

**SUMMARY AND TRANSCRIPT OF ZOOM TELECONFERENCE
CFA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
NOVEMBER 10, 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.	APPROVE ORDERS OF THE DAY.....	11
2.	RATIFICATION OF ONLINE MOTIONS/APPROVAL OF PRIOR MINUTES.	12
3.	JUDGING PROGRAM.	20
4.	CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT.....	24
5.	SHOW SPONSORSHIP.....	29
6.	LEGAL ADVISORY.....	34
7.	INTERNATIONAL DIVISION.	42
8.	VIRTUAL CAT COMPETITION REPORT.....	44
9.	MILLENNIAL OUTREACH COMMITTEE.	48
10.	UNFINISHED BUSINESS.....	53
11.	OTHER COMMITTEES.	54
12.	NEW BUSINESS.....	56
13.	CENTRAL OFFICE.	59

Secretary's Note: The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. met on Tuesday, November 10, 2020, via Zoom teleconference. **President Darrell Newkirk** called the regular meeting to order at 8:00 p.m. Eastern Time. A roll call by **Secretary Rachel Anger** found the following members found to be present:

Mr. Darrell Newkirk (President)
Mr. Richard Mastin (Vice President)
Ms. Rachel Anger (Secretary)
Ms. Kathy Calhoun (Treasurer)
Ms. Sharon Roy (NAR Director)
Mrs. Pam Moser (NWR Director)
Steve McCullough, D.C. (GSR Director)
Mr. John Colilla (GLR Director)
Mr. Howard Webster (SWR Director)
Mrs. Cathy Dunham (MWR Director)
Mr. Kenny Currle (SOR Director)
Ms. Yukiko Hayata (Japan Regional Director)
Ms. Pam DelaBar (Europe Regional Director)
Ms. Cyndy Byrd (Director-at-Large)
George Eigenhauser, Esq. (Director-at-Large)
Mrs. Carol Krzanowski (Director-at-Large)
Ms. Melanie Morgan (Director-at-Large)
Mr. Brian Moser (Director-at-Large)

Also Present:

Shelly K. Perkins, Attorney at Law, CFA Legal Counsel
Allene Tartaglia, Executive Director
James Simbro, IT Systems Analyst
Eva Chen, ID-China Representative
Gavin Cao, China Business Advisor
Matthew Wong, ID Representative

Absent:

None

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

Newkirk: The meeting is called to order. Madame Secretary, will you please call the roll? [**Secretary's Note:** Secretary Rachel Anger called the roll, as reflected above.] **Anger:** We are all here and definitely have a quorum. Back to you, Mr. President. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you Madame Secretary.

SUMMARY

1. APPROVE ORDERS OF THE DAY.

The Orders of the Day were accepted without objection and became the Orders of Business.

Reports of Officers, Boards, and Standing Committees

2. RATIFICATION OF ONLINE MOTIONS.

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
MOTIONS THAT DO NOT REQUIRE RATIFICATION			
1.	Anger Krzanowski 10.09.2020	To post the minutes of the motion in regard to suspension of the RW for the 2020-2021 show season.	Motion Carried. Hayata abstained.
No discussion.			
4.	Anger DelaBar 10.28.2020	Grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04 and allow the China Yantze River Cat Fanciers Club to change their show format from 2 AB rings to 2 SSP rings for their show November 7, 2020 in Chongqing, China (ID-China).	Motion Carried.
Roy: I think they are trying to do what might be best for their exhibitors. Having SS allows more chances for cats to earn grand and regional points. I actually think we should encourage this throughout CFA this year as the shows are smaller and few and far between.			
5.	Anger Curre 11.04.2020	Approve the China Associate Judges for judging at CFA shows in China, to judge only the specialty in which they were trained. China Associate Judges will be paid \$.50 per cat and expenses (the same as apprentice judges).	Motion Carried.

[**Secretary's Note:** The *above* motions were adopted by unanimous online vote. They need not be ratified but are included for the record. The *following* online motions carried but were not unanimous. They must be ratified and are still open to debate, discussion and voting.]

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
MOTIONS THAT REQUIRE RATIFICATION			
2.	Curre Mastin 10.12.2020	Rescind the CFA Board decision to Eliminate RW awards for the 2020-2021 season.	Motion Carried. Calhoun, Colilla, DelaBar, Eigenhauser, McCullough, Morgan, B. Moser and P. Moser voting no.
Roy: As I stated during the meeting I have very mixed feelings on the right or wrong. While not part of the motion if the regions can set the amount if awards for this year to insure some consistency and validity, i will			

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
		<p>reluctantly support it. My region is just about 50/50 in awarding. Colilla: I would like to suggest that we combine the 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 seasons into one season making it then 2020-2022 season. This would allow us to restore all awards. DelaBar: It is not the award “hardware” that is the problem. It is the lack of opportunity for exhibitors to get to shows, the problems clubs are experiencing finding suitable show halls, then being restricted to the number of people allowed in that facility. Additionally, Gulf areas have been hit by numerous hurricanes and tropical storms; the West Coast has been hit by the wrath of the gods. Except for one club, all the clubs in my club council have supported the board’s decision to cancel RW’s for this show season.</p> <p>Krzanowski: I support this motion. Along with all governments, small businesses and large corporations worldwide, we are trying to navigate an uncertain environment that changes daily due to the pandemic. As a Board we all try to keep the best interests and wellbeing of our clubs, breeders and exhibitors in mind. These are very difficult times and decisions do not come easily. I have received more letters and phone calls about this issue than I have on any other issue during my tenure on the Board. When the issue of suspending RWs was first discussed and voted upon at the Board meeting on Saturday, I admit that I did vote to suspend them for this season. However, I was very torn about that decision and was happy that a motion to reconsider was passed. When it was brought up for another vote on Sunday, I voted to keep the RWs in place. I changed my vote because I felt it was the fair thing to do. Back in May the Board decided to suspend NWs and BWs but to award RWs for this season. Results of the CFA poll conducted in the spring were overwhelmingly in favor of retaining regional awards. At the time many felt that without regional awards, shows would not be able to attract enough entries for the clubs to survive. I still believe this to be true. Any change to the Board’s decision regarding regional awards should have been done in June when we decided to once again allow licensing of shows. It is unfair to change the rules mid-season, especially after clubs have begun to license shows and accept entries. The clubs have proceeded and exhibitors have entered shows in good faith, based on rules that have been in place since May. Some may argue that allowing RWs would not be fair for exhibitors who cannot travel or attend shows due to Covid-19 restrictions. It is important to keep in mind that in any given show season, exhibitors may not be able to exhibit at any number of shows due to health, employment, family matters, finances or even weather. This should not prevent others from having the opportunity to attend these shows. Clubs and exhibitors are willing to take the chance and for that reason, we should not change the rules mid-season after commitments have already been made. I believe we should reinstate RWs and establish point minimums for the title. In my opinion, this would be a fair compromise. Point minimums would still give the RW title some meaning and credibility, yet the exhibitors would have a goal to work toward. We already ruled that for this show season, exhibitors do not have to exhibit in their region of residence in order to achieve a RW title in their home region. This eliminates the potential for region shopping. The regions could certainly opt out of providing trophies and/or award celebrations based on the wishes of their clubs.</p> <p>Mastin: Imo, suspending RWs this year is a very big mistake on our part. I mentioned three reasons in an earlier email and ask Rachel to include my entire email from earlier in the week to be included in the debate on this motion. Additionally (please correct me if I am wrong), did we already have a show in Japan under the Board’s decision to allow RWs? As I recall we did. Were there other shows within the 9 Regions that may have had shows under the Board’s decision to allow RWs? If we decide to not rescind what we did on October 4th, we are now taking away RW points towards all those who showed under the then rule. Why is it okay to takeaway RW points from all these cats/kittens, yet we did not take away the points from the last show of last year’s show season? How can you have it both ways? This makes us look bad and possibly showing favoritism. How can this be right to do and in the best interest of CFA, Clubs and Participants?</p> <p>Furthermore -</p> <p>As I have mentioned in the past, we are not always going to make the right decisions, and nor will our decisions make everyone happy. However, we do have an opportunity (imo), to make this decision with the least amount of negative impacts and possibly minimize financial hardships for our CFA Clubs, Participants and CFA Corporate.</p> <p>As I mentioned in my email earlier in the week, the decision to suspend RWs should have been done in May when we suspended NWs and BWs. We as a Board decided not to do that, and here we are today trying to change things five months later and six months into the season. This is wrong and not for (imo) the right reasons.</p>	

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
<p>Who is being harmed if we allow RWs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - People who cannot show for whatever reason of course can be a concern. This was the main reason why I was in favor of suspending RWs back in May. We need to ask ourselves, are they really harmed or are they feeling personally cheated because they cannot attend? I am sure those who cannot show their cat/kitten due to government restrictions will figure out alternative ways to show their cat/kitten if they really want to. As we all know many people work with friends and family members when showing cats in different Regions. This is an option if people work with the people they can trust. Also, why should everyone else suffer now after knowing what the rule has been for the past five months? - Regions do not have to award ribbons or trophies and nor do they need to do a banquet. I see no harm in this, especially of this is announced immediately. - Some of us are saying we are cheapening the award. That is your opinion and you are possibly correct on some level. However, the cats our judges are selecting for finals probably deserve to be in those finals and they should receive their RW if they reach a certain minimal level. My sense is the quality of cats will still be very nice and in some cases as nice as it has ever been. - I have heard the argument our focus is registrations. And that shows, points and awards are not necessarily the priority (or something to that point). I do not agree with this position. I see CFA as having many focuses that are important to the overall brand and where CFA is today on so many different levels. Imo, our shows are very important to: CFA, the Brand, Clubs, Exhibitors, Breeders, potential buyers, Judging program and all the many more programs CFA has to offer. I think we can all agree, we need to be very careful in our decision making when we change rules in the middle of a year. Some of us have said multiple times we should not make changes in the middle of a show season, yet many of you who have said this are now in favor of making changes. I am okay with making changes in the middle of a show season when absolutely necessary (as we have done in the past). I don't see this one being one of those that now needs to be done in the middle of the show season. The decision to suspend RWs has two opportunities: once in the beginning of the year (when we suspended NWs) and if there are no shows until two or three months to the end of the show season (that would be February 28th/29th or January 31st of every year). Yes, this is my opinion based on what we have done in the past and what I believe makes reasonable sense on a CFA business level and for our Clubs and participants. - We decided on October 4th to allow DWs because we heard parts of the world don't have issues. Allowing DWs and not RWs seems very odd and unfair to all those who wish to attend a CFA show in any Region. - What is the competition doing? Did TICA, FIFe and others suspend RWs? Did AKC suspend RWs? <p>I know what I am asking is not a popular request for everyone, and I do not expect everyone to agree with my opinion or assumptions. I ask you to remove your personal thoughts and feelings from this and look at this on a global business level and the impacts it has (positive and negative) on either decision. What decision provides the least amount of hardships and possibly the best outcomes for Clubs and participants? This is just not a CFA corporate decision we are making, this decision will negatively impact CFA Clubs and participants.</p> <p>All, please reconsider your position on this and rescind this motion to allow RWs for the 2020-2021 show season. And lets get to working on some of the other challenges we need to address to make this a reality.</p>			

Mr. Currle moved to *rescind the CFA Board decision to Eliminate RW awards for the 2020-2021 season*. Seconded by **Mr. Mastin**, **Motion Carried**. Morgan, B. Moser, P. Moser, Calhoun and Colilla voting no.

3.	Dunham Anger 10.23.2020	Approve the revised reciprocity agreement with ACFA.	Motion Carried. Morgan voting no. P. Moser did not vote.
----	-------------------------------	--	---

Currle: In favor as presented. **Eigenhauser:** I appreciate the work everyone has done putting this agreement together. I support the motion. **Byrd:** I'd like to suggest that we hold off on voting on the agreement since it has not been shared with ACFA. They should have a chance to review the agreement and may have something they'd like us to tweak to be acceptable to them. An agreement requires the agreement of both sides. **Dunham:** Here is the background. The Midwest Region asked an ACFA judge to judge our VCC event. The ACFA judge asked permission through their judging program and was told the two associations need a reciprocity agreement, which prompted the contract that is the subject of this motion. This ACFA judge lives in the Midwest Region and has supported CFA and the Region by registering and showing multiple cats in the association. This person deserves the opportunity to be judge for this event. Timing of this acceptance is going to be very close as to whether or not the region will have to replace this person prior to our entries opening for the event. The only way for this to happen is for us to accept the contract so that it can be sent to ACFA for consideration and acceptance as soon as possible.

Morgan: There are a number of typos in this agreement that need to be corrected, but beyond that I have an issue with the second sentence in item number 8 which seems to me to be in direct conflict with the approved motion from September -8. ...Any consideration beyond the 200-mile radius will be reviewed by and at the discretion of the judging coordinators of the respective associations.

As for the question of whether or not this is a time sensitive “emergency”, I think I will have to agree to disagree with you all on that one. I do not think that we should rush into an agreement because of an issue getting approval for a virtual competition. In September, we discussed reciprocity with U.S. Based associations. We voted on exceptions for this season only. While this agreement is for one season only it has provisions for renewal and screams slippery slope to me. I am very uncomfortable with the fact that we are rushing into an agreement that involves our judging program for regular shows without considering long-term implications. It seems to me that the time constraints are rather arbitrary. It should not be our problem that the other association is not allowing one of its judges to participate in a virtual event. Certainly finding an alternate judge should not be an issue. It is not like there are differences in expenses etc.

This agreement goes well beyond the scope of virtual competitions and we are allowing the timetable on this to be manipulated by an issue that is, in my opinion, non-emergent. I really do not see why we need to drop everything to approve an agreement so that we can get approval for a judge on a virtual competition slate.

Frankly, I do not see why we cannot accept the answer that the ACFA judge is not approved to judge the virtual show and address this at our regular meeting. That said, there is a motion on the floor so apparently we will consider this off-cycle. I would like to go on record with the fact that I am extremely uncomfortable with this and will not support it.

8. Any judging contract will be limited to judges residing within a 200-mile radius of the sanctioned show, provide there are no judges from the sanctioned show’s association available within the same 200-mile radius. Any consideration beyond the 200-mile radius will be reviewed by and at the discretion of the judging coordinators of the respective associations.

Newkirk: I just received an email from ACFA and they have responded to our agreement for reciprocity and it is all systems go.

Mrs. Dunham moved to approve the revised reciprocity agreement with ACFA. Seconded by **Ms. Anger**, Motion Carried. Morgan and P. Moser voting no.

3. JUDGING PROGRAM.

Ms. Anger moved to adopt the following Judging Program rule change, effective immediately.

SECTION 2 - APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS	
Existing Wording	Proposed Wording

<p>2.8 An application cannot be filed sooner than seven (7) years from the date of birth of the applicant's first registered litter within the appropriate specialty.</p>	<p>2.8 An application cannot be filed sooner than seven (7) <u>five (5)</u> years from the date of birth of the applicant's first registered litter within the appropriate specialty.</p>
<p>RATIONALE: This rule needs to align with rule 2.5 and 2.7A which were changed at the October 2020 board meeting to reflect five (5) years of breeding lowered from seven (7) years of breeding. One cannot have a first litter required to be born 7 years from date of Application if we are requiring 5 years of breeding and cattery registration. This rule was overlooked when we requested the rule change for 2.5 and 2.7A.</p>	

Seconded by **Mr. Currle**, the motion was **ratified by unanimous consent**.

4. CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT.

Ms. Anger moved to approve the expenditure up to \$12,000 to develop the needed software to interact with the WeChat app. Seconded by **Mr. Currle**, the motion was **ratified by unanimous consent**.

Ms. DelaBar moved to approve up to \$1,000 to provide grand points online without title restrictions, i.e. champion/premier. Seconded by **Ms. Anger**, the motion was **ratified by unanimous consent**.

Ms. Anger moved to half the number of finals required for the Grand of Distinction requirement from 30 finals (20 must be AB finals), to 15 finals (10 must be AB finals). Seconded by **Mr. McCullough**, the motion was **Withdrawn** (see December 2020 teleconference minutes).

5. SHOW SPONSORSHIP.

Ms. Calhoun moved that, effective immediately, sponsorship funds awarded to Clubs/Regions/ Areas for any Sponsorship Program (Regular Show Sponsorship, New Show Sponsorship, In-Conjunction Show Sponsorship, Region 9 Incentive to use CFA Judges and Agility Ring Sponsorship), will be sent to Club/Region/Area after Central Office receives show packet and payment for entry fee surcharge. Seconded by **Mr. Currle**, **Motion Carried**. Eigenhauser voting no. DelaBar abstained.

Ms. Calhoun moved that CFA will not reimburse Clubs/Regions/Areas for show expenses if show is cancelled or shutdown due to Government mandates and restrictions related to COVID-19, or for not having government approval/legal authority to host a show after May 31, 2020. Seconded by **Mr. McCullough**, the motion was **ratified by unanimous consent**.

6. LEGAL ADVISORY.

Ms. Byrd moved to approve the minimum requirement of 200 points to earn a Regional Win title in kitten class in the 2020-2021 show season. Seconded by **Ms. Anger**, **Motion Carried**. Calhoun, Morgan, B. Moser, P. Moser and McCullough voting no.

Ms. Byrd moved to approve the minimum requirement of 400 points to earn a Regional Win title in championship class for the 2020-2021 show season. Seconded by **Mr. Mastin**, **Motion Carried**. Morgan, B. Moser, Eigenhauser, Roy, P. Moser, McCullough, Calhoun and Colilla voting no.

Ms. Byrd moved to approve the minimum requirement of 200 points to earn a Regional Win title in premiership class in the 2020-2021 show season. Seconded by **Mr. Mastin, Motion Carried.** Morgan, B. Moser, P. Moser, Calhoun, Colilla and Roy voting no.

Ms. Byrd moved to approve the minimum requirement of 100 points to earn a Regional Win title in household pet class in the 2020-2021 show season. Seconded by **Mr. Mastin, Motion Carried.**

7. INTERNATIONAL DIVISION.

Chair **Mr. Webb** had no action items.

Reports of Special (Select or Ad Hoc) Committees

8. VIRTUAL CAT COMPETITION REPORT.

Liaison Mrs. Dunham moved for permission to authorize and help schedule additional virtual shows (following the required Regional Director approval) beginning after the CITCC has completed. Future shows would be limited to a maximum of two a month to maximize profitability. Seconded by **Mrs. Krzanowski.**

Mr. Mastin moved to amend the main motion by deleting *Requesting permission to authorize and help* and replacing with *The Committee is going to*. Seconded by **Mrs. Dunham.** Further, **Mr. Eigenhauser** moved to amend the main motion by deleting *two a month* and replacing with *one per weekend*. Seconded by **Mr. McCullough**, the primary amendment was **ratified by unanimous consent.**

The amended main motion was ratified by unanimous consent and will now read as follows:

Requesting permission to authorize and help The Committee is going to schedule additional virtual shows (following the required Regional Director approval) beginning after the CITCC has completed. Future shows would be limited to a maximum of ~~two a month~~ one per weekend to maximize profitability.

9. MILLENNIAL OUTREACH COMMITTEE.

Ms. Anger moved that we split the budget of \$1,000 for marketing in half, and apply half to marketing and half to prizes. Seconded by **Mr. Curre.**

Mr. Mastin moved to amend the main motion to continue to give them \$1,000 for their marketing budget and add \$500 to be used for prizes. Seconded by **Mr. Eigenhauser**, the primary amendment was **ratified by unanimous consent.**

The amended main motion was ratified by unanimous consent and will now read as follows:

That we add to the budget of \$1,000 for marketing an additional \$500 for prizes.

Unfinished Business and General Orders

10. UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

No action items were presented.

11. OTHER COMMITTEES.

The **Household Pet Committee** presented a report. No action items were presented.

12. NEW BUSINESS.

Mr. Currle moved to add in pre-notice meetings two weeks after the 12 meetings that we have scheduled, to be used only in an emergency situation; the Executive Committee to declare the meetings cancelled if not needed. Seconded by **Ms. Anger**, the motion was **ratified by unanimous consent**.

PRE-NOTICED TELECONFERENCE/ZOOM MEETING SCHEDULE		
Date	Time	Event Type
December 1, 2020	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting
December 15, 2020	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting for Emergencies*
January 5, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting
January 19, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting for Emergencies*
February 6/7, 2021	To be announced	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting
February 16, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting for Emergencies*
March 2, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting
March 16, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting for Emergencies*
April 6, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting
April 20, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting for Emergencies*
May 4, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting
May 18, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting for Emergencies*
June 1, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting for Emergencies*
June 16-20, 2021	To be determined	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting or Westin Galleria, Houston, Texas

*May be cancelled by Executive Committee if not needed.

Executive Session

[**Secretary’s Note:** The following motions were conducted in executive session. No discussion will appear in the following transcript and in some cases votes may be sealed.]

13. CENTRAL OFFICE.

Ms. DelaBar moved to remove invalid cattery name prefixes from litter/cat registrations as necessary. Seconded by **Mr. McCullough**, the motion was **ratified by unanimous consent**.

14. INTERNATIONAL DIVISION.

In order to encourage more clubs to complete NGO filing for CFA in various cities and provinces, to prevent any club/single filing from monopolizing all show dates within a 650km radius, and to enable CFA clubs to put on as many shows as possible while taking into consideration both points above, **Ms. Morgan** moved to adopt a ***Policy for Show Date Booking in China*** as presented. Seconded by **Mr. McCullough**, **Motion Carried**. Currle and Colilla did not vote.

TRANSCRIPT

1. APPROVE ORDERS OF THE DAY.

CFA EXECUTIVE BOARD Teleconference Meeting Agenda November 10, 2020		
1.	Approve Orders of the Day	Newkirk
Reports of Officers, Boards, and Standing Committees		
2.	Secretary’s Report - Ratification of Online Motions; Approval of Prior Minutes	Anger
3.	Judging Program	Anger
4.	Central Office Report	Tartaglia
5.	Show Sponsorship	Mastin
6.	Legal Advisory – Regional Win Issue	Byrd
7.	International Division – Mainland China Report	Curre
Reports of Special (Select or Ad Hoc) Committees		
8.	Virtual Cat Competition Committee	Dunham
9.	Millennial Outreach Committee	Anger
Unfinished Business and General Orders		
10.	Unfinished Business	
11.	Other Committees	
12.	New Business	
	ADJOURN OPEN SESSION	

Newkirk: Everyone received a copy of the agenda. Is there any additions or deletions to the agenda, Rachel? **Anger:** Just mine. On the Secretary’s Report, we are just ratifying the online motions tonight. **Newkirk:** OK, so no approval of any minutes. **Anger:** Correct. **Newkirk:** So, without objection, the pre-printed agenda will become our Orders of Business. Hearing no objection, we now have our Orders of Business as stated.

2. RATIFICATION OF ONLINE MOTIONS/APPROVAL OF PRIOR MINUTES.

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
MOTIONS THAT DO NOT REQUIRE RATIFICATION			
1.	Anger Krzanowski 10.09.2020	To post the minutes of the motion in regard to suspension of the RW for the 2020-2021 show season.	Motion Carried. Hayata abstained.
No discussion.			
4.	Anger DelaBar 10.28.2020	Grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04 and allow the China Yantze River Cat Fanciers Club to change their show format from 2 AB rings to 2 SSP rings for their show November 7, 2020 in Chongqing, China (ID-China).	Motion Carried.
Roy: I think they are trying to do what might be best for their exhibitors. Having SS allows more chances for cats to earn grand and regional points. I actually think we should encourage this throughout CFA this year as the shows are smaller and few and far between.			
5.	Anger Curre 11.04.2020	Approve the China Associate Judges for judging at CFA shows in China, to judge only the specialty in which they were trained. China Associate Judges will be paid \$.50 per cat and expenses (the same as apprentice judges).	Motion Carried.

Newkirk: First off is the Secretary’s Report. **Anger:** We have some online motions that are not currently on the screen, but those motions were provided to the board members. Here they come. I would like to make a motion that we ratify these online motions. I believe there were five in all. **Newkirk:** Rachel, I want to get a clarification from the attorney about New York State law and our online motions. There were three motions – 1, 4 and 5 – that had a unanimous vote. Motions 2 and 3 did not. So, I think 2 and 3 were voted on before Shelly came out with the ruling from New York law, so I need to ask Shelly do we need to vote on 2 and 3, or can we do this lot by unanimous consent? **Perkins:** Anything that was passed online by unanimous consent is considered passed. **Newkirk:** Yes, I understand. **Perkins:** OK. **Newkirk:** Alright, there were two – motion 2 and motion 3 – that did not get a unanimous vote. **Perkins:** Then those motions need to be heard right now. They’ve been pre-noticed, they’re here and you should call a vote. **Newkirk:** OK. I’m thinking that everyone got Shelly’s note emailed dated November the 2nd that explained all of this and there’s two options here.

Here are the two rules that the CFA must consider when voting online:

- *If an online motion has an unanimous vote, then it has passed. It can be acted upon immediately. It need not be ratified at the next meeting, although my recommendation is that it is brought up at the meeting for the record.*

Newkirk: So, motions 1, 4 and 5 fall into that category. The second bullet point is:

- *If an online motion has any vote but unanimous, then it must be called in a regularly noticed meeting. This means that if an online motion has a favorable*

vote, but not unanimous, it cannot be acted upon until the regularly noticed meeting where it is voted upon. However you can discuss it to any and all to let them know that the favorable vote happened online, and that it is expected to pass therefore at the next meeting. Board members can change a vote from online to the meeting if they desire, as any online motion that did not have unanimous vote must be ratified at the next meeting so it is still open to debate, discussion, and voting.

Newkirk: So, we don't need to act on motions 1, 4 and 5 even though they are listed here for everyone's edification, but motions 2 and 3 did not receive a unanimous vote, so we have to call for a vote. We'll start with 2, and this is rescinding the board decision to eliminate regional awards for the 2020-2021 season. **Anger:** May I make a comment before we get into ratifying those votes? **Newkirk:** Yes. **Anger:** Thank you. My understanding is that if new information has come forward that would cause someone to change their vote; otherwise, it's assumed that the way we voted before is the way that we're going to vote. **Newkirk:** That would be my recollection, but Shelly says they can change their vote. Shelly, do you want to comment on that? **Perkins:** Yeah. If the vote online is not unanimous, then the motion is considered not to have passed until it reaches a formally noticed meeting, whereupon it has to be voted on. Anyone can change their vote from an online vote, because technically it's as though the vote did not happen when something is not unanimous. So, you're sitting here today with two noticed motions. Anybody can vote any way that they want. **Newkirk:** Does that satisfy your comment, Rachel? **Anger:** I disagree slightly with it, but if that's our attorney's interpretation of the law then I will go with that. **Newkirk:** I think she talked to Anita and that was the advice she got from Anita. **Perkins:** That's correct. **Newkirk:** I think that, I mean, I understand that people can change their vote but I mean this is one, I mean, I hope to God that the board doesn't change their mind on this one, because this needs to stay in effect, what we voted on online. So, this motion was made by Kenny Curre and seconded by Rich Mastin. You have all seen the debate that was listed. Is there any further debate to add to motion 2? **Perkins:** Darrell, I believe that I would like Kenny to make the motion and there to be a second. I think it has to be a formally called motion. That is my understanding and I would like to see that done. **Newkirk:** OK, that's fine. OK, Kenny, would you make the motion?

[From after the motion is made] **DelaBar:** This is not for discussion on this motion. I had my hand up before the motion was made, but could you clarify for everybody and for the minutes who Anita is? It's just not Anita from next door or whatever. **Newkirk:** Shelly? **Perkins:** Anita is the attorney with Nixon Peabody that the CFA consults with and is handling some of our finer contractual international issues. She is also our expert on New York not-for-profit law that we consult with when we have specific questions. **DelaBar:** Thank you. **Newkirk:** Any other comment before I call the question? **Eigenhauser:** I have kind of my own philosophy on this. This isn't a legal opinion, this is my personal opinion. When we vote on things online, sometimes we do so because it's kind of an urgent situation, there's a ticking clock, we want to get the word out to the fancy that we're dealing with a problem in a timely fashion, but if the board online vote isn't official, there are people downstream who may rely on it. Many of our online votes have been things like, you know, show rule waivers and judging substitutions and things like that, that people need to act on immediately. So, my personal policy is that whatever the majority vote was on an online motion, I will switch to that side because the first time we pass an online vote and somebody relies on it, and then we reverse it when we

actually have a formal meeting, then we've cut the legs out from under doing the online votes at all. People need to have a sense of stability, they need to have a sense of certainty when the board acts, so I'm not telling anyone else they shouldn't vote their conscience, but I'm telling you from my purposes when there is an online vote and it comes up at a board meeting, I will vote whatever way the majority went, even if that means switching my vote, because I think we need stability in the actions we take online. **Newkirk:** I agree with you George. That's a good point, but since we don't have provisions for online vote in our constitution, we have to rely on New York not-for-profit law. That's why I asked Shelly to look into that. She did the research and she posted that to the board list. **Eigenhauser:** And I agree with her legal opinion. I'm not making this as a legal opinion, this is my personal policy that I think is the best thing I can do for CFA. **Newkirk:** Thank you George, I appreciate that. **Currle:** I want to amplify what George is saying. It's not only good personal practice for the association, but it's the best business practice. We do on occasion run into situations where we need to act quickly, where an online motion is necessary for us to conduct CFA business. I don't know under New York State law, maybe Shelly can research this, either with what is written pre-COVID or during any executive orders that may or may not have been changed as far as implementing something online because of the situation, that maybe something has not been researched deep enough. I'm not challenging her authority or anyone else's authority in this, but for us as a business to react properly, we've got to have the opportunity or at least an avenue to implement. Like George says, we don't want to leave this hanging in the balance where our constituents have no idea whether or not it's going to be enacted or not, in case something pops up and throws things in reverse. So, I just want to see a little bit more consistency from the board. Right now, this is a perfect example of how it can go awry. **Perkins:** So, what you have actually is a conflict between our constitution, which doesn't allow for any emergency meeting. It's not really online. We're online right now, Kenny, and so we have the ability to meet online, vote online, but it's really about voting outside of a meeting, and so we don't have any ability for anyone in the CFA board to call an emergency meeting right now. It's not in our constitution, and so actually that's kind of a big problem. It used to be where people might have to fly or whatever to come to a meeting, but we are holding our meetings online right now, which is allowed, so it's a lot easier for people to meet ad hoc in a situation where there's an emergency. They don't have to travel by train or so forth, so I don't want to get too far winded on this, but the reality is that this is really about whether or not we can meet outside of a noticed meeting and what the timelines are in the constitution for requiring to wait a really long time to have a meeting when it hasn't been pre-noticed. I brought this up before to Darrell and I'll just bring it up here because I think it solves your problem; which is, that Darrell could notice a meeting every 2 weeks indefinitely. In that meeting, the agenda would only be emergency issues that 10 or more people on the board believe is an emergency. Then, that meeting would be pre-noticed so that a motion could be brought at it, but you could have a gentleman's agreement on the board not to use that unless there's actually an emergency. Otherwise, you really have no ability to meet in between your one month every monthly meeting unless you pre-notice it, and then you're into the constitution requiring 60 days and so forth. That's why you couldn't have an emergency meeting to vote the way you wanted to vote. So, there's some options out there to try to get you some meetings in between your regular meetings that could be used only for grave emergencies, but right now the problem isn't online, it's just can anybody call an emergency meeting? The answer is no, that's not in your constitution. **Newkirk:** Can we bring this up under New Business and we can discuss at that time whether – my idea would be that, like tonight, well normally we would have met on November the 3rd, OK,

so two weeks later would have been November the 17th, so I would say two weeks after our scheduled meetings we would add a meeting only for an emergency if it needed to be called, but let's wait and discuss that in New Business. Is that OK with everybody?

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
MOTIONS THAT REQUIRE RATIFICATION			
2.	Curre Mastin 10.12.2020	Rescind the CFA Board decision to Eliminate RW awards for the 2020-2021 season.	Motion Carried. Calhoun, Colilla, DelaBar, Eigenhauser, McCullough, Morgan, B. Moser and P. Moser voting no.
<p>Roy: As I stated during the meeting I have very mixed feelings on the right or wrong. While not part of the motion if the regions can set the amount if awards for this year to insure some consistency and validity, i will reluctantly support it. My region is just about 50/50 in awarding. Colilla: I would like to suggest that we combine the 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 seasons into one season making it then 2020-2022 season. This would allow us to restore all awards. DelaBar: It is not the award “hardware” that is the problem. It is the lack of opportunity for exhibitors to get to shows, the problems clubs are experiencing finding suitable show halls, then being restricted to the number of people allowed in that facility. Additionally, Gulf areas have been hit by numerous hurricanes and tropical storms; the West Coast has been hit by the wrath of the gods. Except for one club, all the clubs in my club council have supported the board’s decision to cancel RW’s for this show season.</p> <p>Krzanowski: I support this motion. Along with all governments, small businesses and large corporations worldwide, we are trying to navigate an uncertain environment that changes daily due to the pandemic. As a Board we all try to keep the best interests and wellbeing of our clubs, breeders and exhibitors in mind. These are very difficult times and decisions do not come easily. I have received more letters and phone calls about this issue than I have on any other issue during my tenure on the Board. When the issue of suspending RWs was first discussed and voted upon at the Board meeting on Saturday, I admit that I did vote to suspend them for this season. However, I was very torn about that decision and was happy that a motion to reconsider was passed. When it was brought up for another vote on Sunday, I voted to keep the RWs in place. I changed my vote because I felt it was the fair thing to do. Back in May the Board decided to suspend NWs and BWs but to award RWs for this season. Results of the CFA poll conducted in the spring were overwhelmingly in favor of retaining regional awards. At the time many felt that without regional awards, shows would not be able to attract enough entries for the clubs to survive. I still believe this to be true. Any change to the Board’s decision regarding regional awards should have been done in June when we decided to once again allow licensing of shows. It is unfair to change the rules mid-season, especially after clubs have begun to license shows and accept entries. The clubs have proceeded and exhibitors have entered shows in good faith, based on rules that have been in place since May. Some may argue that allowing RWs would not be fair for exhibitors who cannot travel or attend shows due to Covid-19 restrictions. It is important to keep in mind that in any given show season, exhibitors may not be able to exhibit at any number of shows due to health, employment, family matters, finances or even weather. This should not prevent others from having the opportunity to attend these shows. Clubs and exhibitors are willing to take the chance and for that reason, we should not change the rules mid-season after commitments have already been made. I believe we should reinstate RWs and establish point minimums for the title. In my opinion, this would be a fair compromise. Point minimums would still give the RW title some meaning and credibility, yet the exhibitors would have a goal to work toward. We already ruled that for this show season, exhibitors do not have to exhibit in their region of residence in order to achieve a RW title in their home region. This eliminates the potential for region shopping. The regions could certainly opt out of providing trophies and/or award celebrations based on the wishes of their clubs.</p> <p>Mastin: Imo, suspending RWs this year is a very big mistake on our part. I mentioned three reasons in an earlier email and ask Rachel to include my entire email from earlier in the week to be included in the debate on this</p>			

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
		<p>motion. Additionally (please correct me if I am wrong), did we already have a show in Japan under the Board's decision to allow RWs? As I recall we did. Were there other shows within the 9 Regions that may have had shows under the Board's decision to allow RWs? If we decide to not rescind what we did on October 4th, we are now taking away RW points towards all those who showed under the then rule. Why is it okay to takeaway RW points from all these cats/kittens, yet we did not take away the points from the last show of last year's show season? How can you have it both ways? This makes us look bad and possibly showing favoritism. How can this be right to do and in the best interest of CFA, Clubs and Participants?</p> <p>Furthermore -</p> <p>As I have mentioned in the past, we are not always going to make the right decisions, and nor will our decisions make everyone happy. However, we do have an opportunity (imo), to make this decision with the least amount of negative impacts and possibly minimize financial hardships for our CFA Clubs, Participants and CFA Corporate.</p> <p>As I mentioned in my email earlier in the week, the decision to suspend RWs should have been done in May when we suspended NWs and BWs. We as a Board decided not to do that, and here we are today trying to change things five months later and six months into the season. This is wrong and not for (imo) the right reasons.</p> <p>Who is being harmed if we allow RWs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - People who cannot show for whatever reason of course can be a concern. This was the main reason why I was in favor of suspending RWs back in May. We need to ask ourselves, are they really harmed or are they feeling personally cheated because they cannot attend? I am sure those who cannot show their cat/kitten due to government restrictions will figure out alternative ways to show their cat/kitten if they really want to. As we all know many people work with friends and family members when showing cats in different Regions. This is an option if people work with the people they can trust. Also, why should everyone else suffer now after knowing what the rule has been for the past five months? - Regions do not have to award ribbons or trophies and nor do they need to do a banquet. I see no harm in this, especially of this is announced immediately. - Some of us are saying we are cheapening the award. That is your opinion and you are possibly correct on some level. However, the cats our judges are selecting for finals probably deserve to be in those finals and they should receive their RW if they reach a certain minimal level. My sense is the quality of cats will still be very nice and in some cases as nice as it has ever been. - I have heard the argument our focus is registrations. And that shows, points and awards are not necessarily the priority (or something to that point). I do not agree with this position. I see CFA as having many focuses that are important to the overall brand and where CFA is today on so many different levels. Imo, our shows are very important to: CFA, the Brand, Clubs, Exhibitors, Breeders, potential buyers, Judging program and all the many more programs CFA has to offer. I think we can all agree, we need to be very careful in our decision making when we change rules in the middle of a year. Some of us have said multiple times we should not make changes in the middle of a show season, yet many of you who have said this are now in favor of making changes. I am okay with making changes in the middle of a show season when absolutely necessary (as we have done in the past). I don't see this one being one of those that now needs to be done in the middle of the show season. The decision to suspend RWs has two opportunities: once in the beginning of the year (when we suspended NWs) and if there are no shows until two or three months to the end of the show season (that would be February 28th/29th or January 31st of every year). Yes, this is my opinion based on what we have done in the past and what I believe makes reasonable sense on a CFA business level and for our Clubs and participants. - We decided on October 4th to allow DWs because we heard parts of the world don't have issues. Allowing DWs and not RWs seems very odd an unfair to all those who wish to attend a CFA show in any Region. - What is the competition doing? Did TICA, FIFE and others suspend RWs? Did AKC suspend RWs? <p>I know what I am asking is not a popular request for everyone, and I do not expect everyone to agree with my opinion or assumptions. I ask you to remove your personal thoughts and feelings from this and look at this on a global business level and the impacts it has (positive and negative) on either decision. What decision provides the</p>	

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
<p>least amount of hardships and possibly the best outcomes for Clubs and participants? This is just not a CFA corporate decision we are making, this decision will negatively impact CFA Clubs and participants.</p> <p>All, please reconsider your position on this and rescind this motion to allow RWs for the 2020-2021 show season. And lets get to working on some of the other challenges we need to address to make this a reality.</p>			

Currle: I make a motion to rescind the CFA board decision to eliminate regional awards for the 2020-2021 show season. **Mastin:** Rich will second. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you. [transcript goes back to discussion above.] **Newkirk:** Is there any other discussion on the current motion? OK, so I'm going to call the vote. All those in favor of rescinding the CFA's board decision to eliminate regional wins for the 2020-2021 season, raise your hand if you're in favor.

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

Newkirk: Hayata-san? **Hayata:** I don't know how to hands up. I say yes. **Newkirk:** OK, so we'll add you onto the yesses then. So, let's go ahead and recognize the yesses. Rachel Anger, Kenny Currle, George Eigenhauser, Cyndy Byrd, Carol Krzanowski, Cathy Dunham, Sharon Roy, Pam DelaBar, Steve McCullough and Hayata-san. **Webster:** And Howard Webster. **Newkirk:** And Howard Webster. If you will take your hands down, those opposed please raise your hand. **Morgan:** My hand is up. **Newkirk:** So, the no votes are Melanie Morgan, Brian Moser, Pam Moser, Kathy Calhoun and John Colilla. Is that everybody, Rachel? **Anger:** I did not get a vote for Rich Mastin. **Newkirk:** Rich must have got kicked out because I don't see him on here. **Tartaglia:** I'll look for him under Attendees. No, he's not here. He seconded it. That doesn't mean he has to vote yes. **Newkirk:** That's correct. **Tartaglia:** I'll go get my phone. I'll text him. **Calhoun:** I'm calling him. I'm calling him. Rich is a yes. Rich is a yes. **Tartaglia:** He can talk now. I think that's Rich. He's on mute. **Calhoun:** Just to expedite this, I have Rich on my cellphone and he has voted yes. **Newkirk:** Alright, we'll take your word for it, Kathy. You're an honest person, I know that. **Calhoun:** There you go. **Newkirk:** Rachel, can you announce the vote, please? **Anger:** Yes. There are 12 yes votes, 5 no votes, 0 abstentions. **Newkirk:** OK thank you. The motion is agreed to.

3.	Dunham Anger 10.23.2020	Approve the revised reciprocity agreement with ACFA.	Motion Carried. Morgan voting no. P. Moser did not vote.
----	-------------------------------	--	---

Currle: In favor as presented. **Eigenhauser:** I appreciate the work everyone has done putting this agreement together. I support the motion. **Byrd:** I'd like to suggest that we hold off on voting on the agreement since it has not been shared with ACFA. They should have a chance to review the agreement and may have something they'd like us to tweak to be acceptable to them. An agreement requires the agreement of both sides. **Dunham:** Here is the background. The Midwest Region asked an ACFA judge to judge our VCC event. The ACFA judge asked permission through their judging program and was told the two associations need a reciprocity agreement, which prompted the contract that is the subject of this motion. This ACFA judge lives in the Midwest Region and has supported CFA and the Region by registering and showing multiple cats in the association. This person deserves the opportunity to be judge for this event. Timing of this acceptance is going to be very close as to whether or not the region will have to replace this person prior to our entries opening for the event. The only way for this to

happen is for us to accept the contract so that it can be sent to ACFA for consideration and acceptance as soon as possible.

Morgan: There are a number of typos in this agreement that need to be corrected, but beyond that I have an issue with the second sentence in item number 8 which seems to me to be in direct conflict with the approved motion from September -8. ...Any consideration beyond the 200-mile radius will be reviewed by and at the discretion of the judging coordinators of the respective associations.

As for the question of whether or not this is a time sensitive “emergency”, I think I will have to agree to disagree with you all on that one. I do not think that we should rush into an agreement because of an issue getting approval for a virtual competition. In September, we discussed reciprocity with U.S. Based associations. We voted on exceptions for this season only. While this agreement is for one season only it has provisions for renewal and screams slippery slope to me. I am very uncomfortable with the fact that we are rushing into an agreement that involves our judging program for regular shows without considering long-term implications. It seems to me that the time constraints are rather arbitrary. It should not be our problem that the other association is not allowing one of its judges to participate in a virtual event. Certainly finding an alternate judge should not be an issue. It is not like there are differences in expenses etc.

This agreement goes well beyond the scope of virtual competitions and we are allowing the timetable on this to be manipulated by an issue that is, in my opinion, non-emergent. I really do not see why we need to drop everything to approve an agreement so that we can get approval for a judge on a virtual competition slate.

Frankly, I do not see why we cannot accept the answer that the ACFA judge is not approved to judge the virtual show and address this at our regular meeting. That said, there is a motion on the floor so apparently we will consider this off-cycle. I would like to go on record with the fact that I am extremely uncomfortable with this and will not support it.

8. Any judging contract will be limited to judges residing within a 200-mile radius of the sanctioned show, provide there are no judges from the sanctioned show’s association available within the same 200-mile radius. Any consideration beyond the 200-mile radius will be reviewed by and at the discretion of the judging coordinators of the respective associations.

Newkirk: I just received an email from ACFA and they have responded to our agreement for reciprocity and it is all systems go.

Newkirk: Can you scroll up to #3? So, this is, approve the revised reciprocity agreement with ACFA. Cathy Dunham, would you like to make that motion? **Dunham:** Yes. I make the motion to approve the revised reciprocity agreement with ACFA. **Newkirk:** And Rachel, you were the second. **Anger:** And I am still the second. **Newkirk:** Good. Is there any further discussion on this? We’ve already sent that contact or that agreement with them, and I have signed it and so has Murlene Priest. So, there was one no vote and one person who did not vote, so is there any further debate on this motion? No one has raised their hand, so let’s vote on this. If you’re in favor to approve the revised reciprocity agreement that we have sent to ACFA, please raise your hand.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Morgan and P. Moser voting no.

Newkirk: Melanie, do you want to wait? **Morgan:** I’m waiting. **Newkirk:** OK, Hayata-san? **Hayata:** Yes. **Newkirk:** Hayata is a yes. **Calhoun:** Rich is a yes. **Newkirk:** And Rich is a yes, OK. So, the yes votes are Rich Mastin, Sharon Roy, Pam DelaBar, Brian Moser, Kathy Calhoun, Rachel Anger, George Eigenhauser, Cyndy Byrd, Carol Krzanowski, Kenny Currle, Cathy Dunham, John Colilla, Steve McCullough and Hayata-san. **Webster:** And Howard Webster. **Newkirk:** And Howard Webster is a yes. The no votes. **Morgan:** My hand is up. **Newkirk:** OK, Melanie Morgan is a no. Pam Moser is a no. So, the no votes are Pam Moser and

Melanie Morgan. So, that concludes that order of business. **Anger:** Do you want to call that motion? **Newkirk:** Oh yeah, thank you. Rachel, would you announce the vote, please? **Anger:** We had 15 yes, 2 no, 0 abstentions. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you. The motion is agreed to.

3. JUDGING PROGRAM.

Full Committee Roster

<i>Trainee/Application Chair:</i>	<i>Ellyn Honey</i>
<i>CFA Approved Judges:</i>	<i>Vicki Nye</i>
<i>Guest Judges:</i>	<i>Vicki Nye, Wendy Heidt</i>
<i>China Associate Judge Program Chair:</i>	<i>Anne Mathis</i>
<i>Judges' Workshop/Tests/Continuing Ed:</i>	<i>Anne Mathis</i>
<i>Education and Mentoring:</i>	<i>Loretta Baugh</i>
<i>Breed Awareness & Orientation:</i>	<i>Barbara Jaeger</i>
<i>Applications Administrator:</i>	<i>Kathi Hoos</i>
<i>Domestic File Administrators:</i>	<i>Nancy Dodds; Marilee Griswold</i>
<i>Japan File Administrator:</i>	<i>Yaeko Takano</i>
<i>ID-China File Administrator:</i>	<i>Anne Mathis</i>
<i>Europe File Administrator:</i>	<i>Pam DelaBar</i>
<i>ID-International Div File Administrator:</i>	<i>Allan Raymond</i>
<i>Ombudsman:</i>	<i>Diana Rothermel</i>

Applicants and Trainees

<i>Chair:</i>	<i>Ellyn Honey</i>
<i>Board Liaison:</i>	<i>Rachel Anger</i>
<i>Domestic File Administrators:</i>	<i>Nancy Dodds, Marilee Griswold</i>
<i>Japan:</i>	<i>Yaeko Takano</i>
<i>Europe:</i>	<i>Pam DelaBar</i>
<i>ID (except China):</i>	<i>Allan Raymond</i>
<i>China:</i>	<i>Anne Mathis</i>

Action Item: Adopt the following Judging Program rule change, effective immediately.

SECTION 2 - APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS	
Existing Wording	Proposed Wording
2.8 An application cannot be filed sooner than seven (7) years from the date of birth of the applicant's first registered litter within the appropriate specialty.	2.8 An application cannot be filed sooner than seven (7) <u>five (5)</u> years from the date of birth of the applicant's first registered litter within the appropriate specialty.
RATIONALE: This rule needs to align with rule 2.5 and 2.7A which were changed at the October 2020 board meeting to reflect five (5) years of breeding lowered from seven (7) years of breeding. One cannot have a first litter required to be born 7 years from date of Application if we are requiring 5 years of breeding and cattery registration. This rule was overlooked when we requested the rule change for 2.5 and 2.7A.	

Newkirk: Business Order #3 is the Judging Program. Allene, can you promote Ellyn Honey? **Tartaglia:** Yes. Sorry, I was trying to see what happened to Rich. He's not on again. There's Ellyn. **Newkirk:** Rachel, you're down for the lead on this, so I will let you start and you can turn it over to Ellyn when you're ready. **Anger:** Ellyn does have an action item, so I'm going to turn it right over to her. **Honey:** OK. Good evening everyone. I hope everyone is doing well and staying healthy. When we presented our rule changes in October, we found after we had finished with the board meeting and looking through, that we had overlooked one rule for Section 2 which goes hand in hand with Sections 2.5 and 2.7.a. Rule 2.8, the existing wording is, *An application cannot be filed sooner than seven (7) years from the date of birth of the applicant's first registered litter within the appropriate specialty.* It needs to be changed to align with 2.5 and 2.7.a. The reason that I asked to have it brought up at this particular meeting is that it is confusing and a conflict for somebody applying to the Judging Program. The change should say, *An application cannot be filed sooner than five (5) years from the date of birth of the applicant's first registered litter within the appropriate specialty.* [From Rationale]: *One cannot have a first litter required to be born 7 years from date of Application if we are requiring 5 years of breeding and cattery registration.* I have to apologize, but this rule was overlooked when we requested the rule change for 2.5 and 2.7.a. **Anger:** Rachel moves that we accept this rule proposal. **Newkirk:** Thank you Rachel. I need a second. [inaudible, multiple speakers] One of you speak clearly. **Curle:** Kenny seconds. **Newkirk:** OK, Kenny Curle is the second.

Newkirk: Alright, the floor is open for debate. This is sort of a housekeeping thing. Hayata, any comments? **Hayata:** I agree. **Newkirk:** Howard, any comments? Melanie, any comments? **Morgan:** Again, I agree with you, it's a housekeeping thing. I didn't agree with the original thing, but since it has passed, we should have our rules in alignment. **Newkirk:** Yes, yes. OK, any other debate? Is there any objection to the passing of this rule? Hearing no objections, the rule is passed by unanimous consent.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Newkirk: Thank you Ellyn. We appreciate it. **Honey:** Thank you very much for the board passing this. I appreciate it very much.

Future Projections for Committee:

1. *We will have one advancing judge coming forward for advancement in December.*
2. *We will have the Implementation of the Alternative Application Program in February, along with two applicants to the judging program, and possibly several more advancements.*

Newkirk: We saw your other two notices, where you will be bringing the accelerated program up in February, so we look forward to that in February. **Honey:** Right.

*Respectfully submitted,
Ellyn Honey, Chair
CFA Applicant, Trainee and Advancing Judges*

Education Committee Report

Committee Chair: *Barbara Jaeger (Barbara.jaeger911@gmail.com)*
Oversight: *Loretta Baugh, Chair*
BAOS: *Barbara Jaeger, Chair*
Workshops, Continuing Education, Testing: *Anne Mathis, Chair*

The BAOS Committee completed its first On-Line BAOS from October 15-17, 2020. This class was conducted in English with our instructors Loretta Baugh, Barbara Jaeger, Anne Mathis, Vicki Nye and Tracy Petty. We were unable to have a handling component but will be looking for alternatives to this important portion of the school. The registrations closed on October 7, 2020 and our final count was 36 people registered for the class.

Of the 36 people registered, we had 35 people present for the three-day class. We had 12 countries (China - 2, Hong Kong-1, India - 1, Indonesia – 1, Italy – 1, Japan – 13, Russia -1, S. Korea – 3, Taiwan – 1, Thailand – 1, USA – 10, Vietnam – 1) represented in the school and the majority of them were from Asia. Eight of the attendees were present to obtain CE points. It was evident that the class was well received from the evaluations submitted at the close of the school. The revenue generated for the class was \$6,000 and the expenses for licenses and instructors were approximately \$2,900.

We are looking to hold the next school in another time zone although we are still looking at it being taught in English. More information will be forthcoming on school activities.

*Respectfully,
Barbara Jaeger, Chair
Breed Awareness and Orientation School
Barbara.jaeger911@gmail.com*

Newkirk: Allene, can you promote Barb Jaeger so she can give us a little run-down on the BAOS that was done online? **Tartaglia:** Yes. She should be in any second. There she is, she's in. **Newkirk:** Barb, you are recognized if you would like to give us a report about the BAOS. **Jaeger:** The first On-Line BAOS was conducted October 15-17, 2020. This class was conducted in English with our instructors Loretta, myself, Anne Mathis, Vicki and Tracy Petty. We were unable to have a handling session but will be looking for alternatives to this important portion of the school. The registrations closed on October 7th and our final count for attendees, our registry was 36. Of the 36, we had 35 people present for the three days. We had one person that was ill. She is going to attend the next one. She was also from one of the Asian countries. We had 12 different countries represented. Eight of the attendees were present to obtain their CE points for next year. The class was received well. All of the evaluations have been reviewed and they did come in with a lot of positive information. We collected \$6,000 and the expenses for the licenses – the licenses we are talking about are Zoom licenses - and instructors were almost \$2,900. So, we are looking to hold another show [sic] possibly in the spring. Even though it being taught in English, it will be on a time zone that's more acceptable to some of the other countries. We have been looking at Europe. I haven't talked to Pam yet about that, though.

DelaBar: Pam would like that. **Jaeger:** I'm sure she would. **Newkirk:** Is that the conclusion of your report, Barbara? **Jaeger:** Yes, it is. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you very much. That's a wonderful job you guys have done.

4. CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT.

Submitted by: Allene Tartaglia, Executive Director

***WeChat App:** James worked with Gavin and Sonit to determine what is needed to integrate the WeChat app with CFA's database and the associated cost. Following is James' synopsis:*

To develop the web service for validating the cat information and getting the list of licensed shows for the WeChat entry app, it will take approximately 72 to 88 hours of development, with an estimated cost of up to \$11,440. Gavin believes this is a fair quote for development time. Approximately half of this quote is not directly related to the app and is to set up web services architecture. CFA currently doesn't have Web Services architectures in place which is needed for this app. About half the quote is to set up the basic architecture. The other half is putting two "requests" into the architecture for the WeChat entry app. Subsequent apps requiring access to CFA's data will be less costly because the web architecture will already be set up. As always, any change requests outside the agreement could raise the costs beyond the quoted price.

After discussions with Tim Schreck, who headed up the entry clerk software development, and with Gavin, it was determined that direct show entry input from the app could not be accomplished without a significant redesign of the entry clerk software. We have come up with a viable alternative option that still accomplishes part of Gavin's goal of submitting show entries, and Gavin has indicated it is an acceptable option.

The estimated completion date of the app will be 4-6 weeks once Sonit is able to start the work. The start date is dependent on Sonit's workload schedule at the time approval to move forward is received.

Newkirk: Our next order of business is the Central Office Report. Allene, you're recognized. **Tartaglia:** I just wanted to talk a little bit about the WeChat app that was discussed before we got more information. James worked – well, you can see what I reported on. James worked with Gavin and Sonit to determine what's needed to integrate to CFA's database. There was James' synopsis. We can do it. It's going to take 72-88 hours of development. Estimated cost would be \$11,440. Half of that is to develop the web architecture so that outside apps can talk to CFA's system. So, even though we would be creating that for this app, it would be useful in the future for other areas, as well. The only downside is that, as you will see, the entry clerk software development doesn't have direct show entry input from the app. It can't be accomplished without a significant redesign of the entry clerk software. They have come up with a viable alternative that Gavin has indicated is acceptable. You'll see that it's a 4 to 6 week completion date once we give Sonit the OK to start. We did check with Gavin to see if he thought the 72-88 hours of development was reasonable for what's being done. He did agree that it is. So, James if you have a comment or if Gavin wants to add anything to that. **Simbro:** No, I don't have anything to add. It pretty much sums up everything there. The key thing is, half of that cost is just to put that architecture in place onto the system so that could be used in the future for other, similar programs or apps, as well. **Newkirk:** I have a question. If this app is going to be instituted in China initially, will there have to be any changes when we introduce the app to the rest of CFA? **Simbro:** No, not at all. The architecture will be in place. Whether we can reuse

what Gavin does I don't know. We may be writing our own app. I don't know how that will work. **Newkirk:** Gavin, would you like to comment on that? **Cao:** The WeChat app is based on its own STK [systems tool kit] and its own framework, so it's actually developed by the WeChat company, so strictly speaking the coding cannot be reused, but like James said, the design and the database and the UI [user interface] can probably be reused when we are doing it for other apps for other regions. So, I guess we can reuse part of it, but not a straight port from WeChat to IOS. **Newkirk:** So then, that would be like a short-term development in order to implement that here in the States? **Simbro:** It depends on how complex an app we want. You're talking pretty much something from scratch. We would have an idea of what we want to do, based on the WeChat app, but it would be all fresh programming. **Newkirk:** Anything else, Gavin? **Cao:** No.

Board Action Item: *Approve the expenditure up to \$12,000 to develop the needed software to interact with the WeChat app.*

Newkirk: I need someone to make the motion. **Anger:** Rachel moves. **Currle:** Kenny seconds. **Newkirk:** OK, Rachel moves and Kenny seconds to *approve the expenditure to develop the needed software to interact with the WeChat app.* The floor is open for debate. **Eigenhauser:** I have a question and a comment. I'll start with a comment. My preference would be that the motion include the amount we're authorizing. The other thing, I just wanted to question how – we're getting some cross-talk here – how solid a number is that \$11,440? The expenditure of \$11,440, how good an estimate is that? Is that fairly tight, or is it maybe a little more, a little less? Should we make it a motion of *up to \$12,000*, for example? **Tartaglia:** I would be more comfortable with \$12,000, just to be sure. **Newkirk:** OK, so why don't we put *approve the expenditure up to \$12,000* in the motion *to develop the needed software.* Is that acceptable, George? **Eigenhauser:** Fine by me if it's acceptable to the maker and the second. **Anger:** It's acceptable to me. Kenny? **Currle:** And the second as well. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you. George, do you have any other comments? Is there any further debate? I don't see anybody's hands up. Howard, do you have any comments? Hayata? Melanie? Did I see Rich? Is Rich back in the meeting? **Calhoun:** Darrell, Rich and I both materially had our hands up about the amount of money in the motion. We were in agreement with \$12,000. **Newkirk:** You are in agreement? OK. **Calhoun:** Both of us. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you so much. Is there any objection to this amended motion that we're going to be voting on? Hearing no objection, by unanimous consent, the motion is agreed to.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Grand Points and Confirming Champions: *As you know, the number of grand points for a cat are available through "Herman Online" <https://ecat.cfa.org/public/hermanonline.aspx>*

However, grand points are viewable only if a champion/premier title has been claimed and confirmed. I propose, effective immediately and indefinitely, that we remove this restriction and have grand points viewable for any cat which has earned grand points. This is particularly important now that many of our shows are only two rings.

There will be a slight programming cost, possibly \$500-\$1,000, to do this and I believe the goodwill and information this will provide for our customers is a good return.

Newkirk: OK. **Tartaglia:** I have one other item. Darrell, let me go ahead and share that. It came up just yesterday. It's regarding grand points and confirming champions. Grand points are available for a cat online through Herman Online. Unfortunately, they are only viewable if a champion or premier title has been claimed and confirmed. We believe that this restriction should be removed, so anybody showing their cat towards a grand can see how many points they have towards grand, regardless of whether they have had a chance to confirm the champion or premier yet, or even had enough rings to do so. It has become particularly important, or I should say inconvenient for our exhibitors, now that many of our shows are only two rings. So, there would be a slight programming cost but we believe it's something that would be a good thing. We would ask that the board endorse a motion to provide the grand points online without title restrictions. **Newkirk:** Can we, after the motion, put to approve up to \$1,000 to provide grand points online without restrictions? Because everybody seems to want to add in the dollar amounts.

***Action Item:** Motion to approve up to \$1,000 to provide grand points online without title restrictions, i.e. champion/premier.*

DelaBar: I was going to put that in and make the motion. We've had two 2-ring shows already in the past 30 days, and we also had the provision that we gave for the rest of the show season that cats can claim the title of grand champion or grand premier once they reach the required points without having the number of qualifying rings. This will give people the chance to be accurate with their grand points. **Anger:** Rachel seconds. **Newkirk:** Thank you Rachel. So, we don't need an amendment because we inserted the dollar amounts. Pam, do you have further comments? Anyone else would like to debate this motion? OK, I don't see anybody's hands up, so is there any objection to the ratification of this motion? Anyone? OK, hearing no objection, the motion is agreed to by unanimous consent.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Tartaglia: Thank you everybody.

Kenny and I held a meeting before the start of the Cotton States show this weekend. One question that was brought up and I feel we need to address is the requirements for GoD award. I had two suggestions made.

1. *Half the number of finals. Currently, it requires 30 finals (20 must be AB finals), suggested change to 15 total finals, 10 must be AB*
2. *Alternate, would be to require 20 finals, in any combination of AB/SP.*

Please give this some thought, and we can bring this up during new Business. So consider this email a prenotice for any motion that might arise from the discussion.

Newkirk: We also have the Grand of Distinction that I sent out yesterday, but I think we can cover that in new business if that's OK, or if you want to do it now we can do it now.

Currle: Why don't we do it now, Darrell? **Newkirk:** OK, alright. So, at Cotton States this weekend before the show began, Kenny and I had a meeting with everybody. One of the things

that got brought to our attention was the need to modify the number of finals to qualify for grand of distinction this year. Allene sent out a note today that, for last season, we changed it to 20 finals with any combination of allbreed and specialty rings.

Hi All,

A reminder the requirement for the shortened show season ending April 2020 was 20 finals in any combination of AB/SP and that was only for last show season. It was discussed that the requirements would be revisited for this show season once shows started back up again. The requirement was less for Hawaii but I don't have that exact number at the moment and will need to do some research for it.

Allene

Newkirk: So, I need someone to make a motion to continue it after this season, since we've lost about half of the show season. **Anger:** So moved. **Newkirk:** Thank you Rachel. **McCullough:** Steve seconds. **Newkirk:** And Steve McCullough seconds. **DelaBar:** I'm a little concerned that people who, last year, were keeping themselves online to be able to get the Grand of Distinction. This year, especially in Region 9, I don't know if we're going to have enough shows even to get to that threshold that's required. Do we want to have a gimme season for Grand of Distinction? Otherwise, cats are going to fall out because they can't get to enough shows. **Newkirk:** Pam, do you know how many rings you have planned for this show season? **DelaBar:** Right now, one more two-ring show. **Newkirk:** So, four rings altogether. **DelaBar:** Six. **Newkirk:** Six rings. **DelaBar:** We've got, Germany is going to be held up until at least Christmas. They are locked in. Spain is the same. Italy, the three richest areas of Italy or under restrictions. We don't know when we can have the shows. We have some that are planned, but we don't know if they are going to be able to be licensed. **Eigenhauser:** Maybe the way to deal with that is to have a dual system – X number of points or X% of the number of available rings in that region this year, whichever is less. That way, if there's only 10 rings available in Europe, then we would go with a percentage of 10 – whatever percentage we agree upon – and that way we can have a work-around for the work-around. **Curre:** I agree with what George is saying. There are restrictions in certain areas within regions and what have you. I do like the percentage of rings approach. Right now, we've already taken 1/3 away, for instance, because it used to be 30 rings, so now we're down to 20. We may not be able to achieve 20. It sounds like Europe is never going to reach that particular amount. I think that we should decide on a percentage of rings made, depending upon the region. That way, it makes it more equitable for the people that are participating within that area. **Newkirk:** Thank you. Pam, would you like to make an amendment to make it a percentage? We probably should do Region 8 and Region 9 and the International Division, don't you think? **DelaBar:** That probably will work. I'm trying to find what you put out. It was 20 rings that you had proposed? **Newkirk:** That's what we did for the last show season. Allene sent that out this morning. **DelaBar:** I just found it. Your suggestions were, half the number of finals, which would be 15 total finals. Ten must be allbreed or, as an alternative, it would be to require 20 finals in any combination of allbreed or specialty. **Newkirk:** That's correct. That was the suggestions given to me at the meeting. **DelaBar:** Right. I move that for Grand of Distinction there be a total of – **Newkirk:** Pam, we already have a motion on the table. **DelaBar:** Never mind. **Newkirk:** If you want to amend that motion, you can do that. I would say, for any exhibitors outside of Regions 1-9. **DelaBar:** 1-7. **Newkirk:** Yeah,

1-7. **Calhoun:** Could I just make a suggestion? This might be something that we would want to take offline and have a small group work through the details and bring it back in December, as opposed to trying to work it through on this call. **DelaBar:** That works. **Newkirk:** Does that work for you, Pam? Rachel, do you want to withdraw your motion, and I think it was Steve that did the second, or Kenny? **Currie:** No, Steve did. **Anger:** I'll withdraw this one. **McCullough:** I'll withdraw. **Calhoun:** Rich as aligned, as well. **Newkirk:** OK. So Pam, do you want to take on that chore, to bring it back in December? **DelaBar:** Sure. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you so much. So, that one is resolved.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Allene Tartaglia*

5. SHOW SPONSORSHIP.

Committee Chair: **Rich Mastin**
List of Committee Members: **Finance Committee, Allene Tartaglia & Melissa Watson**

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Review sponsorship requests as submitted (note - not many) and confirm show(s) are scheduled and approved to take place. Confirming shows are taking place with government authority (legal authority and or Covid restrictions related), has been challenging. The majority of all shows scheduled this year have cancelled (or rescheduled) and the remaining shows scheduled run the risk of cancelling or will cancel.

Current Happenings of Committee:

1. Show Sponsorship Approvals:

- a. Moving forward, in an effort to award sponsorship funds to Clubs/Regions/Areas hosting show(s) that have not cancelled, the following change should be adopted immediately.*

***Motion:** Effective immediately, Sponsorship funds awarded to Clubs/Regions/Areas for any Sponsorship Program (Regular Show Sponsorship, New Show Sponsorship, In-Conjunction Show Sponsorship, Region 9 Incentive to use CFA Judges and Agility Ring Sponsorship), will be sent to Club/Region/Area after Central Office receives show packet and payment for entry fee surcharge.*

Newkirk: Next is Show Sponsorship, Rich Mastin. **Calhoun:** Rich is having problems with the internet. It's cutting in and out, so I'm going to present this for him. Hopefully everybody has read the document. I'm going to move to the motion. **Currle:** Kenny will second. **Newkirk:** Let her read the motion Kenny, for the record. **Calhoun:** *Effective immediately, Sponsorship funds awarded to Clubs/Regions/Areas for any Sponsorship Program (Regular Show Sponsorship, New Show Sponsorship, In-Conjunction Show Sponsorship, Region 9 Incentive to use CFA Judges and Agility Ring Sponsorship), will be sent to Club/Region/Area after Central Office receives show packet and payment for entry fee surcharge.* So, the difference is, there is no pre-sponsorship. All the sponsorship dollars that are being awarded would be sent to the appropriate recipients after the show packet and the surcharges have been paid. **Currle:** I will second. **Newkirk:** Are you including the b. and the 2. and the a.? Is that all part of the motion. **Anger:** No, that's a different issue. That's part of the report. **Calhoun:** I see what you're saying. That's part of the report, which I am assuming everybody has digested. **Newkirk:** Alright, OK. Good deal. So, this is for 1.a. Kathy, you have made the motion and Kenny seconded.

DelaBar: I had had some correspondence with Rich about this. We have vendors who have not been making money. We have show halls that have not been making money. They want their deposits upfront. The rosette people want their stuff paid upfront. There are a lot of expenses that have to be paid upfront for a lot of people and even our vendors, etc., who have not been particularly flush with money. Now, I'm going to have to personally abstain because my

club is going to be putting on a show on the 29th of this month and did ask for a sponsorship. I just think that, with the money that we're looking, at this board meeting, spending on other matters, I think that our first priority should be to the clubs. There haven't been problems with any of the Region 9 clubs previously, but with the show packages, I can tell you from the show on the 18th of October that fortunately everything was faxed in to Shirley so she could score the show. The fees were paid online, as well as the surcharges. The show package itself, even though it was sent priority, still has not reached Central Office. That has been since the 18th of October. I don't know what else to tell you. I have told my clubs that if they get a sponsorship and the show does not happen, they must pay that back to CFA immediately. I have to abstain, even though I would be a very strong no against this. **Eigenhauser:** I agree with Pam. I understand the reason for this motion. With so many unknowns out there in the world, we don't know how many shows are going to get cancelled. It's going to be chaotic for a while. It's much harder to get money back than not send it in the first place, but the purpose of the sponsorships fundamentally is to help the clubs. There are a lot of clubs out there that don't have a whopping big bank account that can afford to wait until after their show is over to get their sponsorship money. Maybe some sort of a compromise can be found. Maybe we can put a little more pressure on the clubs to pay it back. If they've gotten money and had to cancel their show, but the way this is written clubs are going to lose a lot by not getting the sponsorship money until after the show, and I think that's the wrong thing to be doing now when so many clubs are hurting. **Calhoun:** While I can understand both Pam and George's position. What we have, we have a lot of shows that have been cancelled and they have already gotten the pre-show sponsorship, which we have spent an enormous amount of time chasing down and trying to recover the monies, and have not always been successful. So, I would like to move forward with this motion as it is. The other thing, really, given this situation – I can understand that a lot of clubs don't have big bank accounts, but given this situation, really, if a club is really on the razor's edge where the pre-sponsorship money is the difference between having the show or not having the show, there's a tremendous amount of risk they are taking on. The show could be financially unsuccessful for so many reasons. It calls into question whether you should really move forward if your financials are really that tight, particularly – and we're talking about particularly during this pandemic. **Currle:** The Cotton States show that we just had this past weekend, they lost money. I know that the next two shows that are planned in my region, they have already counted on losing money. So, they are using their money. They're putting it on the line in service to CFA, so I'm torn on this, as far as accepting this motion or not accepting this motion, but I figure that if they're going to take the risk then we need to take the risk, as well. That's the way I feel. I do think that they need to know that they're obligated if for some reason their show is cancelled to either pay it back or move it forward to the next show when things may or may not get better. So, perhaps a little bit more thought can be given into this situation as things open back up, hopefully very, very soon. **Anger:** If I recall correctly, this entire issue was discussed at length at our last meeting and we tasked Rich with writing it up in a motion. I recall that there was pretty unanimous alignment just a month ago. Now it seems like we are reversing that position. I don't really understand why. Frankly, as a club member in CFA I think we are extremely blessed, because we have the opportunity to have not one but three different types of sponsorship – very generous sponsorship – that CFA gives to the clubs so that we can continue to put on our shows and promote our association. I challenge any other association in the world to do that, where a club could hold their show and get \$3,000 in sponsorship. So, I don't think that this motion is putting a hardship on any club. I think not implementing the motion would put a hardship on CFA and our staff.

Thank you. **DelaBar:** If I remember, our total amount that we had for show sponsorship was somewhere in the neighborhood of \$25,000 or something like that, so considering what we're going against, I still do not see why the clubs who have constantly done good and have acted in good faith are the ones that are getting punished for the other clubs that are not. We can go and get different things against the clubs that are not paying, if they don't put on their show. One, I would wait until like a week before or whatever. Let me put it this way. If CFA is that hard up, wait maybe 7 days before the show before sending the money to the PayPal, but otherwise our clubs are acting in good faith by putting on shows. CFA does not need to change a rule in mid-stream when clubs may be – it is not easy when you are putting this into your budget, when it's been approved and now we find out mid-stream that there's a problem with getting the funds, especially if you're waiting for the show package to reach CFA. Once it leaves the mail system here in Finland, we have no control over that, just like you have no control over your postal system in the U.S. The club is the one that's getting hurt. **Calhoun:** Circumstances have changed on both sides of this issue and we're just trying to be financially good stewards for the entire organization. We have had probably more shows that have cancelled than shows that have occurred. CFA was quite generous in allowing clubs to keep that money. We just feel that we need to ensure that we are looking out for the best interests of CFA and for the clubs. Again, I would say, if you have a situation like Pam said where she's got a packet lost in the mail or delayed in the mail, well, let's talk about that. Let's talk about that if we need to do something different. Generally, that's not the case. It's not the case that the packet and the surcharges are held up by postal systems. We can certainly – Pam, given your situation where a club has done every effort they can to have the show, get the packet and the surcharge to us, and it's delayed. Let's talk about that as a one-off. **DelaBar:** Or three-off. **Calhoun:** Let's talk about it individually. **Tartaglia:** Just to mention, if we receive scans of all the documents and all the fees are paid, to us that's the show package being received. We're not going to wait for that show package come in the mail if we have been able to score the show already, because we have everything faxed or scanned to us. **Newkirk:** Any further discussion? **Morgan:** Looking at this, I understand where Pam is coming from. On the other hand, I don't think we're taking anything away from the clubs. We're not saying they can't have the sponsorship funds. They know they will get them and they know that CFA is good for it. We're simply doing what is a fairly normal process for awarding sponsorship-type funds. **Newkirk:** Anyone else? **Morgan:** Knowing the money was coming would give me the ability to move forward, knowing that the funds could be counted on. So, I tend to be in favor of supporting what our committee chairs and Central Office, etc. and our Show Sponsorship people are asking for, so I'm in support of this. **Calhoun:** I know this is my third round, but I'm taking Rich's comments, as well. The other thing is that we are, as far as pre-show sponsorships, we are having a hard time confirming that clubs are actually having shows. They requested funds, the facilities have been called, sometimes they don't answer the phone, sometimes they say they don't know anything about it, it's not on their calendar or their website. It's beginning to be – as these facilities are also limiting their staff because of COVID and quarantines and self-quarantines, verification is beginning to be exceedingly difficult prior to the show. **DelaBar:** This is my third. **Newkirk:** Make it short, please. **DelaBar:** I am short. With that, Kathy, it's very easy to verify over here in Europe whether we're having a show or not. Melissa, before she agrees to give a sponsorship to one of the clubs, has been coming to me saying, "would you please verify that this show is going to happen?" I have been doing that. I don't see why other regional directors couldn't do it, either, as well. **Newkirk:** Are we ready for the question? All those in favor, please raise your hand.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Eigenhauser voting no. DelaBar abstained.

Newkirk: Yes for Yuki. I think Howard is on now. **Webster:** Howard. **Newkirk:** Are you able to raise your hand, Howard? **Webster:** No. **Newkirk:** So, the yes votes are Kenny Currie, Rich Mastin, Cyndy Byrd, Rachel Anger, John Colilla, Carol Krzanowski, Cathy Dunham, Brian Moser, Pam Moser, Sharon Roy, Kathy Calhoun, Steve McCullough, Yukiko Hayata and Howard, are you a yes or a no? **Webster:** Yes. **Newkirk:** And Howard Webster is a yes. **Morgan:** Did you get me as a yes? **Newkirk:** No, I didn't. OK, Melanie is a yes. All those opposed to the motion, now please raise your hands. The no votes are John Colilla and George Eigenhauser. Abstentions? **Colilla:** John Colilla is a yes. I didn't lower my hand. I'm sorry. **Newkirk:** Oh, you're a yes. OK. Pam DelaBar is an abstention. Rachel, would you please announce the vote? **Anger:** We have 15 yes votes, 1 no vote, 1 abstention. **Newkirk:** Thank you. That's 17.

b. *Request for Sponsorship(s) submitted to Melissa Watson will remain the same, at least seven (7) days before show date.*

2. *Reimbursements for Show Cancelations:*

a. *All Clubs/Regions/Areas hosting shows during government's (local, state, federal and or national), current restrictions and mandates relating to COVID-19 Pandemic (and any strains of the current COVID-19), and without government legal authority to host a CFA show do so at their own risk of show(s) cancelling up to the day of the show. CFA needs to avoid financial expense reimbursements, such as and not limited to airfares, show hall lease rental, cage service, equipment and supplies, entry fees, etc. for shows being held after May 31, 2020.*

Motion: *CFA will not reimburse Clubs/Regions/Areas for show expenses if show is cancelled or shutdown due to Government mandates and restrictions related to COVID-19, or for not having government approval/legal authority to host a show after May 31, 2020.*

Newkirk: Kathy, you're up for your next motion. Rich, are you on now? **Calhoun:** Rich is in and out, so I'm going to go ahead. Hopefully again, you have read paragraph a. I'm going to read the motion. *CFA will not reimburse Clubs/Regions/Areas for show expenses if show is cancelled or shutdown due to Government mandates and restrictions related to COVID-19, or for not having government approval/legal authority to host a show after May 31, 2020.* Just let me add a comment here. The May 31, 2020 and prior to that were the shows that CFA mandated be shut down because of COVID and we put together a program to reimburse clubs for given expenses, due to CFA's action. Post-May 31st, the clubs have decided – given the circumstances of a pandemic – that they feel that they want to go forward with a show, which may be at risk financially or at risk of being shut down, and deposits and those sorts of things may be at risk, as well. So, the motion is that CFA's liability for those shows prior to May 31st that we were responsible for shutting down, not shows after May 31st. **McCullough:** Steve seconds. **Newkirk:** The motion is put on the floor for debate. Anyone have a comment? Melanie, Hayata? **Morgan:** None for me. **Newkirk:** Are we ready for the question? Is there any objection to passing the motion about not reimbursing after May 31st? Hearing no objection, by unanimous consent, the motion is agreed to.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Calhoun: Rich and Kathy thank you.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Updates as available

*Respectfully Submitted,
Rich Mastin Chair*

6. LEGAL ADVISORY.

Committee Chair: Cyndy Byrd
List of Committee Members: George Eigenhauser, Shelly Perkins, Ed Raymond

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

In the last weeks of October, a survey of member clubs was conducted to gather views on subjects including shows and Regional Win titles for the 2020-2021 show season. Based on the results of the survey the following board actions are recommended.

Newkirk: Let's move on to Order #6. Cyndy Byrd, I think this is you. **Byrd:** Yes. Based on our survey in the last few weeks of October, it was determined that people would like to see minimum point requirements for a regional win. Each of these action items suggest the minimum points that received the highest votes in the survey. So, I would ask that you either approve these minimums or make amendments to each one, as appropriate.

[**Secretary's Note:** For reference, the survey results have been added for reference, to supplement the report.]

*CFA Club Survey of Shows and Region Win Titles
in the 2020-2021 Show Season*

1. *Please indicate your club's region.*

<i>Region 1</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Region 2</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Region 3</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>Region 4</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>Region 5</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Region 6</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>Region 7</i>	<i>49</i>
<i>Region 8</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>Region 9</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>ID</i>	<i>16</i>

2. *Has your club produced a show in any of the last three show seasons (May 2017-April 2020)?*

142 YES

147 NO

3. *Will your club put on a show during the 2020-2021 show season?*

33 YES

165 NO

91 MAYBE

4. Will a majority of your club members enter and attend a show in the 2020-2021 show season?

165 YES

124 NO

5. Does your club want CFA to award Regional Winner (RW) titles for the 2020-2021 show season?

172 YES

117 NO

6. Should individual regions be allowed to opt out of producing a regional awards banquet and awards?

221 YES

68 NO

7. Should point minimums for the 2020-2021 show season only be set for Regional Winner (RW) titles?

173 YES

116 NO

Board Action Items:

8. Choose one of the following point minimums for the Kitten Class:

71 200

47 300

55 400

1. Approve the minimum requirement of 200 points to earn a Regional Win title in kitten class in the 2020-2021 show season.

Newkirk: Let's take the first one. Cyndy, do you want to read it and then we'll ask for a second? **Byrd:** Approve the minimum requirement of 200 points to earn a Regional Win title in kitten class in the 2020-2021 show season. **Anger:** Rachel seconds.

Newkirk: Is there any discussion? **Currie:** I have no problem with any of these action items, but I would like to point out, I know that I'm an elderly person but I do not remember the board actually, as a whole, authorizing this survey to go out, period, based on the questions that this Committee had come up with. Is that something that I missed? **Newkirk:** I think we charged

the board with making a survey to update current stuff from what we did in the Spring. **Currle:** I do know that there were a lot of discussions that had come up about certain questions that people had some problems with, myself included, but there was never a vote conducted as to the overall survey before it went out to our constituents. **Newkirk:** OK, that's fine, but that's not germane to this motion, Kenny. If you want to bring that up after we cover these four motions, you can do it then, OK? **Currle:** I just think it's important, because we're voting on something that technically is not something that was approved by the board. Alright, I'll be quiet. **Newkirk:** The Committee did the work. They sent it out. We wanted to get some input from the members and we got that. That's what they came up with. **P. Moser:** I personally think these are too low. I looked at the survey. There was not much difference between them. This is like asking people, "would you rather have a million dollars, \$500,000 or \$10,000?" Everybody is always going to go for the lowest which they can achieve. At this point, I mean, you're just giving them the lowest to make it, and I just think they need something to try to achieve besides just getting the minimums. **Byrd:** I agree with Pam Moser, as well. I had a friend who, based on these minimums, would have earned a regional win, may have earned a regional win in one show at Cotton States, because she made a lot of rings and made well over 200 points, so that's why, when I introduced this, I said, "or amended as we see fit." **DelaBar:** When I'm looking at these points, I'm also looking at the number of cats that my region is going to see in a show. Our first show was 47 cats. Our second show was 53 cats. I don't know what's going to happen at the third. As things are right now, unless we have some more shows with larger entries, we're not going to have any regional wins if the points go higher. In fact, with Household Pets, when we get to it I'm going to ask for a reduction, but it's just not going to be there, especially with the second and third rounds of COVID going around. **Roy:** I'm going to say, I agree with Pam Moser. I think that overall they are a little bit too low. I certainly can go along with the Household Pet one, but the rest I would like to see a little bit higher. **Anger:** The way I look at it is, we ran this poll for a specific reason – to get information. This is the information that we got. I am very hesitant to go against what our constituents are overwhelmingly telling us they want. My one issue is with Pam's region. If there's a way that we can do a certain number of points per ring or 200 points, something like that, where a region that 200 is unachievable, I would be much happier. As far as raising it, our constituents said that these are the amounts that they are comfortable with and I am going to support that. **Eigenhauser:** I'm going to slightly disagree with Rachel. These aren't the amounts our constituents picked, these are the amounts they picked among the choices we gave them. On some of these – I don't really have as big a problem with the kitten one because I think that's reasonable, but when you look at the championship class, almost as many people went for the highest choice as the lowest choice. The lowest choice won by a few votes, but there are almost as many people that wanted to go for the highest choice. For the Household Pets, 200 points is too much. It really needs to go down a bit from there. I don't know how that was picked as the minimum, but again it was the least people could go with among the choices they were given. So, I support #1, I would like to go higher on #2, I would support #3, I would like to go lower on #4. **Newkirk:** We can get to those when we get there. **Currle:** We have to keep in mind, now this is for the lower rung. We would like to recognize as many of our constituents, I think, throughout the year, which is obviously going to be very short. You can accumulate, if you want to stay in the lead in your particular region, by continuing to go to shows, which incentivizes people to enter shows where they feel safe and can achieve an even higher amount of points. So, keeping in mind, this is the lower end of the entire totem pole. I have no problem with what the majority of the fancy voted for – the clubs in particular – so I am going to support

all four of these motions. **Newkirk:** Any further debate on item #1? **Mastin:** Sorry for my bad connection earlier. I'm going to support what Rachel said and also support what Pam DelaBar is asking for on the Household win. As I recall, there wasn't a lower number on the Household Pet numbers for the clubs to choose, so I think if we do set that lower amount, it's OK. If we raise 1, 2 and 3 – and that's not what the clubs voted on – it's not necessarily the majority, it's that these point levels received the greatest number of selections. I understand what George is saying. That's what was presented to them, but that's what they were asking for and I think we need to honor that; otherwise – and I've said this before in an email to the board – if we're not prepared to take the information from our clubs, based on a survey, and go by it, don't put out the survey, because a lot of times when you ask the information on a survey from your clubs, you may not like what you get. So, we got it. I'm OK with it and I think we should support it and address #4. **Byrd:** I just want to remind us that regional win titles are 25th through Best. These point minimums would be a barrier to get across to 25th. This is not automatic. **Newkirk:** That's a good point. Any further debate on item 1? **Calhoun:** I wondered, would there be an opportunity to possibly have a different minimum point threshold for Europe? **Newkirk:** We could make that a separate motion if you want. Let's vote on #1. Is there any objection to #1? **Morgan:** Yes. **Newkirk:** OK. All those in favor of #1 as presented with 200 points to get a regional title for the kitten class, please raise your hand.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Calhoun, Morgan, B. Moser, P. Moser and McCullough voting no.

Webster: Howard is a yes. **Newkirk:** OK Howard. Yukiko-san? **Hayata:** Yes. **Newkirk:** Yukiko is a yes. Howard is a yes. Kathy Calhoun is a yes, Rachel Anger is a yes, George Eigenhauser, Carol Krzanowski, Kenny Curle, Cathy Dunham, Cyndy Byrd, Pam DelaBar, Rich Mastin, Sharon Roy, John Colilla. **Calhoun:** Darrell, I apologize. My hand was still up based on my other comment. I'm a no. **Newkirk:** OK, that's fine. Rachel, take Kathy Calhoun out and add in Yukiko Hayata and Howard Webster. All those opposed. Melanie is a no. Hang on a minute. Calhoun is a no, Brian Moser is a no, Steve McCullough is a no, Pam Moser is a no, Kathy Calhoun is a no. Any abstentions? No abstentions. Rachel, would you mind announcing the vote please? **Anger:** Sure. We had 12 yes votes, 5 no votes. **Newkirk:** No abstentions. OK, the motion is agreed to.

9. *Choose one of the following point minimums for the Championship Class:*

69 400

43 500

61 600

2. *Approve the minimum requirement of 400 points to earn a Regional Win title in championship class for the 2020-2021 show season.*

Newkirk: We'll move on to #2. Cyndy Byrd? **Byrd:** Approve the minimum requirement of 400 points to earn a Regional Win title in championship class for the 2020-2021 show season. **Mastin:** Rich will second. **Newkirk:** Thank you Rich. We have a motion and a second to approve a minimum requirement of 400 points to earn a Regional Win title in championship

class for the current show season. That question is up for debate. Anyone? Melanie? Howard? Yukiko? **Morgan:** I have the same problem with this as I had with #1, but even more so here because the votes were as close as they were on the survey, even. I think that 400 points is too low, with the exception of Region 9, which I would certainly consider a separate motion for. **Newkirk:** Sure. I think after we get through these four motions we'll tackle Region 9 at that point in time. Any further debate on item #2? All those in favor please raise your hand.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Morgan, B. Moser, Eigenhauser, Roy, P. Moser, McCullough, Calhoun and Colilla voting no.

Newkirk: Hayata-san? **Hayata:** Yes. **Newkirk:** Howard? **Webster:** Yes. **Newkirk:** So, the yes votes are Yukiko Hayata, Howard Webster, Rich Mastin, Carol Krzanowski, Kenny Currie, Cyndy Byrd, Cathy Dunham, Pam DelaBar, Rachel Anger. If you guys will take your hands down, we will call for the no votes. Melanie? **Morgan:** Yes. I mean no, but yes. **Newkirk:** OK, you're a no vote. Melanie Morgan is a no, Brian Moser, George Eigenhauser, Sharon Roy, Pam Moser, Steve McCullough, Kathy Calhoun, John Colilla. Are there any abstentions? No abstentions? Rachel, will you announce the vote please? **Anger:** There were 9 yes votes, 8 no votes, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you so much. We'll move on to item #3. Oh, that motion was agreed to.

10. Choose one of the following point minimums for the Premiership Class:

81 200

39 300

53 400

3. Approve the minimum requirement of 200 points to earn a Regional Win title in premiership class in the 2020-2021 show season ~~only~~.

Newkirk: #3, Cyndy? **Byrd:** Approve the minimum requirement of 200 points to earn a Regional Win title in premiership class in the 2020-2021 show season. That "only" snuck in there. It shouldn't be there. **Mastin:** Rich will second. **Newkirk:** Any debate? The motion is up for debate. Alright, I'll call the vote. All those in favor raise your hand.

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

Webster: Howard is a yes. **Newkirk:** Yukiko-san? **Hayata:** Yes. **Newkirk:** The yes votes are Yukiko Hayata, Howard Webster, Rich Mastin, Pam DelaBar, Cyndy Byrd, Steve McCullough, Cathy Dunham, Carol Krzanowski, George Eigenhauser and Rachel Anger. **Currle:** And Kenny Currle. **Newkirk:** And Kenny Currle. Thanks Kenny, I just saw you pop in there. All those opposed, please raise your hand. Melanie Morgan is a no vote, Brian Moser is a no vote, Pam Moser, Kathy Calhoun, John Colilla, Sharon Roy. Any abstentions? Rachel, would you announce the vote? **Anger:** We have 11 yes votes, 6 no votes, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** 17, OK thank you. That motion is agreed to.

11. Choose one of the following point minimums for the Household Pet Class:

106 200

33 300

34 400

4. Approve the minimum requirement of ~~200~~100 points to earn a Regional Win title in household pet class in the 2020-2021 show season.

Newkirk: Now let's move on to the Household Pets, #4. Cyndy Byrd? **Byrd:** Approve the minimum requirement of 200 points to earn a Regional Win title in household pet class in the 2020-2021 show season. **Mastin:** Rich will second, with comment. **Newkirk:** Before I state the question and open debate, do you want to change the 200 points, so that we don't have to go through an amendment process? **DelaBar:** Yes. **Mastin:** That was my comment. **Newkirk:** What number do you want to put in? 150? 100? **Eigenhauser:** I would like 100. **Roy:** I would like 100, too. I think that's realistic. **Newkirk:** OK, let's make the question read 100 points and if that doesn't get approved, then we can vote on another one. So, the motion that I'm going to put on the floor for debate is, Approve the minimum requirement of 100 points to earn a Regional Win title in household pet class for the show season. **Eigenhauser:** I just wanted to point out that the HHP Chair posted to the chat and she is OK with 100, as well. **Newkirk:** Yeah, I saw that. **Mastin:** I'm supportive of the 100, as well. **Newkirk:** Any other comments? Let's vote on the motion, which is to approve the minimum requirement of 100 points to earn a Regional Win title in the household pet class in the current show season. Everybody in favor of that, please raise your hands.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

Webster: Howard is in favor. **Morgan:** Morgan. **Hayata:** Yukiko. **Newkirk:** OK, so Morgan, Yukiko and Howard. Looks like it's unanimous but I'll call the names since I called for the vote. The yes votes are Howard Webster, Yukiko Hayata, Melanie Morgan, Sharon Roy, Rachel Anger, Rich Mastin, Brian Moser, Cyndy Byrd, Kenny Currle, Kathy Calhoun, John Colilla, Carol Krzanowski, Pam DelaBar, Cathy Dunham, George Eigenhauser, Steve McCullough and Pam Moser. If you will take your hands down, any no votes please raise your hand. Any abstentions? Rachel will you announce the vote? **Anger:** I have 17 yes votes. **Newkirk:** Thank you. OK, that passed.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Cyndy Byrd, Chair*

Newkirk: Who wants to make a motion about Europe? Pam DelaBar, would you like to? **DelaBar:** Actually, I'm not prepared to come up with this, because this is something I hadn't even considered might happen. I would like to bring it up in December. **Newkirk:** OK, that's fine. We'll bring up the point minimums for regional wins for Region 9 at the December meeting. Rachel, will you make a note of that and make it a Special Order? **Anger:** I will. **Newkirk:** Thank you so much.

Morgan: Darrell, question. Back in October, we passed the exception for the split season kittens from last year, because at that time we were not having regional wins. Now that we have reinstated regional wins, when would it be appropriate to address undoing what we did in October on that? **Newkirk:** Well, if you do it tonight, if you want to rescind that and make it for the current one, it would take 2/3 vote to do it tonight. If you want to do it for December, it could be pre-noticed and it will only take a majority vote. **Morgan:** That's probably what we should do, right? **Newkirk:** That's the smartest thing to do, in my opinion, because I don't know if you can get 2/3 vote tonight to rescind it. **Morgan:** OK, let's do that. Basically, the reason that we did it no longer exists, so it doesn't make any sense to have it. **Newkirk:** I understand, yeah. If you want, my suggestion – since it would only require a majority vote instead of a 2/3 vote – is to pre-notice it and then you can get with Rachel. She can pre-notice the motion. I'm assuming what you're wanting to do is rescind it, because we put them in last season. **Morgan:** Right. Now we're robbing other kittens that should have – yeah. We've basically moved things back in time. We change the reason that we changed it in the first place. **Newkirk:** My question is, has Central Office awarded those regional winning kittens for last year? **Tartaglia:** I believe we did, so now we'll have to take those titles away. **Newkirk:** It would be out of order then, Melanie. You can't undo a motion. **Tartaglia:** I'm sorry, we haven't actually awarded the titles yet. We haven't given them the NW [*sic*, RW] yet, those four kittens. I thought it had been done but James says no. **Newkirk:** OK, alright, because if you had we couldn't rescind it because the action has already taken place. If the action has not taken place, then it can be rescinded so that they would qualify. I'm assuming, Melanie, you're going to put them into this show season, is that correct? **Morgan:** Well yeah. They just need to go back to where they belong, because now there's a number of other kittens who are now eligible for regional wins that would be basically falling in a gap, based off of the fact that we had passed on rule based off one set of criteria. We then changed that criteria and if we don't change it back then there's a whole group of kittens that will now fall in that vacuum. We can do that in December as long as it's not going to – as long as, Allene, you can hold off on awarding those titles so that we don't become out of order. **Newkirk:** Allene? **Tartaglia:** We can hold off on awarding the titles. **Morgan:** OK then, I'll bring it up in December. **Newkirk:** Alright, thank you. **Mastin:** I think I need a little refreshing of my memory. Didn't we determine it was only two kittens that were impacted and we weren't taking away any awards from any others? It was an additional award to the existing? **Newkirk:** That's correct, and I think it was three kittens. **Mastin:** OK, it was three. So, I don't think we are impacting any of the other kittens by giving these awards, based on what we did back in October. **Morgan:** Yes, we are Rich. What we did for those three kittens was, we only awarded kittens that would have been eligible for regional awards, based on the points from last season. If we left the kittens where they were and had done absolutely nothing, then those kittens would have been eligible for regional awards this season. We just passed a rule that basically put in a 200 [inaudible] regional award. There are many more kittens than three that will now become eligible to fight for those regional awards amongst all the other cats, so if we don't change what we did now that we have reinstated regional awards, then those kittens basically have been left without a home. They weren't eligible to get an award last season, yet they earned points, and now we're saying they're not eligible to earn an award this season. So, they are left in limbo and that's not right for those kittens. **Mastin:** OK, thank you for explaining that, Melanie. **DelaBar:** We have already announced that those three kittens are going to be getting an appropriate regional award, based upon where their points lie. I know the one that was in my region. That kitten has aged out. There is no way it can be competitive for this season, especially since it's in a country that's

restricted right now. Again, we're bouncing around. I think we ought to stick with the action that we took for those three kittens and move on. This is an aberrant time. It hopefully will never happen again with these two show seasons, to come up with all these different conditions that we have had to do. Otherwise, again, we're confusing the issue. **Perkins:** I need to object at this time. I feel like we're out of order. Is there a motion on the floor here? **Eigenhauser:** I was going to say that. There's no motion. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you. Melanie, if you want to do it, you can bring it up in December. **Morgan:** OK thanks. That's all I was asking. **Newkirk:** Pam, you're going to bring back in December for regional wins for Region 9. **DelaBar:** Yes, I am. **Newkirk:** Thank you Shelly for bringing that to our attention.

7. INTERNATIONAL DIVISION.

Committee Chair: Russell Webb

Liaison to Board: Kenny Currle

List of Committee Members: Gavin Cao, Eva Chen, Richard Kallmeyer, Nancy Dodds, Anne Mathis, Rain Pang and Agnes Sun

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

1. *Update on Entry Clerk Program.* 1 90 minutes entry clerk training program was conducted thru Zoom. All entry clerks attended. They worked with CFA IT to provide each entry clerk with an individual test account as well as setting up a test show for entry clerks to practice. CFA also offered full support in case the entry clerks had any questions during their practice. All did very well.

Newkirk: Our next Order of the Day is the International Division – Mainland China report. Allene, can you bring Russell Webb onto the panel? **Tartaglia:** He is already in. **Newkirk:** Good deal, thank you. Hi Russell. How you doing? **Webb:** Good evening, how are you? I'm going to be pretty quick. It's just a quick review. Our new entry clerks, they went through 90 minute training with a test and all did very well.

2. *Update on WeChat App.* The WeChat app Gavin has completed about 60% of the development. Currently, we are pending CFA IT and our vendor to provide the webservices required so that the WeChat app can communicate with the CFA system.
3. *Update on October show.* The October 24th show put on by The Mountain City Cat Fan Club was a licensed CFA show and had 2 AB rings and had 101 entries. The show was held in Chongqing, China. I was told that exhibitors were pleased to have CFA back in China and came from many different cities to show there cats.

Webb: We did hold our first licensed CFA show in China on October 24th. We received 101 entries and it was held in Chongqing, China.

We have another 2 AB ring show on November 7, 2020 and more shows to follow.

Webb: We do have another show that was done November 7th. This got 71 entries. It was a two allbreed ring show. I also want to bring up the Skyline Feline Cat Club is doing a 10 ring show November 14th. They did invite all our new Associate Judges – T1 Judges – to actually do the show. I did speak to Anne Mathis about the training and she said everybody did very well on the Zoom training. So, I want to thank that cat club for opening their arms and taking in our new judges.

Current Happenings of Committee:

Pending approval from the Board our T1 Associated Judges will be invited to Judge a show sometime in November. Good Luck to all of them!

Future Projections for Committee:

Update on WeChat App.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Updates on programs.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Russell Webb, Chair*

Webb: That's all I have. **Newkirk:** Thank you Russell. Kenny, do you have anything to add on that? **Currle:** Yes. I just want to compliment Russ and all the people in China. Even though I was the only one to vote against this China Associate Program, it has been very successful. I know how hard the people that have been working on this worked. Russell and I have been in contact with creating an opportunity for these judges to get rolling. This is what Russell has been able to do with this coming up weekend's show. It's going to be a very exciting time for CFA in China. So, kudos to Russell and everybody in China that's been working so hard. I want to compliment Russell on really creating a very equal and equitable situation over there in China. That's the only way you're going to succeed when you're expanding. I've had a lot of experience in expanding CFA in certain parts of the world. You've got to be fair with everyone. You're not going to be able to be friendly with everyone; you're not going to be able to do any favors. If you treat them all the same and support those individuals that support our brand and our ideals, you will be successful. So, kudos to Russell and equal kudos to those in China that have supported us over the last several years. Thank you again. **Newkirk:** Good deal, thank you.

Reports of Special (Select or Ad Hoc) Committees

8. VIRTUAL CAT COMPETITION REPORT.

Committee Chair: Iris Zinck
Liaison to Board: Cathy Dunham
List of Committee Members: Michael Altschul, Deirdre Gerhardt, Nancy Kerr

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Providing platform orientation, promotion guidance, and ongoing exhibitor and platform support for the Southern, Southwest, North Atlantic-Europe, Midwest and International Division Qualifiers.

Preparing assorted how-to documents to facilitate entering, processing entries, judging, and preparation of finals, as well as two videos, one on Spectators Choice voting and one on how to record Zoom finals for judges, plus numerous event promotion videos.

Increasing our familiarity and capabilities with the VCC platform so as to be able to assume more management responsibility for it over time.

Current Happenings of Committee:

Past activities summarized above will continue through mid-November, possibly beyond.

Drafting an outline for a VCC Planning and Show Production Manual, which will eventually be presented to the Board for approval.

Incorporating a project management tool (JIRA) into our work approach to better track activities.

Exploring the most effective strategies for online promotion of VCC shows.

Future Projections for Committee:

Preparing and proposing requirements and procedural guidelines for future VCC shows, plus providing recommendations for more effective promotion

Newkirk: We will have our first Special Committee report, which is line item 8, the Virtual Cat Competition Committee, and that is Cathy Dunham. **Dunham:** Good evening. Allene, could you scroll up just slightly for me. There we go, thank you. I am sure everybody has read this report. They have done a phenomenal job. They have hit the ground running working with the Millennial Committee on the Top Cat Challenge qualifiers.

Board Action Items:

~~Requesting permission to authorize and help~~ The Committee is going to schedule additional virtual shows (following the required Regional Director approval) beginning after the CITCC has completed. Future shows would be limited to a maximum of ~~two a month~~ one per weekend to maximize profitability.

We are already receiving requests for shows and need to be able to address them.

We believe ALL post-CITCC virtual shows should be overseen by the Committee and that this would be the most effective way to manage and support them.

Dunham: We do have one action item for the board this evening; that is, a motion requesting permission to authorize and help schedule additional virtual shows (following the required Regional Director approval) beginning after the Top Cat Challenge is complete in December. This would allow the Virtual Cat Competition Committee to oversee scheduling. We are not in any way going to require that they use the current platform. Any group can use the platform of their choice. This is just a scheduling issue to help insure that moving forward everyone has adequate visibility and can be successful with their competition. **Newkirk:** OK, and you're making that motion? **Dunham:** I am making that motion. **Newkirk:** I need a second. **Krzanowski:** Carol seconds. **Newkirk:** Thank you Carol Krzanowski for the second.

Newkirk: The floor is open for debate on this. **Mastin:** I think we need to go back to the written instructions that were set in place for the Virtual, to make sure that we're not running afoul on that. I don't remember anybody being in charge of the schedule on the outlined instructions. **Dunham:** Rich, this would be for additional shows after the Top Cat Challenge finishes. Regional directors still have the authority to approve a virtual event, just as had been discussed in previous meetings. This is just to allow so that two groups do not pick the same time period, because we want them to be completely successful for both events. **Mastin:** So then, should the motion be specific to, instead of *Requesting permission to authorize and help schedule*, to *The Committee is going to schedule*? **Dunham:** That's fine. I'm comfortable with that. **Anger:** You know, I agree with whoever spoke earlier saying they like to support committee chairs, which I like to do as well, but when something comes forward where we are limiting things, I have a little bit of an issue with that. I don't want to limit anything. What if someone in California wants to have a virtual cat competition and then two weeks later someone in Europe wants to have a virtual cat competition? I'm not sure how that is going to affect the profitability of either one of them, so I would like to see the maximum number lifted. I can't really support that. **Dunham:** Well, Rachel, in your specific example, both of those shows would be scheduled. It's more of a matter of, in your example, the California show and a European show being on the same weekend or week that would potentially cause one or both of them to not see the full financial profitability that they could if they were on different weekends. That's what the Committee is trying to achieve, is to help – in your example, a California club may not know what Europe is doing, so if we can help guide them to be the best event they can be in a timeframe by asking them to hold off a week, I think that's a viable solution to make sure that they are all financially sound and can raise the money that they're looking for. **Anger:** Can I just have a wrap-up on that? **Newkirk:** Sure, go ahead Rachel. **Anger:** Thanks. I do understand all that, Cathy. I just happen to disagree. I really don't think that one virtual cat competition in one part of the world is going to affect a virtual cat competition in another part of the world. **Dunham:** Understood. **DelaBar:** We do have a virtual show in Russia the first weekend of

December that I did take through the Committee. That's when I discussed with Iris and with Cathy about having an overall supervision of the virtual shows. I would think that those that use the VCC, which we have [inaudible] show season, would definitely come under this Committee. I do have a problem that I don't think that something that is held in, let's say, Russia and is going to be held in the Russian language is going to effect what happens in southern California. I don't know if virtual shows are going to be the go-to thing. People are planning their breedings and everything, based on having real shows and real titles. Basically, I can support everything but the two shows a month. I think we need more. **Dunham:** Actually, the Committee, we can run five shows on the VCC platform. I'm sure that same protocol would be applied to any organization [inaudible] the platform is. **Eigenhauser:** Part of it is that we don't have a lot of experience with virtual shows. With physical shows, we all have our opinion about whether something in southern California affects northern California, whether something in Kentucky affects Florida, but virtual shows, having no physical site, you're limitations on entry are zero. You can enter from anywhere in the world without air fare, without a hotel room, without any of the associated costs. So, I think the market for virtual shows, the entry for virtual shows, is going to be much bigger than the 500 miles or whatever we normally assume for brick and mortar shows, so I do believe we need to have some handle on the virtual shows so we're not inundated with them so nobody makes money, but I think two is far too many. I would prefer to see four or five. I think that would be a reasonable number in any given month, and if five is the limit on our platform, then that would be a good number go to with, but I really don't know how much these shows are going to impact each other. I don't want to make it just a free for all because we just don't know how that's going to pan out. **Newkirk:** Does someone want to make an amendment to a maximum of five a month? Or are you OK with the way it's worded? **Eigenhauser:** I'll make the motion to amend it to five a month as the maximum. **McCullough:** Steve seconds.

Newkirk: So, let's debate the amendment. Is there any debate on the amendment? George? **Eigenhauser:** No, I'm ready to vote. **Dunham:** Iris is also on to answer any questions and she would like to speak. **Newkirk:** OK. She's the chair. We can promote her and get her on. **Dunham:** She's already on. **Newkirk:** OK Iris, you're recognized. **Zinck:** I would just like to point out that if we are authorizing a maximum of five shows in a month, that means there could be two shows on the same weekend. Based on my experience with the VCC platform and what we've been through with the regional qualifiers, I do not see that as anything remotely approaching a recipe for success. Two may be too little, but five is too many. **Newkirk:** George, would you consider lowering that five to four? That way we wouldn't – **Eigenhauser:** How about just make it one per weekend? **Newkirk:** OK, that's good. **Zinck:** I'll deal with that. **Newkirk:** OK, fantastic. Steve, do you want to second that? **McCullough:** Yes, because some months have five weekends. **Newkirk:** Yes, OK. So, it will be a maximum of one per weekend. **McCullough:** Correct. **Newkirk:** So that's the amendment. Is there any objection to the amendment? Hearing no objection the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment is ratified by unanimous consent.

Newkirk: So now, our main motion is going to be amended. Is there any further debate on that? I'm going to call the question on the amended main motion, and that amendment was one a weekend to maximize profitability. Any objection to the amended main motion? Hearing no objection, by unanimous consent, the motion is agreed to.

The amended main motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Time Frame:

Ongoing

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

More detailed guidelines for post-CITCC VCC shows

Schedule of planned shows

Progress report on the VCC Manual

Newkirk: OK Iris, do you want to go with what you are planning for the next meeting?

Zinck: Well, we already have several requests in place from people that want to run shows that we have been holding in abeyance, pending this board action, so the first thing we're going to do is get back to these people and start trying to figure out when they can do their shows. We'll be reporting on that next time. **Newkirk:** OK, good deal. Thank you so much.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Iris Zinck, Chair*

9. MILLENNIAL OUTREACH COMMITTEE.

Committee Chair: **Lorna Friemoth**
Liaison to Board: **Rachel Anger**
List of Committee Members: **Krista Schmitt, J’Aime Lerner, Nicole Turk**

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

The Board approved the CFA International Top Cat Challenge and Regional Virtual Qualifying events in concept to engage exhibitors during this time of social distancing and attract Millennials to the cat fancy.

Current Happenings of Committee:

We are busily finalizing the details of the CFA International Top Cat Challenge, as well as supporting the RQVEs with Facebook marketing and content creation, as well as PowerPoint presentation template creation and general support.

Newkirk: The next Order of Business is the Millennial Outreach Committee. Rachel, and Allene, could you promote Lorna? Are you on, Lorna? **Anger:** While she is getting on, I did want to acknowledge all the work that everybody is doing on these shows. To say it’s a full-time job would be a severe under-estimation. I know these guys are putting in 50, 60, 100 hour weeks working until the wee hours of the morning to make this happen. You know, I have to say, for those of us that have been fortunate enough to judge these virtual cat competitions, everything is right there and put together beautifully. They put everything together for our finals presentation and have someone there holding our hand. How they are not falling asleep while we are doing that I don’t know, but I think they are doing a terrific job. This is really a lot of fun. If you have not participated in one or donated to one, do it! **Newkirk:** Great. Thank you Rachel. Lorna, do you want to unmute yourself and give your report? **Friemoth:** Sure, thank you so much. This is, like Rachel said, beyond a full-time job but it has been a lot of fun. We are busily finalizing the details of the CFA Top Cat Challenge finale, as well as supporting the Regional Virtual Qualifying Events with FaceBook marketing and content creation, as well as PowerPoint presentation template creation and general support.

Future Projections for Committee:

Due to some personal issues with the International Division virtual qualifying event committee, we will delay entry for the CITCC for an additional week.

Entries Accepted: **Nov 23-December 8**

Judging: **Dec 9-18**

Spectators Choice: **Dec 1-18**

Finals: **Fun rings – Dec 12-13**
 Conformation – Dec 19-20

Best of the Best – Dec 21

Friemoth: Due to some personal issues with the International Division virtual qualifying event committee, we would like to give them an additional week to procure entries for their event, and therefore bump the CFA International Top Cat Challenge by one additional week. The schedule proposed is below.

Board Action Items:

We have not found that paid marketing seems to have any effect on viewers or entrants of the events and therefore I propose:

Motion: *That we ~~split~~ add to the budget of \$1000 for marketing in half, and apply half to marketing and half to an additional \$500 for prizes.*

Friemoth: With the last event that I put on as a co-manager with Desiree Bobby for the Tricks and Picks for Treats Challenge, she did do quite a good number – I think it was close to \$300 to \$500 worth of marketing in FaceBook promoting her event. We did not find that the paid promotion had any effect on entries, participation and spectator’s choice voting, and because of that we would like to ask that the budget of \$1,000 that was previously allocated be split into two parts – half to go ahead and try to get the virtual audience to watch the show happenings, and the other half to put towards prizes. **Newkirk:** Rachel, would you like to make that into a motion? **Anger:** I will make that motion, *That we split the budget of \$1000 for marketing in half, and apply half to marketing and half to prizes.* **Currle:** Kenny seconds.

Newkirk: The motion is up for debate. Anyone have comments to make? **Calhoun:** I have a comment. I can’t get my hand up. **Newkirk:** Go ahead Kathy. **Calhoun:** Typically, because you are moving funds from one line item to another line item, we typically go and – if your budget resides on CFA’s P&L, we typically go to the Budget Committee first so that we can ask all the appropriate questions so that the board doesn’t have to do that, and then we make a recommendation. Now, one of the interesting things is that – this is in my October board report – we are having a mid-year budget review of the entire budget for CFA the 18th, I believe. This is coming right up. What I would recommend, as opposed to having this discussion here about reallocating funds, that we kick it to the Budget Committee next week and we’ll be on top of it, because that is happening next week, and then come back and see how – really, we need to refine your financials within that budget at any rate for these shows, because it really wasn’t there at the beginning when we set the budget, so we really need to do some refinement, so it would be my recommendation that we kick it to the Budget Committee and then move forward from there. **Newkirk:** So Kathy, that \$1,000 that they’re getting now will have to be used toward marketing. Is that what you’re saying? **Calhoun:** No, I’m not. No, no. What I’m saying is that, first of all, we don’t know from a financial standpoint, we don’t know very much about the financials. We know that the shows have been successful, we know the clubs are making a lot of money. We know all these things but we really don’t know any more than that – just generalities – so we would like to get a little closer to what’s going on from a financial standpoint. **Newkirk:** I understand that, but it says here that the budget is \$1,000 for marketing. That obviously has been approved. **Calhoun:** Right, so they want to reduce the budget and put it somewhere else. Typically, when that sort of thing is done, it goes to the Budget Committee first. **Newkirk:** I

understand that. My point is, it's \$1,000. Right now it's all into the marketing aspect, correct?

Calhoun: Correct. **Newkirk:** OK, so all they're asking is to allow half of that budgeted – it's already budgeted. **Calhoun:** Here's what – this is what – I think what they're saying is that the marketing has not been successful, based on all the work that Desiree did for the Lykoi show. We don't know what's been done for any other show, so we don't know any background. You would not think that taking money away from marketing is going to improve marketing. It could be that maybe you need another \$500 period. It could be that you don't really need to rob Peter to pay Paul. We want you to be successful, so the rationale about taking money away from marketing when it's already not successful is not really going to help that. You really want to broaden this, and that's what marketing does, so I'm actually really trying to – there may be a point that the Committee may need additional funding for toys, in and of itself. **Newkirk:** I'll just point out they're just asking for reallocation, not more money. **Eigenhauser:** I understand what Kathy is saying, but we're on kind of a short fuse here. We're going to start taking entries in less than two weeks and we're going to start doing the judging in three and a half/four weeks. If we're going to advertise more prizes to encourage entries, we need to do that advertising now for it to have any effect, so sending this to the Budget Committee in a week and then the board taking it up in December to approve it and then not even getting started on it until sometime in December, it may already be moot by then. I think we need to deal with this today, one way or the other. **Calhoun:** OK, so then I will ask all my questions that I would ask tonight. So, I would like to understand more about the marketing efforts that were made, as opposed to being made on the shows. **Friemoth:** When I say that she used paid marketing, I mean FaceBook-targeted ads. I do not mean anything other than that. It is my opinion that the prizes that she offered, which were in the sum of \$2,000, were what made the show successful. The Tricks and Treats show had almost 800 entries, when the other regional shows had somewhere in the ballpark of 300 maybe, so I feel that having more prizes is a better marketing tool than paid ads for people that may not already be somewhere within our realm of people that we can reach to enter virtual cat competitions. **Calhoun:** Do you have a distribution plan for the toys. **Friemoth:** I didn't say toy. I'm not sure where that came from. **Calhoun:** Prizes. **Friemoth:** Sure. I don't really have a plan yet, but the easiest thing to do is to send people things directly from Amazon so there is no shipping cost, and we don't have to spend time physically shipping and packaging awards. I did that for my region's show and it took three of us about two weeks to do that. **Newkirk:** Anything else, Kathy? **Calhoun:** Do you plan that all of the finals be given some sort of gift card? **Friemoth:** No, that's not what I plan at all. I'm going to take the budget back to my committee and say, "this is what we have, let's try to figure out the best spend for this money." It could be that we give a small prize for all of the top 15 finals. It could be that we give some bigger prizes for the best cat in each final. There are a lot of different ways that we can go about distributing the funds. As of right now, we do have one \$500 sponsorship from Zymox for the show and we have not even really begun to procure sponsors for this event. We are working on getting it onto the VCC platform currently with the help of Central Office. My committee member, J'Aime Lerner, is going to be doing the html back end on trying to make the VCC event page more aesthetically pleasing and out of the box, to try to make this a really spectacular event. She is donating her time to do that. **Calhoun:** Are the other sponsors donating or paying for their sponsorship spots? **Friemoth:** Zymox already sent the money. It was received months ago. **Calhoun:** Zymox and Felicity Lane US.etsy, are they all paid sponsors, as well? **Friemoth:** They are paid per region. All of the things that you've seen on the slide so far, those are sponsors that the regions have procured on their own. Those are not anything that my Committee has

done. **Calhoun:** Got it, OK. **DelaBar:** Where can people find out if their cat did receive an award from one of the Regional Qualifiers? Is it listed? I'll give you an example; best Norwegian Forest Cat from Region 1/9 was supposed to get a special award. Where can people actually see where this is written on what they are supposed to get? **Friemoth:** They are on each region's VCC page. **DelaBar:** Cannot find that. **Friemoth:** Then you would need to speak to that region's show manager. **DelaBar:** OK. **Mastin:** I'm wondering if we should look at this a little differently. Instead of taking \$500 from the marketing budget and putting it to prizes, maybe we should leave the marketing budget as is, and come with a motion saying that you want \$500 additional to the budget for prizes. If you don't spend your full \$1,000 on marketing, so be it. I understand the concerns that Kathy is having. If you take money away from marketing, you might end up with fewer participants, so it's just a thought to think about approaching it that way. **Friemoth:** I understand that. We should work smarter and not harder, but honestly, the posts that Mike Altschul and I do together with the hundreds of different pages and the breed groups that we're in, those seem to be generating the most amount of entries and the spectator's choice voting. **Newkirk:** Any other comments?

Anger: I will accept that amendment to the motion – Rich's suggestion. **Newkirk:** Well, he just threw it out there. Rich, do you want to make it into a motion? **Mastin:** I can, just to get some discussion going on it, sure. **Newkirk:** It's \$1,000 for marketing and you're adding \$500 for prizes. **Mastin:** Correct. **Eigenhauser:** George will second. **Newkirk:** Rachel already seconded it, George. OK, so we're into debate on the amendment. Rachel? **Anger:** Go for it. **Currle:** Could you just clarify the motion we'll be voting on at this time, please? **Newkirk:** The motion is that we will continue to give them \$1,000 for their marketing budget and add \$500 to be used on behalf of prizes. **Friemoth:** I will note that at this time all of the shows have met their goal and CFA has not had to pay for judges for any of the qualifiers at this time. **Mastin:** Great job, and thank you. **Newkirk:** Any other debate? **Eigenhauser:** Excuse me. Somebody needs to mute. I'm hearing what sounds like a heavy breather and didgeridoo going on in the background. **Currle:** I just want to thank Lorna and her entire group for the hard work that they've been doing, to put this all together. It looks like it has been a very successful thing for them to do on behalf of our association. Speaking for my region, which they certainly enjoyed putting on that show, I want to thank you personally for your efforts. Thank you. **Newkirk:** Are we ready to vote on the amendment? Is there any objection to the amendment? Hearing no objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment is ratified by unanimous consent.

Newkirk: Now, let's vote on the amended main motion, which is the amended motion we just passed. Any objection to the amended motion? Hearing no objection, the amended motion is agreed to.

The amended main motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Newkirk: Alright Lorna, go get 'em. **Friemoth:** Thank you so much. **Newkirk:** You're welcome.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Further updates on the CFA International Top Cat Challenge.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Lorna Friemoth, Chair*

Unfinished Business and General Orders

10. UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

Newkirk: We're into Unfinished Business. Is there any Unfinished Business that we need to bring up? **Currle:** I've got something I would like to say. We were talking about online motions. We did an online motion pertaining to our T1 judges in China. **Newkirk:** Yes. **Currle:** We've already done a ratification because it was unanimous, correct? **Newkirk:** It doesn't need to be ratified. According to New York law, if we get a unanimous vote it's automatically accepted and enacted. We brought it up because it needs to go in the minutes, Kenny. **Currle:** Alright, very good. Thank you.

11. OTHER COMMITTEES.

HOUSEHOLD PET COMMITTEE

Committee Chair: Jenny Wickle
Liaison to Board: George Eigenhauser
List of Committee Members: Julie Benzer, Sue Robbins

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

The current committee was appointed this past June.

Current Happenings of Committee:

- 1. The Half Moon Club from Region 1 is becoming a club for CFA HHP exhibitors. Sue Robbins has been in contact with Sharon Roy and Carol Krzanowski. A slate of officers has been selected. We will be seeking new members soon.*
- 2. Since the CFA board voted on letting clubs use the VCC platform for free, the Half Moon Club would like to utilize the platform for club fundraising.*

Future Projections for Committee:

- 1. Build a membership for the Half Moon club by mid-December.*
- 2. Fundraise for the club. We would like to host a VCC beginning on the second week of December. We would take entries Dec. 6-13. Judging would be the week of Dec. 14-18 with finals the weekend of Dec. 19 and Dec. 20 and best of the best on Dec. 21.*

Board Action Items:

The Half Moon Club be authorized to host a holiday-winter themed VCC as outlined above.

Time Frame:

To begin following Board approval.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Jenny Wickle, Chair*

Newkirk: Let's go into Other Committees, because I think there's a Household Pet. Can we bring Jenny on to the – **Wickle:** I'm here. **Tartaglia:** She's already there. **Newkirk:** Good deal. Hi Jenny. How you doing? **Wickle:** Hi. **Newkirk:** Good to see you at Cotton States. **Wickle:** Good to see you, too. **Newkirk:** You want to go ahead and present your report? **Wickle:** Yes. I think that as far as a board action item, that I won't need a board action item at this point because it was just discussed with the other committee, but I just wanted to introduce myself and say that we have been working on a club for Household Pets. Half Moon Club is now going to be taking Household Pet exhibitors and will be making them into club members. We

appreciate Sharon Roy and Carol's [Krzanowski] help on that. That's it. **Newkirk:** Good deal. Thank you so much. We're glad you joined the meeting tonight, OK? Take care.

12. NEW BUSINESS.

Newkirk: Alright, let's go into New Business. Let's talk about if we want to add in to pre-notice a meeting two weeks after the 12 meetings that we have scheduled that would be used only in an emergency situation. **Currle:** I'll make a motion in order to do that until we can change the constitution or add to the constitution. **Anger:** Rachel seconds. **Newkirk:** So the motion is that we will add to our – we won't be able to do it for this meeting because that would be like one week before our December meeting, so Rachel, if you will make a note that two weeks after the December meeting and then two weeks after every meeting that's on the schedule right now, if you will pre-notice. If there's no emergency business to be conducted, then the meeting will be cancelled. Everybody on the same page with that? **Calhoun:** I have a question. Would it be on a Tuesday evening? **Newkirk:** Yes, two weeks after. **Calhoun:** We start at 8 PM Eastern Time? **Newkirk:** That's correct, just like we do now. We'll just add that in two weeks after our 12 scheduled meetings. Do you want to call for a vote of 10 to make it an emergency, or shall we just use our discretion and cancel if we don't need a meeting? Or, we can make it subject to the call of the Executive Committee. **Calhoun:** I don't think we need to make it – maybe Shelly has a point of view – I don't think we need to make it unduly complicated. If there's no emergency, I think – **Newkirk:** Sure. **Eigenhauser:** I would like to see the Executive Committee cancel it. My fear is, work tends to fill the available space. If we create another meeting, people are going to get a little casual about what an emergency is. They want something quick, they put it on there. I would rather the Executive Committee make the decision whether we need the meeting or not. **Newkirk:** Somebody needs to mute their mike. **Perkins:** So, I'm reading the constitution. Essentially, you're just setting a meeting which I guess you could call this a special meeting, but the constitution requires the special meeting be set not less than two months away nor more than three months from the date of such. That would be in Section 2 of the constitution [Article IV – Annual and Special Meetings], so I don't think you can actually set it for after the December meeting. I mean, it's too soon. I don't have a problem with you doing it, but I feel like if somebody doesn't want something voted on in that meeting, then they are going to say, "well, I didn't actually have real notice." Technically, according to the constitution, you can't set a meeting without giving at least two months' notice, so if you notice now indefinitely we're having this meeting, you have given two months' notice for all of the future. It's just your first one can't happen in December. **Newkirk:** So Shelly, I think in that under the delegation special meetings, that's not under the board. There's a section for meetings under the Board of Directors [Article VII – Executive Board]. I think that requires a 30-day notice. **Perkins:** I'm just trying to find that right now. **Newkirk:** I just brought up the constitution. **Eigenhauser:** I believe it's Article VII – Executive Board, Section 2 – Meetings. **Newkirk:** Yeah, it's 30 days. **Eigenhauser:** It's 30 days for board meetings. **Newkirk:** Yes. **Perkins:** OK, I withdraw that comment. **Newkirk:** Alright. So, are we ready to call the question? **Calhoun:** Actually, I thought that board member DelaBar would have chimed in. Is there any way that we can have these special meetings that might accommodate people on other sides of the globe, as opposed to the same "in the middle of the night" for those folks. **Newkirk:** Well, I don't work. I can have the meeting anytime you want. **Calhoun:** Me too, but maybe accommodate those that work. Maybe we could have it like, I don't know, 7 in the morning. [inaudible] everyone that's not in the United States. **Newkirk:** I know, but Kenny and Rich and George and a lot of people have jobs. **Calhoun:** I know. **Mastin:** What I am suggesting is, we may want to check with Anita Pelletier, the New York attorney, on what New York State has in place for new provisions due to COVID that go out to 2021. There may be something on there specific to board meetings.

It may not require a 30-day notice for board meetings. **DelaBar:** Kathy, thank you so much for the thoughtful comment. I took this position knowing full well that I was going to have middle-of-the-night meetings. I know Hayata-san is also stuck in the same situation, as far as the time schedule goes. Of course, I didn't realize it was going to be an every-month thing. If it becomes every other two weeks, then I think that we might have some relief, but otherwise nothing special for us. We're well aware that we have to have some of these special meetings in the middle of the night. I just find it a little harder to form complete sentences at this hour of the day or night, as the case may be, but otherwise no. Thank you for the thought, though. **Newkirk:** Thank you Pam. I don't envision this being a happening thing very often, just if we have something that really comes up that really needs to be handled emergently. **Eigenhauser:** I just want to respond to Rich's comment. I understand there may be emergency regulations in the past, in the present, in the future, that may change minimum meeting notice requirements in the State of New York, but that doesn't mean what we would do tonight is wrong. It's not wrong for us to set up these meetings and then cancel them. That would not be in conflict with New York law. There may be an easier way to do it, but this is a sure way to do it. So, why don't we take the sure win today and then if somebody does come up with some other work-around with COVID-specific executive orders in New York, we can cancel this, but I would rather have it and not need it, than need it and not have it. **Mastin:** I'm OK with that. **Newkirk:** Any other comments? **McCullough:** Am I understanding that any 10 members can call a meeting and leave the rest of them out and vote, and then those that weren't invited to the meeting get notified at what point in time? **Newkirk:** Well, we only have to have 10 people to form a quorum, so what we're going to do is, these will all be pre-noticed on the website. Ten board members – I already took the constitution down – but I think ten board members, but you have to have 30-day notice, OK? It would not make much sense to try to get 10 board members to special notice a board meeting when we've got one every two weeks. **McCullough:** So, this goes out to every board member, just not 10? **Newkirk:** Nobody is requiring anybody to attend the board meeting. **McCullough:** That was my question. **Perkins:** The constitution says that you're going to mail each member notice, and so I'm assuming that email is notice. Is this meeting notice, or are we actually going to follow through and snail mail the fact that we have this meeting? The notice is now set that it's happening indefinitely in answer to the last question, but it's just whether or not it gets cancelled. All of that would be noticed to every, single member. **Newkirk:** Yes, and that will go out in an email. Rachel will make that notice, but I think we've always done email notifications and I don't see a reason that we need to change that. Any other comments? Let's call the question. Is there any objection to the addition of the two-week meeting after our 12 scheduled meetings, to be posted on the list? They will be cancelled if we don't need them. Hearing no objection, the motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Newkirk: Any other new business? Are we ready to adjourn? It's 10:18 East Coast time, so the meeting is adjourned.

PRE-NOTICED TELECONFERENCE/ZOOM MEETING SCHEDULE		
Date	Time	Event Type
December 1, 2020	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting
December 15, 2020	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting for Emergencies*
January 5, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting
January 19, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting for Emergencies*
February 6/7, 2021	To be announced	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting
February 16, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting for Emergencies*
March 2, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting
March 16, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting for Emergencies*
April 6, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting
April 20, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting for Emergencies*
May 4, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting
May 18, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting for Emergencies*
June 1, 2021	8:00 p.m. ET	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting for Emergencies*
June 16-20, 2021	To be determined	Teleconference/Zoom Meeting or Westin Galleria, Houston, Texas

*May be cancelled by Executive Committee if not needed.

Executive Session

13. CENTRAL OFFICE.

DelaBar moved to remove invalid cattery name prefixes from litter/cat registrations as necessary. Seconded by **McCullough**, the motion was **ratified by unanimous consent**.

14. INTERNATIONAL DIVISION.

In order to encourage more clubs to complete NGO filing for CFA in various cities and provinces, to prevent any club/single filing from monopolizing all show dates within a 650km radius, and to enable CFA clubs to put on as many shows as possible while taking into consideration both points above, **Morgan** moved to adopt a ***Policy for Show Date Booking in China*** as presented. Seconded by **McCullough**, **Motion Carried**. Currle and Colilla did not vote.

1. *For an NGO filing that has been completed and published on the government website:*
 - *A maximum of 2 show weekends within a 30-day period may be booked by the said filing*
 - *A total of no more than 5 show weekends may be booked/held by any NGO filing at any given point in time*
 - *If there are no other NGO filings requesting show dates within 650km of the said filing, additional show dates may be booked by the said filing at the discretion of the ID China Chair*
 - *If there are multiple NGO filings requesting show dates within a 650km proximity, show dates shall be fairly distributed amongst the qualified filings at the discretion of the ID China Chair*
2. *For an NGO filing that has been submitted and passed initial application process:*
 - *A maximum of 1 show weekend can be booked by the said filing at the discretion of the ID China chair*
 - *Repeated fall through of final NGO approval for such filing shall be weighed in and affect the outcome of future show date booking*
3. *For any filing, repeated failure to produce shows on booked show dates shall be weighed in and may affect the outcome of future show date booking*
4. *For cases not explicitly covered in point 1-3 above, show date booking shall be approved at the discretion of ID China Chair*

Note

1. *Since NGO filing is now the center piece for show production, our policy should be adapted to regulate show date booking per filing not per club.*
2. *We need to ensure that show dates are never monopolized by any single filing while mitigating the risk of wasting show dates. We feel this policy change strikes a good balance between these two objectives. With fair interventions from ID China Chair, we hope to create a fair ground for all China clubs/filings to book and produce CFA shows.*

* * * * *

Executive Session adjourned at 11:53 p.m. Eastern Daylight Saving Time.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Anger, CFA Secretary