

Reports of Special (Select or Ad Hoc) Committees

Newkirk: OK, we'll pick up. Rachel? **Anger:** #24, Scoring Manipulation Investigation Committee. **Newkirk:** OK, Reports of Special Committees at 3:15, Cathy Dunham's Scoring Manipulation Investigation Committee. **Dunham:** Thank you Darrell.

(24) SCORING MANIPULATION INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE.

Committee Chair: Cathy Dunham
List of Committee Members: Martha Auspitz, Cyndy Byrd, Leslie Carr, Pam Moser, Teresa Sweeney, Mark Kolencik, Jodell Raymond

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

The Scoring Manipulation Investigation Committee ("SMIC") was established at the May 3rd board meeting.

Current Happenings of Committee:

The SMIC presents the following recommendations for consideration by the CFA Board of Directors to minimize or eliminate similar situations, as seen during in the 2021-2022 show season, from happening again.

Dunham: The report is presented here. This Committee worked long and hard, and I have to commend them for all of their work. We looked at two different things. One you will see later in closed session. This part is in relation to areas that we think can be implemented in two phases – a short-term phase and a long-term phase. I am going to make a standing motion for our recommendations, and then I am happy to answer questions. **Currle:** I'll make a standing second. **Newkirk:** Thank you Kenny. **Anger:** I know it's a pain to use the microphone but I want to capture every word, so I appreciate you using the microphone even though we all feel just a little bit awkward. My only question is, the essence of this entire situation is stuffing. Of course, there are other elements that go into it, but "stuffing" is never defined anywhere and I don't see in the proposal – although I have to say I haven't gone to a good forensic review of it. I would like to see the word "stuffing" defined in our show rules and added to the first section where our terminology and language is set forth, so that people clearly understand what is stuffing and what isn't stuffing. **DelaBar:** I want there to be a definition between stuffing and what we're seeing which caused the problem, which was the reverse stuffing. There's not one of us at this table that has shown and has not entered an extra cat to get a benching space or double cage or to bring up a few more grand points. Stuffing essentially benefits everybody that's at that show. The reverse stuffing is what we saw being very negative. So, I think we need to make sure that there's a definition between the two. **Newkirk:** Everybody, please use the microphone when you're talking, OK? So, if someone on this end starts talking, pass the mike down for them. **Eigenhauser:** I agree with Pam, but I like the approach that this report is taking. They're not necessarily – there are some immediate action items, but they are also talking about surveying the clubs because it's important we have their buy-in if we're going to be changing the way people enter in order to deal with the problem. I think we'll be in a better position to define

stuffing once we've gotten the response back from the clubs. If they say entering 15 cats is stuffing, well then, we add that definition to stuffing, and the various other things we want to poll them on. I don't want to go too far into the closed session, but in the report there they mention stuffing, reverse stuffing and tandem stuffing, so there may be multiple ways that people stuff or manipulate counts. I think there's a better word. I really think we need buy-in from the clubs. While I agree that we need to define what it is we're trying to outlaw because we want people to be able to comply with the rules, I do think it's premature to make that definition now until we've gotten the feedback from the clubs. **Dunham:** To answer a couple of those, I think you'll see in tomorrow's meeting a couple of resolutions that are coming up from the floor that will, in part, address some of the definitions at the beginning of the show rules, so we may very well get a consensus after the delegation meeting tomorrow that will help solidify some of that information. **Newkirk:** Do you have some action items here, Cathy? **Dunham:** I do. I made a standing motion. Do you want me to read them into the record? **Newkirk:** Please do. **Anger:** Page 83 of the compiled reports.

Short-term recommendations:

This set of recommendations can be implemented during the next three months. Specific dates are included by each item.

Dunham: The first motion is to approve the short-term recommendations, as presented. **DelaBar:** Can I have the microphone, because I want to make sure that Paula Noble – **Newkirk:** Yes, there are critics in the audience. **DelaBar:** Can you hear me? Cathy, I have a few comments on some of your action items here. [reads #3] We are still – I don't know how things are going in the U.S., but in the continent of Europe we're still having problems getting show halls, and several different things that make this possible to have shows when we have enough judges. You're putting the Board of Directors into no tolerance for going against any of these show rules or policies, then that means I can't ever enter a cat in a show that I know I can't go to, but I'm entering to help the club. So, we've got to look at this from a couple of different directions. One, you've got to look at everything that we put here is global, not just the U.S. Secondly, you've got to look at, let's use some common sense when we put some of these actions to actual rules. **Eigenhauser:** There are several different action items presented here – the board statement, follow the show rules, rescind the show rules and then the survey. They are distinct items and I would prefer separate votes on each of them. **Dunham:** I'm fine with that.

1. *Board Statement – Publish a strong statement warning exhibitors that count manipulation will ~~no longer~~ not be tolerated. The language of the statement to be written by ~~CEA Legal Advisory Committee~~ the Scoring Manipulation Investigative Committee, as approved by the Board of Directors, with publication as soon as the statement is complete and approved, no later than October 1, 2022.*

Newkirk: Let's take the first one, Cathy. **Dunham:** [reads]. **Newkirk:** Comments. **Perkins:** I wasn't sure there was going to be a Legal Advisory Committee, and so if there is or isn't one I don't know about that. The other one is, *no longer tolerated*. Do we not have show rules that say we're not supposed to do that? So are we saying we're now going to enforce the show rules? Do you want to say, instead of saying *will no longer be tolerated*, to just say *will not be tolerated*? Those are my comments. **Dunham:** I'm fine with those changes, Shelly. I guess I

don't know if there's going to be a Legal Advisory Committee, so I guess that's something that will need to be addressed on Sunday. **Mastin:** On Sunday, my plan was to allow appointment of Legal Advisory as things come up. I did confer with George, Shelly and Cindy on this, and they all felt that much of the work that they had done for the past two years is coming to an end, and if there is additional work that arises, then I will appoint as it comes up. **Anger:** Can we just task the CFA Attorney to write the statement? **Newkirk:** Shelly? **Perkins:** I would like the committee who has investigated this to come up with a proposed statement and I can always review but I think that the initial proposition should come from the Committee because they know exactly what things they want to put in that warning and then I can review it. It could just say *approved by the Executive Committee* or something, and then it can get approved somehow. **Newkirk:** Any other comments? Any objections? Seeing and hearing no objections, by unanimous consent it's approved. **Perkins:** Was that a motion amended, though? I assume the amendment was approved, so you're going to – **Newkirk:** We'll vote on the amendment. Any objection to the amendment? **DelaBar:** Can we have that restated? **Anger:** I've got it. *Publish a strong statement warning exhibitors that count manipulation will not be tolerated. The language of the statement to be written by the Scoring Manipulation Investigative Committee, as approved by the Board of Directors, with publication as soon as the statement is complete and approved, no later than October 1, 2022.* **Newkirk:** Any objection to that amendment? Seeing no objection, by unanimous consent.

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

Newkirk: Now let's vote on the amended motion. Any objection to the amended motion, as Rachel just read it? Seeing and hearing no objections, by unanimous consent it is approved.

The main motion, as amended, is ratified by unanimous consent.

2. *Respectfully request that the CFA Board of Directors follow the show rules and policies of the organization with a no tolerance policy for granting exceptions unless an Act of God situation is presented. Effective immediately.*

Newkirk: Next, Cathy. **Dunham:** [reads]. **Tartaglia:** Hold the microphone closer. **Dunham:** I'm sorry, I thought I was close enough. Do you want me to read it again, or are you OK Rachel? **Anger:** Thank you, I have it. **Newkirk:** Comments? **DelaBar:** Define "Act of God". **Dunham:** We were actually thinking tornadoes, storms, snow storms, those kinds of Acts of God. **DelaBar:** Like war? **Dunham:** War. **DelaBar:** War is not considered an Act of God. Is not legally considered an Act of God. **Newkirk:** Does force majeure – **DelaBar:** Force majeure does not consider war either. **Wilson:** I think it doesn't allow for a lot of flexibility, and while I agree that we need to enforce and follow the rules, I think there are sometimes business reasons in a particular area or in a particular situation that – when I say "business", I mean the business of CFA, not necessarily the business of clubs – but I think this is a little – what I would like – I know I'm jumping ahead – is the formation of a committee to address things as they come up. I kind of have a feeling that might actually help alleviate this issue. Thank you. **Newkirk:** Any other comments? **Currle:** Basically, I think that this will make it difficult to do business on the run. I would like to see it say, we recommend we adhere to show rules with a no tolerance policy, but business on the run, we need to be flexible as Annette just brought up. We just don't know what may happen. **Perkins:** I'm not really sure what teeth this kind of motion has, because

if the board wanted to not follow it they would just vote an exception to this rule and then pass it, and it would be plus 50% if it was pre-noticed, so it's kind of a meaningless rule. I wouldn't rule it out of order, I just think that there's no way to enforce this, because all show rules can be modified with a 50%, so if you're adding this to a show rule it's not going anywhere. Thank you.

Dunham: The Committee felt pretty strongly about this, mainly in response to the number of exceptions that we have seen come from, whether it's the Executive Committee or the board as a whole, in granting exceptions to show rules to change limits, to extend deadlines. While some of them may be the result of business, some of them are just because the clubs didn't do their due diligence to begin with, and if we're going to continue down this path, then why do we have the rules at all if we're going to continue to make exceptions to them. That's where the Committee is coming from. I am willing to look at other language for Act of God, but we really want a serious consideration of what the board is granting exceptions to and whether or not it's really necessary to do those exceptions. **Newkirk:** Any other comments? All those in favor of the motion.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Hannon, Dunham, Webster and Moser voting yes. Curre, Hayata and Wilson abstain.

Newkirk: The yes votes are Mark Hannon, Cathy Dunham and Howard Webster. No votes? No votes are Carol, Pam DelaBar, Rich, Kathy, Melanie, John, Sharon, George. Abstentions? Oh, Steve McCullough. **Anger:** I was a no also. **Newkirk:** Oh, you were a no, OK. Pam Moser, how are you voting? **Moser:** I'm voting yes. **Newkirk:** OK. Abstentions, raise your hands. I've got Kenny, Hayata-san and Annette. **Anger:** That's 4 yes, 10 no, 3 abstentions. **Newkirk:** The motion fails.

3. *For Regions 1-7, rescind the current exception to show rule 4.04. This will provide notice to any club that show licenses must be filed and approved according to the rules and if filed late the imposed late fees will be enforced. ~~The committee also requests There shall be a zero tolerance for licensing a show within less than 30 days of opening day of the show. Effective with shows processed beginning October 1, 2022.~~*

Newkirk: Cathy, you can go on to the next one. **Dunham:** OK, #3. [reads] **Newkirk:** Does that take in the exception for China? Because they can license a show 7 days out. **Dunham:** No, that doesn't take into consideration China. **Newkirk:** Should it? **Dunham:** I would like it to, but I don't know. **Newkirk:** Just say, I don't want to get us in trouble. **Dunham:** The main issue with this, again, while I understand Pam's position for Europe and really probably for maybe China because of their governmental restrictions, we're seeing more and more show licenses come within 30 days of the opening day, especially in the States that we're seeing licenses 3 weeks out, 2 weeks out, and most of those shows have been in the planning stages but clubs just didn't file the license. If there were changes because of the show venue, the license should have already been filed and then potentially a change of venue filed with CFA, not just waiting to file the license until all of those things are done. Part of this goes back to what will be discussed later. It does potentially go to count manipulation because hey, if I'm running a cat and I want my own particular line-up of judges after I determine what they are, I'll just license the show 2 weeks before the event and I'll have my perfect slate of judges for my cat. That in its own way is manipulation, so that's what we're trying to get at here. We're not really trying to hinder the issues that Europe has seen with having difficulties finding show halls, we're trying to get at the problem of manipulating a show to the benefit of a cat or a couple of cats

based on the judging slate that is put together at the very last minute. **Newkirk:** Your intent is good. **Anger:** I would like to propose an amendment that the motion begin with *For Regions 1-9*. **DelaBar:** No. **Calhoun:** I move that it begin with *Regions 1-7*. Would that help? **Anger:** That's my amendment then. **Hannon:** What's the amendment? **Newkirk:** Adding *Regions 1-7* to start the paragraph. **Mastin:** Cathy, can this motion be worded the same as the current show rules, where it says *For licensing a show within 30 days*, the show rule currently says *less than 30 days*. **Dunham:** Yes, I'm fine with that, changing that word. **Mastin:** *less than 30 days*, thank you. **Newkirk:** Everybody OK with that? **DelaBar:** No, I still don't like it. **Newkirk:** Pam doesn't like it, so she can vote no. **Perkins:** Is there an amendment? We're voting on the amendment? **Newkirk:** Yes, we're voting on the amendment, and that's adding *Regions 1-7* to start the paragraph. **Anger:** And *less than 30 days of opening*. **Newkirk:** Who did the second? **Calhoun:** I will. **Newkirk:** There we go, we've got a second, so we're in order. All those in favor of the amendment, raise your hands.

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

Newkirk: Kenny, Hayata, Annette, Mark, Carol, Rachel, Rich, Kathy, Melanie, John, Sharon, George, Cathy, Steve, Pam, Howard. And the no votes are? Abstentions? **DelaBar:** I'm sorry, I do not believe that I should be voting on restrictions for my other fellow regional directors. **Perkins:** Did you count the people online? **Newkirk:** Yes. **Perkins:** I just didn't hear their names. OK. **Anger:** That is 16 yes, zero no, one abstentions. **Newkirk:** So, the amendment has passed.

Newkirk: Now, let's vote on the amended motion. Rachel, would you read the amended motion please? **Anger:** Sure. *For Regions 1-7, rescind the current exception to show rule 4.04. This will provide notice to any club that show licenses must be filed and approved according to the rules and if filed late the imposed late fees will be enforced. The committee also requests zero tolerance for licensing a show within less than 30 days of opening day of the show. Effective October 1, 2022.* **Newkirk:** Any debate on the amended motion? **Tartaglia:** A question for clarification. The effective date, that means starting with any shows processed October 1st and after, correct? **Dunham:** Yes. **Newkirk:** OK, let's vote on the amended motion. **Perkins:** I think there was another comment over there, but my question is, the motion also says *The committee also requests a zero tolerance*. The motion doesn't say *There shall be a zero tolerance*. The motion is just, the Committee is hoping you guys will honor that. I just want to make sure that I understand the effect of this motion. There isn't – **Newkirk:** Teeth to it. **Perkins:** Right. The Committee is recommending this. OK, thank you. **Hannon:** And then the board is adopting this if we pass this. **Newkirk:** Yes. **Perkins:** So then, the motion is, *There shall be a zero tolerance for licensing a show within less than 30 days of opening day of the show*. So, that's actually the motion, not *The committee also requests a zero tolerance*. **Newkirk:** Rich is making that as an amendment. **DelaBar:** Second, with the right to vote against. **Newkirk:** Pam is going to second. Shelly, do you want to read what it is amended to? **Perkins:** That last sentence is amended to, *There shall be a zero tolerance for licensing a show within less than 30 days of opening day of the show*. Effective, whatever Allene said on the effective. **Anger:** October 1. **Newkirk:** October 1, 2022. **Perkins:** Right, but there is a definition as to what that meant. Allene? **Hannon:** Shows processed. **Newkirk:** Shows processed after October 1, 2022. **Perkins:** OK, thank you. **Newkirk:** Got that? **Anger:** Yes. **Newkirk:** So, we're all clear as mud. **Calhoun:** Should that be *shows processed* or *shows licensed*? **Hannon:** Processed. **Tartaglia:** *Show licenses processed*.

When we start receiving show licenses on October 1st or after, [inaudible]. **Currle:** Reading this, if it's going to be mandatory that it's a zero tolerance, then let's take out the late fees that may be imposed. In this, it's reading that if it's filed late, imposed late fees will be enforced. Why should there be late fees enforced? **Hannon:** The show rule states that shows will be licensed within 90 days of the show and there is a penalty if it's not licensed within 90 days. There's a further penalty if it's not licensed within 60 days. So, that's why we're talking about penalties and the additional fees, because it's not just shows within 30 days. We're talking about 90 days is the actual show rule. **Eigenhauser:** I have a couple of things. First, when we're talking about zero tolerance, I think what we're trying to do is say, *The board shall not grant exceptions* and I don't think this board can tell future boards not to grant exceptions by a simple majority on a pre-noticed motion, so I have a problem with the concept. The other thing is, I don't see this is a screaming problem that we have to fix. Most of the shows that we've seen this kind of last-minute entry count manipulation have been in China where one faction only tells their members and the faction that the show is coming, they wait until the last minute, they take the entries and the rest of the world doesn't know about it. If you're a show in Regions 1-7, you want to get out the word as soon as possible, because you can have the most wonderful judging line-up but if you've got no entries, you've got no points. So, licensing a show at the last minute cuts you off at your own legs if you're not careful, so I just don't see that that many clubs in Regions 1-7 are licensing at the last minute for the specific purpose of trying to manipulate the count. I see that we're fixing a problem that doesn't exist. **Newkirk:** Cathy, do you want to address that? **Dunham:** Actually George, we have seen that in the last show season. There were at least one if not more shows that was licensed less than 30 days. The producers of those particular shows had cats in contention for various placements in national wins and it caused problems because there was count manipulation on top of them being able to pick their particular slate of judges that favored the particular cat in question. That's what we're trying to get at. **Wilson:** I appreciate that that may have happened and perhaps the board, by voting on an exception, in retrospect encouraged it. I really think this ties the board's hands – a future board's. I think when we do try to follow the rules, I think that there are still business reasons for different clubs in different regions why waiving late fees might still be appropriate and I think the board should look at that as some analysis is done, as some areas open up. I actually like the words *zero tolerance* because I like really specific rules, but I don't think I could support this as is, just because I think there's always going to be exceptions. I think though, point is taken that we need to be more careful when we consider these. **DelaBar:** Let me just stand and maybe I can get my command voice going. **Newkirk:** Take the mike. Here, here. **DelaBar:** Often times when we study things – and I found this when I was doing Animal Welfare – that when you are being so investigative and particular on a problem area, that the rest of the possible effects of bringing something that's going to address your problem area, we lose the total ramifications of our particular course of action. In the Army, we had a term called “pole vaulting over mouse turds”. We have to be careful that we're not doing this and trying to correct what we all know was a problem and your Committee got charged with trying to correct that for the future, but that's what I see the problem is with this. Again, I do not want to put extra burden on my fellow regional directors in trying to address this problem for the future. **Newkirk:** Cathy, anything else? **Dunham:** I have nothing else.

Morgan: I understand the issue with zero tolerance. What I'm having a problem with is, why we have a problem with enforcing our show rules [inaudible]. Right now, we have an exception to the show rule that allows a club to license up to 30 days out and clubs are taking

advantage of that, when in reality I don't think our environment in these Regions 1-7 truly warrants that. So, I can support this. I would probably prefer that that last statement about zero tolerance wasn't there. I think that's right, point is well taken, but I truly think that we need to start doing a better job at following our own show rules the way they were written and that's a pretty simple task. **Hannon:** Part of the problem is that we've not been charging the late fees. I think that's one of the things they are trying to address here is, let's put back into place the fact that if you license your show late, you've got to pay a penalty. I think that's part of what this issue is. Let's go back to the policy that we had pre-COVID by saying, if you license your show less than 90 days, there's a fine. If you license it less than 60 days, there's a fine. If you license it less than 30 days, you're not having a show. **Newkirk:** Point well taken. Are we ready to vote? We've about beat this one to death. All those in favor, raise your hand. **Anger:** This is on the second amended motion? Is this the main motion or the amendment? **Newkirk:** I didn't know we had an amendment. **Perkins:** Yes, we had an amendment. **Anger:** It was, *Effective with shows processed beginning October 1, 2022.* **Newkirk:** Oh, OK. So, this is an amendment. October 1st processing. **Anger:** Do you want me to read the whole thing? **Newkirk:** Rachel will read it. **Anger:** The last sentences will now read, *There shall be a zero tolerance for licensing a show less than 30 days of opening day of the show. Effective with shows processed beginning October 1, 2022.* **Newkirk:** OK, so that's the amendment. **Calhoun:** I have confused myself here. So, 4.04 already states, *No license will be granted for shows whose complete and accurate application, ... for a show license received in the Central Office with less than 30 days remaining prior to the opening day of the show.* **Hannon:** Did you think we could hear you? **Calhoun:** *No license will be granted for shows whose complete and accurate application, including judging program committee approvals for any proposed guest judges in the application, for a show license received in the Central Office with less than 30 days remaining prior to the opening day of the show.* So, it also says, *No license will be granted.* **Newkirk:** Are we repeating ourselves with this motion? **Perkins:** I think you are. **Newkirk:** Shelly thinks this is repeating what the show rule actually calls for. **Perkins:** Is there an exception somewhere? **Calhoun:** I'm looking for that, too. **Perkins:** Cathy, what exception to 4.04 do you think exists somewhere? **Dunham:** In April when Monte presented the show rules that would be extended into the current show season, this was an exception. There was an exception to this rule that we approved and we're asking for that to be rescinded, to go back to the rule that Kathy just read. **Perkins:** So, would it not be better to just say, "Rescind the current exception to show rule 4.04" and then also include the second sentence which says, *This will provide notice to any club that show licenses must be filed and approved according to the rules and if filed late the imposed late fees will be enforced.* Then you have the effective date for shows processed October 1, and then just skip that second to last sentence. **Dunham:** I'm fine with that. **Newkirk:** Read it now. **Anger:** OK, so the amendment to the amendment is, *For Regions 1-7, rescind the current exception to show rule 4.04. This will provide notice to any club that show licenses must be filed and approved according to the rules and if filed late the imposed late fees will be enforced. Effective with shows processed beginning October 1, 2022.* **Newkirk:** And you're making that motion? **Anger:** I am making that motion. **Newkirk:** And Carol Krzanowski made the second. Thank you Carol. Alright, everybody on the same page now? Alright, let's vote on this. **Eigenhauser:** Are we voting on the motion or the amendment? **Newkirk:** This is actually rescinding. **Perkins:** Don't they have an amended motion on the floor? I don't want to make this difficult, but they need to withdraw their motion on the floor that you first and seconded the amendment. **Mastin:** I'm going to withdraw my amendment so we can start over. **Perkins:** And

then this amendment is fine. It's what was just firsted and seconded, so you can vote on the amendment. **Newkirk:** Thank you. Well, we're rescinding, right? **Perkins:** Yes, you are rescinding the exception. **Newkirk:** We're rescinding the exception. All those in favor of the rescinding of the exception, please raise your right hand and say, "speak now or forever hold your peace."

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

Newkirk: All those raising their right hand is Kenny, Hayata, Annette, Mark, Carol, Rachel, Rich, Kathy, Melanie, John, Sharon, Cathy and Howard. We've got Steve and Pam voting yes. All those that are voting no please raise your hand. Abstentions? Pam DelaBar, George Eigenhauser. **Eigenhauser:** I don't like pole vaulting over turds either. **DelaBar:** Yeah, it's pole vaulting. **Newkirk:** Alright, so that amendment is passed. **Newkirk:** Do you want to read the amended motion that – well, whatever. **Anger:** That was 15 yes, zero no, 2 abstentions.

Anger: The amended motion is as I read before. **Newkirk:** Yes, OK. Let's vote on the amended motion. All those in favor, raise your right arm or hand or leg.

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

Newkirk: Kenny, Hayata, Annette, Mark, Carol, Rachel, Rich, Kathy, Melanie, John, Sharon, Cathy and Howard and Pam and Steve. No votes? Abstentions? Pam and George. Pam DelaBar. **Anger:** That's 15 yes, zero no, 2 abstentions. **Newkirk:** The amended motion passes.

4. *Survey (by Awards Committee) for clubs and exhibitors for scoring, awards, and other pertinent items to be completed no later than October 1, 2022.*

Items to be included but not limited to the following:

- a. *Should there be limits placed on the number of cats entered in a show by one exhibitor.*
- b. *Should there be limits placed on the number of times one's cats or more can be entered in multiple shows on a given weekend.*
- c. *Proposed change to awards: We still celebrate the top 3 national breed winners like we do now, but we do away with NW 1-25 in each category (CH, PR, K, HHP). We celebrate the RW at the regional level with each region's best cat, best kitten, best cat in premiership and HHP, would be celebrated at the annual awards banquet with the tittle of (NW Reg 1, 2 etc.). CFA would have 9 best cats, 9 best kittens, etc. each year. DM's and cattery achievement awards would also be included in the annual awards banquet. This would give people a more realistic chance of getting a NW. Regional award would stay the same in each region. Top 25 cats, kittens, etc. Extending this to the international division would take additional research and implementation.*
- d. *15% cap on absentee rate at a given show.*
- e. *To be counted in the overall show count a cat must be shown in the first ring on the opening day of a show.*

- f. *Instead of points based on cats defeated, implement a scoring structure that gives points based on placement in finals.*
- g. *Set a minimum number of points for an NW/RW, if the points are achieved an NW/RW is achieved. No placements listed.*
- h. *Scoring system remains the same but the presentation of awards is done alphabetically by owner and no Best Cat presentation.*
- i. *Develop an entirely different competitive system.*

Each question in the survey would have a like or dislike option and a sliding scale 0-10 to determine the how strongly the person feels about the option.

Newkirk: Cathy? **Dunham:** #4, [reads]. **Newkirk:** And who will be putting this survey together? The Committee? **Dunham:** The Committee will. **Newkirk:** So, we're not disbanding the Committee then. **Dunham:** I would really like the Awards Committee to take this task on and continue it. **DelaBar:** That's Cathy anyway. **Hannon:** The Awards Committee has offered to do it. **Newkirk:** OK, alright. **Eigenhauser:** First, I would like to second it. **Newkirk:** Thank you. **Eigenhauser:** Then I would also like to say, this is the one that excited me the most because if we're going to get anything done, we're going to have to get buy-in from the clubs and the exhibitors. We can nip around the edges, we can beat our chests about how much we hate stuffing, but unless the clubs and exhibitors join us in this we're not going to get anywhere, so I strongly support this motion. **Newkirk:** Any other comments? Any objections? Seeing no objections, by unanimous consent it is approved.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

- 5. *"Continental" closing date and time for all shows in R1-9. No extensions allowed by clubs. This would be the time which the Entry Clerk would stop taking entries. Processing of entries may continue after this time. Suggested date/time Monday 8:00 pm EDT prior to the show opening date. R8-9 times to be established based on input from those regional directors. All entries must come through the CFA online entry form to ensure date/time stamp. Effective 8/1/2022.*

Dunham: #5, [reads]. **Newkirk:** Are you suggesting that be in the show rules, and where? **Dunham:** Yes, it would. We're thinking it would fall under the Entry Clerking area and it would be part of the entry clerk's responsibilities at this point. **Newkirk:** I'll tell you, I talked to a lot of exhibitors and they are all for this. They are really, really for this. Any other comments? **DelaBar:** You know I'm going to vote against this. I have 14 time zones – 14 – and you've got to remember that when we make these rules they are global. You're making the rules for continental U.S. because of what happened in the continental U.S. This is a club and show killer. **Newkirk:** She is seeking your input. **Dunham:** I am seeking your input, Pam. **Newkirk:** For Region 8. **Dunham:** For your region. **DelaBar:** And I still – do you realize how difficult it is to come up with one, especially if I, in my entire region of 42 countries, can come up with, if I have more than 2 shows, coming up with one closing time and date. It ain't gonna happen. **Eigenhauser:** A couple problems. First, I don't think this is actionable at this time. We can address the concept or whatever, but there's no specific show rule, no description of what the

language is going to be in the show rule. We don't even have a closing time here, we only have a suggested closing time. So, this is not ready for an up or down vote. If it were, I would vote no because Monday at 8 p.m. Eastern sucks for everybody on the west coast, which means people on the east coast can enter after work on Monday and people on the west coast can't. What about entry clerks on the west coast that have to get their mailed in or other entries in by the universal closing time? At 5:00, some entry clerks on the west coast are still working. This is a horrible time. If we're going to have a universal closing time, it should be some innocuous time that doesn't favor anybody. We change the daylight savings time at 2:00 in the morning because nobody is doing anything good at 2:00 in the morning. I would prefer this be something more like midnight east coast time or 1:00 in the morning – something where no region gets the advantage from being favored by the time. I would also like to see the clubs' input on this. We hear people say they like it. We hear people say they want it, but if you put an 8:00 p.m. Eastern time closing on there, you will get a very different response from the west coast clubs. I think we should table this for now and put it in the survey. **Dunham:** Well, I'm OK with tabling it, but I will say this. This is one piece that will go towards something that is in the long term recommendations for centralized entry clerking. Quite frankly, the way we're thinking about the centralized entry clerking, the data entry and the entries would be in the Eastern time zone, because it would be based off of Central Office. So, I'm OK with tabling this and putting it in the survey, but it is a piece of, we're just trying to get the exhibitors and the clubs used to this continental/universal closing time philosophy as we move towards something additional in the long term. **Calhoun:** I can hear what George is saying about a time that might be better for east versus west. Maybe you might want to reconsider, because a lot of things that are valid dates and times and other things that are managed by the Central Office, they have a cut-off time of midnight Eastern time, so it might be easier to continue that. **Dunham:** I am fine with tabling this and putting it in the show rules. **Newkirk:** Alright, somebody make the motion to table. **Eigenhauser:** I'll move. **DelaBar:** I'll second. **Newkirk:** Thank you. Any objections to tabling this motion? Mark objects, so all those in favor of the table, raise your hand.

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

Newkirk: The yes votes are Kenny, Hayata, Annette, Carol, Pam, Rachel, Rich, Kathy, John, Sharon, George, Cathy, Howard, Steve and Pam. The no votes? The no votes are Mark and Melanie. Abstentions? No abstentions. **Anger:** That's 15 yes votes, 2 no votes, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** OK, this motion is tabled.

Tabled.

6. *Auto shut down of entries through CFA's on-line entry form. All shows in RI-9 close on date/time suggested above. Central Office would have authority to extend closing time based on a server or website issue only. Additional consideration would need to be looked at for the ID divisions. Effective October 1, 2022.*

Dunham: #6, [reads]. **Eigenhauser:** I move we table this until we get a response to the previous. **DelaBar:** Second. **Newkirk:** OK, we have a motion to table. All those in favor of the motion to table, raise your hands.

Newkirk called the motion (to table). **Motion Carried.**

Newkirk: Kenny, Hayata, Annette, Mark, Carol, Pam, Rachel, Rich, Kathy, Melanie – it’s unanimous. **Hannon:** And Pam and Steve? **Newkirk:** Yes.

7. *Create a real time query for each show, linked on the CFA Schedule, that runs against the entry database. Query produces a count of entries submitted by class (kitten, championship, premiership, HHP). It is not intended to replace the current Show Summary, but to provide an ongoing count as entries added to the database. Effective of October 1, 2022.*

Dunham: OK, #7 [reads]. **Eigenhauser:** I’ll second, but what I would like to do though is ask IT what it’s going to cost to do this. [unidentified speaker, inaudible] **Eigenhauser:** If it’s going to come from the database, it’s got to be somebody. **Tartaglia:** What are we requesting her to do and how often? **Dunham:** It’s just a one-time programming to do a query, per show. **Tartaglia:** [inaudible]. **Eigenhauser:** I want to say that I am in support of the concept of exhibitors being able to get a real-time count, because one of the ways to manipulate count obviously is to hide where your stuffers are until the last second in order to take advantage of it. There are ways around this, obviously, if somebody submits a lot of entries on paper. That would avoid the system, but I think this is definitely a step in the right direction. If it can be done without cost to CFA, then I definitely support it. **Newkirk:** Anybody else? **Tartaglia:** So is this kind of on demand, where exhibitors can press a button and that [inaudible] a query? **Dunham:** No. We are asking that Kathy [Durdick] would write a query that would just, as an entry comes in – whether it’s a kitten, a champion, premier or household pet – gets added to a count so that part of the reasoning – and George kind of alluded to it – part of the reasoning is, if we can see that there is 30 entries sitting out there and they tabulate into whatever the total is, but there’s 30 entries out there that have not been completely processed into the breed summary, then exhibitors would have a better understanding at a glance that the count is going to potentially be 150 at this show, potentially 70 in championship or whatever they are looking at, knowing that the entry clerk still has to process them and they fall into whatever breed on the breed summary. **Tartaglia:** And Kathy Durdick said she can do this. **Dunham:** I talked with her a little bit about it and I think it’s doable. That’s why we set the date out a little bit, so that she had some time to do it and test it and make sure that it works right. **Newkirk:** Anyone? **McCullough:** What if you don’t use Central Office’s or CFA’s entry program? How will you populate those programs that aren’t tied into the database? **Dunham:** Steve, this doesn’t matter because the entry database is different than the actual entry clerking programs, so what we are wanting the query on is the actual database that the entries come into. The online entries. They go into a different database that the entry clerks access to do the data entry into either CFA’s entry clerking program or whatever other program other entry clerks are using. **McCullough:** That doesn’t require different programming, say like [name omitted] waits until the last minute to dump a bunch or [name omitted] decides to wait until 2:00 in the morning to dump 50 entries in there? **Dunham:** No, because the query would capture those, as long as they are online entries and they’re not paper entries being held somewhere, that would be part of the query that everybody would see online pretty much in real time once the query is built. **Newkirk:** Anybody? Let’s call for the vote. All those in favor raise your hand.

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

Newkirk: The yes votes are Kenny, Hayata, Annette, Mark, Carol, Pam, Rachel, Rich, Kathy, Melanie, John, Sharon, George, Cathy, Howard, Pam and Steve. So it’s unanimous.

Anger: That's 17 yes, zero no, zero abstentions. **Hannon:** You're getting into this, aren't you?
Newkirk: The motion is agreed to.

Long-term recommendations:

This set of recommendations is an overview of concepts to be worked on if approved. All of them involve revision to or addition of show rules and the need to work with other existing committees and central office to work out specific details and programming.

Dunham: Moving on, the Committee also had some long-term recommendations. Although I had them all in one motion, I will follow what we did with the short-term motions and I will do them individually.

1. *Exhibitor Code of Conduct – working with Legal Advisory to write this document. The show entry form would be modified to require acknowledgement of the code of conduct.*

Dunham: The first one is a motion to write an exhibitor code of conduct. We would like to work with either the CFA Attorney or the Legal Advisory Committee, whichever makes the most sense, to write the document. The show entry form, we would like modified to include the language that they are accepting the exhibitor code of conduct when they submit that entry.

Newkirk: That's a motion? **Dunham:** That's a motion, yes. **Calhoun:** Second. **Newkirk:** Kathy Calhoun seconds. Debate? Objections? Seeing and hearing no objections, by unanimous consent the motion is adopted.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

2. *Special Investigation Committee – working with the Protest Committee to refine the role and processes for this committee to include but not limited to the ability to quickly review allegations related to show rules 1.03 and 6.34.*
 - a. *Initial inquiry that is complaint-driven including, but not limited to, show entry patterns, abnormal numbers of entries, and blatant conduct unbecoming regarding in-show behaviors including excessive and/or undue celebration and animal welfare issues.*
 - b. *This inquiry should be a short window of opportunity, no longer than 30 days, and is relative to receiving all necessary documents for review.*
 - c. *The committee could consist of a large pool of people established to investigate complaints. One or two people who are out-of-region of the complaint and uninvolved with the show or exhibitors would be assigned to investigate individual complaints.*
 - d. *Creation of a sliding scale of penalties with option for recommendation to protest committee.*

Dunham: The second motion is to implement a special investigation committee [reads].
Eigenhauser: First, I will second. Second, this is not unique to stuffing. One of the problems Protests has is, we're constantly getting, "somebody ought to do something about this." "Well, will you file a protest?" "No, I don't want to get involved, I don't want to do anything." That

happens all the time. What we've done with certain shoddy business practices – selling kittens and not delivering, blah blah blah – they have largely been picked up by the Animal Welfare Committee who investigates a lot of those and makes protests from time to time based on people just having horrible practices as a breeder in terms of dealing with the public. But, we don't have really a way to get this into the system. The Protest Committee is more of an adjudicatory body. We're not really the police force. In CFA, we largely allow individual exhibitors to file a complaint when they have been a problem. The problem is, problems exist and nobody does anything. Everybody says, "somebody should do something," but nobody ever does. I wouldn't mind expanding this to not just specific stuffing issues, but just general show hall issues where there may be multiple issues but nobody willing to come forward as a complainant so we can have a committee investigate, determine if there is probable cause and then run it through the process. **Mastin:** Cathy, did you mean Awards Committee or are you trying to reinstate the Special Investigation Committee to continue? **Dunham:** No, this would be a new potential committee. While the Awards Committee can certainly look at it, we were thinking this is more of a committee that would have the ability to do exactly what George said, do some investigation. It could very well continue into looking at other things like special circumstances in show halls. We are hoping that this is a standing committee that would work along side the Protest Committee, but our timeframes could be shorter than the due process that's in the protest process right now. We would like to work with – as it says – to figure out a sliding scale of penalties, whether we have the authority to – not me, because I don't want this committee. The committee would either have the approval from the board to send out letters or we would work through the Protest Committee to do that. Whatever that refinement of process looks like is something that my Committee felt important that the two committees – this Special Investigation Committee and the Protest Committee – were on the same page so that if we did – this Special Investigation Committee – found something that could be filed as a protest, that we were following the right procedures to be able to hand it off to the Protest Committee. **Mastin:** I understand all that. Thank you for further explaining it. Are you asking the board for a special committee, or are you asking Darrell to appoint a special committee and then the board will ratify that appointment? **Dunham:** I am asking the board for the special committee to ratify the appointment. I am not asking to be the chairman, so don't look at me please. **Newkirk:** I've got big eyes. That's what I figured you would say. **Hannon:** AKC has something where one of their employees attends every show and they resolve issues at the show. Now, I don't think the Committee is asking for this, but they want to be able to process things a lot faster than what we do now through the Protest Committee. If you look at the last year's stuffing situation, here we are two months after the show season, awards are being handed out this weekend and nothing has been done yet, and there have been a lot of complaints about that. They wanted us to "do something" so what the Committee is asking us to do is find a process where we can fast track some of these things. [**Secretary's Note:** The AKC position is called "AKC Field Representative", which is a large financial expenditure.] **DelaBar:** It's not only AKC that has this person at each show, but several of the cat organizations do the same thing, be it Australia or throughout Europe. There is one person designated at each show. They check to see if there's anything obvious but they are also the go-to person to get things resolved immediately or forwarded on for quick action through the Protest Committee. **Eigenhauser:** And just so I don't create the wrong impression, the biggest delay in most protests is the amount of time it takes before anybody does anything to file. When we get a complaint in, if the respondent lives in the United States they have 21 days to answer the complaint. If they live outside of the United

States, they get 28 days to respond to the complaint, but when a complaint takes 2 or 3 years before somebody files it, necessarily we can't resolve it in less than 2 to 3 years. Part of the problem we have with the situation of stuffing is, it went on apparently for several months before it finally hit a nerve. It apparently started possibly as early as December but it didn't hit a nerve until April. We can't resolve it any faster than it gets to us. Part of the problem is that everyone sits around on their hands thinking somebody else is going to do it. So, having somebody that actually goes out and gathers the evidence and files these, if these can get to the Protest Committee faster they will get done faster, not because of the time it takes for the Protest Committee to handle them, but because of the amount of time it takes before it even gets to us in the first place. The other thing I wanted to mention is, item d. under here, the sliding scale of penalties. We have something like that already in our sentencing guidelines and they have not been reviewed for several years. Every so often, we look at them and realize some of the show rule numbers have changed and whatever, so it is certainly time to look at that again. We can go more in depth in some of the things that we have here for rules like stuffing, but we have to add penalties for that, where it's not automatically in the existing guidelines, but the concept is there. We just need to update it and refine it. **Wilson:** I think this committee is a great idea. I think initially keeping it related to the show rules mentioned would be a good place to start. It would give people a feeling like they could go to someone and get some immediate investigation, which may or may not prove anything and may down the road prove a pattern, I don't know, but I think they should wear badges and I think they should carry squirt guns. But seriously, I think this is one of the best things that could come out of this, is to have someone immediately look into something, if nothing else but to reassure people that it's OK. **Newkirk:** I think the committee is a great idea, but if you're going to try to penalize these people, I think our bylaws restrict that to the Board of Directors. **Dunham:** That's kind of what we thought. We were hoping that working through the Protest Committee there was an avenue then for that punishment, to assist with that and/or the committee would bring it to the board for whatever that resolution – **Newkirk:** A direct cite, because that's a lot quicker. **Dunham:** Right. **Currle:** Since we're specifically talking about actions at shows, can we simply make it a requirement of each show committee to have somebody designated as such, to act on that behalf? **Newkirk:** I'm not sure that that's a good idea. **Currle:** If you want to create a gestapo here that's going to go out and watch these people, everybody knew that this stuffing was happening. I knew from my judging ring. Nobody had to tell me, 52 cats were missing. **Newkirk:** How about 98 were missing? **Currle:** Right. It was an incredibly embarrassing thing for the club and the show hall, and it has affected people, but I don't know if putting somebody in the show hall and correcting it first thing is really going to correct anything. I think coming down on these people is going to have a lot more effect. **Perkins:** Two things. There are already the show rules and we already have protests available, so every single exhibitor is essentially on notice that they could file a protest at any moment when they see something. The second thing is, there is a question about this committee, they would have to bring something to the board, but can't that special investigation committee just file a protest just like anyone else? So they don't have to bring anything to the board. If they think there's something, then they should just send it as a protest and follow the normal procedures. Board cites should only be used when there is something where we can't go through the Protest Committee, so if this special investigation committee finds something, they can file that protest. They have all the data. It's just like any other protest and then it can go forward to the committee. **Newkirk:** My deal was, the bylaws restrict the board to the penalty. **Perkins:** A hearing for penalty, sure. **McCullough:** Will this replace our Ombudsman, our advocate, our

ombudsperson or whatever that title is? **Newkirk:** It's gender neutral, OK? **McCullough:** There you go. **Newkirk:** We just learned that. Shelly told us. Anything else, Steve? **McCullough:** No. I was wondering if they are replacing. **Eigenhauser:** "Ombudsman" is a neutral mediator or facilitator. They are not an advocate. I just want to point out that the motion as written does not say we're going to assign people with badges at every show. That's just an idea that came up for discussion here. The actual motion says the inquiry would be initiated by a complaint, so that would imply that somebody at a show had a problem, they wanted somebody to do something about it, but they weren't necessarily willing to file a protest themselves. So, that's what the actual motion is. The motion is not to create a CFA police force, it's simply to have somebody investigate them when an exhibitor reports a problem. **Newkirk:** Don't they need to know who to report it to? **Eigenhauser:** That's why we would have that committee. **Newkirk:** OK. **Eigenhauser:** But they wouldn't necessarily be at every show. **Dunham:** That's correct. We did base this off of AKC and other entities that use this kind of investigation, but some of the organizations that we looked at made it almost as if the person was anonymous. I'm going to tell you, the first time I walk into a show hall in Region 7 that I haven't been in ever, they are going to know that I'm there for another reason. Or if I walk into a show in Region 5, they are soon going to figure out who the people are, so we felt that it was better to have a committee that looked at any of the allegations that were brought forth because most of them you can't see or do anything about until after the show is over anyway to know if the cat was really shown in one ring or 5 rings or whatever the issues are. Sometimes we have to have the master clerk book, sometimes we have to have other information to really verify whether it really was a true problem. So, that's why we got an investigating committee where exhibitors could come to the committee and say, "hey, I saw this, will you look at it" and then we can pull whatever data we need then, to look at it and verify it. **Wilson:** Yes, I see this as reactions to red flags, whether it's an entry clerk that says, "wait, something is a little fishy here, could you take a look right now" or an exhibitor says, "I don't know, this doesn't sound right," they could just go to the committee and red flag something. Then, you could do an immediate investigation, whether that's auditing the show reports after the fact or whatever, to see if there is something that happened, if there's a pattern, and then move on from there. **Newkirk:** Comments? Any others? OK, let's vote. All those in favor, raise your hand.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Anger and Curre abstained.

Newkirk: The yes votes are Hayata-san, Annette, Mark, Carol, Pam DelaBar, Rich, Kathy, Melanie, John, Sharon, George, Cathy, Howard, Pam, Steve. No votes raise your hand. Abstentions? Kenny and Rachel. **Anger:** That's 15 yes, zero no, 2 abstentions. **Newkirk:** Thank you. The motion is agreed to.

| Committee | Chair | Co/Vice Chair | Board Liaison | email |
|---|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-------|
| | | | | |
| Appointment of CFA Standing Committees | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Special Investigation Committee | Michael Shelton | | | |

| Committee | Chair | Co/Vice Chair | Board Liaison | email |
|-----------|-------|---------------|---------------|-------|
| | | | | |

Newkirk: Committee members, Cathy? Suggestions? **Dunham:** As a chair, the name of Michael Shelton came up. **Newkirk:** Do you want somebody on the board doing it? Because Michael will be a board member on Sunday. **Dunham:** He will be a board member on Sunday. **Newkirk:** That's my only concern. Maybe it's not an issue. **Dunham:** We did not necessarily talk about potential committee members, but Michael's name did come up in a conversation that I had with some of my committee members. Totally random, so I am comfortable with Rich picking his committee chair. It's just not me. **Newkirk:** I did a little private consult with my attorney over there, and she thinks that Michael could be the committee chair and the liaison to the board. **Dunham:** Perfect, perfect. **Newkirk:** I don't see anybody shaking their head no back there [referring to Shelton]. Michael, would you be comfortable picking your committee? **Shelton:** With consultation from legal and other board members, yes. **Newkirk:** OK. So, I appoint Michael to chair this committee. It will be a standing committee. That's what you requested, right? **Dunham:** Yes. **Eigenhauser:** Mr. President, do we really need to make a 3 day appointment? There's going to be a new committee chair [inaudible] Sunday morning. **Mastin:** I'm just going to leave it. He is agreeing. **Newkirk:** If he [Shelton] is agreeing, he [Mastin] is not going to change it. **Perkins:** It's already here. It's going to take more time to talk about it. **Newkirk:** Let's get it done. **Eigenhauser:** I move we ratify the appointment. **Mastin:** Second. **Newkirk:** Any objections? Hearing no objections, by unanimous consent, you have a new job Michael. Two new jobs – Regional Director and committee chair. **Currle:** Congratulations. **Dunham:** Thank you Michael.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

3. *Centralized Entry Clerking Process – working with the Entry Clerking Program Committee and Central Office with the intent to move forward with a centralized entry clerking program which included two levels of administration. The first level would be the actual data entry and opening/closing of show to be done through CO. The second level would be the current entry clerks that work directly with the clubs as they do now. Effective May 1, 2023.*

Dunham: The last motion I have is to do centralized entry clerking. This would be, we would be working with the entry clerking program committee and Central Office with the intent to move forward with a centralized entry clerk program to include two levels of administration. The first level would be the actual data entry, and opening and closing of a show based on the information gathered in our survey for universal closing date and time. That person or persons we are potentially thinking would be working through Central Office. They would actually be doing the data entry piece. The second level of it would be the current entry clerks we have in place all over the world, they would still do all of the finance that's related to a show, adding the entry fees, gathering the payments of entry fees, printing their catalogs to get ready to go to the printer, printing their judges' books, printing the master clerk book – all of those same things – benching, all the same things that an entry clerk does now. The only piece removed from them is the true data entry of the entry into the system, and closing and opening the show. We would like that to be effective May 1st of 2023. **Anger:** I have two things. In the second line of text, can I

add the word *entry* clerking program, *with a centralized entry clerking program*? **Dunham:** Yes.

Anger: I would also like to get Central Office's take on this proposal. **Newkirk:** Hang on a minute. Rich is going to second the motion. Go ahead Allene. **Tartaglia:** Cathy and I have spoke about this and I think it is doable. It will take us a bit of time to implement this. There are considerations that we have to look at. For instance, it's not just one person to handle this, because all the entries come in at the same time. If everybody has the same closing date – Monday, for instance – now we are potentially trying to close out 8 shows with one person, which is not possible. Cathy Dunham said it takes approximately 12 hours to do a 225 entry show, just the entry portion and not the rest of it, so we would be looking at potentially tagging several people at the Central Office to do this entry. **Hannon:** They don't need to be Central Office employees. We could do like we're doing in China, where we have several designated entry clerks. **Dunham:** What we were actually thinking was, we're trying to eliminate the potential manipulation of an entry clerk, quite honestly. If everything is run through somebody that does not have the personal connections to the exhibitors and all they are doing is the data entry, it takes away some of that potential to manipulate things. That's one avenue. Yes, we understand that there is potential for multiple people to have to be involved. They can be contract people that work from home. They don't have to sit in Central Office, but what we're trying to put that division between is the person that's actually doing the data entry versus the person that gets the ton of questions. As an entry clerk, I will say, on closing day I spend 99% of my time answering emails and phone calls. "Is so-and-so entered?" "Is so-and-so entered?" "Is so-and-so entered?" "Is the black Persian so-and-so's cat?" Eventually I turn my phone off so I can do the data entry so I can even get the entries in the system so I can close the show. So, if we can take that piece away from the entry clerks so that it's just a straight data entry, and we can open and close the shows that way, I think we'll eliminate some of the things that we have seen happen, not only this past year but even historically. So, I do kind of envision this person being a Central Office, somebody that's not an exhibitor. That's what I'm trying to get at. Somebody that's not an exhibitor doing the data entry, so all they are doing is straight data entry. And then the entry clerks that we are all used to seeing now and seeing our faces at check-in, then we are simply doing the bidding for the clubs; you know, doing the entry fee piece, doing the show reports and all those kinds of things. That's why we are looking at a two-level system – part to be through Central Office. I don't know what we're going to call them. Tier I, Tier II, Assistants, whatever. That's the distinction we're trying to make. **Colilla:** I have a question. The online entry form, right now provides all the data you need to enter a show. Am I correct? **Dunham:** In theory. **Colilla:** OK, in that case, why can't we use the online entry data and strip the data out of that and use that to end the show automatically? You do not need an entry clerk. **Dunham:** We're trying to head that direction, John. **Colilla:** Good. That's the way it should be, thank you. **Dunham:** But we're not there yet. **Colilla:** I just wanted to make sure we are heading that way, thank you. **Dunham:** Definitely. **Eigenhauser:** I have mixed feelings about this, because certainly insulating the entry clerks from partisan politics, they don't have an axe to grind, they're not aligned with a particular faction, would be an advantage but I don't know if CFA is willing to accept that. They are still going to want to call and say, "did so-and-so enter a cat," "did you get my third entry," "what's going on with this?" That's going to be a real burden. The computer isn't going to be able to answer that. We're still going to need hands-on hand holding from whoever ultimately does the entry clerking function. I don't know how the fancy will accept this. I also know that there's a personal touch to having somebody in your region that entry clerks a lot of shows. They call you up and say, "hey George, I know you are showing this cat, I haven't

gotten your entry yet, did you forget?”, that you’re not going to get from a stranger that doesn’t know anybody, so I think it’s going to cost us in terms of client relations. Now, whether it’s going to be a lot or a little I can’t really tell you, but I do know it’s going to be there. **Wilson:** But if I’m understanding right, there still would be an entry clerk, correct? **Dunham:** Correct. **Wilson:** There’s just the data entry would be done by a non-partisan person, correct? So you would still be in contact with your entry clerk. So, if I entered and I didn’t get a confirmation back for 2 days, I would contact the entry clerk. They would go and look and tell me if my entries were there. **Dunham:** Absolutely. **Wilson:** If I wanted to know – which I never thought I could call and ask how many other Russian Blue kittens were entered, who owns them and what region are they from – I would call the entry clerk. I wouldn’t call Central Office. That would just be something that would have to be – **Dunham:** Correct. **Newkirk:** Would you also want their addresses? **Wilson:** No. Anyway, I’m kind of amazed people do that, but I used to be an entry clerk a long time ago and I know they do. So basically we’re really just taking out that data entry thing. The person in the region or whoever is doing it – the entry clerk – would still be the person that would be the face of the entry clerk. **Dunham:** Yeah. I’ll use myself in this example because I am an entry clerk. If I don’t have to do the data entry piece, I am perfectly fine with that. In fact, I would love it if I didn’t have to sit down and spend hours doing the data entry. Then I can spend more time doing what George said. I can communicate with the exhibitors. I can answer the questions for the exhibitors in, “what’s the color class for my cat?”, or “do I have all the pedigrees for the TRN numbers,” although I would really like to get out of doing that as an entry clerk, but different story. Then I can personalize my reactions to an exhibitor if I’m not trying to concentrate on doing the data entry piece and misspelling the name of a dam or a sire and then I get that email saying, “you misspelled blah blah blah,” which I get too, so I think there’s some good advantages to this. It also gives the ability maybe for an entry clerk – this is thinking a little outside the box – but we had a discussion a little earlier about scanning data to Central Office for end of show season shows and even potentially other shows. It might be another avenue for an entry clerk to be able to have the technology to be able to do that and provide that service for a club, to actually take the show package home, scan it properly so that Shirley can read it or whoever the scorer is can read it at Central Office, and that’s just something else that I could offer that I don’t potentially offer now. So, I think there’s some advantages that entry clerks could find another niche to add to their list of potential things that they can do for a club. **DelaBar:** Allene and James, how close are we actually – considering the changes that we’re making to our system – how close are we to actually doing a centralized system through Central Office? **Tartaglia:** A centralized system? **DelaBar:** What Cathy is talking about, the entry clerk. How close are we to actually being able to do this, and let me put in the word “globally” how close are we? **Tartaglia:** I don’t really have an answer for that, because it’s not something we were planning on doing until we knew that the board was interested in exploring this. This isn’t something we have talked about before, a centralized entry clerking system. **DelaBar:** So, we really don’t know how long this would take, even though this has an effective date of 1 May. **Tartaglia:** Well, we could have it in place by May 1, 2023. We have the software in place. It’s really allocating personnel, training, putting into place Tier I, Tier II. How are we going to separate the different job functions that an entry clerk currently does? So, it’s really just getting all that in place, and also giving consideration to [inaudible], making sure it uses the CFA software, so there’s just a lot of pieces that we need to bring together. **DelaBar:** So, right now, we do not require the clubs to use the CFA [entry clerk] software. **Tartaglia:** That’s correct. **DelaBar:** This would be a change in our way of doing business with clubs. We are taking that

portion of clubs. As far as I'm concerned, I think all my clubs use the CFA system. The question I have pertaining to this is, how much are we looking at cost-wise? I'm surprised Kathy Calhoun isn't sitting there going, "what's going on, what's going on?" **Tartaglia:** It would be more costly to pay Central Office to do the entry data piece. I did a quick calculation and it currently costs approximately \$112 to pay an entry clerk to do just the data entry piece for a 225 entry show. For Central Office, it would be approximately \$150 plus more, depending if they are a contract employee or a full-time regular employee. So, there would be an additional cost. **DelaBar:** Just a comment. Our whole system, our core business, is predicated on honesty. We put in for registrations and pedigrees based upon what we hopefully are getting honest input from our breeders. There is something deep in my heart against us going at a process in a negative manner. That's it. **Mastin:** Allene and James, what is the additional cost to further upgrade the system upgrade that's in the process now. **Simbro:** We're already looking at the revamp of eCat, of allowing online entries through the eCat system by selecting a cat from a list. That's something that is already in place that we're planning on doing. That's one step into it. What John was kind of alluding to is getting eCat and those online entries to talk to our entry clerk program, to push the data over, eliminating the need for somebody in Central Office to do the data entry. So, that's already in the books. I can't really say that there's no cost, but we're kind of early enough in this that we don't know the total cost. Minimal, I would say. **Mastin:** Minimal cost, meaning no greater than \$5,000? **Simbro:** Yes. **Hannon:** There seemed to be some interest in clubs that do not use the CFA entry clerk program. My understanding, from having talked to Allene about it and having talked to Clinton Parker about it, is the only people that do not use it use Clinton Parker's program. That's the Peets and clubs affiliated with Debbie Kusy who is an entry clerk, and I believe you said two clubs in Japan. So, everybody else is using the CFA entry clerk program, so it's a minimal impact to say, "we're going to do away with the others."

Eigenhauser: Allene has already mentioned that we're probably going to need more than one person to handle this at the Central Office end. We can't have one person if 6 shows are closing at exactly the same minute. Do you have a guestimate of what we have to pay that kind of person and how many people we need? **Tartaglia:** I have an idea of the pay, which I don't want to say in open session. **Eigenhauser:** Can you give us a ballpark annual cost, if you don't want to break it down? **Tartaglia:** I haven't fleshed out an annual cost. **Eigenhauser:** Multiply it by 52 weeks. **Tartaglia:** While I am figuring it out, we were just talking about it during the break that as registrations decline, we estimate we will have staff who do registration work [inaudible] so it should work out that we can allocate 3 or 4 current staff members to doing data entry for shows, which would not be on a full-time basis but it would be a part of their job function. That's counting up to 8 shows on a weekend. Some may only have 3, some 4. We could have up to 8 shows based on the review that I wrote up for this past show season and last several seasons.

Newkirk: Is there a reason why our entry program is not linked to the data base, so that when you get an entry and it's 0000-[whatever the number is], it doesn't pull that information in automatically? **Tartaglia:** We're working on it. **Simbro:** That's in the works right now. **Newkirk:** OK, alright. I mean, we've asked this before and it just seems like it never gets to the end where we say, "hey, we've got it, there it is." You pop that number in and there you are. **Simbro:** They were built by two different companies. The entry clerk program and ours are two different companies. One of the key things that we put in place for Gavin and the WeChat app, that's going to allow us to make that connection. **Newkirk:** OK, and where are we on that? **Simbro:** Making progress. I just got an email from Gavin with more questions. **Calhoun:** Cathy D and I have talked about this a number of times, and I think there are other advantages that we

hope over time will occur. One would be automatic data integration to the entry clerk program, which would eliminate errors. If it's changed in the database, it's changed everywhere else. The ability to see real time counts, per se, over time we hope that would mitigate the habit of entering at the last minute. If you can see the cats that are entered, there would be less reason to wait until the 11th hour and scurry around and call people and try to find out what the count is, because it's going to show in the preliminary entry. So, all these things will work to create efficiencies that we are currently not seeing today. **Newkirk:** Anyone else? Cathy, closing statement? **Dunham:** The only thing I'll say, and Allene and I talked about this, and anybody that has entry clerked knows, entries come in sporadically. So, while we hopefully can use staff that's already at Central Office. Some days they may enter 20 or 30 entries across 4 or 5 shows, and some days they may not enter any. That's the nature of an entry clerk waiting on entries to come in, and then an hour before the show closes you will get 50 entries or 100 entries or whatever. So, coming down to the closing time is probably the heaviest amount of work for any entry clerk and would be the same for whoever the data entry person or persons are through Central Office, so we're just hoping that this is something that the board is interested in pursuing and we can continue to work on it with the entry clerking program committee and Central Office, and continue down this path for an effective date of May 1. **Newkirk:** You made a motion for this, is that correct? **Anger:** Rich seconded. **Newkirk:** OK, so let's vote on Cathy's motion. How about reading it, Rachel, so we'll know what we're voting on. **Anger:** *Centralized Entry Clerking Process – working with the Entry Clerking Program Committee and Central Office with the intent to move forward with a centralized entry_clerking program which included two levels of administration. The first level would be the actual data entry and opening/closing of show to be done through CO. The second level would be the current entry clerks that work directly with the clubs as they do now. Effective May 1, 2023.* **Newkirk:** OK, all those in favor raise your hand.

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

Newkirk: The yes votes are Kenny, Hayata, Annette, Mark, Carol, Pam, Rachel, Rich, Kathy, Melanie, John, Sharon, George, Cathy, Howard, and Pam and Steve. No votes? That's everyone. **Anger:** That's 17 yes, zero no, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** The motion is agreed to. **Dunham:** Thank you. **Newkirk:** How about that. **Calhoun:** Cathy Dunham [claps]. **Dunham:** It was a lot of work.

Future Projections for Committee:

If approved, the survey for exhibitors and clubs to be completed and work with the appropriate committees to continue to refine the long-term projects.

Board Action Items:

Motion: *Approve the short-term recommendations as presented.*

[**Secretary's Note:** See results of individual proposals above.]

Motion: *Approve the long-term recommendations as presented.*

[**Secretary's Note:** See results of individual proposals above.]

Time Frame:

On-going if approved.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Updates on both short- and long-term projects if approved.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Cathy Dunham, Chair*

Newkirk: Shall we take a 10 minute break? [yes]

BREAK.