

CFA EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING
Sunday, June 30, 2019

Index to Minutes

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.

(58)	CALL MEETING TO ORDER.	320
(59)	APPOINTMENT OF CFA ATTORNEY AND PARLIAMENTARIAN.....	321
(60)	TAKING OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS' OATH.	322
(61)	COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS.	324
(62)	NEW BUSINESS.....	326
(63)	OLD BUSINESS.	340
(64)	UPCOMING BOARD MEETINGS.	341
(65)	DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS AND SUSPENSIONS.	342

Secretary's Note: The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. met on Sunday, June 30, 2019, at the Turning Stone Resort and Casino, Verona, New York. President Mark Hannon called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. with the following members present:

- Mr. Mark Hannon (President)**
- Mr. Richard Mastin (Vice President)**
- Ms. Kathy Calhoun (Treasurer)**
- Ms. Rachel Anger (Secretary)**
- Ms. Sharon Roy (NAR Director)**
- Mrs. Pam Moser (NWR Director)**
- Ms. Kathy Black (GSR Director)**
- Mr. John Colilla (GLR Director)**
- Mr. Howard Webster (SWR Director)**
- Ms. Mary Auth (MWR Director)**
- Mr. Kenny Currie (SOR Director)**
- Mrs. Kayoko Koizumi (Japan Regional Director)**
- Mr. Michael-Hans Schleissner (Europe Regional Director)**
- George Eigenhauser, Esq. (Director-at-Large)**
- Mrs. Carol Krzanowski (Director-at-Large)**
- Ms. Melanie Morgan (Director-at-Large)**
- Mr. Brian Moser (Director-at-Large)**
- Mr. Darrell Newkirk (Director-at-Large)**

Also Present:

- John M. Randolph, Esq., CFA Legal Counsel**
- Allene Tartaglia, Executive Director**
- James Simbro, IT Systems Analyst**

Absent:

None.

Secretary's Note: For the ease of the reader, some items were discussed at different times but were included with their particular agenda.

(58) CALL MEETING TO ORDER.

Hannon: I'm going to call the meeting to order. The first order of business is certainly to thank Allene and her staff for the tremendous amount of work they did. [applause] And certainly Sharon and the North Atlantic Region exceeded all expectations. Congratulations to you. [applause]

Hannon: I want to welcome our new board members, Brian and Darrell. [applause]

(59) **APPOINTMENT OF CFA ATTORNEY AND PARLIAMENTARIAN.**

Hannon: I am going to appoint John Randolph as the CFA Attorney and the Parliamentarian. May I have a motion to ratify? **Eigenhauser:** I move we ratify. **Black:** Second. **Hannon:** Any discussion?

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

(60) TAKING OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS' OATH.

Cat Fanciers' Association Board of Director Code of Ethics

Preamble

The Cat Fanciers' Association is a not-for-profit association formed to register pedigreed cats, sanction CFA clubs, shows, and events, protect the hobby of breeding and showing, and enhance the well-being of all cats. CFA's principle membership consists of CFA cat clubs. The business of the association is managed under the direction of the CFA Board of Directors. This code of ethics serves as a code of conduct for association volunteers and staff in their capacity as board members. Members of the board affirm their endorsement of the code and acknowledge their commitment to uphold its principles and obligations by accepting and retaining membership on the board.

Mission

CFA's mission is to preserve and promote the pedigreed breeds of cats and to enhance the well-being of all cats.

Board of Directors Code of Ethics

Members of the board shall at all times abide by and conform to the following code of conduct in their capacity as board members:

- 1. Abide in all respects by the rules and regulations of the association including but not limited to CFA's articles of incorporation, constitution, bylaws, and show rules.*
- 2. Conduct the business affairs of CFA in good faith and with honesty, integrity, due diligence, and reasonable competence.*
- 3. Lead by example in serving the needs of CFA and its members and also in representing the interests and ideals of the cat fancy at large.*
- 4. Uphold the strict confidentiality of all closed meetings and other confidential communications and not disclose any confidential information related to CFA affairs.*
- 5. Perform assigned duties in a professional and timely manner pursuant to the board's direction and oversight.*
- 6. Exercise proper authority and good judgment in dealings with CFA staff, judges, breeders, exhibitors, other board members, and the general public and respond to their needs in a responsible, respectful, and professional manner.*
- 7. Handle conflicts of interest appropriately by identifying them to the board and removing themselves from all discussion and voting on that matter.*
- 8. Act at all times in the best interest of CFA. Avoid placing (and the appearance of placing) one's own self-interest or any third party interest above that of CFA.*

9. *Not abuse board membership by improperly using board membership for personal or third-party gain or financial enrichment.*
10. *Not represent that their authority as a board member extends any further than that which it actually extends.*
11. *Not engage in any outside business, professional or other activities that would directly or indirectly materially adversely affect CFA.*
12. *Not engage in or facilitate any discriminatory or harassing behavior toward CFA staff, members, officers, exhibitors, breeders, or others in the context of activities relating to CFA.*
13. *Not solicit or accept gifts, gratuities, or any other item of value from any person or entity as a direct or indirect inducement to provide special treatment to such donor with respect to matters pertaining to CFA without fully disclosing such items to the board of directors.*
14. *Provide proper care for their cats and maintain them in an exemplary manner beyond CFA's Minimum Cattery standards.*

Hannon: The oath of office, John. **Eigenhauser:** Are we going to stand? **Randolph:** Yes, stand. I'm going to read the oath of office. I'm going to read it all the way through and then I'm going to ask all the members of the board to say, "I assent and agree to abide by the Board of Directors Code of Ethics." **Hannon:** You can say, "Do you agree," and we all say "aye." **Randolph:** [reads] Do you agree to abide by the Code of Ethics? **Board:** Aye.

(61) COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS.

Committee	Chair	Liaison
Agility	Jill Archibald	Sharon Roy
Ambassador Cats	Karen Lane/Joel Chaney	TBD
Animal Welfare/Breeder Assistance/ Food Pantry/Breed Rescue	Charlene Campbell	Darrell Newkirk
Awards Committee	Mary Kolencik	Mark Hannon
Audit Committee	Kathy Calhoun	
Breeds and Standards	Annette Wilson	Melanie Morgan
Budget Committee	Kathy Calhoun	
CFA Foundation Liaison	Carol Krzanowski	
Clerking Program	Dan Beaudry	Carol Krzanowski
Club Marketing	Finance Committee	
Club Membership	Carol Krzanowski	
Community Outreach/Education	Joan Miller	Rachel Anger
Credentials	Nancy Dodds	Rachel Anger
Executive Committee	4 CFA officers plus George Eigenhauser	
Experimental Formats	Sharon Roy	
Finance Committee	Rich Mastin	
Hotel and Travel Program	Rachel Anger	
Household Pet Representatives	Julie Benzer/Sue Robbins	Report to Marketing Chair
International Division Asia	Richard Kallmeyer/Wain Harding	Melanie Morgan
Rest of World (ROW)	Kenny Curre	
International Show	Rich Mastin	
IT Committee	Tim Schreck	John Colilla
Judging Program	Melanie Morgan	
Legislative Committee	George Eigenhauser	
Legislative Group	George Eigenhauser	
Marketing	Kathy Black	
Mentor	Kathi Hoos	Carol Krzanowski
NewBee Program	Teresa Keiger	Kathy Black
Ombudsman	Teresa Sweeney	George Eigenhauser
Privacy Policy Committee	Rich Mastin	
Protest Committee	George Eigenhauser	
Scientific Advisory Committee	Roger Brown	George Eigenhauser
Show Rules	Monte Phillips	Carol Krzanowski
Winn Feline Foundation Liaison	George Eigenhauser	
World Cat Congress Delegate	Rachel Anger	
Yearbook	Mary Auth	
Youth Feline Education	Carmen Johnson-Lawrence	Rich Mastin

Hannon: The next order of business is Committee Chair Appointments. [reads] The Household Pet representative is new this year. I've asked Julie Benzer and Sue Robbins to co-chair that. One is in Region 5 and one is in Region 7. Those are the two areas where Household Pets seem to be very popular. I am told they experience different types of issues, so they liked the idea of having two of them – one on each coast. I had a choice of putting that under Breeds and Standards. Although it's not a breed, they are conceptually the same. I talked to Kathy about it and we agreed it was more of a Marketing thing. They're coming out with Companion Cat World which encompasses the Household Pets, so it seemed to make sense, having to report to Kathy. For the Personnel Committee, last year it was the four officers and Carla. It just seems to me that it's a duplication of effort in a lot of cases, so I'm going to delete that and have the personnel responsibilities under the Executive Committee, which will be the four officers and George. I already asked the Executive Committee about it and they were all fine with it, so we will vote on that at the end. The Yearbook chair was me for a number of years. Kathy [Black] had it this past year and Kathy said she would rather not continue with it. She's just got too many other things going on, so I need somebody to volunteer to be the chair of the Yearbook Committee. What that consists of is coming up with ideas for articles for the Yearbook, finding authors for that. What else would you say is involved? Talking with Shelly about any issues she may have. **Black:** Yes, and just promoting it. **Hannon:** The big part would be to promote the Yearbook. Do I have somebody that would be willing to help us out in this area? That's the problem we had before. **Black:** Mary has got her hand up. Sort of. **Hannon:** OK Mary, sort of the Yearbook. I really appreciate that. I need a motion to ratify my appointments. **Eigenhauser:** I move we ratify the appointments. **Krzanowski:** Second. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion? Any concerns? Any questions you may have about any of the appointments? **Mastin:** I just have a question. During the data protection policy review, I had asked Peter and brought it up during our discussion. Might we need a committee for our privacy protection? I would like to ask James if he thinks it's necessary. If he does, then we may want to consider that. If he doesn't think it's necessary, then we can skip it. **Eigenhauser:** Maybe we can vote on the appointments already made, then address that. **Mastin:** Sounds good. **Hannon:** Any other discussion of the appointments I made? Are there any questions? All those in favor.

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

Hannon: What do we want to do about answering his question? **Simbro:** It probably wouldn't be a bad idea. The privacy policy is very involved. I think the more eyes that look at it or help with it, we have a better chance of [inaudible]. **Anger:** Can you say that again please? I didn't hear any of it. **Simbro:** I'm sorry. It's probably a good idea. Defining all these policies, they're not simple and I think with review we have a better chance of getting a good policy. **Hannon:** OK. The price one pays for bringing this up, we want to thank Rich for agreeing to be the committee chair for the Privacy Committee. **Mastin:** Oh, that's how it works, hu? [laughter] **Eigenhauser:** I move we ratify the appointment. **Newkirk:** Second.

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

Hannon: Does anyone else have an idea for a committee they would like? **Black:** Did you list the Breeds and Standards? **Newkirk:** Yes. **Black:** I slept through it? **Hannon:** Annette Wilson. **Black:** OK. There it is, with Melanie as the liaison. Thank you. **Hannon:** She talks to her every now and then.

(62) NEW BUSINESS.

(a) In-Conjunction Show Discussion.

Hannon: Next is New Business. What New Business might we have? **Calhoun:** We had deferred conversations from the Thursday meeting to talk about in-conjunction shows and potentially budgeting in-conjunction shows with common CFA clubs. As opposed to being in conjunction with a different organization, that two CFA clubs could work together for an in-conjunction show and get some sort of financial support to do that, so I would like to bring that to the floor. **Hannon:** And you would like to start the discussion. Say something. **Calhoun:** I am in favor of it. **Hannon:** What amount do you want to give? What if it's something that's been long standing, where two clubs have been doing this for years and years? Are you going to give them money anyway? **Calhoun:** We could structure it so it's new clubs that are working in conjunction. I think we had four shows last year that were in conjunction with TICA. I would have loved to have seen four additional CFA shows. **Hannon:** Mary did two with ACFA. **Calhoun:** OK, but I think we had four in-conjunctions. **Hannon:** Two were ACFA, at least one was TICA because that was March in Raleigh. **Calhoun:** My point is that I am not strongly in favor of having in-conjunction shows and supporting them financially with other organizations. I think that we should funnel those dollars to promote CFA shows to work together. I don't want to get rid of the in-conjunction program. I don't want to hurt the clubs, as far as clubs that need the money to help them put on shows, but I think those dollars would be best supporting our brand and having two CFA shows work together. **Hannon:** Melanie, you had something to say on this subject? **Morgan:** Yes. I concur. I think we should be supporting our CFA clubs and I would really like to see that switch in the allocation going on, so not a new program but simply switching our focus to CFA from combining with other associations. If, on the other hand, we choose to continue with the in-conjunction, based off the experience we had last weekend – there were a lot of positives, but there were some negatives, as well – I would like to see us flesh out our guidelines, because there were some things that happened that disturbed me immensely. **Hannon:** We certainly thank you for volunteering to head up that effort. **Calhoun:** I'll head up the effort to write something on in-conjunction shows. **Hannon:** Are you proposing that we allow to continue in-conjunction shows with other associations – **Morgan:** No. **Hannon:** – and continue to provide them with financial incentives, or do you want to take that financial incentive away from in-conjunction shows and provide it to CFA? I don't know if you wanted to take it away from other associations or in addition to. **Calhoun:** My lead idea would be to take it away from in-conjunction shows being in conjunction with clubs from other associations and funnel all that money into CFA shows working together. **Hannon:** You will have to have an escape clause for those that have already been committed. If we've already told a club we are going to give them money for a show they are holding with another organization, we ought to honor that commitment. **Calhoun:** I think very well that we can work through all those details and do it the appropriate way, but in concept I think that we should be pushing our own brand and our sponsorship dollars should be going to our own brand, and that it would benefit CFA far more to have two CFA clubs on a Saturday and Sunday, as opposed to CFA and someone else. **Eigenhauser:** I'm going to take the contrary position here. If we have two CFA clubs putting on a show on the same weekend, they are already both eligible for sponsorship for each of their shows as two CFA clubs. **Hannon:** No. **Morgan:** No. **Eigenhauser:** Only one? **Hannon:** We only give it per weekend. **Eigenhauser:** Oh, my mistake. **Hannon:** So they would have to work out amongst themselves how they are going to divvy up that money. **Eigenhauser:** I think we

need to continue reaching out to other organizations and working with in-conjunction shows. I don't know if you guys are old enough to remember the TV commercials, "the Pepsi Challenge," where PepsiCo was service Coke and Pepsi side by side to people. **Calhoun:** Oh wait, that was the wrong example. That is so wrong, because you will never see – that was a commercial in order to point out that one is better than the other. **Eigenhauser:** I'm being interrupted here. I'm still talking. This is our commercial, a way to promote our brand among other exhibitors. There are a lot of exhibitors out there that don't know the CFA brand, that don't know the advantages to CFA, that don't know what it means to be CFA, and if we can poach some of these people from the other associations, that works to our benefit. This is not a matter of subsidizing the other club. We're subsidizing the CFA club at a combined event, basically, and we're having these in-conjunction shows with the purpose of showing people the CFA way and giving them the opportunity to cross over. If we lose people as a result of that, which some people think we do, that's on us that we can't promote ourselves and show our advantages. So, I'm in favor of having subsidies for these in-conjunction shows. I think over time it will benefit us more than it hurts us, and if it doesn't, shame on us. **Schleissner:** The question we had is, I think this maybe only works in the United States. In different corners of the world we have different situations, which I said on Thursday. For us in Europe – and I want to bring Europe in the game again – we have a different situation. We have many, many different associations and we have independent clubs and whatever, so for us it's very important to have this in-conjunction with clubs from other associations. I think it will not work in Europe, having two CFA clubs doing an in-conjunction show. For me, it's important to have it open to go together with other associations and this is what we actually do or what we have done during the last year, and which was very successful. You see it on all these TRN cats we brought in from other associations. I think we should go this way. **Auth:** I have been a strong advocate of the in-conjunction for the same reason that George is talking about, and from our own experience in the Midwest Region, CFA benefitted a heck of a lot more than ACFA. I don't know that ACFA is going to want to do it again with us, because we did prevail so much, but we did have ACFA people experience a CFA show that they might not have otherwise experienced. When you consider that the pie is only so big, we might as well try to pluck up people coming over to our piece of the pie. I think this one way to give them exposure that it's easy for them to do. **P. Moser:** Clarification; Kathy, you're not saying you can't have an in-conjunction show. You're just saying you're not going to give them \$1,000. **Hannon:** That's what she is saying, but that's not what Melanie said. Melanie wants to stop in-conjunction altogether. **Morgan:** I'm fine with Kathy's thing. **Hannon:** You said earlier you didn't want to have in-conjunction shows. **Morgan:** I'm saying if we have them, we need to have guidelines. **P. Moser:** OK, so Kathy, am I correct that you can still have in-conjunction, you're just not going to give them \$1,000. **Hannon:** We're not going to give you an incentive to play with the other team. **P. Moser:** Right, but you can still do it. There's no problem with doing it, and then if you want to have another show with another club, do a 6x6 or whatever, then they each get \$1,000 – each club. So you're putting your funds into CFA, correct? **Calhoun:** Into CFA, right. Michael and I discussed that there may be a different opportunity and a different need for Europe. To the point, one size does not fit all, so there could be exceptions in Europe where we need to grow and that would help. I'm not opposed to that at all, to making an exception for Europe.

Mastin: We talked a little bit about this on Thursday. I just want to remind everybody, we have now voted three times to approve spending for in-conjunction shows. We did it last year, we did it this year and we did it again on Thursday when we decided not to restrict it to one

per region or area. We lumped it in with the \$11,000 that was approved for the whole year without an increase in budget. That's #1. #2, we just don't have enough history yet on whether this is good or bad for CFA. Let's get through this year to determine whether or not it's working or it's not working. We can do both. We don't have to get rid of one and not do the other. We have enough to do both, so we can do that. The last thing I have is, Melanie wants to revise the guidelines for the in-conjunction show. I don't know if that means she wants to revise the guidelines to take away the income, it just means she wants to revise the guidelines on what we're doing with in-conjunction shows. I think Kathy, instead of us trying to make a decision here today, should present to us what she has in mind to doing an in-conjunction with a club maybe who hasn't put on a show in many years. Maybe that's one of the qualifications. Present it to us, we'll look at it in August. If she can't get it done in time, we'll do it in October. **Morgan:** To be clear, I don't specifically have a problem with in-conjunction shows, although I would prefer we didn't have them. Two, I do have a problem with providing a financial incentive to clubs, to have in-conjunction shows. Three, if we do have them, and we clearly have voted to continue to do that, we need to have specific guidelines and we need to follow them. For example, on this last show that we just had last weekend with TICA [Southern Regional Show], it was clearly stated in the minutes that there would not be double entries; yet, there were 5 cats that were double entered. It is clearly stated in our guidelines. We talked about how we will handle this specifically when there is an in-conjunction show on the flyers – that wasn't done. We had a breed showcase that was supposed to be a CFA-sponsored event and people brought their cats for that, yet they decided that there would be a TICA judge presenting it. **Hannon:** In addition to. **Morgan:** In addition to the CFA judge. On Sunday, while they had 6 rings, and we had 4 rings for judging and 2 rings for the breed showcase, we didn't have a breed showcase. We had a TICA congress in the two rings that we had. So, they effectively had 6 rings plus 2 of ours, and we had 4 rings. I had exhibitors telling me it was the Southern Region TICA awards show. I mean, this is not – yes, it's good to share with the other associations. I really enjoyed going over and meeting some of the TICA officials and judges. Everyone was phenomenally courteous and professional, and I had a fabulous time watching the different breeds. I was very taken with one specific breed that you would be surprised, but we sent a message that was very mixed and we're not sending a message to our exhibitors that we're not unique. So anyway, I would like to see us follow our own guidelines and specify them, because that was not a message I think we should have sent. **Hannon:** It was definitely an issue, because Dave Peet told me personally you could not double enter. He didn't post it anywhere. I don't know how these people realized they could double enter. I never saw a post saying you could enter both shows, but he allowed it. I didn't have a problem with them entering both. My problem was, he told me they weren't doing it and then he turned around and did it. If he had said from the beginning, then I would have been OK with it. **Black:** I just want to point out that we approved \$25,000 – right? – for new shows and also the in-conjunction. To Kathy's point, if she wants to have new clubs put on shows, they are already eligible to get money, so we're already supporting that. **Hannon:** What if it's the second time? They won't be able to get new show money. **Black:** So, if you're wanting to have clubs that are not new clubs go together to put on a show, then that's going to potentially be almost every weekend. It could be. We have a lot of clubs that could go together that way. I'm just saying, I don't know what kind of control you would have over that, so I would like to see that fleshed out, because that could be a lot. I know that Kenny said he's got 6 new shows coming into his region. With the new show money, I could potentially have more paper clubs come out of paper club existence and also put on shows, but if you're talking about supporting two clubs

going together that currently are putting on shows, then that could be almost every weekend. So, CFA could be spending thousands of dollars that we're not exactly ready to do. Personally, I have an issue with the same club putting on a back-to-back 6x6. I didn't think that was possible, so maybe this would incentivize two clubs to work together. It could all be the same people, who knows, but at least you would have two club names. I also agree with Melanie. Those of us that weren't at the Southern Regional and did not experience what you guys saw – I personally have not attended any in-conjunction shows with other associations, so I don't know what issues are there, but I agree we need to have guidelines and we need to follow them and there needs to be teeth if we don't.

Currle: As far as the in-conjunction show is concerned, the one that did occur last weekend, I just want to make it clear that the club never got funding from CFA specifically for holding an in-conjunction show. **Hannon:** You had already given that money elsewhere. **Currle:** The money had already been earmarked for the show on the former CIS date in Florida. I just wanted to make that perfectly clear. The \$2,000 that the board voted on was specifically for the Winn Symposium, just so everybody is on the same page. What Rich brought up as far as beta testing of this particular concept is what we should be doing. Let's give it a year, make it quite clear in the guidelines as far as what has now amounted to \$36,000 for all of our clubs, for the newer clubs. I have a group of people that have two clubs that have been inactive for well over 5 years that will be holding a show not this season but the following season, and I just want to make sure that I've got this correct. I told them they would only be eligible if we vote on it in February to include it in the budget for \$1,000 only. They don't get \$1,000 for each show, is that correct? **Hannon:** Currently. **Currle:** I'm saying, based on what we've got right now. **Hannon:** What we've got right now you are right, but who knows where this is going. **Currle:** I would rather do it on our own, but I think it's too early in the game to see what type of effect these in-conjunction shows have with CFA. If anything, it leads to good will between the organizations. You've met these people. Last weekend was a big, big success as far as a friendship event. As far as the logistics that occurred at the show, it may have been a perfectly honest mistake, I don't know. I'm not sure. I was not completely privy on that. David was running the show and of course the banquet was another situation, but I agree with Rich. Let's give it some time. **Webster:** That's what I was going to say. We need to see how this is going to work this year. Setting up guidelines maybe is a good idea. We should have those, but let's see how this works before we scuttle it or anything like that. Give it another year. **Anger:** We have guidelines. I don't think they address what we are talking about here, but for in-conjunction shows we have guidelines that this board approved a year ago. They do not prohibit an exhibitor from entering both shows, so that's something we need to consider. Historically, this started out as a good will gesture. I came to Rich, asked for \$3,000 from the show sponsorship budget to approve three in-conjunction shows for last year as a promotion of the concept. It went from that small, feel-good initiative into a wild, out of control explosion at the February board meeting, where we budgeted \$11,000. Now, we are kind of backing off on that and trying to figure out where we want to go. What I would like to see is a committee work on it, condense everything have, prepare a timeline to figure out where we're at, find out what we want to do, come up with a plan and go from there.

Calhoun: To George's comparison about the Coke versus Pepsi commercial – **Hannon:** You're a little sensitive to that. **Calhoun:** That was just that, a commercial. You will never go to a store or a restaurant and have Coke and Pepsi in the same dispenser, so that folks can check

and see which one they like better. That is highly unlikely to happen. In fact, it won't happen, and even Rich will say that. I do believe that we are spot on, that this should be vetted, scrubbed and brought back in August or October with a fully fleshed-out plan and maybe a comprehensive one where all of these programs are intertwined with the fact that you can only qualify for one – not an in-conjunction and a new show and a this and a that. It won't pile on and pile on. So, I fully agree that today we can't make this decision. I will take the lead in bringing that back in August or October – hopefully in August – and we can discuss it further. Maybe October might be a better one because we are face to face. **Hannon:** You don't want to do it in August? **Calhoun:** I might do it in August, but I'm just saying some of the face-to-face conversations are better than August conversations, and the baby is not coming in August. **Hannon:** So you want us to get together face to face in August. **Calhoun:** No. I'm going to plan it for October and then we're going to have a grandchild and I'm not going to come. The other thing, I would like us to have clear measurables. We have to find out if this works. We did this last year and we had four. We need to have the data on prior years to see how many we had. We need to know, what were the counts at these shows, to say, did it grow or didn't it? Let's have some data-driven decisions and we'll come back with something in October or August. Fair enough? **Hannon:** Are you finished? **Calhoun:** I think I am.

Newkirk: I would like to make a couple points. I'm not sure why you would want to exclude the TICA people from showing at our show. When we did the Royal Canin events in Moscow Kenny and I judged that one year, those people entered 2 or 3 shows. How else are we to show what our product is if we exclude them from entering our show? That doesn't make sense to me. **Hannon:** What some people did was, they entered Cat A in one show and Cat B in another. They didn't necessarily show the same cat. **Newkirk:** OK, but I've got one cat. They crossed over and it wasn't an issue. **Hannon:** It's clear you have to have a cat that's amenable to handling if you're going to enter them in both shows. **Newkirk:** I know, but we have 6x6's. **Hannon:** But a 6x6 is spread over two days. This 6x6 could happen on Saturday with another 6x6 on Sunday if they were entered in both the CFA and TICA shows. **Newkirk:** I agree with George. We've got to have a better product so that people want to come and partake of our product. I think it's very important, especially for Michael in Europe, because we're not the big cat fancy in Europe, we're an alternative. FIFe is the big, compelling force in Europe. **Eigenhauser:** First, I agree with Darrell agreeing with me. One of the purposes of having these in-conjunction shows is so they can see how the other half lives. If we exclude cross-over entries that's a problem. The reason we had a problem this time was, they had said they were going to not allow it and then mucked it up. I'm going to say that there were some other things that happened in the in-conjunction show last week and with the Winn involvement that could have been done better. Let's just put it that way. It could have been smoother, communication could have been better, it could have been clearer. That's one show. Let's not focus on the one show. **Hannon:** That wasn't the show, that was the Friday experience. **Eigenhauser:** It was awkward. I do agree with Darrell, the purpose of having this in-conjunction show is so we can coax the other people over. Excluding them from entering both shows would be the opposite of what we're trying to do. I agree with everybody who has said yes, we have rules in place. We really do have rules, but all of our rules are always a work in progress, so we need to revisit those rules, we need to come back with some improvements, see what works, see what hasn't worked, tweak them from time to time, update them to make sure it works. Giving in-conjunction shows to 6x6 I think is just going to encourage people to pick up paper clubs so they can get an additional sponsorship. I don't think it's really going to be a big boon for CFA. We have 6x6 shows

anyway. I'm not even sure that's the format we should be encouraging, so I don't see that being an issue but let me just say, I know people think that we're giving money to in-conjunction shows to encourage the shows. I think that if we allow in-conjunction shows at all, what we want to do is make sure that the CFA show that's being held with the in-conjunction show puts our best foot forward at all times. Otherwise, why even have in-conjunction shows if we're not putting our best foot forward? That's what the subsidy is for. It's not intended to necessarily encourage in-conjunction shows – although it will – but the primary purpose of giving the CFA show in an in-conjunction situation additional money is so that we can really shine when we're showing ourselves off to the other association and the exhibitors in the other association. That's what it's for. I agree with what some of the other people have said. Let's just not make a lot of changes here today on the fly on Sunday morning, let's let this play out. We've got a budget for this year, we've got a plan for this year. We just re-voted on it on Thursday. Let's let this play out and let's revisit this at budget time next Spring.

Schleissner: It's pretty difficult for me, after having 7 other speakers in line before me, because I originally wanted to answer to Rich what Rich said in the beginning, but nobody remembers what he said because this was 7 speakers ago. **Hannon:** Nobody remembers, Rich. **Mastin:** I'll try harder. [laughter] **Schleissner:** For me there is three important things. We have voted on this on Thursday and it passed, so we have it at the moment. Then there was two things which already came up and one thing Kathy brought is measurements. We should have measurements to measure what is the success we make. We talk about something we are not sure what is good, what's not good. So, we have to make measurements where we can see, does our program fit what we want to have? The other thing, I don't know who said it, it would be good having maybe a committee who cares about these measurements but at the moment I want to have it running like we voted on it. We have rules, but we can change rules. That's OK, but for me it's important to have measurements to make a decision. Everything which goes only by motions or we think it can be or it may be, this is not a measurement. **Morgan:** Primarily, actually I agree with the majority of what George said. I wanted to make a point that my issue is not necessarily with the specifics, but with the fact that in the discussion we had before the motion was made and we voted on it, that double entries not being allowed was what we thought we were voting on.

Colilla: Since at one point we mentioned about new guidelines, if we're going to do that I think we should not approve any more in-conjunction shows until we decide what the new guidelines are. **Mastin:** Because I can remember what you just said, John, I would have to disagree with that right away. I think we should not do that. If you need me to stand so I will become memorable, I'm happy to stand. I don't want you to forget any of this. [laughter] Some of it is good. A couple things. We're all going to differ on whether this is good or bad, and we still don't know so that's out there. The guidelines may result in new show rules. We don't know. They could. If we go back to what was said in February and you actually read the minutes, we didn't approve the point of, cats would not be shown in each. That wasn't the motion. It was discussed and Mark did point out no, they were not going to, but it wasn't part of the motion. The motion was to approve the show itself. Rachel, you can vet that if you want or Melanie can. It was in the discussion but it wasn't part of – [inaudible, multiple speakers] Right, and we all believed that's what was going to happen. So, what I think from last week, we're going to learn a lot from what happened last week and that's what is going to develop these guidelines and move that in the right direction. The funding part, I think George had mentioned it. What we don't

want to do is a manipulation of requests for sponsorships where now all of a sudden we've got all these show-producing clubs convincing these paper clubs to come out of the woodwork to work together, so now they get an extra \$1,000. We've got to be careful of that. Kathy, let me finish. **Hannon:** Kathy, would you like me to add you to the list? **Mastin:** So, we've got to be careful of that. I do want to say that I agree with George and Darrell, and they agree with me too, because I'm all on that. One last very important thing that Kathy is trying to convince us that happens – maybe it does, maybe it doesn't. Coke and Pepsi. You go into a grocery store, they are on the shelves sometimes side by side, so you do have a choice. Some of you who have come to a show that I vend at, because I help the club out, if you see what I sell as a vendor, Coke and Pepsi side by side, because I can't please everybody if I don't have those options. So, maybe a restaurant doesn't carry both. Some do, certain ones do. **Hannon:** What happens in your stores? Do you carry both? **Mastin:** We carry Pepsi and I'm proud to say we carry Pepsi. [**Calhoun** applauds] We have been for nearly 30 years. **Calhoun:** That's your saving grace. **Mastin:** Am I still on your good side? **Calhoun:** You are. **Mastin:** OK, whew. **Hannon:** Think back a few years when he didn't have a sense of humor. **Mastin:** You're all helping me, thank you.

Roy: I've judged a couple of the in-conjunction shows, but granted they were Saturday CFA and Sunday TICA. The CFA people actually ended up better because the TICA people entered for Saturday's CFA show. The CFA people didn't stay for Sunday at the TICA show. This past year they had a Selkirk summit and there were people with Selkirks that have never come to CFA that came at the end of the show and said, "we really enjoyed the CFA judging, we'll be back," which was a great thing. The guy with the Bengals said he thought CFA would always hate their Bengals came and said, "you guys have passed the test, I'm going to start showing CFA." So, there is some benefit to both, at least for the time being. **Calhoun:** To Kathy Black's point about how this could escalate, that's why we have limited budgets and we have controls on how much money we give out, so that can be controlled. There's a benefit to waiting, because there's also the issue in the back of my mind is, globally what are other associations' relationships with associations that are strictly in place to undo CFA. That's also playing in the background of what we decide to do and move forward. That being said, am I the last one? Is there more? I'm more than happy to bring this in fully fleshed out for us to discuss, and we'll have even more data on a global stage by then. **Auth:** I gave you statistics on the first in-conjunction show that we had, how many CFA people after the ACFA portion. I didn't get the numbers to you for the second one. It worked out well, because people from ACFA came to the CFA show and I was so tempted to try to make it easier. It was easier for ACFA people to enter the CFA show because of the TRN. It's not so easy to enter the ACFA show. I thought, well gosh, in order to work together maybe we should make it easier. I thought no, that's not my role. If ACFA wants to figure out how to get CFA people in their show, that's on them. At the end of the last one, the ACFA president Murlene [Priest] said, why don't we do this because what the ACFA people objected to was, they didn't want 6 rings on Saturday, they wanted an 8 or 10 ring show. The only way to do that is for them to have half the show hall – this is what she was proposing – half the show hall ACFA and the other half CFA, and you enter both. I don't think that can work. It's problematic when you have them in Russia because somebody is over in the TICA show and they can't get their cat to the CFA show, so I wouldn't encourage that but there's two separate days. It was a good boon for us in CFA. For those ACFA people who had not been to a CFA show to watch it happen, they entered with a TRN so we got some exposure. I think that was the intended consequence, is that we get some exposure. I wouldn't favor having them on the same day in the same venue, because that's problematic in my mind. **Hannon:**

Would you be willing to make exceptions for Europe? **Auth:** Oh, absolutely yes. I will get you statistics that I have for both of the shows, so you will have those as you are formulating your ideas. **Calhoun:** Thanks. **Currle:** Not many people cross-show in Moscow, but they do. They're never late. **Auth:** I've judged there and I had trouble. **Eigenhauser:** I don't think we're going to reach a consensus on this this morning, so I think what would be best, if the President appoints a committee to review the in-conjunction guidelines, we work on producing some metrics for determining the success, and then table this discussion until those have come back to us. **Hannon:** Kathy is in charge of that committee. Anybody that has an interest in working with Kathy on the committee, talk to Kathy. Is there anything else we want to talk about on this subject?

(b) Household Pets in Listing by Breed.

Hannon: Other new business? **Eigenhauser:** Something came up at the meeting with the breed secretaries about the Household Pets being listed in the listing by breed. I've kind of slept on it. I can't think of a way to talk about breed registration statistics without using the word "breed." There's no easy and convenient word that the public would use in its place, so here is my suggestion. Registration statistics by breed, asterisk down at the bottom, *Household Pets are included in with the breeds for informational purposes.* Done. That's my motion. **Newkirk:** I'll second it. **Hannon:** Discussion? James, do you want to contribute anything to the discussion? **Simbro:** Sounds good to me. **Mastin:** Can we just work on the wording of the asterisk? **Eigenhauser:** That's fine, but that concept.

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

(c) Strategic Planning Session.

Mastin: The strategic planning session will be October 4th. It's a Friday. Mary has agreed to work with me on putting together the list. She is going to help coordinate that, so if you have items that you would like to discuss on that Friday to present to the group, please email it to Mary and myself. Mary and I will also work with Peg Johnson. Peg Johnson will facilitate the event, assuming she accepts. I will ask her. **Black:** What day are we talking about? **Mastin:** Friday, October 4th. **Black:** Oh, before the October meeting. **Mastin:** Yes. It's the day before. That's all I have. **Hannon:** So we need to schedule, to come in on time for that.

(d) August Teleconference Pre-Notice Item.

Hannon: Any other new business? **Newkirk:** I would like to pre-notice something for August; that is, we have a big incongruity between late payment/penalty fees for clubs. It was brought up about Israel, that their late payment was \$67 and they got fined \$500, so I would like to ask Rachel to add that on for August so we can discuss amending that. **Hannon:** Would you send her something, with your suggestion of how you would like to – **Newkirk:** Yes, I will. I want to research it. I don't want to bring it up now because I don't know all the details. **Mastin:** Darrell, I'm willing to work with you on that. I have some ideas. **Newkirk:** OK cool. I do, too.

(e) **International Division Representatives.**

Krzanowski: At the meeting with the International Division folks on Saturday, it was mentioned that we are losing some of the people in China because they are unsure about what's happening there and some of the clubs are getting impatient. I realize that we don't have any representatives any longer for the International Division and no one for Other. **Hannon:** I'm glad someone finally picked up on that. **Krzanowski:** I think that we should hold a special election for new representatives. It would be a way for us to reach out to these clubs there and let them know we're still interested in them, we still want them to be part of CFA. Then, as information does become available, we can use the representative to help disseminate that information. **Eigenhauser:** I'll second that. **Black:** I'm so glad you brought this up, Carol, because I was going to bring it up, too. When we have 60% of our income coming in from China and we have no representation from them on the board, I think that's a large injustice to those people. I think that we should have an election, they should have at least one, maybe two people, whether it's a committee, a committee chair. Have some kind of voice to the board. They have their own unique set of issues, they have their own unique culture about how to do things. They are looking to us to help them with marketing, they're looking to use for support and I think they should have a voice on the board. I don't know what that consists of. We can talk about the best way to go about that, but I think we definitely need to get some representatives back in place with an election. **Morgan:** I'm not exactly sure about what the procedure is. I looked but I don't see in the constitution anything that says that they have to be elected. I'm wondering, with divisions if it might be more prudent to have these positions – and I agree that we need them desperately – representing different areas of these growing areas that are such huge potential for us, if it wouldn't be more prudent for us to appoint them, rather than have elections. **Currle:** I'm glad I was remembered. This would send a nice, subtle message without telling people what our future plans are in China. Like you said, we've divided it up into three different parts. We need to see a list of volunteers from each of those particular areas, and then we can appoint whoever is necessary. The initial message is something that they are looking for, showing a CFA commitment. To me, it's innocuous except you want volunteers to be appointed. That's all I have to say. **Eigenhauser:** I agree with a lot of what Kenny said. Part of the reason to do this is to show China that we're still engaged, that we're still interested, that we haven't forgotten them, that we're still working on it and we still want to hear them. This isn't a subtle message, this is a very loud and clear message, "CFA is still interested in you, CFA still cares." I think it's important that we get that message out. On the other hand, I understand that there are political conflicts there, but I think it would be stronger if they picked their representative, rather than we did. **Hannon:** The motion was for an election. **Eigenhauser:** Correct. **Hannon:** So if you want an appointment – **Newkirk:** Point of order. The constitution says, "appoint or elect." **Eigenhauser:** That's right. I'm leaning toward elect. **Hannon:** But he's in favor of the election. I'm saying, if you're in favor of an appointment, vote no on his motion and we'll bring up a second motion for appointing. **Eigenhauser:** Well, it's Carol's motion. **Krzanowski:** I would rather see an election, because I feel it would be more inclusive with the clubs there in China, it would give them a little bit of a voice in what's happening. **Hannon:** All those in favor of an election for one representative from China, one representative from Asia outside of China, which is what we had and both of them are no longer in that position.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Morgan, Roy, Colilla, Calhoun, P. Moser, Newkirk and Black voting no.

Hannon: So, Allene will have a new election. We'll have to first ask for people who are interested, to declare. **Black:** I know we've already voted on this. I would like to see two from China, not just one. **Hannon:** I'm taking that as a motion? **Eigenhauser:** I'll second. The question was, is it a motion? The answer is yes. **Black:** OK yes, I'll make a motion. **Eigenhauser:** And I second. **Webster:** Shouldn't we have maybe one from each of the three areas, a representative from each area? **Black:** I'll revise the motion to make it three. **Hannon:** Is that acceptable to the second? **Eigenhauser:** Wait a minute. I'm just trying to understand. When you say "three," do you mean two from China? If we're going to have two from China and one from Other Asia and one from ROW, that's four. **Hannon:** Yes, it's a total of four, because China was divided into three competitive areas. **Black:** It's a constitutional change. We can't do it. **Eigenhauser:** No, it's not constitutional. **Newkirk:** Yes, it is. It says there are two people. Two representatives from the International Division. We can ask the parliamentarian for a ruling. **Hannon:** It was a recommendation from Kallmeyer that we break it up so that there was one from China and one from outside of China. **Black:** So, I withdraw my motion because it's a constitutional change. **Hannon:** What we're going to do is, hold an election with one from China and one from outside of China in Asia. Allene will send out a notice asking people to declare. **Webster:** Should we think about, though, having some sort of representation from each the provinces or whatever? **Hannon:** We can certainly do that, but we need to revise the constitution, which means we have to wait until the next annual to do that, but we ought to keep in mind that when it comes time, we want perhaps the board to submit that proposed change to the constitution.

Morgan: I know we've already voted on it. **Hannon:** Yes, we have. **Morgan:** And it has passed. However, might I beg the board's attention to the fact that perhaps maybe we should get input from the International Committee chairs before making the final decision? **Hannon:** You're speaking as the liaison. **Morgan:** I am. **Eigenhauser:** Point of order. The constitution says, *Every two years, 'International Members' shall elect two representatives to participate in a council of the International Division, to consider matters particularly relevant to the 'International Members.'* *The Board shall adopt rules of procedure for the appointment or election of representatives. The Board shall also select the times and places for the International Council to meet, which meetings shall occur not less than once a year.* Then it says, *The President of the Association shall appoint a committee of at least two members of the Board, one of which shall be designated as Chairman, to attend and conduct such meeting.* We've never had any board members attend and conduct a meeting. **Newkirk:** That has never been abided by. That's been in there forever and it has never happened. **Hannon:** We might also want to propose an amendment to change that. **Eigenhauser:** If we're going to amend this, we may want to go to that part, as well. Something to think about. **Hannon:** So, you'll keep that in mind, George. You generally are the one that handles the amendments. **Auth:** Since I approached you and said that I would come back and start doing changes to the constitution – **Hannon:** I was going to bring that up under Old Business. **Auth:** That would be a time to. **Hannon:** Anything else on this subject? We voted and passed it, so we're good.

Hannon: Any other new business?

BREAK.

Hannon: I'm calling the meeting back to order. **Webster:** I move to reconsider the China motion that we had. **Mastin:** Second. **Hannon:** Discussion? **Webster:** I guess, because of the timeline that we would have, to wait 60 days and then hold the election, I think we maybe should appoint somebody, then even if we appoint somebody now and then hold the election at a later date. **Hannon:** It's scheduled already for next June. **Webster:** Right, so appoint somebody until then. There's what is it, 30 days or 60 days? **Hannon:** We have to give them time to declare and then we have to give them time to vote, so we're talking months. **Newkirk:** I have a couple issues. One is, the China rep has been vacant for several months. **Hannon:** They were vacant almost simultaneous. **Newkirk:** Oh, were they? I didn't know when Eva resigned, but I knew that Gavin had resigned early on. They have been without representation for several months. If we make the appointment and the China clubs don't agree with those appointments, their election will be a few months later, so then they can come in and they can pick who they want if they don't like our picks. I think the one person that stands out for the China ID rep is someone who has worked his butt off to help CFA in China. The other one for outside of China that comes to my mind is somebody who attends every ID meeting every year and gives valuable input to us. If they don't agree with that, then next year they can change it. **Hannon:** Rather than get into people first, let's discuss the concept and whether we want to reconsider. **Black:** When the original motion was brought up by Carol, I was very supportive of that but I also would rather see an appointment so I had to vote no on the way it was stated, so I'm happy this is being brought back up because I'm very much in favor of them having a voice on the board. I agree there have been too many months gone by since both those people resigned. They are sitting there feeling like they have been cut off from CFA and I would like to see us appoint the two people then hold the election on a regular cycle. **Eigenhauser:** I think we can have our cake and eat it too with this one. I think that if we call an election and say we're going to appoint somebody just as a temporary seat holder until the election, #1 it gives our blessing to that person as the lead candidate so we have a little bit of sway over the election. It fills the seat immediately so we don't have to wait for the election, but we still have an election so they feel like they are engaged and that we're listening to them. So, what I would like to see is, still have the election but have an interim appointment, somebody to keep the seat warm for the 60, 90 or whatever days it takes to actually hold the election. **Hannon:** Howard, this was your motion. **Eigenhauser:** Actually the motion is to reconsider. **Newkirk:** The motion is to reconsider. We have to vote on that first. **Hannon:** Let's vote on whether or not to reconsider. All those in favor of reconsidering.

Hannon called the motion [to reconsider]. **Motion Carried.**

Hannon: Alright, now let's make a motion to appoint. **Eigenhauser:** My motion is going to be that we still hold the election, but we make an interim appointment to fill the seat until the election can be completed. **Krzanowski:** Second. **Hannon:** Discussion. **Morgan:** I'm going to vote against this because I would like to see a motion to appoint and, if we choose to have an election at the regular time, have that person serve out the term until then. **P. Moser:** I'll vote no too. It's for such a short period. A year isn't that long, and to have to go in and hold an election for the 60 days, it will take 60 days to appoint for that election, so I think that I would prefer to just have it appointed and then we vote to have a new election next year in June. **Mastin:** I agree with Pam and Melanie. There's too many things that are going on right now in China with activity behind the scenes and not activity on the show front. I think it would be best at this point in time not to have an election, and we push it out, let it run it's normal course. It's 51 weeks

away because we move one week earlier next year. This is more of the right direction. Howard, thanks for opening it up, because I was considering doing the same because I was on the fence on that one. **Newkirk:** I agree with that. You know what? We've got to get some backbone. We're going to get criticized either way we do it, OK? However, we're doing the right thing because we have to have somebody that people can contact as their representative. They have nobody right now except the chairs of the ID. They need somebody in China and outside of China that they can go to if they have issues. I understand your concept, George. I think you're trying to do something in between, but if we appoint them and they're on there for two months and there's an election and they don't get elected, then I don't understand what we've accomplished with that. We're going to be putting them in it's going to be less than a year now because they will hold the election for next year. So, let them get in there, do their job. If they do the right thing then they're going to get re-elected; if they don't, they are going to say bye bye. **Eigenhauser:** Part of the reason to hold the election is to show the Chinese clubs that we're engaged with them, that we care about what they think, that we care about China. It's the energy that the election would generate, to let them know that we're still there, that we haven't left them behind. Appointing somebody doesn't send that message. It sends the message that we know what's right for you and we picked it. It doesn't show that we're still engaged there. I think having an election shows a greater engagement in an area where they feel for awhile that they have been abandoned. **B. Moser:** I'm all about elections, but saying that, China is a different culture. I still think they are influenced by people that we basically got rid of that are still out there. I think we need to bring in the people that actually speak for them. I think I know who I think would be the best people for that job. **Hannon:** Your concern is, we want to have somebody whose got CFA's interests at heart. **B. Moser:** At this point, an appointment I think would be the best. **Calhoun:** I agree with Darrell's point. I think we have far too many irons in the fire right now. It would be far too disruptive to appoint somebody until an election and have them in place for a couple of months and perhaps have another set of people. Too many irons in the fire, too disruptive. I think that they should be appointed for the balance of the term and then we can do an election. **Newkirk:** I think we could market this to our advantage a little bit, and that is by saying, while we favor democratic elections, since there has been a vacancy for so many months, we felt it important to put somebody in those positions immediately. That way, we considered having an election but we thought the appointment overrode the time frame to hold an election. **Krzanowski:** I have to agree with what Darrell just stated. I think the main thing is to be sure they have some kind of representation as quickly as possible. That's really what I intended when I brought the motion up in the first place. **Webster:** They would have to declare by March, like the rest of us would who are going to run again, so that gives them time to prepare and think about it. March isn't really that far away. **Auth:** Darrell, you just said – I'm not going to be able to paraphrase you, but we need to show them that we're going to engage them. So, in my mind, George's solution really is the appropriate one. You engage them with an election, you treat them just like every other region, because this is what would happen if there was a regional director vacancy. We would hold a special election, but in the interim you have an appointee, and the appointee would be the favored one which would give that person presumably a little bit of an edge over any other candidates. When you look at something this way, you see it one way because there's going to be some people that only watch Fox News and they believe the information they're getting on Fox News is the right one. Then there's those who watch CNN and they think it's the only thing. So, I really believe that George's solution is the best – appoint, anoint and then follow the process that we have for the rest of the regions. **Curre:** I want to

combine what Rich said and what George said. I don't disagree with holding an election, but as far as we have come with trying to get our stuff settled in China, I think that anything that we do, the louder we speak at this point, I think we have a target date I believe around September a couple of beta shows are going to go on. Let's see how they work. In the meantime, I'm all for appointing. You have convinced me to do that. If we bring up an election immediately following that, with the situation that is so unsettled in China and has been for months upon months, you are just going to create perhaps a firestorm and particularly incentivize the opposition even more. I agree with Rich. I agree with the intent of George, but in the meantime let's let the process play out. They can declare in March. That's even less than 51 weeks. In the meantime, perhaps things will get settled down and that would be my suggestion, just to appoint at this time. **B. Moser:** I recommend having an election but appoint for the remainder of this term and have the election come the next year. **Newkirk:** That's when it's scheduled. That's the normal process, so that's no change. **Eigenhauser:** So that's a no on the motion. **Mastin:** What's the motion? **Eigenhauser:** The motion is to hold an election now and appoint an interim. **Auth:** That's not what Brian is saying. **Eigenhauser:** Brian is a no on the motion. **Mastin:** Right, that's not what Brian is saying. Rachel, I assume this is in open session? **Anger:** That would be my question.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Hannon: I'm going to call the question. The motion is to hold an election, right George? **Eigenhauser:** With an interim appointment. **Black:** To appoint and hold a special election. **Eigenhauser:** It's both.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Eigenhauser and Auth voting yes.

Eigenhauser: Is the President ready to make an appointment now? **Hannon:** I think we have to have a motion. **Newkirk:** I'll make a motion. **Eigenhauser:** Well no. Somebody has to nominate, and usually it's the President that nominates. **P. Moser:** But we have to have a motion first, don't we? **Hannon:** I think we have to have a motion that we appoint. **Black:** We have nothing on the table. **Currle:** It's already in the constitution, isn't it? **Newkirk:** It doesn't matter. Usually Mark appoints committees. **Hannon:** We said appoint or elect and we voted down elect. **Eigenhauser:** We voted down elect, so the President should appoint. **Currle:** So moved to appoint. **Eigenhauser:** Second. **Hannon:** All those in favor.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

In an executive session discussion, **President Hannon** appointed Allen Shi (China) and Matthew Wong (Hong Kong) to serve as ID Representatives. **Mr. Newkirk** moved to ratify the appointments. Seconded by **Ms. Black**, **Motion Carried.**

Memo From Mark

Two weeks ago we held our Annual Meeting in Verona, NY. It was certainly one chock full of great memories. Many thanks to Allene Tartaglia and the CFA staff who worked so hard to make it the success it was. Thanks are also owed to Sharon Roy and the many members of the North Atlantic Region who helped out in so many ways. The Friday night hospitality hosted by the Region was outstanding. Congratulations to those who were honored with various awards on Saturday night.

The next big event on CFA's calendar is the CFA international Cat Show presented by Royal Canin. The show is returning to the IX Center in Cleveland, Ohio and is scheduled for October 12-13, 2019. There again will be two shows. While the initial show flyer indicated Household Pets could choose to enter either show, a number of HHP exhibitors asked to have all the HHPs entered in one show. We chose the Teal Show. Check out [the blog](#) for a copy of the show flyer and lots more information about the show. We had the best gate in the show's history last year and there are plans to exceed it this year. It is an exciting show you will not want to miss.



Photo by Carolyn Jimenez

Are you a member of your Breed Council? If you are qualified, be sure to join or rejoin by August 1st. It can all be done [online](#)

As spelled out in the CFA Constitution, the clubs in the International Division elect two representatives for a two-year term. Both of the representatives elected in 2018 resigned. With board ratification, I appointed Allen Shi and Mathew Wong to fill the vacancies until the next regularly scheduled election in 2020. Thanks to both of them for agreeing to serve.

* * * * *

(f) **Canadian Cat Association Follow-Up.**

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

(g) **China Recap.**

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

(63) **OLD BUSINESS.**

Hannon: Old Business. Once upon a time, Mary recommended that we review the constitution and make some changes, due to some errors that she felt it had. I asked her if she would be in charge of that, and she declined. She has now changed her mind and said she would be happy to head that up. So, if anybody is interested in working with Mary on that.

Eigenhauser: I would volunteer to help. **Hannon:** I appreciate your willingness to help. Is there any other Old Business? **Mastin:** I've got two items for closed session. **Hannon:** He's got two items. Alright, so we will now go into closed session.

BREAK.

(64) UPCOMING BOARD MEETINGS.

- ❖ August 13, 2019 – Teleconference
- ❖ October 5/6, 2019 – In Person, Marriott Cleveland Airport, Cleveland, OH
- ❖ December 10, 2019 – Teleconference
- ❖ February 1/2, 2020 – In Person, Marriott Cleveland Airport, Cleveland, OH
- ❖ April 14, 2020 – Teleconference
- ❖ June 17-June 21, 2020 – In Person, The Davenport Grand West, Spokane Falls, WA

* * * * *

Hannon: If there's nothing else, then the meeting is adjourned. Thank you all for coming.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:33 a.m.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Rachel Anger, Secretary*

(65) DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS AND SUSPENSIONS.

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

19-011 CFA v. Bagley, Cheryl

Respondent shall be placed on administrative suspension of all CFA services until she completes and passes a CFA cattery environment inspection. If the Respondent successfully completes the inspection, the matter can be re-opened for further proceedings if necessary. [vote sealed]

19-008 CFA v. Johnson, Jessica

Respondent will remain on administrative suspension of all CFA services until she completes and passes a CFA cattery environment inspection. If the Respondent successfully completes the inspection the matter can be reopened for further proceedings if necessary. [vote sealed]

19-009 CFA v. Baldwin, Angela

Violation of CFA Constitution, Article XV, Section 4(g)

GUILTY of violation of CFA Constitution, Article XV, Section 4(g). Respondent shall make restitution to Complainant in the sum of \$1,500 and pay a fine of \$500 to CFA. Both restitution and fine are to be paid within 30 days or Respondent shall be suspended from all CFA services until the fine and restitution are paid in full. [vote sealed]

19-010 CFA v. DuBois, Valerie

Violation of CFA Constitution, Article XV, Section 4(g)

GUILTY of violation of CFA Constitution, Article XV, Section 4(g). Sentence of a one year suspension from all CFA services and a \$500 fine to be paid within 30 days. If the fine is not paid prior to the end of the suspension period, the suspension will continue until the fine is paid in full. In addition to the sentence in this matter, CFA will change the registration of "Blackfire Odin" registration number 0108-02717943 back into the names of all three parties. [vote sealed]

Board-Cited Hearing: The Board may consider any protest filed by any member of a member club or in any other manner brought to the attention of the Executive Board. The Board may delegate authority to one or more persons to review, investigate, and determine if probable cause exists for the filing of a formal protest. This case was heard on direct cite by the CFA Executive Board. Timely notice was given to the party, and the matter was heard in open session, at the request of the respondent.

19-015-0409 CFA v. Wintershoven, Henny

Violation of CFA Constitution, Article XV, Section 4(g)

GUILTY of violation of CFA Constitution, Article XV, Section 4(g). Sentence of (an additional) two year suspension to the concurrent suspensions from all CFA services pursuant to 18-025-0615 and 18-026-0618. To the extent that prior fines imposed have not been paid by the end of the extended term of suspension, Respondent shall remain suspended from all CFA services until all fines are paid in full. [vote sealed]

Appeals: Cases that have been reviewed by the Protest Committee and for which a recommendation was presented to and heard by the Board, a tentative decision was rendered, timely notice was given to the party, an appeal and/or appeal fee was timely filed, and the appeal was heard by the Board of Directors. Therefore, final disposition is as follows:

None.