

**SUMMARY AND TRANSCRIPT OF CONFERENCE CALL
CFA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
JANUARY 5, 2016**

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.

(1) NATIONAL SCORING.....	2
(a) Future Years' Award Proposals.....	2
(i) Combined Committee Proposal to Expand the NW Awards.....	2
(ii) Kittyhawk Proposal to Expand the NW Awards to Two Divisions.....	35
(iii) Kittyhawk Proposal to Expand the NW Awards to Three Divisions.....	39
(b) 2015-2016 Show Season Award Proposals.....	45
(i) Proposal to Award Top 25 National Wins (K/CH) in R1-9.....	45

Secretary's Note: The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. met on Tuesday, January 5, 2016 via teleconference. **President Mark Hannon** called the meeting to order at 9:00 p.m. A roll call by **Secretary Rachel Anger** found 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)**
- Mr. Edward Maeda (Japan Regional Director)**
- Mrs. Pam DelaBar (Europe Regional Director)**
- Roger Brown, DVM (Director-at-Large)**
- George Eigenhauser, Esq. (Director-at-Large)**
- Mrs. Carol Krzanowski (Director-at-Large)**
- Mr. Richard Mastin (Director-at-Large)**
- Mr. Darrell Newkirk (Director-at-Large)**
- Mrs. Annette Wilson (Director-at-Large)**

Not Present:

- Mrs. Carla Bizzell (Director-at-Large)**

Also Present:

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

Teresa Barry, Executive Director

Verna Dobbins, Director of CFA Services

Shino Wiley, Japanese Interpreter

Tim Schreck, Chair, IT Committee

Monte Phillips, Chair, Show Rules Committee

Mary Kolencik, Chair, Awards Committee

(1) NATIONAL SCORING.

(a) Future Years' Award Proposals.

(i) Combined Committee Proposal to Expand the NW Awards

List of Committee Members: Rich Mastin, Mark Hannon (Awards Committee Board Liaison), Carol Krzanowski (Show Rules Committee Board Liaison), Dick Kallmeyer (ID Committee Chair), Monte Phillips (Show Rules Committee Chair) and Mary Kolencik (Awards Committee Chair), January 2, 2016

Hannon: The order in which I want to proceed tonight is to discuss the proposal that the Committee came up with for next show season. Once we have decided what we'll do with that, we will determine where we'll go after that. So, everybody has received the proposal. Rather than go through it line by line, are there any questions or comments people have about it? I first should say that the Committee put in a tremendous amount of time on this and I really am grateful to each of the Committee members for the time they have devoted to this.

Proposal

As CFA has grown globally, the national awards have not. Decades ago, our national awards grew out of competition centered mainly in one geographic area. But now with the difficulty of global travel, particularly with a cat, a cat can accumulate points in one area without ever competing directly with a cat from another area. Ranking those cats according to their points does not tell us how they compare to each other. By splitting the competitive field into areas and assigning awards to those areas we can accommodate the growth of CFA and retain meaningful competition.

A major concern with the existing national awards is the ability for one geographic area to achieve extremely high counts, whereas it is next to impossible for exhibitors in other geographic areas to access such counts creating a perception of defeatism. We are seeing this now in China's geographic area where counts have expanded rapidly while counts in North America, Japan and Europe have declined. North America currently has more cats competing at more shows, but our competition is spread out, while China's counts are concentrated in much fewer shows. North American shows cannot effectively concentrate counts to allow cats in the area to achieve the point levels achieved in China. North American exhibitors have a "why bother"

attitude, the defeatism becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy as people stay home and drive counts further down.

We propose the creation of geographic areas with a set number of national awards per area. By creating geographic areas, we would adjust the national awards to keep pace with global growth. We recommend approaching this problem in this order:

- 1. Discuss potential changes for the 2016-2017 show season – before Monte can give you show rules to approve, he needs to know the parameters of the changes. Monte will present the show rules for your approval at the February meeting. The Jan. 5th discussion will give him direction on how to proceed.*
- 2. Once settled on a plan for 2016-2017, discuss whether to implement a change to the current season.*

There are three parts to any expansion of the National Awards program – show rules, cost, and pageantry (the banquet). We address each of these in sequence, although some of you may wish to consider them in parallel.

Show Rule Parameters

For the 2016-2017 show season, we recommend the following:

- 1. Create three geographic areas for NW titles:
 - a. Regions 1-9*
 - b. ID-China*
 - c. ID-Other**

RATIONALE: *Competition in CFA follows geographic areas with only a small amount of cross-over. There are four main blocks of competition – North America, Japan, Europe, and ID-China. Competition in the remainder of the world, ID-Other, is spread out. This makes 5 logical areas for competition. A split into 5 areas is not preferred by the clubs at this time, so we recommend beginning with 3 areas until and unless the clubs in Europe and Japan request to be their own areas. Another rationale for three areas is that it keeps all of the areas with region status together.*

- 2. The number of NW placements for Regions 1-9 will remain at 25 in each category. The number of NW placements for the other two areas will be set according to the ratio of present cats in those areas compared to present cats in North America. This calculation will be done by using a formula created by Dick Kallmeyer (i.e. not a programming change for Computan). The ratio will be calculated based on a full season of data from the 2015-2016 season and released in May 2016 on the CFA website. This means the number of NWs in the two ID areas will not be in the show rules. The show rules will identify where on the CFA website to find information on the distribution of NWS. The*

distribution of NWs will be updated each May after the final show counts are reported to Central Office.

If we were to apply this formula to the counts ending with December 6, 2015, the distribution would be:

<i>R1-R9</i>	<i>K-25/C-25/P-25</i>
<i>ID-China</i>	<i>K-17/C-13/P-2</i>
<i>ID-Other</i>	<i>K-4/C-6/P-3</i>

RATIONALE: *There are many possible formulas to consider. The goal should be to distribute NWs according to the level of participation in the areas. We recommend using the number of cats present to determine participation rather than the number of rings or number of shows. A show can have 10 rings but a very small count. This means the number of rings or shows is not a good measure of the number of cats actually competing in an area. Dick can give us current figures on the number of awards that each area would have if we used the stats as of now.*

- The minimum points required for any NW in any area will be as follows: Championship – 4300; Kitten – 1800; Premiership – 2200. These values will be in the show rules and will not change until the board or the clubs decide to change them. The board will review these minimums for potential adjustments for the next show season at its February board meeting.*

RATIONALE: *The reason for having a point minimum is to ensure an equivalent level of competition across the areas and that cats do not receive NWs by default without accumulating a significant number of points. The minimum needs to be realistic for every area to achieve, yet high enough to require significant wins. We chose the recommended values as minimums because they are 75% of the 25th Best Cat in each category from the 2014-2015 season rounded to the nearest hundred.*

Eigenhauser: I have two comments. The first is, I'm not really happy with the minimum point requirements they have. We've never had a minimum point requirement for national awards and we already have a mechanism in place if areas aren't well served and their point counts are lower. We adjust the number of the national wins in that area, so I don't see that we need a point count floor separate and distinct from the sliding scale on the number of places we give, based on the previous year's count. I think that doing it with basically two minimums is redundant. We have never done that before and I don't see that as necessary.

Hannon: OK, anybody else have comments on anything in the proposal they would like to bring up? **Newkirk:** I want to know if, let's say in Regions 1-9, and I'll just use kittens as an example, the minimum points I think for kittens is 1,800 points. What if there's a kitten that's the 25th best kitten and it only makes 1,700 points. Are we going to give it 25th or are we going to invoke the minimum number of points to get a win? **Kolencik:** Yes, Darrell. If 25th Best Kitten does not have the minimum number of points, then 25th Best Kitten would not get a national win. The reason why we have the minimum in there is because if you look at the standings as they are right now, especially in Premiership we have this problem where you would have cats in the

International Division and China getting national wins with so few points. Right now, the highest scoring cat in Premiership in China has 1,000 points, whereas 25th in the United States has 1,800 right now. It's even worse in ID-Other. Best Cat in Premiership has 612 points. So, in order to enforce that those areas have significant competition, especially in Premiership, that's why we picked a minimum. So, if you wanted to do it some other way, I don't know how but it doesn't seem fair to us that a cat with 612 points can get a national win in Premiership, when it takes so many points to get it in the United States. **Newkirk:** I agree with you 100% Mary. I just wanted to make sure in my own mind that that's the wording being used in the proposal to say that, because I think a lot of people will assume that if we do this, we're going to get 25 in every category in Regions 1-9. I think it needs to be clarified to people that if they don't meet the minimum requirements, that position won't be awarded a national win. **Kolencik:** You're right. In fact, we might have to change that minimum within a year or two, because if the counts continue to decline, we might be in a position where we can't get 25 winners in a certain category in North America, so we have to watch that minimum every year. **Newkirk:** OK good. Thank you.

Kuta: Would the board or the delegation have to revisit every few years if we think the points are shifting? Is there a mechanism in here? I'm not finding that in any of the materials. **Kolencik:** There's no mechanism. We would have to address that whenever we want to. There's no automatic mechanism for that. We could put one in there. If you guys want, we could put one in there. **Kuta:** I couldn't think of one. It would get probably a complicated mess, figuring out how many cats were shown and that type of thing. Just a follow-up also on the points, I can see if there is that cat that is at the bare minimum, I could see some egregious stuffing issues come up towards the end of the season to try and get that cat to earn however many points it needs to meet that minimum. **Kolencik:** You mean, egregious stuffing issues other than what we have now? **Kuta:** Yeah. I would think that would probably be just another thing of putting in minimum point requirements. I wouldn't want to devalue the award by having a cat with 500 points get a national award, but I also see the down side, especially with my entry clerk hat on, about putting those minimums in. **Phillips:** There's two ways to put the minimum in. Right now, we put it in as a specific point value. We could also put it in as a percentage of the amount of points 25th got in Regions 1-9 in the previous show season. Just a thought. **B. Schreck:** The spreadsheet that I put together showing the 1st and 25th best for 4 years back – that is, from 2012 year-end up to 2015 – the lowest in any year was 2014 with 2,169, to be exact. Your lowest for 25th best cat was around 5,700. For premiers it was 2,900. I think that for the current situation, these numbers are good. I did not like the first 50% one that was presented, but I think these are reasonable. Again, we could revisit these if it seems like the counts are just falling off the cliff everywhere. Based on the past 4 years, and the current year-to-date by the way, is almost already to that point. I don't see that having the minimums would be a burden, at least in the U.S. **Calhoun:** I don't have a problem with the minimums and the numbers that have been set for this, but I do think it might be a good idea to look at some sort of mechanism moving forward as to when we make changes, so it won't be deemed as arbitrary, depending on who is on the board or whatever. If there is some sort of mechanism, I think that would be a better way to go, moving forward, as we review whatever case is agreed upon. **DelaBar:** On the minimums, I think that they ought to be stated as a number because we are changing the program. We want things to be as clear and concise as can be. We know that we're going to get questions. Let's try to make it as clear as we can. As for reviewing, just put in there that the board will review the minimum levels required for national wins at our February meeting. Just put in there that this is when we will review. We

will either keep it the same, or maybe the minimums will be changed. Just put in there that we will review it. **Hannon:** Are you saying we will review it in February for that particular show season? **DelaBar:** No. We review it in February for the next show season. Let's please not talk about – I know we have to, but with this proposal, let's not talk about changing things in the middle of the season. This would be for the next season.

4. *The residency requirement for NW titles will be the same as the residency requirement for the regions but extended to the geographic area level.*

RATIONALE: *It is possible that geographic area shopping will occur, but we recommend that for now we keep things simple. If the clubs are concerned with area shopping, the clubs can propose different methods to establishing residency in a geographic area at the annual.*

5. *Cats that earn points at shows outside of their area can keep those points for the NW award.*

RATIONALE: *When the clubs discussed a similar proposal at the annual that prevented the retention of cross-over points, a major complaint was that it would inhibit clubs from attracting entries from other areas. There is in reality very little cross-over due to the difficulties of long distance travel with a cat and due to quarantine restrictions around the world. Allowing cross-over point retention satisfies clubs with a goal of being able to attract exhibitors from anywhere and helps to develop personal relationships among all regions and geographic areas, while in reality affecting only a few cats.*

6. *No more than one NW per category per cat per season*

RATIONALE: *This requirement will prevent an exhibitor from collecting a large amount of points in one area then moving the cat to another area to get an additional title in the same category. It may be rare that anybody could do that, but this makes it clear for data records and programming. The programmers do not have to allow for an anomalous situation.*

DelaBar: The way that #6 is worded, *No more than one NW per category per cat per season*. When I read that the first couple of times, it sounded like a cat couldn't get an NW on a kitten win and an NW on a cat for a win on the same cat. **Hannon:** It says separate classes. You can get a national win on a kitten in one area and an adult in another, but they didn't want you to get an adult win in one area and an adult win in another area in the same show season, because you move the cat in the middle of the show season and you are able to pick up enough points in both areas to get two national wins. **DelaBar:** I realize that's what they were headed for, but I thought it wasn't really written that way. **Hannon:** We will clarify it then, but does everybody understand that what we're aiming at here is, to limit somebody from getting a kitten win and moving the kitten to another area and getting an adult win, but you can't get two adult wins in the same category in different regions or different areas. You can't show the cat in China, get enough points for a national win, and send it to a co-owner in Regions 1-9 and get another national win in the same season in the same competitive category. **Fellerman:** When I read it the first time, I thought the same as Pam. When I went back and read it again, it made sense.

Hannon: I would like to remind people that you need to be called on before you speak.

Fellerman: Sorry. **Hannon:** Is there somebody else that wants to speak to this particular issue?

7. *Breed Awards not included; Other awards – DW, RW, Agility – not affected*

RATIONALE: *There are many reasons to not include breed awards at this time, the biggest of which is the complexity of doing so. We currently award 171 breed awards in championship (57 breeds/divisions, 3 awards each). To add 2 additional sets of breed awards would add a potential 342 additional awards for a total of 513. Each award takes 1 minute to present (according to Shelly Borowski), so that is 8.5 hours to present all of those breed awards (513/60=8.55). Even with time saving measures and with some breeds not having all three spots filled due to point minimums, the increase in time at the banquet would be substantial. The potential cost of breed awards would be over \$25,000, a \$17K increase.*

The BW title is a singular title. Only one cat per breed/division receives the BW each year. In 10 years, only 10 cats in a breed/division will have that title. 75 cats per year receive the NW, and we are recommending a dramatic increase in that number. In 10 years, 750+ cats will receive NWs making it possible that multiple cats per breed/division per year can have an NW. When looking at a pedigree, the breeder knows exactly what that BW means and that the cat with the BW was the best of that breed/division in its year. The breeder does not know that by seeing the NW. Adding breed awards dilutes the BW and changes the meaning of the title.

To include the breed awards would require changing how we handle the breed awards as well as changing the meaning of the BW title. Of the 57 breeds/divisions, very few are being affected by the large counts in China. Because of the complexity and the meaning of the BW title, we recommend leaving the breed awards as is and waiting for the clubs to present suggestions at the next annual.

Hannon: Rich, do you want to make a motion on 1 through 10? **Newkirk:** I've got a question. If we are going to leave the breed win as just one award for the whole organization, both R1-9 and China and ID-Other, I would like for us to talk about expanding those breed awards to 1, 2 and 3. **Hannon:** We have 3 breed awards. Let me understand what Darrell is saying. **Newkirk:** For 1st, 2nd and 3rd we bring them up, but the only one that gets to have the title of Breed Winner is best of breed. **Hannon:** Correct. So, you are suggesting the title go to all three? **Newkirk:** Yes. **Hannon:** Let's take that separately. We can vote on 1-10 without addressing that, because it doesn't spell that out here. We can deal with that separately. **B. Schreck:** #7 talks about the breed win title as a singular title, so that's part of 1-10. Also, if I'm recalling correctly, which I may not be, I thought the delegation voted down the resolution to allow the breed winners a 2BW or a 3BW to be put on the title of a cat. I thought that was rejected, so I would not be in favor of that. **Hannon:** What I would propose, Darrell, is that you make a motion before we get into voting on 1-10, and you make a motion dealing with your concern about giving out additional BW titles. **Newkirk:** Do you want me to do that now? **Hannon:** Are we in agreement that that would be the best way to approach this? **Mastin:** If we're going to discuss breed wins separately, we need to pull it from 1-10. **Hannon:** What you're saying is, vote on that after, rather than before. **Mastin:** That's correct. **Hannon:** Darrell,

are you OK with that? **Newkirk:** It doesn't matter which way we do it. [transcript goes to proposal motion]

Hannon: Darrell, do you want to make a motion on #7? **Newkirk:** Yes. I would like to move that we award officially 1st, 2nd and 3rd best of breed, that they get to use the title "Breed Winner". If you want to designate 1, 2 and 3, I'm OK with that, but since we're only giving out one breed award for all of these different areas that we just passed, I feel like that would be a good thing to sort of appease some of the people that are wanting separation of the breed wins. **McCullough:** Second. **Hannon:** Discussion? **Eigenhauser:** If we're going to be adding 100 new titles, this is one area where I really think we need to start thinking about having a better floor. There are some breeds and divisions where you could be 3rd best of breed and only have a few hundred points. **Hannon:** They may not even be a grand. **Eigenhauser:** They may not even be a grand, so if we're going to be adding another 100 titles, I think we should at least have a minimum for them. **Newkirk:** I think it's 200, isn't it? **Hannon:** Monte, do you want to clarify what the minimum is? **Phillips:** It's 200 for all 3 – best, second and third best of breed. **Krzanowski:** I absolutely believe 200 points is too low to provide a BW win. I think it cheapens the BW title tremendously for those cats that really work hard for it and accumulate a lot of points. **Kuta:** I cannot agree with Carol more, in that especially as one who has seen that as the pinnacle of all the awards and has gotten second by 19 points once. I've had 2nd best of breed and 3rd best of breed multiple times. I would not have wanted the breed win title for that. I think this is something that would need more consideration than we are able to give tonight. **Hannon:** Any other comments on Darrell's motion? **B. Schreck:** I just want to reiterate that this was brought to the delegation before. Now, we do have a potential new scoring system, but when it was brought to the delegation, it was rejected rather soundly as I recall. **Mastin:** I myself need some clarification on what Darrell has proposed. I need to understand. Are you proposing a breed win for every breed outside of the singular breed for all areas? **Hannon:** No. He is suggesting that we continue giving out 3 awards for the breed win worldwide, but that all 3 get to use the BW title, or BW2 title or whatever. Right, Darrell? **Newkirk:** That's correct. **Hannon:** Any other questions or comments on Darrell's motion? **Dugger:** I just wanted to say that Leslie Carr from our region and one of our clubs last year did make that proposal. It got some good feedback as far as discussion from people around in our region. I don't know that it was rejected because it was made from the floor, and maybe because people just didn't get a chance to understand what she was trying to do, but I think she was trying to do something very similar or suggesting something very similar to what Darrell suggested. Maybe we need to get this suggestion to come up once again off of resolutions maybe at the annual. **Hannon:** But pre-noticed. **Dugger:** Pre-noticed, correct. **Calhoun:** On the flip side, for some of the larger breeds there are cats that deservedly work really, really hard, that may even get a national win even in the old method of scoring, but they don't get the breed win. So, we have talked about how in some of the smaller breeds where the numbers may be low and maybe they didn't have to work as hard. On the flip side, on the larger breeds, I think this would be a huge incentive if the top 3 cats had the title of BW or BW1, whatever. I would support that. **Hannon:** Any other comments? Not hearing any more comments, I am going to call for the motion.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Newkirk, Dugger, Calhoun, Colilla, McCullough, Mastin and Kallmeyer voting yes.

Hannon: Why doesn't Jean encourage a club to bring it up pre-noticed, and then we can have the delegates discuss it.

[NOTE: See pre-noticed (not floor) Proposals 22 and 23 starting on page 264 of the June 2015 delegate meeting minutes.]

Kolencik: Can you ratify #7 as it is? Do we need to do that? **Newkirk:** Yes. **Mastin:** I make a motion. **Newkirk:** Second. **Eigenhauser:** I'm not really sure that we need a motion. **McCullough:** Why do we need a motion? **Newkirk:** Because it was pulled out. **Hannon:** We voted on 1-6 and 8-10, but we never voted on 7 as it was presented. **Eigenhauser:** The proposal for #7 was to do nothing. Do we need a vote to do nothing? **Newkirk:** Point of order. #7 was never voted on. It was excluded. It was taken out. We only voted on 1-6 and 8-10. **Hannon:** My point is that we don't need to vote on it because that's the current policy and we're not changing the current policy. **DelaBar:** I agree with Darrell. Because we pulled it out from consideration for the first vote, we need to stick it back in, so however it reads, we need to stick it.

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

8. *International Show – not used for residency, everyone keeps points, not used in any calculations to determine the number of awards per area.*

RATIONALE: *this is how the International Show has always been handled.*

9. *All NW awards will be presented at the annual banquet.*

RATIONALE: *All geographic areas must be treated with equal status.*

10. *Do not create an overall "GW" award.*

RATIONALE: *We strongly recommend not creating an overall GW award for several reasons. With the lack of cross-over competition around the globe between the areas, cats from one area in general do not compete with cats from another. Ranking cats that never compete with each other for the same title creates an inequality, which is what has happened with the NW title. To add a GW title simply moves that inequality up a layer. One area will dominate the GW award as what is currently taking place with this year's NW awards and eventually people will complain that they have no chance for the GW and request changes be made.*

Adding NW titles is different from adding a whole new layer of titles. A new layer of titles was never even remotely discussed by the clubs and it is a complicated programming change. If the clubs want such a title, they can make a recommendation at the annual.

Hannon: Rich wants to do 1-6 and 8-10. Rich, do you want to make a motion to that effect? **Mastin:** Yes. I make that motion. **Newkirk:** I'll second it. **Hannon:** If there's no more discussion, I'm going to call the vote.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion carried.**

Cost

The cost of each individual award in the 2014-2015 season was as follows:

Best - \$65 each

2-25 NW - \$52 each

Breed - \$37 each

NW rosettes - \$18 each (this does not include writing on side streamer)

BW rosettes - \$13 each, or \$39 per breed (this does not include writing on side streamer)

There are additional costs such as setup fees, postage to mail unclaimed awards. These are small compared to the overall total.

Every 10 NW awards will add approximately \$700 to the cost of the trophies. If the board adds 50 NWs, it will add \$3,500 to the cost. 75 awards would be \$5,250. The board has multiple options to address cost:

- *CFA does not purchase trophies, recipient purchases trophies*
- *CFA contributes part of trophy cost, recipient contributes part of trophy cost – if the recipient does not contribute, they do not get the trophy*
- *Individual sponsors for trophies, CFA covers any difference*
- *Cut out the rosettes to offset additional trophy costs*
- *No change, CFA eats any cost increase from additional trophies*

The ideal option is the first one – CFA does not purchase trophies and the recipient purchases the trophy. This way, only those people who really want a trophy will receive one. In informal discussions with exhibitors both in the show halls and on Facebook, there is a majority support for this option. There would still be some residual costs for the awards, but the overall budget would be dramatically reduced.

However, that is a drastic change from what people have come to expect and it might be best to ease people into that option. We recommend that if the board does not want to take the step of requiring the recipient to purchase their own trophy, then first implement an individual sponsor program to supplement the cost of the trophies. If the program is successful in raising money this year, then next year CFA could try other options.

We do not recommend cutting the rosettes at this time because many people like the rosettes. Last season, we had a trial sponsorship program for just the breed rosettes. 47 (of 57) breeds were sponsored at \$50 each, and after paying for the writing on the side streamer, the profit from the contributions was \$1750. By expanding this to include the NW rosettes, we believe clubs and breed councils can cover nearly all of the cost of rosettes, or greatly reduce that cost.

The Awards Committee has been working on an individual sponsor plan to purchase slightly more expensive custom breed awards, and we normally would have brought that to the board in February. We are still obtaining quotes on a custom breed award and hope to have a better estimate soon on the cost of custom awards. It may be possible to keep the cost close to last year's cost. If a custom trophy requires a substantial increase, we can postpone that plan if the board does decide to add NWs this season. But, here is the sponsor plan we want to implement this year.

Colilla: I would like to see us do away with the rosette. They're just gathering dust. That's all they are doing. **Kolencik:** What's gathering dust? **Colilla:** The rosette. **Hannon:** Is your point that they are getting rosettes every weekend, and there's no special thing for getting another rosette? **Colilla:** Yeah, that's it. The award should be enough – the plaque or whatever the trophy is.

Hannon: Anyone else have comments? If there are no more comments, I think we need to make a decision on what we want to do about John's comment about rosettes. I don't want to pass this as written if a majority of us don't think that rosettes should be handed out in the future. John, do you want to make a motion? **Kolencik:** About the rosettes, a lot of people like the rosettes. Some people don't, some people do. The rosettes right now are something that I feel very confident that people are willing to sponsor, because last year when we asked them to sponsor the breed rosettes, we had sponsors for 47 out of 57 of the divisions. We raised enough money to almost cover the cost of the breed rosettes, so it's not like that's something that is an exorbitant cost, but if you want to get rid of them, OK. If you think that enough people like them, I think they pay for themselves almost. **Colilla:** I was thinking not doing the rosettes would probably offset the trophy cost. That's why I suggested that. **Moser:** Are we voting on all these different options, like on the bottom where it says we can replace the trophies or CFA contributes to part of the trophies? Is that going to be separate? We've got options here at the bottom on what we might want to do. **Mastin:** I think what we need to do is, we need to vote on the first part of the proposal, and that is changing the way we currently have national wins. So, that would be 1 through 10. Once we get through that, I think we need to go on to our options with the cost and pageantry part. **Moser:** OK. **Phillips:** I was just going to make a comment that the way I planned to write the actual show rule text, it would not specify what you are going to give out as an award for a national win. I was going to do it exactly the way we currently have regional awards specified in the current show rules – just the titles, and that's it.

[discussion goes to #7]

Mastin: I just want to bring some direction back to this. Earlier, John suggested to eliminate the rosette, to help offset the cost of the trophy. Can we get direction? Is John making a motion, and do we have to vote on that before we can proceed on helping Mary with her direction? **Hannon:** John, do you want to make a motion on the rosettes? **Colilla:** Yeah. I make a motion to eliminate the rosettes. **Eigenhauser:** That's for the current show year, right? **Hannon:** For the current show rule? **Mastin:** I'll second it, with the right to vote no. **Moser:** I'm just confused. Is this for this year, or for 2016-2017? **Hannon:** I'm assuming, John, it's for this year and forward. **Colilla:** Yeah. **Hannon:** So, last year will be the last year we hand out rosettes, if John's motion passes. **Moser:** You said this will be the last year we hand out rosettes? **Hannon:** No, I said last year was, if this passes. **Moser:** I don't think we should change that

right here in the middle, because like someone else just said, people are expecting a rosette, and for us to pull that, I don't think that's a good idea. **DelaBar:** Why don't we, for those of us who are up in the middle of the night, it might be a little clearer if we kept to next year forward, since that's what we have been discussing all along, and keep with what we are doing in the future show years and not this show year. We can discuss this show year next, but let's get the future taken care of first, which we have been doing. **Mastin:** Pam brings up a good suggestion. I think we should do that. We should go back to John and ask him if he wants to pull his motion. **Hannon:** He said he is willing to amend it, starting next year. **Colilla:** Yes. **Mastin:** OK, very good. **Hannon:** John's motion is that, starting with the next show season, we eliminate rosettes. People that are showing their cats now, they would get a rosette at the Las Vegas annual. **Moser:** If we're going to vote on that, I actually liked the other option better, where the person has to purchase their own trophy, so I guess I just vote no on this one, and then we can bring that up, right? **Hannon:** Yes, correct. If there's no more comments, I'm going to call for the vote.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Colilla voting yes.

Hannon: Are we ready to go on to cost now? Rich, what do you think we need to vote on for cost? **Mastin:** I think we need to let Mary present what she has here. **Hannon:** What are we voting on? There's information here. There seems to be some options. We've got to vote on the options. **Kolencik:** We could use a little bit of direction on how to go. **Hannon:** Tell us what direction you want. What are the areas you need direction? **Kolencik:** The plan that we were working on was to improve the breed awards this year. Teresa Keiger has a very nice design to make a custom award and she was in the middle of getting quotes when this all came up. So, it depends on who we go with, whether or not that's going to add any cost. It's possible that we might be able to stay in the same price range, but what we need to know is how we're going to pay for the additional awards that you all just voted in. I believe you may have added up to 52 awards. That cost would be about \$3,500. So, there are several ways that you can proceed. The first way is, CFA just doesn't pay for trophies and we let the recipients pay for the trophies. The next possibility is that we have a sponsorship program, which I outlined in the report for everybody. Another possibility is to cut out the rosettes. The way the Awards Committee recommends is to go ahead and try the sponsorship plan this season. If we collect enough money to cover what we need for a minor cost increase for the breed awards and for the extra 52 awards, fine, we're golden. If we don't get enough money, then next year I believe we should revisit the idea of not buying the trophies and not buying the rosettes. **Mastin:** Mary, we just need clarification. Are you proposing an adjustment to the cost for the year we're in? The upcoming annual banquet, or for next year? **Kolencik:** I'm proposing that if we go with a custom award this year, it might cost as much as \$10 more per breed award, which shakes out to less than \$2,500, but I believe we can cover that cost with sponsors. If you want us to delay that, we can delay that until next year. If you don't think that's a risk you want to take this year, we can delay the cost of customization until next year when we find out if the sponsorship plan works. **Hannon:** It seems to me we could do two of your suggestions. John has already brought up the subject of doing away with the rosettes. We could potentially do away with the rosettes and to incorporate a sponsorship program. **Kolencik:** Right, we could do both of those. If you do away with the rosettes, I think we save quite a bit of money. The bill is around \$4,000 so that would do away with that, but you have to realize that a lot of people really like those rosettes and are willing to pay for them themselves. **Kuta:** I don't know if this is too difficult to do on a national level. On a regional level, every award recipient fills out a form asking if they wanted their

rosette or if they didn't. We were able to order about 10% less because of the people who just didn't want them, so the people who wanted them got them and the people who didn't want them didn't get them. We still had our sponsorships and all that. It helped, but it was kind of administratively difficult. I could see it being difficult on a national level. **Eigenhauser:** I'm a little concerned here. Are we talking about making changes to awards we're going to hand to people in July of 2016? **Hannon:** Yes. **Eigenhauser:** I would be really reticent to change the awards for this year. People have been showing all year with the expectation that they are going to get a rosette or the expectation that they are going to get a trophy because that's always how we have done it. If we're going to make this change, I would rather make it effective for the next show season, which would be the awards given out in June of 2017. I don't want anyone to be disappointed they didn't get a rosette if they were expecting one. **Hannon:** George, would it be acceptable to say we will give out rosettes this year; we will discuss what we are going to do the following year later, but that Mary should go ahead with the enhanced awards? She can get some sponsorship for them, and if it's not all covered in sponsorship, CFA picks up the difference. Is that acceptable? **Eigenhauser:** Yes. **McCullough:** Everybody I've talked to is in favor of keeping the rosettes at \$17 and purchasing their own trophy. They all seem to like that idea quite a bit. That would save lots of money. **B. Schreck:** I thought I heard Mary say that allowing people to sponsor the breed awards ended up with some extra money, and that she felt that perhaps allowing people to sponsor the national rosettes might at least cover the cost and perhaps leave a little extra money for other purposes. Is that what I was hearing, Mary? **Kolencik:** Yes. **Hannon:** Last year she had a sponsorship program going for the breed win. She raised enough money to pay for the rosettes, and had money left over. **Kolencik:** Almost paid for the rosettes. **B. Schreck:** In that circumstance, it seems like it's a no-brainer. As treasurer, if there is no money out of CFA's pocket, then why not do it? **Hannon:** Because what we're talking about this year, in addition to the rosettes, is an enhanced award which is going to cost, I thought Mary said, \$10 additional per award. So, she may not raise enough money to pay for the enhanced cost for the new award. Is that right, Mary? **Kolencik:** I think I can, if you approve the individual sponsors for the awards the way that I laid it out in the report. The response from people to the idea of paying for their own awards, I think we will be able to raise enough money to pay for both the additional awards that you just approved, and the minor upgrade to the breed award. We're still in the middle of getting estimates. She just got two more today, so we're still in the middle of getting estimates. We had one estimate that came in at exactly what we paid for the trophies last year. We have the other estimate for \$10-\$12 over that, so I would be able to give you a better picture of that in February on how much that improvement will cost, but if you say don't do this improvement this year, I understand. We can put that off until next year, and we can just focus on paying for the extra awards this year, but before Teresa does any more work, I need to know what kind of direction you want me to go in. **Hannon:** What additional awards are you talking about for this year? Because we haven't voted on anything for this year to change. **Kolencik:** You added a bunch of national winners. **Hannon:** No, we didn't. **Phillips:** For 2016-2017, yes. **Hannon:** We have not changed anything for the current show season, Mary. **Kolencik:** Oh, I'm sorry. You're right, you haven't changed anything for the current show season. I'm getting way ahead of myself. I'm so sorry. **B. Schreck:** That was exactly my comment. Mary was going on about extra awards, but that's not this year, so far. **Kolencik:** I'm confused. You didn't add any extra awards this year. **Hannon:** Does somebody want to make a motion in regards to giving Mary direction on this year? **McCullough:** Do our show rules allow

for individual sponsorships? **Hannon:** It doesn't say, either way, so we're not violating a show rule, to do it. **Phillips:** No. [discussion goes to Colilla motion, above]

Hannon: Mary wants direction on what to do this year. She has already started the process on getting bids on an enhanced award. Some of you want to wait until next year to do that. Mary's plan was to try and do it this year. **Kolencik:** We can wait on that until after you decide whether or not you are going to have awards this year. **Hannon:** So, Mary doesn't need direction yet. What do you want to do with the whole cost section, Mary? What do you need at this point? Anything else? **Kolencik:** Next year – we increase the awards next year and we voted not to get rid of the rosettes. Now we need to decide, do you want to ask people to pay for their own awards next year, or do you want to try to have a sponsor plan next year? **Hannon:** Do we have to decide that tonight? **Kolencik:** Not really. **Hannon:** It's not going to happen until June or July of 2017. **Kolencik:** Right, so for next year we can decide that in February or something. **Hannon:** What else do you need under Cost tonight? Anything? **Kolencik:** At this point, no. Nothing for next season.

Sponsor/Contribution Plan for Awards – from the Awards Committee

Based on the current awards, the Awards Committee suggests the following sponsor plan. If the board changes the number of awards, we would adjust this accordingly.

1. *Breed rosettes – the same as last year where a club or breed council could sponsor the 3 championship breed award rosettes for \$50. The sponsors name will appear on a streamer of the rosettes. This will start in early April. (potential \$2850)*
2. *NW rosettes in groups of 5 (e.g. 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25 in each class) – limited to clubs or breed councils, \$100, the sponsors name will appear on a streamer of the rosette. By using groups of 5, this avoids the stigma of someone feeling left out or “picked last.” This will start in early April. (potential \$500 per set of 25)*
3. *Each cat receiving any recognition (NW, breed, agility, C-O-D) – any person, club or breed council can sponsor any cat for \$30. Multiple people can sponsor the same cat. Each sponsor's name will be printed on a card that will be placed with the award. For some cats this could start in April, but for most it will have to start when the standings are finalized. (Over 200 cats receive awards, potential \$6000 if each is sponsored just once)*
4. *General Contribution Fund*

In the summer of 2014, we conducted a survey asking people various things about the awards. One question was whether people would support the idea of individual sponsors similar to how the regions collected funds for their awards. The response was a clear no. The major complaint was that it was embarrassing when regions repeatedly sent out lists of cats that had not yet been sponsored begging for people to chip in for those cats. Some likened it to the “picked last in gym class” effect and said it would be tacky for CFA to do the same. Our plan described above is different from what the regions do and so should not have that same stigma. No one would know which cats are sponsored, there would be no begging to sponsor unsponsored cats.

The rosettes will be done exactly the same as last year where there will be a drop-down list on the website of breeds/divisions available for sponsors, with the added NW rosette groups. As people pay for a set, it will be removed from the list so that there is only one sponsor per set for the streamer.

For the cats, basically what people will be asked to do is contribute \$30 towards the total awards cost in the name of a particular cat. Rather than keep releasing a list of unsponsored cats, there would just be one drop-down list of all of the cats receiving awards with no indication of whether they have been sponsored yet. If one cat receives multiple awards (e.g. an NW and a breed award), it would appear in the list just once. By allowing multiple people to sponsor the same cat, no one needs to know which ones are unsponsored. Only the recipient of the award will see who sponsored the cat when they open the card.

A list of contributors can be included in the banquet booklet (if time allows before the booklet has to go to the printer) with no indication of which cats they sponsored, just a thank you for their contribution to the awards. So no one will need to feel embarrassed about their cat not being sponsored because nobody else will know.

There will be an option to make a general contribution to the awards.

The amounts we recommend do not cover the actual cost of the individual trophies and rosettes. These amounts are suggested to offset the overall cost of CFA's awards, not to pay for each item individually. We recommend that for this year, since this is the first time we are trying this at the national level and since we recommend allowing multiple people to sponsor the same cat, the price should be reasonable to encourage more people to participate and to sponsor multiple cats. \$30 seems like a small amount when the awards cost more than that, but this small amount could encourage greater participation.

For this year, the Awards committee chair would coordinate with the CFA webmistress to keep track of sponsor names. We are looking into different types of paper for the cards and hope to have samples in time for the February board meeting to demonstrate how we would handle the cards that would list the sponsors and go with the awards.

Pageantry

According to Shelly Borowski, each NW award takes approximately one minute to present. This means if we add 60 NWs, we need 60 minutes to present those awards. We believe that with some sacrifices, we can present up to 60 additional awards, possibly 75, without adding an unreasonable amount of time to the banquet. We recommend the following changes to the banquet script:

- a. JA award – present at the JA meeting, save 10 minutes*
- b. Board service awards – present at the board or delegate meeting, save 10 minutes*
- c. Credentials service awards – present at the delegate meeting, save 10 minutes*

- d. *Call breed award recipient to the stage in groups by breed for one group photo, save 15 minutes*
- e. *Start memorial/OTRA when desert starts; limit memorial to 5 mins max and limit OTRA to 15 minutes max, save 5-10 minutes*

If necessary, these options can also be considered:

- f. *Star Awards – present at the delegate meeting, save 20 minutes*
- g. *Hawaii Awards – determine whether recipients will be present; if not this will go quickly. If so, call all three to the stage at the same time for one photo, save 5 minutes*

This leaves only the question of how to present the top cats and how to call recipients to the stage. We recommend calling in order of placement, i.e. 25th Best in ID-China, 25th Best in ID-Other (if there is one), 25th Best in North America, 24th Best in ID-China, 24th Best in ID-Other, 24th Best in NA, etc. The board can draw numbers at the February meeting to see which area is called first. For the Bests, we recommend that the awards committee, in consultation with Shelly, pick generic upbeat celebratory music and all of the bests in one category are called to the stage one after the other, each remaining on stage as the others are called (but off to the side a little). They will be called in the same order as the other awards.

Eigenhauser: The other thing I have concerns with is pushing off some of the awards into the delegate meeting. A long time ago and far, far away, the delegate meetings often ran into Saturday. In recent years we have been keeping it on Friday only, but we’ve slowly shifted from having all the reports done in the morning and having the resolutions in the afternoon, and now we’re half way through the afternoon before we get done with all the presentations. I think pushing too many presentations into the delegate meeting would probably be a bad idea. In particular, I really think the Star Awards need to be at the banquet. The board awards, if we want to do it at the board table, that’s fine. The JA awards, if they want to do them at the JA meeting, that’s fine. But I really don’t want to be pushing the Star Awards into the delegate meeting. We only have a few hours as it is for the amendments and resolutions. Adding another 20 minutes isn’t something we should be doing, but I’m happy with most of the rest of the proposal.

[from end of report] **Hannon:** On Pageantry, do you need something from us on Pageantry? **Kolencik:** Not for this season yet, but for next season, I was planning on timing everything at the annual to see how long everything took, and then I will come back with a plan. **Hannon:** Alright, they are going to come back to us later about Pageantry next season. You don’t need any direction on Pageantry for this show season, correct? **Kolencik:** At this point, no. **Hannon:** Have we discussed all we need to discuss for next show season? **Kolencik:** I believe we have.

Current Season

Should the board implement a change to the current season, the options include the following:

- a. *Implement the plan that you approve for next season (if you approve one) beginning with this season.*
- b. *Implement a different plan for the current season, perhaps the one suggested by Rachel Anger.*

A plan has been suggested by Rachel which has some support among many exhibitors. This plan simply extends the NWs for this season such that Regions 1-9 and ID-Other have a guaranteed number/limit of awards while China has a guaranteed number/limit. We recommend that in any extension that premiership not be included. Of the top 100 cats in premiership, only 3 right now are from outside of Regions 1-9, and the first of those is #47. There is not sufficient interest in premiership outside of North America to extend those awards. Questions that need to be addressed about any such extension include the number of areas, how many awards will be apportioned to each area in each category, whether to include a minimum points requirement, and whether to include premiership.

Background
(reprint from CFA Newsletter)

During their teleconference on December 8th, the board discussed creating multiple geographic areas each with their own set of NW awards. Each area would have a set of NWs based on a formula comparing the number of present cats competing at shows in that area during the prior season to the number of present cats competing in shows in North America during the prior season. All NWs would be presented at the banquet at the annual; the issues of cost and timing are still being resolved. The transcript of the teleconference will be available on the CFA website soon.

A similar idea was presented at the Toronto annual and failed. The current plan is different from what was proposed at the Toronto annual in some key ways. The table below shows a few differences. Please remember that the left column is the draft plan being considered.

<i>Current plan under consideration</i>	<i>Proposal from the Toronto annual</i>
<i>Allow cats to earn national points at any CFA show. A cat being scored in one area could go to a show in another area and retain those points.</i>	<i>Cats could not earn national points outside of their own area. A cat from the US would not have been able to go to a show in Europe (and vice versa) and retain the points.</i>
<i>NW placements distributed based on a ratio comparing the present counts in the areas.</i>	<i>NW placements distributed based on the number of rings offered during the show season.</i>
<i>No minimum number of awards in any area (although this could change). The number of awards could fluctuate each season (but not during the season) depending on changes in the ratio.</i>	<i>Set a minimum number of awards in each area in each category, including premiership.</i>

Only one NW per cat per category per season.

It would be possible for a cat to change areas and earn two NWs in the same category in different areas in the same season.

Below is an outline of the plan under discussion, however the board is going to continue to refine this plan before voting on a final version at their February meeting. The outline could change dramatically based on feedback. There are tentative plans to have another teleconference in early January to consider feedback. Everyone is encouraged to read through this plan and contact your regional director or any board member with questions or feedback. You can also send feedback to cfanwfeedback@gmail.com.

Questions to consider – should Japan and Europe have their own areas? Should the International Division be split? Should there be a minimum number of NW awards per category per area? Should there be a minimum number of points required for an NW, e.g. 2000 for championship and 1000 for kitten and premiership? Are there any other concerns that need to be addressed?

Geographic Areas for National Awards

- 1. Create two geographic areas for NW titles. No other award or pedigree title will be changed.*
- 2. The two areas are:*
 - a. Regions 1-9*
 - b. International Division*

Note that these areas may change depending on feedback from clubs.

- 3. The number of NW placements for Regions 1-9 will remain at 25 in each category. The number of NW placements for the International Division area will be set according to the ratio of present cats in the ID compared to present cats in North America. This calculation will be done by Dick Kallmeyer (i.e. not a programming change for Computan).*
- 4. The ratio will be calculated based on a full season of data from the 2015-2016 season and released in May 2016 for the 2016-2017 season. This means the number of NWs in the ID will not be in the show rules. Instead it will be posted on the CFA website. The show rules will identify where on the CFA website to find information on the distribution of NWs. The distribution will be updated each May after the final show counts are reported to Central Office.*

Based on present counts for the first part of the current season, the initial distribution for the ID NWs could be 18 K, 15 C, 3 P in the 2016-2017 season. These values could change and are included here only for discussion purposes as an estimate.

5. *National points can be earned anywhere in CFA, however regional points will continue to be restricted as currently. The International Show will continue to be treated as non-area-specific such that everybody can keep points earned there for both regional and national awards.*
6. *A cat should only be able to receive an NW in one geographic area per season per category. This would be similar to how a cat cannot achieve two RWs in any one category in multiple regions in a single season. For example, a cat could achieve an NW in one area in the kitten class and an NW in a different area in the championship class in a single season but could not achieve two championship NWs in different areas in the same year. A cat can only achieve one NW per category per season.*
7. *There will be a geographic area residency requirement for the NW title similar to the regional residency requirement. The International Show will not be used to establish residency.*
8. *The breed awards at the annual will remain the same – top three in breed in championship that are the highest scoring with national points, the highest receiving the BW title.*
9. *All NWs will be presented at the annual banquet in North America.*

TBD: *funding for 36-40+ additional trophies/rosettes, logistics of presentation at the banquet.*

Feedback

The following are emails sent to cfanwfeedback@gmail.com. People were asked to comment on the proposal that the board discussed in early December 2015, so the comments are mostly about that proposal with some adding different suggestions. Identifying information has been removed from each email, but can be provided if requested.

* * * * *

While interesting and complete, I think CFA should reject any changes to our current award system. I can find nothing wrong with the current system other than the fact the Chinese are competing better than Americans. The hullabaloo over the awards is just sour grapes from those exhibitors who habitually "run" for nation wins and are being beaten.

Segregating our competitor recognition will not solve the underlying problem of declining interest in the hobby in the US and the concurrent increasing interest in Asia. Until the playing field is leveled in this crucial aspect, the awards will always go to those areas where the interest is greater.

Changing the awards system hasn't worked in the past, and I doubt it will have a positive effect now.

* * * * *

Please vote this in immediately!! Give them a reason to believe in our association!!!

* * * * *

I think this proposal is great. It is concise and not complicated (like the others). It allows ALL CFA participants to achieve the top titles by leveling the playing field. It also ensures the ID is included and obtains awards based on how many are showing in each competitive category.

Thank you. Please pass this.

* * * * *

I'm confused about split season kittens of this year. What happens with them? But overall I really like all the current proposals except being able to show for points out of your territory. I think if we divide it up it's fairer to all if everyone shows in their own area.

* * * * *

I can't comment via the link...but a thought I had one morning...along the lines of what is being proposed is have the geographical wins, and then a Top 25 of International or Global wins. It would take into consideration all the geographic wins with one HOWEVER...in order to be considered for the BIG win, you had to have shown your cat OUTSIDE your region at least once. Kinda reverse right now of the "region of residence" for your cat (as long as you've shown your cat in your region at least once during the show season you can earn a RW in that region) but in order to be considered for the biggie, you have to go outside your region at least once. It would eliminate that feeling of cats earning NW's but never leave their region so never experience the other competition. Does this make sense?

I guess I'm looking at this from the outside, because honestly I don't ever expect to be in a position of a NW (unless of course that 9 year old gets over ambitious!) But I still think there should be that big win to go for. I think I'm seeing a three tier - RW, NW (geographically) and then an International or World Win. And by stipulating that one has to have shown outside the region of residence at least once, it will be more fair. Otherwise, if we just leave it as a NW but within geographic areas, a COTY Regions 1-9 is equal to COTY in the International Division and I guess I can hear people saying it "cheapens the win" (insert whiny voice there) because now you have two.

* * * * *

1. The draft states that a cat can earn points at any CFA Cat Show; regarding this, when an area has a quarantine – what happens when people find a way to enter the country and earn points.

Thanks to the committee for working toward a change, for trying to adapt to new and changing situations.

* * * * *

My thoughts:

The Board should not be making a rule change of this magnitude without delegate input. What's more, the delegates resoundingly rejected any limitations on China at the Toronto Annual. I may not like it, or agree with it, but those are the rules of our organization. Sometimes you have to live with a bad choice and wait until the proper time to make a change now that we've experienced the fallout.

I think the best way to handle this is to make a rule about countries with quarantine. If they have one, they do not compete for NW with the rest of the world. This solves the problem and will encourage breeders in the rest of the world to come back out and show again.

No one wants to play a game where you know you've lost before you even paid your entry. That's the situation we have right now everywhere but China in CFA. When the perception is that the game is woefully unfair, exhibitors will simply not even enter, and it's killing our US and R9 clubs. We also need to be mindful of the other Asian exhibitors who might get punished by this move. They cannot survive in a "region" dominated by China, which is quarantine limited even to them.

The problems here are isolated to a quarantine country - the answer seems very obvious and simple to me. Quarantine countries can compete for their own awards, as Hawaii has done for years.

* * * * *

Having just campaigned a cat to a NW last season and having being show manager for National Capital and President of CFW I have felt the effects of the Chinese involvement in the NW placements and show counts and participation in the Fancy. I feel that something needs to be done to award people in each of the Divisions, International, Europe and Americas their own NW's.

The issue I have with what the Board has proposed is that we are doing too little too late, thus I feel the changes should be made NOW not next year. Damage is being done to counts, morale and CFA in general here in US and Europe because of the lack of clear understanding and explanations that might have caused something to be completed at the end of the last season at the Toronto Annual.

This situation is now being allowed to bleed into another season and if the Board and Directors of CFA can look at the standings as they are right now and not see there that is an incredible disparity going on then we are in bigger trouble than I thought. I was one of the people who voted to change things in Toronto and felt so disappointed when nothing happened and the proposals presented were written in such a way that people did not feel they could vote for them.

I understand that people don't want to "upset" the Chinese but who built CFA into what it was in the first place what about "upsetting" the US exhibitors that have given their hearts and souls and money for years. We need to listen and listen fast.

* * * * *

I really like the changes and hope they pass... thank-you for all the hard work!!

* * * * *

I think it looks good. My preference would be to have China stand alone. The rest of the ID (including Japan) competing with regions 1-9.

* * * * *

suggestions,

1) End the NW completely and put more emphasis of RW and breed wins (giving BW 3 deep in all categories). Annual banquet could recognize the Best cats from each region/area in all three categories by presenting them on stage, no additional awards given, or maybe flowers :-)

OR

2) separate any area from NW that has a quarantine that effectively blocks competition from other areas. The precedent is already in place to do this because of Hawaii.

3) ANY change should be made retroactively to the start of the current season. The kitten scoring was changed mid season so why wait to do this?

4) Marked catalogs for any CFA show should be available to purchase as a email pdf

* * * * *

We vote yes for the new proposal. (The bottom proposal on the link Lorna shared)

Another idea that has been said that we think would be ideal:

Say the "Top" scoring cat in Japan has only earned 2,000 points and is a gorgeous cat. It will never receive a NW! (Very sad) We could have an invitation only "End of the Year World Show" that could unite all of the top 25 scoring cats/premiers in each Region. This could truly decide who deserves a NW. The cat can compete in any region to stay in his/her own top 25. Keeping the current rules with the January deadline. (Kittens could follow the new proposal rule. Due to possibly being adults at the end of the year)

China can enter 70 exotic shorthairs or 80 American shorthairs but in the end, it's only the best cats that earn the NW. Not money or manipulation that earned it for them.....

* * * * *

Thanks for asking for feedback in the CFA Newsletter.

My suggestion is: This should have been also emailed to ALL club secretaries. CFA is run by clubs, not individuals. It is also the clubs that send the delegates to the annual to vote on issues and changes such as this.

A proposal will follow from my club.

* * * * *

I see in this presentation that you still want to keep the breed wins the same. I am diametrically opposed to that. Sometimes a great cat cannot be shown to NW status or maybe even RW status, but is still a great cat, and in my opinion, if it can earn too many points across the seas, it could knock out an otherwise great cat here that deserves a BW too. We need to look at how to expand the breed wins as well, perhaps allowing more than one cat to carry a BW title? Or different scoring for that award not based on a global approach. I know for myself that I could never travel overseas to gain points on any cat.

* * * * *

I believe there is a real and imminent threat posed to our organization by the **perceived** lack of level playing field within CFA. I further believe this threat calls for drastic mid-season intervention by the BOD in order to stabilize/affirm CFA's commitment to competitive balance.

Though I cannot say I have personally witnessed Show Rule violations at International Division shows involving intentionally manipulated counts, "duplicate" cats (same cat shown under different numbers at

the same show), "variable" and ridiculous show entry fees (whether manipulated by the entry clerk, show management, or both), missing or falsified show flyers, etc., I CAN say that I have seen enough anecdotal evidence and statements from people with first-hand knowledge that my suspicions are raised beyond an acceptable level. Though certainly not valid for a "conviction" of wrongdoing, I believe it more probable than not that:

- serious rules transgressions are repeatedly taking place at shows in mainland China
- the threat of rules enforcement is nearly non-existent for a multitude of reasons, not least of which are geographic distance, language barrier,
- overwhelming (to the point of blind devotion in some instances) desire to not single out an entire nation of exhibitors/clubs)
- the perpetrators are completely aware of the 2nd point above, and actively flout in the face of others because they know full well the repercussions are negligible.
- the perpetrators are working collectively, and have the most to gain by these actions

There is no denying that the above statements (which I would have made six months ago, and recent activity has only served to provide increased amounts of anecdotal evidence to increase my suspicions) have profoundly impacted how I as an exhibitor and club president view the competitive playing field, and by association the organization as a whole.

I am loathe to contemplate ANY rule change mid-season. I am of the opinion that strategic and tactical decisions are made by thousands of exhibitors hundreds of times per week throughout a competitive season based on the rules that exist at the time, and changing them mid-stream punishes some peoples' choices while rewarding other peoples'. That being said, to do nothing when faced with an imminent threat is self-defeating.

Of all the approaches I have seen discussed both personally and in various internet forums, the one I believe makes the most sense is to increase the number of NWs for the 2015-16 show season such that Top 25 Kittens, Championship, and Premiership EXCLUDING cats whose residence is Mainland China be awarded the title. IN ADDITION, any cat who exceeds the point total of 25th Best Kitten, Championship, or Premiership and happens to reside in Mainland China would also earn the NW title. I believe Rachel Anger has a proposal similar to this already written, and I would wholeheartedly support it in whatever form the BOD decides would be most readily implemented, **AS LONG AS** the BOD simultaneously commits to addressing the multiple competitive balance issues going forward, with whatever changes being in place prior to the 2016-17 show season.

In that vein, I would prefer the NW title be scrapped entirely going forward until and unless a methodology is put in place which an impartial person would find balanced, credible, and verifiable. I am hopeful the Rules Committee would act in conjunction with the Awards Committee to form a type of ad-hoc Competition Committee, and try to hammer the various proposals into something that would meet that standard. I am also hopeful that other committees such as the Protest Committee and the Ombudsman could offer insight into ways to increase transparency regarding rules violations and enforcement. There is currently a very negative perception of the entire protest process, and I believe that is CFA's single greatest tool to ensure fair play among all participants.

To be clear, I am not advocating any sort of "China-bashing"; I am quite frankly nauseated by some folks' repeated attempts to label all of us who perceive a serious problem as somehow being negative, poor

sports, bigoted, racist, or any of the myriad of labels that people hiding behind a keyboard like to throw around like so much confetti. The only people and clubs I want singled out are the ones that are breaking the rules (if any).

In closing, I would like to personally thank the members of the Board who encouraged this feedback, as well as Mary Kolencik for facilitating the forum and delivery to the Board.

* * * * *

Regarding rumors concerning the change of NW awarding mid-season and also for next season, as an exhibitor and secretary of a club within ID, I would like to make my voice on these issues in the following.

Proposal on Change for NW awarding this season

1) Lump-sum the rest of ID (without China) with Region 1-9 for NW consideration/ Rationale: "Uneven playfield" is the reason mostly used for the change and that is the same reason for ALL exhibitors outside China. Last season, 2014-2015, there were several Americans and Europeans going to the big cat show in Chengdu, China. This shows that everyone can enter China. We as exhibitors outside China have the same level of opportunity to join the shows there. There is no reason to leave out the rest of ID with China and still give the excuse of "uneven playfield" for exhibitors in Region 1-9.

Proposal on Change for NW awarding next season

1) Separate the rest of ID from China, designate China as "C" and designate the rest of ID as "D"
Rationale: As an exhibitor from the rest of ID (outside China), we no longer can collect DW points from China by the new rule. So, there is no reason in grouping China and the rest of ID together.

2) Apply NAWA and NW should be contributed to every regions (Region 1-9, C, D)
Rationale: Due to "uneven playfield", NAWA is the best solution to distribute NW awards to all region with fairness.

Thank you for your consideration.

* * * * *

I feel that awards for Countries other than the US and Canada should be separate when it comes to the National Win awards.

It is not fair for the US to have to compete with other Countries especially China when we are not able to compete in the same shows that they are. Also---CFA was founded in the USA and it is not fair to the exhibitors here who have supported CFA for many, many years. I have been showing in CFA for 30 years---I have friends who have been with CFA for 40 and 50 years.

A National Award (top 25 cats in each class-title NW) to me means an award within---USA and Canada. China should perhaps have their own awards at the end of the show year.

Thank you for listening to my opinion and I hope good solutions can come from active exhibitors' opinions.

* * * * *

At this point, we are halfway through the show season and we all know that the top 25 will be filled mostly by ID Divisions winners.

Many of us have shown our cats fairly and have continued to support the US clubs and shows. We have done our best to compete with the entirety of CFA on a very uneven playing field. We have entered shows, faithfully and flown trying to get our deserving cats and kittens NW's with CFA. I feel that CFA needs to show support and appreciation to our European and US exhibitors and clubs that have worked very hard to give continued loyalty to CFA.

Our club would support Rachel's proposal of awarding top 25 in China and top 25 in all other areas in CFA, for this season ONLY.

All Divisions means Championship, Kittens, Premiership.

Many exhibitors have tried to compete and attain NW's this season, even with the points manipulations that have happened at many of the China cat shows. We feel cats, kittens and exhibitors in the other areas deserve to be recognized. The manipulation of points and cheating that happened in shows in ID, have made it nearly impossible to get a NW in CFA from any other area for this year. Our club believes that CFA should award 25 additional awards this year only, in each division in all areas except China. China has to be separated because of the quarantine issues and award 25 places in each division in the rest of CFA. I understand we have time to change the rules for next season but it is unfair for this to be a "lost season" for the many long term fanciers that went to shows, with deserving cats and kittens and tried to compete during a very uneven playing field. Please don't drive away even more fanciers that have supported CFA under a very disappointing show season.

Thank you for your consideration!

* * * * *

After reading comments on the CFA List regarding China asking the BOD to fix the problem. Here is a permanent solution:

CFA should prepare a legal Division, i.e. CFA Europe, CFA Asia. CFA Divisions can be broken in to Regions as we have here in the U.S.A. And if needed broken into subdivisions. Appointing a President of each division to oversee the daily operations. Registrations, show fees and other fees remain with the CFA parent corp. You cannot fix any problems until you fix CFA thru a reorganization.

There is no reason the three Continents should compete for or receive the title NW since they are not residing in the United State. They should compete for a title designed for CFA Europe (EW) or CFA Asia (AW). All titles should have meaning to the Continent of Residence.

For those that can afford totting around the globe there can be a Global Winner. Must compete in 3 continents in X number of shows and defeat X number of cats. Top 3 to receive the title.

The point system will not be the Mountain to climb once the main issue is cured.

For the Boards Consideration.

* * * * *

I like the proposal outlined in the CFA Newsletter for the most part.

I'm not sure the ID area outside China should be forced to compete with it. China should be it's own region. Let China play games with itself.

I think breed awards should not be based on overall points blanketing the world. Competing with China on anything based on count, i.e. points, places us back where we started. Breed awards should be given for each area receiving it's own NW awards. This is more expensive, so make people pay for their own award or set up a nominal fee required for each winner to pay, such as \$25 and/or offer sponsorships. I think every single national winner, at least in this country, would be sponsored. I, personally, would love to sponsor my friends or people that win in my breed particularly. I have other ideas about the annual banquet to help get the awards presentation done in a timely manner...Mary K and I spoke on it briefly at a show recently and would be happy to discuss it further.

I also support Rachel Anger's idea about the hotfix for scoring this season.

* * * * *

[This email contains comments in red on the proposal that appeared in the Dec. 15th newsletter.]

Current plan under consideration	Proposal from the Toronto annual
Allow cats to earn national points at any CFA show. A cat being scored in one area could go to a show in another area and retain those points. NO— Cats in 1-9 and the remainder of the ID excluding China may keep their points earned in 1-9 and the remainder of the ID excluding China.	Cats could not earn national points outside of their own area. A cat from the US would not have been able to go to a show in Europe (and vice versa) and retain the points. NO
NW placements distributed based on a ratio comparing the present counts in the areas. NO, with the blatantly stuffed shows in China, this would not provide a reliable base to determine ratio for National Wins.	NW placements distributed based on the number of rings offered during the show season. YES
No minimum number of awards in any area although this could change). The number of awards could fluctuate each season (but not during the season) depending on changes in the ratio. # of Awards for 1-9, plus remainder of ID excluding China will be 25	Set a minimum number of awards in each area in each category, including premiership. # of Awards for 1-9, plus remainder of ID excluding China will be 25. China # of awards to be based on a ratio of # of rings produced in the prior show season.
Only one NW per cat per category per season. YES	It would be possible for a cat to change areas and earn two NWs in the same category in different areas in the same season. NO

Questions to consider –

should Japan and Europe have their own areas? **Europe to stay with 1-7, Japan Clubs to be polled to determine if they want to stay with 1-9, or have their own awards, based on the same criteria (# of rings Japan holds ratio.**

Should the International Division be split? **Yes, into 2 groups, 1) China, and 2) the remainder (South America, Malaysia, Thailand, Singapore, Hong Kong, S Korea, Taiwan, Kuwait, Isreal)**

Should there be a minimum number of NW awards per category per area? **No**

Should there be a minimum number of points required for an NW, e.g. 2000 for championship and 1000 for

kitten and premiership? **Yes, 5000 for Championship, 2000 for Kittens and 1000 for Premiership.**

Are there any other concerns that need to be addressed? **How shall Hawaii be addressed?**

Geographic Areas for National Awards

1. Create two geographic areas for NW titles. No other award or pedigree title will be changed.

2. The two areas are:

a. Regions 1-9 **This to include the remainder of the ID excluding China.**

b. International Division **Only China.**

Note that these areas may change depending on feedback from clubs.

3. The number of NW placements for Regions 1-9 will remain at 25 in each category. The number of NW placements for the International Division area will be set according to the ratio of present cats in the ID compared to present cats in North America. This calculation will be done by Dick Kallmeyer (i.e. not a programming change for Computan). **This calculation shall be based on the number of rings held in China 2015-2016 season, not by entry numbers and calculations will be posted by CFA on the CFA Website for verification.**

4. The ratio will be calculated based on a full season of data from the 2015-2016 season and released in May 2016 for the 2016-2017 season. This means the number of NWs in the ID will not be in the show rules. Instead it will be posted on the CFA website. The show rules will identify where on the CFA website to find information on the distribution of NWs. The distribution will be updated each May after the final show counts(**number of rings held**) are reported to Central Office.

Based on present counts for the first part of the current season, the initial distribution for the ID NWs could be 18 K, 15 C, 3 P in the 2016-2017 season. These values could change and are included here only for discussion purposes as an estimate.

5. National points can be earned anywhere in CFA (**No, we do not want a cat that has residency in Malaysia-going to China to show for the season after meeting the quarantine requirements. Under**

my suggestion of R 1-9 plus the ID excluding China, this cat would be eligible for the R 1-9 win. Points earned in China, stay in China. however regional points will continue to be restricted as currently. The International Show will continue to be treated as non-area-specific such that everybody can keep points earned there for both regional and national awards.

6. A cat should only be able to receive an NW in one geographic area per season per category. This would be similar to how a cat cannot achieve two RWs in any one category in multiple regions in

a single season. For example, a cat could achieve an NW in one area in the kitten class and an NW in a different area in the championship class in a single season but could not achieve two championship NWs in different areas in the same year. A cat can only achieve one NW per category per season. **Agree**

7. There will be a geographic area residency requirement for the NW title similar to the regional residency requirement. The International Show will not be used to establish residency.

8. The breed awards at the annual will remain the same – top three in breed in championship that are the highest scoring with national points, the highest receiving the BW title.

9. All NWs will be presented at the annual banquet in North America

* * * * *

As a breeder, exhibitor, and member and officer of multiple show producing clubs in two regions, I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the impacts the changes in the last few years, particularly our success in China, are having on CFA's scoring and participation in CFA shows. I also offer some suggestions.

Let me begin by saying I am happy to see the cat fancy expand successfully into China. What I am not happy about is the blatant manipulation of entire shows, with obvious coordination to make one show a designated show for champions, another for kittens. That fewer than half of the kittens at the show in China over Christmas weekend made it into more than one ring is very telling.

However we deal with the count manipulation, which we can probably get straightened out in a few years as the fancy is fully established in China, we have an urgent situation for all of CFA in the complete hopelessness this has created in exhibitors around the world. That includes those exhibitors in China who are not included in the planning an execution of the manipulation. It is not good for anyone to feel there is absolutely no hope of success due to this manipulation. I have seen seasoned campaigners walk away, but I have also seen regional showers and strictly local showers give up. By this I mean not only fail to enter shows, but actually give up on CFA or even the entire cat fancy. We cannot afford to wait.

Any solution need to be fair to the exhibitors in China, and not give the impression that they are being slapped down or otherwise are losing face. It also should be one that does not require extensive manipulation of our computerized scoring system. Finally, it needs to happen NOW. We are bleeding exhibitors and breeders right and left due to this sense of unfairness and hopelessness.

To me it seems fair to simply add a layer of awards, which can be done using currently available scoring.

1. First designate National Winner for those highest scoring kittens/championship/premiership cats in regions 1-9.
2. Then designate Divisional Awards for the rest of the world with China as a separate entity.

3. Because China has quarantine regulations that prevent free coming and going for cats to show, it should be its own scoring zone, following the precedent set by having separate awards in Hawaii due to quarantine. This is a fact, and should help explain that this step is not being taken as an affront to China. Cats in China would still be eligible for the biggest awards—Global Winners, so they are not being shunted aside.

4. Use the designation of Global Winner that the delegates approved (then rescinded) to cover the top 25 in kittens, championship, and premiership worldwide, in every division or region.

5. This needs to happen immediately or it will be too late to salvage our fancy in the US and Europe.

I realize that adding awards adds expenses. Although I am not in general a fan of dunning exhibitors to pay for their own awards via some sponsorship scheme (after all, we have already spent thousands showing the cat.), I am willing to contribute to an awards fund for CFA National Winners. I think others would be as well, given the current situation. If China does not already have a surcharge, perhaps one could be added there to help defray expenses.

Thank you for your consideration.

* * * * *

I am concerned about changing the NW awards at this time of the season. What happens to all of the kittens that were so promising when they were born and turned 4 months old and now have aged out? There is no NW as kittens and this late in the season there isn't time to get a NW in adults. So many exhibitors, just like myself, have "Given Up On This Season". The show counts prove this. I don't see how changing the awards is going to be the right thing for the exhibitors. It's going to cause people to be even more upset over the 2015/2016 season that has been LOST. One of the clubs that I belong to is going to put on their show in Palm Springs, CA in February and we, the club members, are very worried that we are going to lose our club's treasury since the counts are so bad, the show hall is so expensive, the judges room are so expensive, food is very expensive, and we really feel this could be our last show. We do hope that there will be enough of a count that we might not lose too much but there is a true fear that this will be the last show for us.

I don't call this plain old stuffing, that may or may not benefit all, or make a club happy about just breaking even.

This is pure and utter MANIPULATION which, if not tackled head on, will have devastating effects upon the genuine, honest, exhibitor in China. They may just decide it is not worthwhile trying to compete against these forces.

The writing was on the wall, last show season, the shows in China, one week a HUGE count in CH and a SMALL count in KIT, and the following week the reverse, a HUGE count in KIT and a small count in CH.

As long as heads continue to bury themselves in the sand and do not take this seriously, we might as well all hang our gloves up.

Think about the cats in the cage in China. Think about the judges that have gone there and done NOTHING about the conditions of the cats they have judged. Is the CFA Board going to look into this at all?

* * * * *

Dear CFA Board Members,

I am writing out of concern for our exhibitors based in regions 1-9. As many can see, China has steadily been taking over the top 25 positions Nationally for both Kittens & Championship. In addition, also taking many National breed wins as well. I don't think this is fair playing ground. Exhibitors outside of China are not actually even competing with those cats or are even able to due to quarantine issues. Counts in China seem to be severely manipulated to the point that exhibitors in the US feel cheated and left with little to hope for. We need to protect our exhibitor base here in the US. Many exhibitors have lost interest this season because some feel there is no hope for us. Not to mention, the lack of entries for the remainder of this season will hurt many of our clubs. Further more, many clubs are potentially faced with putting on their last show due to declining entries.

I am a member of 2 clubs that would be in full support of the Rachel Anger proposal to reinstate the NW's for regions 1-9 for this show season, until we figure out a solution for the next season. I feel this proposal will help motivate exhibitors to continue to show for remaining months in this season, helping morale & increasing entries for our clubs.

For some, this may be the year they finally bred the right cat. I know on a personal note, I have spent over 18 years involved with CFA and breeding that special cat worthy of a NW has always been a goal of mine. Please do not let this be the lost year. It may be that one person's dream that is being taken away.

* * * * *

I'll be mercifully brief - What the Chinese have done to manipulate the NW's this season is grossly unfair. Please take action to bring some semblance of fairness to this year's awards by giving 1-25 in all categories to regions 1-9 and separate awards to China.

Hopefully the issues that caused this problem can more fully be addressed at the annual. Make no mistake, stuffing and count manipulation in ALL areas of the world needs to be addressed. Even though violations are more blatant in China, they still happen right here in the US and hurt us "little people" just as much.

Thanks for your consideration.

* * * * *

Happy New Year! Thank you for soliciting input on the NWs. I hope you have received numerous emails. People have been sitting on the sidelines for too long and then complaining about the outcome.

We advocate for the following:

1. No changes for this season, it is too far along.
2. Next season - make China its own Region with its own NWs.
3. Explore fund raising opportunities or a entry fee surcharge that will go to funding the additional awards.
4. Should numbers in China fall off significantly, reincorporate them into single NW awards
5. We disagree on sponsoring NW awards - I do not like the idea of sponsoring or self-funding awards. It is one small return on the significant investment we make as breeders and exhibitors to maintain and promote pedigree cats, the reason CFA exists. She is okay with this idea.
6. Favor alternative idea that Mary K proposed, something like - If China is not made its own Region,

apportion NWs based on number of exhibitors (If US accounts for 60% of the exhibitors in a given year, then the US gets 15 NW slots = 60% of 25)

* * * * *

I have been showing and breeding for more than 12 years. I am currently involved in 2 CFA clubs, show manager and president. I have campaigned and achieved NW's and have made CFA part of our family. We have supported our region and clubs to help CFA grow. We are proud to be part of CFA and we want to continue growing with the support of our friends in CFA.

But it has come to the point of seeing our hobby falling because of China growing to fast for us and they don't abide by the show rules because they don't understand how important those rules mean to us.

CFA rules are what makes us become a better person in CFA. I'm glad they are excited and want to join us, but they are like little babies and they just want to win no matter what they have to do... We need to teach them the rules so they can abide by the rules and respect them so they can grow in a healthy way. CFA was built in the USA and we have welcomed new regions in the past few years and yes we had a few problems, but at least they learn to abide by our rules. it has come down to the point of us loosing to China, because they ignore our rules and find ways to manipulate the system. I ask that the board to please split China from regions 1-9 immediately to save the few honest exhibitors that abide by the rules and have worked overtime to stay in the standings. China has taken over the standings to a point of mocking all the regions. They are only competing against themselves to the highest level of competition that has become almost scary with their violent actions and by manipulating the NW standings.

This was posted on fb by a CFA exhibitor in China.

They have shut entries out of shows by over charging people as much as \$600 per entry so they will not attend. They refuse to post a show flyer by the deadline. They tell the person that they don't want attending that the show is full while taking other entries.

They bring one cat and cover their benching areas with drapes and then place the same cat in more than one ring with different numbers to help manipulate the counts. They leave the show hall after attending one ring without asking for permission. It's as if our rules do not matter to them as they do to us. Where's the respect ?

China is a quarantine country, we can't attend their high count shows.

Please consider separating China from region 1-9

* * * * *

My primary comment/suggestion regarding National Awards is not to try to make Kitten Awards "match" the NW for championship and premiership. There are already significant differences in the time allowed and number of rings between kittens and the other divisions. Make the kitten award a NKW and allow them to be determined by geographic area as has been suggested. (USA, Europe, China etc)

For Championship & Premiership consider some of the suggestions that would involve head to head competition at one or more "big" shows, # of shows, qualification and # of NW to be determined.

* * * * *

Hi

so...like others I've had thoughts about the "NW situation" rolling around in my head. If you're still accepting submissions to forward on to Rachel, I'll add my two cents worth :)
No solutions, just observations and thoughts.

1. The playing field for NW has NEVER been level. Ever. There have been several things that one had to have in order to obtain that title (and surprise - one of them isn't an outstanding cat. A good cat, well shown, was sufficient). What WAS required was: time, money, means/mode of transportation, and being "show savvy." Not having any of those criteria is just as big an obstacle as not being able to get into a country because of a quarantine restriction.

2. However, this 'fact of life' was never a problem....until American exhibitors began losing placements. First to the cats in Europe, now to the Chinese. NOW it's a problem, where it wasn't 10, 20, 30 years ago. NOW it's something that US exhibitors think need fixing. It was broken a long, long time ago.

3. Take it one step out further: it's only a "problem" for 75 people. Perhaps 90 if you include those "in the hunt." Your average exhibitor isn't affected by who gets those 75 top awards.

4. Do we even NEED 75 NWs? Really. Is that so necessary to CFA? In the grand scheme of things, CFA registers cats. It also sets standards that those cats must meet to be registered, and licenses shows to determine if said cats meet those standards. Is it necessary to determine 75 top cats?

5. More directly connected to the business that CFA is in.....what are we doing to support and encourage breeders? Registrations have dropped (although they are beginning to rebound). This does affect how many cats are being shown, but it's not the only reason show counts have dropped. It's more difficult to be a breeder these days - but it's not impossible. If having a cattery that is effectively a "consortium" of breeders is what is required (where multiple people house and care for cats under the direction of a primary breeder - more common in Europe - then perhaps that's worth exploring. Advocating "breeding smart" to keep numbers manageable.

6. Regardless - exhibitors are entering fewer cats now than they were 10-15 years ago. This directly coincides with the advent of the 1 day show and the 6x6 show, as exhibitors find it impossible to actually show more than one or two cats under this format. These formats have also directly impacted the social infrastructure of both the show hall and the former nurturing/learning experience that all new exhibitors experienced.

So....suggestions

A. Eliminate the NW altogether and ranking a set number of cats. If there must be some sort of top-level award, make it one that someone with a good cat can reasonably achieve. There ARE good cats worthy of a top title that don't get shown outside of their area because the owner doesn't have disposable time or money. The name of whatever award would need to be changed if for no other reason than for pedigree management (i.e. - to differentiate these awards from the previous NW) (see D below)

B. More focus on breed wins. Number of awards to be determined by the number of cats shown in the breed class (kittens, championship, premiership ideally) by the date that one can change regional registration. Minimum of 2 awards (if cats reach 200 points). 1-3 receive physical trophies; all others receive certificates in the mail and recognition on the CFA website & in the awards booklet (so, no real added expense).

C. Create a title somewhere between grand and RW as a goal for the "average" exhibitor. This has the

added benefit of keeping these cats in the show hall longer. (yes, I know it comes up at the Annual, and dispute support, keeps getting voted down). You'll need something like this if #D (below) or any variation that does away with the 75 NWs comes about.

D. If we still feel the need for a top title, make it one that someone - with a good cat - has an actual chance to achieve. Not an endurance test for 365 days; not one that an exhibitor would have to chase points. Perhaps "qualifying shows" throughout the year where a cat's placement in a final is a set number of points (10 points for Best, 9 for Second, 8 for 3rd, etc) and when the cat reaches a set number of points (say, 200?), they are awarded this top title. The shows would need to be shows that are large enough that this finite point assignment means something.

E. Eliminate the 6 x 6 show format. It is not being used as originally intended and it had caused more harm than good. Encourage the licensing of two day shows so that exhibitors actually have a chance to interact with one another.

* * * * *

I have a Facebook group setup for CFA Amendments and Proposal discussion and **several members of the International division have expressed concern with being lumped in with China in regard to scoring.** They feel, as I do, that China is the problem, and to lump them in with China when they, too, **cannot go there to compete due to quarantine restrictions,** will be a serious detriment to growth in the International Division. I also have friends in China that hope that China will become its own entity and this will cease the cheating and bullying that they're experiencing from those exerting power over others there. **I fear the administration is only listening to the campaigners over there in regard to their not wanting to be separate.** There are vast cultural differences between China and the US that I am only beginning to understand, but they see no issue with wanting to take all of the top wins in kittens and championship, and premierships will soon follow. They will stop at nothing to achieve these goals. We are working with one exhibitor in China to file a protest in regard to blatant show rule violations that occurred at this weekend's show, including but not limited to showing one kitten as multiple entries, the entry clerk accepting kitten entries prior to other classes, and an exhibitor inflating the count in a single category.

I also wanted to encourage the separation of breed wins from China. Even in the minority breeds that I and my friends show (Ragdoll, Oriental longhair, and Somalis), the top spots are held by cats in China. With the level of competition that we face in the US, it is virtually **impossible for our cats to be able to get the number of points needed to achieve the BW title, so we've ceased showing our cats, causing lost revenue for clubs.**

One way that both of these could be achieved would be to **make China it's own division within the International division.** Another school of thought would be to eliminate quarantined areas from being eligible for national wins and breed wins. There is support for both of these within the group on Facebook from both Chinese exhibitors and other members of the ID, as well as people in regions 1-9.

Feel free to reply to discuss any of these ideas further.

* * * * *

There is a Facebook group setup for CFA Amendments and Proposal discussion and several members of the International division have expressed concern with being lumped in with China in regard to scoring. They feel, as I do, that China is the problem, and to lump them in with China when they, too, cannot go there to travel, will be a serious detriment to growth in the International Division. I also have friends in China that hope that China will become its own entity and this will cease the cheating and bullying that

they're experiencing from those exerting power over others there. I fear the board is only listening to the campaigners over there in regard to their not wanting to be separate. There are vast cultural differences between China and the US that I am only beginning to understand, but they see no issue with wanting to take all of the top wins in kittens and championship, and premierships will soon follow. They will stop at nothing to achieve this.

I also wanted to encourage the separation of breed wins from China. Even in the minority breeds that I and my friends show (Ragdoll, Oriental longhair, and Somalis), the top spots are held by cats in China. With the level of competition that we face in the US, it is virtually impossible for our cats to be able to get the number of points needed to achieve the BW title, so we've ceased showing our cats, causing lost revenue for clubs.

One way that both of these could be achieved would be to make China its own division within the International division. Another school of thought would be to eliminate quarantined areas from being eligible for national wins. There is support for both of these within the group on Facebook from both Chinese exhibitors and other members of the ID, as well as people in regions 1-9. I feel it would be most fair to give China its own set of awards, and have 1-9 and the rest of the ID another. I would also lump into this that countries outside of 1-9 that have quarantines would become ineligible for 1-3 breed awards because, as I said, this is not just about national wins. It's about people feeling they don't have a chance to win any top title, which includes breed wins.

* * * * *

To whom it may concern,

Because China itself is much greater in counts than Region 1-9, it is a good idea to separate China into more than just 1 region.

For example, Region C1 includes Beijing, Dalian, Tianjin, Chengdu and Region C2 includes Shanghai, Guangzhou, Wu Xi, Foshan.

By doing this, counts will be divided and they will compete with each other. This will separate DWs from NWs in China alone.

* * * * *

To all CFA Board members:

I am writing this letter to show my support for Rachel Anger's proposal to address the extreme numbers of National wins being taken this show season by China. It is my understanding that show counts and entry fees have been manipulated making it possible for those select few able to go to shows in China to acquire vast amounts of points that are basically unavailable to those who reside in regions 1-9. This is certainly not a fair playing ground, and I believe it needs to be addressed this show season. There are many people trying for National wins that will be shut out by what is going on in China. For some, this may be their one and only shot at obtaining the goal of a National win. Some people strive for many years to breed a cat worthy of a National win. To have their dreams erased by unfair tactics is simply not right. I've had my share of National winning cats, but have been away from the cat fancy for over a year due to personal issues. Recently several of my friends have informed me about the dilemma this situation has put them in, and they are considering leaving the cat fancy for good if something is not done to correct this injustice immediately. This situation has caused many people to give up on trying for anything this season, and I believe the counts in regions 1-9 have suffered because of this. Many more

clubs are considering making this season the last for them to produce a show due to lack of funds. We need to protect the exhibitor base and clubs in regions 1-9; not frustrate them to the point of no return. I truly hope for the sake of exhibitors residing in regions 1-9 and for the survival of the Cat fancy in general that you consider passing this proposal.

* * * * *

(ii) Kittyhawk Proposal to Expand the NW Awards to Two Divisions

RESOLVED: Amend Show Rules, Article XXXVI – NATIONAL/REGIONAL/DIVISIONAL AWARDS PROGRAM, **SCORING** and **AWARDS** Sections Paragraphs as follows:

Article XXXVI

**NATIONAL/REGIONAL/DIVISIONAL
AWARDS PROGRAM**

SCORING

At the completion of the show season, a cat/household pet will be credited with the points from its highest 100 individual rings. A kitten will be credited with the points from its highest 40 individual rings earned as a kitten, to be credited in the show year in which its last full weekend of kitten eligibility falls, regardless of the show year in which it begins showing as a kitten.

If a cat/household pet is exhibited in shows totaling 100 rings or less (40 rings for kittens) total credited points will be the sum of total points earned.

All points credited must be earned while competing as a particular color/tabby pattern except for Household Pets, whose descriptive information may change without affecting their points earned. Cats/kittens that have earned points under more than one color/tabby pattern description will only receive those points earned under the color/tabby pattern description for which they were eligible and last shown (see show rule 6.11).

Points gathered at an officially sanctioned CFA International Show will count toward national/regional/divisional points in the competing class for the cat/kitten in the residence of final assignment (see regional definition and regional/divisional assignment sections).

In order to be eligible for a regional award, a cat/kitten/household pet must be shown at least once in the region of final assignment (see regional assignment section).

Breed/Color specialty rings which provide a judging(s) beyond the number of judgments available to other entries will not be scored for National/Division/Regional points. Similarly, Household Pet rings judged by a celebrity judge (anyone other than a CFA licensed judge, CFA judge trainee, or approved guest judge) or held in conjunction with a stand-alone household pet show will not be scored for CFA award points.

Note: requests to restore wins voided by the Central Office or to receive credit for awards/points earned at a show but not posted to the cat's record, due to the presence of an incorrect registration or recording number or the lack of a registration or recording number in the catalog, can be considered only if a correctly completed registration or recording number application for the cat in question was received in the Central Office no later than 21 days prior to the opening day of the show in question or an application for a recording number is included in the show package. A correctly completed registration or recording

number application is one which contains all the information necessary to register or record the cat is accompanied by the proper fee, AND for which no registration impediment exists (i.e., genetic improbability, all kittens in litter already registered, etc.). Such requests for registered cats must be made to Central Office within 30 days after completion of the show or the Monday following the end of the show season, whichever comes first, and must include the correct registration number of the cat, the name and date of the show involved, and be accompanied by a fee as specified in the CFA's current price list for point reinstatement. Such requests for HHPs must be made to Central Office 90 days after completion of the show or in the case of regional points, by the Monday following the end of the show season, whichever comes first, and must include the correct recording number of the cat, the name and date of the show involved, and be accompanied by a fee as specified in the CFA's current price list for point reinstatement.

AWARDS

The awards presented each year are:

National Awards

Best—25th Best Cat*: Trophy, Rosette

Best—25th Best Kitten*: Trophy, Rosette

Best—25th Best Cat in Premiership (Alter)*: Trophy, Rosette

Best—10th Best Cat in Agility+: Rosette

*The title of "National Winner (NW)" is limited to cats receiving the above * awards.

+A minimum of 150 agility points are required for this award and there is no title associated with a national agility award.

National Division Awards

National Division for Regions 1-9 (NDR)

National Division for Regions 1-9 (NDR) Definition: for the purposes of season end awards, the National Division for Regions 1-9 is inclusive of North America (Regions 1-7), Japan (Region 8), and Europe (Region 9).

Best—25th Best Cat*: Trophy

Best—25th Best Kitten*: Trophy

Best—25th Best Cat in Premiership (Alter)*: Trophy

*The title of "National Winner (NW)" is limited to cats receiving the above * awards.

National Division for International Areas (NDI)

National Division for International Areas (NDI) Definition: for the purposes of season end awards, the National Division for International Areas is inclusive of the following geographical areas based on quarantine requirements: Africa and western Asia (including the middle east (minus Israel), Turkey, Iran, India, Maldives, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, etc.); China; Hong Kong; Indonesia; South Korea; Israel; Malaysia/Philippines/Vietnam/Brunei; Singapore; South or Central America, including the Caribbean nations; Thailand; and Taiwan.

To be eligible for the title of "National Winner (NW)" in the National Division for International Areas, cats must earn a minimum of the following: 2000 points in championship, 1000 points in kitten, and 750 points in premiership.

Best—25th Best Cat*: Trophy
Best—25th Best Kitten*: Trophy
Best—25th Best Cat in Premiership (Alter)*: Trophy

*The title of “National Winner (NW)” is limited to cats receiving the above * awards.

Only one “National Winner (NW)” title may be awarded in each competitive class (Championship, Kitten, Premiership) for the same cat in one show season. Each class is awarded based upon the kitten’s or cat’s residence of final assignment (see regional definition and regional/divisional assignment sections).

Agility Awards

Best – 10th Best Cat in Agility+: Rosette
+A minimum of 150 agility points are required for this award and there is no title associated with a national agility award.

Best of Breed/Division Awards

Best of Breed/Division:** Trophy, ~~Rosette~~
**The title of “Breed Winner (BW)” is limited to Championship cats receiving the above award (BEST of Breed/Division). 200 point minimum required for this award.
*****Second Best of Breed/Division:** Trophy, ~~Rosette~~
*****Third Best of Breed/Division:** Trophy, ~~Rosette~~
*****Best of Color:** Certificate
*****Second Best of Color:** Certificate
***200 point minimum required for this award.

Note: The breed/division and color awards are awarded to only the Championship classes for the National, Divisional and Regional awards.

A cat/kitten is credited for all national points earned under the scoring provisions regardless of any transfers of ownership. The owner(s) of record for the last show in **which a cat earns points** within a competitive category (i.e., kitten, championship, premiership, or household pet) will be considered the owner for the purposes of any awards.

RATIONALE: The current CFA National Award system needs to be revised and expanded along with our expansion into other areas of the world, which presents us with both opportunities and challenges. The number of shows available in different areas of the world on any given weekend results in vastly varied counts, which causes a remarkable shift in the current national standings and, thereby, does not allow for measurable fair competition. The overwhelming majority of cats/kittens from different areas of the world are not in a position to directly compete with one another at the same shows, due to quarantine restrictions, geographically isolated areas, travel restrictions, travel hardship on the cat/exhibitor, limited time off from work, and cost restrictions. This solution offers an awards system which will create an atmosphere of fair competition and continue to celebrate all of the top show cats from different areas of the world where CFA is active.

Key Points:

1. **Title:** This solution preserves the “National Winner (NW)” as the highest title in CFA.

2. **Justification:** With this solution, we can more fairly recognize cats and kittens which are capable of competing within divisional competition.
- a. *National Division Awards:* In order to support more divisional and regional area competition, the premise is to establish two national divisions for season end awards.
- i. *National Division for Regions 1-9 (North America, Japan, Europe):*
1. The “Regional Winner (RW)” titles will continue to be awarded as previously defined.
 2. The “National Winner (NW)” title will be awarded to the top 25 in NDR in the eligible competing classes.
- ii. *National Division for International Areas (divided into geographical areas based on quarantine requirements):*
1. The “International Division Winner (DW)” titles will continue to be awarded as previously defined.
 2. The “National Winner (NW)” title will be awarded to the appropriate top 25 in NDI in the eligible competing classes, who meet the defined minimum points eligibility requirement.
 3. A minimum points requirement has been established to set a manageable level of expectation for those competing, in order to account for quarantine restrictions, geographically isolated areas, and travel restrictions. Establishing a minimum points threshold may encourage growth and competition, particularly in Premiership.
 4. Arguments to NOT pro-rate the number of “National Winner (NW)” titles awarded for the International Areas, based upon a comparative number of cats shown in Regions 1-9:
 - a. One reason not to penalize and pro-rate the number of awards for the International Areas, once their National Division’s minimum points qualification has been met, is similar to the variances already encountered in the accumulated points between different regions within CFA, which all award top 25 regional titles and awards. Each region has its own geographical challenges and area competition, but not all regions necessarily compete at the same points level. Exhibitors in the International

Areas must deal with and overcome their own set of limitations and challenges, such as travel and quarantine restrictions.

b. Allows all International Areas more opportunities to work toward the title of “National Winner (NW)”.

c. Eliminates the potential for risk and error, which could result when pro-rating each new show season’s number of titles.

b. The “Agility” awards will continue to be awarded as previously defined.

c. The “Best of Breed/Division” titles will continue to be awarded as previously defined. Points toward a breed win may continue to be earned anywhere in the world.

3. **Award Cost Considerations:** Trophies, rosettes, and/or certificates will be awarded at the CFA Annual Banquet as defined for the “National Winner (NW)”, “International Division Winner (DW)”, “Hawaii Division Award”, and “Best of Breed/Division” placements.

a. Rosettes have been removed from being required to be awarded with the exception of Agility. No longer will rosettes be awarded to the National Winners or Breed Winners.

b. Rosettes could instead be made available to order and purchase at the breeder’s/owner’s own expense.

c. Many of newly awarded NW trophies should be partially funded from the money no longer spent on rosettes in the current awards budget.

d. In order to help the current awards budget, a trophy, rosette, and/or certificate will only be required to be awarded as defined in the Show Rules.

e. It can be at the budgetary discretion of CFA to award the addition of a rosette to any or all of the winners. However, many exhibitors may instead prefer a nicer trophy if the awards budget allows.

f. If additional funding is needed for more expensive trophies, then perhaps exhibitors can be notified in advance and asked to make a partial payment in order to upgrade to a better quality trophy from a lesser quality trophy available.

(iii) Kittyhawk Proposal to Expand the NW Awards to Three Divisions

RESOLVED: Amend Show Rules, Article XXXVI – NATIONAL/REGIONAL/DIVISIONAL AWARDS PROGRAM, **SCORING** and **AWARDS** Sections Paragraphs as follows:

Article XXXVI

NATIONAL/REGIONAL/DIVISIONAL AWARDS PROGRAM

SCORING

At the completion of the show season, a cat/household pet will be credited with the points from its highest 100 individual rings. A kitten will be credited with the points from its highest 40 individual rings earned as a kitten, to be credited in the show year in which its last full weekend of kitten eligibility falls, regardless of the show year in which it begins showing as a kitten. If a cat/household pet is exhibited in shows totaling 100 rings or less (40 rings for kittens) total credited points will be the sum of total points earned.

All points credited must be earned while competing as a particular color/tabby pattern except for Household Pets, whose descriptive information may change without affecting their points earned. Cats/kittens that have earned points under more than one color/tabby pattern description will only receive those points earned under the color/tabby pattern description for which they were eligible and last shown (see show rule 6.11).

Points gathered at an officially sanctioned CFA International Show will count toward national/regional/divisional points in the competing class for the cat/kitten in the residence of final assignment (see regional definition and regional/divisional assignment sections).

In order to be eligible for a regional award, a cat/kitten/household pet must be shown at least once in the region of final assignment (see regional assignment section).

Breed/Color specialty rings which provide a judging(s) beyond the number of judgments available to other entries will not be scored for National/Division/Regional points. Similarly, Household Pet rings judged by a celebrity judge (anyone other than a CFA licensed judge, CFA judge trainee, or approved guest judge) or held in conjunction with a stand-alone household pet show will not be scored for CFA award points.

Note: requests to restore wins voided by the Central Office or to receive credit for awards/points earned at a show but not posted to the cat's record, due to the presence of an incorrect registration or recording number or the lack of a registration or recording number in the catalog, can be considered only if a correctly completed registration or recording number application for the cat in question was received in the Central Office no later than 21 days prior to the opening day of the show in question or an application for a recording number is included in the show package. A correctly completed registration or recording number application is one which contains all the information necessary to register or record the cat, is accompanied by the proper fee, AND for which no registration impediment exists (i.e., genetic improbability, all kittens in litter already registered, etc.). Such requests for registered cats must be made to Central Office within 30 days after completion of the show or the Monday following the end of the show season, whichever comes first, and must include the correct registration number of the cat, the name and date of the show involved, and be accompanied by a fee as specified in the CFA's current price list for point reinstatement. Such requests for HHPs must be made to Central Office 90 days after completion of the show or in the case of regional points, by the Monday following the end of the show season, whichever comes first, and must include the correct recording number of the cat, the name and date of the show involved, and be accompanied by a fee as specified in the CFA's current price list for point reinstatement.

AWARDS

The awards presented each year are:

National Awards

Best—25th Best Cat*: Trophy, Rosette

Best—25th Best Kitten*: Trophy, Rosette

Best—25th Best Cat in Premiership (Alter)*: Trophy, Rosette

Best—10th Best Cat in Agility†: Rosette

*The title of “National Winner (NW)” is limited to cats receiving the above * awards.

†A minimum of 150 agility points are required for this award and there is no title associated with a national agility award.

National Division Awards

National Division for Regions 1-9 (NDR)

National Division for Regions 1-9 (NDR) Definition: for the purposes of season end awards, the National Division for Regions 1-9 is inclusive of North America (Regions 1-7), Japan (Region 8), and Europe (Region 9).

Best—25th Best Cat*: Trophy

Best—25th Best Kitten*: Trophy

Best—25th Best Cat in Premiership (Alter)*: Trophy

*The title of “National Winner (NW)” is limited to cats receiving the above * awards.

National Division for China (NDC)

National Division for China (NDC) Definition: for the purposes of season end awards, the National Division for China is inclusive of the following geographical areas based on quarantine requirements: China. To be eligible for the title of “National Winner (NW)” in the National Division for China, cats must earn a minimum of the following: 3500 points in championship, 2500 points in kitten, and 750 points in premiership.

Best—25th Best Cat, as appropriate*: Trophy

Best—25th Best Kitten, as appropriate*: Trophy

Best—25th Best Cat in Premiership (Alter), as appropriate*: Trophy

*The title of “National Winner (NW)” is limited to cats receiving the above * awards.

National Division for International Areas (NDI)

National Division for International Areas (NDI) Definition: for the purposes of season end awards, the National Division for International Areas is inclusive of the following geographical areas based on quarantine requirements: Africa and western Asia (including the Middle East (minus Israel), Turkey, Iran, India, Maldives, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, etc.); Hong Kong; Indonesia; South Korea; Israel; Malaysia/Philippines/Vietnam/Brunei; Singapore; South or Central America, including the Caribbean nations; Thailand; and Taiwan.

To be eligible for the title of “National Winner (NW)” in the National Division for International Areas, cats must earn a minimum of the following: 1250 points in championship, 750 points in kitten, and 750 points in premiership.

Best—25th Best Cat, as appropriate*: Trophy

Best—25th Best Kitten, as appropriate*: Trophy

Best—25th Best Cat in Premiership (Alter), as appropriate*: Trophy

*The title of “National Winner (NW)” is limited to cats receiving the above * awards.

Only one “National Winner (NW)” title may be awarded in each competitive class (Championship, Kitten, Premiership) for the same cat in one show season. Each class is awarded based upon the kitten’s or cat’s residence of final assignment (see regional definition and regional/divisional assignment sections).

Agility Awards

Best – 10th Best Cat in Agility+: Rosette

+A minimum of 150 agility points are required for this award and there is no title associated with a national agility award.

Best of Breed/Division Awards

Best of Breed/Division**: Trophy, ~~Rosette~~

**The title of “Breed Winner (BW)” is limited to Championship cats receiving the above award (BEST of Breed/Division). 200 point minimum required for this award.

****Second Best of Breed/Division**: Trophy, ~~Rosette~~

****Third Best of Breed/Division**: Trophy, ~~Rosette~~

****Best of Color**: Certificate

****Second Best of Color**: Certificate

****200 point minimum required for this award.**

Note: The breed/division and color awards are awarded to only the Championship classes for the National, Divisional and Regional awards.

A cat/kitten is credited for all national points earned under the scoring provisions regardless of any transfers of ownership. The owner(s) of record for the last show in **which a cat earns points** within a competitive category (i.e., kitten, championship, premiership, or household pet) will be considered the owner for the purposes of any awards.

RATIONALE: The current CFA National Award system needs to be revised and expanded along with our expansion into other areas of the world, which presents us with both opportunities and challenges. The number of shows available in different areas of the world on any given weekend results in vastly varied counts, which causes a remarkable shift in the current national standings and, thereby, does not allow for measurable fair competition. The overwhelming majority of cats/kittens from different areas of the world are not in a position to directly compete with one another at the same shows, due to quarantine restrictions, geographically isolated areas, travel restrictions, travel hardship on the cat/exhibitor, limited time off from work, and cost restrictions. This solution offers an awards system which will create an atmosphere of fair

competition and continue to celebrate all of the top show cats from different areas of the world where CFA is active.

Key Points:

1. **Title:** This solution preserves the “National Winner (NW)” as the highest title in CFA.
2. **Justification:** With this solution, we can more fairly recognize cats and kittens which are capable of competing within divisional competition.
 - a. *National Division Awards:* In order to support more divisional and regional area competition, the premise is to establish three national divisions for season end awards.
 - i. *National Division for Regions 1-9 (North America, Japan, Europe):*
 1. The “Regional Winner (RW)” titles will continue to be awarded as previously defined.
 2. The “National Winner (NW)” title will be awarded to the top 25 in the National Division for Regions 1-9 in the eligible competing classes.
 - ii. *National Division for China:*
 1. The “International Division Winner (DW)” titles will continue to be awarded as previously defined.
 2. The “National Winner (NW)” title will be awarded up to top 25 as appropriate in NDC in the eligible competing classes, who meet the defined minimum points eligibility requirement.
 3. Establishing a minimum points threshold sets a standard to encourage growth and competition, as well as a manageable level of expectation.
 4. Arguments to NOT pro-rate the number of “National Winner (NW)” titles awarded for China, based upon a comparative number of cats shown in Regions 1-9:
 - a. One reason not to penalize and pro-rate the number of awards for China, once their National Division’s minimum points qualification has been met, is similar to the variances already encountered in the accumulated points between different regions within CFA, which all award top 25 regional titles and awards. Each region has its own geographical challenges and area competition, but not all regions necessarily compete at the same points level.

- b. Eliminates the potential for risk and error, which could result when pro-rating each new show season's number of titles.
 - iii. *National Division for International Areas (divided into geographical areas based on quarantine requirements):*
 - 1. The "International Division Winner (DW)" titles will continue to be awarded as previously defined.
 - 2. The "National Winner (NW)" title will be awarded up to top 25 as appropriate in NDI in the eligible competing classes, who meet the defined minimum points eligibility requirement.
 - 3. Establishing a minimum points threshold sets a standard to encourage growth and competition, as well as a manageable level of expectation.
 - 4. Arguments to NOT pro-rate the number of "National Winner (NW)" titles awarded for the International Areas, based upon a comparative number of cats shown in Regions 1-9:
 - a. One reason not to penalize and pro-rate the number of awards for the International Areas, once their National Division's minimum points qualification has been met, is similar to the variances already encountered in the accumulated points between different regions within CFA, which all award top 25 regional titles and awards. Each region has its own geographical challenges and area competition, but not all regions necessarily compete at the same points level. Exhibitors in the International Areas must deal with and overcome their own set of limitations and challenges, such as travel and quarantine restrictions.
 - b. Allows the International Areas more opportunities to work toward the title of "National Winner (NW)".
 - c. Eliminates the potential for risk and error, which could result when pro-rating each new show season's number of titles.
- b. The "Agility" awards will continue to be awarded as previously defined.
- c. The "Best of Breed/Division" titles will continue to be awarded as previously defined. Points toward a breed win may continue to be earned anywhere in the world.

- 3. **Award Cost Considerations:** Trophies, rosettes, and/or certificates will be awarded at the CFA Annual Banquet as defined for the "National Winner (NW)", "International

Division Winner (DW)”, “Hawaii Division Award”, and “Best of Breed/Division” placements.

- a. Rosettes have been removed from being required to be awarded with the exception of Agility. No longer will rosettes be awarded to the National Winners or Breed Winners.
- b. Rosettes could instead be made available to order and purchase at the breeder’s/owner’s own expense.
- c. Many of newly awarded NW trophies should be partially funded from the money no longer spent on rosettes in the current awards budget.
- d. In order to help the current awards budget, a trophy, rosette, and/or certificate will only be required to be awarded as defined in the Show Rules.
- e. It can be at the budgetary discretion of CFA to award the addition of a rosette to any or all of the winners. However, many exhibitors may instead prefer a nicer trophy if the awards budget allows.
- f. If additional funding is needed for more expensive trophies, then perhaps exhibitors can be notified in advance and asked to make a partial payment in order to upgrade to a better quality trophy from a lesser quality trophy available.

* * * * *

Anger: I’m scrolling to these Kittyhawk proposals which we’re not voting on. Is that correct? **Hannon:** I don’t think we need to, because we’ve already passed something for next show season. **Anger:** Exactly. Just clarifying, thanks.

(b) 2015-2016 Show Season Award Proposal.

(i) Proposal to Award Top 25 National Wins (K/CH) in R1-9

Action Item: *For the 2015-2016 show season only, grant an exception to Show Rules, Article XXXVI – NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ DIVISIONAL AWARDS PROGRAM, SCORING and AWARDS Sections, to give additional titles by awarding the title of National Winner to up to top 25 scoring Kittens and Championship cats from Regions 1-9 and the International Division other than mainland China, using the point minimums from #3 of the combined committee proposal.*

Example: *Our current scoring system allows for Top 25 national wins across all regions and international divisions. In a hypothetical example, 15 of the top 25 kittens reside in China and 10 reside in Regions 1-9. If this proposal passes, an additional 15 kittens from Regions 1-9 will be given the title of National Winner, for a total of 25 national winning kittens from R1-9.*

RATIONALE: *Following the December 2015 teleconference which prompted the proposals in the above section (a), on the one hand an outpouring of gratitude was expressed for the board finally “doing something”, while on the other hand tremendous frustration was expressed that*

nothing would be done for the current show season to recognize their efforts. Events have unfolded since the December teleconference which further demonstrate the disparity of competition in various areas of the world, due mostly to socio-economic differences, which have grown from a spark to an explosion in a very short period of time. CFA cannot remain a viable global association with the scoring system we have in place, where competitors are not able to compete head to head, as is done in most sports. CFA is inadvertently experiencing different levels of competition between diverse and remote geographic locations, yet they are competing for the same awards.

The delegation did not pass any of the proposals that would have corrected this situation. The delegates were provided with an excellent statistical analysis which left the impression that fairness would prevail, but that has not happened. The rest of CFA feels as though they have been excluded in the current scenario, and are very vocal about not wanting to be made to wait another year in the hopes that this imbalance is going to be corrected by the proposals in the above section (a). This feeling is being made known by many people who do not even have a stake in the national wins. All they want is to participate in a sport where fairness in scoring and awards is provided by the association. This needs to be rectified now because it's the right thing to do. People need recognition and affirmation that what they are doing means something.

In 2004, we added additional kitten placements to national awards from 20 to 25 in mid-season. The same was done mid-season for the 1991-1992 awards when the kitten wins were increased from 15 to 20. The above proposal simply adds placements to national awards to achieve the identical fairness.

Hannon: The next subject is, what do you want to do this show season? There are three options. One is, we leave it alone. The second is that the motions we just passed for next show season, we move it into this show season. The third suggestion would be to come up with an alternate or a hybrid for this show season. I'm open to discussion. Rachel, you've got a plan here. Go ahead. **Anger:** I have a proposal. In the spirit of fairness in which I wrote it, I need to amend it and I apologize for that. My proposal was to award top 25 national wins in the kitten and championship classes in Regions 1-9. I would like to expand that to all areas of the ID except mainland China, and I would also like to incorporate the point minimums from #3 of the proposal that we just passed. The reason I'm bringing this forward is explained in my rationale. There have been a lot of allegations of wrongdoing, and I don't even want to go into that here. The reason I brought this forward was out of a sense of fairness. Exhibiting in China is not something that could realistically be done by someone from here in the U.S. They claim you can do it, but it would be at great risk and great cost. In order to level the playing field for exhibitors in Regions 1-9 and the other areas of the ID, because they are not able to compete head to head with those cats and earn those points. This is the solution I came up with to give people who have been showing and expect some fairness in our awards system some competitive balance. That's my proposal. **Hannon:** Rachel, I have a question. Why is your proposal better than taking next year's proposal and just moving it into this season. **Anger:** We could certainly do that. **Hannon:** Wouldn't it accomplish the same thing? **Newkirk:** I agree with you, Mark. I don't know why we're trying to make something special for this year, when we're going to implement something that we've already passed for next year. If we're going to give out additional awards this year, we should just go ahead and make this retroactive to this show season. That's my opinion. **Hannon:** Mary, you have a comment about what you want to do for this show season.

Are you there? **Anger:** Who? **Hannon:** Mary. Alright, I'll say it for her. The people in China were expecting top 25 awards. What we just passed for next season does not give them 25 awards. What Mary was going to propose was that for kittens and championship, we go ahead and give them top 25, rather than top 18 or whatever. Is there any response to that? **Anger:** If people are more favorable to that, then that's more than I'm asking for. I would be supportive. **McCullough:** Minimum points apply? **Anger:** Yes. **Hannon:** It's unlikely you will see 25 in premiership this season in China or Other. **Anger:** That does solve the issue of potential for premiership to be the new big thing to show in for a national win. There is time. The Chinese exhibitors could achieve those awards between now and the end of the show season. The show I judged in Hangzhou had top 15 in premiership just two weeks ago. **Hannon:** Wow.

DelaBar: My remark is going to be the same that I've said on the FaceBook forum and on the CFA List. I think by changing our total award system, or even just additional as Rachel first came out with, my region for one is against it. They just said, we go through this and we start anew with a new program. I have made it clear I have some concerns about the liability when we do things like that. I don't want us to get caught up in any more of, somebody said, "I'm not happy with this, therefore I am taking you to court" because it's a drag, not only on the officers but on the board members, as well. Before we get into a lot, is this something everybody wants? **Hannon:** Pam, what I would suggest is, you make a motion to leave this season's awards as is. If that fails, then we can discuss what we want to do. If it passes, then we don't need to go into the others. **DelaBar:** You are right. **Hannon:** Why don't you make a motion? **DelaBar:** OK. I will move that we continue with our current award system for this season, and then start a new awards system with the 1 May 2016 show season. **Eigenhauser:** Second. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion on the motion? **Moser:** I brought this up in my region. We talked about it at a meeting, and also I've talked with people online. As I tend to agree with what Pam is saying, that after 2/3 of your season and then going in and just changing everything, I don't know if that's the best idea. But then again, I will have to vote with my region. **Anger:** I completely agree this is not the best idea. This is a terrible situation that we're in. However, the fact that it is a terrible situation leads me to believe that we are at a crossroad which demands that we put a workable solution in place now. We have people depending on the board to come up with a solution that gives them hope to continue to show and continue in our association because there is fairness in our award system. At the current time, I don't know of anyone who believes our award system today is fair. It is partially our fault that we are this far into the season and no solution has come up. That is why we are in this awful situation and why we need an immediate hot fix. Every time I have been involved in a discussion about the awards, my response has been, "what is your suggestion, what is your fix?" Nobody really has a fix that everybody would be comfortable with. In fact, I'm not comfortable with the proposal I wrote, but I am much more comfortable with that than I am with the current scoring system, where the majority of our Region 1-9 exhibitors are excluded from a chance no matter how hard they try or how good their cat is, because they don't have an opportunity to compete for those points. In my mind, this situation went from a spark to a flame to an explosion very quickly, and we have been behind the 8 ball in not coming forward with something, even though we all saw it coming. I agree that I am very uncomfortable with this. This is the last thing that I would want to do right now. It's upsetting, it's disruptive, but on the other hand, it's something that is going to restore the faith in our competitive balance.

Moser: The delegation had several amendments to vote on this, and they all voted everything down. Then they want the board to fix it. The delegation gets upset with us when we step in. Some are not going to be happy, because we're stepping in when they said no to everything. So, I have concerns. Even with the one we just passed, I think it should go back to the delegation. Let them pass it. **Hannon:** Didn't you vote in favor? **Moser:** Of what? **Hannon:** For next show season. The changes. **Moser:** Yes, but according to your email, Mark, that's why I asked the question. This is supposed to come up again in February. This was just a discussion. The actual vote to change it for sure, under my assumption was, your email that we will vote on this in February. This was just a discussion. This is the way this was supposed to be, that we were going to bring it up in February. **Hannon:** My understanding is, we have approved this and what we need to do to implement it is to have Monte write some show rules for February, that we will vote in favor of or amend or whatever, but my understanding is, what we voted on tonight, we will make changes next season in accordance with the proposal that we had before us. Monte now needs to write show rules to implement this. **Moser:** Right, but then we have to approve those, correct? **Hannon:** We have to approve the show rules, but what we voted on tonight is approving the change for next season.

Newkirk: I want to add on to what Rachel said. I think that we've been put in a horrible situation here. I agree with Pam. I think changing rules in mid-season is terrible. I hated it when we did it for the novice wins. I just thought that was completely wrong, and I don't totally 100% think we should do it now. However, the whole organization is in an uproar. I just want to add, part of the problem is, they think the wins have been cheated from them by the stuffing that has gone on at many shows, and like many people have said, the Chinese have learned to stuff from the best stuffers in the world, and that's our exhibitors here. I really don't care if it's one cat stuffed or it's 50 cats stuffed, it still manipulates the count, even if it's by one point. There are people who have lost wins by less than a point. So, I think it's a terrible thing, but I think we have to do something. I think we also have to look into what is going on over there, to make sure that our people here understand that we are looking into it, that we are concerned, and to me the basic problem here is stuffing. If we don't do something to correct stuffing – I don't know what rules we can come up with to make sure that they have to compete in a certain percentage of the rings or whatever, but to go into one ring and I think somebody said that they judged only 20-some cats out of those 198 kittens that were entered in the show on the 26th and 27th in China. That puts a bad taste in everybody's mouth. So, to me, what we have done is, we have given some chemotherapy although we have not removed the cancer. If we don't remove the cancer, this is going to continue to go on. We need to do a little more research about what's going on over there, how can we fix the stuffing issue, because they do it better than anybody, and if we don't fix that, this problem is going to continue into the future. That's just my opinion. **DelaBar:** Darrell, you took some of the wind out of my sails. I was going to say, one, no, the adding of the additional awards, one, dilutes the awards for this season. But my thing is that we need an investigation. Show rules were not broken, they were stretched incredibly. Really, really stretched, bent in all directions, but we still have a means to look into this, and that's in the Constitution. What is detrimental to the cat fancy? If the actions have been detrimental to the cat fancy, we can go in. We need an investigation to go in and look at these things, and actually get statements from people. It doesn't need to be Dick that does it. It has to be somebody outside of that committee to do it. People say, OK, we get these awards and this is very nice, but what's going to go on to possibly stop anything like this in the future? **B. Schreck:** I, too, am in a quandary. Certainly, they have learned to stuff from the best stuffers, as Darrell put it. To Pam's

comment, what is stuffing? Is it one or is it twenty? What would be your cut-off point? If you put in an extra champion to try and get your cat graded because you can do it with one point in class, is that stuffing? I don't know how you actually measure how far down the line it is in the stuffing before you stay it's a violation of la-de-da. We know that they put a lot of cats in there. We also, as well all know, passed a rule that the kittens had to be registered or have a valid TRN number. That took away the "pet shop" argument that a lot of people were making, saying that they were just pets off the street. So, now we put that rule in and no, it didn't seem to have much effect on the number of kittens entered. Another comment I want to make is, contra to rewarding those who have the points, that you are really in a sense doing a disservice to the person who said, "well, I know what the rules are, I know I can't get a national award, I'll get my regional award and I won't go for the big one." So, those people in my opinion are going to be equally if not more upset if we change the rules midstream because they have missed out on a chance that they might otherwise have had, based on their analysis of where things were going for this year. So, you have a counter-culture group, if you will, who have a different opinion of handing out the awards for those who stuck it out or were dumb enough or stubborn enough to stay there until the end. The group who didn't stay are perhaps going to be annoyed as the others are right now. It's definitely a quandary. **Kuta:** Bumping off Barb's point about rewarding those who stuck with it and not rewarding those who decided to make that decision that they couldn't get a national, one of the things that I've seen is that exhibitors all over the country who wouldn't think going for a national, I haven't even seen some of them go for a high regional. It was like national or nothing. So, I kind of like the idea of rewarding those who stuck it out and were going for high regionals, and getting a national. I was originally against expanding the awards for this year. I was thinking it would be like an asterisk or rewarding squeaky wheels, but as the season has gone on, and especially talking with my members of the region, I think that it really does make sense to do it. Going back to stuffing, we would have to come up with a definition of stuffing. It kind of comes back to the old thing about obscenity. I can't define it, but I know it when I see it. As an entry clerk, I am privy to some of the workings on how stuffing happens, and then figuring it out. And then, what about the cat that blows in the first ring and is only in one ring. Is that a stuffer cat? No, because that person probably intended and that person probably paid for their own entry. I think that's where it kind of comes down to. No matter how many rules we create, we're never going to be able to know who paid for those entries, because there is also very sly stuffing where somebody going for a championship award, they will pay for a whole bunch of champions to be shown and not grands, or a whole bunch of opens to be shown. Those cats will be in every ring, but it was that they paid for it. So, that's a fine line. Even stuffing, while it was to their benefit that those cats were there, but I just don't know. We are never going to be able to root out some of that. **Hannon:** Is there any more discussion on Pam DelaBar's motion? **DelaBar:** Lisa, there are ways, and that's on the comparison. I don't know how many of the catalogs you have seen from China. I was just looking at a couple that I had. Like in one ring, I disqualified one cat and did N/A-Condition on two others. Those cats didn't appear in any other ring. The cat that blows probably doesn't appear in any other ring, we judges hope, but that needs to be annotated on the judge's copy so we can go back and say hey, was there a problem here? There is a way to research this. I was on the centralized investigating team for recruiting command several years ago, and if you want to dig in and find things that are false, start doing it with Army recruiters. Yes, they are a finite point, but they are there.

DelaBar: I am doubly concerned about changing the program mid-season – not even mid-season, 3/4 of the way through. One, it does affect the prestige of the award. Secondly, it's

sort of like occupying an outpost in the bird sanctuary in Oregon. It's a big show and people get their hardware and nothing is really done, except for a totally new program coming up the next season. I just have very, very strong feelings about changing programs in the middle of the stream. I would rather take the hits over the next couple months by not changing the program, than actually changing it. I am sure if I didn't try to be rational and logical at 4:30 in the morning, it might come out a little better but take it for what it is. **Hannon:** Are there any other comments on Pam's motion? **Kuta:** I don't think we are ever going to be able to find if Exhibitor A gave Exhibitor B money to pay for their entries that helped benefit Exhibitor A. We're not going to be able to root that out. Even if entries are centralized, we're never going to be able to root that out, nor I don't know if we should. Anyway, changing mid-stream, this is a very new situation with CFA's expansion, and I think it shows that we have to have some flexibility, at least for one season. We can't be so rigid. With things changing so much in one year, we need to show some flexibility. Yes, it may dilute the awards, but I think it's the right thing to do for this season. **Wilson:** We all took a straw poll back in December and decided unanimously not to change the awards for this season, and then the show in China happened and everything hit the fan. I think we have an anomalous year. I think we have something, as Lisa said, moved very rapidly and I changed my mind on how I voted. If what we just voted on for next year is good, then it's good enough for this year. Here's my concern. How much lower will the points be next year, if we don't to at least look like we are addressing this this year? That's all. **Anger:** As far as diluting the wins, if people that that's going to happen, we just did that. We voted to "dilute the wins" for next year. I don't believe we have diluted anything. What has happened is on the other end of the spectrum. The awards have been split. Because of our growth, we have almost doubled in size, and the side that has doubled has the ability to inflate these counts so that they are huge and unattainable here. I don't think anything has been diluted, especially when we invoke the scoring minimums. Those are based on previous years' wins, so were they diluted then? I don't believe they were at all. Also, yes, this is a very new situation. However, a mid-season change is based on precedent that this board has set. We have taken some very noteworthy actions mid-season on far less backlash and disruption than this, such as the TRNs and increasing the national awards several times in mid-season. We are in a drastic situation right now that really requires mid-season intervention, so I would encourage everybody to vote down the current motion and give us a chance to discuss some proposals. If they are all unworkable, then we can bring Pam's motion back up again to continue with the current awards, but as it is, I would really like to be able to discuss these proposals.

Mastin: I have a bunch of comments, but I am probably going to save a bunch of them. First, Pam, you did a great job communicating what you wanted to say this early in the morning for you. One comment you did make that brings me a little bit of concern, and I would like to hear some feed-back from Ed. You mentioned the legal ramifications. Do we actually have any legal ramifications for changing this? **Raymond:** I'll preface this by saying anybody can sue anybody for anything. That doesn't mean that the lawsuit has merit. That said, the Constitution gives this board the ability to change the show rules from time to time. It does not limit the changes to prior to the beginning of a season. It allows you to change them from time to time, and as Rachel mentioned, it has been done mid-season many times in the past. I really don't think that there is a serious liability concern, at least for my part, if you make this change now. **Mastin:** OK, thank you. **DelaBar:** Rich, could I just feed something into there? It's not the fact that CFA would get sued, because we have been sued and when we have gone to court we have prevailed, because of the way that we do our laws. My concern is, what happens to the officers

and the board members when CFA is sued like that? Like I said, as CFA President, I could not get a refinanced mortgage on my house because when you come to the point where you must answer “are you involved in any kind of lawsuit?”, when you mark yes, that stops the whole process. I don’t want anybody else to have to go through there – I’m not going to talk about process servers coming in the middle of the night or things like that – but it is such a disruption to your life that I just don’t want to put us in the position of having to worry about that. **Mastin:** Pam, I do appreciate the warning and what you have gone through. I myself have gone through the same thing, personally and through the business that we own over here. We do unfortunately – nothing against you – we have to hire our attorneys and have our insurances in place in order to defend our position in what we do in business or personally. I am extremely satisfied with the answer that I received from Ed when I asked the question on legal. Pam, I appreciate where you are coming from. My other comment that I have is, we as a board are obligated to making tough decisions. This is probably one of the toughest decisions the board has come across in many years. It has been for me, and I have only been on the board for 2-1/2 years. We need to follow through and do what we need to do here, to the best of our ability, to try to make this right. There is concern with fairness. It appears as though it is not a level playing field and that we have a lot of pride. I understand Pam’s concern about the fallout in the next couple of months. I am more concerned about the fallout if we don’t do anything this year. How long does it take to convince people from Regions 1 through 9 that they can trust the board in making good decisions? I am concerned about those that gave up, but they gave up for whatever reasons. There are still people out there that have nearly 4 months left to show their cats. Let them go out and earn what they need to earn. The last thing I had a comment about is the stuffing and us being able to actually figure out what is truly happening in different parts of the world, outside of R1-7. R1-7 it is difficult, but it’s a lot easier here than it is outside of 1-7 because we just clearly don’t understand the language. There’s language barriers. We just don’t have the ability or the resources or the manpower or the money to figure out, what are they doing? Are they doing it right or are they doing it wrong? Now, with the separation for next year, how much does it matter? If that area is going to fill their shows, aren’t we happy that they are filling their shows? We’re not happy that they are doing it with one person putting 50 cats in a ring or entering 50 cats per show. Of course not, but we want to encourage our people to show their cats. We want to encourage them to register cats. We want to encourage CFA to be around for decades longer. I think this is something we’ve got to seriously look at and make the right decision. **Fellerman:** I, too, asked my region for input on this. While some people answered to the entire list, others just answered to me privately. These were people that I have never seen comment on any list at all, but the overwhelming majority was that we’ve got to do something this year, or else we’re losing everybody. So, again, I will vote with what my region asked me to. Having said that, I totally agree with everything that you just said. I, too, know that anybody can sue over anything. Every morning I get a list of cases filed in federal court in New Jersey, and I crack up at some of them. So, it doesn’t scare me. **Anger:** Just to wrap up the legal discussion, every meeting, every time we vote, we open ourselves up to liability. We are in a position where we are running a business and we are answerable to our constituents. That is why CFA has insurance. Each one of us has insurance that covers us. We have the officers’ and directors’ liability insurance that is invoked if anything like that should happen. I don’t think we can go around worrying about being sued. Certainly that’s something that we should always keep in mind, but if we are making sound business decisions, then we have fulfilled our ethical obligations. If there has been mismanagement, then that’s a different issue. Just so Pam’s legal discussion doesn’t come off

sounding threatening, “if you vote for this, you’re not going to be able to get a mortgage”, I just wanted to clear that up. I understood that’s not what Pam meant literally, and I want to make sure that everyone who reads these minutes understands that, as well. **Eigenhauser:** Let me take Pam’s side on this. We want to show that the board is listening. We want to show that the board is responsible. We want to show that the board can make good decisions, but acting in panic is not the way to do it. Ask 9 out of 10 people on the street, “is it fair to change the rules in the middle of a competition?” and they will tell you no. I think the majority of CFA feels that way, too, even if the loudest ones are asking us to make changes for this season. The average rank and file person in CFA is happy to grand a cat. They are not going to get a national win this year, they were never going to get a national win this year. All they hear is the screaming on the CFA list, and that has made a lot of attention but that isn’t necessarily a reason for the board to react. If we jump every time there’s an active discussion on the CFA list, that doesn’t show we’re responsive. That just shows we’re not competent. We need to be a steady hand on the helm. We need to assure people that when we take up a problem, we find a solution going forward, but we don’t upset the apple cart in the middle of the show season just because a few people happen to be loud. Our integrity is more important. We need to convince people that when the board says something, we follow through. At the beginning of the show season, we say, “these are the awards we are giving out and these are the rules we are going to follow.” We should interfere with that only when it’s either something minor in housekeeping or just something that can’t be fixed any other way. If it can’t be fixed any other way, we don’t do it 3/4 of the way through the show season. That is just too late. Very few people are going to benefit by us changing the rules this year. It’s a blight on our integrity by changing the competition in the middle of the competition. I think that hurts us more in the long run than the temporary silence we will get on the CFA list. **DelaBar:** Thank you, George. That’s what I would have said if I was awake. **Kuta:** So George, ordinarily I would agree with you, but I think this is an extraordinary situation and we need to show some forward thinking on this. Yes, it is only a few, but you talk about the rank and file. I think many of the rank and file, and especially when I talk to them, are aspirational, too. They think that maybe one day they are going to go for that award. They would want to be in that situation, to know that if there was an extraordinary situation, that the board would consider that in making it as right as it possibly could be right. I was very against changing it, but the more I see and especially after seeing some more things putting my entry clerk cap on again, and seeing some of the various things going on in the ID, I really think that we should deeply consider changing it just for this season, because it is such an extraordinary situation.

Anger: Hopefully this will wrap it up and we can do some voting. Actually, this is not about one or two loud people on the CFA list. It’s about the people who have never had a national win and may never try to get one. They want to participate in a sport where there is fairness in scoring. Those are the people that I have gotten private emails from. Those are the people that have encouraged this proposal being presented. They don’t want a national win. It’s not about that. They just want to participate in an association that is based in fairness, so I have presented this because it is the right thing to do. Yes, we are far down the line into the season – uncomfortably so. Every one of us should be uncomfortable about this discussion because of the weight of it. I am, too, but we still have a chance to do the right thing and that is what we should do right now. Thank you. **Hannon:** OK, I’m going to call for the vote. Just as a reminder, Pam’s motion is to make no change with the national awards for the current show season.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Failed.** DelaBar, Eigenhauser, B. Schreck, Brown and Maeda voting yes.

Hannon: Now that we are going to make a change this season, we have to decide what change we want to make. Again I ask Rachel, what is the purpose of coming up with something different than what we are doing for next season by implementing it now? **Anger:** That was based on the thought that we would not change the show rules this show season, so it was an exception to the existing rules. However, since you brought up the possibility of making what we passed earlier effective for this show season, that would be my motion. **Newkirk:** Second. **Hannon:** With the exception that I mentioned earlier, rather than give out 17 kitten wins in China and 13 championship wins in China, that we go ahead and offer them 25 if they meet the minimums. **Anger:** Correct. **Hannon:** They clearly have 25 kittens already. As of the latest ePoints, I think they have 23 out of the 25. With 4 months left in the show season to add to that, they are going to. It doesn't seem fair to China to say, "we're only going to let you have 17 kitten wins" when they've already got 23. Do you agree, Rachel, to amend your motion to say that we would expand the wins for this season to top 25, should they meet the minimums? **Anger:** Actually it is a new motion because I haven't actually moved for the proposal that I submitted, so that is my new motion, yes. **Mastin:** Second. **Hannon:** OK, so the motion is to take next year's proposal and implement it this show season, with the exception that rather than the numbers that we saw in #2, that we would offer up to top 25 in each of those categories, should they meet the minimums. **Eigenhauser:** Does that include the ID? **Hannon:** Yes, that's everybody. China and the ID-Other can have up to 25 if they meet the minimums. Clearly, they are not going to meet the minimums for 25 in some of those areas. **Moser:** So, we are going with the minimums we have in here, which is championship 4,300, kittens 1,800 and premiership 2,200. Is that correct? **Hannon:** That is correct. **Moser:** OK. So, they have to meet that minimum to get in the top 25, right? **Hannon:** Right, and they've already got 25 kittens over 1,800. They've got 23 in the top 25. **Moser:** I like the minimums. **Hannon:** With the minimums as a caveat. We're not just going to give a blanket 25. They have to meet the minimums. **Wilson:** What about Regions 1-9. Do they have to meet the minimums? **Hannon:** Yes. **Wilson:** Because the minimum in kittens right now is under 1,800. **Hannon:** Correct. They've got 4 months left to reach 1,800. If they don't, then we give out 23 or however many have 1,800 points. **Wilson:** OK, so basically we're not giving out top 25, we're giving out a minimum of 25 as long as the minimum count is met. **Hannon:** We're giving a maximum of 25 if they meet the minimum. That applies world-wide. **Newkirk:** Sounds good. **McCullough:** Let's vote. **Hannon:** Are we ready to call the motion? **Anger:** Yes, please.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Eigenhauser and B. Schreck voting no. DelaBar abstained.

Hannon: Is there anything else we need to do tonight? **Moser:** OK, because we passed this, we need to figure out how the awards are going to be. Are we going to give them a rosette and a trophy or not? That's really important, because now that we've got all these additional awards, it's going to be a lot of cost. I would like to make a motion that, because this year we went ahead and increased the awards, I feel that my motion is going to be that they get a rosette but if they want a trophy, then they need to pay for it. **Anger:** Rachel seconds. **Eigenhauser:** Can't we give Mary a couple of weeks to see if she can make her sponsorship proposal work before we start telling people they have to pay for their own awards? **Hannon:** Pam, will you

withdraw your motion and give Mary until the February board meeting to come to us with something? **Moser:** That's fine, as long as we vote on it in February. I'm fine with that. **Hannon:** Mary, do you think you can have something to us at the February meeting? Mary are you there? **Newkirk:** I've got a quick question. I'm sorry, I couldn't get signed on at the beginning of the meeting, but I'm assuming this is all open session. <yes> So, can we put a note on the CFA list so these people will calm down? **Hannon:** Annette is going to have something tomorrow morning. **Wilson:** I'll have it tonight. **Newkirk:** Thanks. **Wilson:** I have a very early flight in the morning, but it's very basic. Just basically what passed, and that's about it. **Hannon:** I'll make a CFA News announcement when I get it. **Calhoun:** So, do we need to have a motion to allow Mary to work on this award sponsorship program from now until February? **Hannon:** We don't need a motion. **Calhoun:** We don't have to vote on that? **Hannon:** She will come back to us in February because she is the committee chair, and have a proposal for us. I don't know if she has fallen asleep or what. **Kolencik:** No, this is Mary. Hello. **Hannon:** Glad you woke up. **Kolencik:** I was on double mute. **Hannon:** I figured you were out of it. Go ahead. **Kolencik:** I have no problem with coming up with a plan for you in February. I can have some totals for you and better projections, and a better laid out plan for you in February, so if you want to wait until then. I do like Pam's motion asking us to pay for the trophy. I think a lot of people will accept that, but let's consider everything when we have a little more time to digest it. Is that OK? **Hannon:** That's fine, Mary. So, we will see you in February with your proposal. **Kolencik:** Yes. **Calhoun:** I have a second question. I know, given the fact that there will be an announcement, you're not prohibiting the regional directors, because I know quite a few of us are getting emails. **Hannon:** You can do whatever you want. If you want to do it before Annette's notes get published, go right ahead. **Calhoun:** People are sitting up at night waiting. **Hannon:** Go ahead.

Kolencik: Do you want me to put the proposal that we came up with on the International blog and give everybody a link to it? **Hannon:** Why don't you put it on the blog and give the link to Annette, and she can incorporate it into her notes. **Kolencik:** OK, that's good. I can upload it tonight. **Hannon:** What Mary is going to do is put it on the blog for the International cat show because she has access to that blog, and she is going to send you a link to the actual proposal, so you don't have to spell out the proposal. You can just tell people, "go here and you can see the proposal." You might want to do a paragraph summary of it and then say, "to see the actual proposal, go here." **Wilson:** I actually just copied and pasted 1-10 into my Word document. If you want to put something more expansive there – **Hannon:** No, that's fine. **Phillips:** Just a reminder, we revised the text on #3 to add a sentence that says, *The board will review these minimums for potential adjustments for the next show season at its February board meeting.* A new sentence right at the end of the first paragraph. **Colilla:** Why don't we have Mary do it and then you just link it in so you don't have to worry about it. **Hannon:** She's already got it. Mary is not going to do it. **Wilson:** Are these minimum points? These are the minimum points this show season? **Hannon:** Correct, and next. **T. Schreck:** Would you like me to give you the cost on this in February? **Hannon:** It's not going to matter. We're going to have to pay it. **B. Schreck:** Would you also like to know if this is doable in time to get the reports out to everybody for all these awards? **McCullough:** It's doable. **B. Schreck:** OK, it's your job.

Hannon: Are there any other comments? Terri, are you still awake? **Barry:** I'm here. **Hannon:** You know you're going to get questions, so make sure you understand this. **Barry:** I'm trying hard to. I will be seeking some clarification, I am sure, tomorrow. **Hannon:** OK. I

suspect that Rich will be your point person. **Barry:** Thank you Rich. **Mastin:** You are welcome. **Hannon:** Let's go ahead and adjourn. Thank you everybody.

Meeting adjourned at 10:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Anger, Secretary