



**GENERAL MEETING OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL OF THE CAT FANCY**  
Meeting of Full Council



Wednesday 15 February 2017 at the Conway Hall, Holborn, London

	PRESENTED BY	ACTION BY
<b>C2137</b>	<b>WELCOME TO THE DELEGATES AND IN MEMORIAM</b>	<b>CHAIR INFO</b>
	<p>Shortly after 1pm the Chairman welcomed 77 delegates and thanked them for attending the GCCF Council meeting. One new delegate introduced herself. Amanda Lachlan was representing the National Cat Club. The Chairman requested that delegates should respect each other. Personal attacks would not be tolerated, and he hoped that conversations between delegates would be at a minimum so that those who wanted to listen to the business of the meeting could hear what was being said. He had received complaints about this on previous occasions.</p> <p>Chris Bamford, Peter Lamb, Sheila Mackereth, Jean Murchison, Pat Norman, E Palmer, John Robinson, Doreen Sillis, Louvane Stevenson and Paul Tomlinson were remembered in a moment of silence.</p>	
<b>C2138</b>	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>	<b>CHAIR INFO</b>
	<p>The Chairman gave apologies on behalf GCCF's Vice-Presidents: Gordon Butler, Eric Wickham Ruffle and Brenda Wolstenholme. Delegate apologies were as recorded on the attendance sheet. A representative from Agria Insurance had been expected to attend the meeting, but was unexpectedly unavailable. It was hoped that someone would be able to come along in June.</p>	
<b>C2139</b>	<b>CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS</b>	<b>CHAIR INFO</b>
	<p>1.1 The Chairman, Steve Crow, reported that there was an update on the government's intentions re the future of the selling of animals bred in the home. In response to a parliamentary question a DEFRA minister had given the news that the exemptions given in the 1951 Pet Shops Act would be removed. These allowed for kittens bred from pedigree cats, or the family pet, to be sold without any sort of licensing or premises inspections, so removal could bring about major change.</p> <p>1.2 More would be known when a paper entitled 'Next Steps' was published after further consultation, but no date had been set for this. In all discussions on licensing in the Canine &amp; Feline Sector Group meetings reference was to it being carried out by local authorities who would pass the cost on to those requiring licences, but it wasn't known whether the need for a licence would depend on whether a certain number of breeding cats were owned, as was the case with dogs.</p> <p>1.3 It was observed that this was something that Cats Protection had been lobbying for, and as a large well funded charity it had established a place in the consultative process. It would be GCCF's aim to be informed and report on proposals made, to assess their impact on breeders and minimise the effects.</p> <p>1.4 Following a delegate query there was discussion on whether income from hobby breeding would subsequently attract tax. The Chairman was in agreement with delegates who explained that from personal experience they knew HMRC was not interested as profits were minimal. However, it was essential for breeders to keep records to prove this.</p> <p>1.5 The Chairman informed delegates that the World Cat Conference this year was in Las Vegas, but neither he nor the Vice-Chairman could attend. Mrs Betty Singleton would represent GCCF.</p> <p>1.6 However, he would be attending a convention in Montpellier in June hosted by Royal Canin to celebrate the launch of their Cat Encyclopaedia. There would be speakers on feline health, genetics and welfare, with Prof Leslie Lyons as one of the keynote speakers. Two others planned to attend (at their own expense) and the event was open to breeders. The Chairman would put details on the website as soon as they were available.</p> <p>1.7 Mr Crow concluded by reminding delegates that a new GCCF President and Vice-president needed to be elected in June. He asked delegates to remind their clubs to make nominations for these positions no later than the closing date given for nominations for GCCF Officers and committees.</p>	
<b>C2140</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b>	
	<p>1. <b>The Minutes of the Council meeting of 5 October</b></p> <p>1.1 The draft minutes had been circulated. They were approved following a minor word order change to C2129.3.3. <b>Unanimous approval</b></p>	<p><b>CHAIR JL</b></p>
	<p>2. <b>Delegate questions on ongoing business not covered by an agenda item</b></p> <p>2.1 There were none taken</p>	<p><b>CHAIR INFO</b></p>
<b>C2141</b>	<b>MINUTES OF MEETINGS (for information only)</b>	<b>CHAIR INFO</b>
	<p>1. <b>Board of Directors:</b> 6 September 2016, 11 November 2016</p> <p>The Chairman remarked that Board meeting minutes carried more detailed information on C&amp;FG discussions.</p>	<p>No questions</p>

C2142

**FINANCE****OM****INFO****1. Financial statement**

- 1.1 Mark Goadby, Office Manager, gave an update on GCCF finances by providing information gained during the preparation of the end of year accounts for examination.
- 1.2 The OM reported that there was an 8% increase approximately in the turnover for the year, taking this to around £400,000. The operating profit was up by over 10%. There would be capitalisation of a proportion of the IT spending so that the cost of this outlay could be spread over a period of years.
- 1.3 The accounts this year would be prepared by Monahans as there had been a merger after the death of Adrian Wood, but the accountant assigned to GCCF would be Laura Green, as in the previous year.

**2. Presentation of the current volume figures for core business****OM****INFO**

- 2.1 Volume graphs presented for core business in 2016 indicated particular areas of growth. Prefix registrations had remained steady, but figures for non-prefix registrations, transfers and imports onto the GCCF register were all at record levels. The total number of prefixes applied for had also grown during 2016.
- 2.2 There was comment on the lack of published figures in support of the graphs, particularly as none had been put to Council in October because of the computer system change. It was promised this would be given consideration in February 2018.

**3. Waiver of charges for a status change following a required genetic/health check****CHAIR**

- 3.1 It was explained that as GCCF rules, and some breed registration policies, asked for mandatory DNA or health results before breeding (active) status would be recorded it was considered that in these circumstances no charge should be made.
- 3.2 Unanimous approval was given by all delegates for the suggestion, and the Chairman responded that rule changes would be brought to Council in June. He was pleased that testing that promoted health could be encouraged in this way.

**Action: rule changes to be drafted****OM/JL****4. Repayment of club loans**

- 4.1 The Chairman announced that club loans would be repaid in April to clubs who wanted to have their money returned. A letter would go out to Club Chairmen and Treasurers shortly.
- 4.2 Other options would be offered to clubs including donating the money to CWT, or continuing to loan it to GCCF, but it was expected that most clubs would welcome the return of their funds and the finance was available to make all the repayments requested.

**Action: letters of information to be sent out to clubs****OM**

C2143

**BUSINESS MATTERS****1. Report on the conclusion of Project Phoenix****SRO****INFO**

- 1.1 Mrs Rainbow-Ockwell made a presentation to show the return of the investment (ROI) from Project Phoenix, with emphasis on why this differed from what had been projected.
- 1.2 There were two areas of particular significance:
- the company hired to complete the project had not fulfilled its contractual obligations, having underestimated the complexity of the project. Therefore GCCF had had to hire its own programmer to complete the task, and this had incurred additional expense.
  - the staff savings predicted had not yet been made, as the completion of the project had been delayed. These would be happening as the number of staff had reduced, but account had to be taken that some staff had required pay increases for the additional work they had carried out in establishing the operations of the new system. Some had worked a considerable number of extra hours in their own time.
- 1.3 Therefore there wasn't yet the predicted ROI, under 50% of the figure given, but it could be estimated that at least £50,000 had been saved due to system change compared with the amount that would have been spent on maintaining the old system, put into place 30 years ago, and the number of staff required for its procedures based on its limited capabilities when compared with up to date technology.
- 1.4 Plus GCCF now had the benefit of a system that was not at significant risk of failure, and was capable of dealing with the new services it was hoped to add in the future.
- 1.5 Mrs Rainbow-Ockwell concluded by proposing a vote of thanks to office staff, Mark Goadby and Heather McIntyre, and programmer Leon Barrington, for all the work they had done to ensure the project reached completion. The Chairman thanked both Sally, and Ian Macro, for their significant contribution. GCCF ad benefitted considerably from the efforts made by this team. Delegates showed their appreciation with two rounds of applause.

**2. Presentation of the 2017 Business Plan****SRO****INFO**

- 2.1 The 2017-21 Business Plan had been published on the website, and Mrs Rainbow-Ockwell made a presentation to delegates to add some detail.
- 2.2 It was explained this was a set of eleven goals for 2017-21, projected according to the current economic landscape, though this naturally carried many future unknowns. Therefore it was accompanied by a revised risk assessment.
- 2.3 These aims were to be developed into projects to be worked on, and it was intended that each Board member should take responsibility in one or more. Therefore those who wished to stand for the Board in June this year would need to state their interests with reference to the goals in their own nomination statements.

2.4 In brief these were:

- International expansion. The work for GCCFI was underway, it was possible similar work could be undertaken for other small registries.
- HHP registration. A target had been set and incentives had to be offered, especially to junior cat owners
- Expansion of show numbers
- A staff member dedicated to marketing - after the new staff appointment in the Office, Heather McIntyre would be the member of the staff team championing this
- Getting GCCF high on search engine results for kitten sales and pedigree cat information.
- Getting all GCCF services on-line by the end of this year
- Developing revenue from other sources other than core business with new business relationships forged alongside those existing with Agria and Royal Canin
- Offering better services to breeders for pedigree registration and transfers and the Breeder Scheme
- Training judges more efficiently.
- Using customer surveys, and reporting and using the information gained effectively
- Broadening the range of services aimed at young people

2.5 Data protection was mentioned in addition, as the company would be required by law to be compliant with new regulations by 2018.

2.6 A time line ran alongside the goals to indicate when during the five years it was hoped that these goals would be completed, and it observed that year on year budget planning would be based around them.

2.7 There were queries from the floor, questioning whether the targets set were realistic, and for clarification of detail. Mrs Rainbow-Ockwell was then thanked for her work by the Chairman.

2.8 Delegates indicated endorsement of the business plan with just one abstention.

### **3. Information on proposed further IT development**

**SRO INFO**

- 3.1 Mrs Rainbow-Ockwell explained that many of the IT developments would not be obvious to breeders and exhibitors using the system as their purpose was to introduce greater efficiencies into office practices.
- 3.2 The first new service, already under development, was to provide registration and transfer services to GCCFI.
- 3.3 A 'show services' package was planned which would enable online entries for club shows in the same way that was used for the Supreme. Clubs could opt to use it.
- 3.4 It was planned to make Phoenix display judge information, automatically updating lists and eligibility for title classes.
- 3.5 Clubs would be provided with the facility to make returns on-line and provide information on any officer, committee or rules changes when they occurred.
- 3.6 It was aimed to restore the one click transfer facility to the breeder services offered, and also allow completion of mating certificates on-line.
- 3.7 Those were some of the ideas. The conclusion of the report was to state that other suggestions would be welcome, and could be provided if the demand was there and it was possible to install them with not too much cost and/or difficulty.
- 3.8 In response to a complaint about system failure experienced by one delegate she said she could only reiterate her advice of the previous meeting, and all should be aware of it. If a problem is experienced, and no result is obtained from a first contact with the Office, then don't wait for something to happen, but get in touch with someone else. The OM could usually be reached, or she was quite happy to be contacted personally. One addition to the system would be a 'help desk' for users to report problems and it was intended there would always be a response made to that.
- 3.9 There was also a question on the coding of variants, and it was explained that because GCCF had so many different variants each was coded with its individual phenotype by GEMS code letters and numbers, with an additional v placed at the end to show that for the particular registration policy being used this individual was a variant.
- 3.10 The 'Einstein Guide to GEMS', due to be published shortly, would tell breeders and exhibitors everything they would want know about the system's lettering and numbering.

### **4. Report on GCCF partnerships**

**SC/OM INFO**

- 4.1 The Chairman reported that it was now five years since the contract between GCCF and the Agria insurance was signed to operate the partnership for that period. However, a new contract now was not necessary, as the partners could agree to it rolling on, until one indicated a wish to terminate, and this was now the situation by mutual agreement.
- 4.2 In a recent meeting the transition period to new GCCF officers had been discussed, so there was good indication that Agria wanted to continue the partnership deal, from which GCCF benefited by about £5000 per month.
- 4.3 Mr Crow touched on recent problems during the period when both companies were upgrading their technology, but it had now been made extremely simple to obtain five week free cover notes for kittens. There would be promotion for this, as at present there was indication that 50% of breeders did not use them, either from Agria or its competitor offering the same service.
- 4.4 He observed that insurance was a personal matter for breeders, but made that point that like for like comparisons should be made. It was the intention to point out to Agria from breeders' experiences where their strengths and weaknesses were in this respect.
- 4.5 The OM reported that there no problems in the partnership with Royal Canin. GCCF transfer numbers continued to grow, and RC was having the best response it had ever had to any of its campaigns.
- 4.6 Both Agria and RC would be the main sponsors of the Supreme once again.
- 4.7 The Chairman gave news that the 'Checklist for Kitten Buyers' produced by the Cat Group had reached its final draft. It was intended that all member organisations would use it, so it would be a feature of the GCCF website. Its chief function was to educate the kitten buying public on what to look for re health and welfare.

- 4.8 The Chairman referred back to the government's intentions for animal welfare, and informed delegates that there was a strong lobby for the mandatory microchipping of cats. He wanted to reexamine GCCF's position on this through discussion. It was essential that the GCCF designated itself as a forward-thinking, self-regulating authority to establish a position with those who would be drafting legislation.

## C2144

### RULE CHANGES

- 1. Revision of Section 1:3d-f (mating certificates) to reflect the current practice** **CHAIR**
- 1.1 The rules concerning mating certificates had been reformatted to reflect chronological order, and had been updated to take account of the facility to make online declarations.
- 1.2 There were no substantive changes, but a note had been added to state that any contracts made at the time of mating were personal agreements, and GCCF would not be responsible for resolving disputes.
- 1.3 There were no queries. **Majority approval. 0 against 1 abstention**
- 2. Addition to Section 1: 7b iv to include 15 common English prepositions in the list of permitted repetitions in registered names to avoid the frequent use of hyphens.** **SoBritSHCC**
- 2.1 The club proposed that the prepositions by, for, from, in, into, of, off, on, onto, over, to, under, up, upon and with should be added to the limited list of words it was acceptable to repeat in kitten names, without the need for hyphenation.
- 2.2 There was some discussion on the context of the rule requiring greater clarity, and the OM promised to look at reformatting this when he added the new text into the rule book.
- 2.3 The rule change was agreed. **Majority approval. 0 against 1 abstention**
- 3. Rule changes following the removal of the Experimental Register (October 2015) for information** **JL**
- 3.1 It was explained that the rule changes had been agreed in principle in October 2015 (C2084.8) but had not been published on the web site as intended, as this was undergoing an upgrade at the time, and so had not yet been added into the rule book.
- 3.2 There were no comments or queries.
- 4. Amendment of Section 2:16f to allow the agreed addition of a certificate for average BIS to be awarded in the most practical way.**
- 4.1 It was explained that the purpose of changing the process from an award being made on the show day was to simplify it for SMs. It would not be known in advance what certificate (if any) would be required on the day. All they would need to do was make the return to the Office, where it would be validated, the cat's records amended, and then the correct certificate would be posted out to the exhibitor.
- 4.2 Questions were asked about the process, and it was established that if the same cat won overall BIS in different shows at the same venue, then two certificates would be awarded, and if a title had been gained then the first certificate for the next level would have been achieved. However, if changes were required to make additions to the rule, re kittens or the type of Olympian certificates, then clubs would have to bring proposals to the next Council meeting.
- 4.3 Prior to a vote being taken it was requested that the word 'without precedent' be recorded as this rule amendment (that changed the procedure, rather the substantive of the rule) had been circulated via the supplementary rather the main agenda. The additional wording was approved unanimously.
- 4.4 The rule change was agreed. **Majority approval. 1 against 5 abstentions**
5. To notify a correction to a Byelaw.
- 5.1 A correction was needed to Byelaw 11(6) (agreed February 2015 C2042.8) to ensure that the same figure (three) was stated for the Appeals Committee quorum in each of the first two paragraphs.
- 5.2 There were no comments or queries
- Action: the rules and byelaws to be amended accordingly with reformatting where necessary** **OM**

## C2145

### SHOW MATTERS

- 1. A report on the 2016 Supreme Show** **JH** **INFO**
- 1.1 The OM reported the accounts had been finalised and the 2016 Supreme Show had a deficit of £15,484.27. It was confirmed that this did not include money allocated from the marketing budget to promote GCCF.
- 1.2 The gate had increased, with advance ticket sales strong, but exhibit numbers had remained static.
- 1.3 Disappointment was expressed, but some acknowledgement from delegates that if there was to be an event that promoted pedigree cats and the GCCF to the public in a prestigious event, then there would be some cost, and this could be afforded at present.
- 1.4 The Chairman took comment from the floor on reasons why the show was no longer as popular with exhibitors as it once was. There was opinion that a later time of year would mean more cats were in full coat, also that the atmosphere was not as it once was, and large open spaces could be a reason for this. However, it was noted that what some disliked others were pleased by.
- 1.5 As it seemed that the addition of qualifications for cats in breed classes had made no significant difference a straw poll confirmed that they would not be required in 2017.
- 2. Information on the Supreme Show of 2017** **JH** **INFO**
- 2.1 This would be at the NEC on Saturday, 28 October 2017. It would be in different halls from those usually used, but another hall was allocated as a car park for no additional cost.
- 2.2 Mrs Lynda Ashmore had been appointed by the Supreme Show Committee as Show Manager, and the section managers would be : Mrs Sally Tokens for pedigrees, and Mrs Lesley Swzed for HHPs. The service of ring managers had been secured for all rings, and most roles to cover advance planning and/or organisation on the day had been allocated.

- 2.3 There would be a 'Meet The Breeds' area again at no cost to clubs.  
 2.4 Mr Hansson confirmed that negotiations were ongoing with a hotel off the main complex as it was hoped to achieve both better services and reduced costs.  
 2.5 It was the intention to send out judge invitation letters in early March, but there was still discussion ongoing about class structure, with some exhibitors wanting greater competition and others more class splits.  
 2.6 The OM was putting together a schedule for ticket price entry for the gate in discussion with the Ticket Factory. It was intended there would be a discounted family price to attract those at a toy brick event in a neighbouring hall.

### 3. Update from the Show Structure Review Group

**CK INFO**

- 3.1 Mrs Kaye informed delegates that there had been just one meeting of the SRRG since the October Council meeting. Some consideration had been given to delegate opinion, plus the data that GCCF was losing judges at a rate four or five times faster than new ones were created.  
 3.2 Therefore it had been decided that the next meeting should be held in conjunction with the BAC Review Group. The need to revise judge training seemed inextricably linked with that for structure reorganisation. A date had been set in the last week of March.  
 3.3 Proposals from that meeting would be on the agenda for the June Council meeting.

### 4. Mandatory registration by owners of HHPs wishing them gain titles.

- 4.1 This had been agreed by Council in October 2014 (C2032.1). It had been deferred until the computer system could maintain suitable records which was now possible.  
 4.2 It was agreed that it would be operational from June 2017.  
 4.3 It was confirmed that any cat needed to be registered only once. If a pedigree pet had been registered as a pedigree that number would be appropriate. If it had not, an HHP registration would be required.

**Action: A check to be made to ascertain if rule changes were required. Any made to be on the agenda of the June Council meeting** **OM/JL**

**C2146**

## JUDGES

### 1. JUDGES APPOINTMENTS JL

<b>Birman BAC</b>	Pupil Judge	Ms Charis White
<b>Burmese BAC</b>	Pupil Judge	Mrs Di Brown
<b>Exotic BAC</b>	Discounted time until August 2017	Mr Jonathan Emery
<b>Oriental BAC</b>	Discounted time until January 2018 (self, non-self & OLH) Full Judge (LH) Pupil Judge	Mrs Joan Pounds Mrs Linda Walpole Mrs Maria Chapman-Ber
<b>Snowshoe BAC</b>	Full Judge	Mrs Anne-Marie Heath
<b>Somali BAC</b>	Sandra Moore	Pupil Judge
<b>Toyger Breed Club</b>	Full Judge	Mrs Sue Dalton-Hobbs Mrs Peri Mansaray

### 2. NOTIFICATION OF JUDGES APPROVED VIA THE WEBSITE SINCE OCTOBER COUNCIL

<b>British Shorthair Group Committee</b>	Pupil Judge	Mrs Elizabeth Adair Mr Jonathan Emery Miss Joanne Seggie
<b>Joint Rex BAC</b>	Pupil Judge of LaPerms	Mrs Rosemary Fisher
<b>Ocicat &amp; Aztec BAC</b>	Full Judge	Ms Janet Tonkinson
<b>Persian Longhair BAC</b>	Full Judge Pupil Judge	Mrs Di Brown Mrs Eileen Fryer Mrs Sue Dalton-Hobbs
<b>Siberian BAC</b>	Full Judge Pupil Judge	Ms Claire Lewis Mrs Sally Rainbow-Ockwell Mrs Sue Dalton-Hobbs
<b>Siamese Cat JAC</b>	Pupil Judge	Mrs Maria Chapman-Ber
<b>Suffolk Breed Group</b>	Full Judge	Dr Julia Craig-McFeely Mrs Rosemary Fisher

<b>Toyger Breed Group</b>	Full Judge	Mrs Lynn Fryer Mr George Godfrey Mrs Catherine Kaye Mr Stephen McConnel Ms Elisabeth Stark	<b>INFO</b>
---------------------------	------------	--	-------------

3. **JUDGE WITHDRAWALS/REMOVALS**

<b>Joint Rex BAC</b>	Cornish Rex List	Mr Ian Macro	
<b>Oriental BAC</b>	Resignation as Pupil Judge with immediate effect	Mr Richard Lord	<b>INFO</b>

**C2147 BREED APPLICATIONS CHAIR**

**1.Promotion to Championship Status for the Australian Mist**  
 1.1 This had Board approval, confirming all requirements and had been met satisfactorily.  
 1.2 There were no questions of comments. **Unanimous approval.**  
**Action The A-M BAC to be informed.** **JL**

**2. Name recognition for the British Longhair CHAIR**  
 2.1 There was a query from the floor on whether this impacted on the British SH registration policy as the cats were currently registered as BSH variants.  
 2.2 The Chairman replied that this was promotion of the variant as a new breed, as was allowed for by the variant policy, and the rules for new breed recognition. It was a matter for the BSH BAC to revise its registration policy subsequently, and decide whether it wished to retain the LH gene within the SH population.  
 2.3 Delegates commented on precedents for this, and assurance was given that, as with other LH breeds, the SH progeny of any outcross would be a variant of the LH and not a member of the existing SH breed. **INFO**

**C2148 REGISTRATION & SOP REVISIONS**

**1. Revised Balinese Registration Policy BALBAC**  
 1.1 The intention was to provide Balinese breeders with additional outcross options, to maintain genetic diversity.  
 1.2 There was no comment. **Majority approval. 0 against 1 abstention**

**2. Revised Orienta SH Registration Policy ORIBAC**  
 2.1 There were revisions to the policy concerning Orientals Longhairs, longhair variants and white cats of Oriental type to clarify breed status when these were in the background of Oriental SHs.  
 2.2 There was no comment. **Unanimous approval**

**3. Minor amendment to the British SH SOP (tipped cats)**  
 3.1 This had been posted on the website in advance of the meeting and no queries had been received.  
 3.2 The British Shorthair Group Committee had been informed of this after a four week period had elapsed.

**4. Minor amendment of the Siamese SOP (ear set) SCJAC**  
 4.1 This removed the words 'and pricked' from the description of the ear set as it caused confusion on occasions.  
 4.2 There was no comment. **Unanimous approval**  
**Action: confirmation to BACs with requests that an updated clean copy of the policies and amended SOPs are sent to the GCCF Office and for website publication.** **JL**

**5. GEMS code amendment for British Shorthairs in line with FIFE**  
 5.1 When it recognised the British Longhair FIFe had changed EMS to reflect this. The BSH was no longer BRI, but BSH and the British Longhair became BLH.  
 5.2 Mrs Rainbow-Ockwell reminded Council that it had been agreed that GEMS would keep in line with EMS and proposed the change. **Majority approval. 1 against 1 abstention**  
 5.3 It was agreed that there would be no implementation until the BSGC had had a chance to discuss this at its March meeting.

**6. Reappraisal of the terminology used in the rules for the active, non-active and genetic registers.**  
 6.1 It was explained that a number of changes would be made, but it was not intended that the meaning of the rules should be altered in any respect.  
 6.2 The wording would reflect the processes carried out by the system in assigning a particular status to cats, to clarify their suitability for breeding by breeder choice, and/or according to required health checks.  
**Action: a redraft of some of the wording in Section 1 of the rule book SRO/JL/HM**

**7. The introduction of a Standard of Points template RF**  
 7.1 Mrs Fisher gave a brief explanation of the project whose aim was to standardise the format of SOPs for all breeds, with the eventual intent of getting them onto portable devices, including tablets and smart phones, with illustrations. This would be particularly useful for judges, especially novices  
 7.2 Assurance was given that BACs would be consulted and it wasn't the intention to amend SOPs in any way.  
**Action: the template to be published on the website.** **RF**

**C2149 CLUB AND BAC MATTERS**

**1. Application for GCCF membership by the Aztec Cat Club**

1.1 It was confirmed that the club had met the required criteria for membership.

1.2 There was no comment. **Majority approval. 0 against 1 abstention**

**2. Application for GCCF membership by the Northern British LH & SH Cat Club**

2.1 It was confirmed that the club had met the required criteria for membership

2.2 A delegate noted that the club's name was very similar to others from the same part of the country which could be confusing. However, it was observed that the club had held provisional membership for three years without this being an issue. **Majority approval. 4 against 1 abstention**

**3. Provisional membership for Toyger Cat Club**

3.1 This information was accepted without question or comment.

**4. Judge Appointment Scheme wording amendments**

**Chair**

4.1 Revisions had been made to reflect amendments to rules and byelaws made in Council, and to eliminate a number of typographical errors that had crept into the master copy over the years as it had undergone amendments.

4.2 There were no questions on the amendments listed.

**Action: to be on the GCCF website for use by BACs**

**JL**

**C2150 FOR DISCUSSION**

**1. Teleconferencing**

**Chair**

1.1 It was noted that clubs could make their own decisions on whether or not to meet around a table or by phone or video link, but the BAC constitution currently did not give this option.

1.2 Those who spoke seemed to be in favour, but there was the matter of how to conduct voting.

**Action: communications support to be investigated to ascertain what was available that could be suitable.**

**SRO/OM**

**C2151 ANY OTHER BUSINESS OR INFORMATION**

None

1. There was comment on exhibitor names and addresses being in catalogues, as the option to opt out of this wasn't widely known, or was disregarded by SMs. There was comment on compliance with the new regulations on data protection mentioned earlier.

**Action Consideration on what GCCF show services would be able to offer in this respect**

**OM**

The meeting closed at 5:10pm with the agenda completed.

NEXT MEETING: Wednesday, 14 June 2017 at the Conway Hall, Holborn, London, commencing at 12 Noon

**ADDENDUM**

**Wording of Rule Changes Agreed at C2144**

**Rules re Mating Certificates Section 1** (new layout to reflect the chronological order of events)

3d) i) The owner of a stud cat must provide a Certificate of Mating to the owner of the queen upon collection. A ~~Certificate of Mating~~ This must state the registered name, breed name/breed description and registration number of the dam and the dates of mating and must be signed by the registered owner(s) or specified keeper of the sire.

ii) If a stud cat is loaned without transfer of registered ownership, the registered owner(s) must notify the GCCF Office in writing, giving the name and address of the specified keeper and authorisation for that person to sign mating certificates relating to that cat. A copy of this letter (**paper or electronic**) must accompany each mating certificate submitted when an application to register is made.

3e) When a litter is registered, the application to register must be accompanied by a copy of the certificate of mating (**if the application is made on paper**), or a **declaration that the mating certificate has been received (if the application is made online)** unless the person registering the kitten(s) is also the registered owner of the sire.

**Note: contracts between the owner of the stud and the owner of the queen for mating services are a private arrangement, and any disputes will not be resolved by GCCF intervention.**

3f) If a kitten is sold unregistered, in addition to the pedigree (see Rule 10a) the seller must supply a copy of the certificate of mating whether or not the seller is the registered owner of the sire. Any application to register the kitten at a later date must be accompanied by this certificate (**if the application is made on paper**), or a **declaration that the mating certificate has been received (if the application is made online)**.

## **Rules re names Section 1**

**7b.** Names must differ by at least one letter from the name of any other cat registered with the GCCF. The following will not be accepted as a name or part of a name:

Numbers in figures (roman or arabic)

Recognised feline titles (Champion, Premier, Supreme, International, Imperial etc)

Cedillas, accents etc

Repetition of words previously registered by the same person or under the same prefix except recognised appropriate breed colour/pattern/coat description words in English, the definite and indefinite articles (the, a, an), **common English prepositions (by, for, from, in, into, of, off, on, onto, over, to, under, up, upon, with)** or recognised human titles (Mr, Mister, Mrs, Miss, King, Queen, Prince, Princess, Lord, Lady, Sir, Dame.)

## **Removal of the Experimental Register and associated changes**

### **THE REGISTERS**

**12a.** Registration Policies for all breeds must be submitted to the Board of Directors of the GCCF. These Registration Policies will state the requirements for registration on the Full, Supplementary, Experimental and Reference Registers and will never be less stringent than these rules of registration.

**12c.** The Full, **and** Supplementary and Experimental Registers are for cats with registered parents, grandparents and great grandparents or additional generations as required by the Registration Policy for that breed. ~~The Full and Supplementary Registers are for cats of a breed carrying Championship or Provisional status.~~

#### **Historic notes:**

i) **Only cats with registered parents, grandparents and great-grandparents have been eligible for full and supplementary registration (conferring eligibility for pedigree classes at shows) since 1971.**

ii) **The Experimental Register (EXP) was for cats of a Preliminary status breed until 21.10.2015 (conferring eligibility for assessment classes).**

#### **Experimental Register**

~~**16a.** Cats of Preliminary status breeds will be placed on the Experimental Register when the preceding generations (minimum of 3 generations) defined by the Registration Policy for that breed conform to acceptable breeding policy for that breed.~~

~~**16b.** When Preliminary recognition is granted to a breed, cats which conform to the Registration Policy for that breed will thereafter be registered on the Experimental Register. Cats already registered on the Reference Register will not have their registration number changed but will be treated as though they were registered on the Experimental Register if they conform to the Registration Policy for this Register.~~

~~**16c.** When Provisional recognition is granted to a breed, cats which conform to the Registration Policy for that breed will thereafter be registered on the Full or Supplementary Register (whichever is relevant). Cats already registered on the Experimental Register will not have their registration number changed but will be treated as though they were registered on the Full or Supplementary Register.~~

~~**16d.** Provisional or Championship status progeny of cats on the Experimental Register will be placed on the Full or Supplementary Register as directed by the Registration Policy for that breed. An application to register the progeny of Experimental Register cats on the Full Register should be accompanied by a letter and a pedigree showing that the cat(s) conform to the relevant Registration Policy for registration on the Full Register.~~

~~**17c.** Cats with at least one parent on the Reference Register (but which would not themselves be placed on the Reference Register) shall be placed on the Experimental Register if of a breed with Preliminary recognition or on the first generation Supplementary Register if of a breed with Provisional or Championship status, unless otherwise directed by the Registration Policy for that breed.~~

**20b.** Amendments **Revisions** to registration policies for Championship, Provisional and Preliminary status breeds shall be placed by the Board of Directors on the agenda for a meeting of Council and, if approved, shall take effect immediately. They shall not be retrospective.

**Minor amendments to registration policies, for the purpose of correction and/or clarification, at the BAC's request and the Board's agreement, will be published on the GCCF website. During the four weeks following each publication a delegate to Council may contact the GCCF Office with an objection to any amendment, and bring this objection to the next meeting of Full Council so that it can be considered. If no objection is received, at the end of four weeks it shall be deemed that the amendment is confirmed. The BAC will be informed of this, and notification will be given to Council as information on the next published Council agenda**

32. A breed number **The GEMS code**, official name and description will be granted or confirmed by the Board of Directors upon Preliminary recognition. The breed will be registered on the Experimental Register and may be shown in Assessment Classes as soon as is practical after recognition has been proposed by the Board of Directors and approved by a meeting of Council. They will be judged in Assessment classes by full judges of the relevant breed group.

NB: ~~Cats registered on the Reference Register will not normally have their registration changed when the colour, coat length and/or pattern becomes recognised but these cats will be treated as if they were on the Experimental Register provided that they conform to the requirements of the Registration Policy for their breed for registration on this Register. (Amended 26.02.2014)~~

#### Application for a Breed Name for cats of New Breed or Hair Type

38. Applications to register, with a breed name, cats of breeds which are not recognised by the GCCF will be placed before the Board of Directors. Any such application must be accompanied by 21 copies, Electronic copies may be accepted by arrangement with the office, of: (Amended 26.02.2014)

#### Section 1 - THE REGISTER - continued

- a. Information about the proposed breed including photographs. If the breed is recognised by other registering bodies, this information may include their Standards of Points and Registration Policies (with English translations if necessary) **for the purpose of agreeing the GCCF registration policy required for each new breed with the support of the Genetics Committee.**
- d. The Board of Directors may refer this information to the Genetics Committee and/or the Veterinary Sub **Advisory** Committee for consideration and may request additional information.
39. When satisfied with the application, including its genetic and health aspects, the Board of Directors may approve a breed name.
- a. If a breed name is granted, these cats shall be placed on the Reference Register **registered according to the agreed policy (38a)** and may be shown on exhibition but not in competition. (Amended 27.06.2012)
- b. These cats will be allocated a breed number **GEMS code**, but their registration or the issuing of a breed name does not guarantee recognition in the future. (Amended 27.06.2012)
43. c) A proposed **Confirmation of the** Registration Policy for the breed including suitable outcrosses and whether there are requirements for DNA tests etc. When any recognised breed is proposed as a suitable outcross for a new breed, the relevant BAC/BACs should be provided with a copy of the proposed Registration Policy at the time of the application by the group catering for the new breed.
- e) A list of full GCCF judges of at least 2 years standing to be submitted for appointment as full judges of the new breed together with a rationale for their choice. Further lists may be submitted prior to the new breed applying for promotion **to** for Provisional recognition. **Championship status.** (Amended 27.06.2012)
44. The Board of Directors, if satisfied that the new breed should be granted Preliminary recognition, will confirm the **GEMS code**, breed number, official name and description. The breed will be registered on the Experimental Register **according to the agreed registration policy** and may be shown in Assessment classes, after recognition has been proposed by the Board of Directors and approved by a meeting of Council, at shows whose closing dates have not yet passed, with the agreement of the show manager. (Amended 27.06.2012)

NB: ~~Cats registered on the Reference Register will not normally have their registration changed when the breed becomes recognised but these cats will be treated as if they were on the Experimental Register provided that they conform to the requirements of the Registration Policy for their breed for registration on this Register~~

#### EXHIBITS AND EXHIBITORS (section 4)

##### 1. Eligibility

- a. d) Exhibits registered on the Reference Register are not eligible for competition, unless they were registered before their breed had Preliminary recognition and are now considered as if registered on the Experimental Register. (see Section 1, rules 32 & 44) **the revision of the registration rules agreed in principle on 21.10.15. Registered cats are eligible to be shown in competition in the pedigree section if their breed has Championship status (title certificate classes) or Preliminary status (Assessment classes).**

(Historically, cats with unregistered parents but which were themselves registered on 1st June 1971 and which were eligible for Challenge certificates on that date continued to be so, and so were their suitable progeny for three generations from 20th October 1971. Thereafter only cats with registered parents, grandparents and great grandparents have been eligible.)

Note: Rules 4.1d, 4.16 and 4.18 do not apply to cats on exhibition who are not being judged with reference to their Standard of Points.

## BEST IN SHOW CERTIFICATES

### Section 2:16f

An overall BIS winner will be awarded a further certificate for the title it is working towards, except for an Olympian. Should the OBIS be an Olympian, or aiming for this, then the certificate will count as a breed Olympian certificate at the level it is working towards. **The award will be validated by the GCCF Office and the certificate signed and sent from there.** It will be signed by the BIS judge, and count towards the total required, regardless of whether that **the BIS** judge is **was** eligible to judge the winner's breed or title class.