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.

Annual Manual............................................................................................................................................(1)
Board of Directors Guidebook....................................................................................................................(2)
Central Office Report..................................................................................................................................(3)
Clubs - Status of show licenses of dropped clubs.......................................................................................(4)
International Division Awards Structure ....................................................................................................(5)
Judging Program .........................................................................................................................................(8)
Publications.................................................................................................................................................(6)
World Show ................................................................................................................................................(7)

Secretary’s Note: The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers’ Association, Inc. met on Tuesday, September 11, 2012, via teleconference. President Jerold Hamza called the meeting to order at 9:00 p.m. with the following members present:

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

Also Present:

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

(1) **ANNUAL MANUAL.**
No action items were presented.

(2) **BOARD OF DIRECTORS GUIDEBOOK.**
Ms. Anger moved to accept the content of the Board of Directors Guidebook. Seconded by Mr. Eigenhauser, **Motion Carried.**

(3) **CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT.**
Ms. Anger moved that the new combined Clerking Manual be sold for $10. Seconded by Mr. Eigenhauser, **Motion Carried.**

(4) **CLUBS.**
No action items were presented.

(5) **INTERNATIONAL DIVISIONAL AWARDS STRUCTURE.**
No action items were presented.

(6) **PUBLICATIONS.**
No action items were presented.

(7) **WORLD SHOW.**
After an executive session discussion, Ms. Calhoun moved to approve the implementation of a second show with the exact format of the first show, and to handle the overflow from the first show in the manner discussed in executive session (to be announced), pending availability of space. Seconded by Mrs. Baugh, **Motion Carried.** Newkirk abstained.

(8) **JUDGING PROGRAM.**
After an executive session discussion, Mrs. Baugh moved to accept Mrs. Imai’s request for a one year leave of absence. Seconded by Mrs. Meeker, **Motion Carried.**

TRANSCRIPT

(1) **ANNUAL MANUAL.**

**Hamza:** Alright, let’s just get right into it, because if we do what we’ve got to do, we can get through this. There’s a few important things in closed session, but we’ll cross that street when we get to it. Ginger, the first two agenda items are yours. One is, you can start with the Annual meeting. **Meeker:** The Annual Manual. **Hamza:** The Annual Manual, I’m sorry. **Meeker:** The Annual Manual has been completed and, as I understand it, does not need to be approved by the board. We simply sent it to the board for review as courtesy. Jodell [Raymond] did a great job putting this together, along with the team. The question that I did have was, or the comment I would have is that I would like to see a project manager affiliated with Central Office take charge of the Annual on a yearly basis. For this next year, I would ask that Jodell be asked to do that task. She has been on this committee and she’s done all the ground work and the training here. **Hamza:** Really, I guess that’s understood anyway, that she would do it. **Meeker:** OK. Well, when I talked to her, I don’t know that she understood. She was certainly willing, but she didn’t know that she had been — **Hamza:** We have talked since, and she’s pretty clear on it now. **Meeker:** OK, great. So, Jodell will serve as project manager, through Central Office, working with the regions. And then, as far as I’m concerned, if everybody agrees, that manual is good for distribution to all of the regions. **Hamza:** I don’t see any reason why not. Does anybody on this call see a reason why not? **Bizzell:** No, as long as we realize that it’s always going to be subject to modification as we come across things. **Hamza:** Nothing stays the same, so it will have to change, to meet any new challenges that arise in our process. **White:** So, is Jodell the keeper of the document if changes need to be made? **Hamza:** For this year, but you know, as we go down the road, I mean, this is a good document to have. Ten years from now it’s still going to be a good document to have, as long as CFA commits to keeping it relevant. Rachel, I think somebody else joined the call. **Anger:** Was that Darrell? **Newkirk:** No, I was here on roll call. **Koizumi:** It’s Shino and Kayoko. **Anger:** Oh, hello. **Altschul:** And Carissa. **Hamza:** Carissa came in too. Good. Good, good, good. OK, I just wanted to make sure that the record reflected everybody who is here.
Hamza: Ginger, the Board of Directors Guidebook. Meeker: OK, I wanted the board to review that for content. I understand from Carol today there’s still a couple clean-up items to do on making it pretty, but I would like the board to vote on acceptance for content. We will fix the page breaks and the numbering. I want to get the content approved. Hamza: As I recall, the person who caught the most corrections was Carla. Carla, have you seen this version of it? Bizzell: Yes. I looked over the part that I had suggested changes, and those changes have been made. Meeker: Also the changes that Ed made. He reviewed it after Carla made her submissions and, as far as I understand, it has his blessing. Hamza: Ed, does it have your blessing? Raymond: Yes, it does. Hamza: Oh. Well, that’s swell. Anybody else have any questions or comments on the Board of Directors Guidebook? White: There was only one modification change, Ginger, in regards to the teleconference protocol. It was just an incorrect number. Meeker: I made that change, David. White: Pardon? Meeker: Didn’t you already send that? White: I did, but the number that you have in there is wrong. I don’t know if that matters. It’s not our normal teleconference number. Meeker: Well, I’m wondering if we should put a specific teleconference number in there, as it may change. Hamza: It changes every time we change the board. I don’t care how you guys do it. It’s just that it seems like the body of the Guidebook is acceptable to everybody. White: OK. It’s not a big deal then. We can bypass it. Meeker: OK. David, what I will do is go in and change that section to say that the number will be – White: Or just take it out. “The number will be provided.” Meeker: That’s fine. I can do that. Not a problem. So, if we could vote to accept the content. Anger: So moved. This is Rachel. Eigenhauser: George seconds.

Hamza called the motion. Motion Carried.
CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT.

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

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

We have completed the creation of the Traditional Show Dates listing with all 9 regions participating. It is in the process of being formatted for inclusion on the web site.

Kristi Wollam worked hand in hand with Mary K, Rachel and Annette to have the off cycle ballot up and running for the Burmese and Tonkinese Breed Councils. Emails were sent to 44 of the 48 Tonkinese Council members and 52 of the 56 Burmese Council members. Four members in each council did not have email addresses. 23 Tonkinese and 18 Burmese members (as of 9/6/12) acknowledged receipt of their email notifications.

Current Happenings of Committee:

We lived the impossible dream last week as Jill and Monique processed a Foreign Pedigree registration in less than 24 hours. While many of our Foreign Pedigree registrations require a bit more time for research, this shows what may be accomplished when work is submitted in a clear and precise order.

Future Projections for Committee:

We are currently making our lists and gathering supplies for the November World Show as well as preparing for the Central Office in house activities affecting the show.

Action Items:

A. With the creation of the new “combined” Clerking Program Manual the fee for the manual needs to be reconsidered. Having given consideration to the cost of the book as well as shipping both domestic and International, I am requesting the New Manual be sold for $10.00.

Hamza: #3 is Donna Jean with some Central Office stuff. Thompson: Thank you. I just had a couple little items. I wanted to get approval on the raising of the fee for the combined Clerking Program Manual. To cover our cost, we need to raise that fee to $10. Hannon: What was the cost? Thompson: I think it was $7, because it was sold in two parts, one for master clerks and one for ring clerks. It came to $7 and that wasn’t covering all our postage fees for the new manual. Hannon: This is Mark. Hamza: Go ahead. Hannon: The clerks pay dues. I don’t know why the dues can’t cover this. It’s something they are required to have in order to perform their job right. I don’t understand why raising it. Hamza: You know what we’ll do, Mark? I will kick this back until the next meeting and we’ll do an analysis. Carla, maybe you can just help me real quick on that, too. Bizzell: Let me just ask a question. Do they not – are they not issued a manual as part of being a licensed clerk, after paying their dues? Hannon: Yes. I got one in the mail. Bizzell: So, this would just be for people who are not licensed clerks and have not paid dues. Eigenhauser: This would be for people who are not licensed clerks, who have not paid dues and who don’t want to download it off the website. Hannon: OK. How many of those do we have, Donna? Thompson: That I don’t know. Bizzell: I would suspect it’s not more than
25 a year or something. I’m just guessing. [Hamza leaves the conference] **Hannon**: Are you there? **Bizzell**: Uh-oh. **Anger**: This is Rachel. Since it’s such a minimal number, let’s cut to the chase and move on this. I move that it be approved. **Eigenhauser**: I’ll second. **Anger**: Mark, are you still on the call? **Hannon**: Yeah. I’m here. Do you hear me? **Anger**: Yeah. Do you want to call that motion? **Hannon**: Did we lose Jerry? **Anger**: We did. **Hannon**: I’m sorry. OK, I’ll call the motion.

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.** [Hamza rejoins the conference] **Hamza**: OK, good. Well, that was easy. **Eigenhauser**: You were just impeached while you were gone. **Hamza**: Oh, thank you all!

**B.** We have had a Cattery Name Request for a cattery name that was registered in the mid-60’s and has not been used since at least 1992 when it was added to the computer. There are no cats registered under the Cattery Name and I am requesting the name be permitted to be re-registered under a new owner.

**Hannon**: Moving right along. **Hamza**: Go ahead. **Thompson**: I’m sorry. The next question we had was, we received a cattery name request very similar to another name. In researching the other name, it appears that we have never registered a cat under that other name and it was registered in the 60’s, was never used. We officially placed it in the computer in 1992 and it has never been used since then. I did tell the lady, I said I would not be able to just give that to her by my own wishes, but that I would take it before the board for them to consider. **Hannon**: What’s the current policy? **Hamza**: They can’t use anything close if it’s a permanent cattery name. **Thompson**: Right. **Hannon**: I thought that there was an activity type of situation, no? **Hamza**: No, not with permanent names. If I recall, and George, you have been on long enough and a couple other people have been on long enough – as I recall, the rationale was even to protect the integrity of some of the more prominent old lines. For instance, in a Persian line, maybe like South Paw. **Bizzell**: Or like Bolo. **Hamza**: Yeah. **Eigenhauser**: Part of the policy was that even when one of our five year cattery names expired, we still might not reissue it if there had been significant activity, significant breeding – you know, DM’s, grands, national winners or something under that name, so I don’t think we ever addressed reissuing something that was similar to. I mean, how close are these two cattery names? **Thompson**: Well, the name they were trying was FancyFelines and she wanted it all put together in one letter – in a group of letters as one word. We checked it with a couple other spellings and we could not find a cat registered under that cattery name. **Hamza**: But, Donna Jean, I think the question is, what is the – what’s the difference between the old one that was registered in the 60’s and the request? **Thompson**: The original one had a space between Fancy and Felines. **Hamza**: And so, this is, in a sense, the same name but the difference would be one has a space and one doesn’t have a space. **Thompson**: Correct. **Hamza**: Before we got a little further, because we do need to discuss policy here, I’ve got a question for Dick. Dick? **Kallmeyer**: Yeah. **Hamza**: Part of the issue here is, because of the COBOL limitations on space, and obviously we have other limitations on what will fit on a certificate, but are we in a position to allow more spaces for cattery and cat names with the new system? **Kallmeyer**: Yeah, but we better do it quick. It’s actually not hard to change. It’s just whether it fits on the forms, right? **Hamza**: I think you need to look at that, because that gives us – you know, I want you to go ahead and stretch it out as much as you can without making it look ridiculous on the forms. You know, so instead of 35 letters, will 50 work? **Kallmeyer**: I think we probably ought to look at the entry program. Don’t they have a limit? They’re probably using – **Hamza**: You have to talk to Steve [Thieler] and see if he can expand it, as well, because then what that does is, it opens up a whole infinite number
of new combinations and kind of heads a lot of this off. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Kallmeyer:** The CFA program is not the problem, I don’t think. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Mark. **Hannon:** If we’re going to expand the number of letters, spaces, whatever, in the cattery name – the cat’s name, then we should also do it for the owners. **Hamza:** We’re already working on that. **Hannon:** OK, but they go hand in hand. **Hamza:** Right. See, but just so everybody knows, the 35 space limitation is more a limitation of the program that we’re using now – the COBOL and all that. You know, with the new system, we should be able to expand it. The other limitation is, what fits neatly on the certificates. **Meeker:** Jerry, this is Ginger. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Ginger. **Meeker:** I thought we were looking to limit the number of owner spaces, to cut down on the cat ownerships. **Hamza:** Well, we are, but you know it’s just, again, we want to make sure we have enough so that it can accommodate if a parent and a child, you know, parents and child and whatever. **Meeker:** I think we have that now. I’m not sure that the number of owners or length of a cattery name are necessarily dependent on each other. **Hamza:** What we’re basically talking about here is what we can fit on a line and I don’t necessarily think that – you know, multiple owners, I think that a lot of people would like to see their full names on the cat. **Baugh:** Jerry, this is Loretta. **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Baugh:** Getting back to the issue of the cattery name, we have a policy that we can’t do this. I hate to change policy, given all the different combinations people can use. I realize what our policy is and what it can be. **Hamza:** Well, in this case, I agree because it’s not close, it’s the same thing. **Hannon:** This is Mark. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Mark. **Hannon:** But, in this case, the cattery name has never been used. I think it’s a different situation than somebody that’s used a cattery name and now somebody is coming up with almost an identical one. We’re talking about something that was never used. It was simply just registered and abandoned. **Hamza:** In that light, I wouldn’t have a problem if they changed one of the letters, or something. The problem here is, it’s identical except for taking a space out. I think it does hurtle that concern of somebody being worried that they were going to use somebody else’s reputation to help them advance their cattery and sell cats. We know that’s not the issue here, but I would be far more comfortable if they would, you know, do something to modify it so it wasn’t an exact duplicate. **Calhoun:** Jerry, this is Kathy. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Kathy. **Calhoun:** I just wondered, the person who – or the people, group of people, who registered the cattery back in 1992, are they active in any way? Is there a way even to – **Hamza:** No, no. I think this was – it wasn’t registered in 1992, it was registered in the 60’s, but 1992 was the time that Central Office transferred over what they considered permanent catteries into the database. **Calhoun:** OK. So, in the 60’s, are these people active in any way at all? **Hamza:** No. I don’t – Donna Jean, you don’t know who these people are, do you? **Thompson:** No. I would have to do another search to find out. **Hamza:** What name do they want? **Thompson:** FancyFelines, as one word. **Hamza:** Can’t they like put an “i” in Fancy, or something, just to give us somewhat of at least one letter spelling difference? **Thompson:** I’m looking up the cattery names that we have right now. **Anger:** This is Rachel. **Hamza:** Go ahead, Rachel. **Anger:** I hate to do this in the middle of this discussion. I’m looking in past minutes, because in the Tom Dent era this issue came up. His point was, eventually we’re going to run out of words for people use or that they will want to use. I just found a reference in an October meeting where the delegates voted on something related in June, and I’m trying to research that right now, so can we table this until later in the meeting? **Hamza:** You know what? Why don’t we table this to next meeting so that we can do – there’s a few more questions I have, too. So Rachel, why don’t you and I talk and see if we can’t look at some things, and you can give us what the history of this is, and the protocol in the past that was used. I just want to see what we’ve allowed in the past, as far as close spellings and such. **Anger:** OK. I have located something from the delegates. It looks like it failed. I’ll share that with the board so they can at least know the history. **Hamza:** Yeah, great. **Thompson:** OK.
What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

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

Respectfully Submitted,
Donna Jean Thompson
(4) CLUBS – STATUS OF SHOW LICENSES OF DROPPED CLUBS.

Hamza: OK, #4. Clubs. Thompson: The question came up at the last board meeting that one of the clubs that was dropped in March was listed in the show schedule. We researched that, and what that was is, the show was not actually licensed. Judges are encouraged to notify us when they have accepted a judging assignment, which is frequently before a show is actually licensed, and that’s what happened in this case. The show that appeared in the schedule was planned and we didn’t catch it, because we were looking for licensed shows. Hamza: So, what you are saying is, how it made the schedule is that the club in question had contacted and/or contracted several judges and the judges informed Central Office, and they just put it on the schedule? Thompson: Right. It goes on – when the judges contact us, the show goes on the schedule as a planned show, with the judges’ names that have contacted us and let us know of their assignment. Hamza: So, the other thing, what you’re really saying is that shows may appear on the schedule that are unlicensed? Thompson: That’s correct, because it’s not infrequent for judges to contact us and say, you know, is this club going to license the show? Is it going to be for real? Because some of them, especially ones that let it go to the last minute, judges do check the schedule to see if, indeed, their show is licensed. Hannon: This is Mark. Hamza: Go ahead. Hannon: If a show is cancelled, even if it’s on the schedule as a planned show, do you not remove it? Thompson: If we find out. If we’re formally noticed that it’s cancelled. Hannon: OK then, this should follow the same logic. If the club is cancelled – we didn’t get the dues or we didn’t get the membership list, so they were dropped – then I would propose that we also go through the show schedule and remove any shows that were planned for that club. Thompson: I think that’s what we’re planning to do next year. Hamza: I don’t think we even need to vote on that. I think that was just a way of Central Office approaching it. It makes sense to list a show when contracts are coming in because, often times, clubs license shows at the last minute. But, it also makes sense, Donna Jean, that if we drop clubs that that list should be checked against the show schedule. Thompson: Right. I mean, we did check to see if they had anything actually licensed, which they didn’t, and we didn’t think about the judge aspect of it when they list, you know, write in and tell of an assignment they have. Hamza: Alright. So, just make sure you just hand Kristi a memo saying that, next year – Thompson: We’ve already done that. Hamza: OK, very good.
Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

The Committee was formed to address the divisional awards structure for the current makeup of the International Division. Unlike most of CFA’s regions (with the exception of Hawaii and Japan), the International Division is plagued with multiple and various quarantine requirements that prevent cats from competing at any show in the division. For example, cats from Malaysia can go to Hong Kong and vice versa. If a Malaysian cat goes to Thailand, it cannot go to Hong Kong for 6 months. Cats from Thailand and Indonesia can go to Malaysia, but not Hong Kong. Effectively, there is no real cross-border competition. Then, Israeli cats cannot go to Dubai, Kuwait or Egypt. Kuwait and Egypt cats COULD go to Malaysia, but it would cost a lot. Poor South America can’t go anywhere cheaply.

Current Happenings of Committee:

The committee has proposed the following award structure for the International Division, similar to how the current awards are handled for Hawaii, based on quarantine restrictions in place in many countries of the International Division. The awards structure is in three parts: The first part identifies the unique geographical areas that each receive awards. The second part identifies how many awards a geographical area may receive based on the number of shows sponsored in that area. The third part specifies a minimum point requirement for any award recipient based on its category of competition. The structure is as follows:

1. The International Division is divided into the following geographical areas based on quarantine requirements: China; Korea; Israel; Hong Kong; Singapore; Taiwan; Indonesia; South America; the countries of Malaysia, Thailand, and Vietnam; and finally the combined Kuwait, Dubai, and Africa.

2. Awards are based on the following formula:

   1-3 shows sponsored in the area = 1 DW award;
   4-7 shows sponsored in an area = 3 DW awards;
   8-10 shows sponsored in an area = 5 DW awards;
   11-15 shows sponsored in an area = 10 DW awards;
   >15 shows sponsored in an area = 15 DW awards.

3. Minimum point requirements to receive an award are 50 for championship, 30 for kittens, and 10 for premiership.

The Board has already been presented the actual award structure for the 2011-2012 season, showing 26 awards in China, 15 for Hong Kong, 7 for Malaysia, 2 for Indonesia, and none for any other country, even though there were shows in Brazil, Singapore, Taiwan, and Korea. Under this revised proposal, the awards would have been distributed as follows:

China – 13 shows = 10 awards in championship & kittens, 4 awards in premiership.
Hong Kong – 5 shows = 3 awards in championship & kittens, 1 award in premiership (this will be tough competition, as Hong Kong still has shows with a top 15 in premiership).
Indonesia – 3 shows = 1 award in all categories.
Israel – none in 2011-2012, but for this year - 1 show = 1 award in two categories (not enough cats to meet minimum in Premiership)
Korea – 1 show – 1 award in all categories.
Taiwan – 1 show – 1 award in all categories.
Singapore – 1 show = 1 award in two categories (not enough kittens to meet minimum in kittens)
South America – 2 shows – 1 award in all categories.
Malaysia, Thailand and Vietnam – 8 shows = 5 awards in championship & kittens, 2 awards in premiership.
Africa, Dubai, and Kuwait - 1 show = 1 award in two categories (not enough cats to meet minimum in Premiership)

TOTAL AWARDS using new structure = 25 in championship & kittens, 12-13 awards in Premiership. If the Board feels this number is too high, it can be lowered by either revising the table, or raising the minimum point requirement. In the latter case, that can result in countries/areas having no awards, like is the case already for Africa and Israel in Premiership and Singapore in kittens.

Note: Given the large premiership counts on the average in Hong Kong (they average 50.5 cats in premiership per show compared to 44.8 in championship, it is probably appropriate that there be no reduction in numbers of premiership DWs in Hong Kong per the 1/3 rule, which would only increase premiership by 2 awards to a total of 3.

Future Actions of Committee

Based on Board input to the above, have the Show Rules Committee draft an appropriate proposal for the October Board meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dick Kallmeyer, Chair

Hamza: Alright Dick, #5, the International Division awards structure. Kallmeyer: OK. Just recapping what the problem is. First of all, the International Division is very fragmented, and there’s a lot of cases where exhibitors cannot even cross country boundaries to show their cats because of quarantine laws. There’s some extreme examples. If you look at Singapore or Taiwan, Taiwan may go to Japan but they don’t usually. Then, there’s other areas where there’s severe restrictions. For instance, Hong Kong cannot go to China. Hong Kong cannot go to Malaysia. Malaysian cats can go to Hong Kong, but if they went to a show in Indonesia or Thailand, they can’t go to Hong Kong for 6 months, so it makes competition awards very challenging. China this year will almost start approaching the number of shows held in Region 5, so since a lot of people cannot go to China, and China has so many shows, it’s obvious that they’re going to win a lot of awards. So, we were looking at alternatives to that. One of the representatives, Russell Law, proposed that China be split off by itself, but then that doesn’t solve the problems for the other countries, as well. So, we came up with a scheme for division awards. It’s really based on number of shows that the segments of the division hold. The reason we did that is, we want to start encouraging them or incentive to producing more shows in order to get more awards.
Kallmeyer: The divisions that we are proposing that would have separate awards would be Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, Indonesia, Hong Kong by itself, China by itself, Thailand and Malaysia together, the Middle East countries and North Africa, so that would be Egypt and Kuwait, basically, Israel by itself, and South America. Now, the number of division awards that they would receive in the category, championship and kitten categories, would be if they have one show, they would receive one award and that would accrue the title of DW. If they have 2-3 shows, it would be 3 awards, 4-7 would be 5 awards, 8-15 would be 10 awards, and 15+ would be 15 awards. If we look at International Division last year, we actually gave 40 awards, combining Europe and Asia. This would bring the total for championship and kittens down to probably about 27, but again the incentive would be, the more shows, the more awards they would get. We probably still have to work out the details on whether there would be one awards banquet or they can have separate categories, but this would give a way that exhibitors could win something for showing, even though they were not able to compete with other cats across the country boundaries. I ran this by a lot of exhibitors at the Malaysian show this weekend and a lot of them were very, very happy. I talked to the Middle Eastern people and South American people, and they were really out of the award picture. This gives them a chance that they can start being part of CFA. Hamza: I like what you’ve done. I’ve got a question. Kallmeyer: Sure.

Hamza: When are you looking to institute this? Kallmeyer: OK. You know, obviously some people in Hong Kong are looking at the China awards and they want it now, but I think we should really begin with the new show season. I don’t think we can really change now. Obviously, we would have to change something with the scoring system, but it is do-able. For continuity across the whole division, we didn’t mention it in this proposal, but I think that we should keep breed awards and color awards across the whole division. This might encourage some of the minority breeds to get some more attention, too. I would hate to break up breed awards by the countries, too. I think that might be a little – Hamza: It might become very labor intensive for Central Office. Kallmeyer: The other part we haven’t figured out, we did make a proposal on premiership, and the only significant premiers that we are seeing so far are really in Hong Kong. There’s much fewer in the other divisions. We did propose a minimum number of points, too, just to make sure that there is some competition in that category. I would also propose a show has a minimum of two judges. We probably would have people maybe putting on 20 one shows just to get the number of awards, but again we just have to look at it. It’s a feedback, though. A lot of exhibitors there like at least 4 ring shows, just in order to get their qualifying rings for champion, so some of the exhibitors would give them push-back if they started reducing the number of rings, so it’s going to be something we ought to pay attention to, but this is a good way, if they are developing their countries or their areas, this is a good incentive to help them start thinking about that. Also, we’re proposing that if you can get to other countries, say Malaysia going to Hong Kong, that the division points would apply across the country boundaries. So, for Malaysia to Hong Kong, I would get Malaysia points. This way, at least we get some interaction across the international division boundaries. Like a lot of people are really interested in the Egypt show coming up in January. Something we want to encourage, as well.

Hannon: This is Mark. Kallmeyer: Yes. Hannon: I’m just concerned that we’re going to be giving out a DW title for basically the highest scoring cat in one show. Korea has one show. Taiwan has one show. You’re going to give out a DW award to somebody from that country and I’m not even sure if those folks are limited to their country. Can they fly off to another show and pick up points? Kallmeyer: No, Korea is pretty isolated. Hamza: And the question here, Mark – I don’t think – DW’s are nice to have, but I don’t think they carry nearly the weight that an RW does. I mean, when I see one on a pedigree and I’m pouring over the
pedigree for my program, I don’t even – I look at DW’s with a grain of salt. The fact that they may be a really good tool to help us grow internationally, I think we need to be generous here. **Hannon:** I don’t agree with you about the DW title. Somebody that earned a DW title in Europe probably had some serious competition for that DW title. **Hamza:** But we don’t have a – you know, the nice thing with Europe was that, you know, they were able to move freely. We just don’t have that now, and so, you know, with our International Division, we’re dealing with a new paradigm and we have to be somewhat proactive. I can assure – let me make this clear to everybody on this call. We are going to explode in Asia. We’ve already started exploding in Asia. If you saw the pictures that Dick sent back from the Chinese show, if you have any doubt in your mind that CFA is going to morph overnight into a giant organization in Asia, don’t, because it’s going to happen. They want it, we see clubs coming in every meeting from Asia, and I think we need to do what we can to open those doors. Unfortunately, we have a much more complex geopolitical landscape in Asia than we did in Europe. **Kallmeyer:** One thing, too, I think is that I can only think of one country that’s really down to one show. Even Korea I think will have two shows this year. They are going to be very small. Again, that’s one reason we imposed minimum point requirements to drive it. You know, I think the other trigger is, now that people have an incentive, they can get an award that we might see much more development in some of those countries where we’re not seeing it now. I mean, if you look at the Middle East or South America, right now it’s hopeless for them to really approach some of the awards, although we did have – I think we had a best of breed silver [tabby and white] Persian from Kuwait that actually won an ID award this year, so I think it’s a good incentive and it will start getting them excited or start bringing them into the fold. **Hamza:** Dick, when are you going to be – obviously, this is – you’re not ready to push this forward yet. There’s still more tweaks. **Kallmeyer:** Well, I think once we tie down the show rules. I wanted to pass it to the board and start putting it out there. I think it’s something we would like to get in the next show rules as part of the process. It’s not something that we’re going to implement this show season, because the rules are already set. **Hamza:** Darrell, you spent a lot of time in the ID world. Do you think this is on the right track? **Newkirk:** Yeah, I agree with it. I think it needs to be tweaked, but I think it’s OK. **Hamza:** OK. So, I guess, where are we at on this, Dick? You’re going to bring something more concrete forward in the next meeting or two? **Kallmeyer:** We’ll bring the show rules. I think if anybody has any ideas or anything they want to bring up now, let’s bring it up in time so we can present at the October meeting the final concept. **Hamza:** OK. Alright. If anybody has anything they think of before the October meeting, you all know Dick’s phone number. He puts it at the bottom of his email every time. **Altschul:** This is Carissa. **Hamza:** Go ahead. **Altschul:** Is it OK if I copy parts of your report, in my report to the region? **Kallmeyer:** Sure, sure. **Altschul:** So I say, if they have any feedback, to contact you? **Kallmeyer:** Sure. **Altschul:** Alright. That’s all I needed, thanks.
PUBLICATIONS.

Current Happenings of Committee:

2013 YEARBOOK

This year we did much more Yearbook ad solicitation than we did in 2011 and we lowered the price of the ads to encourage more cat fanciers to place ads. We received 90.5 pages of advertising compared to 81.75 pages last year. The increased number of ads did not cover the loss of income from the lower cost of those ads. Of course, we do not know how many ads we would have received without the discounted ad prices and increased solicitation. My personal thanks to the Regional Directors for placing Regional Ads in this year’s Yearbook. All seven North American Regions placed ads.

Shelly expects to have the Yearbook printed and mailed in January as we did last year. We are saving space in the Yearbook to include an article with photos of the CFA/Royal Canin World Championship Cat Show. Since the book needs to be at the printer in December, we have a tight time-frame to get that article written, photos selected, and the layout done for a show being held in the latter half of November.

TOP 25 ARTICLES

For a number of Years we have run the three Top 25 articles in both the Yearbook and as part of the Online Almanac. Since we were limited to 320 pages for the Yearbook, and we hoped for an increase in the number of ads, I decided to not include these articles in the 2013 Yearbook. I made that known many months ago and the owners were aware of this change. The articles have been included as part of the CFA public website rather than the Online Almanac so more people can enjoy these articles. Since they are not included in a printed publication, there was no need to conserve space which permitted us to take more space for the text and the ability to use larger photos of the cats. These articles were put online September 5th and that evening I sent out a CFA-News announcement to more than 3,100 cat fanciers letting them know they are now online. Thanks to those who coordinated the articles: Linda Bartley (Kittens), Marilyn Conde (Championship), and Ronna Colilla // Bethany Clark (Premiership). Thanks also to CFA’s graphic artist, Kelly Conger, for her skills in preparing the articles for the web.

Respectfully Submitted,
Mark Hannon, Chair

Hamza: OK, Mark. Hannon: I just put out that report so that people would know the status of where we’re going right now. I don’t have anything to add to it. If anybody has any questions, I will be happy to answer them. Hamza: Does anybody here have any questions for Mark on the Publications? Anger: This is Rachel. Hamza: Go ahead. Anger: I did want to say that the top 25 articles were very nice, what I’ve read so far. I am really enjoying them. Hamza: Outstanding, just outstanding. They were so much fun to read and we’ve had such positive feedback. I hope everybody has had a chance to look at them. Hannon: There’s a link to them on the front page of the CFA website.

Hamza: OK. We’re getting closer to the new front on the website, too. Dick, what do you think, around Halloween? Kallmeyer: Well, let’s wait and see. Right now we’re at the stage of, we did a lot of testing of the data we had on the computer, but the initial data load was about
a year – probably last July a year ago, so Computan is putting the current data, porting it over, and so we’ll see what we find as part of that testing. There were some things we couldn’t test. They ported some of the data wrong, but we’re starting to get closer. Hannon: You’re talking about moving from the Computan server with the website, to the DNT server? Hamza: That’s done. Hannon: What is he talking about? Hamza: Dick, are you talking about the new computer system, or are you talking about the new website? Kallmeyer: I was talking about the new computer system. I’m sorry. Hannon: He’s talking about website. Hamza: Yeah. I’m asking, when do you think that new skin will be ready? Kallmeyer: The new website I would put closer to November, just to do the testing. Hamza: As long as we are talking about the new website, are you still fairly confident in a late Fall launch? Kallmeyer: Oh yeah, yeah. But again, it’s one of those things, we’re doing much more extensive testing than before. Hamza: Right. Hannon: When you said November launch, you’re talking about the website? Kallmeyer: Yes. Hannon: OK.
(7) **WORLD SHOW.**

Hamza: OK, Sharon? Anger: Sharon’s not on yet, but she gave me an outline of what she wanted to present, so I guess I can do that for her. Hamza: Yes, go ahead. Anger: She wanted to let everybody know that parking is going to be paid parking, and they are negotiating that. They will have more information soon, so she encourages everybody to think about possibly carpooling from their hotel to save money, if the parking is an issue. As soon as they have more information, it will be on the CFA blog. There are also updates that will be on the blog. She also wanted to let everybody know that there’s a list of hotels on the flyer and announcements. There is also a giant ballroom dance competition that takes place. It’s this Ohio Star Ball that is a big thing. It’s a pro/am deal, and people come from all over the world for that. Hamza: I’m dancing in that, by the way. I just wanted to let everybody know. Anger: I thought I saw your picture on their website, Jerry. Hamza: You sure did. Hannon: It was a darling outfit. Anger: It was. Hamza: Thank you. Anger: It must be a Latin number, eh? So, she says if there are any concerns, she will take them back to the show committee. If there are any questions, the board members on the show committee will answer as best they can.

Hamza: Alright. And that concludes our open session portion of tonight’s meeting. At this point in time, I will ask our guests to have a good evening and we’ll see them same time next month. So, that would be Donna Jean and Roeann. Thank you guys for participating in tonight’s call. Thompson: You’re welcome. Fulkerson: Good night. Anger: Bye guys.

[EXECUTIVE SESSION]

After an executive session discussion, Ms. Calhoun moved to approve the implementation of a second show with the exact format of the first show, and to handle the overflow from the first show in the manner discussed in executive session (to be announced), pending availability of space. Seconded by Mrs. Baugh, Motion Carried. Newkirk abstained.
JUDGING PROGRAM.

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

List of Committee Members:

Norman Auspitz – Representative on the CFA Protest Committee; Mentor Program Administrator; Domestic Training and File Administrator

Pat Jacobberger – Education Chair

Ellyn Honey – Domestic Training and File Administrator

Rick Hoskinson – Domestic Training and File Administrator

Jan Stevens – Domestic Training and File Administrator; Secretary (keeps all files/records and compiles for Board report)

Donna Isenberg – New Applicants (inquiries, queries, follow ups, counseling); May teach Judging Application Process at Breed Awareness & Orientation School, Application/Advisor Coordinator

Wayne Trevathan – Japan and International Division Trainee and File Administrator; guest judge (CFA judges in approved foreign associations, licensed judges from approved foreign associations in CFA)

Peter Vanwonerghem – European Liaison; Application Advisor - Europe

Current Happenings of Committee:

The JPC is currently working on several items:

1. JP/Show Rules Changes and Requirements.
2. Reserve Judge Status—a topic that was presented at the JA meeting in June 2012.
3. VISA issues which were also presented at the JA meeting in June 2012.
5. Mailing out Judges’ Workshop Attendance Certificates.

Acceptance/Advancements:

There are no Acceptances/Advancements for September 2012.

Medical Leave of Absence

Mrs. Yoko Imai has asked for a one year leave of absence.

Action Item:

Accept Mrs. Imai’s one year leave of absence.

After an executive session discussion, Mrs. Baugh moved to accept Mrs. Imai’s request for a one year leave of absence. Seconded by Mrs. Meeker, Motion Carried.
Respectfully Submitted,
Loretta Baugh,
Committee Chair

Meeting adjourned at 11:44 p.m. EST.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Anger, Secretary