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Secretary’s Note: The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers’ Association, Inc. met on Saturday, October 1, 2016, in the CFA Foundation Museum, 260 East Main Street, Alliance, Ohio. President Mark Hannon called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. EDT with the following members present after a roll call:
Mr. Mark Hannon (President)
Mr. Richard Kallmeyer (Vice President)
Ms. Kathy Calhoun (Treasurer)
Ms. Rachel Anger (Secretary)
Mr. John Adelhoch (NAR Director)
Mrs. Pam Moser (NWR Director)
Ms. Kathy Black (GSR Director)
Mr. John Colilla (GLR Director)
Ms. Lisa Kuta (SWR Director)
Ms. Mary Auth (MWR Director)
Ms. Jean Dugger (SOR Director)
Mr. Edward Maeda (Japan Regional Director)
Mrs. Pam DelaBar (Europe Regional Director)
Carla Bizzell, C.P.A. (Director-at-Large)
Roger Brown, DVM (Director-at-Large)
George Eigenhauser, Esq. (Director-at-Large)
Mrs. Carol Krzanowski (Director-at-Large)
Mr. Richard Mastin (Director-at-Large)
Mr. Darrell Newkirk (Director-at-Large)
Mrs. Annette Wilson (Director-at-Large)

Also Present:

John M. Randolph, Esq., CFA Legal Counsel
Teresa Barry, Executive Director
Verna Dobbins, Director of CFA Services
Allene Tartaglia, Special Events Coordinator
Angela Watkins, Marketing and Communications Coordinator
Monte Phillips, Show Rules Chairman
Jim Flanik, CIS Show Manager
Shino Wiley, Japanese Interpreter
Brian Buetel, Central Office

Not Present:

None

Secretary’s Note: For the ease of the reader, some items were discussed at different times but were included with their particular agenda item.
Hannon: I’m calling the meeting to order. I want to welcome everybody to Alliance, Ohio, famous for being the home of the CFA Central Office. I want to thank the CFA Foundation for allowing us to make use of their gorgeous Museum for our meeting this weekend. For those of you who are not aware, the gentleman in the green shirt back there – raise your hand Jim Flanik – is the show manager for the CFA International Cat Show. He has pins with him that we are selling for $10 to raise some money for the show. He will be hitting you up for some money, so be prepared. I want to thank Jim for being with us this weekend. Let’s get started with the meeting.

[from a pause during the Judging Program report] Hannon: There are 5 posters here with the Best in Show from the last five CFA International Shows. We had them printed and we’re going to hang them in that ring as part of the ring decorations. We’re talking about going further back and doing some sort of a collage, perhaps, with some of the other Best in Show winners going back previous years. Anger: Look at that beautiful Ocicat! Isn’t he lovely? Hannon: It’s nice that Roger is sitting there facing it all weekend. Delabar: You can definitely tell that’s not a Bengal. Anger: He is so cute. Delabar: I hope you can find a picture of that wonderful Aby of Lynn Martin’s. Newkirk: [GC/NW Tinbats] Morgan’s Passing? [1997-1998 2nd Best Kitten] Delabar: That’s my mind’s eye quintessential Abyssinian. Newkirk: I was standing next to Mark when he got Best of the Best. It was you and Craig and I can’t remember who the third judge was. I remember you got the toy out and he ran to the next judge. Hannon: He went from table to table. Newkirk: I told Mark that if that cat doesn’t win, there will never be another Aby that wins. Delabar: No question on that one. Newkirk: That cat was beautiful. Black: What years was that? Delabar: God, when was that? It was in the 90’s.
Hannon: The first order of business would be the additions and corrections to the minutes. Are there any additions or corrections to the minutes? Is there a motion to accept them? 


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

### RATIFICATION OF ON-LINE MOTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moved/Seconded</th>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Anger Eigenhauser 07/08/16</td>
<td>Grant an exception to Show Rule 3.13 for the Rolandus Cat Club to allow the use of up to 50% guest judges at its 8-ring show to be held on November 12/13, 2016 in Kiev, Ukraine (Region 9).</td>
<td>Motion Carried. Calhoun, Moser, Black, Kuta, Auth, Dugger and DelaBar voting no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Executive Committee 07/12/16</td>
<td>Due to the health situation of one of its contracted judges causing her to cancel the show, grant the Poppy State Cat Club emergency permission to change the judging assignment from Ellyn Honey to Becky Orlando at its one-day, 6 ring show (225 entry limit) in Roseville, California on July 30, 2016 (Region 5).</td>
<td>Motion Carried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anger Krzanowski 07/14/16</td>
<td>Grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04.c. for the Cat Fanciers of Finland and charge a reduced show license fee of $100.00 for its 2 ring show (150 entry limit) to be held on October 16, 2016 in Kerava, Finland (Region 9).</td>
<td>Motion Carried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Anger Krzanowski 07/15/16</td>
<td>Grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04 and allow the Sternwheel Cat Fanciers permission to change their show license to add Household Pets in all rings at their show on August 13, 2016 in Jeffersonville, Ohio (Region 4).</td>
<td>Motion Carried. Colilla and Calhoun abstained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Anger Auth 07/24/16</td>
<td>Grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04 and allow the Cat Fanciers Society of Indonesia permission to change their show license to add Household Pets in all rings at their show on August 20, 2016 in Jakarta, Indonesia (ID-Other).</td>
<td>Motion Carried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mastin Bizzell 08/11/16</td>
<td>Ratify the appointment of Eve Russell as the Committee Chair of the Credentials Committee.</td>
<td>Motion Carried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Anger Mastin 08/15/16</td>
<td>Regarding a cat in question who did not complete the requirements for grand, void all points earned at the first show in which the cat competed as a grand and scored points in the Premiership class.</td>
<td>Motion Carried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Anger Mastin 08/18/16</td>
<td>Grant an exception to Show Rule 3.02.d. and allow the April 22/23, 2017 World Cat Congress show to be exempt from counting towards the five show limit for guest judges.</td>
<td>Motion Carried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Moved/Seconded</td>
<td>Motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Executive Committee 08/18/16</td>
<td>Due to a family emergency of one of its contracted judges causing her to cancel the show, grant the Cenla Cat Fanciers emergency permission to change the judging assignment from Sharon McKeeneh-Bounds to Kathy Black at its one-day, 6 ring show (225 entry limit) in Alexandria, LA on August 27, 2016 (Region 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Anger Mastin 08/22/16</td>
<td>Grant an exception to Show Rule 3.02.d. and allow Satu Hamalainen permission to guest judge an additional show over the current limit of 5 shows per show season at the Johor Bahru Cat Club show on December 31, 2016 in Cyberjaya, Malaysia (International Division-International).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Anger Mastin 08/23/16</td>
<td>Effective September 17, 2016, cats or kittens competing in the ID-China award area must be present in 80% of the rings in order to be a part of the official count.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Executive Committee 08/29/16</td>
<td>Due to the health situation of one of its contracted judges causing him to cancel the show, grant the Southern Tier Cat Fanciers emergency permission to change the judging assignment from Gene Darrah to Brian Pearson at its one-day, 6 ring show (225 entry limit) in Binghamton, New York on September 11, 2016 (Region 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Executive Committee 08/29/16</td>
<td>Due to the health situation of one of its contracted judges causing her to cancel the show, grant Felinus International emergency permission to change the judging assignment from Irina Tokmakova to Yanina Vanwonerghem at its two-day, 6 ring show (225 entry limit) in Grote-Brogel Belgium on September 10/11, 2016 (Region 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Executive Committee 08/29/16</td>
<td>Due to the health situation of one of its contracted judges causing her to cancel the show, grant Felines Asia Exotic Club emergency permission to change the judging assignment from Irina Tokmakova to Jan Rogers at its two-day, 10 ring show (225 entry limit) in Foshan, China on September 17/18, 2016 (International Division).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Executive Committee 08/30/16</td>
<td>Due to the health situation of one of its contracted judges causing her to cancel the show, grant Great West China Cat Fanciers emergency permission to change the judging assignment from Irina Tokmakova to Carol Fogarty at its two-day, 8 ring show (250 entry limit) in Wuxi, China on September 3/4, 2016 (International Division).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Eigenhauser Anger</td>
<td>Accept the results of the ID-China reballot and destroy the ballots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved/Seconded</td>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/31/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Executive</td>
<td>Allow Felinus International to switch Yanina Vanwonterghem to judge on Sunday and Tatiana Slizhevskaya to judge on Saturday and Tatiana Slizhevskaya to judge on Sunday at its two-day, back-to-back 6 ring show (225 entry limit) in Grote-Brogel Belgium on September 10/11, 2016 (Region 9).</td>
<td>Motion Carried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee 09/06/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Anger Calhoun</td>
<td>Regarding the Great West China Cat fanciers 6-ring, 225 entry show in Chongqing, China (International Division), on October 1/2, 2016: (1) grant an exception to Show Rule 3.02.d. and allow Nadejda Rumyantseva permission to guest judge an additional show over the current limit of 5 shows per show season; and (2) due to a visa situation causing him to cancel the show, grant emergency permission to change the LH/SH judging assignment from Albert Kurkowski to Nadejda Rumyantseva.</td>
<td>Motion Carried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/23/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Executive</td>
<td>Regarding the Tianjin Feiming Cat Club’s 10-ring, 225 entry show on October 8/9, 2016 in Beijing, China (International Division): (1) due to the health situation of one of its contracted judges causing her to cancel the show, grant emergency permission to change the judging assignment from Irina Tokmakova (AB) to Rachel Anger (AB); and (2) due to a family emergency of one of its contracted judges causing her to cancel the show, grant emergency permission to change the judging assignment from Amanda Cheng (LH) to Karen Godwin (LH).</td>
<td>Motion Carried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee 09/27/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATIFICATION OF TELECONFERENCE MOTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moved/Seconded</th>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• From August 9, 2016 Teleconference •</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Eigenhauser</td>
<td>Accept the Protest Committee’s recommendations on the protests not in dispute.</td>
<td>Motion Carried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Wilson Anger</td>
<td>Grant Megumi Yamashita an early return from her medical leave of absence, effective immediately.</td>
<td>Motion Carried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. DelaBar Eigenhauser</td>
<td>Request Central Office credit clubs for a future show license when shows are cancelled because of loss of venues due to security concerns for terrorist activities.</td>
<td>Motion Carried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Anger Krzanowski</td>
<td>Regarding a CFA member club who is allegedly issuing pedigrees, that the matter be referred to the CFA Protest Committee for investigation and resolution.</td>
<td>Motion Carried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moved/Seconded</td>
<td>Motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Kallmeyer Anger</td>
<td>Approve the ID request for a “World Show” in Bangkok Thailand, the weekend of March 17-18, 2018. No other shows in Asia to be allowed that weekend. The show would be 10 rings, 500 cats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Krzanowski Kallmeyer</td>
<td>Approve the acceptance of SIAM BLUE-EYED CAT FANCIERS, International Division (Thailand).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>DelaBar Anger</td>
<td>Allow Nadejda Rumyantseva to judge the CFA show in Moscow as originally contracted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>DelaBar Eigenhauser</td>
<td>If Rumyantseva is not allowed to judge the Moscow CFA show, approve Artiom Savin, allbreed judge and president of the International Cat Union (a Russian independent association and co-organizer of the prestigious Royal Canin Grand Prix).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Eigenhauser Moser</td>
<td>Refer to the Show Rules Committee for preparation a proposal for the October 2016 CFA Board meeting to eliminate Show Rule 4.06 as to out-of-region show approval and make any other necessary changes to revoke that rule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Anger Calhoun</td>
<td>Refer to the Show Rules Committee for preparation a proposal for the October 2016 CFA Board meeting to eliminate Show Rule 4.04 as to emergency changes to the judging slate if less than 30 days in advance of the show and make any other necessary changes to revoke that rule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Anger Newkirk</td>
<td>Effective immediately, amend ARTICLE IV – LICENSING THE SHOW, Show Rule 4.07.a.3. to provide a separate specialty ring requirement for Region 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Anger Newkirk</td>
<td>Effective immediately, amend ARTICLE IV – LICENSING THE SHOW, Show Rule 4.07.a. and b. to provide the same specialty ring requirement for Region 8 as Region 9 currently has.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Kuta Eigenhauser</td>
<td>That the Board send a letter expressing formal endorsement of the consensus statement and recommendations created by the Veterinary Task Force on Feline Sterilization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Adelhoch Dugger</td>
<td>Approve the Atlantic Himalayan Club (Region 7) to hold a show on March 25/26, 2017 in Exton, Pennsylvania (Region 1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hannon: Do you want to go through these things that we passed online and the various teleconference motions? Anger: I would like to move that the motions we passed online and at our August 9th teleconference be ratified. DelaBar: Second.

Hannon called the motion. Motion Carried.

Anger: Thank you. Hannon: Is that the end of you? Anger: That’s it, although I hope it’s not the end of “me” yet. Hannon: Alright. The first order of business is going to be the Protests and the second order of business is going to be the Judging Program. Much of both will be in Executive Session. George, do you have anything for open session? Eigenhauser: No. Hannon: Alright, then we will ask our visitors to depart and make use of the second floor or go for a walk and get some steps in for your FitBit.
(3) **PROTEST COMMITTEE.**

Protest Committee Chair George Eigenhauser gave the Protest Committee report containing recommendations for disposition of pending matters. **Motion Carried [vote sealed].**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Chair:</th>
<th>George J. Eigenhauser, Jr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Members:</td>
<td>Dick Kallmeyer, Betsy Arnold, Norman Auspitz, Joel Chaney and Pam Huggins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Welfare: Linda Berg;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Region liaison: Pauli Huhtaniemi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japan liaison: Kayoko Koizumi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judging liaison: Jan Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal Counsel: John M. Randolph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

The Protest Committee met telephonically on September 8, 2016. Participating were George Eigenhauser, Dick Kallmeyer, Betsy Arnold, Norm Auspitz, Joel Chaney, and Pam Huggins.

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

Ongoing protest investigations and recommendations.

Respectfully Submitted,

George J. Eigenhauser, Jr.
Protest Committee Chairman
(4) **JUDGING PROGRAM.**

Judging Program Chair Annette Wilson presented the following report and made all standing motions with the right to vote no:

**Committee Chair:** Annette Wilson – General Communication and Oversight; File Administrator  
**List of Committee Members:** Becky Orlando – File Administrator (Region 9); Mentor Program Administrator  
Rachel Anger – Guest Judge Administrator; Ombudsman; prepares Board Report  
Tracy Petty – Guest Judge Paperwork Review  
Melanie Morgan, Jan Stevens, Aki Tamura-Kametani – File Administrators  
Larry Adkison, Beth Holly – Application Administrator (inquiries, queries, follow ups, counseling)  
Pat Jacobberger – Chair, Judges’ Education subcommittee (Breed Awareness and Orientation School)

---

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

The Committee members met by teleconference on September 7, 2016, to discuss the judge applications, the Judging Program Rule proposals, and preparations for this teleconference. Recent changes to job duties are as follows:

- The Mentor Program Administrator is now Becky Orlando.  
- The Region 9 File Administrator is now Becky Orlando.  
- The Guest Judge Administrator is now Rachel Anger.

**Current Happenings of Committee:**

Hannon: Judging Program. Wilson: Thank you. Good morning. I’ve got one announcement that I would like to have in regular session, as far as the minutes go. We were notified that retired allbreed judge Kazuko Akiyama passed away yesterday. She has been retired from judging for a few years. She’s from Region 8 and I just wanted to make that announcement. She was 88 years old.

Wilson: You can see that we’ve had a few changes within our Committee to try to consolidate some of our efforts.
International/Guest Judging Assignments: Permission has been granted for the following:

### CFA Judges to Judge International Assignments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Assn</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>City/Country</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chung, Chloe</td>
<td>CCCA</td>
<td>Western Districts Cat Society</td>
<td>New South Wales, Australia</td>
<td>07/15/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DelaBar, Pam</td>
<td>ASC</td>
<td>Catsburg</td>
<td>Moscow, Russia</td>
<td>03/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DelaBar, Pam</td>
<td>CCCA</td>
<td>Abyssinian Breeders</td>
<td>Sydney, Australia</td>
<td>05/21/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond, Allan</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Fun Show</td>
<td>Mumbai, India</td>
<td>12/17/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond, Allan</td>
<td>CCCA</td>
<td>National Show</td>
<td>Launceston, Tasmania</td>
<td>07/22-23/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivard, Lorraine</td>
<td>CCA</td>
<td>Club Felin de Montreal</td>
<td>Laval, Quebec</td>
<td>11/27/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinck, Iris</td>
<td>WCF</td>
<td>Cercle Feline d'Est</td>
<td>Andorra</td>
<td>09/04/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Assn</th>
<th>CFA Show</th>
<th>City/Country</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baraldi, Walter</td>
<td>WCF</td>
<td>Cat-H-Art</td>
<td>Andorra</td>
<td>09/03/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baraldi, Walter</td>
<td>WCF</td>
<td>Swedish Cat Paws</td>
<td>Sigtuna, Sweden</td>
<td>01/07/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belyaeva, Olga</td>
<td>RUI</td>
<td>Chatte Noir</td>
<td>Moscow, Russia</td>
<td>10/29/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du Plessis, Kaai</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>Northeast Cat Fanciers Cl of China</td>
<td>Shenyang, China</td>
<td>10/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du Plessis, Kaai</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>Felinus International</td>
<td>GroteBrogel, Belgium</td>
<td>05/06/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleason, Elaine</td>
<td>CCA</td>
<td>NEMO</td>
<td>Sturbridge, Massachusetts</td>
<td>08/26/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnatkevich, Olga</td>
<td>RUI</td>
<td>Rolandus Cat Club</td>
<td>Kiev, Ukraine</td>
<td>11/13/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gubenko, Dmitriy</td>
<td>RUI</td>
<td>Pearl River Cat Club</td>
<td>Foshan, China</td>
<td>08/21/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gubenko, Dmitriy</td>
<td>RUI</td>
<td>Edelweiss Cat Club</td>
<td>Moscow, Russia</td>
<td>09/24/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gubenko, Dmitriy</td>
<td>RUI</td>
<td>Cat Friends of Germany</td>
<td>Niederhausen, Germany</td>
<td>12/10/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamalainen, Satu</td>
<td>FIFe</td>
<td>China Southern CC</td>
<td>Taiyuan, China</td>
<td>10/01/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korotonozhina, Olga</td>
<td>RUI</td>
<td>Rolandus Cat Club</td>
<td>Kiev, Ukraine</td>
<td>11/13/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurkowski, Albert</td>
<td>WCF</td>
<td>Great West China CF</td>
<td>Chongqing, China</td>
<td>10/01/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurkowski, Albert</td>
<td>WCF</td>
<td>Felinus International</td>
<td>GroteBrogel, Belgium</td>
<td>05/06/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merritt, Chris</td>
<td>CCCA</td>
<td>Indonesia Royal Feline</td>
<td>Bogor, Indonesia</td>
<td>10/16/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazarova, Anna</td>
<td>WCF</td>
<td>Aurora Cat Club</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Russia</td>
<td>12/17/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podprugina, Elena</td>
<td>RUI</td>
<td>China Int’l Pedigree</td>
<td>Guangzhou, China</td>
<td>09/24/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podprugina, Elena</td>
<td>RUI</td>
<td>Northeast Cat Fanciers Club of China</td>
<td>Shenyang, China</td>
<td>10/16/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podprugina, Elena</td>
<td>RUI</td>
<td>Rolandus Cat Club</td>
<td>Kiev, Ukraine</td>
<td>11/13/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pohvalina, Victoria</td>
<td>RUI</td>
<td>Chatte Noir</td>
<td>Moscow, Russia</td>
<td>10/29/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pohvalina, Victoria</td>
<td>RUI</td>
<td>Aurora Cat Club</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Russia</td>
<td>10/16/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumyantseva, Nadejda</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>Great West China CF</td>
<td>Xi’an, China</td>
<td>09/11/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumyantseva, Nadejda</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>West Lake Cat Club</td>
<td>Shanghai, China</td>
<td>10/29/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savin, Artim</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>Edelweiss Cat Club</td>
<td>Moscow, Russia</td>
<td>09/24/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sizhkovskaya, Tatiana</td>
<td>RUI</td>
<td>Northeast CF Club</td>
<td>Shenyang, China</td>
<td>10/16/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U’Ren, Cheryle</td>
<td>CCCA</td>
<td>Katinip/Cornerpet</td>
<td>Shanghai, China</td>
<td>10/22/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U’Ren, Cheryle</td>
<td>CCCA</td>
<td>CF Club of Thailand</td>
<td>Bangkok, Thailand</td>
<td>12/10/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U’Ren, Rod</td>
<td>CCCA</td>
<td>CF Club of Thailand</td>
<td>Bangkok, Thailand</td>
<td>12/10/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ustinov, Andrew</td>
<td>RUI</td>
<td>Rolandus Cat Club</td>
<td>Kiev, Ukraine</td>
<td>11/12/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Pre-Notice of Application:** The following individuals have been pre-noticed for application to the CFA Judging Program and are scheduled to be presented to the Board in February 2017 for acceptance:

Bethany Colilla (Longhair – 1st Specialty)  
Mie Takahashi (Longhair – 1st Specialty)

**Wilson:** We’ve got two applications coming up for February. There is still a day to get things in, but I know that Bethany Colilla’s application has been received and Mie Takahashi also has an application in. I’m not quite sure everything got in on time, but I think it did so we will have two 1st Specialty applications to look at for February.

**Judging Program Rule Changes:** The following housekeeping changes to the Judging Program Rules are being presented.

**Wilson:** We’ve got some Judging Program Rule changes. They are actually mostly housekeeping, I think. **Eigenhauser:** Maybe we should do the closed session items first and then open it back up, so we are doing things like rule changes that are open session items in open session. **Wilson:** Oh, OK. That’s fine. **Hannon:** Before I forget, you are taking notes for us. **Wilson:** I’m not but I’ll try. Once I get through this, then I can. **Hannon:** We haven’t done anything in open session yet, other than what you just talked about. **Wilson:** So, we’ll go to the Executive Session things. Thank you, George.

**Action Item:** Adopt the following proposed Judging Program Rule housekeeping changes:

**Wilson:** We will go back and do the rest of our Judging Program Committee report, which is the housekeeping changes to the Judging Program Rules.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION 1 - DEFINITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 INACTIVE STATUS. A judge who is prohibited from accepting assignments for any reason, as determined by the Board of Directors. However, all other provisions of Section 10 must be met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATIONALE:** When the Rules were reformatted in 2015, this reference to a previous section should have been omitted.

**Wilson:** The first one is to change 1.12 to remove the reference to a section that no longer exists. We are just taking the words out entirely and saying all other provisions must be met. So moved. **Newkirk:** Second. **Hannon:** Any discussion on the first one?

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.**
### SECTION 8, Subparagraph 8.1.c. – ADVANCEMENT PROCEDURES FOR APPRENTICE AND APPROVAL PENDING JUDGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Wording</th>
<th>Proposed Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. Judges approved in one specialty and approval pending in the second specialty must satisfactorily judge a minimum of eight (8) complete championship shows, in accordance with the provisions in this Section. To satisfy the eight (8) required evaluations, judges may officiate at shows for clubs in which they maintain membership.</td>
<td>c. Judges approved in one specialty and approval pending in the second specialty must satisfactorily judge a minimum of eight (8) complete championship shows, in accordance with the provisions in this Section. To satisfy the eight (8) required evaluations, judges may officiate at shows for clubs in which they maintain membership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATIONALE:** Previously, a rule existed that allowed an advancing judge to count only so-many evaluations from clubs for which they are a member. Because this discourages club membership and volunteerism, that rule was deleted. This is a clarification that is no longer necessary.

**Wilson:** The second one is to remove the last sentence in 8.1.c. There used to be a rule that you could only have so-many shows that you judge that you are a member of your club to have them count. That was taken out, but it still hangs in there in one place. It shouldn’t, so we are removing that. So moved. **Krzanowski:** Second. **Hannon:** Any discussion?

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

### SECTION 8, Paragraphs 8.3 and 8.4 – ADVANCEMENT PROCEDURES FOR APPRENTICE AND APPROVAL PENDING JUDGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Wording</th>
<th>Proposed Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Requirements for any specific advancement must be completed within a forty-eight month period. Apprentice judges not fulfilling these requirements will be dropped from the Judging Program; Approval Pending Specialty Judges will be dropped to Apprentice Specialty status. This requirement shall not apply to Approval Pending Allbreed Judges.</td>
<td>8.3 Requirements for any specific advancement must be completed within a forty-eight month period. Apprentice judges not fulfilling these requirements will be dropped from the Judging Program; Approval Pending Specialty Judges will be dropped to Apprentice Specialty status. This requirement shall not apply to Approval Pending Allbreed Judges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Requirements for any specific advancement must be completed within a forty-eight month period. Apprentice judges not fulfilling these requirements will be dropped from the Judging Program; Approval Pending Specialty Judges will be dropped to Apprentice Specialty status. This requirement shall not apply to Approval Pending Allbreed Judges.</td>
<td>8.4 Requirements for any specific advancement must be completed within a forty-eight month period. Apprentice judges not fulfilling these requirements will be dropped from the Judging Program; Approval Pending Specialty Judges will be dropped to Apprentice Specialty status. This requirement shall not apply to Approval Pending Allbreed Judges.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RATIONALE: This is a duplication. Subsequent paragraphs would be renumbered.

Wilson: The last one is just, we had something in here that was a duplicate – one paragraph duplicating the other, so we are removing paragraph 8.4 since it is a duplicate of 8.3 and we will renumber as appropriate. So moved. Krzanowski: Second. Hannon: Any discussion?

Hannon called the motion. Motion Carried.

Acceptance: The following individuals are presented to the Board for acceptance:

Accept as Trainee:

Frank Dueker (Shorthair – 1st Specialty) 20 yes
Nicholas Pun (Longhair – 2nd Specialty) 20 yes
Teo Vargas-Huesa (Longhair – 1st Specialty) 20 yes

Accept as Approval Pending Allbreed:

Dmitriy Gubenko (Approval Pending Allbreed) 10 yes (Adelhoch, Anger, Bizzell, Black, Calhoun, Colilla, DelaBar, Eigenhauser, Mastin, Newkirk); 8 no (Auth, Brown, Dugger, Kallmeyer, Kuta, Krzanowski, Moser, Wilson); 2 abstain (Hannon, Maeda)

Hannon: Do we want to go back to the changes in the Judging Program Rules or anything else you may want to do in open session? Wilson: Do I announce the results? Hannon: Welcome back everybody. Wilson: I would like to announce that we have accepted Frank Dueker to shorthair first specialty, Nicholas Pun to longhair second specialty and Teo Vargas to longhair first specialty. Congratulations.

Hannon: Do you have anything else for open session? Wilson: I’m finished, thank you.

Respectfully Submitted,
Annette Wilson, Chair
CENTRAL OFFICE OPERATIONS.

Committee Chair: Teresa (Terri) Barry  
List of Committee Members: Teresa (Terri) Barry, Verna Dobbins, Allene Tartaglia and Angela Watkins

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Staff continued to assist with the computer system update.

Staff wrapped up final items for the 2016 Annual.

Jordan Lampley expressed interest in the Back-up Scoring position, and was interviewed along with other candidates; Jordan was offered and accepted the position therefore leaving a vacancy in Registration with the eCat position. We advertised the opening and began the interview process. The part-time Marketing/Communication’s Coordinator’s position was advertised.

International Ballots were received at C.O., opened and counted under the direction of Dick Kallmeyer.

Staff is assisting with the upcoming 2017 World Cat Conference Annual meeting, events and show. A Letter of Agreement between CFA and The Las Vegas Cat Club was developed. This confirms that CFA and the LVCC have agreed to responsibilities as they relate to the 2017 WCC event.

Current Happenings of Committee:

Central Office I.T. update: Submitted by Tim Schreck, Chair, I.T. Committee, report will be presented by Tim Schreck through Dick Kallmeyer, I.T. liaison with the Board. C.O. continues to work with the I.T. Committee to assist with the implementation of new modules, fixes and updates as necessary by Computan. Continue to assist when needed with the development of the new Clerking Program.

A major issue developed with the Computan system when an update was installed resulting in General Registration being down for four days. Once the system issues were resolved staff were shifted to focus on General Registration and the expected turnaround timeframe was met.

There continues to be issues with Windows 10 viewing PDF’s with the new Edge browser install by Microsoft. This is a Microsoft issue and a fix only they can implement.

Pat Zollman submitted a summary of the Hotels that bid on the 2022 CFA Annual for review. A total of 15 facilities submitted a proposal. Terri and Pat discussed the proposals to narrow the list of sites to visit. Of those being considered, Pat will contact each for a proposed floorplan of meeting space.
Amanda Ganni was hired to fill the eCat Registration position that will be vacated when Jordan transfers to the Scoring position. Amanda’s training expects to be completed by September 30th at which time Jordan will begin her training in the Scoring Department.

Operations in the registration department continue to move forward yet each day brings new challenges. The Associates are keeping up as best as possible even with registrations up 40% over last year at this time. The team feels a considerable amount of pressure trying to meet the expected turnaround timeframe. On five occasions we found it necessary to pull staff from other departments in order to stay within the expected timeframe. This is a hardship on our entire team. However, they remain committed to providing quality work.

The Marketing/Communication’s Coordinator position was advertised, resumes received, reviewed and interviews held. The position was offered to Angela Watkins who started September 6th. Angela has an extensive background that includes Communications and Media Manager for GOJO, manufacture of PURELL, L’Oréal, USA in New York and most recently US Acute Care Solutions. Her key focus at this time will be the CIS as she gets up and running.

Initial calls were placed with specific staff, Board members and CIS Show Committee members. The objective was for her to learn more about CFA and the upcoming CIS.

C.O. has an inventory of 225 2016 Year Books. We are requesting Board members to try to sell these in their Regions or at shows.

**CIS Update:**

Floor plan for the CIS has been sent to the decorator and we are waiting for the first formal rendition. Timing of check in and some vendor set up will be a little different this year because we do not have access to ½ the show hall until noon on Friday. Fortunately, we’ve been at this facility before and worked with the same decorator so there is some familiarity.

Shirt orders with CFA logo have been placed for core CIS show management and CO staff attending the show. The shirts will help identify individuals able to answer questions about the show. The shirts will vary in style based on an individual’s preference but they will all be in red.

Floor plan for the CIS has been sent to the decorator, we are waiting for the first formal rendition. Timing of check in and some vendor set up will be a little different this year since we do not have access to half of the show hall until noon on Friday.

Staff is assisting the 2016 CIS Show Committee and will continue to do so. C.O. is also responsible for Corporate Sponsorships, media (traditional and social media) and Public Relations for the event. We are in the process of identifying and developing relationships with the community, business and media, including social media in the Novi area. We have identified and reached out to the Senior Adult community, school districts and Chamber as a way to increase gate.

A marketing strategy for the CIS is being developed with input from Board member Lisa Marie Kuta’s for both traditional and social media.
**World Cat Congress Update:**

Assisting the WCC Committee with details of the April 2017 event scheduled to be held in Las Vegas April 19th – 24th.

**Future Projections for Committee:**

*International Show 2016 Planning –* work with the Show Committee and Manager on all aspects of the show in areas of show committee appointment, show flyer, show hall layout, judges, show events such as Breed Awareness, Ambassador Cats, Education Ring, etc.

C.O. is assisting the WCC Committee, Subcommittees, Show Manager and Rachel Anger, on all aspects of the upcoming World Cat Congress events that CFA will host.

Continue to focus on staffing and the processing of registration.

**Board Action Items:**

None at this time

**Time Frame:**

Items will be reported out when completed.

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

To be determined.

*Respectfully Submitted,*

*Teresa Barry, Chair*

---

**Hannon:** Central Office. **Barry:** With the exception of the addendums, the only thing I have to add is, I would like to introduce Angela Watkins, who is a contractor that recently joined us as a new Marketing and Communications Coordinator. **Hannon:** Welcome, thank you. Nice to have you with us, Angela. Angela is taking over some of the responsibilities that had previously been assigned to Jodell Raymond. **Barry:** Right now, her focus is media for the International. **Hannon:** She is working on bringing in some gate for us. **Barry:** Unless someone has any questions, I will turn the addendum part over to Rachel.
ADDENDUM

1. **Club Name Change Request:**

   - **Current Name:** Chicago Shorthair Cat Club (Region 6)
   - **Proposed Name:** Cats Kansas City
   - **Conflict with Existing Names:** Name does not conflict with any existing CFA club
   - **Reason:** The club has been transferred out of the Chicago area, and the club member base is now located in the Kansas City area.

   **Action Item:** Approve the name change of the Chicago Shorthair Cat Club (Region 6) to Cats Kansas City.

   **Anger:** Thank you. We have four items that require action. The first one is a change of name from Chicago Shorthair Cat Club to Cats Kansas City, because the club has moved away from Chicago into the Kansas City area. I move that we approve the name change of the Chicago Shorthair Cat Club to Cats Kansas City. **Adelhoch:** Second. **Hannon:** Any discussion?
   **DelaBar:** Just, what a shame. So much history behind Chicago Shorthair. **Anger:** It is Club #54.

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

   **Hannon:** The name change is approved.

2. **Club Resignation:**

   **Illinois Feline Fanciers (Region 6)**

   **Background:** On February 10, 2016, Central Office received a notification that the Illinois Feline Fanciers club had resigned. Generally, if a resignation is received after the first of the year, we simply let the process take its course and the club falls off the list of CFA clubs in June. However, in this case, the club submitted their membership list on December 5 and paid their dues on December 14, 2015, which placed the club in good standing for the coming year so it didn’t automatically fall off the list. Therefore, the club remains on the list of clubs in good standing. The regional director at the time received notice of the resignation, but she would have had no way of knowing that they had met the requirements for continued membership, either.

   The majority of the club members voted to give their treasury and assets away when Norma Jean Broman passed away at Christmastime, after the membership requirements for the upcoming year had already been met. Therefore, they would like to formalize the club resignation.

   **Action Item:** Accept the resignation of Illinois Feline Fanciers, with regret.
Anger: Regarding the club resignation, generally when a resignation comes in, we just let the process take it’s natural course and the club is dropped. In this case, an unusual set of circumstances caused the club not to follow that natural course, so now we are officially going to present this club for resignation, so that we will have an end date to their existence as a club, according to their wishes. So, I would like to move to accept the resignation of Illinois Feline Fanciers. Krzanowski: Second. Hannon: Discussion. DelaBar: Is there any way that we can put “with regret?” Again, we are showing a club that really was big part of the Midwest Region. Anger: I will amend my motion to include “with regret,” thank you. Hannon: Any other discussion?

Hannon called the motion. Motion Carried.

3. **Show License Fee Change Request.**

Change the license (processing fee) amount for shows to be based upon number of rings, as follows:

**Proposed:**

- **Show Insurance Premium**: $100.00 per show
- **Show Processing Fee**: $17 per ring

**Rationale:** Because Central Office has less work to do with smaller shows (less scoring, less paperwork), the cost to process a show should be reflected accordingly.

The amount of $17 per ring is based on the amount per ring currently being charged ($100/6) with the greatest number of six ring shows (55% of total shows in North America).

The 4-ring shows being planned in the Midwest region could realize a savings of $32 per show, making the idea more palatable. Ideally I would like the amount per ring be greater, but that might be too much sticker shock for clubs.

The request does not include a reduction in insurance premium, on the assumption that there is not an insurance discount for fewer rings.

**Action Item:** For shows licensed after January 1, 2017, change the license (processing fee) amount for shows as follows:

- **Show Insurance Premium**: $100.00 per show
- **Show Processing Fee**: $17 per ring

Respectfully Submitted,
Mary Auth, Midwest Regional Director

Hannon: Next. Anger: Mary is going to field this one. Auth: Alright. My reason for bringing this up is, we’re trying an experimental format in the Midwest Region of 4 ring shows.
It occurred to me that I don’t know exactly what the costs are that CFA has for supporting a show. I know that there’s a $100 insurance fee and then there’s the processing fee, which has been historically $100, and then of course that year’s club fees. It occurred to me that perhaps we should be actually pricing the processing fee on a per-ring basis because a 4 ring show is not going to take as much processing because there’s not as many finals to score and not as many materials that need to go to the show. The processing fee should be based on the number of rings, so a 4 ring show is not going to take as much processing as a 10 ring show. I picked $17 because I took Dick’s numbers and there were more 6 ring shows – 55% of all shows in North America were 6 ring shows, so I took the $100 and divided it by 6, and came up with $17 per ring. So, that’s where I came up with the number. I’m not sold that it has to be that number. I actually think the processing fee should be higher than that, because I know CFA probably loses money on every show that they send a package out for. That’s a fight I’m not willing to champion at this point. I’m just trying to make it more palatable and reasonable. If you’re going to put on a 10 ring show, you need to pay a little bit more; if you’re going to put on a 4 ring show, let’s get a little bit of a discount.

Eigenhauser: A couple things. First, I agree with the last comment. We’ve always talked about how our show fee doesn’t really recover our cost anyway. This might be a good time to look at what it really does cost us and incorporate that into any new fees, because when you change fees, it may be more palatable at that time, rather than just a cold increase on existing fees, so if it’s restructured so the smaller shows are a little cheaper and the big shows are a little more expensive, that might be the time to kind of inch up the fees a little bit so that it’s full cost recovery. The other thing is, I’m not sure there isn’t an economy of scale. An 8 ring show doesn’t require twice as many show packages be sent as a 4 ring show. It doesn’t require twice as many sets of show rules, it doesn’t require twice as many processings of the license fee, so some of the cost of the show is baked in. A show costs “this” amount, no matter how many rings it is. This is kind of the base price, and then over and above that, yeah, it costs more to score a bigger show, it costs more to ship a bigger box, but there are some costs that are uniform and inherent, that don’t always split evenly according to the number of rings. So, what I would like to do is charge Central Office with the responsibility of taking this back, doing an analysis of what does it really cost to put on a show, what really is the cost difference of putting on a 4 ring show and a 10 ring show, and coming back to us with some background materials on this so that we can say, is $17 a good number? Maybe we should go to $20. Mastin: Mary, thank you for bringing this up. This is pretty important and we have talked about it in the past that we need to address it. However, as George indicated and you touched on, this is bigger than just trying to decide, do we charge $17 per ring? I had a conversation with the Finance Committee and I would like to work with the Central Office on just blowing this up and starting it over from scratch and presenting something that makes a little bit more sense to the board on everything. As we know right now, we don’t charge what we should. Hannon: We don’t cover our costs. Mastin: We’re not covering our costs, from a club standpoint. I want to make sure we know what the number is. When the number of shows comes down, our insurance comes down but it doesn’t come down accordingly. When the number of shows goes up, our insurance also goes up. The big thing we miss in our processing fee is postage. Now, postage ranges from $14.95 per show, upwards of over $400 per show. Now, let me explain what happens here. The majority of all show licenses that come in are not complete. When I say “the majority,” it’s well over 50%. It’s probably closer to 80% are not
complete. Now, those show licenses may come in before 90 days, but by the time you get the completed information and the corrected information to actually license the show, you are now pushing the time clock further, closer to the show date, in order to send the packaging. As you get closer, you start running into issues with express postage or something quicker than that. So, we run into those issues. The other thing we have to keep in mind is — and it has already been touched on — a show here in Alliance, Ohio, if it’s 4 rings, should not be paying the same price as a show half way around the world putting on a 10 ring show. The smaller shows that are here in the States can’t be subsidizing what’s happening overseas, so we have to look at that. Now, I know the outcome is probably going to be, show licensing fees are going to be more than what we really want them to be, so there is going to be some sticker shock. I have some solutions to some of the ideas of, how do we compensate for increased show licensing fees? One would be to give clubs more sponsorship dollars to put on their shows. The current program right now is, you take that money and you spend it towards marketing. Now, if you understand the whole concept of what happens with CFA in a business sense, you have to invest money into your business to continue to make money. The engine is driven — in my opinion here in CFA — it’s driven by what happens at the show level. In order for us to get people interested in CFA and pedigreed cats, they have to see them and touch them and feel them and talk to the people that believe these cats are the best cats to own. Now, if that’s what’s going to happen, we need to support our clubs and say, “that’s good, we want you to put a show on, here’s some money to put on this show.” So, my proposal will eventually be, and I have talked this over with the Finance Committee, to take our $500 CFA sponsorship, increase it to $750 for the upcoming year. $500 remains in the Marketing Program. You are committed to promoting the show. We can’t spend enough money on CFA corporately to go to a newspaper or a magazine and say, “here, go reach our market.” Our market is in the show halls. It would cost us hundreds of thousands of dollars, so why not take the $100,000 and spend it on our clubs? Use the $500 for your marketing, the other $250 you use it for what you think is best. If you want to bring in a judge from a further distance and it helps cover the cost, bring it in. If you want to spend more money on your rosettes, bring it on. We’ve got to look at all of our expenses and do what we need to do because things will change. China’s not always going to be China 5-10 years from now and we’re going to say, hey, now what do we do? So, bring it in line. Mary, I would just ask, you’re welcome to help us with this. We’ll communicate with you, but I would really like to take this back to the Central Office and work together with them.

Auth: I’m happy just having the dialogue started. Mastin: Thank you.

Hannon: My concern was, and I have expressed this to Rich, that we had a profit last fiscal year of $400,000. Based on the first quarter of the current year, we’re ahead of that. We’re doing well at the corporate level. Our clubs are not doing well. I have an aversion to raising their fees when they are already struggling. Now, he’s compensating for that by saying, “we may raise your fees $100 or so but we’re going to give you $750.” So, that offsets it, but I just wanted to say publicly that my concern was that we not burden our clubs with greater expense when we’re doing well at the corporate level. We don’t need additional income. For example, we’re charging $100 for show insurance. It costs $166 for show insurance. I don’t want to see us say, “OK, we’re going to charge actual cost. You’re going to have to pay $166 for your show insurance,” when we don’t need that money. They do. Moser: I’m just saying, on that line, something that would really help the clubs would be to take back that $1 service charge. I get a lot of complaints about that. I know we’re giving $2. The reason why we give that extra dollar was because CFA
was struggling at the time. CFA is not struggling at this time, so why can’t we give that dollar back to the clubs. That would go a long way. **Hannon:** Rich has an answer for you. You want to tell her? **Mastin:** It’s the same thing as the – **Hannon:** I’ve brought this up many times myself, so I’m on your side. **Mastin:** We’re basking in “life is good.” Life is not always going to be good. You can go back to not too long ago – maybe a decade – and things weren’t so good. We were scrambling. **Hannon:** Six years. **Mastin:** OK, thank you. So, the surcharge, now that Central Office has taken over the Annual, we need to figure out ways to generate money for the Annual. In the past, the regions had it and all the regions did fundraisers. They raised tens of thousands of dollars. Central Office doesn’t do that. We don’t have a department for fundraising yet. Maybe that will happen down the road, but we have to do business in the right way. Let’s charge what we need to charge, and if we have money to give – I started at $750 but that’s not all I want to give. I would prefer to give $1,000 because then the clubs are like, “I can get $1,000 to put on my show if CFA helps?” Here’s $500 to use for marketing, the other $500, knock yourself out. Maybe it helps support your show hall or what have you. **Moser:** At least I have an answer to give back to some people when they ask, “why don’t we take it back?” That gives me an answer to give to them. **Mastin:** We have to put on more staff to handle the Annuals. **Kallmeyer:** George was right about that. The cost economics for the shows is really different. It’s not only number of rings. It takes the same time to do the official count for a 12 ring as it does 4. That doesn’t really change substantially, but other affects, not only the number of rings because you’re typing in more finals and all, but the number of champions or premiers at the show, because they are almost a manual process doing qualifying rings and the points, so it’s kind of tricky. I think we ought to look at it and really get the cost down. Point out, our competition actually prices their shows on the cost per ring, so those 16 or 20 ring shows are extremely profitable as part of it. There’s probably some games we could play as part of it. As we talk about surcharge, too, are you willing to give up the 25¢ a cat for the regions? I think that’s a tremendous benefit to avoid some of the fundraising shows, as well. So, I think we ought to do some numbers on this and really tie it down. **Kuta:** A couple things. Going back to the show packages, I’ve been kind of harping on this for too long now, but as a frequent entry clerk I get a lot of redundant materials – materials that I check and see what gets thrown out every show. That photocopy package of stuff that’s in there and the CD, no club I’ve ever worked with has used that, so maybe there’s some stuff that we can just eliminate from the show package. Also, for frequent entry clerks, could we send them stuff in bulk? Like, right now I have 3 show boxes in one stack that were shipped to me at 3 different times. Like, could I have just gotten it once and then cut down also because I didn’t need that much paper? I mean, I know it’s just a little thing, but if it saves like $30/$40 per show, that could add up. It’s nickel and dime, but it’s also waste. I hate seeing those ring signs – the last 4 clubs I’ve done it for haven’t used them and I just feel terrible throwing those out because I know they are expensive to print. **Calhoun:** To what George said earlier talking about the difference between fixed cost and variable. We need to make sure we’re pricing them both appropriate. Rich, you talked about this. I think Rich has got a fabulous idea. **Anger:** Can you speak up please? I can’t hear you. **Calhoun:** I was talking about the difference between – to what George was talking about, the difference between fixed costs and variable costs, because there are costs that, no matter what the size of the show is, we incur. Then, there are variable costs that very much are dependent on show size. An additional point, yes, we need to make sure that we are priced properly, but we don’t want to put the clubs out of business when we are doing so well. We want to continue to do well, but we certainly have an
opportunity that we haven’t had in the past to be able to make sure that we bring the clubs along, and I’m fully supportive of that. We’re talking about a good action plan. **DelaBar:** One, on the show insurance, Rich, I want you to be aware that in Europe they still have to buy more show insurance that the CFA insurance does not cover, so they have additional expenses above and beyond the CFA insurance. Also, the surcharge. When we originally put the surcharge in, it was to help recover some of the money that we spent on getting the show packages out, to sort of lessen the gap between the actual cost and what it was costing the clubs. It wasn’t because CFA was down so much money, as try to recoup some of that charge. **Hannon:** You’re talking about the original dollar? **DelaBar:** The original surcharge. **Hannon:** But the second dollar was because CFA was hurting. That was back in the days when Craig, I think was President. **DelaBar:** No, Don. **Hannon:** The first dollar, right, but the second dollar was different. **DelaBar:** I do like the idea of this, but one thing; you’re going to get a different number for North America, the ID, Japan and Europe. I hand carry a lot of show packages every time I come over, to help alleviate the cost of mailing for Central Office. We figured it was going to cost US$450 to ship a show package to Kiev. So, I hand carry stuff. Then, they are reproducing the forms on the local economy. So, there are a lot of different things that are going to have to be massaged if we come up with it by ring. Basically, I like Mary’s idea. **Mastin:** If I can just quickly answer Pam’s thought on the show packaging. We thought about that, as well. When we build the show license, it will be line items – the insurance costs this much, every ring would cost this much, postage would be this much based on where you’re at. If you don’t need postage, it becomes zero. You save it, whether the regional directors are helping the clubs in transporting them. **Hannon:** Or, if they just download it from the internet and print the forms locally. **Auth:** I think we probably should have done this a long time ago, but in the interest of transparency, would there be any advantage to say, “this is what CFA’s costs are,” let everybody know that, and “this is what CFA is subsidizing you on these costs, and by the way, we’re going to throw some money at you, too.” Just so that people understand that if it costs $166 for a show for the insurance, yet you are only paying $100, that’s a subsidy there. I think it goes a long way in terms of public relations, too, for your audience when they realize we are eating some of their expense, so I think there’s some value in sharing a lot more information, as you go and develop the actual costs. **Anger:** Two things. With the entry clerk package, in our culture we have entry clerks who work many shows, so if they get to a point where they are stockpiling show package materials, why don’t they reach out and tell Central Office? It’s not Central Office’s responsibility to ask you how many you have in your office, and they would have no way of knowing. I think entry clerks should be communicating not to send a package if it isn’t needed. Am I correct that, for Central Office, that that would not be an issue? Maybe it is, I don’t know. **Hannon:** You would prefer that the entry clerks contact you far enough in advance before you’ve shipped the package to say, “I don’t really need this, this and this, just send me that.” **Kuta:** That’s part of it. **Anger:** We could put that on the entry clerks’ list and tell them that they can save room in their office and save CFA money. I think that’s a great thing to put out there. If people are throwing things away, that’s just wasteful. Second, to me, the distribution of the show surcharge is a big mystery. I understood that part of it went to the regions to help them put on an annual. Now that they are not putting on an annual, what is happening with that money? **Hannon:** We cut it back. They were getting 50¢ of the $2.00 when they were putting on an annual. Then, we cut it back to 25¢ when Central Office took over the responsibility. So, Central Office gets $1.75 of that $2.00 surcharge, and the regions get 25¢ sent back to them, and I think it’s on a quarterly basis that
each regional director gets a check. **Anger:** And that becomes part of the regional budget, to help maintain the regional expenses, like awards and such. Is that right? **Hannon:** Right. **Anger:** Thank you. **Black:** Lisa brought this up and we talked a little bit about this. I was just going to suggest, that I think the way to save a lot of money is if somehow we had a checklist that went out with the show license. When you sent your show license in, you have checklist saying, “I need banners, I need ring signs, I need this, I need that.” I have ideas for expanding the ability of what we can get in the show package along with Rich’s idea of helping our clubs out financially with advertising and things like that. I think if we had a checklist that came in with the license that said, “I don’t need any of this stuff,” then they wouldn’t send it. I don’t know how you build a package, but I would imagine you have everything on a shelf and you just go bop, bop, bop down the row. If you have a checklist, you can say this, this, and this, close the box and off it goes. I think that would save a lot of redundancy. **Hannon:** Brian, would you agree that’s how you do the show packages? You just go down the row and go bop, bop, bop? **Buetel:** The majority are based on 6, 8 and 10 ring shows. If it’s an odd ring, then it’s individually built. **Black:** So, do you make them up ahead of time? **Buetel:** I pre-stage as much as I can, since always I’m multi-tasking. **Barry:** I would just like to make a comment. I believe it was my first February here. Verna and I had worked on a checklist and got it out, and we were crucified for doing it. I couldn’t even tell you who it was. That first year, my life here is a blur. I will tell you, we did it and we tried to get it implemented. **Black:** What were they criticizing you for? **Barry:** That they shouldn’t have to do that. We should know what they have. **Krzanzowski:** As a member of several show-producing clubs, I know that many clubs are struggling and many are about to fold. Rich and I had a discussion earlier in the week about perhaps even implementing some kind of a loan program for some of these clubs. In this climate today, everybody waits until the last minute to enter shows. Meanwhile, the clubs have to pay their show hall deposits, they have to pay judge air fares and things like that. Many times they don’t have the cash to do it. I may be wrong, but Pam, Region 9, don’t they already do that? **DelaBar:** I started it with Region 3 with $500 back in the 80’s. Now, Region 9 has a €1,000 loan payable back with no interest within 90 days after the show. **Krzanzowski:** So, perhaps that’s another way we might be able to help support our clubs that are really struggling, and make them able to continue to do shows. **Eigenhauser:** A couple of things have come up. First, in terms of problems with doing a show package checklist, maybe it’s just a matter of how we package it. Instead of saying, “what things do you need in the package,” say, “what things would you like to save on? Click this box if you don’t want these forms and you can save $25. Click this box if you don’t need these forms and you can save $50.” So, presenting it in a positive way might pipe down some of the trolls that didn’t like it the first time around. **Hannon:** Part of the problem, George, is that some of the package is for the entry clerk and some of it isn’t, so if we’re going to ask the entry clerk, they don’t have the information of, the club doesn’t want the signs, for example. **Eigenhauser:** When the show secretary sends it in, have the checklist with them and if they don’t want to talk to their entry clerk, they can pay full price. **Hannon:** When they first put this out, that was the entry clerks’ objection, “We shouldn’t be speaking on behalf of the club. We’re frequently not even in the club.” **Eigenhauser:** Make it the show secretary. Then, when they send in the license, it’s their responsibility to communicate with their show secretary what they need. It’s not our problem. The second point I wanted to talk about is a comment that we need to be transparent about or fees. That’s part of what we’re trying to do here. We need to get a report. We don’t even know exactly what each item costs us at this point, so it’s hard to be transparent about something
that we don’t even know. So, I do think that we need to get a report back from Central Office that will be part of the public minutes of whatever meeting it comes up in, and that will be the transparency we need. The last point I wanted to make is something Rich addressed. We can’t be thinking about just today. I remember back in the 1990’s when CFA peaked in terms of registrations for the 7 North American regions. We were awash in sponsorship money at the same time, and we budgeted like it would never end – and it did. It always does. So, whatever we do, we need to think in terms of, how is this going to look in the long term? Certainly, charging more and offsetting it may be easier to wiggle later than simply charging less and then down the road when we have to raise it, they are getting only pain. So, I really like the split approach of charging what it really costs us, but then providing a subsidy and then down the road if we can’t afford the subsidy anymore, it’s probably easier to take away a subsidy than to raise a fee.

**DelaBar:** One thing George, Terri and I did sit down last year and talk about the future a bit, when we were trying to get in some strategic planning before that was overcome by events. We’re looking at electronic transmission. This is not something we can do today, but this is something that we need to look forward to in the future. I showed Tim Schreck what was done on tablets at a show in Poland that some computer programmers had put together, to be able to transfer what was being done per individual judge, going up through their secretariat, which would be our master clerk, and then on to their headquarters. It’s do-able. We can’t do it right now. There are too many issues in catching up everything on our current system, but this is something we look to for the future, where we don’t have paper and it is kept at maybe club level, and everything is transmitted electronically. Then, we’re saving money big time. I just again want to reiterate, we need to look at this globally. One situation is not going to fit everybody, but I think the best thing is the checklist, “yes I need this, no I don’t need this.” Before I come to a meeting, I’m given a list by various clubs of what I’m to bring back, what I’m to take over, because mailing is quite expensive. For a club in Finland to mail a show package in – we can’t do overnight. There’s no way that any club in Finland can do overnight to get a show package back to CFA. The quickest we can do is pay €280 and that will get it in a week, so we’ve got to start thinking about how we’re going to get in our show information. Hopefully, we’ve got a judge from the U.S. that can hand carry it back, but €280 is a big chunk for one club, and that’s for a two-ring show with 100 entries. So, that’s expensive, really expensive. **Colilla:** Can the region charge a surcharge? 25¢ an entry? So we get back our 25¢ from Central Office for the annual? **DelaBar:** John, we have one, but we had the clubs vote on it. **Colilla:** That would help fund our regional awards show. **Calhoun:** Pam said much of what I was about to say. The real productivity is elimination of paper. That’s when you get out of the U.S. mail business and making them profitable, and you get information on a timely basis. For instance, show packages being mailed back, if they are coming from over the water they are typically late and they are expensive. That’s low hanging fruit, because that could be done with templates today. Just as someone in Central Office opens up that show package and they key it into something, they could get that electronically. That doesn’t require any programming, I don’t believe. So, I think we probably need to put together a capabilities group or tag that onto someone’s work to do, to start to look at, what’s the low hanging fruit? There’s other things that require computer programming and that could be years down the road, but there’s some low hanging opportunities that we don’t take advantage of. Here’s one [expense report form]. There’s no reason why everybody is giving me this piece of paper. It didn’t take any time or a lot of money, but here is an easy example. I can send you an electronic sheet that calculates and adds up, you send it to me and it would be
done. Low hanging fruit. **Moser:** On the checklist, I like that because our club doesn’t need half that stuff. We don’t even need the judges’ signs. That would be great. On Carol’s point with shows that are struggling, I totally agree with that. In our region, we have a fund. We have a fund in our region that we will give up to $1,000 to a club that’s really struggling and they don’t have to pay it back. The reason why they don’t have to pay it back is that I do fundraisers throughout the year and that’s what that money is marked for – that purpose, because I think the thing that we need to do the most here is to keep the clubs surviving. That was the only way I could figure out how to do it, so we’ll help our clubs in our own region. **Kuta:** Yeah, on that same note, like I personally schlep a coffee maker, a tea pot and high-end coffee and junk with me to every show, even if I’m not entered, and for any club that likes it. Most clubs are happy to have it. Most people put in more than a few bucks into it. That’s a surcharge, to get coffee and a donut, you know? I mean, it’s kind of stupid but last year it was over $1,000 and it wasn’t too much effort. For me it was a pain, but anyway, going back, I think a lot of the shows, at least in our region, I have offered to help them budget. I know it’s not fun to have somebody help you budget. It can be not so fun having somebody poking around and saying, “why are you doing this, why are you doing that?” But, we can usually get a show to come in balance. I’ve offered to help people budget. I’ve put out that template. I think like only 2 or 3 people asked me for the show budget template. I think it’s kind of a sad truth that a lot of clubs say they are hurting and all that, but they really don’t want to budget. They will do things cheaply, like certain things, like, “oh, it’s too expensive so we’ll do the cheapest route,” but overall they don’t want to think of a holistic budget. They want what they want. I hate saying that, but that’s a big part of it. You’re not going to stop somebody from doing that. “Because I need to have a more expensive judge.” That’s great, especially if that judge is a draw, so it’s maybe worth spending the extra $200 on them, but then you have to take it out of somewhere else. “No, but we don’t want to do that.” I can’t help you if you don’t want to send in the second part for your sponsorship money, you know? I can’t help you if you don’t want to try and get gait. So, I think that’s part of it. A lot of people are cranky and don’t want help. **Bizzell:** The discussion has kind of morphed. It’s a good morph, but information is power. We did an analysis maybe 5 years ago of the cost of scoring a show. I was shocked, as treasurer, how much certain components cost. We looked into staff time and priced that out. I mean, the whole thing. It came up because clubs were asking for the surcharge to be reduced. Once they saw the fact of what it actually cost, it was like, “oh, never mind.” So, it’s important that we do the analysis. That will make an even more robust discussion, because once we say, “oh my God, why are we still doing that?”, if we are doing that because Central Office doesn’t know that we don’t want them to do it this way. Like the electronic thing, once we get there, that’s saving a lot of money. So, we’ve done an analysis but it’s about 5 years old. **Kallmeyer:** One thing, talking about the show package sizing. I think we really ought to look at it. Do you need the signs? Because that adds to the size of the box. The other part is the 3-part paper. You can buy that at Kinko’s or FedEx. In the U.S., maybe we can do a deal that they could ship it direct, because that’s a large part of the weight of that package. Eliminating that would provide the cost. The other part I wanted to mention is that John and I started looking a couple months ago at a master clerk program to eliminate that. It’s probably over a year away if we started, but I think we are kind of looking at it. That would be something that would eliminate data entry, it would eliminate a lot of your work up front that we could electronically transmit. It would be in the office and they could go do the detail. So, it might be possible. I think it would be that person first, but the judges would still need the piece of paper to do their sheet. I don’t
think tablets would be reliable. What if somebody stole the tablet? **Hannon:** Why don’t we just say that’s further down the road? **Kallmeyer:** That’s further down the road, right. **Hannon:** Is there anything else? I’m going to break for lunch. **Colilla:** On those signs, do you remember the single signs being used in China? I don’t remember seeing them. **Kallmeyer:** Sometimes they do. **Colilla:** They always have fancy signs. **Kallmeyer:** But in the U.S., a lot of people just use an 8-1/2 x 11 poster and just put the judge’s name up. **Colilla:** I’m talking about China. **Kallmeyer:** They don’t use them. **Colilla:** Then why are we shipping them? That would save a lot of postage.

4. **Ohio Registered Agent.**

**Background:** When the Central Office moved from New Jersey to Ohio, CFA completed the paperwork necessary to do business in Ohio, including naming a registered agent for service process. The Ohio Secretary of State currently has a private fancier who is an Ohio resident listed as holding this position. While that individual is well known to many as a trustworthy person, she is not an employee or board member who has taken an oath, nor should she be expected to perform as agent if she is required to accept service on behalf of CFA. The industry standard is to use a professional service which charges a nominal yearly fee to accept service, since staff and officers will come and go.

**Action Item:** Grant the CFA Attorney authority to retain a professional service of his choice to act as registered agent for CFA in the State of Ohio.

**DelaBar:** Can we finish this before we break for lunch? There’s still a #4. **Hannon:** Oh, I’m sorry. Alright, #4. **Anger:** The last action item concerns our registered agent. When we started doing business in Ohio, for some reason an individual Ohio fancier was asked to be our resident agent. That’s kind of an unusual action, but there was so much going on at the time that we had to have someone living in the State of Ohio to accept service. Through a series of events, we discovered that this person is still listed as our resident agent. Generally, when a business conducts business in multiple states, they use a service like CT Corp. to accept service, who specializes in passing official business along to the company. It would be appropriate for us to change our resident agent. The action item is to grant our CFA Attorney authority to retain a professional service of his choice to act as registered agent for CFA in the State of Ohio. **DelaBar:** Second. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion? **Calhoun:** Associated cost? **Anger:** Less than $100 a year. Much less.

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

[BREAK]
CLUB APPLICATIONS.

Committee Chair: Carol Krzanowski

Hannon: The next item on the agenda I believe is Club Applications, which is Carol.

Krzanowski: Before I start on my report, I just want to mention that we have a new club application information page on the CFA website now. There’s one link on the exhibitor page to it. It gives a general overview of what’s required in an application. The links that were formerly on the exhibitor page – that would be the club application form, the constitutional outline and the formal instructions – have all been moved to this general information page now, with the hope that club applicants will actually read everything and submit what they need to the first time around with their application. We now have a new email address specifically for club applications. So, all of that information is there. You should check it out when you have a chance. I would like to thank Kathy Durdick in helping us get that set up.

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

New clubs applying for CFA membership were presented to the Board for consideration.

Current Happenings of Committee:

Club Regional Reassignment

In accordance with the constitutional amendment passed at the 2016 CFA Annual Meeting, CFA Constitution, Article III – Membership, Section 4 – Regional Assignment, the 44 Gatti Cat Club has submitted a petition to the Board for reassignment to Region 9 (Attachment A). Under normal procedures, the club would be eligible for reassignment in 2020 based on the same section of the Constitution as mentioned above.

This club is a Region 5 club that moved to Italy in 2015 and reorganized there. The club’s request for a name change from Online Feline Fanciers to 44 Gatti Cat Club was passed by the CFA Board at the July 2, 2015 meeting. The secretary lives in Italy. All the club members reside in Region 9, and all but two live in Italy. The club produced a show in Italy last season, and they plan on producing three shows in Italy this season, the first of which is licensed for October 1-2, 2016 in Rome. Both the Southwest Regional Director and the Europe Regional Director support this reassignment.

Action Item: Approve the request by 44 Gatti Cat Club for immediate reassignment from Region 5 to Region 9.

Krzanowski: The first item in the report is an action item regarding a club regional reassignment. If you have read the report, you see that the club is 44 Gatti Cat Club in Italy. They are asking for immediate reassignment from Region 5 to Region 9. This is because they have organized in Italy, all their members except for 2 are living in Italy, they are producing shows in Italy and they feel that this is a reasonable request. We did pass a constitutional amendment at the most recent annual that permits a club to petition the board for reassignment. So, I move that we
reassign this club immediately to Region 9. **DelaBar:** Second. **Eigenhauser:** I’m going to vote yes on this, just to be clear right up front, but I think that when we assign a club to a new region, we ought to publish it in the CFA News, the same way as when we introduce a new club to the region, just in case some club already in the region might have a reason to object. I think that’s only fair, so going forward, I would recommend to the New Club Committee that when there is a request for reassignment, we publish it in the CFA News, so if there is some sort of negative comment from existing clubs in the region, they can voice it. But, that would be going forward. For today, I’m ready to vote. **Krzanowski:** That’s reasonable. It’s just for when they petition for a regional reassignment, OK. **Black:** I was going to say, this was an online club only, the Online Feline Fanciers. I was past president of it. I did not realize it was now going to Europe, but that’s fine. We never held a show. **DelaBar:** I became secretary of the club. The former secretary tried to get in touch with you. For whatever reason they couldn’t. I became secretary, I needed another club in Finland like a hole in the head. This is our only active club in Italy. **Hannon:** Any other discussion.

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

**Hannon:** The regional reassignment is granted.

**New Club Applicants**

Four clubs were pre-noticed for membership. They are:

- Angel Fairy Sphynx, International Division; Richard Kallmeyer, Chair
- Anshan Asia Cat Club, International Division; Richard Kallmeyer, Chair
- RagaMuffin Cat Fanciers, Region 1, John Adelhoch, Director
- World Top Feline Club; International Division; Richard Kallmeyer, Chair

**Angel Fairy Sphynx**

**International Division, Tianjin, China; Richard Kallmeyer, Chair**

The constitution and by-laws are in order. There are nineteen members. No member is a member of another club. Most of the members are breeders with CFA registered cattery names, and most are actively exhibiting at CFA shows. Several members have show production experience, and they have already put on two shows under the names of other clubs. One member is a licensed Certified Clerk, and two other members have clerking experience. This is an allbreed club with a special interest in the Sphynx breed. The club wishes to produce three shows a year in the Tianjin area. The dues have been set. If the club is disbanded, the funds will be donated to charity. This club was pre-noticed and no negative letters have been received. The International Division Chair supports this club.

**Krzanowski:** Before I start, please excuse me for any mispronunciations on Chinese names. The first application is Angel Fairy Sphynx. This club is located in Tianjin, China, the largest coastal city in northern China. The city is completely surrounded by Hebei Province and is bordered by Beijing Municipality. Its prime location has made the city a major seaport and gateway to the nation’s capital. With a population of nearly 15.5 million, Tianjin is one of the
four direct-controlled municipalities of China. This club wishes to help promote some of the lesser-known pedigreed breeds in China. They also intend to help educate fanciers on proper cat care and work with local relief groups. Several members have clerking experience with one being a licensed Certified Clerk, and the group has already produced two shows utilizing the names of other clubs. If accepted, the club hopes to produce three shows a year in Tianjin. I move that we accept this club. **Anger:** Second. **Kallmeyer:** I support all the clubs from the ID this time. **Hannon:** Any other comments or questions? All those in favor of the Angel Fairy Sphynx Club.

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

Hannon: Welcome Angel Fairy Sphynx.

**Anshan Asia Cat Club**  
International Division, Anshan, China; Richard Kallmeyer, Chair

The constitution and by-laws are in order. There are eighteen members. No member is a member of another club. The officers and directors are active CFA breeders and exhibiting pedigreed cats at CFA shows. Several members have experience helping other clubs produce shows. One member is working to become a licensed clerk, and four other members have clerking experience. This is an allbreed club that wishes to produce at least one show a year in the cities of Anshan, Shenyang and Haerbin. The dues have been set. If the club is disbanded, the club funds will be donated to the local animal rescue center. This club was pre-noticed and no negative letters have been received. The International Division Chair supports this club.

Krzanowski: Next is Anshan Asia Cat Club. This club is located in Anshan, China, the third largest prefecture city in Liaoning Province, which is bordered by Jilin Province to the north and Hebei Province to the south. Anshan is situated in the central area of the province about 57 miles south of Shenyang, the provincial capital. With a population of over 3.5 million, Anshan is a key center of heavy industry in northeast China and an important steel producer. Several members have clerking experience as well as experience helping other clubs produce shows. The club wishes to help popularize CFA in China, and intends to work with local animal associations to increase interest in the cat fancy. If accepted, this club plans to produce at least one show a year in the general Anshan area. I move that we accept this club. **Newkirk:** Second. **Hannon:** Any discussion on the Anshan Asia Cat Club. Dick, you already said you support it. **Kallmeyer:** Right. Point out too, the members of this club actually went to one of the clerking schools I had up there. They weren’t even showing their cats. They drove 150 miles, about 20 of them, to go to the clerking school. I was impressed. **Hannon:** Any further discussion?

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

Hannon: Welcome Anshan Asia Cat Club.
RagaMuffin Cat Fanciers  
Region 1, Pottsville, PA; John Adelhoch, Director

The constitution and by-laws are in order. There are twenty-two members. Three members are members of other clubs. Nearly all of the members are active CFA breeders and exhibitors, and several belong to the breed council. This is a RagaMuffin breed club whose membership is geographically widespread. The club plans to produce or co-produce one or two allbreed shows a year in Exton, PA, the greater Philadelphia area, and possibly in Phoenix, AZ. The dues have been set. If the club is disbanded, the club funds will be donated to the Winn Feline Foundation. This club was pre-noticed and no negative letters have been received. The North Atlantic Regional Director supports this club.

Krzanowski: The next application is RagaMuffin Cat Fanciers. This club is based in Pottsville, Pennsylvania and because it is a breed club, the membership is geographically widespread. All of the members have CFA registered catteries and most are currently breeding and exhibiting. A major goal of the club is to help promote awareness of and interest in the RagaMuffin breed. They intend to do this by engaging in activities such as putting up breed booths at shows and working to educate spectators. If accepted, this club plans to produce or co-produce one or two shows a year, which would include agility if space allows. They hope to partner with other clubs in order to hold shows in both the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and Phoenix, Arizona areas, so that club members from different regions of the country will have an opportunity to participate. I move that we accept this club. Anger: Second. Hannon: Any discussion? John, as Regional Director, do you want to comment? Adelhoch: I’m perfectly fine with it. They have asked me to mentor them to their first show. That’s wonderful. Yes. Hannon: All those in favor of the RagaMuffin Cat Fanciers.

Hannon called the motion. Motion Carried.

Hannon: Welcome RagaMuffin Cat Fanciers to CFA.

World Top Feline Club  
International Division, Sheung Shui, Hong Kong; Richard Kallmeyer, Chair

The constitution and by-laws are in order. There are nineteen members. Four members are members of other clubs, and two members are currently officers in other clubs. Most members are active breeders and exhibitors in CFA, and several members have show production experience. One member is a Master Clerk and two other members have clerking experience. This is an allbreed club that wishes to produce at least one show per season in Shenzhen and perhaps other cities in Guangdong Province. The dues have been set. If the club is disbanded, the club funds will be donated to local cat welfare associations. This club was pre-noticed and no negative letters have been received. The International Division Chair supports this club.

Hannon: Next, Carol. Krzanowski: The last application today is World Top Feline Club. This club is based in Hong Kong, and their intent is to produce shows in Guangdong Province, China. The members reside in various areas of China, including Hong Kong, and there are a couple of members that reside in the U.S. as well. The club intends to produce one or more
shows a year in Shenzhen and other cities in Guangdong Province. Guangdong is situated on the south China coast and is bordered to the north by Hunan, Jiangxi and Fujian Provinces. Shenzhen is an economic hub of the province with a population of over 10.5 million, and it is located just north of the Hong Kong and Macau Special Administrative Regions. Several club members have clerking and show production experience, and one member is a licensed Master Clerk. If accepted, this club plans to offer Feline Agility and encourage Household Pet entries at its shows in order to help promote CFA and educate newcomers. I move that we accept this club.


Hannon called the motion. Motion Carried.

Hannon: Welcome to CFA, World Top Feline Club.

Future Projections for Committee:

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

Time Frame:

October 2016 to December 2016 CFA Board teleconference.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

All new clubs that have applied for membership and satisfactorily completed their documentation.

Respectfully submitted,
Carol Krzanowski, Chair

Hannon: Do you have anything else, Carol? Krzanowski: That’s it, thank you.
TREASURER’S REPORT.

Treasurer Kathy Calhoun gave the following report:

This report is based on the first quarter reporting (May, June and July) of the CFA financials. The comparison will be actuals as compared to budget.

Hannon: Next is the Treasurer. Calhoun: Happy to present the first quarter’s Treasurer’s Report for the time period of May 1 through July 31, 2016, and the analysis is the actuals compared to our approved budget.

Headlines on Profit: Gross profit was $49,096 ahead of budget.

There were four components in that category that drove much of that revenue.

✓ Total litter registration was $10,282 ahead of budget.
✓ Revenue from individual registration was $20,571 positive to budget.
✓ Breed council dues were up $22,550 as compared to budget.
✓ The largest single line item contributing to this level of profit was cattery registration. That category was $51,135 ahead of budget!

There were a few line items that came in unfavorable to budget. Registration services were unfavorable to budget by $14,310. Also Yearbook advertising was $20,069 unfavorable.

Calhoun: Headlines. We are $49,000 in gross profit ahead of budget. The four leading components that are driving that are total litter registrations which are about $10,000 ahead of budget, revenue from individual registration of almost $21,000 ahead of budget, breed council dues almost $23,000 ahead, and the biggest line item is our cattery registrations which are $51,000 ahead of the budgeted number. That’s driving our profit. We also had a few line items that were unfavorable. The ones called out are registration services being unfavorable by about $14,000 and the Yearbook being unfavorable about $20,000. DelaBar: What do you mean by registration services, as opposed to registrations? Calhoun: It’s the expedite fees, all those sorts of things. So, that’s really good news.

Headlines on Expense: Expenses were well monitored and came in $29,682 under budget.

Almanac expenses, which are Cat Talk Magazine, came in $10,257 over budget. Payroll was under budget, but that was offset by contracted labor being over budget. Central Office and the CFA Museum had a bit of optimization. All of the windows were washed and grout was cleaned and repaired. These expenses are captured under building maintenance.

Calhoun: Headlines on expenses. Expenses have been very well monitored. They are coming in under budget almost $30,000. The call-outs in that category include Cat Talk Magazine, which is a bit over budget by about $10,000. Payroll came in under budget, but it was
offset by some contracted labor. Then we did some optimization to the building, the windows were cleaned, we cleaned the grout and those sorts of things. So, a little bit of that was spent.

The Bottom Line:

Net income for the first quarter of the fiscal year was $149,785 which was $79,417 ahead of budget!

A great start to the year!

Calhoun: The bottom line from a CFA perspective for the first quarter of the fiscal year is that we are almost $150,000 positive, which is $79,000 ahead of what we budgeted. So, that is very, very good news. Questions? Kuta: For the Almanac, that part that was over budget? Was it for Cat Talk Magazine or the online Almanac? Do we know? Hannon: It’s combined in one budget item. Kuta: But do we have any idea of what drove it? Calhoun: We can certainly dig into that. Kuta: I think where my question is going, because also for the advertising is low on the other two kind of physical items and does that spread to Cat Talk? Is it the physical Cat Talk or is it online? I’m just trying to figure out where the advertising needs to be boosted more. Hannon: She’ll look into it.

Communication to the Fancy:

Q1 financials with my comments were distributed to all CFA club secretaries. In addition, a new communication was put in place called “The Bottom Line”. This will be published in the CFA News on a quarterly basis or whenever communication is needed. This communication is intended to provide all Fanciers visibility to CFA financial performance. The next step will be to have these two communications translated to other languages so that the contents are relevant to all.

Hannon: I should point out, where it says Q1 financials with my comments were distributed to all CFA club secretaries, that’s not quite accurate. It’s going to be this coming week. Calhoun: Right, so we’re getting that communicated to the fancy. We thought that we would have it out before the bottom line report that went out on the CFA News. The bottom line report is a communication to everybody in the fancy that has an opportunity to get that, and we refer in that communication that they can go to their club secretaries if they want further detail, and then that club secretary data didn’t get issued, but that will be issued next week, so club secretaries will have an overview and the detailed financials along with the board. It’s the same thing I’m going to send to the club secretaries. I want to make sure that the board has the same information. The bottom line communication to the fancy in general, this will be something that will be done quarterly and as needed, so, for instance, there will be a communication that will advise the fancy about the annual, there will be a separate communication that will advise the fancy about the International, so in addition to the quarterly reports, there will be event-based reports so that we can bring the fancy along if they want to know how we’re doing, so at the end of the year there will be no surprises. Hannon: Kathy told me one of her goals is to put that communication in plain English so that the clubs who are not auditors can understand what we are doing. Calhoun: Make it user friendly.
Moser: Is there any thought about discontinuing the Yearbook? Calhoun: No. It has come up from time to time, but I think the Yearbook – and we can certainly review that again – but I think the Yearbook is very important to the history of CFA. It’s one of those things that, those publications have always struggled but we do things to support those publications. I think it’s really important from an historical standpoint. Hannon: Rich, do you want to address the lack of profit in those publications and why we don’t think negatively about that? Mastin: I’ll address my part, and then I’ll ask Carla and Kathy to touch on it. In reference to the first quarter Yearbook and publications, the timing may not be 100% accurate with what happened the year before. So, things are coming and going in different parts of the year, meaning that $20,000 that is being referenced as Yearbook may be off for the first quarter, but it may balance out or is equal to any upcoming part. The other part, touching on what Kathy was saying, there are certain parts of the business that we need to look at as cost of doing business, and the Yearbook and Cat Talk are two pieces. We don’t necessarily have to make money on those. Now, I want to turn it over to Carla and Kathy to explain why, because this comes up maybe once every year or 18 months, so would you please? Bizzell: Are you talking about unrelated business income? Mastin: Unrelated business income. Bizzell: Losing a lot of money is not a good idea, but I agree that it’s the permanent record of CFA. It’s the representation of what the year had. Calhoun: Just to add to that, we need to protect ourselves from attacks around undue amount of profit in that business. It’s also skewed that, for instance, with publications quite often the beginning of the year we will see more expenses to publishing the magazine if we hit that correctly, or toward the end of the year we will see, when we start to sell Yearbooks, we’ll see more around the income side. Kuta: Essentially, I really get why it’s very important, but if we’re going to have a $20,000 subsidy of something like this, like hey, if the purpose is to really keep the history of the organization and all that, could we spend say $20,000 or $10,000 on having something like an archivist or historian doing something for the year that would cost us money and maybe be a really cool thing? I mean, there’s just other thoughts out there, like OK, if we’re going to spend $20,000 a year on history and documentation, is the Yearbook the best vehicle for that? Mastin: So remember, we should probably be looking at that at the end of the year as a whole, and not just a very small snapshot. I can’t really speak on what you’re suggesting until we know where all that ends up. It may be a great idea, it may be added expense that’s going to be more than $20,000. Kuta: Exactly. I think of this because I have a friend who is employed part time by a large organization that puts on an event every year, and he is their documentarian and puts together a paper record and also a film and something else that costs the organization something. It’s distributed but not everybody buys the paper anymore. Bizzell: First of all, what he [Mastin] said with the timing, because the deadline for advertising is after the end of the first quarter. So, that’s one thing. One of the big expenses in that account is the employee who works in that area. We do allocate some of her costs out to other areas. We may want to do a time study to see if we’re accurately allocating the proper amount to that business area. DelaBar: One of the other reasons that we have the Yearbook – this is probably not the best reason, but every other association has one. I get those from ACF and CCCA out of Australia. They are sent to me as comp copies. I’ve been getting those for years. But, it’s our brag book. Breeders use this. It goes around the world. I’m also buying Yearbooks and sending them to my friends who are sending me their yearbooks. So, it gets around. Breeders get visibility. CFA gets visibility. I once said, why can’t we put this on a DVD? It was sort of knocked down at the time, but a DVD fits a little easier but it’s not the coffee table book that gets us the visibility within homes, within people coming to visit, paging
through, seeing all these phenomenal cats. It’s not only our history but it’s also a PR effort, too.

Calhoun: I think some people actually purchase copies and they give them to veterinarians so it’s in the lobby and it’s something folks can thumb through, that coffee table-type item. Bizzell: Just one last little thing. Back in 1973 when I got my first very poor quality pedigreed cat, a friend I worked with brought me the CFA Yearbook to look at. I went through, and I could not believe all the different breeds, and I decided right then I wanted Balinese as my breed, and it was from that CFA Yearbook. It wasn’t what that friend bred, but that publication was so wow, particularly at the time. It was like, I have to have a Balinese, and I went and got one. The rest is history.

DelaBar: Just to give you an idea, we have always, to my knowledge, operated the Yearbook at a loss. Back when Mark was in charge of it many, many years ago, we were charging $25 for the Yearbook and it was costing us $29 to produce. So, there was also a built-in deficit there that we had going in, but it has always been considered one of the prime yearbooks of the worldwide cat fancy. If you look back, we’ve been worldwide for quite some time with our publications. Calhoun: The other piece I would like to add is that we also are very careful about the number of Yearbooks that are ordered. In past years we had a lot of surplus, so that’s part of the cost management piece, as well. Brown: Couldn’t a part of this be listed as advertising expense to avoid worrying about profit on it? Mastin: We don’t have to worry about the profit side if we’re not showing a profit, but touching on what Carla said, what’s the American Express commercial phrase — “priceless.” So, that Yearbook is actually a form of advertising. For all of you who are in business and you spend advertising, you wonder what it’s doing for you because it’s very hard to monitor and put an actual return on it. Let’s use Carla for an example. She has been with us since 1973, give or take a year. She used the Yearbook to pick out the cat that she wanted to be associated with CFA. If the Yearbook cost the association $20,000 a year in advertising, Carla has probably spent $20,000 a year with CFA. That’s just one person. Do the math on it. Over 40 years of $20,000 a year, that’s $800,000 that she has probably spent. So, when you try to put a number on it — Kuta: I’m saying doing the evaluation now. I know anybody, even older cat fanciers I know, we don’t want stuff in our house, like another object. That’s the thing, it’s a physical thing that takes up space. Auth: The Yearbook is part of CFA’s brand, so I would say there’s some cost associated with that, but I wonder, the Cat Talk or the magazine is not so much. I actually reached out to CFA a couple years ago and asked if could get it electronically, because I’m a green person and don’t want to kill a tree. I was told no, that wasn’t an option. Hannon: It is an option. It’s available electronically. Auth: Is it? OK, I didn’t know that. But, I wonder why we have the magazine. I have more objection to the magazine. Certainly, the Yearbook is part of our brand. Hannon: Under a previous administration, we discontinued the publication, then subsequently it was brought back to life. Auth: I thought the previous administration brought the magazine Cat Talk in. DelaBar: Yes, but the administration previous to that, we did away it. Calhoun: It went from a monthly publication to a bi-monthly publication and then it went away. Hannon: And then Jerry brought it back under a different name as a bi-monthly publication. Newkirk: Supposedly profitable. Auth: And I’m just questioning why we have it when it costs money. Hannon: What do you want to do, other than toss that out? Do you want to do something about eliminating it? DelaBar: Just a little history. We used to do a CFA Quarterly. It was sent to the clubs quarterly – once every 3 months. Karen’s got some copies of it. There were other publications, as well. Cats Magazine was a biggie. It was on newsstands. We had Cat Tab, which was Bill Reach’s. We had one that Daphne Negus did, Cat World or something like that. We had all of those publications, then we decided
to do away with the Quarterly and come up with a monthly magazine, which ended up being the *Cat Fanciers Almanac*. This is from July of 1984. We didn’t have the scoring, we didn’t have ePoints and stuff like that, so in here was the show thing. The big deal was, for everybody showing, you wanted to have the black line. You wanted to be best cat in show. This was really popular. When we started getting to ePoints and other things like that, that’s when the magazine subscription started falling off. When we were keeping track of points on our cats by hand and by Gar DeGeer coming up with all these points or the Collinses and people like Mark Hannon. **Hannon:** You are forgetting Donna Fuller. She was the big one. **DelaBar:** It was a vital part, and the more we got online and the more we started with the ePoints – I don’t know if ePoints subscriptions cover the difference in the expense and the profit that we had when we originally came out with the *Cat Fanciers’ Almanac*. I think that there has been some degradation of spirit or whatever you want to call it, from when we went from this to when we went to everything right now – “why have ePoints not been updated in the past 24 hours” or something like that – to that mindset. To me, there has been a loss, but that’s the basic history of how these publications have gone. **Calhoun:** I don’t think that’s terribly different from all hard copy publications. Because of so much information now available real time and electronically on your iPad, your iPhone, your this and that, those types of – **Hannon:** Publications all over are suffering like that. *Time* magazine and the *New York Times* and what have you. **DelaBar:** The other thing is, if we went to digital only, what would that do? If it wasn’t the same cost as the print, I would probably subscribe to it. All my magazines except for *Time Europe* are all online. **Hannon:** We did that for a short while with the online Almanac. When we didn’t have the printed Almanac, we had featured articles in the online Almanac, but when Jerry brought back the magazine, that took a nose dive. **Kuta:** So, that’s why I was asking that first question, was trying to figure out for that one line item what was coming from the paper *Cat Talk* and what was coming from the online Almanac. One of the problems with a paper version, those articles are genuinely helpful to me as a breeder, but because I can’t search and it’s hard for me to archive them and all that, I see it almost as a burden. Like I have this stack of unopened ones on our table by our mailbox right now, and I’m like, “oh, I have to go through those and figure out what to do with the paper and then remember which one has what articles so I can go look it up again.” It’s just a mental burden. Maybe I’m speaking of myself but it’s really useful information and we spend a lot of time doing it, so I think if there’s a way, we need to find out. **Hannon:** Why don’t we move on?

**Other news:**

*I traveled to Central Office to meet with our Executive Director Terri Barry and our bookkeeper Stacy Malone. The meeting was in conjunction with other business meetings in Akron, Ohio, which shared expenses. The focus of the meeting was to review the Las Vegas Annual financials and insure expenses were properly categorized. These expenses will be captured in the August financial statements.*

**Hannon:** Do you have anything else, Kathy, for your report? **Calhoun:** Just travel to Central Office. We were working on the Vegas Annual to make sure that everything is appropriately allocated. That will be in the August financials which will be mailed out, and there will be communication out to the fancy. **Hannon:** Thank you.

*Respectfully submitted, Kathy Calhoun, CFA Treasurer*
Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Follow up on questions asked at the August 9, 2016 Board Teleconference Meeting: is there a travel insurance policy Judges can purchase directly to cover airfare reimbursements and medical coverages (including medical transportation back to home) over and above CFA’s current policy/policies?

Response from Insurance Provider -

- Coverage exists for judges and other individuals. This includes reimbursement from being transported back to United States - as long as a doctor recommends it.

- Terror isn’t excluded in the policy so available benefits won’t be excluded due to terror incident.

- But CFA can’t purchase trip cancellation coverage under this Travel Accident policy.

- We would need to attempt to procure a policy with another carrier OR, more practically, CFA should consider purchasing trip cancellation through the airline.

Current Happenings of Committee:


- Accessible to Central Office Management Team, Special Events Coordinator, Treasurer, Budget, Audit Committee Chair and Legal Counsel.

- Review weekly bank account balances and biweekly payroll reports.
  - As of September 16, 2016 combined bank accounts totaled $1,918,440.98

- Review first quarter 2016-2017 financial profit & loss statements and commentaries to previous year’s performance.

- Review and advise as needed on contractual agreements/arrangements and capital improvement needs.
- Working with Roger Brown and John Randolph on GeneSeek’s/Neogene’s revised DNA Program Contract/Agreement.

- Requested investment proposals from Investment Firms. Meeting scheduled with one firm on 9-30-16 to review recommended proposal and Q&A.

**Future Projections for Committee:**

- Follow through on tasks, projects and contracts in process.

**Board Action Items:**

- Board to share thoughts (level of interest and concerns) on investing with investment firm(s).

**Time Frame:**

- Board to consider making a decision by February 2017 Board Meeting on investing with investment firm(s).

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

- Investment proposals by December 2016 Board Meeting.
- Committee’s progress and updates.

Respectfully Submitted,

**Rich Mastin**

Rich Mastin, Chair

**Hannon:** Next is Finance Committee, Rich. **Mastin:** I brought back the answers on the questions that were brought up in August for the insurance. Is there any further follow-up you want, other than what I took down this morning? I took down, what happens if you are dead, and are guest judges from other associations also covered. Are there any other questions you want me to follow up on for the insurance? **Kuta:** The inverse of that, if any of our judges are guest judging a show, or does that even matter? **Mastin:** I’ll find that out. **DelaBar:** I can tell you. As a guest judge, we are covered by the association we’re judging for, not CFA. **Mastin:** That’s what I think the answer is going to be for the other ones, OK? Any other questions on insurance?

**Mastin:** You have the report there. I don’t have to go through it line by line, but down in the action item, the Finance Committee met with one investment firm yesterday afternoon and we received another proposal from an investment firm earlier in the week, maybe Wednesday. I need to start the process of just touching base with the board on, where is the level of comfort and what are your questions? The last thing the Finance Committee wants to do is spend time on something if there’s no interest, or we’re too conservative on moving it in a certain direction. We have a tremendous amount of money that we could invest that could potentially make money over time – underline “over time” please, because you don’t invest today for tomorrow’s returns,
you invest today for future returns over 5 years, 10 years, what have you. So, we’ve got to just open it up. **Hannon:** It started with me. We’ve got nearly $2 million sitting in the bank and a little bit is invested in CDs which are bringing us in next to nothing in the way of interest. It just seems to me if we’re not using all this money, we can invest some of it and get a return on it. **DelaBar:** One, I would make a recommendation we wait to do anything until after the elections. **Hannon:** He agrees. **Mastin:** I agree. It’s already outlined in there. The plan was to present this and then, in December, to provide to you folks some proposals and then ask more questions. By February. It will be after. **DelaBar:** Let me continue. I would say that, to be as responsible to our constituents as possible, I personally go medium risk on my investments, but I think we need to be a bit more conservative and maybe do the mutual fund levels so it’s spread across. I’ve been fairly lucky with those, with having steady growth. I do think that we need to be responsible to our clubs and people, and look on the conservative side. **Kuta:** I would say if we are going to go anywhere in equities, I would want to go with something like an index fund with the lowest fees possible and where the hidden costs in there where the fund manager is taking out .1% or something like that. I would say that our portfolio shouldn’t be that heavily into equities, but I would be fairly comfortable with something that’s trying to do an index fund with little cost or no fees. **Eigenhauser:** One of the things when you do investing, my experience has mostly been with people. You make adjustments according to their age and what their long-term goals are and timelines and things like that. With a corporation with infinite life, I think we need to think in terms of very, very long-term goals, as well, so what I see is keeping a big chunk in cash because equities go up and down in value, cash stays the same, so if we ever do feel the need to dig into our investments, a chunk in cash means we’re not going to lose principal. A chunk should be in low to middle risk investments that, as a responsibility to our shareholders, we’re being conservative, but I think part of it has to be in growth, and that’s going to necessarily be higher risk. I would want that to be the smallest chunk, but I think in terms of thinking about where is CFA going to be in 50 years, not just 3 years or 5 years. We need to look at things that have the potential for long-term growth, so that would be the smallest pot. I think we do need some risk. With $2 million we can carve a small piece out and say, this is going to be for growth-oriented funds, maybe even overseas – things that a prudent, conservative 65 year old investor wouldn’t do, but maybe a 22 year old would. **Black:** I agree with what you’re saying. I think that there are lots of different vehicles out there. I know because I sell them. There are a lot of index funds that have no load fees and no risk, and you can still make a nice profit, but they are going to be locked up for 10 years or less, depends on state laws. You can definitely put a chunk there, you can put a chunk like what you’re talking about, in something that would potentially lose money but have the bigger potential of making money. There are lots of different ways. I think it’s nice that you met with an investor. The best advice I ever got was, don’t just trust one investor, so I would meet with several people. I would recommend a varied portfolio. Anything like you’re talking about, there’s no fees and no risk, it’s going to be tied up for the next 10 years, so you would need to leave enough cash to cover any kind of emergency. Otherwise, you’re going to be losing money to get that money out. **Hannon:** Carla, do you want to address some of these comments, based on what the presentation was yesterday? **Bizzell:** Do you want me to do it, or Rich? **Mastin:** No, you do it. **Bizzell:** We were actually looking at a $500,000 – we plan to leave quite a bit in cash for operating expenses out of necessity and out of not wanting the money tied up in case we might need it. We asked them to propose the use of a $500,000 investment and we got 2 different proposals. One was primarily mutual funds and bond funds. I forget what, .75% fee. Of
course, there are also fees inside the mutual fund, so you can’t really look at the fees apples to apples. The one yesterday was more direct investments in a varied basket of low-risk stocks. They chose a basket of stocks that they typically propose for not-for-profits, which are historically and pretty much universally very conservative, so that one had a little higher fee attached to it; something like 1.21 or something if we got just a little over $500,000, but then you didn’t have the fees inside the instruments themselves. **Hannon:** Wasn’t that a mixture, though, of like almost 50% of it was stock and the rest of it was – **Bizzell:** I think it was 60/40, yes. So, it was a fairly low-risk investment. They both had about the same return. So, mutual funds would give you a little more broad exposure over more areas of the market. **Hannon:** In addressing George’s comment about putting some small percentage of it in a higher risk, we talked about that and she recommended against it until the board got a comfort level with investments, in general, but she liked that idea of putting a small part. **Bizzell:** They, in fact, have different baskets of stocks and bonds for different levels of risk. **Hannon:** The one she recommended for us was not the lowest, but the next to lowest risk. **Kuta:** Is this a fee-only planner, or is this somebody who is getting commission from the vehicles themselves? Or were they getting commissions on the specific things that they are selling you or was it a fee only? **Bizzell:** It’s a fee on balance. **Kuta:** But would they probably still get commissions based on what fund they put you in? **Bizzell:** I assume they get paid some way, yeah. **Kuta:** But it’s not like we are paying them like $5,000? **Bizzell:** No, no. It’s just a fee based on the balance you have in the investments. It’s a big company with a lot of resources and headquarters that does a lot of research. Of course, I would research all the stocks they would recommend, or all the funds that would be recommended myself, just to get a comfort level. **Kuta:** Right, and if their funds have beaten the market index for like the past 10 years. **Bizzell:** They actually had graphs that showed how that investment would have done over the past 7 years. Was it 7 years? **Mastin:** I think it was 9 years. **Bizzell:** It wasn’t 10 years. I could be 10 years because some things had split or sold off or something. **Eigenhauser:** As the cynic, I’m reminded that Mark Twain said, “There are lies, damn lies and statistics.” Every person selling you anything is going to choose the timeline that makes it look best. If they took it in the shorts 9 years ago, they will give you the last 8 years. If they took it in the shorts 8 years ago, they will give you the last 7 years. A lot of them do that. You talk about historical trends over 5 years, 10 years. I would like to see a little longer trend line than 7 years. **Mastin:** We did that with the one group that submitted a proposal. Not the one that we spoke with yesterday. The one that spoke yesterday went back to 2008. I requested that they go back to 2002, so we’re look at apples to apples from the original proposal. The other thing we did was, we went from 2008 to today, took X number of dollars in both plans, and they both doubled their money within 9 years, based on their recommendation. So, it was an average return of 8% after fees. **Eigenhauser:** But if you look at it since the big crash, you can throw darts and still make money. **Mastin:** That is why we requested they go back. Now, the original company that went back to 2002, the $500,000 investment end result to today was $1.4 million. That included the 2008 period, based on their recommendation, including fees. **Calhoun:** And the model that they provided also gave what had happened in the last 30 days, what happened in the last quarter, what happened year to date, what happened in the last 5 years, so you got a feel for those segments of time, as opposed to just that overall snapshot. **Black:** These companies were chosen by the Finance Committee? **Mastin:** Yes. **Hannon:** He can tell you who they are off the record, but we don’t want it to go in the minutes.
Mastin: In terms of a recommendation for investments, just my opinion, with nearly $2 million in the bank, I recommend that we maintain $400,000 as available at all times, and that we only invest $1 million to start, not the $1.6. We could leave the $600,000 or so in CDs, low-producing CDs or sweep accounts earning half a point or less, but we want to look at this and somebody said – George, it might have been you – look at it going out 50 years. Where are we planning the organization for when we’re gone? We want to leave the next group of people to have something to continue in CFA. Moser: I have zero risk tolerance, so you know where I go.

Newkirk: How about spreading your CD over a year so that every month you roll over the CD? It’s a ladder. Bizzell: Do we have ladders now or not? Hannon: One of the exercises we decided we needed yesterday was somebody to go look at those CDs and find out when each of them is fully mature. Some of them are and we know they are just sort of sitting there. We need to figure out where we stand with our current CDs and decide what we want to do with those. Newkirk: My thought is, at some point in time the Fed is going to raise the rate, probably in December is the latest I heard. They didn’t do it this last month, but they think probably in December it’s going to go up 25 basis points, maybe 50, but the rates are going to come up eventually and if you have one where it’s coming due every month and you’re rolling it over, then you don’t get tagged for that low interest rate when you’ve got a new CD coming out. You can get a little bit more in a CD than you can in a money market account or a sweep. Were they saying mutual funds or ETF funds? Bizzell: The folks we talked to yesterday were talking about direct investment and equities and bonds. The other proposal we had from another company had a basket of mutual funds and bond funds. So, it just depends. We need to look at the cost of management – the cost inside those funds – to do an accurate comparison of this fee versus that fee. You do get a little bit more diversification if you go with the mutual fund. Newkirk: But you can get the same mutual funds in ETF funds. Those ETF funds can be traded any hour of the day, where a mutual fund is not traded until the end of the day. If it goes down and you’ve got a smart money manager and they’re watching it and it’s on a trend down, they can sell an ETF, where they can’t sell a mutual fund until the end of the day. Bizzell: Right, but we’re really looking at long-term investments. We’re talking 10 years, 20 years, 30 years. Newkirk: Everything has a chance of falling. Bizzell: I understand. You just have to hold your breath and let it come back. That’s the long-term nature. Hannon: Rich, do you have anything else for your Finance Report? Mastin: No. Black: I have a question. He kind of laid out a timeline. Can you tell us a little more about your timeline? Are you going to make a decision on one of these companies anytime soon? You just got some ideas, basically? Mastin: No. We just wanted to get some information. Hannon: They didn’t want to come back in December with a proposal if there’s not any interest in investing the money. It seems like there’s a fair amount of interest, and we want to hear more. Mastin: What we will do is go back to both companies, give them the feedback that we heard, tweak whatever they need to tweak, answer the questions we need to know, and then present the proposal to you in February for another round of questions. Say, “I really don’t like this, maybe we should be looking at that.” There’s no rush for a decision here. Black: Are you open to another company suggestion? Mastin: Absolutely. Definitely.
(9) INTERNATIONAL SHOW UPDATES.

(a) 2016 Show.

Committee Chair: Rich Mastin
List of Committee Members: Rachel Anger, Joel Chaney, Kathy Calhoun, Jim Flanik, Mark Hannon, Megan Hiemstra, Teresa Sweeney, Allene Tartaglia and Rich Mastin

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Short list of who is handling what -

- Show Manager – Jim Flanik
- Asst. Show Managers – Megan Hiemstra & Joel Chaney
- Show Secretary – Rachel Anger
- Show Treasurers – Kathy Calhoun & Teresa Sweeney
- CFA Show Coordinator – Allene Tartaglia
- Central Office Team Attending – Terri Barry, Shelly Borawski, Brian Buetel, Verna Dobbins, Allene Tartaglia and Angela Watkins
- Best In Show Announcer – Darrell Newkirk
- Full Assignment List is available to the Board upon request.

Current Happenings of Committee:

- Budget is in the works.
- Preliminary floor-plan transferred to CADD (computer-aided design and drafting) plan by decorator. Needing to provide floor plan to potential vendors (some will not commit until they see floor plan).
- We had a few extra days to submit rosette order; sponsorship deadline was extended to 9/25. All rings have been sponsored. However, we do have a few misc. ring sponsorships and breed sponsorships available, also accepting sponsorships for Agility Ring and Education Ring.
- Ongoing preparations of all tasks and assignments.

Future Projections for Committee:

Continue to work on the many different aspects and tasks of the show.

Time Frame:

On going
What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Recap of the event’s exciting, interesting and challenging happenings.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rich Mastin
Rich Mastin, Chair

Hannon: International Show Updates, 2016 Rich. Mastin: I don’t believe I have any action items for 2016. Just an announcement. It was on the blog news. Carol, you are doing a clerking school? Krzanowski: Yes, that’s correct. Mastin: I don’t believe we have done one in the last 5 years at the International Show that I’m aware of. Krzanowski: No, I think the last one was probably – I think Allene and I said maybe 2008 or something like that. We’re hoping to get a large turn-out, so please encourage anyone from your region that is interested in clerking to register. It’s the Friday before the International Show. It’s being held in the hotel adjacent to the show hall. Mastin: Anybody have any questions on this year?

***

(b) 2017 Show.

Committee Chair: Rich Mastin
List of Committee Members: Rachel Anger, Mary Auth, Kathy Calhoun, Wendy Heidt, Pam Moser, Allene Tartaglia and Rich Mastin

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

- Show Manager – Pam Moser
- Asst. Show Managers- Mary Auth and Wendy Heidt
- Show Secretary – Rachel Anger
- Show Treasurer – Kathy Calhoun
- Benching- Tammy Roark and Kathy Durdick
- Vendors- Wendy Heidt
- Hospitality- Linda Hammer and Kim Welch
- Raffle- Kendall Smith
- Pat Zollman (Helms Briscoe) has three main hotels contracted for show personal, judges and exhibitors. She is also working with other hotels in the area to obtain courtesy holds.
- Number of Shows Proposed – two (2) eight-ring shows (Red Show & Purple Show).
- Recommended Format – 6 AB & 2 SP Kittens, Champions & Premiers / HHPhs in Purple Show
Current Happenings of Committee:

Working with/on the following to obtain contracts and or proposals.

- **Show Hall - Portland Expo Center** (provided quote on 108,000 square feet)
- **Decorator - Triumph Expo and Events** (have a quote), obtaining an additional quote from another decorator.
- **Cage Service - Obtaining quotes from 2 different vendors.**
- **Marketing and advertising - Veracity Agency is providing a quote (should have in time for board meeting).**
- **TICA has reached out to John Randolph (CFA Legal) requesting CFA change the name of the show to not use “International Cat Show”. The basis for their request is due to their January 2018 show held in Portland area.**

Future Projections for Committee:

Continue to work on the many different aspects and tasks of the show.

Board Action Items:

Board is encouraged to make suggestions and share thoughts on show format and any special requests.

Time Frame:

On going

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Updates on progress made.

Respectfully Submitted,

**Rich Mastin**

Rich Mastin, Chair

---

*Mastin:* Pam, do you want to review 2017? *Moser:* Sure. As you can see, we have started. I gave a brief summation of who is doing what so far. Now, that can change or if anybody else has something that they want to do, we can look into that. That’s not a problem. Then, the Current Happenings, I have been trying to get the show hall to send me a contract. I’m not getting very far with that. Don’t get me wrong, we’re on the calendar. I’ve been assured there’s no way that we don’t have the show hall. The problem is that they keep telling me they’re so busy because of these new people coming up that are wanting the show hall that they have to put those on track before ours since ours is over a year away. I said we might want something in writing if that’s the case and they said they would provide that if we did. I’ve gone to one decorator and I’ve gotten a quote on, for instance, tables, drapes, all of that. I have the quote, Rich has seen it.
Cage services, looking for obtaining two quotes. Rich is looking into Peets and I’m looking into Bob Rosenberry, down in southern California, for quotes. Marketing and advertising, I went to Veracity and got a quote. Rich has got the proposal for some local advertising. These people have in’s with the local television sites and things like that, so they can provide – like the one television station usually comes on site for like 4 hours and just broadcasts on television 4 hours on our site, which is nice. Then there’s another television station which usually does its morning show and they possibly would. He’s a little bit of a prima donna, so we don’t know if we can get him yet. Anyway, they had some really good ideas on how to advertise and what demographics they would go for and those kinds of things. I was very impressed with them. I did like them but we’ve got to talk about their fees. Do we want to do that or not? Then, of course, TICA reached out to John. I don’t know, did you want to talk about that or not, Mark? Hannon: We can.

Moser: We can? Well, they reached out to us and said that they had a copyright on international cat show – a trademark, excuse me – a trademark for international cat show. [this discussion constituting legal advice, it was moved to executive session]

Moser: There was something that I went right over, and that was the recommendation for format. The recommendation was 6 and 2. The reason why we thought of this was because that’s our regular format whenever we do a show. That’s CFA’s format, 6 and 2, so I didn’t know why we would want to change that. I know that will be brought up for discussion. I heard when I was kind of going around talking to some people today that maybe they wanted to go back to doing just kittens and champions like we used to do it. That can be brought up, also. It’s nothing in stone. We’re trying to get some feedback from the board also as to how you would like to go on this. Hannon: George, do you want to address the 6 and 2 format? Eigenhauser: I still have concerns about having that many allbreed rings for kittens but I seem to be in the minority on that. Hannon: I don’t think you’re in the minority. Eigenhauser: I’m just very concerned that when we have one big show like that, it can be the thumb on the scale for kittens. While premiers and champions have all year to try to make up that advantage, the kitten that happens to fall in the right window and have the right coat on the right day could easily have just a huge advantage over every other kitten every other time of the year. We can’t control life to make everything a level playing field, but we as an organization can avoid making it worse. I think when we have that many allbreed rings for kittens, it creates the possibility that CFA itself would be skewing the scoring. I would try to avoid that. DelaBar: I still like the format where we had all specialties and where we did 666 kittens in 2 days, and the championship and premiers. Hannon: But Pam, the difference is, in those days they weren’t scored. We didn’t score the shows then. DelaBar: And you can still score them. No matter the format, it can still be scored. Moser: So are you saying, Pam, to go back to the old format? Hannon: She wants all specialties. DelaBar: I just said I would like it to be considered. I liked it. One thing we get to do is recognize more cats. There’s not one person that enters a show that doesn’t want to take back one rosette from the International Show. Brown: I think we have to remember that kittens have a very short timeline that they can be shown – 4 months, and for most of them it’s 3 months. So, unless there are counts available to make the points necessary that you have to accumulate in a short period of time, you’ve got to have allbreed rings. Hannon: George’s point is that having 6 allbreed rings really skews the situation, because if you don’t happen to have a kitten at that time of the year, you don’t have a chance at getting those kinds of points. Brown: No matter how many rings there are any time of the year, you still have to get the points. Mastin: Last year there was a push
to go to all specialty kittens. Shortly thereafter, we got a lot of negative feedback that, why is it all specialty kittens when the year before it was maybe 4 and 4 – I don’t remember, but we had allbreeds. So, we tried to take into consideration that concern. George’s concern is very valid. However, and it’s a very big however, it really only comes into play if you get a show count. If you don’t get a show count, the allbreed 6 and 2 then may be like a normal show when you have two shows. To Pam’s point, Pam, I did the numbers and I went from two shows 8 rings versus one show of 6 rings split half and half, and more people get rosettes by the hundred going to two shows, rather than one show, because we’re already doing top 20 kittens. DelaBar: If we have specialties in kittens. Mastin: Even the allbreeds. DelaBar: But you have longhair/shorthair getting 20 instead of 20 longhair, 20 shorthair. Hannon: But it’s times two, because there are two shows. Mastin: We’ve always done a combination of specialty and allbreed. We’ve never done all allbreed in either one of these two shows. It’s always been – Hannon: But it’s not even proposed. Mastin: No, it’s not proposed.

Hannon: Do you want to talk about loss of sponsorship income with the breeds? Mastin: That’s another concern. It’s not a lot but it’s some. It adds up. If you’ve got 41 breeds at $50, that’s $2,050 per show. If you take one whole show away, that’s $2,000 that you’ve lost for the show for other expenses. Hannon: It’s actually more than 40 breeds because we go by divisions, so you’re talking a larger cost. Mastin: 46, right. DelaBar: We don’t have to go to a 16 ring. You can still do your specialties with the two different shows and then come up and meld them together. My thing is, I’m looking at the reason for the show differently than probably Roger does. Roger is looking at it from a point thing. I’m looking at it as a push for CFA. The reason that we brought this show in back in what, 1988 was the first Invitational? Was to showcase CFA and CFA cats. So, that’s why I’m looking at, how do we draw in more people? I want this to be a success in Portland, even though they’re not going to get that many people coming in from my region to the show, but I still think – Hannon: You’re on her side with that, because you also want to see a lot of people leave that show hall with a rosette. Mastin: Absolutely, and your vision X number of years ago is possibly different than the vision of today’s people who are attending the show. Years ago they didn’t give out points, but people today need the points or want the points to justify their expenses. DelaBar: We can still give the points. Mastin: I do have a concern with a high count show, all specialty, and then there’s a manipulation formula to put everything in line with the rest of the year; meaning, if you have 600 kittens – not that it’s going to happen – and you do top 20, that means the #1 kitten gets 599 points if they all show up. DelaBar: If they are allbreed. Mastin: Right, so we’ll split it in half. It’s specialty, 300 and 300. The #1 kitten gets 299 points. The #20 kitten gets 15 points. How do you address the 299 points? Are you going to use a .5 multiplier or a .3? I don’t like the idea of manipulating numbers just because of the high-count show. DelaBar: Who would want to manipulate? It’s competition. Mastin: Going back to George’s position, now you are definitely going to produce nearly 100% of all your kittens are going to come out of one show for national winners. I don’t think that’s what we should be doing. DelaBar: I have a different thing on national wins whatsoever, but I’m just saying, I want to make this an exhibitor-friendly show. I’m not looking at national winners or anything. I’m looking at exhibitor friendly to get the people in because they think they have a chance to come out of that show with a rosette. Hannon: And he agrees with you. Mastin: I agree 100%. DelaBar: And I will shut up after this. That’s my thought and that’s it. Black: Is your show planning on doing the top 4 longhair/shorthair champions and top 3 longhair/shorthair
premiers like they are doing this year? **Mastin:** We probably would. That would come later. Somebody recommended it at the last meeting. **Anger:** Barb Schreck did. **Mastin:** I forgot who did it. **Anger:** Barb Schreck. **Hannon:** I thought John was the one that went with putting allbreeds in kittens rather than all specialty. **Mastin:** I’m talking about 4 champions and 3 premiers. We adopted it, so it will probably come up again for next year. It makes sense when we have that big of a show. **Black:** OK, so it was only put in place for this one year? **Mastin:** That’s correct. **Black:** Not for any future shows. **Mastin:** Just for 2016. **Wilson:** I know that we have two shows because of the year when everybody entered way early and there wasn’t an option to take more entries without doing that, but entries have decreased at each of the shows since then. Is it a good idea to be set with this being two shows next year, until we know how the International Show this year is going to fill out? Maybe an option would be to do like we used to do. I mean, have that many rings but have it split by specialty instead? I don’t know how long we can keep that kind of an option open in your planning procedures, but this idea of two shows in a location which may get – hopefully not, but fewer entries than it will be if more people can drive concerns me a little bit. Are you tied to having it actually be two shows? **Moser:** I’m not tied to it, no. Myself, I wouldn’t have any problem with the other option of doing like we used to do it, but were those all specialty rings when we used to do it? **Black:** The whole thing was all specialty? **Wilson:** Yes. That’s why there were so many judging rings, but they judged specialty. **Hannon:** Back in those days it was 6 rings for each; there were 6 kitten rings and 6 adult rings. **Wilson:** It was split by category. I’m just thinking that maybe, I mean if there’s time to wait and see. I just didn’t know if you were tied to two shows. **Hannon:** There is. There’s no need to make the decision today. She is tossing out some ideas that she’s got, and so you’re agreeable to waiting until after this show is held and then we can talk further about whether it’s one show or two shows, what the split is between allbreed and specialties? **Moser:** Absolutely. This is just throwing out an idea.

**Hannon:** Do you want to make a pitch for why you feel it’s better to contract with a PR firm out there, when we just hired our own PR person? **Moser:** I’m not saying that we need to – they gave us a number of different options; you know, high options, lower options. I think a local firm, they have ties in with the TV media, they have ties in with what’s going on in our area, so to me I think it would be beneficial to maybe have them work with the person that we have. That’s my option because when you already have the tie-in’s, you want to get the best gate you can possibly get and those people have those tie-in’s. **Kuta:** Also, Portland has a good amount of pet bloggers. Reaching out to them beforehand and cozying up with them would be a great idea because they have a pretty good following. **Moser:** Also, the PR person, our market is a little bit different than any other markets in the country, whereas our people are – I don’t know what they call it – they decide at the last minute. I don’t know the term for it, but Portland as they advertise is weird. They kind of know how the people in our area work, so I think that maybe something that works back east or somewhere else might not work in Portland. By using a local PR firm for some of it, they know. I think that we would want to be able to get the most for our buck. They like to try to find things that are free. It doesn’t cost us anything that they can do free for us, so that’s my pitch. **Mastin:** I just want to touch on that a little bit. I had a conversation this morning with Pam. When Pam was in contact with the agency way back when, Angela wasn’t on board. She was reaching out and making the connections, and just finding out what we need to do. So, for 2016, we made a decision to turn over the advertising to Angela, but get feedback from the
people that participated in the last few events and some local people. So, we met with Angela and Terry yesterday morning to review her proposal. We had some questions and comments, and we said, “go back and get some more information on this.” We gave the budget. Right now she is under budget with the right to use the full budget. We said fine. So, how I see 2017 working is very similar. We’ve got to look at all the options. Angela can work with the ad agency. It may come down to a final decision of who is on the committee on what direction we go, but we want to use both resources. We want to use the person who is doing our marketing for all of CFA on a global basis, as well as look at these agencies. So, we’re not committed to this agency. It was just a proposal.

**Hannon:** Are you through? **Mastin:** Unless there’s any other questions, I’m done.
 CLUB MARKETING.

Committee Chair: Rich Mastin
List of Committee Members: Verna Dobbins & Rich Mastin

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:
- Process & approve sponsorships as submitted.

Current Happenings of Committee:
- 2016 Dr. Elsey’s Sponsorships:
  - 46 Clubs/Shows selected: 43 clubs have been paid sponsorship amounts, 1 club will not be holding a show, 2 clubs never responded and their date has passed.

- 2016 – 2017 CFA Sponsorships:
  - 32 Clubs sponsored to date, with $13,100.00 paid out thus far.
  - Note – additional clubs have likely been approved since the submission of this report.

2016 – 2017 CFA Show Sponsorship Awards -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Pd 1st</th>
<th>Docs Received</th>
<th>Pd 2nd Install</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cats N Cats</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>April 9, 2016</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felinus International</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>April 30, 2016</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seacoast Cat Club</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>April 30, 2016</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Cat Fanciers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>May 7, 2016</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Lancaster Feline Fanciers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>May 7, 2016</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Heaven Cat Club</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>May 21, 2016</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Triangle Cat Fanciers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>May 28, 2016</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat Friends of Germany</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>May 28, 2016</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Annapolis Cat Fanciers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>June 4, 2016</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Atlantic Regional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>June 11, 2016</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stars and Stripes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>July 9, 2016</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden State</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>July 16, 2016</td>
<td>$1,150.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poppy State Cat Club</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>July 30, 2016</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat -H-Art</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>August 3, 2016</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sternwheel Cat Fanciers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>August 13, 2016</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe Shorthair Cat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>August 21, 2016</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposites Attract</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>August 27, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Meow Outfit</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>August 27, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Siamese Cat Club</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Sept. 3, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thumbs Up</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Sept. 27, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin City Cat Fanciers</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>Sept. 24, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Birman Fanciers</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>October 15, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallmark Cat Club</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>October 22, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire Feline</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>November 5, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate Cat Club</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>November 5, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Purrpuss Cat Club</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>November 5, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton Cat Fanciers</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>November 12, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier Feline Fanciers</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>November 25, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Baltimore Cat Club</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>December 3, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville Cat Club</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>December 31, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Cat Club</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>January 7, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puget Sound</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>April 8, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Paid =**

$10,850.00
$17,000.00
$2,250.00

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

- Year to date update of club sponsorships awarded.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rich Mastin
Rich Mastin, Chair

Hannon: Are you ready to go on to Club Marketing? Mastin: I have an update. Since the report, we have paid out $17,000. This moves almost on a daily basis because we get the request in and approvals are usually done within a matter of hours, sometimes minutes. There was one correction on Garden State. The second payment was $1,150 not $250. I just wanted to make sure we are clear on it and that we weren’t hiding anything. The total is $17,000. The jump was,
we have the clubs that came in, the correction with Garden State, but we also – this weekend, we
give Pam DelaBar money to take back to her region so she can support her clubs as the requests
come in and we don’t have to mail checks and then they’ve got to try to cash them. We’ve been
doing this a couple years now and it has worked out well, so we gave her some money to do that.
Any questions on Club Marketing? Kuta: How many of the clubs are spending the whole
amount on advertising, and what kind of feedback are they giving? Hannon: In the report it says,
“documents received, yes.” That tells you that they spent all the money, because part of the
documents received is providing us with invoices that they’ve paid that prove they have placed
ads. Kuta: Not any of these clubs, but I know other clubs I have helped advertised, I know they
haven’t spent $500 and we send back the things, like for Dr. Elsey’s money, too. Like we didn’t
spend the full amount on advertising. Hannon: You are hearing this? Do you want to address
that? Mastin: Look, it’s a double-edged sword here, guys. You give somebody some money and
you tell them to spend it on this and they come back with a bag of candy. You know what I
mean? It’s hard. Kuta: It is hard to spend that much in some markets. Mastin: In some cases, it
is. Going back to what we talked about this morning, we want to promote the clubs. We’re giving
them resources. Are they doing what’s right by it? We hope so. Kuta: I would even be in favor
of taking off that restriction or say spend half the money on advertising. Mastin: Like I said, that
will come next year when I introduce the increase. I don’t think we want to pull back on what
we’re spending, since we have the money to encourage them to spend it. Kuta: That’s great.
Hannon: We’re going to be more vigilant in reviewing those invoices. Dobbins: Some of them
come in a little low, but most of them come in within a reasonable amount. Some come within
$50, some spend more. Mastin: It’s a balance. Do you want to go to a club and say, you didn’t
spend your full $500; guess what? You’re not getting any money next year. That goes against
what our goal is; to try to produce the shows. So, it’s at work all the time. Kuta: No, no. I 100%
agree. I would not say to take it away from them at all. Hannon: Any other questions or
comments on Club Marketing?
International Division Committee Chair Dick Kallmeyer gave the following report:

**Committee Chair:** Dick Kallmeyer  
**List of Committee Members:** Kathy Calhoun (CFA Board), Ken Currle (Middle East, Africa), Wayne Trevathan (South America and judging), Sandra Al Sumait (GCC, Gulf Cooperation Countries), Phebe Low (ID rep), Suki Lee (Hong Kong), Amanda Cheng (China), Nicholas Pun (clerking), Jimmy Lee (SE Asia), Pat Pumphrey (Portuguese/Spanish translation)

[No report submitted, but an executive session discussion took place]
(12) **SHOW RULES.**

**Committee Chair:** Monte Phillips  
**Liaison to Board:** Carol Krzanowski  
**List of Committee Members:** Cathy Dunham, Kathy Gumm, Shirley Michaud-Dent

---

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

The Committee has reviewed and prepared show rule changes for issues identified during both the annual meeting of the delegates, concerns identified by various members of the board concerning certain issues, and a review of the current rules.

**Current Happenings of Committee:**

The committee has prepared this report in five parts – the first part deals with rule changes that were pre-noticed, voted on by the delegates, and passed by 2/3. These are rules forwarded to the Board for ratification. There were five proposals containing nine rules. The second part deals with the rules that passed by majority or passed from the floor. There were three of these containing 15 rules. The third part is made up of rule proposals requested by the Board or individual Board members from either the July or August board meetings. These include such things as clarifying the text on trainees acting as agents, issuance of TRNs to kittens, etc. Each rule proposal includes a description in the analysis of the basis for the change. The fourth part of this report deals with non-show rule resolutions passed by the delegates. Normally, we don’t present these, but have been requested to do so. There are two of these – one dealing with reducing the number of male grand offspring to obtain the DM title, and the other on the use of the term 2nd best or 3rd best of breed in CFA advertising. The final part covers typographical errors that have been caught on a complete re-check of the rules, including missing commas, extra commas, inconsistent capitalization, etc. and rules passed since the current rules (2016-2017) were put in effect on April 29, 2016. They are included here so that all rule changes that need to be made for the next version of the rules (2017-2018) are located in this document.

**Hannon:** Are we ready for Show Rules? Monte, you’re on. We’re ready. **Phillips:** We’re ready, good. **Hannon:** You’ve got 15 minutes. [laughter]

**Future Projections for Committee:**

The committee will be incorporating those rules adopted at this meeting into the version taking effect for the 2017-2018 season, and updating that, if necessary, with any rule proposals that come out of the December board meeting. [NOTE: There are none anticipated at this time.] That version will be proofed to ensure it is accurate and ready to go (except for the page numbering of the table of contents – that will await the print version proof in March), but will not be forwarded to printing until after we have read the complete minutes from the February Board meeting so that we can verify there are no rules requiring changes (such as color class descriptions/additions/deletions, breed listings, etc.) as a result of that meeting. The final version for printing will then be sent to Central Office before the first of March.
**Action Items:**

1. **Items Pre-noticed to the Annual Meeting Delegates and Passed by Greater than 2/3 margin.**

Ratify the following rule proposals, all passed at the annual by a better than 2/3 majority:

**Phillips:** Section 1 are the ones that passed at the Annual by greater than 2/3.

1a. **Revise Rule 3.12 to Revise Judge Acceptance Requirements for the Same Weekend**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 3.12</th>
<th>Passed by greater than 2/3 at annual – Resolution 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A judge may not accept two shows at different locations in any one weekend in the United States and Canada.</td>
<td>A judge may not accept two CFA shows at different locations in any one weekend in the United States and Canada nor may they officiate at both shows consisting of two one-day shows in the same location. This does not preclude CFA judges accepting guest judge assignments for approved associations when contracted for a CFA show held in conjunction with one or more foreign associations and as approved by the CFA Board of Directors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATIONALE:** The intent of the original show rule was to prohibit judges from judging in North America in one location on Saturday and for another club in another location on Sunday. We are now world-wide and the restriction should be expanded for CFA globally. The original show rule did not prohibit CFA judges from judging both days of two one-day shows held on the same weekend in the same location. Finally, the revision puts into print a long-time practice at in-conjunction shows; particularly, but not limited to, such shows as the Royal Canin Grand Prix held in Moscow and the world’s largest cat show. Often CFA judges will be invited to judge one day of a back-to-back show and also invited the other day to judge for an approved association. This helps our CFA clubs sharing expenses with another club, especially in those areas requiring expensive visas and plane flights. The Board of Directors must approve all in-conjunction shows and also guest judging permission through the JPC. Additionally, this gives exposure for CFA. As Kim Everett once stated, “Our judges are ambassadors of CFA and when they shine, CFA shines. It should be the goal of CFA through its Judging Program panel to create good will throughout the world for cats and not politics”.

Passed as Resolution 11 by greater than 2/3.

**Phillips:** The first one on the list has to do with judging the same weekend in different locations. Right now, the rule only applies to the United States and Canada. This provision makes the rule apply everywhere and it also puts in that judges are not precluded from taking assignments in other associations on the same weekend; i.e., they can judge at a World Cat Congress association show somewhere [one day and a CFA show the other]. I believe this is
yours, Pam. **DelaBar:** Yes, it is. **Hannon:** Do you want to talk about it? **DelaBar:** It passed by 2/3. I move that we ratify it. **Eigenhauser:** Second.

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

**1b – Revise Rule 4.04 to Require License Applications to be Submitted at least 30 Days in Advance of the Show**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 4.04</th>
<th>Passed by greater than 2/3 at annual – Resolution 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for license should be received in the Central Office with a postmark of at least 90 days prior to the opening day of the show on the official form that may be obtained from the Central Office. Applications post-marked with a date less than 90 days from the opening day of the show will incur late filing fees, in addition to the regular show processing and show insurance fees, as specified in the CFA’s current price list. No license will be granted for shows whose license is received in the Central Office with less than 15 days remaining prior to the opening day of the show. A club will be considered not in good standing until the late filing fee is paid. The show secretary of the benching club must submit to the Central Office the following:</td>
<td>Application for license should be received in the Central Office with a postmark of at least 90 days prior to the opening day of the show on the official form that may be obtained from the Central Office. Applications post-marked with a date less than 90 days from the opening day of the show will incur late filing fees, in addition to the regular show processing and show insurance fees, as specified in the CFA’s current price list. No license will be granted for shows whose license is received in the Central Office with less than 30 days remaining prior to the opening day of the show. A club will be considered not in good standing until the late filing fee is paid. The show secretary of the benching club must submit to the Central Office the following:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATIONALE:** While this is the information age, having a show pop up on the schedule 7 days before its being held gives exhibitors little time to make travel arrangements and other plans necessary to attend a show. In the spirit of inclusiveness, we feel that 30 days is a more reasonable timeframe. Passed as Resolution 12 by greater than 2/3.

**Phillips:** 1b is a little more complicated. Once upon a time we had a requirement that shows had to submit their license application within 7 days of a show. You guys changed that to 15 days and then at the Annual the proposal was to make it 30 days. The 30 days is what passed, and that’s all this rule does. It requires you to submit your license application 30 days in advance of the show. **Eigenhauser:** I move we ratify it. **Mastin:** Second.

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

**1c – Revise Rules to Allow Clubs to Provide Benching Space Rather Than Benching Cages – Cages Available for Rental/Purchase**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 5.01.j.</th>
<th>Passed by greater than 2/3 at annual – Resolution 15</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. The size of benching cages.</td>
<td>j. The size of benching cages space. If benching cages are not provided, the flyer must clearly state this. The club is responsible for having wire cages for rent or inexpensive pop ups for purchase in the instance an exhibitor is without a benching cage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 6.24.b.</th>
<th>Passed by greater than 2/3 at annual – Resolution 15</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cats may be pre-entered with the show entry clerk using the CFA feline agility competition form. If the cat is not entered in any other class, it must be pre-entered and a cage provided.</td>
<td>b. Cats may be pre-entered with the show entry clerk using the CFA feline agility competition form. If the cat is not entered in any other class, it must be pre-entered and a cage benching space provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 7.15.c.</th>
<th>Passed by greater than 2/3 at annual – Resolution 15</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. the entry’s cage number, its name (in capital letters with no titles indicated) and spaces for its awards must appear on the same line;</td>
<td>c. the entry’s cage catalog number, its name (in capital letters with no titles indicated) and spaces for its awards must appear on the same line;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 9.03</th>
<th>Passed by greater than 2/3 at annual – Resolution 15</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show management shall assign benching cages for all entries. All entries of a particular exhibitor and those entries for which that exhibitor is the designated agent shall be benched together. No more than one agent may be named by an exhibitor for all cats entered in a show. No change of benching assignments shall be made without the permission of the show manager. Non-benched shows are not permitted. Benching must be provided on the second day of a one day Longhair/one day Shorthair show for cats and kittens who have qualified for the Best of the Bests judging.</td>
<td>Show management shall assign benching cages spaces for all entries. All entries of a particular exhibitor and those entries for which that exhibitor is the designated agent shall be benched together. No more than one agent may be named by an exhibitor for all cats entered in a show. No change of benching assignments shall be made without the permission of the show manager. Non-benched shows are not permitted. Benching must be provided on the second day of a one day Longhair/one day Shorthair show for cats and kittens who have qualified for the Best of the Bests judging.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Rule # 9.08.l. | Passed by greater than 2/3 at annual – Resolution 15 |  |
### Rule # 10.05
Passed by greater than 2/3 at annual – Resolution 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Wording</th>
<th>Proposed Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tables and/or bottoms used under benching cages MUST be covered with paper or plastic.</td>
<td>1. Tables and/or bottoms used under benching cages spaces MUST be covered with paper or plastic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATIONALE:** With the number of cage vendors shrinking, passing this proposal would allow clubs the opportunity to hold a “cageless” benching area wherein the exhibitors will bring their own benching cages, should this option be more financially appealing to the club. Clubs would need to clearly state this on the show flyer. It is recommended that clubs have cages for rent in the event that an exhibitor forgets their tents, or for newbies that are not privy to the different types of show shelters and tents are available on the market today. No changes to the requirements of judging ring cages have been made.

Passed as Resolution 15 by greater than 2/3.

---

**Phillips:** 1c is a little more complicated. It occupies more than one page. It’s about a page and 2/3. Basically what this rule does is, it allows clubs to put on shows where they do not actually have to provide cages for the exhibitors automatically. Exhibitors would be required to either (a) bring their own cage, or (b) rent a cage from the club or something like that, but the club itself is not required by this rule to have cages available – available yes, but not cages for each exhibitor, and it affects a lot of rules. **Hannon:** Is there a motion? **DelaBar:** So moved.  **Mastin:** Second. **Anger:** Was there an effective date specified? **Phillips:** All of the effective dates for all of these rules is the beginning of next show season. That’s all sections. **Anger:** Thank you. **Mastin:** Can I just get a clarification, Monte? You said that the clubs don’t have to provide, but they are required to provide at an expense, no? **Phillips:** They are required to provide the space for the cat. **Hannon:** But they are also required to have a cage available. **Phillips:** They are required to have cages available for rent, purchase, whatever, but they don’t have to provide the cage automatically.

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

**Eigenhauser:** Before we leave this one, I would like to ask Monte to come back with a proposal to put in show flyers what the cost of the last-minute cage would be. I think if you put that on the flyer and set it high enough, it would give people a little fear of the devil and make sure they bring their own cages. **DelaBar:** If they have them. **Eigenhauser:** And if they don’t, they will know how much they are going to pay. I think that’s an important piece of information. **Krzanowski:** You said that you want it to be on show flyers? **Eigenhauser:** Yes, the charge for the last-minute cage.
**Id – Revise Rule 5.01m – Specify Opening Date for Entries on Show Flyer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 5.01 and 5.01.m.</th>
<th>Passed by greater than 2/3 at annual – Resolution 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There must be a printed show flyer and it must include the following:</td>
<td>There must be a printed show flyer published on the CFA website no less than 30 days prior to the show and it must include the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. The specific closing date and the entry limit(s).</td>
<td>m. The specific closing date and the entry limit(s), as well as the date entries will begin to be accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All shows must open for entries no less than 30 days prior to the date of the show.

**RATIONALE:** While this is the information age, having a show pop up on the schedule 7 days before it’s being held gives exhibitors little time to make travel arrangements and other plans necessary to attend a show. In the spirit of inclusiveness, we feel that 30 days is a more reasonable timeframe. There is a show schedule on the homepage of the CFA website where these flyers can be published. Passed as Resolution 16 by greater than 2/3.

**Hannon:** Monte, what’s your next one? **Phillips:** The next one is 1d, the opening date for entries on a show flyer. Right now there is absolutely no requirement to specify when a show opens. This puts a requirement in place no less than 30 days prior to the show. You can open sooner than that, but you have to open for entries at least 30 days in advance of the show. **Hannon:** This prevents the last-minute shows. **Phillips:** It passed by 2/3. **Hannon:** Is there a motion? **DelaBar:** So moved. **Eigenhauser:** Second. **Bizzell:** I have a question about where it requires that there be a show flyer published on the CFA website. We currently have an arrangement where there is a fee for play to get your flyer up on a website that’s owned by CFA. How is that going to affect that? I don’t want to say much in open session. Maybe we should talk about that offline. **Eigenhauser:** The board has the concurrent power to amend this later. We can approve it as is, and if we want to make it a little cleaner on that, we can do it later. **Mastin:** What are we doing for those clubs that are not providing Central Office with a show flyer? It’s happening now. **Hannon:** I brought this up before because I was getting a report from the Central Office on a monthly basis of which clubs had submitted their flyers, because they were having a problem getting the flyers. This board was not interested. They did not care that the Central Office wasn’t getting the flyers. This was in the past two meetings. **DelaBar:** Oh, contraire. I said contact me and I’ll contact the clubs and get them in. **Hannon:** Verna will support me on the fact that they are not getting a lot of those flyers. When I brought it up before, I said we need to have some sort of a penalty to hold over their heads and you guys said no. **DelaBar:** I don’t remember saying no. **Hannon:** There was no interest in doing anything to force the issue. We have had it in the show rules for decades, that you had to provide a copy of the flyer to the Central Office and clubs aren’t doing it. **Kallmeyer:** The China clubs don’t get a license unless they provide it. **Mastin:** So, if we are going to require it but yet not have any consequences, why have a policy? **Eigenhauser:** I can answer that one. Most of our show rules don’t have any
consequences, but we have them anyway because you can file a protest. That’s the remedy for anything that doesn’t have an automated procedure for enforcement. Black: Now that we have a 30 day lead time on licenses, when are the show packages going to be mailed out? Within a week? Two weeks? A month? When is the show package leaving? Phillips: You can open the show anytime you want to. Hannon: She is asking when Central Office mails the box of supplies to these shows. Buete: We try to get them out right after they are licensed. Black: Right after they are licensed, OK. So, I’m just saying, we have 30 days’ lead time. They should have a flyer in Central Office prior to the show package going out. Calhoun: Do you want to hold the package? Hannon: We got a letter from Cotton States addressing their concern. If you license a show a year ahead of time, you don’t have all the information to create a flyer, so it’s difficult to follow the show rule. Phillips: We’re going to get to the one on flyers in a few minutes.

Dobbins: Going with 30 days for the International, we’re not going to get show boxes there. Hannon: You won’t get them there, or you won’t get them there without paying an express fee? Dobbins: They won’t get there without paying exorbitant amounts. Hannon: Alright, but you can get them there. It’s just that it may be a $500 fee if you send it there. Dobbins: Correct.

Phillips: Why would they need the box when they license the show? Black: We’re on another subject now. Hannon: On this rule, we are talking about the cage space, right? Is that what we’re still on? Black: We’re talking about the flyer being in 30 days. Eigenhauser: Accepting entries 30 days before the show.

Anger: I just researched the minutes from June to find the answer about what we talked about when clubs do not submit a show flyer. Basically, everybody wanted to hold off until the delegates voted on the proposals and then we would discuss it in August, which we didn’t do. Hannon: So, here we are, discussing it. Anger: Here we are. Hannon: What do you want to do about flyers that are not submitted? Eigenhauser: Maybe we should see which of these we pass and which we don’t, and then take it up in December. My recommendation is that this is such a routine thing, maybe we should put something in the show rules with the bounced checks; you know, you get a fine and have so many days to clean up the fine, and if you don’t clean it up within that many days, it goes to the board to ratify a suspension. Hannon: Monte, is 1d something that passed by 2/3, so we have no choice. Phillips: They all passed by 2/3 if that’s the question, yes. Hannon: So, we cannot fail to implement this. We don’t have a choice in this. Delabar: We have to ratify it. Hannon: OK, so let’s ratify it.

Hannon called the motion. Motion Carried.

1e – Amend Article XXXVI Section on Breed Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article XXXVI – National Awards, Breed Awards Section</th>
<th>Passed by greater than 2/3 at annual – Resolution 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of Breed/Division**</td>
<td>Best of Breed/Division**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**The title of “Breed Winner (BW)” is limited to **</td>
<td><strong>The title of “Breed Winner” (BW-BWR for regions 1-9, BWC for China, BWI for the International Division) is limited to Championship catalysts receiving the above award (BEST of Breed/Division). 200 point minimum</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60
**Note:** The breed/division and color awards are awarded to only the Championship classes for the National, Divisional, and Regional awards.

RATIONALITY: The same reasons the NW was separated into three areas apply to the breed win. Competing at a global level, even for minority breeds, does not make sense when we don’t do this at the national level. The average exhibitor is more apt to show their cats for a BW, 2nd or 3rd Best of Breed/Division and the playing field should be leveled so this can occur. Previously awarded BW titles will not be affected. For award presentation purposes, the board could decide a number of ways to reduce overall award costs and presentation times at the banquet, such as only the three highest scoring overall cats will be presented at the Annual Awards Banquet or the best from each division. This would not add additional costs or time to the awards ceremony as we would only be awarding 3 awards at the banquet. Another option would be to have 3rd Best of Breed from each area go on stage at once, then 2nd from each area, then Best. The award could go to a rosette or plaque instead of both.

Passed as Resolution 22 by greater than 2/3.

**Phillips:** The very last one that passed by 2/3 creates 3 award titles for the breed winners, plus in the national award areas it also creates another award title for the 2nd and 3rd best. Did I get that right? BWR for Regions 1-9, BWC for China and BWI for the International Division.

**Hannon:** We’re doing the same for best, second and third? So we are going from 3 to 9. <no> **Phillips:** Right now we have just the one breed award. That’s worldwide. This creates one for each of the national areas. **Hannon:** Right now we have one best of breed, one second best of breed and one third best of breed for CFA. Does this not change that to three best of breeds, one in each of the three award areas, and the same for second and third? <yes> So we went from 3 to 9 which is what I said. You guys said no. **Newkirk:** The board members didn’t do very well at math. **Anger:** I would either like to vote on this and then make a subsequent motion, or amend this motion to provide that this be effective this show season, whichever is your preference. **Kuta:** OK, so this would not be changing the title. The title change would only still apply to the
best in each division? **Hannon**: Correct. **Kuta**: OK good, thank you. **Phillips**: What that would mean is that you are going to hand these awards in July or June, whenever the Annual is coming up in 2017, as opposed to waiting until 2018. **Eigenhauser**: I suggest we vote on this as is, with the effective date May 1, and if somebody wants to make a motion to make it effective this year, then that can be a separate motion. **Anger**: I will, thank you. **Hannon**: Did somebody make a motion on this? **Newkirk**: I will. **Eigenhauser**: Second. **Hannon**: All those in favor of the motion, as presented.

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

**Hannon**: Now, is somebody going to make a motion? **Anger**: I move that this be effective this show season, so essentially effective immediately. **Krzanowski**: Second. **Hannon**: Any discussion?

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

2 – **Resolutions that passed by majority or from the Floor at the Annual Meeting (Advisory to Board) – Presented Here for Approval**

Approve the following rule proposals passed at the annual by a majority, all to become effective with the next show season.

2a – **Create Gold/Silver/Bronze levels for Champion Titles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 2.04</th>
<th>Passed by a majority at annual – Resolution 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Wording</td>
<td>Proposed Wording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A BENCH CHAMPION or PREMIER is one that is present and qualified for competition and judged in one ring as a Champion or Premier, Champions or Premiers, including Opens competing as Champions or Premiers, transferred to Grand Champion or Grand Premier after the first day of a two day show will be counted as a Champion or Premier in all rings. Such cat is presumed to be benched and present for competition throughout the entire show. Any cat competing in a ring, including a disqualified cat, is considered a benched cat for Grand Championship and Grand Premiership scoring purposes.</td>
<td>A BENCH CHAMPION or PREMIER is one that is present and qualified for competition and judged in one ring as a Champion or Premier, except in China. Champions or Premiers, including Opens competing as Champions or Premiers of any title (including Bronze, Silver, or Gold Champions or Premiers), transferred to Grand Champion or Grand Premier after the first day of a two day show will be counted as a Champion or Premier in all rings. Such cat is presumed to be benched and present for competition throughout the entire show. Any cat competing in a ring, including a disqualified cat, is considered a benched cat for Grand Championship and Grand Premiership scoring purposes, excluding China.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Rule # 2.07.c. | Passed by a majority at annual – Resolution 7 |
| Existing Wording | Proposed Wording |

c. The CHAMPION CLASS is for cats that have completed Championships in this Association, and for which the required Championship claim form and fee has been mailed to the Central Office, claimed on-line or filed with the show master clerk. The Champion Class includes opens (with either temporary or permanent registration numbers) for competition purposes. Opens are listed in the show catalog as opens and the judge’s book as champions. Opens compete in the champion class and count as champions.

Rule # 2.08  
Passed by a majority at annual – Resolution 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Wording</th>
<th>Proposed Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLASS refers to the competitive divisions within the competitive categories as follows: Kitten, AOV, Provisional Breed, Miscellaneous (Non-Competitive) and Household Pet classes; Novice, Champion (including Opens) and Grand Champion classes; Novice, Premier (including Opens) and Grand Premier classes.</td>
<td>CLASS refers to the competitive divisions within the competitive categories as follows: Kitten, AOV, Provisional Breed, Miscellaneous (Non-Competitive) and Household Pet classes; Novice, Champion (including Opens and Bronze, Silver, or Gold Champions) and Grand Champion classes; Novice, Premier (including Opens and Bronze, Silver, or Gold Premiers) and Grand Premier classes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rule # 2.23.b.  
Passed by a majority at annual – Resolution 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Wording</th>
<th>Proposed Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. The following classes will be recognized for neuters and spays of each Championship Color Class: Grand Premier, Premier, Open and Novice. The eligibility for each class will be determined in the same manner as for the corresponding class in Championship competition.</td>
<td>b. The following classes will be recognized for neuters and spays of each Championship Color Class: Grand Premier, Premier (including Gold, Silver, and Bronze Premiers), Open and Novice. The eligibility for each class will be determined in the same manner as for the corresponding class in Championship competition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rule # 6.11  
Passed by a majority at annual – Resolution 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Wording</th>
<th>Proposed Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A cat that has been confirmed a Champion, Grand Champion, Premier or Grand Premier may be eligible for entry under a different color and/or</td>
<td>A cat that has been confirmed a Champion (including Bronze, Silver, or Gold Champion), Grand Champion, Premier (including Bronze,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pattern than its confirmed color and/or pattern (except Sphynx, which are shown with no color or pattern description listed). It may be shown as an Open in the Champion/Premier class at the show in which the owner decides to make the change. These cats may not continue to compete as the new color and/or pattern at any further shows until the Central Office has been notified of the color and/or pattern change and payment of the current fee for a corrected registration has been submitted. Points and titles earned under the previously confirmed color and/or pattern are not carried over to the new color and/or pattern and the cat must compete again as an Open in the Champion/Premier class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 7.02</th>
<th>Passed by a majority at annual – Resolution 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The entry clerk or a designated representative is responsible for preparing the judges’ books, including those for judging Best of the Best competitions, which shall be in numerical, but not necessarily consecutive catalog order. A minimum of two (2) lines must be left between color classes. The color class number, age (indicated in years and months) and the class for each entry must appear in the judges’ books. At least two (2) spaces should be left between each class (Champion and Grand Champion) to allow for transfers. Opens shall be listed as champions or premiers in the judge’s book, as applicable. Champions and opens competing as champions shall be listed within each color class in sequence by age, youngest to oldest. Premiers and opens competing as premiers shall be listed within each color class in sequence by age, youngest to oldest. When a color class includes entries of more than one color/tabby pattern, the exact color/tabby pattern indicated on the entry form must be entered in the judges’ books unless the breed is Sphynx, in which case no color or tabby pattern will be listed in the judges’ books. At the end of each breed, the show entry clerk shall type a form for the following awards: Best of Breed/Division, Second Best of Breed/Division for Kittens, Championship and Premiership, and where necessary, Best Champion/Premier of Breed/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The entry clerk or a designated representative is responsible for preparing the judges’ books, including those for judging Best of the Bests competitions, which shall be in numerical, but not necessarily consecutive catalog order. A minimum of two (2) lines must be left between color classes. The color class number, age (indicated in years and months) and the class for each entry must appear in the judges’ books. At least two (2) spaces should be left between each class (Champion and Grand Champion) to allow for transfers. Opens and Bronze, Silver, or Gold level Champions and Premiers shall be listed as champions or premiers in the judge’s book, as applicable. Champions (including Bronze, Silver, or Gold Champions) and opens competing as champions shall be listed within each color class in sequence by age, youngest to oldest. Premiers (including Bronze, Silver, or Gold Premiers) and Opens competing as premiers shall be listed within each color class in sequence by age, youngest to oldest. When a color class includes entries of more than one color/tabby pattern, the exact color/tabby pattern indicated on the entry form must be entered in the judges’ books unless the breed is Sphynx, in which case no color or tabby pattern will be listed in the judges’ books. At the end of each breed, the show entry clerk shall type a form for the following awards: Best of Breed/Division, Second Best of Breed/Division for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Division.

At the end of the Veterans Class, the entry clerk shall type a form for Best through Fifth Best Cat and, if applicable, Sixth through Tenth Best Cat.

Rule # 7.10

Passed by a majority at annual – Resolution 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Wording</th>
<th>Proposed Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All entries must appear in numerical order (but not necessarily consecutive) in the printed catalog that is required at shows held under these rules. No addendum to the catalog is permitted except as provided by rule 12.06. The catalog shall list entries in their correct breed, color and/or pattern (except Sphynx, which are shown with no color or pattern description listed), and competitive category. It is recognized that occasional transfers will be necessary due to entry error or late change in status; flagrant disregard of this show rule will be subject to disciplinary action. Transfers of competitive status, from Open to Champion or Premier, Champion or Premier to Grand Champion or Grand Premier, filed in accordance with rules 27.05 and 28.06 are valid catalog changes.</td>
<td>All entries must appear in numerical order (but not necessarily consecutive) in the printed catalog that is required at shows held under these rules. No addendum to the catalog is permitted except as provided by rule 12.06. The catalog shall list entries in their correct breed, color and/or pattern (except Sphynx, which are shown with no color or pattern description listed), and competitive category. It is recognized that occasional transfers will be necessary due to entry error or late change in status; flagrant disregard of this show rule will be subject to disciplinary action. Transfers of competitive status, from Open to Champion or Premier, Champion or Premier to Grand Champion or Grand Premier, filed in accordance with rules 27.05 and 28.06 are valid catalog changes. No catalog changes are required for transfers within the tiered Champion or Premier titles (i.e. Bronze to Silver, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rule # 7.15.e.

Passed by a majority at annual – Resolution 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Wording</th>
<th>Proposed Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e. the competitive class is not included in the group headings, but is noted below each catalog entry number as in the following example. The following abbreviations should be used: “MISC” for Miscellaneous; “PROV” for Provisional; “AOV” for Any Other Variety; “KIT” for Kitten; “NOV” for Novice; “OPN” for Open; “CH” for Champion; “GRC” for Grand Champion; “PR” for Premier; “GRP” for Grand Premier; “HHP” for Household Pet; “VET” for Veteran Class; “EXH” for Exhibition Only. Example:</td>
<td>e. the competitive class is not included in the group headings, but is noted below each catalog entry number as in the following example. The following abbreviations should be used: “MISC” for Miscellaneous; “PROV” for Provisional; “AOV” for Any Other Variety; “KIT” for Kitten; “NOV” for Novice; “OPN” for Open; “CH” for Champion (including all Bronze, Silver or Gold Champions); “GRC” for Grand Champion; “PR” for Premier (including all Bronze, Silver or Gold Premiers); “GRP” for Grand Premier; “HHP” for Household Pet; “VET” for Veteran Class; “EXH” for Exhibition Only. Example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rule # 10.23.c.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Passed by a majority at annual – Resolution 7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. If any of the entry information as printed in the catalog is in error, or a registration number or household pet recording number has not been printed in the catalog, it is the exhibitor’s responsibility to provide corrections of the information printed in error and/or the lacking registration or recording number to the master clerk or the Entry Clerk or their designee (individual handling check-in), as appropriate. An official catalog correction request form must be used and the exhibitor submitting the form must obtain a copy of the catalog correction form signed by the master clerk, or designated representative, showing the correct information has been supplied for corrections of erroneous or missing entry information involving the name, registration or recording number, birth date, ownership, region of residence of the cat, or competitive category (Novice, Open, Champion, Premier, Grand Champion, Grand Premier, Household Pet). This receipt should be retained by the exhibitor in the event any question might arise at a future date regarding an entry. For erroneous information regarding sex, age, color/tabby pattern, color class, competitive category (changes to or from Grand Champion/Grand Premier only) or competitive class of the cat, the correction must be made on the absentee/transfer sheet with the entry clerk or their designee (individual handling check-in), or, if check-in is completed, with each ring clerk prior to the cat being judged. Correction of erroneous information regarding the sire, dam, or breeder is not required.</td>
<td>c. If any of the entry information as printed in the catalog is in error, or a registration number or household pet recording number has not been printed in the catalog, it is the exhibitor’s responsibility to provide corrections of the information printed in error and/or the lacking registration or recording number to the master clerk or the Entry Clerk or their designee (individual handling check-in), as appropriate. An official catalog correction request form must be used and the exhibitor submitting the form must obtain a copy of the catalog correction form signed by the master clerk, or designated representative, showing the correct information has been supplied for corrections of erroneous or missing entry information involving the name, registration or recording number, birth date, ownership, region of residence of the cat, or competitive category (Novice, Open, Champion, Premier, Grand Champion, Grand Premier, Household Pet). This receipt should be retained by the exhibitor in the event any question might arise at a future date regarding an entry. For erroneous information regarding sex, age, color/tabby pattern, color class, competitive category (changes to or from Grand Champion/Grand Premier only) or competitive class of the cat, the correction must be made on the absentee/transfer sheet with the entry clerk or their designee (individual handling check-in), or, if check-in is completed, with each ring clerk prior to the cat being judged. Correction of erroneous information regarding the sire, dam, or breeder is not required. Changes to titles within the Bronze, Silver, or Gold tiers of Champions or Premiers are not required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rule # 12.17</strong></th>
<th><strong>Passed by a majority at annual – Resolution 7</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The master clerk is responsible for counting the</td>
<td>The master clerk is responsible for counting the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
number of cats and kittens present and competing in the Kitten, Championship, Veterans, Household Pets, and Premiership Classes, as well as the number of Champions and Premiers present and competing. He shall have these numbers available for the exhibitors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 12.19</th>
<th>Passed by a majority at annual – Resolution 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The master clerk will accept completed official championship/premiership claim forms and Household Pet Recording Number applications. In addition, the master clerk will also accept correction slips that transfer a cat from Open, Champion or Premier to Grand in either the Championship or Premiership classes from the owner/agent. The master clerk will provide the show secretary with a list of the catalog numbers of these transfers.</td>
<td>The master clerk will accept completed official championship/premiership claim forms and Household Pet Recording Number applications. In addition, the master clerk will also accept correction slips that transfer a cat from Open, Champion or Premier to Grand in either the Championship or Premiership classes from the owner/agent. Correction slips are not required for transfer between tiers of the Bronze, Silver, or Gold Champions or Premiers. The master clerk will provide the show secretary with a list of the catalog numbers of these transfers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 27.06</th>
<th>Passed by a majority at annual – Resolution 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New rule.</td>
<td>A cat eligible and shown in the Champion or Premier class will compete concurrently for the Grand Champion or Grand Premier title, and the Bronze, Silver and Gold level of Champion/Premier. A cat can earn points toward these Bronze, Silver and Gold level of Champion/Premier points in any type of ring, e.g. Allbreed, Longhair, Shorthair or Breed specialty. Points are earned in the same amounts and percentages as those described in Rule 28.02 and 28.03.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. To qualify for any Bronze, Silver or Gold Champion/Premier title, a cat must have at least one win of Best Champion/Premier, Second Best Champion/Premier or Third Best Champion, or a final placement award in either a CFA Specialty or Allbreed final.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Fifty (50) Grand Championship points are</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rule # 28.04.f. Passed by a majority at annual – Resolution 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Wording</th>
<th>Proposed Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. An Open must complete the requirements for the Champion/Premier class in order to qualify for the title of Grand Champion/Grand Premier. Opens may not compete as Grand Champions or Grand Premiers until all of the requirements for the Championship or Premiership claim have been met, including the filing of the claim form.</td>
<td>f. An Open must complete the requirements for the Champion/Premier class in order to qualify for the titles of Bronze, Silver, or Gold Champion/Premier or Grand Champion/Grand Premier. Opens may not compete as Grand Champions or Grand Premiers until all of the requirements for the Championship or Premiership claim have been met, including the filing of the claim form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATIONALE:** This proposal would add multiple tiers to the Champion/Premier title. In doing so, more people will be encouraged to show cats that they are not sure will be easy Grands, which are now not shown past the six qualifying rings.

We all know that massive numbers of entries arrive as Opens and, after obtaining the CH title after 6 Qualifying Rings, go home never to be seen again. Some are cats that owners think might be too hard to Grand; others are in breeds that do not always have time to Grand before they need to be bred. In the last 12 years there has been a 43% decline in entries. Fewer than 8% of cats shown in Championship became Grand Champions in 2014; the Premiership Grands have not cracked 9% in any year since 2008. In 2014, 1,338 cats became Grand Champions – out of 18,578 cats shown in Championship. If even a small percentage of those 18,000+ cats can be persuaded to return to show halls to obtain a new level title, it will be a boon to our member clubs. Similarly, only 623 of 8,686 cats showed to Grand Premiership. The recapture of even a small number of these entries can easily be the difference between a club folding or continuing show production.

We also see a need for this title for added meaning to the Champion title, as well as to meet the need of an exhibitor who must right now only use the phrase “Grand pointed.” A Grand pointed cat could mean a cat with 1 point, or with 199 points. Other breeders reviewing pedigrees have no way of knowing anything about a cat with a CH title other than it has obtained six qualifying rings.

This would only apply to cats earning points toward Grand Championship/Premiership. Points would be earned ONLY in Champion/Premier finals or in breed/division Champion/Premier points (purple ribbon). This would accrue in every ring or show over multiple seasons. The levels would be:

- Champion (CH) – six qualifying rings
Bronze Champion (CHB) – six qualifying rings; one final; 50 Grand points toward GC
Silver Champion (CHS) – six qualifying rings; one final; 100 Grand points toward GC
Gold Champion (CHG) – Six qualifying rings; one final; 150 Grand points toward GC
Premier (PR) – six qualifying rings
Bronze Premier (PRB) – six qualifying rings; one final; 20 Grand points toward GP
Silver Premier (PRS) – six qualifying rings, one final; 40 Grand points toward GP
Gold Premier (PRG) – six qualifying rings; one final; 60 Grand points toward GP

Once the Grand title is achieved the initial titles related to Champion/Premier will drop off. As each title is obtained the old one is replaced (i.e. rather than a CH, CHB, CHS, the cat would be a CHS upon earning 100 Grand points). The points are cumulative through the levels. That is, a cat does not start out back at 0 after achieving any level. The additional titles are automatically conferred as the Grand points are earned – there is no need for a claims process, or additional charges, as no award or certificate will be issued until the Grand is achieved.

Passed as Resolution 7 by majority (not 2/3)

Phillips: OK, 2a. We are now on the proposals that were passed at the Annual by a simple majority. They did not receive 2/3, so these are up for grabs. You can either pass them or fail them. 2a is the one that creates the 3 levels of champion titles, where you end up with gold champions, bronze champions, silver champions. It occupies about the next 4-1/2 pages of different rules that all need to be changed. It’s a long set of proposals, but what they are all doing basically is creating this three-tiered champion philosophy so that, based on how many points you have earned, you’re either a bronze champion or you’re a gold champion or you’re a silver champion before you become a grand champion. DelaBar: So moved. Phillips: One thing it does change; right now, you can earn the various titles without making a final as long as you win inside the breed with purple ribbons. This does require you to make a final to get gold, silver or bronze. Mastin: I’ll second. Newkirk: Are we doing all of them, since they are all related? Anger: Yes. Phillips: They are all related. Newkirk: So, we’re doing the whole group of them?
Phillips: Right. Newkirk: That’s what the motion is? It covers all of them. Hannon: What we’re discussing then is the concept. Do we want 3 different levels? DelaBar: I am for this. I have seen this work in other associations in my region and it does give people something to work for. People in Europe – and I’m going to use Europe, and I’m sorry of that offends anybody but I have to use Europe – they do not have as many cats per household as you will find within the U.S. They will show a cat for multiple years because they are collecting additional titles. These people come back to show after show after show. They have something to work for. That’s why I am for this. Now, the problem I have, I don’t see how we can implement this right away until our computer system gets totally online. If you have a one-show grand, you can go from open to grand without having to claim these other titles, but this does give people something to work for. We just need to work on the concept more. Colilla: We need to do a study how much it’s going to cost. Kallmeyer: About 20% of the opens become grands. Hannon: CFA wide? Kallmeyer: Yes. It’s really high. The numbers Monte used at the Annual, he took the total cats shown, including grands and everything, and then divided the number of grands into that, so his ratios
were totally out of line. Most of the grands make it within 3 shows. If you’re going to grand, you will do it in 3 shows. DelaBar: In what areas are you doing this? Kallmeyer: It’s CFA wide. It’s something to think about, but it will require programming changes that are kind of not on the schedule. DelaBar: That’s what I said. I like the concept but we can’t do it right away. Calhoun: I think it is pretty much stated, but my concern would be the programming costs to do this. Is it feasible and what are we asking Central Office to do differently? I think we need to understand all that before we can move forward. Black: Is Central Office going to mail out a certificate every time they reach one of these levels? DelaBar: It’s something that has to be claimed. Black: Do they pay at each level? That’s not clear in this proposal. Phillips: Point of clarification. The cat would only have one championship title. It will either be nothing, CH, Bronze CH, Silver CH, Gold CH or Grand. Hannon: But you didn’t address her question of whether they have to claim it. Phillips: They won’t carry all those titles, just whatever it’s got. You could go all the way to grand in one show. Black: But what if I only achieved the first level? Do I have to turn that in to Central Office and pay a fee to get that title? Phillips: Yes. For a CH you’ve got to do that. Bizzell: And then the next level the same thing and the next level the same thing? Hannon: If you’re doing it at subsequent shows, but if you just pass through the whole thing at one show – Black: I’m not talking about the same show. Hannon: You will have to submit a claim form for each level. Black: We don’t do that now. Hannon: We don’t have the levels now. Black: I’m talking about when you grand. DelaBar: Yeah, but you do for champion, Kathy. Black: But I’m already a champion. Newkirk: A lot of associations will charge a fee for each level, so if you grand then you have to pay the fees in between to get up there, and so that would be the money that you would use to pay for the programming. Even if you only charge $5 for a championship and $2 for the intermediate levels, you still make money off of it because there is an associated cost to it, OK? The point I wanted to make is, we’re saying in our minutes how much money we’re making and now we’re whining about having to pay a little bit of money here in programming to make things that our delegates voted for. Eigenhauser: I’m a little fuzzy on the finals you need, because it says to go from champion to bronze, you need one final and 50 points. Then to go to silver, you need a final and 100 points. Is that an additional final, or is it the same final? Black: I think it’s one final. Phillips: As I read the rule, the only cat that has to file a claim form is an open. Hannon: Alright, but what about this question? With a bronze you have to make a final. Then you go to silver. Do you have to make a second final, or does that first final qualify you? Phillips: Not according to this. Hannon: You’re saying what? One final is all that’s required. DelaBar: No. Phillips: One final qualifies for all. Anger: The way it’s written is cumulative, because for gold champion you don’t need to have 6 qualifying rings again. You already did that, so I think that you are a gold champion if you have already achieved all of the silver qualifications plus what it says for gold – not an additional final and not an additional 150 grand points. Eigenhauser: At the very least, I think it would be clearer if we rewrote it. Instead of saying “6 qualifying rings for each level,” say “meet the requirements for bronze plus,” “meet the requirements for silver plus,” so we know what additional thing is required at each increment. Calhoun: The only thing that I was going to comment is that I’m not saying I’m against it. What I’m saying is that I want to better understand what’s the cost and then how do we offset it in fees? Hannon: So, can we turn this over to the IT Committee to come back to us with the potential cost to implement this? Moser: And also how long is it going to take for the computer system to be able to do it? If the computer system can’t do it, is that a problem? Auth: It’s going to be at least a year. Colilla: It can be done, it’s just a matter of how much programming and how
much you want to spend. **Moser:** Oh, so we’ll have to spend money to do the programming. **Colilla:** Yeah, somebody has to write it. **Phillips:** This isn’t going to be a freebie, you’re right. **Wilson:** It says at the end of the rationale, *The additional titles are automatically conferred as the Grand points are earned – there is no need for a claims process, or additional charges, as no award or certificate will be issued until the Grand is achieved.* Somehow it will magically occur, it will cost us nothing and no one will pay for it. **Hannon:** But it’s going to cost us something because that’s additional programming. **Phillips:** The only claim form you have to file is the one as an open, to become a champion. **Krzanowski:** However, I think we need to address the programming issues before we even discuss how we’re going to formulate this particular thing, but since this did not pass by 2/3, we’re free to tweak it as much as we want, including charging fees and requiring them to submit a claim form. **Newkirk:** I suggest that we table this and let them get us the information we need and then pick it up at the teleconference. **Kuta:** Is the board’s only issue the cost, or just the idea of having multiple titles? We haven’t addressed that yet. I just would like to hear other opinions on that. **Wilson:** Maybe we could have a straw poll on the idea, don’t you think? **Hannon:** So, if we don’t like the idea, we don’t need to go to the trouble of checking out the cost. **Wilson:** If the board likes the concept, we should know that and then you know how to proceed. **DelaBar:** Let me withdraw my motion. **Hannon:** Withdraw your motion. **DelaBar:** I withdraw my motion. **Hannon:** Alright, all those in favor of the concept of three levels. Let us have a straw poll on all those in favor of the concept of a bronze, silver and gold level for champions. [An even split] **Eigenhauser:** I’m kind of in the middle because I think this is too many levels. I can see one intermediate level, but this many is just getting too confusing. **Hannon:** Well then, you need to vote no on this. **Eigenhauser:** I’m abstaining. **Mastin:** Just a clarification. Didn’t we just approve this and Rachel did an addendum? **Anger:** That was the one before. **Mastin:** OK, sorry. **Hannon:** All those in favor of the three levels of champions, please raise your hands. [9 in favor, 9 against] **Eigenhauser:** Then I will change my abstain to a yes because I’m OK with levels. I just think it’s a bit overkill but I’m OK with levels. **Newkirk:** Is that 10 yes then? **Anger:** 10 yes. **Hannon:** Motion carried on the straw ballot. So we’re going to now investigate. We’re going to cost this, so that might change some of these votes. In the cost valuation, we will also find out how long they anticipate it taking. So, this is something that goes to the IT Chair, right? Dick, will you make sure that the IT Chairs knows about it.

**Tabled.**

2b – *Revise Rule 3.02d to allow up to ten guest judging assignments per season and three per club*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 3.02.d.</th>
<th>Passed by majority at annual – Resolution 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Individuals may guest judge for CFA a maximum of five (5) times per show season and a maximum of two (2) times per club per show season.</td>
<td>d. Individuals may guest judge for CFA a maximum of five (5) ten (10) times per show season and a maximum of two (2) three (3) times per club per show season.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RATIONALE: We simply do not have enough eligible CFA judges on our judging panel to fill all our shows with only CFA judges on a global basis. Our attrition rate of judges through retirement, etc., is greater than our acceptance of new judges into the program.

Passed as Resolution 10 by majority (not 2/3).

Hannon: Monte, next. Phillips: 2b. This is kind of a simple one. This is one basically for the International Division people mostly. Right now, our guest judging requirement is 5 times per show season, two times maximum for a club. This changes it to 10 times per show season, three times maximum for a club. Newkirk: So moved. Mastin: Second. Hannon: Is there discussion on this one? Anger: I would like to make this effective immediately, so I will be having a subsequent motion, or Pam can do it. Hannon: Is there any further discussion? Auth: I am vehemently opposed to this. It goes back to my – you’re going to hear this a lot from me, “brand of CFA.” If you go and allow to have this many times, allowing a guest judge, you are diluting what CFA means to the exhibitors. They are guest judges who we have approved of, but they are still not to the level that we have for CFA judges. They haven’t jumped through all of the hoops. Moreover, if someone wants to judge 10 times as a guest judge in CFA or make themselves available for that, they should come and apply to CFA. I like this as an analogy – if you want to go see the new Jason Bourne films and then you look at it and it’s Bill Murray playing Jason Bourne, it’s not Matt Damon. So, it’s like you are substituting. If someone wants to go to a CFA show, they want to see CFA judges. Anger: But if Bill Murray wants to be Jason Bourne, he can just come over and be as good as Matt Damon? Auth: He could. Anger: But that wasn’t my point. Auth: He is just as good an actor but he’s not Matt Damon. Anger: I agree wholeheartedly about the CFA brand. Fortunately, we have guest judges who allow us to continue our CFA brand exposure, when our judging roster is not currently deep enough to fulfill the demand. This is what we are experiencing over and over when I send out these repeat ISO emails begging CFA judges to respond. The clubs want to hire CFA judges but they are not getting enough judges to meet the need. Second, and I’m sure other people want to speak about this, but some judges don’t want to come to CFA. They don’t want to leave their association. They have a home there. There would be no reason for them to come to us. Other judges are – I had a student judge in another association who specifically wanted to become a judge there as her path to become a CFA judge, because she couldn’t fulfill our requirements due to geography. So, it works both ways. That’s my statement which I am sure will be expounded on shortly. DelaBar: I have 30 clubs in Region 9. Twenty-nine of the 30 clubs support this. Only one does not. Right now, we do not have enough judges in Region 9 to staff a 6 ring show. It’s just not there. We ask for people to see if they can come over. I go to Rachel and say, “Such-and-such a club can spend €500 on a plane ticket. Could you use your miles and we will give you that?” We get no takers. Right now, I’m begging to find a judge to be our 6th judge in Tallinn, Estonia. These clubs don’t have a lot of money. When you get into Russia, these clubs have to pay to get an invitation to bring over a judge from outside of Russia. Then, for me, I can’t get the 3 year visa. I have to pay €218, which I did a week ago, to get my 6 month, 2 times into Russia visa. It’s expensive. You don’t have the effects of the sanctions that the EU and the US have put against Russia. It has not only hurt the Russian economy, it has hurt the European economy. I don’t think it has the effect on the US economy. So, the clubs, they chose the CFA brand. They want the CFA brand, but we’re in a Catch 22, and the proverbial between a rock and a hard place, because to put on a CFA show we
need judges. We’re putting on 2 ring shows, we’re putting on 3 ring shows, but we also want to put on the 6 ring shows, and we need the judges to do it. Now, to go up from 5 to 10, we want the judges that know what’s going on. I train the new guest judges that come over, we hold clerking schools. The last school that I taught, we had 14 students, 2 of which were FIFe judges. These are people that we can use to help fill out our shows. They want to see us succeed because they also like going to the other shows, they also like being helpful. They like the cat fancy. These are not bad judges because they are not CFA judges, these are people who are very experienced. I daresay, most of them have more genetic knowledge than our CFA judging panel does. We have a lot of things that we can learn from each other. This is not degrading our brand. We’re trying to build our brand, and if I have a guest judge in my region, it doesn’t lessen the experience that John has in his region with his shows, or any other region. It does not hurt their regions; if anything, it helps build CFA. That’s why we have them.

**Newkirk:** To me, when we are making exception after exception after exception to this rule, then that says the rule is not working. We can pass this, we still may run into making exceptions into the future, but this will lessen the burden of our Secretary, who once or twice a week is sending out an exception to the rule. We just did it yesterday. We had to make an exception because somebody max’ed out on the 5 shows, so that a show could be sponsored. You can sit there and you can limit it and say 5 and it’s no good for the CFA brand because somebody is not a CFA judge, but what’s the alternative? If they can’t get judges, they cancel the show, and that’s not good for the CFA brand.

**Wilson:** I spoke against this at the Annual and I agree with Mary’s statement. I stated much the same thing at previous meetings. However, I think we do need to be realistic. The Judging Program Committee is supporting this, with the caveat that it will eliminate the exceptions, and clubs in Region 9 will continue to either limit their rings, think about if they only need judge to cancelling a ring if it’s the last minute, and/or making those offers of travel arrangements earlier. I looked at if I could get to Tallinn. If I can get to Helsinki and take the ferry and all of this, I would have gone but it just becomes overwhelming trying to figure out how it’s going to work that I didn’t respond. So, I think we just need to cooperate a little bit more on this and we need to do a much better job in both the ID and in Region 9 of supporting these guest judges. We’re not giving them the best clerks, the master clerks are letting paperwork go by. At that Andorra show, two of the guest judges’ paperwork was horrible. Where were the clerks? I wrote to you about that. It’s something that Region 9 and the ID need to take under consideration. It’s something they need to do. I didn’t realize how important that was until I was guest judging in Australia. They assign you an experienced steward that looks over your paperwork on every page to make sure you understand how to mark it. We should be doing that. I actually had written up before the Annual a fairly complex guest judging program training and review process, but I just threw it out. I’m now spending more time trying to figure out how to train guest judges to judge CFA shows than I am training our own judges. So, I support this. I think there is a need for it, absolutely, but I really do want to see less exceptions and I want to see more advance planning and I want to see these judges and even newer ones – I realize the experienced ones can jump right in many times, but I want to see newer ones brought along too so that clubs have a variety of judges to pick from.

**DelaBar:** Just one thing, Annette. The Tallinn vacancy happened over Kharchenko, who just told us last week that she was not going to be able to judge. **Wilson:** I’m not talking about that one. **DelaBar:** Well, you brought up that one. **Wilson:** But the whole idea of maybe a couple of rings for a show next April, see if there are judges willing now. You have to plan in advance if you want to use miles or travel, if you want to make a vacation of it. **DelaBar:** I agree with that. I
just wanted you to say that Tallinn happened because we lost another CFA judge. I’m in total agreement. I have put this out. I am teaching another clerking school in Tallinn. We already have 6 students. They are all from Norway. We don’t have a club in Norway yet, but we will. We had the best clerk in Russia with our new guest judge last week in Russia. Supposedly, he did a phenomenal job, but he had the best clerk. I had as my clerk the person that put on the show in Andorra and I made sure that that got through. I also said, “you need to put on 6 ring shows.” I’m pushing the 6 ring shows. This week, it’s sad to say but in Manchester, England, we had 20 entries. When they pulled the Household Pets because they couldn’t get anybody to bring them, they ended up with 7. It is costing an arm and a leg for the UK. So, as I said, I am begging for help. I am past being aggressive or being very firm asking for help; I am now begging for help and that’s why I am now asking for this. **Kuta:** So, with these numbers of 10 and 3, would that have covered every exception we made? **DelaBar:** Yes. **Kuta:** Like in the past, if we were to go back and look at the ones we have approved. **DelaBar:** Yes. **Wilson:** We’re only 1/4 through the show season. **DelaBar:** But for last year, yes. **Wilson:** Maybe. **Kuta:** If we applied this to previous seasons, like are these numbers, will we have to change these numbers again? **DelaBar:** No, because hopefully I have other people coming up. One thing I want on the record is that Region 9 is going to pay for people to go to the BAOS. We’re going to pay their fee for them to go. We have 3 signed up to go already for November. I have another transfer judge that will be applying that I have been working on. This one’s good. We have others, so it’s not like we’re just sitting here begging for all these extra guest judges. We are so active in trying to build our clubs, our shows and our judging panel. They must be half way good because they spend a lot of time in the ID. **Kallmeyer:** Point out too, I guess if I had my druthers I wouldn’t like as many guest judges. However, in Europe, one of our US-based competitors, the reason they have been so successful is that they have gone with basically foreign judges to get the shows on in Europe. I think we really are at a disadvantage now for not having the talents. There are certainly cases in Asia where we’re having so many shows that we’re having to go outside just to keep the volume that we would like. **Moser:** I don’t know if anybody – Rachel sent out this letter in opposition of this rule. She sent it out for the last meeting in August, but this should have been for this meeting. Basically, there were some statistics done by a judge over in Europe. It basically states that there’s a number of different issues, but of the 11 guest judges that have been taking assignments, of the total of 66 assignments, they took 19 in Europe and they took 47 in Asia. So, my thing is, they want to guest judge but it doesn’t look like they want to guest judge in Europe, they want to guest judge in Asia. Now that, to me, that’s an issue. So, if you’re looking for guest judges for Region 9, why aren’t they judging in Region 9? Why are they going to Asia. **DelaBar:** One, we’re not limited to where we can judge. We’re independent contractors. I can’t say, “oh, you are from Norway; therefore, you can only guest judge in Region 9,” unless we want to put on other parameters, we can’t limit the clubs. Clubs are allowed to invite who they want to and who the Judging Program approves. **Moser:** I realize that, but your argument is that you don’t have any judges in Europe, but your guest judges are going to Asia. They’re not going to Europe. **DelaBar:** But we have a lot in Europe. That’s the one club out of the 30 that doesn’t agree with guest judges. **Wilson:** I appreciate that information. I see this as a mid-term solution. I really hope that at some point we can crunch this back down again, but we have a need for these judges in both places. If someone invites you to a show and it’s a show in China, if you can get a visa and you don’t mind going to China, you go. If then a club in Europe puts on a show and they invite you, in order to get an assignment, there’s many more shows – there’s multiple shows
every weekend in Asia. There are not multiple shows every weekend in Europe. So yeah, it’s just like people here. There are judges here in the US that are judging a lot in Asia because that’s who is inviting them. You know what? If you get an invitation, you’re going to take it. DelaBar: Just one thing. Most of these judges still have to get permission from their organization and permission from the JPC before they can judge for us. Auth: I have one last comment. I know the shows want to be able to have these guest judges because they are less expensive. They are local and they don’t cost as much to bring over, but I’m speaking from what exhibitors in Europe have told me, that they are getting tired of seeing so many guest judges that they don’t feel like they are going to a CFA show. DelaBar: That is true, but they want to have shows more. So, as I said, we’re between a rock and a hard place. If we can’t put on a 6 ring show, we can’t get exhibitors because they can’t champion a cat. If we don’t have enough judges that we can afford, surely you can say, “oh, you have to hire US judges,” then I want US to hire European judges. But, it’s frustrating because we totally want to build our brand. By having these guest judges, yes we are slowly getting these people interested and just maybe we can get them to come over to CFA. Newkirk: By us taking in the new trainees, we’ve got a few more that are coming up. This is sort of a short-term problem that hopefully in the long run, in a year or two, we will have these guys up and trained, and they will be taking some of those guest judging spots. Hannon: But Darrell, they are going to be judging in Asia. [laughter] Newkirk: Not until they are approved in one or whatever that stupid question was [on the judges’ test] that I missed. Moser: To Darrell’s point then, if that’s the case, why are we making a show rule change? Why aren’t we just making an interim change then until this clears up, instead of making a show rule? Because once it’s a show rule – DelaBar: It is a show rule. Moser: The show rule was fine, but I’m saying if we’re going to change it to 10 then it’s going to be a show rule so it will stay there. DelaBar: Until it’s change. Newkirk: Didn’t Annette just say that at some point in time we might be able to drop this back down to 5? Wilson: It used to be there was no limit. Phillips: Once upon a time this section didn’t even exist. Newkirk: Can we call the question? Hannon: Alright, let’s vote on this. All those in favor of expanding it.

Hannon called the motion. Motion Carried. Auth and Moser voting no.

Anger: May I give the floor to Pam? It’s her motion. DelaBar: I move that this is effective immediately. Anger: Second. Hannon: Any discussion?

Hannon called the motion. Motion Carried. Moser voting no. Auth abstained.

2c – Amend Article XXXVI – Add a title of Breed Award (BA) to those cats achieving a National Second or Third Best of Breed Win

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article XXXVI – Breed Awards</th>
<th>Passed by majority at annual – Resolution 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of Breed/Division**</td>
<td>Best of Breed/Division**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The title of “Breed Winner (BW)” is limited to Championship cats receiving the above award</strong></td>
<td><strong>The title of “Breed Winner (BW)” is limited to Championship cats receiving the above award</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(BEST of Breed/Division). 200 point minimum required for this award.

***Second Best of Breed/Division
***Third Best of Breed/Division
***Best of Color
***Second Best of Color
***200 point minimum required for this award.

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

***Second Best of Breed/Division
***Third Best of Breed/Division
***The title of Breed Award (BA) is limited to Championship cats receiving the above awards (2nd and 3rd Best of Breed/Division). 200 point minimum required for this award.

****Best of Color
****Second Best of Color
****200 point minimum required for this award.

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

RATIONALE: Earning the award of 2nd or 3rd Best of Breed/Division has become one worth celebrating, especially now with implemented point minimums. Adding a title to these achievements will enhance the pedigrees of these winners as such an achievement. These are the titles that the “regular” exhibitor is more apt to achieve. An added title may add further encouragement of showing a cat after achieving its Grand Champion title.

Passed as Resolution 21 by majority (not 2/3).

Phillips: 2c, yes? Hannon: Yes. Phillips: 2c basically adds a title for all those second and third best national breed winners. Right now, they don’t get anything except a plaque or a piece of plastic or whatever, but there is no title put on those cats. Only the breed winner itself – number one – gets the title of BW. The title BA is for second and third winners. There would be 6 of them because there are 3 award areas, and second and third in each. Hannon: Right now, one cat per breed or division gets the title and there would be 9 cats per breed or division getting titles, based on this. There will be 9 if this passes. Krzanowski: My main objection to this particular change is that it provides the same title to both the second and third. There could be a disparity in points of thousands and down to like 500. I don’t think they should have the same title. My other objection is that it’s going to require a programming change at Central Office to be able to bestow these awards on these cats, so that’s an issue. Eigenhauser: My objection to this is that we are giving a permanent, in-your-pedigree title to a cat that earns as little as 200 points. Hannon: Don’t we currently do that? Eigenhauser: No. Hannon: If best of breed has just 200 points, don’t they get a BW? Eigenhauser: That’s true. Phillips: There is a point minimum. Eigenhauser: Still, it bothers me that this is going to put some really low-scoring cats in the position where they get a national title. Hannon: Particularly with some of the minor breeds. Can you imagine 9 LaPerms getting this title? Eigenhauser: I think before we split them into 3 this might have gone down a little easier, but turning it from 1 to 9 is a lot of new titles to be giving out all at once. Wilson: I object to this because I think the BW title is almost as important to a breeder as a DM title is. We have limited it to championship cats because those are the cats that reproduce. “Breed Win” to me means that the cat can breed. I know it’s not exactly the same connotation, but I think it’s a very important title. We have now just previously decided there will be 3 breed winners every year in the different divisions. I think that that was a
good decision. I think it keeps it as an important title, but I think giving out other titles for second and third kind of gets to the extreme. **Newkirk:** I sort of agree with Annette. I like the idea but 200 is not very many points. Why can’t we bump that up to 400 or 500 points at a minimum. **Hannon:** You are going to have to do the same with best. You can’t have best at 200 and second best at 500. **Newkirk:** I’m saying, at a minimum, any cat that gets any of these awards has to have 500 points. **Dugger:** I would like to see a sliding scale. **Newkirk:** I would like to slide right up to 500, like sliding into home. **Kuta:** As one who has gotten second best of breed twice and by not that many points, I wholeheartedly think that we should keep it to just the top cat. I don’t go for national awards. My eye is on the breed win prize and then breeding that cat; like keeping that cat healthy enough to breed during that run. I think that’s such a respected award that I don’t want to dilute it. **Mastin:** Just to clarify, it’s not 9 BWs, it’s 3 BWs and 6 BAs, right? **Hannon:** Right, it’s 9 cats with a title. Let’s call the question. **Anger:** We don’t have a motion and a second. **Newkirk:** I’ll move it. **Black:** Second. **Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Newkirk, Mastin and Dugger voting yes.

### 3 – Rules proposed based on Board discussions or Requests to Show Rules Committee

Approve the following rule proposals at this time, all to become effective with the next show season.

### 3a – Limitation on Number of Shows at Which a Cat May Be Shown the Same Weekend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 6.13</th>
<th>Show Rules Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cat or kitten shall compete in more than 1 two-day show or 2 one-day shows (total 12 rings maximum) within three calendar days of any previous benching. If a cat/kitten is scheduled to be judged on only one day of a two day show, it will be considered to be benched only on that day. Cats benched in violation of this rule will receive no credit for the awards/points achieved in the latter show.</td>
<td>No cat or kitten shall compete in more than 1 two-day show or 2 one-day shows (total 12 rings maximum) within three calendar days of any previous benching. While the two one-day shows may be in separate locations, a cat cannot show at a one day show on one day at one location and the first or second day of a two-day show at a different location. If a cat/kitten is scheduled to be judged on only one day of a two day show, it will be considered to be benched only on that day. Cats benched in violation of this rule will receive no credit for the awards/points achieved in the latter show.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATIONALE:** It has always been the intent of this show rule to ensure that a cat can only attend two one-day shows or one two-day show the same weekend. However, some have misinterpreted the wording to imply that attending the second (or first day only) of a two-day show was acceptable while also going to a separate one-day show. This has never been the case, and the rule has been clarified to make this clear.
Phillips: 3a is an attempt to clarify Show Rule 6.13, which has to do with cats going to two different shows on the same weekend. What you can do is go to a one-day show on Saturday and a one-day show on Sunday. They don’t have to be at the same place, but they are two one-day shows. What you can’t do is go to a one-day show on Saturday or Sunday, and a two-day show on Sunday or Saturday. That’s what this is trying to clarify, and make clear that that’s a no-no. It is a no-no now but it’s not clear. Hannon: You’re not changing the intent of the rule, you’re just clarifying. Wilson: Can I clarify what a – Hannon: Can you start with making a motion? Wilson: Me? Hannon: Somebody. Wilson: OK, so moved. Newkirk: I’ll second. Wilson: What about a show that’s in one location, one club puts on a show on Saturday and one club puts on a show on Sunday. Is that considered two separate shows? Phillips: Yes. Wilson: OK. We just voted on letting judges judge in two different days of a show, so I don’t understand why we can’t have cats going to two different shows. Phillips: Ah, they can. What they can’t do is, do a two-day show and a one-day show. Auth: They can’t go to half of a two-day show. Black: Isn’t a 6x6 considered a two-day show? Phillips: No. Black: OK, so a 6x6 is not considered a two-day show? Phillips: No, it’s considered two separate one-day shows. Hannon: Correct. You can go to one day of a 6x6 and go to another 6x6 on Sunday. Black: And that’s legal? Hannon: Right. Anger: So, this happened. Rich was there and we called Mark on the phone to come up with a ruling. It really was confusing. We looked at the rule forensically and still were not 100% clear. A gal had exhibited somewhere else Saturday at a one-day show, and our show was a two-day show. She showed up there Sunday. Well, that was going to be my best cat, so it was an important decision. We talked about it and determined that if she exhibited at that show, her points wouldn’t count. They would be voided, so she pulled her cat, packed up and went home. It really was confusing, so I’m completely in support of this rule that clarifies it a little better. Wilson: I’m in favor of clarifying it. I’m just wondering if we’re clarifying it the right way. Right now, you have two-day shows and back-to-back shows or whatever. People will come and say they are going to be absent on Saturday only or absent on Sunday only. That seems to be acceptable, even though we have rules that you have to be at the show or you might lose your points. I don’t know if those people get permission ahead of time. I’m entering, I’m paying the entry fee, it’s a two-day show but I can only come on Sunday or I can only come on Saturday. I’m not saying they are going to another show one of the other days, but if we’re allowing that then why wouldn’t we let people go to the one-day show on Saturday and go to the second day of a two-day show they entered on Sunday? Eigenhauser: Part of the problem is, if you’re there for either day of a two-day show, you’re there for both days. So, if you’re at a one-day show on one day and at a two-day show the other day, you are also at the two-day show on the one day. The cat is now in two shows at the same time. Wilson: It’s the count, OK. Eigenhauser: Right, the count. Wilson: OK, I’m good with it. Newkirk: Call the question. Hannon: All those in favor of the clarification.

Hannon called the motion. Motion Carried.
3.b – Revise Number of National Awards for the National Areas by Eliminating the Formula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article XXXVI – National Awards</th>
<th>Approved in Principle at June 30th Board Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Awards</strong></td>
<td><strong>National Awards</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Award Area Definition:</strong> for the purposes of season end awards, the National Awards are divided into three geographical areas as follows:</td>
<td><strong>National Award Area Definition:</strong> for the purposes of season end awards, the National Awards are divided into three geographical areas as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cats/Kittens residing in Regions 1 through 9</td>
<td>Cats/Kittens residing in Regions 1 through 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cats/Kittens residing in the International Division - China (this does not include those cats residing in the Special Administrative Regions of Hong Kong and Macau).</td>
<td>Cats/Kittens residing in the International Division - China (this does not include those cats residing in the Special Administrative Regions of Hong Kong and Macau).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cats/Kittens residing in the rest of the International Division (including those cats/kittens residing in the Special Administrative Regions of Hong Kong and Macau).</td>
<td>Cats/Kittens residing in the rest of the International Division national award area (including those cats/kittens residing in the Special Administrative Regions of Hong Kong and Macau).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards/Titles for each of the above areas vary based on the following formula, the results of which will be available in May on the CFA Exhibitor’s Corner page of the CFA Website and published in a May CFA News Announcement. For cats/kittens residing in Regions 1 through 9, Best up to 25th Best Championship, Kitten, and Premiership*</td>
<td>Awards/Titles for each of the above areas vary based on the following formula, the results of which will be available in May on the CFA Exhibitor’s Corner page of the CFA Website and published in a May CFA News Announcement. For cats/kittens residing in Regions 1 through 9, will be Best up to 25th Best Championship, Kitten, and Premiership*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For cats/kittens residing in either the International Division-China or the rest of the International Division, the number of awards for each category (Championship, Kitten, and Premiership) is determined based on shows and counts from the previous show season in accordance with the following formula:</td>
<td>For cats/kittens residing in either the International Division-China or the rest of the International Division, the number of awards for each category (Championship, Kitten, and Premiership) is determined based on shows and counts from the previous show season in accordance with the following formula:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For each category, number of cats/kittens present during the previously-completed show season is determined by multiplying the number of cats/kittens present in a category by the corresponding number of rings at that show where all cats could compete and this value is then summed for all shows and categories in the area [NOTE: The CFA International Show is not used in this calculation]. This total in each category is divided by its corresponding category sum for cats competing in Regions 1-9. That ratio is then</td>
<td>For each category, number of cats/kittens present during the previously-completed show season is determined by multiplying the number of cats/kittens present in a category by the corresponding number of rings at that show where all cats could compete and this value is then summed for all shows and categories in the area [NOTE: The CFA International Show is not used in this calculation]. This total in each category is divided by its corresponding category sum for cats competing in Regions 1-9. That ratio is then</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
competing in Regions 1-9. That ratio is then multiplied by 25 and the calculated number obtained, rounded to the nearest whole number, determines the potential number of awards in each category for that area. The actual number of awards to be issued for that area will be the calculated value or 25, whichever is smaller.

To obtain any national award and its associated title (National Winner - NW), the cat/kitten must earn a minimum number of points over the duration of the show season in the category to which the award will be earned. Those minimums are as follows:

– for championship cats, the cat must earn a minimum of 4,300 points; for kittens, the kitten must earn a minimum of 1,800 points; for premiership, the cat must earn a minimum of 2,200 points. Cats failing to meet these minimums are not eligible for any national award or title. The Board will review these minimums for potential adjustment for the next show season at their February Board meeting.

Best – 10<sup>th</sup> Best Cat in Agility+
*The title of “National Winner (NW)” is limited to cats receiving the above * awards.
+A minimum of 150 agility points are required for this award and there is no title associated with a national agility award.

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

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

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

multiplied by 25 and the calculated number obtained, rounded to the nearest whole number, determines the potential number of awards in each category for that area. The actual number of awards to be issued for that area will be the calculated value or 25, whichever is smaller.

To obtain any national award and its associated title (National Winner - NW), the cat/kitten must earn a minimum number of points over the duration of the show season in the category to which the award will be earned. Those minimums are as follows:

– for championship cats, the cat must earn a minimum of 4,300 points; for kittens, the kitten must earn a minimum of 1,800 points; for premiership, the cat must earn a minimum of 2,200 points. Cats failing to meet these minimums are not eligible for any national award or title. The Board will review these minimums for potential adjustment for the next show season at their February Board meeting.

Best – 10<sup>th</sup> Best Cat in Agility+
*The title of “National Winner (NW)” is limited to cats receiving the above * awards.
+A minimum of 150 agility points are required for this award and there is no title associated with a national agility award.

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

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

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

RATIONALE: At the June 30, 2016, Board Meeting, the Board voted to allow ALL National Areas to have top 25 awards in all categories if the minimum point requirements were met. At that time, there was no rules text available to associate with the proposal. The above is the revised rules text to implement the requirement already passed by the Board.

Phillips: 3b you already voted on but you didn’t actually have rules text. Back in June you decided to get rid of the formula and do top 25 in all three national areas. This is the actual text that does what you voted on. Newkirk: So moved. Mastin: Second. Hannon: Any discussion? We already discussed it.

Hannon called the motion. Motion Carried.

3.c – Require Registration Numbers for Bengals entered in Household Pets or Exhibition Only (Guarantees they meet the F5 registrable requirement necessary to be considered “domestic”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rules # 2.19.f. &amp; g.</th>
<th>Show Rules Committee &amp; Central Office Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The HOUSEHOLD PET (HHP) CLASS is for any domestic kitten (altered/unaltered) or altered cat entry. Household pets are eligible only for awards in the Household Pet Class. Household pets are to be judged separately from all other cats, solely on beauty and condition. Wild cats or wild cat-domestic cat hybrid crosses are not eligible for entry. (See Article VI – Entering the Show).</td>
<td>f. The HOUSEHOLD PET (HHP) CLASS is for any domestic kitten (altered/unaltered) or altered cat entry. Household pets are eligible only for awards in the Household Pet Class. Household pets are to be judged separately from all other cats, solely on beauty and condition. Wild cats or wild cat-domestic cat hybrid crosses are not eligible for entry. For Bengals to enter this class, they must have a registration number. (See Article VI – Entering the Show).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The EXHIBITION ONLY CLASS is for any cat or kitten for which an entry form has been received, and for which a listing appears in the show catalog, but which is not scheduled for handling in any ring.</td>
<td>g. The EXHIBITION ONLY CLASS is for any cat or kitten for which an entry form has been received, and for which a listing appears in the show catalog, but which is not scheduled for handling in any ring. For Bengals to enter this class, they must have a registration number.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATIONALE: These rules are being revised to clarify that Bengals need to be registered to be able to be present in the show hall. That is because our registration rules define this breed as “wild-hybrid” if it is F1 to F4, and “domestic” if it is F5 or beyond. Normally, neither Household Pets nor Exhibition Only cats require a registration number to be entered at the show. By requiring such a number for Bengals, we guarantee that they meet the F5 or beyond requirement to be considered ‘domestic’ cats.
Phillips: 3c. This has to do with our friends the Bengals, requiring them to have registration numbers in the Household Pet class. This is actually a request from Central Office.

Hannon: Alright, is there a motion? Newkirk: I’ll move. Mastin: Second. Hannon: What this doesn’t do is address what I’ve gotten many telephone calls on, is Agility. They take a cat that’s obviously a Bengal, it’s not registered, it’s in the show hall against our show rules in Agility. I’ve even written you to make sure I was right in my interpretation on this. Black: So you’re thinking that we need to add an Agility comment to this section? It talks about Exhibition Only, so we could just also put in there, “Agility cats also must be registered.” Phillips: It covers both of them, Exhibition Only and Household Pet. Black: But it doesn’t cover Agility. Phillips: Oh.

Anger: I think we should go forward with this and then come back with a subsequent clean-up in December. Black: We can modify these now, right? Eigenhauser: We’re also going to be here tomorrow. Hannon: If you do it now, he’s just going to sit there and mutter to himself for a while. Newkirk: Can’t you just add an h., and put that it also applies to Agility? Phillips: I would say up in the Agility section, but no problem. We can add that. Eigenhauser: I support what we’re doing here, but understand that there are still going to be people that walk in with a kitty cat and it looks like a Bengal to you but it doesn’t look like a Bengal to you, and we’re still going to have problems. We’re going to have people complaining about it. Most Household Pets aren’t going to have papers so there’s going to be no way to do it, but at least we’re sending a message saying we want only cats that would be – Hannon: George, a surprising number of these cats’ owners admit the cat is a Bengal, and then we say, ‘well, if it’s a Bengal, our show rule says …”. Eigenhauser: As I said, this sends the right message. Hannon: Right now, it’s harder to point to a show rule for the Agility people. Bizzell: How about if it’s part Bengal? I had some bi-color cats that obviously had Bengal pattern. Hannon: Monte, what’s your interpretation? What happens if it’s part Bengal? Bizzell: So it couldn’t be registered as a Bengal. Hannon: But it looks like a Bengal and – she quotes a bi-color Bengal she saw. Phillips: Are you talking besides adding Bengal to agility? Hannon: Is it allowed in the show hall? Black: If you have half Bengal, half Household Pet? Newkirk: It can only enter half the rings. Eigenhauser: As you said, this is primarily targeting people that know their cat is a Bengal. There are always going to be mutts out there that they just don’t know. It looks like, but there are people who are sneaking Bengals in now and this would give us the moral authority. Brown: If they don’t have papers, they don’t know. Hannon: If they don’t know then they shouldn’t be there. Brown: If it was an F2 that was half, it wouldn’t qualify. Hannon: Obviously, they couldn’t register it anyway, other than as a Household Pet. DelaBar: It doesn’t specify in here. That registration number could be a registration number for a Household Pet. Hannon: Do you hear them, Monte? The problem with a Household Pet that’s required to have a registration number, it could have a Household Pet registration number, rather than a Bengal registration number. So, shouldn’t this say, however we phrase it? DelaBar: It’s not a Bengal if it’s half and half. Hannon: No, no, but what if it’s a full Bengal but they have a Household Pet registration number? DelaBar: That’s why I brought that up. It says “registration number.” Hannon: That’s why I’m asking Monte. Do you want to clean this up? Phillips: I can add the wording for a Bengal registration number if you would like. I see your point. 0892 is a registration number, it’s not a Bengal registration number. It could be anything in the world. Hannon: Household Pets now get a registration number, right? Not a recording number. Phillips: That is a good point. There’s a difference between a registration number and a recording number. The 0893 is a recording number. A registration number is something that has to be breed specific. Hannon:
Alright, so that’s not a problem. If they have a Household Pet number they’re not eligible because it’s not a registration number, it’s a recording number. **Black:** I’m reading the show rule about a recorded cat. It says that you can change a pedigreed cat and register it as a recorded cat. You could actually take a Bengal that has been registered and turn it into a Household Pet.

**Bizzell:** But it would have a registration number. **Hannon:** They would still have to provide the CFA registration number, in addition to the recording number. The recording number would help them get their Household Pet points, but they would need the registration number in order to bring it into the hall. **Anger:** Interesting to note, we never defined Agility cat in the show rules.

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

### 3d – Delete Rule 4.06 – Considered Redundant to Rule 4.03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 4.06</th>
<th>Request from August Board Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An application for a show license which designates a show hall located in a CFA region other than that to which the applying club is assigned must be submitted to the Executive Board for its determination as to whether a license will be issued. In making this determination the Executive Board will consider:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Other shows scheduled in the area;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Input from the Regional Director of the region affected;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Any other relevant facts which may be brought to the Board’s attention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No club holding a show license shall change the location of the designated show hall without approval of the Executive Board if the substituted show hall will be located in a region other than the club’s CFA region. The Executive Board may grant blanket permission, to member clubs whose secretary resides within 100 miles from any boundary separating the club’s region with another, to hold shows in the adjoining region with such conditions and restrictions as the Board may attach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATIONALE:** Under the current show rule 4.03 adjacent region approval is required to license a show in a region (US/Canada/Mexico only). For example, if a show changes show hall city location or date from the prior year in say Region 1, by moving either within the region or to an adjacent region, both adjacent regions 4 and 7 need to provide approval for that new date/location. If they don't approve, the show can't be licensed. That decision (not to license the show) could then be appealed to the Board for
resolution. Show Rule 4.06 addresses the subset of this situation where a club wants to put on a show in an adjacent region. In that situation, Board approval is required in ALL cases. The move to the adjacent region would require that both regions' directors approve the move per 4.03, and if both regions are amenable to it, does the Board really need to take action to approve the move? If the regions aren't in agreement, then 4.03 prevents a license from being issued, and the Board would have to intervene to allow the show to be licensed (exactly what 4.06 requires in ALL cases). The need for this rule has been superseded by all of the changes over time that have been made to show rule 4.03.

Phillips: The next item, 3d, is to delete Rule 4.06. Basically 4.06 talks about licensing a show and we’ve already got all of that in 4.03.a., b., c., d., etc. So, what we’re doing here basically is cutting down the size of the rule by getting rid of 4.06 and replacing it. Hannon: Is there a motion? Eigenhauser: I’ll move. Newkirk: Second. Hannon: Is there any discussion?

Hannon called the motion. Motion Carried.

3e – Revise Rule 4.07 to Routinely Allow Licensing of Super specialty Rings at Shows, and Take Credit for All but One of the Specialty Ring Requirements for the Super specialty Rings (NOTE: Japan Move to Match Region 9 versus 1-7 already passed, but included here for completeness)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule 2.31 – New, Sections in current rules from 2.31 on will be re-numbered</th>
<th>Board Request from July 2, 2016 Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Wording</td>
<td>Proposed Wording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None.</td>
<td>A SUPER SPECIALTY RING is a competition involving the kitten, championship, or premiership competitive categories where the judge will award both specialty finals for longhairs and shorthairs, and an allbreed final made up of those eligible from the specialty finals to be in the allbreed final.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phillips: 4.07, you requested I believe at the last board meeting to make super specialty rings permanent, so to speak. That’s what 3b does. It makes super specialty formats permanent. What it also does is what Dick requested for switching the International Division’s specialty requirements, so that’s in here as well. So, China will look like Regions 1-8 as far as specialty requirements and the main International Division will look more like Europe and Region 8. Hannon: Let’s get a motion first. Is there a motion? DelaBar: I’ll move. Bizzell: Second. DelaBar: On your proposed wording, when you are adding in super specialty, I don’t think that we agreed that super specialty should substitute for a specialty ring. Hannon: Correct. DelaBar: Super specialty is included in it, but one, two, three or four judgings per entry in any combination of Allbreed, Super specialty, or Specialty rings. Eigenhauser: That’s just for licensing. DelaBar: But the way it sounds is that – Hannon: It does sound confusing. DelaBar: It does sound confusing, like you can have four allbreed, two super specialty rings. It doesn’t work that way. Phillips: You will notice at the end of 4.07.a.2., for example, the last sentence
says, *The use of a Super specialty ring will not meet this requirement.* That requirement is the specialty ring requirement. You will see that at the end of 2, you will see that at the end of 3 and you will see that at the end of 4. **Hannon:** Why don’t you change that to say, *The use of a Super specialty ring will not meet –* **Eigenhauser:** It says that on another page. *The use of Super specialty rings will not meet the requirement for specialty rings.* **DelaBar:** But it needs to come up into that first sentence so it is well stated. **Krzanowski:** Currently we don’t have a specialty ring requirement for shows with four or fewer rings. **Hannon:** Say that again. **Krzanowski:** We don’t have a specialty ring requirement for shows with four or fewer rings. **Phillips:** That’s true, too. **Krzanowski:** So they don’t have to have a plain specialty ring currently. **Calhoun:** I just got contracted for a 4 ring show in the Midwest Region. They called Central Office and said they have to have a specialty ring. **Hannon:** No. **Auth:** Wait a minute. You are talking about the second day. The first show on Saturday is a 4 allbreed ring show, one club. The second club wanted to put on a show and I called upon Monte to clarify the show rule. If you have 5 or more rings in the same venue on the same weekend, the formula kicks in. So, the second day show has to be a 2/2. There has to be 2 specialty rings for those 8 rings. **DelaBar:** Wait. We’ve got rule 2.31, then you’ve got rule 4.07. Can we vote on 2.31 first? That’s the one I made the motion on. **Hannon:** Alright, 2.31, which is creating the super specialty as a permanent format, rather than experimental format.

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

**DelaBar:** I would like to move that we make this effective immediately, so Sharon doesn’t have to keep getting bugged on super specialty. **Hannon:** The problem with that is, we’ve got printed rules and now we’re throwing this in as a current rule which isn’t included in the rules. **Newkirk:** We set a bad precedent, didn’t we? **Hannon:** Years ago. **Newkirk:** The prior administration. **Hannon:** We will blame one of the prior administrations. **Newkirk:** THE prior administration. **DelaBar:** The most recent prior. **Hannon:** So you are making a motion to make it effective immediately? Was that seconded? **Mastin:** I second. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion? **Eigenhauser:** My understanding is, we made super specialty available up until the end of this show season. If we make this effective at the beginning of next show season, people are going to be confused about, if I license a show now for a show that’s not going to take place until June, it’s just easier to go with Pam’s motion. **Hannon:** Any other discussion? **Black:** I thought we voted to extend super specialty to the end of this show season. **Phillips:** I think the point George is trying to make is, he would like to make the rule immediately effective, as opposed to waiting until May 1st of next year. **Hannon:** We understand. **DelaBar:** Yes, that’s the motion I made.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 4.07</th>
<th>Board Request from July 2, 2016 Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CFA Central Office will issue a license for the following types of shows:</td>
<td>The CFA Central Office will issue a license for the following types of shows:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a. A one day show which permits:

1. one, two, three or four judgings per entry in any combination of Allbreed or Specialty rings. Shows with four or fewer judging rings are not required to contain a specialty ring, but may offer them if they so choose.

2. a one-day show format consisting of up to six rings with an entry limit of 225 cats. This format will permit up to six judgings per entry in any combination of Allbreed or Specialty rings for shows licensed in Region 9. For shows licensed in Regions 1-8 or the International Division, the combination of Allbreed or Specialty rings must include at least one Specialty ring for both longhair and shorthair specialties in kittens, championship, and premiership.

3. Two one day shows in the same location consisting of up to six rings held on the first day and up to six rings held on the second day with an entry limit of 225 cats. This format will permit up to six judgings per entry each day. To be licensed in Regions 1-8 or the International Division, the total number of specialty rings in kittens, championship, and premiership shall comply with the following formula: for fewer than five total rings licensed at that location over the full weekend, no specialty rings are required; for five or six total rings licensed at that location over the full weekend, at least one longhair and one shorthair specialty ring are required between the two shows; for seven or eight total rings licensed at that location over the full weekend, at least two longhair and two shorthair specialty rings are required between the two shows; for nine or ten total rings licensed at that location over the full weekend, at least three longhair and three shorthair specialty rings between the two shows are required; for 11 or 12 total rings licensed at that location over the full weekend, at least four longhair and four shorthair specialty rings between the two shows are required. To be licensed in Region 9, the total number of specialty rings in kittens, championship, and premiership shall comply with the following formula: for six or fewer total rings licensed at that location over the full weekend, no specialty rings are required; for

b. A one day show which permits:

1. one, two, three or four judgings per entry in any combination of Allbreed or Specialty rings. Shows with four or fewer judging rings are not required to contain a specialty ring, but may offer them if they so choose.

2. a one-day show format consisting of up to six rings with an entry limit of 225 cats. This format will permit up to six judgings per entry in any combination of Allbreed, Super specialty, or Specialty rings for shows licensed in Regions 8, 9, or the International Division (excluding China). For shows licensed in Regions 1-8 or China, the combination of Allbreed, Super specialty, or Specialty rings must include at least one Specialty ring for both longhair and shorthair specialties in kittens, championship, and premiership. The use of a Super specialty ring will not meet this requirement.

3. Two one day shows in the same location consisting of up to six rings held on the first day and up to six rings held on the second day with an entry limit of 225 cats. This format will permit up to six judgings per entry each day. To be licensed in Regions 1-8 or China the International Division, the total number of specialty rings in kittens, championship, and premiership shall comply with the following formula: for fewer than five total rings licensed at that location over the full weekend, no specialty rings are required; for five or six total rings licensed at that location over the full weekend, at least one longhair and one shorthair specialty ring are required between the two shows; for seven or eight total rings licensed at that location over the full weekend, at least two longhair and two shorthair specialty rings are required between the two shows; for nine or ten total rings licensed at that location over the full weekend, at least three longhair and three shorthair specialty rings between the two shows are required; for 11 or 12 total rings licensed at that location over the full weekend, at least four longhair and four shorthair specialty rings between the two shows are required. To be licensed in Regions 8, 9, or the rest of the International Division (excluding Hong Kong,
seven, eight or nine total rings licensed at that location over the full weekend, at least one longhair and one shorthair specialty ring are required between the two shows; for ten or more total rings licensed at that location over the full weekend, at least two longhair and two shorthair specialty rings are required between the two shows. Requests to license two shows pursuant to this rule must be submitted together to Central Office, each with its appropriate license and insurance fees. In cases where more than one specialty ring is required, they must be split as evenly between the two shows as possible, i.e., if two required, one for each show; if three required, one for one show and two for the other; if four required, two for each show.

b. A two day show which permits up to ten judgings per entry over the two days of the show and a maximum of six judgings per entry per day. It is recommended that a judge shall not be scheduled to judge more than 250 cats on either day. For shows in Regions 1-8 or the International Division utilizing a total of 5 or 6 rings, at least one of these rings must be a shorthair and longhair Specialty ring in kittens, championship, and premiership. For shows in Regions 1-8 and China the International Division utilizing a total of 7 or 8 rings, at least three of these rings must be both longhair and shorthair Specialty rings in kittens, championship, and premiership. For shows licensed In Region 9 utilizing a total of 7, 8, or 9 rings, at least one of these rings must be both a shorthair and longhair Specialty ring in kittens, championship, and premiership. For shows in Region 9 utilizing 10 rings, two of these rings must be both longhair and shorthair specialty rings in kittens, championship, and premiership. Two day shows offer a variety of formats:

1. one day Specialty shows where Longhairs are present one day and Shorthairs are present the other day;

Macau, Kuwait, or Thailand), the total number of specialty rings in kittens, championship, and premiership shall comply with the following formula: for six or fewer total rings licensed at that location over the full weekend, no specialty rings are required; for seven, eight or nine total rings licensed at that location over the full weekend, at least one longhair and one shorthair specialty ring are required between the two shows; for ten or more total rings licensed at that location over the full weekend, at least two longhair and two shorthair specialty rings are required between the two shows. There are no specialty ring requirements for shows licensed in Hong Kong, Macau, Kuwait, or Thailand. Requests to license two shows pursuant to this rule must be submitted together to Central Office, each with its appropriate license and insurance fees. In cases where more than one specialty ring is required, they must be split as evenly between the two shows as possible, i.e., if two required, one for each show; if three required, one for one show and two for the other; if four required, two for each show. The use of Super specialty rings will not meet the requirement for specialty rings.

b. A two day show which permits up to ten judgings per entry over the two days of the show and a maximum of six judgings per entry per day. It is recommended that a judge shall not be scheduled to judge more than 250 cats on either day. For shows in Regions 1-8 or the International Division utilizing a total of 5 or 6 rings, at least one of these rings must be a shorthair and longhair Specialty ring in kittens, championship, and premiership. For shows in Regions 1-8 and China the International Division utilizing a total of 7 or 8 rings, at least two of these rings must be both shorthair and longhair Specialty rings in kittens, championship, and premiership. For shows in Regions 1-8 and China the International Division utilizing a total of 9 or 10 rings at least three of these rings must be both longhair and shorthair Specialty rings in kittens, championship, and premiership. For shows licensed In Regions 8, 9, or the rest of the International Division (excluding Hong Kong, Macau, Kuwait, or Thailand), utilizing a total of
2. a show where non-championship and premiership classes are present one day and championship classes are present the other day;

3. a format where the entries, 225 limit, are present for two days and the judge is present only for one day and is succeeded in the ring by another judge the second day (back-to-back show);

4. a show where the judge is present for two days and the entries are also present for two days.

5. The above #2, #3 and #4 described shows may have any combination of Allbreed or Specialty rings.

c. A Best of the Best ring may be added to any format show described above. Participation in the Best of the Best competition shall not be considered a violation of the provisions in rule 4.05 and paragraphs 4.07.a. and b.

d. The Central Office will also license breed/color specialty rings which limit entries to a certain breed(s)/division(s)/color(s) as either stand alone or concurrent with other Allbreed and/or Longhair/Shorthair Specialty rings.

7, 8, or 9 rings, at least one of these rings must be both a shorthair and longhair Specialty ring in kittens, championship, and premiership. For shows in Regions 8, 9, or the rest of the International Division (excluding Hong Kong, Macau, Kuwait, or Thailand), utilizing 10 rings, two of these rings must be both longhair and shorthair specialty rings in kittens, championship, and premiership. The use of Super specialty rings will not meet the requirement for specialty rings. There are no specialty ring requirements for shows licensed in Hong Kong, Macau, Kuwait, or Thailand.

Two day shows offer a variety of formats:

1. one day Specialty shows where Longhairs are present one day and Shorthairs are present the other day;

2. a show where non-championship and premiership classes are present one day and championship classes are present the other day;

3. a format where the entries, 225 limit, are present for two days and the judge is present only for one day and is succeeded in the ring by another judge the second day (back-to-back show);

4. a show where the judge is present for two days and the entries are also present for two days.

5. The above #2, #3 and #4 described shows may have any combination of Allbreed or Specialty rings as long as the number of required specialty rings are met.

c. A Best of the Best ring may be added to any format show described above. Participation in the Best of the Best competition shall not be considered a violation of the provisions in rule 4.05 and paragraphs 4.07.a. and b.

d. The Central Office will also license breed/color specialty rings which limit entries to a certain breed(s)/division(s)/color(s) as either stand alone or concurrent with other Allbreed or Longhair/Shorthair Specialty rings.

RATIONALE: At the July 3, 2016 Board meeting, we were requested to draft a rule that would make the super specialty ring format licensable for all shows. We were not provided any guidance on how these
would be used in conjunction with the specialty ring requirements already in place for all shows, so we clarified that the requirement for specialty rings were not satisfied by having a super specialty ring. At the August 9, Board teleconference meeting, the Board voted on and approved the proposal to change the specialty ring requirements for Japan to match Europe, versus what currently exists where they match Regions 1-7. Similarly, at the October 2015 Board Meeting Kuwait and Hong Kong were granted exceptions from the specialty ring requirements, so they have been so exempted in this proposal. Finally, a similar exemption for Thailand was voted on and approved at a teleconference discussed in the August Board minutes. That exemption has also been made permanent here. The International Division Chair has requested that the shows in the International Division outside of China have the same specialty ring requirements as Europe and Japan, rather than the requirement for the United States.

**Hannon:** We’re on 4.07. **Phillips:** I thought we just finished 4.07. **Hannon:** We broke it apart and did 2.31. Now we are doing 4.07. **Phillips:** Oh, you did it in two parts. **Hannon:** Is there a motion for 4.07? **Brown:** So moved. **Hannon:** Is there a second? **Eigenhauser:** Sure. **Hannon:** Is there any more discussion? **Mastin:** Are you changing the wording to what Pam requested? **DelaBar:** No. I was reading ahead.

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

**Hannon:** OK, Monte. **Phillips:** You need to make this one immediately effective, too then, don’t you? **Eigenhauser:** So moved. **Newkirk:** Second.

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

3f – Revise Rule 5.04 to Require Show Flyer Submittal No Earlier than 90 Days Before the First Day of the Show

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 5.14</th>
<th>Show Rules Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td>The show secretary must file a copy of the show flyer with the Central Office within 7 days of license approval for shows licensed at least 90 days prior to the date of the show. For shows licensed less than 90 days to the date of the show, the show flyer must be included in the license application package (see Rule 4.04).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
<td>The show secretary must file a copy of the show flyer with the Central Office within 7 days of license approval 90 days prior to the date of the show for shows licensed at least 90 days prior to the date of the show. For shows licensed less than 90 days to the date of the show, the show flyer must be included in the license application package (see Rule 4.04).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATIONALE:** As noted in the following text from the Cotton States Club, clubs often do not have all of the information necessary to prepare a show flyer 7 days after license receipt if the show is licensed significantly in advance of the show date. In fact, some clubs are working on licensing shows right now for 2018. Many clubs contract judges more than 270 days in advance of the show, well before they can even make hotel arrangements to identify the show hotel or negotiate a show rate. While the club could wait many months after they have obtained their judges and wait to get all final “flyer” arrangements complete before submitting the application, it really makes more sense to submit it when the club has obtained its judges and show hall rather than sit on the request until they have all “flyer” information.
The following is text from the Cotton States club concerning the issue: “My club, Cotton States, contracts our judges at least 9 months in advance (and in the case of the Nov 2017 show, 17 months) of the shows. At that time, we do not have ALL the details required for a show flyer. While most is available, we definitely have not decided on entry fees. Most clubs have a theme of some sort that goes with the show, that is not decided until at least 9 months prior to our shows and is reflected on the flyer. Our flyers always include any special hotel rates; those cannot be negotiated more than 6 months in advance.

I certainly understand the need for Central Office to have a copy of the flyer at least 90 days prior to the show, however, it is impossible for us to provide one when we license our shows so far in advance. For our 2016 show in November, I have most of the flyer completed and have sent it to the Central Office; however, I am just now negotiating hotel availability and rates. An updated flyer will be sent to CO when that information is completed.

My concern now is that I have all the judges contracted for our November 2017 show, have identified the venue, format and entry clerk (ALL the information needed for a show license), however, I am nowhere near designing a flyer to send to CO within 7 days of the license being issued. Must I wait nearly a year before sending in the license application?

We have found that if we wait until 6 months prior to the show to contract judges, the judges we have invited have already been contracted.

Another issue to consider is that sponsorship is often NOT approved until 4-6 months prior to the licensed shows. With sponsorship logos are required on flyers, it means revisions to the flyer and yet another update sent to CO.”

**Phillips:** 5.14 now? 5.14 has to do with the rule about flyer submittals. We passed a rule last time that you are supposed to submit your flyer within 7 days of your license approval. The trouble is, some clubs get their license way in advance of their shows; by “way,” I mean 2018 licenses now. Well, under this rule they would have to submit their flyer for 2018 within the next week which, as they say, “We don’t even know where our show hotel is going to be. We may not have even contracted with the exact venue we’re going to have, so we’re nowhere near in shape to put a flyer out.” So, what this rule does is back off the 7 days for license approval to 7 days of the license approval, or 90 days prior to the date of the show, whichever comes later. **Hannon:** Is there a motion? **Newkirk:** So moved. **Hannon:** Is there a second? **Bizzell:** Second. **Hannon:** Any discussion?

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

**3g – Revise Rule 4.04 Regarding Handling Emergency Format Changes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 4.04.d.</th>
<th>August Board Meeting Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. If requesting a license with less than 90 days left to the date of the show, a copy of the show flyer for the show must be included in the license application package (see Rule 5.04).</td>
<td>d. If requesting a license with less than 90 days left to the date of the show, a copy of the show flyer for the show must be included in the license application package (see Rule 5.04).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These documents and fees must be submitted as a package, and the Central Office will not issue the license for any show until all the papers have been received in proper order. The office will return copies of the approved license(s).

Applicable late filing fees will apply if a completed application with all judging contracts and show license and insurance fees is received with a postmark of less than 90 days from the opening day of the show.

*Clubs are permitted to schedule one ring for which no judge(s) has been contracted (commonly known as a “to be announced” (TBA) judge). If a club chooses to schedule such a ring, include the initials “TBA” on the show license under the judging information section and the type of ring scheduled for the TBA judge. Completed judges contracts (to include the name and signature of the judge) for any previously scheduled TBA judge(s) must be received in the Central Office no later than 30 days prior to the opening day of the show.

Once a show license is approved by the Central Office, no change in club sponsorship will be allowed except the addition of a club or clubs as co-sponsor(s) if requested no later than 30 days prior to the opening date of the show.

Once a show license is approved by the Central Office, no change in format, including a change in a judge’s assignment (e.g. allbreed to specialty or specialty to allbreed) will be permitted, except in the case of an emergency. An emergency constitutes a situation where one or more contracted judges cannot judge the show as contracted. If as a result of an emergency the club is notified more than 30 days in advance of a judge’s inability to fulfill their contract(s), a revised license application must be sent to the Central Office for approval. The show judges, exhibitors and Regional Director must be notified immediately of any change in format or assigned judges.

In cases of emergency, format changes will be permitted without prior Board approval provided the request is received in the Central Office with a postmark of at least 30 days prior to the opening day of the show. The request must be approved by the Central Office.

Once a show license is approved by the Central Office, no change in format, including a change in a judge’s assignment (e.g. allbreed to specialty or specialty to allbreed) will be permitted, except in the case of an emergency. An emergency constitutes a situation where one or more contracted judges cannot judge the show as contracted. If as a result of an emergency the club is notified more than 30 days in advance of a judge’s inability to fulfill their contract(s), a revised license application must be sent to the Central Office for approval. The show judges, exhibitors and Regional Director must be notified immediately of any change in format or assigned judges.

In cases of emergency, format changes will be permitted without prior Board approval provided the request is received in the Central Office with a postmark of at least 30 days prior to the opening day of the show. The request must be approved by the Central Office.
must include a description of the emergency necessitating the format change. Revised judging contracts must be obtained before the format change request is submitted if a judge’s ring type is being changed.

In cases where the club is notified of the emergency less than 30 days in advance of the show, such as on the day before or day of the show, a change in format/judging assignment must be approved by the CFA Board’s Executive Committee. The club must contact a member of the Executive Committee as soon as the emergency becomes known to the club. Once approved by the Executive Committee, revised judging contracts must be submitted to Central Office with the show package if not submitted earlier if a judge is replaced for the show or a judge’s assignment changes.

A change from a two-day show where all judges and entries are present both days to a back-to-back show or the addition of Household Pet and/or Veterans judging, are not considered format changes (see rule 4.07); however, Central Office and all contracted judges must be notified of the change by the club.

If a show scheduled as a two day show is changed to a one day show or a show scheduled as a one day show is changed to a two day show, the judges, exhibitors, Regional Director and Central Office must be notified as soon as possible.

| RATIONALE: Approval of Emergency Format changes has been pretty much perfunctory for the Board, but has taken up considerable time. The Board stated that it does not feel it needs to be in the loop to grant these change requests. Since they can come up at any time, the rule is revised to require that notification be made to Central Office of an emergency format change as soon as practicable, and that revised contracts, if required, are submitted to Central Office. |

| Phillips: 3g has to do with rule 4.04 regarding emergency format changes. Right now, every emergency format change that happens less than 30 days in advance of the show comes to the board for approval. Technically, it doesn’t have to come to the entire board, it just has to go to the executive committee, but as I understand it, the executive committee brings it to the board anyway. This gets rid of that requirement completely and leaves it all to Central Office. 30 days is no longer the time frame, it’s anytime they have to do a format change it goes to Central Office. The board is out of the system completely. Hannon: Is there a motion? Anger: So |
moved. **Hannon:** Is there a second? **Eigenhauser:** Second. **Hannon:** Pam has a question. **DelaBar:** I don’t have a question. I just think that some things – the reason that we put this in is that we were seeing changes, like people stepping aside from their all-breed assignment to let somebody else come up to take theirs, and that’s why the board had control. **Hannon:** But the problem now is that with our aging judging panel, we’re having a lot of health issues and people are canceling at the last minute. The executive committee every week has multiple requests. **DelaBar:** And that’s why you get paid so much. **Hannon:** I get paid so much but some of the others don’t. Dick probably doesn’t consider his too much. **DelaBar:** I am saying that tongue in cheek. I do think that the board needs to retain some control. **Eigenhauser:** The problem is that when these come up at the last second, there’s really no time for investigation, there’s really no time for analysis, we just act on how it appears on its face anyway. **Hannon:** We’ve never said no. **Eigenhauser:** So, if somebody did start playing games with switching judges at the last minute, we can always go after them after the fact and punish them for declaring an emergency when all it was, was a judge wanted to go on vacation or whatever. **Hannon:** Or somebody else wanted the assignment, and they were nice and let them have it. **Eigenhauser:** For whatever improper reason when you do that after the fact, but when we’re voting on this 2 or 3 or 4 days before the show, we’re just going to take it on face value and vote yes anyway, so there really is no oversight. Our oversight really is after the fact anyway. It just seems like an unnecessary step. **DelaBar:** But it says “Central Office.” That’s a space. Who at Central Office has the authority to approve it? **Eigenhauser:** They’re not approving it, they are simply notifying Central Office that they have done it. **Newkirk:** Then does Central Office notify the board or at least the executive committee? **Anger:** They just do it. That’s what they do now when it’s over 30 days. **Phillips:** That’s the requirement now. **Newkirk:** No, the requirement now is that they vote on it. I’m saying if Central Office makes an annotation that, let’s say Pam cancelled at the last minute and John filled in. This happens on Friday before the show. The show manager writes to Central Office and says, “we had this change.” It doesn’t go to the executive committee now, it would go to Central Office, so Central Office I think should notify at least the executive committee, or just a note to the board that the following change was made, and just state the circumstances. **Anger:** Central Office has several tasks that they already have authority to do – emergency format changes to licensed shows more than 30 days, emergency judge substitutions more than 30 days, show co-sponsor addition to license more than 30 days. Those are things that they do now that they just do, and we don’t get any notice of it. **DelaBar:** The thing is, the Central Office has set hours. We’re not a set hour organization. **Hannon:** We noticed that yesterday. **DelaBar:** China is 12 hours ahead of us right now. The English show, it’s now 10:00 p.m. in England and it’s 11:00 in Rome. They can’t always reach somebody at Central Office at the last minute when we’ve got a problem. **Black:** But they’re not approving it, they’re just noting it. **DelaBar:** I know, but there’s nobody to note it. **Hannon:** They will find it Monday morning when they open up their email. **Eigenhauser:** They will get it in the show package. **Hannon:** Any other concerns?

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.** DelaBar voting no.
### 3h – Clarification on TRN issuance for Bengals and Kittens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 6.16</th>
<th>Show Rules Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The temporary registration number (TRN) is obtained for the exhibitor from the CFA Central Office via the Entry Clerk. Temporary Registration numbers will be issued by the entry clerk upon receipt of the appropriate TRN fee (which is in addition to the club’s entry fee), application form, and a four-generation pedigree (or whatever is required for registration of that breed if fewer than four generations are required) issued by a cat registering body recognized by CFA, with all cats on the pedigree being acceptable for that breed per current registration requirements. This would include Longhair Exotics shown as Persians (see rule 6.08). If both parents of the entry are registered with CFA, the CFA registration numbers of the parents are acceptable in place of a pedigree. The fee, application form, and pedigree (or CFA registration numbers, if applicable) must be provided to the entry clerk no later than the close of check-in for the show and these will be provided to Central Office in the show package. The Entry Clerk will not issue a TRN until they are in receipt of the application, fee, AND pedigree (or CFA registration numbers, if applicable). Upon review, which is done prior to the show being scored, the registration number will either remain valid for 60 days from the first day of the show, or be voided if CFA registration requirements are not met for the breed being registered. In cases where the TRN is voided, those cats/kittens will not be included in the Official Count for the associated category (K/C/P). Central Office will notify any exhibitor whose temporary registration number is voided with the basis for such decision. Note: wins will also be voided if a cat competes in a competitive category not otherwise eligible based on its permanent registration, e.g., offspring of a “not-for-breeding” cat competing in Championship. Temporary registration numbers will be printed in the catalog as if they were permanent. Cats may compete and continue to earn points for 60 days from the first day of the first show where they have obtained a TRN. That number should be used on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The temporary registration number (TRN) is obtained for the exhibitor from the CFA Central Office via the Entry Clerk. Temporary Registration numbers will be issued by the entry clerk upon receipt of the appropriate TRN fee (which is in addition to the club’s entry fee), application form, and a four-generation pedigree (or whatever is required for registration of that breed if fewer than four generations are required) issued by a cat registering body recognized by CFA, with all cats on the pedigree being acceptable for that breed per current registration requirements. [NOTE: Bengals cannot obtain a TRN via pedigree as it will not guarantee that the cat meets the requirements to be considered a domestic feline per show rule 2.05]. This would include Longhair Exotics shown as Persians (see rule 6.08). If both parents of the entry are registered with CFA, the CFA registration numbers of the parents are acceptable in place of a pedigree. The fee, application form, and pedigree (or CFA registration numbers, if applicable) must be provided to the entry clerk no later than the close of check-in for the show, except that TRNs for kittens may be issued up to the point where the Master Clerk no longer takes catalog corrections, and these will be provided to Central Office in the show package. The Entry Clerk will not issue a TRN until they are in receipt of the application, fee, AND pedigree (or CFA registration numbers, if applicable). Upon review, which is done prior to the show being scored, the registration number will either remain valid for 60 days from the first day of the show, or be voided if CFA registration requirements are not met for the breed being registered. In cases where the TRN is voided, those cats/kittens will not be included in the Official Count for the associated category (K/C/P). Central Office will notify any exhibitor whose temporary registration number is voided with the basis for such decision. Note: wins will also be voided if a cat competes in a competitive category not otherwise eligible based on its permanent registration, e.g., offspring of a “not-for-breeding” cat competing in Championship.
all subsequent entries after the first show for the 60-day period or until the cat obtains a permanent registration number within that 60-day period. At the end of this 60-day period, the cat may not be shown without a permanent registration number. For cats to receive credit for Regional, Divisional or National points earned during a specific show season with a TRN, the exhibitor must supply the associated permanent registration number to Central Office by the Monday following the completion of that show season.

cat competing in Championship. Temporary registration numbers will be printed in the catalog as if they were permanent. Cats may compete and continue to earn points for 60 days from the first day of the first show where they have obtained a TRN. That number should be used on all subsequent entries after the first show for the 60-day period or until the cat obtains a permanent registration number within that 60-day period. At the end of this 60-day period, the cat may not be shown without a permanent registration number. For cats to receive credit for Regional, Divisional or National points earned during a specific show season with a TRN, the exhibitor must supply the associated permanent registration number to Central Office by the Monday following the completion of that show season.

RATIONALE: There has been considerable confusion on the issuance of TRNs for Bengals. Some think it cannot be done, others think it can. In reality, TRNs can be issued, but only via the registered parents option. That is because the TRN rule only requires a four generation pedigree, while to be considered a domestic cat, a Bengal has to have five generations free of Asian Leopard Cats in its pedigree. The pedigree review would have to be done BEFORE the cat could be admitted to the show hall, as without proof that it meets the 5-generation requirement, it is not considered a domestic cat per show rules. The rule is revised to clarify the Bengal methodology for TRNs. Also, the rule is clarified to allow kitten TRNs to be issued during the show. In the case of kittens, entry does not require a registration number, and often kittens add their permanent registration numbers during the show. This revision would also allow owners to add a temporary registration number in accordance with the same time frame that is already permitted for owners adding a permanent number.

Phillips: Next one, clarifying TRNs for Bengals and kittens. Right now, I’ve had at least 3 entry clerks try to give me TRNs from the master clerk based on a pedigree for a Bengal. My comment to them is, first of all, how do I know that it’s got no Asian Leopard Cat in it for 5 generations when you’re giving me a 4 generation pedigree? That’s my first problem. Second of all, even if you give me the pedigree, how do I know what’s an Asian Leopard Cat and what isn’t an Asian Leopard Cat? So, this clarifies that if you’re going to give a Bengal a temporary registration number, you have to do it from CFA registered parents. That’s the only option. The second thing it clarifies has to do with the timing for TRNs for kittens. Right now, the rule requires TRNs shut off and cut down at close of check-in. This extends it for kittens to the same point as where we do catalog corrections, to add registration numbers for kittens. Hannon: Is there a motion? Newkirk: I’ll move. Mastin: Second. Hannon: Discussion? The problem I have with it, Monte, is that we already have campaigners pressuring people to get a TRN. They wander the show hall throughout the weekend, as recently as last weekend I experienced this, pressuring people to get a TRN. That’s just not right, trying to get people to put in for a TRN when they don’t want to. Maybe they have already put in for a regular registration. Phillips: No matter what, to get a TRN they still have to have the appropriate stuff. Hannon: Right. Phillips: A 4 generation pedigree or registration numbers on certified CFA parents. Plus the bucks.
Hannon: I agree, but it was happening last weekend, and the master clerk did not appreciate mid-afternoon getting TRNs. Phillips: This one doesn’t care. Kuta: We have had that situation a couple times. Hannon: Probably with the same exhibitor. Kuta: As an entry clerk, I have reached out to people who entered their kittens that don’t have registration numbers asking them, “hey, if you think you’re going to have it by then, if not here’s the TRN, here’s the form, we will even have the form for you ready to fill out.” I gave the master clerk a list of all the kittens that may be getting TRNs and putting TRNs in, just so we can have our ducks in a row. It’s a lot of extra work, but just trying to keep ahead of the situation. Hannon: And the campaigners appreciate your help. Kuta: Well, not really I guess. Black: So Mark, if we took out the sentence about all the way up to catalog corrections, would that solve that issue? Hannon: The current rule is that you have to do it by close of check in and that hasn’t stopped them. At least we have the rule to toss in their face. What happened last weekend was, rather than argue with the exhibitor, the master clerk took it, and “Dear Shirley, this is what happened Saturday afternoon.” Shirley wouldn’t know when the TRN was provided when she gets the package, unless somebody like the master clerk alerts her, and she voided it. Newkirk: Did she notify the campaigner? Hannon: I don’t know. Newkirk: He would have argued with her. Hannon: He already argued with her about something else about the count. She had the count up, “The count’s wrong.” “I know it’s wrong, I’m going to correct it before I send it to CFA.” “No, you’re going to correct it now,” to which she said, “get out of my face.” So then when he came back later with a TRN, she decided not to argue. We don’t know who this is. Newkirk: No, we don’t.

Hannon: Is there any other discussion on this motion? Black: Are you making a recommendation that we take out that sentence? Hannon: I would be happy to see that taken out. DelaBar: Or we can vote it down. Newkirk: Vote it down and then bring it up later. Actually, if this is a 50% rule, can’t we amend it? Anger: It’s not. We’re past that batch. DelaBar: It was never voted on. Newkirk: So we can amend it. Krzanowski: I thought the general consensus was that the board wanted them to be able to submit TRNs for kittens the same way they do kitten registration numbers, but maybe I’m wrong on that. Did we ever discuss it? Hannon: I just disagree with it. I understand the logic of why you are doing it. All those in favor of what was presented to us here.

Hannon called the motion. Motion Failed.

Hannon: Does somebody want to re-do this motion? Black: I make a motion that we take out the second underlined sentence where it says, except that TRNs for kittens may be issued up to the point where the Master Clerk no longer takes catalog corrections. Newkirk: Second.

Hannon: Any discussion?

Hannon called the motion. Motion Carried.
### 3i – Add Household Pet Finals Award Form to What Must be Printed in Catalog

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 7.18</th>
<th>Show Rules Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Championship, kitten and premiership finals awards must be printed in the catalog. Forms to record championship and premiership breed/division awards may either be printed in the catalog or made available at the master clerk’s table. All forms shall conform to an approved CFA format.</td>
<td>Championship, kitten, and premiership, and Household Pet (if entered) finals awards must be printed in the catalog. Forms to record kitten, championship, and premiership breed/division awards may either be printed in the catalog or made available at the master clerk’s table. All forms shall conform to an approved CFA format.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATIONALE:** Currently, there is no requirement to print the Household Pet (HHP) finals award page in the show catalog, although the corresponding requirement does exist to print the Kitten, Championship, and Premiership forms. This change proposes to include the HHP Finals sheet in the catalog for shows where HHPs are entered.

**Phillips:** 3i. Once upon a time, at the end of the Household Pet judging form sheet was a listing of placements for the Household Pets, 1 through 10, or in some cases 1 through 15. Some entry clerk programs have taken that away completely, some have left it there. Either way, the master clerk does need to know who were the Household Pet top 10 finalists? There is no form anymore there. So, this basically puts the requirement that we put a Household Pet final awards sheet into the catalog, just like we have right now for championship finals, kitten finals and the premiership finals. **Krzanowski:** So moved. **Eigenhauser:** Second. **Hannon:** Any discussion?

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

### 3j – Clarify Rule Concerning When Judges can Agent Cats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 21.03</th>
<th>Judging Program Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anyone participating in the CFA judging program in any capacity may NOT agent cats or kittens or present to the judging ring cats or kittens other than those registered in his/her name as owner, except single-specialty judges and trainees may agent cats of the opposite specialty.</td>
<td>Anyone participating in the CFA judging program in any capacity may NOT agent cats or kittens or present to the judging ring cats or kittens other than those registered in his/her name as owner, except single-specialty judges and single-specialty trainees may agent cats of the opposite specialty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATIONALE:** The Judging Program Committee wishes to revise this rule to clarify that only SINGLE specialty trainees can agent cats. A judge licensed as a trainee in one specialty but who is an Approval Pending/Apprentice/Approved judge in the other, cannot agent cats in the specialty in which he/she is qualified to rank and final cats.
Phillips: 3j. This is one from the Judging Committee to try to clarify the wording on the rule that allows trainee judges to agent cats. What it has been revised to say to make it clear is, a single specialty trainee may agent cats in the opposite specialty. The wording in there, as it is right now, has been a little bit confusing. Some thought it meant yes, some thought it meant no, some thought it meant that I could be a trainee in my second specialty and I could agent cats in either. This is to make it clear. Hannon: Somebody make a motion. Newkirk: I move. Krzanowski: Second. Hannon: Discussion?

Hannon called the motion. Motion Carried.

3k – Add e-mail address as something the Master Clerk is to include on either the official CFA catalog or Show information Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 12.12</th>
<th>Show Rules Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The master clerk shall sign the cover of the official CFA catalog or show information sheet and note his current clerking status, his address and telephone number.</td>
<td>The master clerk shall sign the cover of the official CFA catalog or show information sheet and note his current clerking status, his address, e-mail address (if available), and telephone number.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATIONALE:** Since most people now have access to computers and e-mail accounts, and Central Office’s preferred method of contact is via e-mail, it makes sense that the master clerk include their e-mail address on the information sheet sent from the show to Central Office.

Phillips: 3k adds a requirement. Right now, the master clerk is supposed to give his clerking status, address, phone number, etc. on the official show information sheet. This adds his email address so they can communicate by email. That seems to be the way we are doing all our communication these days, as opposed to writing letters. Krzanowski: So moved. Newkirk: Second. Hannon: Discussion? Black: So, the current forms that go to the master clerk, they’re just going to write their email in for now until we use up all the forms we have, and then the new forms will have a place for email? DelaBar: We usually use up the old forms. Black: You want to use all the old ones up? I mean, do we have millions of them? Barry: No. Black: OK, alright. Phillips: Some of us put it on there anyway, even though there’s no line to put it there. Hannon: No more discussion?

Hannon called the motion. Motion Carried.
31 – Add Ireland to the List of Exceptions for Grand Points and Qualifying Rings to Match What is Required in the United Kingdom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 27.03.a.</th>
<th>Show Rules Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Six (6) Qualifying Rings earned under at least four (4) different judges are required for Championship or Premiership confirmation. For cats residing and competing in Hawaii, Mexico, Central America, South America, the United Kingdom, and the Maritime Provinces of Canada (New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island) four (4) Qualifying Rings earned under at least three (3) different judges are required for Championship or Premiership confirmation. For cats residing and competing in Russia (east of the Ural Mountains), Malta, and Asia (except China, Japan, Hong Kong, Indonesia, and Malaysia) four (4) Qualifying Rings earned under at least two (2) different judges are required for Championship or Premiership confirmation.</td>
<td>a. Six (6) Qualifying Rings earned under at least four (4) different judges are required for Championship or Premiership confirmation. For cats residing and competing in Hawaii, Mexico, Central America, South America, the United Kingdom, Ireland, and the Maritime Provinces of Canada (New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island) four (4) Qualifying Rings earned under at least three (3) different judges are required for Championship or Premiership confirmation. For cats residing and competing in Russia (east of the Ural Mountains), Malta, and Asia (except China, Japan, Hong Kong, Indonesia, and Malaysia) four (4) Qualifying Rings earned under at least two (2) different judges are required for Championship or Premiership confirmation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 28.04.b.</th>
<th>Show Rules Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Two hundred (200) points are required for Grand Championship; seventy-five (75) points for Grand Premiership in Regions 1 through 9 with the exceptions of the Maritime Provinces of Canada, the United Kingdom, Malta, the Ukraine, Hawaii, Russia (east of the Ural mountains), and the International Division. For cats residing and competing in Hawaii, Malta, Russia (east of the Ural mountains), the International Division (except Hong Kong, China, Malaysia, Thailand, Taiwan, and Indonesia), the United Kingdom, and the Maritime Provinces of Canada seventy five points (75) are required for Grand Championship; twenty-five (25) points are required for Grand Premiership. In Taiwan ninety (90) points are required for Grand Championship; forty (40) points are required for Grand Premiership. In Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand, and Indonesia one hundred</td>
<td>b. Two hundred (200) points are required for Grand Championship; seventy-five (75) points for Grand Premiership in Regions 1 through 9 with the exceptions of the Maritime Provinces of Canada, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Malta, the Ukraine, Hawaii, Russia (east of the Ural mountains), and the International Division. For cats residing and competing in Hawaii, Malta, Russia (east of the Ural mountains), the International Division (except Hong Kong, China, Malaysia, Thailand, Taiwan, and Indonesia), the United Kingdom, Ireland, and the Maritime Provinces of Canada seventy five points (75) are required for Grand Championship; twenty-five (25) points are required for Grand Premiership. In Taiwan ninety (90) points are required for Grand Championship; forty (40) points are required for Grand Premiership. In Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand, and Indonesia one hundred twenty-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RATIONALE:
The Country of Ireland was inadvertently omitted when the point requirements were adjusted for the United Kingdom. While Northern Ireland is part of the United Kingdom, the Country of Ireland is not. Also, the comma after Thailand needs to be deleted in the second from the last sentence.

Phillips: 3l. I apologize to Pam on this one. When we put in the United Kingdom, I forgot about Ireland. I should apologize to my relatives, too. What this does is, it puts Ireland in the same point requirement category as the United Kingdom, because technically Ireland is not part of the United Kingdom. Anger: So moved. DelaBar: Second. Hannon: Any discussion?

Hannon called the motion. Motion Carried.

#### 3m – Adjust Point Requirements for Household Pet Grand to Match Reduced Requirements for Championship/Premiership in United Kingdom and Ireland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 29.02.a.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Two hundred (200) points are required for Grand Household Pet in Regions 1 through 9 with the exceptions of the Maritime Provinces of Canada, Malta, the Ukraine, Hawaii, Russia (east of the Ural mountains), and the International Division. For cats residing and competing in those excepted areas one hundred (100) points are required for the Grand Household Pet (GH) title.</td>
<td>a. Two hundred (200) points are required for Grand Household Pet in Regions 1 through 9 with the exceptions of the Maritime Provinces of Canada, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Malta, the Ukraine, Hawaii, Russia (east of the Ural mountains), and the International Division. For cats residing and competing in those excepted areas one hundred (100) points are required for the Grand Household Pet (GH) title.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATIONALE:** At the time the Household Pet proposal to title cats was made, the revised point requirements for the United Kingdom (and now Ireland) had not been put in place. Since they have now been put in place, this would correspondingly lower the requirements for granding Household Pets in a similar manner.

Phillips: 3m, we’re back to the same issue essentially. We have the 200 point requirement for Household Pets to become a grand, except in certain countries. Then countries,
when we made the exceptions, we did not include the United Kingdom or Ireland. This puts the United Kingdom and Ireland on the same basis as Malta and the Ukraine and Hawaii and Russia as far as grand point requirements for Household Pet grands. **Anger:** So moved. **Mastin:** Second. **Hannon:** Any discussion?

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

### 3n – Limitation on Clerking for Trainees who are Licensed in the Other Specialty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule # 21.07</th>
<th>Show Rules Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A judge shall not serve as clerk for another judge but may serve as master clerk. (See paragraph 9.09.c) A single specialty judge may clerk for a ring in the category for which he is not licensed. Trainees may serve as clerks in all capacities.</td>
<td>A judge shall not serve as clerk for another judge but may serve as master clerk. (See paragraph 9.09.c) A single specialty judge may clerk for a ring in the category for which he is not licensed. Single-specialty Trainees may serve as clerks in all capacities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATIONALE:** This is a clarification that if a judge is a trainee in one specialty but licensed in another as Apprentice, Approval Pending, or Approved, they may not serve as clerks in all capacities, but only in the ring where a judge is judging a specialty for which that judge is still a trainee.

**Phillips:** Last but not least, limitations on clerking for trainees who are licensed in other specialties. Basically, right now, a judge cannot serve as a clerk for another judge, but a single specialty judge can clerk in a ring with a judge in the other category. This is back to again clarify that a single specialty trainee has to be not licensed as a trainee in the other specialty, to clerk for another judge. **Mastin:** So moved. **Anger:** Second. **Hannon:** Any discussion?

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

Unless directed otherwise, it is our intent to remove the cross-reference table at the end of the rule book with the publication of the 2017-2018 rules. This table harkens back to the versions of the rules in existence prior to 2014-2015. By now, everyone should be familiar with the current rule format, and the cross-reference should no longer be necessary.

### 4 – Non-Show Rule Resolutions for Discussion

[Note: These have nothing to do with show rules, but are included here at the request of the Board for completeness of items discussed and voted on at the annual meeting.]

Approve or disapprove of the following non-show rule resolutions passed at the annual by a simple majority.
4a – Resolution 23 – Reduce the Grand/DM Offspring for Male DMs from 15 to 10

Resolution 23: Effective April 29, 2016, amend the Rules for Registration to reduce the grand offspring for male DMs from 15 to 10.

RATIONALE: 1. Current legislation and restrictions on selling cats/kittens have reduced the number of litters that are being produced. 2. Limit laws in communities limit the number of animals allowed per household. 3. As an association we need to show due diligence and decrease the necessity of “breeding for record” in order to produce extra kittens to earn titles just to achieve a male cat’s DM.

DISCUSSION SYNOPSIS: Most of the discussion centered on two themes – don’t cheapen the award (cons), and we’re all getting older and being forced to reduce the number of litters bred, so let’s make this award achievable for new people (pros). The motion passed by a teller vote of 180-160.

Hannon: Are you through? You took more than 15 minutes. Phillips: 4a is the one to basically reduce the number of male cats required for DM from 15 to 10. Two points I want to make that are not clear from this rule. The first is, this is an “in perpetuity” rule. It says it’s effective on April 29, 2016. You could pick any date, but we’re talking about cats that may have been born in 1908 all the way up to now. Ten grands will exist for them on that date, just like it exists for them today, just like it existed for them back in 19-whatever. So, that rule takes effect and it modifies everything for everybody. The second thing, just for a head’s up, I looked at the statistics on DMs. If you add up from 1998 through 2016, we have had 418 male DMs, compared to 2,060 female DMs. Males constitute about 17% of the DMs, compared to the 83% of females accounted for. Based on the Chartreux, just as an example, we calculated how many new DMs we would get if we went down to 10. We would basically double the number of males. That would take that 17% up to about 20%. Hannon: Is there a motion. Anger: So moved, reserving the right to vote no. DelaBar: Second. Phillips: Rachel’s got an alternate proposal. DelaBar: We’ve got to vote on the original first. Newkirk: We need to know what the alternate is. Eigenhauser: We should vote down the original and then go on to the alternate. Black: This is a very hot topic in my region. I polled the region just to get a feel, and just like the Annual, it was about 50/50, those for and those against. It seemed like the ones that are for it though tend to have more people they work with, more breeds – maybe not larger breeds, but maybe a good network of people to work with. I had people tell me, “this would give my cat a DM but I don’t want it that way, I want it to stay at 15.” Those that make the argument on the other side say, “we have fewer cats, we have fewer breeders, we have fewer shows, it’s harder for minority breeds,” so they make the opposite argument. I’m just saying, this was a very – just like at the Annual, it was split about 50/50, so it’s a very hot topic among the people that are voting and the people that are watching us today of what decision we will make. Anger: Just to facilitate the discussion, I moved on the original proposal, reserving the right to vote no. DelaBar: Second. I’m against what I call dumbing this down. When you think that we registered well over 2 million cats and we have less than 3,000 that can claim the title of DM, males and females, this is not a title that was supposed to be freely given out. This is something that is supposed to be way, way special. When you have a breed and have a couple DMs, that to me is really the mark of a breeder. I’m sorry, the males can have the opportunity to be the sire of many more cats that grand
than females do, so I cannot support this. **Calhoun:** I also don’t support this. I think that the cat of Distinguished Merit to be aspirational. I understand that times have changed and breeding programs have changed, but I don’t feel the need. I don’t feel that it’s in the best interests of that title to dumb it down. I certainly don’t feel, given the way it’s written, that we would have to make this retroactive to 1906. I would vote no. **Wilson:** I had a breed council meeting at the Annual which, of course, was the Saturday after the delegation meeting. My breed council members – I had a number of them attend – were very strongly against this. They pretty much agree, it’s a goal that is difficult to reach. Most of them were offended by the rationale, that whatever clubs wrote this are making the assumption that breeders are keeping their males whole just to attain this. Sure, maybe if you only need one or two more. I had a male that DM’ed last year. He is 11 years old and still going strong. I don’t make a decision on whether to keep a male whole or not, based on whether he is going to get a DM title; it’s based on what he produces. That’s the mark of a breeder – being able to look at what you’re getting and make your breeding decisions based on that. If there really is an issue with the disparity in the number of females versus the number of male DMs, then raise the number of grands required for females. I polled the people who weren’t there. The Russian Blue Breed Council is against this proposal. **Anger:** Or, we could consider the alternate proposal, which we will talk about later. I don’t know how many of you in the room have a DM. I have several female DMs, but I have only one male DM. In this lifetime, I will never have the chance to have another one. For someone to do 2/3s of the work that I did when I had the means and the time to do it is offensive to me. You don’t lower the bar and give people the same credit as someone who worked 1/3 again harder and longer to achieve the title. **Mastin:** I’m anxious to hear Rachel’s alternate, but I sense there may be more chapters to this, as time goes on. I know Monte produced some numbers, but I don’t know what time frame those numbers are in blocks of time; meaning, is that the last 5 years, 10 years, 15 years, and how it’s trending. What happens when we go into the future? If 15 is the number – and I’m not saying it’s right or wrong – what I’m saying is, going forward, if fewer cats are being shown and they are not breeding as long, as it stands today, do we get to a point where there are no more DMs? I think it’s going to be one of those things we look at later as we evolve. **Newkirk:** I don’t support this because, to me, if we lower this and then all these cats have a DM title, those of us who have produced 15 grands to get a DM on a male, it sort of lessens that. I had a male that produced quite a few grands and I’m very proud of that cat. I don’t mind if we give them a title, but I don’t think it should be “DM.” DM is what we focused on for all these years. I just think it lessens all those cats that have worked so hard over the years if we lower the requirement and then call them a DM. If we call them something else, I would support that, but I don’t support giving those cats that title. To me, it’s the best title you can get on a cat. **Hannon:** I’m going to call the question.

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

* * * * *

**PROPOSAL 23 – ALTERNATE SOLUTION**

**BACKGROUND:** At the June 2016 Annual Meeting, a non-Show Rule proposal was made to reduce the grand offspring requirement for DM males from 15 to 10, yet retain the same title with the same name. A lengthy discussion followed and the motion was called. The outcome was too
close to determine, so a teller count was had, without the Credentials Chair being present. The results were 180 in favor, 160 against (total of 340 votes). 392 delegates were registered for the meeting. These facts are being stated for clarity, because there has been subsequent dispute surrounding the results. The proposal carried.

**RESOLVED:** Effective April 30, 2016 (start of the current show season), amend Rules for Registration© (Revised November 15, 2015) to reduce the grand offspring for male DMs from 15 to 10, as follows:

**ARTICLE I – REGISTRATION**

...  

**Section 4 – Cat Names:** ...

*Titles – One or more official CFA titles, as outlined below, may appear as part of a cat’s name.*

... **DM:** Distinguished Merit, the title given to a cat which has produced the required number of Grand Champions, Grand Premiers or Distinguished Merit Cats (5 for females and 15 for males). ...  

**Motion Carried.**

**NON-SHOW RULE PROCEDURE:** Non-Show Rule Resolutions must pass by more than 50% and are advisory only. Therefore, the proposal may be either adopted, amended (in whole or in part), or rejected.

**ALTERNATE PROPOSAL:** No one is disputing any of the three points of the originally proposed rationale.

**RATIONALE:**

1. Current legislation and restrictions on selling cats/kittens have reduced the number of litters that are being produced.

2. Limit laws in communities limit the number of animals allowed per household.

3. As an association we need to show due diligence and decrease the necessity of “breeding for record” in order to produce extra kittens to earn titles just to achieve a male cat’s DM.

The alternate proposal seeks to support and achieve these same points, as well as provide what the authors of the proposal requested, but goes about it in a different manner which does not employ the drastic measures that will devalue the special title of Distinguished Merit that has been earned by hundreds of male cats over the decades that the title has been in existence.

This could be accomplished by adopting a more realistic intermediate award of 10 grand offspring, while retaining the 15 grand offspring title for those breeders who have a male cat that is truly special enough to produce that number in what one would hope would be the same time frame and conditions as the 10 grand offspring title. Such a proposal is as follows:
RESOLVED: Effective April 29-30, 2016 (start of the current show season), amend Rules for Registration© (Revised November 15, 2015) to add an intermediate title for male DMs who produce 10 grand offspring, as follows:

**ARTICLE I – REGISTRATION**

... 

Section 4 – Cat Names: ...

**Titles** – One or more official CFA titles, as outlined below, may appear as part of a cat’s name.

... DA: Distinguished Achievement, the title given to a male cat which has produced 10 Grand Champions, Grand Premiers or Distinguished Merit Cats. DM: Distinguished Merit, the title given to a cat which has produced the required number of Grand Champions, Grand Premiers or Distinguished Merit Cats (5 for females and 15 for males). ...

**Action Item:** Adopt an intermediate title of “Distinguished Achievement” for males who produce 10 grand champion, grand premiers or distinguished merit offspring.

**Hannon:** Do you want to present your alternative? **Anger:** I do. The alternate solution hopefully takes into consideration the philosophy of both camps. For the people who think we should have a title at 10, it gives a title at 10. For the people who want to retain the title and requirements of Distinguished Merit and sustain what it has been for almost 20 years, it honors that, as well. What it does is to create a new title called “Distinguished Achievement” which kicks in when a male cat produces 10 or more grand champions, grand premiers or distinguished merit cats. This was not my idea. Somebody mentioned it during the discussion at the Annual and I thought at the time, “that’s the perfect solution.” After listening to the discontent over the devaluing of the Distinguished Merit requirements, I thought I would put that person’s thoughts in writing. **Hannon:** So, you are making a motion? **Anger:** I am. **Newkirk:** I’ll second it. 

**Hannon:** Any discussion?

**Eigenhauser:** I have two questions. First, what are we going to do in terms of an effective date for this, because I assume we’re not going back to the beginning of time on this. The second question is, whatever we have as an effective date, if somebody does want to go back farther than that to claim it, could we charge a fee? **Anger:** The effective date is in the proposal, that effective with the start of the current show season. **Eigenhauser:** Does that mean the first qualifying offspring is produced after that or the 10th qualifying offspring is produced after that? **Calhoun:** If you have a male cat today that has 9 grands and we pass this today, does that mean the 9 it has count toward this, or does it mean the clock starts now? **Eigenhauser:** That was my question. **Colilla:** I’m cheap. I’m concerned that my region will have to buy more awards. **Anger:** Reading it again, I just cut and pasted the resolution from the original proposal from the Annual. The title will be available beginning April 29, 2016, so any cat that qualifies for it from then on. I would assume that we will implement it the exact same way we did when the Distinguished Merit was originally implemented. **Hannon:** That we go back as far as our computer records? **Anger:** You can go back and claim it. **Hannon:** If you have a cat that pre-dates that, you can provide the documentation. **Anger:** That’s my motion. **Black:** I want some clarification. I’m sorry. So, you’re saying that Rachel’s proposal says that any cat in our record
database that has 10 qualifying offspring could, if the breeder provided the records – **Hannon:** No, no. It says we will automatically do it, right? We will automatically go check the records and any cat that current has 10 – **Anger:** No. **Hannon:** Why? **DelaBar:** We have always put the requirement on the breeder or the owner of the cat to provide the information. **Hannon:** No. **Anger:** Not anymore. **Hannon:** We did initially. **DelaBar:** I did it on two. **Hannon:** And I’ve gotten DMs just in the mail, “oh surprise.” I didn’t ask for it. **Kallmeyer:** The new system will pick it up. **Black:** Did you say there was going to be a fee involved? **Hannon:** No, there’s no fee. **Kuta:** So, for the catteries of distinction, that was like automatically at the end of the show season we just did them, right? **Hannon:** Automatically, because he [Kallmeyer] did it. **Kuta:** I don’t know how that worked. I would think maybe this is similar. **Hannon:** This will be the same as a DM. You would tweak what you’re searching for. **Kallmeyer:** Realistically, it would have to be by hand. It’s not going to be automated right away. We could probably do a query. It would be kind of ugly for a while, to be honest. **Bizzell:** This may have been mentioned, but if not, someone said something about the cattery of distinction. Right now, we have DM as part of the superior requirement. **Hannon:** It doesn’t have DA. **Bizzell:** Right, it doesn’t, but we will need to think through, do we add that somehow? **Hannon:** Maybe as part of a fraction. **Wilson:** I’m just curious. Does a certificate need to be produced or would a title be sufficient? The reason I ask is because if this passes, then all of a sudden a whole bunch of male cats could become DAs. **Hannon:** The same thing happened when we created DMs. **Wilson:** I understand that, but then remember we had a lot of issues trying to get the DM certificates issued in Central Office until recently. They weren’t coming out. I don’t know what was involved in that, with the programming or what. If this passes and a whole bunch of male cats that have between 10 and 14 grands to their credit – first of all, how are you going to know that? Secondly, are you going to be able to produce all those certificates and send them out? **Barry:** I don’t know that we can produce them, but I would think there would have to be some kind of computer changes. **Wilson:** I think we need to look at that. I don’t think it’s instant. **DelaBar:** If this goes through – and I’m really not all that happy about this – if this goes through, like we did when we accepted the DM title, we made the breeder go back and state who the grands are and what show they granded at so Central Office could go back and verify that information. We could do the same. Right now, Central Office has a ton of stuff they have to do to go back and automatically search out these cats. We should put the onus on the owner to do the basic work to submit to Central Office for the title. **Kallmeyer:** It’s going to take some computer work to do it. It could be automated but I don’t think we should do it the end of this show season. I think we ought to put it off until June or July. Let’s get through the awards. It’s painful enough, rather than throwing something else extra there. They will get it, but give time to do it. There will be some manual processing in the beginning, plus we have to probably code change to allow the title as part of it. It’s not going to be really drop-kick. We don’t want to turn the awards into a crisis. **Hannon:** I discourage you from passing this. **Black:** What if, like Pam suggested, what if it was on a voluntary basis, where only those people that put in for it? **Kallmeyer:** Somebody’s got to check and that takes time. **Black:** I understand the checking side of it, but instead of just making it retroactive to every cat since 1906 or whatever, I’m just saying only those people who request it for those qualifying cats. Then you would have a lot less to check. **Kallmeyer:** Well, we can identify them. The problem is, what happens after we identify them? Do we print a certificate? Somebody has to look at that list and say yes or no. Two, you have to build the title into the system, so it’s not a drop-kick where you can just add it and recognize it. So, identifying is probably not the problem.
It’s, what do you do then, like certificates and all that. **Krzanowski:** I would like to recommend that we table this until we do some investigation as to what programming would be required and how we would implement a claim system, what the fee might be, etc. **Calhoun:** I think, too, we need to go back to our constituents and pose that question; in theory, do we think this is a good idea? Then do more work on how to execute. **Anger:** Just so we can exhaust all the discussion, so our constituents know we really tried, I have amended my action item to say, *Effective May 1, 2017,* so that’s next show season, adopt an intermediate title of “Distinguished Achievement” for males who produce 10 grand champion, grand premier or distinguished merit offspring. The DA title must be claimed by the current owner, who must list names and registration numbers of all qualifying offspring. **Hannon:** Are we tabling this or what? **Newkirk:** There wasn’t a second. **Colilla:** I’ll second it. **Hannon:** John seconded it. So, we are voting on tabling? **Newkirk:** Yes. **Hannon:** All those in favor of tabling this.

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion [to table] Carried.** Anger voting no.

**Hannon:** Who has the work to bring this back? We’re tabling this so that we can do some research. Who is charged with that work? **Black:** I think the IT Committee. **Hannon:** You think the IT Committee? **Kallmeyer:** Parts of it. **Hannon:** Alright, so you’re going to talk to the IT Committee Chair and have him come back to us with some information to help us make a decision on this, right? **Newkirk:** For the December meeting. **Hannon:** December would be ideal.

* * * * *

**4b – Resolution 24 – Allow the top 3 cats in breed in kittens and premiership to use the Best title**

**Resolution 24:** Allow the top three cats in breed in kittens and premiership to use the terms Best, 2nd or 3rd Best of Breed in Kitten or Best, 2nd or 3rd Best of Breed in Premiership in all CFA publications the same as championship cats.

**RATIONALE:** Currently, the Yearbook staff rejects ads that use the Best terminology in the kitten and premiership class and insists that instead the ad use the Highest Scoring terminology. If someone is willing to put an ad in the yearbook, do we really need to be that picky? It would be too costly to add awards for these rankings, and there isn’t enough time in the day to include them in a banquet. But rather than putting these in the show rules as titles, we could simply change the publication policy.

**DISCUSSION:** [Mary Kolencik was the only speaker]: I’m going to be brief. If you submit an ad to the Yearbook that says your cat was “best Maine Coon in premiership” or whatever breed you breed, yeah, it will be rejected. You have to change it to “highest scoring Maine Coon in premiership.” My question is, it’s a Yearbook ad, what difference does it make? Seriously. I thought about adding these designations to the show rules as non-trophied awards, but then I thought it would be better to first just try to change the policy. If someone wants to take out an ad in the Yearbook that says, “best Siamese kitten,” we shouldn’t be turning them down and saying, “no, you have to say “highest scoring kitten.” Let’s just take the money.
**Hannon:** Monte, you’re on. Go. **Phillips:** OK, the last one I have is 4b, Resolution 24 which is to allow cats and kittens and premiership that have the highest and second highest scores to use the phrase “best, “second best” and “third best” in their Yearbook ads. Apparently, currently they are being rejected because they are not championship cats. **Hannon:** Carol, you know the history of this. It goes way back. We have for many years, as I understand it, said, you cannot say you have the Best Abyssinian Kitten in CFA, but you could say you have the highest scoring. **Krzanowski:** Right. Best Abyssinian Kitten is not an official title. **Hannon:** We limited the ads in our publication to the official titles. **Krzanowski:** Yes, but we permitted them to say highest scoring. **Hannon:** What was passed by the delegates was, it’s OK to say best. **Krzanowski:** But then how does the reader know if that’s an official title or not? It’s an official CFA publication, so our policy was always to state – **Hannon:** Alright, somebody make a motion and second it. **Mastin:** So moved. **Hannon:** Is there a second? **Eigenhauser:** Sure. **Hannon:** Does anybody else have any other discussion on this? **Mastin:** My understanding is, it’s just used for advertising purposes. It’s not going to show up on any certificate, it’s not going to be sold as, that cat is best or whatever. It’s just advertising. **Hannon:** Right, in a CFA publication. **Eigenhauser:** And if it is the second best kitten, it is the second best kitten whether we give it that title or not. It’s factually correct. **Mastin:** True. That’s my point. **Hannon:** Any other discussion?

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Krzanowski, Calhoun, Wilson and Moser voting no.

**5 – Rule Changes Not Requiring Board Approval at this Time**

No Board action is required on the following unless the Board wants to get involved in actions previously-passed or to vote on typographical corrections.

**5a – Rules passed in Rules Text at Previous Board Meeting – Included here for Completeness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule #28.02</th>
<th>International Division Chair &amp; Chinese Clubs – Passed at August Board Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A cat eligible for and shown in the Champion or Premier Class will compete for Grand Championship or Grand Premiership points in any type of ring, e.g. Allbreed, Longhair/Shorthair or Breed specialty as follows:</td>
<td>A cat eligible for and shown in the Champion or Premier Class will compete for Grand Championship or Grand Premiership points in any type of ring, e.g. Allbreed, Longhair/Shorthair or Breed specialty as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Any Champion or Premier placing in the top ten (or fifteen, where applicable) finals awards may receive points towards Grand Championship or Grand Premiership. The highest placing Champion or Premier will receive one point for every benched Champion or Premier defeated. The second highest placing Champion or Premier will</td>
<td>a. Any Champion or Premier placing in the top ten (or fifteen, where applicable) finals awards may receive points towards Grand Championship or Grand Premiership. The highest placing Champion or Premier will receive one point for every benched Champion or Premier defeated. The highest placing Champion or Premier will receive one point for every benched Champion or Premier defeated for shows held outside of China, i.e., Regions 1-9 and most of the International Division (including</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
receive 90% of the points awarded the highest placing Champion or Premier, third highest 80%, fourth highest 70% and 5th highest 60%, etc. In all cases, fractional points .5 and greater will be rounded to the next higher number.

b. Best Champion or Best Premier will receive one point for every benched Champion or Premier defeated.

c. Second Best Champion or Premier will receive 90% of the points received by the Best Champion or Premier. Third Best Champion will receive 80% of the points received by the Best Champion.

d. Best Longhair Champion and Best Shorthair Champion in Allbreed Rings will receive one point for every benched Champion defeated in that specialty.

e. The Second Best Longhair Champion and Second Best Shorthair Champion in Allbreed Rings will receive 90% of the points received by the Best Longhair or Best Shorthair Champion. The Third Best Longhair Champion and Third Best Shorthair Champion in Allbreed Rings will receive 80% of the points received by the Best Longhair or Best Shorthair Champion.

f. Best Longhair Premier and Best Shorthair Premier in Allbreed Rings will receive one point for every benched Premier defeated in that specialty.

g. The Second Best Longhair Premier and Second Best Shorthair Premier in Allbreed Rings will receive 90% of the points received by the Best Longhair or Best Shorthair Premier.

the special administrative areas of Hong Kong and Macau). For champions/premiers competing at shows in China, the cat will receive one Grand Championship/Premiership point for every Champion/Premier defeated that was present in at least 80 percent of the Rings held at that show, as noted in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Rings held at show</th>
<th>Rings present for cat to be in count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ring held</td>
<td>1 Ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Rings held</td>
<td>2 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rings held</td>
<td>3 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Rings held</td>
<td>4 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Rings held</td>
<td>4 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Rings held</td>
<td>5 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Rings held</td>
<td>6 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Rings held</td>
<td>7 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Rings held</td>
<td>8 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Rings held</td>
<td>8 Rings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cats not present in the number of Rings specified in the table based on the number of Rings held at any show held in China will not be counted as competing at the show for determining the official champion/premier count; however, any grand points won by these cats in any ring will still be credited to that cat’s record.

The second highest placing Champion or Premier will receive 90% of the points awarded the highest placing Champion or Premier, third highest 80%, fourth highest 70% and 5th highest 60%, etc. In all cases, fractional points 0.5 and greater will be rounded to the next higher number.

b. Best Champion or Best Premier will receive one point for every benched Open/Champion or Open/Premier defeated in accordance with the method for calculating champions and premiers present described in 28.02a.

c. Second Best Champion or Premier will receive 90% of the points received by the Best Champion or Premier. Third Best Champion will receive 80% of the points received by the Best Champion.

d. Best Longhair Champion and Best Shorthair Champion in Allbreed Rings will receive one point for every benched Open/Champion
defeated in that specialty in accordance with the method for calculating champions present described in 28.02a.

e. The Second Best Longhair Champion and Second Best Shorthair Champion in Allbreed Rings will receive 90% of the points received by the Best Longhair or Best Shorthair Champion. The Third Best Longhair Champion and Third Best Shorthair Champion in Allbreed Rings will receive 80% of the points received by the Best Longhair or Best Shorthair Champion.

f. Best Longhair Premier and Best Shorthair Premier in Allbreed Rings will receive one point for every benched Premier defeated in that specialty in accordance with the method for calculating premiers present described in 28.02a.

g. The Second Best Longhair Premier and Second Best Shorthair Premier in Allbreed Rings will receive 90% of the points received by the Best Longhair or Best Shorthair Premier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule 28.03a</th>
<th>International Division Chair &amp; Chinese Clubs – Passed at August Board Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Cats which receive the award of Best Champion/Premier in each of the Breeds/Divisions currently recognized for Championship/Premiership competition (see rule 30.01) will receive one Grand Championship/Premiership point for every benched Champion/Premier defeated within the Breed/Division.</td>
<td>a. Cats which receive the award of Best Champion/Premier in each of the Breeds/Divisions currently recognized for Championship/Premiership competition (see rule 30.01) will receive one Grand Championship/Premiership point for every benched Champion/Premier defeated in accordance with the method for calculating champions and premiers present described in 28.02a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article XXXVI, Show Points, Official Show Count, Item 3</th>
<th>International Division Chair &amp; Chinese Clubs – Passed at August Board Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Wording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A cat/kitten/household pet handled by a judge in one ring is counted as competing in all Rings.</td>
<td>3. A cat/kitten/household pet handled by a judge in one ring is counted as competing in all Rings for shows held outside of China, i.e., Regions 1-9 and most of the International Division (including the special administrative areas of Hong Kong.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For cats/kittens/household pets handled by judges in China, the cat/kitten/household pet must be handled in 80 percent of the Rings held at the show, as noted in the following table, for the cat/kitten/household pet to be counted as competing at the show:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Rings held at show</th>
<th>Rings present for cat to be in count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ring held</td>
<td>1 Ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Rings held</td>
<td>2 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rings held</td>
<td>3 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Rings held</td>
<td>4 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Rings held</td>
<td>4 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Rings held</td>
<td>5 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Rings held</td>
<td>6 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Rings held</td>
<td>7 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Rings held</td>
<td>8 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Rings held</td>
<td>8 Rings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cats/kittens/household pets not present in the number of Rings specified in the table based on the number of Rings held at any show held in China will not be counted as competing at the show for determining the official count; however, any awards won by these cats in any ring will still be credited to that cat’s record.

**ORIGINAL RATIONALE:** The China clubs are petitioning for an 80% rule for scoring (both for points and GC/GP points). They want it implemented as soon as possible, i.e., within a few days of Board approval. Scores already attained would remain. It looks like a majority of Chinese clubs already support this to be effective as of September 15, 2016, in the current show season. This rule is NOT intended for implementation anywhere other than China. It would face significant opposition from just about everybody outside of China if it were to be recommended for implementation anywhere outside of China.

**OCTOBER BOARD MEETING RATIONALE:** No action required on this proposal – it was voted on in August and made effective as of September 17, 2016. It is here so that all changes for the 2017-2018 rules are located in one place – here.

### 5b - Correction of Typos in Current Rule Book

3.02b – First Sentence: Invitations from CFA clubs in the International Division may be considered only by judges who are Approved or Approval Pending, [delete preceding comma] judges that are Approved in one specialty and at least Apprentice in the second specialty, or judges at any level that reside in Regions 8, 9, or the International Division.

7.05 - Show catalogs must not be smaller than 5-1/2 x 8-1/2 inches. [add the hyphens to clarify page size]
11.24f – delete the extra period within the parenthesis at the end of the sentence.

14.01 first sentence should have “kitten or cat” in both places where the term is used, not just the first time.

Add “Calico Smoke, Lilac Calico Smoke” behind Chocolate in Exotic Color Class pair 7594/7595 to match text in Breed Standard for this color class pair.

In Exotics and Persians note at end of section, add Divisional between National/Regional to be consistent with usage throughout the show rules, i.e., National/Divisional/Regional.

Ragdoll colorpoint colors class, should have a comma after seal, not a period.

Under Lynx point colorpoint shorthair; there should be a space between the comma after cream and the word lilac.

For both Longhair and Shorthair Other Mi-ke Japanese Bobtail color classes, all of the examples should be spelled Mi-ke to be consistent. Currently, some have a capital K, some do not.

Under Manx bi-color color class (both longhair and shorthair), add a comma after Red as the series of solid colors continues.

Ensure all of Article XXXVI uses the term National/Divisional/Regional throughout where it applies.

Article XXXVI National/Divisional/Regional Assignment section number 1, add the word “and” before the last category of competition listed in the series.

Add an index listing for Bengal and reference those rules where the breed is specifically referenced.

What will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Unless a significant issue is identified between completion of this report and the date when inputs are due to the Board for the February meeting, we do not anticipate making a presentation to the February meeting (or the December meeting either, for that matter).

Respectfully Submitted,
Monte Phillips, Chair

Hannon: Are you through, Monte? Phillips: I’m essentially through. Section 5 of my report is basically what you have already passed or are typographical errors. I don’t think we need to vote on those, so I think we’re done with Show Rules. Hannon: Thank you very much, Monte. We appreciate all your work and your coming to be with us in person. We appreciate that.

Hannon: It is 4:35. I suggest we adjourn, and we can pick up the rest tomorrow, since we don’t have a lot tomorrow.

[MEETING ADJOURNED]
The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers’ Association, Inc. continued the meeting on Sunday, October 2, 2016, in the CFA Foundation Museum, 260 East Main Street, Alliance, Ohio. President Mark Hannon called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. EDT with the following members present after a roll call:

Mr. Mark Hannon (President)
Mr. Richard Kallmeyer (Vice President)
Ms. Kathy Calhoun (Treasurer)
Ms. Rachel Anger (Secretary)
Mr. John Adelhoch (NAR Director)
Mrs. Pam Moser (NWR Director)
Ms. Kathy Black (GSR Director)
Mr. John Colilla (GLR Director)
Ms. Lisa Kuta (SWR Director)
Ms. Mary Auth (MWR Director)
Ms. Jean Dugger (SOR Director)
Mr. Edward Maeda (Japan Regional Director)
Mrs. Pam DelaBar (Europe Regional Director)
Carla Bizzell, C.P.A. (Director-at-Large)
Roger Brown, DVM (Director-at-Large)
George Eigenhauser, Esq. (Director-at-Large)
Mrs. Carol Krzanowski (Director-at-Large)
Mr. Richard Mastin (Director-at-Large)
Mr. Darrell Newkirk (Director-at-Large)
Mrs. Annette Wilson (Director-at-Large)

Also Present:

John M. Randolph, Esq., CFA Legal Counsel
Teresa Barry, Executive Director
Verna Dobbins, Director of CFA Services
Allene Tartaglia, Special Events Coordinator
Angela Watkins, Marketing and Communications Coordinator
Monte Phillips, Show Rules Chairman
Jim Flanik, CIS Show Manager
Shino Wiley, Japanese Interpreter
Brian Buettel, Central Office
Tim Schreck, IT Committee Chair (via teleconference)

Not Present:

None

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

The CFA Constitution states, “Ballots that are illegible, incomplete or those containing write-in candidates shall be considered void.” At the most recent Annual meeting the Credentials Committee chair reported that her committee discarded ballots where there was not a vote for every position up for election due to the ballot being ‘incomplete.’ That is, to use the most recent ballot, if there was not a check in the box for Mark Hannon nor the box for Abstain in the election of President, the Credentials Committee tossed out the ballot so that votes for the other three offices and the RD which were correctly completed were not counted. I would like as many ballots as possible to count. I emailed our attorney, John Randolph, and asked if failure to vote for one office constitutes an ‘incomplete’ ballot. John’s response is below:

“General election law does not require a vote for all open positions unless there is a contrary provision in the articles, bylaws or, in our case, our constitution (with the provision requiring a vote for each member at large). Thus, a ballot that does not have a vote for each open directorship or office would not be “incomplete” provided that all information required to qualify the ballot (signature, club name etc.) is present. Of course, this could be specifically addressed in an amendment to Article VI, Section 2(e) Election Procedure, but that would indicate the board believes an amendment is required before any change could be made to the current practice.”

Based on the input from our attorney, I am asking for a motion to declare a ballot ‘complete’ even though there is no vote for one of the four Officers, Regional Director, or any office other than Director-At-Large. The Constitution does require that clubs vote for exactly five candidates for Director-At-Large and voting for more or fewer than five does void the ballot.

Hannon: Let’s start the meeting. We’re still on yesterday’s agenda. Welcome to our board meeting. I believe the next order of business is the incomplete ballot proposal, which I submitted and everybody has read. It concerned me that some of our current board members, as well as it happened in the past, won the election by one or two votes, yet we tossed out a number of ballots which were considered by the Credentials Committee to be incomplete because they didn’t vote for a particular office. They consider that an incomplete ballot. When I talked with John about it, he said that’s not really considered an incomplete ballot. I thought we should give some guidance to the Credentials Committee as to whether we consider that a complete ballot if everything else is correct. If they didn’t mark the ballot for me or abstain, but they correctly voted for vice-president, secretary, treasurer and regional director, the whole ballot got thrown out. It seems to me they should have gone ahead and counted the rest of the ballot. Eigenhauser: I support this. The basic principle, when you are talking about balloting, should be to be as inclusive as possible. Unless there is a clear reason to exclude a ballot, then we should try to include it. This is completely different than the directors at large, where you are voting for one common pool and the top 5 vote getters are elected. The vote or non-vote for president has no effect on the regional director election. They are completely separate elections that just happen to be physically on one piece of paper, so that if you void one for failing to vote, it really doesn’t have any effect on the others, so we may have done this by tradition in the past, but it really isn’t “small d” democratic. It isn’t inclusive for voting. I also think now is a really good time to bring
it up, because there’s no officer and regional director election coming up until 2018, so there’s plenty of time to get this out in the ether, everybody will know about it, and it will be well settled long before the election even starts. So, I think this is a good time to bring it up. I think it’s a good concept fundamentally. **DelaBar:** My concern was, we really can’t compare this to our civic elections. In civic elections, they don’t give the alternative of an abstain, where we do. I’m just concerned that people that cannot follow directions should have everything counted, when they have been given specific instructions on how to do it. **Hannon:** What are you saying? Do you support this or don’t you? **DelaBar:** I don’t. Actually Mark, I don’t have a high care level. Either way is fine, but I just wanted to point out, you can’t compare the two because we offer abstain. **Wilson:** I think if we looked at this, that the alternative would be to have four separate pieces of paper, one for each office. That’s exactly what we’re talking about here. All we are doing is saving paper by putting it all on one piece of paper. **Mastin:** I’ll make the motion. **Eigenhauser:** I’ll second. **Hannon:** Is there any other discussion? **Mastin:** Can we go back to Annette’s suggestion? Do we need to have separate ballots then? **Hannon:** She is saying no. **Wilson:** I was just explaining it that way; the difference between this and the director at large ballot is that for directors at large, you would still have one ballot. It will say “pick 5” or whatever it is, but on this one the alternative would be to have a separate ballot for president, separate ballot for vice president, because that’s really what it is. We’re just putting it all on one piece of paper, and that’s the way to explain it, in my opinion. I’m not saying we should do it. **DelaBar:** I like that explanation. **Wilson:** Thank you. **Hannon:** Any other comments?

**Hannon** called the motion. **Motion Carried.**
Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Federal legislators are now returning to Washington, DC at the end of their summer recess. Most states have ended their legislative sessions for this year. A few states are in the first year of a two year session and we continue to monitor their activities along with new local (city/county) legislation being introduced and hearings on “hot” matters.

The Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council (PIJAC) helps us identify and track state and federal bills affecting cats based on search parameters we provide. In recent years they have expanded their tracking abilities for local ordinances as well. We read through hundreds of bills and ordinances to select those for CFA tracking. In some instances we are tracking bills which may appear not to affect us directly, but we suspect it will be amended in the future. Some bills apply to cats, or cats and dogs, or apply to dogs only but are of concern to us. Some states, such as Illinois, have very liberal rules for substitution of bill text (“gut and amend”) which means that a bill may be amended to add cat or breeder regulation unrelated to the original provisions.

Despite improvement to our tracking abilities, local (city and county) government continues to be a problem. Ordinances are being introduced on a variety of subjects, often with very short notice. In addition to tracking information provided by PIJAC, the CFA Legislative Group actively monitors several dozen pet law lists online, Facebook and other social media. We also rely on our “grassroots” network of fanciers to report proposed pet-related legislation in their area. We work with other animal groups including many non-traditional allies and monitor their alerts. We monitor major Animal Rights groups, their web sites and public events for information on upcoming legislative initiatives.

For the most recent list of state and federal bills CFA is tracking please use the following link: http://www.cfa.org/Portals/0/documents/legislative/bill-tracking.pdf

The Legislative Group has ventured into social media to strengthen its relationships with CFA’s historical legislative constituency and raise its visibility among fanciers. We now have a Facebook Page called CFALegislativeNews. The Page has the CFA Logo, and most posts feature a photo or other graphic from the linked media adding visual interest. We are posting links to relevant media stories about proposed local measures such as limit laws and pet shop bans and occasional alerts from the American Kennel Club's Government Relations Department when cats are included and time is short to develop our own alert. In addition to an immediate, localized source of information for fanciers, the Facebook page can provide...
feedback to the Legislative Group. Since publishing the page on July 8, 2016, 218 people have liked CFALegislativeNews. For a given period of time, or even for a given post, we can see how many people we have “reached” which is the Facebook term for the number of unique people who saw our content. For example, on September 9, 2016 we made 3 posts. The Santa Fe, NM post reached 91 people, Palm Beach County, FL post reached 142 people, and the Brampton, Canada post reached 160 people. The feedback that Facebook provides will enable the CFA Legislative Group to tailor how it uses the page and other tools to send information to fanciers on legislative news. To receive posts click “Like”, and to be sure to receive all posts, set “Notifications” to “All On” and also click “See First.” CFALegislativeNews is accessible at https://www.facebook.com/CFALegislativeNews/

We have also established a “closed” Facebook Group called CFA Legislative Liaisons which currently has 7 fanciers with extensive cat legislative experience in addition to our three administrators for a total of 10 members. So far, we have not utilized this forum but expect that it will be needed at some time when new members can benefit from interaction with an experienced group in a forum other than email or lists.

The Legislative Group has also begun to investigate the possibilities of incorporating a blog with our social media and other communications strategies to create an online presence that we can manage ourselves and link to especially in time sensitive situations.

We reported to the CFA Board in June 2016 that AHI (the Animal Health Institute) had cancelled Pet Night on Capitol Hill. We are pleased to report that Pet Night is back on September 20, 2016. The Pet Leadership Council (PLC) and the Human Animal Bond Research Initiative (HABRI) jointly approached AHI to ask if they could carry on and expand the event. Since it’s under new management we don’t know how much will change. They are shifting the focus away from “celebrity” pets and toward pet ownership (and the pet industry) in general. However, AHI will continue their “Cutest Pet” awards at the tail end of the event. Other changes are being made to boost turnout by actual members of Congress.

Current Happenings of Committee:

Highlights of a few selected issues: (Not by any means complete - just a few examples.)

Federal

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (USDA/APHIS) published a proposed rule concerning dealers, “exhibitors” and de minimis exemptions to exhibitor licensing. NOTE: The meaning of “exhibitor” as used in the AWA is not the common meaning cat fanciers ascribe to the term. The term refers to commercial exhibition such as carnivals, circuses, zoos and similar events. A few cat fanciers may be impacted as exhibitors if their cats are used in movies, television shows, commercials or other covered activities. Hobby breeding/sales may be subject to Federal regulation under different provisions of the AWA. However, some of the changes in the proposed rule raised concerns that other definitions and exemptions may be impacted indirectly. [For more details
Please see the CFA e-Newsletter, September 2016 “The Proposed De Minimis Rule of 2016” by Kelly Crouch, CFA Legislative Information Liaison.

Previously, on September 18, 2013, USDA/APHIS announced changes to the rules implementing the Animal Welfare Act (AWA). The rule was ostensibly intended to deal with the issue of breeders selling over the Internet. Thanks largely to efforts by the American Kennel Club (AKC) and others the Agricultural Act of 2014 (the Farm Bill) spoke to some concerns about the rule. The Farm Bill amended the AWA providing, in part, that a dealer or exhibitor selling pets at retail shall not be required to obtain a federal license under the AWA if the size of business is determined by the Secretary to be de minimis.

The 2014 Farm Bill Conference Report also noted the confusion created by the failure of the USDA/APHIS to clarify the term “breeding female” which is not defined in the AWA. They “urged” that the agency clarify that only those female animals capable of reproduction and actively being used in a breeding program qualify as breeding females. They also “recommend” clarifying that USDA/APHIS oversight of such sales pertains to those transactions in interstate commerce as provided for under the Commerce Clause. Unfortunately, these latter concerns have not been addressed by the USDA/APHIS in any new rulemaking to date.

State Issues - HOT!

New Jersey Senate Bill 63 was approved in the State Senate on June 30, 2016 and moved on to the Assembly. It has been referred to Assembly Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee. This bill has been heavily amended since initial introduction. A few provisions, such as the repeal of New Jersey’s consumer protection law have been removed from the bill. Other amendments allow some pet stores to be “grandfathered in” and they may continue to sell cats and dogs from specific breeding facilities. The bill still includes two pages of legislative findings which are straight out of the Animals Rights playbook. Some proposed provisions in the bill relating to dogs appear to be in conflict with existing law. [For a general discussion of the bill (prior to the recent amendments) please see the CFA e-Newsletter, June 2016, “June Legislative Update - New Jersey Bill Would Require Face-to-Face Sales of Cats and Dogs if Enacted” by Kelly Crouch, CFA Legislative Information Liaison.]

Litigation

The CFA Board has allowed CFA to join with the Animal Health Institute (AHI) coalition on amicus curiae (friend of the court) briefs opposing non-economic damages (i.e. “pain and suffering”) for injuries to animals. In our June legislative report to the CFA Board we advised of a possible appeal in the case of Robert Repin v. State of Washington. The trial court rejected Plaintiff’s claims for recovery of noneconomic damages for an incident involving an allegedly flawed euthanasia. Plaintiff claimed the dog suffered excessive pain and distress and that the owner also suffered as a witness to the incident. This August CFA
joined AHI, AVMA, AKC, NAIA, PIJAC and others in an amicus brief filed in support of Defendants.

There is also a case pending in Florida that involves a veterinary emergency clinic and the treating veterinarian. The AHI has been in contact with the Florida Veterinary Medical Association who will participate as well. As of now we don’t have many details but we have been advised this case may require action later this fall. We will continue to follow the situation and report on any new details as they become available.

In Other News

In August the American Kennel Club (AKC) approved a new Canine Legislation Position Statement on Pet Choice. AKC has become concerned about local ordinances and state bills to ban the sale of puppies from licensed breeders in retail pet shops and require pet shops to sell only dogs from rescues or shelters. Their position statement emphasizes issues like consumer choice and the value of sources for healthy, socialized purpose-bred puppies. They note that elimination of choice may lead some consumers to obtain unhealthy or temperamentally unsound dogs from other, less reliable sources. For the AKC position go to: http://www.akc.org/news/pet-choice-position-statement-august-8/

Publications

The CFA e-Newsletter provides space for a “What’s Hot” legislative column used to provide information on new and urgent matters of interest to the cat fancy. In general, Cat Talk Almanac articles are written for less time sensitive matters with a focus on guidance on lobbying in general. Articles since the June/July 2016 Board meeting:

* CFA e-Newsletter, July 2016, “July Legislative Update - Massachusetts Senate Bill 2390 is a muddled mix of cattery licensing, inspections, consumer protection provisions and pet shop restrictions” by Kelly Crouch, CFA Legislative Information Liaison. The amended bill (incorporating provisions of other bills) includes a hodge-podge of new restrictions including personal cattery and kennel licensing, consumer protection provisions, and additional restrictions on pet stores. It would require the Massachusetts Department of Agricultural Resources to make rules and regulations for cattery (and kennel) facility and care standards. Of course, the government has no direct knowledge about breeding practices of dogs and cats for hobby breeders. Trying to apply commercial standards to in-home catteries simply does not work. Restrictions on pet sales include a “pet lemon law” warranty. Some proposed provisions in the bill appear to be in conflict with existing law.

* CFA e-Newsletter, August 2016, “August Legislative Update - Montgomery County, Tennessee considers another revision of its animal ordinance” by Kelly Crouch, CFA Legislative Information Liaison. This article looks at a
new set of revisions (the last was just three years ago) to their animal control ordinances. The changes being debated appear to be focused heavily on generating revenue with new or increased fees and permits. Animal Control hopes the new fees could generate as much as $600,000 in the first year. While the county cat and dog license would apply to all owned pets, cat owners do not receive the same benefit from licensing as dog owners. Cats are far more likely to return home on their own than if taken to the shelter. While the proposed revenue could be used to help pay for low-cost sterilization and trap-neuter-return programs, these programs benefit society as a whole. But it places the financial burden on responsible cat owners and involves government intrusion into private homes.

* CFA e-Newsletter, September 2016 “The Proposed De Minimis Rule of 2016” by Kelly Crouch, CFA Legislative Information Liaison. The USDA/APHIS has published a proposed rule about animal dealers, “exhibitors” and de minimis exemptions to exhibitor licensing. Most cat fanciers will not be affected by the exhibitor exemptions as cat and dog shows are expressly excluded in the AWA definition. However, it is important to any cat owner who may use their cat in exhibitions such as films, television shows or commercials. There is also a concern that the new definitions may impact the retail pet store and other exemptions to USDA licensing. Unfortunately, the proposed rule does not address the meaning of “breeding female” in the 2013 rule, despite the Farm Bill Conference Report stating that the term causes confusion and urging USDA/APHIS to limit the definition to females capable of and actively used in reproduction.

* Cat Talk Almanac, August 2016, “The Technology and Environment of Animal Microchip Systems Part 4 – The Database System” by Kelly Crouch, CFA Legislative Information Liaison. This fourth installment in the microchip series is devoted to the databases used to store the identity and contact information for the owner of the microchipped pet. This includes the labyrinth of registries and databases in which chip information is stored. In the real world pressures to protect proprietary information may limit cooperation between competing registries. Technological limitations in the chips and the explosion of databases that store chip information add to the difficulties of creating a universal registry for all chipped pets. Other failures in the system may be as basic as the failure of the pet’s owner to understand the need to register the chip in addition to the implantation or to update contact information when they move. Suggestions are made to improve the success rate in recovering lost, chipped pets.
Meetings and Conferences:

**Pet Night on Capitol Hill**, is back and was held September 20, 2016 in Washington, DC. In May 2016 Animal Health Institute (AHI) had announced they were discontinuing the event and developing new approaches to Congressional outreach to replace Pet Night. However, in late August the Pet Leadership Council and the Human Animal Bond Research Initiative (HABRI) approached AHI to ask if they could carry on and expand the event. AHI agreed and will remain as a sponsor and important participant in this event. The new leadership of PLC and HABRI will help expand participation to other organizations in the pet industry. CFA co-sponsored this event as we have done for 19 years. George Eigenhauser represented CFA at Pet Night as well as at the coalition meeting the following day. The day following Pet Night there is a coalition meeting including Pet Night sponsors to discuss joint legislative strategy on matters ranging from non-economic damages, pet shop bans, and other issues. Coalition participants provide us with legislative information, access to inside opinions of their lobbyists, and other help throughout the year. Additional updates will be presented as we learn more about the new leadership and their ideas to expand the event.

Future Projections for Committee and Legislative Group:

Upcoming conferences related to legislation—committed or pending:

**National Animal Interest Alliance (NAIA) Conference**, November 5-6, 2016 Orlando, Florida. The NAIA is the one national group directly confronting the extreme animal rights positions that threaten pet ownership and breeding of dogs/cats. CFA used to be a participant in this event but we have been unable to participate in recent years due to time and budget constraints. We are hoping for some CFA presence at the conference this year.

**SAWA Annual Conference**, November 16-18, 2016, Portland, OR. The Society of Animal Welfare Administrators are leading animal control and shelter professionals. SAWA partners with the National Council on Pet Population to present a cat research day symposium in conjunction with their Annual Conference. SAWA members tend to be pragmatic professionals in the sheltering community and amenable to discussion. George Eigenhauser and Joan Miller are both SAWA members on behalf of CFA and George Eigenhauser plans to attend this year.

**Pet Industry Leadership Conference**, January 30 - February 2, 2017, Laguna Beach, CA. Two years ago the Pet Industry Distributors Association (PIDA) unveiled a new partnership between PIJAC and the Pet Leadership Council. Lost in the new venture was the Top2Top annual conference hosted by PIJAC. Since then the PIDA has created this conference which brings together leaders in the pet industry including suppliers, wholesalers, retailers and others. George Eigenhauser and Joan Miller both hope to be able to attend this year.

**HSUS Humane Care Expo** will take place May 9-12, 2017 in Fort Lauderdale, FL. Our continuing CFA presence at the Expos each year gives us an opportunity to reinforce CFA’s goal of promoting respect for all cats with an emphasis on public education. This conference
provides positive networking with a variety of animal groups and leaders who are often unaware of our devotion to the welfare of cats and our common love of animals. This is by far the largest animal rights conference of the year and is often used to showcase upcoming HSUS legislative and public relations activity. Our ongoing presence at Expo helps us anticipate their legislative initiatives for the coming year. George Eigenhauser is scheduled to attend this year.

Ongoing goals -

- Networking with the sheltering community, aligned organizations, veterinarians and lawmakers so we better understand the problems and trends that cause homeless animals to be in shelters and develop ways to address the issues that motivate legislation detrimental to our interests.

- Continuing to find new methods for presenting perspective on the cat fancy views to those in animal related fields and government.

- Working with national and local cat fancy teams to defeat legislation/regulation detrimental to pedigreed cats, feral/unowned cats, CFA’s mission and cat ownership.

- Enlisting professional help with strategic public relations and communication to build greater public awareness and gain more support for our opposition to mandated sterilization laws across the country.

- Increasing efforts to raise funds for the Sy Howard Legislative Fund and to help clubs present projects suitable for funding.

Action Items: None at this time.

Time Frame: Ongoing.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Updates and pending legislative matters.

Respectfully Submitted,

George J. Eigenhauser, Jr., Chair

Hannon: Legislation, George. Eigenhauser: I only have one brief update on Legislation, and that is, Pet Night on Capitol Hill, which was cancelled in the Spring, came back in the Fall with relatively short notice. That being said, it was a very well-attended event this year, it was
very well done. It has taken a slightly different direction than in previous years. I think it’s a little less warm/fuzzy, geared toward staffers and their family and more about the industry. So, there were booths there. I’m thinking maybe next year CFA may want to have a table with some breed pamphlets or something there. I’ll talk to them about that. The after-meeting was interesting when we discussed legislation. They have many of the same concerns that we do in legislation. We often work together on things. One of things that you may not be aware of that’s kind of up and coming are these animal abuser registries. On a substantive level, it’s kind of a question, why would we create animal abuser registries when murderers are released on parole and we don’t keep registries? Why is that a more serious crime than murder? From a practical matter, the concerns have always been, once you create an animal abuse registry, you’re going to have government saying, “ok, we have this registry, we should do something with it. Let’s make it against the law to sell, transfer or convey an animal to somebody on the registry,” and suddenly we’re all in the process of enforcing some government mandate, which could physical put us at risk. The industry is concerned, because if you have a database they have to consult before they can sell a pet to somebody, and that somebody is known to be a violent and abusive person, saying, “no I will not sell you the pet because you’re on this list” could put people in danger. So, this is an issue that’s been coming up more and more at the state level. Even some cities and towns have adopted these, which is even sillier, because people can cross city lines so easily. But, that was kind of the new, up and coming issue that people were interested in there. That’s pretty much all I have to add unless people have questions.
WINN FOUNDATION.

Winn Foundation Liaison George Eigenhauser presented the following report:


____________________________
Winn Feline Foundation’s outline of accomplishments and ongoing projects from the past 3 months:
**Grant Program**

- **2016 Miller Trust Grant Proposal for the Winn Feline Foundation.**

  Winn receive 18 proposals for review through the George Sydney and Phyllis Redmond Miller Trust Fund/San Francisco Foundation. We have been allocated $124,495.66 to be directed toward feline health research studies this year. Proposal topics include feline asthma, renal diseases, heart diseases, pharmacology (steroids, maropitant), neoplasia (SCC, feline injection site sarcoma, chemoresistance), periodontal disease, feline nutrition, diabetes, FIP, dermatophytosis, and GI lymphoma/IBD. Proposal review is schedule for October 14, 2016, 12pm (ET).

**Financial Status**

- To date, Winn has funded over $5.7 million in health research for cats at more than 30 partner institutions worldwide. 2016 Winn grant funding is $141,171 and 2016 Miller Trust grant funding allocation is $124,495.66; thus, 2016 grant funding estimate is $265,666. Winn Endowment fund is over $2,000,000 and healthy.

**Donor Programs**

- Ms. Holly Aglialoro has signed a MOU, which includes a monthly ongoing donation of $500/month for a total recurring annual donation of $6000. For her generous contributions, Winn will name one of the 2017 Winn funded studies in the memory of Holly’s cat, Augustus, and Winn will include the named sponsorship of the study on all promotional materials related to that grant award.

- Donna Garrou approached Winn about how she could help fund research on cancer, especially small cell lymphoma, in cats. Her cat, Quasimodo, developed low-grade small cell lymphoma. Donna, through her determination and ingenuity, developed a medical device as an aid for his required esophagostomy feeding tube. The tube was needed to maintain nutrition and weight for healing and named the Kitty Kollar. Kitten Kollars are now being distributed by Jorgensen Laboratories. In conjunction with Winn, funds raised by Kitty Kollar (and IBDKitties) will be directed toward sponsorship of at least one 2017 research study pertaining to lymphoma, kidney disease, diabetes, FHL, and/or pancreatitis.

**Purrfect Partners, Affiliates**

- TICA set Winn their Seal of Excellence, which will be placed on the Winn website as a part of our affiliate partnership.

- Winn Feline Foundation is proud to announce that Winn has endorsed the American Association of Feline Practitioner’s Cat Friendly Practice® program.
• Winn Feline Foundation is also proud to announce that we formally support the recommendation by Marian's Dream to have kittens spayed or neutered by 5 months of age.

Infrastructure and Systems

• Winn’s Cat Health blog content continues to be frequently updated to help cat lovers keep apprised of important advances in feline medicine research. Matthew Kornya DVM, DABVP(feline) from Hamilton, Ontario and Patricia Shea DVM from Eugene, OR have graciously helped with writing blogs. Drs. Kornya and Shea’s blog contributions are in addition to those already provided by Drs. Vicki Thayer, Glenn A Olah, and Melissa Kennedy.

• Dr. Olah, Dr. Thayer, and Ms. Salvaggio are continuing to call and thank donors who have contributed $100/mo or more to Winn. While in most instances a thank you message is left by voicemail, we have spoken to a number of donors who all have appreciated the personal thank you.

Promotion and Brand Building

• Dr. Thayer has maintained our monthly Winn enewsletter and content for the CFA enewsletter. The Winn mascot, Winnie, continues to share Winn news and engage readers. Betty White continues to provide content about Winn for the CFA newsletter when needed.

• Dr. Thayer, Ms. Salvaggio and Dr. Olah keep the Winn Facebook website up-to-date.

• Dr. Olah continues to represent Winn Riders for Feline Health cycling club at various biking events. Winn Rider online store was open for purchase of bike kit, bike jerseys, bike shorts, or bike sport shirt.

Ongoing and Coming Events

• 2016 Winn teleconference board meeting is scheduled for October 7, 2016 at 12noon ET.

• Miller Trust Grant Review is schedule for October 14, 2016 at 12noon via teleconference.

• Bria Fund raffle for FIP research is actively going on until October 31, 2016.

• In preparation for Winn’s 50th anniversary (2018), Merck Animal Health Corporation has agreed to sponsorship our 50th Winn Feline Foundation Anniversary Book.

Respectfully submitted,
Glenn A Olah DVM, PhD, DABVP (feline)
Winn Feline Foundation, President
http://www.winnfelinehealth.org
http://www.winnfelinehealth.blogspot.com
Hannon: OK, Winn. Eigenhauser: That’s pretty much all I have to say unless people have questions. Hannon: My question is, there’s a president listed and a president elect. When does that take effect? Eigenhauser: That would have taken effect in June when we have our annual meeting in conjunction with the CFA Annual meeting. Our president elect has been kind of MIA at our meetings, and so at our next meeting, which is going to be next Thursday, we’re going to be discussing what the transition is going to be. Hannon: Is Glenn Olah currently still serving as president? Eigenhauser: Glenn is still president. He will be president at least until June. He has said he will not serve another term, so we are trying to decide who is going to be his replacement. That’s one of the issues we have on our agenda for next Thursday. Hannon: Are you through with your report then? Eigenhauser: That’s it, unless someone else has a question.
Chair Dr. Roger Brown presented the following report:

Committee Chair:  Roger Brown, DVM  
List of Committee Members:  Michael Henry, MD

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

I have had frequent contacts with the General Manager and the Companion Animal Manager of GeneSeek, a division of Neogen Laboratories while working to create a new DNA Program for CFA.

Current Happenings of Committee:

Negotiations are under way to provide CFA with a DNA array testing program. A Genomics Testing and Service agreement is currently under review. We are working on an agreement acceptable to both CFA and GeneSeek.

Validation of the test panel is almost complete. Both Gus Cothran at Texas A&M and Leslie Lyons at the University of Missouri have assisted GeneSeek with the validation process.

I am working with GeneSeek on the format of the test report. We will soon be ready to have CFA IT make the necessary changes to the existing DNA web site pages.

The Laboratory selected is Neogen Laboratory. Their GeneSeek Division works 24 hours a day and 7 days a week. They run 1½ million samples a year. GeneSeek provides DNA testing for AKC, numerous horse and cattle registries, poultry producers, and even botanical nurseries.

Future Projections for Committee:

Finalizing the new DNA program. Media Blitz announcing the initialization the new DNA program.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Updates on the new DNA program.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Roger Brown, DVM, Chair

Hannon: Scientific Advisory. Brown: You all should have in front of you some material on GeneSeek. They are going to be our new DNA company. The first sheet is an order form and the second sheet is an example of what a report is going to look like. We have just, as of yesterday, been able to sign an agreement with GeneSeek. That’s in line. At this point, we’re still doing some testing to validate each of the tests that we’re doing. We are at the point that the only ones that are remaining are the cinnamon – we still have to validate cinnamon, and I’m looking
for samples for that. We also have to validate one of the longhair markers, so as soon as that is ready, we’re good to go. CFA started their DNA program in October of 2007. The first platform that we were testing our SNP markers on was a Biotrove. There were so many samples that were submitted later in the program, the laboratory couldn’t deal with the flow and we got way behind, so at that point we went from an assistant Texas A&M laboratory to Texas A&M. Texas A&M was going along OK until Biotrove decided they weren’t going to support the veterinary testing market anymore. So then they started to go to Illumina. Well, Illumina then changed their platform, so now we are with Neogen and Neogen’s partner that we are doing companion animal testing with is GeneSeek. This time, we will be using a Seconal platform. Each time you change from one platform to another, you have to go through and validate each one of the markers that we’re testing for, so that’s why it’s taking time. The test will be $45 for the main panel and that will include the mutation for Mucopolysaccharidosis I and Mucopolysaccharidosis VII. There will be four longhair markers and, in the past we have done three, so this is probably going to be an even more complete test. We will be testing for cinnamon, chocolate, recessive black – that’s an agouti recessive black – dilute modifier, a new on that we haven’t done before is pyruvate kinase deficiency. PRA, not only will we be doing one marker for PRA, but we will be doing two. We will be doing HCM in the Ragdoll. The main panel costs $45, which is a bargain no matter how you look at it for that many markers. In the commercial market, some of these markers cost $40 each, so we get all of that for $45. Then, if you want to do the add-on tests, the add-on tests you can see on the form. PKD, that’s $10. Blood type is $10. HCM in the Maine Coon is $10. And then there is a group of three different markers; one for albinism and two for points. There’s a Siamese point marker and a Burmese point marker. The reason that these are add-ons and that they cost $10 is that they have patents. GeneSeek is going to have to pay a percentage of that $10 to the patent owners, as well as buying licenses to be able to run these tests. So, that’s the reason that they’re separate and that they are $10 each. You cannot order just the add-ons. You have to order the main panel, and then if you want the add-ons, you have to add that to your $45 panel. We are hoping that we’re going to be up and running sometime within probably the next 3-4 weeks. It depends upon our IT people. We still have to do some work on our website. What we’re going to do is have a little key or a blog that they bring it up on our website, they hit the button on our website which takes them to GeneSeek’s website, then on GeneSeek’s website they order and pay for the tests through GeneSeek. CFA doesn’t have to handle any of the money. Then the report will be issued to the person within a 3 week period. In most cases, I think it’s going to be less than 3 weeks, because the Seconal panel only requires 27 tests to run the chip for that panel, so as soon as 27 tests are on board and ready to go, they run it and probably the next day the report is emailed. We will probably add to this as time goes on. There are some new tests. We tried to do GM1, the Gangliosidosis, but it just doesn’t seem to work on the Seconal panel. If we offer it, we may have to offer it as a separate test. They are still working on this. We have been very lucky in that, during this validation process, I have worked with them, Texas A&M has worked with them and Leslie Lyons has helped. So, we’ve had material coming in from three different areas, as well as material that GeneSeek already had, so we have been able to really speed up this validation process. There are different markers for blood type. We’re going with the markers for blood type that are patented. There are two other markers that will pick up B blood type, and it’s a question whether or not we can add this to the main panel and verify it. So, there are a lot of things that are still a little bit murky, but I think we’re almost ready to go. If anybody has any questions, I will be glad to try to answer them for
Black: Will it be on the CFA website when it’s ready to go? Brown: Yes, and for the kick-off I’m going to write an article for Cat Talk and then we are going to try to do something like an email blast to everybody, to let them know that we’re up and running and we’re ready to take samples. Eigenhauser: If there’s a wish list for future tests, I would like to add SMA – spinal muscular atrophy in Maine Coons. Brown: It’s on the list. It’s on their list, and if we’re able to do that test, it would be one year down the road, probably with the next agreement that we sign with GeneSeek. DelaBar: Roger, I would like to see GSD IV (Glycogen storage disease type IV). Brown: OK, and that’s on the list, by the way. Kuta: Will there be some sort of dashboard or something where we can track how many orders have come in and what our royalties are from that? Brown: I think what will probably happen, they are going to provide an accounting on a quarterly basis. So, every quarter we are going to know where we’re at and what the test number flow is. Kuta: I was just thinking if we are able to track where the people came from and how they ordered it so that we could – if it’s something that’s worth marketing. Brown: I think we’re only going to get numbers. Hannon: Anybody else? Thank you Roger. Brown: You’re welcome.
(17) **MARKETING.**

Committee Chair: Lisa Marie Kuta  
List of Committee Members: Mary Auth

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

Terri Barry, Lisa Kuta and CFA’s new marketing associate, Angela Watkins, met via teleconference on September 15, 2016. This call was to introduce Angela to Lisa, review CFA’s current marketing activities and discuss CIS gate advertising.

The spectator/pet owner newsletter has continued to exceed its goal of a 40% open rate and 20% click rate. The September edition had the largest amount of opens ever at 625, with 74% of the clicks going to show listings, 12% going to further featured breed information, 6% on the CIS banner and the rest made up of all other links. The sign up link on cfa.org generates three to five sign ups per day.

**Current Happenings of Committee:**

The committee is planning the gate marketing campaign for this November’s CIS in Novi, MI. Lisa Kuta will focus on taking the learnings from last year’s successful online ad buys and applying them as appropriate to the Novi market.

The committee is currently working with IT to generate a list of prospective email addresses from CFA’s databases to add to the pet owner newsletter. The committee is also queuing up future editions of the newsletter to have ready to send during the first ten days of each month. Send days selected for optimal open and engagement rates.

**Future Projections for Committee:**

The committee will be working closely with the marketing associate to define a high-level marketing framework to unify and magnify the organization’s various efforts. Lisa Kuta will be continuing to engage with clubs with upcoming shows to include show details in the newsletter.

**Time Frame:**

The committee’s actions are ongoing.

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

The committee will present an initial review of the CIS gate marketing.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Lisa Marie Kuta, Chair

**Hannon:** Lisa, you’re up with the Marketing Report. **Kuta:** Yes. There’s the report and I want to say that the details are in it. Now that Angela is on board, I think we’re ready to really
pick up and move forward. I’ve been running in place a little bit, so this is a great opportunity to really unify and get everything going. Angela, Terri and I had a nice initial meeting, and then Angela has prepared a plan for the upcoming CIS in Novi. It looks to be solid and I’m enthusiastic about it. I’m looking forward to that. I also wanted to put out there that if any of you have anybody in your regions or constituencies that you think would be a great addition to the Marketing Committee, please see me. We want to start meeting in the next couple weeks and I would love to get more people on. Right now, it’s just me. **Mastin:** Lisa, are you looking for one person from every region? **Kuta:** If possible. I mean, I don’t know if that’s feasible, but then also if any of the directors at large know someone who would be a good addition. At least to every geographic area, if not region, if possible. **DelaBar:** Lisa, I brought up to Angela on Friday about licensing and branding CFA. I would recommend going to AKC and seeing who their current provider is. **Kuta:** Right, right. Rich, we were talking about the corporate sponsorships earlier. Is that part of that umbrella? **DelaBar:** No, it’s absolutely different. **Mastin:** Those are two separate. **Kuta:** It’s a separate thing, but is it like part of the same initiative? **Mastin:** Not likely, but what Pam is referring to is, we want to put the CFA logo on this toy and collect 2.5% of all the sales that are sold at Wal-Mart, PetCo or whatever. Pam, that’s what you are referring to, correct? **DelaBar:** Right. **Mastin:** The corporate sponsorship is more on a marketing level, whether it’s CFA website or globally or it’s direct to the shows. **Kuta:** Is that something currently that’s going on right now, where we are seeking licensing agreements? **DelaBar:** No. **Hannon:** Are you through? **Kuta:** Yes.
Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Show licensing and Judging specifications are nearing completion to be quoted by Computan.

Programming to simplify and enhance tracking of incoming payments has been completed. This has significantly reduced the time required to match payments to services.

Current Happenings of Committee:

Testing on the New Entry Clerk software is progressing quickly.

Work has also begun on further enhancements to ecats screens to provide an improved level of customer service.

Future Projections for Committee:

Completion of Entry Clerk software and testing for implementation.

Board Action Items:

None

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Update on System Analyst progress with program specifications and moving of programs to new system and update on Entry Clerk Software progress.

Respectfully Submitted,
Tim Schreck, Chair

Hannon: Next is the IT Committee. I understand Tim wanted to call in. Were we able to work that out? Dobbins: We’re getting it set up. Hannon: OK, we will wait until Tim calls in. Do you have anything you want to say before Tim gets on? Kallmeyer: No.
NEW ENTRY CLERK PROGRAM.

Tim Schreck joins the meeting by teleconference. Schreck: Hello. Hannon: We’ve gotten to the IT Committee report section. We’re ready for you to talk to us. Schreck: OK. Most of this was information received about the new entry clerk program that I knew would not be here in time for the report. As far as the progress goes on this, they expect to have all the reports finished within the next 2 weeks, then we can do some final testing for a couple weeks, documented training. Hopefully, we are planning on training at the International Show for any of the entry clerks that would be coming. It would be especially helpful for those from foreign countries that may be planning to attend. One other point that I want to point out is, we have confirmed that the current work-around that we’re using for Steve’s program will not work after January 1st. So, we are on a definite timetable to get this up and running. Any input from your end? Hannon: When you are talking about this training at the International Show, we need to advertise that, so could you send me something? I’ll send out a CFA News notice and we can get Mary Kolencik to put it up on the blog so that people are aware ahead of time that this is going to be available. Schreck: OK.

Kuta: I have a show in November that I’m doing. I would love to be able to be a guinea pig for this. I’m volunteering. Hannon: Is that viable, to try something in November? Schreck: Well, we don’t expect to have everything quite done until the end of October. If she can wait that long to start. Kuta: I can do it concurrently. I can have the show going in both softwares. Hannon: When is your show? Is it early November or late November? Kuta: It’s Thanksgiving weekend. Hannon: So, it’s towards the end of November. It’s Thanksgiving weekend, and what she is willing to do is, to do it on the current software as well as the new software. Kuta: And then compare the outputs. Hannon: So, if you are going to be ready by the end of October, that gives her time. She’s not going to be receiving a lot of entries prior to that. Schreck: We really wanted to get this out to those people with shows in January so that they know they need to be prepared to use the new software. Kuta: And I have a show the second week of January. Schreck: OK. We’ll have at least one person that has used it before then. We do have other people working on it. We have several people doing more testing through November. Another question, as regional directors, if anybody has someone in your region who would like to volunteer for this, please have them get in touch with us. Hannon: Kathy Black said that you are already working with Sheryl Zink. Sheryl is entry clerking a show in December. Schreck: She has been working on this and is well aware. DelaBar: I have two entry clerks, one of which is a computer type, that are very willing to work on this. My other question to you, Tim, is how can we export the training over to Europe, Japan and the ID? Schreck: I would like you to email the information to me if you could. DelaBar: No, I’m talking about how can you export the training. Hannon: She wants to know how you are going to provide the training. How are you going to train the people who are not going to be physically at the International Show? How are you going to train the people in Europe, Asia, etc.? Schreck: We’re looking into possibilities on that now. We’re thinking of the possibility of a training video. We have a couple possibilities for that. As soon as we know any more, we will let you know. Hannon: You said earlier that the existing software – Steve Theiler’s software – is not going to be working after, I think you said January 1st. That means, for shows in January, the entry clerk is going to have to be trained to use the new software. So, you’ve got a short timeframe here in which to get the software finished, and to train
people. **Schreck:** I understand. That’s why I wanted to make sure everybody is aware of it. **Hannon:** So, the regional directors need to put the word out to their entry clerks in their region that as of January 1st they can no longer use Steve Theiler’s software, and they are going to have to either use this or contract with Clinton Parker. They are not going to be able to use Steve’s. **Schreck:** After the first of the year, you will not be able to use it. It will appear to work. The problem that has been encountered is the same as what we had before. It does the first 50 and then quits. **Hannon:** OK. So, make sure your entry clerks understand that. **Schreck:** We need to get the word out, because some people may think it’s working, but it’s not. **Hannon:** The regional directors need to tell their entry clerks that even though it looks like it’s working in January, once they get to the 51st entry they are going to find a problem. **Schreck:** They are going to find a problem, yes. **Kuta:** Can this be communicated on the entry clerks’ list? If not, I can post it, but if you have more details, anything you can post would be very helpful. **Hannon:** She suggested that there be something on the entry clerks’ list regarding the January cut-off, and if you don’t have access to it, she would be happy to do it on your behalf, but you need to get her what you want the entry clerks to be told, OK? **Schreck:** OK, I will. **Mastin:** How many people can he handle at the International Show? **Schreck:** We’ll accommodate as many as sign up, OK? They said they already have a room reserved. I will see what the capacity is and let you know, but we can certainly do more than one session. **Hannon:** Do you know when and where you are planning to do this? Is it going to be at the hotel? Is it going to be in the show hall? Is it going to be in an office in the show hall? How are you going to do this? **Schreck:** I will check with Allene and see what’s reserved. I have not been told yet. **Barry:** My understanding is, Allene has already reserved a room at the hotel a couple of weeks ago so that we could have the training. It would be easier to cancel it than to try and book it later. **Hannon:** Allene’s already got it reserved at the hotel in anticipate if you needing it. **Schreck:** OK. **Calhoun:** I was just going to suggest, Tim, if you would consider doing a WebEx or something that’s live. If you need some assistance with that, I can help get you set up on a WebEx that would have international access so folks could call in and actually see you do it, and they could pop up and ask text questions that quite often helps with training sessions. I’ll call you about possibly training via WebEx. **Hannon:** Some live training. **Schreck:** OK. **Hannon:** Anybody else have questions or comments for Tim? OK Tim, do you have anything else you want to say before we hang up on you? **Schreck:** No, that’s all. Thank you. **Hannon:** Hope you recuperate well. **Schreck:** It’s coming along slowly. That’s all I can say. **Hannon:** Thanks for calling in, Tim. Good-bye.

**Eigenhauser:** I have a stupid technical question. In ancient times, we used to have people call in on the speaker phone because that was the easiest way to do it. Now we have a conference call number. All of us could call into the conference call number, Tim could call into the conference call number, then we’re not shouting at a box at the far end of the room. **Hannon:** So what are you saying? Each of us should have a phone sitting here? **Eigenhauser:** Each of us has our cell phone. We call in so we can hear what’s going on without having to listen to one box in the far corner of the room. How much more does it cost if we have 20 people calling in than one? **Hannon:** Verna, how much more does it cost if we have 20 people instead of one? **Dobbins:** For that amount of time, you’re talking less than $20. **Wilson:** We still have an issue with talking over each other, though. **DelaBar:** We can still raise our hand. **Eigenhauser:** Hearing would be better. **Hannon:** The problem with him, he kept talking and couldn’t hear us. **Newkirk:** I think it would help if the phone had been up on the counter. **Hannon:** We didn’t know until early this
morning that he wanted to call in. **Newkirk:** I’m just saying that instead of the phone being on a chair over there where the sound waves don’t hit it, if it was up here in front of you, he could have heard it better.
Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

The 2016 Clerking Test cycle was completed, and new clerking licenses were mailed in July to all clerks who passed the test with a satisfactory score.

The Clerking Contract form was recently revised and is available for download on the CFA website. It was designed as a fillable PDF form so that information may easily be typed into the fields. All clubs and clerks are encouraged to use the contract for all clerking assignments.

Current Happenings of Committee

Several individuals are working their way through the program at this time. Most inquiries being received are from clerks wanting to know their current status and if they meet the requirements for advancement to the next level. All pending issues are being handled promptly. Sincere thanks go to Kristi Wollam for her work to keep things running smoothly.

The Clerking Evaluation form is currently in the process of being revised, and the new one will be available soon.

The Clerking Manual is being revised to include recent show rule changes passed since the manual was printed last spring, in addition to the revised contract and evaluation forms.

A number of clerking schools were held in recent months and additional schools are planned, including a school held in conjunction with the Dr. Elsey’s CFA International Cat Show in Novi, MI. It will be held on Friday, November 18, 2016 at the Hyatt Place hotel adjacent to the show hall. The school is being sponsored by the Clerking Program with the intent of attracting potential students from various geographic areas of CFA, some of which have not offered schools in quite some time.

Work to develop the online clerking school is progressing. Some video for the school was filmed at the Garden State Cat Club clerking school held in July. A PowerPoint presentation is being developed for the online school as well as for use at traditional clerking schools. Once the presentation is completed, our intent is that it will become the standard for use at all clerking schools. Plans are to use this PowerPoint presentation at the clerking school in Novi. Additional video will also be filmed at the Novi clerking school for use in the online school.

All clerks are reminded to notify Central Office immediately if there is any change in their contact information. This will ensure that records are current and that the Online Almanac clerk list remains accurate.
**Future Projections for Committee:**

The revised Clerking Evaluation form will be made available for download from the CFA web site once it is completed.

The Clerking Manual revisions will be completed and a new PDF version of the manual will be made available for download on the CFA web site. An addendum will be written for inclusion with the printed manual.

Work to develop the online clerking school will continue.

Individuals will be licensed as they complete the requirements for advancement in the Clerking Program. Up-to-date records will be maintained so that all inquiries can be handled promptly and efficiently.

**Board Action Items:**

None at this time.

**Time Frame:**

Revision of the Clerking Evaluation form should be completed and the new form made available within the next few weeks.

The Clerking Manual revisions will be completed after the October Board meeting, so that any new Show Rules changes passed by the Board and affecting clerking duties may be included. The revised PDF version of the manual and the revised addendum to the printed manual will be made available as soon as possible.

Work to develop the online clerking school is ongoing.

The list of clerks for the Online Almanac will continue to be updated monthly or as needed to maintain current online resources.

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

The Board will be kept advised of any significant changes or updates in the Clerking Program.

**Addendum:**

Attached is a request for discussion regarding changes to the Clerking Program submitted by Mary Auth. The Clerking Program Committee was neither consulted regarding these changes nor notified of this request prior to its submission as an agenda item for the Board meeting. With the permission of the author, the request has been shared with members of the Clerking Program.
Committee to obtain their input. The committee’s response for discussion will be provided verbally at the Board meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,
Carol Krzanowski, Chair

Hannon: Moving on to the Clerking Program. Carol. Krzanowski: You have all seen my report. I basically have nothing else to add to my report, but I know that Mary Auth submitted a proposal, if she wants to speak to that.
ADDENDUM

REQUEST FOR DISCUSSION/CHANGES

October 1-2, 2016 Board Meeting
Board Member: Mary Auth

Brief Summation of Request:

Change the requirements to be a CFA-licensed ring clerk in Regions 1-9 to be less rigorous. Changes indicated with strikethrough.

**Proposed for Assistant Clerk:** 4 assisting ring clerk assignments under 3 different licensed Chief Ring Clerks.

**Proposed for Certified Clerk:** Act as solo Chief Clerk 4 6 times under 3 5 different judges.

**Proposed for Master Clerk:** After licensed as a Certified Clerk, you must perform 4 additional clerking assignments under 4 different judges before Assistant Master Clerking.

Complete 3 assignments assisting 2 different licensed Master Clerk/Master Clerk Instructor.

Complete 3 four solo assignments as Master Clerk.

**Proposed for Master Clerk Instructor:** Must be licensed Certified Clerk. Four (4) additional Chief Ring Clerk assignments under 3 judges, plus 2 additional Master Clerk assignments required before assisting a Clerk school MCI.

2 assists under 2 different MCI conducting an authorized, approved clerking school.

Conduct 2 four authorized, approved clerking schools solo, as Instructor-in-Charge.

Reason for request:

It is increasingly harder for a person to become a licensed ring clerk and licensed Master Clerk for several reasons:

- There are fewer licensed ring clerks to assist under (example: Region 6 has six licensed ring clerks and three seldom ring clerk).

- There are fewer shows where to clerk (example: Region 6 has a total of 16 shows).

- With the current requirements, potential licensed clerks would need a total 14 shows before they can ever assist as a Master Clerk.
• It is my understanding that the rules were written by someone in the North Atlantic region, who may not be aware of the lack of clerking opportunities in other parts of the country.

• The rules should be modified for the lowest common denominator to be all inclusive.

**Board Action Items:**

Approve changes

**Time Frame:**

Immediately

Respectfully Submitted,
Mary Auth, Midwest Regional Director

**Auth:** First of all, I want to apologize again publicly to Carol. I circumvented a system or process that I didn’t realize existed. I submitted the proposal to Rachel and then Rachel submitted it to Carol. Carol and I had a brief conversation about it yesterday, so I am going to withdraw it, based on our conversation. Her committee is going to review my suggestions and perhaps come up with some solutions. **Krzanowski:** I would just like to add to that, after our discussion, we are willing to concede on some things, and we would just prefer to review the entire process before any recommendations are presented to the board for approval. I’ve already gotten some feedback from the Clerking Program Committee, but I would like to continue to do so. At some point we will bring something forward for review by the board. **Hannon:** Anything else on your report? **Krzanowski:** No.
MENTOR/NEWBEE PROGRAM.

Committee Co-Chairs: Teresa Keiger & Jean Dugger

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

At the 2016 Annual meeting with the Breed Council Secretaries and the Board, we had a productive dialogue with a number of participants, who were very interested and willing to involve the breed councils, along with the Regional Directors and their coordinators in the CFA mentoring program. Since that time, I have received several mentoring applications asking for specific information about a breed. I have referred them to the breed council secretary, who has successfully assisted them.

Current Happenings of Committee:

The NewBee website (www.cfanewbee.org) underwent a long overdue revision over the summer. It is now using a responsive template to make it comparable with any mobile device or table. It also has more information and links to CFA Programs. This new structure also makes it more inviting and feasible for CFA Marketing to offer it up for corporate sponsorship, as well as easier for the new exhibitor population to find information they are looking for.

Future Projections for Committee:

We will continue to work with the breed council secretaries on a case-by-case basis, where needed. We will evaluate our general mentoring information that is available to ensure we are making all resources that we have available to new breeders/exhibitors.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Progress regarding the breed councils working with the mentoring program to share their available knowledge.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jean Dugger & Teresa Keiger, Co-Chairs

Dugger: The main thing that’s in the report – Teresa and I did the report together – the main that that we’ve done, Teresa re-did the NewBee website for a long overdue overhaul. She put some nice pictures on there. She has done that. We’re still working on it. It’s an ongoing type thing with the mentoring and involving the breed councils. I know I sent you one yesterday. That seems to work really well. I hooked a breed council secretary up with somebody in another state, but she had another person there that could help that even the RD wasn’t aware of, so I think that’s working well, to be able to contact the breed council secretaries to ask them for a little bit of feedback or assistance. So far, so good. I just hope to automate it a little more in the future. That’s my goal.
**Hannon:** Any questions? **Black:** I just want to make a comment. I’m the one that approves people joining the Yahoo Group, so I get all the requests for the CFA NewBee group. They all come to me and I’m the one that sends them out. I’m getting a lot from Russia and Asia. I don’t know if we have any mentors in place in those regions. They are mostly coming into the NewBee system, or they say, “I’ve got a bunch of Siberians and I’m going to be showing them.” Things like that. That group has really got a core group of people that always respond to requests for information about showing and how to get into showing and things like that. We’ve got a pretty good group of people who respond. I typically don’t because I might see that cat as a judge, so I don’t respond. I’m just wanting to let you know kind of a head’s up. I’m getting a lot from outside the U.S. now. **Dugger:** I’m getting some of those mentoring forms that are filled out in Chinese or whatever. If I get one like that, I send it to Dick. I’m sure you send it to Gavin or whoever. **Kallmeyer:** I send it to Danny Tai or Frankie. **Dugger:** That’s right. You send me that and I sent it to Danny last time, right. **Kuta:** I’m just having a little hypothetical. I’m wondering what the best course of action is. For instance, I had someone call me who said their first show was going to be a show I’m entry clerking. I probably spent a good 2 hours on the phone with them going through various websites and all that, and talking about things like cage curtains. They had read it, but they still wanted to talk to somebody. I just happened to have some time that night, but then she called about 5 or 6 times. I know it was kind of a burden. I’m wondering if there’s a phone-based resource that would be available for somebody to set an appointment time. Is there something like that, or has there ever been something like that?

**Hannon:** Jean, do you have an answer? **Dugger:** Not exactly, except to say that I’ve been in Lisa’s shoes and done the same thing myself, especially if they were going to be at a Southern Region show. I always tell them to come find me and we’ll talk, or I talk to them on the phone. She’s right. Sometimes it will be a one-time thing and sometimes you take somebody to raise, which might not be what you want to do, but you always want to do the best thing for CFA because you want to keep them interested. It’s just kind of a case-by-case basis. I try to write people back as copious of emails as I can and hope that maybe in writing they will just not call, but sometimes they do. It’s OK. **Black:** The website is very comprehensive. **Krzanowski:** Yeah, it is. **Dugger:** There’s a lot of information there. Teresa has done a really great job adding a lot of stuff for that. **Colilla:** But they prefer to call. **DelaBar:** If you get any of those, Kathy or Jean, for Russia or any part of Region 9, let me know and I can get them forwarded to the right people. **Dugger:** I do. I forward them to you and maybe I can forward them to whoever. **Hannon:** Anything else on the Mentor Program?
Hannon: Publications, which is also Jean. At the February board meeting, we normally have the Yearbooks fresh from the printer here at the Central Office. I would encourage board members to take some back with you to sell at the shows. John has had tremendous success. Talk about what you did. He’s got a show in his region the following weekend. Dugger: Speaking of the Yearbook, I told Shelly that I would mention this to you guys again. Please remember, RDs, we need your exhibitor of the year write-up, so that that way we can get those into the Yearbook. If there’s any other information that somebody wants to submit to the Yearbook, send it to Shelly. That way she can look at it and see if it’s something we can add in there. If it’s something about your region that you need in there, I know we just got our ad done and it’s going to be in the Yearbook. We’re doing the Cotton States article this year, so we’re going to have that. But if you haven’t submitted that to Shelly or if you have somebody write it up for you or whatever, please do that so we’re not scrambling at the last minute trying to find you all. Black: What’s the deadline? Hannon: It has already passed. Dugger: The sooner the better, but at least maybe in October would really help her. She’s got to figure out the lay-out and where things can be put and how long they are. Hannon: The Yearbook goes to the printer at the end of December, and the Editor of the Yearbook, Shelly Borawski, is involved in the International Show, so her time is really limited for the Yearbook in the month of November.

Hannon: John, just give them a couple sentences on your success with selling these books in February. Colilla: I normally just tell them I have them available and announce it over and over in the loudspeaker. I normally sell them all, and then I start selling Mark’s. Hannon: He easily sells 20 the following weekend. Colilla: Oh yes, at least. Hannon: Usually there’s a show a week later. Isn’t Kittyhawk a week later? Colilla: Yes. I sell them there, too. Hannon: He’s got the advantage that he drives to this meeting so he can take a lot of books back, but if you want they can arrange to have a stock of books sent directly to you from the printer, so you don’t have to bring them back from here if you’re flying. Delabar: That’s not going to work. Shipping over to Europe is going to be too expensive. I get about 8 that I take back with me. I put them online before I even leave here. I’ve got people saying, “I want one, I want one.” I’ve got them all sold by the time I reach Europe. Hannon: That’s great. Anything else, Jean, you want to talk about on Publications? Dugger: No.
(23) **AMBASSADOR CAT PROGRAM.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Chair:</th>
<th>Chairman, Karen Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Liaison:</td>
<td>Darrell Newkirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Committee Members:</td>
<td>Secretary/Treasurer, James Flanik; Media Director, Tracy Dalton; Ambassador Cat Coordinator, Chris Willingham; Graphics and Design, Teresa Keiger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Recently we lost one of our members, Donna Brown, due to a sudden death. This was tragic news and really took our breath away. Two of our older members have resigned, Chris Willingham and Donna Hinton. Because of this sudden decline in membership, we are going to start actively reaching out to our members to find new people for our program.

All of the breed banners, from our last year’s project are all in use by our members. Everyone enjoys having them.

We continue to replenish the “breed trading cards” when needed by our members.

**Current Happenings of Committee:**

Our newest project is our coloring book. This publication is targeted for primary grades. These are the children that are learning to read and use a Crayola. This age group is pre-school to eight years old; from scribbling to actually coloring and staying inside the lines of the pictures.

My background is marketing and in my real life, outside the Cat Fancy, our company produced a number of coloring books. Our research clearly showed that children of this age are the most influenced and gain ideas that they carry with them for their entire life.

The coloring book is a group project; Nancy Bueno is our graphic artist and Teresa Keiger is doing finish work on the total production. Nancy is one of our A-Cats and Teresa has been invaluable for all of our A-Cat projects. Our coloring book is titled “Caring for your Kitty”. It will be also called our Edition One in hopes that there may be other books to follow.

Work on the coloring book started right after the dust settled in July when we all got home from the Annual meeting. Before asking for a budget to fund this project, some research was done and a goal was set.

*Edition One, “Caring for your Kitty,” will be a twenty page coloring book.*

*Our book will carry a message for the child’s parents and an invitation to read and be involved in learning to caring for a kitten/cat.*

*We will invite the children’s parents to send a finished picture from their child; with the child’s name and age printed on the face of the picture. We plan to find a space on our CFA website, or other CFA media, for display of the colored pictures.*
We are not quite halfway finished with the pictures; we have developed nine pages already. What is included in this report is simply an up-date on the work accomplished so far. The pictures you see today are our first drawings and before final draft of the book is released for printing, the pictures may be refined and tweaked.

A coloring book project has been kicked around CFA for many years and the A-Cat Program is proud to bring this idea into reality.

**Future Projections for Committee:**

We will be continuing to work on finalizing the first coloring book, and then begin work on the second.

**Time Frame:**

New resources and articles will be added to the websites as available.

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

A final version of the first coloring book.

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Lane

---

**Hannon:** Ambassador Cat Program. That’s you, right? **Newkirk:** Yes. No action items. If you’ve read the report, Donna Brown passed away suddenly. They’ve had a couple other members that resigned, so they are looking for new members. The big thing is that they are working on the coloring book. I think they’re about half way through. They think that will be completed and be able to present that at the next meeting. **Hannon:** One of the things we have done for the Ambassador Cats program, we’ve ordered some shirts for them with the CFA logo on it and *Ambassador Cats* written underneath that, that they will be debuting at the International Show. Hopefully they will stand out in a show hall with a purple shirt with the CFA logo on it and help promote the program. **Kuta:** We have Nancy and her cat Danny come down to a lot of our shows in southern California. We put her usually right out in front. The spectators really love that. I saw so many young people taking selfies with Danny. He was wearing a little Star Trek shirt. It’s just really cool. We’re lucky enough to have 3 or 4 Ambassador Cats in our area. Anytime I’m show managing a show, I’m like, “I don’t care, we’re giving them a lot of space,” and we’re making sure that they come. I just like looking at them, too. **DelaBar:** I would like to have some good contact. We would like to have these people in Europe – or maybe it’s not for Europe. I know it can be in Japan. We do have Iams in Europe. **Hannon:** Iams isn’t the sponsor for the program anymore. **DelaBar:** OK, never mind. But I would like to have this open to our people. We have several that are at every, single show. I can tell you that the exhibitors from the Ukraine would be phenomenal representatives for this program. **Newkirk:** I will let Karen know. **Hannon:** We’ll put Karen in touch with you. **DelaBar:** Thank you. **Hannon:** Any other comments or questions about the Ambassador Cat Program?
(24) **AMBASSADOR PROGRAM.**

**Committee Chair:** Candilee Jackson  
**Liaison to the Board:** Pam DelaBar  
**Committee Members:** Art Graafmans, Diane Coppola, Alene Shafnisky

---

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

With the resignation of Ken Cribbs, Hawai‘i Division, the Ambassador Program extends a warm welcome to Donna Fuji who will now coordinate Ambassador activities in paradise. Additionally, the new Pet Me! Banners have been distributed to regions 1-8, and a few extras were ordered to keep an inventory available to any region who needs an extra. An explanation of the Pet Me! Cats program was created for the October issue of Cat Talk, and a combined article written by Candilee Jackson and Karen Lane, A-Cats Program, for the September online newsletter to better explain these outreach programs.

**Current Happenings of Committee:**

The committee is currently looking for two Ambassadors to host the “welcome” station at the International Show in Novi, Michigan, in November.

**Future Projections for Committee:**

The committee hopes to work with various CFA graphic designers to re-create and update the CFA declawing informational brochure. Working in tandem with The Paw Project, the Ambassadors hope to provide more education both inside CFA show halls and within the community as opportunities present themselves throughout the year.

**Time Frame:**

All Ambassador programming goals and objectives are ongoing

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

Any updates based upon Ambassador reports from the field.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Candilee Jackson, Chair

_Hannon:_ Next would be the Ambassador Program, which is Pam. _DelaBar:_ There are absolutely no action items. We are looking for people to give some tours at the International Show. I gave at least one last year but I’m judging this year and can’t do it, so we are looking for volunteers if anybody would like to. _Hannon:_ What we did last year was, we gave a corner of the CFA booth to the Ambassador Program. I believe it was Diane Coppola and Alene Shafnisky staffed that. Right now, Candilee is still looking for somebody to sit at the booth and promote the program, answer questions and tell people where to line up for the tours. If you’ve got people that
you think might be able to help with this, let Candilee know. **DelaBar:** I may have somebody from Europe that can do that. We’ll see. **Hannon:** That’s great.
Board Action Item:

I am asking the board that with any application for registration by pedigree it must contain proof of ownership such as:

1. Certificate of registration from another association showing applicant is owner, or

2. Certified Pedigree showing applicant as owner, or

3. One of the above showing ownership and a written document transferring from owner to applicant

4. In the case of a lease some proof that the cat is leased from Breeder A to B.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Respectfully Submitted,
Linda Berg Chair

Hannon: Next is Animal Welfare, which is Pam. DelaBar: This is rather sensitive information. I don’t know how much needs to go out. When you register a cat by pedigree, there is no form to say if the cat is being transferred into a new name. We don’t know if there are additions or whatever, it’s whatever goes on that initial form. That name can differ from what’s on the pedigree that is submitted. If you look at pedigrees from other associations – like FIFe, we get a lot of transfers over from FIFe – up in the top block it gives breeder and owner name on that pedigree. We have a case of a breeder in Europe that was working with a breeder in the U.S. The U.S. breeder re-registered a litter of kittens that was actually born to the breeder in Europe – re-registered the same litter and got credit for that litter, then took the cats that were being leased, turned around and transferred the ownership of these cats that are actually owned by a person in Europe, and are now owned by the breeder in the U.S. We need to add some form that shows a change of ownership so that our registration people will not change the ownership of these cats without this form – a form that either this cat is being leased to so-and-so, or the ownership is changed to show the original owner and this new owner, or the cat is being sold and transferred solely to this new person. We need that paperwork. This is going to end up to be a very nasty protest, and it is being filed. Hannon: Why don’t you work with Verna on this issue? I’m concerned that somebody who has leased a cat can all of a sudden transfer it to their own self as an owner. That shouldn’t be happening. We need the original owner’s approval to transfer the
ownership. Eigenhauser: I think the board does need to act, because I don’t think if Pam and I talk to Verna, we still need a board policy saying, this is what you need to register a cat by pedigree – you need document A or document B or document C – some sort of written proof that you actually own the cat. So, there is an action item on there down at the bottom. It’s got a 1, 2, 3 and 4. These are the ways you can show that you either own or are leasing the cat, and it doesn’t seem all that unreasonable. If you want to say, “I want to register this cat by pedigree,” bring your registration slip from the other association to show that you actually own it, or show a certified pedigree that’s got their name on it, or something like that so we know that you are the actual owner of the cat, rather than just, you can register with a certified pedigree without the cat actually being yours. This is not the first case where it has come up. DelaBar: Right. This is not the only problem. There are others that have happened in the past. Eigenhauser: Linda has been kind of the repository of these complaints. It has reached the point now where we really need to take some sort of a board action saying, “this is the minimum you need to register a cat by pedigree.” I came up with some of it and Linda came up with some of it, but I don’t think any of this that she is asking for is unreasonable. DelaBar: No, it’s very reasonable. Eigenhauser: There may be other things we can think of, maybe a document E, F or G would be fine, too. We can add that to the list later when we come up with that, but at least for now have a policy that we can tell people, “this is what you need.” DelaBar: Monique is not in charge of any type of transfer action or checking ownership. She is only checking to see if those cats on those pedigrees are eligible for this cat to be registered in CFA, so it falls back to Central Office to actually check the ownership on these. Auth: I’m confused. Why is this under Animal Welfare? DelaBar: Because things like this come to Linda. Eigenhauser: Linda is the repository of a lot of our contract disputes. It started out in ancient times with sick kitten complaints. She would get the sick kitten complaints. When enough of them aggregated, then we would bundle them up and call it conduct detrimental to CFA. Over time, as CFA has gotten involved in more and more contract disputes, they have kind of fallen to Linda by default because they don’t fit anywhere else. So, she is the repository of contract disputes and transfer disputes and things like that. It’s not technically Animal Welfare, but it doesn’t fit anywhere else either. So, she has taken it on. Auth: Why doesn’t it go to Sharon Roy, the Ombudsman? Eigenhauser: It often does before it goes to Linda. If Sharon can handle it and clear it up, it doesn’t even bother going to Linda. Eventually it goes to Linda, and if Linda has problems with it further, it winds up going to Protests. Mastin: When do you want to make this effective, and what happens with all the stuff we have currently? Eigenhauser: Let’s ask, if we adopted this today, how quickly could it go into effect? Dobbins: I could do it with the ones that we have pending. I can start immediately. Mastin: So, we are going to start it immediately, including the ones that are pending. If you don’t have it, you are going to have to go back to the ones that are pending. Dobbins: Right. Hannon: Have you read this to the point that you’re clear with it and you don’t have an issue with implementing it? Dobbins: From what I understand here, I don’t. If I have any questions with it, I will definitely get in touch with Linda and George. Eigenhauser: Are there any additional documents you think might substitute for proof of ownership that we haven’t included? Dobbins: Not that I can see. Bizzell: What I was going to say is, I didn’t realize that we are no longer requiring this. I know when I registered cats in the past via pedigree, I had to send in the FIFe or whatever information with the original owner signing off on it. I didn’t realize that wasn’t required anymore. Dugger: I was just going to ask. I’m assuming we are asking for original documents. I mean, not like copies of or whatever. My counterfeiting background in
another life, but a lot of things go on. I was thinking it would be important to have the original TICA or whoever slip if it was a transfer. DelaBar: Jean, no. It’s done by scanning. I can say from experience, we have scanned the original documents. Dugger: As long as it’s a scanned original. DelaBar: It’s a scanned original, and that should be OK. The FIFe pedigree is 4 pages. You’ve got the cover pages which have medical information on the inside – such things as, the cat has two testicles, has no umbilical hernia, things like that – and then on the back sheet it has the cat’s vaccinations. The inside portion of it is the pedigree, so this document in Europe, if you don’t have a pet passport, then you have to have this document to prove that the cat has had its immunizations. So, you cannot send the original anywhere, or else the owner is really stuck.

Hannon: I’m looking for a motion. DelaBar: I so move that we adopt this. Eigenhauser: I second. Hannon: Is there any more discussion on the motion? Dobbins: I did have a request from the girls that work on registrations via pedigree, that we do not accept copies any longer. DelaBar: We cannot. We can’t do it. Hannon: They can’t send the original. DelaBar: They cannot send the original. Dobbins: If they send us a copy, but not via email electronically. Hannon: Why? Dobbins: Because what is happening is, they can’t read them. We’re doing a lot of guess work. Black: Are you saying the quality is too poor? Dobbins: The quality is very, very poor. Eigenhauser: I think that’s more a matter of, “we can’t read it, send it back.” DelaBar: Send it back for a better copy. Eigenhauser: Snail mail, they can give you a bad photocopy, too. Black: If you can’t read it, send it back and say, “we can’t read it.” Hannon: Any other questions or comments on the motion? Newkirk: Her claim about that was backed up in some of those files where the guest judging program evaluations, where you can hardly make out anything on those.

Hannon called the motion. Motion Carried.

Anger: What I would like to propose is that I scrub out the first three paragraphs of this report. I did that in the compiled reports that went to our constituents. DelaBar: Please do. That’s going to be part of the protest.
OTHER COMMITTEES.

Hannon: That’s the end of the committee reports that we received. Has anyone else got a committee report? Eigenhauser: Do any of the show rule revisions we talked about yesterday – have any of them come back today? Like putting Bengal restrictions in Agility. Hannon: Monte? He just asked you a question. Eigenhauser: Did you come up with a place to put the Bengal restrictions in Agility? Phillips: You want me to give you the text? The same thing as what’s in g. or f. or whatever, and just say agility. Eigenhauser: But you know where it’s going now? Phillips: Oh yeah. Eigenhauser: Could we do that now? Phillips: It will be in the report. You passed it with the word “agility.” Eigenhauser: OK. Hannon: Are you satisfied with that, George? Eigenhauser: I don’t care. If nobody else cares, I don’t care.
(27) **OLD BUSINESS.**

Hannon: Old Business. Moser: I was wondering, I’ve been hearing things on this 80% rule in China. I was wondering if we could have a little discussion on that. I understand, I think you brought up that they are showing pregnant cats, cats that are in deplorable condition and all of this because of that 80% rule. Colilla: It’s going to be brought up under New Business. Moser: Oh, it is? So, I just need to be quiet. OK. Kallmeyer: Point out, it’s not because of the rule, it’s because they are trying to stuff the shows anyway. Moser: Right, but he said it’s going to be brought up in New Business so I’ll just wait. Hannon: Any other Old Business?
NEW BUSINESS.

Hannon: New Business. John has something. Colilla: Yeah. I was in China the last couple weekends. One kind of worked out nice because of the new 80% rule. My experience so far is, the first weekend was not that bad. There was not that many point-assist cats. Last weekend was kind of bad. Several of our judges started doing NA-Condition, DQ and stuff like that. One of them recommendations we thought would maybe solve that situation is, whenever we have any kind of disqualification, NA-Condition, they are going to be counted as absent. All we need is three of us to do it. For 80% in a 10 ring show, that cat would not be counted. Our experience is that the same cat is coming at the same time. One of them is like supposedly a British Shorthair with folded ears. We have cats tipping the tongue coming into my ring. If you DQ the cat twice, you are going to find a tail fault in the same spot, we had pregnant females and it’s not a good situation. So, if all the judges start doing that, that will eliminate some of the stuffing, I would think. So, I am proposing that we change the show count for China only. If any of those cats have NA-Condition or DQ, it is counted as absent. Hannon: Are you making a motion? Mastin: So moved. DelaBar: Second. Hannon: Discussion. Phillips: So, you want to revised the rules text as I understand it right, so that if a cat is DQ’ed or NA’ed, it is no longer part of the count. Colilla: Any of those that don’t have a dash or a 1, 2 or 3. Phillips: A dash means you handled it. Wilson: No, if it doesn’t have a dash or a 1, 2 or 3, if it doesn’t have an award. So, if it’s NA-Condition, IM – Phillips: Because right now if it’s handled at all it’s in the count. So, you want to change that. Colilla: No, no. Kallmeyer: He is saying it’s marked absent. So, if one judge just does an NA and no other judge marks it that way, it would be part of the count. But, otherwise it is just marked absent. Remember, the 80% rule in a 10 ring show, you have to be in 8 rings. If 3 judges mark it NA, then it becomes absent in every ring and it does not become part of the count. So, it’s just marked absent. Calhoun: I think what Annette said – Colilla: I want to mark it as it is – NA-Condition – but when you do the show count, it’s going to be counted as absent. That way it’s recorded correctly. Calhoun: If I have 5 silver tabby American Shorthair females, none of them are NA but not everybody is going to get a ribbon. Hannon: They are all included in the count then. Black: So, you’re saying that if a cat gets 3 NA’s from 3 different judges in the same show – Newkirk: Or DQ. Black: - then it doesn’t count for the count. Colilla: Yes. Black: What if that cat got a DQ, and NA and a – Colilla: Same thing. Three for the same cat and it’s not in the count. Wilson: Anything other than a 1, 2, 3 or hyphen. Black: I understand that, but I’m saying, it has to be three different judges. Wilson: Or more. Hannon: It’s based on a percentage, Kathy. So, at a 10 ring show it would be three, but if it was a 6 ring show it wouldn’t be three. Black: Oh, it would be a smaller number. Wilson: It would be considered absent for purposes of the count. Eigenhauser: I have a hypothetical question. What if it gets no award in 3 rings and gets breed or gets a final in one of the other rings? How can an absent cat get a final? DelaBar: It can be polled by ring. That’s easy. Kallmeyer: George, it’s effectively not part of the count. John said leave the mark. Hannon: What if it gets best cat? Do we give it credit for best cat if it’s absent? Colilla: It should still get best cat. It’s just not going to be part of the count, that’s all. Hannon: Are we going to give it the points it earned in that ring? Colilla: I would think you would have to. Hannon: I don’t see how you could if it’s absent. Newkirk: It’s only absent for the count. Colilla: Let me put it this way. It’s not likely going to happen. Phillips: Let me make sure I have this right. If 20% or more judges mark a cat Disqualify or any NA, the cat will not be included in the official count.
**Eigenhauser:** But only in China. **Moser:** I’m wondering if we should rethink this whole thing. Now we’ve got people showing pregnant cats, we’ve got them showing cats in deplorable condition. Do we really want to put cats through this? This is getting to the point where it’s ridiculous. So, they get DQ’ed in one show. Couldn’t they come back at another show and do the same thing? **Hannon:** It might be in good condition at the next show. **Moser:** I don’t know. I don’t think we are doing this correctly. **Colilla:** Actually, there were some that I marked NA-IM last weekend and other judges did the same thing. Like the folded British Shorthair. **Eigenhauser:** I was going to ask Dick, how do you think the Chinese people are going to take this? **Kallmeyer:** I think a lot of them would be happy. They didn’t like them bringing a lot of bad condition cats. The only thing is, how do you track them? Some of these were under TRNs, so there’s no real way to track them. The only thing you can do is make it not beneficial to bring them. **Black:** If it’s not included in the count, then there will be no incentive. **Kallmeyer:** Right, that’s what I’m saying. That’s one way to do it. It’s the same in the U.S. People can bring poor condition in and it counts, too. **Hannon:** I used an example yesterday of a show last weekend where somebody brought in a kitten’s TRN in the middle of the afternoon and the Central Office, once they knew about it, just voided it. It didn’t stop him. He was doing it again yesterday. **DelaBar:** Here are some pictures of the way these stuffer cats are kept in these small cages. They will have several adult cats in one of these wire cages. They will double stack these wire cages. This group happened to be in the show area but they were like under the escalator, so they were not benched with everybody else. **Black:** Where was that? **DelaBar:** This was in China. **Kuta:** When? Recently? **DelaBar:** Very recently. I want to say September 25th. That was last weekend. **Kallmeyer:** Monte, wouldn’t the rule be that if you have an NA or DQ, it’s not considered present for that right, right? For the count? **Phillips:** It is now. **Kallmeyer:** No, but I mean, that’s what he is proposing. **Phillips:** He is proposing 20% of them. **Kallmeyer:** No, forget the 20%. Just say that, for the count, an NA or DQ is not considered present in that ring. **Phillips:** You will get the same result then. **Hannon:** But it’s easier to say. Any other questions or comments on John’s proposal? **Newkirk:** Effective date? **Colilla:** It’s up to you guys. We need to notify them that we’re going to do it. At least a couple weeks after translation. **Eigenhauser:** If Monte is going to write up the rule, we should probably have the rule in hand before we vote for it. You can give tentative approval today and then final approval later. **Hannon:** Monte, what we’re going to do is bring it back in December with what you’ve written up for us, OK? **Phillips:** OK. **Hannon:** And we will formally pass it then and inform the clubs in China. **Colilla:** I recommend earlier. **Kallmeyer:** I do, too. **Hannon:** You want to do it online? **Colilla:** Because by December you’ve got 2 months of those. **Hannon:** Monte, can you get it to Rachel and we’ll poll the board online, rather than wait until December? **Phillips:** I can send it to you probably Tuesday afternoon. **Hannon:** OK, and then we will do it online. Is that satisfactory with everybody? So, for now we are tabling the motion, right? **Colilla:** And we need to figure out the effective date, too, and we can get it translated. **Hannon:** We can get the effective date today. What do you want to do? **Colilla:** That’s up to you guys. I’m just suggesting. **Hannon:** Somebody got an idea of when they want to make this effective? **Kallmeyer:** November 1st. **Colilla:** That will give us time to do the translation. We’ve got to get somebody to do the translation. **Hannon:** Who made the motion? **Mastin:** I did. **Hannon:** Did you want to amend your motion to include an effective date of November 1st? **Mastin:** Yes. **Hannon:** Alright, so Rachel, when you get from Monte you will repeat the actual motion, right? **Anger:** Correct. **Hannon:** We will handle this online.
Hannon: Any other new business? Eigenhauser: I just want to make one last comment on that. This new rule presupposes judges are going to actually DQ or NA cats. There’s always that judge with a kind heart who wants to just kind of bury the cat in class and not do it, so maybe what we need is a little educational work on the judges’ list that it’s OK if a cat really doesn’t belong in a show. It may hurt somebody’s feelings from time to time, but sometimes you’ve just got to suck it up. Black: I think there will be at least one out of six. Wilson: I absolutely agree with that. We have a number of shows in China and a lot of judges that are sitting around this table that are going to be judging them over the next few weeks. I think that’s your opportunity to discuss this with your colleagues at the shows. Also, though, I would like to ask John, are you saying anything to the exhibitors or getting a translator to let them know why? Colilla: I can’t because my clerk doesn’t speak English and I do not speak Mandarin. In Hong Kong I can do that. Wilson: Right, but it’s not an issue in Hong Kong. Colilla: As far as they’re concerned, it’s just one of those and you let them go, you know? Because you only have 12 cages and you’ve got about 30 British Shorthairs, some of them are going to turn down the number with no markings. DelaBar: Too bad you can’t red card them. Kallmeyer: Can’t you, as a judge, if the cat’s pregnant, call it to the attention of the show committee? Colilla: Here’s the other thing. It takes forever to get the show management. Like last weekend, there’s at least 6 or 7 of them. By the time you get the owners – another issue to the 80% rule is, it takes forever to finish judging, because like normally you get done by 6. The last two shows we didn’t get done until about 8:30 because we judged every stuffer there is. You know how slow those cats come up to the ring. Wilson: Well, that’s what we wanted. We wanted to have the cats in ring. Now we’ve got the cats in the ring, so we’re going to have to handle the issue. Colilla: I just wanted to let you guys know what’s going on over there. Be prepared to get done around 8:00. DelaBar: And don’t be afraid to say, “oh, you brought me the wrong cat, I’ve already seen this one.” Wilson: I’m using a magic marker. Newkirk: I mentioned this once before. I had a brown tabby Maine Coon in championship and then I called premiership up, and I looked over and it’s the same cat. I said, call the owner up here. He came up and I said, “tell him he can’t do this.” He took the cat and left. DelaBar: You said, Annette, you are taking a magic marker? Wilson: A whole bunch of different colored ones and I will do it on their paw. I’m making this up, but it’s an idea. Black: I so wanted a bar code scanner because I had like 80 Brits and they were all blue. They were all bad Chartreux looking, that bad of a Brit. I so wanted to have a bar code scanner because I know I’ve seen this one, I know I’ve seen that one. But, they don’t care in class judging. No one is sitting on the edge of their seat seeing how their cat performs or behaves. I know I judged one cat twice because it had a bald spot and came back. I couldn’t say for sure on the others. [multiple speakers] They actually put a cat in the wrong cage. It was transferred to a Balinese. My clerk put the number up and said it was a Brit, and there was a Brit that showed up in that cage. I’m like, who is the owner of this cat? Nobody could tell me. So finally it just went away. Then we just kept going and the cat showed back up. I said, “look, it showed back up,” and my clerk said, “you recognize that cat?” I said, “of course I recognize that cat. This is the one that got stuck in the Balinese’s cage.” They were shocked that I knew it was the same cat. DelaBar: Question. You said you had a Brit transferred to Balinese? Black: Well, one of the numbers that was entered got transferred to a Balinese. One of the Brits went to be a Balinese. DelaBar: They can’t do that. Colilla: You can’t transfer breeds. Black: It was an error. The owner transferred it before the show. My clerk put the number up because he was putting all the Brit numbers up and he didn’t pull it out. Wilson: Rachel had an idea that I think is really worth considering. Whenever there’s
a class of more than 20 cats over there and you’ve only got 12 cages in the ring, say there are 30
blue British Shorthair kittens. Have all of them scheduled in 3 or 4 of the rings at the same time.
Bring them all up and let the judge in this ring judge this batch and so on, then all the judges
move to the next ring. **Anger:** Like bay judging in Australia. **Wilson:** All the cats would be
there, and the judges would move. I judge the first 12 in my ring while Rachel is judging 13-24
in the next ring and so on, then when we are done we judge move to the next ring and judge the
next batch. We all write our book separately and we would know if they were all there or not.
**Phillips:** That’s a show rule violation. **Wilson:** It’s not a show rule violation except a judge can’t
go into another judge’s ring, but we would move in tandem. **Newkirk:** We could carry our sign
with us and take ownership of the ring. **DelaBar:** It’s like what we do in Australia. **Kuta:** Just
wear a sandwich board. **Wilson:** This would only have to happen I think a few times. **Phillips:** I
find it fascinating that they think a judge cannot recognize the same cat. That’s exactly what it is
you are being paid to do. **DelaBar:** This really is a disrespect to judges, that they think we don’t
notice this. I was very happy that one time to say, “oh, you’ve already brought this one up, I’ve
seen it.” **Newkirk:** I don’t think they look at it that way. Their point of view is, it’s a point.
**Wilson:** This is what I have to do in order to get a win.

[from after next motion] **Newkirk:** Point of order. I don’t think we made a motion and
voted on tabling John’s proposal. **Hannon:** We didn’t vote on tabling it. **Newkirk:** That’s what
I’m saying. We need to. **Hannon:** Do you want to make a motion, John? Somebody make a
motion to table John’s motion. **Colilla:** I make a motion to table this until we get the written
version of it from Monte. **Newkirk:** Second.

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

**SHOW RULES COMMITTEE**

Special Report

**Committee Chair:** Monte Phillips
**Liaison to Board:** Carol Krzanowski
**Committee Members:** Cathy Dunham, Kathy Gumm, Shirley Michaud-Dent

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

Based on the request from the October 2016 Board meeting to provide immediate rulemaking to
ensure that cats that were disqualified or had awards withheld in China would not be included in
the champion, premier, or show counts for any category.

**Rule Revisions to Revise Process for Determining Count in China – Cats/Kittens from Which
Awards were Withheld Will Not be Part of any Count**
### Rule # 2.04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Wording</th>
<th>Proposed Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.04 A BENCHED CHAMPION or PREMIER is one that is present and qualified for</td>
<td>2.04 A BENCHED CHAMPION or PREMIER is one that is present and qualified for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competition and judged in one ring as a Champion or Premier. Champions or</td>
<td>competition and judged in one ring as a Champion or Premier (except in China –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premiers, including Opens competing as Champions or Premiers, transferred to</td>
<td>see Rule 28.02). Champions or Premiers, including Opens competing as Champions or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Champion or Grand Premier after the first day of a two day show will be</td>
<td>Premiers, transferred to Grand Champion or Grand Premier after the first day of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counted as a Champion or Premier in all rings. Such cat is presumed to be</td>
<td>a two day show will be counted as a Champion or Premier in all rings. Such cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benched and present for competition throughout the entire show. Any cat</td>
<td>is presumed to be benched and present for competition throughout the entire show.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competing in a ring, including a disqualified cat, is considered a benched cat</td>
<td>Any cat competing in a ring, including a disqualified cat, is considered a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Grand Championship and Grand Premiership scoring purposes.</td>
<td>benched cat for Grand Championship and Grand Premiership scoring purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rule # 28.02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Wording</th>
<th>Proposed Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A cat eligible for and shown in the Champion or Premier Class will compete for</td>
<td>A cat eligible for and shown in the Champion or Premier Class will compete for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Championship or Grand Premiership points in any type of ring, e.g.</td>
<td>Grand Championship or Grand Premiership points in any type of ring, e.g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allbreed, Longhair/Shorthair or Breed specialty as follows:</td>
<td>Allbreed, Longhair/Shorthair or Breed specialty as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Any Champion or Premier placing in the top ten (or fifteen, where applicable)</td>
<td>a. Any Champion or Premier placing in the top ten (or fifteen, where applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finals awards may receive points towards Grand Championship or Grand Premiership.</td>
<td>finals awards may receive points towards Grand Championship or Grand Premiership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The highest placing Champion or Premier will receive one point for every benched</td>
<td>The highest placing Champion or Premier will receive one point for every benched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champion or Premier defeated for shows held outside of China, i.e., Regions 1-9</td>
<td>Champion or Premier defeated for shows held outside of China, i.e., Regions 1-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and most of the International Division (including the special administrative</td>
<td>and most of the International Division (including the special administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>areas of Hong Kong and Macau). For champions/premiers competing at shows in</td>
<td>areas of Hong Kong and Macau). For champions/premiers competing at shows in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China, the cat will receive one Grand Championship/Premiership point for every</td>
<td>China, the cat will receive one Grand Championship/Premiership point for every</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champion/Premier defeated that was present in</td>
<td>Champion/Premier defeated that was present in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
at least 80 percent of the Rings held at that show, as noted in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Rings held at show</th>
<th>Rings present for cat to be in count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ring held</td>
<td>1 Ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Rings held</td>
<td>2 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rings held</td>
<td>3 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Rings held</td>
<td>4 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Rings held</td>
<td>4 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Rings held</td>
<td>5 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Rings held</td>
<td>6 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Rings held</td>
<td>7 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Rings held</td>
<td>8 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Rings held</td>
<td>8 Rings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cats not present in the number of Rings specified in the table based on the number of Rings held at any show held in China will not be counted as competing at the show for determining the official champion/premier count, however, any grand points won by these cats in any ring will still be credited to that cat’s record.

The second highest placing Champion or Premier will receive 90% of the points awarded the highest placing Champion or Premier, third highest 80%, fourth highest 70% and 5th highest 60%, etc. In all cases, fractional points 0.5 and greater will be rounded to the next higher number.

b. Best Champion or Best Premier will receive one point for every Open/Champion or Open/Premier defeated in accordance with the method for calculating champions and premiers present described in 28.02a.

c. Second Best Champion or Premier will receive 90% of the points received by the Best Champion or Premier. Third Best Champion will receive 80% of the points received by the Best Champion.

d. Best Longhair Champion and Best Shorthair Champion in Allbreed Rings will receive one point for every Open/Champion defeated in that specialty in accordance with the method for calculating champions present described in 28.02a.

e. The Second Best Longhair Champion and
Second Best Shorthair Champion in Allbreed Rings will receive 90% of the points received by the Best Longhair or Best Shorthair Champion. The Third Best Longhair Champion and Third Best Shorthair Champion in Allbreed Rings will receive 80% of the points received by the Best Longhair or Best Shorthair Champion.

f. Best Longhair Premier and Best Shorthair Premier in Allbreed Rings will receive one point for every benched Premier defeated in that specialty in accordance with the method for calculating premiers present described in 28.02.

g. The Second Best Longhair Premier and Second Best Shorthair Premier in Allbreed Rings will receive 90% of the points received by the Best Longhair or Best Shorthair Premier.

Best Champion.

d. Best Longhair Champion and Best Shorthair Champion in Allbreed Rings will receive one point for every Open/Champion defeated in that specialty in accordance with the method for calculating champions present described in 28.02.

e. The Second Best Longhair Champion and Second Best Shorthair Champion in Allbreed Rings will receive 90% of the points received by the Best Longhair or Best Shorthair Champion. The Third Best Longhair Champion and Third Best Shorthair Champion in Allbreed Rings will receive 80% of the points received by the Best Longhair or Best Shorthair Champion.

f. Best Longhair Premier and Best Shorthair Premier in Allbreed Rings will receive one point for every benched Premier defeated in that specialty in accordance with the method for calculating premiers present described in 28.02.

g. The Second Best Longhair Premier and Second Best Shorthair Premier in Allbreed Rings will receive 90% of the points received by the Best Longhair or Best Shorthair Premier.

### Article XXXVI, Show Points, Official Show Count, Item 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Wording</th>
<th>Proposed Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> A cat/kitten/household pet handled by a judge in one ring is counted s competing in all Rings for shows held outside of China, i.e., in Regions 1-9 and most of the International Division (including the special administrative areas of Hong Kong and Macau). For cats/kittens/household pets handled by judges in China, the cat/kitten/household pet must be handled in 80 percent of the Rings held at the show, as noted in the following table, for the cat/kitten/household pet to be counted as competing at the show:</td>
<td><strong>3.</strong> A cat/kitten/household pet handled by a judge in one ring is counted s competing in all Rings for shows held outside of China, i.e., in Regions 1-9 and most of the International Division (including the special administrative areas of Hong Kong and Macau). For cats/kittens/household pets handled by judges in China, the cat/kitten/household pet must be handled and no award withheld because of insufficient merit, condition, or disqualification (see Rules 11.23, and 11.24) in 80 percent of the Rings held at the show, as noted in the following table, for the cat/kitten/household pet to be counted. In rings where an award is withheld from a cat/kitten for the reasons given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rings held</td>
<td>Rings present for held at show to be in count above, that cat/kitten will be considered absent for the purpose of determining if the 80% requirement has been met, as competing at the show:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ring held</td>
<td>1 Ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Rings held</td>
<td>2 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rings held</td>
<td>3 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Rings held</td>
<td>4 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Rings held</td>
<td>4 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Rings held</td>
<td>5 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Rings held</td>
<td>6 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Rings held</td>
<td>7 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Rings held</td>
<td>8 Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Rings held</td>
<td>8 Rings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cats/kittens/household pets not present in the number of Rings specified in the table based on the number of Rings held at any show held in China will not be counted as competing at the show for determining the official count, however, any awards won by these cats in any ring will still be credited to that cat’s record.

RATIONAL: The revision to the “count” rule has resulted in cats being shown that are being routinely disqualified in China. However, these cats are currently still considered part of the count in determining if they meet the 80% present to go in the count. The proposed change would remove cats that are disqualified or otherwise have awards withheld (condition, insufficient merit, or wrong color class) from being considered present in the ring where such an award withholding took place. Thus, these cats could not be shown to inflate the count in China.

**Time Frame:**

At a special meeting/review by the board.

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

Nothing planned at this time.

Respectfully Submitted,
Monte Phillips, Chair

[Secretary’s Note: A subsequent online motion was made by Krzanowski and seconded by Wilson as follows: Effective November 1, 2016 for shows held in China, adopt the Show Rules changes as written so that any kitten/cat receiving a DISQ, NA/IM or NA/COND in a ring will be considered absent in that ring. **Motion Carried.** Anger and Black abstained.]
Anger: We have a motion from a club that has come forward to ask for 50% guest judges. The Edelweiss Cat Club is having a show on February 18th, six rings. DelaBar: Four rings. Anger: This request says six rings. So, it’s a four ring show. They want to have two CFA judges and two guest judges. Let me amend that. They want up to 50% guest judges as a safety mechanism, due to the fact that currently no other judges can be successfully negotiated. The reason for their request is the expense of air fares, the expenses for official invitations and the expenses for the actual visas. I would like to move that we grant the Edelweiss Cat Club permission to have up to 50% guest judges at their show on February 18, 2017. DelaBar: Second. Rachel, you are correct, it is a six ring show. I just double checked. They have four judges contracted right now. Wilson: Where is the show? DelaBar: Moscow. Many of our judges go over to Russia and they have three-year visas, but these are more tourist visas. They’re cheaper. These cultural visas are really rather expensive. The club has to go to the immigration people and they pay to get official invitations. Once these are given out, then they can send them usually by express mail to the judge for the invitation. Then it costs the judge more money to get that cultural visa. Now, just recently, Russia has put even more of a stipend, per se, on America visas for these cultural exchange visas. I had to pay an additional €101 extra because I was an American. My visa for two entries into Russia, the newest one, cost me €214, so around $225. So, this is not including the expense of the original invitation. The club actually has to pay more than what I’m paying to get my visa. They are paying more to get that invitation. It’s getting very expensive for us to put on shows in Russia with non-Russian judges. Anger: One more element to add to that is, I have a Russian visa and it was obtained through a club that’s not Edelweiss. Theoretically, the only club that I should be judging for is the club that obtained my visa, because part of the visa says that club will be responsible for me while I’m in Russia. So, if I go and judge the Edelweiss show and something happens to me, this other club is responsible for me. Technically, this limits the number of judges that can accept the show, even if they wanted to go. DelaBar: I don’t know if you’re aware, Russia used to be the second largest cat-owning population in the world. It’s now the third largest cat-owning population. The U.S., China and now Russia are top. It’s a phenomenal market. You’ve got FIFe there, you’ve got WCF there. Cat shows can be quite large. The largest cat show in the world is held in Russia. It will be the first weekend in December, and that’s the Royal Canin Grand Prix. Of course, the exhibitors go in on tourist visas. I’ve never seen immigration officials come in to any one of these large corporate shows like the one that Iams did or the Catsburg show that’s held the first of March, also a very big multi-organizational show. For the small clubs putting on a regular show, it’s hard. It’s very difficult. Mastin: So, do all the judges in the Judging Program know about this requirement? DelaBar: I don’t know, to tell you the truth. Annette could answer. Wilson: The judges have resources and links to the various visa agencies. It really is up to them to do the research, but when the clubs invite you from Russia, they tell you what’s needed. Applying for a Russian visa is extensive. They want to know all the places you’ve visited out of the country in the last 10 years. You can use your passport stamps or you can use all sorts of things, but when you apply for it the best thing to do is save that, so if you apply for another one, you’ve already done the research once. The folks that invite you really tell you what kind of visa to get and then the visa services, that’s all online and they walk you through how to fill out the various types of visas, what’s required and so on. You need to start early. It’s not a last-minute thing you can do. Black:
And you hope the letter you got in Russian is correct. Newkirk: You have to use an agency now.
You used to be able to write to the Russian Embassy and get your own visa but you can’t do that
anymore. Delabar: That’s why I use this agency. You can imagine what kind of fun I have when
it says, have you ever served in any armed forces, have you received training on weapons and
stuff like that. I’m perfectly honest but I’ve yet to ever be turned down. Newkirk: We need to get
back to the point. Delabar: So anyway, that’s why they’re asking, is because one, it’s expensive
all the way around, and two, it’s difficult. Wilson: We have two of our Russian-based CFA
judges that are incapacitated somewhat right now. Hannon: OK, so we’ve got a motion on the
floor. Let’s vote on it. The motion is to grant them approval for up to 50%. And that was
seconded? Anger: It was, by Pam. Auth: I have a question. If it’s the third largest cat owning
population in the world, what does that mean for CFA, financially or philosophically? Do we
gain any benefit from that? Certainly, in China right now, our benefit is increased numbers of
registrations. Do we have some comparable measurement of what it means to us in Russia?
DelaBar: Dick can answer that. Kallmeyer: The answer is yes, and Russia is very significant for
Europe. It’s probably the largest registrations in Europe for us. Kuta: How big is that Europe
chunk? Kallmeyer: You would have to look at the reports. I sent it to you. Delabar: It’s
between 8% and 9% of all CFA registrations come from Europe.

Hannon called the motion. Motion Carried. Auth voting no.

* * * * *

Hannon: Rachel has a piece of new business. Anger: Pam, do you want to make that
motion? I would like to give you the floor, about Wesley. Delabar: As everybody knows,
Wesley passed on at the age of 16. I thought it would be a nice gesture – how much do you
think? Anger: $100. Delabar: If we donated $100 to the Winn Foundation in Wesley’s name.
That’s my motion. Anger: Second. Hannon: Any discussion?

Hannon called the motion. Motion Carried. Eigenhauser abstained.
CH MISTEKATZ WESLEY

Wesley was part of CFA his entire life. He was a show cat and sired 3 handsome sons. Wesley came to Central Office in September 2014 and became the King of our office. He was extremely loving, playful and brought joy to Central Office every day. Vendors and guests were greeted with a soft meow. His popularity was apparent, as I would receive phone calls to just ask how Wesley was doing. Wesley has left us and our hearts ache, we are grateful for the time and love he gave us. He will be forever in our hearts, the memories he gave us are now treasures.

Verna M. Dobbins

* * * * *
Hannon: Anything else? Brown: I would like to personally thank John Randolph and Rich Mastin for their help with a teleconference and going through the [GeneSeek] contracts. There were a lot of things that had to be done before we finally ended up with a contract. They have spent a lot of time on it and I would like to personally thank them. [applause]

DelaBar: I would like to thank Edward [Maeda] for his assistance. One of my breeder/exhibitors in Europe from Italy went to Tokyo for some specialized facial surgery to correct a tumor that had been on her face. She was by herself. I emailed Edward and I said, if you have anyone who speaks English, could they please maybe take some flowers, go by and make sure she does not feel alone in the world. Erica [Nitta] went over. Edward asked Erica. She did go over and my exhibitor was thrilled to death. She said, “now I really know that CFA is a worldwide family.” So Edward, thank you so much for helping my person and for the wonderful thing that Erica did. Thank you for your help. [applause]

Hannon: Finally, in the way of thanks, I’m thanking the Central Office staff for all they did helping with the lunches, with the dinners, with picking us up at the airport and transporting us around, and their advance work, as well. We appreciate all the help they have given us. [applause]

Hannon: Thank you to the CFA Museum for allowing us to use the museum for our meetings, once again. DelaBar: Yes, thank you Museum. [applause]

Hannon: Anything else before I adjourn? Mastin: I don’t think we touched on this yesterday. I talked to Carla about it on Friday. Our audit firm, the guy passed away Monday or Tuesday. He was in a car accident. Barry: He was buried this past Wednesday. Mastin: So, we need to re-look at how that whole process is going. The Finance Committee is going to work on things with Stacy and Terri on probably changing this. He was pretty much a one-man operation, so we’re going to have to re-look at it.

Hannon: Last call. Anything else? Thank you all for coming. The meeting is adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m. Eastern Daylight Saving Time.

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

**16-013 CFA v. Ling, Liu Mei**

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

**GUILTY.** Sentence of a one year suspension of all CFA services; a $500.00 fine payable to CFA within 30 days; void the registration of the litter and the six kittens; and void any points, titles, or awards for the kittens identified. If the fine is not paid prior to the end of the suspension period the suspension will continue until the fine is paid. [vote sealed]

**16-014 CFA v. Stephens, Zayda**

Violation of CFA Constitution, Article XV, Section 4 (b, c, e, f and g)
Violation of Show Rules: Article 1, 1.03

**GUILTY.** In view of the commonality between this matter and two prior and still unresolved protests, no sentence was given. All three matters will be consolidated in determining an appropriate sentence. [vote sealed]