

**SUMMARY AND TRANSCRIPT OF CONFERENCE CALL
CFA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
APRIL 14, 2020**

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) | JUDGING PROGRAM..... | 23 |
| (2) | BREEDS AND STANDARDS. | 26 |
| (3) | CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT. | 30 |
| (4) | CORONAVIRUS RESPONSE TEAM UPDATE..... | 42 |
| (5) | TREASURER'S REPORT..... | 47 |
| (6) | BUDGET REPORT..... | 53 |
| (7) | AWARDS..... | 54 |
| (8) | INCORPORATION AND CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE. | 57 |
| (9) | CLUB APPLICATIONS. | 69 |
| (10) | MARKETING..... | 74 |
| (11) | IT REPORT..... | 79 |
| (12) | REGIONAL HOUSEHOLD PET AWARD PROPOSAL..... | 80 |
| (14) | OTHER COMMITTEES. | 83 |
| (15) | OLD BUSINESS..... | 84 |
| (16) | NEW BUSINESS..... | 102 |
| (17) | DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS AND SUSPENSIONS..... | 103 |

Secretary's Note: The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. met on Tuesday, April 14, 2020, via teleconference. **President Mark Hannon** called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m. A roll call by **Secretary Rachel Anger** found 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)
Mr. Michael-Hans Schleissner (Europe Regional Director)
George Eigenhauser, Esq. (Director-at-Large)
Mrs. Carol Krzanowski (Director-at-Large)
Ms. Melanie Morgan (Director-at-Large)
Mr. Brian Moser (Director-at-Large)
Mr. Darrell Newkirk (Director-at-Large)

Also Present:

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

Absent:

Mrs. Kayoko Koizumi (Japan Regional Director)

SUMMARY

(1) JUDGING PROGRAM.

Ms. Morgan moved to approve leave of absence for Becky Orlando until October 1, 2020.
Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser**, **Motion Carried.**

Ms. Morgan moved to approve the following applications and advancements:

Advance to Apprentice:

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>Michelle Beaudry (Longhair – 1st Specialty)</i> | <i>16 yes; 1 did not vote (Hannon)</i> |
| <i>Jennifer Reding (Longhair – 2nd Specialty)</i> | <i>14 yes; 2 no (Colilla, Morgan); 1 did not vote (Hannon)</i> |

Advance to Approval Pending:

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>Mie Takahashi (Longhair – 1st Specialty)</i> | <i>16 yes; 1 did not vote (Hannon)</i> |
|---|--|

Advance to Approved Shorthair:

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>Gavin Cao (Shorthair – 1st Specialty)</i> | <i>16 yes; 1 did not vote (Hannon)</i> |
|---|--|

Advance to Approved Allbreed:

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| <i>Wendy Heidt</i> | <i>16 yes; 1 did not vote (Hannon)</i> |
|--------------------|--|

(2) BREEDS AND STANDARDS.

Liaison Ms. Morgan moved to adjust the eligibility requirements for breed council membership for the 2020/2021 season by deleting the requirement to have exhibited in the last two calendar years. **Out of Order.**

Ms. Morgan moved to make a housekeeping change to the Japanese Bobtail breed standard.
Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser**, **Motion Carried.** Anger abstained.

(3) CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT.

Mr. Eigenhauser moved to endorse a policy to issue a reverse pedigree to only the owner of a cat or with permission from the owner. If the owner is deceased, a reverse pedigree can be issued to a non-owner submitting appropriate documentation of the owner's death. Seconded by **Mrs. Krzanowski, Motion Carried.** Newkirk voting no.

Ms. Black moved to endorse a policy to reissue a CFA registered cattery name that has expired: (a) after a one-year grace period after expiration date if no litters have been registered; (b) after five years from the birth of the last litter if no individual kittens have been registered for any litters. Seconded by **Mrs. Krzanowski, Motion Carried.**

Mr. Newkirk moved to appoint Credentials Committee members/tellers, as presented by the Credentials Committee Chair, to travel to Alliance, Ohio, to count the 2020 Officer and Regional Director ballots. Seconded by **Mrs. Moser, Motion Failed.** Newkirk, P. Moser and B. Moser voting yes.

Ms. Roy moved that we use six local people within a two-hour drive of Alliance, Ohio, to count the 2020 Officer and Regional Director ballots. Seconded by **Mr. Newkirk, No Action.**

Ms. Calhoun moved that we use an outside accounting firm to handle the tabulation of the ballots and verification of the 2020 Officer and Regional Director ballots. After the ballots are counted by the outside accounting firm, they will be sent by overnight mail to the Credentials Committee Chair for review, confirmation of the count, and destruction of the ballots. Seconded by **Mrs. Krzanowski, Motion Carried.**

[**Secretary's Note:** The process will be as follows: (1) an outside accounting firm will count the ballots; (2) Central Office will verify the count; (3) if the count matches, the ballots will be sent to Nancy Dodds via overnight mail, who will verify the count; (4) the results will be provided to the CFA Executive Director, who will call the candidates in contested positions with the results of their election only; (5) Teresa Keiger will disseminate a CFA-News post with the results.]

(4) CORONAVIRUS RESPONSE TEAM UPDATE.

Ms. Calhoun moved that, due to the global coronavirus pandemic, effective immediately, CFA will extend the current moratorium on issuing show licenses for any show, regardless of show date or location to June 30, 2020. This motion may be revisited, ended early, extended or subject to individual case-by-case exceptions. Once the moratorium is lifted and show license applications are once again accepted, shows within the late fee window will not accrue a late fee. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.**

Mr. Eigenhauser moved that all CFA shows be cancelled through June 30, 2020. Seconded by **Mrs. Krzanowski, Motion Failed.** Eigenhauser, Black and Schleissner voting yes. Roy abstained.

Ms. Roy moved that the Finance Committee be appointed to entertain requests for reimbursement from clubs on a case-by-cases basis if clubs feel they can justify more expenditures than were approved in the March 25, 2020 Club Non-Recoverable Expenses Reimbursement Policy. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.** Calhoun and Mastin abstained.

(5) TREASURER’S REPORT.

Treasurer Ms. Calhoun had no action items.

(6) BUDGET REPORT.

Chair Ms. Calhoun had no action items.

(7) AWARDS.

Mr. Mastin moved to proceed with collecting the 2019-2020 Star Award nominations now. Seconded by **Mr. Newkirk, Motion Carried.** [Secretary’s Note: It will be determined at a later time what will be done with the nominations.]

(8) INCORPORATION AND CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE.

Chair Ms. Auth moved to approve the Whistleblower Policy, as presented. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.**

Ms. Auth moved to approve the Policy on Conflicts of Interest, as presented. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.**

(9) CLUB APPLICATIONS.

Chair Mrs. Krzanowski moved to accept the resignation by the Dutch Purppuss Club with regret, effective February 3, 2020. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Motion Carried.**

The following club applications were presented for acceptance on motion by **Mrs. Krzanowski:**

- INDIAN CAT CLUB (International Division - AWA/CSA). Seconded by **Mr. Currle, Motion Carried.**
- ORANGE CAT CLUB (Region 9). Seconded by **Mr. Schleissner, Motion Carried.**
- STARRY SKY CAT FANCIERS’ CLUB (International Division – Asia). Seconded by **Ms. Morgan, Motion Carried.**
- VIETNAM CAT CLUB (International Division – Asia). Seconded by **Ms. Morgan, Motion Carried.**

(10) MARKETING.

Chair Ms. Black had no action items.

(11) IT REPORT.

Liaison Mr. Colilla presented no action items.

(12) REGIONAL HOUSEHOLD PET AWARD PROPOSAL.

Ms. Roy moved to amend Article XXXVI National and Regional Awards to give all Household Pets receiving a regional award the HRW Prefix based on the awards given out by the regions. Minimum of 200 points. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser, Withdrawn.**

(13) **OTHER COMMITTEES.**

None.

(14) **OLD BUSINESS.**

RATIFICATION OF ON-LINE MOTIONS

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| 1. | Executive Committee 01.29.20 | Due to the coronavirus affecting parts of Asia, effective until amended by the CFA Board, grant an exception to Show Rules 3.09-3.11 and permit any CFA judge who feels uncomfortable or unsafe traveling to Asia, for any reason, to cancel his or her Asian judging contract by advising the contracting club of such cancellation. Judges cancelling an Asian contract will be allowed to exhibit or accept a judging assignment for that weekend in any area other than Asia. | Motion Carried. |
| No discussion. | | | |
| 2. | Currle Anger 02.10.20 | Due to calendar issues, grant the Nashville Cat Club (Region 7), or any other club with dates affected by the calendar challenges, an exception to the provision in Show Rule 2.32: <<Clubs that do not hold a show for two (2) consecutive years on their traditional date will lose the distinction of having a traditional date weekend.>> and allow them to retain their traditional date of the last weekend in December until 2022 (at which time the T-date of the last weekend in December will resume), so that the show can be held on another weekend in 2020 and 2021. | Motion Carried. |
| Black: I recently did a show announcement for Finicky Felines as they have the same issue with their next two years falling on or near Christmas. I would like Kenny's motion to include any traditional show which has the traditional date for the last weekend in December to keep their traditional date lock, even if not holding a show for the next two years. Roy: Finicky Felines has done this several times over the years. They usually pick a 5th weekend. Krzanowski: I like this suggestion of a blanket motion to include the traditional show dates for all clubs that may be affected by the holiday. Hannon: I am waiting to see if Kenny wants to amend his motion to expand his motion to include all shows with a Traditional Date of the 4th weekend of December. In addition to Finicky Felines and the Nashville Cat Club there is a show in Japan. Currle: Please add any other dates affected by the calendar challenges in my motion regardless of area to my motion. | | | |
| 3. | Morgan Anger 02.10.20 | Approve changing region for Raventree Ramsey, 1114-02851140 to Thailand for the 2019/2020 season. | Motion Carried. |
| Morgan: Both ID chairs support this motion and given the current situation with travel restrictions etc., I do too. Newkirk: Thanks to everyone for a quick resolution to this issue. | | | |
| 4. | Executive Committee 02.11.20 | Grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04 and allow the Club Felino Espanol to change their show format from 3AB, 2 SSP-CH, 1LH, 1 SH to 5AB, 1LH, 1 SH for their show on February 15/16, 2020 in Derio, Spain (Region 9). | Motion Carried. |
| Eigenhauser: I have a problem with the words "... if the count stays small." That's conditional and this close to the show it should be yes or no, not "if". However, since that's in the background/rationale and not part of the motion fine with the format change (and they need to advise exhibitors ASAP.) | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|---|---------------------------------|---|--|
| 5. | Executive Committee 02.11.20 | Grant the Club Felino Espanol an exception to Show Rule 9.08.n. and allow ring sharing of two rings at their 5 AB/1 LH/1 SH show on February 15/16, 2020 in Derio, Spain (Region 9). | Motion Carried. |
| Eigenhauser: With only 54 entries total ring sharing is practical. If it helps them keep the show open all day to promote CFA I support their request. | | | |
| 6. | Anger Newkirk 02.11.20 | For their show on August 29/30, 2020 in Malaysia, grant the Malaysia Cat Fanciers Club an exception to the show licensing and scoring rules, and allow them to have (1) top 20 AB final for all rings; (2) top 5 scored breed placements; and (3) points from the show to be counted for all Divisional, Regional, Breed and National awards from all around the world, just like the International Show. | Motion Carried. |
| Anger: Just a mention that this is NOT the awards show. That event will be held a couple of weeks later. I have confirmed with Dick that he supports the show. He provided me with this statement: <i>The Malaysia Cat Fanciers club would like to put on an Asia World show similar in concept to the CFA international Show in Kuala Lumpur. This show is being sponsored by Malaysia royalty. The club has high hopes that this show is world class event. No other show in the ID will be licensed for this weekend. Up to 5 breed awards, like the CFA International show would be awarded. Exhibitors from throughout the world would be invited. Malaysia would allow exhibitors from key eastern Asia countries (China, South Korea, Hong Kong, Thailand and Indonesia) as well as Middle East, Europe and North America.</i> The ID had a similar show in Bangkok several years ago. Hannon: I attended the Bangkok show mentioned in Dick's post. It was an honor to attend. The exhibitors from throughout Asia supported that show and were very excited about the show. My hope is that this show is also well-received by the Asian exhibitors and perhaps some European and American exhibitors will attend as well. Black: I support this. | | | |
| 7. | Anger Newkirk 02.13.20 | For its show in Pekayon Jaya, Indonesia, on February 22, 2020, grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04 and allow the Borneo Cat Fanciers to change their show format from 5 AB/1 SP to 5 AB, and move Allan Davies from SP to AB. | Motion Carried. Schleissner and Koizumi did not vote. |
| No discussion. | | | |
| 8. | Anger Newkirk | Modify Show rules, International Division awards (page 42) for this show season and succeeding show seasons to: 71-160 rings sponsored in an area = 15 awards*; and >160 rings sponsored in an area = 25 awards*. 71-94 rings sponsored in an area = 15 awards*; 95-117 rings sponsored in an area = 20 awards; and >117 rings sponsored in an area = 25 awards*. | Motion Carried. Koizumi did not vote. |
| P. Moser: I need a better explanation on this. I don't understand the rationale. Hannon: Before calling for a vote, I am hoping someone can answer Pam's question. Morgan: To take the example further - So far this show season, Hong Kong has had twice the number of rings as Region 2. However, with the current ID scoring algorithm, they are only eligible for 15 award places, but Region 2 will receive 25 places. This motion is designed to adjust to the current environment and keeps things as equitable as possible. Morgan: From ID Chairs – an example... Region 5 had 118 rings last show season, but still was able to award 25 places. According to current rules, an ID area would need 161 rings to get the same number of places. An ID DW area should be able to receive 25 awards also if a Region 1-9 can receive 25 awards for the same number of rings. Awards less than 25 are based on a proportionate amount of 118. P. Moser: So we are just talking Regional awards not National correct? Auth: Shouldn't the region has some consideration based upon their ability to pay for awards? Black: I agree. Why should the ID have fewer awards than Region 1-9 with less total rings. This looks fair to me. Morgan: From Dick- "The ID has sufficient external sponsorship - last season, sponsorship was over | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| US\$15,000; this season will probably be the same.” It is my understanding that the division IS asking for this change. | | | |
| 9. | Black Anger 02.20.20 | Approve \$7000 for Shephard to create our CFA Branding Guide. | Motion Carried. P. Moser voting no. Auth abstained. Schleissner and B. Moser did not vote. |
| Black: I hope the Board will support this. CFA spent [a large amount] back with Pam and Roanne with the 4kids promotion. The resulting designs were not continued. This will give us a top rate style guide and a wow factor to the website. Auth: While I support this and understand the need for it. I believe that \$7200 could be put to better use right now relative to marketing. | | | |
| 10. | Anger Krzanowski 03.04.2020 | Grant CatFashion Cat Club in Israel an additional \$670 \$237 of CFA assistance due to the coronavirus ban on judges coming from Thailand. | Motion Carried. |
| Newkirk: I will call United to check into options for the money we received toward the purchase of our airfares. Black: I was very impressed with the huge gate and the exhibitors holding a breed workshop during lunch. This club works very hard to support CFA in Israel where there is competition from other associations. I support this. Auth: I think it would be important that should this pass, the money is specifically limited to the CFA show and to airfare. I am not voting until this gets straightened out – until I have enough information about the cost of tickets and the liability to the club. | | | |
| 11. | Eigenhauser Newkirk 03.06.2020 | Adopt the amendment, as presented, to the existing procedure for late fees and suspensions upon failure to obtain a mandated cattery environment inspection. | Motion Carried. |
| No discussion. | | | |
| 12. | Anger Newkirk 03.10.2020 | Due to the coronavirus affecting parts of Asia, effective for the current show season (2019-2020), for International Division cats, grant an exception to the requirements under page 43, paragraph 4, requiring a kitten/cat to be shown at least once in the competitive category in the national area of final assignment. | Motion Carried. |
| No discussion. | | | |
| 13. | Anger Newkirk 03.11.2020 | Approve spending up to \$5,000 with Matt Banjo to close the books for January, and for February at the appropriate time. | Motion Carried. P. Moser, Auth and B. Moser voting no. Koizumi and Schleissner did not vote. |
| Executive Session Discussion involving personnel. | | | |
| 14. | Anger Krzanowski 03.13.2020 | Effective March 16, 2020 through May 31, 2020, that all CFA shows be shut down. This motion may be revisited, ended early or extended. | Motion Carried. Webster abstained. |
| Newkirk: I know this is really a difficult decision, but we are not living in normal times. I hate that we have to do this, but I will support this motion. Eigenhauser: I fully support the motion. We are in a global pandemic and we have to put the health of our people first. With shows closing piecemeal, if a local show gets cancelled it may encourage exhibitors to travel to other shows, increasing the risk of infection and spread of the disease. Yes, there will be economic consequences to the clubs that CFA may need to offset. Yes, we should consider changing our | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|--------------------|--|------|
| | | <p>awards to lower or eliminate some point minimums and otherwise try to avoid harm to exhibitors. We can discuss those separately. Right now we need to act in the best interest of our people. Once we have the moratorium in place we will have time to discuss mitigation later. Roy: The club I belong to has been discussing already cancelling for the 1st week of the new show season. Fear of no entries and fear that the gate will stay home too. Economically a fear of not being able to recover financially. This is a good decision. Black: I have been against canceling the remainder of the season as I think much of what we are experiencing is over reaction. That was my opinion yesterday, but today I feel differently about it. I fear that one of our exhibitors or judges will develop this virus and that will cause a wave of panic with the cat fancy. I would rather end the season than see that happen. P. Moser: I have some concerns here, as we have discussed before if we say we are cancelling the shows what kind of financial obligation are we going to incur? I of course, do not want to see anyone come down with this because they are traveling to a show. I have some clubs in my Region that this will destroy, others will be able to absorb the financial impact. I'm very conflicted on this one. Currie: This is the only thing that makes sense at this time. We can deal with the ramifications later. Auth: I am ready to vote right now and I will be voting Yes to cancel. P. Moser: If we are going to do this and that means this weekend's shows will be canceled, we need to vote right now. People will be getting on planes shortly. Hannon: CFA's Coronavirus Response Team discussed this. We wanted a clean motion for today so we can quickly get the word out if it passes. If there are no shows after this weekend, we have time to discuss how we can assist clubs who will lose money due to the cancellations. The team will meet next week and bring a proposal to the entire board. In the meantime, give some thought to what you believe is fair. As far as I can tell, the only show this weekend that has not been cancelled is Crab & Mallet in suburban Baltimore. They have a 6x6 which filled on Saturday and nearly filled on Sunday. They have been given permission by the government to hold the show but without gate. As we are discussing this motion, more and more clubs are sending out cancellation notices. The motion is to cancel shows a AFTER this weekend. Webster: I must be the only one who disagrees with this move of ending the show season. As Crab and Mallet has their show this weekend, in areas that is not being shut down should be allowed to have their shows. The Gov. gave them permission but no spectators. I think it should be up to the clubs and or the Government of the locality. Ending the show season now would hurt the clubs who can have the show in their area. Just my opinion. Is Las Vegas shutting down the casino's? Black: I disagree about the shows this weekend. People are already on their way, and Crab & Mallet has decided not to have any spectators. Mo-Kan has canceled. I would not want to harm the club at this late date. Newkirk: Idacats just cancelled. Webster: KC major canceled the events in that area. Palm Springs has canceled all events through the end of March so the show has canceled. However if an area is not shutting down, we should allow them to go ahead and have their shows. As many have already spent the money to have it. If we cancel is CFA paying for everything? If the state, Local gov. cancels then the clubs get their deposits back. I think everyone is a little premature with canceling the season, My question is why, campaigners? Mastin: Howard, It is too soon to know what all CFA will pay. Many of the clubs have already been or will have been forced to cancel shows by local and state authorities. When this happens, most show halls, hotels and other businesses will work with the clubs to retain future business. What the clubs will go throw is the same thing we/CFA is dealing with on the Annual hotel concerns in Washington State. The difference between the shows today and the annual in June is three months. Much will happen over that time, and we will need to address things on a daily and weekly basis. Unfortunately, things are predicted to get far worse before they get better. We the board, must work with all clubs on their upcoming challenges. This may and will require all types of assistance from; reviewing contracts, offering advice to contracts, possibly assisting in negotiating contracts and providing financial support. As of right now, nothing should be off the table, and we should be receptive to addressing all the challenges to the best of our abilities after we get through this motion. We will have plenty of work to do over the next couple of weeks, and I am sure we are all committed to helping to the best of our abilities.</p> <p>Mastin: This is an extremely difficult and challenging time for CFA, CFA clubs, exhibitors, business associates, friends, family members, communities and everyone impacted by the world wide epidemic.. CFA is very important to all of us and all who participate. However, what is currently happening globally with COVID-19 is health and life threatening, and it requires all of us to make difficult decisions that are in the best health interest of all parties involved in show production and for those visitors attending shows. We all need to be mindful cancelling CFA shows from March 16th to May 31st and ending this year's show season after this weekend is not life threatening. It is difficult, upsetting and will come at a cost. There will be many negative & criticizing comments, all kinds of recommendations and suggestions and some financial setbacks. CFA will recover over</p> | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>time (as will many others). This board will be tasked to do what we can to address all issues and concerns thrown or way. We will be required to be open minded, creative, willing to be helpful, accommodating to the best of our abilities, make concessions and be wise in our financial assistance and decisions. Once we get past this motion we will work on all the setbacks and concerns, from point minimums to financial help and everything in between. The motion is the right thing to do, and I am fully supportive. Newkirk: I think you touched on every salient point that need to be considered. I would suggest that we proceed with the vote? Mr President? Colilla: If we are going to cancel shows I think we should cancel up to the second weekend in April. We should have a better idea about the situation in a couple of weeks. We can always extend it a couple of weeks more. Morgan: I think Rich provides us with a well thought out and comprehensive summary of where we stand. This is not business as usual, and as such we need to do the right thing, however hard it might be. Sad as it is, I am supportive of this motion. Calhoun: I am fully supportive. This is a life threatening global situation - as we all know. This is the right thing to do.</p> | | | |
| 15. | Anger Krzanowski 03.20.2020 | Due to the global coronavirus pandemic, effective immediately through May 31, 2020, that CFA impose a moratorium on issuing show licenses for any show, regardless of show date or location. This motion may be revisited, ended early, extended, or subject to individual case-by-case exceptions. Once the moratorium is lifted and show license applications are once again accepted, shows within the late fee window will not accrue a late fee. | Motion Carried. Schleissner abstained. |
| <p>Auth: I was not able to listen in last night, but agree this is a smart move and really believe the Mark (as president) should be the ONLY one to formally announce this – not announced by any other board members. Roy: What is not in here in the explanation and perhaps it is a 2nd motion is that if licensed clubs cancel, they can roll over their show license/insurance to the next show season. Anger: That is a different motion. We are not talking about cancelling anything in this particular motion. It deals only with future show licenses. Newkirk: With many more cases in the USA and California and Oregon adding new rules today that ban gathering of more than 250 people, I think this board should consider shutting down all shows licensed but CFA immediately. No amount of financial loss would make up for the death of a fancier. I know this is drastic, but we need to discuss this, future shows are that. This is an emergent issue. [At this point the motion was tabled]</p> <p>[Motion re-introduced off the table] Mastin: Imo, based on the current happenings across the globe we do need a short-term moratorium on licensing future shows, and I am supportive of this motion. We need to do this at least until we have a clearer understanding of what improvements, changes and progresses are being made in each Area, Region and Country. If things improve sooner than later (this is not likely) we can change this decision, same will apply if things get worse (as Rachel has included in the motion). Eigenhauser: We brought up this motion for discussion a week ago but tabled it to take up the more urgent motion to suspend shows. Things have only gotten worse since then. I'm ready to vote. Roy: Rich makes some very valid points. I personally, do not think we should allow shows in any area until we can allow shows in every area. We do not know when or if travel restrictions and bans on public gatherings will be lifted. Eigenhauser: When CFA is ready to resume licensing shows it need to be in a manner that works for the Regions. We have relied on the RDs in R1-R7 to work together on show scheduling and try to resolve any differences among themselves. Before we restart show licensing (whenever that might be) it might be beneficial for the RDs 1-7 to have a conference call to find common ground about how to resume shows.</p> | | | |
| 16. | Morgan Calhoun 03.24.20 | Accept airfare flight reimbursement policy, as presented. | Motion Carried. Calhoun, Roy, P. Moser, Black, Colilla, Auth, Morgan, Newkirk and B. Moser abstained. |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|---|--------------------|--------|---------------------------------------|
| | | | Schleissner and Koizumi did not vote. |
| <p>Roy: This seems very fair. Will the clubs send a copy of the check as proof? Auth: I worry that the motion is non-specific with the words “as presented.” I think that needs to be more specific since “as presented” could have been at any time (i.e. as presented when???) Anger: When motions are made that have additional supporting documentation, this is the format that has always been used and has never been questioned. While I am not opposed to change, there is precedent for doing it this way, over a number of years. Auth: So Rachel can you modify the motion to include wording that says “as presented by Melanie at the March 18 COVID 19 teleconference.” Anger: This is not my motion. Auth: Then perhaps Melanie can modify the motion.</p> <p>Eigenhauser: No, that would be incorrect. The March 18 meeting came up with the framework but the exact wording was worked out later. The language presented is in the email that included the motion. So if any amendment is needed (and I do not think it is) it would be “as presented above” or “as presented herein” Auth: Then I ask Melanie to add the word herein. Morgan: The motion stands as presented. Auth: Then I will vote “no” since it is not stated specifically what was presented.</p> <p>Mastin: Melanie, Kathy C, Allene and I worked on this motion together on Thursday afternoon in order to get this in front of the board immediately after the last motion. This past Wednesday evening many of us felt it was important to work on this quickly so that we could inform Clubs and Judges what CFA would do in order to refund flights so that both parties were not waiting on such refunds in case they needed funds. I believe the motion appears to be in very good order for the board to approve. And, thank you and great job on quick turnaround to Melanie, Kathy C and Allene for working on this with me.</p> <p>If it matters during our meeting on Thursday, we estimated the total cost of refunding (before any credits will be applied for new flight bookings) could be in the \$72k to \$78k range. This is just an estimate if anyone wants to keep track of funds going out for all these different happenings.</p> <p>My next shared thoughts may very well be out of line or not. George and or others will hopefully comment and set me straight if he/all of you believe I need to be set straight.</p> <p>Because this motion is to reimburse Judges and or Clubs directly for prepaid airfare expenses, it might be best for all Judges who are on the board to abstain from voting so that this does not appear inappropriate or give reason for anyone to believe there could be a conflict of interest. I will be supporting this motion and I hope all fellow non-Judge board members will do the same. This is one of those motions that could be called into question should all Judges who are board members who vote in favor of this motion to reimburse x-expense, and then votes no against a y-expense reimbursement. Let’s keep you all protected from having to vote on something that will go directly to you or your fellow Judges. You may also want to limit your comments and be very careful on speaking against or in favor. I may be over reacting on this, but I don’t think so.</p> <p>Newkirk: Thank you Rich for your keen insight. I will abstain. Auth: I am aware that my “no” vote will have no impact. I am not against the spirit of the motion – but rather on the wording of the motion. I do believe, however, that as a judge, I should abstain. Morgan: Rich, you make a good point. Roy: Really good point.</p> <p>Morgan: George and/or John, do you have an opinion on whether judges should abstain or not? I made this motion and support it, but do not want to put us in a precarious situation if that is a risk. Black: I appreciate Rich’s words of caution but I have do not like to abstain on any vote. This votes helps the clubs and our judges. I support that and have no qualms voicing that. I asked Rachel what if the majority abstained. She said abstention is not counted as a no vote. Ratification at a meeting is when a majority is needed. Anger: Just to clarify, what Kathy and I discussed is that an abstention is handled as if the voting party were not present. So, if all board members vote (18) and two abstain, then we base pass/fail on 16. Newkirk: Kathy, I agree. I do not like to abstain, however I have submitted cancelled flight where CFA may be sending me money. That to me create a conflict of interest and could be viewed as voting for a motion that could be viewed as financial benefit. I do not want that to happen even though I support this motion.</p> | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|---|--------------------|--------|------|
| <p>Newkirk: At the risk of having paper wads thrown at me. This question is a perfect question for a motion to divide the question. I can explain that, or you can look it up. There are essentially two parts to this motion, one to reimburse clubs that have already paid a judge for an airfare for a show that has not been cancelled. The 2nd part is to refund to the judge, if they have not been paid by the club. If the question is divided, we would vote on each part. The beauty of it is that the judges can vote on part 1 and the judges that are going to ask for a refund would abstain. It isn't a financial benefit to a judge, as they expended money. However, there will always be someone that will complain. Just a suggestion to use a parliamentary motion to help solve the conundrum.</p> <p>Eigenhauser: We all have our own opinions on the matter and each is subject to the limitations of our own conscience. Each of us has to make our own decision on whether to abstain on a vote due to a possible conflict of interest when we may benefit from a motion. In addition, there is the need to maintain the appearance of integrity. For my \$0.02, if I were a judge and expected to be reimburse directly or indirectly by this action I personally would abstain. I wouldn't even be part of the debate. But it's not just what we do, it's also how it's perceived. The fancy does not know who has already purchased tickets or how they will be reimbursed. So if I were a judge, and had NO AIRFARES reimbursed under this policy, I would still abstain. The appearance of impropriety would be too great. Lawyers have a saying, loosely translated from the Latin: "the law, like Caesar's wife, must be above reproach." It means public figures must not only avoid wrongdoing but even the mere appearance of impropriety. If I were a judge I'd abstain. As always I remind the Board that our online votes are not legally meetings and parliamentary rules for meetings to not apply. Newkirk: Question for George, since you always bring this up about RRO being for meeting. How do we make a motion and have a debate on line. Are you saying that is the only course of action for the board to take. We can make a motion and vote on 1 thing, but toss of rules as they apply to motions in any other regard? Sorry, but I disagree with your argument. Morgan: Thank you George. I appreciate the input. Auth: And I would ask George – if our online "meetings" are not "legal" meetings, then are we violating the law. And if they are not binding, then any action we take relative to the C & M show will not be effective until we meet in person again?? Help me out here. Newkirk: Actually He speaks out of both sides of his mouth. A face to face meeting and a telephonic meeting when everyone is present and everyone can hear each meet the criteria for a deliberative assembly. The email voting does not. AND it is discouraged. However, we do this all the time. To say that we are not doing "business" is bullcrap. So any business we conduct does not have to be ratified at the next business meeting, like they did in October. I questioned it and George sided with Rachel. That is ok, but did you notice, they were not listed at February to be ratified? Eigenhauser: NY Law only allows virtual meetings if Board members are all together online together in real time. Our CFA Constitution allows virtual Board meetings by "conference telephone or similar communications equipment allowing all persons participating in the meeting to hear each other at the same." Our previous attorney advised us that while NY law does not allow email meetings, as long as we ratify the results at our next legal meeting we are good. Then it retroactively always was legal. Eigenhauser: I'm not sure of what you are saying. Ratification of the online motions was item 3 on the February agenda. Newkirk: Sorry, I used the wrong term, the teleconference meeting motions were not ratified at the Feb meeting. Eigenhauser: Actions taken at an official CFA Board meeting are different than unofficial e-mail votes. Actions taken at a meeting don't need to be ratified to be effective. The teleconference meetings ARE legal meetings per NY law and the CFA Constitution, Article VII, Section 3, which states in part: "Any one or more members of the Board may participate in a meeting of the Board by means of a conference telephone or similar communications equipment allowing all persons participating in the meeting to hear each other at the same time. Participation by such means shall constitute presence in person at a meeting." This language used in the CFA Constitution closely mirrors NY law at the time it was adopted. So actions taken at a regular meeting, face-to-face or telephonic, do not need to be ratified to be legal. However, it is good practice to approve the minutes of one meeting at the next. Unofficial votes taken by e-mail technically need to be ratified later. Newkirk: At the October 2019 meeting, the ratification of on line motions were followed by ratification of the Teleconference motions. Page 17 of the minutes to remind you. I questioned then why we were ratifying the teleconference minutes. You argued against me. Did you have an epiphany since October 2019? Rachel let her motion stand and we approved the minutes of the teleconference. Now you are taking a position in line with what I said back then? Thank you. Eigenhauser: No, you are just very confused. As I stated in October 2019: "Wait a second. It's traditional to approve the minutes after they are transcribed unless we are approving the transcription, not the actions. With respect to the email votes, we're ratifying the actions. With respect to the other minutes, we're ratifying the minutes." Mark then asked Rachel if</p> | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|--------------------|--------|------|
| <p>she would so move, and she did. For minutes of an official meeting we are voting on the accuracy of the transcription, not the underlying actions. For unofficial actions, like online votes, we are ratifying the action itself. That is what I said then.. That is what I am saying now. It is good practice to approve the minutes of one meeting at the next. Unofficial votes taken by e-mail technically need to be ratified later. Newkirk: Fantastic, The motion was to ratify the teleconference motions, not to approve, them please read the whole thing. I saw what you did, but it didn't change the fact that we approved / ratified motions that were already ratified. My statement was we don't need to ratify them. You were more than anxious to countermand my comments. Its ok George, we have been on the Board for many years together and you do a great job. I have gotten used to your opposition on almost every item of debate that I utter. Auth: So George, Here is my concern. We motioned and passed by email the following motion on March 12. (see below). So please clarify. In order for this to be a legal motion, it has to be ratified – presumably on Wednesday, March 25 when the board meets telephonically. The question you have not yet answered (or I haven't seen your answer) is this: Until ratified – an email motion is not valid and cannot be implemented. Therefore, we passed a motion on March 12 and implemented the result of that motion (cancelled all shows beginning March 16). Did we do something illegal by implementing the motion? Are we at risk to be challenged? Eigenhauser: As I mentioned, our previous attorney advised us on this years ago when we began the practice. It's a bit of a kludge but not it is not illegal. Auth: Then until we ratify the motion on C & M (yet to come) and the current motion on judge's reimbursement during our April meeting – how can they legally implemented prior to the April meeting? Newkirk: Additionally, there is no provision for email voting in our constitution if you want to get technical. Eigenhauser: Thank you. That is what I keep saying. Technically we can't take Board votes by e-mail. Our CFA Constitution does not provide for e-mail voting by the Board. NY Law does not allow it either. Hamza wanted the whole Board to be able to vote on important matters by e-mail between Board meetings but that is not authorized under NY Law. So our then attorney advised we could do a work-around. While the e-mail votes are technically not official, any actions taken by e-mail are ratified at the next meeting. That is the basis for our Board e-mail votes. This is one area where NY law may still be a bit behind real life. But we make-do.</p> <p>Auth: Just to clarify. If a board takes action on a motion before the motion is ratified, is the action illegal?</p> <p>Randolph: My understanding of New York law is that action taken on a motion made and voted on by email may be subject to challenge until the motion and action are ratified at a properly called Board meeting held either in person, telephonically or other technological medium in real time. Even after the decision on the notion and action have been ratified, an aggrieved party could bring a lawsuit in New York challenging the decision under New York Consolidated Laws, Civil Practice Law and Rules - CVP § 217. I understand that in such action, called a Section 78 Action, the standard for determination of the Board's decision would be the Business Judgment Rule which, given the present circumstances, would make the decision difficult to overturn. Auth: Thanks John for the explanation. I want to be sure of the board's exposure on this and future email votes before ratification. Newkirk: I agree with John on this issue, and I thank him for providing his interpretation of NY law. My concern is this. We often have an email vote and put the action item in that vote into practice, when we have not had a meeting to ratify the action. In the above referenced case, we can justify, due to the outbreak of COVID-19 and the response of many of the state prohibiting crowds of great than 10 people. But, what about an action item that cannot be justified. What concerns me is this part of Section 708 of the NPC law. <i>(a) Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, any reference in this chapter to corporate action to be taken by the board shall mean such action at a meeting of the board. (b) Unless otherwise restricted by the certificate of incorporation or the by-laws, any action required or permitted to be taken by the board or any committee thereof may be taken without a meeting if all members of the board or the committee consent to the adoption of a resolution authorizing the action. Such consent may be written or electronic.</i></p> <p>Randolph: I understand your concern in reference to subsection (a) of Section 708 and that is why I focused my response on ratification of what has occurred. I don't believe that subsection (b) prohibits after the fact ratification of actions taken without full board approval, but would want some input from our New York attorney before making a blanket statement to that effect. To me, subsection (b) permits action by unanimous approval where notice requirements or other impediments prevent calling a board meeting before the action is required. An example would be the approval and execution of loan documents for a major financing transaction that has a closing deadline.</p> | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|---|---------------------------------|---|---|
| 17. | Anger Newkirk | Due to email transmission difficulties, accept the declaration for ID-Rep from Heike Anne Hagenguth which was submitted via email on March 15, 2020, prior to the declaration deadline. | Withdrawn. |
| 18. | Anger Mastin 04.01.2020 | Due to mail difficulties, accept the declaration for ID-China Representative from Zhi Ning which was alleged to have been submitted via regular mail on March 7, 2020, prior to the declaration deadline. | Motion Failed. |
| <p>Anger: While I appreciate anyone who offers to volunteer for CFA, we have processes and procedures in place that should be adhered to. When it comes to a declaration for office, the burden is on the candidate to make sure the declaration arrives with ample time for confirmation, and should be submitted in such a way that it can be verified. Currle: I agree with Rachel.</p> | | | |
| 19. | Colilla Mastin 04.03.2020 | Allow the Great Lakes Region to hold a pet fair in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania on November 6-8, 2020, which is 483 miles from the New Hampshire Feline Fanciers show in Schenectady, New York. | Motion Carried. Anger, Roy and Currle abstained. |
| <p>Mastin: I am also supportive of a show within x-miles of the current 500 mile sort of rule (not sure it's a hard rule, more so a number that has been used for Regions and the Board to negotiate with). 17 miles seems reasonable in this case (and likely most all cases), and since some have expressed concerns with changing the recommended 500 mile rule this makes sense to allow. A possible concern/question might be, are we handling this request properly during the moratorium on issuing show licenses and show sponsorships? I suppose the motion could be approved, yet the club cannot license the show seems sort of odd to me. I realize at some point shows will be licensed and sponsorship requests will be approved, we just don't know when that will happen. I understand John needs to get back to the Pet Expo contact in order for him/her to count on CFA attending or not. If the motion is approved John could always inform the contact that the show cannot be licensed until CFA lifts the moratorium on issuing show licenses, and CFA and the Great Lakes Region cannot be held responsible for any expenses if the event is cancelled for any reason. I am not suggesting things will or will not be back to normal by November 6-8, 2020, we really don't know what the occupancy restrictions might be (if any) going forward. My sense is occupancies for large gatherings may not go back to normal right away, and local, state and federal governments may want to gradually increase occupancies over time (this could be a problem for some events and some areas). Auth: If I were to guess. The Pet Expo doesn't care about our ability to license a show, they only want to know if there will be a cat presence there. If we are not able to license a November show, then we have much bigger problems to deal with. I think the bigger question is – will the board support John's efforts to engage with a pet expo in Pittsburgh. Colilla: I talked to Rocco early today. He is aware that it depends on the approval of CFA. I can also tell him about our moratorium and we will not be held responsible for any expenses if the event is cancelled for any reason. Mastin: You could be correct that the Pet Expo doesn't care if the show is licensed, however, I think the Pet Expo should know up front that CFA is not licensing any shows right now and CFA and the Region does not want to be responsible if the event is cancelled, and if John and his region cannot have a cat show. We just don't know what the new normal will be in 7 months. I sure hope things improve quickly, but I don't have a great feeling for how things are going to play out over the next three to six months. Trying very hard to be positive and look at what are the potential great things that could happen over the next two to three weeks to shed positive light on getting back to normal. We need to be concerned, cautious, possibly conservative on many things and hopefully wise in our decisions. I support the request and have concerns. Krzanowski: I agree with Rich's concerns. It would not be advisable to solidly commit to any event until we have a better feel for when the problems surrounding the virus may level off and things may begin to return to some semblance of normal. I also agree that restrictions on large gatherings may remain in place for some time, even after conditions improve. That being said and provided things work out by that time, I support the motion. Auth: If we cannot license a show it will likely happen that the Pet Expo will also be cancelled. I suppose a contract can be written with language that supports that. I think acting positively is the way to go. We can cover</p> | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|---------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>ourselves with legal words. Mastin: As long as John communicates to the Pet Expo our current position on licensing shows, and CFA & the Region cannot be held responsible for cancelations (event or the CFA show), I would feel more comfortable addressing this motion. If these two are absent from the motion we should not approve as requested. The Pet Expo contact would want to know our current status and what our expectations are, so that he/she can make the right decisions. This is good business for all parties and it helps to develop a stronger relationship in the future. Colilla: I can make sure he is aware of it. He told me we were really easy to work with and did not cause him any issue. He said it cost him \$10,000 to have us there last year because of the space and union cost. He also mention that he put on other events. I am going to talk to him about other events maybe we can do something out of the box. Newkirk: I would like to know what show format is planned by John. If he plans a 6X6, then that would really adversely affect a show within the 500 mile radius. Colilla: 4x4 like last year. Newkirk: Ok, I am confused. We get an email from Rachel on behalf of the Exec. Committee that [text deleted] and not further expos are going to happen. Now we are being asked to approve one. What is What? Hannon: I shared your confusion so I asked Allene about it. At this event last year Allene, Jo Ann, Desiree, and Amber worked the CFA Booth that was adjacent to [the cat show at] this expo. She told me CFA staff could handle it next year. I suspect that it is helpful that Pittsburgh is not too far from Alliance.</p> | | | |
| 20. | Newkirk Mastin 04.06.2020 | The award for the Japanese Bobtail (Shorthair) Breed Winner [and for the Persian – Smoke & Shaded Division Breed Winner] for the 2019-2020 show season shall be shared between the two highest scoring cats [of each breed], as Co-Best of Breed winners, with both cats getting the BW title. | Motion Failed. Mastin, P. Moser, Black, Auth, Schleissner, Newkirk and B. Moser voting yes. |
| <p>[Secretary's Note: the motion was amended by the addition of the bracketed words.]</p> <p>Newkirk: Can we hold up a few minutes. I sent Rachel the updated motion. I spoke with Allene today after reviewing the post Mark shared with Board in regard to the Breed winners. I missed it when he first posted it. After speaking with Allene today, she informed me that the Persian Smoke and Shaded Division winner also switched after scoring Crab and Mallet. As you all are aware, everything that I post in a motion is scrutinized to a nonometer. So I didn't want to miss a cat. Thankfully, Allene informed me of the additional Breed/Divison winner that was affected by scoring Crab and Mallet. I apologize to Rachel, as I sent the motion below before checking in with Allene.</p> <p>Black: Darrell I was going to mention the S&S cat. Are you amending your motion to include this cat? Newkirk: Yes, that is correct. Anger: Working for home has been a challenge. My internet is cut off at 6:00 and Darrell's updated request arrived at 6:01. So, my apologies that there was not an immediate response. Morgan: Since there seem to be a number of "issues" regarding Breed wins, I would prefer to discuss any proposed changes during the teleconference meeting. This would give us time to pull together all requests, look at the data and make an informed decision on all the requests. To add to my request to delay this until our regularly scheduled meeting, I am wondering what input the chair of our awards committee has on these requests? Hannon: We also have Mary K's comments about residency requirement that we dropped this past Wednesday. She feels we should not be doing this for kittens that aged out prior to the coronavirus situation since they had ample time to show in their own area.</p> <p>Morgan: I reached out to Mary [Kolencik] for her input as I wanted to get a better handle on the situation and I felt that the Recommendation of the Chair of the Awards Committee should at least be considered. Here is her response:</p> <p><i>In the case of the JBob, the US JBob was going to pass the European JBob. It was doing much better at shows. It granded in late December and was picking up points fast. The US has more shows than Europe, higher count, it was going to pass. For the Europeans to be complaining so much over this pass at Crab & Mallet is not realistic, the European JBob was going to come in 2nd unless something happened to the owner of the US Jbob. Also, the Smoke & Shaded Persian that was passed had around 200 points, did the owner really think they could hold onto that spot? That title was going down too.</i></p> | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|---|--------------------|--------|------|
| <p><i>This is getting out of hand. Soon, people will want to be awarded GC titles for cats that are a few points short. There might be cats that were displaced from RWs by the Crab & Mallet show, what about them? What about cats that were displaced from regional breed awards by that show? Where is the line? Why does the line go to whoever complains the loudest or whoever catches the attention of a board member?</i></p> <p><i>I do not support dual BW titles, I would vote no. This is just not what our competition is supposed to be about. One show does not make an award, we have the whole season to get enough points for that title, and to claim that one show caused another cat to win is not fair. I know of no other sport, other than little league baseball or pee wee football that would ever consider this.</i></p> <p><i>That said, I understand I might be in the minority on this (since I never would have diluted the NWs as the board did) and I really would rather the board not issue ties. The cats did not tie. The board could award dual titles but keep the order for the awards presentation. In other words, both bobtails get a BWR, but when presented (if we ever have a presentation), they are presented in order. The trophy says Best of Breed, because the only person that sees the trophy is the owner, so it can say whatever. We announce them as Best JBob (and same for the others). And there are still just 3 cats that get breed awards. If the owner of the one that is highest scoring wants to run a yearbook ad that says Best X and highest scoring X, then they can do that. Call it a dual BWR title, just don't call it a tie. I don't like this, but it is better than a tie. Just please don't issue ties. This isn't pee wee football.</i></p> <p><i>As for the middle East cat, that is totally out IMO. We can't go back to every cat that was affected by certain shows and adjust the titles. Where is the line? Is this a competition or is it little league? If the board wants to do something for the Himalayan, then how about this. I am a co-breeder of a CPSH that was being shown in Israel. She ended the season in 2nd place in Israel, 2 points behind the Maine Coon in 1st place. Just 2 points. There was another show to be held in Israel where she likely would have passed the best cat. There is only one DW in Israel. Hey, if I complain enough do you think I could get the board to consider a motion to go ahead and give two DWs in Israel since the CPSH was just 2 points behind???? I mean, if everybody else is getting these special dispensations, why shouldn't that cat get it too. Where is the line?</i></p> <p>BTW, I'm not asking for a 2nd DW, just illustrating that there are many cats that were affected. Newkirk: I called Allene to see if other cats were involved She informed me about the Persian. I provided that info in the work up for the motion.</p> <p>Morgan: Before I vote I want to say one thing for the record as a relatively new board member... I believe we all want what is best for CFA and the breeders and exhibitors. We may disagree on what that means or how to go about accomplishing that, but essentially we all want the same thing. None of this should be personal and in this instance where we are discussing titles, we need to do our level best to stay neutral when deciding awards. I do not think a lively discussion is counterproductive. I do not think that spending time discussing the motions is meandering. Often when we rush to "do the right thing" or help one individual we make decisions without considering all the consequences, intended or not. I understand that when people reach out to us our first instinct is to help, but stepping back and taking the time to consider the big picture, or other related issues makes good sense. I find that often when we get into discussion on an issue someone brings up something I had not considered. It is our job to take the time to listen and take action on making informed decisions. This line of debate is what we all signed up for is it not? I applaud every effort to consider all the data and not rush to make a decision. Last Wednesday it took us one hour and forty six minutes to change CFA history. I think when we rush through agendas to get things done, we do ourselves and CFA a disservice. Sometimes we need to take a step back to look at the big picture. It is impossible to come up with a totally fair solution for every scenario this season because guess what? There is nothing right about the challenges we are facing. I thank Darrell for bringing these latest issues to our attention... I thank Mary K for all the hard work she put into analyzing the numbers. I thank Kenny for bringing up yet another issue and Mark for yet another... and while I am doing my academy award thing... I might as well thank central office for all the numbers crunching as well... there is no right and wrong here, just a whole lot of people trying to do the right thing in a messed up situation. Roy: This is a really hard decision where we have said yes to so many other requests. We have no way of predicting what might have happened if the show season went on. When do we draw the line? Currie: The reasoning for my pending motion was in consideration of a similar situation in the ID-other which I saw as my obligation as committee chair of the AWA/CSA to forward to the board on behalf of our CFA breeders in that area. If the present motion fails, I will</p> | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|--------------------------------|---|---|
| <p>withdraw my motion. Newkirk: Melanie, Thanks you for a very well thought out presentation. The CFA Board asked Central Office to give us the impact on the NWs after scoring Crab and Mallet. Allene informed us it would take a few days to see the impact on the Breed wins. Mark forwarded that file to Board. I overlooked the attachment. There were complaints sent to Mark by the owners of the JBT. They were informed that no one brought it up at the Board meeting, last week. I called Allene, because I didn't understand the file when I printed it out. Scoring Crab and Mallet changed the Breed winner for the two cats that I list (by breed) in my motion. It was the final issue we had to deal with in regard to Crab and Mallet scoring. The cat Kenny is talking about, was not affected by Crab and Mallet Scoring. The cat Mark referred to as being Best Cat in Premeirship, has nothing to do with Crab and Mallet scoring, at least I do not think that has anything to do with moving into 2nd place. All of these things can be discussed. In their order and in their time. My point was not to diminish anyone's concerns that we should address. We should address them all, if they are brought to our attention.</p> <p>Mastin: I believe back on March 13, 2020 Mary Auth may have begun the Board list email discussions on concerns with allowing Crab & Mallet show to continue. In Mary's March 13th email Mary stated, "I am already getting some pushback on letting the Crab & Mallet show continue." My initial response (also sent to the entire Board on March 13, 2020) and one of many thoughts to Mary's initial email discussion was, "I agree with those who say points earned at Crab & Mallet should not impact National or Breed standings." My position and opinion has not changed, I believe the Board has an obligation to look at the negative impacts to those who did not attend Crab & Mallet or who was pushed out of NW or BW placement(s). I also shared some thoughts on Regional level in the same email (not needed for this discussion). Assuming these are the only two breeds that have been negatively impacted, I am ready to vote. If these are not the only two breeds, I hope we are not pushing this motion too quick, otherwise we will revisit this again. As for all the other issues that we are presented with, I believe we need to look at each request separately or group them if the same. This is a very complicated and stressful year due to outside forces negatively impacting CFA's traditional showing and scoring procedures. Unfortunately we will not be able to make everyone happy (and nor should this be our goal), and we will be criticized for attempting to make reasonable and fair decisions. Imo this motion is reasonable and fair.</p> <p>Mastin: I also failed to mention a possible concern that might need to be taken into consideration – any Board member(s) who have shown or bred a cat/kitten that was shown in the 2019-2020 season that is eligible for a BW may want to abstain from voting on this motion. John R and George may be able to offer some advice on this.</p> <p>Newkirk: Rich, also any board members that judged Crab and Mallet have a potential conflict. Hannon: The decision to abstain on a motion has historically been left up to the individual board member. I realize Rich stated "may" want to abstain. This is the decision for each board member. If you judged Crab & Mallet and do not believe you have a conflict, you have a right to vote. Calhoun: Following is a procedure based on the Alice Sturgis's The Standard Code for Parliamentary Procedure but also applicable to Roberts Rules of Order. <i>What is a conflict of interest? A "conflict of interest" exists when a person in a position of trust has competing professional or personal interests.</i></p> <p>Schleissner: The two guys showing the JBSH did a great job; unfortunately they have the wrong mentor.. It sounds to me, that Henny Wintershoven is very much involved in this business. Isn't she suspended from all CFA services? Once again she is violating the board's decision, what a surprise. This is what she posted on the discussion page on April/02. She tells us, that she entered the cat for another 6 shows, she bought flight tickets and paid the entree fees, all this in public on FB. She just ignores the board and now she wants to press us. Anyway, if nobody has a problem with such behaviors I vote yes, because the two guys in her side haven't woke up. Currle: I recall that scoring the C&M show was unanimous (1 abstain) without any designations or ramifications for any particular entry. Would we need to amend that motion if this passes?</p> | | | |
| 21. | Anger Newkirk 04.10.2020 | Amend the April 1, 2020 Motion as follows: 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. This motion does not include Kittens who attained the age of 8 months on or before March 16, 2020. | Motion Carried. Roy, P. Moser, Auth and Koizumi abstained. Schleissner did not vote. |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|---|--------------------|--------|------|
| <p>Eigenhauser: Kittens who aged out before the shows ended could not have shown later to meet their residency requirement. We should fine tune this a bit. Auth: I have gotten some comments about this from people in my region and will be voting to reconsider. Newkirk: May I please make a statement. Reconsider is out of order. This can be corrected one of two ways, both versions of the same motion. Rescind or amend something previously adopted, they are basically the same motion, one annuls the action, the other amends the action. Either motion needs 2/3 vote to pass. However, this could be prenoticed, that way it only needs majority vote. To act upon it. Just my thoughts and John can weigh in on this. Newkirk: Mark, please consult your parliamentarian. A motion to reconsider can only be made on the same day the motion was adopted or the next day, the adjourned meeting. I am in favor of this please do not misunderstand me. I just want it done right. Have Mary K write up the amended motion, pre=notice it for the April 14 meeting and it only needs a majority vote to Pass. It is a very simple fix, and it done within the rules. Eigenhauser: Just a reminder to everyone that the April 1 meeting was not an official Board meeting. To be an official meeting it must be pre-noticed 30 days according to the requirements of the CFA Constitution. Any action taken at the April 1 meeting is not official until ratified by the Board at an official meeting. Hannon: Perhaps the best way to deal with this is to have the person who made the motion to reconsider withdrawn the motion and someone can make a new motion. Auth: Nice said George. This is how it should be.</p> <p>Hannon: Darrell commented that Robert's Rules only permit a vote to be reconsidered during the meeting at which a motion is made. I conferred with our legal counsel and he agrees that is his interpretation of Robert's Rules. John further commented, as has George multiple times, that we do not always follow Robert's Rules at our board meetings. John suggested that we would be better served by a motion to Amend the motion passed at our April 1, 2020 meeting which is listed above. I am ruling the motion made yesterday to Reconsider out of order. I am requesting someone to make a motion to Amend the motion made at our April 1, 2020 meeting dealing with the residency requirement. [Anger revises motion as appears above.] Newkirk: I will 2 Nd. With the understand that the vote required is 2/3rds to pass. Eigenhauser: I know we are working partly on the Board e-mail list and partly in conversations with Mary K and others. We are also trying to listen to our constituents at the same time. So I don't blame anyone for needing some time to sort this out. I have a slight problem with this motion. Mary K correctly pointed out that any kitten who already aged out before the moratorium on shows would not have been able to show in their home Region to establish residency. They could not have done so even if there had never been COVID-19. So those kittens [who timed out before] should have been excluded from looser residency requirements. However, this new motion still leaves kittens looking for regional wins, whose owners planned to show them later in the show season, from using the same rules for residency as CH/PR cats in the same situation. I would prefer the last line exclude kittens who already timed out, but not all kittens. Newkirk: How does this affect kittens that were being shown until March 14-15? Are any kittens that were shown in January, February and March impacted? Hannon: Do we know how this impacts Regional awards? While we were told during the board meeting that all kittens had aged out by the time we cancelled shows, that comment referred to nationally ranked kittens. There may be kittens that were still young enough to continue to be shown had we not cancelled shows through May. As I understand the motion, by removing all kittens, we still require kittens to be shown once in their home Region or ID. Some younger kittens may have had plans to do that before they aged out but we removed that possibility for kittens that could have otherwise been shown in latter March, April, and May. Newkirk: Mark, Thank you, that was my thoughts, although I did not express it very well. As Mary K pointed out, all the NW kittens had aged out and this motion would not affect them, but it could affect Regional placements. Not sure how we find out the answer to the question on regional kitten placements, but we need that bit of information to make an informed decision on the motion. Hannon: Shirley would normally verify that RW cats/kittens had met the residency requirement prior to releasing the regional end-of-season lists. She likely has already done that for this year but I will ask and get back to you with the impact of this amended motion. Anger: From Mary K: <i>I have been told there is a kitten in region [omitted] that is in the top 25 that did not meet the residency requirement but completed its kitten season *before* the season was closed. Central Office would be better able to answer if other kittens are affected. This should be simple. If a kitten aged out before the season ended, it should meet the residency requirement unless it was somehow affected by a lack of shows, such as in Asia. But a blanket waiver in R1-7 allows kittens that *could* have met the requirement to have a waiver. If the residency requirement is waived for every kitten, then at least one kitten that I know of will get an RW without having met the requirement when it could have.</i> By copy of this response, I am requesting Allene to have</p> | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|--------------------|--------|------|
| <p>someone get us this information. Newkirk: Are we not singling out one kitten? This was the complaint about the BWs, we singled out a cat. If we are going to have fair play, we need to be consistent in how we deal with issues. Anger: A question was asked and this was simply the response to that question. You will note that I omitted the region, so no one is singling out a specific cat – it is merely being pointed out that (at least) one cat falls under the parameters of the question asked. Newkirk: Rachel, you made the motion on behalf of Mary K, she singled out 1 kitten. I don't blame you for posting the motion, like she blamed me for the motions I made. Auth: And I am getting heat for that one kitten. I believe it should NOT be in the top 25 in its region and the exhibitor knows it and actually had the same thing happen to her last year. I also believe that Mary K is correct in bringing it to our attention. Hannon: I think there may be an easy solution. We could limit the original motion to exclude kittens that had aged out prior to the moratorium on shows. [Anger amends motion as appears above.]</p> <p>Anger: Here is Allene's response: <i>As best we can tell, no. There are some kittens which could have picked back up showing and maybe moved into the top 25 and would need to meet the regional requirement but we didn't look at those kittens since we have no way of knowing they would have gone to a show if one had been available.</i> If anyone has a question that this does not answer, my recommendation is to ask it directly of Allene. Newkirk: I guess the question I have is this: Are there kittens in the top 25 ranking that are still of showing age that will be knocked out of the 25 because we cancelled the show season and took away their ability to show in their region? I am not sure if Allene's response below answers that question. Anger: To avoid confusion, please ask Allene directly. Newkirk: Just to be clear. If we do not know if any current kittens may be negatively impacted that are of show age and may have been prevented from meeting the test of residency, I cannot support this motion. What good does it do to correct something Mary K should have considered when she suggested her original motion that I presented from her comments to the committee, if we amend something previously adopted and then create a different unintended consequence? This has gotten confusing and until it is clear I am not inclined to support the motion. Hannon: I do not understand your stated reluctance to support the motion. Kittens that aged out prior to the cancellation of shows had a full four months to follow the existing Show Rule. If they did not accomplish that, they are not in compliance with the rule and the rule kicks in. If a kitten was still eligible to be shown as a kitten beyond the last weekend of the show season (March 14-15), we will not require that the kitten be shown in its own Region/ID. It does not matter if that is one kitten or 20. We are not making this exception for a particular kitten but for every kitten to which it applies. This motion treats all affected kittens the same. Anger: What is unclear to me is what your question is. I recommended that you contact Allene to get the answer to your question, but rather than do that and help us all be clearer, you are giving up? I have spent a good part of the day going back and forth with Allene to try to answer your questions and have failed, which is why I recommended that anyone with questions go to her directly. To use one of your phrases, Darrell, I have no dog in the fight but neither do I want to abandon this. You say you want to avoid unintended consequences, but this very situation IS an unintended consequence that should be resolved. The purpose of the discussion phase is exactly this – to overcome any confusion. Let's do that. Newkirk: The motion states, this does not include kittens. Therefore, kittens must comply with the residency requirement. The stated objective to amend a previously adopted motion is correct a kitten in a regional standing (that should not have been there). There may be kittens of show age, that may be excluded from an RW, if we make them comply with the residency requirement, as this motion excludes them from the waiver. If there are no kittens to be affected, then just say so, but it appears from Allene's comments they cannot tell. My objection is this, if we pass this, kick the kitten out of the regional standings that should not have been there under the old rule before we passed a motion to allow a waiver, then we are in the same boat and padding from the other side. Newkirk: Rachel, I didn't mean to muddy the waters. However, we have two sets of circumstances with kittens. We have NWs, they have aged out and should be easily determined that they met the residency/divisional requirement. We also have a subset of kittens that have not aged out, those are the ones that concern me. E.g. I have a 6 month old kitten I have shown in region 3, I planned to show at the Las Vegas CC show, but now that show is cancelled, and I cannot meet the residency requirement. I am now screwed, if we has this motion. The last sentence says, does not apply to kittens. So, NO WAIVER for the residency requirement for my kitten. Does that explain it? I don't know of a different path to explanation. I know you think I am trying to be difficult, but I just want to make sure our action doesn't impact another person's kitten that might be negatively impacted. If we can clear that up, I am 100% on board. Hannon: I believe Rachel revised her motion which might resolve your issue with the motion attached to this thread. Look at her latest motion. Eigenhauser: Darrell, I think you missed a message earlier in this thread. Rachel withdrew the first</p> | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|--------------------|--------|------|
| <p>motion and submitted a new one. The new last sentence now reads: “This motion does not include Kittens who attained the age of 8 months on or before March 16, 2020.” So the kitten in your hypothetical, who the owner planned to show in Las Vegas on March 28 but couldn’t due to the moratorium, would still get the relaxed residency requirement. But kittens who aged out before the moratorium took effect would not. Their show season ended when they aged out and the moratorium didn’t affect their ability to show where they chose. I agree with you. I didn’t like the first version either. I also agree that we need to all be clear on what we’re voting on. But I hope the change resolved your question. Newkirk: Thank you George. Yes, that answers my concerns, and I must have missed that email. Yes, it does answer my concerns. Hannon: I may have lost track. Has anyone seconded this motion? Newkirk: I did. Anger: Thank you for the explanation Darrell but make no mistake - I have clarity over the situation. That was never the issue. My reason for referring you to Allene for your questions was that something always gets lost in the translation when too many people are involved. We are all under a magnifying glass right now and I am doing everything I can to try to avoid confusion. Stepping away from your inquiry process was the best way for me to do that. I appreciate and agree with your concern for having the most information possible.</p> | | | |

Ms. Anger moved to ratify the online motions, as presented above. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser**, **Motion Carried.**

RATIFICATION OF TELECONFERENCE MOTIONS

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|---|------------------------|---|---|
| • From March 25, 2020 Special Meeting Teleconference • | | | |
| 1. | Currle Morgan | Score the Crab and Mallet show in accordance with our CFA show rules and procedures. | Motion Carried. |
| 2. | Calhoun Eigenhauser | That a club that has been given pre-show sponsorship money (the \$500 sent in advance as part of the \$1,000 that we provide to every club; new show sponsorship; and in-conjunction) for a show during the mandatory cancellation period March 16 th through May 31 st would retain the sponsorship money, to use for any reason they see fit. | Motion Carried. |
| 3. | Calhoun Masstin | An additional \$500 post-show sponsorship will be available for clubs that have contracted and paid for advertising up to \$1,000. Requires receipt and proof they could not negotiate out of the charges. | Motion Failed. Calhoun, Morgan, Roy, Colilla, Auth, P. Moser and B. Moser voting yes. |
| 4. | Black Mastin | Post-show sponsorship will be available for clubs that have contracted and paid for advertising up to \$1,000. Requires receipt and proof they could not negotiate out of the charges. | Motion Carried. |
| 5. | Calhoun Krzanowski | The show license and insurance (\$200) paid for a show that has been cancelled due to coronavirus will be refunded (estimated to be \$12,00). | Motion Carried. |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| 6. | Calhoun Eigenhauser | Entry clerk fees are eligible for reimbursement for entries processed through March 20, 2020. | Motion Carried. |
| 7. | Calhoun Anger | Show hall or event deposits or payments will not be reimbursed by CFA. | Motion Carried. Schleissner voting no. |
| 8. | Calhoun Black | Down payments to third-party catering (not supplied by the venue) are eligible for reimbursement consideration or negotiation. | Motion Carried. |
| 9. | Calhoun Eigenhauser | CFA will not reimburse any travel costs for exhibitors and attendees as a result of cancelled CFA events as a result of coronavirus concerns. | Motion Carried. |
| 10. | Eigenhauser Auth | Apply the above motions to shows that were cancelled between January 1 to March 16, 2020 by Government regulations are eligible to apply for the above reimbursements. | Motion Carried. Anger and Calhoun voting no. Currle abstained. |
| 11. | Eigenhauser Mastin | Reimburse catalog printing costs for shows held between January 1 - March 15, 2020 due to government edict to cancel the show. | Motion Carried. |
| 12. | Eigenhauser Mastin | New airfare reimbursement program applied for shows from March 16 – May 31, 2020 be extended to shows cancelled by the government for shows January 1 – March 15, 2020. | Motion Carried. Calhoun, Morgan, Black, P. Moser, B. Moser, Roy, Auth and Colilla abstained. |
| 13. | Implied in all motions above | Clubs must provide proof of payment to be considered eligible for reimbursement. Any charges in excess of provision will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. | |
| 14. | Calhoun Mastin | That we not hold the 2020 CFA annual as scheduled. | [after motion below to table fails] Motion Carried. Newkirk and Auth voting no. Schleissner abstained. |
| 15. | Newkirk Auth | Table the above motion until the April 14, 2020 teleconference. | Motion Failed. Auth, Newkirk, B. Moser and Schleissner voting yes. |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|----------------------------|--|--|
| 16. | P. Moser Currle | For unreimbursed expenses incurred by Region 2 due to the cancellation of the annual, that CFA will pay those expenses upon receipt from the region | Motion Carried. P. Moser abstained. |
| 17. | Newkirk Eigenhauser | The requirement to qualify as a traditional date is not affected by the cancellation of shows. | Motion Carried. |
| 18. | Mastin Eigenhauser | Give the CFA Foundation rent relief in the form of a waiver during the mandated shutdown until the mandates are lifted; the month of March to be prorated based on the date that they were shut down. | Motion Carried. Krzanowski and Calhoun abstained. |
| • From April 1, 2020 Special Meeting Teleconference • | | | |
| 19. | Newkirk Anger | That the current NW point minimums be adjusted based on the chart as presented. | Motion Carried. Krzanowski abstained. |
| 20. | Newkirk Currle | That the current Grand of Distinction 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. | Motion Carried. |
| 21. | Newkirk Anger | 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. | Motion Carried. |
| 22. | Newkirk Anger | That Show Rule XXXVI be set aside and the awards as presented be given to the DWs for this year only. | Motion Carried. |
| 23. | Newkirk Anger | 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 | Motion Carried. Webster, Eigenhauser, Morgan, Colilla, Krzanowski, Calhoun and Black voting no. |
| 24. | Eigenhauser Black | Award top 20 national wins in Household Pets for cats that meet the NW point minimums. | Motion Carried. |
| 25. | Black Roy | Reconsider above motion. | Motion Carried. P. Moser voting no. |
| 26. | Black Eigenhauser | Award top 25 national wins in Household Pets for the 2019-2020 show season, with no point minimums. | Motion Failed. Eigenhauser, Currle, Black and Auth voting yes. |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| | | | Webster abstained. |
| 27. | Mastin Anger | Award top 25 Household Pets for the 2019-2020 show season, and lower the point minimum from 935 to 800. | Motion Failed. Eigenhauser, Currle, Black, Webster and Auth voting yes. Schleissner abstained. |
| 28. | Schleissner Eigenhauser | Award top 30 Kittens for the 2019-2020 show season, for Kittens that meet the point minimums. | Motion Failed. . Eigenhauser, Schleissner, Newkirk and Auth voting yes. |
| 29. | Eigenhauser Mastin | Reduce national breed win point minimums from 200 points to 150 points. | Motion Carried. |
| 30. | Calhoun Mastin | CFA will place a moratorium on awarding show sponsorships until the occupancy restrictions in the geography of the show hall have been lifted. | Motion Carried. |
| 31. | Calhoun Anger | Amend judging program advisory to include reimbursement to CFA judges for transportation to guest judging assignments in the event the show has been cancelled. | Motion Failed. Currle, Colilla, Black, Newkirk, Morgan, Roy, Auth, B. Moser and P. Moser abstained. |
| 32. | Calhoun Eigenhauser | Amend judging program advisory to include reimbursement to Guest judges for transportation to CFA shows in the event the show has been cancelled. | Motion Carried. Schleissner abstained. |

Mr. Newkirk moved to ratify the teleconference motions, as presented above. Seconded by **Mr. Mastin**, **Motion Carried.**

(15) NEW BUSINESS.

None.

TRANSCRIPT

(1) **JUDGING PROGRAM.**

Committee Chair: *Melanie Morgan*
List of Committee Members: *Larry Adkison – General oversight and quality control*
Claire Dubit - –Applications Administrator
Pat Jacobberger –Chair, Judges’ Education subcommittee
(Breed Awareness and Orientation School)
Barbara Jaeger
Ann Mathis
Tracy Petty
Becky Orlando – File Administrator; Mentor Program
Administrator
Sharon Roy – Ombudsman, General Communications
Representative
Jan Stevens – File Administrator; Member, Recruitment &
Development subcommittee
Annette Wilson – Chair, Guest Judge subcommittee; Guest
judge paperwork review
Education and Recruitment Subcommittee, Melanie Morgan
Chair
Laurie Coughlan
Pat Jacobberger
Jan Stevens

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

The Committee members met by teleconference on Tuesday April 7, 2020, to discuss the judge applications, advancements, and preparations for this board meeting.

Retirements/Resignations:

None.

Recent Death:

Lorraine “Ricky” Carroll. Retired CFA Allbreed Judge Ricky Carroll passed away due to complications from COVID-19 on April 3, 2020. Ricky became a CFA judge in 1971 and retired in 2007. Ricky bred and exhibited Shaded and Solid Color Persians under the cattery name of Carroll’s and she was known for her vibrant personality and wicked sense of humor.

Leave of Absence:

CFA Allbreed Judge Becky Orlando has requested an extension on her medical leave of absence until October 1, 2020. We wish Becky a speedy recovery.

Action Item: Approve leave of absence for Becky Orlando until October 1, 2020.

Morgan: My first action item is, CFA Allbreed Judge Becky Orlando has requested an extension of her medical leave of absence until October 1st, 2020. We wish her a speedy recovery. The action item is, approve a leave of absence for Becky until October 1, 2020.

Eigenhauser: Second. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion?

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

Guest Judging Report:

(Note: Guest Judge approvals granted for shows subsequently cancelled are not included)

CFA Judges to Judge International Assignments:

| Judge | Assn | Club Sponsor | City/Country | Date |
|---------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| Honey, Ellyn | SACC | South Africa CC | Johannesburg, SA | 11/7/2020 |
| McKeehen-Bounds, S. | None | Humane Society Event | Bowling Green, KY | 6/20/2020 |
| Rivard, Lorraine | CCA | Ottawa Valley Cat Club | Ottawa, Ontario | 9/27/2020 |
| Tsuchiya, Toshi | None | Fun Show | Indonesia | 3/8/2020 |
| U'Ren, Rod | CCCA | Siberian and Other CC | Perth, Australia | 8/9/2020 |
| U'Ren, Rod | CCCA | Cat Control Council of Tasmania | Longford, Tasmania | 8/23/2020 |

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

| Judge | Assn | CFA Show | City/Country | Date |
|----------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| Balciuniene, Inga | WCF | Felinus International CC | Helchteren, Belgium | 12/13/2020 |
| Counasse, Daniel | WCF | Felinus International CC | Helchteren, Belgium | 12/13/2020 |
| Davies, Allan | CCCA | Borneo Cat Fanciers | Bekasa, Indonesia | 2/22/2020 |
| Gleason, Elaine | CCA | Santa Monica Cat Club | Ontario, CA | 9/20/2020 |
| Gleason, Robert | CCA | Santa Monica Cat Club | Ontario, CA | 9/20/2020 |
| Grebneva, Olga | RUI | Hong Kong & Macau CC | Malaysia | 3/6/2020 |
| Grebneva, Olga | RUI | Garden State Cat Club | Edison, NJ | 7/18/2020 |
| Grebneva, Olga | RUI | Feline Fanciers of Benelux | Berlare, Belgium | 2/13/2021 |
| Korotonozhkina, Olga | RUI | Feline Fanciers of Benelux | Berlare, Belgium | 2/13/2021 |
| Nazarova, Anna | WCF | MuKeDer CC | Turkey | 11/21/2020 |

Education and Recruitment update:

BAOS scheduled for April in France cancelled.

Judges Workshops: We are working on options for on-line seminars to replace the breed presentations already scheduled for the Spokane annual.

Advancements: *The following individuals are presented to the Board for advancement:*

Advance to Apprentice:

*Michelle Beaudry (Longhair – 1st Specialty) 16 yes; 1 did not vote
(Hannon)*

*Jennifer Reding (Longhair – 2nd Specialty) 14 yes; 2 no (Colilla,
Morgan); 1 did not vote
(Hannon)*

Advance to Approval Pending:

*Mie Takahashi (Longhair – 1st Specialty) 16 yes; 1 did not vote
(Hannon)*

Advance to Approved Shorthair:

*Gavin Cao (Shorthair – 1st Specialty) 16 yes; 1 did not vote
(Hannon)*

Advance to Approved Allbreed:

*Wendy Heidt 16 yes; 1 did not vote
(Hannon)*

[from end of meeting] **Morgan:** I have an update on the Judging Program. Just for the record, all five of the judges who were up for advancement have been advanced. Congratulations to all. **Hannon:** Can we get the numbers? What about the numbers? **Morgan:** Unanimous for everyone except for Jennifer, which was 14 yes and 2 no. **Hannon:** OK, thank you.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Melanie Morgan, Chair*

(2) BREEDS AND STANDARDS.

Committee Chair: *Annette Wilson*

Liaison to Board: *Melanie Morgan*

List of Committee Members: *Carla Bizzell, Kathy Black*

Potential impact of Covid-19 based cancellation on requirements for upcoming breed council membership.

Action item: *Adjust the eligibility requirements for breed council membership for the 2020/2021 season by deleting the requirement to have exhibited in the last two calendar years.*

Rationale: *Some people may not have the opportunity to fulfill the requirement to exhibit due to the lack of CFA shows prior to membership application deadline. Note this was brought to Breeds and Standards Committee by exhibitors and is being forwarded to the Board to consider as just one more portion of CFA business that is potentially impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic. Breeds and Standards Chair does not support this motion (see below)*

Current eligibility requirements:

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

- *Have a CFA registered cattery name.*
- *Are at least 18 years of age or older.*
- *Have bred and registered with CFA at least three litters of the appropriate breed/division.*
- *A judge or an officer of another cat registering association is not eligible.*

In addition to the above requirements, membership is limited to individuals who have met either of the following qualifications:

Bred at least one CFA Grand Champion or Grand Premier of the appropriate breed/division,

OR

Registered one litter of the appropriate breed/division within the previous two calendar years and, have exhibited a cat/kitten of the appropriate breed/division at a CFA show within the previous two calendar years.

Statement from Chair of Breeds and Standards

My opinion on this proposal is that BC membership requirements are already quite generous once someone has met the first level of requirements; registering a litter and showing a cat within a two (2) calendar year period should be eminently doable even if there are 2 (or 4 or 5 months subtracted from the two year period.

It seems to me that maybe this suggestion has been brought up because:

- 1. It is a BC Secretary election year; and,*
- 2. One or more BC is looking to do some down-to-the-wire “recruitment” in order to influence an election outcome (or possibly a standard change outcome).*

As Chair of the Breeds & Standards Committee, I don’t think it is in CFA’s best interests to moderate the requirement. I would rather see recruitment of already eligible breeders to join their breed councils.

*Sincerely,
Annette Wilson*

Hannon: Do you want to move on to Breeds and Standards, Melanie? **Morgan:** Sure. We discussed some of this in email earlier today, but basically, we have two small issues up for Breeds and Standards. The first one is in response to question we received from exhibitors and breeders who were very concerned about the effect of COVID19 and our subsequent shut-down, and what effect that might have on eligibility for the new requirements of joining the breed council. I think we really wanted to make sure that they felt that they had been heard. As you can see, Annette as the chair of this Committee does not support making a change. My understanding from John [Randolph] earlier today and everyone is that it would be constitutionally out of order. So, we can’t go forward with the action item, which was: *Adjust the eligibility requirements for breed council membership for the 2020/2021 season by deleting the requirement to have exhibited in the last two calendar years.* But we did want it to be out there and to make the point that we’ve looked at the top line issues with COVID19 and how it affects things. It is trickling down to other aspects of what we do. We probably are going to have to broaden our scope as we look forward, in terms of how to adjust and deal with the ongoing implications of this. So, no action. We will pull the motion, unless anyone has any comments on it.

[**Secretary’s Note:** CFA Attorney John Randolph ruled the proposal out of order. His statement follows.] *The proposal under item two on tonight’s agenda (Breeds and Standards) is out of order for the reason that the CFA Board does not have the power, nor the authority, to set aside a constitutional requirement. The requirements for Breed Council Membership are set forth in Article XI of the CFA Constitution and cannot be amended by Board action.*

* * * * *

[**Secretary’s Note:** The following housekeeping revision from the 2019 Japanese Bobtail breed council ballot was presented. The color class information in italics was not included with the original ballot but is being presented here for ratification.]

- 1. PROPOSED:** Revise the Japanese Bobtail standard under OTHER ALLOWED COLORS/PATTERNS. Housekeeping.

OTHER ALLOWED COLORS/PATTERNS: Any other colors or pattern or combination thereof. ~~except coloring showing the evidence of hybridization resulting in un-patterned agouti (i.e. Abyssinian coloring), or that color/pattern with white.~~

RATIONALE: The 2018 Japanese Bobtail Breed Council passed new Rules of Registration, including removing the prohibition against “ticked” tabby/patterns. This is a housekeeping measure to bring the standard in line with the Rules of Registration. This prohibition removal passed by 96% (22 to 1).

*The following information is for reference purposes only
and not an official part of the CFA Show Standard.*

Japanese Bobtail Color Class Numbers

...
Other Japanese Bobtail Colors (OJBC)..... 6790 6791
(Tabby/Patterned colors [Brown, Chocolate,
Blue, Lilac, Red, Cream, Silver, Chocolate
Silver, Blue Silver, Lilac Silver, Cameo,
Cream Cameo], Patched Tabby/Patched
Patterned colors [Brown Patched, Chocolate
Patched, Blue Patched, Lilac Patched, Silver
Patched, Chocolate Silver Patched, Dilute
Silver Patched, Lilac Silver Patched], Other
Smoke colors [Black Smoke, Chocolate
Smoke, Blue Smoke, Lilac Smoke, Red Smoke
(Cameo), Cream Smoke (Cream Cameo),
Tortoiseshell Smoke, Chocolate Tortoiseshell
Smoke, Blue-Cream Smoke and Lilac Cream
Smoke], Colorpoint and Colorpoint and White
(Any of the following colors with white:
including but not limited to solid or tabby
point restricted colors and pointed and white
colors: Black (Seal), Red, Cream, Chocolate,
Lilac, Blue, Tortoiseshell, Blue-Cream,
Smoke, Dilute Smoke, and all of these colors
in lynx pattern. Also, all of these colors with
white or colors with lynx pattern and white or
any colors genetically possible in the breed.

Morgan: The next item is technically not Breeds and Standards. It’s a show rule for a color class change, not a breed standard change, but we wanted to make sure it was addressed. When the new standards and show rules were printed, the color class section was not updated to reflect what was passed by the Japanese Bobtail breed council in 2018-2019. So, Annette contacted the breed council secretary for the Japanese Bobtail. She confirmed that this was an oversight, so it’s essentially simply a housekeeping issue. With the agreement of the breed council secretary Marianne Clark, I would like to request a motion to update the 2020-2021 color class description for the Japanese Bobtail by deleting the conflicting information from the Show Rules under Other Japanese Bobtail Colors, both longhair and shorthair. So, that would be affecting classes 6790-6791, 6690-6691. That’s the longhair and shorthair versions. We would delete the last sentence, which states: *Any other colors or pattern or combination thereof, except coloring showing evidence of hybridization resulting in unpatterned agouti, i.e. Abyssinian coloring or that color or pattern with white.* That’s in direct conflict with what they passed. It simply was an oversight when the documents were printed. So, we would like board approval to

go ahead and make that correction. **Hannon:** Melanie, did you make the motion? **Morgan:** Yes. **Hannon:** George, are you seconding it? **Eigenhauser:** I'll second it, but I want to make a comment, too, or a question. **Hannon:** That's great. I wanted a second first. Go ahead. **Eigenhauser:** I just want to be clear from my own mind. This was a clerical error and we're fixing a prior clerical error, is that correct? **Morgan:** 100% correct. **Hannon:** We're not changing the standard. **Morgan:** Not at all. It's simply clerical. It was missed when they went through and did the documents. **Hannon:** Anybody else have any questions or comments on the motion?

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

Hannon: Allene, you'll take care of that? **Tartaglia:** Yes. In fact, I already have. **Hannon:** OK. Are you through? **Morgan:** That's all I have.

(3) CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT.

Committee Chair: Allene Tartaglia

Current Happenings

Ballots for Officers, Regional Directors and ID Rep: *emails with individualized links for each club to vote online are scheduled to be sent Friday, April 10, 2020.*

Hannon: Next is Central Office. **Tartaglia:** OK. As you probably all know, ballots for officers, regional directors and ID Reps are out. They are coming in pretty steadily. That's typical for what we see – a lot in the beginning, then there's a lull, then there's a lot right at the very end for the deadline. So, that all seems to be going along quite well.

Reverse Pedigrees: *originally when reverse pedigrees were made available, the policy was to issue them only to the owner of a cat since they show breeding activity. At some point years ago (prior to 2006) the policy changed to supply a reverse pedigree for a cat to anyone paying for the report. It does not have to be the owner. A reverse pedigree provides 3 generations of progeny for a specific cat. Some reverse pedigrees are short and some are quite extensive.*

Information from a reverse pedigree can and has been used to populate pedigree databases maintained by individuals. We were contacted in February by an individual who was quite upset that their cats' information was included on one of these pedigree database websites since he hadn't released the information to anyone. The information was obtained from a reverse pedigree purchased from CFA in December. The person who purchased the reverse pedigree did not own the cat.

Based on today's privacy issues, the complaint we received, and that a reverse pedigree on a cat shows breeding activity, I recommend we stop providing reverse pedigrees to non-owners and issue a reverse pedigree to only the owner of a cat, or with permission from the owner.

Tartaglia: Reverse pedigrees. When we first made reverse pedigrees available, which was many years ago, they were issued only to the owner of the cat, because they do show breeding activity. At some point later, prior to 2006, the policy changed to provide those pedigrees to anyone paying for the report. A reverse pedigree provides three generations of progeny for a cat, for those of you who aren't familiar. Some reverse pedigrees are short, and some are quite extensive. Information from reverse pedigrees has been used to populate pedigree databases maintained by individuals. We were contacted in February by someone who was quite upset since he hadn't released the information to anyone. We did a little research and realized that the information was obtained from a reverse pedigree purchased from CFA in December. The person who purchased the reverse pedigree did not own the cat. Based on today's privacy issues, the complaint we received, and that a reverse pedigree on a cat shows breeding activity, we would like to stop providing reverse pedigrees to non-owners and issue a reverse pedigree to only the owner of a cat, or with permission from the owner. I don't know if you want to wait until the action items at the end, or if you want to do them after each topic. **Hannon:** Let's do it after each.

Cattery Name Reissuance: *At the February 2020 board meeting, a policy was passed to reissue a CFA registered cattery name if it had been expired for 20 or more years and zero (0) litters were registered.*

Not long after the board meeting, I became aware of the following parameters to reissue an expired cattery name adopted by the Board at the October 1999 meeting:

- *Immediately if no litters are registered.*
- *After one year from the birth of the last litter if no individual kittens are registered.*
- *After five years from the birth of the last litter if no individual kittens/cats are titled.*

Statistics are not available for the number of cattery names reissued under this policy. This is a much more liberal policy than what was recently passed and perhaps something in the middle of these two could be adopted, effective immediately, once a cattery name has expired:

- *Immediately after expiration date if no litters have been registered*
- *After five years from the birth of the last litter if no individual kittens have been registered for any litters.*

Hannon: Allene, back to you. **Tartaglia:** Cattery name reissuances. You probably recall that at the recent board meeting, we passed a policy to reissue a CFA-registered cattery name if it had been expired for 20 or more years and zero litters were registered. As luck would have it, not long after the board meeting, I became aware of the following that was passed at the October 1999 meeting, as far as reissuing cattery names. It's quite liberal and it said: [see above]. I don't have any statistics on how many cattery names were reissued under that policy. As I mentioned that policy from 1999 is quite liberal, compared to what we passed in February. So, I would ask the board to consider something in the middle, and what I'm offering is that we consider issuing a cattery name [see above].

Board Action Items

1. *Endorse a policy to issue a reverse pedigree to only the owner of a cat or with permission from the owner. If the owner is deceased, a reverse pedigree can be issued to a non-owner submitting appropriate documentation of the owner's death.*

Hannon: I need a motion. **Eigenhauser:** I'll go ahead and make the motion.

Krzanowski: I'll second. **Hannon:** Discussion? **Krzanowski:** I think it makes a lot of sense, especially with the privacy issues today and I don't see any problem with endorsing this policy. I think it's something we should go with. **Newkirk:** So, who owns the information on the cats?

Does CFA own that? That's the question, does CFA own that information or the person who –

Tartaglia: I would say CFA owns the information, just like we own all registration information, certified pedigrees, cattery reports. I think it is really CFA's property. That's what we're about.

Hannon: How can you say that, though? If we get a pedigree for a cat that is registered by pedigree from other associations, that other association should own that information, not us.

Tartaglia: That's true. **Newkirk:** When we get a pedigree from another organization, they do own that information, but they are lending it to us so that we can register a cat and that's just proving the ancestry of that animal. We don't put all that stuff in our database. We just use it to

verify that it meets the criteria for that individual cat being registered in our organization. I sort of have a problem with this. I think it comes down to who owns the information. We track the lineage of our cats, and that's CFA's information. If we choose to sell that to someone and make a profit on it, that's part of our business model. I understand the guy is upset, but maybe we should put a disclaimer that when you register a cat, the information belongs to CFA.

Eigenhauser: This isn't just about information, though. CFA has my name in their database, too. That doesn't mean they own my name. The problem we have here is, the exact presentation of the information may be subject to CFA ownership, but the individual if they can be identified in any way from the information has a right to privacy under both American law and some of the states like California, and under European law. We can't give out information on the person, even though we may own that particular bit of information because that person still has a right to privacy. They overlap considerably, but they are not the same thing. A person's right to privacy is affected by the information we give out that can be identified to them. Once somebody knows who the owner of a cat is, and they can do a reverse pedigree, then they can get a handle on how often that person breeds. You get enough information, and pretty soon it becomes a weapon. That's why I think we need to be careful about not just who owns the data, but who is affected by release of the data. I think under GDP law this is problematic, at the very least. **Hannon:** By releasing the information, we could be harming somebody that's registering with us. **Randolph:** George is correct on GDPR. You can't release any personally identifying information and we've got some other laws in the United States that talk about that, too. The best policy is not to release any personally identify information about the owners, and I don't know how this is released but if you are sticking with the cats only, that's one thing, but to the extent they could be tied to an owner or individual, that's the problem. **Newkirk:** Maybe Allene can tell us exactly what information is being provided on this purchased information. **Tartaglia:** I don't recall offhand. It's been a long time since I've seen one. There was the cat's registration number, the cat's name and title. It may have the owner, but I couldn't swear to it. **Simbro:** There's no individual owner information on the progeny. The only information is for the cat that it's actually being run against, so if you want to know how many kittens a certain dam has produced, we will give the owner information of that dam. However, because nearly everybody that breeds seriously has a cattery name attached to their cat's name, it's not a far step to determine ownership, based on the cattery name associated with the cat. **Morgan:** It seems to me that with the sensitivity we have with privacy issues, etc., and the fact that Allene is including in here that we can certainly issue one of these with owner permission, then it would be prudent to err on the side of caution and support their request. **Hannon:** Does anybody else have anything to say? OK, let's vote. All those in favor of the motion as Allene presented it, only providing information to the owner or with the owner's approval.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Newkirk voting no.

2. *Endorse a policy to reissue a CFA registered cattery name that has expired:*

- (a) *~~Immediately~~ After a one-year grace period-after expiration date if no litters have been registered.*
- (b) *After five years from the birth of the last litter if no individual kittens have been registered for any litters.*

Hannon: Does somebody want to make a motion? **Black:** I'll make the motion.
Krzanowski: Carol will second. **Black:** I have a question. Allene, remind me what is the expiration date for a cattery registration. Is it five years or is it one year? **Tartaglia:** Five years.
Black: Ten years? **Tartaglia:** It's five years. **Black:** OK, thank you.

Eigenhauser: I just want to make a comment. I have not been happy with the way CFA notifies people that their cattery name expires. I have mentioned to you guys before, my cattery expired earlier this year and I found out when I went to register a litter. I got no previous notice of it. The last time our cattery expired five years earlier, we didn't get a notice either. Mary found out when she went to register a litter and it got kicked, so I have a little trouble with *immediately after expiration date*. I would rather have some short grace period – 60, 90 days or something, because I'm not really thrilled with how well people are being made aware of their expiration dates. **Hannon:** Allene, do you want to respond to George's comment? **Tartaglia:** Yes. The notification of expired cattery names has been an issue and it has been corrected, although fairly recently. However, I certainly see George's point and perhaps we could go with a year after expiration if no litters have been registered. Remember, this is if no litters have been registered. I think in most instances there have been litters registered, a cattery name is expired, and the breeder becomes aware of it when an individual kitten is registered from that litter.
Eigenhauser: I would be happy with a one-year grace period. **Hannon:** Kathy, you made the motion? **Black:** Yes. I will amend the motion, with the right to vote no. **Hannon:** Kathy, what's the current motion then, as amended? **Black:** There's two parts to it, that after a one year grace period if no litters have been registered and the cattery has expired, that name will be available; and five years from the birth of the last litter if no individual kittens have been registered for any litters, that cattery name will then be available. **Hannon:** Any other comments before we call for the vote? **Calhoun:** I just have a question. With this new process of informing folks that their cattery has expired or is about to expire, are we also providing information how they can make their cattery name permanent? **Tartaglia:** I believe we are, but I will double check when I get to the office tomorrow, to make sure that we are with the renewal notices. I am pretty certain we do. **Calhoun:** OK thank you. **Hannon:** Any more comments or questions? **Black:** I just want to make a comment. I understand what George was saying about, it would be quite alarming if you go to register a cat and your cattery is no longer active, but the way this was written originally, these people had not registered a single litter in five years, so I don't think they would be – chances are they wouldn't be all of a sudden breeding cats after five years had passed.
Eigenhauser: I showed in premiership for a number of years under the Eigencats cattery name without ever breeding a single litter. **Hannon:** OK, let's go ahead and vote on this. All those in favor of the motion, as amended.

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

Credentials Committee/Tellers Appointment: *ballots are scheduled to be counted and results announced via a live feed on the CFA Facebook page on Friday, June 19, 2020. Eight individuals who have regularly served as Credentials Committee members and Tellers are proposed by Nancy Dodds for appointment (list below). The ballot counting is scheduled to take place in Alliance, Ohio at the CFA offices in the museum due to more space availability. A concern regarding individuals planning to drive long distances or fly during the COVID-19 pandemic and aftermath has been shared with Nancy.*

Nancy Dodds (Arizona), Chair – Driving
Marilyn Conde (Massachusetts), Region 1 – Driving
Erin Cutchen (Utah), Region 2 – Flying
Cheryl Peck (Colorado), Region 3 – Driving
Barb Schreck (Michigan), Region 4 – Driving
Hilary Helmrich (Arizona), Region 5 – Driving (with Nancy)
Nancy Petersen (Iowa), Region 6 – Driving
Donna Andrews (Georgia), Region 7 – Flying

Board Action Items

Endorse a policy to issue a reverse pedigree to only the owner of a cat or with permission from the owner. If the owner is deceased, a reverse pedigree can be issued to a non-owner submitting appropriate documentation of the owner's death.

Endorse a policy to reissue a CFA registered cattery name that has expired – 1) Immediately after expiration date if no litters have been registered, or 2) After five years from the birth of the last litter if no individual kittens have been registered for any litters.

Appoint Credentials Committee members/Tellers to count the 2020 Officer and Regional Director ballots.

Tartaglia: The Credentials Committee. I had included something in my report, a very brief statement covering just the basics about the Credentials Committee appointments. Nancy Dodds followed up with a lengthy memo to the board that I believe Rachel sent out this morning. I don't know if everybody had a chance to read that, but the original idea was, due to all the travel restrictions, that it would be sufficient to have a much smaller group of people come to the office to count ballots under the supervision of Nancy Dodds. **Hannon:** Wasn't that local people? **Tartaglia:** Yes, people within a reasonable driving distance of the Central Office. As it turned out, Nancy sent a request to all of her members from past years, and eight individuals – one from each region – volunteered to drive or fly. Some are driving rather lengthy distances, as I had outlined. Nancy Dodds and Hilary Helmrich are driving from Arizona. They are dropping a kitten off in Indiana. Cheryl Peck from Colorado is driving, Nancy Petersen from Iowa. So, there's a concern with all that's going on that it's just too large a group of people to gather to count the ballots. It just is probably not necessary this year. So, I wanted the board to discuss how they think this should happen. It's really up to the board to make this decision, not Nancy Dodds. At least, that's my understanding. **Hannon:** What typically happens is, Nancy provides us with a list of names of who she is going to have on her committee that year, and the board approves or not. I know that in the past we have objected to an individual, but not to the whole group that she is suggesting. My understanding was, she had initially agreed to within the local area and then she changed it, much to our surprise, to include a larger group of people. **Newkirk:** That's not correct. She knew nothing about the four people. **Hannon:** Allene, do you want to address that? **Newkirk:** She told me that. **Hannon:** She told me otherwise. **Tartaglia:** Nancy and I had discussions. I don't remember if a specific number was mentioned, but we did talk about people that are local within the Central Office location. In looking at the members of the Committee from prior years, that didn't amount to too many people. It was only a matter of a couple of people who were within a 3-4 hour driving distance. The driving distance to the

Central Office within a couple hours was the driving reason for the number. I may not have said four, I don't remember. **Hannon:** But you recall that it was local? You were not discussing with her people driving across country. **Tartaglia:** No, not at all. Or flying.

Calhoun: Given the horrible concerns that we have with COVID-19, I think to have that number of people consent to drive or to fly, and to risk their health to do this – whether they are willing to risk their health or not to come all the way to Alliance, Ohio, and then to be in a room where social distancing will be difficult at best to do this, is something that we should not do. I just think that the problems that these people may face are huge, and there are other alternatives. I know it's a great honor to be part of the Credentials Committee. No doubt, but the number of votes that are reviewed are small. Most of the ballots come in electronically, so handling the paper is less and less every year, every time we do this. Necessity is the mother of invention. I think we also had some concerns where people would have to sign some sort of waiver that would not hold CFA accountable or liable if they became sick. This is something that I just don't think in good conscience we should do. **Anger:** I agree with Kathy. In the present circumstances, we don't want to do anything to encourage our exhibitors to be out and about, i.e., holding shows and events, so why would we condone and encourage these people to travel across the country in the service of CFA? I think it is extremely noble that they are so willing to do this. It's very touching. Historically, this Committee has been very important to CFA, but the demand this year for counting ballots and a possible hand count of the delegates is not going to be there. I think we have viable alternatives that won't put anyone at risk. Much as we would love to have a world where we could take these volunteers up on it, I certainly would not want to be a part of putting anyone on this list in any kind of danger. These people are all friends and people I care about, so I cannot support going forward with this list. Thank you.

Eigenhauser: I want to mention two things. First, it isn't just the physical number of people she wants involved, it's the distance we're having them travel. Assuming that the country does start to back off on the social distancing over the next couple of months, we are still faced with the probability that there are going to be areas where the virus is still active and where there are still restrictions. Some of these people are going to be crossing multiple state lines, countless counties and God knows how many cities, each of which may have their own particular rules in place for traveling. So, even if hypothetically Ohio lifts its travel restriction and allows people to come in from out of state without a quarantine, who knows what jurisdictions they are going to have to cross to get there, how many possible types of exposure there might be, and how many people they are going to place at risk? As great as these people may be, to be willing to travel during a pandemic to count ballots, they are putting other people at risk, too – everyone they come in contact with along the route, everyone they meet with once they get here, and everyone they come in contact with when they go back are all going to be at risk. We need to set the example. We need to set the standard that human life comes first, that the safety of our people comes first, and that's what we should be focused on. The second point I want to make is that Credentials is going to have a fairly light load this time. Typically, Credentials also deals with delegate issues at the annual, and those can involve a considerable amount of time, too. In this instance, all we're asking the people to do is count ballots, many of which will have arrived electronically anyway and can be counted fairly easily, so the work load is going to be much lower than the Credentials Committee would normally have. So, they should be able to operate with a much smaller crew, but more importantly they should be able to operate with a crew that's not going to be cross-pollinating coronavirus with different parts of the country from areas that

may have low incidents to high incidents and back again as they drive across the United States.

Krzanowski: I agree wholeheartedly with everything that has been said so far. While I have the greatest respect for the Credentials Committee and their willingness to go to the extra extreme to fulfill their duties, I just think it would be irresponsible of CFA as an association to encourage this type of thing. Even if the situation with the coronavirus does start to let up somewhat, there are still going to be various hot spots across the country. As we're seeing now, it's kind of moving around. It started in certain major metropolitan areas and now it has spread to other areas. I think it's going to continue for some time, and to have these people risk their health and the health of others in trying to come to Ohio to do this type of work just seems irresponsible if we would permit such a thing.

Krzanowski: There are alternatives. I don't know if anyone has considered possibly having an outside accounting firm count the ballots. Maybe if there are any ballots that are in question, Nancy could get those electronically for review, but we need to find another way to do this. I'm just not comfortable with having all these people travel such a great distance and be together in a confined space. There is no way to count ballots as a group like this and have social distancing at the same time. I'm opposed to this. **Hannon:** I want to point out that Allene did discuss with Nancy Dodds having a local accounting firm count the ballots, and Nancy rejected that. She came back with, she wanted cat fanciers involved in it.

Newkirk: This is the way I look at this. This is April the 14th. Those ballots are going to be counted I think on the 19th of June, which is two months away. Right now, the quarantine coming into Ohio expires on June 1. We don't know what's going on. I watch the reports every day on this, what's going on, and where most of these hot spots occur is flattening. New York is getting a lot better. California, Washington, is in great shape. These people are willing to come here. Now, Nancy had said in her letter that she is willing to do the alternative of having local people count the ballots, should the June 1st ban on traveling into Ohio is extended past that date, so I don't understand why we can't go along with what the Credentials Committee wants, as long as there is an alternate plan to put in place if the situation with COVID-19 does not improve. Then, I have a question for all you who don't want anybody coming. Are we going to ban Nancy and Hilary from coming? The other point I would like to make is, it doesn't matter who goes in and counts the ballots. You are not going to be able to social distance, because you are sitting there two people looking at it and the third person observing to make sure that nobody is cheating. So, there's no way to have social distancing. So, it's going to be local people that are going to be next to one another or it's going to be these people from other areas that many of them are driving in by themselves and will be exposed to nobody. **P. Moser:** Darrell said pretty much what I was going to say.

Roy: I'm just wondering, based on [inaudible] although it probably will pass to just have local people. Would it be a problem to wait until next month and vote on it, when we know more about what's happening? **Hannon:** Part of the problem is, if it's the group that Nancy suggested, they want to make their flight arrangements. **Roy:** That's true. **Hannon:** Right now, there are real good air fares, you know? **Roy:** There sure are. **Hannon:** In a month, it might be a different situation.

Black: Mark, can someone restate the motion? So, is the motion that Central Office will arrange local people to do the voting, or is the motion for – **Hannon:** I think the motion is to accept or reject, as a first step, Nancy's recommendation, which is one person from each region. **Eigenhauser:** I don't believe anybody has made a motion yet. **Hannon:** Kathy, do you want to make the motion? **Black:** I'll let George. **Newkirk:** I'll make the motion. **Anger:** Would you state your motion please? **Hannon:** To go with Nancy's recommendation. Is that your motion? **Newkirk:** Yeah, of course. That's what we have been debating. **Anger:** I just want to get the motion right. **P. Moser:** I'll second. **Hannon:** Is there any more discussion before I call the vote? The motion is to accept Nancy Dodds' list of Credentials Committee members – one from each region plus herself.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Newkirk, P. Moser and B. Moser voting yes.

Hannon: Now what? Does somebody want to make another motion? **Roy:** I make a motion that we use local people within a two-hour drive of Alliance, Ohio. **Eigenhauser:** And how many people? **Hannon:** Do you want to put a number in there of how many local people? **Roy:** Allene suggested four. Is that correct, Allene? **Hannon:** The problem with that is, the way Nancy has it set up, is that three people are involved in counting a particular set of ballots, so you're either going to have a person sitting out or you are going to have to have some other people participating, if you are going to have two teams of three. **Eigenhauser:** We can have Central Office staff supplement. **Roy:** Let me amend my motion to say six local people. **Black:** I think if we're getting up to six, we're getting close to what the original amount of people was going to be. I would rather just see three people with Nancy supervising, if she wants to supervise. **Calhoun:** Is there a second on this? **Anger:** Not yet. **Hannon:** Who seconded, for the record? **Anger:** We don't have a second yet. **Hannon:** Let's have a second. **Newkirk:** I'll second it. **Hannon:** Thank you Darrell.

Auth: Did Nancy share with anyone why she objected to an accounting firm? **Hannon:** She had the conversation with Allene. **Tartaglia:** She didn't really give us specifics, she just felt that it has historically been the Credentials Committee, and people have faith and trust in what they do. She just felt it should stay within the cat fancy. **Auth:** Then my comment would be, we should abandon any historical thinking because we're not in the same world that we have been in, in the past. If people can't trust an accounting firm, that's one of their roles is to be a non-biased counter. **Calhoun:** I completely agree with Mary Auth. **Hannon:** Kathy Black, do you have that written down? [laughter] **Black:** I wrote that down. **Calhoun:** The problem remains the same. The social distancing remains the same. The travel remains lessened, but it's the same risk. People are saying *STAY AT HOME*. We have people of a certain age group that we're asking to participate in counting somewhat north of 100 pieces of paper and taking their lives in their own hands to do it. I understand that this is important and has history, but as Mary said, times are different. I know that we've gotten pricing on having a third party do this. Can we talk about that? **Hannon:** Allene, what was the price? **Tartaglia:** About \$750. **Hannon:** Keep in mind, we're talking about more than just counting ballots. We're also talking about the eligibility of these clubs to vote. The date may have been passed or they may not meet the criteria for other reasons to cast a ballot, so we would be asking an independent audit firm to also look at that. I am assuming that is one of Nancy's concerns in turning it over to an accounting firm. **Eigenhauser:** If there's a problem with the acceptance of any ballot, the entire Credentials Committee could teleconference about it without requiring their physical presence. If it arrived in

Central Office on a particular date, then Central Office can say, "it arrived on this date." The Credentials Committee can still make the ruling and assist the accounting firm in that way, if necessary, but I like the idea of the accounting firm doing it because the reason we have them count in threes when we have fanciers do it is to avoid any bias. It provides checks and balances. Everybody has got a team of three so no one person is going to put their thumb on the scale. The accounting firm doesn't give a damn one way or the other. They don't have to count in threes. They can do social distancing. They can have one person count through it, and if we want a recount, have a second person at the office do it without even being in the same room together. It solves a lot of problems and it seems like an awfully reasonable price. **Hannon:** Anybody else? The motion we have on the floor, as I understand it, is for cat fanciers. So, if you don't want local cat fanciers, vote against this and then we'll bring up an accounting firm. **Eigenhauser:** The motion was also for six people, wasn't it? **Roy:** I was going to change it if need be, but I'll withdraw the motion if we want to do the other one first. We'll see if that passes.

Hannon: Does somebody want to make a motion for the outside accounting firm?
Calhoun: Kathy will make the motion. **Hannon:** Alright, Kathy, you are making the motion.
Krzanowski: Carol seconds. **Hannon:** Discussion on the motion to have an accounting firm handle the tabulation of the ballots and verification. Any discussion on that? **Newkirk:** I would agree to it on one condition; and that is, that after the ballots are counted, the ballots are sent to Nancy so she can review to confirm the count. **Black:** I like the idea that a number of the Credentials Committee could easily be on a Zoom teleconference or something similar to that if there were questions that came up. Normally, there's always a motion at the annual to destroy the ballots. I like Darrell's suggestion, for those to be sent to the Credentials chairperson. If she wants to be in Ohio, she can count them there after the accounting firm is done with them, just to have a second set of eyes look at them. **Hannon:** Any other comments before I call for the vote? All those in favor of having an accounting firm handle it.

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

Newkirk: And we're putting in the inclusion that those ballots will be sent to Nancy after the accounting firm has completed their assessment. **Hannon:** Yes. Allene, you will take care of that? **Calhoun:** And then, how are they destroyed? **Newkirk:** I don't care how she destroys them, but I think Nancy needs to look at the ballots. **Hannon:** After she gets them Darrell, would it be your plan that Nancy destroys them? **Newkirk:** Yes. **Hannon:** Do we all agree to that? There's no objection to that? OK, so Allene, you'll take care of, once they have been counted you will get them to Nancy?

Hannon: Now, when do we want to announce the results? **Black:** That was my question. **Hannon:** There's no reason why the accounting firm has to count them on the Friday of what would have been the annual. We can have them count them earlier and then send them to Nancy. When Nancy has agreed with the count, we can release the count? **Newkirk:** I'm fine with that. **Hannon:** That Friday? **P. Moser:** Yeah. **Hannon:** So Allene, you will overnight to Nancy, once the accounting firm is through with them? **Tartaglia:** Yes, I will. **Hannon:** Last year, Allene told us that 80% of the ballots came online, so we will assume that it's going to be at least 80% this year. A very high percentage of these are not going to be paper ballots. **Tartaglia:** We still print them out. We print them out for actual counting. **Hannon:** Right, we'll print them out, but she's not going to have an envelope to check on the postmark and hand it around to everybody

like she has done in the past. **Tartaglia:** Just for clarification, the Central Office is typically the one who brings issues to the attention of the Credentials Committee. So, if something is received late, we bring it to their attention. We would be able to go over all of those items with Nancy in advance of delivering anything to the accounting firm. **Hannon:** Nancy may want to be there the day the accounting firm handles this. She may want to review it on site, so we don't have to send it to her. We can leave that up to Nancy, right? If Nancy wants to commute to Alliance, Ohio and review them in person there, rather than shipping them to her in Arizona. We'll give her that option. **Anger:** I still oppose that. It's hypocritical and defeating the purpose. If we bring one person in or eight people in, it's still going against the basic principle of why we are doing all this. I think Nancy can do it just as easily from her home, rather than risk her life. **Hannon:** OK. **Calhoun:** I agree. **Eigenhauser:** I agree. **Hannon:** Alright, so we will not give Nancy that option. You'll make that clear to her, Allene, that you will send the ballots to her after the accounting firm is through with them and she can verify whatever she needs to verify, whether eligibility or numbers or whatever.

Hannon: Do you have anything else, Allene? **Tartaglia:** I just have a question on how we release the information. Do you want to do some sort of live feed on the CFA Facebook page? I'm not sure that Nancy can do that from her home, but how do we want to publicize the results? **Hannon:** Once Nancy has the ballots, we'll give her 24 hours to review them and she can provide you with the actual numbers, and if she agrees or disagrees, and we'll have a CFA News announcement sent out right away. The three people who have the ability send out CFA News announcements are Kathy Black, myself and Teresa. Kathy Black and I are involved in this election, so my proposal will be that Teresa Keiger would send it out. **Auth:** Would there be any way possible that the people who are running opposed could get a phone call first, just so that maybe the world finds out about it and I'm in a meeting somewhere and I don't know about it? **Hannon:** Do we have any objection to, once Nancy has verified the numbers, for Allene notifying the parties that are involved in a contested election? **Eigenhauser:** But only as to their election. **Auth:** That's correct. Yes, George. **Hannon:** OK, so Allene, you will take care of that? **Tartaglia:** Yes.

Tartaglia: Let me make sure I have it all right. We're going to hire an accounting firm to count the ballots. Once they are done with that, then I will take the ballots, we'll send them to Nancy via overnight, give her 24 hours or maybe 48 hours to verify the count, and then she will provide me with the information. I'll call the parties in contested positions with the news, the result of just their particular election, and then the information will be provided to Teresa Keiger to post to CFA News. Do I have that right? **Hannon:** Yes, but I have one concern. What happens if Nancy disagrees with the accounting firm and it changes the result of a contested election? We've had elections that were won by one vote in the past. What if Nancy says, "no, that's not true, I found that it's the other party that won"? **Mastin:** Allene, what you might have to do is make copies of all the documents that are being sent to Nancy, because if she finds a discrepancy, she can review it with the accounting firm. **Black:** I was just going to as Allene, and maybe you can answer it too, Mark. How has that been handled in the past when there is a discrepancy? **Tartaglia:** They do a recount. **Hannon:** Whenever there is a real close election, they keep counting over and over, more than just the normal, to verify that indeed this person won by a hair. **Black:** I would say, if there was a discrepancy, then we have to go back to the accounting firm and ask them. **Hannon:** That's why she was asked to make a copy, so she can take the copy back to the accounting firm. **Tartaglia:** What we could do is, when we take the

ballots to the accounting firm, if the board would like, the accounting firm will do their count. At the same time as they are done with the ballots, I could do a count. If we match, then that's certainly good and then we could send them to Nancy. It would just be a verification of what the accounting firm is doing. It's just something to offer. It may help or may not. It's up to you.

Hannon: I don't think it's going to matter because we're still going to send them to Nancy, and Nancy may still find what she thinks is a discrepancy and then she is going to have to work it out with the accounting firm. **Tartaglia:** OK. We can make copies of everything that we send to Nancy. We don't have to take copies of the electronic ballots, because we can print them off again but any hard copy ballots, we'll make copies before sending to Nancy. **Hannon:** OK.

Cancelled Show Reimbursement Procedure Draft Letter to Affected Shows/Clubs

Dear Show/Club Secretary:

We are all faced with an extremely challenging period as we respond to the Coronavirus Pandemic. The CFA Board of Directors voted to assist clubs in attempting to recover expenses incurred for cancelled shows due to the Coronavirus-19 situation. Please refer to the information below:

Automatically Refunded/Retained Funds

- *Clubs which requested and received pre-show sponsorship funds (\$500) may retain these funds.*
- *The show license and insurance (\$200) paid for a show that has been cancelled due to coronavirus will be refunded to the club.*

Requests for Reimbursable Item

- *Advertising expense paid prior to the show is eligible for reimbursement. Maximum total reimbursement is \$1,000. Proof of payment and copy of the ad required if ad already ran. If the ad was paid but did not run, please provide evidence that an attempt was made to claim a refund or future credit.*
- *Entry clerk fees are eligible for reimbursement for entries processed prior to March 16, 2020.*
- *The cost of show catalogs for shows cancelled by either local government or CFA due to COVID-19 are eligible for reimbursement. Proof of payment required.*
- *Show hall or event deposits or payments will **not** be reimbursed by CFA. However, upon request, CFA will offer a review of any contract between a CFA Club and the show hall contracted. John Randolph and Rich Mastin have volunteered to provide guidance to a club as to how they should pursue financial relief from their contracted venue. Neither Rich nor John will negotiate with the venue. They are available only for advice to a CFA member club. Contracts are essential for evaluation. Review is not considered a guarantee of favorable results or reimbursement by CFA.*

- *Down payments to third party catering (not supplied by the venue) are eligible for reimbursement consideration or negotiation. Proof of payment and receipt required.*
- *Items that do not fall into these approved categories or exceed authorized amounts will be elevated to the CFA Finance Committee for a final determination.*

Process to Request Reimbursement

Provide the following information in English, along with evidence that an attempt was made to claim a refund or future credit:

Club name:

Show date:

Club/show contact name and address:

Club/show contact email address:

Total amount of reimbursement requested (in U.S. funds):

List detailed expense type (advertising, entry clerk fee, show catalog printing, catering) and amount of each:

*Respectfully Submitted,
Allene Tartaglia*

Hannon: Anything else you have, Allene, before we move to the next item on the agenda? **Tartaglia:** There was just, for information only, the reimbursement policy that we're sending out to the clubs. I don't know if we need to go over that. **Hannon:** Does anybody have any questions on that? You should have it in front of you. **Schleissner:** The question is, I have got an email from the Ukraine club and they had a very detailed list of their money they have already spent on this show which was cancelled the week before. So, does this go to the item that means all others because it's more than \$1,000 on advertising? **Hannon:** What we decided is that we would handle a case-by-case basis for those who felt that they wanted an exception made. **Anger:** I'm just confirming that. Michael, I have been copying you in on all my correspondence with the club. We have had 4 or 5 email exchanges back and forth, under which this has already been taken care of, so I am concerned you're not getting those emails. **Schleissner:** I haven't got them up to now, so I'm sorry. **Hannon:** Under the Coronavirus Response Team we will discuss who is going to be approving the case-by-case issues. **Tartaglia:** Just to let you know, we will be contacting each club or show that was cancelled with this information, so they know the procedure to follow, to seek reimbursement. **Hannon:** OK.

(4) **CORONAVIRUS RESPONSE TEAM UPDATE.**

List of Team Members: Mark Hannon, Rich Mastin, Kathy Calhoun, Rachel Anger, Allene Tartaglia, Sharon Roy, Melanie Morgan, George Eigenhauser

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Team Activities:

The team has conducted five meetings all of which have had transcripts prepared and presented to the CFA Board.

Current Happenings of the Team:

Currently the CFA Board has suspended licensing CFA shows through May 31, 2020. Based on volatility of the coronavirus pandemic the Board should consider extension.

Motion: *Due to the global coronavirus pandemic, effective immediately CFA will extend the current moratorium on issuing show licenses for any show, regardless of show date or location to June 30, 2020. This motion may be revisited, ended early, extended or subject to individual case-by-case exceptions. Once the moratorium is lifted and show license applications are once again accepted, shows within the late fee window will not accrue a late fee.*

Hannon: Let's move on to the Coronavirus Response Team. Kathy? **Calhoun:** The report is relatively concise. There is a motion to extend the moratorium on licensing shows. It currently is May 31, 2020, and the motion is to extend it to June 30, 2020. This is in regard to licensing. **Eigenhauser:** Second. **Hannon:** The motion is to continue the ban on shows for another month. **Eigenhauser:** The ban on licensing shows. **Calhoun:** On licensing shows. I think there's going to be a different motion. **Hannon:** If you're going to not license shows until the end of June, obviously you're not going to hold shows until the end of June. **Eigenhauser:** Not necessarily so. There are shows already licensed in June. **Hannon:** Oh, you're right, you're right. For licensing. Kathy made a motion and George seconded it. Let's have discussion on licensing of the shows. Any comments or questions?

Black: I was just going to make the same comment that George did. There are shows that were licensed through that date. I think most of them have cancelled at this point in time. I don't know for a fact. Allene would have to answer if there are any that she knows of that are not cancelled yet. I think this helps the clubs that may have been holding on, trying to get out of deals, because a lot of the contracts we had, if you told them our organization will no longer allow us to put on our event, that would give them an easier way out of their contract than just saying, we don't think it's going to be able to get everybody here, so I'm in favor of this.

Hannon: Alright, so we're going to take this in two steps. The first step is to say we're not going to license any shows through the end of June. Then, there will be another motion about shows that are already licensed in the month of June. For right now, we're just talking about licensing additional shows. Any other comments on the motion before us? **Curle:** I've already gotten a letter from Rachel stating about the licensing of further CFA shows. It was effective in regaining our initial \$1,000 down payment. We had already cancelled the show, but they wanted some documentation from CFA. I think the second motion that we vote on will create even more

strength for any other region that needs to cancel a show. **Hannon:** All those in favor of the motion.

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

Hannon: Now, there's another motion, Kathy? **Calhoun:** George, do you want to make the next motion? **Eigenhauser:** Sure. I'll move that we cancel all CFA shows through June 30, 2020. **Krzanowski:** Second. **Hannon:** Any discussion on actually holding shows in June? **Auth:** I used the card of, our organization is not allowing us to have shows when I was negotiating our contract for our regional show that was supposed to be held on June 6th. Their attitude was, too bad, it's your organization's decision. You still have to pay the penalty. What we ended up doing was just holding over the contract until next year. That's the only way I could get out of the contract. **P. Moser:** I did not think that CFA should be cancelling any more shows. The reason why is, that starts holding us liable for all this and making all these payments back to the clubs. I think that most people are reasonable and realize and should be able to understand that they need to cancel these on their own accord. By us doing this, it's just going to put us financially bound to all this stuff all the time. I mean, if people want to go to a show, then my goodness, are they that crazy? I don't think that we should be cancelling shows. I think it's up to the clubs. I know that we have said many times that we do not dictate to the clubs. We are dictating to the clubs. I know George has told me many times; we don't do stuff on clubs' business. We don't do this with the clubs. **Calhoun:** I agree with Pam Moser. When we did this back in March, everything went nuts that week before. Sports teams started to cancel. It was just crazy. We didn't want to put our people at risk and we still don't, as we have just proven. But, at this point in time, folks have had some time to think about what they need to do. Local governments are making things available or not available, and I think at this point we need to step back and let folks make their own decisions. **Eigenhauser:** By extension of that logic, you should have voted no on the last motion. The previous motion said you can't license a show in July, August, September, October during the month of June because we don't want to put our people out there and put them at risk until we know – **Calhoun:** Also, we don't have any financial risk. The licensing also restricts the financial risk. That's the difference. **Eigenhauser:** Our financial risk doesn't mean as much to me as the health and safety of our people. **Calhoun:** I didn't say that it did, but that was my logic. **Mastin:** I agree with Pam Moser and Kathy on this one. It's my understanding there may have been 8 shows scheduled for the month of June. Five have already cancelled, three have not, one might be, which may only leave two shows that could possibly cancel on their own. I think we can do a little wait and see on this one and see if the state and local authorities are going to force the clubs and/or the events to cancel. My sense is that's what's going to happen. Let's not let CFA make that decision to cancel them, let the authorities and the events cancel so we don't have the liability, nor does the club. By doing the opposite, Pam is right. If we force the clubs to cancel now without any mandates or restrictions, the clubs are held responsible and then potentially so is CFA. We likely will be. **Eigenhauser:** What happens if the two remaining shows happen to be in areas where local government allows the shows to go forward, but we can't get exhibitors from other areas because they are still in quarantine, we can't get judges from other areas because they're still in quarantine. Is it fair? We got in a lot of trouble for the way we shut down the show season and let one show go forward when everybody else was cancelled. Now, you're saying we should let two shows go forward when everybody else has cancelled. That's going to create a great inequity for people that live outside of those particular areas, if those shows did happen to be allowed to go forward. I think it's better for everybody

and for planning for us to just say no. **Mastin:** George, I think what we can do is, this is April 14th. We can hold out probably for another four weeks if we don't hear anything and then cancel well in advance of those two shows. Doing it now, I think we run the risk of making the clubs liable for this. So, I'm very comfortable holding off on this and not forcing the clubs to cancel for June yet. **P. Moser:** These people are adults. My goodness, you would think that they would have some sense if there's still issues that they're going to cancel the show. Give them some credit here. I mean, we should not be taking the financial risk to cancel these shows. When things are back to normal, the shows are going to be lower because people are still going to be afraid. So, you know, I don't think CFA should continue to mandate to these clubs that they have to cancel. **Black:** I looked at the show schedule and it says four show still, but I think that a couple of them like what Rich said have cancelled. I have to side with George on this one. I mean, we caught a lot of flak over Crab and Mallet, and if there's two shows that happen and they're the only ones and nobody else can come in and license a show for June, we don't know what's going to happen, if things open up or not, but if we just have two shows in the month of June and people that couldn't travel couldn't get to those, (a) the clubs are going to suffer financially greatly and they won't be able to put on a profitable show, or (b), the people who couldn't get there will be upset, just like they were with Crab and Mallet. So, I don't mind holding off for another month like Rich said, but I also don't have a problem with us cancelling those shows at this point in time. **Roy:** One of those shows that's licensed is our regional show. We are already working on a contingency plan to take another date, so more than likely it won't be held.

Roy: My question is, if we change to this other date, can we just use the same show license and just adjust it in Central Office? **Hannon:** You're talking about taking over the date for Garden State in July, right? **Roy:** Correct. Garden State is worried that they just won't get a gate. Right now, their facility is being used as a hospital, so we asked about taking over that date but still having it in the [inaudible]. **Mastin:** I don't see a reason why we wouldn't want to transfer the show license to a different date. That's what we're doing with all the shows that are being cancelled. If your club cancels, they are going to receive a full refund. I think we all agreed to do a full refund, just to keep it clean and simple. **Hannon:** Rich, the problem is, we said we're not going to license any shows in June. If she cancels a June show, she cannot license a July show in June. **Mastin:** Mary, what did you do with your June date? You moved it out to a later date? **Auth:** We moved it out a whole year. **Mastin:** OK. **Roy:** That's my concern. What you passed is that, unless we could directly transfer that to July, we could not license a July show. **Mastin:** I understand. **Calhoun:** Well, you can but you can't license a July show until July 1. **Hannon:** Maybe. This is an evolving situation. We may vote that we're not going to license until the end of July. **Eigenhauser:** I believe our previous motion expressly delineated that we can make exceptions on a case-by-case basis, or at least that was the written motion.

Newkirk: Of these four shows that are on the show schedule, somebody said two of them were cancelled. Is that correct? **Hannon:** Rich said that. **Mastin:** Darrell, I think there was a total of, I thought it was closer to six or eight shows. A bunch of them already cancelled. There may be two or three shows that have not yet cancelled, but I heard somebody say there were four. **Newkirk:** There's four on the show schedule. I'm looking at it right now. **Colilla:** The Great Lakes Region cancelled theirs. **Hannon:** What are the four shows you are looking at, Darrell? **Newkirk:** I'm looking at Parkville, Maryland the 6th and 7th, and then Jacksonville, Florida the 13th and 14th, and the Columbus, Ohio the 13th and the 14th, and on the 27th Albany, New York. **Currle:** Jacksonville has been cancelled. **Colilla:** Columbus cancelled. **Hannon:**

Alright, and then Sharon, you are the Albany one, right? **Roy:** Correct. **Hannon:** So, the only one that's left is Colonial Annapolis in Maryland the first weekend in June. As far as we know, they are still planning to go forward, and within the last week or so they asked for sponsorship money. Is that correct, Rich? **Mastin:** Yes, and we passed the motion a week ago that we were not going to grant any sponsorship money during the no licensing of shows. **Hannon:** Right, but that tells me that as of a week or so ago, they were still planning to hold that show the first weekend of the month in Maryland. I heard from a judge today or yesterday that they were invited to judge the show and they have not been cancelled. Is that you, Kathy? **Calhoun:** I have not been cancelled. **Roy:** I have not been cancelled, either. **Hannon:** OK, so as far as we know, they have not told the judges that they are cancelling the show the first weekend of June in Maryland. The others have cancelled. They were regional shows. **Colilla:** I heard that there is no social gathering in Maryland until the middle of June. I don't know if that's true or not. **Hannon:** I don't know either. **Newkirk:** Somebody posted that on Facebook. **Eigenhauser:** I think that the one problematic show is at the beginning of June, rather than the end of June. That argues against us waiting too long in making a decision, because there will be judges buying tickets. There may be additional payments for various show expenses. The closer we get to the show, the more of a problem it is, and this show is the first weekend in June. **Calhoun:** I think this regional type of areas opening up and other areas not opening up is probably going to be a concern that we need to figure out how to handle. If anything happens like the governors are starting to talk about, there may be regions that open up, where other parts of the country are not opening up, so I think we need to wrap our heads around how we handle that overall. That being said, I think if we wait another two weeks, I get the feeling that, come the end of this month, a lot of things are going to happen that are in regard to May and June, and we might be able to make a different decision if we can hold off maybe just two weeks.

Hannon: Does the person who made the motion want to hold off two weeks, in which case you can just pull the motion? **Eigenhauser:** I would rather just vote on it now and if it fails, we can try again in two weeks. **Hannon:** OK. Let me call for the vote. All those in favor of the motion, which is to cancel shows in the month of June.

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

* * * * *

Hannon: Now, as part of Kathy's Coronavirus thing, we discussed that we would entertain requests for reimbursement from clubs on a case-by-cases basis if they felt they could justify more money than what we generally passed for everybody. We didn't decide who is going to make that determination. In the Coronavirus Committee, they suggested that it be the Finance Committee. Somebody want to make a motion and a second, and we can discuss whether that's what we want to do? **Roy:** I'll make the motion. **Eigenhauser:** George will second.

Hannon: Alright, so let's have a discussion. **Mastin:** The Finance Committee is prepared to review these requests. If we run into any stumbling blocks or it may be more than we can handle, we can bring it to the board for recommendation, but at this point in time I think we can handle it. **Hannon:** Any other discussion? I'm going to call for the vote.

Hannon called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Calhoun and Mastin abstained.

Hannon: Is that the end for Coronavirus, Kathy? **Calhoun:** Yes.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Kathy Calhoun*

(5) **TREASURER'S REPORT.**

CFA Treasurer: Kathy Calhoun

May 1, 2019 through February 29, 2020

CFA maintained strong financial performance through February 2020.

Key Financial Indicators

Balance Sheet Previous Year Comparison as of February 29, 2020

Cash assets have decreased 0.7% when compared to February 28, 2019. The Wells Fargo investment performed better than prior year primarily due to a rebalancing of investments within the portfolio. This change was driven by the Finance Committee – Rich Mastin, Chair.

Profit and Loss Analysis

Total registration, which includes litter registration and individual registration, delivered \$989,652.00 to the bottom line. This represents a 2.2% increase compared to the same time period last year.

| Category | May '19 - Feb '20 Actual | May '18 - Feb '19 Actual | \$ Change to Prior Fiscal Year |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>Litter Registrations</i> | <i>\$331,523.00</i> | <i>\$325,478.00</i> | <i>\$6,045.00</i> |
| <i>Individual Registrations</i> | <i>\$658,129.00</i> | <i>\$642,804.00</i> | <i>\$15,325.00</i> |
| <i>Total Registrations</i> | <i>\$989,652.00</i> | <i>\$968,282.00</i> | <i>\$21,370.00</i> |

Other key indicators:

- *New cattery registration increased 7.5%.*
- *Championship confirmation decreased 16.7%.*
- *Show License Fees decreased 14.3%.*
- *Show Entry Surcharge decreased 19.9%.*

Additional key performance indicators are captured in the following summary.

| Category | May '19 - Feb '20 Actual | May '18 - Feb '19 Actual | \$ Change to Prior Fiscal Year |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>HHP / CCW</i> | <i>\$4,307.00</i> | <i>\$5,980.00</i> | <i>(\$1,673.00)</i> |
| <i>Registrations, Cattery</i> | <i>\$276,625.00</i> | <i>\$257,338.00</i> | <i>\$19,287.00</i> |
| <i>Championship Confirmation</i> | <i>\$47,365.00</i> | <i>\$56,865.00</i> | <i>(\$9,500.00)</i> |
| <i>Breed Council Dues</i> | <i>\$26,865.00</i> | <i>\$28,215.00</i> | <i>(\$1,350.00)</i> |
| <i>Judging School Income</i> | <i>\$3,250.00</i> | <i>\$7,355.00</i> | <i>(\$4,105.00)</i> |

| | | | |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| Show License Fees | \$34,875.00 | \$40,675.00 | (\$5,800.00) |
| Show Entry Surcharge | \$57,096.38 | \$71,280.25 | (\$14,183.87) |
| Show Insurance | \$26,800.00 | \$29,460.00 | (\$2,660.00) |
| DNA Test | \$14,892.00 | \$11,577.00 | \$3,315.00 |

Total Ordinary Income delivered \$1,947,332.21 to the bottom line compared to \$1,964,400.06 the prior year.

This represents a 0.9% reduction in income which translated to a \$17,067.85 change.

Publications

Almanac (Cat Talk, Newsletters, and the White Pages)

Income: Almanac income is 4.6% lower than year ago. The income reduction is largely driven by a \$2,509.33 reduction in Cat Talk subscriptions.

Expense: Almanac expense is 12% lower than year ago.

| Almanac | May '19 - Feb '20 Actual | May '18 - Feb '19 Actual | \$ Change to Prior Fiscal Year |
|------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Income | \$51,955.40 | \$54,470.03 | (\$2,514.63) |
| Expense | \$51,910.24 | \$58,979.70 | (\$7,069.46) |
| Net Income | \$45.16 | (\$4,509.67) | \$ 4,554.83 |

Yearbook

Income: Yearbook income YTD is down 11.5% compared to prior year. This is primarily driven by a \$2,780.00 reduction in 2019 Yearbook sales.

Expense: Yearbook expenses are 1.0% lower than prior year.

| Yearbook | May '19 - Feb '20 Actual | May '18 - Feb '19 Actual | \$ Change to Prior Fiscal Year |
|------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Income | \$28,876.50 | \$32,627.90 | (\$3,751.40) |
| Expense | \$46,597.45 | \$46,128.62 | \$468.83 |
| Net Income | (\$17,720.95) | (\$13,500.72) | (\$4,220.23) |

Marketing

Income: YTD is down 48.9% compared to prior year.

Expense: YTD has increased 13.2% compared to prior year.

| Marketing | May '19 - Feb '20 Actual | May '18 - Feb '19 Actual | \$ Change to Prior Fiscal Year |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>Income</i> | \$4,324.05 | \$8,460.02 | (\$4,135.97) |
| <i>Expense</i> | \$84,191.83 | \$74,401.49 | \$9,790.34 |
| <i>Net Income</i> | (\$79,867.78) | (\$65,941.47) | (\$13,926.31) |

Central Office

Total Central Office expense for this review period was \$1,073,446.49 which is a 5.12% reduction compared to the prior year.

| Central Office | May '19 - Feb '20 Actual | May '18 - Feb '19 Actual | \$ Change to Prior Fiscal Year |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>Payroll- C.O. Staff</i> | \$577,333.94 | \$660,546.23 | (\$83,212.29) |
| <i>Contract Labor</i> | \$50,940.92 | \$57,843.17 | (\$6,902.25) |
| <i>Utilities</i> | \$16,390.68 | \$18,646.00 | (\$2,255.32) |
| <i>Security Expense</i> | \$1,818.10 | \$594.09 | \$1,224.01 |
| <i>Depreciation-All</i> | \$48,857.95 | \$18,226.29 | \$30,631.66 |
| <i>Amortized Cost of Software</i> | \$8,207.22 | \$11,730.59 | (\$3,523.37) |
| <i>Office Supplies/Expense</i> | \$13,252.86 | \$20,461.17 | (\$7,208.31) |
| <i>Printing Supplies/Expense</i> | \$42,813.24 | \$26,656.47 | \$16,156.77 |
| <i>Postage/UPS</i> | \$34,242.36 | \$18,428.55 | \$15,813.81 |
| <i>Credit Card Fees</i> | \$63,244.72 | \$92,296.73 | (\$29,052.01) |
| <i>Professional Fees - Legal</i> | \$4,051.00 | \$250.00 | \$3,801.00 |
| <i>Donation</i> | \$2,000.00 | \$16,975.00 | (\$14,975.00) |
| <i>Simple IRA</i> | \$9,283.59 | \$24,168.07 | (\$14,884.48) |
| <i>Development</i> | \$80,726.12 | \$12,453.77 | \$68,272.35 |

Computer Expense

Total Computer expense for this review period was \$123,698.28 which is a 22.95% reduction compared to the prior year.

| Computer Expense | May '19 - Feb '20 Actual | May '18 - Feb '19 Actual | \$ Change to Prior Fiscal Year |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>Professional Service-Computer</i> | \$52,593.67 | \$10,104.98 | \$42,488.69 |
| <i>Computer Supplies/Equipment</i> | \$3,840.20 | \$1,083.50 | \$2,756.70 |
| <i>Contract Computer Services</i> | \$33,900.70 | \$73,966.50 | (\$40,065.80) |
| <i>Web Hosting/Support</i> | \$21,279.10 | \$12,402.01 | \$8,877.09 |
| <i>IT Travel</i> | \$2,996.56 | \$3,051.97 | (\$55.41) |

CFA Programs

Total CFA Program expense for this review period was \$370,143.72 which represents a 30.1% increase compared to the prior year.

| CFA Programs | May '19 - Feb '20 Actual | May '18 - Feb '19 Actual | \$ Change to Prior Fiscal Year |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Judging Program | \$1,385.21 | \$ 5,591.29 | (\$4,206.08) |
| Judging Workshop | \$2,289.62 | \$3,432.67 | (\$1,143.05) |
| Judging Schools | \$12,237.62 | \$6,993.27 | \$5,244.35 |
| Clerking Expense | \$689.10 | \$ 3,538.32 | (\$2,849.22) |
| Breed Council Expense | \$10,268.89 | \$7,082.04 | \$3,186.85 |
| Show Supplies/Postage | \$24,266.00 | \$31,064.87 | (\$6,798.87) |
| Animal Welfare Committee | \$16,500.00 | \$13,100.00 | \$3,400.00 |
| Ambassador Program Committee | \$3,357.22 | \$1,963.74 | \$1,393.48 |
| Ambassador Cats Committee | \$7,004.43 | \$22,258.97 | (\$15,254.54) |
| Protests Committee | \$766.97 | \$3,877.40 | (\$3,110.43) |
| Agility Program | \$3,467.49 | \$348.43 | \$3,119.06 |
| Budget/Finance Committee | \$1,983.68 | \$412.82 | \$1,570.86 |
| Youth Feline Education Program | \$1,300.00 | \$3,119.63 | (\$1,819.63) |

Corporate Expense

Total Corporate expense is \$161,151.08 which represents a 7.5% increase in spending.

The increase in Board Meeting expense is due to moving the Board Meeting and Board Travel expense from the Annual schedule to the Corporate Expense schedule.

| | May '19 - Feb '20 Actual | May '18 - Feb '19 Actual | \$ Change to Prior Fiscal Year |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 500809 · Board meeting expense | \$69,143.48 | \$46,878.61 | \$22,264.87 |
| 500812 · Legal Counsel - China | \$768.59 | \$33,307.35 | (\$32,538.76) |
| 500813 · China Judge's Fees | \$237.50 | \$2,742.50 | (\$2,505.00) |
| 900401 · Emergency Reimbursement | \$7,018.28 | \$4,878.98 | \$2,139.30 |

Legislative Expense came in \$4,159.96 above year ago.

Events

Annual - Syracuse

Comparison to Budget

Income increases when compared to budget, are largely due to sponsorship income. Income was 131.2% of budget.

Expense reporting has been amended to accurately represent true costs to conduct the Annual Meeting and Banquet. Budget and expense associated with the Board including travel and hotel have been moved to Corporate Expense.

| <i>Annual - Syracuse</i> | <i>May '19 - Feb '20</i> | <i>Budget</i> | <i>\$ Over Budget</i> |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|
| <i>Total Income</i> | \$90,458.63 | \$68,949.00 | \$21,509.63 |
| <i>Total Expense</i> | \$139,306.89 | \$180,585.00 | (\$41,278.11) |
| <i>Net Income</i> | (\$48,848.26) | (\$111,636.00) | \$62,787.74 |

International Show – Cleveland

Comparison to Budget

Income was 111.0% of budget. Our major sponsor was contracted after the budget was created and approved, driving favorability. Expenses came in at 98.2% of budget.

| <i>International Show</i> | <i>May '19 - Feb '20</i> | <i>Budget</i> | <i>\$ Over Budget</i> |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|
| <i>Total</i> | \$238,468.13 | \$ 214,860.00 | \$23,608.13 |
| <i>Total Expense</i> | \$223,168.86 | \$ 227,315.00 | (\$4,146.14) |
| <i>Net Income</i> | \$15,299.27 | \$ (12,455.00) | \$27,754.27 |

The Bottom Line – May through February 2020 CFA realized a profit of \$74,611.71!

| | <i>May '19 - Feb '20 Actual</i> | <i>May '18 - Feb '19 Actual</i> | <i>\$ Change to Prior Fiscal Year</i> |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| <i>Income</i> | \$2,361,354.82 | \$2,369,622.42 | (\$8,267.60) |
| <i>Expense</i> | \$2,401,497.73 | \$2,353,802.66 | \$47,695.07 |
| <i>Net Ordinary Income</i> | (\$40,142.91) | \$15,819.76 | (\$55,962.67) |
| <i>Total Other Income</i> | \$114,754.62 | \$30,134.86 | \$84,619.76 |
| <i>Net Income</i> | \$74,611.71 | \$45,954.62 | \$28,657.09 |

*Respectfully Submitted,
Kathy Calhoun, CFA Treasurer*

Hannon: Do you want to move on to the Treasurer's Report? **Calhoun:** OK. The Treasurer's Report has been posted. There's quite a bit of detail there. In the last monthly budget review, Pam Moser participated in the review. One of the things she asked is if we could post the

detailed financials, so we gave them to the board. The detailed financials have been posted to File Vista for your review.

Hannon: Does anybody have any questions on the Treasurer's Report? **Calhoun:** The only other thing I wanted to draw your attention to, the end of the report showed that we made \$74,611.71. That's great, but you know that was in February and the battle began really in February. So, we are likely to be not as favorable moving forward, but we are really trying to be as prudent as possible. Other questions?

(6) **BUDGET REPORT.**

Committee Chair: Kathy Calhoun
List of Committee Members: Mark Hannon, Rich Mastin, Teresa Sweeney, Matthew Wong, and Allene Tartaglia

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Committee budget requests have been received.

Current Happenings of Committee:

In abundance of caution and concern, the Budget Committee will not have an in-person meeting this cycle. In its place, a subset of the committee will meet over the next weeks to develop an operating budget for review by the CFA Board.

Future Projections for Committee:

Using current trends, 3, 6, 9, 12-month projections will be developed in the effort to extrapolate “what if” projections.

Decisions made for each country and, in the US, each state regarding “stay at home” and social distancing recommendations will impact the reinstatement of future CFA cat shows, events and the CFA Budget.

Optimistically, we hope to have additional direction in the next few weeks.

Therefore, the Budget presentation to the CFA Board for preview and subsequent approval is being delayed to late April/early May.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Kathy Calhoun, Chair*

Calhoun: Shall I go on to the Budget Committee? **Hannon:** Yes ma’am. **Calhoun:** The Budget Committee Report is a synopsis of what we said earlier in conversations with the board, that we are doing 3-, 6-, 9- and 12-month assessments of what our budget looks like moving forward. I think the March numbers will be educational and give us a lot of information, so hopefully we will have March closed by the end of next week and we will start to move forward. In the past, we have had situations where we had to have a budget to start with at the beginning of the year. It’s not ideal, but these circumstances are something we have never faced before, and we want to try and make good decisions. There was not motion. It was just information.

Hannon: Anybody have any questions or comments about the budget?

(7) **AWARDS.**

Committee Chair: Mary Kolencik
Liaison to Board: Mark Hannon
List of Committee Members: Linda Peterson, David Raynor

Current Happenings of Committee:

Star Awards

Since there is no annual this year, there is no need to consider star award nominations at this time. However, we are concerned that this might get pushed to the 2021 annual and that people might forget some worthy nominees from the past year. We would like to proceed collecting nominees for the board to consider at their June meeting. If there is an awards presentation before the 2021 annual, these can be presented there. If there is not, then these recipients can be held until the 2021 annual.

Point Minimums

The April meeting is where the board sets the point minimums for the next season. Since we don't know when the next season will start, we recommend waiting to set those minimums until shortly before the season starts so that they can be based on the length of the season.

The 2020-2021 season will be shortened, possibly multiple times. We do not know what is going to happen with the pandemic. The season may start, but then next winter we might be forced to shut down again and this could go on until there is a widely available vaccine. There are several elements of our scoring system that are affected by shortened seasons as the board found out with the 2019-2020 season. Recommendations for each of these are outlined below, but the board should wait to act until we know when the next season will start.

Grand of Distinction – depending on when the season starts, reduce the number of finals required accordingly, but only for a shortened season. Return to normal when we have a full season.

Point minimums for breed awards – reduce this to 100 but only for a shortened season. Return to normal when we have a full season.

Ring minimums for DWs – Allow each DW area to have a default number of DWs based on the prior season. Then allow the area to have more DWs based on the number of rings held.

Residency requirements – if we have an uninterrupted season, these should stay as according to the show rules.

*Point minimums for NWs – we need a different plan for the NWs. What we have does not work when the board changes the minimums *after* the season is over, and exhibitors need something that is not a moving target. Exhibitors in the International Area prefer to have the same point minimum as R1-9 because they do not want cats from R1-9 being moved into their area to get*

easy NWs. The point minimums prevent this kind of area shopping. However, we could change the title and accomplish the same thing. The breed wins are split with a letter denoting the area – BWR, BWI, and BWC. Perhaps it is time to do the same with the NWs and have a token point minimum, such as 1000 in championship, 500 in kittens, premiership and HHP, and label the awards NWR, NWI and NWC. We would all know where the NW was earned based on the letter and thus would know that one required defeating more cats than the other. But this needs further discussion among the exhibitors.

Hannon: Moving on to the next item on the agenda, is the Awards Committee and I'm the board liaison for that committee. Mary is recommending that we do not adjust minimums at this point because we don't know how the show season is going to proceed. We know there are going to be no shows in May, and June looks pretty bleak. So, at the earliest, we're talking about maybe having shows in July. Unless somebody objects and wants to go ahead and discuss minimums right now, we'll pass on that until some future board meeting.

Future Projections for Committee:

None

Board Action Items:

Decide whether to proceed collecting the 2019-2020 Star Award nominations now or wait until some future date which might be the 2021 annual.

Hannon: Mary has asked us about what we want to do about the Star Awards. Normally, she would ask for recommendations for presentation at the annual. There's going to be no annual, so she is suggesting that we go ahead and solicit recommendations now, rather than wait a whole year to do it, where somebody might forget. **Mastin:** Rich will make the motion. **Newkirk:** I'll second it.

Hannon: Any discussion? **Eigenhauser:** The motion itself is fine. When she explains the motion in her narrative part of her discussion, she talks about bringing it to the board in June and just holding the names in confidence if we don't get a chance to give them out this year. I don't have a problem with the Committee collecting the names now, but if the board votes on them in June, and we don't have a chance to give them out this year and we give them out next June, it's going to leak. There's just too many people involved. **Hannon:** Why don't we let the Committee collect the information and sit on the information until the board decides they want to do something with it. **Eigenhauser:** That's right, and that's how I read their motion. The motion doesn't call for them to bring it to the board in June. The narrative does, and I want to be clear that what we're talking about was actually put in the action item and not the additional material that appears in the narrative. **Morgan:** I'm not sure why we can't award them even if there isn't an annual. People have still gone above and beyond, and worked really hard for CFA, perhaps more so this year than any other year we have ever had, since we have faced unprecedented challenges. No, there's certainly not the pomp and circumstance of walking up and getting to receive them in front of everyone, but certainly this is a way to recognize some of those people and a relatively easy way to do so. **Hannon:** Why don't we have her collect the information and we can determine later what we want to do with the information, once we have a better

understanding of how the year is going to progress? **Krzanowski:** I really feel that the pomp and circumstance and the surprise element is what makes it even more special for these people who get the Star Award. I think it will be kind of a let-down in a way if we just said, “we voted to give you this award.” It’s not going to be something special with a special presentation.

Hannon: What we’ll do now is just have Mary gather the information. We don’t have to determine tonight what we’re going to do. We can punt. **Krzanowski:** That makes sense. OK.

Hannon: Are there any other questions or comments on the Awards Committee?

Eigenhauser: We have to vote on the motion. **Hannon:** I’m sorry. All those in favor.

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

Time Frame:

This meeting.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Possibly the Star Award nominees.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Mary Kolencik, Chair*

(8) INCORPORATION AND CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE.

Committee Chair: Mary Auth
List of Committee Members: George Eigenhauser, Pam Moser, Kathy Calhoun, John Randolph, Barbara Schreck, Rachel Anger, Mark Hannon, Rich Mastin

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

The following list is in order of importance to complete

1. *A revised Article of Incorporation has been written and requires approval by CFA membership. Copy attached. This could be accomplished at a special meeting of the membership.*

Hannon: Mary, the Incorporation and Constitution Committee. **Auth:** Thank you. I will start out by saying that there were several attachments that are part of File Vista. Without going through this line by line, the most important thing is that, before we can move much further on some of the stuff, is we do have an item. Revising the Articles of Incorporation will have to be voted on by the membership, and it was created first before we went any further on the Bylaws document because it referenced this particular document in other places in the Bylaws. So, we are going to have to leave that for whenever there may be an opportunity for the membership to vote on it. So, the Constitution and bylaws are sort of on the back burner for the time being.

2. *Committee met to discuss incorporation of regions. John Randolph is preparing an Affiliation Agreement. Anita Pelletier is recommending that the regions incorporate in Delaware but is also investigating the incorporation environment in Ohio.*

Auth: Moving forward on the incorporation of the regions. Anita, who is the New York attorney, suggested that we have first an affiliation agreement. She was going to provide a template to John, and John was going to prepare something. John, can you report on what the status of that is? **Randolph:** Mary, I don't have the template, so we don't have that yet. **Auth:** Alright, then I'll go ahead and reach out to Anita and nudge her, because the other thing that she was going to do, we had a fair amount of discussion on what state the regions should be incorporated in. Ohio was not high on her list for a number of reasons, so she was going to investigate how the corporate environment in Ohio is before we actually decide what state we're going to incorporate the regions in.

3. *Constitution moved to the back burner until we are further along on incorporation and because the annual meeting was cancelled. The latest version of changes is back with Anita to revise.*
4. *John Randolph has prepared a Whistleblower Policy and Conflict of Interest Policy that will be referenced in the updated constitution/bylaws. (copies attached)*

Policy on Whistleblowers

The Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. (CFA) encourages its employees to report improper activities in the workplace and will protect employees from retaliation for making any such report in good faith.

Employee Rights

Employees have the right to report, without suffering retaliation, any activity by CFA or any of our employees that the employee reasonably believes: 1) violates any state or federal law; 2) violates or amounts to noncompliance with a state or federal rule or regulation; or 3) violates fiduciary responsibilities by a nonprofit corporation. In addition, employees can refuse to participate in an activity that would result in a violation of state or federal statutes, or a violation or noncompliance with a state or federal rule or regulation.

Employees are also protected from retaliation for having exercised any of these rights in any former employment.

The whistleblower protection laws do not entitle employees to violate a confidential privilege of CFA (such as the attorney-client privilege) or improperly disclose trade-secret information.

Where to Report

Employees have the duty to comply with all applicable laws and to assist CFA to ensure legal compliance. An employee who suspects a problem with legal compliance is required to report the situation(s) to the Executive Director or President of the Board of Directors if the complaint involves the Executive Director.

Employees may also report information regarding possible unlawful activity to an appropriate government or law enforcement agency.

Protection from Retaliation

It is the intent of this policy to encourage employees to report fraudulent or illegal activities and there shall be no retaliation for any reports made pursuant to this policy. Any employee who believes they have been retaliated against for whistle blowing may file a complaint with either the Executive Director or the President of the Board of Directors. Any complaint of retaliation will be promptly investigated and remedial action taken when warranted. This protection from retaliation is not intended to prohibit managers or supervisors from taking action, including disciplinary action, in the ordinary course of business based on valid performance-related factors.

5. *Invoice from Anita Pelletier received. (copy attached) It does contain time that was not budgeted under the Constitution efforts (proxies and annual meeting discussion). The invoice (\$6792.15) is just about what we approved at the December 10, 2019 teleconference (\$7000) for both the incorporation and constitution.*

Current Happenings of Committee:

We are awaiting comments from Anita and a document from John for the regional incorporation activities.

Future Projections for Committee:

The committee will convene again (possibly week of April 13) to discuss incorporation of regions.

Board Action Items:

Auth: Then, there are two items here for a vote. I see on this thing here there are three, so we need to approve the Whistleblower Policy and the Policy on Conflicts of Interest. Both of these are key documents and are required by the New York Not-for-Profit Law that will eventually be – it's already referenced in the Bylaws, but we need to have them formally approved.

Motion: *to approve the Whistleblower Policy*

Auth: Did everybody get a chance to read the Whistleblower Policy? I would like to move that we approve the Whistleblower Policy, as presented. **Eigenhauser:** George seconds. **Hannon:** Is there a discussion?

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

Motion *to approve the Policy on Conflicts of Interest*

Hannon: Mary, your next motion? **Auth:** The next motion is to approve the Policy on Conflicts of Interest. **Eigenhauser:** Second. **Hannon:** Is there discussion?

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

~~**Motion** *to approve an additional \$3500 to cover Anita Pelletier in the coming months—to finish the constitution and incorporation documents. Her original estimates for the two activities are \$5000-\$6000 and \$2000-\$3000.*~~

Auth: There's a third motion on this report that needs to go away. We don't need to get any more money because enough money has already been covered to handle her through this point and into the next step.

Time Frame:

Ongoing with no particular deadline at this time.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Final decisions on incorporation state.

More refined constitution/bylaws for discussion by entire board.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Mary Auth, Chair*

Auth: There will be more reporting once we move a little bit further down the line.
Hannon: OK, thank you very much.

Policy on Conflicts of Interest

It is in the best interest of The Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc., a New York not-for-profit corporation ("CFA") to be aware of and properly manage all conflicts of interest and appearances of a conflict of interest. This conflict of interest policy is designed to help directors, officers and committee members of CFA identify situations that present potential conflicts of interest and to provide CFA with a procedure to appropriately manage conflicts in accordance with legal requirements and the goals of accountability and transparency in CFA's operations.

1. Conflict of Interest Defined. In this policy, a person with a conflict of interest is referred to as an "interested person." For purposes of this policy, the following circumstances shall be deemed to create a Conflict of Interest:

a. A director, officer or committee member, including a board member (or family member of any of the foregoing) is a party to a contract, or involved in a transaction with CFA for goods or services.

b. A director, officer or committee member (or a family member of any of the foregoing) has a material financial interest in a transaction between CFA and an entity in which the director, officer or employee, or a family member of the foregoing, is a director, officer, agent, partner, associate, employee, trustee, personal representative, receiver, guardian, custodian, or other legal representative.

c. A director, officer or committee member, (or a family member of the foregoing) is engaged in some capacity or has a material financial interest in a business or enterprise that competes with [Name of Nonprofit].

Accepting gifts, entertainment or other favors from individuals or entities can also result in a conflict or duality of interest when the party providing the gift, entertainment, favor does so under circumstances where it might be inferred that such action was intended to influence or possibly would influence the interested person in the performance of his or her duties. This does not preclude the acceptance of items of nominal or insignificant value or entertainment of nominal or insignificant value which are not related to any particular transaction or activity of CFA.

2. Definitions.

a. A "Conflict of Interest" is any circumstance described in Part 1 of this Policy.

b. An "Interested Person" is any person serving as an officer, employee or member of the Board of Directors of CFA or anyone else who is in a position of control over CFA who has a personal interest that is in conflict with the interests of CFA.

c. A "Family Member" is a spouse, parent, child or spouse of a child, brother, sister, or spouse of a brother or sister, of an interested person.

Active/51196948.2

d. A “Material Financial Interest” in an entity is a financial interest of any kind, which, in view of all the circumstances, is substantial enough that it would, or reasonably could, affect an Interested Person’s or Family Member’s judgment with respect to transactions to which the entity is a party.

e. A “Contract or Transaction” is any agreement or relationship involving the sale or purchase of goods or services, the providing or receipt of a loan or grant, the establishment of any other type of financial relationship, or the exercise of control over another organization. The making of a gift to [Name of Nonprofit] is not a Contract or Transaction.

3. Procedures.

a. Prior to board or committee action on a Contract or Transaction involving a Conflict of Interest, a director or committee member having a Conflict of Interest and who is in attendance at the meeting shall disclose all facts material to the Conflict of Interest. Such disclosure shall be reflected in the minutes of the meeting. If board members are aware that staff or committee members have a conflict of interest, relevant facts should be disclosed by the board member or by the interested person him/herself if invited to the board meeting as a guest for purposes of disclosure.

b. A director or committee member who plans not to attend a meeting at which he or she has reason to believe that the board or committee will act on a matter in which the person has a Conflict of Interest shall disclose to the chair of the meeting all facts material to the Conflict of Interest. The chair shall report the disclosure at the meeting and the disclosure shall be reflected in the minutes of the meeting.

c. A person who has a Conflict of Interest shall not participate in or be permitted to hear the board’s or committee’s discussion of the matter except to disclose material facts and to respond to questions. Such person shall not attempt to exert his or her personal influence with respect to the matter, either at or outside the meeting.

d. A person who has a Conflict of Interest with respect to a Contract or Transaction that will be voted on at a meeting shall not be counted in determining the presence of a quorum for purposes of the vote. Such person’s ineligibility to vote shall be reflected in the minutes of the meeting. For purposes of this paragraph, a member of the Board of Directors of CFA has a Conflict of Interest when he or she stands for election as an officer or for re-election as a member of the Board of Directors.

e. Interested Persons who are not members of the Board of Directors of CFA or who have a Conflict of Interest with respect to a Contract or Transaction that is not the subject of Board or committee action, shall disclose to the Chair or the Chair’s designee any Conflict of Interest that such Interested Person has with respect to a Contract or Transaction. Such disclosure shall be made as soon as the Conflict of Interest is known to the Interested Person. The Interested Person shall refrain from any action that may affect CFA’s participation in such Contract or Transaction.

In the event it is not entirely clear that a Conflict of Interest exists, the individual with the potential conflict shall disclose the circumstances to the Chair or the Chair’s designee, who shall determine whether full board discussion is warranted or whether there exists a Conflict of Interest that is subject to this policy.

4. Confidentiality. Each director, officer, or committee member shall exercise care not to disclose confidential information acquired in connection with disclosures of conflicts of interest or potential conflicts, which might be adverse to the interests of CFA. Furthermore, directors, officers and committee members shall not disclose or use information relating to the business of CFA for their personal profit or advantage or the personal profit or advantage of their Family Member(s).

5. Review of policy.

a. Each director, officer or committee member shall be provided with and asked to review a copy of this Policy and to acknowledge in writing that he or she has done so.

b. Annually each director, officer and committee member shall complete a disclosure form identifying any relationships, positions or circumstances in which s/he is involved that he or she believes could contribute to a Conflict of Interest. Such relationships, positions or circumstances might include service as a director of or consultant to another nonprofit organization, or ownership of a business that might provide goods or services to CFA. Any such information regarding the business interests of a director, officer or committee member, or a Family Member thereof, shall be treated as confidential and shall generally be made available only to the Chair, the Executive Director, and any committee appointed to address Conflicts of Interest, except to the extent additional disclosure is necessary in connection with the implementation of this Policy.

c. This policy shall be reviewed annually by each member of the Board of Directors. Any changes to the policy shall be communicated to all staff and committee members.

Basic Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form

Date: _____

Name: _____

Position (committee member or employee): _____

Please describe below any relationships, transactions, positions you hold (volunteer or otherwise), or circumstances that you believe could contribute to a conflict of interest between [Name of Nonprofit] and your personal interests, financial or otherwise:

_____ I have no conflict of interest to report

_____ I have the following conflict of interest to report (please specify other nonprofit and for-profit boards you (and your spouse) sit on, any for-profit businesses for which you or an immediate family member are an officer or director, or a majority shareholder, and the name of your employer and any businesses you or a family member own):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

I hereby certify that the information set forth above is true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I have reviewed, and agree to abide by, the Policy of Conflict of Interest of CFA

Signature: _____

**RESTATED
CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION
OF
THE CAT FANCIERS' ASSOCIATION, INCORPORATED**

Under Section 805 of the Not-For-Profit Corporation Law

The undersigned, being the President of The Cat Fanciers' Association, Incorporated (the "Corporation"), for the purpose of amending and restating the Certificate of Incorporation of the Corporation pursuant to Section 805 of the Not-for-Profit Corporation Law of the State of New York (the "N-PCL"), hereby certifies:

- (1) The name of the Corporation is The Cat Fanciers' Association, Incorporated.
- (2) The Corporation's Certificate of Incorporation was filed by the Department of State on October 6, 1919, pursuant to the Membership Corporations Law.
- (3) The Corporation is a corporation as defined in subparagraph (a)(5) of Section 102 of the N-PCL.
- (4) This amended and restated Certificate of Incorporation was duly authorized by the members of the Corporation.
- (5) The Certificate of Incorporation is hereby amended to affect the following:
 - (a) Paragraph FIRST relating to the Corporation's purposes is amended to read in its entirety as follows:

The purposes for which the Corporation is formed are the registration of the pedigrees of cats and kittens; the promulgation of rules for the management of shows; the promotion of the interests of breeders and exhibitors; and the improvement of the breeds of cats.
 - (b) Paragraph THIRD relating to the territory in which operations are principally to be conducted is hereby deleted in its entirety.
 - (c) Paragraph FIFTH relating to the number of directors is hereby deleted in its entirety.
 - (d) Paragraph SIXTH setting forth the names and addresses of the initial directors is omitted in its entirety.
 - (e) Paragraph SEVENTH relating to the annual meeting is hereby deleted in its entirety.
 - (f) The remaining paragraphs shall be re-numbered.

(6) The Certificate of Incorporation of the Corporation is restated as amended herein to read in its entirety as follows:

[REMAINDER OF PAGE LEFT BLANK]

**CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION
OF
THE CAT FANCIERS' ASSOCIATION, INCORPORATED**

FIRST: The name of the Corporation is The Cat Fanciers' Association, Incorporated.

SECOND: The purposes for which the Corporation is formed are the registration of the pedigrees of cats and kittens; the promulgation of rules for the management of shows; the promotion of the interests of breeders and exhibitors; and the improvement of the breeds of cats.

THIRD: Its principal office is to be located in the Borough of Brooklyn, City and State of New York.

FOURTH: The address to which the Secretary of State shall forward copies of process accepted on behalf of the corporation is c/o Paracorp Incorporated, 2804 Gateway Oaks Drive #200, Sacramento, CA 95833.

FIFTH: Paracorp Incorporated is designated as agent of the Corporation upon whom process against the corporation may be served. The street address of the registered agent is 2804 Gateway Oaks Drive #200, Sacramento, CA 95833.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have made and subscribed this certificate and hereby affirm under the penalties of perjury that its contents are true this _____ day of _____ 2020.

Name: Mark Hannon
Title: President

**RESTATED
CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION
OF
THE CAT FANCIERS' ASSOCIATION, INCORPORATED**

Under Section 805 of the New York Not-for-Profit Corporation Law

Filed by:

Nixon Peabody LLP
1300 Clinton Square
Rochester, New York 14604

(9) **CLUB APPLICATIONS.**

Committee Chair: Carol Krzanowski

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

New clubs applying for CFA membership were reviewed and presented to the Board for consideration. Assistance and guidance were provided to clubs with questions and issues regarding membership and applications.

Current Happenings of Committee:

Club Resignation

The Dutch Purrruss Club has submitted their resignation to the CFA Central Office with an effective date of February 3, 2020.

Action Item: *Accept the resignation by the Dutch Purrruss Club with regret, effective February 3, 2020.*

Hannon: Next is Clubs, Carol. **Krzanowski:** Before we get into the applicants for tonight, we have one action item. It's a club resignation which was received from the Dutch Purrruss Club, so my action item is to accept the resignation by the Dutch Purrruss Club with regret, effective February 3, 2020. **Eigenhauser:** George seconds. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion? Michael, do you have anything to say about it? **Schleissner:** I think maybe Kenny can say something, because he is still a member of the club. He has more background information than I have. **Currle:** Basically, Monique is the secretary of the club and she has made the decision, along with a majority of the members, to let it go at this time. That's pretty much what she told me.

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

New Club Applicants

Four clubs were pre-noticed for membership. The applicants are:

1. *Indian Cat Club, International Division - AWA/CSA; Ken Currle, Chair*
2. *Orange Cat Club, Region 9; Michael Schleissner, Director*
3. *Starry Sky Cat Fanciers' Club, International Division - Asia; Wain Harding and Richard Kallmeyer, Co-Chairs*
4. *Vietnam Cat Club, International Division - Asia; Wain Harding and Richard Kallmeyer, Co-Chairs*

Indian Cat Club
International Division – AWA/CSA; Hyderabad, India
Ken Currle, Chair

The constitution and by-laws are in order. There are 19 members. None of the members are members of other clubs. Three members are breeders with CFA registered cattery names, and several others are breeders with another association. Most members have been exhibiting pedigreed cats or household pets in another association and at local shows. One member has show production experience. This is an allbreed club and if accepted, the club plans to conduct educational seminars promoting CFA, pedigreed cats and responsible breeding, in addition to producing several shows a year in the cities of Hyderabad, Bangalore, Mumbai, New Delhi and Pune. The dues have been set. If the club is disbanded, the funds will be donated to the Hyderabad animal welfare society. This club was pre-noticed and no negative letters have been received. The International Division - AWA/CSA Chair and the International Division Representative support this club.

Hannon: Carol, do you want to go into the new clubs? **Krzanowski:** Yes. We have four applications to consider tonight. The first application is from the Indian Cat Club. This club is located in Hyderabad, the capital and largest city in Telangana, a state in the north central area of southern India. With a population of about 7 million, the city is a hub of pharmaceuticals and biotechnology. A few members are CFA registered breeders, and some are breeders with another association. Most members are exhibiting in another association and at local shows. This would be the second CFA club in India. If accepted, this allbreed club wishes to hold educational seminars and produce shows in major cities such as Hyderabad, Bangalore, Mumbai, New Delhi and Pune. The International Division – AWA/CSA Chair and the International Division Representative support this club. I move to accept. **Hannon:** Kenny, do you want to second it? **Currle:** I'll second the motion, and what I will say is, we do have a business plan going forward with India as soon as this terrible virus lessens. We won't need to discuss it right now, but this club of course will be key in that effort. **Hannon:** Great. Any other comments or discussion on the club in India?

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

Hannon: Welcome to India Cat Club.

Orange Cat Club
Europe Region; Orange, France
Michael Schleissner, Director

The constitution and by-laws are in order. There are 11 members. Four members are members of other CFA clubs. Most members have CFA registered cattery names, and all members are active breeders and exhibitors. One member is a CFA licensed master clerk, one is a CFA licensed certified clerk, and several members have show production experience. If accepted, the club plans to hold charity events to benefit homeless cats and produce one or two shows a year in the cities of Orange and Avignon or the surrounding area. The dues have been set. If the club is disbanded, the funds will be donated to local charity associations. This club was pre-noticed and no negative letters have been received. The Europe Regional Director supports this club.

Hannon: Next on your list, Carol? **Krzanowski:** The next is Orange Cat Club. This club is located in Orange, a community in the Vaucluse Department just north of Avignon in the Provence-Alpes-Cote d'Azur region in southeastern France. Orange has primarily an agricultural economy and a population of about 29,000. Most members are CFA registered breeders and exhibitors. One member is a master clerk, one a certified clerk, and several members have show production experience. If accepted, this allbreed club plans to hold events to benefit homeless cats and produce shows in Orange, Avignon and the surrounding area. The Europe Regional Director supports this club. I move to accept. **Hannon:** Michael, do you want to second it? **Schleissner:** I want to second it. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion? Michael, do you have some comments you want to make about this club? **Schleissner:** I'm very happy that these people finally tried to form a club because it's a group around Frederic Gaspard. Maybe everybody if you know the Exotic and Persian breeder from France. He is doing this for a long time, maybe for 20 years. He is showing beautiful cats. The negative thing is, we had planned for the last weekend a show in Orange in conjunction with our BAOS and finally the show was cancelled. This show was planned by Frederic Goedert and it was for some practice for the other Frederic. So, unfortunately this show couldn't happen because we are quarantined in France. I have heard yesterday on the news they are even longer than Germany on quarantine, so for this moment the only thing we can do, we can accept the club. **Hannon:** Anybody else have any comments on the Orange Cat Club?

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

Hannon: Welcome to the Orange Cat Club.

Starry Sky Cat Fanciers' Club
International Division - Asia; Chengdu, Sichuan, China
Wain Harding and Richard Kallmeyer, Co-Chairs

The constitution and by-laws are in order. There are 20 members. None of the members are members of other clubs. All members are active exhibitors of pedigreed cats in CFA shows. Six members have clerking experience and five members have show production experience. This is an allbreed club and if accepted, the club plans to hold educational seminars to help promote CFA and responsible breeding, work with cat rescue, and produce one or two shows a year in Chengdu and possibly Beijing or Shanghai. If the club is disbanded, the funds will be donated to the homeless cat rescue center. This club was pre-noticed and no negative letters have been received. The International Division - Asia Co-Chairs and the International Division Representative for China support this club.

Krzanowski: The next application is Starry Sky Cat Fanciers' Club. This club is located in Chengdu, a sub-provincial city and the capital of Sichuan Province in the southwest area of China. Sichuan is famous as the home of giant pandas. Chengdu has a population of over 14 million and is an important and diverse economic area with a variety of industries. All members are active CFA exhibitors of pedigreed cats, and several members have clerking experience as well as show production experience. If accepted, this allbreed club plans to hold educational seminars and produce shows in Chengdu and possibly Beijing or Shanghai. The International Division – Asia Co-Chairs and the International Division Representative for China support this club. I move to accept. **Morgan:** Second. **Hannon:** Any discussion?

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

Hannon: Welcome to Starry Sky Cat Fanciers' Club.

Vietnam Cat Club
International Division - Asia; Hanoi, Vietnam
Wain Harding and Richard Kallmeyer, Co-Chairs

The constitution and by-laws are in order. There are 10 members. None of the members are members of other clubs. Four members are active breeders and exhibitors with CFA registered cattery names. Several members own CFA pedigreed cats and one member has clerking experience. Some members are working in pet-related businesses and one member is a breeder with another association. This is an allbreed club and if accepted, the club plans to help promote CFA and cat welfare in Vietnam, as well as produce one or two shows a year in Ha Noi and Ho Chi Minh City. If the club is disbanded, the funds will be donated to animal rescue groups or animal shelters. This club was pre-noticed and no negative letters have been received. The International Division - Asia Co-Chairs and the International Division Representative support this club.

Hannon: Next one, Carol. **Krzanowski:** The last application tonight is from Vietnam Cat Club. This club is located in Hanoi, the capital of Vietnam. Hanoi is situated in the northern area of the country between the China and Laos borders. With a population of over 8 million, it is Vietnam's second largest city and its second most productive economic center after Ho Chi Minh City. Four members are CFA registered breeders and exhibitors, several others own CFA pedigreed cats and one member has clerking experience. This would be the first CFA club in Vietnam. If accepted, this allbreed club plans to help promote CFA and cat welfare in Vietnam and produce shows in Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City. The International Division – Asia Co-Chairs and the International Division Representative support this club. I move to accept. **Morgan:** Second. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion?

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

Hannon: Welcome to the Vietnam Cat Club. Carol, do you have anything else?
Krzanowski: No, that's all I have. Thank you. **Auth:** Can I make a comment? This would make a very nice news release, to announce that CFA has its first Vietnamese cat club. **Hannon:** Kathy, can you work with Desiree on that? **Black:** Yes. **Hannon:** OK, thank you. **Black:** I will. Thank you, Mary, I agree.

Future Projections for Committee:

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

Time Frame:

April 2020 to June 2020 CFA Board meeting.

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*

(10) MARKETING.

Committee Chair: *Kathy Black*
List of Committee Members: *Desiree Bobby, Mike Altschul, Wendy Carson, Jennie Batten, Alene Shafnisky, Nicole Turk, Kathy Black, Ariel Bartelmes*

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

1. *Facebook/Instagram Following*

*Facebook - Hit end of season goal of 60K followers.
Instagram – is currently at 8500 followers*

2. *Brand Guide*

Upon board approval from last meeting, contract was signed and project started with Shepherd.

3. *Facebook Profile Photo Covers*

Desiree worked with Teresa Keiger to create the Stay at Home FB cover per Mark's request. It went over well. We are considering creating covers for 2019-2020 winners

4. *PR*

Established account with PR Newswire and committed to 4 official releases per year. Top 10, National Winners, CIS Winners and CCW.

The Top 10 release in February got great traction from the official press release, social and individual contacts. Blogs and publications that reached out directly for more content were: Pet Product News, Petage, Purrington Post, Pittsburgh Gazette and Pet Buzz Radio Show.

5. *CCW*

a. *Worked with Kathy Durdick to create CCW Shopping Cart*

HHPs will be able to purchase membership cards, luggage tags, keytags on our website. The wooCommerce shopping cart is set up and KD is finalizing payment/invoice processing with CO.

b. *Marketing is now handling the CCW membership card fulfillment process; photo editing and sending to fulfillment.*

6. *Cats101 Trademark*

Applied for this name. Animal Planet let it lapse and it would be a great brand name for our blog and videos.

Current Happenings of Committee:

1. Instagram

End of season goal is 10,000. Optimizing daily to get to goal (may not meet it but will keep going till we do.) The reason 10k is so important on Instagram is because at 10k they open the ability to add call-to-actions to stories.

2. Responsible / Preservation Breeders

Publish posts for this every Wednesday. We did the writing, design and publishing of the first 3 prototypes and now are working with Pat Jacobberger. to write copy that pulls at heartstrings of breeders and anti-breeders.

3. Photo Contests / Giveaways

Contests will run for 2 weeks, once a month. Goal to engage with cat lovers and lift spirits while building brand partnership and growing our fanbase/mailling list.

The first couple contests will be prototypes to examine scalability as we may be able to use the same platform to have larger contests with additional cat categories; kind of like a virtual cat show but using photos/videos.

a. First Contest Scheduled for 4/13 – 4/27

Neon Litter - Quarantine Edition - Win Neon Litter Mixed Packs

Neon Litter donated top 3 prizes; 12 bags, 6 bags, 4 bags and discount codes to all contestants.

b. Exploring partnerships with Wanderland, Evangers Pet Food, LivePeeFree for future contests.

4. CCW

a. Fixes and Mobile Ready Version – *We began a social campaign and errors were reported by users when registering multiple cats at one time so we stopped advertising. James is working with Sonit to fix the issue and to create a mobile ready version. Google Analytics and FB Pixel is configured to work with application so we can see that 70% of users are on mobile device.*

b. Past HHPs on Website Gallery - *We are adding all HHP winners since 2018 to the gallery. Jenny Wickle has volunteered to gather all the RW photos and Kathy Durdick is adding all NWs. Regional Directors may be hearing from Jenny Wickle to obtain the RW data and photos.*

- c. *HHP NW Cards – We are going to be sending 2019-Present HHP NW winners complimentary cards.*
 - d. *Printing – Our printing company, CPS has limited staff and it appears the printing quality of cards may be waning, so we have decided to not print any cards until things get back to normal and define their QA process. We are also getting prices from GBS to explore our options during this time.*
 - e. *Amazon – We are exploring using Amazon to sell cards/membership. Our merchant account application was approved, and the next step is to get the products uploaded and customization form (cats name, photo) developed.*
 - f. *Member Communication – We have partnered with Arden Moore to be the voice of CCW when reaching out to new and potential members. Working on email campaign content.*
 - g. *Rescue Partners – Regions are reporting rescue partners, just a few lefts. We are planning to provide print and digital assets for them to help promote. Once all rescues are in, discussions will continue to determine what assets will support their efforts.*
6. *Branding*
- a. *Brand book development in process. Expect to review drafts by 4/17.*
 - b. *Branding for Shows*

Evaluating needs of clubs and pre-planning graphic assets and products that could be made available to them for download or purchase (banners, etc.)
 - c. *CFA Logo Refresh and Sub marks*

We reviewed comps of the logo refresh and will be focusing on slight modernization and quality of cats in logo. It will vary only slightly from our existing logo. Development of sub marks with would say CFA only are underway was well. Another set of comps to come by 4/13.
7. *Merchandise*

Working with GBS to get pricing for items to offer customized for our members; mini brochures, trading cards, pet passport/vaccination records, printed canvases and more.

Future Projections for Committee:

- 1. *CCW - Expect to have mobile version up, bugs fixed and fulfillment QA in optimized so we can advertise and reports all revenue including that from Amazon.*
- 2. *Brand Guide - Expect to have it completed.*

3. *CFA Logo Refresh and Sub marks - Expect to have them completed. Web Projects to be in testing mode or completed*
 - a. *Breeder Search Tool - We asked Kathy Durdick to bump this to the top of the list of her projects. We would propose if she can't get to it within the next couple weeks, then we hire a low-cost contractor on Fivrr to knock it out. Our goal was to have it completed by the start of the new season.*
 - b. *Registration by Pedigree - Registering cats by pedigree helps move breeders over from other registries and puts new catteries into our sales funnel. We have asked her to bump it above online show licensing and CIS vendor signup and if she can't get to it, we propose we assign this to another resource now that WordPress is installed.*
 - c. *Online Show Licensing - Marketing's goal to get this done is so that we can have show data all in one database. Kathy Durdick started this a while back and just needs to recreate it now on the WordPress platform. This is pretty straightforward, and she expects to have it completed before the end of season.*

Board Action Items:

None

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Report on photo contests, CCW, social media, merchandise.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Kathy Black, Chair*

Black: OK, Marketing Report. We don't have any action items. I just want to give everybody kind of an update. As you see, we gave a quite lengthy report this time. We have been very busy, even though there has not been shows going on. The Marketing team has been trying to keep our exhibitor base and our social media followers engaged. Desiree has been posting daily on Facebook and Instagram. She announced a fun online contest that started yesterday. It will come out in the Newsletter also when Teresa puts that out this week. It's sponsored by Neon Cat Litter and we thank them for being a sponsor. There's no fee to upload your picture, and it's voted on by popularity. So, that's going to be a lot of fun to participate in. Mike Altschul has been posting a daily running cartoon that's from the cat's perspective having her owner at home. It's quite humorous, and he has been posting that to about 20 different Facebook pages – the regional pages, the cat clubs he has done advertising for in the past, our New Bee webpage also. Speaking of our New Bee webpage, there has been a lot of activity on it. It's exciting to see people talking about buying their first show shelter to have at home during this intermission of shows to get the cat used to it, so hopefully when the shows go back to happening, their cat will be used to the show shelter and they are looking forward to going to their first show. So, there's lots of activity going on with our social media.

Black: Now for some negative news. We've had a couple of issues with the Companion Cat World program. The first two issues are Sonit, as I had reported in February, had promised to complete the mobile version of the form that people go and fill out when they want to register their cat, and that still has not been completed. As Tim says in his ID report that's coming up, he just says "soon," and I don't know what that means. The second issue is the form itself. We had 230 people over 4 days, they went to the website, they clicked on the button to register their cat, they landed on the page where they enter their information, and yet nobody completed that application. We received an email from a person in Asia and they sent us the error message that they had received, so we don't know how long that form was not working. So, we sent that to James and James got in touch with Sonit. They ended up fixing that error, but we don't know how many people tried to register their cat and failed. We received another email with some pictures of the card that our company that's doing the membership cards, and there was definitely a quality control issue going on there, so we reached out to them and told them that was totally unacceptable, they are going to have to figure out what's going on with their process. They are experiencing fewer workers due to the virus, and other constraints, so that's kind of on hold right now. So, we have placed a temporary hold on sending out any more membership cards at this time. For anybody that happens to read the minutes, we apologize for the delay, but we want to make sure that you get a quality product. **Hannon:** Aren't you also talking to GBS? **Black:** Yes, and Desiree is also talking to another company that we may want to end up switching companies to fulfill those cards. **Hannon:** GBS does our Almanac and Cat Talk and other things for us. **Black:** We have a relationship to establish with them. **Hannon:** Anybody have any questions or comments in regard to the Marketing Report?

(11) **IT REPORT.**

Committee Chair: *Tim Schreck*
Liaison to Board: *John Colilla*
List of Committee Members: *Steve Merritt, Dick Kallmeyer, Sheryl Zink and Seth Baugh*

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Since the last report we have had 9 new tickets (programming corrections) with 5 still open.

Automated posting of Epoints/Scoreboard Project and CCW with Mobile friendly screens will be completed this month.

Specs for Cattery of Distinction programing has been sent to Sonit.

Move to Work from Home has affected our programming Vendors, as they adapt to these major changes in doing business, we will experience everything getting back on schedule.

Current Happenings of Committee:

Tier Champs setup is to be completed by May 1st

All current projects will be affected by Year End changes made recently and completion of this work will take precedence this month.

Work is nearing completion on Breed Council project

Genealogy/Color project is moving forward. Testing reworked initial color questions to better aide users in color selection.

GDPR internal audit is on hold due to scheduling issues with both Central Office and Vendor/Scenario77.

We are working with our programing provider on simplifying yearly changes to Breeds and Divisions in our Entry Clerk program

Future Projections for Committee:

Genetics project and continue moving of remaining applications from HP to the new system.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Progress of moving of all applications from HP to the new system.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Tim Schreck, Chair*

(12) REGIONAL HOUSEHOLD PET AWARD PROPOSAL.

Amend Article XXXVI National and Regional Awards

Current rule, Title of HHP Regional Winners is limited to Best - 10th, minimum of 100 points.

Change to All HHP receiving a regional award will be entitled to the HRW Prefix based on the awards given out by the regions. Minimum of 200 points.

RATIONALE: *The number of awards given out by the Regions varies from 10 to 25. 3 Regions award top 10, 3 top 15 and 1 - up to 25 provided the minimum of 200 points are reached. HHP Exhibitors are not asking to have Regions change the number of awards given out but that any Region that do award more than 10 that these cats can also receive the HRW award. The reason for 200 points is that it ensures all winners are a HHP GC.*

If passed this would be effective for this past show season.

Hannon: Sharon, I believe you have a household pet proposal. **Roy:** I do. This came about primarily – and Kenny was copied on some of the early emails from the Southern Region because several of the Southern Region cats, more than the top 10, are actually national winners. The top 15 should all have the regional winner title. We did send comments or ask for comments from Sue Robbins and from Julie Benzer. Sue Robbins answered right away. It took awhile for Julie to answer. As a matter of fact, most of her answers came – Jenny Wickle started a Facebook page, which I know Kathy Black has been on, has read it and commented. I know Rachel was on it. I don't know if any other board members looked at that Facebook page at all.

HHP Regional Award Proposal

Cats which meet the point minimums up to proposed 25 placements

Currently 10 placements per region

| | 100 Point Minimum w/10 Places CURRENT | 100 Point Minimum w/25 Places - # Qualifying | 200 Point Minimum PROPOSED w/25 Places - # Qualifying |
|----------|--|---|--|
| Region 1 | 10 (383.75) | 25 | 22 (201.05) |
| Region 2 | 10 (237.30) | 15 | 12 (201.20) |
| Region 3 | 10 (532.30) | 21 | 18 (290.60) |
| Region 4 | 10 (382.25) | 25 | 17 (215.25) |
| Region 5 | 10 (431.20) | 24 | 17 (205.15) |
| Region 6 | 10 (496.15) | 25 | 18 (214.90) |
| Region 7 | 10 (849.55) | 25 | 23 (200.80) |
| Region 8 | 5 (130.75) | 5 | 1 (289.70) |
| Region 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Roy: Then I did get a thing from Allene that she thought it was going to be a little difficult for this year, so I'm certainly willing to make it for next year. Whatever the region gives out, they're not trying to make regions give out more than the top 10 that they currently give out, but if a region like the Southern Region gives out 15 and somebody else gives out 15, then those cats should also have the HRW title. That's all it is. **Hannon:** If somebody is getting a national household pet win, they are still eligible for the regional one, right? **Roy:** They're still eligible, but they are already going to be superseded by a national win. **Hannon:** These are similar to what we do with championship and premiership and kittens. If they're getting a national win, they also get a regional win. **Roy:** Right, correct. The household pet people would like it to be more than 10 if their region gives out more than 10. **Hannon:** Kathy Black had that issue, right? You could have top 15 but only 10 are going to get the title? **Black:** Yes. I'm fully in support of this, because I had announced to my region that based on the number of cats being shown – and you will see in the report that we have quite a high number, even with the 200 minimum. But I'm fully supported. I want the cats 11-15 to get the regional win title. **Eigenhauser:** I don't think it has been seconded yet. I second.

Krzanowski: I'm a little concerned about this because I feel it's something that the delegates should vote on. Last year there was a resolution brought before the delegates to increase the number of regional household pet awards to 25 and that failed. Basically, what this is doing is increasing the number of household pet awards and titles to more than 10. Currently the show rules limit the title to the top 10, so I'm a little uncomfortable doing this as a board motion. I really feel that the clubs did not want this last year. They did not want to increase the number of awards for household pets. My other concern is that the number is not consistent across the regions. I don't feel that that's a good way to handle this. Those are my comments. **Tartaglia:** Carol touched on what I was going to say at the very end; that is, it's inconsistent the number of titles that the regions would give out. We have always been very consistent with regional win titles. It's 25/25/25. I think it would be a mistake to let the regions decide if they are going to give 10 or 15 or 20. That concerns me. **Eigenhauser:** I think the impression before was, they didn't want to be forced to give out a particular number of household pet awards. This doesn't require that the regions give out 25 awards, it simply means if the region chooses to give out 25 awards, that everybody as long as they meet the 200 point minimum gets a title. That doesn't cost the region anything, so this has an entirely different set of values and an entirely different effect than increasing the number of household pet or regional awards that the regions would be required to give out. This doesn't hurt anybody. Most of the people that go to the annual don't show household pets and don't really care. I don't think this is one of those things that needs to go to the delegation, and I fully support this motion.

Tartaglia: At what point do the regions tell us how many placements they want to give out? Is this something that we want to put in the show rules? Do we just want to have an amount that people that know what they are working toward, or do the regions have to tell us at least a year in advance or at the October board meeting what it's going to be for the upcoming show season, how many awards to give out? **Roy:** I was just going to answer Allene that I thought October would be a very good time for us to tell you whether our region was changing or adding or subtracting household pet awards. **Hannon:** You're saying, in October you would give them the numbers for the current show season? **Roy:** Correct. **Hannon:** At the halfway point in the show season? **Tartaglia:** Which would not be in the show rules. That would be something that's not in the show rules. **Hannon:** I'm concerned about making that decision halfway through the

show season. **Roy:** Do you think February? **Anger:** May. **Eigenhauser:** Yes. What's wrong with the start of the show season as being the starting point? **Roy:** OK. **Hannon:** So then, that would be the April board meeting, right? **Tartaglia:** And it's still not in the show rules. The printed show rules that will be coming out will not have that information. **Hannon:** It will be an addendum. **Tartaglia:** And, we voted in October not to make changes to the show rules. **Hannon:** I know. **Roy:** I know. **Currle:** We have a plethora of national winners in Region 7. We expanded it to top 15 last year. At a 200 point minimum, we could go to top 25. I think that it's beneficial for us to recognize these people if it doesn't really cost the region or CFA any money, except it takes research. **Black:** Some of the regions are already awarding top 10 and those cats are not getting the title, so they are just getting a plaque or rosette or whatever. I think they deserve a title. My other point is, many of the household pet exhibitors, they like to get the Grand of Distinction title, so they are out many years in a row which takes up the top spots. I like being able to reward more placements with the cats that have the minimum number of points, so I'm fully supportive of this motion. I think that it strikes a happy medium. They're not mandatory. You're not making it mandatory that the regions have to do top 25, and yet it will reward more cats than I was even planning on rewarding. As for when we announce the number, I think that most regions probably have a feel for what they have done historically. Unless there's a great increase all of a sudden from household pet exhibitors, which would be fantastic if that happened, I think that you would have a good feel for what was going on. The regional directors can then set those numbers as to whatever it is – 10 through 25.

Anger: I am supportive of increasing the household pet awards, but I have three problems with this, having to do with the format of it. The start time or notification time of what the awards will be is too vague and not in a rule. The consistency across regions is not in there. The third one was, we are adopting this outside of when we all agreed that we would accept new show rules. So, while I am very much in support of the concept, I would like to see this cleaned up and presented as a whole in October, with a much clearer focus on what we are doing, with input from the Co-Chairs of the Committee. **Simbro:** I just want to say real quick, the program right now as it works, will not support different placements per region for household pets. The way it's written right now, it's none or all. So, they are all set to 10, they are all set to 15 or whatever the number is. There is going to be some programming expense.

Hannon: Alright, so what I suggest is, Sharon, if you will pull this motion and then bring it back in June. In the meantime, James and Tim can do some research on what the programming costs will be. **Roy:** OK. Sounds good. **Hannon:** Thank you.

(14) **OTHER COMMITTEES.**

Hannon: Any other committees before we get to New Business. Are there any other committees we have reports on?

(15) **OLD BUSINESS.**

June 2020 CFA Board Meeting

RATIFICATION OF ON-LINE MOTIONS

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|---------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| 1. | Executive Committee 01.29.20 | Due to the coronavirus affecting parts of Asia, effective until amended by the CFA Board, grant an exception to Show Rules 3.09-3.11 and permit any CFA judge who feels uncomfortable or unsafe traveling to Asia, for any reason, to cancel his or her Asian judging contract by advising the contracting club of such cancellation. Judges cancelling an Asian contract will be allowed to exhibit or accept a judging assignment for that weekend in any area other than Asia. | Motion Carried. |
| No discussion. | | | |
| 2. | Currle Anger 02.10.20 | Due to calendar issues, grant the Nashville Cat Club (Region 7), or any other club with dates affected by the calendar challenges, an exception to the provision in Show Rule 2.32: <<Clubs that do not hold a show for two (2) consecutive years on their traditional date will lose the distinction of having a traditional date weekend.>> and allow them to retain their traditional date of the last weekend in December until 2022 (at which time the T-date of the last weekend in December will resume), so that the show can be held on another weekend in 2020 and 2021. | Motion Carried. |
| Black: I recently did a show announcement for Finicky Felines as they have the same issue with their next two years falling on or near Christmas. I would like Kenny's motion to include any traditional show which has the traditional date for the last weekend in December to keep their traditional date lock, even if not holding a show for the next two years. Roy: Finicky Felines has done this several times over the years. They usually pick a 5th weekend. Krzanowski: I like this suggestion of a blanket motion to include the traditional show dates for all clubs that may be affected by the holiday. Hannon: I am waiting to see if Kenny wants to amend his motion to expand his motion to include all shows with a Traditional Date of the 4th weekend of December. In addition to Finicky Felines and the Nashville Cat Club there is a show in Japan. Currle: Please add any other dates affected by the calendar challenges in my motion regardless of area to my motion. | | | |
| 3. | Morgan Anger 02.10.20 | Approve changing region for Raventree Ramsey, 1114-02851140 to Thailand for the 2019/2020 season. | Motion Carried. |
| Morgan: Both ID chairs support this motion and given the current situation with travel restrictions etc., I do too. Newkirk: Thanks to everyone for a quick resolution to this issue. | | | |
| 4. | Executive Committee 02.11.20 | Grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04 and allow the Club Felino Espanol to change their show format from 3AB, 2 SSP-CH, 1LH, 1 SH to 5AB, 1LH, 1 SH for their show on February 15/16, 2020 in Derio, Spain (Region 9). | Motion Carried. |
| Eigenhauser: I have a problem with the words "... if the count stays small." That's conditional and this close to the show it should be yes or no, not "if". However, since that's in the background/rationale and not part of the motion fine with the format change (and they need to advise exhibitors ASAP.) | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|---------------------------------|---|--|
| 5. | Executive Committee 02.11.20 | Grant the Club Felino Espanol an exception to Show Rule 9.08.n. and allow ring sharing of two rings at their 5 AB/1 LH/1 SH show on February 15/16, 2020 in Derio, Spain (Region 9). | Motion Carried. |
| Eigenhauser: With only 54 entries total ring sharing is practical. If it helps them keep the show open all day to promote CFA I support their request. | | | |
| 6. | Anger Newkirk 02.11.20 | For their show on August 29/30, 2020 in Malaysia, grant the Malaysia Cat Fanciers Club an exception to the show licensing and scoring rules, and allow them to have (1) top 20 AB final for all rings; (2) top 5 scored breed placements; and (3) points from the show to be counted for all Divisional, Regional, Breed and National awards from all around the world, just like the International Show. | Motion Carried. |
| <p>Anger: Just a mention that this is NOT the awards show. That event will be held a couple of weeks later. I have confirmed with Dick that he supports the show. He provided me with this statement: <i>The Malaysia Cat Fanciers club would like to put on an Asia World show similar in concept to the CFA international Show in Kuala Lumpur. This show is being sponsored by Malaysia royalty. The club has high hopes that this show is world class event. No other show in the ID will be licensed for this weekend. Up to 5 breed awards, like the CFA International show would be awarded. Exhibitors from throughout the world would be invited. Malaysia would allow exhibitors from key eastern Asia countries (China, South Korea, Hong Kong, Thailand and Indonesia) as well as Middle East, Europe and North America.</i> The ID had a similar show in Bangkok several years ago. Hannon: I attended the Bangkok show mentioned in Dick's post. It was an honor to attend. The exhibitors from throughout Asia supported that show and were very excited about the show. My hope is that this show is also well-received by the Asian exhibitors and perhaps some European and American exhibitors will attend as well. Black: I support this.</p> | | | |
| 7. | Anger Newkirk 02.13.20 | For its show in Pekayon Jaya, Indonesia, on February 22, 2020, grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04 and allow the Borneo Cat Fanciers to change their show format from 5 AB/1 SP to 5 AB, and move Allan Davies from SP to AB. | Motion Carried. Schleissner and Koizumi did not vote. |
| No discussion. | | | |
| 8. | Anger Newkirk | Modify Show rules, International Division awards (page 42) for this show season and succeeding show seasons to: 71-160 rings sponsored in an area = 15 awards*; and >160 rings sponsored in an area = 25 awards*. 71-94 rings sponsored in an area = 15 awards*; 95-117 rings sponsored in an area = 20 awards; and >117 rings sponsored in an area = 25 awards*. | Motion Carried. Koizumi did not vote. |
| <p>P. Moser: I need a better explanation on this. I don't understand the rationale. Hannon: Before calling for a vote, I am hoping someone can answer Pam's question. Morgan: To take the example further - So far this show season, Hong Kong has had twice the number of rings as Region 2. However, with the current ID scoring algorithm, they are only eligible for 15 award places, but Region 2 will receive 25 places. This motion is designed to adjust to the current environment and keeps things as equitable as possible. Morgan: From ID Chairs – an example... Region 5 had 118 rings last show season, but still was able to award 25 places. According to current rules, an ID area would need 161 rings to get the same number of places. An ID DW area should be able to receive 25 awards also if a Region 1-9 can receive 25 awards for the same number of rings. Awards less than 25 are based on a proportionate amount of 118. P. Moser: So we are just talking Regional awards not National correct? Auth: Shouldn't the region has some consideration based upon their ability to pay for awards? Black: I agree. Why should the ID have fewer awards than Region 1-9 with less total rings. This looks fair to me. Morgan: From Dick- "The ID has sufficient external sponsorship - last season, sponsorship was over</p> | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| US\$15,000; this season will probably be the same.” It is my understanding that the division IS asking for this change. | | | |
| 9. | Black Anger 02.20.20 | Approve \$7000 for Shephard to create our CFA Branding Guide. | Motion Carried. P. Moser voting no. Auth abstained. Schleissner and B. Moser did not vote. |
| Black: I hope the Board will support this. CFA spent [a large amount] back with Pam and Roanne with the 4kids promotion. The resulting designs were not continued. This will give us a top rate style guide and a wow factor to the website. Auth: While I support this and understand the need for it. I believe that \$7200 could be put to better use right now relative to marketing. | | | |
| 10. | Anger Krzanowski 03.04.2020 | Grant CatFashion Cat Club in Israel an additional \$670 \$237 of CFA assistance due to the coronavirus ban on judges coming from Thailand. | Motion Carried. |
| Newkirk: I will call United to check into options for the money we received toward the purchase of our airfares. Black: I was very impressed with the huge gate and the exhibitors holding a breed workshop during lunch. This club works very hard to support CFA in Israel where there is competition from other associations. I support this. Auth: I think it would be important that should this pass, the money is specifically limited to the CFA show and to airfare. I am not voting until this gets straightened out – until I have enough information about the cost of tickets and the liability to the club. | | | |
| 11. | Eigenhauser Newkirk 03.06.2020 | Adopt the amendment, as presented, to the existing procedure for late fees and suspensions upon failure to obtain a mandated cattery environment inspection. | Motion Carried. |
| No discussion. | | | |
| 12. | Anger Newkirk 03.10.2020 | Due to the coronavirus affecting parts of Asia, effective for the current show season (2019-2020), for International Division cats, grant an exception to the requirements under page 43, paragraph 4, requiring a kitten/cat to be shown at least once in the competitive category in the national area of final assignment. | Motion Carried. |
| No discussion. | | | |
| 13. | Anger Newkirk 03.11.2020 | Approve spending up to \$5,000 with Matt Banjo to close the books for January, and for February at the appropriate time. | Motion Carried. P. Moser, Auth and B. Moser voting no. Koizumi and Schleissner did not vote. |
| Executive Session Discussion involving personnel. | | | |
| 14. | Anger Krzanowski 03.13.2020 | Effective March 16, 2020 through May 31, 2020, that all CFA shows be shut down. This motion may be revisited, ended early or extended. | Motion Carried. Webster abstained. |
| Newkirk: I know this is really a difficult decision, but we are not living in normal times. I hate that we have to do this, but I will support this motion. Eigenhauser: I fully support the motion. We are in a global pandemic and we have to put the health of our people first. With shows closing piecemeal, if a local show gets cancelled it may encourage exhibitors to travel to other shows, increasing the risk of infection and spread of the disease. Yes, there will be economic consequences to the clubs that CFA may need to offset. Yes, we should consider changing our | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|--------------------|--|------|
| | | <p>awards to lower or eliminate some point minimums and otherwise try to avoid harm to exhibitors. We can discuss those separately. Right now we need to act in the best interest of our people. Once we have the moratorium in place we will have time to discuss mitigation later. Roy: The club I belong to has been discussing already cancelling for the 1st week of the new show season. Fear of no entries and fear that the gate will stay home too. Economically a fear of not being able to recover financially. This is a good decision. Black: I have been against canceling the remainder of the season as I think much of what we are experiencing is over reaction. That was my opinion yesterday, but today I feel differently about it. I fear that one of our exhibitors or judges will develop this virus and that will cause a wave of panic with the cat fancy. I would rather end the season than see that happen. P. Moser: I have some concerns here, as we have discussed before if we say we are cancelling the shows what kind of financial obligation are we going to incur? I of course, do not want to see anyone come down with this because they are traveling to a show. I have some clubs in my Region that this will destroy, others will be able to absorb the financial impact. I'm very conflicted on this one. Currie: This is the only thing that makes sense at this time. We can deal with the ramifications later. Auth: I am ready to vote right now and I will be voting Yes to cancel. P. Moser: If we are going to do this and that means this weekend's shows will be canceled, we need to vote right now. People will be getting on planes shortly. Hannon: CFA's Coronavirus Response Team discussed this. We wanted a clean motion for today so we can quickly get the word out if it passes. If there are no shows after this weekend, we have time to discuss how we can assist clubs who will lose money due to the cancellations. The team will meet next week and bring a proposal to the entire board. In the meantime, give some thought to what you believe is fair. As far as I can tell, the only show this weekend that has not been cancelled is Crab & Mallet in suburban Baltimore. They have a 6x6 which filled on Saturday and nearly filled on Sunday. They have been given permission by the government to hold the show but without gate. As we are discussing this motion, more and more clubs are sending out cancellation notices. The motion is to cancel shows a AFTER this weekend. Webster: I must be the only one who disagrees with this move of ending the show season. As Crab and Mallet has their show this weekend, in areas that is not being shut down should be allowed to have their shows. The Gov. gave them permission but no spectators. I think it should be up to the clubs and or the Government of the locality. Ending the show season now would hurt the clubs who can have the show in their area. Just my opinion. Is Las Vegas shutting down the casino's? Black: I disagree about the shows this weekend. People are already on their way, and Crab & Mallet has decided not to have any spectators. Mo-Kan has canceled. I would not want to harm the club at this late date. Newkirk: Idacats just cancelled. Webster: KC major canceled the events in that area. Palm Springs has canceled all events through the end of March so the show has canceled. However if an area is not shutting down, we should allow them to go ahead and have their shows. As many have already spent the money to have it. If we cancel is CFA paying for everything? If the state, Local gov. cancels then the clubs get their deposits back. I think everyone is a little premature with canceling the season, My question is why, campaigners? Mastin: Howard, It is too soon to know what all CFA will pay. Many of the clubs have already been or will have been forced to cancel shows by local and state authorities. When this happens, most show halls, hotels and other businesses will work with the clubs to retain future business. What the clubs will go throw is the same thing we/CFA is dealing with on the Annual hotel concerns in Washington State. The difference between the shows today and the annual in June is three months. Much will happen over that time, and we will need to address things on a daily and weekly basis. Unfortunately, things are predicted to get far worse before they get better. We the board, must work with all clubs on their upcoming challenges. This may and will require all types of assistance from; reviewing contracts, offering advice to contracts, possibly assisting in negotiating contracts and providing financial support. As of right now, nothing should be off the table, and we should be receptive to addressing all the challenges to the best of our abilities after we get through this motion. We will have plenty of work to do over the next couple of weeks, and I am sure we are all committed to helping to the best of our abilities.</p> <p>Mastin: This is an extremely difficult and challenging time for CFA, CFA clubs, exhibitors, business associates, friends, family members, communities and everyone impacted by the world wide epidemic.. CFA is very important to all of us and all who participate. However, what is currently happening globally with COVID-19 is health and life threatening, and it requires all of us to make difficult decisions that are in the best health interest of all parties involved in show production and for those visitors attending shows. We all need to be mindful cancelling CFA shows from March 16th to May 31st and ending this year's show season after this weekend is not life threatening. It is difficult, upsetting and will come at a cost. There will be many negative & criticizing comments, all kinds of recommendations and suggestions and some financial setbacks. CFA will recover over</p> | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>time (as will many others). This board will be tasked to do what we can to address all issues and concerns thrown or way. We will be required to be open minded, creative, willing to be helpful, accommodating to the best of our abilities, make concessions and be wise in our financial assistance and decisions. Once we get past this motion we will work on all the setbacks and concerns, from point minimums to financial help and everything in between. The motion is the right thing to do, and I am fully supportive. Newkirk: I think you touched on every salient point that need to be considered. I would suggest that we proceed with the vote? Mr President? Colilla: If we are going to cancel shows I think we should cancel up to the second weekend in April. We should have a better idea about the situation in a couple of weeks. We can always extend it a couple of weeks more. Morgan: I think Rich provides us with a well thought out and comprehensive summary of where we stand. This is not business as usual, and as such we need to do the right thing, however hard it might be. Sad as it is, I am supportive of this motion. Calhoun: I am fully supportive. This is a life threatening global situation - as we all know. This is the right thing to do.</p> | | | |
| 15. | Anger Krzanowski 03.20.2020 | Due to the global coronavirus pandemic, effective immediately through May 31, 2020, that CFA impose a moratorium on issuing show licenses for any show, regardless of show date or location. This motion may be revisited, ended early, extended, or subject to individual case-by-case exceptions. Once the moratorium is lifted and show license applications are once again accepted, shows within the late fee window will not accrue a late fee. | Motion Carried. Schleissner abstained. |
| <p>Auth: I was not able to listen in last night, but agree this is a smart move and really believe the Mark (as president) should be the ONLY one to formally announce this – not announced by any other board members. Roy: What is not in here in the explanation and perhaps it is a 2nd motion is that if licensed clubs cancel, they can roll over their show license/insurance to the next show season. Anger: That is a different motion. We are not talking about cancelling anything in this particular motion. It deals only with future show licenses. Newkirk: With many more cases in the USA and California and Oregon adding new rules today that ban gathering of more than 250 people, I think this board should consider shutting down all shows licensed but CFA immediately. No amount of financial loss would make up for the death of a fancier. I know this is drastic, but we need to discuss this, future shows are that. This is an emergent issue. [At this point the motion was tabled]</p> <p>[Motion re-introduced off the table] Mastin: Imo, based on the current happenings across the globe we do need a short-term moratorium on licensing future shows, and I am supportive of this motion. We need to do this at least until we have a clearer understanding of what improvements, changes and progresses are being made in each Area, Region and Country. If things improve sooner than later (this is not likely) we can change this decision, same will apply if things get worse (as Rachel has included in the motion). Eigenhauser: We brought up this motion for discussion a week ago but tabled it to take up the more urgent motion to suspend shows. Things have only gotten worse since then. I'm ready to vote. Roy: Rich makes some very valid points. I personally, do not think we should allow shows in any area until we can allow shows in every area. We do not know when or if travel restrictions and bans on public gatherings will be lifted. Eigenhauser: When CFA is ready to resume licensing shows it need to be in a manner that works for the Regions. We have relied on the RDs in R1-R7 to work together on show scheduling and try to resolve any differences among themselves. Before we restart show licensing (whenever that might be) it might be beneficial for the RDs 1-7 to have a conference call to find common ground about how to resume shows.</p> | | | |
| 16. | Morgan Calhoun 03.24.20 | Accept airfare flight reimbursement policy, as presented. | Motion Carried. Calhoun, Roy, P. Moser, Black, Colilla, Auth, Morgan, Newkirk and B. Moser abstained. |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|---|--------------------|--------|---------------------------------------|
| | | | Schleissner and Koizumi did not vote. |
| <p>Roy: This seems very fair. Will the clubs send a copy of the check as proof? Auth: I worry that the motion is non-specific with the words “as presented.” I think that needs to be more specific since “as presented” could have been at any time (i.e. as presented when???) Anger: When motions are made that have additional supporting documentation, this is the format that has always been used and has never been questioned. While I am not opposed to change, there is precedent for doing it this way, over a number of years. Auth: So Rachel can you modify the motion to include wording that says “as presented by Melanie at the March 18 COVID 19 teleconference.” Anger: This is not my motion. Auth: Then perhaps Melanie can modify the motion.</p> <p>Eigenhauser: No, that would be incorrect. The March 18 meeting came up with the framework but the exact wording was worked out later. The language presented is in the email that included the motion. So if any amendment is needed (and I do not think it is) it would be “as presented above” or “as presented herein” Auth: Then I ask Melanie to add the word herein. Morgan: The motion stands as presented. Auth: Then I will vote “no” since it is not stated specifically what was presented.</p> <p>Mastin: Melanie, Kathy C, Allene and I worked on this motion together on Thursday afternoon in order to get this in front of the board immediately after the last motion. This past Wednesday evening many of us felt it was important to work on this quickly so that we could inform Clubs and Judges what CFA would do in order to refund flights so that both parties were not waiting on such refunds in case they needed funds. I believe the motion appears to be in very good order for the board to approve. And, thank you and great job on quick turnaround to Melanie, Kathy C and Allene for working on this with me.</p> <p>If it matters during our meeting on Thursday, we estimated the total cost of refunding (before any credits will be applied for new flight bookings) could be in the \$72k to \$78k range. This is just an estimate if anyone wants to keep track of funds going out for all these different happenings.</p> <p>My next shared thoughts may very well be out of line or not. George and or others will hopefully comment and set me straight if he/all of you believe I need to be set straight.</p> <p>Because this motion is to reimburse Judges and or Clubs directly for prepaid airfare expenses, it might be best for all Judges who are on the board to abstain from voting so that this does not appear inappropriate or give reason for anyone to believe there could be a conflict of interest. I will be supporting this motion and I hope all fellow non-Judge board members will do the same. This is one of those motions that could be called into question should all Judges who are board members who vote in favor of this motion to reimburse x-expense, and then votes no against a y-expense reimbursement. Let’s keep you all protected from having to vote on something that will go directly to you or your fellow Judges. You may also want to limit your comments and be very careful on speaking against or in favor. I may be over reacting on this, but I don’t think so.</p> <p>Newkirk: Thank you Rich for your keen insight. I will abstain. Auth: I am aware that my “no” vote will have no impact. I am not against the spirit of the motion – but rather on the wording of the motion. I do believe, however, that as a judge, I should abstain. Morgan: Rich, you make a good point. Roy: Really good point.</p> <p>Morgan: George and/or John, do you have an opinion on whether judges should abstain or not? I made this motion and support it, but do not want to put us in a precarious situation if that is a risk. Black: I appreciate Rich’s words of caution but I have do not like to abstain on any vote. This votes helps the clubs and our judges. I support that and have no qualms voicing that. I asked Rachel what if the majority abstained. She said abstention is not counted as a no vote. Ratification at a meeting is when a majority is needed. Anger: Just to clarify, what Kathy and I discussed is that an abstention is handled as if the voting party were not present. So, if all board members vote (18) and two abstain, then we base pass/fail on 16. Newkirk: Kathy, I agree. I do not like to abstain, however I have submitted cancelled flight where CFA may be sending me money. That to me create a conflict of interest and could be viewed as voting for a motion that could be viewed as financial benefit. I do not want that to happen even though I support this motion.</p> | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|---|--------------------|--------|------|
| <p>Newkirk: At the risk of having paper wads thrown at me. This question is a perfect question for a motion to divide the question. I can explain that, or you can look it up. There are essentially two parts to this motion, one to reimburse clubs that have already paid a judge for an airfare for a show that has not been cancelled. The 2nd part is to refund to the judge, if they have not been paid by the club. If the question is divided, we would vote on each part. The beauty of it is that the judges can vote on part 1 and the judges that are going to ask for a refund would abstain. It isn't a financial benefit to a judge, as they expended money. However, there will always be someone that will complain. Just a suggestion to use a parliamentary motion to help solve the conundrum.</p> <p>Eigenhauser: We all have our own opinions on the matter and each is subject to the limitations of our own conscience. Each of us has to make our own decision on whether to abstain on a vote due to a possible conflict of interest when we may benefit from a motion. In addition, there is the need to maintain the appearance of integrity. For my \$0.02, if I were a judge and expected to be reimburse directly or indirectly by this action I personally would abstain. I wouldn't even be part of the debate. But it's not just what we do, it's also how it's perceived. The fancy does not know who has already purchased tickets or how they will be reimbursed. So if I were a judge, and had NO AIRFARES reimbursed under this policy, I would still abstain. The appearance of impropriety would be too great. Lawyers have a saying, loosely translated from the Latin: "the law, like Caesar's wife, must be above reproach." It means public figures must not only avoid wrongdoing but even the mere appearance of impropriety. If I were a judge I'd abstain. As always I remind the Board that our online votes are not legally meetings and parliamentary rules for meetings to not apply. Newkirk: Question for George, since you always bring this up about RRO being for meeting. How do we make a motion and have a debate on line. Are you saying that is the only course of action for the board to take. We can make a motion and vote on 1 thing, but toss of rules as they apply to motions in any other regard? Sorry, but I disagree with your argument. Morgan: Thank you George. I appreciate the input. Auth: And I would ask George – if our online "meetings" are not "legal" meetings, then are we violating the law. And if they are not binding, then any action we take relative to the C & M show will not be effective until we meet in person again?? Help me out here. Newkirk: Actually He speaks out of both sides of his mouth. A face to face meeting and a telephonic meeting when everyone is present and everyone can hear each meet the criteria for a deliberative assembly. The email voting does not. AND it is discouraged. However, we do this all the time. To say that we are not doing "business" is bullcrap. So any business we conduct does not have to be ratified at the next business meeting, like they did in October. I questioned it and George sided with Rachel. That is ok, but did you notice, they were not listed at February to be ratified? Eigenhauser: NY Law only allows virtual meetings if Board members are all together online together in real time. Our CFA Constitution allows virtual Board meetings by "conference telephone or similar communications equipment allowing all persons participating in the meeting to hear each other at the same." Our previous attorney advised us that while NY law does not allow email meetings, as long as we ratify the results at our next legal meeting we are good. Then it retroactively always was legal. Eigenhauser: I'm not sure of what you are saying. Ratification of the online motions was item 3 on the February agenda. Newkirk: Sorry, I used the wrong term, the teleconference meeting motions were not ratified at the Feb meeting. Eigenhauser: Actions taken at an official CFA Board meeting are different than unofficial e-mail votes. Actions taken at a meeting don't need to be ratified to be effective. The teleconference meetings ARE legal meetings per NY law and the CFA Constitution, Article VII, Section 3, which states in part: "Any one or more members of the Board may participate in a meeting of the Board by means of a conference telephone or similar communications equipment allowing all persons participating in the meeting to hear each other at the same time. Participation by such means shall constitute presence in person at a meeting." This language used in the CFA Constitution closely mirrors NY law at the time it was adopted. So actions taken at a regular meeting, face-to-face or telephonic, do not need to be ratified to be legal. However, it is good practice to approve the minutes of one meeting at the next. Unofficial votes taken by e-mail technically need to be ratified later. Newkirk: At the October 2019 meeting, the ratification of on line motions were followed by ratification of the Teleconference motions. Page 17 of the minutes to remind you. I questioned then why we were ratifying the teleconference minutes. You argued against me. Did you have an epiphany since October 2019? Rachel let her motion stand and we approved the minutes of the teleconference. Now you are taking a position in line with what I said back then? Thank you. Eigenhauser: No, you are just very confused. As I stated in October 2019: "Wait a second. It's traditional to approve the minutes after they are transcribed unless we are approving the transcription, not the actions. With respect to the email votes, we're ratifying the actions. With respect to the other minutes, we're ratifying the minutes." Mark then asked Rachel if</p> | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|--------------------|--------|------|
| <p>she would so move, and she did. For minutes of an official meeting we are voting on the accuracy of the transcription, not the underlying actions. For unofficial actions, like online votes, we are ratifying the action itself. That is what I said then.. That is what I am saying now. It is good practice to approve the minutes of one meeting at the next. Unofficial votes taken by e-mail technically need to be ratified later. Newkirk: Fantastic, The motion was to ratify the teleconference motions, not to approve, them please read the whole thing. I saw what you did, but it didn't change the fact that we approved / ratified motions that were already ratified. My statement was we don't need to ratify them. You were more than anxious to countermand my comments. Its ok George, we have been on the Board for many years together and you do a great job. I have gotten used to your opposition on almost every item of debate that I utter. Auth: So George, Here is my concern. We motioned and passed by email the following motion on March 12. (see below). So please clarify. In order for this to be a legal motion, it has to be ratified – presumably on Wednesday, March 25 when the board meets telephonically. The question you have not yet answered (or I haven't seen your answer) is this: Until ratified – an email motion is not valid and cannot be implemented. Therefore, we passed a motion on March 12 and implemented the result of that motion (cancelled all shows beginning March 16). Did we do something illegal by implementing the motion? Are we at risk to be challenged? Eigenhauser: As I mentioned, our previous attorney advised us on this years ago when we began the practice. It's a bit of a kludge but not it is not illegal. Auth: Then until we ratify the motion on C & M (yet to come) and the current motion on judge's reimbursement during our April meeting – how can they legally implemented prior to the April meeting? Newkirk: Additionally, there is no provision for email voting in our constitution if you want to get technical. Eigenhauser: Thank you. That is what I keep saying. Technically we can't take Board votes by e-mail. Our CFA Constitution does not provide for e-mail voting by the Board. NY Law does not allow it either. Hamza wanted the whole Board to be able to vote on important matters by e-mail between Board meetings but that is not authorized under NY Law. So our then attorney advised we could do a work-around. While the e-mail votes are technically not official, any actions taken by e-mail are ratified at the next meeting. That is the basis for our Board e-mail votes. This is one area where NY law may still be a bit behind real life. But we make-do.</p> <p>Auth: Just to clarify. If a board takes action on a motion before the motion is ratified, is the action illegal?</p> <p>Randolph: My understanding of New York law is that action taken on a motion made and voted on by email may be subject to challenge until the motion and action are ratified at a properly called Board meeting held either in person, telephonically or other technological medium in real time. Even after the decision on the notion and action have been ratified, an aggrieved party could bring a lawsuit in New York challenging the decision under New York Consolidated Laws, Civil Practice Law and Rules - CVP § 217. I understand that in such action, called a Section 78 Action, the standard for determination of the Board's decision would be the Business Judgment Rule which, given the present circumstances, would make the decision difficult to overturn. Auth: Thanks John for the explanation. I want to be sure of the board's exposure on this and future email votes before ratification. Newkirk: I agree with John on this issue, and I thank him for providing his interpretation of NY law. My concern is this. We often have an email vote and put the action item in that vote into practice, when we have not had a meeting to ratify the action. In the above referenced case, we can justify, due to the outbreak of COVID-19 and the response of many of the state prohibiting crowds of great than 10 people. But, what about an action item that cannot be justified. What concerns me is this part of Section 708 of the NPC law. <i>(a) Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, any reference in this chapter to corporate action to be taken by the board shall mean such action at a meeting of the board. (b) Unless otherwise restricted by the certificate of incorporation or the by-laws, any action required or permitted to be taken by the board or any committee thereof may be taken without a meeting if all members of the board or the committee consent to the adoption of a resolution authorizing the action. Such consent may be written or electronic.</i></p> <p>Randolph: I understand your concern in reference to subsection (a) of Section 708 and that is why I focused my response on ratification of what has occurred. I don't believe that subsection (b) prohibits after the fact ratification of actions taken without full board approval, but would want some input from our New York attorney before making a blanket statement to that effect. To me, subsection (b) permits action by unanimous approval where notice requirements or other impediments prevent calling a board meeting before the action is required. An example would be the approval and execution of loan documents for a major financing transaction that has a closing deadline.</p> | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|---|---------------------------------|---|---|
| 17. | Anger Newkirk | Due to email transmission difficulties, accept the declaration for ID-Rep from Heike Anne Hagenguth which was submitted via email on March 15, 2020, prior to the declaration deadline. | Withdrawn. |
| 18. | Anger Mastin 04.01.2020 | Due to mail difficulties, accept the declaration for ID-China Representative from Zhi Ning which was alleged to have been submitted via regular mail on March 7, 2020, prior to the declaration deadline. | Motion Failed. |
| <p>Anger: While I appreciate anyone who offers to volunteer for CFA, we have processes and procedures in place that should be adhered to. When it comes to a declaration for office, the burden is on the candidate to make sure the declaration arrives with ample time for confirmation, and should be submitted in such a way that it can be verified. Currle: I agree with Rachel.</p> | | | |
| 22. | Colilla Mastin 04.03.2020 | Allow the Great Lakes Region to hold a pet fair in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania on November 6-8, 2020, which is 483 miles from the New Hampshire Feline Fanciers show in Schenectady, New York. | Motion Carried. Anger, Roy and Currle abstained. |
| <p>Mastin: I am also supportive of a show within x-miles of the current 500 mile sort of rule (not sure it's a hard rule, more so a number that has been used for Regions and the Board to negotiate with). 17 miles seems reasonable in this case (and likely most all cases), and since some have expressed concerns with changing the recommended 500 mile rule this makes sense to allow. A possible concern/question might be, are we handling this request properly during the moratorium on issuing show licenses and show sponsorships? I suppose the motion could be approved, yet the club cannot license the show seems sort of odd to me. I realize at some point shows will be licensed and sponsorship requests will be approved, we just don't know when that will happen. I understand John needs to get back to the Pet Expo contact in order for him/her to count on CFA attending or not. If the motion is approved John could always inform the contact that the show cannot be licensed until CFA lifts the moratorium on issuing show licenses, and CFA and the Great Lakes Region cannot be held responsible for any expenses if the event is cancelled for any reason. I am not suggesting things will or will not be back to normal by November 6-8, 2020, we really don't know what the occupancy restrictions might be (if any) going forward. My sense is occupancies for large gatherings may not go back to normal right away, and local, state and federal governments may want to gradually increase occupancies over time (this could be a problem for some events and some areas). Auth: If I were to guess. The Pet Expo doesn't care about our ability to license a show, they only want to know if there will be a cat presence there. If we are not able to license a November show, then we have much bigger problems to deal with. I think the bigger question is – will the board support John's efforts to engage with a pet expo in Pittsburgh. Colilla: I talked to Rocco early today. He is aware that it depends on the approval of CFA. I can also tell him about our moratorium and we will not be held responsible for any expenses if the event is cancelled for any reason. Mastin: You could be correct that the Pet Expo doesn't care if the show is licensed, however, I think the Pet Expo should know up front that CFA is not licensing any shows right now and CFA and the Region does not want to be responsible if the event is cancelled, and if John and his region cannot have a cat show. We just don't know what the new normal will be in 7 months. I sure hope things improve quickly, but I don't have a great feeling for how things are going to play out over the next three to six months. Trying very hard to be positive and look at what are the potential great things that could happen over the next two to three weeks to shed positive light on getting back to normal. We need to be concerned, cautious, possibly conservative on many things and hopefully wise in our decisions. I support the request and have concerns. Krzanowski: I agree with Rich's concerns. It would not be advisable to solidly commit to any event until we have a better feel for when the problems surrounding the virus may level off and things may begin to return to some semblance of normal. I also agree that restrictions on large gatherings may remain in place for some time, even after conditions improve. That being said and provided things work out by that time, I support the motion. Auth: If we cannot license a show it will likely happen that the Pet Expo will also be cancelled. I suppose a contract can be written with language that supports that. I think acting positively is the way to go. We can cover</p> | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|---------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>ourselves with legal words. Mastin: As long as John communicates to the Pet Expo our current position on licensing shows, and CFA & the Region cannot be held responsible for cancelations (event or the CFA show), I would feel more comfortable addressing this motion. If these two are absent from the motion we should not approve as requested. The Pet Expo contact would want to know our current status and what our expectations are, so that he/she can make the right decisions. This is good business for all parties and it helps to develop a stronger relationship in the future. Colilla: I can make sure he is aware of it. He told me we were really easy to work with and did not cause him any issue. He said it cost him \$10,000 to have us there last year because of the space and union cost. He also mention that he put on other events. I am going to talk to him about other events maybe we can do something out of the box. Newkirk: I would like to know what show format is planned by John. If he plans a 6X6, then that would really adversely affect a show within the 500 mile radius. Colilla: 4x4 like last year. Newkirk: Ok, I am confused. We get an email from Rachel on behalf of the Exec. Committee that [text deleted] and not further expos are going to happen. Now we are being asked to approve one. What is What? Hannon: I shared your confusion so I asked Allene about it. At this event last year Allene, Jo Ann, Desiree, and Amber worked the CFA Booth that was adjacent to [the cat show at] this expo. She told me CFA staff could handle it next year. I suspect that it is helpful that Pittsburgh is not too far from Alliance.</p> | | | |
| 23. | Newkirk Mastin 04.06.2020 | The award for the Japanese Bobtail (Shorthair) Breed Winner [and for the Persian – Smoke & Shaded Division Breed Winner] for the 2019-2020 show season shall be shared between the two highest scoring cats [of each breed], as Co-Best of Breed winners, with both cats getting the BW title. | Motion Failed. Mastin, P. Moser, Black, Auth, Schleissner, Newkirk and B. Moser voting yes. |
| <p>[Secretary's Note: the motion was amended by the addition of the bracketed words.]</p> <p>Newkirk: Can we hold up a few minutes. I sent Rachel the updated motion. I spoke with Allene today after reviewing the post Mark shared with Board in regard to the Breed winners. I missed it when he first posted it. After speaking with Allene today, she informed me that the Persian Smoke and Shaded Division winner also switched after scoring Crab and Mallet. As you all are aware, everything that I post in a motion is scrutinized to a nonometer. So I didn't want to miss a cat. Thankfully, Allene informed me of the additional Breed/Divison winner that was affected by scoring Crab and Mallet. I apologize to Rachel, as I sent the motion below before checking in with Allene.</p> <p>Black: Darrell I was going to mention the S&S cat. Are you amending your motion to include this cat? Newkirk: Yes, that is correct. Anger: Working for home has been a challenge. My internet is cut off at 6:00 and Darrell's updated request arrived at 6:01. So, my apologies that there was not an immediate response. Morgan: Since there seem to be a number of "issues" regarding Breed wins, I would prefer to discuss any proposed changes during the teleconference meeting. This would give us time to pull together all requests, look at the data and make an informed decision on all the requests. To add to my request to delay this until our regularly scheduled meeting, I am wondering what input the chair of our awards committee has on these requests? Hannon: We also have Mary K's comments about residency requirement that we dropped this past Wednesday. She feels we should not be doing this for kittens that aged out prior to the coronavirus situation since they had ample time to show in their own area.</p> <p>Morgan: I reached out to Mary [Kolencik] for her input as I wanted to get a better handle on the situation and I felt that the Recommendation of the Chair of the Awards Committee should at least be considered. Here is her response:</p> <p><i>In the case of the JBob, the US JBob was going to pass the European JBob. It was doing much better at shows. It granded in late December and was picking up points fast. The US has more shows than Europe, higher count, it was going to pass. For the Europeans to be complaining so much over this pass at Crab & Mallet is not realistic, the European JBob was going to come in 2nd unless something happened to the owner of the US Jbob. Also, the Smoke & Shaded Persian that was passed had around 200 points, did the owner really think they could hold onto that spot? That title was going down too.</i></p> | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|---|--------------------|--------|------|
| <p><i>This is getting out of hand. Soon, people will want to be awarded GC titles for cats that are a few points short. There might be cats that were displaced from RWs by the Crab & Mallet show, what about them? What about cats that were displaced from regional breed awards by that show? Where is the line? Why does the line go to whoever complains the loudest or whoever catches the attention of a board member?</i></p> <p><i>I do not support dual BW titles, I would vote no. This is just not what our competition is supposed to be about. One show does not make an award, we have the whole season to get enough points for that title, and to claim that one show caused another cat to win is not fair. I know of no other sport, other than little league baseball or pee wee football that would ever consider this.</i></p> <p><i>That said, I understand I might be in the minority on this (since I never would have diluted the NWs as the board did) and I really would rather the board not issue ties. The cats did not tie. The board could award dual titles but keep the order for the awards presentation. In other words, both bobtails get a BWR, but when presented (if we ever have a presentation), they are presented in order. The trophy says Best of Breed, because the only person that sees the trophy is the owner, so it can say whatever. We announce them as Best JBob (and same for the others). And there are still just 3 cats that get breed awards. If the owner of the one that is highest scoring wants to run a yearbook ad that says Best X and highest scoring X, then they can do that. Call it a dual BWR title, just don't call it a tie. I don't like this, but it is better than a tie. Just please don't issue ties. This isn't pee wee football.</i></p> <p><i>As for the middle East cat, that is totally out IMO. We can't go back to every cat that was affected by certain shows and adjust the titles. Where is the line? Is this a competition or is it little league? If the board wants to do something for the Himalayan, then how about this. I am a co-breeder of a CPSH that was being shown in Israel. She ended the season in 2nd place in Israel, 2 points behind the Maine Coon in 1st place. Just 2 points. There was another show to be held in Israel where she likely would have passed the best cat. There is only one DW in Israel. Hey, if I complain enough do you think I could get the board to consider a motion to go ahead and give two DWs in Israel since the CPSH was just 2 points behind???? I mean, if everybody else is getting these special dispensations, why shouldn't that cat get it too. Where is the line?</i></p> <p>BTW, I'm not asking for a 2nd DW, just illustrating that there are many cats that were affected. Newkirk: I called Allene to see if other cats were involved She informed me about the Persian. I provided that info in the work up for the motion.</p> <p>Morgan: Before I vote I want to say one thing for the record as a relatively new board member... I believe we all want what is best for CFA and the breeders and exhibitors. We may disagree on what that means or how to go about accomplishing that, but essentially we all want the same thing. None of this should be personal and in this instance where we are discussing titles, we need to do our level best to stay neutral when deciding awards. I do not think a lively discussion is counterproductive. I do not think that spending time discussing the motions is meandering. Often when we rush to "do the right thing" or help one individual we make decisions without considering all the consequences, intended or not. I understand that when people reach out to us our first instinct is to help, but stepping back and taking the time to consider the big picture, or other related issues makes good sense. I find that often when we get into discussion on an issue someone brings up something I had not considered. It is our job to take the time to listen and take action on making informed decisions. This line of debate is what we all signed up for is it not? I applaud every effort to consider all the data and not rush to make a decision. Last Wednesday it took us one hour and forty six minutes to change CFA history. I think when we rush through agendas to get things done, we do ourselves and CFA a disservice. Sometimes we need to take a step back to look at the big picture. It is impossible to come up with a totally fair solution for every scenario this season because guess what? There is nothing right about the challenges we are facing. I thank Darrell for bringing these latest issues to our attention... I thank Mary K for all the hard work she put into analyzing the numbers. I thank Kenny for bringing up yet another issue and Mark for yet another... and while I am doing my academy award thing... I might as well thank central office for all the numbers crunching as well... there is no right and wrong here, just a whole lot of people trying to do the right thing in a messed up situation. Roy: This is a really hard decision where we have said yes to so many other requests. We have no way of predicting what might have happened if the show season went on. When do we draw the line? Currle: The reasoning for my pending motion was in consideration of a similar situation in the ID-other which I saw as my obligation as committee chair of the AWA/CSA to forward to the board on behalf of our CFA breeders in that area. If the present motion fails, I will</p> | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|-----|--------------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>withdraw my motion. Newkirk: Melanie, Thanks you for a very well thought out presentation. The CFA Board asked Central Office to give us the impact on the NWs after scoring Crab and Mallet. Allene informed us it would take a few days to see the impact on the Breed wins. Mark forwarded that file to Board. I overlooked the attachment. There were complaints sent to Mark by the owners of the JBT. They were informed that no one brought it up at the Board meeting, last week. I called Allene, because I didn't understand the file when I printed it out. Scoring Crab and Mallet changed the Breed winner for the two cats that I list (by breed) in my motion. It was the final issue we had to deal with in regard to Crab and Mallet scoring. The cat Kenny is talking about, was not affected by Crab and Mallet Scoring. The cat Mark referred to as being Best Cat in Premeirship, has nothing to do with Crab and Mallet scoring, at least I do not think that has anything to do with moving into 2nd place. All of these things can be discussed. In their order and in their time. My point was not to diminish anyone's concerns that we should address. We should address them all, if they are brought to our attention.</p> <p>Mastin: I believe back on March 13, 2020 Mary Auth may have begun the Board list email discussions on concerns with allowing Crab & Mallet show to continue. In Mary's March 13th email Mary stated, "I am already getting some pushback on letting the Crab & Mallet show continue." My initial response (also sent to the entire Board on March 13, 2020) and one of many thoughts to Mary's initial email discussion was, "I agree with those who say points earned at Crab & Mallet should not impact National or Breed standings." My position and opinion has not changed, I believe the Board has an obligation to look at the negative impacts to those who did not attend Crab & Mallet or who was pushed out of NW or BW placement(s). I also shared some thoughts on Regional level in the same email (not needed for this discussion). Assuming these are the only two breeds that have been negatively impacted, I am ready to vote. If these are not the only two breeds, I hope we are not pushing this motion too quick, otherwise we will revisit this again. As for all the other issues that we are presented with, I believe we need to look at each request separately or group them if the same. This is a very complicated and stressful year due to outside forces negatively impacting CFA's traditional showing and scoring procedures. Unfortunately we will not be able to make everyone happy (and nor should this be our goal), and we will be criticized for attempting to make reasonable and fair decisions. Imo this motion is reasonable and fair.</p> <p>Mastin: I also failed to mention a possible concern that might need to be taken into consideration – any Board member(s) who have shown or bred a cat/kitten that was shown in the 2019-2020 season that is eligible for a BW may want to abstain from voting on this motion. John R and George may be able to offer some advice on this.</p> <p>Newkirk: Rich, also any board members that judged Crab and Mallet have a potential conflict. Hannon: The decision to abstain on a motion has historically been left up to the individual board member. I realize Rich stated "may" want to abstain. This is the decision for each board member. If you judged Crab & Mallet and do not believe you have a conflict, you have a right to vote. Calhoun: Following is a procedure based on the Alice Sturgis's The Standard Code for Parliamentary Procedure but also applicable to Roberts Rules of Order. <i>What is a conflict of interest? A "conflict of interest" exists when a person in a position of trust has competing professional or personal interests.</i></p> <p>Schleissner: The two guys showing the JBSH did a great job; unfortunately they have the wrong mentor.. It sounds to me, that Henny Wintershoven is very much involved in this business. Isn't she suspended from all CFA services? Once again she is violating the board's decision, what a surprise. This is what she posted on the discussion page on April/02. She tells us, that she entered the cat for another 6 shows, she bought flight tickets and paid the entree fees, all this in public on FB. She just ignores the board and now she wants to press us. Anyway, if nobody has a problem with such behaviors I vote yes, because the two guys in her side haven't woke up. Currie: I recall that scoring the C&M show was unanimous (1 abstain) without any designations or ramifications for any particular entry. Would we need to amend that motion if this passes?</p> | |
| 24. | Anger Newkirk 04.10.2020 | Amend the April 1, 2020 Motion as follows: 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. This motion does not include Kittens who attained the age of 8 months on or before March 16, 2020. | Motion Carried. Roy, P. Moser, Auth and Koizumi abstained. Schleissner did not vote. |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|---|--------------------|--------|------|
| <p>Eigenhauser: Kittens who aged out before the shows ended could not have shown later to meet their residency requirement. We should fine tune this a bit. Auth: I have gotten some comments about this from people in my region and will be voting to reconsider. Newkirk: May I please make a statement. Reconsider is out of order. This can be corrected one of two ways, both versions of the same motion. Rescind or amend something previously adopted, they are basically the same motion, one annuls the action, the other amends the action. Either motion needs 2/3 vote to pass. However, this could be prenoticed, that way it only needs majority vote. To act upon it. Just my thoughts and John can weigh in on this. Newkirk: Mark, please consult your parliamentarian. A motion to reconsider can only be made on the same day the motion was adopted or the next day, the adjourned meeting. I am in favor of this please do not misunderstand me. I just want it done right. Have Mary K write up the amended motion, pre=notice it for the April 14 meeting and it only needs a majority vote to Pass. It is a very simple fix, and it done within the rules. Eigenhauser: Just a reminder to everyone that the April 1 meeting was not an official Board meeting. To be an official meeting it must be pre-noticed 30 days according to the requirements of the CFA Constitution. Any action taken at the April 1 meeting is not official until ratified by the Board at an official meeting. Hannon: Perhaps the best way to deal with this is to have the person who made the motion to reconsider withdrawn the motion and someone can make a new motion. Auth: Nice said George. This is how it should be.</p> <p>Hannon: Darrell commented that Robert's Rules only permit a vote to be reconsidered during the meeting at which a motion is made. I conferred with our legal counsel and he agrees that is his interpretation of Robert's Rules. John further commented, as has George multiple times, that we do not always follow Robert's Rules at our board meetings. John suggested that we would be better served by a motion to Amend the motion passed at our April 1, 2020 meeting which is listed above. I am ruling the motion made yesterday to Reconsider out of order. I am requesting someone to make a motion to Amend the motion made at our April 1, 2020 meeting dealing with the residency requirement. [Anger revises motion as appears above.] Newkirk: I will 2 Nd. With the understand that the vote required is 2/3rds to pass. Eigenhauser: I know we are working partly on the Board e-mail list and partly in conversations with Mary K and others. We are also trying to listen to our constituents at the same time. So I don't blame anyone for needing some time to sort this out. I have a slight problem with this motion. Mary K correctly pointed out that any kitten who already aged out before the moratorium on shows would not have been able to show in their home Region to establish residency. They could not have done so even if there had never been COVID-19. So those kittens [who timed out before] should have been excluded from looser residency requirements. However, this new motion still leaves kittens looking for regional wins, whose owners planned to show them later in the show season, from using the same rules for residency as CH/PR cats in the same situation. I would prefer the last line exclude kittens who already timed out, but not all kittens. Newkirk: How does this affect kittens that were being shown until March 14-15? Are any kittens that were shown in January, February and March impacted? Hannon: Do we know how this impacts Regional awards? While we were told during the board meeting that all kittens had aged out by the time we cancelled shows, that comment referred to nationally ranked kittens. There may be kittens that were still young enough to continue to be shown had we not cancelled shows through May. As I understand the motion, by removing all kittens, we still require kittens to be shown once in their home Region or ID. Some younger kittens may have had plans to do that before they aged out but we removed that possibility for kittens that could have otherwise been shown in latter March, April, and May. Newkirk: Mark, Thank you, that was my thoughts, although I did not express it very well. As Mary K pointed out, all the NW kittens had aged out and this motion would not affect them, but it could affect Regional placements. Not sure how we find out the answer to the question on regional kitten placements, but we need that bit of information to make an informed decision on the motion. Hannon: Shirley would normally verify that RW cats/kittens had met the residency requirement prior to releasing the regional end-of-season lists. She likely has already done that for this year but I will ask and get back to you with the impact of this amended motion. Anger: From Mary K: <i>I have been told there is a kitten in region [omitted] that is in the top 25 that did not meet the residency requirement but completed its kitten season *before* the season was closed. Central Office would be better able to answer if other kittens are affected. This should be simple. If a kitten aged out before the season ended, it should meet the residency requirement unless it was somehow affected by a lack of shows, such as in Asia. But a blanket waiver in R1-7 allows kittens that *could* have met the requirement to have a waiver. If the residency requirement is waived for every kitten, then at least one kitten that I know of will get an RW without having met the requirement when it could have.</i> By copy of this response, I am requesting Allene to have</p> | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|--------------------|--------|------|
| <p>someone get us this information. Newkirk: Are we not singling out one kitten? This was the complaint about the BWs, we singled out a cat. If we are going to have fair play, we need to be consistent in how we deal with issues. Anger: A question was asked and this was simply the response to that question. You will note that I omitted the region, so no one is singling out a specific cat – it is merely being pointed out that (at least) one cat falls under the parameters of the question asked. Newkirk: Rachel, you made the motion on behalf of Mary K, she singled out 1 kitten. I don't blame you for posting the motion, like she blamed me for the motions I made. Auth: And I am getting heat for that one kitten. I believe it should NOT be in the top 25 in its region and the exhibitor knows it and actually had the same thing happen to her last year. I also believe that Mary K is correct in bringing it to our attention. Hannon: I think there may be an easy solution. We could limit the original motion to exclude kittens that had aged out prior to the moratorium on shows. [Anger amends motion as appears above.]</p> <p>Anger: Here is Allene's response: <i>As best we can tell, no. There are some kittens which could have picked back up showing and maybe moved into the top 25 and would need to meet the regional requirement but we didn't look at those kittens since we have no way of knowing they would have gone to a show if one had been available.</i> If anyone has a question that this does not answer, my recommendation is to ask it directly of Allene. Newkirk: I guess the question I have is this: Are there kittens in the top 25 ranking that are still of showing age that will be knocked out of the 25 because we cancelled the show season and took away their ability to show in their region? I am not sure if Allene's response below answers that question. Anger: To avoid confusion, please ask Allene directly. Newkirk: Just to be clear. If we do not know if any current kittens may be negatively impacted that are of show age and may have been prevented from meeting the test of residency, I cannot support this motion. What good does it do to correct something Mary K should have considered when she suggested her original motion that I presented from her comments to the committee, if we amend something previously adopted and then create a different unintended consequence? This has gotten confusing and until it is clear I am not inclined to support the motion. Hannon: I do not understand your stated reluctance to support the motion. Kittens that aged out prior to the cancellation of shows had a full four months to follow the existing Show Rule. If they did not accomplish that, they are not in compliance with the rule and the rule kicks in. If a kitten was still eligible to be shown as a kitten beyond the last weekend of the show season (March 14-15), we will not require that the kitten be shown in its own Region/ID. It does not matter if that is one kitten or 20. We are not making this exception for a particular kitten but for every kitten to which it applies. This motion treats all affected kittens the same. Anger: What is unclear to me is what your question is. I recommended that you contact Allene to get the answer to your question, but rather than do that and help us all be clearer, you are giving up? I have spent a good part of the day going back and forth with Allene to try to answer your questions and have failed, which is why I recommended that anyone with questions go to her directly. To use one of your phrases, Darrell, I have no dog in the fight but neither do I want to abandon this. You say you want to avoid unintended consequences, but this very situation IS an unintended consequence that should be resolved. The purpose of the discussion phase is exactly this – to overcome any confusion. Let's do that. Newkirk: The motion states, this does not include kittens. Therefore, kittens must comply with the residency requirement. The stated objective to amend a previously adopted motion is correct a kitten in a regional standing (that should not have been there). There may be kittens of show age, that may be excluded from an RW, if we make them comply with the residency requirement, as this motion excludes them from the waiver. If there are no kittens to be affected, then just say so, but it appears from Allene's comments they cannot tell. My objection is this, if we pass this, kick the kitten out of the regional standings that should not have been there under the old rule before we passed a motion to allow a waiver, then we are in the same boat and padding from the other side. Newkirk: Rachel, I didn't mean to muddy the waters. However, we have two sets of circumstances with kittens. We have NWs, they have aged out and should be easily determined that they met the residency/divisional requirement. We also have a subset of kittens that have not aged out, those are the ones that concern me. E.g. I have a 6 month old kitten I have shown in region 3, I planned to show at the Las Vegas CC show, but now that show is cancelled, and I cannot meet the residency requirement. I am now screwed, if we has this motion. The last sentence says, does not apply to kittens. So, NO WAIVER for the residency requirement for my kitten. Does that explain it? I don't know of a different path to explanation. I know you think I am trying to be difficult, but I just want to make sure our action doesn't impact another person's kitten that might be negatively impacted. If we can clear that up, I am 100% on board. Hannon: I believe Rachel revised her motion which might resolve your issue with the motion attached to this thread. Look at her latest motion. Eigenhauser: Darrell, I think you missed a message earlier in this thread. Rachel withdrew the first</p> | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|--------------------|--------|------|
| <p>motion and submitted a new one. The new last sentence now reads: “This motion does not include Kittens who attained the age of 8 months on or before March 16, 2020.” So the kitten in your hypothetical, who the owner planned to show in Las Vegas on March 28 but couldn’t due to the moratorium, would still get the relaxed residency requirement. But kittens who aged out before the moratorium took effect would not. Their show season ended when they aged out and the moratorium didn’t affect their ability to show where they chose. I agree with you. I didn’t like the first version either. I also agree that we need to all be clear on what we’re voting on. But I hope the change resolved your question. Newkirk: Thank you George. Yes, that answers my concerns, and I must have missed that email. Yes, it does answer my concerns. Hannon: I may have lost track. Has anyone seconded this motion? Newkirk: I did. Anger: Thank you for the explanation Darrell but make no mistake - I have clarity over the situation. That was never the issue. My reason for referring you to Allene for your questions was that something always gets lost in the translation when too many people are involved. We are all under a magnifying glass right now and I am doing everything I can to try to avoid confusion. Stepping away from your inquiry process was the best way for me to do that. I appreciate and agree with your concern for having the most information possible.</p> | | | |

Anger: Rachel has something. **Hannon:** Go ahead, Rachel. **Anger:** I presented the online motions and would like to move that they be ratified. **Eigenhauser:** I’ll second. **Hannon:** Is there any discussion on this? All those in favor.

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

RATIFICATION OF TELECONFERENCE MOTIONS

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|---|------------------------|---|---|
| • From March 25, 2020 Special Meeting Teleconference • | | | |
| 33. | Currle Morgan | Score the Crab and Mallet show in accordance with our CFA show rules and procedures. | Motion Carried. |
| 34. | Calhoun Eigenhauser | That a club that has been given pre-show sponsorship money (the \$500 sent in advance as part of the \$1,000 that we provide to every club; new show sponsorship; and in-conjunction) for a show during the mandatory cancellation period March 16 th through May 31 st would retain the sponsorship money, to use for any reason they see fit. | Motion Carried. |
| 35. | Calhoun Masstin | An additional \$500 post-show sponsorship will be available for clubs that have contracted and paid for advertising up to \$1,000. Requires receipt and proof they could not negotiate out of the charges. | Motion Failed. Calhoun, Morgan, Roy, Colilla, Auth, P. Moser and B. Moser voting yes. |
| 36. | Black Mastin | Post-show sponsorship will be available for clubs that have contracted and paid for advertising up to \$1,000. Requires receipt and proof they could not negotiate out of the charges. | Motion Carried. |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|-----|------------------------------|---|---|
| 37. | Calhoun Krzanowski | The show license and insurance (\$200) paid for a show that has been cancelled due to coronavirus will be refunded (estimated to be \$12,00). | Motion Carried. |
| 38. | Calhoun Eigenhauser | Entry clerk fees are eligible for reimbursement for entries processed through March 20, 2020. | Motion Carried. |
| 39. | Calhoun Anger | Show hall or event deposits or payments will not be reimbursed by CFA. | Motion Carried. Schleissner voting no. |
| 40. | Calhoun Black | Down payments to third-party catering (not supplied by the venue) are eligible for reimbursement consideration or negotiation. | Motion Carried. |
| 41. | Calhoun Eigenhauser | CFA will not reimburse any travel costs for exhibitors and attendees as a result of cancelled CFA events as a result of coronavirus concerns. | Motion Carried. |
| 42. | Eigenhauser Auth | Apply the above motions to shows that were cancelled between January 1 to March 16, 2020 by Government regulations are eligible to apply for the above reimbursements. | Motion Carried. Anger and Calhoun voting no. Currle abstained. |
| 43. | Eigenhauser Mastin | Reimburse catalog printing costs for shows held between January 1 - March 15, 2020 due to government edict to cancel the show. | Motion Carried. |
| 44. | Eigenhauser Mastin | New airfare reimbursement program applied for shows from March 16 – May 31, 2020 be extended to shows cancelled by the government for shows January 1 – March 15, 2020. | Motion Carried. Calhoun, Morgan, Black, P. Moser, B. Moser, Roy, Auth and Colilla abstained. |
| 45. | Implied in all motions above | Clubs must provide proof of payment to be considered eligible for reimbursement. Any charges in excess of provision will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. | |
| 46. | Calhoun Mastin | That we not hold the 2020 CFA annual as scheduled. | [after motion below to table fails] Motion Carried. Newkirk and Auth voting no. Schleissner abstained. |
| 47. | Newkirk Auth | Table the above motion until the April 14, 2020 teleconference. | Motion Failed. Auth, Newkirk, B. Moser and |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|----------------------------|--|--|
| | | | Schleissner voting yes. |
| 48. | P. Moser Curle | For unreimbursed expenses incurred by Region 2 due to the cancellation of the annual, that CFA will pay those expenses upon receipt from the region | Motion Carried. P. Moser abstained. |
| 49. | Newkirk Eigenhauser | The requirement to qualify as a traditional date is not affected by the cancellation of shows. | Motion Carried. |
| 50. | Mastin Eigenhauser | Give the CFA Foundation rent relief in the form of a waiver during the mandated shutdown until the mandates are lifted; the month of March to be prorated based on the date that they were shut down. | Motion Carried. Krzanowski and Calhoun abstained. |
| • From April 1, 2020 Special Meeting Teleconference • | | | |
| 51. | Newkirk Anger | That the current NW point minimums be adjusted based on the chart as presented. | Motion Carried. Krzanowski abstained. |
| 52. | Newkirk Curle | That the current Grand of Distinction 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. | Motion Carried. |
| 53. | Newkirk Anger | 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. | Motion Carried. |
| 54. | Newkirk Anger | That Show Rule XXXVI be set aside and the awards as presented be given to the DWs for this year only. | Motion Carried. |
| 55. | Newkirk Anger | 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 | Motion Carried. Webster, Eigenhauser, Morgan, Colilla, Krzanowski, Calhoun and Black voting no. |
| 56. | Eigenhauser Black | Award top 20 national wins in Household Pets for cats that meet the NW point minimums. | Motion Carried. |
| 57. | Black Roy | Reconsider above motion. | Motion Carried. P. Moser voting no. |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 58. | Black Eigenhauser | Award top 25 national wins in Household Pets for the 2019-2020 show season, with no point minimums. | Motion Failed. Eigenhauser, Currle, Black and Auth voting yes. Webster abstained. |
| 59. | Mastin Anger | Award top 25 Household Pets for the 2019-2020 show season, and lower the point minimum from 935 to 800. | Motion Failed. Eigenhauser, Currle, Black, Webster and Auth voting yes. Schleissner abstained. |
| 60. | Schleissner Eigenhauser | Award top 30 Kittens for the 2019-2020 show season, for Kittens that meet the point minimums. | Motion Failed. . Eigenhauser, Schleissner, Newkirk and Auth voting yes. |
| 61. | Eigenhauser Mastin | Reduce national breed win point minimums from 200 points to 150 points. | Motion Carried. |
| 62. | Calhoun Mastin | CFA will place a moratorium on awarding show sponsorships until the occupancy restrictions in the geography of the show hall have been lifted. | Motion Carried. |
| 63. | Calhoun Anger | Amend judging program advisory to include reimbursement to CFA judges for transportation to guest judging assignments in the event the show has been cancelled. | Motion Failed. Currle, Colilla, Black, Newkirk, Morgan, Roy, Auth, B. Moser and P. Moser abstained. |
| 64. | Calhoun Eigenhauser | Amend judging program advisory to include reimbursement to Guest judges for transportation to CFA shows in the event the show has been cancelled. | Motion Carried. Schleissner abstained. |

Hannon: Are there any other items before we get to new business? **Newkirk:** I guess this would be new business, but we had two telephonic meetings that had motions that were covered in those two telephonic meetings. As George pointed out, they were not legal because they didn't have a 30 day pre-notice, so those motions need to be ratified. **Hannon:** Do you want to make that motion, Darrell? **Newkirk:** I will make that motion. **Mastin:** Rich will second. **Hannon:** Any discussion on Darrell's motion?

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

(16) NEW BUSINESS.

Hannon: Any new business?

* * * * *

Hannon: Are we ready to adjourn? Thank you everybody.

Adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Anger, Secretary

(17) **DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS AND SUSPENSIONS.**

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

None

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

None