate it. We could continue allowing these and, at the same time, evaluating them. If we decide that they are worthwhile putting in on a permanent basis, we could put that in the show rules for next year. Meanwhile, the experimental could continue until the end of the show season. We don't have to cut off those in order to evaluate. **Unidentified Speaker:** ... nothing important. **Ganoe:** I believe that's Geri not on mute. **Fellerman:** It's not me. I forgot what I have to do to put it back on mute. **Anger:** Star 6. **Ganoe:** At some point, we have to make a decision as to whether we are going to continue allowing the Super Specialty. If we keep letting them be scheduled without putting a stake in the ground as to when we're going to make the decision to go forward or not, we're not going to be able to make that decision at any point. Now, the last few experimental formats we've done, we've done a lot of different things. They have gone straightforward, like the one day 6 ring show, the 6x6 and the 10 ring formats. They went forward and got approved right away. I don't think we need to run this experiment in such a way that we don't close it off and then do the evaluation. Otherwise, we're just perpetuating something that we may not put into the show rules. That's why I propose that we go with Sharon's last date and cut it off at that point and make an evaluation. If the board decides that they want to continue that format, it can then take it up then. **Hannon:** Would it be better to say we will allow those through the end of the current show season, since we've got several clubs that are wishing to hold it after the March 1<sup>st</sup> date? Would that satisfy those who are objecting to it because they've got clubs that want to hold shows? Pam, would that satisfy you? **DelaBar:** That would help, but I disagree with Dennis on being able to establish a milestone for evaluation, even though some may be going forth. I think that we've had a fairly good sampling of what's going around to come in. I don't know how many people have filed evaluation reports. I don't have that information, but I do believe that we can evaluate while the trial is still going on. It's not going to go in before the show rules that will come out next May, but it will be the year after that, that it's going to be able to be put in cement and in writing in the show rules. So, I don't see anything wrong with doing the evaluation while the action is ongoing. **Calhoun:** I strongly agree with that. I see no reason for a cut-off. We're going to miss show rule publication anyway. There's no reason why clubs can't continue to schedule these while this evaluation is going on and this determination is made. Once the determination is made, we can move forward one way or the other, but I don't see a reason to cut it off. There's nothing that we are trying to achieve by the cut off, except a cut off. **McCullough:** Where are the evaluations now standing from those that have been done? Is it mostly that exhibitors love it and judges hate it? **Hannon:** Yes. **Calhoun:** [inaudible – disagrees] **Hannon:** That's what Sharon has indicated, based on the forms that she has collected.



**McCullough:** Exhibitors love it, judges hate it, so we don't need a cut-off date. We already have our data, correct? **DelaBar:** We have some. **McCullough:** We just need more exhibitors saying yes, we love it? **DelaBar:** We need more judges to say yes, that we'll do it. **McCullough:** They don't have to accept the contract. They have the option to say no. **DelaBar:** They are going to say no to Europe? **McCullough:** Jeff did. **Calhoun:** I think one of the things that some of the judges – people that have a negative comment write more than people that have positive ones, but I do think that what Barb has suggested is going on in the Great Lakes about instead of having one judge do all – I've done that, I've done all and it wasn't a big problem – but instead of having one judge do all, one judge could just do it for specific competition, which kind of spreads it out and balances a bit, so there's modifications that can make this appeal to all. We haven't gotten there yet, so the first couple evaluations that have come out from judges that had to do it all, they may not have liked it. As I said, I did it and I didn't have a problem with it. This can be modified. It doesn't have to be a black or white, yes or no decision. **Hannon:** To respond to Kathy, I clerked at a show last weekend that had the Super Specialties and they had them spread out. Some judges just did championship. Some did others. I clerked for a judge who only did part of it and submitted a negative evaluation. **Calhoun:** OK, that's one. **Meeker:** I'm tending to agree with Kathy. The judges that I have sought out that have done this and given me their feedback, some of it just gets down to common sense show scheduling. If you are going to do this format, you don't do your longhair champions in the morning and your shorthair champions in the afternoon. That was some of the complaints. I think it can be fine-tuned. They can do one class in this format and not mind. The judges that I have talked to that have complained the most were the ones that did all three and felt like it was really, extremely taxing and it took some fun out of their judging weekend. The exhibitors that have come to me love it, and the clubs that I've talked to about it seem to think that if they tried it, it would enhance entries. That's why the whole thing was submitted to begin with – to try to get those local folks to feel like they had a shot at a final, when 8 of the top 10 national runners showed up at their show. There was a perception of a better playing field. **Schreck:** I have a couple comments about the judges not liking it. I remember a while ago that we didn't hang breed ribbons on kittens, and I remember that we didn't hang other things. The judges didn't like that either for a while, but now it's pretty natural and we get breed wins for our kittens. I think that what we need to do is to give this a little time, and maybe at the February board meeting to come up with some different types of ways that the Super Specialty – if we decide that we want to continue it on a regular basis instead of experimental basis – to set some rules up that each judge can only do one Super Specialty ring or however you want to do it, so the burden doesn't fall all in one place, and also you don't have everybody fighting for those cats in the finals. **Colilla:** I agree with Barb. I did a Super Specialty. I did the whole thing. It bogs down. I agree with spreading it out. **Schreck:** We could put that in the show rule. **Hannon:** What do we want to do about the motion that's on the floor? **McCullough:** Call it. **Meeker:** Repeat it first, please. **Hannon:** Dennis made the motion. Could you repeat the motion? **Ganoe:** The motion was to not accept any other Super Specialties after the last weekend in February/first weekend in March. Any Super Specialties before then, we could consider those after or not, until we make a decision as to whether to go forward with the format.

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Ganoe, Wilson, Moser and Fellerman voting yes.

**Anger:** Can I get the ayes please? I got Dennis. **Moser:** Pam. **Anger:** Moser? **DelaBar:** Moser. **Anger:** Thanks. **Hannon:** Any other people vote in favor of that? **Wilson:** Annette. **Fellerman:** Geri. **Anger:** I have Gano, Wilson, Moser and Fellerman voting yes. Thank you.

**McCullough:** Mark, I have a question. [inaudible – someone having an off-conference telephone conversation with a non-Board member] If we create a sliding scale for the clubs to follow, what happens with that? **Hannon:** We passed that in the sense that it would go to Monte to come back in October when he does the other show rules, to give us a show rule that has a sliding scale. **McCullough:** OK, thanks. **Inaudible Speaker:** [inaudible – someone having an off-conference telephone conversation with a non-Board member]

**Anger:** Before we proceed, can I say something without sounding overbearing? This is a CFA Board meeting, and someone is disrespecting the integrity of their position. We are supposed to be directing our attention to the meeting and not to our friends in a side conversation. Somebody is obviously on a separate phone call. I don't know what that's all about, but I think you should choose your priority and either hang up from this call or that call. Thank you.

**B. *Ten Ring and 6x6 Formats.*** Monte's statistical analysis states:

*“For a typical 10-ring or 6x6 weekend, an exhibitor is looking at more than \$100.00 per entry. Given the increased costs imposed to travel, the exhibitor is faced with reducing that budget somewhere, and the entry fee expense seems to be where many have turned. They still want to attend shows, so instead of entering three or four cats per show, they now enter one. Fortunately, our counts aren't down 67%, but you can see how this drop can represent a significant impact on club entries, and probably explains the drops we have seen given the stagnant economy throughout most of the world. That is what I think started the large drop in counts for our shows*

*This season marked the sixth year of the 6x6 format show and the fourth full season for the new 10-ring format. There were a total of 36 6x6 show sets, and 40 ten ring format shows this past season. That is a fairly even distribution. That means that about a third of all CFA shows were of this format type (112 out of 330). Unfortunately, with this large number of rings to support, the average entry fee for one of these formats runs anywhere from \$70 to over \$100 per cat entered (including the double cage fees for most of the country). As I noted above in the economic effects section, I believe this has had a significant impact on the average counts at shows.”*

*Many of the clubs opting for the 10 ring or 6x6 format are doing so in the belief that they need to in order to be competitive with other shows using this format. They believe if they have a traditional 6 or 8 ring show they will lose entries to shows with more rings. Many of our clubs are losing money and these format are a contributing factor. As Monte points out, many exhibitors cannot afford the entry fee clubs need to charge for these shows so they opt to enter one or two cats rather than three or four cats and the overall number of cats at our shows decrease year after year. With many clubs losing money, we see fewer shows being held.*

*The justification proposed for the 6x6 was to help exhibitors in less populated areas of the country who had difficulty finding shows within a reasonable drive. They could get “more bang for the buck.” That has not proven to be what we have seen with the implementation of such shows. Every area, no matter how sparsely or densely populated, are seeing this format.*

*I would like to see a discussion of possibly eliminating the 6x6 and 10 ring shows.*

**Hannon:** What I’m going to do is, because here in the East it’s already past 11:30 and we’ve got a lot more on the agenda, I’m going to pull the next part of that, which was to do away with the 6x6’s and the 10 ring shows, and we can discuss that at some other point.

**Tabled.**

**(14) CO-OWNED CAT REGISTRATION ACTIVITY TRACKER.**

*At the request of a cat co-owner/co-breeder, The Cat Fanciers' Association will provide notification of registration activity involving the cat in question. This service will communicate, to the subscriber, any activity which has taken place relating to a transfer of ownership or litter registration involving the named cat.*

*This service is limited to **notification** only by email of any action with the named cat. At the time the tracking service is put into place, all co-owners/co-breeders will be notified that the service is in place. CFA will track the named cat for one year from the date of the request. The tracking service will automatically expire at the end of one year and a renewal notice for this service will NOT be sent. It is the responsibility of the applicant requesting the tracking service to contact CFA to renew the service. Renewal is to be done annually.*

*The cost of the Tracking Service is \$75 per cat per year.*

*If for any reason, including negligence, CFA should fail to advise you of any activity contemplated under this agreement, the limit of CFA's liability shall be no more than the amount of the fee paid for the service.*

**Hannon:** Ginger. **Meeker:** At the June board meeting, I was directed to work with Ed Raymond and George Eigenhauser to offer up a program to replace the cat tracking system that we found to be not in compliance with our CFA rules. [inaudible – paper shuffling] I am hoping you have all read that. The difference here is that the service is limited to a notification-only process. All co-owners of the cat at the time, one of the co-owners puts that tracking system in place would be notified and the tracking service would automatically expire at the end of one year and a renewal notice would not be sent. We also talked at the June board meeting about a fee for this tracking service, and the board seemed to be in agreement that \$75 per cat per year was a reasonable charge. I also included in this item the caveat that: *If for any reason, including negligence, CFA should fail to advise you of any activity contemplated under this agreement, the limit of CFA's liability shall be no more than the amount of the fee paid for the service.* This was simply to protect CFA Central Office, should an error be made. I'm making the motion that we accept this program and then I will work with the new Executive Director to get it in place.

**Hannon:** Is there a second? **Eigenhauser:** George will second. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion? **Schreck:** I just wanted to know from Verna and/or Dennis, do we have the capability of tracking this and doing what people are paying for? **Dobbins:** I know we can flag, but I don't know if we can track. That would have to go to Dennis. **Ganoe:** We can track. Right now it would not be automatic. It would have to be a manual search which requires some programming skill that both I and James have. We can put that on the list of things to be added to be able to track this. Ginger, do you remember how many we actually had at one point? We didn't have too many. **Meeker:** We didn't have too many. When it came to our attention, I think it was only 7 or 8 cats that this was being done on, and it has always been a by-hand procedure. That's why we opted to increase the fee. We were doing this by hand before for \$10 a cat and there is a way of doing it. One of our staff members, this is part of her job description and job responsibilities. So, it is possible to do. There aren't that many. **Hannon:** There being no other discussion about this, I'll call for the motion.

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

**(15) CATTERIES OF DISTINCTION – COMBINING CATTERIES.**

I \_\_\_\_\_ hereby request CFA to consider the merging of the following catteries for the Cattery of Distinction award designation.

Criteria for merging catteries for this award designation are: (a) the same person is working with both catteries; (b) all co-owners of these catteries agree to the merge for said award; (c) the new level of award will be awarded at the following regional or annual awards ceremony.

When filling out this form please list all owner using the full name not initials.

The catteries to be merged are:

A. Cattery number: \_\_\_\_\_  
Cattery Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Cattery owner(s) \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature(s) of cattery owner \_\_\_\_\_

B. Cattery number: \_\_\_\_\_  
Cattery Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Cattery owner(s) \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature(s) of cattery owner \_\_\_\_\_

C. Cattery number: \_\_\_\_\_  
Cattery Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Cattery owner(s) \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature(s) of cattery owner \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of applicant \_\_\_\_\_

**Hannon:** Ginger, you are up next with the Catteries of Distinction – combining catteries.  
**Meeker:** Mark had asked our Business Committee to look at the process for combining catteries. This was part of the award process for last year, but a system hadn't been put in place for actually making it happen. What I have done is simply create a form that the co-owners can fill out and file. This would be, again, a hand-done process through Central Office staff, and then these people who have combined catteries and have gone to the next level for Cattery of Distinction would then be awarded at the following regional and/or national awards ceremony.  
**Eigenhauser:** If we're going to have staff going through these by hand, is there going to be a fee involved? **Meeker:** Good question. **Schreck:** I didn't hear the question. **Hannon:** Is there going to be a fee involved. **Schreck:** Oh yes. Let's charge them a lot. **Meeker:** What would you suggest? **Hannon:** I don't suggest. **Kuta:** Would we want to charge them for CFA's less-than-desirable data structure? **Hannon:** I'm sorry? **Kuta:** Would we want to charge them because it has to be done by hand, because CFA has a less-than-ideal data structure? **Eigenhauser:** I don't think we would be charging them because we created the work; we would be charging them

because they created multiple catteries under multiple numbers for the same person. **Schreck:** I agree with George. I hate to do that, but I agree with George. This isn't an error. They've got two cattery names, so they are asking for something. We should charge them something for that work. **Kuta:** OK. Thanks for the further explanation. That makes sense. **DelaBar:** What happens if one of the owners of the original cattery, you don't even know if that person is still alive. Some of these go back a long, long time. For whatever reason there may be a second cattery and the other person doesn't even show up on Google. **Hannon:** Pam, we had 5 people that made the request at the end of last show season in hopes that they would be able to reach the next level for their regional awards banquet last June. Two of the five, their spouses had expired. They were no longer alive. We couldn't go back to them and ask them to sign anything. A third one was a divorce situation and I'm not even sure if they were still in contact. I do know that the divorced partner is not active in the fancy, but I would be reluctant to tell somebody who had gone through a messy divorce, "oh by the way, you're going to have to go get a signature from that spouse that you're no longer speaking to." **Meeker:** I would also point out that when these people renew their cattery names and pay their renewal fees, we don't ask for the co-owner on the cattery to sign off on it. The folks who are combining catteries for this award are already paying for two cattery renewal fees. **Hannon:** I don't know that that's necessarily true. What if they let one of them lapse? The fact that those cats still existed with that cattery name as a grand we would count, even if it was no longer an active cattery. **Mastin:** If this is the document we're going to use to merge the catteries, shouldn't we have the requested cattery name be listed, that they want to merge it into? The second point is, I agree with George and Barb. If you're looking for a price, I would recommend either \$50 or \$75. That's a reasonable fee to merge these catteries. **DelaBar:** Let me use mine. I have two permanent cattery names. Sapad cattery, you would run the report on that, and then you would run the report on Alsace. Then, count up the number of grands. That's what we mean by "by hand". That's assuming that all the information is, of course, correct on that. That's what we're talking about, just running the cattery reports. **Ganoe:** There is on the books as project to try and track these Catteries of Excellence so that we can get some kind of notification or a report that comes out of the system. If we go forward with allowing – we would actually have to go forward with allowing because we said we would – the combining of catteries, we have to modify that programming so that we can put in a single or a list of cattery numbers to come out on a single report, so it's not even so much as having to print multiple reports. We can do it all in one report if we give it multiple parameters. **DelaBar:** Can we get registrations fixed first? **Hannon:** Any other serious discussion? **Anger:** I do agree with Rich that when we make the motion, we should include an indication that we're going to add to this form what cattery name and number they want to combine them into. **Hannon:** I'm looking for a motion. **Meeker:** I'm looking at the form. There is a request for the number and the name, plus the names of the owners and the signatures. **Anger:** Right, but if I own A and you own B, and we're combining them, how does Central Office know what the surviving cattery is going to be? **Meeker:** You're not combining catteries to a new name. You're simply combining the number of grands for the Cattery of Excellence. **Hannon:** What we would have on the certificate would be "Cattery A/Cattery B". You wouldn't put it under one name. You would have the two of them go on one certificate. **Anger:** OK, so neither cattery is going to go away then. I see, thank you. **Schreck:** So, I want to get one of these snappy certificates and I get somebody else who has some grands, no relationship to me at all. **Hannon:** No. It has to be you. **Schreck:** Oh, I have to be on both? **Hannon:** Yes. Mark Hannon is on 3 different catteries, and there are grands on all 3 of those catteries. **Schreck:** OK. So, there has to be a common name? **Hannon:** Correct.

I need a motion and I would hope the motion would include a fee. **Meeker:** I would move that we accept the Cattery of Distinction – combining cattery procedure, with a fee of \$75 to accomplish the procedure. **Krzanowski:** Carol seconds. **Hannon:** Is there any additional discussion?

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

**McCullough:** When does this go into effect? **Meeker:** Immediately, I would think. As soon as we get it set up with Central Office. You can do this at any time of the year. **Hannon:** We only pass out the certificates at the end of the year, right? At the awards ceremony? **McCullough:** Correct, at the regional. **Meeker:** And the annual. **Hannon:** It would be in effect to have time for the regional awards banquets or the annual. **McCullough:** So, we're going to make this retroactive to the beginning of this show season? **Hannon:** No, for the next show season. **McCullough:** Starting May 2016, OK. **Hannon:** It would be for the current show season, for next awards banquet. It would be effective for the June 2015 awards banquets. **Schreck:** Because it's for the lifetime of the cattery. **Hannon:** Correct. **Kallmeyer:** One thing to bring out, too, is that grands probably from before about 1975 will not appear in our numbers. The reason is that CFA records at that time did not associate a cattery number with a particular cat, so therefore some of these catteries may have grands associated with it. I know that two of the top three candidates do, so it's something we probably ought to figure out eventually how to handle that, as well. **Hannon:** Let's not do it tonight. **Kallmeyer:** No, I'm just letting you know.



## (16) CATTERY NAME RENEWAL PROCESS.

*Proposal: Give cattery owners the option of paying for extended periods of time on their cattery names. The current system asks breeders to renew their cattery names every 5 years. I would propose that breeders be given the option of paying for extended time earlier in the process with an option of a one-time fee for a lifetime cattery registration. This fee would be in addition to the charge for the initial cattery name request. For example if a new person wants to establish a cattery name and opts for a lifetime contract with CFA the charge would be \$75 for the initial process and \$100 for the lifetime registration fee for that name. The current option of a \$25 fee for the 5 year time frame would remain in place.*

*\$25/5 YEARS*

*\$50/10 YEARS*

*\$100/20 YEARS (LIFETIME)*

*THEREBY SAVING CFA the costs of the renewal process.*

## CATTERY NAME RENEWAL FEE

[按此連接中文網頁.](#)

A registered cattery name can be renewed for an additional five (5) year period. The fee is \$25.00

### CFA Cattery Name Renewal Fee

Price: \$25.00 (five year period)

Cattery Name:  Cattery Number:

**ADD TO CART**

Bottom of Form

**Hannon:** Ginger, you're up next. Cattery name renewal process. **Meeker:** I got to looking at the process for the cattery renewal process, and Mark had made a comment about someone saying they would pay money to get a permanent name. I had a couple other people say the same thing, and I looked at the current process, which is very cumbersome. In order to get a permanent cattery name, if you were not grandfathered in prior to I think it was 1988, you have to prove 10 grands, go through a process and it's a very well hidden, secret process. What I would propose is to give cattery owners the option of paying for that extended time period to get a permanent cattery name. The current rate if you renew your cattery is a \$25 fee for 5 years. What I would propose is that we add a \$100 fee to wherever they are to give them a permanent name. For example, if you are establishing a new cattery, the fee for that is \$75, so in order to have a permanent name you would pay the \$75 initial cattery fee and then you would pay \$100 for that name to be permanent. Geri made a very interesting point in one of her emails, that this is more than just about the money. It's about protecting that name and giving honor to that name and the cats that you bred and did show under the name. So, I just tossed a proposal out here. The \$50 for 10 years, that's no different than what we're doing now, but if you wanted to pay \$100 which you would do over a 20 year period, if you wanted to pay that up front you could

have your permanent cattery name and it would save CFA the cost of sending out about 300 renewal notices a month, and it would save people the process of having to remember or having to jump through that 10 grand hoop if you wanted to do it through the granding process.

**Eigenhauser:** This happened before my time. I have a renewable cattery name myself, but my understanding was this originally came about because of the limitations on the CFA computer as to the number of characters you could have for the cattery name, the cat's name and the suffix, that just logically as you go along in time, you get more and more cattery names used up. Pretty soon you run out of short, easy to fit cattery names. People have to go to longer and longer cattery names to find something that isn't already used, and our software wouldn't allow it. Is there a way we can expand the field for the total length of the cat's name – the cattery name, the cat, the suffix – to a larger number to open up more cattery names. I would feel more comfortable if we made permanent cattery names easier, if we opened up more names available at the same time. **Anger:** We discussed that exact issue at the October 2012 during the Central Office report, and I think the proposal was, for when our computer could handle it, that we would stick with our limit of 35 characters, but for a fee someone could have a longer name for their cat. Are we interesting in pursuing that? **DelaBar:** I did send out to the board how this first came about. It was in the 1987 Yearbook. I gave you the pages. Did anybody get a chance to read the rationale, why this was first put in? **Schreck:** I didn't get it. **McCullough:** I didn't either. **Hannon:** None of us did. **DelaBar:** I put that out to the board list. I will send that back out and make sure everybody sees that, but it gave you the pages and the item numbers.

*1987 Yearbook, page 566, (October 1986 meeting), Cattery Names-Proposed Policy. February 1987 meeting, page 576, item (12). FYI...voting NO: Beedy, Rothermel, DelaBar, Petersen, J. Thompson and Bradshaw.*

It was actually brought up in an October 1986 meeting and then again the following February of 1987 that the board actually ruled on it. Other interesting reading in that particular set of minutes. I will send that out to you, so those of you with 1987 Yearbooks can go back and check the actual discussion on the cattery name situation. **Hannon:** Is there any other discussion? **Kallmeyer:** Just point out, too, that currently we would have to do some reprogramming just because more than 35 characters would have problems with some of the forms for printing. **Meeker:** My main motivation for doing this was to simplify processes. We have a lot of processes that are very cumbersome and tedious. I think we should make our process as transparent and as easy as possible. My understanding was that the number of names wasn't the issue, it was the older names took I think 25 years to be retired. They weren't permanent. **Eigenhauser:** For those of us that don't have a 1987 Yearbook, could somebody please scan that information and email it to us? **DelaBar:** Yes. **Hannon:** You want to put this over to October, so we can have a chance to review that? **DelaBar:** Actually, I think Ginger's got a good point, but I will get that scanned in for you. Hopefully it will come out OK. Since I'm the one that found it, I'm the one that takes ownership of it. So, I will get that done. **Hannon:** Do we want to handle this tonight? **McCullough:** No. **Hannon:** Somebody is saying Mark. I don't know who. **Meeker:** I think that's a bird or a cat. **Hannon:** Never mind then. Ginger, what do you want to do? Do you want to put this forth with a motion tonight, or do you want to wait until October? **Meeker:** I would just as soon get it done and get it in place. **Hannon:** Alright. There's a motion on the floor and it has been seconded.

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Krzanowski, McCullough and Eigenhauser voting no.

**Hannon:** I heard three no's. Do you want to identify yourselves so that she can put it in the record? **McCullough:** Steve. **Krzanowski:** Carol. **Eigenhauser:** George is a no, just because I would like to have had the information before we voted. **McCullough:** Me, too. **Krzanowski:** Carol agrees. I would rather read the information first. **Hannon:** Alright, but the motion carried. Pam is going to send that information to us.

(17) ANNUAL MANUAL.

(a) **Review**

**Hannon:** The next item is the Annual Manual, and we have two different parts. Ginger is going to start off with a review and then we will turn it over to Pam. Ginger? **Meeker:** I would like to invite Jodell to come in at this point, because she's the point person in Central Office. **Hannon:** Is she still awake? **E. Raymond:** She's here. Hang on. **J. Raymond:** OK, I'm here. **Hannon:** The floor is yours. Let's talk about the review of the Annual Manual. **Meeker:** I would like to hear first what Pam's concerns are, and then we can deal with whether or not we accept the proposed manual. Are you OK with that, Jodell? **J. Raymond:** That's fine. [transcript goes to agenda item 17(b)]

(b) **Discussion on CO Responsibilities Versus Regional Responsibilities**

**Hannon:** Alright, Pam Moser. **Moser:** What I wanted to discuss is, Central Office taking over all the responsibilities of the annual going forward, with the exception of Thursday hospitality and the delegate bags. This was discussed a couple years ago, back in the meeting minutes which I sent out to everybody. The discussion was that Central Office should take it back because of a number of different things. Basically, with Central Office doing the annual it would create consistency, instead of each region having to reinvent the wheel each year. Also, it was stated in that that the 50¢ that the region is getting today would go to Central Office, and of course the delegate registration would go to Central Office. Raising the funds to put on an event off the back of our exhibitors is getting old, not to mention that the exhibitor base is aging and a lot of them are on fixed incomes. This would eliminate the competition of one region trying to outdo the other. Also, each region is not equally invested in putting on the annual each year. Each region could use the funds from the annual to help clubs stay afloat, because if our clubs don't stay afloat, there's not going to be an annual. These are just my thoughts on turning this back over to Central Office, because I know back in the day – and I've been here a long time. I've been here over 40 years – that the region, when we had a hospitality suite, we had a room in the hotel and we brought in our own food and there was somebody there doing bartending. The idea of the annual, I feel, has gotten out of hand. It's way too expensive. Our regions just can't afford it any longer. So, if people would like to discuss that. **McCullough:** Is that a motion? **Moser:** I can make the motion. **McCullough:** So we can discuss it. **Moser:** OK. I make a motion that, starting in 2016, Central Office takes on all functions of the CFA Annual, with the exception of Thursday night hospitality, which would be optional for the region, and the delegate bag. **Hannon:** Pam, would you amend that to say, "except for hospitality events", so that it could be a Thursday, a Friday, a Saturday after the banquet, it could be a brunch on Sunday morning as they did this year. It would be up to the region as to what they wanted to do, as far as hospitality. They're not limited just to Thursday night. **Moser:** I want to limit it to just Thursday night because if you're going to leave that open, that means they're still going to have to do Thursday and Friday. Are you saying that you want them to do Thursday, Friday, Saturday – all of those three? **Hannon:** I'm not saying they have to. I'm saying I want to leave it as an option, that if they want to do a Friday night hospitality. You're talking about the expense of putting on annuals, and the annuals are making a profit. They are raising more money than they need. **Moser:** The reason why is that there is somebody out there trying to raise money all the time. In fact, I have had to do that numerous times. It's not easy to go out and keep asking people, "can I

have money to put on an annual.” It comes to a point where people just aren’t going to be willing to do it any longer. Going down a row – I’m sure other people have the same situation – people see me coming and all they say to me is, “how much money do you want?” It gets to a point where it gets ridiculous. All these people think all I want is just to get money from them.

**Meeker:** Pam, would you also want Central Office to do the banquet decoration and the dinner benching? **Moser:** That’s correct. The regions should have minimal involvement in it, because Central Office can do this year after year after year, and they would know what they’re doing instead of each year, you’re going into a region where you have a new chairperson every year, and you have to learn the whole thing over again. **McCullough:** You have to reinvent the wheel all over again, year after year. **Meeker:** Pam, what I hear you saying is, you want all of the functions to go back to the Central Office, except a hospitality event to be funded by the region that may be optional, and the delegate bag. **Hannon:** And the delegate bag. **Moser:** That is correct. **Schreck:** Who is going to pay for this? Central Office? **Moser:** That is correct.

**McCullough:** That is correct. **Meeker:** And the delegates. **Schreck:** And where are we getting the money from to do this? **Hannon:** You are keeping the delegate fee and you are keeping the surcharge. **Schreck:** And that’s going to pay for this whole thing? **Meeker:** It should.

**McCullough:** We used to pay for it. **Kuta:** Would it be possible to raise the delegate fee to take away the subsidy that it’s currently getting from the regional fundraising? **McCullough:** Sure.

**Hannon:** Keep in mind we have a \$2 surcharge and you’re only talking about 50¢ of that. That \$1.50 would still be imposed, because that goes to CFA, not to the region. **Meeker:** Two years ago, we raised the delegate fee to \$30 and there was quite a push-back at that time, but I think that delegate fee raised to \$30, Region 2 was the first one to really have the advantage of that, and that truly helped a great deal. I don’t think I would want to raise the delegate fee again this soon. I think if Central Office knew what the budget was, they could function within that budget.

**E. Raymond:** I just wanted to point out the delegate fee is in the constitution. The only way to raise it is by a 2/3 vote of the membership. **McCullough:** That’s correct. **Meeker:** It was a struggle 2 years ago. **Hannon:** Because Pam brought this up tonight and I don’t think we’ve had a lot of time to think through this, I’m going to put this off until the October meeting, and ask Ginger and Jodell to take Pam’s recommendation and provide us with something in October, OK? **Schreck:** I just have one final comment on this. We have a new ED and we have a lot of other problems in Central Office. The computer problems are no secret to anybody. To impose this on Central Office for the 2015 Annual, I think is a bit premature. **McCullough:** 2016.

**Moser:** I will change that to 2016. I did say 2015, but I can change it to 2016. But, we do have a motion, don’t we, and a second? **McCullough:** I seconded it. I think we should vote on it.

**Meeker:** Let’s hear what Jodell thinks. She’s the point person in Central Office. **J. Raymond:** It does not really put all that much on Central Office. Shelly and I have been in place and are in place to take over what we need to, so if we need to add a few more things, perhaps even get a national annual committee, people who are willing to take certain parts, that would be great. We can certainly take a look at that, Barb. I can understand, but really we have been in place and it’s written. We can rewrite it and adjust it just a little bit. It’s not much more labor. **Krzanowski:** Mark, I think this should be held off for a little while. I think it needs to be investigated a little bit more, because there’s a lot involved to putting on an annual, and if even the decorations are to be done by Central Office, that’s really asking a lot. There’s not a lot of staff at Central Office to begin with, and very few people from Central Office attend the annual, so putting all that on Central Office I think is a little much. I would prefer that we hash it out a little bit with some of our constituents, talk about it, think about it a little bit more and come back at a later meeting and

discuss it further. **Hannon:** Pam, will you withdraw your motion so we can discuss this in October? **Moser:** I would really like to have it voted on. **Hannon:** I'll call for the motion but I'm going to encourage people to vote against it, so that we can discuss it in October. **McCullough:** Well, it's already null because you can't influence the votes of the people who are doing the voting. You cannot tell people how to vote as president, which you just did, and that nixed the vote. **DelaBar:** Actually, Mark is able, per Robert's Rules of Order, to wrap things up and to make a recommendation. It's perfectly within his rights as Chair. Call the question, Mark. **McCullough:** He can't tell me how to vote. **Calhoun:** What is the question? Let's vote. **Hannon:** Pam, repeat your motion. **Moser:** My motion is – I said I would amend it that starting in 2016, Central Office will take on all functions of the CFA Annuals, except the Thursday night hospitality which would be optional for the region, and the delegate bags.

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Failed.** McCullough, Moser, Fellerman and Kuta voting yes.

**Anger:** Can I get the yes votes? I have McCullough and Moser. Was there anyone else who voted yes? **Fellerman:** I did. Fellerman. **Kuta:** And Lisa. I voted yes. **Anger:** Got it, thank you. **Calhoun:** So, is the plan to bring this back in October because it was voted down? **Hannon:** My direction to Jodell and Ginger is to come back at the October board meeting with a recommendation on how to implement giving most of the responsibilities to the Central Office. **Meeker:** Will do. Jodell, is that OK? **J. Raymond:** That's fine with me, thanks.

(18) **CLUB NAME CHANGE.**

- A.     *Current Name:*        *A1 Cat Academy (Region 8, Club 1114)*  
       *Proposed Name:*     *Nyanko Yokohama*  
       *Meaning:*            *“Nyanko” is the Japanese sound effect for “meow” (“nya”*  
                              *in Japanese) and the suffix “ko” used exclusively in*  
                              *Japanese girls names*
- Conflict with*  
       *Existing Names:*     *Only similar club name is Yokohama Bay Cat Fanciers.*  
                              *That club does not object.*

Eigenhauser seconds. Motion carried.

**Hannon:** Club name change, Rachel. **Anger:** Yes, here we go. This is a club in Japan, club #1114, so it has been around for some time. They would like to change their name to a name in Japanese that I cannot pronounce, but you have in the report what it actually means. The other club with a similar name did not object. So, I would move that we change the name of A1 Cat Academy from Region 8 to Nyanko Yokohama. I also want to comment that Edward Maeda supports this name change. **Eigenhauser:** George seconds. **Hannon:** Any discussion?

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

**Anger:** Thank you.

**(19) ROLANDUS CAT CLUB – GUEST JUDGE INCREASE REQUEST.**

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

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

*Finally, at the June 2014 Annual Meeting, the delegates voted to increase the number guest judges allowed.*

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

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

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

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

- 1. We have 15 judges of RUI for judging on CFA Show. At a limit of 25% only a few judges will be able to judge CFA Show.*



2. *RUI has good judges and we want for them to judge for CFA. Some of our judges have become or will become CFA judges. RUI has a strong judging school and it seems to me that exception for RUI judges 50x50 mutually beneficially both for CFA and for RUI. For this reason particularly we ask you to support us in addressing CFA.*
3. *RUI judges who would transfer from RUI to CFA would have to become guest judges for their original organization and they would have to ask permission to judge on their own shows. This particular requirement stopped many of our judges."*
4. *46 CFA shows took place in the last show season in Europe. 8 AB CFA judges in Europe, it is enough?*
5. *We don't want expansion of other organizations in Ukraine which aggressively comes to Ukraine now.*
6. *We have a serious judging school, which consists of:*
  - (a) *General lessons on felineology and anatomy, including principles and terminology of standards creation.*
  - (b) *Lessons about breeds. The CFA Judges' Education Committee allowed to use their materials in training our judges. RUI President presented the whole set of lessons to Wayne Trevathan on breeds that are not recognized in CFA but recognized in RUI.*
  - (c) *Four lessons on genetics, written on the basis of Jean-Paul Maas' book "Cats' genetics made easy. The heredity of coat and eye colours."*
  - (d) *Two lessons on breeding.*

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

**Action Item:** *Grant an exception to Show Rule 25.13 for the Rolandus Cat Club show (Region 9) to be held in Kiev, Ukraine, on November 15/16, 2014 and March 21/22, 2015, to allow the use of up to 50% guest judges at their 8-ring shows.*

**Hannon:** Pam, do you want to discuss the Rolandus request? **DelaBar:** Yes. I'm going to first state, I did not write this but I do want to make some clarifications here. Rolandus Union International is an association unto itself. Rolandus Cat Club is a separate organization; it's not an association, it's a separate club also made up from the Rolandus people. They are asking for an exception to the show rule to allow them to hire 4 guest judges for their upcoming show in November and again in March. The reason being is that they've lost some money from the past board cancelling their show in March. Right now, they have perception problems. There are CFA judges from the U.S. who feel that they don't want to fly into Kiev because of what may be

happening some 1,000 kilometers away. So, they are asking for this exception. By and large, their judges are very good. We use 3 of them quite consistently in our shows in Europe. In fact, I judged with one of them last weekend in Bangkok. So, these are good people and yes, we are working to try to see what we can do to get these people CFA certified, but that's down the road. Right now, we have a very viable club that is keeping CFA alive in a very large geographical part of our region. We are asking for an exception for two shows, and that's really to help them get back in line with where they used to be, financially. **Hannon:** Are you making that motion? **DelaBar:** I make a motion that we approve an exception to the show rule for these two show dates for the Rolandus Cat Club show to be held in Kiev. **Hannon:** Is there a second? **Anger:** Rachel seconds. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion of the motion?

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Ganoë voting no.

**DelaBar:** Thank you.

**(20) LEGISLATION UPDATE.**

**Committee Chair:** George Eigenhauser  
**List of Committee Members:** Joan Miller, Fred Jacobberger, Phil Lindsley  
**CFA Legislative Group:** George Eigenhauser, Sharon Coleman, Joan Miller

---

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

*Since the 2014 CFA Annual Meeting we have been working on ways to fill the void left by the resignation of Joan Miller as CFA Legislative Information Liaison. For 17 years Joan Miller has been a legislative consultant to the Cat Fanciers' Association and has been an integral part of the Legislative Group at its inception in 1997.*

***Brief History of the Legislative Group:***

*In June 1994 the delegates at the CFA Annual Meeting voted strongly in favor of a paid, full time person to handle legislative responsibilities. A full-time Legislative Director was hired and started working January 1996. After a tumultuous relationship with CFA the individual departed in the spring of 1997.*

*The Legislative Committee met to reassess the status of CFA's legislative needs, the strengths and weaknesses of our prior efforts and to discuss ways in which CFA could best address our objectives. The Committee noted that:*

*"The education, background experience, expertise and personal qualities, as well as the functioning and time expectations, that would be optimum for this job are manifold. It cannot be reasonably anticipated that any single individual would meet all of the criteria even if CFA were to offer a greatly increased salary and budget."*

*In the interim, the job of Legislative Director was left unfilled and the duties assumed by three individuals acting in concert together. Thus was born the CFA Legislative Group, in essence a job sharing, consulting position utilizing the abilities and experience of Joan Miller, as Legislative Coordinator; Anna Sadler, as Legislative Information Liaison; and Sharon Coleman, as Legislative Legal Analyst. In addition to their mix of skills and expertise the job sharing arrangement allowed for better time utilization. Simply put, three people could devote more time to an emergency than any one person could. The CFA Legislative Group was formally established by the CFA Board of Directors in 1997.*

*With the passing of Anna Sadler, George Eigenhauser became the Legislative Information Liaison in 2004. In January 2009 George began transitioning into Joan's role as Legislative Coordinator. In 2009 George also assumed the role of Legislative Committee Chair. Joan Miller took over the job of CFA Legislative Information Liaison to concentrate her efforts on communication and articles related to public affairs issues. Sharon Coleman remains CFA Legislative Legal Analyst.*

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

*Almost immediately after the 2014 Annual we began reviewing possible candidates to succeed Joan. Some were contacted directly to determine their interest. The CFA Legislative Committee met telephonically to discuss possible candidates. An article was published in the July 2014 CFA e-Newsletter "Are YOU The One For This Job? - CFA Legislative Information Liaison" describing the job and calling for applicants.*

*While there are many people working hard in the legislative field, the candidate with both the essential qualifications and who stood out from the others is Kelly Crouch. We have asked Kelly to become the new CFA Legislative Information Liaison and she has accepted.*

*Kelly Crouch has 13 years' experience in legislative issues involving the cat fancy. She served as TICA's South Central Legislative Liaison from 2001 - 2012. She also held the position as the Chair of TICA's Legislative Committee from 2003 through 2008. Most recently, Kelly has been the TICA Representative for the federal APHIS breeder regulations and Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety (PUPS) proposed federal legislation.*

*Kelly was responsible for reviewing legislation, communicating TICA's position to legislators, educating TICA's membership on legislative issues and working with other legislative groups including CFA, RPOA Texas, and NCRAOA. For the 2010-2011 show year, the members of the TICA South Central Region voted Kelly the Humanitarian of the Year for her legislative efforts.*

*She became involved in the cat fancy in 1999 showing Maine Coons and Oriental Shorthairs in the alter class before starting her cattery Xcalipurrrz. She retired from breeding in 2009.*

*Kelly's non-feline background involves legal work in the semiconductor industry. She holds a J.D., B.S. in Electrical Engineering, and a B.A. in Communications.*

*Kelly has also worked successfully with the CFA Legislative Group a number of times over the years. The "TICA/CFA APHIS flowchart - a helpful flowchart for understanding the licensing exemptions for the new APHIS Rule" was a result of her efforts and her close working relationship with the CFA Legislative Group. Since the Group is, in essence, a job sharing arrangement her ability to fit into the culture of the Group is a significant asset.*

### **Future Projections for Committee and Legislative Group:**

*We will continue with the transition with an anticipated completion in three months. After she leaves the Legislative Group, Joan Miller has agreed to stay on the CFA Legislative Committee. This position will still allow her to share her expertise and experience in legislative matters but in a policy role without the stress and time commitment of day to day activity. Joan currently receives a stipend of \$1,706.00 a month for her legislative consulting activity. We are asking for a budget increase of \$5,118.00 to cover the three month period during which both Joan and Kelly will be working on the transition.*

**Board Action Items:** *Approve legislative budget increase request in the sum of \$5,118.00.*

**Hannon:** George, legislation update. **Eigenhauser:** As I mentioned on Sunday at the board meeting at the Annual, Joan Miller has resigned from the CFA Legislative Group. It's really a big loss for us, and we're trying to do the best we can in her absence. Kelly Crouch is our choice to replace her, but what I want to do, my one action item is that I would like a budget increase. Joan gets a stipend of a little over \$1,700 a month. What I would like to do is overlap it so that Kelly and Joan are both being paid for a 3 month period, for Joan to train Kelly. Before anybody says it, yes I understand we can't possibly train anyone with everything Joan knows in just 3 months, but I really think that's a reasonable transition period, given the work load Joan carries and the importance of the position. My motion is to approve a legislative budget increase of \$5,118 so that Joan and Kelly can both be paid a stipend for the CFA Information Liaison during the transition period. **Meeker:** I would second that, George.

**Hannon:** Discussion? **McCullough:** What-all does this cover? **Eigenhauser:** Three months. **McCullough:** No, is this gasoline, air fare, hotel rooms, transportation? Things that we don't pay for other chairmen? **Hannon:** It's a salary. **Eigenhauser:** It's a stipend. It's a salary. It's compensation for devoting – in this particular position, it's around a 25 hour a week job. **Schreck:** Do you think that they would each be working that number of hours a month, George? **Eigenhauser:** I think they will be working more than that, to try to get all the information transferred within 3 months. If I recall, Joan moved some of her documents to an online cloud storage a little while ago in case something ever happened to her. I believe there are 130,000 documents on that server. When you put together something like that, you structure it according to how you would put things. I would put things in my left drawer, you would put it in the right drawer. It's not necessarily intuitive where all those documents are and all that's in there. That's a lot to go through, plus thousands and thousands of contacts Joan has in her rolodex, and then after transmitting all this information, training Kelly on how to handle it. So, I anticipate they will both be working very hard during the 3 month transition period. **McCullough:** Is this going to be enough to cover everything? **Eigenhauser:** I will make it enough. I'm going to tell them that that's the time they have. **Schreck:** It's a fixed amount, as I understand, right George? **Eigenhauser:** Right. **Mastin:** George, when do you want to make this effective? **Eigenhauser:** Let's make it effective September 1. **Hannon:** So, for September, October and November, you would have both of them being paid? **Eigenhauser:** Right. **Mastin:** We're going to need the information. **Eigenhauser:** Right, for the 1099's. I understand. We'll get all of that offline. **Mastin:** OK, very good. Thank you. **Hannon:** Is there any other discussion?

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

**Time Frame:**

*Immediate.*

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

*Updates and pending legislative matters.*

*Respectfully Submitted,*

  
George J. Eigenhauser, Jr., Chair

(21) **AMBASSADOR PROGRAM.**

**Hannon:** The next thing on the agenda is the Ambassador Program. When I passed out the committee appointments in June, there was no Ambassador Program listed. That was deliberate. It was not an oversight. As I traveled the country last year when I was running for President, I saw very little visibility of this particular program. When I mentioned that to Willa, who was chairman of the committee, her response was, “I get to very few show so I would have no idea whether there’s anything going on at the shows.” I had 3 of the Ambassador Program regional coordinators approach me. The regional coordinators told me that they thought this program should be disbanded. They didn’t think it was an effective program. June a year ago, when Jerry was president, he broke away the Ambassador Cat Program out of the Ambassador Program, and that took the heart out of the Ambassador Program. It didn’t leave an awful lot in the Ambassador Program. One of the things it did leave is something called Pet Me Cats. Now, you could have a Pet Me Cat that was registered with the Ambassador Program, but you didn’t have to. You could have Pet Me Cats anyway, so I don’t see that that is a reason for keeping the program. There’s no sponsor for the program. Iams had sponsored the program and Iams saw little value to continue it, so they pulled their sponsorship. What I would propose is that we continue this program at the club level, we provide them with Ask Me stickers, so if they have people that they want to be able to answer questions from the public, they can identify them. Perhaps we could even provide them with some printed material if they wish, to make it available to the gate, and that if there was someone like Candilee who is very involved, very interested in the program, that they could have a regional program. They could have regional people involved, and if they had some finances they needed, they could go right ahead and have the regions support this. I explained in an email to the board today what the budget was for this year, and what it covered and what it didn’t cover. So, I open this for discussion. **DelaBar:** I have continued this for Region 9. It is very valuable. In fact, this program actually started back in October of 1986, if you want to read the Publicity Report from that board meeting. This does help enhance our recognition here in Europe. To have people with the Ask Me buttons and people being able to respond to the spectators coming in, in their own language, it has been totally invaluable. When you get our mega events where you’ve got over 35,000 spectators coming in and you’ve got other organizations also working, and we have our banners up and the people with the Ask Me buttons, they are drawn to CFA. They’re not drawn to FIFe and WCF, because those people are judging in a different manner, so they really don’t lend themselves. But, when you have people out front selling CFA, selling CFA cats (I mean, selling the concept), it’s a definite boon for us. I’m keeping the program, and I think that if we have more than one region that wants to keep the program, then we could have a national chair like Candilee Jackson. Maybe we just need new blood pushing the program. We don’t have ambassador cats in Europe. We don’t have the program. It’s never been offered to us, so we have to have something that will take the place of that, and that has been our Ambassador Program. We put a lot of effort into this, and I’m going to keep it going. As I said, if we have other regions that are interested in keeping it going, then why not have an overall chairman to be in charge of it, like Candilee? **Hannon:** Any other comments. **Anger:** Here’s my thought. They had a budget line item request which was granted, if I understand correctly. They have not expended those funds. I was very pleasantly surprised by the presentation to the delegates. There seemed to have been a realization that some new blood was needed, a new mindset was needed. I would really like to give them a chance and allow them to go forward for a year, or the balance of their current funding. **Kuta:** I got contacted by several people within my region who really feel that it’s an important program,

especially at the larger shows and for welcoming new people, but I feel it's especially when there are some guidelines and maybe specific cats or activities to have at shows, instead of just posting to a list, "hey, everybody smile." Like making sure the materials get distributed and having pointers and tips from the national level I think would be really appreciated. I would love to see the program continue. **Fellerman:** I've been Region 1 coordinator since it started officially, but I just don't see that it has to cost all that much. You need some stickers for people and that's about it. **Hannon:** With all due respect, Geri, I go to a lot of shows in your region and I don't see the program there. **Fellerman:** We do have Ambassador Cats. **Hannon:** But that's a different program. **Fellerman:** I know, it's no longer in the program and I really had nothing to do with the cats, but there's a lot of people wearing stickers and talking to people. I guess what I'm saying is, maybe it doesn't need to be on a huge, splashy level, but we can keep the costs down to almost nothing and still have some sort of a program. **Colilla:** I have people in my region who would like to see this program continue. Quite a few people wrote me from my region. **Calhoun:** I've had conversations with Candilee and I think she did a really good job. If anybody can continue and light a fire under the program and enthusiasm that really comes from the heart, it would be Candilee. I would agree that I don't see a lot of stickers, but it just needs to be re-energized. I think she can do it. I don't think it would take a ton of money. They have a budget they haven't spent. Why not let them go and give it a try? **DelaBar:** May I make a motion? I would like to make a motion that Candilee Jackson be appointed Chair of the Ambassador Committee, with the current budget that's in the line item of \$1,600 or whatever it was. **Schreck:** It's \$250. **Calhoun:** I second.

**Hannon:** What I would like to see happen is, I would like a committee to come back to the board with a proposal for what they're going to do with this program to bring some life back into it. I don't want to just say, OK, we're going to put Candilee in charge and give her the money. I would rather have a group of people – maybe Pam, you could chair the committee and Candilee could be on it, and maybe Geri could be on it – and come back to the board and say, "OK, here's what we've developed. This is what we propose to do." **McCullough:** Are you proposing Candilee be the chairman and Pam be the board liaison? **Hannon:** I'm proposing that Pam and Candilee co-chair a committee to come back to the board with a proposal. The proposal could include an increase in the budget, with an explanation of what they wanted to do with that money. **Schreck:** No more budget increases! **Hannon:** When I had a discussion with Candilee, she told me that there wasn't enough money there and she wanted to spend some money to make this program work. I'm not objecting to that, but I think she needs to come back to us with a proposal so that we can vote on additional funding, if that's what's necessary, and we understand what it's for. **Calhoun:** I would like to be on that committee, as well. I see Candilee all the time. We talk about a lot of things in the region, so I think it might help with the communication. **Hannon:** I'm going to appoint Pam and Candilee to chair the committee. Kathy has said she would like to be on the committee. Geri, do you want to be on the committee, since you're currently a regional coordinator? **Fellerman:** Yes. Actually, [inaudible] but I'm still involved. **Hannon:** Is there anybody else who would like to be on the committee to come back to the board with a proposal on how to reinvigorate this particular program? If there are people in your region that are interested, have them get in touch with Candilee or Pam, OK? **Meeker:** This is Pam D, not Pam M. **DelaBar:** Pam D. **Hannon:** Pam D. **Mastin:** Does Pam have to pull her motion, or do we have to vote it down? **DelaBar:** I can pull my motion and make a new one. **Hannon:** OK. What's your new one? **DelaBar:** The new one is, I move that a committee of Candilee Jackson,

Pam DelaBar, Kathy Calhoun and Geri Fellerman bring a proposal to the board to revitalize the Ambassador Program. **Eigenhauser:** George will second. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion?

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

**McCullough:** Is this for the October board meeting? **Hannon:** Whenever they can get it together. If they can get it together for October, we'll discuss it then. If they can't, then when they get it together we will discuss it. **McCullough:** Get it together, girls.



## **(22) CAT WRITERS' ASSOCIATION REQUEST.**

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

*The Cat Writers' Association is a journalism organization founded to encourage professionalism among cat writers, photographers, artists, and broadcasters. On Saturday, November 21, 1992, four "cat journalists" met at the CFA Invitational Cat Show in Fort Worth, Texas. They included Cat Fancy magazine editor Debbie Phillips-Donaldson and circulations specialist Suzanne Stowe; CFA Public Relations Expert (the late) Michael Brim; and freelance pet writer Amy Shojai. All wanted to help get "good information" about cats out to the general public, and support writers dedicated to that effort. The CWA was born that day.*

*Today, the CWA supports existing professional writers and seeks to mentor those new to the profession. The Association welcomes all those who love and work for the well-being of cats through their various communications venues. If it's about CATS, the CWA members cover it!*

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

*CWA especially seeks to improve the quality of cat information for the general public, and hosts annual conferences with continuing education about writing, publishing and cat information. The CWA also recognizes and rewards the outstanding work of the year in an annual contest.*

*Both the conference and contest are open to members and nonmembers alike. CWA programs are made possible by dedicated CWA member volunteers and outstanding sponsors who support the CWA vision.*

*Last year, CFA's own Teresa Keiger won the "In the Spotlight Award" for the entry that best advances the protection, preservation and promotion of pedigreed cats and/or the pedigreed cat fancy. Teresa's brochure, "CFA-We're Waiting for You" was the winner. CFA's Lisa-Maria Padilla won a Muse Medallion in the Humor category for "Abyssinian Corporate Promotional Service" in Cat Talk Magazine.*

*The CWA is partnering with BarkWorld and is expecting even higher attendance at the 2014 conference of between 400-500 bloggers, writers, and other participants in the pet industry, many of which work with, live with, or are otherwise involved with cats.*

*BarkWorld is a social media conference and expo focusing on the pet industry. They focus on social media, lifestyle and technology as it relates to pet owners and businesses. Because BarkWorld focuses primarily on dogs (especially in terms of lifestyle and technology), they have decided to develop a "sister" that is devoted to cats, called MeowWorld.*

*To that end, CWA has partnered with BarkWorld to offer "MeowWorld Presented by the Cat Writers' Association". Though the two conferences and two organizations remain separate entities, this is a true partnership that will provide attendees the opportunity to attend events from both conferences without paying two separate registration fees. Many BarkWorld attendees are involved with cats in various capacities (as owners, rescuers, breeders, etc.) and attend to learn more about social media and how it can be used to promote a business, book, non-profit or other pet-related cause. Networking is also a big part of the BarkWorld experience.*

**Future Projections for Committee:**

*The 2014 Conference will be held in Atlanta, Georgia, partnering with the BarkWorld Pet Expo to present BarkWorld/MeowWorld Presented by the Cat Writers' Association from October 30-November 1, 2014.*

**Board Action Item:**

*As was done last year, CFA has been invited to make a contribution to the delegate bags for this year's conference. Just like our own delegate bags at the CFA annuals, the CWA members really look forward to these bags every year.*

*This year the CWA is preparing 150 bags with strictly cat-oriented materials, which is an increase over the number of bags prepared for last year's conference. The increase is due to the partnership with BarkWorld at CWA's two conferences. Together, between 400-500 registrants are expected, which is a significant increase over the number of attendees the conference has historically registered as a solo conference. All registrants will receive a choice between a gift bag for dogs (provided by BarkWorld) or one for cats (the CWA gift bags), with CWA members receiving a priority claim on the cat bags. Remaining cat bags will be distributed on a first come, first served basis to non-CWA conference registrants.*

**MOTION:** *Provide a small item for the CWA bags for the BarkWorld Pet Expo in Atlanta, Georgia on October 30/November 1, 2014. McCullough seconds.*

**Time Frame:**

*Immediate. Thank you for your consideration.*

*Respectfully submitted,  
Rachel Anger, Secretary*

**Hannon:** Cat Writers' Association, Rachel. **Anger:** This is a request from the Cat Writers' Association. I've given you an introduction to who they are and how CFA plays an important part in this great association. They have their big gala – their “annual” – coming up and in the past few years, CFA has donated something to their delegate bag. The motion is to provide a small item to the Cat Writers' Association bags for the cat attendees of the BarkWorld Pet Expo in Atlanta. I believe that we have arranged to put an issue of *Cat Talk* in the delegate bag. **Hannon:** Do you need a motion for that, or is that something you're just telling us you're going to do. **Anger:** It's something we are going to do – something of that sort, but that's the plan at this point. **Hannon:** OK, so you're sharing information with us. **Anger:** A small item would be, not keys to a new Ferrari; it would be something that spreads the CFA good will. **Hannon:** Is there an action item or can we just move on to the next item? **Anger:** The motion was my action item. **Hannon:** That you be allowed to put a small item in their delegate bag. **Anger:** Exactly. **Hannon:** And there's a second. **DelaBar:** Second. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion. **Meeker:** Yes, I have a question. I would like to ask Rachel, is the small item in addition to the copy of *Cat Talk*? **Anger:** No. That was my example of what the requested small item would be. **Meeker:** What would your budget be if we didn't use *Cat Talk*? **Anger:** That's what we've always used, so the same as it has historically been. **Meeker:** It just didn't say that.

It said “a small item”. **Hannon:** She’s telling us that it’s going to be *Cat Talk*. **Anger:** At the time the report was written, those details had not been finalized, so I would estimate in the neighborhood of \$500. **Hannon:** Any other discussion? **McCullough:** I have a question. Why are you only preparing 150 bags for 400-500 delegates? **Hannon:** Where do you see 400 or 500 delegates? **McCullough:** It says they are going to do 150 bags, and then it says between 400 and 500 bloggers showing up. **Eigenhauser:** George can answer that. In the past few years, the Cat Writers have combined with a dog blogging group, so there will be 400 to 500 registrants of cat people and dog people. The 150 is for the cat people. **Anger:** Exactly. **McCullough:** So, the dog people don’t get anything. OK.

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

**Proposal #17 from June 2014 Annual Meeting: Hannon:** We have finished with the printed agenda. There are a couple additional items. One, at the Annual, the delegates passed a motion dealing with a committee coming up with a proposal for the Household Pet awards and the Awards Committee has taken that on. They plan to have a proposal for us at the October board meeting, and it will include any changes to the show rules. She is working with Monte on that, so that's for information.

**Swedish Cat Paws Show: Hannon:** The next item is, we received from a club in Sweden an email, and Pam Moser wants to talk about it. **Moser:** Yes, thank you. I would like to bring up the Executive Committee's actions concerning the Swedish Paws Cat Club. It was my understanding that the Executive Committee passed a resolution allowing a Russian club to put on a show – **Calhoun:** Mark, are we in executive session? **Moser:** Why? **Hannon:** No.

**Calhoun:** Just asking. Just asking. **Moser:** – the same weekend as Swedish Paws' traditional date in January. If this is the case, per the committee's responsibilities, you must have the Board of Directors ratify the decision at this meeting. I would just kind of like to have a discussion on that. **Hannon:** I apologize for that. It's something that should have been on the agenda and in the past has been on the agenda. In the future, we certainly would make sure that's on the agenda. We can bring that up now and have the board ratify the decision of the Executive Committee.

**McCullough:** Was that a motion? **DelaBar:** Can I address this real quickly? This was brought to the Executive Committee, as things of short-term nature can be when decisions need to be made. The Nika Center Cat Club puts on one show a year. That show is in conjunction with Expocat, which is the large multi-association function sponsored mainly by Iams, but also includes the largest dealership of pet products within Russia. The other associations are the World Cat Federation, TICA, FIFe and World Cat Association. And CFA. Iams had to change their date. This has traditionally been in October. For whatever reason, they were the driving force in changing the date. It was not the club. The club is in a reactive mode on this. That's why it went to the Executive Committee, because we needed a decision. The region policy that we set 2 weekends ago was to not have two shows on the same weekend if at all possible, and if we did, to make sure that the countries did not affect each other, as far as exhibitors. I had originally stated that the one club would be adversely affected. That's why I brought it to the board to say, would it be OK to try to compensate the one club for the possible loss of entries by allowing the CFA club to participate in this large event. That's why we needed an immediate decision, and that's why it was brought to the Executive. **Moser:** In your email that you sent, you said that CFA would compensate Swedish Paws \$2,000 for the Russian entries. Well, this doesn't address the fact that the other exhibitors in Europe will also go to that show, and that will impact the Swedish club. They are not going to have any entries at all. **DelaBar:** Do you realize what it takes to get into Russia with a cat for a show? **McCullough:** Isn't there an embargo right now by Obama and Putin? **DelaBar:** No, there's no embargo on cat shows, but a visa is quite expensive. For me to go in, and I live next door to Russia. As Sarah Palin says, "I can see Russia from my porch." To get in there, my visa alone is €250. Now, multiply that times 1.35 and you will get an idea what it costs to get the U.S. It's not that easy to get in. Basically, this is a Russian show. Sweden, of course, contributes nothing to Russian entries, no matter what show you look at. Right now, the Russian exhibitors don't have to go through the hoops to travel to European shows that Europeans do to get into Russia. So no, there's not going to be a large influx. It's basically the Russians. We get some from the Ukraine and occasionally we've had U.S. exhibitors. Last March at Katsburg, there were two U.S. exhibitors. Otherwise no, the majority of the participants are from Russia. **McCullough:** What made this an emergency that it couldn't

wait until today. **DelaBar:** We needed to know last week. **McCullough:** Well, you submitted this on Friday. That's why I'm asking why it couldn't wait over the weekend. I don't like the way how you went behind everybody's back to get this done. **DelaBar:** Steve, you are making an assumption that didn't happen. Friday I was in Bangkok. This was done prior to me being overseas. **McCullough:** The 7<sup>th</sup>. **Moser:** Friday. **DelaBar:** Friday I was in Bangkok. This happened before that. **McCullough:** Mark, what day did this happen on, that we didn't have time to convene the board? **Hannon:** I don't know when we had that discussion. **DelaBar:** I'll have to go back. Rachel will have it. **McCullough:** Rachel will have it. **Anger:** Yes, I do have it. However, the facts so far are not correct. What came to the Executive Committee was not in the form of a motion. Pam explained the situation, which is a regional director's scheduling issue. The board has always supported the regional director's decision. That was basically what the discussion consisted of – "this is the situation, this is what I would like to do" and it went forward from there. There was no motion. If there is ever an executive committee motion, it is immediately reported to the rest of the board and included in our motions to ratify at the next regularly scheduled quarterly board meeting. **Moser:** But it was not. **Anger:** Even if there had been a motion, it would not have been ratified at the next teleconference. There was not a motion, so there's nothing to ratify. **McCullough:** There's nothing to ratify. Is that correct? **Moser:** OK, if you didn't make a motion, then how come you went ahead and did this, then? I don't understand. I mean, don't you have to make a motion to do this? **DelaBar:** No. I needed board direction. **McCullough:** [inaudible – multiple speakers] **Hannon:** Wait a minute. I'm running the meeting. Steve, are you talking about the amount of money? **McCullough:** I haven't got there yet. **Hannon:** We have no say about putting on two shows in Europe on the same weekend. That is the regional director's decision. It does not impact a neighboring region, so the only person that has any say on that is the regional director. Pam made the decision that she was going to allow the two shows. We have no say about that. **Mastin:** I have a question. Does the entire board have to approve an in-conjunction show, and is this an in-conjunction show? **Hannon:** Did we approve this already? **DelaBar:** No. It's coming in. **Schreck:** What's coming in? **DelaBar:** The request for an in-conjunction show. If I remember correctly, we had talked at the Sunday board meeting, and I can't tell you right now without looking at the minutes, that these 3 large in-conjunction shows at that time the board thought to be of high importance. We had talked about granting permission for those three. I don't know if that went anywhere. I can't tell you right now, but this is something that will be coming forward. They've got to submit the request to the region and it's got to go forward to the region for the show. I have not submitted it to go into the CFA Newsletter yet until after this board meeting. **Moser:** OK. So, my understanding then is, Pam, that this has not even been approved. Is that correct? Because you have to get approval for an in-conjunction show. Is that correct? **DelaBar:** That's correct. I went to the Executive Committee to get guidance on how to handle this situation on dealing with policy, especially with this being an in-conjunction show that the board has always highly supported previously. **Moser:** OK. I guess I don't understand why, if the show hasn't even been approved, why it was such a hurry to have the Executive Committee approve it, that being the case. **DelaBar:** No. They were not approving the in-conjunction show. They were giving me guidance about the situation, since we do have a standing policy about two shows in the same region. I needed input. **Mastin:** I just want to make sure I'm clear on my question, and I have a comment here. The board needs to approve an in-conjunction show. Based on what I'm hearing, the Executive Board has not given Pam the approval to do this. Is that correct or is that incorrect? **Hannon:** That is correct. Pam, do you agree? **DelaBar:** I agree. I haven't come forward with it

yet. In fact, to let things be known, because the show in Sweden has already contracted the two Russian judges, one of which is a member of the Russian club, to judge the Swedish show, this could all be in jeopardy now with the big Expocat. So, this whole thing could be moot. I'll know that within the next couple days. That's why I'm waiting; to find out if, in fact, CFA is going to be represented at the Iams Expocat show. **Moser:** OK then, why was the \$2,000 discussed if it was just, you know. **Hannon:** Can I explain that? The Finance Committee is in charge of sponsorships that we provide to the clubs, and the Finance Committee was agreeable to providing \$2,000 in sponsorship funding to this particular show. They determine the shows that get the sponsorship and the amounts of that sponsorship. **McCullough:** I thought that went only for advertising. **Hannon:** We said when we discussed this back in June that is frequently the case. That is not always the case. **Schreck:** So, do we have a motion or are we just talking here? **Hannon:** There's no motion to be made, evidently. Pam went to the Executive Committee for some advice and guidance. She got the advice and guidance. She will come back to the board with a request for an in-conjunction show. Pam, is that your understanding of where we are? **DelaBar:** Yes. **McCullough:** And is CFA part of this, or do we know yet? **Hannon:** She doesn't know yet. She will let us know. There's no need to request the in-conjunction show if CFA is not participating. She has to find out first whether CFA is participating, right? **DelaBar:** Correct, and that's why sometimes it behooves people to possibly go to the source and say, "hey, what's going on" instead of a knee jerk reaction, taking up board time. I could have explained this very easily in an email. **McCullough:** I'm sorry you feel that took up board time, but it seems back handed to me. Just my opinion. **DelaBar:** Well, shoot me an email and I would have shot you the emails that I sent to the Executive Committee, Steve. Then you would have understood. I don't blindside people. I assumed you had the same attributes. **Hannon:** Any other comments? **Mastin:** I have a question and I would just like to know, how badly do you think this show, if approved, the Swedish show will be affected by lost entries? **DelaBar:** Their last show was 66 entries. To be perfectly honest, there are other factors that affect that, not just Russian exhibitors. For me to go into that, that would be in executive session. Right now, 20.3% of their past entry has come from Russian exhibitors. So, 20.3% of 66 gives you an idea as to the affect. **McCullough:** What has their highest overall entry been? **DelaBar:** The highest I think has been something like 88. **Anger:** For reference, agenda item #17 from the Thursday board meeting in June, we discussed that club sponsorship can be either for advertising or a club can come to the Finance Committee and ask for the funds for any purpose that they need in order to keep their club afloat. **McCullough:** I thought Annette opposed that. She didn't think we should give sponsorship money to keep a club afloat. Didn't that get shot down? **Hannon:** That's only one vote. That doesn't mean that she was on the winning side. **McCullough:** OK, that's good to know. We might need some.

**Hannon:** Is there anything else that we want to talk about tonight before we adjourn? **Colilla:** I have one quick question. How many European exhibitors will go to a Russian show? **DelaBar:** John, I have that information. It depends on the show. Grand Prix, the one sponsored by Royal Canin in December, attracts a lot more of the European exhibitors than does Expocat. I think last year's Expocat was around 150 entries. **Hannon:** How many of them were from Europe? Are you talking about outside of Russia, or are you just asking in general? **Colilla:** In general. I'm just curious. What's the average? **DelaBar:** Actually, Europe includes Russia, you know. **Colilla:** I know, but since the show is in Russia, you said the majority of exhibitors are from Russia, so I'm curious how many Europeans will go to Russia to show. **DelaBar:** Dick, do you have the stats for the different shows? **Kallmeyer:** I'm trying to call it up. Just keep talking

and I'll try to get it. It's taking a while to download. **Colilla:** I don't need the number. Just a ballpark figure. 10? 20? 15? **DelaBar:** No, it's not that much. **Mastin:** I have a letter from Swedish Cat Paws stating – and I don't know if this is accurate, I have no way of proving it – the letter states, *In January of 2014 when we had our show, we were the only CFA club that weekend. We had 130 cats. Most of them was coming from all over Russia. In April 2015 we also had a show and at the same weekend it was another CFA show in Russia, Moscow. We got only 65-66 cats.* I think the concern here is, she is estimating she is going to lose 50% and not 22%. **Kallmeyer:** January 12/13, the Swedish show had 89 cats. Nine came from Russia, 9 from Germany, 9 from Italy, 9 from Finland. That's the last number I have. Now, looking the other way, from Russian shows, I can't see anything from Sweden at all. **DelaBar:** No, it's nothing. **Kallmeyer:** From the top 6, it's not there. One show pulled from Germany, but most of their entries come from Ukraine, Belarus, Bulgaria and Switzerland, just because of the people putting on the show. **Hannon:** Do we need to discuss this tonight, because we've got no motion on the floor. Pam at some point is going to bring to the board a request for an in-conjunction show, should the CFA club go forward with it. It's closing in on 1 a.m. here.

#### **Santa Monica Cat Club Request:**

**Motion:** *Due to the local fire marshal's request that the aisles be wider than the original floor plan, the Santa Monica Cat Club is requesting permission to lower the entry limit from 325 to 275 at its August 23/24, 2014 show in Costa Mesa, California (Region 5).*

**Kuta:** Could I bring a quick motion to get approval for the Santa Monica show, to reduce their entries? **Hannon:** Yes, you have a motion. Is there a second to her motion? **McCullough:** I second it. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion of her motion?

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

**Schreck:** I make a motion we adjourn. **McCullough:** I second. **Hannon:** Good night everybody. **DelaBar:** No, good morning.

\* \* \* \* \*

The meeting adjourned at 12:57 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Rachel Anger, Secretary

(23) **DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS AND SUSPENSIONS.**

**Disciplinary Hearings And Suspensions:** Cases that have been reviewed by the Protest Committee and for which a recommendation was presented to the Board. The following cases were heard, a tentative decision was rendered, timely notice was given to the parties, and no appeal and/or appeal fee was filed. Therefore, final disposition is as follows:

[to be provided when 30 day appeal period expires]