

**TRANSCRIPT OF ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE
CFA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
APRIL 5, 2022**

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)	RATIFICATION OF ONLINE MOTIONS.....	5
(3)	JUDGING PROGRAM REPORT.	7
(4)	CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT.	19
(5)	BUDGET REPORT.....	22
(6)	TREASURER’S REPORT.....	23
(7)	IT REPORT.....	26
(8)	AWARDS REPORT.	27
(9)	LEGAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.	30
(10)	EXPERIMENTAL FORMATS.....	49
(11)	CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE.....	54
(12)	NATIONAL SCORING COMMITTEE.....	55
(13)	OTHER COMMITTEES.	73
(14)	NEW BUSINESS.....	74
(15)	OLD BUSINESS.....	76
(16)	DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS AND SUSPENSIONS.....	77

Secretary's Note: The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. met on Tuesday, April 5, 2022, via Zoom video conference. **President Darrell Newkirk** called the regularly scheduled mid-quarterly video conference meeting to order at 8:00 p.m. Eastern Time. A roll call by **Secretary Rachel Anger** found the following members to be present:

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

Also Present:

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

Absent:

None

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

[**Secretary's Note:** Secretary Rachel Anger called the roll, as reflected above.] Is there anyone on the call as a panelist whose name I have not called? So, we have all the board members present and a quorum. I will turn the meeting back over to you, Mr. President.
Newkirk: Thank you Rachel.

TRANSCRIPT

Reports of Officers, Boards, and Standing Committees

(1) APPROVE ORDERS OF THE DAY.

CFA EXECUTIVE BOARD Video Conference Meeting Agenda April 5, 2022		
1.	Approve Orders of the Day	Newkirk
Reports of Officers, Boards, and Standing Committees		
2.	Ratification of Online Motions	Anger
3.	Judging Program Report	Anger
4.	Central Office Report	Tartaglia
5.	Budget Report	Calhoun
6.	Treasurer’s Report	Calhoun
7.	IT	Simbro
8.	Awards	Dunham
9.	Legal Advisory	Byrd
10.	Experimental Formats	Roy
11.	Credentials	Dodds
Reports of Special (Select or Ad Hoc) Committees		
12.	Scoring	Krzanowski
Unfinished Business and General Orders		
13.	Other Committees	
14.	New Business	
	(a) Live Streaming Equipment	Tartaglia
	(b) Entry limit for regional show	Roy
15.	Old Business	
	ADJOURN OPEN SESSION	

Newkirk: Our first order of business is to approve the Orders of the Day. Rachel, I know you have some additions to the agenda. **Anger:** I do. Under New Business we have an item that Allene will be presenting regarding live streaming equipment. Sharon Roy has a motion about the entry limit for her regional show. Pam DelaBar has a proposal about a letter regarding flying into the Ukraine. Kathy Calhoun has an entry issue. **Dunham:** That’s Cathy Dunham, Rachel. **Anger:** So sorry. Cathy Dunham has an entry issue. **Dunham:** That’s in closed session please.

Newkirk: OK. Rachel, we also need to move Kenny's International Division report in closed session in front of #16. **Anger:** I believe it is in closed session. **Newkirk:** He wanted to do that at the beginning of closed session. **Anger:** I'm so sorry. Yes, that's correct. **Currle:** Thank you both. **Newkirk:** I see Matthew Wong is here. **Anger:** So noted. **Newkirk:** Matthew, are you on? **Tartaglia:** I'm letting him in right now. **Wong:** Yes, I'm here. It's Matt. **Newkirk:** Thank you Matt. **DelaBar:** My issue needs to be in closed session also. We're going to be discussing a possible policy. **Newkirk:** OK. Allene, your live streaming is open. Sharon, yours is open. Is that correct? **Tartaglia:** Yes. **Roy:** Mine is in open, sorry. **Newkirk:** OK. **Anger:** I also have a guest judging motion that we will be presenting during the Judging Program Report by Vicki Nye. **Newkirk:** In closed session or open session? **Anger:** Open. **Newkirk:** OK. Any other changes to our Orders of Business? Any objections to our re-ordered Orders of Business? Hearing no objections, by unanimous consent.

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

Reports of Special (Select or Ad Hoc) Committees

(2) RATIFICATION OF ONLINE MOTIONS.

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
MOTIONS THAT REQUIRE RATIFICATION			
1.	Executive Committee 03.04.2022	Due to the continuance of Omicron in Hong Kong causing extended government reinforced social distancing measures, grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04 to delay the Hong Kong Black Cat Club's show date from April 2, 2022 to a date in June, 2022.	Motion Carried (subject to ratification).
No discussion.			
2.	Anger Currie 03.08.22	Remove the points earned at the Houston Cat Club January 9-10, 2022 show from the record of Tehy Toss Up of Pajeau 0147-02944062, as the kitten was ineligible for entry due to Show Rule 3.11.	Motion Carried (subject to ratification). DeLaBar and Moser voting no. McCullough abstained.
No discussion.			
3.	Executive Committee 03.22.22	For the Micina Cat Fanciers' 6 AB show in Tokyo, Japan on March 26, 2022, grant an exception to Show Rule 9.08.e. and allow the club to have 12 cages per ring if the entry meets or exceeds 150 cats.	Motion Carried (subject to ratification).
No discussion.			
4.	Executive Committee 03.22.22	<p>Grant a show license to Mad Catters Cat Club for a show to be held April 16/17 in Parkville Md. 8 Ring Back to Back (225 Limit) Waiving Late fee due to Show Hall issues.</p> <p>Please allow Mad Catters Cat Club (a southern region club) to relocate their show, April 16/17 2022, 54 miles from Frederick Maryland to Parkville Maryland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 8 Ring Back to Back, 225 o Rationale<> To support our CFA Member Clubs o I have sent a request to nearby regions o Kenny received approvals from all nearby RD's and everyone supported the motion. 	Motion Carried (subject to ratification). Mastin and Calhoun abstained.
<p>Mastin: I understand things happen with show halls, however, I have three questions – Will this create problems or precedent in the future if other clubs want to license shows with less than 30 days to show date? Have we ever licensed a show with less than 30 days? I would be far more comfortable approving a relocation of the show had the show already been licensed. Are there other shows this weekend that require adjoining RD's be contacted in advance due to the location of this show? Currle: Mad Catters has had a Traditional date the third weekend of April for years. They did not license the show in a timely manner for lack of a show hall commitment, thus the reason for this motion. I may be wrong, but I do believe we have already licensed shows within the 30 day period. A traditional show date normally does not have to be approved by adjoining regionals. My view is that it's a</p>			

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
business decision for a member club who has a problem and has asked for help in providing our exhibitors with an exhibition opportunity. Calhoun: Question: Are any of the members of the EC on the slate? Newkirk: did they sign the contract with the new venue? Currle: Not sure Darrell. They are just waiting for approval from CFA. My view is we technically “relicense” any show that deviates from their original application, I will be supportive of circumstances not foreseen by any of our clubs who serve our constituents. Mastin: I want to make sure we are not creating problems in the future (more than what has already been created) and also avoid issues with the rest of the board. I believe there was a show licensed with less than 30 days last year in the late summer early fall. By chance is the producer of this show the same producer of the show that was licensed with less than 30 days the last time? If yes, then the precedent has already been set and maybe it is being taken advantage for the second time in the same show season. Also, does moving the show from Frederick MD to Parkville MD require approval because it’s more than 50 miles? Currle: I am in France. I assume the club has honorable intentions which provides another opportunity for our constituents to show their CFA registered cats.			
5.	Executive Committee	For the China Skyline Feline Fanciers Alliance show March 26, 2022 in Chengdu, China, grant an exception to Show Rule 6.35.c. to allow the club to extend its closing date to 9 PM China time on Thursday, March 24, 2022.	Motion Carried (subject to ratification).
No discussion.			
6.	Executive Committee 03.23.22	Grant a show license to Mad Catters Cat Club for a show to be held April 16/17 in Parkville Md. 8 Ring Back to Back <225 Limit> Waiving Late fee due to Show Hall issues.	Motion Carried (subject to ratification).
See #4.			

Newkirk: We’ll start out with #2, Rachel. **Anger:** Thank you. I have a couple of changes to make to the online motions. #4 and #6 are duplicates, so I would like to strike #6. I also want to apologize for the index. It will be revised. Someone has a code in their report that transferred over, which cancelled out my automatic numbering so I will have to start the document over from scratch. On motion #4 the actual motion that we voted on is slightly different. The motion should say, *Please allow Mad Catters Cat Club (a southern region club) to relocate their show, April 16/17 2022, 54 miles from Frederick Maryland to Parkville Maryland.* We should also note that Mastin and Calhoun abstained on that vote. Those are the only changes to the online motions. **Newkirk:** Any talk about #1? **Mastin:** Rachel, #4 as it is listed on the ratification of online motions, that is the motion that Kathy Calhoun and I abstained, and then Kenny presented the motion that you just read to the board. I believe the Executive Committee all voted in favor of that. There was some discussion prior to it, leading to the Executive Committee voting in favor. Kenny, correct me if I am wrong, I believe you confirmed with all the adjoining regional directors and they approved your request. **Currle:** That is correct, Rich. **Newkirk:** Annette, I think you and Mark made comments when this got posted to the board list. Do you have any comments now? Annette? **Wilson:** I don’t have any comments. It passed and I moved on. **Newkirk:** OK, alright. Any issues with 2 or 3? No, OK. Do you want to ratify these en masse? **Anger:** That’s my motion, if you can hear me over the lawn mower noise. **Currle:** Kenny will second. **Newkirk:** Thank you. Is there any objection to the ratification of these 5 motions? Seeing no objection, by unanimous consent they are ratified.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

(3) **JUDGING PROGRAM REPORT.**

Chair: *Rachel Anger*

Subcommittees and Subchairs

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

Newkirk: Move on to #3 Rachel. **Anger:** Thank you. I'm trying to keep myself muted, to cut down on all the background noise. If others could do the same, that would be awesome. Next is the Judging Program Report. The first report that you see is the Associate Judge Subcommittee. I would like to make a standing motion for approval of any of the Judging Program motions, both open and closed session. **Newkirk:** Anybody want to make a standing second? **Currle:** Kenny will make a standing second. **Newkirk:** Thank you Kenny.

CFA Associate Judge Subcommittee

Chair: *Anne Mathis*
Coaches: *Jacqui Bennett, Chloe Chung, Pam DelaBar, Hope Gonano, Barbara Jaeger, Anne Mathis, Teresa Sweeney, Liz Watson, Russell Webb, Bob Zenda*

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

1. *The Coaches have been reviewing handling video segments sent to them, and feel they are all ready to advance to Associate Judge. We would ask this be done in closed session.*
2. *The CFA Associate Program Guidelines are part of this report, presented for approval, so they may be added to the CFA Judging Program Rules in October.*

Current Happenings of Committee:

The T2 China Associate Program will conclude when they are advanced. Evaluations should be submitted by the clubs.

Future Projections for Committee:

If the CFA Board feels there needs to be another round of the Associate Program, plans will be made to publicize this, so applications can be submitted.

DelaBar: Back under the Associate Program, there was an item stating if we should continue the program, flipping through there very quickly. I would like to be able to bring a motion to the board at our next meeting to have the Associate Program for Europe. I have been asking for that I think for about the time we started the Associate Program. We need to get it off the ground. We've just got to do it. Such situations have cut us out of four of our judges that we could get from the Approved Guest Judge list. We're hurting and we need to address it now, actually, but I didn't have a chance to write up a motion before this board meeting. I want to bring that up later. **Anger:** I know Pam has been crazy busy with some other hot issues, but the Region 9 Associate Judge proposal, I think it was left where you and Anne were going to work together on that and bring something forward. I believe Anne was waiting for that. **Currle:** I do know that Anne is somewhat supportive of that. Region 9 has needed a little bit of special treatment for a while. It's a fantastic area and they do need some judges. They have challenges for many different reasons, as well as the same here in the U.S. Pam, I'll be over there for the next couple weeks. Maybe we'll have a chance to talk and I'll help you with whatever I can move this forward. **DelaBar:** I will see you Friday, Kenny. **Currle:** I would like to personally thank you on behalf of all my constituents here in the Southern Region for the work you and Peter and Charlene Campbell and the BAOS [*sic*, BAP] have done for our friends in Ukraine. So, thanks again. **Newkirk:** We all thank you Pam for that. Lots of work.

Board Action Items:

1. *The Associate program asks the board to advance the China T2 Associate trainees to Associate Judges, so that they may begin to judge shows in China.*

Anger: The first motion is, we are asking to advance the China T2 Associate trainees to Associate Judges, and that will be dealt with in Executive Session.

China Associate Judge T2 Trainees: *The following individuals are presented to the Board for advancement:*

Advance to Associate Judge:

Longhair:

Name	Vote	# Voting	# Votes Need
Tan Hua Charcial	18 yes	18	13
<i>Chengdu, China</i>	<i>Tan, who breeds and shows Persians, showed us thorough examination of the cats he presented. His use of standard terms was good throughout his presentations, and his finals were well presented. He presented an American Curl, Exotic, Maine Coon, and Persians.</i>		
Jade Liu	18 yes	18	13
<i>Shenyang, China</i>	<i>Jade, who breeds and shows Exotics and Persians, had very nice use of standard terms when she presented her finals. Her English is excellent. The time she took to assess the cats was appropriate. She looks professional and confident behind the table. She presented us with Ragdoll, Exotic, and Persian.</i>		
Shazhao (Wasabi) Luo	18 yes	18	13
<i>Jinhua, China</i>	<i>Wasabi, who breeds and shows Ragdolls, improved every time with her time with the cats on the table, and also with the thoroughness of examination. We had her submit some extra segments with the Persian and Exotics, as the judges were concerned about how close she got her face to the cats on the table, and she showed nice improvement with those additional segments. She presented Ragdoll, Exotic, and Persians.</i>		
Angel Sun	18 yes	18	13
<i>Shenzhen, China</i>	<i>Angel, who breeds and shows Persians, improved with each session with her use of terms from the standard. Her timing on the table was good, and improved with every session. She is gentle with the cats, and controls them well on the table. She presented Persian, Exotic, and Ragdoll.</i>		
Xiuran (5D) Wang	18 yes	18	13
<i>Beijing, China</i>	<i>5D, who has bred and exhibited Exotic, Persian, and Ragdolls, showed a nice sense of timing with the cats in the table. We questioned his attire in the first week of presentations, and he looked very professional in the other sessions. Among the breeds he presented were Ragdolls, Maine Coon, Exotic, and Persian.</i>		

Shorthair:

Name	Vote	# Voting	# Votes Need
Tao (Tony) Chen	18 yes	18	13
<i>Xi'an, China</i>	<i>Tony, who breeds and shows Scottish Folds, also showed a nice variety of breeds in his presentations, including Devon Rex, Cornish Rex, British Shorthair, Russian Blue, Abyssinian, and Scottish Fold. He does a nice job of using words from the standard in his final presentations. He has a gentle hand with the cats, and they respond well to him.</i>		

<i>Jia (Stella) Lau</i>	<i>18 yes</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Shanghai, China</i>	<i>Stella, who breeds and shows Scottish Folds and British Shorthairs, is also excellent in her English proficiency. She looks professional behind the table, and showed us a nice variety of breeds, including Oriental, British Shorthair, Scottish Fold, American Shorthair, Sphynx, and Devon Rex. Her examination of the cats was very thorough, and her timing improved with every session.</i>		
<i>Xin (Charlene) Jin</i>	<i>18 yes</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Shanghai, China</i>	<i>Charlene, who with her husband, breeds and shows British Shorthairs and Scottish Folds. She shows nice timing and use of standard terms in every session. She looks professional behind the table, and presented an excellent variety of breeds, including British Shorthair, American Shorthair, Devon Rex, Selkirk Rex, Scottish Fold, Scottish Straight Ear, Selkirk Rex, and Abyssinian.</i>		
<i>Kong Demao</i>	<i>18 yes</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Chengdu, China</i>	<i>Kong, who breeds and shows Abyssinians, has a very gentle touch with the cats, and they respond well to him. His timing is good, and he is professional in dress and behavior behind the table. He presents finals with excellent use of the standard terms. He handled Abyssinian, Cornish Rex, Selkirk Rex, Oriental Shorthair, and Scottish Fold.</i>		
<i>Daniel Wu</i>	<i>18 yes</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Shanghai, China</i>	<i>Daniel, who breeds and shows British Shorthairs, had a good pace in his presentation. His confidence improved each time he sent us video segments. He looked professional behind the table, and improved with his use of terms from the standard with each week. He showed us British Shorthair, Scottish Fold, American Shorthair, Sphynx, and Devon Rex.</i>		
<i>BoBo Xiaoxia</i>	<i>18 yes</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Taiyuan, China</i>	<i>BoBo, who breeds and shows Sphynx, showed us a nice variety of breeds in her presentations, including Bengal, Abyssinian, American Shorthair, British Shorthair, Devon Rex, Bengal, Scottish Fold, and Sphynx. Her finals presentations were excellent. Her demeanor and appearance behind the table are very professional.</i>		

[From end of meeting] **Anger:** The T2 Judge Advancements were 18 yes.

2. *Two other items involving the Associate judges/trainees will be addressed in closed session.*

Anger: As will #2 that refers to two other items.

3. *Approve the CFA Associate Program Guidelines, as presented.*

Anger: #3 is approval of the CFA Associate Program Guidelines, as presented. We have seen this a few times and hopefully the 3rd or 4th time will be the charm here. I broke it up into more of a table. Each category that a number would be helpful to have has had a number inserted and we hope that it meets with everyone's approval. I have received no feedback since we sent the report out, so I would like to move that we approve the CFA Associate Judging Program Application Requirements as you see presented here. **Morgan:** I would like to thank you Rachel

for putting this together. We asked for more specifics and I am glad to see them here, so many thanks to you and all the Committee for putting it together.

CFA Associate Judging Program Application Requirements

Updated 3/30/22

Application criteria considered in evaluating applicants for acceptance:

<i>Requirement</i>	<i>Number Required</i>
<i>Number of years of breeding</i>	<i>Four years minimum</i>
<i>Exhibiting history</i>	<i>Four years minimum required, with a minimum of two breeds shown in the same specialty</i>
<i>Number of grand champions/grand premiers</i>	<i>Minimum of 5; 3 of which must be bred by the applicant</i>
<i>Number of major awards (RW, DW, NW, BW)</i>	<i>Awards earned by at least two cats, at least one of which is the applicant's breeding</i>
<i>Breeds of experience (showing and/or breeding)</i>	<i>Minimum of 2 in specialty of application</i>
<i>Clerking license required (or pass a basic clerking test); master clerk experience preferred</i>	
<i>Club memberships held</i>	<i>At least 2 years' <u>current</u> club membership required, <u>in good standing</u></i>

Morgan: I have only one suggestion and that would be on club membership. I would like to see it specify they must be an active member in good standing with a minimum number of 2 years. **Anger:** OK. It already says 2 years. What is the exact edit you would like to make? Would you like to add *in good standing*? **Morgan:** Yes. **Anger:** So we will have, *At least 2 years' club membership required, in good standing*. **Morgan:** Right. My concern here is that they could have 2 years of club membership 4 years ago, based off the way it's written. Somehow I wanted to say basically they are currently an active member and have had at least two years' membership. **Newkirk:** Why don't they just put *current* in front of *club membership*? **Morgan:** Perfect. **Newkirk:** Is that alright Rachel? **Anger:** Yes. Do you want to leave in *in good standing*? **Morgan:** I like that, yes. **Anger:** So under *Club memberships held* the requirement will be *At least 2 years' current club membership required, in good standing*. **Newkirk:** Is that OK Melanie? **Morgan:** Good by me.

<i>Show production experience, including at least one letter from a club the applicant belongs to or has worked for</i>	
---	--

<i>Service to CFA</i>	
<i>Attendance at feline topic seminars (feline breeding, health, grooming, BAOS, etc.)</i>	

English speaking ability is required for this program. All materials will be presented in English only.

Newkirk: Any other discussion on the application criteria presented? Any objection, as modified by Melanie? Any objections? Any further discussion on that? Anyone opposed to the edits in the final draft here? Seeing no objections, by unanimous consent this proposal is adopted.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Anger: Thank you very much everyone.

Time Frame:

Immediate advancement of the T2 China Associates would be ideal, as the demand for additional judges in China has been high for quite some time.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

An update on the future plans of the committee will be presented, as well as progress of the T2 China Associates, assuming they will be advanced at this meeting.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Anne Mathis, Subcommittee Chair*

Applicants Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chair: Kathi Hoos

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Two trainees have utilized the optional Breed Handling Experience, in lieu of Cattery Visits. Two shows had large numbers of Cornish and Devon Rex present. Nancy Dodds offered to serve as a mentor to review the standard, help compare and contrast the breed exhibits and review handling. This made the experience for both trainees a valuable educational experience. We hope that, while this Experience can be completed on the trainees own, mentors will step up and help to make it a very educational experience.

Current Happenings of Committee:

No new applications have been submitted

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Hopefully there will be applications for review.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Kathi Hoos, Subcommittee Chair*

Anger: Next is our Applications Subcommittee report. You see that no applications have been received, so we will move on.

CFA Trainee, Advancing Judges Subcommittee

Chair: *Loretta Baugh*
File Administrators: *Nancy Dodds, Marilee Griswold – US; Pam DelaBar,
Allan Raymond - International, Yaeko Takano – Japan*

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Continue to monitor and support advancing judges as they complete more assignments.

Continue to collect ideas and suggestions for a new Questions and Answers for Trainees Manual.

Current Happenings of Committee:

- 1. Held an online vote with the JPC Chair, all Sub-Committee Chairs, and the Applications Administrator to discuss and vote on advancement for Jennifer Reding.*
- 2. Present advancing judge for advancement to Approval Pending LH (2nd Specialty).*

Future Projections for Committee:

- 1. Continue to work with Central Office as FileVista is made safer, easier to use.*
- 2. Continue monitoring progress of all trainees and advancing judges.*
- 3. Continue working on Manual for Trainees. A copy of a previous Judging Manual was received from JPC Chair, Rachel Anger. Discussion on the update of that manual vs creating a new one has been put on hold until after the June Annual meeting.*

Board Action Item:

Advancement: *The following individual is presented to the Board for advancement:*

Advance to Approval Pending:

Jennifer Reding (LH – 2nd Specialty) 18 yes

[From end of meeting] **Anger:** Would you like the actual votes? **Newkirk:** Why not?
Anger: Jennifer Reding was 18 yes.

Emeritus Recommendation: *The following individual is presented to the Board for elevation to Emeritus status:*

Carolyn Owen

Granted [Vote sealed]

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Any individuals who are eligible for advancement will be presented

*Respectfully Submitted,
Loretta Baugh, Subcommittee Chair*

Anger: The Trainee and Advancing Judges subcommittee. They give a bit of their history. We do have an action item. Again, it will come up in Executive Session to advance Jennifer Reding to longhair second specialty approval pending.

Approved Judge Administrator Report

Sub-Committee Chair: Vicki Nye

Current Happenings of Committee:

Subsequent to the February 6, 2022 board action which granted Judging Program Chair Rachel Anger authority to approve Leaves of Absence, Resignations and Retirements, the below serves to document the most recent actions on the above listed items.

“That leaves of absences, retirements and resignations be reviewed and approved by the Judging Program Chair. Once approved, the Judging Program Chair will inform the board by including the approval in its next board report.”

Leave of Absence:

Jeri Zottoli – request as of 3/9/2022. LOA 4/1/2022-6/30/2022.

Ellyn Honey – was approved LOA 11/22/2021 through 5/22/2022. I have received Physicians signed Release to return to judging as of 4/12/2022.

Anger: Then, moving on to the Approved Judge Administrator report. [Transcript returns to Associate Judge Program report] Our next report is Vicki Nye’s report. This is the approved judges. **Nye:** Hi Rachel. It’s Vicki. I’m on. **Anger:** Great, thank you. **Nye:** Under the Leave of Absences, we have received a request from Jeri Zottoli for a leave of absence from April 1, 2022 to June 30, 2022. Per the February 6th board action which granted Rachel [sic, the Judging Program Committee] authority to handle these and then document it for the board after the fact, that’s the way we have handled this. In addition, Ellyn Honey was originally approved for a

leave of absence to extend to May 22, 2022. I have since received her physician's signed release to return to judging as of April 12th. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you.

Retirement

Sharon McKeehan-Bounds effective March 7, 2022. Sharon's cattery name was Shabou, breeding Siamese and Colorpoints. Sharon entered the judging program in 1989. Sharon's letter of retirement is as follows.

Dear Vicki and Fellow Judges,

I have struggled with writing this letter for several months. Because of Covid and other personal reasons, I feel it is time for me to step down from the Judging Program and retire.

It has been a fabulous 30+ years of judging with so many of you! You each and every one have not only taught me so much but extended the hand of friendship and fellowship. I feel very privileged to have been able to be associated with you! I have many wonderful memories by which I will remember you!

In parting I would like to leave you with one thought: IT IS ABOUT THE CAT.... not about who finishes first, earliest or has the most shows booked. These precious felines did not ask to be born and thrust into the egocentric world of the Cat Fancy – but here they are – on your table. Be sure you take the time to make every second they are in your ring the best they can have! Act silly, look stupid, cuddle the scared and encourage the uncertain. But most of all, have fun!

I wish all of you the very best that life will bring.

Nye: Under Retirements, we received a retirement letter from Sharon McKeehan-Bounds. I have copied the letter here with her permission. Sharon's cattery name was Shabou and Sharon had been in the Judging Program for 33 years, I believe. Her retirement was received and accepted by us via email.

Notice of retired judges now deceased:

The Judging Program was saddened to learn that Mrs. Jody Garrison-Judge Emeritus (retired 4/30/2016), passed away March 28, 2022.

Nye: Additionally we received news that, sadly, Jody Garrison had passed away. Jody retired from judging April 30, 2016 and was granted the title of Judge Emeritus. She passed away on March 28, 2022.

Guest Judging Administrator Report

Sub-Committee Chair: Vicki Nye

A club in Thailand wants to put on a show April 23, 2022, in Bangkok using Guest Judge Janis Christison from Australia. This request to have a guest judge approved is less than 60 days per show rule 3.02 c, and would require Board approval. I have a guest judge resume for Janis and as Guest Judge Administrator, I approve Janis Christison to judge for Central Breed Cat Club, pending board approval of waiving the 60 day request requirement.

Club is trying to fill their other listed TBA with 2 Associate Judges LH and SH.

Motion: *Grant an exception to Show Rule 3.02.c. and allow Central Breed Cat Club to hire guest judge Janis Christison to judge its show April 23, 2022 in Bangkok, Thailand (ID-Other).*

Nye: Additionally, a change to this, we have the one that Rachel was mentioning as additional business for the Guest Judging Program, the club that has been very active in Thailand putting on shows virtually every other weekend, Central Breed Cat Club, they are trying to put on a show on the 23rd and 24th of this year. I believe they already have sponsorship. The people that are sponsoring these shows or the club is fairly new. They're not that up on show rules. They reached out to a judge that was not on the Tier I list in Australia, so apparently Australia is now able to fly to Thailand, and engaged a guest judge and also paid for their air fare. So, our motion – Allene, do you have that one up and available? **Tartaglia:** Yes, just give me one second. They already have Allan Raymond and Douglas. The guest judge has judged for CFA before, Janice Christison. I do have her resume. They also have an additional TBA that they are trying to fill with associate judges but they are having difficulty with that. They are still working on the other judge, so be alert that there may be another motion for another guest judge. I'm not sure how they're going to fill that. The current motion, however, is due to the fact that they are trying to fill this show with a guest judge less than 60 days, which is what Show Rule 3.02.c. requires, so the motion is [reads]. **Newkirk:** Any discussion on that? I know Janice. She is an excellent judge. I see Rachel shaking her head, and Pam. Any objections to setting aside this show rule to allow this to happen? Seeing no objections, by unanimous consent, Janice Christison will be able to judge April 23 in Bangkok.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Nye: Thank you very much to the board. I will convey that information to the club and also to Lisa, who will be fielding that show license. That's all for me. **Newkirk:** Thank you Vicki. Appreciate it.

CFA Judges to Judge non-CFA International or Domestic Assignments:

<i>Judge</i>	<i>Assn</i>	<i>Sponsor</i>	<i>City/Country</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Date Approved</i>
<i>Myers, Douglas</i>	<i>Fun Show</i>	<i>Central Breed Cat Club</i>	<i>Bangkok Thailand</i>	<i>03/06/22</i>	<i>2/4/22</i>
<i>Raymond, Allan</i>	<i>Fun Show</i>	<i>Central Breed Cat Club</i>	<i>Bangkok, Thailand</i>	<i>03/06/22</i>	<i>2/4/22</i>
<i>Rumyhnsteva, Nadejda</i>	<i>Fun Show</i>	<i>Siam Cat Fanciers</i>	<i>Nonthaburi, Thailand</i>	<i>03/24/22</i>	<i>3/18/22</i>
<i>Rumyhnsteva, Nadejda</i>	<i>Grooming Seminar</i>	<i>Central Breed Cat Club</i>	<i>Bangkok, Thailand</i>	<i>03/29/22</i>	<i>3/21/22</i>
<i>U'Ren, Rod</i>	<i>CCCA</i>	<i>Feline Control Council Victoria Inc</i>	<i>Melbourne Australia</i>	<i>05/01/22</i>	<i>3/02/22</i>
<i>DelaBar, Pam</i>	<i>WOC</i>	<i>Malta Royal Cat Society</i>	<i>Malta</i>	<i>05/14/22</i>	<i>2/20/22</i>
<i>Raymond, Allan</i>	<i>Fun Show</i>	<i>Borneo Cat Fanciers</i>	<i>Jakarta, Indonesia</i>	<i>06/16/22</i>	<i>3/24/22</i>

<i>Myers, Douglas</i>	<i>Fun Show</i>	<i>Borneo Cat Fanciers</i>	<i>Jakarta, Indonesia</i>	<i>06/19/22</i>	<i>3/24/22</i>
<i>Baugh, Loretta</i>	<i>CCA</i>	<i>Hamilton CC</i>	<i>Hamilton Ontario Canada</i>	<i>07/31/22</i>	<i>3/12/22</i>
<i>Rivard, Lorraine</i>	<i>CCA</i>	<i>Ottawa Valley Cat Club</i>	<i>Ottawa, Canada</i>	<i>09/24/22</i>	<i>3/22/22</i>
<i>Griswold, Marilee</i>	<i>AFeF</i>	<i>AFEF</i>	<i>Talk on Breeding Folds</i>		<i>2/5/2022</i>

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

<i>Judge</i>	<i>Assn</i>	<i>CFA Show</i>	<i>City/Country</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Date Approved or GJ Status</i>
<i>Nazarova, Anna</i>	<i>WCF</i>	<i>Chatte Noir</i>	<i>Moscow, Russia</i>	<i>1/15/22</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
<i>Balciuniene, Inga</i>	<i>WCF</i>	<i>Club Felino Espanol</i>	<i>Bilbao, Spain</i>	<i>2/19/22</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
<i>Grebneva, Olga</i>	<i>RUI</i>	<i>Central Breed Cat Club</i>	<i>Bangkok, Thailand</i>	<i>2/26/22</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
<i>Korotonozhkina, Olga</i>	<i>RUI</i>	<i>Central Breed Cat Club</i>	<i>Bangkok, Thailand</i>	<i>2/26/22</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
<i>Korotonozhkina, Olga</i>	<i>RUI</i>	<i>Cat-H-Art</i>	<i>Perpignan, France</i>	<i>3/5/22</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
<i>Grebneva, Olga</i>	<i>RUI</i>	<i>Cat-H-Art</i>	<i>Perpignan, France</i>	<i>3/5/22</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
<i>Du Plessis, Kaai</i>	<i>WCF</i>	<i>Siam Cat Fanciers</i>	<i>Nonthaburi, Thailand</i>	<i>3/26/22</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
<i>Balciuniene, Inga</i>	<i>WCF</i>	<i>44 Gatti Cat Club</i>	<i>Chiuduno, Italy</i>	<i>4/10/22</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
<i>Counasse, Daniel</i>	<i>WCF</i>	<i>44 Gatti Cat Club</i>	<i>Chiuduno, Italy</i>	<i>4/10/22</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
<i>Balciuniene, Inga</i>	<i>WCF</i>	<i>Khao Manee Cat Club</i>	<i>Orange, France</i>	<i>4/16/22</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
<i>Grebneva, Olga</i>	<i>RUI</i>	<i>Cat-H-Art</i>	<i>Orange, France</i>	<i>4/17/22</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
<i>Korotonozhkina, Olga</i>	<i>RUI</i>	<i>Cat-H-Art</i>	<i>Orange, France</i>	<i>4/17/22</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
<i>Counasse, Daniel</i>	<i>WCF</i>	<i>Felinus International CC</i>	<i>Houthalen-Helchteren, Belgium</i>	<i>4/23/22</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
<i>Grebneva, Olga</i>	<i>RUI</i>	<i>Felinus International CC</i>	<i>Houthalen-Helchteren, Belgium</i>	<i>4/23/22</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>
<i>Korotonozhkina, Olga</i>	<i>RUI</i>	<i>Felinus International CC</i>	<i>Houthalen-Helchteren, Belgium</i>	<i>4/23/22</i>	<i>Tier 1</i>

Nye: Moving on to the Guest Judge Administrator report, the first section is relatively accurate. The CFA judges requesting permission to judge for other associations. The second section, however, has been a moving target. That's due to the fact that we have three upcoming shows in Europe April 9/10, April 16/17 and April 23/24. All three shows had Olga Grebneva and Olga Korotonozhkina judging. Neither one is able to leave the Ukraine at this time. They are trying to all replace judges. Italy was able to replace with Inga Balciuniene, who is a Tier I approved guest judge, and I believe Daniel Counasse, who is also a Tier I. Right now we are trying to assist Cat-H-Art in replacing their two judges and I sent emails back and forth with Frederic Goedert on that. I understand that the last show of the season, Felinus International, has replaced Olga and Olga with Inga and Peter himself.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Vicki Nye, Judging Program Committee
Guest Judging Program*

Breed Awareness and Orientation School Subcommittee

Subcommittee Co-Chairs: Barbara Jaeger, Loretta Baugh

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

We have been reviewing information available for the BAOS

Current Happenings of Committee:

Since the International Show for 2022 was cancelled, we will be planning on having one or two on-line Zoom Breed Awareness and Orientation Schools in 2022. Each of the COVID Zoom BAOS's have made money, all be it not a large amount.

Future Projections for Committee:

Projected on-line BAOS for the Spring will be either the last weekend of May or the first weekend in June.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Board Report for current activities with the BAOS

*Respectfully Submitted,
Barbara Jaeger, Subcommittee Co-Chair
Loretta Baugh, Subcommittee Co-Chair*

Newkirk: Rachel, back to you. **Anger:** We wrap up our report with a summary by the Breed Awareness and Orientation School Subcommittee. Are there any questions on any sections of the Judging Program Report – Open Session? Great, thank you everybody. **Newkirk:** Thank you very much, Rachel. Excellent report.

[**Secretary's Note:** In an executive session action, the following motion **Carried:** *Accept the application by Felidae e.V. for guest judge privileges.*]

(4) **CENTRAL OFFICE REPORT.**

Submitted by: Allene Tartaglia, Executive Director

Annual Meetings – 2026 & 2027

We are scheduling site visits for the 2026 and 2027 annual meetings (North Atlantic and Northwest regions) and hope to have at least one contract, if not both, secured by the October board meeting. Site visits for the 2028 annual meeting will follow and we will be back on track in presenting a location for the 2028 annual at the 2023 annual (5 years in advance).

Newkirk: Let's move on to Central Office Report. Allene? **Tartaglia:** The first one is just simply information that we're getting started on site visits for the two annual meetings, 2026 and 2027. I'll have more information on that later.

Cat Names – “Champ”

CFA's Rules for Registration, Section 4-Cat Names, reads in part that “The words “Champion” or “Champ” may not be used in a cat's name.” Inadvertently, a cat was registered with the word “Champ” as part of its name: (cattery name) A New Champ. This came to our attention when the cat achieved the Champion title. Certainly, the word “Champion” should not be part of a cat's name, however, should we continue to disallow the word “Champ” too?

Board Action Item: motion to allow the use of the word “Champ” in a cat's name.

Tartaglia: I do have two motions if you desire. The first one is regarding the use of the word “Champ” in a cat's name. It's explained here, but the Rules of Registration indicate that “Champion” nor “Champ” should be used in a cat's name. We inadvertently used the word “Champ” in a cat's name and I am wondering, is the word “Champ” a problem in a cat's name? I don't think it is, but I'm just providing that to you to see what you thought. There was a board action item if you want to consider it. **Morgan:** While I'm not sure that I don't agree with you, Allene, that it may not be a problem, if the Rules of Registration specify that the word “Champ” isn't to be used, I see no reason to change that just because it was inadvertently used. So, two wrongs don't make a right. Based off that, I'm not supporting it. **Tartaglia:** It wasn't my intent to just have this rule for this particular purpose. It just simply brought it to our attention, the rule that's there. We were discussing it in the office and thought, well, we're not even sure why it was ever there. **Hannon:** I agree, we should not be using “Champ”. I don't support this. **Newkirk:** So Allene, it fails for lack of a motion. **Tartaglia:** OK.

No Action.

Election Ballot Tallying – Amendment to By-Laws and Rationale

The following amendment to CFA's Bylaws was approved at the February 2022 board meeting. This change will allow the electronic tallying of ballots cast using the online system. Nearly 100% of the votes are cast electronically. The rationale to accompany the amendment is provided below for your review and approval.

Article VI – Officers and Directors, Section 2 - Elections

e. Election Procedure. On or before April 25 of each election year, the Central Office shall send by electronic means or mail to all member clubs in good standing and eligible to vote, ballots listing all candidates for whom timely declarations were received. Central Office shall establish procedures, subject to approval by the Executive Board of Directors, for optional electronic voting which shall include securing, printing, and appropriately destroying electronic ballots. Returned ballots must be received by the Central Office by June 1 of such year in order to be counted. Ballots returned by mail shall remain sealed until the Annual Meeting, at which time duly appointed inspectors will supervise the opening and counting of the ballots. Electronic ballots may be tabulated electronically or ~~Electronic ballots shall be~~ individually printed by Central Office and brought to the Annual Meeting to be tabulated by the inspectors with the mailed ballots. Ballots that are illegible, incomplete or those containing write-in candidates shall be considered void. Ballots in elections for Directors-at-Large selecting less than five (5) candidates (or less than all declared candidates if fewer than five) shall be considered incomplete. Results shall be announced at the Annual Meeting as soon as the ballots have been tabulated. Ballots shall remain under the control of the inspectors until a motion to destroy the ballots is passed at which time the ballots shall be destroyed under the supervision of the inspectors. No person other than a duly appointed inspector shall have access to the ballots until after they are destroyed. If the duly appointed inspectors are unable to conduct in-person tabulation of ballots, the Board shall establish a procedure to assure ballots are tabulated by a neutral audit firm with results reviewed and approved by a subcommittee appointed by the chair of the Credentials Committee.

RATIONALE: The Virtual Annual Committee recommended electronically tallying ballots as an alternative to the counting of paper ballots done by the appointed Tellers/Credentials Committee. The electronic tallying of ballots is as accurate as a hand count and is instantaneous versus a hand count which typically takes 3-4 hours. This amendment provides the option of an electronic tally and does not remove the ability for a paper ballot count. The passing of this amendment will make it effective for the 2023 Annual. The hand counting of paper ballots will be done for the 2022 Annual and compared to the electronic tally to, once again, confirm the accuracy of an electronic tally.

Board Action Item: *motion to include this board sponsored amendment and rationale to Article VI – Officers and Directors, Section 2 – Elections at the 2022 Annual Meeting.*

Newkirk: Next one? **Tartaglia:** The next one is the amendment to the Bylaws that the board passed at the February meeting. It was to allow electronic tallying of the ballots. That would be an addition to hand counting. It would be a choice of whichever way we wanted to go. That's all that this amendment did. I was supposed to come back with a rationale for the amendment and this is the rationale. It's basically what was presented in February. **Anger:** Rachel moves. **Eigenhauser:** George seconds. **Newkirk:** Any discussion on this amendment to the Bylaws? Any objection? Seeing no objection, by unanimous consent it is approved.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Tartaglia: Thank you. That's all I have. **Newkirk:** Thank you very much, Allene.

*Respectfully submitted,
Allene Tartaglia*

(5) **BUDGET REPORT.**

[Secretary's Note]: This section is merely a place marker. No report is being presented.

Newkirk: Let's go on to the Budget Report. Kathy Calhoun, you are recognized.

Calhoun: The details of the Budget Report will be in closed session. If we arrive at an agreement on the budget, it will be inserted after it's approved. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you.

[Secretary's Note: In an executive session motion, the 2022-2023 budget was approved, with a net operating budget of a plus \$28,535.84 with a net income of \$114,915.84.]

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

MAY 1, 2021 THROUGH FEBRUARY 28, 2022

Submitted by Kathy Calhoun, CFA Treasurer

Key Financial Indicators

Balance Sheet

Cash reserves, excluding checking, have increased 13.39% over prior year.

Profit & Loss Analysis

Total registration, which includes litter registration and individual registration, contributed \$886,547 to the bottom line. This represented a -8.0% reduction compared to the same period last year and 100.6% of budget.

	<i>May 2021 - Feb 2022</i>	<i>May 2020 - Feb 2021</i>	<i>Change</i>	<i>% Change</i>
<i>Total Litter Registrations</i>	\$309,339	\$320,278	<i>(\$10,939)</i>	<i>-3.42%</i>
<i>Total Individual Registrations</i>	\$577,208	\$627,370	<i>(\$50,162)</i>	<i>-8.00%</i>
<i>Total Registrations</i>	\$886,547	\$947,648	<i>(\$61,101)</i>	<i>-6.45%</i>

Other Key Indicators: *Additional performance indicators are captured in the following summary.*

	<i>May 2021 - Feb 2022</i>	<i>May 2020 - Feb 2021</i>	<i>Change</i>	<i>% Change</i>
<i>HHP / CCW - \$13</i>	\$7,271	\$5,512	\$1,759	31.92%
<i>Cattery Registration</i>	\$256,131	\$286,690	<i>(\$30,559)</i>	<i>-10.66%</i>
<i>Breed Council Dues</i>	\$26,030	\$40,345	<i>(\$14,315)</i>	<i>-35.48%</i>
<i>Certified Pedigrees</i>	\$137,500	\$114,535	\$22,965	20.05%
<i>Registration via Pedigree - \$40</i>	\$98,139	\$56,742	\$41,397	72.96%
<i>Show License Fees</i>	\$18,875	\$4,725	\$14,150	299.47%
<i>Show Entry Surcharge</i>	\$37,422	\$6,711	\$30,711	457.64%
<i>Show Insurance</i>	\$19,475	\$5,100	\$14,375	281.86%

Categories that continue to exceed prior year include championship confirmation, show license fees, show entry surcharge, and show insurance.

Total Ordinary Income contributed **\$1,818,370** to the bottom line compared to **\$1,718,742** the prior year. This represents a **5.8 %** increase compared to prior year and **110.3%** of budget.

Newkirk: Treasurer’s Report. Go ahead, Kathy. **Calhoun:** OK, thank you. I just wanted to point out a couple things, primarily that registration is down 6.45%. This has been an ongoing trend. The Key Indicators are highlighted. I’m not going to drain that. Allene, if you could continue to scroll to the bottom.

Publications: In both the Almanac and the Yearbook expense categories, contracted labor and salary expense have been moved to Central Office which is consistent with salary management in other similar categories.

Almanac (Cat Talk/Epoints): Cat Talk is showing a net income year-to-date which can be attributed to printing expense timing.

	May 2021 - Feb 2022	May 2020 - Feb 2021	Change	% Change
Income	\$29,233	\$34,000	(\$4,768)	-14.02%
Expenses	\$23,713	\$38,330	(\$14,617)	-38.14%
Net Income	\$5,520	(\$4,330)	\$9,850	227.49%

Yearbook: Income decreased 51.9% primarily due to a reduction in advertising. The production costs of the current edition are less than prior year due to the production of a smaller book.

	May 2021 - Feb 2022	May 2020 - Feb 2021	Change	% Change
Income	\$17,760	\$36,927	(\$19,166)	-51.90%
Expenses	\$6,340	\$43,969	(\$37,629)	-85.58%
Net Income	\$11,421	(\$7,042)	\$18,463	262.18%

Marketing, Central Office and Computer Expense: These three expense categories are performing under budget or slightly above budget.

- **Marketing:** Expenses are 38.4% of budget One of the major categories attributing to this is travel to expos which were delayed to other dates due to the pandemic.
- **Central Office:** Expenses are 106.7% of budget. This is primarily due to the amortization of software, legal fees, and postage.
- **Computer:** Expenses are 71.6% of budget primarily due to a reduction in programming expense.

CFA Programs: Overall CFA programs through February 28 are 77.7% of budget.

Donations to Every Cat, Cat Writers, BAPBR, Regions 1-9, the International, the CFA Foundation and TrapKing Cat Solutions have been dispersed. The donation to TrapKing was a carryover from a virtual event in the prior season.

	May 2021 - Feb 2022	May 2020 - Feb 2021	Change	% Change
Total Income	\$1,877,277	\$1,822,965	\$54,312	2.98%
Total Expenses	\$1,705,259	\$1,590,148	\$115,111	7.24%
Net Operating Income	\$170,794	\$232,816	(\$62,023)	-26.64%
Interest Income	\$6,793	\$8,396	(\$1,603)	-19.09%
Rental Income	\$22,000	\$15,400	\$6,600	42.86%
Unrealized Gain/Loss	(\$48,864)	\$204,854	(\$253,718)	-123.85%
Total Other Income	(\$20,071)	\$228,650	(\$248,721)	-108.78%
Net Other Income	(\$20,071)	\$228,650	(\$248,721)	-108.78%
Net Income	\$150,722	\$461,467	(\$310,744)	-67.34%

Corporate Expense: This category is 89.9% of budget.

Legislative Expense: This category is at 94.4% of budget.

The Bottom Line:

CFA realized a profit of \$150,722 which far exceeds the budgeted amount of \$14,256. That being the case, CFA's income compared to prior year is lower due to market performance.

A critical performance indicator to be mindful of is Net Operating Income. This is simply income less expenses. While still lower than the prior year, CFA performance was strong at \$170,794.

Calhoun: I want to call out that our Net Income is \$150,722. It exceeded the budget. We thought we would be about \$14,000. While that is great, I particularly want to be mindful of this when we talk about the budget. The Net Operating Income is really a critical number. It's a very simple number. It's just income less expenses without all of the rental income and anything from investments. So, that's really an important key point there. So, our Net Operating Income is \$170,794. I just wanted to call attention to that particular line item because we will be revisiting that when we talk about the budget. That's it. **Newkirk:** Any comments? OK, thank you Kathy.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Kathy Calhoun, CFA Treasurer*

(7) **IT REPORT.**

Systems Administrator: James Simbro

Genetics Project: *Testing on the Beta test site is in progress for the phase one launch on eCat. The process integrates nicely with the current process and will be live very soon.*

People Record Management/Clerk License Status Project: *The developers are finalizing the project for our review. The people record management is live on the Beta site for our testing. We will begin testing and review of the clerk side the week of April 11th, 2022.*

Prepare for year-end awards: *Year-end award preview files were sent to the regional directors. Final files will be sent as soon as all shows for the season are received and scored in Central Office. Provided show packages arrive in Central Office by Tuesday April 26th, 2022, all scoring will be completed by Friday the 29th. The week of May 2nd will be used to audit and prepare results, and the Top, Breed and Color Awards will be sent Monday May 9th. The remaining files (Grands, DM's, etc.) will follow later that week.*

*Respectfully Submitted,
James Simbro*

Newkirk: James Simbro, you are recognized for the IT Report. **Simbro:** Good evening. Nothing to add to the report that's already on here. If there's any questions about these items, I will entertain those. **Newkirk:** Anyone have questions for James? No hands up. OK James, thank you very much.

(8) **AWARDS REPORT.**

Committee Chair: Cathy Dunham
List of Committee Members: Cyndy Byrd, Martha Auspitz, Donna Isenberg

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

All plans are moving forward for the Annual banquet. Discussions continue concerning the on stage photos for breed wins. Richard Katris pointed out that people will be expecting their picture to be taken no matter what they are told. He believes that it may be easier to just take quick photos. We will be monitoring the time and talk to Richard as needed during the evening.

The committee and CO worked on a new design for the Star Award and we were able to purchase 150 pins @ \$4.00 each (\$600.00) below the amount requested. A photo of the new pin is below.



Newkirk: Let's move on to Awards. This is Order #8. Cathy Dunham, you are recognized. **Dunham:** Thank you Darrell. As you can see, the Committee is continuing to work on planning for the Annual banquet and the honoring of our award winners from the 2019-2020 and the 2021-2022 winners. We also worked with Central Office to redesign the Star Award pin and that is presented there for you to see. We were able to purchase 150 pins for \$600, which was below our budget request, so that was good news.

Current Happenings of Committee:

The committee met and discussed proposed changes to the Star Award criteria and guidelines. The following is what the committee is suggesting. All text that is underlined is new and all text that is a strikethrough is to be removed.

Award Criteria:

The CFA Star award is intended to recognize individuals for outstanding service that benefits and enhances the objectives of CFA. It is impossible to list all ~~of~~ the types of service that would merit consideration for this award, but may include any outstanding work benefiting CFA, public outreach, rescue, fund-raising, donation of professional services, mentoring, promotion of health and welfare of all cats, dedicated service, outstanding service in unique or emergency circumstances, behind-the-scenes support of CFA activities which may go unrecognized, special

leadership of a significant CFA activity, or stand-out service that significantly promotes the objectives of CFA, are just some examples of service that may be recognized by a Star Award.

Award Guidelines:

1. All non-employees ~~individuals~~ are eligible.
2. An individual cannot nominate themselves.
3. This is not intended to recognize service for which compensation was received at market rates.
4. This is not ~~merely~~ a length of service award, ~~for example, for judges or clerks.~~
5. Individuals may be recognized in more than one year ~~season~~.
6. There is no limit to the number of individuals who may be recognized in a given year.
7. Service at the national/global level is given more consideration than at the regional level, as the Regions already give out service awards of various types.
8. Nominations must be accompanied by a brief rationale (a few sentences) which summarizes the service.
9. Any board member, committee chair, ~~or~~ committee member, or CFA fancier may make nominations to the Awards Committee.
10. The Awards Committee will make recommendations to the board; the board has the final say on recipients.

* * * * *

Usually, a nomination or two is received that doesn't fit the criteria. Here are examples of nominations that were not successful in past years:

CFA employees - there are a couple of CFA employees who are highly visible to the people who can make nominations, and these visible employees often get nominated for star awards. Unfortunately, CFA employees are not eligible. To reward one of the more visible employees is unfair to the others who do a great job but do not catch our eye simply because they interface with us less often. We want to avoid causing tension between employees, so the awards for CFA's paid employees are left to the CO personnel department. When you look at the list of past recipients, you will see a couple of CFA employees on the list. These people did something beyond what they were paid to do.

Regional achievements - every region has an Exhibitor of the Year or similar award. If the service that someone does fits the regional EOY award, it usually does not fit a star award. For example, if someone organized the regional awards banquet, that is a regional service that should be considered for that region's EOY. The star award is for a service to CFA, such as

working on the annual banquet. Every region can present its own version of the star awards, and we encourage that path for regional nominees.

Service already recognized - ~~new board members often suggest~~ nominations for services that have already been recognized with stars previously achieved. ~~which is why I always include the list of past recipients.~~

The committee will be soliciting nominations from board members, committee chairs, committee members, and CFA fanciers.

Future Projections for Committee:

Continue planning the annual awards presentation of the 2019-2020 awards with CO.

Accepting nominations, reviewing, and preparing nominations for board approval.

Board Action Items:

Motion: *Approve the Star Award criteria and guidelines as presented.*

Dunham: Our motion this evening is to accept the guidelines and criteria for the Star Award as presented here. If you have any questions, let me know. **Hannon:** It's my understanding that after the 10th – **Newkirk:** Mark, hang on. Let's get a second before we debate it. **Calhoun:** Kathy seconds. **Newkirk:** Thank you. Go ahead Mark. **Hannon:** The comments that are below item #10 were not originally part of the criteria. They were part of an email that Mary K sent to the board and somehow got added in here, and so I don't think that should be part of the criteria. Everything after #10. **Dunham:** That's fine, Mark. I just put it in here so that everybody knew that that information was there. **Hannon:** Right, but I wanted them to understand what they are voting on is through #10. They are not voting on below that. **Dunham:** Yes, that's fine, and I accept that. **Newkirk:** Thank you Mark for pointing that out. Any other comments? Anybody object to the proposal? Seeing no objection, by unanimous consent it is approved.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Newkirk: Anything else, Cathy? **Dunham:** No, that's it. Thank you very much. **Newkirk:** Thank you very much.

Time Frame:

On going

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Present the Star Award nominations to the board for approval.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Cathy Dunham, Chair*

(9) **LEGAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**

Committee Co-Chairs: Cyndy Byrd
List of Committee Members: George Eigenhauser, Shelly Perkins, Ed Raymond

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Several Event Cooperation Agreements for clubs in China have been completed since fall 2021.

Current Happenings of Committee:

The Legal Advisory Committee has been finalizing Conflict of Interest and Whistler-Blower board policies, proposed bylaws amendments for the Annual Meeting in June 2022 and assisting the Incorporations Committee to finalize their documents.

Newkirk: Next is Legal Advisory. Allene, is Cyndy Byrd in the stands? I don't see Cyndy there, so George, you are on the Committee. Do you want to take this on then?
Eigenhauser: I wasn't prepared to, but any port in a storm. The first item is something that came up during board discussions that our current Bylaws need to have a provision that officers and directors must at all times be members in good standing of the association. We have that as a provision right now that they have to be in good standing in order to run, but then we completely forget about it once they are elected. So, this would put that in the Bylaws and then provide that a director at large can be removed if they are no longer in good standing. The reason it's limited to director at large is because New York law requires that when you have a specific electorate that puts an officer on the board, it takes an action of that specific electorate to remove them. That's why we couldn't apply this to regional directors, but this has gone through the Committee and has been approved by the powers that be.

Board Action Items:

There are three amendments to the CFA Bylaws to be presented at the upcoming Annual Meeting that need the Board's approval. Additionally, the Whistleblower and Conflict of Interest policies, as required by New York law, need the Board's approval.

1. -- **CFA Executive Board**

Resolved: *Amend the CFA Bylaws to add that officers and directors must be members in good standing of the Association to hold office and that loss of "in good standing" shall deem the officer or director resigned immediately.*

ARTICLE VI – OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

Section 1 – Titles

The officers of this Association shall be President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer.

The Directors of this Association shall consist of nine (9) Regional Directors, representing the geographical regions herein specified, provided that not more than one person resident in any one of the Regions specified shall be elected a Regional Director, and five (5) Directors at Large.

No person may hold more than one office.

Officers and Directors must at all times be members in good standing of the Association.

Section 6 – Resignations and Removal of Executive Board

a. Any Officer, Regional Director or Director-at-Large may resign at any time by giving written notice to the President or the Secretary. Such resignation shall take effect at the time specified therein or, if no time be specified, then on delivery. The Executive Board is not required to accept the resignation for the resignation to take effect. An Officer, Regional Director or Director-at-Large shall be deemed to have resigned if they are no longer a member in good standing of the Association with such resignation taking effect immediately when the individual is deemed to not be a member in good standing by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Board of Directors.

Rationale: *To maintain the integrity of the CFA, leaders of the Association, officers and directors must maintain “in good standing” status.*

Eigenhauser: I move that we submit this as a board amendment to the Bylaws. **Mastin:** Rich will second. **Newkirk:** Thank you Rich. Any questions? **Currle:** I am somewhat for and against it. I’m torn in the middle as far as this is concerned, depending upon the make-up of the board and the situation that may arise. I understand completely based on past experience why this has come up but again I think that within the walls of our country, it’s very important that our electorate have a voice, so I’m going to have to at least abstain from moving forward to support this. **Eigenhauser:** Kenny, can I just say one thing in response to that? **Currle:** Sure. **Eigenhauser:** We can’t adopt this today. All we can do is send this to the electorate and see if this is what they want. **Currle:** No, I don’t have a problem with it, but I’m just expressing my opposition at this point, depending upon the discussion that’s going to follow. I understand what you’re saying, George. **Newkirk:** Anyone else? Alright, since I know there’s going to be an abstain, I’ll call for the vote. All those in favor raise your hands.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Carried.** McCullough and Currle abstained.

Newkirk: OK, the yes votes are Carol Krzanowski, Melanie Morgan, Mark Hannon, George Eigenhauser, Kathy Calhoun, Pam DelaBar, Annette Wilson, Cathy Dunham, Rachel Anger, John Colilla, Rich Mastin, Howard Webster, Sharon Roy, Pam Moser, Hayata-san. OK, if you will take your hands down. Annette, did I call you? **Anger:** You did. **Newkirk:** I did? OK, alright. So if you’re a no vote raise your hand. No no votes. Abstentions? Steve McCullough and Kenny Currle. Rachel, you can announce the vote when you have it tabulated. **Anger:** That’s 15 yes votes, zero no votes, 2 abstentions. **Newkirk:** OK, so the motion is agreed to.

2. - *CFA Executive Board*

Resolved: Amend the CFA Bylaws to clarify that regional directors may only be removed from office by voting member clubs in the region that elected the regional director.

ARTICLE VI – OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

Section 6 – Resignations and Removal of Executive Board

Regional Director or Director-at-Large may be removed with cause by vote of the member clubs, or by two-thirds (2/3) vote of the entire Executive Board. “Cause” shall include, but not be limited to, the following: (1) failure to attend three consecutive Board meetings; (2) failure to attend four Board meetings during the course of the year; (3) violating policies and procedures of the Association; or (4) engaging in conduct detrimental to the best interests of the Association.

a. Any Officer may only be removed by vote of the voting member clubs with cause; provided that an Officer may be suspended from performing the Officer’s duties by the Executive Board. “Cause” shall be defined as set forth in Section 6(b) above.

b. Any Regional Director may only be removed by vote of the voting member clubs in the Region who elected the Regional Director with cause. “Cause” shall be defined as set forth in Section 6(b) above.

Rationale: *Regional directors are voted into office by their regional clubs. New York law requires that only the body that elected the director may remove the director.*

Newkirk: OK George, next? **Eigenhauser:** #2 has to do with the removal of a director at large. As I mentioned earlier, because they have a specific electorate, they can only be removed by that electorate, but our Bylaws don’t make any provision for that. So, this would allow a regional director to be removed, essentially recalled, by a vote held within their own region. I move we adopt it as a board-sponsored resolution at the annual. **Newkirk:** Thank you. I need a second. **Mastin:** Rich will second. **Newkirk:** Thank you Rich. Any discussion?

Moser: George, my question is that on this for regional directors, I mean, I was reading through these and it’s kind of confusing to me because basically New York law states that the regional director can only be removed by the people that put them in office. Now, I don’t know if this is saying that’s what they have to do, because it seems like you are contradicting yourselves in some of these motions. So, I mean, it’s New York law that you can’t be removed. I thought we go by New York law, so how can we make something else up to, you know, mute New York law? **Eigenhauser:** This is in compliance with New York law. The regional director can only be removed by the voting clubs in their region. That’s New York law. That’s why the board can’t remove them – only their region can – and that is what this resolution is to do, is to allow the regions to vote to remove a regional director if they should choose to do so, so that is in compliance with New York law. Directors at large can be removed by the board. Regional directors can only be removed by the region. This would allow them to be removed by the region, although New York law allows regional directors to be removed by the region. Our Bylaws don’t make any kind of provision for it currently. **Moser:** So, what does that mean? I

mean, that's what I mean. I don't understand. You're saying that New York law a regional director can't be removed, but then you say – **Eigenhauser:** Except by vote of the region.

Moser: Right. **Newkirk:** Pam, it's the class of voters that put you there for the regional directors. **Moser:** No, no. I understand that part, Darrell. What I don't understand is that I think you're saying that the board can go ahead and still remove the regional director even though –

Eigenhauser: No. **Newkirk:** No. **Moser:** OK, that's all I'm trying to clear up. **Eigenhauser:** It says, *may only be removed by vote of the voting member clubs in the Region who elected the Regional Director*, so only removed by a vote of the clubs in their region. That's the only way they can be removed. **Currle:** I understand Pam's confusion. Again, I just go back to one simple notion. I don't want a huge power in the hands of so few. People get elected for a reason. Now, if we go with specific reasons, then I will be supportive so I'll be an abstention once again.

Newkirk: Any other comments? Pam, are you finished? You got any more questions?

Moser: No, I'm fine. **Newkirk:** OK great, let's vote. All those in favor raise your hand.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Currle and Roy abstained.

Newkirk: The yes votes are Mark Hannon, Pam DelaBar, Melanie Morgan, Carol Krzanowski, George Eigenhauser, Kathy Calhoun, Annette Wilson, Hayata-san, Steve McCullough, Cathy Dunham, John Colilla, Rachel Anger, Pam Moser, Rich Mastin, Howard Webster. If you will take your hands down, any no votes raise your hands. No no votes Rachel. Abstentions? Kenny Currle and Sharon Roy. You can announce the vote, Rachel. **Anger:** That's 15 yes, zero no, 2 abstentions. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you. The motion is agreed to.

[From item #3 discussion] **McCullough:** I have a question about the second one where it says, *shall be defined as set forth in Section 6(b) above*. Where is 6(b)? **Eigenhauser:** I think Lorraine Shelton mentioned that in the chat and I would like to go back to that one after we finish #3. **McCullough:** OK, thanks.

Newkirk: Go ahead George. **Eigenhauser:** I would like to go back to #2. As was pointed out, it makes a reference to a Section 6(b) above. It is 6(b), so it's kind of a circular reference. I would just take out *in Section 6(b)*. Just say, *as set forth above*, because it refers to the un-numbered paragraph ahead of it that says, *(1) failure to attend three consecutive Board meetings; (2) failure to attend four Board meetings during the course of the year; (3) violating policies and procedures of the Association; or (4) engaging in conduct detrimental to the best interests of the Association*. I think there should be a reference to that un-numbered paragraph above, so rather than saying *in Section 6(b) above*, just say *as set forth above*. **Newkirk:** Since we passed the motion, somebody want to make a motion to reconsider? **Eigenhauser:** I'll move we reconsider. **Mastin:** Rich will second. **Newkirk:** Thank you Rich. OK, so it's back now open so you can amend what we've got on the table.

Eigenhauser: I would like to remove at the end of paragraph (a) where it says *as set forth in Section 6(b) above*. I would rather say *as set forth above* and remove *in Section 6(b)*.

Mastin: Rich will second. **Anger:** We need to vote on the motion to reconsider, I believe.

Newkirk: Alright, thank you. **Perkins:** I was going to say, you need to vote on the motion to reconsider, but also I believe that it references *Section 6(b) above* in both paragraph (a) and (b), and so I'm hoping that motion, once it's reconsidered, then the motion would be to say *as set*

forth above in both in both paragraph (a) and (b). **Newkirk:** How about, Allene, if you scroll down so we can see what we're voting on? Thank you, (a) and (b) both have 6(b). **Eigenhauser:** Let's reconsider first before we decide – **Newkirk:** OK, that's fine. Let's vote. Anybody object to the reconsideration? Seeing no objections, the reconsideration motion is approved.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Newkirk: Alright now, what do we want to change? **Eigenhauser:** Take out *in Sections 6(b) above* and we'll change it just to *as set forth above* in both (a) and (b). **Mastin:** Rich will second. **Newkirk:** Thank you. Shelly, does that meet your specifications? **Perkins:** I just wanted to say, you still have to pass the change that's underlined, as well, because you are reconsidering. So, that motion is gone. You undid the vote because you are reconsidering, so what you need to say is, the motion would be to pass (b) except change that section like he just said in both (a) and (b). **Eigenhauser:** Then that's my motion. **Newkirk:** Well, we're doing an amendment. **Perkins:** I thought he said reconsideration. I'm sorry. **Newkirk:** The reconsideration was by unanimous consent, so now we're amending. Once the amendment is done, then we'll vote on the motion. **Perkins:** OK. So, I'm just saying that the motion to amend should include all the changes, which include voting on (b) again. **Newkirk:** Yes, exactly, (a) and (b). **Eigenhauser:** The amendment to the motion is only to those two parts of the motion, but when we vote on the main motion it will be to add the section that's underscored, because that's the main motion. **Newkirk:** Yes. So George, you made the amendment and I think Rich seconded. Is that correct? **Mastin:** Correct. **Newkirk:** Alright. Any objection to the amendment? Seeing no objections, the amendment is adopted by unanimous consent.

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

Newkirk: Now we have an amended main motion that strikes out *in Section 6(b) above* in (a) and strikes out *in Section 6(b) above* in (b); that being the heart of the issue here, OK? So, I think it was George and Rich who made the motion originally. **Mastin:** That's correct. **Newkirk:** OK. Alright, good deal. Any discussion now? Everybody know where we're at and what we're voting on? Any objection to the amended main motion? **Currle:** Abstain. **Newkirk:** Alright, all those in favor raise your hand.

Newkirk called the [amended main] motion. **Motion Carried.** Currle abstained.

Newkirk: The yes votes are Melanie Morgan, George Eigenhauser, Kathy Calhoun, Steve McCullough, Carol Krzanowski, Mark Hannon, John Colilla, Pam Moser, Pam DelaBar, Rich Mastin, Annette Wilson, Cathy Dunham, Hayata-san, Rachel Anger, Howard Webster, Sharon Roy. If you will take your hands down, are there any no votes? Abstentions? Kenny Currle. Alright Rachel, you can announce the vote. **Anger:** Thank you. That's 16 yes votes, zero no votes, 1 abstention. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you very much.

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

3. - *CFA Executive Board*

ARTICLE VII – EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETINGS AND VOTING

2 - Quorum

Resolved: Amend the CFA Bylaws to correct a reference to a section which no longer exists.

a. The presence of ten (10) members of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. A majority of the Executive Board members present, whether or not a quorum is present, may adjourn any meeting to another time and place provided that notice is provided in accordance with Section ~~1(b)~~ 2 above.

Rationale: In updating the CFA Bylaws a dead-end reference was overlooked. This house-keeping resolution corrects that error.

Newkirk: Let's go on to #3. **Eigenhauser:** #3 is housekeeping. When we redid the Bylaws before, basically the section on quorum moved. So, it makes a reference to a section 1(b). That should be a reference to Section 2. I move we adopt that. **Mastin:** Rich will second. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you Rich. Kenny, do you have any comments? **DelaBar:** Second sentence where it says, *A majority of the Executive Board members pre-sent*, it should read present, not pre-sent. **Newkirk:** Thank you for catching that, Pam. **DelaBar:** I'm surprised. **Newkirk:** Lack of sleep, hu? Alright, any other comments? Any objections? **Eigenhauser:** As amended. **Newkirk:** As amended, thank you George. Seeing no objections, by unanimous consent it is adopted.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

The Board needs to adopt Conflict of Interest and Whistle-blower policies to bring the Association into compliance with New York Not-for-Profit Corporation Law. Here are the proposed policies for the Board's vote:

4.

WHISTLE-BLOWER/CODE OF CONDUCT POLICY

The New York State Not-for-Profit Corporation Law requires certain nonprofit corporations to adopt policies on internal reporting mechanisms. The Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. (the "Association") has adopted this Whistle-Blower/Code of Conduct Policy to satisfy New York State requirements.

Whistle-Blower/Code of Conduct Policy

In keeping with the policy of maintaining the highest standards of conduct and ethics, the Association will investigate any (a) suspected fraudulent or dishonest use or misuse of the Association's resources or property; or (b) suspected violation of corporate policy by staff, board members, consultants, or volunteers. The Association is committed to maintaining the highest standards of conduct and ethical behavior and promotes a working environment that values respect, fairness, and integrity. All staff, board members, and volunteers shall act with

honesty, integrity and openness, and shall comply with all corporate policies, in all their dealings as representatives for the organization. Failure to follow these standards will result in disciplinary action including possible termination of employment, dismissal from one's board or volunteer duties, and possible civil or criminal prosecution if warranted.

This policy shall be distributed to all directors, officers, key person, employees, and volunteers who provide substantial services to the Association. Substantial services to the Association is defined as a contribution of 50 hours or more of service to the Association per year. Distribution for these purposes may include posting the policy on the Association's website or at the Association's office in a conspicuous location accessible to employees and volunteers.

Staff, board members, consultants, and volunteers are encouraged to report suspected fraudulent or dishonest conduct (i.e., to act as "whistle-blower"), pursuant to the procedures set forth below.

Reporting

The Association has designated the President to act as administrator of this policy. The President shall report any actions taken pursuant to this policy to the Board of Directors; provided that directors who are employees may not participate in any deliberations or voting relating to the administration of this policy.

A person's concerns about possible fraudulent or dishonest use or misuse of resources or property or violation of corporate policies should be reported to his or her supervisor or, if

suspected by a volunteer, to the staff member or Board member supporting the volunteer's work. If for any reason a person finds it difficult to report his or her concerns to a supervisor or staff member supporting the volunteer's work, the person may report the concerns directly to the President. Alternately, to facilitate reporting of suspected violations where the reporter wishes to remain anonymous, a written statement may be submitted anonymously to one of the individuals listed above.

Definitions

Baseless Allegations: Allegations made with reckless disregard for their truth or falsity. People making such allegations may be subject to disciplinary action by the Association, and/or legal claims by individuals accused of such conduct.

Fraudulent or Dishonest Conduct: A deliberate act or failure to act with the intention of obtaining an unauthorized benefit. Examples of such conduct include, but are not limited to:

- *forgery or alteration of documents;*
- *unauthorized alteration or manipulation of computer files;*
- *fraudulent financial reporting;*
- *pursuit of a benefit or advantage in violation of the Association's Conflict of Interest Policy;*
- *misappropriation or misuse of the Association's resources, such as funds, supplies, or other assets;*

- *authorizing or receiving compensation for goods not received or services not performed; and*
- *authorizing or receiving compensation for hours not worked*

Whistle-Blower: An employee, consultant, or volunteer who, in good faith, informs a supervisor or the President about an activity relating to the Association, which that person believes to be fraudulent, dishonest, or in violation of corporate policy.

Rights and Responsibilities

Supervisors

Supervisors are required to report suspected fraudulent or dishonest conduct or violations of corporate policy to the President.

Reasonable care should be taken in dealing with suspected misconduct to avoid:

- *baseless allegations;*
- *premature notice to persons suspected of misconduct and/or disclosure of suspected misconduct to others not involved with the investigation; and*
- *violations of a person's rights under law.*

Due to the important yet sensitive nature of the suspected violations, effective professional follow-up is critical. Supervisors, while appropriately concerned about "getting to the bottom" of such issues, should not in any circumstances perform any investigative or other follow up step on their own. Accordingly, a supervisor who becomes aware of suspected misconduct:

- *should not contact the person suspected to further investigate the matter or demand restitution; and*
- *should not discuss the case with attorneys, the media, or anyone other than the President.*

Investigation

All relevant matters, including suspected but unproved matters, will be reviewed and analyzed, with documentation of the receipt, retention, investigation, and treatment of the complaint.

Appropriate corrective action will be taken, if necessary, and findings will be communicated back to the reporting person and his or her supervisor. Investigations may warrant investigation by an independent person such as auditors and/or attorneys.

An individual subject to a complaint under this policy shall not be present at or participate in any deliberations or vote on any matter relating to such complaint. However, the Board of Directors may request that the individual present information or answer questions prior to deliberations or vote on the matter.

Whistle-Blower Protection

The Association will protect whistle-blowers as defined below.

- *The Association will use its best efforts to protect whistle-blowers against intimidation, harassment, discrimination, or other retaliation. In the case of whistle-blowers who are employees, the Association will use its best efforts to protect such persons from adverse employment consequences in connection with whistle-blowing complaints. Whistle-blowing complaints will be handled with sensitivity, discretion, and confidentiality to the extent allowed by the circumstances and the law. Generally this means that whistle-blower complaints will only be shared with those who have a need to know so that the Association can conduct an effective investigation, determine what action to take based on the results of any such investigation, and in appropriate cases, with law enforcement personnel. (Should disciplinary or legal action be taken against a person or persons as a result of a whistle-blower complaint, such persons may also have the right to know the identity of the whistle-blower.)*
- *Employees, consultants, and volunteers of the Association may not retaliate against a whistle-blower for informing management about an activity that that person believes to be fraudulent or dishonest with the intent or effect of adversely affecting the terms or conditions of the whistle-blower's employment, including but not limited to, threats of physical harm, loss of job, punitive work assignments, or impact on salary or fees. Whistle-blowers who believe that they have been retaliated against may file a written complaint with [the President]. Any complaint of retaliation will be promptly investigated and appropriate corrective measures taken if allegations of retaliation are substantiated. This protection from retaliation is not intended to prohibit supervisors from taking action, including disciplinary action, in the usual scope of their duties and based on valid performance-related factors.*
- *Whistle-blowers must be cautious to avoid baseless allegations (as described earlier in the definitions section of this policy).*

Newkirk: OK George, back to you. **Eigenhauser:** I believe we were already past item #3, so moving on to item #4, the Whistle Blower Code of Conduct Policy. The best I can say about this is, this is an immense amount of boilerplate. It's a really boring read but our New York lawyer says we have to have it, so I move we adopt it as our policy. **Currle:** Kenny seconds. **Newkirk:** Thank you Kenny. Is there any discussion on our Whistle Blower policy? **DelaBar:** In my past life I wrote many Army regulations for both the whistle blower, but specifically the one following. I realize there's a lot of lawyer speak here, but both areas need to be a little bit more Dick and Jane, KISS principle, so we actually understand what we are to do and how we are to do it. There's just some statements that seem to be rather convoluted when I was reading through this several times on both the Whistle Blower and the Conflict of Interest Policy. We don't know who does what to whom in the way that so many things are stated. If it's our policy, do we have to have something that is so stated as it is here, or can we have something that, since the majority of the population reads at the 10th grade level, something that fits that we can actually understand, especially our employees and others that are interested in both of these policies? **Mastin:** I agree with Pam, but in addition to that – and I know Cyndy has put a lot of

work into this and the committee which reviewed it – I did not get a chance to do a thorough review on this but I do see there are some spacing issues, maybe a missing period. I do have a question on one of the requirements in here that is in line with our Bylaws and there's another section here that refers to something that we don't even have, which is a compensation committee. Then it refers to the board of directors in a different paragraph. I would like to take the time and work with Cyndy, George and Shelly to try to get this down to something that's a little bit more manageable and easier, as Pam stated. Otherwise, if we're going to go with this, we've got to clean it up before the board brings this to final approval to bring to the delegation. **Eigenhauser:** This doesn't go to the delegation. It's a board policy. **Mastin:** It doesn't have to, George? **Newkirk:** No. We're going to abide by what's required in New York law. This is a board policy, it's not an amendment to our Bylaws. **Mastin:** OK great. Well then, I think we've got time to clean this up. The way this is worded is required by New York State law, or we can use a shorter document. **Perkins:** I agree with Rich. This was a template that was given to us overall by our New York attorney Anita and I think that it was expected that we would tweak this heavily to match our organization, which I don't think has been thoroughly done yet. I did not review it yet myself formally even though I was on the Committee, and so I really do support more time, just like Rich said. I think we can shorten it and streamline it. **Newkirk:** Cyndy is a little bit frustrated because nobody gave input. **Eigenhauser:** It seems to me there is a consensus we would like to see this and the one following rewritten, so what I would like to do is table them both to the next meeting if that's permissible. **Newkirk:** Sure. Need a second. **Currle:** Second. **Newkirk:** Thank you. Any objections to tabling these, to get a rework? **Eigenhauser:** And to give Cyndy a chance to be in the meeting. **Newkirk:** Any objections to tabling the two policies – the Whistle Blower Policy and the Conflict of Interest Policy? Seeing no objections, by unanimous consent it is approved.

The motion [to table] is ratified by unanimous consent.

Tabled.

5.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY

The Cat Fanciers' Associate, Inc. (the "Association") is an organization subject to the New York State Not-for-Profit Corporation Law with respect to its governance, including dealing with conflicts of interest. The New York Not-for-Profit Corporation Law imposes several requirements with respect to conflicts of interest and related party transactions, in addition to the judge-made common law, which deals with these concerns.

Additionally, the Association is an organization described in Sections 501(c)(3) and 509(a)(1), (2) or (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the "Code"), and so is subject to the requirements of Code Section 4958 with respect to various dealings with disqualified persons.

The Association adheres to the highest standards of ethical conduct in governance and operations to ensure that board of directors, officers, staff, volunteers, and/or consultants do not have or give the appearance of having Conflicts of Interest and do not use their relationship with the organization for impermissible private benefit. An appearance of a Conflict of Interest exists

when a reasonable person would conclude that a decision is being made based on personal interests rather than in the best interests of the Association.

The Association has adopted this Conflict of Interest Policy (this "Policy") to identify and limit the effect of any possible conflict between the personal interests of directors and officers and the interest of the Association. The purpose of this Policy is to ensure that decisions about corporate operations and the use and dispositions of corporate assets are made solely in terms of benefits to the Association and are not influenced by any private profit or other personal benefit to the individuals affiliated with the Association who take part in the decision.

Administration

The Board of Directors shall adopt, oversee and administer this Policy. The Board of Directors shall review this Policy periodically to ensure compliance with applicable state and federal laws. Any questions about this Policy may be directed to the Board President at [President's email address].

Definitions

A "Related Party" is defined as the following:

- (a) Any individual who currently serves as:
 - (i) a voting member of the Board of Directors of the Association or any Affiliate of the Association;*
 - (ii) an officer of the Association or any Affiliate of the Association;*
 - (iii) a Key Person of the Association or any Affiliate of the Association; or*
 - (iv) any other person who exercises the powers of directors, officers or Key Persons over the affairs of the Association or any Affiliate of the Association.**
- (b) Any Relative of those persons listed in (a) above. A "Relative" includes: spouse; domestic partner as defined in New York Public Health Law Section 2954-A; ancestors; brothers and sisters (whether whole or half-blood); children (whether natural or adopted); grandchildren; great-grandchildren; and spouses or domestic partners of brothers, sisters, children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren.*
- (c) Any entity in which an individual listed in (a) or (b) has a Controlling Interest. A Controlling Interest is defined as:
 - for corporations, ownership (directly or indirectly) of more than 35% of the combined voting power;*
 - for partnerships or personal service corporations profits interest; and**

- *for trusts or estates, ownership (directly or indirectly) of more than 35% of the beneficial interest.*

"Key Person" includes any person, other than a director or officer, whether or not an employee of the Association, who:

- has responsibilities, or exercises powers or influence over the Association as a whole similar to the responsibilities, powers, or influence of directors and officers;*
- manages the Association or a segment of the Association that represents a substantial portion of the activities, assets, income, or expenses of the Association, which for these purposes shall be ten percent (10%); or*
- alone or with others controls or determines a substantial portion of the Association's capital expenditures or operating budget, which for these purposes shall be ten percent (10%).*

"Affiliate" is any entity controlled by, or in control of, the Association.

A "Related Party Transaction" is any transaction, agreement, or other arrangement in which a Related Party has a financial interest and in which the Association or any Affiliate of the Association is a participant.

The following shall not be considered a Related Party Transaction:

- *A transaction that is de minimis, including: a single transaction that does not exceed \$100; or multiple transactions with a single third-party within a one-month period that do not exceed this threshold.*
- *A transaction that would not customarily be reviewed by the Board of Directors or boards of similar organizations in the ordinary course of business and is available to other on the same or similar terms.*
- *A benefit provided to a Related Party solely as a member of a class of the beneficiaries that the Association serves as part of its activities, and which benefit is available to all similarly situated members of the same class on the same terms.*

A "Conflict of Interest" is any transaction that is not a Related Party Transaction, but involves a transaction that could be perceived or interpreted to be in conflict with the Association's interest.

Annual Disclosure Statements

- *Duty to Complete Questionnaire. Each director shall complete a conflict of interest questionnaire prior to becoming a director and annually thereafter. Each officer or Key Person shall complete a conflict of interest questionnaire when assuming the relevant position and annually thereafter. The questionnaire shall be in the form*

approved by the Board of Directors. The questionnaire shall be submitted annually no later than July 31 of each year and maintained by the Board Secretary for five years from the date of signing

- *Duty to Update Information. Each director, officer, or Key Person shall promptly advise the Secretary or designated compliance officer of any changes to the information provided in that individual's last completed conflict of interest questionnaire.*

If during the course of a Board of Directors or any committee meeting, discussion, or deliberation a participant believes an actual or potential Conflict of Interest or Related Party Transaction may exist, the participant should raise the issue and disclose such information as the participant is aware so that the Board of Directors or committee may review and refer the matter for additional action if required by this Policy. In all cases, any disclosure should be documented in meeting minutes or other corporate records.

The Secretary or designated compliance officer will ensure that all individuals required to complete an annual disclosure statement do so in accordance with this Policy. If any individual fails to comply with the Policy's disclosure requirements, the Secretary or designated compliance officer will report such failure to the Board of Directors, which shall recommend appropriate corrective action.

Disclosures and List of Related Parties.

All information in completed questionnaires or subsequent disclosures shall be compiled and reported by management to the Board of Directors.

A list of individuals and organizations identified as Related Parties through the annual disclosure process (the "Related Party List") shall be assembled and provided to employees of the Association or other individuals who have authority to sign contracts, enter into transactions, or sign checks on behalf of the Association. Such individuals shall be responsible for reviewing the Related Party List before entering into a transaction or signing a check to confirm whether it is a potential Related Party Transaction.

Review Process for Related Party Transactions

Once a Related Party Transaction is identified, a Related Party Transaction Review Request (attached to this Policy) is completed and submitted to the Secretary or designated compliance officer who will then call a meeting of the Board of Directors to review the Related Party Transaction before it is entered into by the Association. The review required by this Policy shall be in addition to, and not in place of, the review process the Association would normally use to approve the transaction.

The Board of Directors must review and approve the proposed Related Party Transaction before the Association enters into the transaction. Specifically, the Board of Directors must confirm that the transaction is fair, reasonable and in the Association's best interests.

Any member of the Board of Directors who has an interest in the transaction (either directly, through a Relative or an organization in which a director or a Relative has a Controlling Interest) shall not participate in the vote, nor may the individual be present during voting or deliberations.

During the review process, the Board of Directors should review information from other providers (e.g., quote, proposals, etc.) to the extent they are available.

The Board of Directors shall also document its decision and deliberations in the meeting minutes.

Review Process for Conflicts of Interest

A potential Conflict of Interest should be disclosed as it arises for consideration by the Board of Directors, a committee or individuals reviewing the matter. If a potential Conflict of Interest is disclosed at a Board or committee meeting, the Board or committee shall review and determine whether an actual Conflict of Interest exists making sure to adequately document its decision and deliberations.

Any individual with an interest in the transaction may not participate in the vote, nor be present during voting or deliberations on the matter.

If a potential Conflict of Interest is identified by the Association, information regarding the potential conflict shall be provided to the designated compliance officer for a determination regarding whether an actual Conflict of Interest exists. If a Conflict of Interest exists, the designated compliance officer shall ensure that proper documentation is maintained to confirm that the transaction is fair and reasonable to the Association.

Any individual with an interest (either directly, through a Relative or an organization in which the director or a Relative as a Controlling Interest) may not participate in the approval of the transaction.

Quorum and Voting

Directors or committee members who must leave a meeting due to a Conflict of Interest or Related Party Transaction shall be deemed present for voting purposes regardless of whether the individual returns to the meeting.

Employee Conflicts of Interest

All employees should deal with vendors without any appearance of favor or preference based on personal considerations. Employees must, at all times, exercise their best skill, care and judgment for the benefit of the Association and must refrain from being influenced by personal considerations of any kind in the performance of their duties. Whenever a Conflict of Interest—or even a possible Conflict of Interest—exists, it must be fully disclosed and the employee involved may then be required to refrain from participating in the consideration or determination of any transaction with the vendor.

Specifically, an employee of the Association with a potential Conflict of Interest in a particular matter shall promptly and fully disclose the potential conflict to his or her supervisor who shall then disclose the matter to the President or designated compliance officer. The President or designated compliance officer shall be responsible for determining the proper way for the Association to handle decisions which involve employee Conflicts of Interest. In making such determinations, the President or designated compliance officer may consult with legal counsel.

The President or designated compliance officer shall report to the Board of Directors at least annually concerning employee Conflicts of Interest that have been disclosed and contracts and transactions involving employee conflicts that the President or designated compliance officer has approved.

Compensation Decisions.

A compensation decision for a Related Party is a Related Party Transaction. All recommendations for such matters shall be referred to the Board of Directors for review in accordance with this Policy once a recommendation is made by the Compensation Committee.

The Related Party shall not participate in the deliberations or voting on any matter relating to compensation such individual receives in any context (except expense reimbursement). Such individual may provide information to the Compensation Committee or Board of Directors reviewing the compensation decision.

All compensation will be measured against an appropriate recognized survey or surveys for compensation (if applicable) of corresponding rank, position, and/or specialty in the same or a comparable geographic area as that of the Association. There shall be sufficient and adequate documentation to support the reasonableness and appropriateness of all compensation decisions. All deliberations regarding compensation of a Related Party shall be documented in the minutes of the Compensation Committee and the Board of Directors.

Violations of Conflict of Interest Policy

If the Board of Directors determines that an individual has failed to comply with the policies and directives set forth in this Policy, it shall recommend or take appropriate corrective action.

Tabled.

RELATED PARTY TRANSACTION REVIEW REQUEST

Purpose: The purpose of this form is to provide sufficient information to the Board of Directors of The Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. (the "Association") so that the Board of Directors may review certain transactions ("Related Party Transactions") as required by the New York Not-for-Profit Corporation Law and the Association's Conflict of Interest Policy.

Instructions: A staff member should complete this form when a Related Party Transaction is identified. Staff members should attach sufficient information to permit the Board of Directors to determine whether such transaction is fair and reasonable and in the Association's best

interests. Once completed, the staff member should submit this form along with any attachments to the Secretary or designated compliance officer for the Board of Directors consideration.

Describe the transaction, agreement or other arrangement and how it will benefit the Association.

List all Related Parties involved in the transaction and why they are considered a Related Party.

Describe the Related Party's interest in the transaction and, if applicable, how that interest is deemed "substantial."

Describe how the Association or an affiliate is involved.

Describe generally the terms of the transaction and the amount(s) the Association will pay or be paid.

Describe any alternate transactions (to the extent available) and why the alternative transactions are not more favorable to the Association.**

**For this purpose, "substantial" shall mean any transaction (a) directly between the Association and the Related Party; or (b) between the Association and an entity in which the Related Party has a controlling interest as defined in paragraph (c) under the Related Party definition above.*

***Alternate transactions are required where the Related Party has a substantial financial interest in the transaction. If in doubt, please include alternate transaction information.*

**THE CAT FANCIERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.
ANNUAL DISCLOSURE FORM**

It is important to provide complete and accurate information when filling out this form as incomplete information could result in penalties being assessed against you or your Relatives.

Provide information regarding any of the individuals or entities that fall within the categories described below:

- (a) who are currently a party to a transaction, agreement or other arrangement with The Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. ("Organization");
- (b) who could potentially enter into a transaction, agreement or other arrangement with Organization; or
- (c) who are directors/officers, are currently employed by, or volunteer for or otherwise are affiliated with Organization.

Please check the appropriate box regarding whether you have any disclosures for the following: Yes No

Yourself

Any of your Relatives including:

- spouse or domestic partner as defined in New York Public Health Law Section 2954-A;
- ancestors;
- brothers and sisters (whether whole or half-blood);
- children, grandchildren or great-grandchildren (whether natural or adopted); and
- spouses or domestic partners of brothers, sisters, children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren

Any entity in which you or a Relative (collectively or individually) has a controlling interests. A controlling interest is defined as:

- for corporations, ownership (directly or indirectly) of more than 35% of the combined voting power;
- for partnerships or personal service corporations, ownership (directly or indirectly) of more than 5% of the profits interest; and
- for trusts or estates, ownership (directly or indirectly) of more than 35% of the beneficial interest.

Any entity in which you are an officer, director, trustee, member, owner (either as a sole proprietor or a partner), or employee.

Note that this includes both for profit as well as nonprofit organizations.

If yes, please list all such individuals and entities including the specific relationship with you and the Organization.

<i>Name of Individual or Entity</i>	<i>Type of Relationship with you and/or Organization</i>

Other Significant Involvement (e.g., membership on foundation boards, consultancies, advisory committees; active political or advocacy role; elected or appointed office) **which could impact your ability to serve as a disinterested party with respect to your position with the Organization.**

I have read and understand this annual disclosure form as well as the Organization’s Conflict of Interest Policy. The foregoing information is true and complete to the best of my knowledge.

In addition, I recognize the need to maintain confidentiality regarding information I might receive as a director, officer or staff member regarding donors, donations, investments and grant making activities of the Organization.

REMINDER: If at any time there is a matter under consideration, which may constitute a direct or indirect conflict of interest, it is your obligation to disclose the facts to the Board of Directors involved, to abstain from voting and to refrain from using your personal influence on the matter.

Dated: _____ Name: _____

Time Frame:

Bylaws amendments must be finalized now to be prepared for presentation at the up-coming Annual Meeting. The policies are required by New York Not-for-Profit Corporation Law and should be finalized as soon as reasonably practicable.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

It is my hope that this will be my final report for the Board as Legal Advisory Committee chair. Serving the CFA Board has been a unique and challenging experience – and I always enjoy a challenge. Thank you all for the pleasure of serving.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Cyndy Byrd, Chair*

Newkirk: George have you got anything else in there? **Eigenhauser:** No, thank you.

(10) **EXPERIMENTAL FORMATS.**

EXPERIMENTAL SHOW REPORT

Committee Chair: Sharon Roy

1. *At the last meeting, the board approved an experimental format for allowing up to 2 rings at each regional for opens/champions, and opens/premiers. So far only the Southern Region has requested this format.*

Guidelines:

1 ring each day. AB only.

Judge will have a standard judging book. The only pages that will need printing for these rings are the championship and premier pages. Before the start of judging, the judge will mark all the Grand Ch and Grand Pr. Absent. Ribbons will be hung as in a standard judging ring per show rules. Best and 2nd Best of Breed and best Ch. At the completion of judging, judges will award a Top 10 AB. Grand points will only be awarded to cats making the top 10. No points awarded in breed.

For the Southern Regional, show Manager Karen Lane has decided that the judging for this experimental ring will start 1/2 hour before regular judging rings.

Should a conflict arise between the experimental ring and the other rings during the show, precedence will be given to the judges with full schedules.

Newkirk: Sharon Roy, you are recognized for Experimental Formats. **Roy:** The first is just what's going to happen. I spent a lot of time in emails back and forth with both Karen Lane and Karen Boyce on how we're going to handle the two special rings at the Southern Regional Awards. By the way, they are the only region so far that has asked for that experimental format. So, basically the two judges will get a regular judge's book. They will go off and mark all the grand champions absent and then they will judge them just like they're judging a regular show. They will do a top 10 allbreed champions. One of the questions that did come up was if there's multiple champions in a breed, will we give champion points in breed. To keep it simple, for right now no, we will just do if you make the top 10 unless somebody has objections to doing it that way. **Newkirk:** I don't see any hands up. **Eigenhauser:** I just want to be clear, is this a one off? Is this guidelines for one show, or is this an experimental format that all of the other regions haven't signed up for yet but they still could? **Roy:** They absolutely could. The other regions could sign up for it. What the board did pass was, it had to be at their regional awards show. It's not something a region or a club can just pick up and do at this point, because that's not what was passed by the board at the last meeting. **Eigenhauser:** Then my only concern is if we're going to use the way you're doing it as the guideline. On the one ring each day, I would leave it up to the regions to decide if they want to put both rings on the same day, or one on each day, or even do a one-day show and have them both on the same day. I'm going to vote yes on this, but I don't see why it needs to be one ring each day. I think that's a little constricting, but if no one else is interested I'm not going to argue the point. **Roy:** [inaudible] originally thought about the

International Show, so we kept it that way but it's fine with me if clubs want to do it both on one day as long as they don't go over the 6 rings per day judging. **Currle:** It's mainly a space issue as far as one each day, although they could do 2 in 1. Plus, this is in conjunction with our regional banquet. We didn't want to slow the show down extra for that. We just wanted to give our exhibitors an opportunity for grand points. We do appreciate Sharon working on this so closely with Karen, thank you. **Morgan:** Sharon, something that just came to me is that, based off the entry, if there are space issues it could be a situation where the count would be such that ring sharing would be appropriate, so again limiting it to one each day might actually prove to be more restrictive. I'm kind of with George on this. I would like to give the clubs the flexibility to make adjustments based off of what they get. **Roy:** I'm fine with that. I'm fine with that. We don't technically have a formal motion, because the motion had already been passed to allow this to happen at regional shows and we didn't specify at that point one each day or two on one day. I'm fine if the regions want to do two on one day. **Currle:** To reiterate, their plan is to have one each day. **Newkirk:** So Sharon, you're not asking for votes since you're just bringing this back as a guideline. **Roy:** Absolutely. To address Melanie's and George's point, as long as it doesn't go over the 6 rings per day judging, which would require some special voting. There's no reason that they can't do both if a region would prefer to have it all in one day. **Newkirk:** OK great, thank you.

No Action.

2. *Experimental Format approval – GEMS July 30, 2022*

For the past five years, with the support of the CFA Board, GEMS has successfully produced Breed Summits that take breed focus to another level. The Board has graciously supported our requests to have combined breed judging for the Egyptian Maus. We would like to once again have the special combined breed judging for the Egyptian Mau and Egyptian Mau breed awards during the show in all six rings. However, this year we want to take into consideration the feedback we have received from other exhibitors who complain that the breed focus and combined judging results in scheduling traffic jams. This year we are once again asking for approval of the combined Breed judging with the addition of bay style judging, and staggered show hours to allow the Egyptian Mau combined judging to be conducted before the start of regular judging. The details: Judging for the Egyptian Maus only will commence at 8:30 AM, all classes will be benched in consecutive rings and judges will move from ring to ring in two rounds of three judges each. Judging will commence at 11AM for all non-Egyptian Maus with check-in at 10AM. This will accomplish several beneficial things for the club and exhibitors: 1 This will allow all non-Egyptian Mau breeders to come in later and potentially save them a hotel night. 2 – because all three classes of Egyptian Maus will have been judged before the start of the regular show, no finals will need to be held to accommodate Summit judging. 3 – This will allow Egyptian Mau breeders to actually watch the judging process and should promote breed camaraderie.

Details on the show are as follows:

Richmond Virginia, July 30, 2022. Format is a 6 ring show with 5 AB rings, 1 SP ring.

We have included an example with details of the proposal below.

Egyptian Mau Breed Summit Judging Proposal:

Show hours will be 8:30-11:00AM for Egyptian Maus only. Regular show hours for all other breeds other than Egyptian Maus will be announced as 11AM-5PM with check-in beginning at 10AM.

Motion: *Grant an exception to Show Rule 11.29.b. and 9.08n and allow the Global Egyptian Mau Society to hold breed specialty rings for Egyptian Maus in all six rings at their annual show in Richmond VA on July 30, 2022. in the following manner: all classes (Kittens, Championship and Premiership) will be judged consecutively, but cats will stay in specific ring and judges will move from ring to ring. Each class will award Breed wins in the usual manner, which will include top three breed awards; then, a breed specialty final for each breed will be held across all classes (i.e., including Kittens, Championship and Premiership competing together in a breed specialty final). Awards will be given based on the total Breed entry for each breed as follows: up to 15 entries = top 3; 15 to 20 entries = top 4; 25 or more entries = top 5. No points will be associated with these awards. Only one judge will be in each ring at a time. Egyptian Mau breed Judging will commence two and a half hours earlier than judging for all remaining cats entered in show.*

Proposal:

Egyptian Mau breed judging will commence with three designated judges at 8:30AM. The other three judges will be scheduled to start at 930AM. All Egyptian Maus will be brought up to separate rings by class. If the number of entries require multiple rings, they will be utilized. One judge will start with kittens, one with championship, and one with premiership. Each judge will evaluate all the entries in the class, hang and mark their placements along with naming top three. Once the clerk for that ring has recorded their placements, the flats will be removed from the cages. Once all three judges have completed their first rings they will be released from their ring and will move to the next class. Example - The judge who was judging kittens will move to championship, the judge who was judging championship will move to premiership and the judge who was judging premiership will move to kittens. They will rotate until all Egyptian Maus have been evaluated.

Once all classes have been judged. The judges will leave the rings and go to the club area to determine their best of the best across all three classes. One at a time they will be assigned to go back to the rings and award their Best of the Best across all the classes. They will have access to all three rings for this process and will simply have to announce and hang their Best of the best regardless of the class based on the following requirements:

0-15 Egyptian Mau entries: Top three Best of the Best

16-24 Egyptian Mau entries: Top four Best of the Best

25 Egyptian Mau entries or more: Top five Best of the Best

Cats may be removed and taken back to the benching area for a break at any point during this process if needed as long as they are not needed for judging at that moment. A ring coordinator

will manage transitions and best of the best so that at no time will there be more than one judge in any ring and the process moves smoothly.

Once the Best of the Best for the first three rings has been completed, the second three judges will rotate in and complete the process.

Newkirk: Do you want to move on to #2 then? **Roy:** I will turn this over. Seeing it's the Egyptian Mau show, I would like to turn this over to Melanie to go over exactly what's going to happen at that show. **Morgan:** Thank you. One of the things that has been interesting as I have gotten out there and been chatting this year with a lot of the exhibitors is, I hear over and over we need to put the emphasis on our breeds. GEMS, I think, has been really good with the help of the board, which we are very appreciative of and their support in coming up with these breed summit ideas, which have been phenomenally successful bringing in exhibitors from all over our system globally, etc. One of the pieces of feedback we received from the exhibitors of the people who didn't have Egyptian Maus is that our summit-type judging really put a big roadblock in what was going on, and so we started thinking about ways to make the show more user friendly to everyone and hopefully generate more entries, and that's what this idea is designed to try to address, so that perhaps we can add to the exhibitors that don't have Egyptian Maus a little added bonus that they might be able to forego a hotel cost the night before since the show will be starting later for them, and maybe come in that morning. So, this is just our attempt to try to continue to refine the idea. Any questions? **Currle:** I think this is a fantastic idea. When I was first going through the Judging Program, one of my sessions was at a show in Pittsburgh and it was an Egyptian Mau specialty show where I recall them having anywhere from 50 to 60 Maus in all three classes. It was truly fantastic, and this looks like it can be rekindled so I applaud this effort and I'm going to support it.

Newkirk: Melanie, do you want to run through the proposal real quick so everyone knows what we're voting on? **Morgan:** Sure. What's going to happen basically is, regular show hours for all non-Egyptian Maus will be announced for later in the day. I think it's 11:30, but Egyptian Mau judging will start at 8:30 in the morning. We'll start with 3 rings. One ring will have the kittens benched, one will have championship and one will have premiership. If there's overflow because there's too many cats in one class, we'll move to more rings for that. Then we will do basically a version of bay judging, I guess, for lack of a better word, in that we'll bring the first three judges in right at 8:30 and they will be tasked with judging all of the Egyptian Maus from kittens to championship and premiership. Once they are done hanging each one of those classes, as they would normally and filled in their books, they will then go back and select their top Egyptian Maus across all breed classes. The number of best of the best in the breed will depend on the numbers of cats that are entered, and so then we will basically start to judge. One would go into the first ring, judge 2 will go into the second ring, judge 3 will go into the third. Once they are done, they've been checked out by the clerk for that ring, they will then do musical chairs and flop to the next ring until all the three judgments have been done. We will have a separate area where the judges will then go and then one judge will come out to hang their top 3 best of the best and do their little mini-final. We're going to have a ring manager who will orchestrate and make sure that we are in compliance, that each judge gets what they need to do but we're not overlapping. Once those three judges are done, they can go off and have breakfast or whatever, fill out their books for the rest of the show and the other three judges will then proceed to finish the Mau judging, at which point the Maus go back to their benching area and the other cats which have probably been benched during the latter part of this process will be in and the regular show

will start. None of the judges will then be slowed down and not be able to do finals because they hadn't judged all three of the big Egyptian Mau classes. So then they can just fold the Egyptian Maus back into their regular judge. Does that make sense? That was a really short synopsis of the whole idea, but we're really hopeful that it will flow smoothly and there will be some breaks built in for the cats, as well. **Newkirk:** I have a question, Melanie. Will the cats that participate in this be entered in the regular show? **Morgan:** They are entered in the regular show. They are simply being judged between 8:30 and 11:30, and then the judges will just have – it's kind of like when you judge, you know, you are doing a trainee and you do all your shorthairs on one day and your longhairs on another. They will just have already been done. **Newkirk:** OK, so they won't be judged again during the regular – **Morgan:** No, no, no, no, no. They will not be judged again. In the past when we have done the summit where we judged all three classes, what has happened is, because the judges are doing the kittens, championship and premiership Maus all at once, they can't do a final until they have judged all the Maus, so many of the finals were getting delayed. So, it was creating these strange little roadblocks where it was gridlock and nothing could happen. We were trying to listen to the feedback we are getting from exhibitors from all sides. **Newkirk:** Thank you. **DelaBar:** Melanie, how long are the cats going to be held in the judging cages in the rings? **Morgan:** We're trying to build in – a lot of it will depend on the size of the classes, because there will be breaks in between each swap of rings. So, if the owners feel that they need to take their cats back, they will be. That's why we're going to have a ring manager, so that if the owners feel that the cats need to be removed and need a break, during those ring swaps we will be building in breaks.

Newkirk: Any other questions for Melanie? Did we get a motion and a second for this? **Mastin:** No, you did not. **Newkirk:** OK, well, we need that. **Morgan:** Can I make that motion? Because I'm going to abstain on this. **Eigenhauser:** I'll make the motion then. George moves. **Newkirk:** Thank you George. I need a second. **Calhoun:** Kathy Calhoun seconds. **Newkirk:** Since we have already discussed it, let's go ahead and vote on this. Everybody in favor raise your hand.

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

Newkirk: So the yes votes are Mark Hannon, Kathy Calhoun, John Colilla, Kenny Curre, Annette Wilson, Cathy Dunham, Carol Krzanowski, Hayata-san, Rich Mastin, Pam DelaBar, Sharon Roy, Steve McCullough, Pam Moser, Rachel Anger, Howard Webster. And George. If you will take your hands down, any no votes? No no votes Rachel. Melanie, you can raise your hand for your abstention. OK Rachel, you can announce the vote. **Anger:** That's 16 yes, zero no, 1 abstention. **Newkirk:** Alright, good deal. **Morgan:** Thank you to everyone.

Newkirk: Sharon, do you have anything else? **Roy:** No, not in experimental.

(11) **CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE.**

Committee Chair: Nancy Dodds

Liaison to Board: Rachel Anger

List of Committee Members: Marilyn Conde, Kevin Brown, Erin Cutchen, Kendall Smith, Cheryl Peck, Pamela Bassett, Norm Auspitz, Nancy Petersen, Barb Schreck, Jim Dinesen, Mary Ann Martin, Hilary Helmrich, Donna Andrews, Jill Archibald, Marilee Griswold (Alt), Betty Bridges (Alt)

The Credentials Committee will meet on Thursday June 21, 2022 at 9:30 AM following approval of the membership by the Board of Directors. At this meeting we will discuss any problems relating to seating of the club delegates. We will also complete the inventory of ballots received and brought to the meeting by Central Office Staff. We will meet again on Friday, June 22, 2022 at 7 AM to open/count the ballots for the Regional Directors and officers Election.

Our 2022 membership includes the following persons:

Nancy Dodds, Chairperson

Region 1: Kevin Brown and Marilyn Conde

Region 2: Erin Cutchen and Kendall Smith

Region 3: Cheryl Peck and Pam Bassett

Region 4: Norman Auspitz and Barb Schreck

Region 5: Hilary Helmrich and Mary Ann Martin

Region 6: Jim Dineson and Nancy Petersen

Region 7: Donna Andrews and Jill Archibald

Alternates: Betty Bridges (Region 1) and Marilee Griswold (Region 7)

*Thank you,
Nancy Dodds*

Newkirk: Allene, can you bring Nancy Dodds in as a panelist? **Tartaglia:** She is in. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you. Hi Nancy. You can go ahead and give your report please. **Dodds:** Hi there. **Newkirk:** How are you doing? **Dodds:** We'll meet on Thursday at 9:30 following the approval of the membership by the board. We'll discuss any problems that relate to the seating of the delegates. Based on my conversation with Allene, we'll also complete the inventory of ballots received and brought to the meeting by Central Office. We won't count the votes, but typically we have done that inventory on Friday morning, so that would cut down on the amount of time that we're going to need to count the votes. So, we will meet at 7:00 in the morning to count votes for regional directors and officers.

Dodds: We have the following people that have remained on the Committee. [reads]
Newkirk: Any questions for Nancy? Seeing no questions, Nancy thank you for providing the update. **Dodds:** You're welcome. Thank you.

Reports of Special (Select or Ad Hoc) Committees

(12) NATIONAL SCORING COMMITTEE.

Committee Chair: Monte Phillips
Board Liaison: Carol Krzanowski
List of Committee Members: Sharon Roy, Mary Kolencik

Current Happenings of Committee:

This ad hoc committee was charged with presenting parameters for national win scoring for the 2022-2023 season. We reviewed current season scoring data as of the 2nd weekend in March that Dick Kallmeyer and James Simbro prepared for us. We also spoke with exhibitors in show halls to gather their opinions. While we do have recommendations for the parameters that should be set for next season, we included other options for the board to consider.

In April of last year, there were few shows on the schedule. At that time, it was not clear when we would get closer to a normal schedule. The board reduced the number of rings scored in the hope that more areas of the world would open up later in the season and exhibitors would be able to contend for a national win with a late start. The reduction was intended for one year only. Flash forward to now, and while some areas are still without shows, exhibitors in other areas have been able to get to many shows. We do have exhibitors who were able to get into the top 25 with late starts that might otherwise not have tried a campaign. We are having shows in some parts of the US and Japan, but Europe, China, the International area and even some parts of the US are still struggling to hold shows. In the US, we have had some clubs cancel their shows at the last minute due to a low count. All is not back to normal everywhere.

Dick and James gave us the rings for all cats scored in CFA, and Dick further refined that to tell us what the top rankings would be if we had scored more rings. We did not include the data because the season is not over and we do not want to affect the remaining competition, but the data is available to board members on request. Before we discuss the data, please remember we cannot just say that this is what would have happened if we scored things differently. Exhibitors choose their shows based on what they want to achieve and where they are in the rankings. If we had counted more rings, some might have gone to different shows, some might have gone to more shows, some might not have tried at all. Also, remember that we have had an abnormal pattern of counts in the 2021-2022 season. Usually, the championship counts at the beginning of the season are low and begin to rise as kittens age out. This season, we had high counts early on that gave some cats a large boost. Exhibitors at the beginning were unsure if there would be shows throughout the year and so went to some shows last summer with low counts “just in case”. Some perennial large shows were not held (e.g. the International, San Diego) that would have dramatically affected the kitten competition. All of this means we must be careful in how we interpret the data. The data can only approximate what might have happened had we scored differently. However, the data does dispel some of the myths about the 50/20 ring scoring system.

The data shows that regardless of how many rings we count, the cats at the top change very little. Placements would change, and one or two cats might drop out of the top 25 if we counted

more rings but most would stay in. We are confident though that while counting more rings may have changed who tried for NWs, if an exhibitor has a great cat and the resources to get to enough shows, a cat that would be in the top 25 counting 50 rings would likely be in the top 25 counting 75 or 100 rings. The caveat “and the resources to get to enough shows” is what should guide the decision on scoring. Does counting fewer rings enable more people to try to achieve NWs? That is the question to answer before setting the parameters for the title.

One of the myths that some exhibitors expressed is that while ePoints shows only the total rings up to 50, many cats in championship have far more than 100 rings and would have many more points if we counted more rings. This is not true. We looked beyond ePoints. In championship, only 28 have more than 100 rings in championship, and not all the cats in the top 25 have over 100 rings. One cat in the top 25 only recently reached 50. The data tells us that while many cats have more than 50 rings and many kittens have more than 20, the rings they dropped through substitution are not high value rings. Fewer cats would have met the point minimums if we counted more rings. Counting fewer rings enabled cats to more easily achieve the point minimums, something that people worry about every year. Counts are lower than pre-COVID, which is why we recommend keeping the point minimums low. We based the point minimums on the same average ring score as for the 2021-2022 season.

Another myth is that a kitten can get enough rings for an NW in just two 10 ring or 6x6 shows. The data dispels this myth as well because in reality all the kittens in the top 25 have more than 40 rings. The kitten must still finish in the top 25 to achieve an NW, and the kitten class is quite competitive requiring far more than just 2 weekends to achieve an NW.

A belief of some exhibitors is “we should go back to the pre-COVID rules.” If we did, as of the 2nd weekend in March only 11 cats would qualify for an NW in Championship, 23 kittens, 11 premiership and just 5 Household pets. If we had different parameters, we cannot be certain of exact numbers. But we are certain that most likely fewer than currently qualify and fewer than the full complement of 25 in each category would qualify for national wins if we counted more rings.

A concern some have is that counting fewer rings is keeping the counts low because people are not entering cats that cannot use the count. As we can see from the data, only a small percentage of cats even reach the point of substitution. This is normal. In past seasons, only the cats vying for NWs are shown to the point of reaching 100+ rings. Few others hit that milestone. And at the end of every season, some cats reach the point where they are substituting higher than the count. Shows at the end of the season, every season, do lose some entries from cats substituting. But every season, they also pick up double and even triple entries from campaigners trying to squeeze every possible point out of the counts.

Consider this chart for the championship class:

<i>Cats that achieved ring totals as of 2nd weekend in March, from ePoints. Excludes Hawaii.</i>				
	<i>Total Cats that earned points in at least 1 ring</i>	<i>50+ rings</i>	<i>75+ rings</i>	<i>100+ rings</i>
<i>R1-9</i>	<i>1826</i>	<i>87</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>168</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>135</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>167</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>4</i>	<i>254</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>5</i>	<i>151</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>6</i>	<i>184</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>7</i>	<i>238</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>R1-7 Total</i>	<i>1297</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>8</i>	<i>243</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>9</i>	<i>286</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>China</i>	<i>194</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>International</i>	<i>280</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>

This season, while some parts of the US and Japan have had enough shows for cats to get well over 100 rings, other parts of have not. Other parts of the world have struggled to have any semblance of a normal schedule. No cats or kittens in Europe, Japan or the International area reached the maximum number of 50 rings. In just Regions 1-7, only 6% of the cats shown in championship achieved 50+ rings, 4% 75+ rings and 2% 100+ rings. This chart tells us that counting 75 rings is a reasonable compromise that could enable more cats to compete. It also tells us that exhibitors in some parts of the world have no hope of a national win this season, and likely no hope next season if we increase the parameters for their cats.

In our discussions with exhibitors, there was little consensus on what to do. Opinions ranged from “we should just get rid of national wins altogether” to “we should count every ring.” Most people in the middle agreed that we should count more than 50 for adults and 20 for kittens but were split over whether to count only a few more, such as 75/30, or go back to the full 100/40. Those who want to count 75/30 are concerned about lack of shows, lack of count, increased travel costs (hotel, airfare, rental cars), inflation, and especially are influenced by the price of gas and how that will affect everything. Those who want the full 100/40 rings want to be able to show their cats at more shows in the season because they like going to shows, like showing off their great cat, and especially want to keep points from those shows. It can be heartbreaking to wait all year for a favorite show near your home, perhaps one that you work on, only to not be able to show your great cat and keep any points.

Exhibitors who campaigned in different classes are also not in agreement. Some Household Pet exhibitors want to keep their rings at 50 to encourage more people to show their cats. Some want to count the full 100/40 because they have discovered what other campaigners have known for

decades – at the end of the season, substitution is a factor in show choices. Kitten exhibitors are adamant that counting only 20 rings hurt their competition. The data shows little would change if we counted more rings, but there is a psychological aspect that affects exhibitors. Kitten exhibitors experienced a great deal of anxiety counting just 20 rings. We want people to enjoy the challenge with as little anxiety as possible and should set the parameters to suit.

The ad hoc committee believes that the data shows that not all regions and areas have returned to a pre-COVID level of competition. The question posed earlier was “does counting fewer rings enable more people to try to achieve NWs?” and our answer is yes. The quest for a national win should be a marathon, but should also be achievable for most of the areas of CFA. We recommend a gradual increase in rings until the show schedule normalizes. For the 2022-2023 season only, increase the number of rings scored in Regions 1-9 to 75 for Championship and Premiership, 30 for kittens, and keep the number at 50 for Household Pets. We included point minimums to maintain the average ring value from the 2021-2022 season. For China and the International area, we recommend maintaining the 50/20 parameters. Exhibitors in those areas have little hope of competing for national wins at this time, increasing the number of rings would push the possibility even further away. Europe presents a problem. We do not have a solution to help those exhibitors achieve national wins while Europe is included with the other regions.

Since we did not find a consensus from exhibitors, we included motions to return the number of rings scored to 100 & 40 but with the same average ring values from the 2021-2022 season. The first motion in each section for Regions 1-9 is what we recommend.

The committee thanks Dick Kallmeyer and James Simbro for their assistance with the data, and the many exhibitors who chatted with us at shows.

Board Action Items:

The following motions apply to the 2022-2023 season only.

Each category of competition and each area of the world has different needs, the board may wish to set different parameters in each. Board members might not agree with all the parameters that the ad hoc committee recommends, and we did not want a motion to fail without another pre-noticed motion ready for the board to consider. Therefore, we are presenting the parameters as individual motions. The first motion in each class is the ad hoc committee’s recommendation based on our review of the data and based on our discussions with exhibitors. If that motion fails, the board should consider the 2nd motion. If both motions in a category fails, the board will need to pass another motion.

Newkirk: Let’s move on to Carol Krzanowski with Scoring. **Krzanowski:** Actually Monte is the Chair of the Committee but he has asked that Mary Kolencik take the lead on this, so I would ask that she be promoted to a panelist at this time. I am going to give a brief introduction and I will be prepared to present the formal motions. I will do them individually since there are several motions in each section, as you all have read. **Newkirk:** Is Mary K in? I don’t see her. **Krzanowski:** While Allene is promoting her, I want to just give a little brief introduction here. The Committee was charged with presenting the parameters for national win scoring for the 2022-2023 season. We submitted a very comprehensive report. It’s quite lengthy. We just wanted to

make sure that we provided ample information and a good background on why we are recommending the motions as we have presented them. We reviewed the current season's scoring data as of the second weekend in March that Dick Kallmeyer and James Simbro prepared for us. We also spoke with exhibitors in show halls to gather their opinions. Quite a bit of time actually went into preparation of this report. For the 2022-2023 season only, we are recommending to increase the number of rings scored in Regions 1-9 to 75 for championship and premiership, 10 for kittens and keep the number of 50 for Household Pets. We included point minimums to maintain the average ring value from the 2021-2022 season, due to the lower counts than usual that we experienced this past season. For China and the International area, we recommend maintaining the 50/20 parameters. I would also like to mention, the Committee thanks Dick Kallmeyer and James Simbro for their assistance with the data, and also the many exhibitors who were willing to chat with us at the shows about their thoughts and suggestions. Right now, I would like to turn it over to Mary. She can probably give a little more insight as to how we arrived at our motions.

Newkirk: Go ahead Mary. **Kolencik:** As Carol said, we collected some statistics. Dick Kallmeyer and James Simbro collected data for us. The data is surprising and not so surprising, because when you think about it, it really matches what should happen. It turns out that if we count 50 rings, 75 or 100, the same cats are all going to be near the top. They are going to rank differently. One or two might be out of the top 25, but some might be in. The reason this isn't really surprising is, those are the people who are trying for the awards, and they are going to try for the awards no matter what because they have a great cat. So, they are going to get up there, no matter how we count the rings. So the statistics, they only take us so far. They dispel a lot of the myths that people have about counting only 50 rings, but they still only get us so far. What we had to do was, ask people what they really wanted. I talked to quite a few people in the show halls and they were split. It is very, very split. Some people want to go back to counting 100 rings and 40 rings for kittens, and some people want to count 75 for adults and 30 for kittens, but the thing that everybody has in unison, in common, is they do not want to count 50 rings and they do not want to count 20. They want to increase it from there. Some people are very concerned about the economy, the price of gas and how that's going to work, and then other people want to show their cats as much as possible. We have some people in CFA that are really dedicated to showing their cats, and when they get a good one, they want to show it every week. So, it's a toss up. What the Committee felt was, we thought that because not all areas of the world have returned to a normal show schedule with normal counts – really, nowhere has returned to complete normal – but we've got some areas where the regions and especially China and the international area where they are just nowhere near normal, so we thought a gradual increase to 75 rings in championship and premiership, and 30 for kittens and 50 for Household Pets, because there are some Household Pet exhibitors who really wanted to keep it at 50 to be able to encourage new people. What counting fewer rings does is, it encourages people to go for it. If they see that they can do this in 6 months rather than a year, they are more willing to try to get in. So, we did suggest an increase for those areas in Regions 1-9. In China and the international area, no cats are anywhere near 50 or 20. There might be somebody in the international area that gets in there, because she's in the United States right now, but nobody is hitting those targets. So, we did suggest leaving China and the international area at the lower values of the rings. That's all I wanted to say. **Newkirk:** Thank you Mary K. **Krzanowski:** At this time, do you want to move on to the motions? **Newkirk:** Yes. **Krzanowski:** The first motion in each class is going to

be our Committee recommendation, based on a review of the data and our discussion with exhibitors. If the first motion fails in a section, then we have additional motions to present.

Newkirk: Pam, did you have something besides the motion to talk about? **DelaBar:** Yes, I did. I just wanted to make a statement that Region 9 will probably take a long time to get back any sense of normality with our transportation problems, judge problems, whatever, but I intend to support the Committee recommendations. **Newkirk:** Melanie, you are recognized. **Morgan:** Thank you. My comments apply to this motion but they also apply to the following motions, but I think it's important to say them at the outset. Clearly this Committee has put a considerable amount of time and effort into this and for that I thank them. There are a lot of numbers to parse here. I myself came in and I recognized that I have pre-conceived notions, and I didn't want to let that personal bias impact how I viewed this proposal, so I have made it a point, since the last meeting where we assigned these people to research this, to ask for feedback from as many people as possible, understanding that when we have our pre-conceived notions, we may or may not actually impact on how people give their opinions, but I have to say that with a very few exceptions the feedback I received was that people saw no reason to change the numbers from 100 and 40 for Regions 1-8. Many, however, were open to looking at adjustments to 9, especially given what's happening with Ukraine and the ID based on the fact that those areas have very different restrictions. People feel that reducing the numbers of rings are depressing entries and ultimately hurting clubs. I also received feedback that reducing the rings makes count manipulation easier in terms of impact on a campaign. You have a 10 ring show and that could be a major portion of your 50 rings. While reducing the number of rings made sense when we looked at this at the very uncertain beginning of last season, I personally have not seen any compelling reason to perpetuate it. I took a look at all the feedback I received, I read the report that submitted here – which was very detailed – and then I took a hard look at the actual data that was provided. Understanding that numbers and statistics can be interpreted in many different ways, I have to say that I come up with different conclusions than the Committee did from the very same data. I took issue with a number of the assumptions that were made, mostly because there simply is not enough data for really meaningful conclusions. The bottom line is, I looked at the statistics on 50 versus 75 versus 100 rings. My conclusion was pretty simple – despite what is implied in this report, there is no question that when we change the scoring parameters for a season, we change the makeup of the results. While it is true that there are some cats that would not have been affected, especially the top end of that ranking, changing the number of rings changes the rankings significantly especially in the kittens and the lower half of the top 25. Each one of those affected cats represents a breeder and an exhibitor with their own specific hopes and dreams, so our actions affect them in a very personal way. The board has a responsibility to take that seriously. So to me it boils down to question of, why? Why are we considering making a change to our scoring system without input from our constituents and in an environment that, while changed, is not in full crisis mode, at least in Regions 1-8? They say that the first step to getting back to normal, or the new normal, as the case may be here for us, is to start to act like things are normal. CFA is ever resilient and our intrepid exhibitors have done just that. They are getting back to what they can, in their new normal. At this point, for the most part, shows have resumed in Regions 1-8. Because this Committee feels that reducing the number of rings will give exhibitors a better change for a win, is that why we're looking at changing the number to 75? Well, that is a different issue than the emergency situation that precipitated the adjustment in the first place last year.

Morgan: At any rate, I mentioned that I have been taking a lot of time lately to listen to the people who are out there breeding and exhibiting and it has been very eye opening. One of the big take aways that I have heard loud and clear is that we as a board need to be careful not to overstep where we should go. We may think that we are doing the best thing here, and maybe it is, but the bottom line is that when it comes to major changes to our system, we should not take it upon ourselves to implement them without buy-in from our core customers. If there is a desire to change the number of rings used in our scoring system, that request should come from our delegates. In my opinion changing from 100 and 40 is not something that is necessary in Regions 1-8 at this time and I do not support a change. Sorry that went on long. **Eigenhauser:** Actually, I'm glad Melanie went that long because that way I have less to say. I agree with every word she said. This comment applies to the next several votes in a row, all of the votes for Regions 1-8. Again, I'm willing to make a carve-out for Region 9 because of the exception mentioned. We made an exception to the Show Rules because we were in the middle of a pandemic. Experts tell us now it's not a pandemic anymore, it's endemic. I was one of the first people when the pandemic started to crawl into my hole and hunker down, but now when I go out shopping in California, which is one of the most activist states in terms of restricting people's activities, requiring masks, requiring vaccinations – nobody is wearing masks anymore, nobody is checking people at doors anymore. I think at least in this part of the country people have decided this is the new normal, we're going to live with it, and if the world is going back to normal, I think CFA has to follow suit. Whatever minor benefits we can gain by tweaking our show rules every year based on last year's statistics is outweighed by the value of having a consistent set of show rules that people can read, people can review and people can follow from year to year. I would rather go back to the show rules than another year of trying to tweak the difference or trying to parse out who does or does not get a regional win. I don't see a huge ground swell coming from CFA to ask us to have another asterisk year. I would like to return to normal as soon as possible, and I think that's the way most people – at least in Regions 1-7 – feel these days. **Moser:** I totally agree with George and Melanie. I know that I feel that this is hurting the clubs by reducing the points. In my region, I usually don't get a lot of input from people, but the last show a number of people came up to me and said, "let's go back. I want to go back to the 100 and the 40." So, I don't see any reason why this shouldn't go back to that. It's just kind of like, to me, it's diluting the win somewhat, just like when we took away the winners ribbons. What happened then is that people don't show up, so I think that we need to go back to 100 and 40.

DelaBar: These are for national wins and not regional wins. It doesn't really matter when we put, we're going to count your top 75 rings. That does not mean that you have to stop once you reach 75 rings. You can keep going to amass the points to hopefully get highest number of points per the top 75 rings. This is a very strange attitude I see on the exhibitors. Nothing is stopping them from showing. If that attitude is out there, it needs to be corrected. Anybody that thinks, "OK, I'm going to show 75 rings, I've got 3,500 points. I'm a shoe in for a win." No, you're not, because somebody is going to come along and maybe show a little bit more, make higher wins, and they are going to have the higher overall 75 rings total points than you have. It's a very strange, strange attitude that I'm seeing from some of these exhibitors. Right now, we're going over, per my look at statistics, we're talking about approximately overall 150 exhibitors out of our total population. So, I don't see where it's going to – we have people who make national wins with under 100 rings, with under 75 rings, or even under 40 rings or 30 rings for the kittens. They just keep adding their points the more they show – hopefully, if the cat is still in

condition. So, I do not understand, I do not agree with the consternation that's being voiced by some exhibitors and what George and Melanie have said. The rationale just doesn't get it.

Hannon: I'm not hearing what Pam [Moser] and maybe George are hearing. I'm hearing over and over again 70 and 30. I'm not hearing people who want to go back to 100 and I think it's a little late to say, "let's ask the constituents." We can't ask the constituents in time for the beginning of the show season. People that are going to the first show of the season need to know from them how we're scoring. I can cite myself as an example. I showed a cat this year because we were doing 50 rings. I wouldn't have campaigned this cat if I had known we had to go to 100 rings. Clubs got my entry because we lowered it. Clubs didn't lose entries, they picked up entries from people like me who wouldn't have otherwise bothered.

Colilla: I have exhibitors from my region and out of my region approach me. They want to go back to 100 and 40. I will not support anything less than 100 and 40. **Morgan:** When I say "go to the constituents", I'm suggesting that if the constituents want that, that they have until April 15 to write up a resolution that wouldn't be for this next season. In my opinion, this next season we should go back to our new normal – 100 and 40 rings. As for the numbers, they can show in as many rings as they want. I think our exhibitors understand that. What changes is, if you only count 50 rings, the results are very different than if you count 100 rings, so saying it doesn't matter and it doesn't make a difference, tell that to the person who is sitting 26th with 50 rings counted, but if they were showing with 100 rings they would be 16th. These are people's hopes and dreams we are messing with here, and the numbers are pretty drastic at the bottom. There are quite a number of cats that get bumped out that if they were under our normal scoring system would not. We have plenty of shows. Well over the top 25 cats have met our 100 ring requirement and gone well past that, so clearly there are enough shows in Regions 1-8 to justify going back to the 100 rings minimum.

Krzanowski: I think what we might be overlooking here is the average exhibitor. We need to find a way to bring the average exhibitor into the fold. If they feel that a win is out of reach for them, they're just not even going to try. By setting the bar midway between the 50 and the 100 at 75, it's a little harder to get but it's maybe something that the average exhibitor could possibly strive for. With expenses being what they are, travel restrictions, difficulties flying, difficulties with gas prices, etc., we have to consider that there may not be as many people able to get to shows, but they may try if they feel they stand a chance. It's just, you can't base your decisions on only a few of the top winners. You have to try to bring in the average person. Without them, there will be no count at the shows. **Currle:** Just to inform our constituents that are listening in, when we adopted 50 rings, Mary K helped write these proposals up and that was specifically because the year before we didn't score national wins because of COVID. It has been a difficult couple of years in scoring for national wins. I understand everybody's concern. It's too early to go back to 100 and 40. It's not too early to bump it up a bit, for the many reasons that people have talked about. We need to continue to give people a goal to reach and if we make it too hard, we're going to lose people. If we make it too easy, we are going to get the complainers. What I have seen with 50 rings, people can start out early in the year and get to a good level. People can now start out later in the year and they have only got to get the highest scoring 50 rings. I think we have opened up the competition, as opposed to restricting it, but I would certainly support what this Committee has come up with. **Newkirk:** Anyone else?

Motions to Consider

For the 2022-2023 season only, amend Article XXXVI National/Regional/Divisional Awards Program to set the number of rings credited and the national win point minimums according to the following motions.

At the completion of the show season, a cat/kitten/household pet (adult or kitten) will be credited with the points from its highest individual rings according to the following set of parameters:

Championship in Regions 1-9:

Motion: *75 rings credited, 3000 point minimum for a National Win*

Krzanowski: I'm going to proceed with presenting the first motion. For championship in Regions 1-9, the motion is that [reads]. **Newkirk:** OK Carol, hang on. I've got some hands up. **Morgan:** I was just waiting for the discussion. Has someone seconded her motion? **Newkirk:** She just read it, so she's making the motion. I thought you guys had questions about Mary K. **Currle:** Kenny will second. **Newkirk:** George, did you have something to say? **Eigenhauser:** I was going to discuss the motion when you're ready for that. **Newkirk:** Alright, so Carol has made the motion, Kenny seconded it.

Newkirk: Let's vote on the first motion; that is, [reads]. All those in favor raise your hand.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Hannon, Krzanowski, DelaBar, Hayata, Currle, Dunham, Roy and Webster voting yes.

Newkirk: The yes votes are Mark Hannon, Carol Krzanowski, Pam DelaBar, Hayata, Kenny, Cathy Dunham, Sharon Roy, Howard Webster. If you will take your hands down, the no votes are George Eigenhauser, John Colilla, Steve McCullough, Pam Moser, Kathy Calhoun, Annette Wilson, Melanie Morgan, Rachel Anger, Rich Mastin. If you will take your hands down, any abstentions? So, Rachel you can announce. **Anger:** That's 8 yes votes, 9 no votes, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** Thank you. So, the motion fails.

Motion *(withdrawn if the first R1-9 championship motion passes): 100 rings credited, 4000 point minimum for a National Win*

Newkirk: Let's go to the next motion, which is to go back to 100 rings, 4000 points for a national win. Do we need to vote on that Shelly? **Krzanowski:** It's the points, I think. The points might be different from what we had before. **Newkirk:** Alright, let's vote on it and make it clean. Any discussion on the second motion here? No? OK, let's vote. All those in favor of the second motion here, with is 100 rings and 4000 points. If you are in favor, raise your hand.

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

Newkirk: The yes votes are George Eigenhauser, Melanie Morgan, Steve McCullough, Mark Hannon, John Colilla, Annette Wilson, Pam Moser, Carol Krzanowski, Hayata-san, Rich Mastin, Kenny Currle, Kathy Calhoun, Cathy Dunham, Howard Webster. If you will take your

hands down, the no votes are Hayata-san [*sic*], Pam DelaBar. Abstentions? Sharon Roy. Rachel, I didn't see your hand up. **Anger:** I'm sorry, I couldn't get my hand up quickly enough. I am a yes vote. I did not record a vote for Howard Webster. **Eigenhauser:** Howard indicated he is having trouble with his microphone. Howard, did you vote in the chat so that we know what your vote is? **Newkirk:** I don't see Howard on here. **Tartaglia:** I think he dropped off. **Newkirk:** He's not on the list right now. We can pick up his vote when he comes back in. **Tartaglia:** Here he is. I'm promoting him now. **Newkirk:** Are you in, Howard? While Howard is getting the resolved, Carol, let's go on to the kittens.

Anger: Just wondering, a point of order if we have two motions on the floor at once. **Newkirk:** If Howard can vote, or we can just sit here and wait. I'm OK with either. **Anger:** He says he can talk, the audio is not working. **Newkirk:** Howard, would you just put in the chat if you are a yes for the 100 rings and 4000 points? Yes, he's OK with that. Do you see that Rachel? **Anger:** Yes. Is that a yes vote, then? **Anger:** Just wondering, a point of order if we have two motions on the floor at once. **Newkirk:** If Howard can vote, or we can just sit here and wait. I'm OK with either. **Anger:** He says he can talk, the audio is not working. **Newkirk:** Howard, would you just put in the chat if you are a yes for the 100 rings and 4000 points? Yes, so you can announce the vote. **Anger:** 15 yes, 1 no, 1 abstention. **Newkirk:** Thank you very much.

Kittens in Regions 1-9:

Motion: *30 rings credited, 1000 point minimum for a National Win*

Krzanowski: I'm going to go ahead and present the motion and we will see what happens. The motion is for [reads]. **Newkirk:** Any comments? [Discussion goes back to previous motion]

Newkirk: OK Carol, kittens Regions 1-9. **Krzanowski:** I already read the motion. Is there a second? **Newkirk:** Need a second. **Anger:** Rachel seconds. Standing second for all the motions in this report here. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you so much for doing that, Rachel. Any discussion on the kittens? No discussion? **Hannon:** Is this 30 rings? **Krzanowski:** Yes. **Newkirk:** Yes, 30 rings and 1000 points. Let's vote. All those in favor of 30 rings and 1000 points raise your hand.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Webster, Hayata, DelaBar, Roy, Currle and Krzanowski voting yes.

Newkirk: The yes votes are Howard, Hayata, Pam DelaBar, Sharon Roy, Carol Krzanowski, Kenny Currle. If you will take your hands down, the no votes are Mark Hannon, George Eigenhauser, Melanie Morgan, Rich Mastin, Pam Moser, John Colilla, Cathy Dunham, Kathy Calhoun, Steve McCullough, Annette Wilson, Rachel Anger. If you will take your hands down, any abstentions? No abstentions. OK Rachel, you can announce the vote. **Anger:** That's 6 yes votes, 11 no votes, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** The motion is not agreed to.

Motion (*withdrawn if the first R1-9 kitten motion passes*): *40 rings credited, 1400 point minimum for a National Win*

Newkirk: Let's go on to the second motion here for kittens. **Krzanowski:** The next motion is [reads]. **Newkirk:** Any discussion on this? Rachel did a standing second. Let's vote. All those in favor raise your hand.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Webster and DelaBar voting no.

Newkirk: The yes votes are George Eigenhauser, Mark Hannon, Pam Moser, Kenny Currle, Steve McCullough, Melanie Morgan, John Colilla, Carol Krzanowski, Sharon Roy, Kathy Calhoun, Rich Mastin, Hayata-san, Annette Wilson, Cathy Dunham and Rachel Anger. You can take your hands down. No votes? Howard and Pam DelaBar. Any abstentions? I don't see any abstentions, so Rachel, you can announce the vote. **Anger:** 15 yes votes, 2 no votes, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** OK, good deal.

Premiership in Regions 1-9:

Motion: *75 rings credited, 1500 point minimum for a National Win*

Newkirk: Let's move on to premiership. **Krzanowski:** For premiership in Regions 1-9 the motion is [reads]. **Newkirk:** Any debate on that motion? Let's call for the yes votes. If you are a yes, raise your hand.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Currle, Hannon, Krzanowski, DelaBar, Roy, Hayata and Webster voting yes.

Newkirk: The yes votes are Kenny Currle, Mark Hannon, Carol Krzanowski, Pam DelaBar, Sharon Roy, Hayata-san and Howard. If you will take your hands down, the no votes are George Eigenhauser, Melanie Morgan, Cathy Dunham, Rich Mastin, Steve McCullough, John Colilla, Rachel Anger, Pam Moser, Kathy Calhoun and Annette Wilson. If you will take your hands down, any abstentions? No abstentions. Go ahead Rachel when you are ready. **Anger:** That's 7 yes, 10 no, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** Thank you.

Motion *(withdrawn if the first R1-9 premiership motion passes): 100 rings credited, 2000 point minimum for a National Win*

Newkirk: Let's go to the next motion for premiers. **Krzanowski:** For premiership in Regions 1-9, the motion is [reads]. **Newkirk:** Any debate on that? All those in favor please raise your hand.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Carried.** DelaBar, Roy, Webster and Hayata voting no.

Newkirk: Rich Mastin, Melanie Morgan, Kenny Currle, George Eigenhauser, Annette Wilson, Mark Hannon, Carol Krzanowski, Pam Moser, Steve McCullough, Cathy Dunham, John Colilla, Kathy Calhoun. If you will take your hands down, the no votes please raise your hands. The no votes are Pam DelaBar, Sharon Roy, Howard Webster and Hayata-san. If you will take your hands down, any abstentions? Zero abstentions. Rachel, if you could announce the vote. **Anger:** I was a yes vote by the way. **Newkirk:** OK, thank you Rachel. **Anger:** That's 13 yes, 4 no, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** Thank you very much.

Household Pets in Regions 1-9:

Motion: 50 rings credited, 500 point minimum for a National Win

Newkirk: Now we are to the Household Pets. **Krzanowski:** Yes. The next motion is for Household Pets in Regions 1-9. The motion is [reads]. **Newkirk:** Any debate? I'll call the question. All those in favor raise your hand.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Currle, DelaBar, Hayata, Krzanowski, Roy and Webster voting yes.

Newkirk: I have Kenny Currle, Pam DelaBar, Carol Krzanowski, Hayata-san, Sharon Roy and Howard Webster. If you will take your hands down, the no votes are Kathy Calhoun, George Eigenhauser, Mark Hannon, Rachel Anger, Pam Moser, Rich Mastin, Steve McCullough, John Colilla, Melanie Morgan, Cathy Dunham, Annette Wilson. Thank you all. Any abstentions? OK Rachel, you can announce the vote. **Anger:** Thank you. That's 6 yes, 11 no, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** The motion is not agreed to.

Motion (withdrawn if the first R1-9 Household Pet motion passes): 75 rings credited, 750 point minimum for a National Win

Newkirk: Carol, we will do the second motion for Household Pets. **Krzanowski:** For Household Pets in Regions 1-9, the motion is [reads]. **Newkirk:** Any debate? Let's vote. All those in favor raise your hand.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Anger, Eigenhauser, Moser and Webster voting no. Hayata abstained.

Newkirk: The yes votes are Carol Krzanowski, Sharon Roy, Mark Hannon, Melanie Morgan, Annette Wilson, Cathy Dunham, Kathy Calhoun, Rich Mastin, John Colilla, Steve McCullough, Pam DelaBar. Going once, going twice. If you will take your hands down, the no votes are Kenny Currle. **Currle:** I'm a yes Darrell, sorry. **Newkirk:** OK. Rachel, you will note that. The no votes are George Eigenhauser, Rachel Anger, Pam Moser and Howard Webster. If you will take your hands down, the abstentions are Hayata-san. You can announce the vote. **Anger:** That's 11 yes votes, 5 no votes, 1 abstention. **Newkirk:** The motion is agreed to.

Motion (withdrawn if either of the other R1-9 Household Pet motions pass): 100 rings credited, 1000 point minimum for a National Win

Newkirk: The next motion is withdrawn.

Withdrawn.

Championship in the China area:

Motion: Set all the parameters for China in each class to the same values as for Regions 1-9. If this motion passes, the rest of the motions for China are withdrawn. The ad hoc committee does not recommend this motion, but we include it in the event the board wants to consider it.

DelaBar: The first motion [reads], has that been withdrawn? **Krzanowski:** If you will read further, I don't know why that reads as a motion. The Committee did not recommend this, but we included it. I should have read that one first I guess. I'm sorry, I apologize. That is a motion. **Newkirk:** If that motion passes, all the rest of them are null. **Krzanowski:** Exactly. I apologize for the confusion, so the motion is [reads]. **Newkirk:** Any debate? Let's vote on that one. All those in favor raise your hand.

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

Newkirk: The yes votes are Hayata-san, Cathy Dunham, Pam DelaBar, George Eigenhauser, Rachel Anger, Kathy Calhoun, John Colilla, Howard Webster, Annette Wilson, Pam Moser, Rich Mastin, Kenny Currle, Steve McCullough, Melanie Morgan, Sharon Roy. Take your hands down please. The no votes please. Mark Hannon, Carol Krzanowski. If you will take your hands down, any abstentions? You can read the results, Rachel. **Anger:** 15 yes votes, 2 no votes, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** The motion is agreed to.

***Motion:** 50 rings credited, 2000 point minimum for a National Win*

Newkirk: Let's go to championship in China, Carol. **Krzanowski:** The motion for championship in China is [reads]. **Newkirk:** Any debate on that one? [Discussion goes to previous motion]

Newkirk: The rest of the motions are withdrawn. Is that right, Carol? **Krzanowski:** That's correct.

Withdrawn.

***Motion** (withdrawn if the first China championship motion passes): 75 rings credited, 3000 point minimum for a National Win*

Withdrawn.

***Motion** (withdrawn if either of the other China Championship motions pass): 100 rings credited, 4000 point minimum for a National Win*

Withdrawn.

Kittens in the China area:

***Motion:** 20 rings credited, 700 point minimum for a National Win*

Withdrawn.

***Motion** (withdrawn if the first China kitten motion passes): 35 rings credited, 1000 point minimum for a National Win*

Withdrawn.

***Motion** (withdrawn if either of the other China Kitten motions pass): 40 rings credited, 1400 point minimum for a National Win*

Withdrawn.

Premiership in the China area:

***Motion:** 50 rings credited, 1000 point minimum for a National Win*

Withdrawn.

***Motion** (withdrawn if the first China premiership motion passes): 75 rings credited, 1500 point minimum for a National Win*

Withdrawn.

***Motion** (withdrawn if either of the other China Premiership motions pass): 100 rings credited, 2000 point minimum for a National Win*

Withdrawn.

Household Pets in the China area:

***Motion:** 50 rings credited, 500 point minimum for a National Win*

Withdrawn.

***Motion** (withdrawn if the first China Household Pet motion passes): 75 rings credited, 750 point minimum for a National Win*

Withdrawn.

***Motion** (withdrawn if either of the other China Household Pet motion passes): 100 rings credited, 1000 point minimum for a National Win*

Withdrawn.

Championship in the International Area:

***Motion:** Set all the parameters for the International Area in each class to the same values as Regions 1-9. If this motion passes, the rest of the motions for the International Area are withdrawn. The ad hoc committee does not recommend this motion, but we include it in the event the board wants to consider it.*

Krzanowski: Now we move on to the International Area. The first motion is [reads].
Newkirk: Any debate here? OK, so let's vote on the first motion here. Raise your hands if you are in favor of setting the parameters for the International Area to the same as China and Regions 1-9. All those in favor, raise your hands.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Roy voting yes.

Newkirk: Yes vote, Sharon Roy. If you will take your hand down, the no votes raise your hand. George Eigenhauser, Mark Hannon, Melanie Morgan, Kenny Currle, Pam DelaBar, Carol Krzanowski, Rachel Anger, Steve McCullough, John Colilla, Hayata-san, Rich Mastin, Kathy Calhoun, Cathy Dunham, Annette Wilson, Howard Webster and Pam Moser. If you will take your hands down, any abstentions? No abstentions. **Anger:** That's 1 yes vote, 16 no votes, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** So, the motion is not agreed to.

***Motion:** 50 rings credited, 2000 point minimum for a National Win*

Newkirk: Let's move on to the first motion. **Krzanowski:** For championship in the International Area, the motion is [reads]. **Newkirk:** Any debate? Rachel? **Anger:** Carol, would you remind us what it was before COVID? **Krzanowski:** Good grief. I don't know. Is Mary still on? **Anger:** Sorry. **Kolencik:** I'm still here. **Newkirk:** Go ahead Mary K. Can you answer the question? **Kolencik:** What was it in the International Area in championship before COVID? It was 100 rings and 4300 points. It was the same as the rest of the world. **Newkirk:** Thank you Mary K. **DelaBar:** I thought we had divisional wins for the International Area. **Newkirk:** We do, and we have national wins. This is setting the point minimums for the national wins. **Currle:** I would just like to go a little slower in these areas as far as getting their points up, because they are still facing more challenges with COVID than we are at this point. **Newkirk:** Thank you. **Kolencik:** I wanted to go back to what Pam said. The International Division does get divisional wins, but for national wins we have three specific areas; we have Regions 1-9 as one area, we have China excluding Hong Kong and I believe Macao – the rest of China is its own area, and then the areas of Hong Kong and all the other areas in the International Division are called the International Area and they do compete for national wins. **Newkirk:** Thank you Mary K. The motion is 50 rings, 2000 points for a national win. Let's vote on 50 rings and 2000 points in the International Area. Those in favor raise your hands.

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

Newkirk: I have Mark Hannon, Kenny Currle, Pam DelaBar, John Colilla, Carol Krzanowski, Cathy Dunham, Hayata-san, Rachel Anger, Rich Mastin, Sharon Roy, Steve McCullough, Howard Webster, Melanie Morgan, Annette Wilson, Kathy Calhoun. If you will take your hands down, the no votes are George Eigenhauser, Pam Moser. If you will take your hands down, any abstentions? No abstentions. OK Rachel. **Anger:** That's 15 yes votes, 2 no votes, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** OK, so the motion is agreed to. That means the next two motions are withdrawn.

***Motion** (withdrawn if the first International championship motion passes): 75 rings credited, 3000 point minimum for a National Win*

Withdrawn.

***Motion** (withdrawn if either of the other International Championship motions pass): 100 rings credited, 4000 point minimum for a National Win*

Withdrawn.

Kittens in the International Area:

Motion: 20 rings credited, 700 point minimum for a National Win

Newkirk: Kittens in the International Area. **Krzanowski:** For kittens in the International Area, the motion is [reads]. **Newkirk:** Questions? Debate? All those in favor raise your hands.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Anger, Eigenhauser, Morgan and Moser voting no.

Newkirk: The yes votes are Pam DelaBar, Kenny Currle, Carol Krzanowski, Cathy Dunham, Sharon Roy, Rich Mastin, Annette Wilson, Howard Webster, Hayata-san, Kathy Calhoun, John Colilla, Mark Hannon and Steve McCullough. If you will take your hands down, the no votes are Melanie Morgan, George Eigenhauser, Rachel Anger and Pam Moser. If you will take your hands down, any abstentions? No abstentions. **Anger:** I did not record a vote for Steve McCullough. **McCullough:** I voted for it. **Anger:** Thank you. That's 13 yes, 4 no, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** OK, the motion is agreed to. The next two are withdrawn.

Motion (withdrawn if the first International kitten motion passes): 35 rings credited, 1000 point minimum for a National Win

Withdrawn.

Motion (withdrawn if either of the other International Kitten motions pass): 40 rings credited, 1400 point minimum for a National Win

Withdrawn.

Premiership in the International Area:

Motion: 50 rings credited, 1000 point minimum for a National Win

Newkirk: Let's go to premiership. **Krzanowski:** For premiership in the International Area, the motion is [reads]. **Newkirk:** Let's vote. All those in favor raise your hands.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Anger, Eigenhauser and Moser voting no.

Newkirk: The yes votes are Kenny Currle, Carol Krzanowski, Sharon Roy, Mark Hannon, Pam DelaBar, Hayata-san, Cathy Dunham, Rich Mastin, John Colilla, Annette Wilson, Melanie Morgan, Howard Webster, Steve McCullough, Kathy Calhoun. Take your hands down. The no votes are George Eigenhauser, Pam Moser, Rachel Anger. If you will take your hands down, any abstentions? No abstentions. OK Rachel, you can announce the vote. **Anger:** That was 14 yes votes, 3 no votes, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** The motion is agreed to. The next two are withdrawn.

Motion (withdrawn if the first International premiership motion passes): 75 rings credited, 1500 point minimum for a National Win

Withdrawn.

***Motion** (withdrawn if either of the other International Premiership motions pass): 100 rings credited, 2000 point minimum for a National Win*

Withdrawn.

Household Pets in the International Area:

***Motion:** 50 rings credited, 500 point minimum for a National Win*

Newkirk: Let's go to Household Pets. **Krzanowski:** Household Pets in the International Area, the motion is [reads]. **Newkirk:** Any debate? I'll call the question. All those in favor raise your hands.

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

Newkirk: Rachel Anger, Kenny Currle, Carol Krzanowski, Kathy Calhoun, Melanie Morgan, Rich Mastin, Mark Hannon, Pam DelaBar, Cathy Dunham, Hayata-san, Steve McCullough, Sharon Roy, John Colilla, Annette Wilson, Howard Webster. If you will take your hands down, the no votes are George Eigenhauser and Pam Moser. Abstentions? No abstentions. Rachel? **Anger:** That's 15 yes votes, 2 no votes, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** Thank you. The motion is agreed to. The next two are withdrawn.

***Motion** (withdrawn if the first International Household Pet motion passes): 75 rings credited, 750 point minimum for a National Win*

Withdrawn.

***Motion** (withdrawn if either of the other International Household Pet motion passes): 100 rings credited, 1000 point minimum for a National Win*

Withdrawn.

Agility in all areas:

***Motion:** Each cat/kitten/household pet will be credited with the results from its 7 highest shows*

Newkirk: Agility. **Krzanowski:** This is the final motion for Agility in all areas. The motion is [reads]. **Newkirk:** OK. Is there debate on that? **McCullough:** What was it before COVID? Was it 10? **Krzanowski:** Again, I defer to Mary to see if she has an answer to that. **Newkirk:** Go ahead Mary K. **Kolencik:** I believe it was 15. **Newkirk:** Oh, it was 15. So, we're going from 15 down to 7. **Kolencik:** Yes, and this is what it is for this year, so it's just keeping what we have this year. **Newkirk:** OK, got it. Thank you Mary K for that update. Any debate on that? Continuing on with 7 highest scoring shows. Let's vote. All those in favor raise your hand.

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

Newkirk: I have Mark Hannon, Kenny Currle, Carol Krzanowski, Pam DelaBar, George Eigenhauser, Rachel Anger, Hayata-san, Kathy Calhoun, Sharon Roy, John Colilla, Melanie Morgan, Rich Mastin, Steve McCullough, Kathy Dunham, Annette Wilson and Pam Moser. If you will take your hands down, any no votes? Any abstentions? Rachel, you can announce the vote. **Anger:** I did not get a vote from Howard Webster. **Newkirk:** Howard, if you are a yes raise your hand. OK Howard, if you are a no raise your hand. **Eigenhauser:** If he can't raise his hand, maybe he can put it in the chat. **Newkirk:** Howard, if you're not there raise your hand. Calling Howard. Calling Howard. Can you put your vote in the chat so we can move on? **Tartaglia:** Now he has dropped off. He's not in the audience, Darrell. I don't know when he will be back. **Calhoun:** Does anybody have his phone number? **Anger:** I have it. **Calhoun:** Can somebody just call him so we can move on? **Anger:** He votes yes. **Newkirk:** Thank you. You can announce the vote. **Anger:** 17 yes, zero no, zero abstentions. **Newkirk:** OK, the motion is agreed to.

***Motion:** If a cat/household pet is exhibited in shows totaling less than the maximum number of credited rings, total credited points will be the sum of total points earned. For Agility, if a cat/kitten/household pet is exhibited in fewer than the maximum number of credited shows, total credited points will be the sum of total points earned.*

Newkirk: Is the next motion withdrawn Carol or not? Is that another motion? **Krzanowski:** That was the end. Wait a minute. Oh, there is another motion, yeah. OK, so the motion for agility [reads]. I believe that's the case anyway, so I don't know if we need this motion. **Kolencik:** In the actual Show Rules it has numbers in there, so this is like a housekeeping thing. It says, if a cat is exhibited in less than 100. No, you don't need this except for Agility you changed it to 7. You also changed it for the International Area, so this is housekeeping to make sure that this still stands, because in the actual Show Rules it has specific rings in that particular role. **Newkirk:** Any debate on this housekeeping motion? Is there any objection to the motion? No objection. By unanimous consent the motion is adopted.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Time Frame:

This meeting

Respectfully Submitted,

Carol Krzanowski, Sharon Roy, Monte Phillips and Mary Kolencik

Newkirk: OK Carol, anything else? **Krzanowski:** No, that really does conclude. Thank you very much. **Newkirk:** Thanks. You guys did a lot of work. Some of it was agreed to.

Unfinished Business and General Orders

(13) **OTHER COMMITTEES.**

None.

Newkirk: Are there any other committee reports we haven't addressed?

(14) **NEW BUSINESS.**

(a) **Annual Meeting Live Streaming Equipment.**

Newkirk: We've got two New Business items. #1 is Allene's live stream issue.

Tartaglia: Yes. I just wanted to ascertain if there was any interest in live streaming the annual meeting and related meetings like the board meeting on Thursday, meetings on Saturday and Sunday's board meeting. If there is any interest in live streaming, we can do that; however, it would require the purchase of some camera equipment and some accessories. So, first I guess there would be, is there an interest in live streaming? The cost of the equipment would be \$1,500, just to give you an idea of what we're looking at. **DelaBar:** I believe there is a great deal of interest in live streaming of our meetings at the annual meeting. I know that there were several clubs here in Region 9 that desired we have a hybrid meeting – in person and online – as we did last year, although I know that that is not something we can do with minimum room counts required, but I believe the streaming really helps people feel part of the organization. **Newkirk:** Can you make that into a motion? **DelaBar:** I so move what I just said. **Eigenhauser:** George seconds what she just said. **Newkirk:** Thank you. George, do you want to add to the debate? **Eigenhauser:** Ditto to everything Pam said. **Newkirk:** Anybody else? Kathy Calhoun, do you want to make a comment since this is spending money? **Calhoun:** My concern is, while I think it would broaden our reach, it will probably have an impact on our room count. So, there may be a significant trade-off for this. **Newkirk:** Anybody else? **DelaBar:** Delegates still have to attend. This helps everybody outside of the U.S. We're a global organization and we have many people who participate in CFA outside the U.S. that will not be delegates because they can't be, unless I can get an amendment passed which would be effective for next year. It shouldn't affect our room count at all, because we still have to have delegates and award winners and everybody else filling up that hotel. Think globally. **Newkirk:** Any other comments? **Calhoun:** I think that there are probably more than delegates and award winners that attend annuals. There will be some impact. I don't know if it would be dramatic, but I know there would be some. **Newkirk:** Let's vote. All those in favor of live streaming meetings at the annual raise your hands.

Newkirk called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Webster did not vote.

Newkirk: The yes votes are Mark Hannon, Kenny Currle, George Eigenhauser, Carol Krzanowski, Rich Mastin, Hayata-san, Steve McCullough, Melanie Morgan, Cathy Dunham, Sharon Roy, Pam DelaBar, Rachel Anger, Pam Moser, John Colilla, Annette Wilson, Kathy Calhoun. If you will take your hands down, the no votes? None. Abstentions? Zero. **Anger:** That's 16 yes votes, zero no votes, zero abstentions. One did not vote.

(b) **Entry Limit for Regional Show.**

Newkirk: Let's move on to Sharon Roy. You had an item about an entry limit, I believe. **Roy:** Yes, and this really was a mistake on Region 1's part. I'll take the blame for it. When we licensed the show, we didn't make an exception to the fact that we wanted a lower entry limit and it wasn't until Kat Brady was doing our flyer that she said, "but the CFA website says 225 and you're saying our flyer is blah blah." Anyway, all I'm asking is that we allow Region 1 to reduce the number of entries from the 225 that was on the original application to 150 entries. **Anger:** Rachel seconds. **Newkirk:** Thank you. **Eigenhauser:** How soon is the show? When is

the show date? **Roy:** It's the weekend before the annual. The third weekend of June.

Eigenhauser: So, it's a couple of months. **Roy:** Yes. **Eigenhauser:** No problem, thanks.

Newkirk: Any more debate? Is there any objection to the motion to decrease from 225 to 150 the entry limit for the Region 1 regional show? Seeing no objection, by unanimous consent, the rule is adopted.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Roy: Thank you. **Newkirk:** You're welcome.

(15) **OLD BUSINESS.**

None.

* * * * *

Newkirk: Anything else in open session? OK, it's 10:12 on the east coast, so let's come back in closed session at 10:30. Is that alright with everybody? It will give us a little bit of a break.

The open session portion of the meeting adjourned at 10:12 p.m. Eastern Time.

The executive session portion of the meeting adjourned at 1:36 a.m. Eastern Time.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Anger, Secretary

(16) DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS AND SUSPENSIONS.

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

22-002 *CFA v. Ortiz, Alex (aka Angelito, Alexcito)*

Violation of CFA Bylaws, Article XV, Section 4 (b, c, & g)

Guilty. The board has imposed the following disciplinary action: (1) \$500 fine payable within 30 days and a six month suspension from all CFA services; (2) CFA shall void the November 2021 registration of BOBERAN JORDAN SPARKS, CFA #0147-02300931, and return the cat to the prior ownership. [vote sealed]

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

None

Board-Cited Hearing: The Board may consider any protest filed by any member of a member club or in any other manner brought to the attention of the Executive Board. The Board may delegate authority to one or more persons to review, investigate, and determine if probable cause exists for the filing of a formal protest. This case was heard on direct cite by the CFA Executive Board. Timely notice was given to the parties, and the matter was heard. Final disposition is as follows:

None