

**TRANSCRIPT OF ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE
CFA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
DECEMBER 6, 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)	VIRTUAL CAT COMPETITION.	9
(4)	ENTRY CLERK PROGRAM COMMITTEE	11
(5)	AWARDS COMMITTEE.....	13
(6)	BREEDS AND STANDARDS.	20
(7)	SHOW RULES.....	21
(8)	JUDGING PROGRAM REPORT.	42
(9)	TREASURER'S REPORT.....	56
(10)	AUDIT COMMITTEE.....	62
(11)	BUDGET COMMITTEE.....	64
(12)	INTERNATIONAL DIVISION.....	67
(13)	EXPERIMENTAL FORMATS.....	69
(14)	IT SYSTEM OPTIMIZATION.....	73
(15)	OTHER COMMITTEES.	75
(16)	NEW BUSINESS.....	76
(17)	OLD BUSINESS.....	82
(18)	MARKETING.....	83
(19)	DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS AND SUSPENSIONS.....	85

Secretary's Note: The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. met on Tuesday, December 6, 2022, via Zoom video conference. **President Richard Mastin** 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. Richard Mastin (President)
Mr. Russell Webb (Vice-President)
Ms. Rachel Anger (Secretary)
Ms. Kathy Calhoun (Treasurer)
Ms. Sharon Roy (NAR Director)
Mrs. Pam Moser (NWR Director)
Ms. Paula Noble (GSR Director)
Mr. John Colilla (GLR Director)
Mr. Michael Shelton (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
James Simbro, IT Systems Analyst
Matthew Wong, ID Representative

Absent:

Eva Chen, ID-China Representative

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

Mastin: Madame Secretary, please do the roll call. **Anger:** Thank you and hello everyone. [**Secretary's Note:** Secretary Rachel Anger called the roll, as reflected above.] Thank you. We appear to have a quorum. I will turn it back to you, Mr. President. **Mastin:** Thank you Madame Secretary.

TRANSCRIPT

Reports of Officers, Boards, and Standing Committees

(1) APPROVE ORDERS OF THE DAY.

CFA EXECUTIVE BOARD Mid-Quarterly Video Conference Meeting Agenda December 6, 2022		
1.	Approve Orders of the Day	Mastin
Reports of Officers, Boards, and Standing Committees		
2.	Ratification of Online Motions	Anger
3.	Virtual Cat Competition	Kerr
4.	Entry Clerking Program	Dunham
5.	Awards	Dunham
6.	Breeds and Standards	Wilson
6.	Show Rules	Kolencik
7.	Judging Program Report	Morgan
8.	Treasurer's Report	Calhoun
9.	Audit Committee	Calhoun
10.	Budget Committee	Calhoun
11.	International Division	Calhoun
12.	Clerking Program [to be moved to Executive Session]	Colilla
13.	Experimental Formats	Roy
14.	IT System Optimization	Simbro
16.	Appeal and Board Cite Hearings (to be held at 10:55 p.m.) [to be moved to Executive Session]	Perkins
Unfinished Business and General Orders		
15.	Other Committees	
16.	New Business	
	(a) Show Date Request [to be moved to Executive Session]	Colilla
17.	Old Business	
	ADJOURN OPEN SESSION	
18.	Marketing	Hannon/Morgan

Mastin: The meeting is now called to order. Welcome all to the December 6, 2022 CFA Board of Directors Meeting. Board members, may I have any additions and changes to the Orders of the Day agenda? **Anger:** To be moved to Executive Session are Agenda Items #13 Clerking, #16 the hearings and #18.a., the Show Date Request. **Mastin:** OK, thank you. **DelaBar:** We have Unfinished Business. I guess this will go under New Business, the question and consideration for 44 Gatti and their request for an exception to policy. That should come under New Business. **Mastin:** OK thank you, Ms. DelaBar. **Wilson:** We can remove item #6, the Breeds and Standards report, and we will move it to the February board meeting. **Mastin:** Thank you Ms. Wilson. Does anybody else have any changes or additions? May I have a motion to accept the Orders of the Day? **Eigenhauser:** I'll move. **Mastin:** George, thank you. May I have a second? **DelaBar:** DelaBar seconds. **Mastin:** Pam DelaBar, thank you. Are there any objections to the Orders of the Day? Seeing no objections, the Orders of the Day are approved.

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

Reports of Officers, Boards, and Standing Committees

(2) RATIFICATION OF ONLINE MOTIONS.

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
MOTIONS THAT REQUIRE RATIFICATION			
1.	Krzanowski DelaBar 10.07.22	Approve the Show Rules addendum as follows: <i>Effective immediately for the 2022-2023 Show Season, when no show takes place in a kitten's region, division, or area of residence during the kitten's four months of eligibility, the owner can request an exception to the residency requirement for the kitten class (see Article XXXVI - National/Regional/Divisional Assignment). The request must be made to Central Office by April 28, 2023. Email Shirley Dent (sdent@cfa.org) and copy James Simbro (jsimbro@cfa.org).</i>	Motion Carried (subject to ratification).
No discussion.			
2.	Anger Hannon 10.28.22	Grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04 and allow the Central Breed Cat Club to change their show license for their November 5/6, 2022 show in Bangkok, Thailand from 10 AB to 5 AB.	Motion Carried (subject to ratification).
<p>Wilson: I'm unclear on the explanation of who will be judging the November proposed 5 ring show. I THINK the message is that it's being worked out with judges who have already bought tickets, but I'm confused by the information about January and February shows and 'moving rings.' Not sure it matters in the grand scheme, it sounds like they are trying to make the best out of an unfortunate situation with their loss of sponsor...but I feel like if this is 'formalizing' the arrangement, it would be good to know the facts (show is now on Saturday, Nov. 5 is a good fact). I don't think we should also be considering changing contracts for future shows until/unless this change is approved...especially being unclear of what (other than going from Nov. 5/6 to Nov 5) is moving.</p> <p>DelaBar: I do not know why there cannot be some split rings and honor most of these contracts. It appears there are some judges with multi-show tickets. How will the change in format, if approved, affect these other shows?</p> <p>Anger: I have posed Pam's question and Annette's question to the club and have requested responses, which I will share when they are received. Calhoun: The International Chairs - Matthew Wong and I, along with the Sub-Committee Chair - Bob Zenda are in support of this change. I am sure that the club will manage their relationships with the contracted judges in a fair and appropriate manner. Mastin: As requested by Pam DelaBar and Paula Noble, we will hold off on the vote to allow Central Breed Cat Club to address the questions. Rachel, please send a request to the Club (and copy in Kathy Calhoun, Mathew Wong and Bob Zenda) asking they respond to the questions as soon as possible in order for the Board of Directors to act on their request in a timely manner. Anger: Already done and a response was received, but it is unclear and I'm attempting to get a clarification. DelaBar: Peter just told me he and Yanina did not have plane tickets yet - he was told on 18 October the show would have to go to 1 day. That's over a week ago and we are just addressing this as of yesterday. We cannot just rubber stamp an action without ensuring we have all bases covered. Anger: Just to let you know, part of the fault is due to my attempt to get it right. After I reviewed the original request, it took a day or two to request and gather information, and compose a motion in order to attempt what Pam suggests - cover all bases. The language barrier is making it more difficult. Webb: Thank you Rachel for the explanation. It is appreciated. Hannon: Ditto.</p> <p>Anger: Here is the clarification from the club and Bob's response. Club: ... Club considers to have 5AB rings as: 1. Dennis Ganoe (AB); 2. Carol Fogarty (AB); 3. Allan Raymond (AB); 4. Nadejda Rumyantseva (AB); 5. Irina Khachenko (AB). ... Zenda: Zuns is our country coordinator for Thailand. She has probably provided more info than you need. Bottom line is they need to reduce from 10 ring 2-day show to a one day 5 ring show, and they</p>			

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
<p><i>have provided the revised judging slate for the one day show. All those judges (except Allan, who is local) already purchased tickets. They will work with the other judges who haven't purchased tickets yet, cancel their contracts for this show and try to bring them in for some future show.</i> Wilson: Thank you. This answers my question. DelaBar: Actually I understand what Zuns is saying. I wanted clarification on the multi-show airfares as I know some were purchased by the Indonesian club. Mastin: Rachel, thank you for obtaining all the information to address questions and comments.</p>			
3.	Anger Roy 10.31.22	For their November 12/13, 2022 show in Ningbo City, Zhejiang Province, China, grant the Swire Cat Fanciers' Club an exception to Show Rules 2.28 and 4.06.3. and allow the Saturday longhair rings to be held in Mall A and the Sunday shorthair rings to be held in Mall B.	Motion Carried (subject to ratification).
<p>Colilla: Both Wain and I support this. It is a very creative way to promote CFA. Please support this. DelaBar: Clever compromise to placate sponsors. Colilla: I talked to Allene prior to sending this request. She think we need to license it as two show separately shows. My preference is to license it as one show instead of two. They will take care of the details in their show flyers. Tartaglia: Something to consider regarding the licensing. Will the exhibitors have a choice of entering one or both shows? If they do, then it should be two shows. If the fee to license the additional, second show is the issue, the fees could be waived. Colilla: Example. The format is 3 LH for Saturday is 500 each in Mall A. The format 3 SH for Sunday is 500 each in Mall B. The HHP is 6 rings for 500 both Saturday in Mall A and Sunday is in Mall B. The two Mall is very close to each other. Tartaglia: I spoke with John for some clarification. The 500 is \$500RMB, the entry FEE (not number of entries). The entry limit will be no more than 225 cats for each day – 225 LH for Saturday, 3 judgments; 225 SH for Sunday, 3 judgments; 225 for HHP spread out over the two days, 6 judgments. The LH and SH cats will be scored as specialty rings and the HHP as an allbreed ring. Technically the format is 3 LH/SH, 6 HHP. Whether the show is licensed as two separate shows or one show will depend on whether or not it's important that Scoreboard list that some cats were shown at Mall A and other cats in Mall B and I'll be discussing this with Agnes. From a strictly scoring standpoint and the number of points a cat receives, the cats will receive the same number of points whether it's licensed as one show or two shows. Mastin: How far apart are the Malls? And, do they share the same address? Colilla: About 6-7km.</p>			
4.	Executive Committee 11.01.22	For the Oriental Crown Feline Fanciers show November 5/6, 2022 in Zhejiang, Ningbo Province, 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, November 3, 2022.	Motion Carried (subject to ratification).
No discussion.			
5.	Anger Curre 11.04.22	For its March 11/12, 2023 show in Timonium, Maryland, grant the Crab and Mallet Cat Club (Region 7) permission to conduct two OCP experimental rings, using two allbreed judges who are already judging the show.	Motion Failed. Dunham, Eigenhauser, Hayata, Morgan, Roy and Shelton voting yes. Anger, Calhoun, Curre and Webb abstained.
<p>Hannon: As pointed out by Rachel, the initial intent was to bring in separate judges for the OCP rings. This was done at the Florida show in June and attracted additional entries which was the reason for this experiment. Shows since then have requested, and received approval, to have existing judges hand out ten rather than three AB champion wins in their final or ten rather than two AB Premier wins. As I previously pointed out, at the first Maryland show to use this exception there were no LH Opens/Premiers and on Sunday, due to transfer to GP and absentees, there were not even ten Open/Premiers present and there were no additional entries attracted due to this experimental format. The Board's reaction was to establish minimum numbers entered in order to use this</p>			

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
<p>exception to the approved exception to the Experimental format. I continue to believe this format should be limited to large shows with extra judges brought in to judge the OCP. I think the intended format has only been used once. DelaBar: I agree with Mark. This was to be an “extra special limited to regional shows” format. If we expand the use of this, it should be for only those shows with large counts(# to be determined). Currle: Cathy Dunham's Show in December has already been approved to have one OCP ring with minimums in place. Is it our intention to just approve some and deny other clubs who are interested in something different that offers their exhibitors an opportunity to compete on what they may perceive as a more level playing field? I don't object allowing Crab and Mallet to have this available to them (they consistently have a very large entry anyway), as well as any other CFA club who may want to offer this which attract a few more entries. Hannon: Kenny points out we have already approved this exception for a show in the Midwest Region. We have also already approved an exception for Capital CF in November and for Greater Baltimore CC in December. That is in addition to Colonial Annapolis last June. I propose we put a pause on any more exceptions to the OCP rings until we receive the required club reports and we can evaluate the format. We have already approved three exceptions for shows in Maryland. At a minimum we should not approve further exceptions in that area until we can review those shows already approved. Currle: I propose we should allow OCP rings with minimums, to remain available to any club throughout this show season. Wilson: I think the ‘minimums in place’ is the key. I don’t think top 10 CH/PR is the way to go, it should be based on entries in those categories. Roy: I have to agree with Kenny. It seems to generate good will. Also we did discuss this as an alternative for clubs who might not be able to have the room for an extra ring or affordability. It is 8 extra pr and ch wins over a weekend only. Hannon: The original proposal was to have this experimental format at the International Show to attract more entries. To permit four shows in suburban Baltimore to have extra awards makes it common and not special.</p>			
6.	Anger Noble 11.07.22	Grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04 and allow the China Kiwi Fanciers Cat Club to change their show license for their November 13, 2022 show in Chengdu, Sichuan Province, China from 5 SH/4 LH to 6 SH/4 LH and add Katherine Liu (who was erroneously omitted) to the show license application.	Motion Carried (subject to ratification).
<p>Anger: One of our eagle eyed board members noticed that the judge's contract had a September date, not the November 13 date of the show we are discussing. I asked Lisa in Central Office why we received a September contract. She said: “the show in September was cancelled due to Covid restrictions. They’ve moved it to November.” My apologies - Lisa does a great job but getting relevant information from her to compose this motion was difficult. I am sorry I wasn't provided with this fact, to pass along to you.</p>			
7.	Executive Committee 11.10.22	For the Swire Cat Fanciers show November 12, 2022 in Jiangsu, Ningbo Province, 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, November 10, 2022.	Motion Carried (subject to ratification).
No discussion.			
8.	Anger Currle 11.10.22	For its March 11/12, 2023 show in Timonium, Maryland, grant the Crab and Mallet Cat Club (Region 7) permission to conduct one OCP experimental ring each day in championship (with a minimum champion entry of 30 at closing) and premiership (with a minimum premier entry of 15 at closing), allowing one of the contracted allbreed judges to do a top 10 OP/CH in each of Championship and Premiership, along with their top allbreed final. If the show meets the required entry counts for champions and premiers, judges Teresa Sweeney and Anne Mathis will do "OCP" in conjunction with their allbreed Championship and Premiership finals.	Motion Failed. Colilla, DelaBar, Hannon, Krzanowski, Moser and Noble voting no. Anger, Calhoun, Hayata and Webb abstained.

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
<p>Hannon: I do not know why the club thinks lack of minimums in the earlier motion was an issue. I assumed minimums would be required if the original motion passed. My concern is having a 4th show in suburban Baltimore using this experimental format. The purpose of experimental formats is to obtain feedback on the format to assist the board in determining whether or not the format should be added as an approved format. This is what we did with the Super Specialties format. We are unlikely to receive any significant input that differs from the first three shows in the Baltimore area. The purpose of this format is to attract additional entries. Having judges already on the panel simply expand their final from Top 3 Champions to Top Ten and from Top 2 Premiers to Top Ten is unlikely to draw many additional entries. It will only attract many entries if there is a large entry such as the International Show which is what this format was created for. Anger: Understood, thank you. Because the club did not contact me directly, they assumed the minimums were in the original motion also. I simply presented what was given to me to present. You may be correct about the outcome of this motion but it is an exercise to make sure the club is receiving fair consideration.</p>			
9.	Executive Committee 11.23.22	For the Nishi Nihon Cat Club's 6 AB show in Osaka, Japan (Region 8) to be held December 4, grant an exception to Show Rule 5.01.m. and increase the entry limit from 100 to 150. The club will issue a new flyer, publicize the change, and send notifications to all entered exhibitors.	Motion Carried (subject to ratification).
No comments.			
11.	Executive Committee 11.29.22	For the Swire Cat Fanciers show December 3/4, 2022 in Jiangsu, Ningbo Province, 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, December 1, 2022.	Motion Carried (subject to ratification).
No comments..			

Mastin: Ms. Anger, we're going to go to Ratification of Online Motions. **Anger:** Thank you. We have motions 1 through 11. On the screen you will not see #10. That was executive session. I would move for ratification of the results of those motions as reported. **Krzanowski:** Carol seconds. **Mastin:** Thank you Carol. Is there any discussion on the online motions for ratification? **Anger:** That obviously acknowledges that #8 failed, so my motion does not include that one to be ratified. **Mastin:** Can we have #8 on the screen? **Tartaglia:** It's there. **Anger:** And #5 failed as well. **Mastin:** OK, thank you. Is there any other discussion? Are there any objections? Seeing no objections, the motion passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Mastin: Thank you Ms. Anger. **Hannon:** Can we make the report on the screen larger? I can't read it and I suspect some of our audience can't read it. **Mastin:** Thank you Mark. Allene, can you accommodate Mark Hannon's request? **Tartaglia:** Yes. Is that better? **Mastin:** It's better for me. Mark, is it better for you? **Tartaglia:** I can't make it much bigger than that. **Mastin:** He is shaking his head yes. **Tartaglia:** OK.

(3) VIRTUAL CAT COMPETITION.

Committee Chair: Nancy Kerr
Liaison to Board: Cathy Dunham
List of Committee Members: Michael Altschul, Nancy Kerr, Denise Mangold, Iris Zinck (as of 11/26/22)

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

The committee was on hiatus to reorganize the committee structure and the format of the shows. A new committee chair was ratified at the October board meeting.

VCCs are still a viable media, they are not meant to replace in person shows. They are a way to reach people who may never attend an in person show or are in an area where there is no CFA cat shows. In this day and age, most people have at least one picture of their cat on their phone, tablet, etc.

Current Happenings of Committee:

The committee is currently recruiting additional members that bring certain talents to the committee such as graphic and web design. Of the current five members of the VCC committee, three people are definitely willing to stay on the committee, while two will have only limited availability.

The committee is currently determining dates for two proposed VCC events during the last half the show season (Jan thru Apr).

The proposed format would be for the events to work within a theme and use two judges. Prizes in the form of e-gift cards and e-certificates would be awards to the top three entries in the category or categories which would reduce the cost of mailing items around the world.

The committee currently does not have a budget for the remainder of the current fiscal year and has submitted a request to the budget committee, which the board will consider during that report.

Future Projections for Committee:

Submit a budget for the 2023-2024 fiscal year.

The VCC committee will continue to plan and run the events

Work with Marketing committee to ensure VCC events become part of the overall marketing strategy for CFA.

Work with Launchpad and CO to schedule the platform upgrade.

Board Action Items:

Motion submitted through the budget committee report.

Time Frame:

Ongoing

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Estimated dates and themes for VCC events.

When platform upgrade will\took place

Report on happening with the Marketing committee

*Respectfully Submitted,
Nancy Kerr, Chair*

Mastin: We are going to move on. Virtual Cat Competition is on the agenda next. Allene, can you bring Nancy Kerr in? **Tartaglia:** Yes. **Mastin:** Hi Nancy. Can you hear me? We can see you talking but we cannot hear you. **Tartaglia:** It's got to be a setting on her end to turn the audio on. **Mastin:** Nancy, we still cannot hear you so I'm going to continue. I want to thank you for your report and thank you for being available. If you are unable to connect with your sound, we will direct questions for Cathy Dunham to answer. Nancy and Cathy, there are no action items on here at this time. The one action item you have will be addressed under Kathy Calhoun's Budget Committee report. Does the board have any questions for Nancy and/or Cathy Dunham on the report? OK, I do not see any questions. Nancy, I want to thank you for your report. Will you be able to be available to address any questions during Kathy Calhoun's Budget Report? She said yes. OK, thank you Nancy. I don't know what time that will be, but it will be later during the meeting. Thank you.

(4) ENTRY CLERK PROGRAM COMMITTEE

Committee Chair: Cathy Dunham
List of Committee Members: Sheryl Zink, Paula Noble, Dick Kallmeyer, James Simbro

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

The committee has been placed under the IT committee as a sub-committee.

Clean up of the Entry Clerk databases which included achieving everything except the last two years of data, duplicate contact information, duplicate cat information, and duplicate email addresses has been completed.

The addition of miscellaneous and provisional cats to the breed summary has been completed.

The following issues are being worked on for inclusion in the system upgrades.

1. *Allowing the use of duplicate email addresses in the contract data.*
2. *Edits to check that Misc. and Prov entries have a CFA registration number and the accepted colors for the specific breed are the only colors that can be entered in the categories.*
3. *Linking the Entry Program to the registration database so data can be verified which will eliminate many changes/corrections that occur in the show hall because information was entered incorrectly and never corrected in the Entry Program. This goes along with being able to enter a show through eCats.*
4. *Add additional reporting options to the system. Example: Many clubs are doing box lunches and that information is collected by the entry clerk and currently being hand counted.*
5. *Ability to add files to the internal email system of the entry clerking program.*

Current Happenings of Committee:

The committee has been discussing with the scoring committee ways that processes can be automated in and around a show. One of the items that we think could be automated is the show catalog for exhibitors. If we could move in the direction of an electronic catalog, it could save some costs related to printing a catalog. Currently, our show rules do not prohibit a club from offering this option although it has never been done to our knowledge. In the spirit of gathering information the committee would like to offer an electronic version of the show catalog to exhibitors at three shows from January 2023 through April 2023. The clubs would still offer the printed version of the show catalog as is the current practice. This electronic version would just be available to exhibitors as an additional option at no charge. After each show is over, we would ask for comments concerning the electronic catalog, delivery system, like/dislikes. Committee chair and entry clerk Cathy Dunham has agreed to offer the option in conjunction

with shows she is entry clerking. Due to the additional work the committee does not want to tax other entry clerks at this time. Due to the current way the show catalog is produced in the entry clerking program we would need exceptions to show rules 7.06, 7.07, 7.09, 7.12, and 7.18 all of which have to do with the specific items that have to be included in a show catalog. The current catalog produced from the program does not include the specific items included in these rules.

Future Projections for Committee:

Continue to review the enhancements for the program. Provide a review of the data collected in the beta test.

Board Action Items:

Motion: *Approve the beta test for an electronic catalog at three shows*

Mastin: We are going to move on to the Entry Clerk Program. Cathy Dunham?

Dunham: As you can see, I am happy to answer any questions. There is one motion that I will

read and then happy to answer questions about that [reads]. **Mastin:** May I have a second please? **Morgan:** Melanie seconds. **Mastin:** I heard Melanie the loudest, so Melanie you've got that one. OK, open for discussion. Cathy, I do not see any discussion. Is there any objections to Cathy's motion and Melanie's second? Seeing no objections, the motion passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Dunham: Thank you. **Mastin:** Cathy, thank you.

Time Frame:

Ongoing

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Update on progress and beta test.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Cathy Dunham, Chair*

(5) **AWARDS COMMITTEE.**

Committee Chair: Cathy Dunham
List of Committee Members: Martha Auspitz, Cyndy Byrd, Leslie Carr

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

The committee continues to work through the recommendations that were presented at the June board meeting. The following is an update on that progress.

Short-term recommendations:

1. *Board Statement – **Completed.***
2. *Respectfully request that the CFA Board of Directors follow the show rules and policies of the organization with a no tolerance policy for granting exceptions unless an Act of God situation is presented. Effective immediately. **This failed at the meeting.***
3. *Rescind the current exception to show rule 4.04. Effective October 1, 2022. **This was approved and has taken effect.***
4. *Survey for clubs and exhibitors for scoring, awards, and other pertinent items to be completed no later than October 1, 2022. **The survey has been completed. The committee continues to review the items that received the most interest.***
5. *“Continental” closing date and time for all shows in R1-9. **Tabled in June so it could be included in the survey. It was one of the items that received positive interest. The committee has worked with the show rules committee and the proposed rule will be presented in the show rules committee report. We did refine the closing date and time to only include R1-7 excluding Hawaii. Additional rationale will be included with the proposed show rule.***
6. *Auto shut down of entries through CFA’s on-line entry form. All shows in R1-9 close on date/time suggested above. Central Office would have authority to extend closing time based on a server or website issue only. Additional consideration would need to be looked at for the ID divisions. Effective October 1, 2022. **Tabled in June so it could be included in the survey. It did receive positive interest and does go along with the continental closing date and time. Currently, the committee will table this option to determine if it is needed after the implementation of the closing date and time if passed. The programming for this already exists as it is used for China.***
7. *Create a real time query for each show, linked on the CFA Schedule, that runs against the entry database. Query produces a count of entries submitted by class (kitten, championship, premiership, HHP). It is not intended to replace the current Show Summary, but to provide an ongoing count as entries added to the database. Effective of October 1, 2022. **This has been completed and is in use on the show schedule.***

Long-term recommendations:

1. Exhibitor Code of Conduct – **This was completed, presented to the board in October and was ratified.**
2. Special Investigation Committee – **This committee has been formed and one member from the awards committee is a member of this new committee to help with the transition.**
3. Centralized Entry Clerking – **Passed in June. Comments from CO are included here. This is a topic that exhibitors included in their comments on the survey with the majority of the comments being positive.**

Comments from CO:

I think it's important to note that the intent is to move forward. I believe it was mentioned at the meeting that further details would be provided at the October board meeting. It was mentioned at the October board meeting but I think it should be made more clear that centralizing entry clerking at the CO is not the way to go and the reasons are outlined below.

The concept of centralized entry clerking is appealing, however, as we further consider what needs to take place to actually make it happen, we are finding the matter to be more complicated than originally thought. The current thought is to have two tiers of entry clerking: Tier 1 is the opening and closing of a show, posting the breed count summary, data entry to be done by Central Office; Tier 2 is everything else at the local level – money, exhibitor questions, print judge's books, master clerk catalog.

Towards the end of last show season, there were up to 8 shows per weekend with usually 8 different entry clerks. The Central Office does not have sufficient existing staff to close 8 shows in a weekend, especially since most entries are received at or very close to the deadline. The staff already involved with registration type work are likely the best candidates to handle the data entry for shows – 3 people – but even that is iffy since people take time off, there are holidays, people get sick, etc. Granted most shows have no more than 150 entries but that can change at any time. Absorbing entry clerking into the Central Office is a very large project for which we are not currently staffed or trained. Splitting the entry clerking task into two tiers – data entry and everything else (money, questions, printing show items) has further challenges. We guesstimate that the cost for CO to do the data entry portion will be more costly than a regular entry clerk service since CFA is paying not only salary but benefits and taxes as well.

Perhaps there is another solution for what we are attempting to achieve with Centralized Entry Clerking (CEC) which may or may not resolve current issues.

1. Stuffing – there are no show rules in place to prohibit the number of cats an individual can enter. Centralized entry clerking will not solve this issue.
2. Reverse Stuffing - there are no show rules in place to prohibit individuals from absenting cats from a ring/rings. Centralized entry clerking will not solve this issue.

3. *Breed Summary Posting – there are no show rules in place that require a breed summary to be posted at any specific time prior to a show. If a breed summary is required to be posted, add a show rule and enforce it. Also, outline a penalty if it isn't enforced. Currently, CFA has the ability to pull a breed summary and post it on the show calendar at any time once entries have been entered in the show. Centralized entry clerking is not necessary to post a breed summary, provided CFA's entry clerk software is used (see #4 below).*
4. *Universal closing date/time and auto shut-down of entries. Centralized entry clerking is not needed for this. CFA has the ability to open and close a show in the entry clerk software at any given time. CO/CFA can also control when online entries close. These motions were tabled.*
5. *Online entries. Kathy Durdick has developed the online, real time, entry count. Of course, this does not capture entries received via regular mail, email, at shows, etc. This motion carried effective October 1, 2022.*
6. *Require CFA's entry clerk software be used for all CFA shows. Approximately 98%-99% of the entry clerks already use CFA's software. Consider penalizing a show which does not utilize an entry clerk who uses CFA's software with a fee, \$500, if they use another software. The fine has to be high or clubs/entry clerks will simply pay it. If the fine is not paid, they don't get to license another show. Incentivize shows to hire entry clerks who use CFA's software. The fine and penalty for non-payment should be outlined in the show rules.*
7. *Dissemination of entry data. There is a concern that some entry clerks provide specific information to certain people regarding entries they've received for a show, for example, so and so entered a black Persian kitten. The show rules do not currently address what information can or cannot be given out. Modify the show rules to clearly state what information can and can't be provided by an entry clerk and the penalty if the show rule isn't followed. This must be done even if there is Centralized entry clerking. We all need to know the rules.*
8. *There is a concern that an entry clerk service has too much control when they are the ones putting on the show, hiring the judges, etc. If this is considered a conflict of interest, then don't let show management also do entry clerking.*

It appears the concerns around the recent count manipulation can be most simply, easily and far less costly addressed by having proper show rules in place, with appropriate penalties and then enforcing penalties when show rules aren't followed. If adding show rules and making a few other tweaks, such as requiring breed summaries to be publicized, are put in place for the new show season and we continue to have problems, then we can look for further solutions and perhaps centralized entry clerking is the ultimate answer.

Once CFA's computer software revamp is completed, CSU2022 estimated to be done by August 2023, CFA's entry clerk software will "talk" with CFA's cat database and data entry for entry

clerking should be less time consuming and more streamlined through a user's Ecat account, regardless of whether it is centralized or not.

Current Happenings of Committee:

The committee continues to work with the show rules committee on the rules for entry clerks. These rules will help current entry clerks and lay the groundwork for centralized entry clerking. These rules will be presented in February for the board's consideration.

We have worked with the show rules committee to prepare two additional show rules for consideration.

- 1. This rule works in conjunction with the real-time query (#7 above). It requires that entries received by other delivery options such as fax, email, etc. be entered through the on-line entry system so they are date and time stamped and included in the query count. The actual rule will be presented during the show rules committee report.*
- 2. This rule requires that all CFA entry clerks use the CFA entry clerking program. The actual rule will be presented during the show rules committee report.*

Future Projections for Committee:

Wrap up any incomplete approved recommendations from the June meeting. Continue to work on any additional items brought to the committee and prepare for the nominations for Star Awards.

Mastin: Cathy don't go too far because you're up next. **DelaBar:** Rich, I had my hand up. **Mastin:** I'm sorry Pam, go ahead. **DelaBar:** Cathy and I have had a few emails over the entry clerk program. I know that there's going to be a show rule brought up on the use of the CFA website entry form. I have given the board previously some ideas on the different characters that are used, especially over here in Europe. It's going to be very difficult for us to be able to use this – not myself particularly, but those that do not speak English as a first language. So, basically, I want to know how many languages will our instructions be in and how are we going to deal with our weird – excuse me – letters that we have in names and sentences. We have a variety of country codes, in addition to our own area codes and the time stamps on the entry form. So, what I am really concerned about is if we have a problem and it's all caused by one of these differences that I've just brought up. With time differences, sometimes we find that there's nobody we can go to for help. **Mastin:** Cathy Dunham, do you want to address the question? **Dunham:** Sure. Pam, after our discussion today online, I did talk with Allene and we are starting the process to investigate. The situation that you're referring to is not only for the entry clerking program, but I think it is a system-wide issue, as I understand it, and we're bringing James Simbro into the conversation and after this meeting and most likely after the holidays, because everybody is going various places, we will start meeting and try to resolve the situation for you and try to give you some ability for your entry clerks to ask questions or be able to get a hold of somebody. I know that's difficult at times because of the time zones, but we will do our very best to accommodate what we certainly can. Some of it might be obsolete by the time we get to the potential use of eCats to be able to enter shows, but we are more than happy to be try and accommodate anything that Regions 8, 9 or the ID Division need to make this process easier.

DelaBar: Cathy and I talked about getting some of my smart entry clerk people to work on this, because I have not used the CFA entry clerk program in this iteration of it. You brought up another problem. CFA is the new guy over here. We have been getting – most of our people coming in to our cat shows came from other organizations. Again, we’re dealing in most cases with people who do not speak English as a first language. Then we’re going to ask that people who even want to try CFA – and we’re not getting them to try to leave their association, we’re trying to get them to add us – and then would require them to sign up for eCat to put their entries on through eCat when, in fact, it’s difficult for them to follow those directions. So, this is something I want you to be aware of. By the by, I have been to several shows over here that use the electronic catalog and people love it over here, so that’s a plus for Europe. We love the electronic catalog. **Dunham:** We’re going to do our utmost, Pam. Allene and I already started the discussion this afternoon and we realize that there are language barriers and that you have a unique situation, so we are going to try our hardest to incorporate some of those unique situations to try and help all of you and CFA move into an electronic age with entry clerking and doing entries. **DelaBar:** Thank you Cathy. **Dunham:** You’re welcome.

Eigenhauser: I have concerns that this may not be ready. While I appreciate that Cathy can work on solutions for the non-English speaking people, working on a solution isn’t the same as having a solution, and I would prefer that solution be in hand before we apply this outside of Regions 1-7. Perhaps what we should do is try this in Regions 1-7 first, get a feel for how it works, and if we work out the bugs for Europe and the ID and places where people don’t speak English, we can add them on later but let’s not add them on now and say, “I hope we fix this on time.” That seems like we’re putting the cart before the horse. **Mastin:** Cathy, do you want to address George’s recommendations? **Dunham:** I am in absolute agreement and may I just amend – well, I haven’t even read the motion. Can I just make the motion the way it needs to be made? **Mastin:** Make the motion the way you want to make it.

Board Action Items:

Motion: *All entry clerks in Regions 1-7 be required to use the CFA entry clerking program beginning May 1, 2023.*

Dunham: Motion, *All entry clerks in Regions 1-7 be required to use the CFA entry clerking program beginning May 1, 2023.* **Mastin:** May I have a second please? **Webb:** Russell seconds. **Mastin:** Thank you Russell. OK, I have a motion by Cathy Dunham and second by Russell Webb.

Hannon: I don’t think this is going to have much of an impact. Allene has told us before that very few people use a different entry clerk software. We’re talking about the software, right? **Dunham:** Correct, Mark. **Hannon:** I know Shirley Peet uses it. Debbie Kusy used to use it but now she is using Shirley as an entry clerk for her show. I have talked to Clinton about it and he’s find with it. He said with so few customers, it’s a lot of work to change this every year to accommodate new breeds or divisions or whatever, and he’s not really making any money off of it, so he is the entrepreneur that is providing the alternate entry clerk software and he told me he didn’t have an issue. **Mastin:** Thank you Mark. **Morgan:** So, I’m confused. I thought that I saw an email earlier from Pam DelaBar that the majority of the entry clerks in Europe are already using the CFA program. If they’re not using the CFA program, I would query what they are

actually indeed using that is so much better than what CFA has put out there. I will go back to the annual where Region 9 wanted to be a region and they said, “we don’t want to be special, we simply want to be a region like everyone else.” I don’t see that there will be a problem in Region 8 either. We’re just talking about the existing software for the entry clerking program at this point on this motion as far as I can tell. Am I wrong Cathy? **Dunham:** No, you are correct, Melanie. I think what George may have been referring to and I am OK with is the potential language changes that need to be made to the online entry form and then the potential language issues that will be considered as we move into the process of using eCats to be able to enter cats with. So, if we just want to – **Morgan:** That’s not what we’re voting on though. **Dunham:** – vote for Regions 1-7 that’s fine. **DelaBar:** Just in response to Melanie, please Rich, please call me Pam. When I queried my clubs, yes, everybody is using – or let me put it this way, I got no responses back stating we don’t use the CFA entry program, but what I did get back saying, “this is what we’re having problems with the CFA entry program with.” This part of it is what I put onto the board list; you know the different characters that we find especially in the Nordic and Germanic languages, is causing some difficulties. The other thing is that we still must be able to use the paper entry form in other cases. Plus, when we’re trying to bring in people – the FIFe show this past weekend or the weekend before, 600 entries and that was Finland. I want some of those people to come over. If they are able to be a part of CFA, I want to invite them to also include our shows, so I’m trying to get it as easy as possible for them. Our entry clerks are trying to get things as easy as possible for new exhibitors, but sometimes when we have problems it’s with the system and not particularly the individual. Also, especially when somebody is trying to order or be part of TRNs. This is why Cathy and I earlier had emailed. That’s why she said yes, we need to address some of these things before we go on, and I’m going to provide some of our smart people to be able to answer or maybe even more better explain and more in depth the problems that they are having. Of course, the other thing is, CFA isn’t open 24 hours a day. If we have problems, we have nobody to get in touch with except another European entry clerk. **Mastin:** Thank you Pam.

Simbro: I just want to clarify with Pam on something here for the entry clerk program and the online entry forms. It sounds like the biggest issue is being able to use what I call “special characters”. Is that what I’m understanding? And not so much translation issues? **DelaBar:** It’s both, but the special characters is the thing that we have as first. **Simbro:** OK, the special characters issue, that could probably be resolved much quicker than translations. That is something easily looked into. I’m hopefully not putting my foot in my mouth, but it should be easy to import. **Mastin:** Thank you James. Cathy, I’m a little bit confused. My understanding is, we just have a handful of clubs in the States using the non-CFA entry clerk program. Maybe one club in Japan. I believe all clubs in Europe are using the current CFA entry clerking program. Why are we limiting this to Regions 1-7? It sounds like the issues that are being brought up by Pam are separate from the entry clerk program. We need to address the entry form and some of the other documents, but not necessarily the entry clerk program requirement that all entry clerks use that program. **Dunham:** Rich that’s true, but I think what we’re going to find as we go through this process and Pam has already said she doesn’t entry clerk, so she might not have an additional comment, but my understanding is, part of the issues that the entry clerks are encountering is because they cannot use these special characters within the entry clerk program and/or the online entry form. It’s making it difficult for exhibitors to have correct information, either in the names of their cats and/or their own personal information. So, while they have been negotiating it thus far, it only behooves us I believe to try to help them solve the problem so that

things make sense going forward and as we become more technologically advanced it would help us at an international level, not only with Europe but the ID divisions, as well, so I am perfectly comfortable starting with Regions 1-7 and then coming back and adding the other areas as we solve the problems that need to be solved for them. I think you will see in the show rules when Mary's report comes up that we have taken the first step in that. **Mastin:** Thank you for explaining that. Is there any other discussion or questions on Cathy's motion? Are there any objections to Cathy's motion? Seeing no objections, the motion passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Mastin: Thank you Cathy. Do you have anything else? **Dunham:** No, not at this time.

Time Frame:

On-going.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Updates on projects as needed.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Cathy Dunham, Chair*

(6) **BREEDS AND STANDARDS.**

Committee Chair: Annette Wilson
List of Committee Members: Carla Bizzell, Dennis Ganoe, Melanie Morgan, Krista Schmitt

Mastin: Breeds and Standards was moved to February. Thank you very much, Annette.

(7) **SHOW RULES.**

Committee Chair: Mary Kolencik
Liaison to Board: Carol Krzanowski
List of Committee Members: Cathy Dunham, Kathy Gumm, Shirley Michaud-Dent,
Brad Newcomb

Current Happenings of Committee:

As time is short at this meeting, these motions are prioritized in order of time sensitivity in case time runs out. Any not covered will be included in February's report. At the February meeting, we will have additional show rule changes that are not as time-sensitive.

At this meeting, we will present the tabled proposals from October that originated at the annual. These will be first so that if they pass can be part of the budget process. Next will be two proposals to address the NW point minimums. Three proposals originating from the Ad Hoc Count Manipulation are included, however there will be associated housekeeping changes that will be addressed in February. Included is a proposed addendum clarifying that when there is a discrepancy between the information on a show license and a show flyer, the show license overrides the flyer. Melanie Morgan has submitted an action item tasking the show rules committee to improve the structure and readability of the show rules. Proposals dealing with resolution # 12 from the annual are included but these were presented to the show rules committee at such late date that we have not been able to review them before submitting this report.

Board Action Items:

Krzanowski: I simply wanted to, in the essence of saving time, I wanted to make a standing motion to accept all the show rule changes as presented, reserving the right to vote no. **Mastin:** Thank you Carol. **Shelton:** First, I will second Carol's motion, also reserving the right to vote no. **Mastin:** Are you seconding the standing motion for all show rules with the right to vote no? **Shelton:** Yes. **Mastin:** OK, thank you.

Unless otherwise stated, show rule resolutions are effective with the 2023-2024 season.

1. Establish a limited and controlled pilot program for hiring seldom-seen judges for the 2023-2024 season. Clubs outside of region 9 that hire a CFA judge who has not officiated at any show in the club's region for the past 3 seasons may receive \$500 toward the cost of that judge. This will apply to one judge per show, only CFA judges that have been approved in both specialties for the past 3 seasons, and only two shows per region and the ID. The cap for this pilot program is \$10,000 for the 2023-2024 season. Clubs must apply for the money similar to applying for other sponsorship money. Kathy Calhoun and Rich Mastin will oversee the applications. The club will receive the money after the judge has officiated at the show. For the purposes of this program only, Hawaii will be considered an independent region.

Rationale: *This was a proposal from the annual that passed overwhelmingly but was tabled at the October meeting. The original proposal was for hiring "overseas" judges, but the point of*

the proposal was to add variety to lineups. Rather than limit the pool to overseas judges, something difficult to define, or try to create a mileage requirement, Kathy and Mary decided that the money could be used for judges who haven't been seen in a region/ID for 3 seasons. Clubs in Europe already receive compensation for hiring out-of-region judges.

Since this will start with judges for the 2023-2024 season, the compensation will not apply to judges that have appeared in a lineup in that region/ID in the 2022-2023, 2021-2022, or 2020-2021 seasons. The compensation will also not apply to judges who join the JP within the past 3 seasons because they are new judges, not seldom-seen judges.

If the program successfully encourages clubs to hire seldom-seen judges, it can be continued or expanded in future seasons.

Mastin: Next is Show Rules. I see Mary K is with us. **Kolencik:** Can you hear me? **Mastin:** We can hear you. **Kolencik:** I'm going to try and get through these as briefly as possible. We're going to probably withdraw some towards the end, or postpone those until the next meeting. The first two items – we have two items dealing with reimbursements to clubs and as they have an impact on the budget they need to be handled tonight. These were both passed at the annual by a large margin and were tabled in October to work out a little bit more detail. First is what I call the “seldom-seen judges pilot program”. Up to two clubs from each region and the ID and Region 9 can apply for \$500 to hire one judge that is seldom seen in the region. The reason why we're not including Europe is, Europe already gets money for this. The program has a cap of \$10,000 for the 2023-2024 season. Originally, this was supposed to be to hire judges from overseas, which is hard to define. So, when Kathy Calhoun and I discussed it, we arrived at a different criteria. The money can be used for clubs that hire judges that have not been seen at any show in that region or the ID for the past 3 seasons. For some areas, that is effectively going to be hiring a judge from other countries. This is a pilot program, so if clubs use it, we can extend it. If they don't use it, we can give it up.

DelaBar: What I was going to – please reiterate that Region 9 has the special program because of lack of judges, not because we don't have judges that aren't seen. I'm sorry guys, I don't like “seldom seen judges”. I wish we had another name for it, but I'm not going to stand in the way of anybody else being able to bring judges into their area. The reason we have the program is for an entirely different reason, and not just to make sure that judges that don't seem to have the assignments in certain areas have a chance now to be invited and that particular expense is paid by CFA, or at least \$500 of it is. **Mastin:** Pam, thank you for clarifying that.

Shelton: I like the idea of doing this as “seldom seen judges”. The only thing in would want to do is add a caveat on here that for the purposes of this rule only, Hawaii be considered its own region. I don't want clubs in Hawaii who want to do this and not be able to get the judges they want because those judges have judged in California, which is also Region 5. That's the only thing I would ask for. **Kolencik:** I want to get back to what Mike said. If you add up that we have 8 regions covered in this and the ID, that's \$9,000. Kathy said that we could cap this at \$10,000, so there's another \$1,000 in play that Kathy and Rich could approve for Hawaii, so if you want to amend this motion we can. I don't know how to do that, or you can just trust that Kathy and Rich will include Hawaii separately from California. **Mastin:** Thank you Mary. **Calhoun:** Back to Mike's suggestion, I'm a big confused. This is not preventing Hawaii from

hiring judges that are economic for them, this is just they won't be supplemented for doing so. I'm confused, so maybe if you could just restate what your objection is. **Shelton:** My objection was – to me, the way I'm interpreting it, the way it's worded, they can receive the supplement if they hire a judge that has not been seen in the region in the last three years. So, for example, Kathy you just judged a show out here [California]. If they wanted to bring you over, they would be restricted from doing that even though you may not have been to Hawaii in the last however long, but you have been to California. The Hawaii exhibitors and the California exhibitors don't go to the same shows. There is no overlap. They can't come here with their cats, we can't go there with our cats. So, they would be restricted from judging [*sic*, hiring] other judges only because those judges have judged in California – not from hiring those judges, from getting the supplement for those judges. I just don't want to put that additional restriction on them if they want to hire somebody who had previously judged two years ago in Arizona. **Calhoun:** Thank you for the clarification. **Mastin:** Mike, do you want to include an addendum to this motion or make a recommendation, and then Carol can make the motion? **Shelton:** It would be something along the lines of, *For the purposes of this program only, Hawaii will be considered an independent region.* **Krzanowski:** I am willing to amend my motion to incorporate the phrase, *Hawaii is considered an independent region for the purpose of this motion.* **Mastin:** Thank you Carol. Mike, I assume you will second this? **Shelton:** Yes.

DelaBar: Who is going to be tracking this program? **Kolencik:** I wanted to answer Pam's question, who will be tracking it. It says right in the motion, *Kathy Calhoun and Rich Mastin will oversee the applications.* Kathy Calhoun already agreed to it. Sorry Rich, we stuck you in there too. That's right in the motion. **Mastin:** For clarification purposes, who Kathy Calhoun and Rich Mastin is, we actually oversee show sponsorships including Region 9 incentive program, is the Show Sponsorship Committee which is under the Finance Committee. Kathy is on that committee as well, so just for clarification purposes, that is who is going to track it.

Anger: I want to first clarify. To me, it's obvious that this is optional. Clubs don't have to hire a seldom seen judge. Is that correct? **Kolencik:** Yes, yes. **Anger:** Second, generally I like to support what the delegates have presented to the board favorably for ratification. To me, this is different from what the delegates proposed, and for that reason I am not going to support it. **Currle:** I understand where Rachel is coming from. We had a similar program within the Southern Region because of our success in raising funds during the COVID year. I'm going to support anything that helps our clubs, so I will be supporting this effort. **Mastin:** Thank you Kenny. **Kolencik:** I just wanted to answer what Rachel said. I was the one that proposed this to the delegates at the annual. Had we passed what the delegates wanted, as Rich pointed out in October, it would have been several hundred thousand dollars, so Kathy and I agreed. Kathy said there was a little bit of money we could use and we could try this out, and so I thought that this was a good compromise. **Mastin:** Thank you for clarifying that, Mary. **Krzanowski:** I think this addresses the spirit of the resolution that the delegates passed. I would like to comment that sometimes air fare is more expensive from California to the east coast than from Europe to the east coast. So, I have no problem with supporting this as written.

Mastin: Mary, are you done? **Kolencik:** With this one, yes. **Mastin:** Thank you. I'm going to call for the vote. If you are in favor, raise your hand. Please keep your hand up until I ask you to lower your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Anger voting no.

Mastin: George Eigenhauser, Kenny Currle, Carol Krzanowski, Mike Shelton, Russell Webb, John Colilla, Pam Moser, Melanie Morgan, Yukiko Hayata, Cathy Dunham, Pam DelaBar, Kathy Calhoun, Sharon Roy, Mark Hannon, Paula Noble, Annette Wilson. Please lower your hand. If you are opposed, raise your hand. **Anger:** Just Scrooge here. **Mastin:** Rachel Anger. Lower your hand. If you are an abstention, raise your hand. Seeing no abstentions, Rachel please announce the vote. **Anger:** That's 16 yes votes, 1 no vote, zero abstentions. **Mastin:** Motion passes. Thank you.

2. Establish a limited pilot program to rebate clubs that discount their entry fees for Miscellaneous, Provisional, or AOV entries for shows in the 2023-2024 season. The discounted entry fee must appear on the show's flyer that is provided to Central Office prior to the show. The cat must be listed in the catalog with a registration number since show rules 2.20 c, d, & e limit these classes to registered cats. The compensation will be up to \$20 per entry based on the actual discount (e.g. if the discount is \$15, the club will only receive \$15, if it is \$25, the club will only receive \$20). Central Office will contact the show secretary after the show by email to notify them of the amount of the rebate available to the club based on the information in the catalog and flyer. The show secretary will have 30 days to respond to the notice and claim the rebate. Clubs may decline the rebate. The cap for this pilot program is \$2500 for the 2023-2024 season. CO will track the claims for future reference.

Rationale: *Strange as it may seem, some clubs do not discount MISC/PROV/AOV entries. These exhibitors are trying to advance their breeds through the acceptance path. Getting exhibitors to enter them at full price with no possibility of titles is an unreasonable expectation. This proposal passed with an overwhelming majority at the annual.*

In the 2021-2022 season, there were only 115 MISC/PROV/AOV entries. \$2,500 should be more than enough to cover this pilot program.

If the program successfully encourages more clubs to offer a discount for these entries, it can be continued in future seasons.

Mastin: Mary, continue. **Kolencik:** Next is another one from the annual. Strange as it may seem, and it's going to come as a surprise to some of you I'm sure, there are in fact some shows that do not offer a discount for Miscellaneous, Provisional or AOV entries. So, the delegates supported a proposal that would allow clubs to receive up to \$20 back from CFA if they offered the discounts now in October. You wanted a little bit more detail, so there's a little bit more detail in this proposal. I got comments from Allene and Central Office already tracks these entries and can inform the club when a rebate is available. We also put a cap of \$2,500 for the whole season. Last season there were 115 of these entries, so that would be well within this cap. **Mastin:** Thank you Mary. Standing motion by Carol Krzanowski, standing second by Mike Shelton. Are there any questions for Mary? Are there any objections? Seeing no objections, this motion passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Mastin: Thank you Mary, congratulations.

3. Establish a common closing time for Regions 1-7, excluding Hawaii.

Article VI Entering the Show, add 6.36 a	Cathy Dunham	
Existing Wording		Proposed Wording
None.		6.36 a. <u>For all shows in Regions 1-7, excluding Hawaii, all shows must close to entries no later than 11:59 pm (Central Office time) on the Monday before the opening of the show. Shows may close to entries prior to that time.</u>
<p>RATIONALE: One of the recommendations presented to the board from the ad hoc count manipulation committee was to establish a universal closing time. This is only needed in areas with multiple shows on the same weekend. Rather than try to find a common closing time that includes all the regions and the ID (which would be almost impossible), this show rule establishes a common closing time in the US and Canada only, excluding Hawaii. China already has a common close time, see 6.35b. Other areas can be added in the future if needed with times adjusted to what best suits those areas.</p> <p>While shows must close to entries no later than this time, entry clerks may still process entries after this time. The next proposal will ensure all entries have a time stamp.</p>		

Mastin: Continue. **Kolencik:** The next three are from Cathy Dunham for various items. The reason it's important to consider these tonight even though they are not effective until May is, if you don't like them and you have comments and you want me to fix them, then I can bring them back in February. So, the first one establishes a common closing time for Region 1-7 excluding Hawaii. This is something the clubs passed several years ago by over 50%. I remember because I'm the one that passed [*sic*, presented] it. The entry clerks supported it but the board declined to implement it. So, this time it's limited to just Regions 1-7 and not Hawaii.

Mastin: Thank you. **DelaBar:** Even though Region 9 is not included in this, I am voting against this. This is putting another hinderance on our clubs to be able to try to fill their shows. If they want to go a day beyond the entry closing time that's central for everyone, then that has to come to the Executive Committee or the board. How many of those are you guys going to get week after week after week? I do not see where this is going to help clubs. What-all it may do is add some type of placating to those who feel that it is the end-all to solve our problems on point manipulation. **Mastin:** Thank you Pam. Any further comments? Seeing no further hands up, I'm going to call for the vote. If you are in favor, raise your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Eigenhauser, Roy, Morgan, DelaBar, Colilla and Currle voting no. Hayata abstained.

Mastin: Mark Hannon, Pam Moser, Carol Krzanowski, Cathy Dunham, Paula Noble, Mike Shelton, Rachel Anger, Kathy Calhoun, Annette Wilson, Russell Webb. Lower your hands. If you are opposed, raise your hand. George Eigenhauser, Sharon Roy, Melanie Morgan, Pam DelaBar, John Colilla, Kenny Currle. Lower your hand. If you are an abstention, raise your hand. Yukiko Hayata. Lower your hand. Rachel, please announce the vote. **Anger:** We have 10 yes votes, 6 no votes, 1 abstention. **Mastin:** Motion passes.

4. *Require use of the CFA online entry form for all shows outside of China.*

Article VI Entering the Show, add 6.36 b	Cathy Dunham	
Existing Wording		Proposed Wording
None		<u>6.36 b. For all shows in Regions 1-9 and the International Division outside of China (see SR 6.35d), all entries must be received through the CFA online entry form on the CFA website. All entries will be time-stamped and the online form will be disabled for each show when that show is closed to entries.</u>
<p>RATIONALE: Another recommendation from the ad hoc count manipulation committee was to require all entries to come through the online entry form so that exhibitors could have a preliminary count of those entries as they are submitted. Programming on the website can generate a preliminary count of entries as they are submitted. Once the entry clerk enters the entries into the show, those would appear in a breed summary. This programming is already in use on the website thanks to Cathy Dunham and Kathy Durdick. China is already required to use certain entry forms by show rule 6.35d.</p>		

Mastin: Mary, continue. **Kolencik:** #4, because of the problem with the character sets that we found out about, we want to withdraw #4.

Withdrawn.

Rule # 6.36.b.	Awards Committee	
Existing Wording		Proposed Wording
None.		<u>6.36.b. For all shows in Regions 1-7, all entries must be received through the CFA online entry form on the CFA website. All entries will be time-stamped and the online form will be disabled for each show when that show is closed to entries.</u>
<p>RATIONALE: I wrote a show rule for Cathy that is this rule but applies to R1-9 and the ID outside of China. Pauli H. from Norway pointed out that some European countries have an issue with the online entry form because of the character set, and something about the time zone. It is possible Kathy Durdick can fix the issue before May 1, and it may be that the board wants to require her to do that as quickly as possible with the proposal in my report. Or they may want to give her a little more time by passing the one that Cathy attached which applies only to R1-7 and then add other countries when the form is fixed. But it would great if the board were pre-noticed so the board could pick one and pass it with a simple majority.</p>		

Kolencik: We pre-noticed another show rule change that applies only to Regions 1-7, so how do we do this? **Mastin:** Allene, can you bring up the pre-noticed motion that was sent? **Tartaglia:** It's there. It's on the screen. **Mastin:** Thank you. **Kolencik:** This is the same show

rule, only it just applies to Regions 1-7 and not to all the other areas. It is that all the entries must be received through the CFA online form. Now, will entry clerks still be able to accept paper entries? Actually yes they can, as long as the entry clerk puts it through the form prior to the closing time. It will get time stamped and it will get there. You may have noticed already, we need to give thanks to Cathy Dunham and Kathy Durdick. There is already a count on the show schedule of the entries as they come in, so that people don't have to wait for the entry clerk to process all the entries in the breed summary. They are already getting a count there. **Mastin:** Thank you Mary.

Mastin: Discussion? **Wilson:** Do we have some idea on how many entries come in through a manual form, either in the mail or as an email attachment? **Mastin:** Mary, we can't hear you but I saw you shake your head no. **Kolencik:** I'm sorry. Very, very few. **Wilson:** Is it like one per show? **Kolencik:** Two or three per show. Is that right, Cathy? Is that your experience? **Dunham:** Yes, that's my experience as well, Mary. **Wilson:** OK, I have a corollary question. **Mastin:** Go ahead, Annette. **Wilson:** So, do the entry clerks have time to put those in and do they intend to put those in by hand? **Kolencik:** If you're getting a paper entry form, I'm sure you're going to get it right before the closing time. Remember, the closing time is now set to midnight Monday night, so they should have all day to put that in, because if they receive it by mail they are going to get it earlier in the day. If they receive it, if somebody hands it to them at a show on the weekend, they have all day Monday to put it in. So, yeah, they should have plenty of time to put that in. **Wilson:** So, if someone, for example, attaches a PDF of an entry form to an email and sends it to the entry clerk on Saturday, say, and the entry clerk decides they don't have time to put that in, then has the person entered the show or not? **Kolencik:** No, because they have to enter – it must be put in through the form. **Wilson:** I realize that the sticking point is that it's not very many people, but if it's a few or if it's one or two entries a show – I'm just feeling like we're saying, "we used to take the entries this way but we don't anymore and I don't have time to do it." Will they be notified their entry is not in? **Kolencik:** Annette, the problem that you mentioned, it can happen now. When I entry clerked, I remember somebody handed me entries at a show and they sat in my purse for a month and I forgot completely about them and had to do an addendum. So, it is entirely possible right now today that somebody can email the entry clerk with a PDF of an entry and the entry clerk is under no obligation to accept an entry that way. You are supposed to send the entries to the entry clerk in the manner in which the entry clerk wishes to accept them and the club can say, no entries any other way. But, just in case they want to accept those paper entries or the emailed PDF, the entry clerk would have time to put that in. If you are afraid of them missing it, well they can miss it now. **Wilson:** I understand, but I don't think this is going to be an excuse for an addendum, right? **Kolencik:** No, you are correct. **Wilson:** I realize it's up to the person entering a show to verify that their entries have been received via confirmation. I'm just a little concerned about people who do it a different way. I'm not one of them, but I know people who do. **Kolencik:** We can try it and if there's problems with it, you guys can come back and say we're going to blow this away. **Wilson:** I don't really want to do that. I would rather see something on the flyer that says, "we are only taking entries through the online forum." **Kolencik:** I can add a show rule in February that says the flyer must state that entries will only be accepted through the online forum. **Wilson:** I'm done. **Dunham:** I just want to make a comment. There are going to be other additional show rules that are being worked on for entry clerks and flyers and catalogs and various other things as we go through the process. I think that's one of the many rules that we can certainly clean up and be able to address Annette's concerns and anyone else's concerns at this point. So, we have the

ability to be able to work on that. We just didn't have the time to get them all ready for this meeting. **Mastin:** Thank you Cathy. We look forward to seeing what you have for February's meeting then.

Mastin: Is there any further discussion on this motion? Are there any objections to this motion? OK, I'm going to call for the vote. If you are in favor, raise your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Carried.** DelaBar voting no.

Mastin: Mark Hannon, Carol Krzanowski, Melanie Morgan, Yukiko Hayata, Cathy Dunham, Kenny Curre, Mike Shelton, Pam Moser, Annette Wilson, Russell Webb, Rachel Anger, Paula Noble, George Eigenhauser, John Colilla, Kathy Calhoun, Sharon Roy. Please lower your hands. If you are opposed, raise your hand. Pam DelaBar. Lower your hand. If you are an abstention, raise your hand. No abstentions. Rachel, please call the vote. **Anger:** We have 16 yes votes, 1 no vote, zero abstentions. **Mastin:** Motion passes.

5. *Require all entry clerks to use the CFA entry clerk program or pay a fee.*

Article VI Entering the Show, add 6.36 c	Cathy Dunham	
Existing Wording		Proposed Wording
None		<u>6.36.c. For all CFA shows in Regions 1-7, entry clerks must use the CFA entry clerk program. A fee, as specified in CFA's current price list, is payable by the club to CFA if any other software is used. No further shows will be licensed for the club until this fee is paid.</u>
RATIONALE: The IT committee and CO are overseeing modifications to eCats that will allow exhibitors to enter their cats from those in their eCats account. Eventually, these entries will go directly into the show's entry database in the CFA entry clerk software. To facilitate this feature which will greatly help exhibitors enter shows easily, we need all entry clerks to use the CFA software.		

Mastin: Mary, continue. **Kolencik:** This next motion is to require all entry clerks to use the CFA entry clerk program or pay a fee. I just wanted to say, if you want to amend this, all we have to do is say, *for all CFA shows in Regions 1-7*, but I can't make the amendment. So, it's up to you. The language about the fee, that is a statement that Central Office wanted and because I said, why not just score the show? So, Allene can comment on why she wants that fee in there.

Mastin: Allene, do you want to comment? **Tartaglia:** It's just an incentive to use the entry clerk software, which is the way we're going. The reason for the fee versus not scoring the show is, not scoring the show affects the exhibitors. The exhibitors have nothing to do with this. They don't even know what entry clerk software is being used, so I think the onus should be on the club and the entry clerk, not the exhibitors. **Dunham:** I would like to amend this motion to just be Regions 1-7. This will be consistent with what was passed in my previous report, and then as programming changes become effective, we can always add the other areas as necessary.

Mastin: Carol, do you accept the recommendation from Cathy Dunham? **Krzanowski:** Yes, I do. **Mastin:** Mike Shelton, do you accept? **Shelton:** Yes. **Mastin:** OK.

Moser: I'm a little confused. I thought we just passed that they have to use the CFA entry clerk software. **Kolencik:** This is a show rule. **Eigenhauser:** If this is a show rule, just make it a show rule they have to use the CFA entry clerking program. I don't see why we're giving them permission not to use it if they are willing to pay a \$500 fine. That seems to be what we're doing. What we should be saying is, "thou shalt" and that becomes the rule, not "you ought to follow this rule, but if you don't," there's no "if you don't." **Mastin:** Thank you George. **Dunham:** To follow up on George, yes this is just the show rule putting in place what we voted on earlier and the \$500 fee, Central Office asked for as the consequence if it's not followed. So, that's why that is there George. **Tartaglia:** Basically, Cathy said what I was going to say. What's the penalty if a club doesn't do it? If they use any other software? We say they must. If they don't, what happens? **Eigenhauser:** The same thing that happens when we violate any CFA rule. There's a protest against them, the board makes a determination as to what we think is the appropriate penalty at the time. It could be more, it could be less. It could be a \$500 fine. If somebody is particularly egregious about it, the penalty might be to bar them from producing shows in the future, but the board should be making that determination on a case-by-case basis. **Krzanowski:** I think that most entry clerks now do use the CFA entry clerking program, if I'm correct. I'm not sure of the exact percentage, but I really believe that allowing putting this fee in place is just a way to try to bring these people over eventually. Some of them might be a little reluctant in the beginning but I also believe that exhibitors, once they find out how convenient it is to enter their cats through eCats, are going to be putting pressure on entry clerks to switch over to the CFA program. **Hannon:** We've got a lot of show rules and the Central Office is frequently in the position of, what's the penalty if they don't do it? Here, we are presenting the penalty and I would much rather just have the penalty in the show rules than have to go through the protest process and take up our time there. I would rather have Central Office just say, "according to the show rules, you owe us \$500 for your failure to follow the show rule."

Mastin: Any other comments? Carol, can you read the revised motion? **Kolencik:** Do you want me to read it? **Mastin:** If Carol's got it, she can; if she doesn't, Mary you can. **Tartaglia:** It's on the screen, as well. **Krzanowski:** I'll read it. *For all CFA shows in Regions 1-7, entry clerks must use the CFA entry clerk program. A fee, as specified in CFA's current price list, is payable by the club to CFA if any other software is used. No further shows will be licensed for the club until this fee is paid.* And then, the next thing is set the fee for using non-CFA entry clerk software to \$500. That's another motion. **Mastin:** Thank you Carol.

Mastin: OK, I'm going to call for the vote on this. If you are in favor of this motion, please raise your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Eigenhauser, Moser and Roy voting no. DelaBar abstained.

Mastin: Mark Hannon, Cathy Dunham, Mike Shelton, Kenny Currle, Melanie Morgan, Carol Krzanowski, Russell Webb, Kathy Calhoun, Yukiko Hayata, Paula Noble, John Colilla, Rachel Anger, Annette Wilson. Please lower your hands. If you are opposed, raise your hand. George Eigenhauser, Pam Moser, Sharon Roy. Lower your hand. If you are an abstention, raise

your hand. Pam DelaBar. Lower your hand. Rachel, please announce the vote. **Anger:** I believe Russell Webb voted, but could I get confirmation of his vote? **Webb:** I voted for. **Mastin:** Thank you. He was in favor. **Anger:** That's 13 yes, 3 no, 1 abstention. **Mastin:** Motion passes.

6. *Set the fee for using non-CFA entry clerk software to \$500.*

Rationale: *this fee is set high to encourage entry clerks to use the CFA software. This software is necessary for the exhibitors to use eCats to enter shows.*

Mastin: OK Mary, continue. **Kolencik:** The next motion is to set the fee for not using the CFA software to \$500. **Mastin:** Thank you. Any discussion on the fee of \$500? Seeing no discussion, is there any objections to the \$500 fee? Seeing no objection, the motion passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

7. *Effective immediately, create an addendum to the current show rules to reduce the minimum points required for National Wins for the 2022-2023 season for all areas.*

Article XXXVI NATIONAL/REGIONAL/ DIVISIONAL AWARDS PROGRAM, National Awards	Requested by Melanie Morgan	
Existing Wording	Proposed Wording	
<p>Regions 1-9:</p> <p>Championship 4000 points (max 100 rings scored)</p> <p>Premiership 2000 points (max 100 rings scored)</p> <p>Kittens 1400 points (max 40 rings scored)</p> <p>HHP 750 points (max 75 rings scored)</p> <p>China (excluding Hong Kong and Macau):</p> <p>Championship 4000 points (max 100 rings scored)</p> <p>Premiership 2000 points (max 100 rings scored)</p> <p>Kittens 1400 points (max 40 rings scored)</p> <p>HHP 750 points (max 75 rings scored)</p> <p>International (including Hong Kong and Macau):</p> <p>Championship 2000 points (max 50 rings scored)</p> <p>Premiership 1000 points (max 50 rings scored)</p> <p>Kittens 700 points (max 20 rings scored)</p> <p>HHP 500 points (max 50 rings scored)</p>	<p>All areas:</p> <p>Championship – at least 25 rings scored and a minimum of 1000 points</p> <p>Premiership – at least 25 rings scored and a minimum of 500 points</p> <p>Kittens – at least 15 rings scored and a minimum of 500 points</p> <p>HHP – at least 25 rings scored and a minimum of 250 points</p> <p>All areas continue with the current number of maximum rings scored.</p>	

RATIONALE: CFA is divided into three areas for National Awards: The Regions 1-9 area, the China area (excluding Hong Kong and Macau), and the International area (the ID excluding China but including Hong Kong and Macau). In most seasons, all three areas have the same minimum number of points required for National awards.

Last April, the board set the parameters for each area for the 2022-2023 season. At the October board meeting, a motion was made and withdrawn to remove the point minimums for all areas. Melanie Morgan, Cathy Dunham, Kathy Calhoun, Carol Krzanowski and Mary Kolencik were tasked to devise a compromise and bring it back at this meeting.

The first question that must be resolved is whether to make a change mid-season. Apart from that question, this proposal is a compromise to switch to a low bar minimum that includes a minimum number of rings as well as a minimum number of points. The cats must still finish in the top 25 in their class and area. The change would apply to all areas but the total number of rings scored would remain the same as set last April. If the board decides to make no changes mid-season, this should be considered the direction to take for the 2023-2024 season, and it will be brought back in April for that season.

For some exhibitors, especially in the International area, the point minimums act as a barrier to even starting a campaign. An exhibitor looks at the high value and sometimes believes it is unachievable with the available shows/counts and so does not even try. By setting a lower yet meaningful bar, the theory is this would encourage competition and as more cats compete they would have to achieve higher values to finish in the top 25.

The point minimums were never meant to make it hard to achieve an NW. They were meant to be an equalizer so that a reasonable amount of effort is required to achieve an NW in all areas of CFA. The NW is a marathon race, it is a test of a cat's ability to maintain a high level of show success for a significant period of the show season. It should not be a default award, nor achievable in one or two shows. But, when the minimums act as a barrier to competition, it is important to lower them to reasonable levels to encourage competition. This proposal would lower the values for points but add an element with a required minimum number of rings scored assuring that the award cannot be achieved by default in one show.

"Numbers nerds" who follow the ring points for cats in NW campaigns know that the ring point average (rpa) of the first 25 finals statistically predicts the cat's point total at 100 finals. If a cat has an rpa of 40 with 25 finals, it is likely to have a point total of around 4000 when it hits 100 finals, give or take a few points depending on the number of specialty rings accumulated. This tells the numbers nerd whether the cat has a shot at hitting the 4000-point target; it is just one of several data points that help determine the cat's potential for a campaign. This is why 25 was chosen in this proposal. The suggested point minimums and required rings are set to have the same rpa as 100 rings with the current point minimums. This means that even though the values are lower, the cat must still be capable of achieving the same minimum rpa as with the current point minimums.

We propose setting the same minimum requirements CFA-wide. Ideally, if we set the bar to a low but meaningful level, we should not have to change it as often. Exhibitors will see that the minimum is achievable, will "go for it", and will raise the level of competition far beyond the low bar. That's the theory.

Some exhibitors in R1-9 want no point minimums for NWs in R1-9. Setting these values as proposed would have the same effect since cats in R1-9 can easily and quickly achieve these values. If we applied these minimums right now, here are how many cats in R1-9 would be over them:

	# over the current minimum	# over the proposed minimum
R1-9		
championship	2	44

kittens	11	87	
premiership	6	49	
HHP	2	38	

Here are the values for the International Area:

IA	# over the current minimum	# over the proposed minimum	
championship	1	15	28 cats have 25+ rings
kittens	17	23	35+ cats have 15+ rings
premiership	0	0	10 cats have 25+ rings, 13 more have between 15 and 25 rings
HHP	4	9	10 cats have 25+ rings, 22 cats have 15+ rings

Unfortunately, no cats in China have anywhere near the current required point minimums. There have been so few shows in China that very few cats have more than a few rings. Even if we set the minimums to the proposed values, or the values in the next proposal, cats in China cannot accomplish anything until the government allows shows.

According to Central Office, this proposal would have a minimal cost impact since these values could be added to the manual review of the awards.

Kolencik: How are we doing on time, Rich? **Mastin:** You are at your 30 minutes, Mary. Anything else that needs – can we do #8? **Kolencik:** #7. #7 and #8 are kind of the same. Do you want to talk about them tonight or postpone them? **Mastin:** Let me go to Carol. **Krzanowski:** I guess the question is, time-wise do we want to address this now? If we're going to address it at all it probably should be now, but I anticipate that it's going to generate quite a bit of discussion, personally. **Mastin:** Can I have a motion to move #7 and #8 until we finish all other open session items? **Currie:** Kenny moves. **Mastin:** Thank you Kenny. **Krzanowski:** I will second. **Mastin:** Thank you Carol. Any objections to moving #7 and #8 until we finish all the other open session items? With no objections, unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Mastin: We're going to move #7 and #8 until the end. Mary, we'll let you back in if we have the time, OK? **Kolencik:** Okie doke. **Mastin:** Great job on your time management. Thank you very much. [**Kolencik** leaves the meeting]

[From after Old Business] **Mastin:** OK, we are now going to go back to Mary K's Show Rules. Mary K and Carol, remind me what number we are on. Are we on #7? **Krzanowski:** Yes, that's correct. **Mastin:** OK, Mary K? While Mary is unmuting herself, I just want to remind the board and Mary that the open session will adjourn at 10:05 p.m. **Kolencik:** We only have a few minutes, so I'm going to go really, really fast. These are hold-overs from October. Instead of a high bar for the point minimums for national wins, we set a low bar. The first question you guys have to think about is, do we change it in the middle of the season or not? With that, I turn it over

to Melanie. **Mastin:** Before I turn it over to Melanie, Carol Krzanowski has a standing motion, Mike Shelton has the standing second. **Morgan:** Those who know me and the fact that I'm usually a broken record about not devaluing our awards are again probably surprised that this is coming from me, but I've looked at the current environment out there all around the globe, especially in the International Division. I have listened to concerns expressed by a large number of exhibitors, as I have been out in the show halls a little more this year. My request to consider this is a result of coming to the realization that although thankfully we have indeed resumed activities, this season is by no means back to "normal." Whether we're ever going to have normal as we once knew it remains to be seen, but while this new normal is our reality, we need to create a workable system that incentivizes exhibitors, not demoralizes. I cannot support no minimums, but I do support what Mary K has presented here and I actually am very impressed by the elegant simplicity of the proposal. We are not changing the number of rings counted. They remain at 100/40, we are adding a minimum number of rings with a point level that is the exact same as the existing RPA if you go down to the basic minimums required currently to reach a national win. So, while I am hopeful that in Regions 1-9 that we will have 25 cats in each category that reach 100/40 rings and have to get to the existing ring point averages, I do not think it is realistic for those in the ID and China especially to have any chance at all of reaching the minimums as they stand. When we put unrealistic goals out there, we encourage manipulation of the system. I would rather see us make adjustments to the current system based on reacting to the reality of our current season, than having people give up or creating an environment that encourages falsely inflated counts. Finally, I understand that there is some concern about changing the parameters mid-season, but in this instance I think Mary K has addressed some of that. We are maintaining a minimum that is at the existing RPA, we are maintaining the maximum number of rings counted and we are simply giving people more options. The hope is that we get a top 25 in our categories. I am hopeful that if this is approved that we will give people something to strive for and that that will translate into more entries and increased competition. I am also hopeful that the Board will at least consider this and I thank Mary K for putting this together.

Eigenhauser: I'm normally a vocal opponent of changing anything to do with the scoring in the middle of the show season, but these are different times. We're just coming out of COVID. We have some optimistic expectations as to what was going to happen. Reality is now slapping us in the face and I think what we have to do is suck it up, do it this last time, but in the future let's please not change points and scoring and things in the middle of the show season once it has started, but these are extraordinary times and I think in this case it's justified.

Krzanowski: One of my biggest problems with this is changing it in the middle of the season. It's not just midway through the season, it's 8 months into the season already. We only have 4 months left after this, pretty much. Changing it now makes it really difficult for people who are trying to plan their year. We are also seeing counts improving as we always do this time of year. Counts are starting to go up in Regions 1-7 and I do believe there's another proposal coming up to address China and the International Division separately, so we can deal with that in another motion. I have heard from people that one of the problems they have with the board is that we're constantly changing our decision, so those are my feelings about it. **Moser:** I have to say that I have to agree with Carol. I think this is really late in the season. I mean, we'll say this every time. We'll say we're not going to change it and then we keep doing it and then as George says, this will be the last time. Well, it never seems to be the last time, so I have to go with Carol. I think it's a bad idea. **DelaBar:** Surprisingly, I would support this. I don't like changes in the

middle of the season. Once we set a parameter, I want us to keep that parameter, but the thing is we're not raising points, we are lower the qualification points needed - not setting what the overall is going to be, just that minimum to qualify to even be competitive for that national win. That's why I will support this. **Calhoun:** I just have a question, in that this is for all areas so if this passes, does that negate the next motion? **Mastin:** Kathy, real quick, what is the change in the next motion that would impact this? **Calhoun:** It's the China, excluding Hong Kong and Macau, 25 rings scored and a minimum of 1,000 points for championship. For premiership, 15 rings and 250 points. Kittens, 15 rings and a minimum of 500 points. So, it makes China different from the all regions that is discussed in the first. It excludes China and gives separate scores for China. **Mastin:** The only change is in premiership? Am I reading that correctly? **Kolencik:** Can I comment, Rich? **Mastin:** Yes, Mary. **Kolencik:** OK. So, the difference between the next proposal and the one we're currently on, the next one does not include Regions 1-9. No changes there. There are no changes to Championship in either China or the International in the next one. The changes are to Premiership in China. It would be 15 rings instead of 25 and 250 points. Kittens would be the same. Household Pets would be 15 rings scored and 250 points. So, it drops from 25 rings to 15 rings for China. For the International area, the same thing. For Premiership and Household Pets it drops from 25 rings scored to 15 rings scored. So, it's fewer rings scored in Premiership and Household Pets. That's the difference between the two. China has a lower 250 point minimum for Premiership, so it basically equates Premiership and Household Pets. That's why I'm not real happy about the next one, but China is not going to make these numbers anyhow. They can't have shows so they're not going to make anything, so I don't know what to tell you about China. **Calhoun:** I wouldn't want to say that China is not going to make anything. Hopefully we are hearing things now that some of the restrictions may be modified in China, so they may be able to have more shows, but they have lost the momentum of the first 8 months. That's why we want to keep people incentivized to try and get recognized. If we just assume that they can't play in this field, then there is no motivation to go to shows. We want to make something that's obtainable for these regions or these areas that with COVID and the governmental restrictions are at a disadvantage. **Wong:** I think this is a very timely proposal, because as we know China starts to open up and of course the rest of the International and Asia, we already have a lot of shows. While this is encouraging, at the same time it really stimulates the competition. I believe the winning cats will still score way higher than this minimum, but as Kathy said, this encourages more people to compete for maybe not the top 5 but the second half of the winners, because they can see the possibility of having more winners in the actual ladder. I think in Hong Kong alone, because of the Associate Judging Program coming out, hopefully they can be available for the last 2 months of the season. I think the scoring will assimilate a lot of shows in the last 2 or 3 months of the show season and will keep us very busy. Already I can see that people are booking judges for January all the way to April already in the rest of the ID, so I strongly hope that we can again adopt both of these. I think it will really be game changing for the ID. Thank you. **Colilla:** I can only comment that from now until the end of December and January there are 5 scheduled shows and there may be more. They are requesting more and more shows. It's kind of surprising, there were 3 shows. The first one had 67 cats. The last 225 and 223. I received a breed summary that's nothing unusual because I remember shows that I judged. 173 British Shorthair is not the case. They are all spread out and nothing unusual. I think that we are coming back in China. People are very enthusiastic, especially Household Pets. In the second show there are 43 and in the last one there are 30-something. They are getting big in Household

Pet competition right now, too. Hopefully everything will go well. That's all I have to say.

Mastin: Thank you John.

Kolencik: I just have a question about procedure here. If the first one passes and people want the lower number of rings for China and the International area, and if you pass the second one, it would override that portion of the first one. Is that what will happen? **Mastin:** Somebody has got to correct me if I'm wrong. If the first one passes and then the second one is presented, the second one says *No change*, which I hope is referring to what potentially could pass.

Kolencik: Would *No change* refer to the prior motion? So, it's no changes from the prior motion? **Mastin:** We've got to ask Kathy Calhoun. **Calhoun:** Yes, Mary is correct. It's no changes to the prior motion. **Mastin:** It's not no changes to the existing. **Calhoun:** That was my initial question, because this motion says all areas. The second is just for China. **Kolencik:** So, my understanding is, if you vote yes of the first one, if you pass the first one which is not a foregone conclusion, but if you pass the first one and you pass the second one, then the parts related to China and the International in the second one would override the first one. I see John Colilla shaking his head yes. **Mastin:** That's my understanding. Shelly, do you agree? **Perkins:** Yes, I do. **Kolencik:** OK, that's all I had.

Currle: Basically, what is being created here is a minimum to be scored, and then it just becomes a competition of points gathered over the course of the season. My question would be, is there any way – I know Mary had done some private polls on this – is there any way we can ask our constituents what they feel about this? **Kolencik:** I didn't say anything for time, but I did a very unscientific poll on FaceBook. You have to take this with a grain of salt, because people sometimes don't really understand the question. I asked if people were opposed to changing the point minimums mid-season. There are people that I know want no point minimums but were opposed to changing it mid-season in that question, so I'm not really sure that they really got the point. It was overwhelming almost that no, they don't want changes mid-season, but they do support – a lot of the very same people support making changes in the International area and China. I don't see how you can change it in the International area and China, and now lower it everywhere. That's a problem, so this is why I'm saying it wasn't a scientific poll.

Eigenhauser: I think we're hitting a hard stop here. We either need to vote on this or table discussion until later. **Mastin:** That's correct. Carol, are we going to move forward with the vote or do you want to table it? **Krzanowski:** I think we should just move forward with the vote. That's a good point. **Mastin:** Very good. I'm going to call for the vote. If you're in favor, raise your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Hannon, Moser, Krzanowski and Currle voting no.

Mastin: Melanie Morgan, Pam DelaBar, Kathy Calhoun, George Eigenhauser, Cathy Dunham, Mike Shelton, Russell Webb, Sharon Roy, Rachel Anger, Annette Wilson, John Colilla, Paula Noble, Yukiko Hayata. Lower your hand. If you are opposed, raise your hand. Mark Hannon, Pam Moser, Carol Krzanowski, Kenny Currle. If you are an abstention, raise your hand. No abstentions. Rachel, please announce the vote. **Anger:** That's 13 yes, 4 no, zero abstentions. **Mastin:** The motion passes.

8. Effective immediately, create an addendum to the current show rules to reduce the minimum points required for National Wins for the 2022-2023 season for China and the International area.

Article XXXVI NATIONAL/REGIONAL /DIVISIONAL AWARDS PROGRAM, National Awards	Requested by Kathy Calhoun and the ID Committee	
Existing Wording		Proposed Wording
Regions 1-9: Championship 4000 points (max 100 rings scored) Premiership 2000 points (max 100 rings scored) Kittens 1400 points (max 40 rings scored) HHP 750 points (max 75 rings scored) China (excluding Hong Kong and Macau): Championship 4000 points (max 100 rings scored) Premiership 2000 points (max 100 rings scored) Kittens 1400 points (max 40 rings scored) HHP 750 points (max 75 rings scored) International (including Hong Kong and Macau): Championship 2000 points (max 50 rings scored) Premiership 1000 points (max 50 rings scored) Kittens 700 points (max 20 rings scored) HHP 500 points (max 50 rings scored)		Regions 1-9: No change China (excluding Hong Kong and Macau): Championship – at least 25 rings scored and a minimum of 1000 points Premiership – at least 15 rings scored and a minimum of 250 points Kittens – at least 15 rings scored and a minimum of 500 points HHP – at least 15 rings scored and a minimum of 250 points International (including Hong Kong and Macau): Championship – at least 25 rings scored and a minimum of 1000 points Premiership – at least 15 rings scored and a minimum of 500 points Kittens – at least 15 rings scored and a minimum of 500 points HHP – at least 15 rings scored and a minimum of 250 points All areas continue with the current number of maximum rings scored.
RATIONALE: This proposal came from the ID Committee as an alternative to the prior proposal. The values for championship and kitten classes are the same as the prior proposal, but are lower for China and the International area for Premiership and HHPs. Instead of a minimum of 25 rings scored for each of those classes, this proposal suggests 15 rings scored. The associated point minimum is reduced for premiership in China.		
This proposal does not include any changes to the regions.		

Again, the first question is whether to make a change mid-season. For those who do not support a mid-season change in Regions 1-9, this proposal is a reasonable alternative that would greatly assist exhibitors in the International area and China. These exhibitors often struggle to meet the high point minimums.

The difference between this proposal and the prior proposal for the International area is the # of rings required in premiership and HHP. The prior proposal required a minimum of 25 rings scored in these classes, this proposal reduces that to 15 without a change in the point minimums. For numbers nerds, 15 is not as statistically significant a test as 25, it is not very predictive of campaign potential. The current ePoints show that in the International area in the premiership class, the problem is not the number of rings. Using the table in the prior proposal, we see that there are cats with 25 rings. There just has not been enough count for cats in premiership to get 500 points.

The HHP class in the International area has more cats that are over their current minimums than in the regions. They have enough shows to hit 25 rings and 250 points, they are even doing better at hitting their current point minimum than cats in the US at hitting theirs! So using these values for the International area probably will not differ much from the values in the prior proposal since the point values are the same. Either proposal will likely have the same impact for the International area.

For the suggested values for China, the premiership values are the same as the suggested values for the HHP class. An NW in just 15 rings and 250 points for Premiership and HHP is an extremely low bar. Again, 15 rings is not statistically significant to predict the quality of the cat. But without shows, the cats in China won't be able to hit any bar.

Mastin: I know we have a hard stop, but I'm not sure we can not move forward with the next one. **Kolencik:** I don't have anything to say about it except what I already said. **Mastin:** Carol and Mike Shelton, do you continue with your standing motion and second? **Krzanowski:** Yes. **Shelton:** Yes. **Mastin:** Thank you. Melanie? **Morgan:** Kathy, I want to clarify that this is what the International Division is recommending for that area. **Calhoun:** It is. We met on a Zoom call and discussed this at length and it is the recommendation.

Mastin: Seeing no other hands up I'm calling for the vote. If you are in favor raise your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Carried.**

Mastin: George Eigenhauser, Melanie Morgan, Kathy Calhoun, John Colilla, Kenny Currle, Cathy Dunham, Paula Noble, Rachel Anger, Russell Webb, Sharon Roy, Mike Shelton, Carol Krzanowski, Mark Hannon, Pam DelaBar, Yukiko Hayata, Annette Wilson, Pam Moser. Lower your hand. If you are opposed, raise your hand. If you are an abstention, raise your hand. No no votes, no abstentions. Rachel, tell us the vote. **Anger:** That was unanimous with 17 yes votes. **Mastin:** Very good, thank you. The motion passes unanimously. Mary K, thank you.

9. Create an addendum to the show rules specifying that when there is a conflict, information on the show license overrides the show flyer. Require the exhibitor calendar on the CFA website to include the maximum number of entries as specified on the license.

Rationale: Recently, there was a mistake on the entry limit for a show. The show flyer had 225, but the show was licensed for 150. The regular schedule on the CFA website does not currently include the entry limit. Some exhibitors were upset when the show filled before they could enter. Central Office goes by what is on the license, but this addendum will make it clear to all

exhibitors that the license overrides the flyer, and will require the entry limit to be on CFA's website. The entry limit is already included on the text schedule, but not on the exhibitor calendar. A show rule change for this will be presented in February.

10. The show rules committee will work on making the current show rules more user-friendly and easier to navigate.

Rationale: *When Melanie Morgan proposed re-organizing the show rules, I agreed that it is needed but did not want to begin such a monumental task without knowing whether the full board is on board. The show rules are difficult to navigate, I struggle to find things in the paper copy and usually have to resort to multiple searches in Acrobat to find what I need. There are things we can work on, such as improving the table of contents and the index, creating a bookmark list in the PDF, etc. We can also break up some of the complicated rules that have multiple rules in one big paragraph (i.e. the "monster" rules), and add rule numbers to the awards section for easier indexing. These things stop short of a total re-organization, but that could be considered if the simpler steps are not enough. Approving this motion will give the show rules committee an indication that the board supports this endeavor.*

The following two proposals have not been reviewed by the show rules committee as they were received too late.

Reconsidering the Show Rule/SCORING change (passed by 2/3 of delegation and therefore effective May 1, 2023) removing the decrement percentages for regional/national scoring.

I am proposing two mutually exclusive options—the first would add back the 5% decrements for Placements 1 through 10 and placements 11 through 15 (or further if applicable) would receive 1 point fewer for each placement lower than 10.

The second option would be to return the rule to what it was previously, with 5% decrements for every placement.

Mastin: Melanie, Judging Program. **Morgan:** What about #9 and #10 for Mary? **Mastin:** We have stopped doing Show Rules altogether. **Morgan:** Alright. **Mastin:** We will bring back #7 and #8 if we have time at the end of open session. **Morgan:** OK, got it.

11. MOTION: Change the Show Rule passed by the delegation at the 2022 Annual Meeting (by 2/3rds) to return the decrements back to 5% for all final placements Best through 10th, with consideration for placements beyond 10th by decreasing by one point by placement (from the points received by 10th Best).

Article XXXVI – National/Regional/Divisional Awards Program, Determination of Show Points	Annette Wilson
Existing Wording (passed by 2/3 of Delegation and at October, 2022 CFA Board Meeting)	Proposed Wording

<p>DETERMINATION OF SHOW POINTS</p> <p>Points are awarded in the following manner based on the wins achieved in each ring and the official show count of cats/kittens/household pets in competition.</p> <p>Eligible Wins</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each cat/kitten in each championship/premiership/kitten/household pet final – one point for each cat/kitten defeated. 2. Best of breed/division – one point for each cat/kitten defeated within the breed/division. 3. 2nd best of breed/division – 95% of the points awarded to best of breed/division. 4. Points achieved in individual rings are added to determine an entry's total points for the show. In all cases an entry will receive the points from only one award per ring – that which carries the most points. 	<p>DETERMINATION OF SHOW POINTS</p> <p>Points are awarded in the following manner based on the wins achieved in each ring and the official show count of cats/kittens/ household pets in competition.</p> <p>Eligible Wins</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Best cat/kitten/household pet – one point for each cat/kitten defeated. 2. 2nd Best cat/kitten/household pet (HHP) – 95% of the points awarded to best cat/kitten/HHP, 3rd best cat/kitten/HHP 90%, 4th best 85%, 5th best 80%, etc. 6th best 75%, 7th best 70%, 8th best 65%, 9th best 60%, 10th best 55%. 3. 11th Best cat/kitten/household pet (HHP) – 1 point less than 10th Best; 12th Best 2 points less than 10th Best, 13th Best 3 points less than 10th Best, etc. 4 3. Best of breed/division – one point for each cat defeated within the breed/division. 5 4. 2nd best of breed/division – 95% of the points awarded to best of breed/division. 6 5. Points achieved in individual rings are added to determine an entry's total points for the show. In all cases an entry will receive the points from only one award per ring – that which carries the most points.
<p>RATIONALE: This 'hybrid' option would revert to the 5% decrements for placements Best through 10th. Finals awarding cats beyond 10th would be counted in one point decrements, or as described, one point less than 10th Best for placement 11; two points less than 10th Best for placement 12, etc.</p> <p>This option recognizes the value of a final when show entries are high for those cats that place below 10th.</p>	

12. MOTION: This option (should Motion 1 fail), reverts the scoring rule passed by the delegation back to the original rule.

<p>Article XXXVI – National/Regional/Divisional Awards Program, Determination of Show Points</p>	<p>Annette Wilson</p>
<p>Existing Wording</p>	<p>Proposed Wording</p>
<p>Existing Wording (passed by 2/3 of Delegation and at October, 2022 CFA Board Meeting)</p>	<p>Current Wording in 2022-2023 Show Rules</p>
<p>DETERMINATION OF SHOW POINTS</p> <p>Points are awarded in the following manner based on the wins achieved in each ring and the official</p>	<p>DETERMINATION OF SHOW POINTS</p>

<p>show count of cats/kittens/household pets in competition.</p> <p>Eligible Wins</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each cat/kitten in each championship/premiership/kitten/household pet final – one point for each cat/kitten defeated. 2. Best of breed/division – one point for each cat/kitten defeated within the breed/division. 3. 2nd best of breed/division – 95% of the points awarded to best of breed/division. 4. Points achieved in individual rings are added to determine an entry's total points for the show. In all cases an entry will receive the points from only one award per ring – that which carries the most points. 	<p>Points are awarded in the following manner based on the wins achieved in each ring and the official show count of cats/kittens/ household pets in competition.</p> <p>Eligible Wins</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Best cat/kitten/household pet – one point for each cat/kitten defeated. 2. 2nd Best cat/kitten/household pet (HHP) – 95% of the points awarded to best cat/kitten/HHP, 3rd best cat/kitten/HHP 90%, 4th best 85%, 5th best 80%, etc. 3. Best of breed/division – one point for each cat defeated within the breed/division. 4. 2nd best of breed/division – 95% of the points awarded to best of breed/division. 5. Points achieved in individual rings are added to determine an entry's total points for the show. In all cases an entry will receive the points from only one award per ring – that which carries the most points.
<p>RATIONALE: This option reverts the scoring back to what currently exists in the 2022-2023 CFA Show Rules (5% decrements for each placement in a final).</p>	

Rule # 6.36.b.	Awards Committee
Existing Wording	Proposed Wording
None.	<u>6.36.b. For all shows in Regions 1-7, all entries must be received through the CFA online entry form on the CFA website. All entries will be time-stamped and the online form will be disabled for each show when that show is closed to entries.</u>
<p>RATIONALE: I wrote a show rule for Cathy that is this rule but applies to R1-9 and the ID outside of China. Pauli H. from Norway pointed out that some European countries have an issue with the online entry form because of the character set, and something about the time zone. It is possible Kathy Durdick can fix the issue before May 1, and it may be that the board wants to require her to do that as quickly as possible with the proposal in my report. Or they may want to give her a little more time by passing the one that Cathy attached which applies only to R1-7 and then add other countries when the form is fixed. But it would great if the board were pre-noticed so the board could pick one and pass it with a simple majority.</p>	

Krzanowski: I would like to make a motion to table the rest of these Show Rule changes and bring them back in February **Eigenhauser:** George seconds. **Mastin:** OK, any objections? Seeing no objections, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you Carol and George.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

We will prepare a set of exceptions that may need to be extended for certain show rules. These will be presented to the board in February or April.

In February, we have multiple show rules that have been requested by various committees (Judging program and Clerking committee are two) for the next show season. We will also have housekeeping changes associated with motions 3-6.

Cathy Dunham has requested that control of regional point minimums be returned to RDs, this will be proposed in February so that RDs have time to set their regional minimums by April for the 2023-2024 scoring tables. We will try to streamline the TRN show rules and work on any show rules associated with shows releasing an electronic catalog.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Mary Kolencik, Chair*

Mastin: Thank you Mary K, thank you Carol. It is 10:10, the [open session] meeting is adjourned. Board members, we will reconvene at 10:20 for the executive session. Thank you all for attending.

(8) JUDGING PROGRAM REPORT.

Executive Committee

Chair: Melanie Morgan
Vice Chair: Vicki Nye
Advisor/Coordinator: Rachel Anger

List of Committee Members:

Rachel Anger: Associate Program and Applications Administrator
Loretta Baugh: Education and Mentoring
Nancy Dodds: File Administrator
Marilee Griswold: File Administrator
Kathi Hoos: Applications Administrator
Barbara Jaeger: Breed Awareness & Orientation
Anne Mathis: Associate Program Training Administrator, Judges' training/tests & Continuing Education
Vicki Nye: Guest Judges, Statistics, Evaluation Coordinator
Teresa Sweeney: Recruitment & Development Administrator
Diana Rothermel: Ombudsperson
Sharon Roy: Experimental Formats

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

The Committee members met weekly to discuss revisions to the Application guidelines. The entire committee also met December 1st to discuss judge advancements and preparations for this board meeting.

Leave of Absence:

Extension LOA Gene Darrah – Background: *At the October 2/3, 2021 board meeting, the following motion was made: Anger moved to approve a medical leave of absence for Gene Darrah until December 31, 2021. Seconded by Krzanowski, the motion was ratified by unanimous consent. The leave of absence has expired. Mr. Darrah has requested an extension of his leave of absence until May 31, 2022, in order to “continue his comeback”. The June 22, 2022 Board Meeting minutes reported Gene Darrah’s request to extend his medical leave from June 1, 2022 through July 31, 2022. On August 5, 2022, Gene requested to extend his Medical leave till September 30, 2022. On October 3, 2022, Gene requested a further extension to 12/31/22.*

Retirements:

Accept with regrets the retirement of Ellyn Honey effective May 1, 2023

The Judging Program Committee is saddened to receive a letter of retirement from Ellyn Honey, CFA Allbreed judge 1999-5/01/23. Ellyn was known for Oriental Shorthairs and Tonkinese

under the cattery names Rifkees and Myrlyn. She had numerous CFA National wins including 2nd Best Cat, best Shorthair in championship GC BW NW Mylun's Plain White Wrapper. Ellyn also served on the judging program committee and was active in training and mentoring new judges.

Dear Vicki:

It is with a heavy heart that I am going to retire from judging on May 1, 2023, because of a combination of medical and personal reasons.

My last show will be for the Las Vegas Cat Club the end of April 2023.

As you know I have been having back problems for some time and it is now affecting my ability to handle cats in some instances.

I have other medical issues which I need to address as well, and do not feel a medical leave of absence will suit my needs. The safety and needs of the cats come first. If I cannot judge at the top of my game, I choose not to judge at all.

I wish everyone well. It's been a wild ride for 23 years as a judge, and more than 40 years as a member of this organization.

*Best,
Ellyn Honey*

Morgan: We also wish Ellyn Honey the best, as she will be retiring in May of 2023.

Resignations:

Accept with regrets the resignation of Rod U'Ren effective November 26, 2022

Dear Vicki,

Following a recent discussion with Diana and some suggestion over the last year about my future, I am taking the next step. I thoroughly enjoyed the experience and camaraderie that resulted from all the CFA shows I have judged since 2006, having seen so many beautiful cats, and wish it could continue.

However, because of Covid I feel unlikely to travel safely overseas again and have to ask myself the purpose of keeping my CFA licence if I am not going to use it. There are also family issues to consider with Cheryle's health, which has left her bedridden after 13 months in hospital and now aged care. We don't know if it will be permanent or not.

In addition, Cheryle's forced withdrawal from the Australian cat fancy has left an enormous gap in expertise and knowledge, which I have found hard to ignore after being a member of FCCV in the state of Victoria for 55 years myself, including a life member for the last 20 years. In an effort to give back to the fancy here, I stood for Committee, have just been voted on by the members and appointed as President of FCCV. I have just arrived home from the Annual General Meeting where the positions were announced. I can't assume these roles and be a CFA judge, so my resignation from the CFA Judges Panel is tendered with regret.

I can only wish you and all the friends I have made over the years the best for the future. I hope to see some of you again in Australia. As you can see, I have copied this email to Diana, as she needs to know the outcome.

*Sincerely,
Rod U'Ren.*

Morgan: We would also like to acknowledge with regret the resignation of Rod U'Ren and wish him the best of luck in his new position as President of FCCV (Feline Control Council of Victoria, Australia).

Notice of retired judges now deceased:

The Judging Program was saddened to learn that Mrs. Edna Field (retired 2002 with Judge Emeritus status), passed away peacefully, at the age of 99 on September 24, 2022.

Karen Lawrence has graciously written a short bio of her life in CFA. Thank you, Karen.

A major portion of Edna's life revolved around her deep love of cats. An active supporter of the Cat Fanciers' Association (CFA), Edna served on their Board of Directors for several years during the 1960s. She was also named Chair of their International Division during the 1990s, where she assisted in the growth of the cat fancy and CFA worldwide. While Edna worked with several breeds of cats over the years, it was with the Abyssinian breed that she made her mark. Her internationally renowned Chota-Li cattery produced numerous outstanding cats, most notably Grand Champion Chota-Li R.S.T. who, even today, is often described as the best Abyssinian ever bred.

Edna traveled worldwide doing what she loved best judging at cat shows. From when she first started judging in 1962, until her retirement in 2002, Edna was in demand worldwide for her gracious demeanor, excellent handling, and fair judging. Upon her retirement, the CFA Board of Directors elevated her to Judge Emeritus status. In 1993, the Cat Fanciers' Association awarded Edna their highest honor, the CFA Medal of Honor, for her major contributions to the world of cats and service to CFA. She is mourned by friends and cat lovers around the world

The Judging Program was also saddened to learn that retired CFA Allbreed Judge, Vicki Abelson, 75 passed away November 22, 2022.

Vicki broke her hip and never fully recovered. She was a friend and mentor and teacher to many. She bred and loved Maine Coon Cats, American Wirehairs and Abyssinians under the cattery name Bangor and showed several to National Wins. Vicki was an avid quilter, needle pointer and knitter in addition to stained glass and she excelled at all.

She entered the judging program in 1999 and retired in 2021. She was a multigenerational cat fancier and started in cats because her mother was active in the fancy. Her cattery was Bangor and she was a top notch groomer by trade with her company Pride and Groom. She never lost her love of the cats and their people.

Morgan: I know time is limited and we're trying to stay within action items, but I would like to start by offering our condolences to the families of Edna Field and Vicki Abelson, who passed away recently.

Advancements:

Advance to Apprentice:

Mie Takahashi (Shorthair - 2nd Specialty) 18 yes

Advance to Approved Shorthair:

Pam DeGolyer (SH - 2nd Specialty) 18 yes

Advance to Approved Longhair:

Jennifer Reding (LH – 2nd Specialty) 18 yes

Advance to Approval Pending Allbreed:

Pam DeGolyer 18 yes
Jennifer Reding 18 yes

Advance to Approved Allbreed

Teo Vargas-Huesa 18 yes

Guest Judging Report:

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>Raymond, Allan</i>	<i>Fun Show</i>	<i>Feline Club of India</i>	<i>Prune, India</i>	<i>11/13/22</i>
<i>Rogers, Jan</i>	<i>Fun Show</i>	<i>Feline Club of</i>	<i>Prune, India</i>	<i>11/13/22</i>
<i>Fung, Kit</i>	<i>Fun Show</i>	<i>Borneo CF</i>	<i>Jakarta, Indonesia</i>	<i>11/20/22</i>
<i>Vanwonderghm, Peter</i>	<i>Fun Show</i>	<i>Borneo CF</i>	<i>Jakarta, Indonesia</i>	<i>11/20/22</i>
<i>Vanwonderghm, Yanina</i>	<i>Fun Show</i>	<i>Borneo CF</i>	<i>Jakarta, Indonesia</i>	<i>11/20/22</i>
<i>Griswold, Marilee</i>	<i>Seminar</i>	<i>Thai Smiles-SF Presentation</i>	<i>Bangkok, Thailand</i>	<i>12/18/22</i>
<i>Zinck, Iris</i>	<i>Fun Show</i>	<i>Malaysia Cat Association</i>	<i>Petaling, Jaya Malaysia</i>	<i>02/05/23</i>
<i>Fung, Kit</i>	<i>CCCA</i>	<i>Dorrigo & District Cat Club</i>	<i>Armidale, Australia</i>	<i>04/29/23</i>
<i>Chung, Chloe</i>	<i>WCF</i>	<i>World International Show</i>	<i>Bangkok Thailand</i>	<i>05/13/23</i>
<i>Griswold, Marilee</i>	<i>WCF</i>	<i>World International Show</i>	<i>Bangkok Thailand</i>	<i>05/13/23</i>
<i>Chung, Chloe</i>	<i>ACF</i>	<i>Western District Cat Society</i>	<i>Clarendon NSW AU</i>	<i>07/08/23</i>
<i>Pun, Nicholas</i>	<i>ACF</i>	<i>Western District Cat Society</i>	<i>Sydney, Australia</i>	<i>07/08/23</i>
<i>Auth, Mary</i>	<i>CCA</i>	<i>PAWSitive Paws CC</i>	<i>Woodstock, Ontario CN</i>	<i>10/1/23</i>
<i>U'Ren, Rod</i>	<i>ACF</i>	<i>Western District Cat Society</i>	<i>Clarendon NSW AU</i>	<i>10/06/23</i>

<i>Chung, Chloe</i>	<i>ACF</i>	<i>Cats New South Wales Inc</i>	<i>Sydney, Australia</i>	<i>06/08/24</i>
<i>Rivard, Lorraine</i>	<i>CCCA ACF</i>	<i>Royal Queensland Show</i>	<i>Brisbane, Australia</i>	<i>08/10/24</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 Tier 1 Guest Judge</i>
<i>Korotonozhkina, Olga</i>	<i>RUI</i>	<i>Feline Fanciers of Benelux</i>	<i>Houthalen-Helchteren, Belgium</i>	<i>9/17/22</i>	<i>Tier 1 GJ</i>
<i>Grebneva, Olga</i>	<i>RUI</i>	<i>Feline Fanciers of Benelux</i>	<i>Houthalen-Helchteren, Belgium</i>	<i>9/17/22</i>	<i>Tier 1 GJ</i>
<i>Counasse, Daniel</i>	<i>WCF</i>	<i>Siam Cat Fancier Club</i>	<i>Bangkok, Thailand</i>	<i>10/8/22</i>	<i>Tier 1 GJ</i>
<i>Balciuniene, Inga</i>	<i>WCF</i>	<i>Central Breed Cat Club</i>	<i>Bangkok, Thailand</i>	<i>11/5/22</i>	<i>Tier 1 GJ</i>
<i>Davies, Allan</i>	<i>CCCA</i>	<i>HK & Macao Cat Club</i>	<i>Negeri Sambilan, Malaysia</i>	<i>11/5/22</i>	<i>Tier 1 GJ</i>
<i>Christison, Janis</i>	<i>ACF</i>	<i>HK & Macao Cat Club</i>	<i>Negeri Sambilan, Malaysia</i>	<i>12/3/22</i>	<i>APP 10.3.22</i>
<i>Davies, Allan</i>	<i>CCCA</i>	<i>HK & Macao Cat Club</i>	<i>Negeri Sambilan, Malaysia</i>	<i>12/3/22</i>	<i>Tier 1 GJ</i>
<i>Merritt, Chris</i>	<i>CCCA</i>	<i>HK & Macao Cat Club</i>	<i>Negeri Simbilan, Malaysia</i>	<i>12/3/22</i>	<i>Tier 1 GJ</i>
<i>Hamalainen, Satu</i>	<i>FIFe</i>	<i>Fluffy Cat Club</i>	<i>Gyeonggi-do, South Korea</i>	<i>12/4/22</i>	<i>Tier 1 GJ</i>
<i>Hamalainen, Satu</i>	<i>FiFe</i>	<i>Thai Smile CC</i>	<i>Bangkok, Thailand</i>	<i>12/17/22</i>	<i>Tier 1 GJ</i>

Number of shows approved for Guest Judges to date 2022-2023 Show Season

<i>Guest Judge Name</i>	<i># Shows</i>
<i>Balciuniene, Inga</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Christison, Janis</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Counasse, Daniel</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Davies, Allan</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>DePlessis, Kai</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Grebneva, Olga</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Hamalainen, Satu</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Korotonozhkina, Olga</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>LaRocca, Barbara</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Merritt, Chris</i>	<i>4</i>

Associate Program update:

Status of T3 training:

Instruction has begun in both the T3 Asia and Europe Associate groups. Many thanks to Anne Mathis and the current coaches: Jacqui Bennett, Pam DelaBar, Chloe Chung, Hope Gonano, Barbara Jaeger, Anne Mathis, Teresa Sweeney, Liz Watson, Russell Webb, Bob Zenda. Instruction is ongoing in both associate trainee groups, with handling instruction to begin in January. Trainees are projected to complete training in time to be presented for Board approval at the February or possibly April meeting.

Education and Recruitment update:

Breed Awareness and Orientation Schools 2022-2023

Summary of Fall 2022 School:

The Fall 2022 BAOS had 22 participants with an 11 LH and 11 SH. The Country breakdown included: Spain – 2, Indonesia – 3, Hong Kong – 2, Thailand – 6, Japan – 2, South Korea – 2, India – 1, USA – 4. Revenue was \$3,150. Expenses were \$1,400 for 5 Instructors.

Upcoming Schools:

On-line School tentatively scheduled for Spring 2023

In Person school scheduled in conjunction with the 2023 International Show.

Handling School Update:

Two sessions planned in upcoming months:

Alianza Felina December 11, 2022 Madrid Spain

Instructors: Peter Vanwonderghem & Pam Delabar

National Norwegian Forest Cat Breed Club February 26, 2023, Morgantown PA

Instructors Melanie Morgan & Sharon Roy

Recruitment update:

Currently have eight potential applicants working on fulfilling their requirements with another twelve that have expressed interest, but are not yet started requirements.

Mastin: Going on, we have a number of items in our report that detail progress but have no action items. If anyone has any questions, I am glad to elaborate on anything. Just raise your hand. Barring that, I will jump straight into our first action item if you don't mind.

Designated Handler Program

Objective: To provide trained handlers to assist judges who may have a temporary condition that prohibits lifting and/or excessive walking.

Judges' responsibility:

The judge requiring assistance must request the use of a designated handler from the JPC in advance using the designated request form. In the request the reason, (i.e., shoulder surgery, hip replacement, Fractured arm etc.) and the approximate length of time assistance will be needed. Use of the handler may not exceed 6 months per incident.

The judge must be able to stand to judge. Judging while sitting is not permitted.

The judge will be responsible to contact a designated handler to work with them at the show, and complete the contract. The judge is responsible to notify the club at least 30 days in advance. Emergencies will be handled on a case by case basis.

The judge will be responsible for the payment of the handler at \$.50 per cat. And provide the handler's lunch.

Should the judge be unable to judge on a contracted date, the contract is void, with no payment due.

Use of a designated handler will be limited to one year.

The Club's responsibility:

The club must include the fact that a designated handler will be used in the specific judge's ring on the show flyer and all show announcements.

The club is not responsible for paying the handler nor providing lunch.

The Handler's responsibility:

The handler must be present at all times in the ring when the judge is present.

The handler, while permitted to have show entries, will need to use an agent for their cats.

The handler must have completed the Designated Handler's course and hold a current license.

The handler will be responsible to bring cats from the judging cage to the judging table and return them to the benching cage.

The handler may hang color class and finals awards based on the judge's direction.

Should the handler be unable to attend the contracted show, a member of the show committee may fulfill that duty per the show rules.

Designated Handler's Course

Those wishing to become designated handlers must be at least 18 years of age. The applicant must have been exhibiting in CFA for a minimum of 3 years prior to applying.

CFA will provide an online introduction to the proper handling of the various breeds of cats and successful candidates will be licensed. Only licensed designated handlers will be approved to handle for a judge in advance of a show.

Criteria for the course:

Written Exam – must pass with at least an 80% score

Practical workshops with approved Allbreed judge at CFA show

Consist of two rings of cats – one Longhair, one Shorthair

Handle a minimum of 25 cats

Must include both specialties, and Persian, Maine Coon Cat and Oriental style cats

The applicant must successfully complete the workshop and secure the approval of the training judge before becoming licensed or accepting any assignments.

Action Item: *Approve program effective May 1, 2023. Training and licensing effective immediately.*

Morgan: I know the proposed Designated Handler Program is controversial and many don't support it. I understand that, but I reiterate that we are losing judges. The accompanying expertise they bring to the table is a huge loss that's coming at us at an alarming rate. We are working hard to replace them, but that process takes time and even in a perfect world we are looking at losing an immense treasure troves of knowledge short term. We have been tasked with coming up with solutions – both long-term and short-term. Solutions come hand in hand with change and we all know – like our cats, we don't like change – change is often difficult to accept. I do not anticipate that this Designated Handler option will be utilized that often, but giving our judges the option gives us the potential for extending the time that we will have with some of our best treasure troves of knowledge, and I believe that is overall in the best interest of CFA. I also think that this program gives us another tool to use in training our future judges, which is kind of cool. In closing, as I look at this Designated Handler Program and move on to the action item here, I would like to say I really appreciate the work that was put into breaking the program out by some of our committee members. I hope that you all will at least consider it. My action item is [reads]. Any questions? **Mastin:** May I have a second? **Eigenhauser:** George will second. **Mastin:** Thank you George.

Mastin: Open for discussion. **Shelton:** I just have a couple of questions. Part of the judge's responsibility, in the first paragraph it says, *Use of the handler may not exceed 6 months per incident* but the last one says, *Use of a designated handler will be limited to one year*. That is confusing to me, to have two different time frames. The other question I have is under the

handler's responsibility, there is a note that, *The handler, while permitted to have show entries, will need to use an agent for their cats.* Would the handler's cats be eligible to be shown in the handler's ring? **Mastin:** Before I call on anyone else, assuming there's going to be more questions, Melanie will you take those first two questions? **Morgan:** Yes. Mike, thank you. What we anticipate is that you might have one incident, kind of like with an insurance policy with deductibles per incident, not per year. So, you might have an incident, say, where you hurt your knee and that would be, you get 6 months on that, but while you were rehabbing on the knee you fell and hurt your shoulder so that is a different thing. That would be another 6 months, not to exceed a year. And yes, right now we would anticipate that the handler's cats could be shown in that ring. **Mastin:** Thank you Melanie. **Webb:** We have the show rule with the affected judges incapacitated prior to leaving for a judging assignment, so with this it would be before the show begins and that they need a handler. I think it shortchanges the cats and the exhibits. If I'm going to go to a show, I want the judge to judge my cat. I don't need a handler taking the cat from the cage to the table and a judge standing there. Most of us, when we judge, by the time we put our hands in the cage and take the cat out and put it on the table, we feel the weight, the muscle tone, the coat. **Mastin:** Thank you Russell. **Currie:** Last time when we initially spoke about this, you had indicated that the rest of the Committee were against this. Have they since come around, or are they now for it, or are they still against it? I'm just wondering. **Morgan:** The entire Committee was not against it. We were split and I think it probably still remains split. **DelaBar:** I was comparing this to the steward program that we often see in the other organizations over here. I was surprised to find a high level of people that view the handling program that we're going to be doing this weekend with favor, but they feel that if a judge is injured, it prevents liability for the judge, the handler. They are worried about the clubs, and most of all they are worried about the cats. So, I am going to not support this. **Mastin:** Thank you Pam. **Krzanowski:** A lot of what I wanted to say was already said, but I do want to comment that I believe this is something that the delegates should vote on. This is a major change in the judging procedure in our rings. We have a show rule in place for when a judge is incapacitated and I think that we would require additional show rules to cover this situation. I also have a question about the handler. There was a note saying that the judge would pay the handler and provide their lunch, but what about travel expenses, hotel, things like that? That's not addressed. Would that be the club's responsibility or the handler's responsibility or the judge's responsibility. I don't think I can support this. **Mastin:** Melanie, do you want to address Carol's question? **Morgan:** Much like in a clerking situation, since the handler's cats would still be eligible to show at this show, it would be the handler's responsibility to pay for their own expenses to and from the show, etc., but during the day when they are not actively getting to participate while their animals might be able to, that's what they would be compensated for. So no, no one will be responsible for their travel expenses other than them. A good point Carol about the delegates.

Mastin: Any further discussion? Melanie, any last comments before I call for the vote?
Morgan: No. **Mastin:** OK. If you are in favor of this motion, please raise your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Morgan voting yes. Anger, Roy and Wilson abstained.

Mastin: Melanie Morgan. Please lower your hand. If you are opposed, please raise your hand. Mark Hannon, Pam Moser, Carol Krzanowski, Russell Webb, Pam DelaBar, George

Eigenhauser, Kenny Currle, Mike Shelton, John Colilla, Cathy Dunham, Paula Noble, Yukika Hayata, Kathy Calhoun. Please lower your hand. If you are an abstention, raise your hand. Rachel Anger, Annette Wilson, Sharon Roy. Please lower your hand. Rachel, please call the vote. **Anger:** Thank you. That's 1 yes, 13 no, 3 abstentions. **Mastin:** Motion fails.

Morgan: Kathy, you had something? **Calhoun:** Sorry, I just had a question whether you planned to present this to the delegation? I agree with Carol that that is really very important to get the delegation to weigh in on this and I wondered if that is something you considered moving forward with? **Morgan:** We will certainly consider it. I think it's a great idea, but not if the board is vehemently opposed to it, which it seems that they are. So, there's really no point in getting it passed by the delegation if the board is opposed. I thought it was a good idea.

Judging Program Rule Updates:

In response to questions on interpretation in a few areas, these proposed changes are presented in an effort to fix the areas that seem to be creating problems and clarify the original intent.

Action Item: Adopt the following Judging Program rule changes *in purple*, effective immediately.

1. Paragraph 2.10 – Custodial Care and Exhibiting Experience:

2.10 Custodial Care and Exhibiting Experience: For application purposes, custodial care is defined as: housing the kitten/cat in the Applicant's home for a minimum of three (3) months, caring for it, and taking the kitten/cat to and from the show hall, grooming the cat at the show, having the cat in the Applicant's care throughout the show and taking it to and from the rings. Custodial care kittens/cats **MUST** reside with the Applicant and be exhibited by the Applicant at a minimum of three (3) shows. Any cats that are shown that do not meet the minimums can be listed on these forms and will count as additional agenting experience but will not count toward minimum requirements for additional breeds and custodial care. The Applicant will be expected to furnish detailed specific information regarding these activities. Photos are required in the Applicant's home and at the show. Custodial care must have the oversight of the Applicant's mentor, as well as the mentor's signature on the appropriate form. Such oversight may include, but not be limited to Zoom calls, visits to the cattery or other means of assuring the requirements are met.

For application purposes, Agenting is defined as having possession of the cat at least the night before the show, completing all grooming and exclusively handling the cat at the show.

To meet the Custodial Care and/or Exhibiting Option: Custodial care is equal to two agenting experiences. The applicant may choose between Custodial care, Exhibiting or the third option of a combination of both. See the specific requirements by Specialty below.

For Application purposes a change in title must be one (1) of the following:

- a. Kitten to BW, RW DW or NW*
- b. Open/Champion, Open/Premier to Grand Champion or Grand Premier*

- c. Grand Champion/Grand Premier to BW, RW, DW or NW

SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS BY SPECIALTY:

LONGHAIR APPLICANT (1ST SPECIALTY): In addition to their primary breed, the Applicant has ~~two (2)~~ three (3) options:

OPTION ONE (1):

The Applicant must have custodial care of or have owned and exhibited each of the two (2) longhair body types (Persian/Exotic and other body types), i.e., the Applicant's primary breed plus a minimum two (2) additional breeds. Persian/Exotic must be primary OR one of the additional body types.

Or

OPTION TWO (2):

The Applicant may agent, meeting the above criteria, six (6) different longhair cats, showing each a minimum of three (3) shows, and achieving a change in title on each.

Or

OPTION THREE (3) – This is a combination of options one and two:

Custodial care or own one (1) and Agent four(4)

Custodial care or own two (2) and Agent two (2)

Meeting the above criteria, of showing and achieving a change in title on each.

LONGHAIR APPLICANT (2nd SPECIALTY): The Applicant has ~~two (2)~~ three (3) options. They may:

OPTION ONE (1):

Have custodial care or ownership while exhibiting a minimum of three (3) different body types to a change in title.

Or

OPTION TWO (2):

Agent six (6) cats to a title change on each.

Or

OPTION THREE (3) – This is a combination of options one and two:

Custodial care or own one (1) and Agent four(4)

Custodial care or own two (2) and Agent two (2)

Meeting the above criteria, of showing and achieving a change in title on each.

SHORTHAIR APPLICANT (1ST SPECIALTY): In addition to their primary breed, the Applicant has ~~two (2)~~ three (3) options:

OPTION ONE (1):

The Applicant must have had custodial care of, or have owned and exhibited each of the three (3) shorthair body types (Oriental/Foreign, Intermediate/Semi-Foreign/Moderate and Substantial), i.e. the Applicant's primary breed plus a minimum of three (3) additional breeds. Oriental/Foreign must be primary OR be one of the additional body types. Each must be exhibited to a title change.

Or

OPTION TWO (2):

The Applicant may agent, meeting the above criteria, eight (8) shorthair cats, showing each a minimum of three (3) shows and achieving a change in title. Each of the three (3) body types must be included.

Or

OPTION THREE (3) - This is a combination of options one and two:

Custodial care or own one (1) and Agent six (6)

Custodial care or own two (2) and Agent four (4)

Custodial care or own three (3) and Agent two (2)

Meeting the above criteria, of showing and achieving a change in title on each.

SHORTHAIR APPLICANT (2nd SPECIALTY): The Applicant has ~~two (2)~~ three (3) options:

OPTION ONE (1):

The Applicant must have custodial care or ownership of a minimum of four (4) different breeds consisting of three (3) different body types and exhibiting each to a title change.

Or

OPTION TWO (2):

The Applicant must agent eight (8) cats consisting of the three body types, exhibiting each to a title change.

Or

OPTION THREE (3) - This is a combination of options one and two:

Custodial care or own one (1) and Agent six (6)

Custodial care or own two (2) and Agent four (4)

Custodial care or own three (3) and Agent two (2)

Meeting the above criteria, of showing and achieving a change in title on each.

Applicants may request a list of the breeds that fall into the various body type categories from the Application Administrator. Any exceptions requested for lack of body type and/or breeds in a specific area must be approved by the JPC in writing.

For all cats that are custodial care, for the purpose of meeting requirements, a form can be found on the CFA's web site or the link may be provided by the Application Administrator. The Applicant and breeder must complete all information. The Applicant, the cat's owner and the Applicant's mentor must sign and date the form. Any violation of the conditions of custodial care, ownership or agenting shall cause the Applicant to be ineligible for consideration to the Judging Program for a period of two (2) years, after which they may reapply.

2. *Paragraph 8.2 – Breed/Division Color Class Evaluations:*

REGULAR PROCESS:

...

f. Trainees in Japan must complete a minimum of two (2) sessions working with judges from ~~the United States~~ Regions 1-7 or 9. These two (2) sessions must be completed in ~~the United States~~ Regions 1-9 7 or 9 or, with the approval of the JPC, in the Asian countries of the International Division.

g. Trainees in the European Region must complete a minimum of two (2) sessions working with judges from ~~the United States~~ Regions 1-7 or 9. These sessions may be completed in Europe or the United States for Longhair. For Shorthair, two (2) sessions must be completed in the United States.

h. Trainees in the International Division-Asia/Latin America must complete a minimum of two (2) sessions working with judges from ~~the United States~~ Regions 1-7 or 9. These sessions may be completed in Japan, Asia, or in the United States. If these sessions are completed in the United States, they may be held a week apart to minimize expenses. It is highly suggested that the last supervised and the first solo sessions be completed with judges from the United States.

ACCELERATED PROCESS:

...

d. Accelerated Applicant Trainees must work with at least three (3) ~~U.S.~~ judges from Regions 1-7 or 9.

Mastin: Melanie, do you have anything else you want to review? **Morgan:** Yes. Moving on, in October the board approved changes to the Judging Program Rules and we thank them for that. Those changes allowed us to give potential candidates more options. Once we started implementing those changes, we realized that we needed to make some modifications to the way they were written in order to maintain the intent of what we had actually proposed and thought we approved. The changes to 2.10 are clarifying those areas that our applications administrator and our recruitment director identified problems and confusion and are consistent with our trying to offer menu choices rather than forcing people to take the same path as they move towards the goal of applying to the Judging Program. The change to 8.2 clarifies that we are including judges from Regions 1-7 and 9 in our training, etc., so I would like to make a motion that all these changes to the Judging Program Rules be approved as written and incorporated into the existing changes as approved at our October meeting. **Mastin:** May I have a second? **Webb:** Russell seconds. **Mastin:** Thank you Russell.

Mastin: Discussion? **Eigenhauser:** I think I spotted a type-o. Under 8.2.f where it says, *These two (2) sessions must be completed in the United States Regions 1-9 or 9.* I think you meant 1-7 or 9. **Morgan:** *Trainees in Japan must complete a minimum of two (2) sessions working with judges from Regions 1-7 or 9.* That's what I have here. **Eigenhauser:** It says 1-9 or 9 on the screen. **Mastin:** The second sentence. **Morgan:** Got it. I see it. OK, so the motion would be amended to change that motion to 1-7 or 9. **Mastin:** Russell, are you in agreement? **Webb:** Yes. **Morgan:** Thank you George. **Mastin:** George, thank you. **DelaBar:** The comment I have to make about trainees from Region 9. If they are longhair they can do their entire training within Region 9, a large area. If they are shorthair, it has, *For Shorthair, two (2) sessions must be completed in the United States.* I think that we are seeing a bigger variety of shorthairs coming up now in many of our areas. Where else can somebody be confronted with 15 Abyssinian grand champions, and other breeds that are not readily available within the U.S. One of the things that does concern me is the fact that we allow trainees from the International Division to have training a week apart, so they get to have it one week and then stay over 5 days and then have another training. That is not given to those from Europe. It's still just as much an expense for them as it is for a trainee from the ID. **Morgan:** None of that portion of that is coming up in this particular motion. That said, Pam has some good points. I'm not sure that it's still pertinent that we should require that they have to be trained in the U.S., especially if U.S. judges are training them over there, and that's certainly something that we might want to take a look at. In terms of allowing consecutive weekends, we have allowed that for the European judges and we certainly would consider that if it's necessary. **Mastin:** Pam DelaBar, do you have any additional comments? **DelaBar:** How about we make this part of our discussion this coming weekend? **Morgan:** OK, that sounds good. **DelaBar:** At least I can have a scotch while we're doing it. **Morgan:** Chocolate for me. **DelaBar:** And chocolate for Melanie, and bread.

Mastin: Any further discussion? Any objections to this motion? Seeing no objections, this motion passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Mastin: OK Melanie. **Morgan:** That's it for me, for now. **Mastin:** Alright, thank you.

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

MAY 1, 2022, THROUGH OCTOBER 31, 2022

Key Financial Indicators

Balance Sheet

Cash reserves, including checking, have decreased 9.17% vs prior year.

Profit & Loss Analysis

Total registration, which includes litter registration and individual registration, contributed \$528,924 to the bottom line. This represents a -5.24% reduction compared to the same period last year and is 91.65% of budget.

	May - Oct, 2022	May - Oct, 2021	Change	% Change	Budget	+/- Budget	% Of Budget
Registrations, Litters (early)	\$88,946	\$82,703	\$6,243	7.55	\$82,942	\$6,004	107.24
Registrations, Litters	\$105,550	\$110,434	(\$4,884)	-4.42	\$119,685	(\$14,135)	88.19
Total Litter Registrations	\$194,496	\$193,137	\$1,359	0.70	\$202,627	(\$8,131)	95.99
Registrations, Cats (early)	\$142,111	\$160,408	(\$18,297)	-11.41	\$158,069	(\$15,958)	89.90
Registration, Cats	\$31,108	\$36,742	(\$5,634)	-15.33	\$35,057	(\$3,949)	88.73
Registrations, Cats- Prepaid	\$158,073	\$163,344	(\$5,271)	-3.23	\$178,383	(\$20,310)	88.61
Registrations, Cats w/Litter	\$3,136	\$4,534	(\$1,398)	-30.83	\$2,996	\$140	104.66
Total Individual Registrations	\$334,428	\$365,028	(\$30,600)	-8.38	\$374,507	(\$40,079)	89.30
Total Registrations	\$528,924	\$558,165	(\$29,241)	-5.24	\$577,134	(\$48,210)	91.65

Mastin: Kathy Calhoun, Treasurer's Report. **Calhoun:** I trust that everyone has read the report, so I will just cover a few points. We know that registration is our #1 income stream and we're down 5.24% for almost 92% of the budget.

Other Key Indicators: Additional performance indicators are captured in the table below.

	May - Oct, 2022	May - Oct, 2021	Change	% Change
Registrations, Cattery	\$119,195	\$166,727	(\$47,532)	-28.51
Add Suffix Name	\$4,810	\$7,811	(\$3,001)	-38.42
Championship Confirmation	\$21,480	\$15,672	\$5,808	37.06
Breed Council Dues	\$24,060	\$26,030	(\$1,970)	-7.57
Shipping/handling	\$6,738	\$1,595	\$5,143	322.56
Registration by Pedigree	\$57,588	\$54,433	\$3,155	5.80
Miscellaneous Regist. Services	\$9,316	\$5,838	\$3,478	59.58
Expedited Services & Fees	\$27,420	\$33,437	(\$6,017)	-17.99

Total Ordinary Income contributed \$1,029,808 to the bottom line compared to \$1,079,730 the prior year. This represents a -4.62% decrease compared to prior year and is 94.44% of budget.

Publications

Yearbook advertising revenue continues to perform better than the prior year. Currently this income line item is \$22,691 compared to \$12,896 and is 130% of budget.

Central Office is 2.0% more than prior year and 98.0% of budget.

Show Sponsorship is currently 77.0363% of budget.

2022 Annual Meeting's financials are summarized in the table below. A detailed report is posted in FileVista.

	Actuals	Budget	over Budget	% Of Budget
Total Income	\$63,046	\$60,965	\$2,081	103.41%
Total Expenses	\$135,482	\$100,359	\$35,123	135.00%
Net Income	(\$72,435)	(\$39,394)	(\$33,042)	183.88%

Note: The financials for the June Board meeting are not a part of the financials for the Annual Meeting and Awards Banquet.

Expenses for the June Board Meeting which include Board Member and Central Office staff expense, were \$45,016.

Calhoun: The Annual Meeting. We have very close to the final numbers on the Annual Meeting. It cost us \$72,435. The budget was – **Tartaglia:** Kathy, you went on mute again.

Calhoun: It doesn't show that I am on mute. **Mastin:** We can hear you. **Calhoun:** We knew that going in there would be an expense, and that was budgeted at \$39,000 but we came in over that. Keep in mind that the annual meeting financials do not include the cost of the board meeting, so the board meeting, in and of itself, was \$45,000.

The Bottom Line: *Net operating income remains positive at \$16,432. The net income is - \$106,251 primarily due to unrealized losses.*

	May - Oct 2022	May - Oct 2021	Change	% Change	Budget	Difference
Gross Profit	\$1,132,778	\$1,117,235	\$15,543	1.39%	\$1,177,322	(\$44,543)
Total Expenses	\$1,116,347	\$965,949	\$150,397	15.57%	\$1,201,243	(\$84,896)
Net Operating Income	\$16,432	\$151,286	(\$134,855)	-89.14%	(\$23,922)	\$40,353
Interest Income	\$4,255	\$4,046	\$209	5.16%	\$4,000	\$255
Rental Income	\$13,860	\$13,200	\$660	5.00%	\$14,190	(\$330)
Unrealized Gain/Loss	(\$140,944)	\$37,670	(\$178,614)	-474.16%	\$25,000	(\$165,944)
CFA Events – Other*	\$146	\$0	\$146		0.00	\$146
Total Other Income	(\$122,683)	\$54,916	(\$177,599)	-323.40%	\$43,190	(\$165,873)
Net Income	(\$106,251)	\$206,202	(\$312,453)	-151.53%	\$19,268	(\$125,519)

Calhoun: The Bottom Line. One of the things that we have been doing well at is our net operating income, which is the third line down. We have been managing our expenses in keeping with our income, so our net operating income is a positive \$16,432, but when you drop down to the Bottom Line we are behind our budget. There is a \$106,000 loss. Keep in mind that this report is through the end of October.

Headwinds:

- *The Pittsburgh Pet Expo had its challenges. The cost of the event is roughly \$5,000.*

Currle: I had a question about the Treasurer's Report, not the motion. The \$5,000 cost for the Pet Expo, what was that for? **Calhoun:** The only thing that we did not pay for was the hall itself, so we paid for the judges coming in, we paid for the set-up, we paid normal expenses for the judges – hotel, travel, judges' fees, set-up. We had some members from the Central Office there, and we didn't get income. We didn't get the entries, but it was budgeted – **Currle:** I was just wondering where the money went. Thank you Kathy. **Calhoun:** Just like any other show, except we didn't have to pay for the facility. On the flip side of that, we also didn't benefit from the gate, because that went to the pet fair. **Currle:** Thank you Kathy. **Mastin:** Kathy, once you have the final report, will you distribute that to the board? **Calhoun:** Absolutely. **Mastin:** OK.

- *COVID-19 continues to be a challenge in China which has prevented shows in that country. That is one of the factors driving a reduction in registration.*

Opportunities

- *Conduct the February 2023 Board meeting via ZOOM. This will result in \$35,000 to \$45,000 in cost avoidance.*
- *Conduct the October 2023 Board meeting in-person on October 16 through October 17 in Cleveland, Ohio following the CFA International Show. Depending upon how many board members judge and/or support the show, a duplication of travel expenses would be avoided.*

Calhoun: There are a couple other things that we have, and I have categorized them as Headwinds. We know that the Pet Expo had its challenges. The rough numbers are, we had a loss of \$5,000 – or cost, however you want to frame that. We also know that COVID continues to be a challenge in China and we have had a number of shows that have been postponed. This is impacting dramatically our registrations out of China. Quite frankly, registration is down for most of the globe.

Calhoun: So, we have a couple of opportunities. One of the opportunities would be to have the February 2023 board meeting via Zoom. This will result in a saving – or a cost avoidance, which is a better way of putting it – of \$35,000 to \$45,000. A couple of other notes. I know that there is the positive element of having in-person meetings, being the ability to collaborate offline and those sorts of things. I know that we have had some thoughts and comments made that when we have the Zoom meetings, we make bad decisions. Actually, what really occurs and what Rich is trying to prevent by keeping us on time, on task and on schedule tonight is that when we have these meetings that we have on a Tuesday evening and they go extremely late, that's when we kind of get weary and decisions are maybe not as well thought through, but the Zoom meetings and our regular meetings (being February, October and even at one point the June meetings), those meetings go very, very well so there is some benefit there. The second consideration would be that in next year's budget, that would be to conduct the October 2023 meeting in person, but in conjunction with the International Show. This, in and of itself, would save money in that there will be a number of board members no doubt that will be participating in the International Show in one way or another, either judging or supporting. So, we would avoid a duplication of travel expenses.

Motion: *Conduct the February 2023 CFA Board meeting, virtually via the ZOOM platform and make the decision regarding the October 2023 Board meeting in June 2023.*

Calhoun: My motion tonight is to [reads]. **Mastin:** May I have a second please? **Mastin:** Annette Wilson, you are on mute. Are you making a second? **Wilson:** No, I had a question, that's all. I'll second it. I can second it. **Mastin:** OK, proceed with your question. **Wilson:** I have a question about this thing about October. What weekend is the International Show? **Tartaglia:** The second full weekend in October. **Calhoun:** So, the board meeting is the first weekend. Where the meetings would come in, say for instance I'm coming in – I'll use myself for the example for the board meeting, flying to Ohio and coming back to Chicago, and then in supporting the International as Treasurer, I would fly back to Ohio and come back to Chicago. This could be avoided. Instead of having two back and forth travel itineraries, it would be one. Now, this won't impact everyone on the board. **Wilson:** Are you talking about a meeting the same weekend as the International Show? **Calhoun:** Well, not the same weekend. It would be

the following Monday and Tuesday. **Wilson:** Oh, Monday and Tuesday. OK, so I thought it would be cost effective to put all the board members up for an entire week and not let them go home. **Calhoun:** No, no, no. **Mastin:** Kathy and Annette, may I interject please? I know it's a little confusing what we have listed there in the Opportunities of doing an in-person board meeting in conjunction with the International Show, but I would like to stick with the motion which is on the floor, which is specific to the February board meeting being done via Zoom. If we want to discuss the opportunities for October after we do that, I don't want the rest of the board getting confused on what the motion on the floor is. So, do we have the motion on the floor? Kathy, go ahead and repeat it. **Calhoun:** *Conduct the February 2023 CFA Board meeting, virtually via the ZOOM platform and make the decision regarding the October 2023 Board meeting in June 2023.* **Mastin:** Thank you. Annette, you did make the second on that.

DelaBar: I think you all know my feelings about having in-person board meetings. I feel that it's vital. I believe it is the cost of doing business of this organization. The more effective we are, the more dynamic we are in our leadership of this organization. I think we're going to see that it will help pump up the organization as a whole and possibly put some spirit back into it, to where people are wanting to register cats and participate in shows. The difference we saw when we were together in June was ever so different than our Zoom meeting in October and even subsequent Zoom meetings. We don't get those intangibles through Zoom. I will participate in any board meeting that we have, but let me tell you guys, at 4:25 in the morning it gets a little strange for those of us living outside the confines of the continental United States. **Mastin:** Thank you Pam.

Mastin: Any further discussion? Kathy, do you want a final comment on this? **Calhoun:** While I do appreciate Pam's input, and I don't doubt that there is a plus in being in-person, I get that but we have to be realistic about our managing costs. There are two points of view on this sort of thing. There are many organizations where people are via Zoom. They are 100% home and those sorts of things. There are other organizations or other thoughts that it does not replace the interaction of being together. I get that. I get that, but in my role I feel it's very important that we manage costs, that we keep that net operating income piece above the red line. It's very important. We have headwinds we have to be prepared to deal with. So, I think that this is one way in our grasp where we can avoid the other consequences of having a meeting in February, being weather conditions which I didn't mention before. I think that we can still be effective. In fact, I know that we can. **Mastin:** Thank you Kathy. I'm going to call for the vote. If you are in favor of the motion, raise your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Calhoun, Moser, Hayata, Dunham, Roy, Anger, Noble and Krzanowski voting yes.

Mastin: Kathy Calhoun, Pam Moser, Yukiko Hayata, Cathy Dunham, Sharon Roy, Rachel Anger, Paula Noble, Carol Krzanowski. Please lower your hand. If you are opposed, raise your hand. Melanie Morgan, Mark Hannon, Annette Wilson, Pam DelaBar, Russell Webb, Kenny Currle, Mike Shelton, John Colilla, George Eigenhauser. Please lower your hand. If you are an abstention, raise your hand. No abstentions. Rachel, please call the vote. **Anger:** We have 8 yes votes, 9 no votes, zero abstentions. **Mastin:** Motion fails.

Tartaglia: I just want to clarify. So, the February board meeting IS going to be in person. Is that correct? **Mastin:** The board voted to not support a Zoom meeting for February. That is correct. **Tartaglia:** Just to let you know, I will be looking at the Crowne Plaza in Cleveland for the location. **Mastin:** Thank you.

Mastin: Kathy, do you have anything further at this time? **Calhoun:** Not from the Treasurer's Report. Unless there are other questions. **Mastin:** Kenny, do you have any further questions? **Currle:** No.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Kathy Calhoun, CFA Treasurer*

(10) AUDIT COMMITTEE.

Committee Chair: Kathy Calhoun
List of Committee Members: Rich Mastin, Allene Tartaglia

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

The 2021/2022 Financial Audit has been completed by Maloney + Novotny LLC., Canton, Ohio.

Current Happenings of Committee:

Current Observations and Recommendations

Accounts Payable Cut-Off – Recommendation is that CFA implement procedures to ensure expenses are entered into the proper period.

Prior Year Observations and Recommendations

Capitalization Policy – The CFA Board has approved the increase of the capitalization policy to \$2,500 as of April 30, 2022. Comment - Recommendation implemented

Contribution of Nonfinancial Assets – The Financial Accounting Standards Board has issued a new accounting standard (ASU 2020-07) that will require additional information on the contributions of nonfinancial assets (also known as gifts-in-kind). While CFA is not commonly the recipient of gifts-in-kind, the CFA Audit Committee is aware of this new standard and its implications. Comment CFA intends to adopt a policy in the fiscal year 2022 – 2023 for recording and tracking contributions of nonfinancial assets.

Future Projections for Committee:

The Central Office will distribute the 2021 – 2022 Audited Financial Reports to all CFA club secretaries.

Board Action Items:

None

Time Frame:

On going

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

The audit in its entirety is available in FileVista.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Kathy Calhoun, Chair*

Mastin: Kathy, let's do the Audit Report. **Calhoun:** OK. Again, I trust that you have read the report. The action item, if you scroll down, we don't have any action items on this but I just wanted to note that the audited financials will be sent to the club secretaries, as stated in the Bylaws, and the entire audit will be in File Vista for your reading pleasure. **DelaBar:** When will these reports be sent out to the clubs? **Calhoun:** Allene can answer that. **Tartaglia:** We should be able to get those out within the next couple weeks. I first want to confer with Kathy to confirm exactly what we will be sending out. It will be sent via email. **DelaBar:** Thank you.

(11) **BUDGET COMMITTEE.**

Committee Chair: Kathy Calhoun

List of Committee Members: Rich Mastin, Matthew Wong, and Allene Tartaglia

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Prepare the Budget submission and approval timeline.

Current Happenings of Committee:

The Budget Committee developed the 2023/2024 budget development timeline which is captured in this report.

Future Projections for Committee:

- *Committee Chairs should work with their Board Liaisons in the development and submission of their respective budget requests.*
- *Committee budget requests should be emailed to the Treasurer by the **Board Liaisons**.*
- *2023/2024 CFA Budget to be approved at the April 2023 Board Meeting*

Communication

12/05/2022 - Committee spending reports (May 1, 2022 – Oct 31, 2022). The Treasurer will email reports to the Board Liaison.

12/06/2022 - Budget Committee timeline communicated

Input Due Dates for Changes to the 2022-2023 Budget

11/29/2022 - Request for additional funding should be submitted to the Budget Committee no later than for review at the December Board meeting. Requests should include supporting rationale.

Input Due Dates for the 2023 - 2024 Budget

01/02/2023 Committee Budget Request from Board Liaison.

01/02/2023 Tucson Annual 2023 Budget

01/02/2023 International Show 2023 Budget

01/16/2023 Capital Requests

01/23/2023 Corporate Sponsorship Estimates

Development

02/01/2023 Budget Committee ZOOM or in person meeting #1

02/02/2023 Budget Committee ZOOM or in person meeting #2

02/06/2023 Budget Committee ZOOM or in person meeting #3

Approval

03/07/2023 Preliminary Budget due to Board
03/14/2023 8:00pm – 9:00pm eastern time Preliminary Budget Review – ZOOM Conference with the CFA Board
03/30/2023 Deadline for Budget Report to CFA Secretary
04/04/2023 April Telephonic Board Meeting – 2023/2024 Budget Approval

Mastin: We will go on to the Budget Committee Report. **Calhoun:** Again, I am sure you read the report. It doesn't change much. There are dates for the timeline for the budget, so I would like to scroll to the action items.

Board Action Items:

VCC Budget Request: The VCC chaired by Cathy Dunham, is planning to produce two virtual cat shows in the second half of the fiscal year. This will require an extension of the subscription to the platform and a software upgrade. While expensed this year, the subscription is based on a calendar year expiring in December of 2023.

Motion: Approve the VCC budget as for January 2023 through April 2023 (see details in the chart below).

	Show one	Show two	Jan - April 2022
Platform Upgrade (includes 10% discount)			\$3,060.00
12-month subscription (includes 10% discount)			\$1,278.00
Total			\$4,338.00
Income			
VCC Expenses per event - two categories and two judges			
Income from entries (after service fees est 5%)	\$2,300.00	\$2,300.00	\$4,600.00
Income from voting	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00
Total Income	\$3,300.00	\$3,300.00	\$6,600.00
Expense			
Judges:	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$200.00
Cost of prizes per category: \$25, \$15, and \$10 x 2	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$200.00
Cost of Facebook advertising:	\$75.00	\$75.00	\$150.00
Cost of Graphic designer:	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$200.00
Entry Clerk: min \$75 or \$0.25 per entry (whichever is the higher amount)	\$75.00	\$75.00	\$150.00
Total Expense	\$450.00	\$450.00	\$900.00
Donation 50% of income from voting	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$1,000.00
Net Profit (Loss)	\$2,350.00	\$2,350.00	\$4,700.00
Total			-\$2,438.00

Calhoun: As mentioned before, the VCC chaired by Cathy Dunham is planning to produce two virtual shows in the latter half of this fiscal year. This was not included in the budget, so in order to do so there will be the expense of the subscription for the software. If we extend it now, it will expire in December of 2023, so we will get a benefit from that next year, as well. There is also a 10% discount to do so. There is also a software upgrade that is necessary, and it is also going to be discounted. Here is their budget. The motion is to approve the VCC budget as outlined below. **Eigenhauser:** George will second. **Mastin:** Thank you George.

Mastin: Discussion? Any objections? Seeing no objections, the motion passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Mastin: Kathy, I want to thank Cathy Dunham and Nancy Kerr for re-establishing the VCC Committee to move forward with the program.

Corporate Sponsorship: *In an effort to develop corporate partnerships, exploration of the cost/benefit of attending trade shows will need to be explored. The current budget does not include funding for this initiative. The funds will be used to attend the Global Pet Expo in Orlando, March 22 -24, 2023.*

Motion: *Approve a budget of \$3,500 to attend the Global Pet Expo.*

Mastin: Continue Kathy. **Calhoun:** The second motion is around corporate sponsorship. We need to develop partnerships with those that may be in a position to provide sponsorship for our activities or shows, and invest in CFA. One of the platforms where that could be done is attending trade shows. We don't have a lot of experience in that. We need to get a better understanding of what will that bring to the table and what do we need to bring to the table to garner those partnerships. There is a trade show called the Global Pet Expo in Orlando March 22-24, 2023. The motion is to [reads]. **Mastin:** May I have a second please? **Currle:** Kenny seconds. **Mastin:** Thank you Kenny.

Mastin: Any discussion? Any objections? Seeing no objections, the motion passes unanimously, thank you.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Review budget requests received.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Kathy Calhoun, Chair*

Mastin: Kathy, continue. Nothing further in the Budget Committee? **Calhoun:** No.

(12) **INTERNATIONAL DIVISION.**

Committee Chair/Co-Chair: Kathy Calhoun/Matthew Wong
Subcommittee Chair/Co-Chair
China: John Colilla/Wain Harding
Subcommittee Chair
Asia(outside of China): Robert Zenda
Subcommittee Chair AWA/CSA: Kenny Currle

China Subcommittee Report: Committee: John Colilla ~ Subcommittee Chair, Wain Harding ~ Subcommittee Co-Chair, Committee Members - Kathy Calhoun, Matthew Wong, Eva Chen.

Shows in mainland China continue to be restricted due to the COVID-19 zero-tolerance policy in China.

There were seven shows scheduled between May 1, 2022, and November 30, 2022. Five of the seven shows were postponed due to COVID-19. Two shows were held. Thus far there have been a total of seven Longhair Specialty and seven Shorthair Specialty rings.

The award banquet schedule on December 10, 2022, in Macau, also had to be postponed because of COVID-19 restrictions.

Date	Club Name	City	Postponed	Show Format			Show Count Entries									
				A B	LH	S H	Kit LH	Kit SH	CH LH	CH SH	Ch LH AOV	CH SH AOV	PR LH	PR SH	HHP	Total
07/02/22	China Free Heart Cat Club	Chengdu			4	4	10	7	20	17	3	5	3	2	0	67
09/10/22	China Kiwi Fancies Cat Club	Sichuen	YES		6	4										
11/05/22	Oriental Crown	Zhejiang			3	3	46	37	41	26	9	12	7	4	43	225
11/12/22	Swire CFC	Ningbo	YES		3	3										
11/13/22	China Kiwi Fancies Cat Club	Sischen	YES		6	4										
11/19/22	Dragon King	Ningbo	YES													
11/26/22	Hua Xia Cat Club	Hangzhou	YES		4	5										
	Actual Rings				7	7										

Mastin: We are going to go on to International Division. **Calhoun:** I'm not sure why this spreadsheet that John Colilla provided had no numbers in it. The File Vista is populated, so I'm not sure what occurred here, but basically the spreadsheet outlines that there had only been 7 rings longhair with the specialty judges – 7 longhair, 7 shorthair rings, and it listed the shows that had been scheduled and postponed. I would be happy to send that to anyone, or it is on File Vista in it's entirety, so I'm not really sure what happened. **Mastin:** Does anybody have any questions for Kathy on the International Division report? **Colilla:** I just have an additional comment about the activity in China. We actually had another show last weekend. We basically approved 8 shows – 3 shows were successful and 5 shows were postponed. Therefore, the first time we actually have a show that's being applied in the Northern Territory. Hopefully, we will have shows in all three territories next year. **Mastin:** Thank you John. Kathy, do you have any

further comments? **Calhoun:** No, I trust everyone has read the report. **Mastin:** I don't see any hands, Kathy. Thank you for your report.

Asia (except China) Subcommittee Report - Bob Zenda ~ Subcommittee chair

Longtime Indonesia Country Coordinator Eva Libranti submitted her resignation effective at the conclusion the Indonesia DW Awards Banquet on October 23, 2022, and Indra Faisal was appointed to serve as her successor (photo attached).

CFA show activity in Asia continues at a steady pace and several of the events, including the DW Awards Banquet in Indonesia, have been documented in the CFA Newsletter along with photographs. Sixteen (16) shows were held in October and November, and eighteen (18) more show dates have been either licensed or dates reserved (Hong Kong 7, Korea 2, Malaysia 5, Thailand 3, and Vietnam 1).

An application for a new club in Korea & reapplication for a club in Hong Kong that was not renewed during the pandemic have been received and will be considered at the February Board meeting. I have also offered assistance to individuals in Malaysia and Indonesia who have contacted me about forming CFA clubs.

On Monday, November 22 there was a massive earthquake on the main Indonesian island of Java with significant damage and loss of life. Although the epicenter was approximately 200km southwest of Jakarta, significant tremors and aftershocks were also experienced in Jakarta, Bogor, and Bandung. I contacted Indra Faisal, our Indonesian Country Representative this to determine if any of our CFA family of breeders and exhibitors were affected, and he responded on November 25th that he has not learned of any thus far.

v/r,
Bob Zenda, Subcommittee Chair
CFA International Division, Asia (except China)



Indra Faisal, Indonesia Country Coordinator

(13) EXPERIMENTAL FORMATS.

Committee Chair: Sharon Roy

(a) Lucky Tomcat Club and Tigers Lair Cat Fanciers

Lucky Tomcat Club and Tigers Lair Cat Fanciers would like to hold two OCP rings at their show April 29-30, 2023. The format for the show would be back to back 7 AB/HHP, 1 SP/HHP, 2 OCP rings (10 rings total). Scoring would be for grand points only for the op/ch and op/pr portion of the final with no points awarded in breed. The rings would only be held if the minimums of 30 op/ch entered and 15 op/pr entered are reached.

Motion: Grant an exception to Show Rule 4.06 and allow Lucky Tomcat Club and Tigers Lair Cat Fanciers to include two OCP rings at their show April 29-30, 2023.

Mastin: We are going to go on to Experimental Formats. Sharon? **Roy:** We actually have two action items. The first one was submitted by Lucky Tomcat and Tigers Lair Cat Club. They would like to hold two OCP rings at their show the end of the year. This will be very similar to what was held at the Florida shows, where they are going to have two separate judgments. Cathy Dunham, do you have anything else to say about it? **Dunham:** No. We are just hoping to provide an opportunity for the exhibitors to grand those cats as they move into the new season, and we hope that you will support that endeavor. **Mastin:** Sharon, would you state your motion? **Roy:** I make the motion to [reads]. **Krzanowski:** Carol seconds. **Mastin:** Thank you Carol. Any discussion?

Currle: I think the clubs really like this. After we turned down a club at the previous board meeting, I got a lot of feedback and said they were disappointed. We have established the minimums. I'm going to be doing an OCP ring this weekend. We did not hit the numbers in premiership, but we did hit the numbers in championship. Just to have this available creates another level of excitement for our exhibitors, and I think that's what we want. **Mastin:** Thank you Kenny. **Hannon:** The one we turned down at the last meeting was because there had already been three scheduled in that area. I am pleased to see we are going into a new area with this and potentially different exhibitors with feedback on it. I am pleased to see that they are bringing in two additional judges for it, which was the original proposal. **Mastin:** Thank you Mark.

Mastin: Any other questions or comments? Any objections to this motion? Seeing no objections, this motion passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

(b) Summit Request – GEMS July 28-29, 2023

For the past six 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. Last year, in response to feedback from exhibitors, we took the breed focused judging to a new level. The Board approved special combined breed judging with of bay style judging for the Egyptian Maus, and staggered

show hours to allow the Egyptian Mau combined judging to be conducted before the start of regular judging. For the Egyptian Maus that started at 830AM and the rest of the show was scheduled to begin at 11AM. We had a near record number of Egyptian Maus entered and although we ran late with start of regular show, the feedback was overwhelmingly positive from both exhibitors and judges alike. We would like permission to have this format again with one proposed change: Allow three of the Egyptian Mau rings to be judged Friday evening if the Egyptian Mau entry is 25 or more. The other three rings for Egyptian Maus would be scheduled to be judged at 830AM Saturday and the regular show would be scheduled for an 11AM start thus giving exhibitors the opportunity to potentially save a night in the hotel.

Details on the show are as follows:

Richmond Virginia, July 28-29, 2023. 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 Friday 7PM -830PM and Saturday 8:30-10:00AM for Egyptian Maus only as long as there are 25 or more Egyptian Maus entered. Show hours for all other breeds would be 11AM-5PM. If less than 25 Egyptian Maus entered show hours would be Saturday 830-11AM for Egyptian Maus. Regular show hours for all other breeds other than Egyptian Maus will be announced as 12PM-6PM.

Depending on the number of Egyptian Mau entered breed judging will commence with three designated judges either judging Friday at 7PM, or Saturday 8:30AM. The other three judges will be scheduled to start at 830AM if the first three rings were judged on Friday, or as soon as first three rings are completed if all on Saturday. 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.

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 28/July 29, 2023. 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 be conducted on Friday July 28 from 7-830PM and Saturday 830-10AM if there are 25 or more Egyptian Maus entered. If less than 25 Egyptian Maus breed judging will be conducted Saturday 830A-11AM. Judging for all remaining breeds other than Egyptian Maus will start at 11AM.*

Mastin: Sharon? **Roy:** The second one is a little different. The GEMS Egyptian Mau club has for several years done a breed summit. Last year it was all on one day but they did the Egyptian Maus first. What they are looking for is an exception to try to help speed the show but be able to have the Maus have more exposure, and to do three of those Egyptian Mau summit rings on Friday night. I'm going to turn this over to Melanie to see if she has some other things to say on it. **Morgan:** I'm happy to answer any questions. The concept is really designed, as Sharon said, to try to expedite things. We would still be starting the show late for all exhibitors other than Egyptian Mau people. What we found was, last time when we had three rings early, early in the morning and then three more rings right after that, that the process took longer than we had anticipated with the bay judging for the Maus in the morning, and so that subsequently meant that we bumped start back for the show. Since most of our Mau exhibitors are in on Friday night and we will have set up the show hall, we thought, "wait a minute, we could do 3 of the rings on Friday night and then start with the first round early in the morning Saturday morning and then be able to start the show later for the other exhibitors, but on time, which would just take a lot of time pressure off of everything. **Mastin:** Sharon, we have your motion here. **Roy:** The motion is to allow the Egyptian Mau summit to have a Friday night – grant an exception to the show rules to allow the Egyptian Mau summit to have three summit rings conducted on Friday night. I just shortened that a little bit. You can read the full motion there. Just so everybody knows, unlike the OCP rings, there are no points awarded in this summit format. **Krzanowski:** Carol seconds. **Mastin:** Thank you Carol. Any further discussion or questions? Any objections? Seeing no objections, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Mastin: Sharon, thank you. Anything further? **Roy:** No, nothing further for this meeting.
Mastin: OK, great.

(14) IT SYSTEM OPTIMIZATION.

Systems Administrator: **James Simbro**

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Activities

Genetics: Steve Merritt and Paul Patton reviewed and edited phenotype data for 1671 colors in the Exotic breed. This data was then imported into the development system for a new round of testing. The initial results show far better results than we have seen in earlier testing. Additional fine tuning of the logic is needed to account for some remaining issues, but these are much smaller than our initial findings. Once those issues are worked out, the remaining breeds data will need to be edited like what was done for the Exotics.

CSU2022: Work is underway. Clean up of the database structure and implementation, as well as setting up the main template are the first steps in the next few months. They have already uncovered several shortcomings in the current system that will be eliminated in the redesign. The system is sure to run far more efficiently and faster once completed.

Entry Clerk Data Verification: Dynamic Edge was given approval to modify the entry clerk program to verify data against CFA registration records. This is done through a read-only API that will query the CFA database and return only the data for the cat requested. This will save the entry clerk time in data entry and reduce errors for things such as the cats date of birth, and Sire and Dam information.

Future Happenings

Continue work on CSU2022 tasks assigned by Sonit as the project progresses through the timeline.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Updates for completed, ongoing and future projects.

Respectfully Submitted,
James Simbro

Mastin: We are moving on to IT. James? **Simbro:** Thanks Rich. I don't have anything additional to add to the report I submitted. I would be happy to answer any questions. **Mastin:** Does anybody have any questions for James? **Morgan:** I don't mean to put your feet to the fire, but it seems like for as long as I have been attending board meetings and have been on the board, that we have been working on the genetics project. It seems that we keep making progress, but I don't see an absolute timeline here and it just keeps rolling down the road, so I'm kind of asking for some specifics on that because I think it's really important. I'm strongly in favor of it, I think you guys are doing great work there, but at some point I would like to see it deliver. **Simbro:** Certainly, and we would really like to put this one away as soon as possible. The reason the timeline just kind of keeps rolling down the road is, it's a massively difficult project. A lot of stuff was not understood until we got into the meat and potatoes of it, so it's a lot of learning on

all of our parts and we are trying to make – what has been invested in we’re certainly not in a position to scrap it, but we need to understand what logic needs to be added and tweaked to get this to work the way we expected it to. I really can’t put a firm date on it because there’s too many unknowns still. **Hannon:** I assume that the longer this goes on the more expensive it becomes, right? **Simbro:** It is, but minimal. Most of the time we have spent has been on our end – the testing, working with Paul [Patton] and Steve Merritt, cleaning up the data. Yes, we are having some expense to update data and have Sonit do some additional programming, but so far it has been pretty minimal. **Hannon:** But we’re also paying Steve, right? **Simbro:** Allene? **Tartaglia:** Steve has not submitted any additional invoices. I think at this point he is just helping us out. One thing I would like to touch on that James mentioned is the learning curve. Learning genetics – we have all had to learn genetics, including our programmers. That’s something they have never encountered before, so that learning curve was very large and frankly is something we hadn’t expected or anticipated. We probably should have but we didn’t, so that’s part of what has taken so long – just the whole understanding of genetics, which I think everybody agrees is not the easiest thing to understand. **Anger:** We may not be paying Steve but we are certainly paying Paul. **Tartaglia:** We’re not paying Paul. **Anger:** I stand corrected, thank you. **Mastin:** Any additional questions or comments? James, maybe you can provide the board with a little bit more of the timeline estimate for the February board meeting? **Simbro:** I think we will. The latest – I hate to call it a breakthrough, but it was kind of a breakthrough because we saw a massive change in our results with this latest update. It has really put us on a little bit clearer path. **Mastin:** OK, thank you.

Unfinished Business and General Orders

(15) OTHER COMMITTEES.

Mastin: We are now going into Unfinished Business. Is there anything from any other committees?

(16) NEW BUSINESS.

Mastin: How about New Business? [transcript goes to (b)] Is there any other New Business?

(a) Show Date Requests.

The reason for getting the following shows approved is to preserve our traditional weekends. We are losing shows every year. When I took over as the GLR Regional Director in 2014 we had the greatest number of shows in regions 1 -7. We are now tie in third place behind region 7 and Region 6 and they are in the mid-twenties. We are around seventeen if I counted right. We could go below 12 next show season.

Please approve the following shows.

Motion: *Paws and Claws would like to put on a show on the weekend of November 11-12, 2023, in Novi Michigan.*

Rationale: *It is a traditional weekend for a club in our region. We will be losing four shows in 2023-2024 in our region if this is not approved.*

Mastin: Next we're going to move on to New Business, Show Date Requests. John?
Colilla: The first one has to do with the Paws and Claws. They would like to request to have the show date again in November. I sent out four emails concerning the show request. I only had one response, from Sharon Roy. I did not get the other responses from the other RDs, so I'm just trying to get this thing approved. I'm only trying to maintain show dates in my region. We are not in good shape. We are in survival mode right now. Every show we can put on will help my region. When I started, we had the most shows – I think around 30. We're down to 17 and I'm losing 3 for sure next year. There could be more. **Mastin:** So your motion is to give Paws and Claws the show for the weekend of November 11-12, 2023 in Novi, Michigan. **Colilla:** Yes, sir. **Mastin:** May I have a second, please? **Anger:** Rachel seconds. **Mastin:** Thank you Rachel. Are there any objections?

Hannon: I just wanted to comment that I was concerned about this, this past November with two shows so close together, but they both got very good entries this year so I don't think they did affect each other as much as I anticipated, so I can support it. **Mastin:** Thank you. **Roy:** I'm going to agree with Mark. I did tell John yes for this show because it didn't seem to affect the Baltimore show as much as I thought it would, so I thought it worked out this year so I'm going to say yes for next year. **Currle:** Mark is correct. Both shows had acceptable entry levels. One of the concerns that the Capital show brought up to me was that they extended on their own their closing date in order to get extra entries, and so they had a few exhibitors that were entered in the Capital Cat Fanciers show that pulled their entries. They were going to accept cash at the door, so that upset them, but other than that both clubs seemed to have a decent weekend.

Eigenhauser: I'm a little concerned that we're doing this in closed session. Show scheduling is something that affects our constituents, it affects the clubs, it affects the exhibitors. There should be transparency on that. Contract matters we do in closed session, protests we do in closed session, judging advancements we do in closed session, because there is some privacy

involved when we're trying to protect people. This, to me, is just an outright open session item, so at the end of this when we're done, if nobody says a dirty word between now and the time we get done, I'm going to make a motion that we move this into open session for the minutes.

Dunham: While the two shows in Region 4 and Region 1 may have been successful, there's a show in my region the very same weekend that did not have a show because their show hall was under renovations, but they are coming back next year. I hesitate to add additional shows to the schedule. I realize it is 500 miles apart. I get it, but the more shows we add on the same weekend, the further the entries get spread out and those two shows may not have the same kind of entry that they had this year, so I don't know that I can really support this for my club coming back. **Mastin:** Thank you Cathy. **Colilla:** This is a traditional show date for my region. This is a show date that used to be Dayton Cat Fanciers. I'm not asking for a brand new show date, I'm just trying to maintain show dates. Like I said, we are in survival mode right now. **Currle:** You lost a club and then you moved right in, which is OK but I'm just saying, I don't have any objections to this particular show date. I do know that the Capital club will have objections, but we cleared one up. I can see where Cathy is concerned if they did not have a show because they did not have show hall availability. If you have three within this proximity, it does affect the entries. We'll see what happens. **Morgan:** I think Cathy brings up a point that gives me some pause and makes me realize that we're kind of voting in a vacuum here. I would really like to see – I mean, I appreciate the fact that the rationale behind this basically states that Region 4 is in third and [Regions] 7 and 6 have more shows, but I would actually like to see the data. I would like to see how many shows are happening in some sort of table or something like that, and I'm wondering, we have the Show Scheduling Committee or whatever, if we could have that data. We asked Carol Krzanowski to give us more information when we were looking at new clubs in terms of actual specific information versus us just going out there and stabbing in the dark. It's making me think that I would like to know a little bit more about how these shows really are breaking out by region before I go and approve things, one way or another. Not that I'm against or for, I simply think that we need the information. **Hannon:** I just want to make a quick correction to one of Cathy's comments in case this goes into open session. The two shows were not in Regions 4 and 1, they are in [Regions] 4 and 7. **Dunham:** Oh, I'm sorry. I stand corrected Mark, thank you. **Hannon:** Like I said, just in case it goes into the open session minutes.

DelaBar: I guess I cannot see the concern. The date is a traditional date for the Great Lakes Region and it was originally traditional for Dayton, which is much closer to Region 6 than Novi, Michigan, where they are proposing to have the show. Dayton is more on the border with the other region than Novi would be, so I cannot see where this is a real problem, because all it is, is just changing the location further away from what could possibly be a conflict. **Mastin:** Thank you Pam.

Mastin: Any further discussion? I'm going to call for the vote. If you're in favor, raise your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Calhoun, Currle, Dunham and Webb voting no. Morgan abstained.

Mastin: George Eigenhauser, Pam DelaBar, Mark Hannon, Annette Wilson, Carol Krzanowski, Sharon Roy, Paula Noble, Mike Shelton, Rachel Anger, Pam Moser, Yukiko Hayata, John Colilla. Please lower your hand. If you are opposed raise your hand. Russell Webb, Cathy Dunham, Kathy Calhoun, Kenny Currie. Lower your hand. If you are an abstention, raise your hand. Melanie Morgan. Rachel, please announce the vote. **Anger:** That's 12 yes votes, 4 no votes, 1 abstention. **Mastin:** The motion passes.

Motion: *GLR would like to have a Fund Raising show on Feb 10-11, 2024 and February 8-9, 2025.*

Rationale: *GLR had a show on the second weekend in February 2021-2022 season. It is a traditional weekend for one of the club's in our region. We will be losing five shows in 2023-2024 in our region if this is not approved. We will be having one show in eight weeks without this show.*

Mastin: John, next motion. **Colilla:** The second weekend in February has been a traditional date in the Great Lakes Region for a long time. Before Steel City took over that weekend, we had the National Egyptian Mau holding a show on that weekend. Last year Steel City did not put on a show and the Great Lakes Region used that weekend as a fundraiser show. I would like to keep that show date in my region, so I am requesting for 2023 and 2024 so we can keep it as a traditional show date in my region. I had sent out 3 emails asking for approval and I only received one email from Sharon Roy on this show. I don't know what happened to all those emails. **Mastin:** John, what motion are you doing, because – **Colilla:** It's the one about the second weekend in February. February 10-11, 2024 to February 8-9, 2025. **Mastin:** OK, because you mentioned something about 2023. **Colilla:** I'm sorry, I mentioned the wrong – well, that's the other one. If this one is approved, we can just ignore the other one. **Mastin:** OK, thank you. May I have a second to John's motion? **Eigenhauser:** George will second. **Mastin:** Thank you George.

Currie: I am assuming that you contacted Steel City's club and you got the OK for it? **Colilla:** Well, they haven't put on a show in years and they have lost their traditional show date. **Currie:** I don't think that's correct. We made exceptions because of COVID. **Colilla:** Which is why we have 2022-2023 is the last year. **Mastin:** Kathy Calhoun, is that correct? I thought the COVID extension was through 2023. Do you remember? **Calhoun:** I think that it was, as well. **Mastin:** I thought a board member requested a 5 year extension out to 2024 and that didn't pass. It went out to 2023. **Calhoun:** I believe. **Mastin:** I can't confirm that 100%. **Dunham:** Rich, you are correct. It was my motion at the time. **Mastin:** Thank you Cathy. OK, so John, I believe – Cathy Dunham correct me if I'm wrong on the motion – I believe all the traditional dates were protected through 2023 due to COVID? **Dunham:** Yes, you are correct. **Mastin:** OK. **Colilla:** OK, I will withdraw it then, if that's the case. **Mastin:** You are withdrawing the statement or withdrawing the motion? **Colilla:** Since it is protected, I can't have 2024 year. I have to wait until 2025, right? Because I shouldn't step on a show in my region. **Mastin:** You should probably touch base with the club. **Colilla:** I will. **Mastin:** OK, so then you are going to withdraw? **Colilla:** Can I bring it up at a later time once I find out? **Mastin:** You can table it. **Colilla:** OK. **Mastin:** George, OK to table? **Eigenhauser:** Yes. **Mastin:** OK, the motion is tabled.

Tabled.

Mastin: No further discussion John. You can bring it back. **Colilla:** OK, thank you. [Side discussions regarding attendees in the waiting room were not transcribed.]

Motion: *GLR would like to hold a Fund Raising show in Columbus on February 11-12, 2023.*

Rationale: *It will be the second year in a row so it will be a traditional weekend for the region. It will be a replacement show. Will withdraw this motion if the one above is passed.*

Mastin: John, our next motion. **Colilla:** Sometimes I find out a club decides not to put on a show really late and I do not have a chance to find a replacement show. I would like for the region to have a capability to hang onto that date for a year while I am trying to find another club to put on a show – all regions, not just me. **Mastin:** OK, before I ask for a second John, is this the same situation? Have you spoke with Steel City? **Colilla:** No, no. I withdrew 2023 already. **Mastin:** Oh, you're withdrawing? **Colilla:** I'm withdrawing 2023. I'm sorry, I'm going down to the last one. I'm sorry about the confusion. **Mastin:** Alright, thank you.

Withdrawn.

Motion: *A region has the right to find a different club to replace a club who is not using their traditional show date for one year and is no less than 500 miles from another traditional show in a neighboring region.*

Rationale: *There are times that the RD does not know that a club is resigning or has decided not to put on a show at the last minute on their traditional show date. This will give the RD time to find another club to replace that original club and not lose a traditional weekend for their region. It must not be less the 500 miles from a neighboring region's show.*

Colilla: The other one is about the region being able to hang onto that traditional date for one more year, to find another show so another region won't jump on it. **Mastin:** Can I have a second on this motion? It's the last motion. **Anger:** Rachel seconds. **Mastin:** Thank you Rachel. Questions and comments? So John, just for clarification purposes, this motion is for all regions? **Colilla:** Yes. **Mastin:** OK.

Roy: I don't have any real opposition to this motion. However, I would really like to see the Show Scheduling Committee weigh in on this and maybe come back with some direction. Let's say that was a conflict with somebody less than 500 miles in another region. I guess I want some more direction before I blanket approve this. **Mastin:** Any other questions or comments? **Currle:** I agree with Sharon. I understand John's purpose for this. It's not a bad idea, but it does need a little bit more vetting, especially if we are going to establish a show committee to assist the regions in planning these shows, so I do think this maybe should be tabled, as well. **Mastin:** John, do you want to table this motion, as well? **Colilla:** No. **Mastin:** OK.

Mastin: Any other discussion? If you agree with the recommendation to table this and get more feedback, you will vote against it. If you are in favor, please raise your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Colilla and DelaBar voting yes. Calhoun, Wilson, Anger and Hayata abstained.

Mastin: John Colilla and Pam DelaBar. Lower your hands. If you are opposed, raise your hand. Mark Hannon, Paula Noble, Russell Webb, Carol Krzanowski, Mike Shelton, Cathy Dunham, Kenny Curre, Sharon Roy, George Eigenhauser, Pam Moser, Melanie Morgan. Lower your hand. If you are an abstention, raise your hand. Kathy Calhoun, Annette Wilson, Rachel Anger, Yukiko Hayata. Lower your hand. Rachel, please call the vote. **Anger:** That's 2 yes votes, 11 no votes, 4 abstentions. **Mastin:** The motion fails. John, it sounds like you have to discuss this with Larry's committee, OK? **Colilla:** That's fine.

* * * * *

Mastin: George, do you want to make your motion? **Eigenhauser:** I'm going to make my motion that that discussion and voting be moved into open session. **Mastin:** Do we have a second? **Morgan:** Melanie seconds. **Mastin:** Thank you Melanie. Any objections? Seeing no objections, the motion passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

(b) 44 Gatti.

	Moved/ Seconded	Motion	Vote
MOTIONS THAT REQUIRE RATIFICATION			
1.	Anger Wilson 12.09.22	Grant an exception to the 2 out-of-region CFA judge sponsorship limit per show for the 44 Gatti Cat Club's January 21/22, 2023 show in San Genesio Ed Uniti, Italy, and allow them to have 3 sponsorships in order to contract another US-based CFA judge.	Motion Failed. Calhoun and Morgan voting no.

DelaBar: This is bringing up the motion on 44 Gatti that was never completed. I don't think with the voting, it just didn't get done. **Mastin:** I think you are right. **Anger:** Still waiting for one vote to come in. **DelaBar:** Well, for online we have had two no votes, so we would have to bring it back to the board now because our online motions have to be unanimous. That's why I wrote you guys about bringing this up. I do have the motion in front of me here. It's not on the screen. **Mastin:** Go ahead Pam, read the motion. **DelaBar:** The motion is – well, first I've got to give – no, I can give background during discussion. *Grant an exception to the 2 out-of-region CFA judge sponsorship limit per show for the 44 Gatti Cat Club's January 21/22, 2023 show in San Genesio Ed Uniti, Italy, and allow them to have 3 sponsorships in order to contract another US-based CFA judge.* The reason for this, they are having a 6 ring show and two of the Region 9 judges that they had originally contracted had to cancel their contracts for the show. This is a weekend that there were no other Region 9 judges to be able to fill in. The rest of us have been committed to judge another show in another area on that weekend, so therefore they have three guest judges, which is their max that they can have, and three CFA judges. Because of the fact that they cannot get any CFA judges from the area, they are requesting an additional \$700 from

the fund. **Mastin:** May I have a second please? **Eigenhauser:** George seconds. **Mastin:** Thank you George.

Mastin: Open for discussion. **Calhoun:** I was one of the no votes on this; the reason being is that the program for Region 9 is already a program that we don't do for any other region currently. Clubs have issues with judges that are able to fulfill their contracts or for whatever reason clubs have to find a judge at the last minute, and it comes as an expense. The clubs are aware of that. CFA does not absorb that. We have already provided the out-of-region or the overseas sponsorship of \$1,400. The club has already been granted \$1,000 in regular show sponsorship. We have seen instances; for instance, the UK Cat Fanciers that brought over three judges. They managed to do that without coming back to CFA for an exception. I don't know how they did it, but they did not come back to CFA for an exception. The show has already been licensed. It has been licensed with three U.S. judges, so they're not really waiting for a decision here to do that. I just don't think that it's – granted, I know that there is money left in the budget, but it sets a bad precedent. It may be what happens the next time. If we supplement Region 9 because there is an additional expense to bring in an additional judge, are we going to do that for clubs in the United States that have that same burden? So, I can't support this. **Currle:** I think that we have an obligation to support Region 9 in this endeavor. We have spent money on assisting clubs here in the United States and I'm fully supportive of this. **Mastin:** Any additional questions or comments? **DelaBar:** I just want to say, please do not try to compare the number of CFA judges that we have in Europe at this current time with the number of judges throughout North America. North America does not look to go to Japan or Asia or to Europe to back fill a judge. We are caught in this situation where it's difficult to bring in two judges from Russia because there's still a war going on and flights from Russia are banned into the rest of Europe. As I said, the other available judges are all committed in another area. I'm not going to say, "oh, I can't judge your show now because one of my clubs is having a problem." I can't do that, so we're trying to make sure that these clubs can at least break even when they are bringing in these judges. That's it. **Mastin:** Thank you Pam.

Mastin: I'm going to call for the vote. If you are in favor, raise your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Calhoun, Morgan, Moser and Roy voting no.

Mastin: Mark Hannon, Kenny Currle, George Eigenhauser, Russell Webb, Rachel Anger, Pam DelaBar, Yukiko Hayata, Carol Krzanowski, Mike Shelton, Paula Noble, Cathy Dunham, Annette Wilson, John Colilla. Please lower your hand. If you are opposed raise your hand. Kathy Calhoun, Pam Moser, Sharon Roy, Melanie Morgan. Lower your hand. If you are an abstention, raise your hand. No abstentions. Rachel, please call the vote. **Anger:** That's 13 yes votes, 4 no votes, zero abstentions. **Mastin:** Thank you. Motion passes. Pam, congratulations to the club. **DelaBar:** The club will be happy, thank you.

(17) **OLD BUSINESS.**

Mastin: Is there any other Old Business? **Eigenhauser:** Are we going to go back to Mary K now? **Mastin:** We will as soon as we're done with Old Business.

(18) **MARKETING.**

Committee Chairs: Mark Hannon, Melanie Morgan
List of Committee Members: Desiree Bobby (Marketing Director), Allene Tartaglia (Executive Director)

Recent Activity

In response to comments from our constituency regarding the importance of continuing to publicize CFA's legacy, an additional submark version of the logo to include "Since 1906" is now available (see below). Clubs/shows may use any of the versions on the page of the website with the various file types of the different logos. We envision the logo with just the letters CFA and the mascot (mascot) being used for rosettes.



*Respectfully Submitted,
Marketing*

Mastin: Marketing. Mark and Melanie, do you have any comments? **Hannon:** We are just providing information. **Mastin:** Melanie, do you have anything? **Morgan:** No. There are no action items at this point. **Mastin:** Does the board have any questions for the Marketing Committee? **Eigenhauser:** My question is why we did this in closed session. If there's not an action item and it's just informational, we're going to be releasing this out to the public. Letting us find out 5 minutes before the rest of the fancy finds out isn't really a closed session item. If it was a closed session action item, I can see it but if this is just informational, tell us when you tell everybody else. **Eigenhauser:** Actually, the reason I raised my hand is I would like to move that this report get moved into open session. **Mastin:** May I have a second? **Webb:** Russell seconds. **Mastin:** Discussion? Objections? Seeing no objections, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

* * * * *

Meeting adjourned at 12:42 a.m. Eastern Daylight Saving Time.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Anger, CFA Secretary

(19) 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:

22-013-0909 CFA v. Pritchard, Kathy

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

Violation of CFA Show Rule 1.03

Guilty. Respondent is ordered to pay a fine to CFA in the sum of \$500.00 to be paid within 30 days. If the fine is not paid in full within 30 days Respondent shall be suspended from all CFA services until the fine is paid in full. [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:

22-015-1001 Frederic Goedert and Cat-H-Art

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

Guilty. Respondents are not permitted to put on any in-conjunction shows for one year. Respondents are jointly and severally ordered to pay restitution CFA in the sum of €3,000 within 30 days. Said restitution represents the sum CFA will pay to Federation Feline de Monaco and L'Association Monegasque De Gati de Munegu incurred at the October 16/17, 2021 Show held in Monte Carlo, Monaco. If the restitution is not paid in full within 30 days Respondents shall be suspended from all CFA services until the fine is paid in full. [vote sealed]