

**CFA EXECUTIVE BOARD SPECIAL MEETING
APRIL 1, 2020**

Index to Minutes

Secretary's note: This index is provided only as a courtesy to the readers and is not an official part of the CFA minutes. The numbers shown for each item in the index are keyed to similar numbers shown in the body of the minutes.

1. A REDUCTION IN THE NW POINT MINIMUMS.....	3
2. GRAND OF DISTINCTION.....	7
3. REGIONAL/DIVISIONAL RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT.....	9
4. DIVISIONAL WIN ADJUSTMENT.....	10
5. INCREASE THE NUMBER OF NWS IN CHAMPIONSHIP AND PREMIERSHIP.....	10
6. REDUCTION IN THE POINT MINIMUMS FOR BREED WINS.....	19
7. MORATORIUM ON AWARDED SHOW SPONSORSHIPS.....	19
8. REIMBURSE CFA JUDGES FOR GUEST JUDGING TRANSPORTATION.....	21
9. REIMBURSE GUEST JUDGES FOR CFA JUDGING TRANSPORTATION.....	22

Secretary's Note: The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. met on Wednesday, April 1, 2020, via teleconference. **President Mark Hannon** called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m. EST with the following members present:

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

Also Present:

John M. Randolph, Esq., CFA Legal Counsel
Allene Tartaglia, Executive Director
Shino Wiley, Japanese Interpreter

Absent:

None.

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

RATIONALE for following five motions:

The COVID-19 coronavirus has invaded the world. It grew legs and has now been reported in every state of the USA and almost every other country around the world. This pandemic caused much concern for the health and wellbeing of our exhibitors, especially our older exhibitors that are suffering grave outcomes in many cases. Many of the states have enacted laws that have prevented the gathering of a set number of people, in some cases as few as 10. This impacted the CFA show scene in a drastic manner and the CFA Board of Directors took the unprecedented action to cancel all show production, globally, until May 31, 2020. This action was necessary to protect our club members, our exhibitors, our spectators and our vendors that participate to produce a CFA cat show.

The unprecedented action caused an upset in all three of our competitive areas around the world: Regions 1-9, China, and International Division. Each of these areas was affected differently, as the COVID-19 virus spread, and is still spreading, at different rates. First affected was China. From there, the virus spread to the USA, Europe, Japan, Russia, Asia West and other areas of our International Division.

In Regions 1-9 the show schedule was stopped by the CFA Board of Directors on March 16 with a potential end date of May 31. Two scheduled shows were cancelled by local authorities on March 7-8, 2020 (Tails and No Tales) and March 14-15, 2020 (Mo-Kan). Our last show was completed on March 14-15, 2020 (Crab and Mallet). For the show season end for Regions 1-9, we can take the first cancellation as the date that show competition was concluded for scoring purposes. Show the show season in the Regions 1-9 was reduced by 15% of the complete show season.

In China the show season consisted of shows on only 8 weekends. Their show season was impacted by not only the COVID-19 Coronavirus outbreak, but also the enforcement of the NGO laws that went into effect on January 1, 2017. For the show season in China, their show season was reduced by 85% (note: for the kitten show season, 8 weekends would equate to 1/2 of a kitten show season.)

For the International Division the show schedule by and large was stopped at the end of February. For the show season in the International Division, their show season was reduced by 25%.

Many scoring issues need to be adjusted due to the reduction to our regular show season. Therefore, I wish to propose the following motions to address 5 issues that I feel are of major concern to our constituents globally.

1. A REDUCTION IN THE NW POINT MINIMUMS.

The following chart is based on the data provided above:

	current requirements	15%	25%	85%
		R1-9	ID Other	ID China
Ch Ship	4300	3655	3225	645
Pr Ship	2200	1870	1650	330
Kittens	1500	1275	1125	750
HHP	1100	935	825	165

Motion: That the current NW point minimums be adjusted based on the chart above.

Hannon: The first item on the agenda is reduction of national win point minimums. Somebody want to take a stab at that? **Newkirk:** Rachel sent out a repeat of the individual e-mails that I sent out last week, and I came up with a chart that everyone should have gotten and it decreases the point minimums in Regions 1 through 9 by 15 percent, International area by 25

percent, and China by 85 percent. That was based on the number of rings that they held. Now, I made a note that I altered the kitten requirement to 50 percent. We have eight weeks – one half of a kitten show career of 16 weeks – and so my motion is that we accept the point minimums as per the chart with the three scoring areas that I presented. **Anger:** Second.

Hannon: OK, any discussion? **Morgan:** I think one of the things that Mary had mentioned in her post was that if there was any way that we could make it one size fits all, to the best of our ability, and just keep things simple, it would be good. So, although I understand 15 percent for Regions 1 through 9 and 25 percent for AWA, etc., and then 85 percent for China, it seems to me that – and looking at things that perhaps we would probably accomplish nearly the same thing if we picked a number and stuck with it. I'm certainly uncomfortable with going to 85 percent for China, where there really weren't that many cats that were truly in contention for a national win, regardless, before a lot of this stuff happened. So for me 25 percent makes sense across the board and it also works for some of the other areas we'll be discussing later on. Examples, breed wins, etc., etc. **Hannon:** Any other comments?

Hannon: I have a question about kittens. There's been discussion on the board list regarding leaving kittens alone, particularly Regions 1 through 9. There's no need to go to minimums. We have 25 kittens that met the minimums. **Newkirk:** It's correct. **Hannon:** And the kitten season is pretty much over. Showing a kitten this late in the year doesn't usually give you enough points for national win. **Morgan:** Totally agree. **Mastin:** I sort of agree with Melanie. I think we can take Regions 1 through 9 and AWA, or the ID-Other, I forget what you call that, and lower the numbers to the point where it's universal for both – for all those Regions 1 through 9 and ID-Other. I sort of like what Mary proposed, and just to refresh what Mary proposed, she proposed 3,000 points for Champion; 1500 for Premier; 1000 for Kittens and 800 for Household Pet. I'm not exactly sure what we do about China. I can't see how we can incorporate them when they have so few number of shows. I think we have to do something, but I don't think we have to force them to have the same level of point requirement. **Newkirk:** With the 1500 point minimums for kittens, currently, there are three kittens that exceed that. If we lower it to 750, there will be a total of 10 national winning kittens. And in championship – **Hannon:** So what are you talking about, China or ID or what? **Newkirk:** China. **Hannon:** OK. **Newkirk:** Isn't that what Rich said? **Hannon:** OK. **Newkirk:** Rich, is that what you were talking about, not knowing what to do with China? **Mastin:** Yes, Darrell. **Newkirk:** OK, so I'm just trying to give you the China points, based on the calculations that I made. Currently there are three kittens that scored above 1,500 points with no alteration in the point minimums. And if we go to 750, that will be – there will be 10 kittens that scored above 750 points. So there would be 10 national winning kittens. In championship, there's only one cat that has scored above 4,300. That's the Ragdoll that campaigned here in the United States. If we lower that to 645, we would have 11 cats that would get a national win in China. **Hannon:** And Premiership? **Mastin:** And what about Household Pet? **Newkirk:** There was no Household Pet shown in China.

Mastin: I don't have a problem awarding 11 champions in China that have earned 645 points or more, and the same for kittens – allowing 10 kittens to earn a national win with 750 points or more. Darrell, if I understand you correctly, you said there's zero premierships and zero Household Pet? **Newkirk:** The highest premierships cat received 129.50 points. So with 2,200 nobody's even close and I decreased it to 330 and there's nobody even halfway to that. So there would be no cats qualified in premierships and there were no Household Pets shown. Nothing

showed up on the sheet anyway. **Hannon:** Yes. According to ePoints it's zero. Now, there may have been one Household Pet in the show, but it didn't defeat anybody, so it didn't get any points. **Newkirk:** Yes. So I have printed it out and Household Pets is a blank page on Household Pets one to 50 in China. **Hannon:** Correct.

Mastin: So I'm still in agreement with Melanie on combining the first two, and I would recommend we go with Mary K's numbers to make them lower than they already are. And I would recommend that we go with what Darrell came up with for China. Now, that may require we have to split this in two motions. **Hannon:** This still doesn't address my concern about kittens in Regions 1 through 9. **P. Moser:** So in Regions 1 through 9, I think we just stay with the way they are. There's no need to be any adjustment. **Hannon:** I agree, but what Darrell suggested was in Regions 1 through 9, we lower the minimums by 15 percent. **P. Moser:** But aren't there already top 25 without lowering it any? **Hannon:** Yes, there are. That is certainly where we might be heading later in discussion of top 30. **Newkirk:** I did the calculations by decreasing it by 30 percent Rich, and there's no change in the kittens, championship and premiership. **Hannon:** Alright. Darrell, with your 15 percent lowering of the minimums in Regions 1 through 9 by 15 percent, that gives us 25 in all three categories. **Newkirk:** OK. And the kittens – hang on a second. **Hannon:** We've already got 25 kittens. **Newkirk:** Yes, OK. OK. And championship, we have 19 cats that have 4,300 points, and if we lower it to 3,655 which is 15 percent, that will give us 25 championship cats. The 25th cat would have 3,887.15. In Premiership, with 2,200 there are 24 cats that are currently competing, and if we lower it to – what is it – 1,870 there are 30 cats that have in excess of 1,870 points. So you can decrease it by 30 percent, but it's not going to give you any more cats in – **Hannon:** 15 percent will give us top 25 in Regions 1 through 9. **Newkirk:** That's correct. **Hannon:** Kittens, Championship, Premiership. **Newkirk:** That's correct.

Hannon: What about 15 percent for Household Pets? **Newkirk:** In Household Pets, the 15 percent will give us 20. There are currently 17 that qualified and at 935 points there are 20 cats that will qualify. **Hannon:** OK. **Newkirk:** But we only give top 10. **Hannon:** OK, but you made a motion, which was for 15, 25 and 85 percent lowering of the minimums for Regions 1 through 9, the International Division and China. **Newkirk:** Yes. **Hannon:** Then you got off onto another subtopic of lowering points in, I guess it was China, where you went to 645 and 1,500. I don't know. **Newkirk:** That was because Rich wanted to separate China out [inaudible] what numbers have qualified with the reduction in points. Rich wanted to combine the International area and Regions 1 through 9. Regions 1 through 9 will not be altered by changing it to 30 percent.

Morgan: OK, so last year, when we had the problems with the NGO eligibility in China, we did not choose to expand the national wins. So, this year there were shows that were canceled because of COVID-19. Primarily, the numbers were in February, so they preceded what we saw in our own experiences in Regions 1 through 9, so they had a few more shows, which brings up the 25 percent. I still don't understand why we're looking at 85 percent reduction in the minimums. **Newkirk:** Because they had eight shows the whole season – eight weekends. **Hannon:** But Melanie's point is that last year we had problems with the NGO, which caused a number of shows to be canceled. This year, we again had problems with the NGO, which caused virtually all the shows to be canceled until Thanksgiving weekend. **Newkirk:** Yes. **Morgan:** We're being inconsistent in how we are applying this. That's all I'm pointing out. **Newkirk:**

Well, they had shows on eight weekends, which is 15 percent of the show season. Does that make sense? **Hannon:** No. It sounds like an NGO issue. **Morgan:** We are combining two different – doing apples and oranges in the same basket, which makes a nice pie, but isn't necessarily what I thought we were talking about. But OK. **Hannon:** What your motion dealt with was the coronavirus situation. **Newkirk:** That's correct. **Hannon:** Now you want to throw in, in the case of China, the NGO situation. Melanie is pointing out, which I agree with, the NGO situation should not be impacting what percentages we decide to lower the minimums to. **Newkirk:** Those were not my words. Those were Melanie's words. **Hannon:** I know, I said that. You want to lower it because there are only eight shows, but the reason there were only eight shows was to a small degree the coronavirus, to a greater degree NGO. **Newkirk:** When I did these calculations, I tried to come up with how the show season was impacted. So, the International area had three months where they could not have shows. In the United States, we had – I based it on two months, OK, which is 15 percent. In China they were only allowed to have shows for eight weekends. I asked Allene how many shows. I don't know – that's a little more than two months, but they had eight weekends of shows. And so, that's what I based the figures on and, I mean, it made sense to me. If you guys want to do Mary K's 30 percent I'm happy with that, you know, because that'll even get more national wins in China than what my calculations will get.

Eigenhauser: I think we're putting too fine a point on this. Yes, technically the shows in China that got shut down by the government are different than the shows in China that got shut down by coronavirus. But that's not what we want to be talking about. What we should be talking about is, how do we please our base? How do we make our customers happy? How do we give them enough wins to be meaningful, but not make the requirements so low that people feel like we're just giving away awards? And that's what we should be talking about, not whether 80 percent is this or whether 25 percent is better than 30 percent. I mean, that's all very rational and very logical, but it doesn't address the problem. The problem is, we want to give out enough awards to recognize the good cats out there and we want to keep our people happy. We don't want to make the people that say every time we add an award, it cheapens it, blah, blah, blah. We're just trying to find a balance here that works. It's not going to be an exact number and you're not going to get it by dividing the number of show dates by the number of months in the year or whatever. Those are all great and math is wonderful. But, like Mary K says, people don't do math. People just look at it and say, does this feel right? Is this fair? And based on the number of cats that are going to get awards, based on the charts that Darrell has proposed, yes, China is getting a lot of awards that maybe we're basing the math on government shutdowns and not the coronavirus. I don't care. What I care about is supporting our exhibitor base in China, giving them enough awards that it's meaningful, but not so many awards that we cheapen them. I think the numbers that are in this chart are a reasonable balance between those two perspectives. So, like I said, you guys can all do wonderful math and we can even say that all the months are equal and why are we dividing a show year by 52 weeks, when we all know summer, nobody has shows anyway. Maybe we should be basing it on a 48 week show season or whatever. We can argue math forever, but what we should be deciding is what's best for the organization. What finds the right balance between too many and not enough. This is a Goldilocks thing. This isn't a math problem.

Newkirk: George, I would ask you a question. Do you think China would rather have five kitten awards and get national wins or 10 kittens get national wins? **Eigenhauser:** I'm not

sure I understand the question. **Hannon:** [inaudible] they were already having over 25. **Newkirk:** I'm just saying, if you decrease it by 30 percent, as Mary K said, there will be five national winning kittens in China. If you use my chart and make it based on 750 points, there will be 10 kittens that will get a national award. **Eigenhauser:** And Darrell, that's what I'm saying is, we should be focusing on the 10 kittens, not how we got the math there. I think 10 kittens is a good number. I'm agreeing that the chart you presented is good. I'm not disagreeing with you. What I'm saying is, it doesn't matter to me how we got to the number. If 10 kittens is a good number of kittens for China, then whether it's 84.5 percent or 87 percent, and whether it's based on a full year or a partial year, that's all background. The issue is, how many awards should we be giving out in China this year? And I think the chart that Darrell has come up with gives enough awards to give them a taste, without so many awards that we're cheapening them. That's what we should be talking about, not about how to arrive at that number mathematically. **Black:** I think George and Darrell are saying the same thing. **Hannon:** They are. They are agreeing. They agree. **Black:** I'm sorry, Darrell. I had not seen this chart for China when I sent my e-mail earlier. I liked the 85 percent number. I think that each region is going to have to be looked at differently because of the situation, and whether or not we're talking about combining the NGO issue with the COVID issue, it doesn't matter. Not having shows is not having shows. I didn't agree with what we did last year. So I'm in favor of this also.

Hannon: Anybody else? **Mastin:** I understand George's point about the math. But I also appreciate what Darrell did by breaking it down by the math in order for us to look at some numbers for comparison and then giving us an opportunity to understand how many awards have been awarded. I fully support Darrell's position on China. And when I referred back to what Mary had recommended with her 30 percent, I didn't mention anything about China, because I don't believe Mary had any recommendations on China. So that's why I had suggested we look at China separately and combine the other two. I agree with Kathy. I think we probably didn't address last year properly when there were NGO issues in China and we just let it go. So now we have an opportunity to fix it for this year – or I'm sorry – yes, for the year we're in, and I support what Darrell has here for China. **Hannon:** Anybody else? OK. I'm going to call for the vote. All those in favor of the motion.

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

2. GRAND OF DISTINCTION.

***Motion:** That the current requirements be adjusted to the following: HHPs: 20 finals and reduce the points required to 165. Hawaii: Reduce the final awards requirement from 10 to 6. All other areas: Decrease the final awards requirement to 20 and allow all SP finals to count in that total. ~~For all cats that fall short of the new requirements, allows them to combine this year's finals with the next season to get a head start on the next season.~~*

Hannon: OK. Grand of Distinction awards. Who wants to take the lead on that? **Newkirk:** I will take it. These are all my proposals, so I'll do them. Number two is, *Resolved that the current requirements be adjusted to the following. HHP 20 finals and reduce the point requirement to 165. Hawaii, reduce the final award requirement from 10 to six. All other areas, decrease the final award requirement to 20 and allow all specialty finals to count in that total. For all cats that fall short of the new requirement, allow them to combine this year's finals with*

next season to get a head start on next season. That's the motion and this was Mary K's wording. **Currle:** Second.

Hannon: Any discussion? **Anger:** Rachel has a question. Were there six rings in Hawaii? **Newkirk:** There were seven. **Anger:** There were seven, so it is achievable. Thank you. **Hannon:** Any other comments or questions? **Newkirk:** I'm sorry. There were eight rings. **Hannon:** OK, so they had to make six of the eight. **Newkirk:** Yes. Yes.

Hannon: Any other comments or questions? **Eigenhauser:** I have a question for Allene. **Tartaglia:** Yes. **Eigenhauser:** How much of a problem is it going to be for Central Office, essentially to combine two show seasons for the scoring of the Grands of Distinction? **Tartaglia:** Well, I was just looking at that and that could – that's going to be problematic, especially if it's something we're not going to be doing going forward. It's just an exception. We'll have to do it manually. **Eigenhauser:** Do you have a guesstimate of how much of a problem it's going to be? **Tartaglia:** No, I really don't. Not off hand I don't, I'm sorry. The Grand of Distinction title is going to be automated for next season – starting next season, so this throws a bit of a wrench in it. **Eigenhauser:** So we're currently doing it by hand anyway, right? **Tartaglia:** We're currently doing it by hand when people claim the title. Yes, they have to claim the title. **Eigenhauser:** So, this won't mess up any of the automatic scoring we already have in place. We don't have any. **Tartaglia:** We don't have it yet. We won't be starting until the new show season. **Hannon:** But the problem is, the new show season, they're going to still have to do it manually, because they're combining two show seasons. **Tartaglia:** Right. **Krzanowski:** Would it be possible to have the owners of those cats that would carry their finals over to next season get in touch with Central Office so that Central Office could flag those? Would that make it easier to track them for next year? **Hannon:** What are we going to do if somebody didn't do it and then, once they've qualified, they're PO'ed because Central Office didn't get their Grand of Distinction? **Tartaglia:** Offhand, I'm thinking that we're going to be automating this. There's going to be a report running in the background all the time looking for these cats. So we may be able to do something where we just have to have the report look for something different than it would have normally. Yes, just off the top of my head, I think we can run reports on a regular basis and pull or identify the cat. But my question is, if we're going to be reducing the finals and the points for this current – well, the show season that just ended, what are going to be the requirements for the new show season? Are we going to be going back to what's printed in the show rules, to the 30? **Newkirk:** Yes. **Tartaglia:** We are, OK. **Newkirk:** Yes. **Tartaglia:** So it is just for this one show season that we're reducing. **Newkirk:** I mean, it says that they get a head start on the next year if they didn't get enough. Then they would have to go by the new season's requirement. **Eigenhauser:** And I think we should all remember that next show season is probably going to be a shortened season, too. We have no clue when we're going to be able to be fully back online, so we may be revisiting this issue again at the end of next year. **Anger:** How many cats does this affect? Are there 25 or 250? What is the range? **Krzanowski:** I think we have about 100-125 a year of the Grand of Distinction. **Morgan:** So, based on this proposal, we're decreasing by a third the requirements, yes or no? They normally look to have 30 finals, with 20 of them allbreed and 10 specialty. So would it just simplify things if we got rid of the fact that we were – what if we just basically deleted the last sentence? Because we're already decreasing it by more than we lost shows for the season, so essentially the cats that would have met that should have met that and then that simplifies it for Central Office. **Tartaglia:** It would actually be – you're right Melanie, that would simplify things. And I'd rather see us reduce the amount for the two show seasons

rather than do the rollover, the combining. It would be easier to just do that than to try and combine. **Hannon:** Darrell, do you want to amend your motion? **Newkirk:** Sure. I'll delete the last sentence. But Mark you'll have to tell Mary K. **Hannon:** Yes, I will. **Tartaglia:** You can blame it on me. **Hannon:** She's calling later tonight. OK, delete the last sentence. And the last sentence, I don't have in front of me. Last sentence is to carry over? **Newkirk:** Yes. Correct.

Krzanowski: But you need to add that it will be reduced for next show season as well, don't we? **Hannon:** Let's not address next season's shows. **Krzanowski:** OK. **Hannon:** We already know it's going to be one month short, because we're not holding shows in May. But we really don't know the implications. **Krzanowski:** Exactly. **Hannon:** It may be less or more serious, and we may want to take a different tack next year. I mean, it'll be reduced for next year, but we don't know by how much. We're not committing ourselves to this particular formula. **Newkirk:** Yes. **Hannon:** I think in Kathy's notes, she can say that the Board will consider a reduction in the requirements for the Grand of Distinction in the next show season, as well, to be determined. **Krzanowski:** That makes sense. **Hannon:** Is that fair to everybody? **Newkirk:** Yes. **Calhoun:** That would probably apply to any of these changes that we're making, because we just don't know what next season is going to bring. **Hannon:** Alright, so we can put that sentence at the beginning or at the end, not necessarily with the Grand of Distinction. **Calhoun:** Yes. **Hannon:** OK. **Black:** Yes, I'll put it at the end, because these are going to be dependent on what happened this year, too. **Hannon:** OK. Is there any other discussion on the motion regarding Grands of Distinction? All those in favor.

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

3. REGIONAL/DIVISIONAL RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT.

Regional/Divisional requirement being shown in your region or division of residence is a show rule requirement. Due to travel restrictions, some cats/kittens were not able to comply with this rule. Due to limited air travel, the Board should be lenient in this requirement.

***Motion:** Any cat that is listed in the e-points as being in a particular region or division will have the requirement to show in that region or division waived.*

Hannon: Residency requirements, Darrell. **Newkirk:** Motion number three also was Mary K's wording and that's, *Any cat that is listed in the ePoints as being in a particular region or division will have the requirement to show in that region or division waived.* We've already done this with the Thai cat and we did this with the Ragdoll recently. I don't know if there are others, but the Board will take a position on it. **Anger:** Second. **Hannon:** We know there's at least one cat in the North Atlantic. **Tartaglia:** There's about 12 cats that are affected, broken out within the regions within top and breed wins. **Hannon:** OK, great. It's not necessarily regions, right. It could be the ID or China. **Newkirk:** Yes, it's region or division. **Tartaglia:** We looked at Regions 1 through 9 specifically and there's 12 cats that are affected. **Hannon:** But there may be cats outside of Region 1 through 9 that may be affected as well. **Tartaglia:** It could be. **Hannon:** OK. Any other discussion? All those favor.

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

4. DIVISIONAL WIN ADJUSTMENT.

The number of Divisional Wins are enumerated in Show Rule XXXVI National/Regional/ Divisional Awards Program. The exact numbers are based on the total rings sponsored in that area. Many shows were licensed and/or had approval for show production. Therefore, the Asia Committee Chairs were consulted and they provided the following adjustments for the Divisional wins per competitive area:

Rings by show season											
DW Area	Licensed & Held						Lic & Canc.	Approv only	Total	Awards	
	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18	18-19	19-20	19-20	19-20		Show rule	Recommend
Asia West	10	10	12	16	32	28	5	6	39	7	7
China	281	555.5	716.5	751	360	62	24	56	142	25	25
Hong Kong	54	58	47	58	32	93	23	0	116	25	25
Indonesia	10	37	50	58	65	63	4	14	81	15	20
Israel	8	8	10	10	10	4	0	0	4	0	3
Malaysia	31	45	31	52	12	46	6	6	58	12	12
S. America	5.5	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Philippines	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Singapore	3.5	8	12	12	10	2	0	0	2	0	3
South Korea	19	22	31	21	28	4	6	12	22	4	4
Taiwan	11.5	16	32	14	10	11	0	0	11	3	5
Thailand	45	45.5	36	51	38	19	8	16	47	7	10

Motion: That Show Rule XXXVI be set aside and the above-referenced awards be given to the DWs for this year only.

Hannon: Darrell, number of DW awards, is that you? **Newkirk:** Yes, that’s me. I wrote to Melanie, Wain and Dick, and asked them to come up with a solution for this. The chart that I clipped and put in the e-mail is the chart that Dick sent to me. And so my motion is, *Resolved, that Show Rule XXXVI be set aside, and the above-referenced rewards be given to the divisional winners for this year only.* **Anger:** Second. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion? All those in favor.

Black: I’m just going to ask Darrell. Darrell, could you send me that chart not embedded in an e-mail or a PDF, because I can’t see the whole thing and it’s blurry. **Newkirk:** OK. I can send you a screenshot of it. **Morgan:** Israel and Singapore would – without this vote – would be getting no awards and with this adjustment will be getting three awards. Indonesia should be getting 15 awards. So, right now, they’re going to be basically getting 20. The Philippines, and South and Central America had no shows, none were planned. So anyway, that was a quick summary from Dick. **Hannon:** OK. One more time, all those in favor.

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

5. INCREASE THE NUMBER OF NWS IN CHAMPIONSHIP AND PREMIERSHIP.

Some of the potential NWs were affected by the premature closing of the show season and others were affected by the cancellation of Tails and No Tales (March 7-8) and Mo-Kan (March 14-15). Every year on the last weekend of the show season those cats in the 26-30th placed ranking compete in an attempt to secure their NW. Under normal circumstances, this is how the competition ends and the assignment of the winners is handed down. However, this year is not

like any prior year. It was not only the scoring of Crab and Mallet (March 14-15) that affected the end-of-year scoring. The other show on the same weekend was cancelled, as was the March 7-8 show. The cancellation of these two shows did have an impact on the final scores of some cats. For this year only, I feel that we should increase the NWs in Championship and Premiership to top 30 for the 2019-2020 show season only with a caveat that they must exceed the current or adjusted minimal point requirements.

Motion: That Show Rule XXXVI be set aside and amend the awards as follows:

Awards as Follows:

Best -30th Cat, as appropriate

Best – 25th kitten, as Appropriate

Best – 30th Cat in Premiership, as appropriate

(remainder is unchanged)

The Best of Breed winners should be explored, but I do not have the data to support any motions there.

Also, the Split Season kittens should also be considered, but again, I do not have data to support any motion.

Hannon: Number 5, additional national wins beyond top 25, Darrell? **Newkirk:** OK. So the end-of-year scoring is not what it normally is since we closed down the show season. In addition to that, on March 7th and 8th, Tails and No Tales was cancelled. And then the following weekend on the 14th and 15th, MoKan was cancelled by the local authorities. However, on that date, Crab & Mallet was allowed to have their show without spectators. So, the normal fighting that goes on in the last four weeks of April where cats 22 to 28, let's say, jockey for the last lower positions in the 25 national ranking awards. So my thought was and one of the poll items that I put out – and I think most of you got Lorna's poll today, and so she asked in two different ways, some favored, some didn't. But if we go to top 30, and we've already amended the [inaudible] there would be three additional national winners in championship. 26, 27 and 28 would meet the minimum requirements in championship, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30 would meet the premiership requirements. So my motion is that – we're not doing kittens. **Hannon:** OK. And you're not doing Household Pets, obviously. **Newkirk:** No, because there's only [inaudible]. 17, I think qualified, but only 10 get it. **Hannon:** OK. **Newkirk:** So anyway, it's the change – the national awards will be the 30 best cats, and the 30 best cats in Premiership. The remainder would be unchanged and the Kittens is unchanged and that's my motion. **Black:** Darrell, we passed the ruling to give out top 25 in Household Pets. I don't know why you're saying top ten. **Newkirk:** I'm quoting from the show rules. **Black:** I don't know. Maybe Rachel can correct me, but I remember we voted for top 25 Household Pets. **Roy:** We did. We did vote for that. I think it was after the show season started. But we did vote to go to top 25 provided they had the minimum amount of points. **Hannon:** OK. **Newkirk:** Well, I thought that was, but I referred to the show rules and the show rules say top ten. **Eigenhauser:** It may have been that we passed this for next year. **Anger:** I looked this up today and I did notice that there was an addendum. I'm checking on that right now to see if it's in the addendum. So don't wait. Carry on. **Hannon:**

Yes, but whether or not it's in the addendum, if we passed that it should be top 25. If we passed it for next season, then it would not be in the addendum. But really, we don't need to know what's in the addendum, we need to know what we passed. **Black:** Yes. I clearly remember us talking about it and as I said some people in my region were asking about it, but while Rachel is looking that up, I just wanted to ask, Darrell, so, with your points, the point minimum that we just passed, how many cats in championship are you saying will get in with that point minimum? **Hannon:** 28. **Newkirk:** 28. **Hannon:** And 30 Premiership, and he's not doing it for kittens. He's leaving kittens at 25. **Calhoun:** Right, right. **Newkirk:** That's – well, everybody assumed to be under the consensus that the kitten shows were over in February and the ranking wouldn't have altered. I mean, I'm not opposed to go into top 30 in kittens if you want to do that. But the top 30 kittens all had more than 1,500 points. **Calhoun:** No, I'm not asking about kittens. Yes. **Hannon:** All right. Rachel, what we really need to know is what motion we passed in regards to top 25 Household Pets. Was it for the season that just ended or for the new show season? It really doesn't matter what's in the addendum. **Anger:** Yes, I understand that. Kathy, do you know when that was passed? **Newkirk:** Currently right now there are 17 Household Pets that have over 1,100 points and what the adjustment [inaudible]. So there aren't 25 that qualify anyway, only 20 or 17, whichever. **Hannon:** OK. All right, so that's your logic for not including the Household Pets. **Newkirk:** Yes. **Hannon:** And the reason for not including Kittens was, the kitten season basically was over.

Eigenhauser: I see it as, we have to include Household Pets if it's top 10, because if there's – if it was really top 10 then we'd have the same arguments that we do for championship that the seven – 11 through 17 – would have still been jockeying for position through the end of the show season. Some of them could have moved into the top 10, some could have fallen out. That's exactly the logic for doing it in championship, to give those who were on the bubble, who might have had a chance, the extra awards. So if it's top 10 – **Newkirk:** Well, George, there's only 20 that qualified with the new point minimums. And that's what we're looking at, point minimums in championship and premiership. **Eigenhauser:** I understand. I'm not arguing for top 25. I think that if we're adding five places for championship from 25 to 30, if it's 10 in Household Pet, we can go from 10 to 15. **Newkirk:** Well, we're actually going 17 to 20. We're going 10 up to 25, I mean. **Eigenhauser:** But Rachel is still looking for that motion. **Hannon:** She is looking up the addendum. **Eigenhauser:** Yes, if it's 25, I have no problem. But if it's 10, then I would like to increase it for Household Pets by five places, the same as we did in championship and premiership, but only if it's currently 10. **Hannon:** Sure. Rachel can you tell us if you're looking? **Anger:** Yes, I am looking. The addendum, there's nothing in it. The February minutes, there's nothing in it. I did ask Kathy the question, when was this motion supposedly discussed. That would narrow it down. I don't see anything in the February minutes where it would be effective immediately for this show season, under the Show Rules report. **Mastin:** Rachel, is it possible this came from last June's annual – from the delegates on the floor? **Anger:** I can check the June minutes. **Eigenhauser:** Or maybe October. **Anger:** October of '19? **Hannon:** Yes. Yes, I'm just not comfortable voting on this until we really know whether it's top 10 or top 25, because that'll have an impact on what we want to do.

Newkirk: The Household Pets aren't my motion. We'd have to make a separate motion for that anyway. **Hannon:** All right. **Anger:** Let's do that. **Mastin:** I have a couple questions before you call the motion. I've heard a couple times that kittens wasn't included in the increase, because some believe that the kitten season was over. Do we all know for sure that the kitten

season was definitely over, not knowing results of seven weeks? So, we're pretty confident with that Melanie? **Morgan:** 100 percent. **Mastin:** OK. **Auth:** I had an exhibitor in my region that said she was hot to go, so it wasn't over for her. **Morgan:** Take a look at historical kitten counts.

Hannon: Vote on the motion that Darrell made, which did not include kittens. If we want to include kittens, we can do that as a separate motion, just like we can do the Household Pets as a separate motion. His motion was to go to top 30 for championship and premiership which, based on the new minimums, would give us 28 in championship and 30 and premiership. **Newkirk:** Great. **Hannon:** Is that your summary? **Newkirk:** That's correct.

Eigenhauser: Substantively, I'm not a fan of going to top 30 in championship and premiership either. Mary K has recommended we not do that. She's our Committee Chair. You know, she's the person with a finger on the pulse of these issues. I tend to agree, saying we don't know who might have been in the top 25, so we're just going to add five more awards. I don't see that as a solution. I think we're just throwing around awards without having a rational reason for doing it. We're simply trying to appease everybody. And unfortunately, when you give participation trophies, it doesn't please everybody. You know, it does to some extent devalue the awards. We've already reduced the point minimums to make it easier for people to get the awards. I think adding additional awards is too much. I don't think we should do it. **Hannon:** What we accomplished by adding three more in championship and five more in premiership is making three and five more people happy. And we make a whole lot of people unhappy. **Anger:** Yes. Correct.

P. Moser: Hey, I disagree with this one. George, everything you said before about how we're squabbling over stuff and now you've just basically reversed everything you said. I mean, because of the issues that are going on, I don't see any harm in doing this. And besides that, you've got in premiership a cat and it's in my region, so I'm going to fight for this. Because it's in our region, and that cat missed the top – it was in 25th place before Tails and No Tales. It couldn't – it was in Tails and No Tales, and it couldn't go. It's in 26 place by under 10 points. That is totally unfair. It was also in MoKan and that one was canceled. So I'm sorry, I disagree with that, I think we should go with the top 30. **Hannon:** Pam, if I can respond to that. There are cats in the 26 to 30 spot that were really trying hard to get into the top 25 and were doing considerably better than the cat you're talking about. The cat you're talking about would have a very good chance of having missed top 25 if we continued the show season. You're trying to make an exception for one cat. **P. Moser:** Again, Mark, how do you know that? You don't know that. That cat was going to go to all the shows that were coming up in this region, so you can't say that. I totally disagree with what you're saying.

Morgan: First of all, I think we really need to try very hard not to look at this in terms of a specific cat or person or exhibitor, because we need to look at what our legacy is and what our rules have always said for top 25. There are always cats that were trying to get in that didn't make it and there are always things that happen. If we go to top 30, or we extend these to top 28 or whatever it is based off the minimums, we're going to essentially be awarding awards to some cats that were no longer even showing. I did some extensive discussions with a number of exhibitors and then read all the letters we got. Almost without fail, with very few exceptions, the exhibitors, even ones who were in potentially in contention to be in that 26 through 30 spots, are not in favor of us going beyond what we have traditionally given for a national award. We've

already lowered the minimums. We've already made adjustments for the special circumstances that we have in this season. We're basically doubling down on this and I think setting a really bad precedent.

B. Moser: Going back to George for a second, and not to criticize you at all, George, but you did mention we were talking – when you were talking about the other folks, you were talking about our customer base, pleasing our customer base. This is the same thing. And as far as Melanie goes, I tend to agree with you somewhat. But on the other hand, you know, there's a lot of – lot happening in this world today and I don't see any problem with awarding eight places. It's not going to break or – or it's – and we're never going to have everyone be happy with us. So, I mean, I don't know, times are changing. You know, what's wrong with helping our customer base, and hopefully maybe they'll come back and maybe they'll – and you'll have people upset. But both ways you're going to have people upset probably. So that's just my schpeal.

Auth: OK, so I have two comments to make. First, Melanie, you said that we – this is a legacy, we don't want to set it aside. We've set aside several legacies already in this board meeting. And then secondly, I can tell you from the people that I've talked to, and this is in support of what Brian just said, we stand to lose customers by not going to top 30 than what we are not going to make people happy. And I would rather keep a customer and piss off a few of our people that are going to stay around forever, than to lose those seven or eight people.

Hannon: Mary, you're making an assumption those people are going to stick around forever. If they're upset enough about getting out of top 30, we're going to lose them. **Morgan:** Well, I can say that for two of those that's not correct. **Black:** I've received several e-mails regarding this topic. I received them from people who are regular campaigners and some just regular exhibitors also. And everyone said no, they did not want us going outside the top 25. That's just based on the feedback that I got from people in my region. **Webster:** That's the same thing I've been getting. They don't want any changes.

Hannon: Anybody else before I call the motion? **Schleissner:** I want to address my question directly to Darrell. I want to come back on the kittens. You said that the kitten show season was over in February. Can you explain little bit more? **Hannon:** Michael, are you telling us that there were kittens in your region that were still trying to make the top 25 and would have continued showing? **Schleissner:** Don't know. The thing is, the question I have is – there is – if we go up to 30 there's five more kittens. And I'm on the same opinion, let's make people happy who are still showing CFA. The thing is, if we do look on these five kittens, first they all had – they have 40 rings. I think, yes. But did they still have an option to move forward or were these kittens too old or was there no way for them to move up? That's my question. **Newkirk:** The top 50 kittens all had 40 rings. **Hannon:** All right, Michael, what we're going to do is vote on the motion, which includes championship and premiership. We can have a separate motion on kittens and Household Pets. **Schleissner:** Thank you. **Hannon:** But the motion that Darrell made was for top 30 championship and premiership that met the minimums. All right? So I'm going to call for a vote.

Newkirk: I'm going to make a closing comment, please. **Hannon:** Oh, yes, sir. Go ahead. **Newkirk:** Thank you. OK, so I knew this would be the most controversial motion that I've made and that's why I made it last, so that there would be a lively discussion. I've got no

skin in the game on this. I don't breed cats. I don't show cats anymore, but I do have a feeling with a lot of people that exhibit. Now, I – this was on my campaign page. This was one of the questions that I put up. Kathy is on there and so is George, and they have seen the comments. And yes, the majority of the comments were against going to top 30. But there were a fair amount of people that thought it would be beneficial to give out a few additional awards, just so – to show that we're not so hardnosed. And so, it makes no difference to me, but I had a feeling that it would be controversial. And, I mean, you have to vote your conscience, but I do feel that if we don't do this – some of the people were going for their very first national win, and now they've had it yanked out from underneath them. And so – and I agree with Pam. Somebody who was sitting at 25 and got knocked out because the 26th cat went to a show and it couldn't go to a show, is completely unfair. And so you can vote your conscience. I mean, if you want to be hardnosed and say, we're never going to give an extra reward because it says top 25 and it's going to devalue the award, I think that's poppycock in my opinion. A national win is a national win. Everybody remembers who best cat was and nobody remembers who two through 25 was. So anyway, I'm going to support the motion, and you vote how you feel. **Hannon:** Darrell, I object to your phrase "hardnosed" in regard to this one. I think we've been flexible in several of the ones that we've already passed tonight that shows we're not hardnosed. **Newkirk:** OK. Noted. **Hannon:** All right. All those in favor.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Webster, Eigenhauser, Morgan, Colilla, Krzanowski, Calhoun and Black voting no.

Hannon: Are there any abstentions? Did I call for a abstentions? All right, so no abstentions, so that's 10 yes, 7 no. OK, motion carries. **Auth:** Mark, you said that was 10 yes and seven no? **Hannon:** Yes. Why? We don't have Kayoko for this. **Auth:** She's on. **Hannon:** OK. Well, if there were seven no votes, and there's 17 board members voting. **Newkirk:** Its 10 Yes. **Auth:** And what does it have to pass by? **Hannon:** 50 percent. **Auth:** So it passed. **Hannon:** Yes, I said that. **Auth:** Oh, I'm sorry. Yay. **Hannon:** I said it passed and I asked for the no votes for the record and we got seven no votes. Yes, it carries. **Auth:** Thank you.

Anger: I can give you an update on what I found for Household Pets. **Hannon:** OK, great. **Anger:** In June, there was a proposal by the Mid-Atlantic Persian, etc. to raise Household Pets to top 25 and that motion failed. So Kathy, I ask again, do you know when this motion that your people think carried was presented? **Black:** I'm sorry, Rachel. I don't remember. I thought that we discussed it at the board table. That was just my memory. But my memory could be wrong. **Anger:** At the board table when? **Black:** I can't tell you. I'm sorry. **Anger:** OK. All right. Me neither. I've been looking this entire time and I was unable to find it. I e-mailed Monte, but I have not heard back from him. **Hannon:** OK, so let us assume its top 10, all right? George, do you want to make a motion regarding the national awards for the Household Pets? **Newkirk:** In the October minutes, it's got best through 25 Household Pet as appropriate. **Tartaglia:** I think it stayed at 10 for the region, but nationally it's 25. **Eigenhauser:** If we did it in October, though, it would have been effective May 1, for the upcoming show season. **Tartaglia:** No, not necessarily. **Hannon:** Well, Darrell is looking at the motion, right, Darrell? **Newkirk:** Yes. Rachel, it's on page 115, I think. **Anger:** What report is it in, Show Rules? **Hannon:** Of the October Board minutes. So the question is, did we pass it effective immediately or did we pass it effective May 1st? **Newkirk:** So what is the [inaudible] CFA website by the 1st of May. **Hannon:** OK, so it's May 1st? **Newkirk:** [inaudible] motion I'm looking for that. So these are

Rachel's minutes, so she should be able to advise us on this. **Anger:** I'm working at a disadvantage because I don't have those files available to me. **Newkirk:** Maybe this might be what she sent out to us ahead of time. **Anger:** I still don't know what section of the October 2019 minutes you are looking at. That would really help. **Newkirk:** I think what I've got is the compiled report that Rachel sends out before the meeting. **Anger:** What report is it appearing in? Please help me know where to look. **Tartaglia:** I have all my notes at the office. I'm sorry, I don't have it right here. Shelly and I talked about having to allot more space to the awards booklet for top 25 Household Pets. I'm as positive as I can be that did pass and that it was for this season. It was something that was effective as of May 1, 2019. **Hannon:** But that's assuming that they met minimums. **Tartaglia:** Right, assuming they meet minimums. Correct. If you want to wait on the Household Pets, when I get into the office tomorrow morning, I'll pull my files for all the show rule changes. **Hannon:** Well, Darrell with your 15 – with your percentages, how many Household Pets would meet that new minimum? **Newkirk:** 20. **Morgan:** Why don't we vote to give them that? **Hannon:** Because George made a motion to give them 15. **Morgan:** Well, why don't we vote to make it? **Eigenhauser:** I haven't made a motion yet, but let's just go with 20 then. That's the motion. **Black:** I will second that. **Newkirk:** Can we make the motion just say top 25 and then we're going to have 20? That will cover our bases. **Morgan:** That's a good idea. **Newkirk:** Looks like it might be 25, and so that we will award the Household Pets up to 25 as long as they meet the amended point minimums. **Hannon:** That's why it [the motion] says 20. **Newkirk:** Yes. **Hannon:** OK, so George, are you making a motion for top 25? **Eigenhauser:** As Darrell just stated, yes. **Hannon:** Darrell, do you want to second George's motion? **Newkirk:** Yes, I will second it. **Hannon:** OK, any more discussion on doing top 25, knowing that there's only going to be 20 that meet the minimums? All right, all those in favor.

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

[from end of meeting] **Hannon:** Is there anything else anybody wants to bring up before I adjourn? **Currle:** Mark and everyone else, I just wanted to – if you don't already know, the Southern Region, we took a poll over the last five days and we've decided to cancel our regional until a future date. **Hannon:** OK, who else was it? George? Somebody spoke up after. **Black:** Kathy. **Hannon:** Kathy, I'm sorry. Go ahead, Kathy. **Black:** Yes, I'm sorry. I want to go back and revisit something. I'm looking real quick just to look at the Household Pets. I would like to make a motion that we award top 25 in Household Pets. The 25th best Household Pet has 849 points and I think that Darrell said that there would only be top 20 based on his point change, but I'd like to make a motion that we award top 25 national wins in Household Pets. **Hannon:** Is there a second? **Roy:** I'll second.

Hannon: Darrell, what's the ruling of Robert's Rules of when something has already passed? Do we have to rescind that? **Newkirk:** Now it has to be reconsidered. **Hannon:** So before we can vote on Kathy's we have to vote on reconsidering? **Newkirk:** Well, Kathy can ask for it to be reconsidered. Sharon's would second and so we'll have a reconsideration. **Hannon:** All right. **Black:** OK, that's – yes, that's what I'm asking, to reconsider. **Hannon:** OK. Is there any discussion on reconsidering? **Auth:** So if we go to top 25 – **Newkirk:** Mary, the motion is to reconsider. **Auth:** I'm sorry. OK, sorry, sorry, sorry. **Hannon:** Any discussion on reconsidering? **Black:** I was just going to say we've already voted to give 28 places for the cats and 30 places for the premierships, outside and above the top 25 that we normally award. We were going to give out top 25 Household Pets if they met the minimums. So that's why I'm thinking that we should

just do top 25. We're trying to grow our Household Pet base, so we are talking about goodwill. **Newkirk:** Point of order. You have to vote on the reconsideration before you discuss it. **Hannon:** All right, we're voting on reconsidering. All those in favor.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.** P. Moser voting no.

Hannon: OK, Kathy, you want to make a motion for top 25? **Black:** Yes, I'll make a motion that we award top 25 in the Household Pets for the previous season. **Eigenhauser:** And you mean specifically without any point minimums? **Black:** Yes. Without point minimums. **Eigenhauser:** I'll second it. **Webster:** I want to know, is that just for this year? Is that from here on out? **Black:** I said just for this show season. **Webster:** OK. **Colilla:** So the region has to go to the top 25? Because we don't have enough pets to go to top 25, I mean point wise. **Hannon:** No. The motion dealt with national awards. **Tartaglia:** This is Allene, I have question. **Hannon:** You will probably have lot tomorrow. **Tartaglia:** That's 25 Household Pets and we're doing away with the point minimums? **Hannon:** Correct. **Tartaglia:** Is that correct? **Hannon:** It's just like we did for the top 30 for the championship and premiership. **Tartaglia:** So that we were doing point minimums for them based on the reduced point minimums. **Hannon:** That's correct. **Tartaglia:** But it sounds like now we're just doing away with any point minimums for Household Pets. Right? OK. I just want to make sure. **Hannon:** That's what it sounds like. **Tartaglia:** OK.

Krzanowski: So if we do away with the point minimums, how many points would the 25th best Household Pet have? **Eigenhauser:** 800 and something. **Krzanowski:** Let's see. I don't agree with doing away with the point minimums. We have minimums with everything else, including division wins and everything. I just don't think we should do away with them. We already lowered the point minimums and more cats should be getting awards. I just don't agree with doing away with any minimum whatsoever. **Newkirk:** I was going to make the same point that Carol did. We've already lowered the points. The champions and premiership met the minimum points. Now this [inaudible] meeting the lower points. So we're giving a few extra awards and 17 to 20 we're giving three additional, based on decrease in the point minimums to 935. 849 it's not quite 100 points, but it's nearly 100 points. So my vote will be no. **Black:** Yes, I was going to just say, if everyone's against lowering or doing away with the point minimum, I wouldn't mind lowering it, but Darrell just said he's not in favor of that. I just think that this is a group of people that are normally our new exhibitors. They're also people that maybe start out as a Household Pet, and then turn into a breeder and a teacher. I just think that this is not cheapening an award. Showing an Household Pet is – most people spend the same amount of money as people in championship to travel and pay their expenses and enter the show. So I just – we were talking about goodwill earlier. I think this is an area where I'm willing to look at it as doing goodwill to award top 25. We're not going outside the 25 that we normally would give if they met the minimum. We're just giving top 25. **Morgan:** OK, so goodwill, definitely I totally agree with that. But we've already taken it from top 10 which is what they were expecting for this year to top 25 as long as they meet the minimums we're going to give – which means that 20 cats rather than 10 cats are going to qualify. And cats 21 through 25, not a single one of them has 100 rings. Now, there are some cats that are in the top 20 that don't have 100 rings, but the majority of them do. I can't support this. **P. Moser:** Right, because I'm all about making everything fair. And if that was the case, if we're going to drop them – drop it to 20 to 25 with no point minimum then you would need to make it fair and go back to the championship and take

that top 28 to 30. Those two didn't meet the minimum in the championship points. So I'm all about making it fair, but not in this instance. **Hannon:** Anybody else? All those in favor.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Eigenhauser, Currle, Black and Auth voting yes. Webster abstained.

Mastin: I'd like to make another motion on this if I can. To award top 25 Household Pets and lower the point minimum from 935 to 800. **Hannon:** Any discussion? **Calhoun:** Doesn't that just go back to the same thing that we did with championship to get it all with 30. Right? So are we going to go back and lower the points on that one as well? **Mastin:** No, I'm not recommending that. When we first talked about point minimums, my original suggestion was to lower all of them to what Mary proposed and Mary had proposed 800. So I'm not suggesting we go back and do all of them. I just want to address the Household Pets, because it seemed like there was some interest from a number of board members that it made sense. I don't feel we should drop all the points altogether. We need have a point minimum. **Hannon:** No more comments? All those in favor of Rich's motion.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Eigenhauser, Currle, Black, Webster and Auth voting yes. Schleissner abstained.

* * * * *

Hannon: Michael, what do you want to do about kittens? **Schleissner:** I would love to see them raised to 30 just to make more people happy, and I think they all fulfill the requirements and if it was still six weeks till the end of the season and we do not definitely know if they go or if they were able to go to other shows. And it's just five – it's five additional awards. I think this should be passed. **Eigenhauser:** George seconds. **Morgan:** So you're going to give awards – **Hannon:** Before you do that, let me ask Darrell, did you not say that 30 kittens met the minimums? **Newkirk:** Hang on just a second. I can tell you. Yes, there are 30 kittens that exceed 1,500 points. **Hannon:** OK, so clearly they exceeded the new minimum. **Morgan:** Some of whom aged out well before any of this became a factor. **Hannon:** Closing the show season early did not impact all the ones in 26 through 30. **Morgan:** So much more eloquent. **Hannon:** She is saying you're giving awards out to cats that weren't impacted by this. **Morgan:** They were already graded and moving on to their next goal in life. **Hannon:** So we're giving them an award based on the coronavirus situation that didn't impact them. **Morgan:** Correct. And in fact, I think 26 and 27, 28, 29 – they all aged out. **Hannon:** Michael, would you be willing to amend your motion? **Schleissner:** Actually my question I had – this was my question I had before. Did they age out or did they still have the chance to go to other shows? There is some say that was not – was not as exact as what Melanie said. So, I think Melanie hit the point, so I do not need to make a motion this way. Because if they have all aged out, it's fine with me. **Hannon:** Why don't you make your motion, Michael, to say additional – **Schleissner:** So let's do the motion and look where you turn it. My motion is to extend the national win on kittens to top 30. **Hannon:** OK, any other comments? All those in favor.

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

6. **REDUCTION IN THE POINT MINIMUMS FOR BREED WINS.**

Black: You skipped, or were you getting ready to do the moratorium on show sponsorships? Did you skip that or were you planning on doing that next? **Calhoun:** It's next. **Black:** OK. And I also want to bring up the breed winners, don't forget that also. **Hannon:** All right. Why don't you bring that up now, because it fits in with discussions one through five. **Black:** OK, I don't really have a motion. I just wanted to – I guess, I have to make a motion, so there can be discussion. I just think that we need to do something for the breed wins. Mary K made a recommendation about lowering the minimum number of points, but I've had people in my region complain that they were trying to get the breed win and they were cut short because of the season ending quickly. So we can take Mary's recommendation and make that a motion or if someone else has a better feel for this, they can make a motion. I just didn't want us to not discuss it. **Eigenhauser:** Mary's recommendation is that we reduce it from 200 points to 150. And I'll make the motion. **Mastin:** Rich seconds. **Hannon:** Any discussion? All those in favor.

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

7. **MORATORIUM ON AWARDING SHOW SPONSORSHIPS.**

***Motion:** CFA will place a moratorium on awarding show sponsorships until the occupancy restrictions in the geography of the show hall have been lifted.*

***Rationale:** CFA should not award sponsorship dollars to future licensed shows until it is clear that said clubs are actually allowed to produce shows.*

Hannon: OK. Now was there – there were some additional items right? **Calhoun:** No, we have the moratorium on sponsorship yet to do. **Hannon:** All right. So that's not in front of me. So, Kathy do you want to bring it up? **Calhoun:** Sure. You want me to do it or Rich, do you want to do it? **Mastin:** No, you can do it and I will second it. **Calhoun:** OK. *CFA will place a moratorium on awarding show sponsorships until occupancy restrictions for the geography of the show hall have been lifted.* So this – the rationale is that *CFA should not award sponsorship dollars to future shows until it is clear that said clubs are actually allowed to produce shows.* **Hannon:** OK. And Rich seconded it. What this says, as I understand it is, we're not allowing any shows to be licensed for a certain period of time. There were shows that were licensed for after May 31st already licensed. So those clubs think they can ask for sponsorship. **Calhoun:** Correct. **Hannon:** What Kathy and Rich are saying is, we're not comfortable providing that sponsorship. We may extend the period of time in which shows are canceled, and those clubs would have to – would already have money, you know. So, my understanding what they're saying is, let's wait until we get back to producing shows before we entertain any more requests for sponsorship money. **Calhoun:** Correct. If we have the government and we've got local municipalities and governors that are extending the social distancing requirements and trying to get people to stay home, it seems like we're probably on a longer haul on this whole thing than we probably thought at some time in the past. So the purpose is, so that we don't award that initial \$500 for shows that don't have – that have not been approved by their local government or local principality. **Eigenhauser:** This just seems like common sense to me. We have no idea when we're going to be able to resume shows. We've already cancelled our annual in June, so we're anticipating the problem will extend beyond the shutdown that we already have in place. The

numbers coming out get worse day by day. We clearly have not reached the peak yet and it may be weeks or months before we have any sense of when we're going to be able to resume. So I support the motion. **Calhoun:** And many of the clubs are already starting to draw those conclusions and advising judges not to buy tickets and making plans for dates in the future. So I don't think the clubs would be surprised. **Mastin:** Just a update on New York state. The governor spoke this morning and indicated that to get back to full occupancy, until sometime after July. He was hoping that by July 1st we can get [inaudible], so that's what's going on in New York. The other comment that I wanted to make and how this came about was, last week – middle of the week I got a request to approve sponsorship for a club that had a show the first weekend in June and I didn't feel comfortable approving it so I reviewed it with Kathy. So I think we've got to [inaudible] sponsorships, so we know when we can allow clubs to hold shows in their states. **Auth:** Just an FYI. Our show is the first weekend in June – the regional show. We already have our \$500. Likely, we're going to cancel or postpone for a year. So what direction would you want to do with that money that we already – the \$500 we already have? **Mastin:** Based on what we did last week, the club can just keep that \$500. **Auth:** Yes? **Mastin:** It was for the region. **Hannon:** Right. So what we passed last week just went through the end of May. **Auth:** Right. **Hannon:** What you're saying Rich is, you're assuming that we will – if we extend it beyond May 31st that the same rule applies? They already have their money, they can keep it. **Mastin:** Yes, I'll be surprised if we change what we did last week for shows going forward. But I suppose anything could happen. **Hannon:** Right. But at this point, Mary, it looks like whoever the money went to – the Region or whatever club in the Region – gets to keep it. **Auth:** OK, very good. Thank you. **Hannon:** OK, is there any other discussion before I call a vote? All those in favor.

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

Hannon: Kathy, is there anything else on tonight's agenda? **Calhoun:** No. **Hannon:** OK, what I suggest for the April meeting is that we put on the agenda, a discussion on whether or not we want to extend beyond May 31st. **Calhoun:** OK. **Eigenhauser:** Yes. Thank you. That's what I was going to ask.

* * * * *

RATIONALE for the following two motions, which relate to the advisory which was disseminated to CFA judges on March 25, 2020, and which appears below:

In the Judging Program Advisory reimbursement to CFA judges with guest judging assignments and reimbursement to guest judges contracted to judge CFA shows was not considered. The purpose of these motions is clarification. Also as a housekeeping item the word airfare in the original advisory should include transportation via airplane, train, or bus.

**CFA Judges Air Reimbursement Process for Shows Cancelled Due to the Coronavirus Pandemic
March 16 through May 31, 2020**

Scenario One: Judge has not been reimbursed by the club for the full amount of the airline ticket

- **Best Option** - Judge should contact airline, cancelling the flight and receive a refund. Airlines may be willing to provide a full refund depending on circumstances and status. Also, if the airline has altered the original itinerary, a full refund is owed the traveler.

- **Second Option** - Judge contacts the airline cancelling the flight and airline rolls over the residual value of the ticket.
 - a. Judge can request a refund from CFA for the full value of the ticket.
 - b. As the judge uses the residual value of the ticket, the judge is responsible for reimbursing CFA until the residual value is paid back to CFA.
 - c. Judge will not have to reimburse CFA for rebooking fees if applicable.

Scenario Two - Judge has been reimbursed by the club for the full amount of the airline ticket

- **Best Option** - Judge should contact the airline cancelling the flight and request a refund. Airlines may be willing to provide a full refund depending on circumstances and status. Also, if the airline has altered the original itinerary, a full refund is owed the traveler.
 - a. Judge should reimburse the club for the full amount of the ticket
- **Second Option**
 - a. Judge contacts the airline cancelling the flight and the airline rolls over the residual value of the ticket.
 - Judge should contact CFA requesting reimbursement of the ticket's full value be directed to the club.
 - b. As the judge uses the residual value of the ticket, the judge is responsible for reimbursing CFA until the residual value is paid back to CFA.
 - c. Judge will not have to reimburse CFA for rebooking fees if applicable.

Judge must provide receipts for all tickets as generated by the airline, identify the applicable show, the contact information for the show secretary and the appropriate scenario to be considered for reimbursement.

This policy is subject to change as appropriate.

8. REIMBURSE CFA JUDGES FOR GUEST JUDGING TRANSPORTATION.

Motion: Amend judging program advisory to include reimbursement to CFA judges for transportation to guest judging assignments in the event the show has been cancelled.

Hannon: Judge airfare reimbursement policy. Is that – Melanie is that you? **Morgan:** No. **Calhoun:** Kathy put this up. So there's two motions and they are related somewhat, but I would like to have us vote on them separately. So the first motion is to amend the judging program advisory that we approved last week to include – because I'm saying this in the positive. OK? To include reimbursements to CFA judges for transportation to get judging assignments in the event the show has been canceled. I'm making the motion with the right to vote no. **Hannon:** So this is when a CFA judge is a guest judge. **Calhoun:** This is when a CFA is – yes, a CFA judge is a guest judge for another association and that show gets cancelled and they have purchased the ticket. The question is, is it reimbursable? That's the motion. **Hannon:** So you've made a motion, is somebody seconding it? **Anger:** Rachel seconds with the right to vote no. **Eigenhauser:** I don't think that CFA should be reimbursing for guest judging

assignments. That's not a CFA matter. **Calhoun:** I think this one could be fairly quick. **Hannon:** Anybody else got a comment? All those in favor of the motion.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Currle, Colilla, Black, Newkirk, Morgan, Roy, Auth, B. Moser and P. Moser abstained.

9. REIMBURSE GUEST JUDGES FOR CFA JUDGING TRANSPORTATION.

***Motion:** Amend judging program advisory to include reimbursement to Guest judges for transportation to CFA shows in the event the show has been cancelled.*

Hannon: Alright, Kathy, your second motion? **Calhoun:** Amend judging program advisory to include reimbursement to guest judges for transportation to CFA shows in the event the show has been cancelled. So if you invite a guest judge, if a show has been canceled, do we reimburse or not? **Eigenhauser:** Second. **Hannon:** Is there discussion? **Morgan:** This does not affect the CFA judges so we can vote on that. **Hannon:** Correct. Yes, Michael, do you want to address this because this probably impacts Europe and Asia more than anything. **Schleissner:** I have no idea who and how many of these guest judges are expected on this. So I have – I think I will abstain in this case. **Eigenhauser:** And part of the reason why we did this reimbursement policy was to help the clubs, and if these are CFA clubs using guest judges, I want to help the clubs as much as we possibly can. So I'm in favor of this. **Hannon:** Anybody else got a comment? **Schleissner:** Do we have numbers on this? **Currle:** Yes, there's no effect on the two shows canceled in the AWA. **Hannon:** Thank you, Kenny. All right, all those in favor.

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

Hannon: Anything else before I adjourn? OK. Thank you, everybody. The meeting is adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 9:44 p.m. EST.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Anger, Secretary
The Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc.