

**SUMMARY AND TRANSCRIPT OF ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE  
CFA BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
APRIL 20, 2021**

**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 .....	3
2.	SHOW RULES. ....	4
3.	UNFINISHED BUSINESS.....	16
4.	OTHER COMMITTEES. ....	17
5.	NEW BUSINESS.....	18

**Secretary's Note:** The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. met on Tuesday, April 20, 2021, via Zoom video conference. **President Darrell Newkirk** called the emergency 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)**  
**Steve McCullough, D.C. (GSR Director)**  
**Mr. John Colilla (GLR Director)**  
**Mr. Howard Webster (SWR Director)**  
**Mrs. Cathy Dunham (MWR Director)**  
**Mr. Kenny Curre (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)**

**Also Present:**

**Shelly K. Perkins, Attorney at Law, CFA Legal Counsel**  
**Allene Tartaglia, Executive Director**  
**James Simbro, IT Systems Analyst**  
**Shelly Borawski, Zoom Meeting Host, Special Projects & Yearbook Coordinator**  
**Gavin Cao, China Business Advisor**  
**Matthew Wong, ID Representative**  
**Monte Phillips, Show Rules Chairman**

**Absent:**

**Mrs. Pam Moser (NWR Director)**  
**Mr. Brian Moser (Director-at-Large)**  
**Eva Chen, ID-China Representative**

**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.]

**TRANSCRIPT**

**Reports of Officers, Boards, and Standing Committees**

**1. APPROVE ORDERS OF THE DAY.**

<b>CFA EXECUTIVE BOARD Teleconference Meeting Agenda April 20, 2021</b>		
1.	Approve Orders of the Day	Newkirk
<b>Reports of Officers, Boards, and Standing Committees</b>		
2.	Show Rules	Phillips Krzanowski
<b>Unfinished Business and General Orders</b>		
3.	Unfinished Business	
4.	Other Committees	
5.	New Business – National Win Proposals	Curlle
	ADJOURN OPEN SESSION	

**Newkirk:** Let's approve the Orders of the Day. You got the agenda that Rachel sent out a couple of days ago. Is there any changes to the agenda? Hopefully, this is going to be not a very long meeting. We just have a couple things to go over. My only other question is, I sent everybody an update on what's going on in China over this past weekend. Does anybody want to talk about that in a closed session item or not? **Morgan:** I didn't receive anything. Can you resend to me? **Newkirk:** OK. I sent it to the board list. **Morgan:** I didn't get it. **Mastin:** Darrell, maybe it would be a good idea if we had a brief from you and our China Reps in closed session on what's going on. It's pretty hard to follow some of the emails and FaceBook posts, because I do not get FaceBook posts. **Newkirk:** Did you get the update I sent to the board today to advise the board what's going on? **Mastin:** Yes. **Newkirk:** Would you mind forwarding that to Melanie. **Mastin:** I will do that. **Roy:** Hi Darrell. I didn't get it either. **Newkirk:** Let me see if I can find it real quick here and I will send it out to everybody. **Anger:** I can find it, Darrell, so that you can go on with the meeting. I also want to take this opportunity to acknowledge that CFA Attorney Shelly Perkins is here, as well. **Newkirk:** OK, fantastic. Hi Shelly. Welcome. So, we'll decide whether we're going to add that as a closed session item before we adjourned. Allene set up a closed session link in case we needed it. Is there any objections to the approval of the Orders of the Day? Hearing no objections, by unanimous consent, our orders are set.

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

## 2. SHOW RULES.

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

---

### Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

The Committee has reviewed and prepared show rule proposals to address the exceptions that were put in place for the 2020-2021 show season, and whether those exceptions should be extended into the 2021-2022 show season. In addition, a couple of new issues are addressed here concerning awards calculations.

### Current Happenings of Committee:

Updating rules based on Board requests.

### Future Projections for Committee:

The committee will be preparing a new handout for publication on the CFA website to identify show rules that are modified or not in effect for the 2021-2022 show season only.

**Newkirk:** Let's move on to business item #2, which is Carol Krzanowski and Monte Phillips. **Phillips:** Alright. This is basically a meeting of extensions of exceptions that were put in place for the 2020-2021 season. The request is whether they should also be extended in the 2021-2022 season, as well. **Krzanowski:** Darrell, before Monte starts, I would like to make a standing motion to approve all of these exceptions be extended to next season. **DelaBar:** I would like to have a standing second to Darrell's motion. **Newkirk:** Monte, go ahead.

### Action Items:

**1 – Extend exception to Show Rules 3.09, 3.10, and 3.11 - Due to the COVID19 virus pandemic and for the 2020-2021 show season only, judges under contract with shows already licensed were allowed to cancel their contract up to six weeks prior to the opening day of the show and may exhibit at a show that weekend. We recommend these exceptions be extended for the 2021-2022 show season as well.**

**Phillips:** The first one has to do with Show Rules 3.09, 3.10 and 3.11. What that basically was about was that judges were allowed to basically cancel shows already licensed. They could cancel their contracts up to six weeks prior to the opening day of the show and could still exhibit at a show the weekend that they cancelled. That was the exception. That's #1. **Newkirk:** Any debate on Motion #1? I don't see anyone's hands up. **Anger:** Monte, can you repeat it if I didn't hear it? What is the motion that we're doing, to extend the exception? **Phillips:** Correct. These are all motions to extend the exception into the 2021-2022 show season. **Anger:** For the entire show season. OK, I see. Thank you. **Newkirk:** Any other questions or any debate? Any objection to the motion? **Morgan:** Rachel, you just mentioned this is for the entire season. I guess my question would be, since we don't really know what's going on with COVID,

should we consider doing this for the first 6 months of the season and re-address 4 or 5 months in? **Newkirk:** Shelly? **Perkins:** Any time you have a rule, you can always change it by amending or rescinding, so it does not matter whether you do 12 months or 6 months, because you can change your mind. It's not like set in stone. **Eigenhauser:** On a completely unrelated topic, somebody turned off my video and I can't turn it back on. It says the host turned it off. **Borawski:** There you go. You should be good. **Newkirk:** You're back. Alright, any other debate? Any objection to Motion #1? Hearing no objection, by unanimous consent, Motion #1 is adopted.

**The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.**

**2 - Extend exception to Show Rule 3.13 to the International Division and Region 8 - Show Rule 3.13 was waived to allow up to 50% guest judges, excluding regions 1-7. Note: this exception was already extended through the 2021-2022 show season for Region 9, but not for Region 8 or the International Division. We recommend this waiver be extended for the 2021-2022 season for the ID, ~~and~~ Region 8 and Region 9.**

**Newkirk:** Monte, #2. **Phillips:** We have an exception to Show Rule 3.13 regarding the number of percentage of guest judges that can judge at a show, excluding Regions 1-7. Basically, it waived the 50% limit. However, that has already been extended for Region 9 but we never addressed Region 8 or the International Division. This proposal is to add it for Region 8 and the International Division. It's already extended for Region 9. **Newkirk:** Any debate on Motion #2? I don't see anybody's hands up. Any objection to the acceptance of Motion #2? **DelaBar:** I have no objection to the rule, but should it be written as to include Region 9 so we lump everything all together and it's just in one place. **Newkirk:** Monte? **Phillips:** You have already extended it to Region 9, so the exception would basically be Regions 8, 9 and the International Division. [inaudible, multiple speakers] **DelaBar:** The difference was, Monte – there is a difference. When George Eigenhauser made that motion back a few months ago, it was an indefinite period. This would put it for the period of the show season. **Newkirk:** Do you want to change your exception to one year instead of indefinitely, Pam? **DelaBar:** The “indefinitely” I took to be an unspecified period within the next show season. George can possibly clarify that, but to me it would make a neater proposal to have it all in one place. **Eigenhauser:** I agree with Pam. The reason it was left open ended was so we could change it later, but since our attorney has already told us if do any of these we can change them later anyway, it's better to have it all in one place, in one consistent language. So, I don't see any problem with including Region 9 in this motion. **Newkirk:** Somebody make an amendment. **DelaBar:** I so move. **Eigenhauser:** George will second. **Newkirk:** OK, so the motion has an amendment, and that is to include Region 9 in this proposal. **Phillips:** Right, just add and Region 9 in the last sentence. **Newkirk:** Yes. Are you OK with that, Pam and George? **DelaBar:** Yes. **Newkirk:** OK. Any debate? This is on the amendment to include Region 9. Any objection to including Region 9 in this motion? Hearing no objection, by unanimous consent, the amendment is adopted.

**The amendment to the main motion is ratified by unanimous consent.**

**Newkirk:** Now we need to go back to the amended motion. Is there any further debate on that? Seeing no hands up, any objection to the acceptance of the amended Motion #2? Seeing no hands up and hearing no objection, by unanimous consent, #2 is adopted.

**The amended main motion is ratified by unanimous consent.**

**3 - Extend the Permission For Contracting Other Association Judges Under Special Circumstances to the 2021-2022 show Season.** *For the remainder of the 2020-2021 season, CFA Clubs are permitted to contract licensed ACFA, TICA or CFF judges of good standing for future shows for the first six months in the 2020-2021 CFA show season only, provided the Guest Judge's residence is no further than 200 miles (322 Kilometers) away from the event show hall, and no CFA Judge with a residence no further than 200 miles away from the event show hall is willing and available to officiate the show. All guest judging approvals shall be determined at the discretion of the Guest Judging Committee and subject to all present rules, with the exceptions of Guest Judging Rules 10.1, 10.2, and 10.3, within which only the prohibitive or more restrictive language contrary to this motion will be waived for the first six months of the 2020-2021 CFA Show Season only. Requests declined by the Guest Judging Committee shall be reviewed by the CFA Executive Committee only by written appeal submitted by the requesting club to the committee. We propose that this permission be extended for the first six months into the 2021-2022 show season, until October 31, 2021.*

**Newkirk:** Monte, #3. **Phillips:** #3 is a little complicated. Apparently, normally we do not allow guest judges from ACFA, TICA or CFF, nor do we do guest judging at their shows in North America. We put an exception in place for the 2021-2022 [*sic*, 2020-2021] show season – if you couldn't get a CFA judge relatively close by, you could use one of these three associations' judges. The limits on distance are here, the limits on shows are here, and it's basically a mutual guest judge exception; i.e., they can judge our shows, we can judge their shows. **Morgan:** While I'm all for giving our clubs whatever support we can to face the challenges of show production during these times, I don't see that there's a need for this extension for this coming season. It's my understanding that there are a number of CFA judges who are ready and willing and able to go out and judge now. The reality is, there just aren't that many shows. Our judges put a considerable amount of time and effort into becoming CFA licensed judges, and I would like to think that there is some value in that. CFA exhibitors keep telling us that they want to see CFA judges, and CFA judges are available. It seems to me that we should be supporting our judges, not extending this emergency measure, especially given the fact that we have no data to support the fact that there actually is a significant cost saving by using these other judges. **Roy:** I wondered what the purpose was for extending this a whole year. It was supposed to be for an emergency situation. What I'm wondering is, can we just extend it, say, for 3 months and see how successful it is, and then review it in the future? **Newkirk:** I have asked Murlene Priest, the president of ACFA, and Vicki Jo Harrison, the president of TICA, if they were in agreement to extend it for 6 months and they both said yes, for what it's worth. **Currie:** I would support 6 months, as well, just because we haven't had enough shows to see if this program – it definitely was to help with the expenses for our clubs. The mileage limit was put in place. The rules were written primarily to protect our CFA judges, so if there was a judge within the 200 mile or plus limit, they would have to be asked first. At the time, COVID was rampaging. This is what we came up with to try to save our clubs money, knowing that they would not be able to have a gate, but as far as the number of shows we or the other associations have had, they have been limited and there are benefits in that we do expose our very professional judges to exhibitors in these other organizations, so I would support an amendment to maybe try another 6 months for this program. That way, data will be collected and we would be able to see where we stand at that point, but we do have protections for our judges that we

presently have, which obviously we would prefer to have. **McCullough:** Steve seconds.

**Krzanowski:** Kenny basically said most of what I wanted to say. I think this was put in place to help our clubs with expenses, because with the lack of spectators and in some cases clubs having to have reduced numbers of entries due to COVID social distancing, I think it does help them. They can't afford to fly in judges from a distance, so I would support doing this for 6 months. I also see a benefit with this, as far as bridging the gap between the different associations in North America. I think it's kind of a good thing. We should all be working together. I think this has sort of helped us understand each other a little more maybe help each other a little more, so I support it. **Anger:** I am supportive of it, as well. My only concern today is that our Guest Judge Administrator doesn't know this is coming up. There were no Judging Program issues on the agenda, so she is not here. That causes me to pause and consider if today is the right day to pass this. **Newkirk:** Well, we know her position. She is against it. **Anger:** OK. **Newkirk:** I mean, that was in her report for the April 6 meeting. Any other people want to weigh in on this? OK, I'll call the vote. All those in favor of the amendment to extend this for 6 months, raise your hands.

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

**Newkirk:** The yes votes are Rich Mastin, Steve McCullough, George Eigenhauser, Pam DelaBar, Cathy Dunham, Carol Krzanowski, Rachel Anger, Yukiko Hayata, Cyndy Byrd, Kenny Currle, Sharon Roy, Howard Webster. All those opposed raise your hands. The no votes are Melanie Morgan, Kathy Calhoun, John Colilla. Any abstentions? No abstentions. Rachel, you can announce the vote on the amendment. **Anger:** I have 12 yes votes, 3 no votes, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** OK, so the amendment is agreed to.

**Newkirk:** Action item #3 that Monte has presented has been amended for a 6 month extension. Is there any debate on the amended motion? I see no hands up so I will call the vote. All those in favor of the amended motion raise your hands.

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

**Newkirk:** The yes votes are Rich Mastin, George Eigenhauser, Carol Krzanowski, Pam DelaBar, Cathy Dunham, Steve McCullough, Sharon Roy, Cyndy Byrd, Yukiko Hayata, Rachel Anger, Howard Webster. Please raise your hand if you're a no. I have Sharon Roy, Melanie Morgan, Kathy Calhoun, John Colilla. **Anger:** May I get a vote from Kenny Currle please? **Currle:** Yes. **Anger:** Kenny is a yes. Sharon, I have you as a yes and a no. **Newkirk:** She is a no. Sharon, can you unmute and tell us which way you are voting? Sharon Roy? **Roy:** I am a yes. **Anger:** So, that is 12 yes votes, 3 no votes, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** Thank you so much. The amended motion is agreed to.

**4 - Extend the Permission Allowing CFA Judges to Guest Judge for Other Associations.** *CFA Judges were permitted to guest judge for ACFA, TICA or CFF feline organizations during the first six months of the 2020-2021 show season only, providing that the contracting organization's planned show hall is within a 200 mile (322 Kilometers) distance of the CFA Judge's residence. All guest judging approvals shall be at the discretion of the Guest Judging Committee and shall be subject to all present show rules and guest judging rules, with the exceptions of Guest Judging Rules 10.1, 10.2, and 10.3, within which only prohibitive or more restrictive language contrary to this motion will be waived for the first six months of*

*the 2020-2021 CFA show season only. Requests declined by the Guest Judging Committee shall be reviewed by the CFA Executive Committee only by written appeal submitted by the CFA Judge to the committee. We recommend this permission be extended to include the first six months of the 2021-2022 show season, until October 31, 2021, as well.*

**Newkirk:** Monte, #4. **Phillips:** #4 is basically a companion to #3. Whereas #3 involved guest judges from those associations judging at CFA shows, #4 is just the reverse – CFA judges being allowed to guest judge at ACFA, TICA and CFF shows. **Newkirk:** Before I state the motion, would you like to change it for a six month extension? **Phillips:** After the last sentence, it should say, *We recommend this permission be extended until October 31, 2021.* **Newkirk:** Thank you. So, the question is stated. As Monte stated, this will be for 6 months. Is there any debate? **Currle:** I was just going to make a motion in favor of that. **Newkirk:** Carol already has a standing motion, Kenny. Pam I think is the one that has a standing second. We don't have to do an amendment because I stated it before I stated the question and Monte wanted to change it. Any debate on this? Let's call for the yes votes. Please raise your hand.

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

**Newkirk:** The yes votes are Steve McCullough, George Eigenhauser, Pam DelaBar, Carol Krzanowski, Rich Mastin, Cathy Dunham, Yukiko Hayata, Kenny Currle, Cyndy Byrd, Rachel Anger, Sharon Roy and Howard Webster. The no votes are Melanie Morgan, Kathy Calhoun and John Colilla. Any abstentions? John, take your hand down unless you're abstaining. You voted no. Alright Rachel, you can announce the vote. **Anger:** I know you will be surprised. **Newkirk:** Yes, I will. **Anger:** 12 yes, 3 no, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** OK, so the motion is agreed to.

**5 - *Extend the Waiver of Show Rule 4.03 Whereby Cancelled Shows During the 2021-2022 Show Season Do Not Count Against a Club's Traditional Date. For the 2020-2021 show season, the requirement to qualify as a traditional date was not affected by the cancellation of shows during that season. We recommend that be extended to also include the 2021-2022 2022-2023 show season.***

**Newkirk:** Monte, #5. **Phillips:** #5. Show Rule 4.03 states that essentially if a club does not hold a show two consecutive years, they lose their traditional date. What we did was put in place for the 2020-2021 show season an exception that said, if you don't have a show that year, that doesn't count as one of the shows you lost. We recommend that be extended to the 2021-2022 show season, which means that if you don't hold a show in 2020 or 2021, that doesn't mean you have lost your show date. **Newkirk:** Thank you for the explanation. Any debate on this one? **Mastin:** There's no debate on this. My question is, didn't we already pass something not too long ago about extending this going out three years? It was proposed four years and then the board changed it to three years. **Newkirk:** Monte? **Phillips:** I can't find that in the minutes. **Colilla:** We passed it to the 2022-2023 season. **Dunham:** Darrell, I was the one that made that motion and we passed it, to extend to the 2022-2023 show season. **Newkirk:** Rachel, can you tell us where it's at in the minutes? **Anger:** That's why I have my hand raised. **Newkirk:** I thought so. **Anger:** When people claim that a motion occurred, it would be helpful to know when it happened. **Newkirk:** Cathy, do you know when it was, since you made the motion? **Dunham:** I want to say it was in February, but I cannot be positive of that. **Newkirk:** Well, just to be sure,



why don't we just amend this to 2023, and then it will just be double voted on but it will be sure to be covered. Somebody want to make that amendment? **Phillips:** With that amendment, the last sentence will say, *We recommend that this modification remain in effect through the 2022-2023 show season.* **McCullough:** Steve seconds. **Newkirk:** Thank you both. Any debate on this? **Krzanowski:** I was going to make the motion. **Newkirk:** Alright, good deal. So, we have an amendment, and that's to add through the 2022-2023 show season. So, we're going to vote on the amendment. All those in favor raise your hands.

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

**Newkirk:** The yes votes are Rich Mastin, Sharon Roy, Pam DelaBar, Cathy Dunham, George Eigenhauser, Carol Krzanowski, Steve McCullough, Cyndy Byrd, John Colilla, Kenny Currie, Hayata-san, Melanie Morgan, Rachel Anger, Kathy Calhoun and Howard Webster. Any no votes? Seeing no no votes, any abstentions? None, so the amendment is agreed to.

**Newkirk:** I'll call for unanimous consent, because I think everybody is going to agree to this motion, so #5 as amended, to extend through 2022-2023. Is there any objection? Hearing no objection, by unanimous consent, the motion is agreed to.

**The amended main motion is ratified by unanimous consent.**

[From end of report] **Mastin:** Darrell, on the traditional show date, the board passed that motion on December 1, 2020 board meeting. **Newkirk:** Thank you.

[**Secretary's Note:** From December 1, 2020 video conference call: **Mrs. Dunham** moved that, effective immediately, all club traditional show dates are protected through the 2023-2024 show season. Seconded by **Ms. Calhoun.** **Ms. DelaBar** moved to amend the motion to replace 2023-2024 with 2022-2023. 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: *Effective immediately, all club traditional show dates are protected through the 2022-2023 show season.*]

**6 - Extend the Reduction of Required Qualifying Ring Judges to Two.** *Show Rule 27.03a was modified for the 2020-2021 show season only to reduce the number of judges required to award qualifying rings from four (or three in certain countries) judges to two. We recommend that this modification remain in effect for the 2021-2022 show season.*

**Newkirk:** Alright Monte, #6. **Phillips:** #6 was a show rule proposal that was passed, I believe either in October or February that basically reduced the number of qualifying rings required for the champion and premier title – number of judges, pardon me – required to issue qualifying rings from four, or three in certain countries, down to two. We haven't really changed conditions between then and this year, so we recommend that this modification remain in effect for the 2021-2022 season. **Newkirk:** OK good, thank you. Any debate on this one? I see no hands up. Is there any objection to the ratification of Motion #6? Hearing no objections, by unanimous consent, #6 is agreed to.

**The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.**

**7 - Extend Permission to Grand Without Requisite Qualifying Rings if Point Requirements are Met.** Show Rules 27.03a, 28.04f, and 28.01 were modified for the 2020-2021 show season only to allow a cat to become a grand champion/premier if it has the required number of points regardless of how many qualifying rings it has toward the champion/premier title. The champion/premier claim and \$15.00 fee must still be filed with Central Office. We recommend that this modification remain in effect for the 2021-2022 show season.

**Newkirk:** OK Monte, #7. **Phillips:** #7. We also passed with that same proposal for three show rules to allow a cat to grand, based on the total number of points received, regardless of how many qualifying rings it received. If it had 200 grand points, for example, and it is in North America, it could become a grand champion. It didn't matter if it had 4 qualifying rings, 5 qualifying rings or 3 qualifying rings. If it managed to get 200 grand points, it could become a grand champion. Same situation with premiership. It's based on the points required in whatever area they live in. **Newkirk:** Any debate on #7? Is there any objection to the ratification of Motion #7? Hearing no objection, by unanimous consent, #7 is agreed to.

**The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.**

**8 - Extend the Waiver to Article XXXVI for Eligibility to Allow an Exhibitor to Win an Award Without Showing in the Final Region/National Area of Residence.** For the 2020-2021 show season, exhibitors were waived from the requirement to attend a show within their region to be eligible for a regional award. We recommend this waiver be extended to the 2021-2022 show season as well. This waiver only applies to regions or divisions in which no shows were held during that show season.

**Newkirk:** Monte, #8. **Phillips:** #8, and you are going to have a contrary proposal when you get to New Business, was to extend the allowance to obtain a regional win without ever showing in your own region. Right now, there is a requirement that you must attend at least one show in your own region. We passed an exemption to that requirement for the 2020-2021 show season. This would extend that waiver into the 2021-2022 show season, as well. **Currle:** Just to be clear, if this passes at this level, it's my intention to withdraw that. **Newkirk:** OK. **Roy:** I would hope this passes. I'm really thinking of our Canadian exhibitors. More than likely, when Canada opens up, they will probably only go to shows in Region 4. They are big supporters of like the Rochester/Buffalo area, and I would hate to see them lose out on a win if we went back to having them attend a show in our region. **Eigenhauser:** I can't support this. The reason we took away the requirement a little over a year ago is that CFA shut down cat shows near the end of the show season, so exhibitors who planned on showing in their own region would have had the ability to do so taken away from them at the last minute. We don't have that situation anymore. What we have are regions opening up. No one has the expectation they're going to lose points already earned because they didn't go to a show in their own region. What we need to do is start getting people to support their regional clubs and their regional shows. If we pass this, what we're saying is that any carpetbagger can go anywhere, earn zero points in their own region, and come back with a regional win to the detriment of people who are supporting their local clubs and their local shows. There's a reason for the rule. After years and years and years of saying, "we ought to focus more on regional awards and breed wins," somebody finally stood up at an annual and said, "can we at least make people have to show once in their own region to get a regional award?" That is such a minimum standard. I don't see any compelling reason to waive

it at this point in time. When we granted the waiver before, it was the end of the show season. We were defeating people's expectations. This is the beginning of the show season. There is no reason to do it. **Anger:** I am just wondering how many shows Region 2 and Region 5 have held since the shut-down? Have they held any? **Newkirk:** No. **Anger:** My concern is that you are going to disqualify someone from earning a regional win because their region was unable to hold a show. **Perkins:** I was going to mention what Rachel just said, so a fix could be to say, to pass the motion but with an amendment that says something like, *so long as there are no shows in your own region* or something like that. I will leave that to you-all, but I was going to say, there are regions that don't have any shows and it's not sure that they will. **Cao:** I think Shelly just said what I wanted to say. For China, right now we have three areas. As of this season, China North has no show at all. We don't expect China North to have any shows anytime soon. In the upcoming season, yeah, I think an amendment saying that, for the regions that do not have their own shows, maybe they will continue to be granted this exception. **Krzanowski:** Rachel said what I wanted to, and Gavin as well. The thing is, I exhibited myself at one show in the Southern Region. There were people exhibiting from regions that have not had any shows at all this year. It would be a real shame if they would not be eligible for any kind of regional award. I would support an amendment to this motion that says, *provided no show in the region is held during the show season*, but to just turn it down altogether, I would be against that. **Anger:** I would support that, as well. My question is, how easy will that be facilitated at Central Office? Is this going to cause giant staff time or programming? **Newkirk:** Allene, do you want to answer that? **Tartaglia:** We'll have to manually monitor it. For just one season, it's not worth making a program change, so we'll just manually monitor it. So, it will take some time but it's certainly not an impossible task. **Eigenhauser:** Then I'm going to go ahead and make the motion to amend #8 to state that *this waiver only applies to regions in which no shows were held during that show season*. **Morgan:** Melanie will second. **Phillips:** [inaudible] divisional areas. **Eigenhauser:** OK, *regions or divisions*. **McCullough:** Steve seconds. **Newkirk:** Any discussion on the amendment? Any debate on the amendment? Any objection to the amendment? Hearing no objection, by unanimous consent, the amendment is agreed to.

**The amendment to the main motion is ratified by unanimous consent.**

**Newkirk:** Any discussion now on the amended motion? Seeing no one's hands up, is there any objection to the amended motion? Hearing no objection, by unanimous consent, #8 as amended is ratified.

**The amended main motion is ratified by unanimous consent.**

**9 - Extend the Exception to Article XXXVI - National/Regional/Divisional Awards Program - Awards - International Division Awards for Hong Kong. For the 2020-2021 show season only, shows in Hong Kong were allowed to count a Super Specialty ring as two rings towards the formula for the number of awards in Hong Kong. We recommend this exception be extended to the 2021-2022 show season as well.**

**Newkirk:** OK, let's go to #9, Monte. **Phillips:** #9 was an exception that was put in place for Hong Kong only, to allow them to count Super Specialty rings as two rings in the formula that creates and calculates the number of awards – not that it would have helped, but we won't go there. We recommend that extension also be extended, because if you're willing to do it for

one season, you might as well do it for two. **Newkirk:** Any debate? Seeing no hands up, is there any objection to ratification of Motion #9? Hearing no objections, by unanimous consent, #9 is agreed to.

**The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.**

**10- Create an Exception to Article XXXVI - National/Regional/Divisional Awards Program - Awards - International Division Awards - for the Determination of Number of Awards to be Granted in a Divisional Area (Number of Rings Held).** *For this past show season, there are two International Division Areas, Hong Kong (2 rings) and Thailand (4 rings), where the formula for awards would dictate zero awards. Also, there have been several shows in China where the equivalent of a half-ring were held (LH ring with no corresponding SH ring). We request guidance on how to proceed - exception for the seasons in question, no exception/rule change, or permanent rule change. For the Hong Kong/Thailand issue, we would recommend that we have 1 award when the number of rings held is between 1 and 9. Currently, those areas would not be eligible for any awards. For counting fractional rings, we recommend that we count 0.5 rings in the formula for shows where a ring only judges one specialty.*

[**Secretary's Note:** See below motions, in which no ring requirement will be in place for ID-China or ID-Other for the 2020-2021 show season, only point minimums.]

**Newkirk:** Monte, #10. **Phillips:** #10 is a request for guidance, essentially. We have two regions or two areas actually – Hong Kong, which has had 2 rings, and Thailand, which has had 4 rings – where the formula for awards would dictate zero. That's the first issue. Second issue, China has rings that aren't really whole rings; i.e., it's a longhair ring only. No shorthair cats are judged. How do you count that? So, we request guidance on how to proceed. Should we also do it as an exception or rule change or not do anything at all, just let them have zero awards.

**Newkirk:** I don't think no awards is a good option.

**Cao:** I can only speak for the China Division. This season I think we will have about 24 shows by end of season, but only maybe around 80+ rings. This is not because clubs are not willing to invite more judges, it's just that we don't have enough judges. This season is also the first time we see a lot of shows coming back to China for CFA and our exhibitors are supporting us. Even though we only have 2 rings or 3 rings, they are still picking us over all the other associations. So, right now, I checked the Scoreboard for the different areas in China. There are quite a few cats that are already within the 25 spots, but depending on how the shows go they may not make it into top 15, which is what we would have right now if we count the 80 rings. I think it's 75-95 would be 15 spots for divisional wins for each area, so what we want to propose is, we're wondering if it is possible to award 25 divisional wins to all the China areas, as long as the point minimum for the divisional win is met. Also, as I understand it, there's no ring requirement for all the RWs in the United States, as long as minimum points are met. So, that's my take on it. **Newkirk:** Somebody want to make that motion? **Morgan:** Melanie will make that motion. **Newkirk:** Thank you Melanie. **Currle:** Kenny will second. **Newkirk:** Alright, are we making amendment to Monte's #10? Is that what we're doing, or is this a stand-alone motion? **Phillips:** It sounds like stand-alone to me. **Newkirk:** Alright, so it will be a stand-alone motion. **Wong:** I think that's a great idea. If Hong Kong and the rest of the ID can have the same, just to

count the minimum points rather than the number of rings. **Newkirk:** OK, so you want to amend it to include all the ID plus ID-China? **Wong:** Yes, please. **McCullough:** Steve seconds. **Newkirk:** He can't make the motion. I need someone to make the motion. **Morgan:** I will. **Newkirk:** Thank you Melanie. **Currle:** Kenny will second again. **Newkirk:** Thank you. Alright, so it's to award not based on rings but on points, is that correct? Gavin, is that correct? Matthew, correct? **Cao:** Right, as long as minimum requirement for the points are met, we should be granted top 25. I don't know what the number is for Hong Kong or ID-Other. **Newkirk:** We're taking away the ring requirement and just basing it on points. Alright, any debate on that motion? I've corrected it to include all the ID. Alright, I don't see any hands up. Since we made a motion and we basically amended it, let's vote on the amendment. Any objection to the amendment? Hearing no objection the amendment is agreed to.

**The amendment to the main motion is ratified by unanimous consent.**

**Newkirk:** So, now we have an amended motion that covers ID-China and ID the rest of the place. Anyone want to debate the amended motion? I see no hands up. By unanimous consent, the ID-China and the ID-Other is agreed to.

**The amended main motion is ratified by unanimous consent.**

**Newkirk:** Monte, anything else on 10? **Phillips:** To be clear, we're going to take that section of the show rules and modify it so that we're no longer looking at number of rings to determine awards, we're looking strictly at whether they meet the point minimums and it's top 25 otherwise? **Newkirk:** Correct. **Phillips:** Got it. **Krzanowski:** I just want to make certain that this is for the current show season. We're not talking about next show season, this is for 2020-2021. Next show season there may be a lot more rings. We don't really know yet. We can address that later. I just wanted to clarify that and make sure that's what everybody is agreeing to. **Cao:** I am talking about this current season. I think next season we will have more shows. **Newkirk:** OK. Matt, are you OK with that? Just for the current season? **Wong:** Yes, current season. Thank you. **Newkirk:** Thanks guys, we appreciate it. Monte, are you OK with that? **Phillips:** Yes. That just means I don't do a rule change after all.

[From end of report] **Mastin:** As far as #10, what are we going to do for next year for #10? Are we not going to do anything at this point in time? **Newkirk:** I think we're going to wait and see how the shows go, and we can always set aside the number of ring requirements if there's a problem. **Mastin:** OK, thank you. **Newkirk:** I think that's what Gavin was saying, and Matthew. Gavin, do you and Matthew want to chime in real quick? **Cao:** I think we are satisfied with [inaudible] for this season. We'll see what happens next season. **Newkirk:** Matt, do you want to add anything? **Wong:** No, it's all good.

*11- Although Not a Show Rule, Continue Fee Exception. The fee structure for licensing shows was adjusted for shows with one to four rings to \$ 50.00 (plus applicable insurance fees) for the 2020-2021 season. We recommend this exception be continued ~~for the 2021-2022 show season~~ permanently.*

**Phillips:** #11 simply is a fee exception extension. Right now, the fee structure for licensing a show with 1-4 rings was revised to be just \$50 plus insurance We recommend that

exception stay in place for 2021-2022, not that a whole lot of shows only have 1-4 rings in the U.S., but they do overseas. **Anger:** I would like to make an amendment that we adopt this as a rule, not with a cap on it. I think those clubs in Region 9 particularly that are putting on the smaller shows are showing that it can be done, and not just there. We can adopt the smaller show format here in the U.S. very readily. **Eigenhauser:** I'll second Rachel's amendment. **Newkirk:** Is there any debate on that? You know we're taking a show rule out of sequence by doing this. **Phillips:** Technically, that's not a show rule. Your fee structure is basically something you have in a table someplace. **Newkirk:** OK. Rachel, are you and George OK with that? **Anger:** Yes. **Newkirk:** Alright. Any debate on the amendment that Rachel and George have presented? Is there any objection to the amendment? Seeing no hands up, by unanimous consent, the amendment is adopted.

**The amendment to the main motion is ratified by unanimous consent.**

**Newkirk:** Does anybody want to talk about the amended motion? I see no hands up. Is there any objection to the amended motion? By unanimous consent, the amended motion is agreed to.

**The amended main motion is ratified by unanimous consent.**

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

*We do not anticipate making a presentation to any future meeting that would be part of the new rulebook. Current Point Minimums for National Awards will remain in effect unchanged.*

*Respectfully Submitted,  
Monte Phillips, Chair*

**Newkirk:** Monte, have you got anything else? **Phillips:** No, but you're going to be talking about Show Rules when you get to New Business. **Newkirk:** Yes. **Krzanowski:** I just want to mention that we will be posting a list of all these exceptions on the CFA website, along with the regular show rules, just so that we all know where to find them and we don't lose track of any of them, and all the exhibitors and clubs will know where to find them, as well. **Newkirk:** That's a good idea. Thank you so much Carol.

## **Reports of Special (Select or Ad Hoc) Committees**

None.

## **Unfinished Business and General Orders**

### **3. UNFINISHED BUSINESS.**

**Newkirk:** Unfinished Business? We have none.



**4. OTHER COMMITTEES.**

**Newkirk:** Other Committee Reports? We have none.

## 5. NEW BUSINESS.

### (a) National Awards.

**Newkirk:** Let's move on to #5, which is New Business and that is about national awards. Kenny Curre, that's you so you're up. **Curre:** Hello everyone, not that I have been anywhere. The reason that I'm bringing this back up is for obvious feedback that I've gotten from any of the clubs in my region, even overseas in the International Division. I'm doing this primarily for the clubs. I want to thank Mary Kolencik for taking the time to put this together. This is a proposal that, I'm looking at the glass half full, hoping that the COVID situation gets better and CFA can open up, keeping a realization that the best marketing tool that we've got, particularly at this time, is our shows. I think that if we reduce things proportionately and as things open up, it at least gives people incentive to continue to show, for yet another level of achievement. My hope is that everybody has read this. My hope is you have read the rationale and heard the support from people. I want to go ahead and propose this motion for adoption by this board. **Newkirk:** Kenny, do you want to make a standing motion for all your motions you have here? **Curre:** A standing motion for all. **McCullough:** Steve seconds, standing. **Newkirk:** Thank you, Steve. Just as a point of information, I held a meeting with Steve and with Cyndy Byrd in Mesquite, Texas, and we talked about reinstating the national wins. Everybody – I mean everybody there – was for this, so just so everyone knows, we've got a lot of people that are – and a lot of them were show-producing clubs and they said they need the national wins so that people will come to the shows. Some of the people said if there weren't going to be any, they were going to shave their cats down because they're not going to do it.

**Morgan:** I don't know that any of us were necessarily against national wins in the April 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. I certainly was not necessarily opposed to reinstating it. What I didn't want to see was us act without doing our due diligence in looking at options that address the changes that we're experiencing as a result of the pandemic. I'm grateful we have taken the time to investigate options. Although what I had come up with was slightly different numbers in terms of rings and ring point averages, the changes and differences really aren't so drastic and certainly they're not worth muddying the waters by debating them. So, the bottom line is, there's no such thing as a completely level playing field, but I think this proposal will do a good job in equalizing things and making the best of what undeniably is a bad situation for the entire world at the moment. So, I can and I do support this proposal. Like Kenny, I think Mary K was the one who first brought this to my attention some time ago. I think it does a really nice job of addressing the changes that we're experiencing, at least for this season.

**Anger:** I'm not speaking for or against it, I'm just bringing up my same concern I had in one of the previous rule discussions. I am sure all the people that were able to attend the Mesquite show were supportive, but what about the large group of people that were not able to attend the show because they live really far away, they would have to take a plane there, and the regions that we have already mentioned that don't have shows up and running, with no immediate relief for that problem. So, what do we do for those people? I just want to be a voice for them. Somebody has got to speak up for the person that's in a remote area that just can't get on a plane and fly to Texas or Florida or wherever the shows are being held.

**DelaBar:** At my Zoom meeting with my region last week, the overall feeling about national awards is, even with these requirements being rewritten, that the award loses value. This was stated by people who have had national awards. That was one concern. Again, my concern is, are we going to be able to put on the shows, to be able to garner enough points for people to get in. As you know, my region had three small shows which did not produce any regional winners, so national wins were just totally out of the question. My personal concern is that when we get these ultimatums from people, like, “if I can’t go for a national win, I’m going to shave my cat,” well, the cat would be happy and the clubs may not be, but the spirit of the award has been taken away.

**McCullough:** I just went through our catalog and every region was represented. Region 3 came in third on the list of attendees. Region 2 was the second highest, so people are getting on planes, people are going to shows, people are getting in their cars and driving from Arizona. I had three exhibitors do that, so people are getting out and showing, not just regionally.

**Cao:** Again, for China, the situation is a bit different for next season. I think we are already looking at, at least 4 or 5 shows for the coming month of May and we are expecting a lot more shows to happen in China next season. So, I’m not sure how exactly the cut-off points for the national wins will be implemented, but we definitely need to have national wins available to encourage our exhibitors here, as well as to fend off our rival associations, because the past season all the other associations have all these awards, including I think TICA. Still, there are people who are loyal to us, but we also want to give the people a fighting chance to obtain such a title. **Newkirk:** ACFA and TICA never stopped awarding their national wins. We’re the only one that shut down our national wins.

**Currle:** I don’t know if anybody else wanted to speak, but I just wanted to address a couple of the comments that I heard. I know I’m dating myself, but I have been judging since 1983. I can tell you unequivocally as a judge, with the dwindling number of entries in a regular year, the competition has never been so equal or fierce, so it doesn’t cheapen a national win by cats defeated. I will never believe that. It’s all about competition, and the competition that I have seen particularly in the last several years – and I think a lot of the judges that sit on this executive board will agree with me – is consistently better than what I used to see back in the early days in the late 70’s as an exhibitor. So, I would belay that. As far as helping our clubs, this will help the clubs. Anytime that we take something out of the equation where entries are going to be inhibited because there is nothing to strive for, you are going to hurt the clubs. We are an association of clubs. **Krzanowski:** I support this motion, and I do like the way it’s written with the reduced number of points. I think it kind of levels the playing field, and it allows cats to come out a little later in the season if there are not any shows they could attend at the current time. I have to say what Kenny said about the level of competition and the quality. It’s amazing this year. During COVID, they bred some wonderful cats. The competition has been really fierce and very extreme. It’s wonderful to see some of the classes really expanding to the point that we hadn’t seen in years prior. People need a goal to work toward. I see no harm in reinstating the national wins and giving them a goal to work for.

**Eigenhauser:** I’m afraid that this may actually be a double-edged sword when it comes to helping the clubs. Certainly, reinstating the national wins encourages people to show. No question about that, but capping the number of scored rings discourages people from showing,

because once you're significantly over 50 and you're throwing away bigger and bigger numbers, it becomes harder and harder to find a show that's worth entering, so while this may get people in the door to start a national run, it closes that door much sooner than we ever did in the past by reducing the benefit you get from continuing to show. So, if we really want to help the clubs, we would set a higher number of rings, rather than 50 for adults and 20 for kittens, in order to encourage people to continue showing once they have started. This is more of a mixed blessing, I think, than people realize. **Anger:** That's a good point, George. I am going to support the motion. I do like the way it's written. I just want to wrap up my comments by saying that I just hate to see a portion of our exhibitor base be excluded because of the current situation.

**Krzanowski:** I just want to comment on what George said. I do not agree with that at all. I think that there are still so few shows that it's going to be very, very difficult for anyone to get more than 50 rings in the season. We're starting to see a few more shows on the schedule, but they are still very few and far between. By having 50 rings or 20 rings or whatever it was, I think that it will give more people an opportunity and the ability to strive toward a bigger goal.

**Currle:** I'm coming from the standpoint of things improving here in our country and around the world. This is why I'm so much in agreement with the reduced amount of rings. It's very rare for a cat in our pre-COVID years to come out, say, in January and achieve a national win, particularly in championship. I have seen it done in December, etc., but this allows everybody the opportunity, again with the hope that things do improve where clubs are allowed to stage shows. I don't know how long it's going to take our clubs to get our visitors to come back. I can't predict that, but I do know that the ability to have shows has a far greater chance with where we are today than we were last year, so I do think that we need to give this as an incentive to our breeders, exhibitors, and certainly to help our clubs get those entries up as high as they can. **Newkirk:** Thank you Kenny. Anyone else before we call the vote?

**Motion:** *For the 2021-2022 season only, amend Article XXXVI National/Regional/Divisional Awards Program to reduce the number of rings credited and the national win point minimums as follows:*

#### *Scoring*

*At the completion of the show season, a cat/household pet (adult or kitten) will be credited with the points from its highest ~~40~~ 50 individual rings. For a kitten award, the kitten will be credited with the points from its highest ~~40~~ 20 individual rings earned as a kitten, to be credited in the show year in which its last full weekend of kitten eligibility falls, regardless of the show year in which it begins showing as a kitten. For Agility, each cat/kitten/household pet will be credited with the results from its ~~15~~ 7 highest shows.*

*If a cat/household pet is exhibited in shows totaling ~~40~~ 50 rings or less (~~40~~ 20 rings for kittens) total credited points will be the sum of total points earned. For Agility, if a cat/kitten/household pet is exhibited in fewer than ~~15~~ 7 shows, total credited points will be the sum of total points earned.*

#### *Awards, National Awards*

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

*- for championship cats, the cat must earn a minimum of ~~4,300~~ 2000 points; for kittens, the kitten must earn a minimum of ~~1,500~~ 700 points; for premiership, the cat must earn a minimum of ~~2,200~~ 1000 points,*

for Household Pets, the cat/kitten must earn a minimum of ~~4,100~~ 500 points. Cats failing to meet these minimums are not eligible for any national award or title. The Board will review these minimums for potential adjustment for the next show season and the results of that review will be posted on the CFA website by the first of May.

**Rationale:** Decreasing the number of rings counted will allow exhibitors to require less time to accumulate enough points to achieve an NW. In a normal season, a NW-contending cat can achieve 100 rings of a national average in 4-6 months if shown almost every weekend. Reducing the number of credited rings will allow exhibitors to show less frequently or start later in the season and still gain the points needed to rank in the top 25. This will allow exhibitors living in areas that are still closed to shows to compete later in the season when the show schedule improves. Cats will still have to finish in the top 25 in each respective category, which means achieving these point minimums will not guarantee any award. This will apply to regional awards as well, enabling cats to start later in the season for those awards as well.

**Newkirk:** All those in favor, please raise your hands.

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

**Newkirk:** The yes votes are Carol Krzanowski, Steve McCullough, Kenny Currle, Rich Mastin, Cathy Dunham, Melanie Morgan, Cyndy Byrd, Rachel Anger, John Colilla, Hayata-san, George Eigenhauser, Kathy Calhoun, Howard Webster. **Roy:** I can't raise my hand, but I'm a yes. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you Sharon. Rachel, you can add Sharon on as a yes. Let's have the no votes. If you're against a proposal, please raise your hand. Any abstentions? Rachel, you can announce the vote on that one. **Anger:** I did not get a vote from Pam DelaBar, or I missed it. **DelaBar:** My hand is up for an abstention. **Newkirk:** Thank you Pam. **Anger:** So, we have 14 yes votes, zero no votes, one abstention. **Newkirk:** OK, so the motion is agreed to.

**Motion:** For the 2021-2022 season only, amend Article XXXVI National/Regional/Divisional Awards Program as follows:

Awards, National Awards

Best of Breed/Division\*\*

\*\*The title of "Breed Winner" (BWR for regions 1-9, BWC for China, BWI for the International Division) is limited to Championship cats receiving the above award (BEST of Breed/Division). ~~200~~ 100 point minimum required for this award.

Second Best of Breed/Division\*\*\*

Third Best of Breed/Division\*\*\*

Best of Color\*\*\*

Second Best of Color\*\*\*

\*\*\*~~200~~ 100 point minimum required for this award.

**Newkirk:** Let's move on to Kenny's next motion. Allene, will you scroll up a little bit, or is Shelly doing the screen share? **Tartaglia:** Yes. **Currle:** This is the title of Breed Winner for Regions 1-9,

Breed Winner for China, International Division, limited to Championship cats receiving Best of Breed. 100 point minimum required for this award. It reduces the minimum from 200 to 100. **Newkirk:** Any debate on this one? Is there any objection to ratification of this motion? **Morgan:** I don't know, I'm not comfortable reducing the points from 200 to 100. I think already at 200 we're awfully low, so I'm not in support of this. **Newkirk:** OK, so let's call for the votes. All those in favor please raise your hand.

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

**Newkirk:** The yes votes are Pam DelaBar, George Eigenhauser, Steve McCullough, Cyndy Byrd, Cathy Dunham, Sharon Roy, Hayata-san, Rich Mastin, Carol Krzanowski, Kenny Currle, John Colilla, Kathy Calhoun, Howard Webster. **Anger:** Sorry, I was a yes, as well. **Newkirk:** The no votes, please raise your hand. Melanie Morgan. Any abstentions? No abstentions. Rachel, you can announce the vote. **Anger:** We had 14 yes votes, 1 no vote, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** OK, so the motion is agreed to.

***Motion:** Reinstate the residency requirement for regions and national award areas.*

***Rationale:** Without a residency requirement to attend at least one show in region/area, exhibitors from outside a region/area can easily claim residence for cats that do not reside in the region/area. It is possible that some regions will not have a show during the season making it impossible for cats in that region to achieve regional wins, but the requirement could be waived later for affected regions/areas.*

**Currle:** I would like to withdraw one motion. That is the motion we have already voted upon, reinstating the residency requirements for regions and national award areas. **Newkirk:** OK, so you are withdrawing that motion. **Currle:** I would like to withdraw that and continue on with the others. **Newkirk:** OK.

**Withdrawn.**

***Motion:** For the 2021-2022 season only, continue the 2020-2021 requirements for the Grand of Distinction award.*

**Newkirk:** Kenny, let's go to your next motion. **Currle:** [reads]. **Newkirk:** Thank you. Is there any debate on this one? **Phillips:** Just a comment from me. That's a rule change that will have to be a permanent rule change, because the Grand of Distinction award has to address every season from when it was created until the current season. **Newkirk:** Do we need to do something to this motion then, to make it legal? **Phillips:** No, we'll just have to write a rule change and you'll see it in October. That was the plan, anyway. **Newkirk:** Good deal. Thank you Monte, we appreciate your input on that. Is there any debate on this motion? Any objection to the motion? Seeing no objection, by unanimous consent the Grand of Distinction award is extended into the next season, so that motion is agreed to.

**The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.**

***Motion:** For the 2021-2022 season only, adjust the point minimums for regional wins to 100 for kittens and premiership, 200 for championship, and 50 for HHPs.*

**Newkirk:** Kenny, next. **Currle:** [reads]. **Newkirk:** Any debate on that motion? Seeing no hands up, is there any objection to the ratification of the motion? Seeing no objection, by unanimous consent, the motion is agreed to.

**The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.**

**Motion:** For the 2021-2022 season only, continue the addendum to rules 27.03a and 28.01 to allow cats that achieve 200/75 points to transfer to grand regardless of the number of qualifying rings achieved.

**Newkirk:** Your last motion, Kenny. **Currle:** I believe we've already addressed this in Monte's motions. **Phillips:** That's correct, we have. **Eigenhauser:** Motion #7, I believe. **Currle:** I will withdraw that motion. **Newkirk:** OK, good deal. Thank you so much.

**Withdrawn.**

**Newkirk:** Is there anything else you have for us, Kenny? **Currle:** No. I just would like to thank the CFA board for their support of our exhibitors, breeders, and particularly our clubs.

**Newkirk:** Thank you.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Newkirk:** Do we have any other – that's the end of our Orders of the Day. We need to decide if we're going to have a closed session meeting. Rich, do you want to talk about that? **Mastin:** Darrell, my suggestion to do it in closed session is to bring everybody up to speed. Since they haven't been able to read the emails or follow the FaceBook posts, it's up to the board if they wish to do that. **Newkirk:** Alright. Can I have a show of hands for people who would like to go into closed session to discuss it? **Eigenhauser:** I was going to say, if the purpose is to bring them up to speed, send them the email again and not tie up the whole board for something they can read at their leisure. **Newkirk:** Cyndy Byrd, do you want to comment? You're the one that talked to me privately ahead of time. **Byrd:** I agree with George. **Newkirk:** OK. So Rachel, you'll make sure everybody gets updated with the email? **Anger:** I have sent it to the two people who indicated they hadn't received it. Does anyone else need a copy of that email sent? I think we're all set. **Newkirk:** I've shut off commenting on the FaceBook post because I gave them one update, and I updated the board with the latest information I had. So, if we need anything, we're going to have a May meeting because we have candidates for the T2 program and the additional Chinese associate judge applicants that we have to review. So, if there's something that needs to be done, we can follow up in closed session at that meeting. Rachel, do you have anything else? **Anger:** I do not, thank you.

**Newkirk:** Anyone else? Alright, thanks. We went about an hour and ten minutes tonight. We got a lot accomplished. I think our constituents will be happy that we're going to have national wins, so we encourage them to get out there and show their cats. Thanks everybody for your valuable input tonight, and we'll see you the first Tuesday in May. That's the next meeting date, Rachel? **Anger:** Correct, May 4. **Eigenhauser:** Happy 420 to everyone. **Anger:** Happy 420!

At 9:12 p.m., the open session meeting was ADJOURNED.

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