



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



Wednesday, 24 February 2016 at the Conway Hall, Holborn, London

DRAFT MINUTES

| | | PRESENTED | ACTION |
|--------------|---|--------------|--------------------------|
| | | BY | BY |
| C2086 | WELCOME TO THE DELEGATES AND IN MEMORIAM | Chair | |
| | <p>At 1.00pm promptly the Chairman welcomed delegates and thanked them for attending the meeting. 99 were present. Two new delegates, representing Manchester & District and Northern Counties clubs, introduced themselves.</p> <p>The Chairman reminded delegates to be concise in their statements and not to repeat points made by others. He stated that he had received several requests to ask that any conversation during the course of the meeting was at low level and infrequent, as otherwise it made it difficult to follow the debate.</p> <p>Mike Buckeridge, Tony Haynes, Jane Hard, Barbara Hoole, Jean Kemp, Maureen O'Dowd and Robine Pocock were remembered in a moment of silence.</p> | | INFO |
| C2087 | APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE | Chair | |
| | <p>The Chairman gave apologies on behalf of Vice-Presidents Brenda Wolstenholme and Gordon Butler. Delegate apologies were as recorded on the attendance sheet.</p> | | INFO |
| C2088 | CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS | Chair | |
| | <p>1. General information & updates</p> <p>1.1 The Chairman informed Council that Project Phoenix was almost completed. A presentation would be given later by the Project Manager, but he thought it worth mentioning that there was now intensive staff training, and registration policies and offices processes were under scrutiny as details were uploaded onto the system. These had to be in a logical form and consistent.</p> <p>1.2 The process had begun to appoint a new member of staff. The post would carry special responsibility for marketing and communication.</p> <p>1.3 The negotiations with GCCFI to provide them with an online service had stalled. It had seemed that there was approval for it, but a challenge to this decision would not be resolved until the end of February.</p> <p>2. Reports from welfare groups with GCCF representation</p> <p>2.1 The Canine & Feline Sector Group meetings had been focussed recently on the compulsory microchipping of dogs. The licensing of commercial premises and the welfare codes were also under review so that recommendations could be made to DEFRA.</p> <p>(A point was raised that the legislation did not make compulsory the updating of the information the microchip carried. The Chairman responded that the CFSG had noted this and it would be passed on to DEFRA with other concerns).</p> <p>2.2 The Breeding & Sale of Cats Group (a sub-committee of the CFSG) had completed a period of monitoring the sale of cats and kittens, most particularly via the internet. The conclusion was that many sites were irresponsible and inaccurate, and no form of control existed. A report had been drafted consisting of 12 recommendations. These were confidential until such time that the report was approved by CFSG and published, but would affect responsible pedigree breeders as well as others (the vast majority). He had been able to ensure no pedigree breeds were referred to directly, although there was mention of 'extreme type', and felt that overall there was little a responsible breeder would not support.</p> <p>2.3 Cats Protection was the group that was proposing the report and who would give it publicity once it was approved. Jacqui Cuff from CP would be attending the March Board meeting to present it and discuss the implications with Board members.</p> <p>2.4 There had been a Cat Group meeting recently. A review of Cats & the Law was in preparation, and data from a survey on the hand rearing of kittens was being analysed for a report. A new kitten contract, providing a check list for new owners, had been produced and end of life principles, and the outcome of research on the handling of cats, would be on the updated Cat Group website. The CG strongly supported the microchipping of all cats.</p> | | INFO |
| C2089 | MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING | | |
| | <p>1. The Minutes of the Council meeting of 21 October 2015</p> <p>1.1 The draft minutes had been circulated. Correction were made at: C2076.2.4 £18,000 and C2078.1.1 Cynthia Mary Cullin</p> <p>1.2 An amendment was taken for an insertion at C2081.1.4</p> <p>1.3 The minutes were then approved by a majority with 6 abstentions.</p> | | JL INFO |

2. Delegate questions on ongoing business not covered by an agenda item

C2081.1.4 It was asked why no draft accounts for the Supreme had been published as the Chairman had made a commitment to this at the previous meeting. Mr Crow responded that it was his understanding that they had not been completed in time, as he hadn't seen them, and the paperwork for all accounts had now been sent to the examiner. It was his belief that finalised accounts were preferable and the Supreme accounts would be incorporated into the GCCF end of year accounts, as was usual. **INFO**

C2090 MINUTES OF MEETINGS FOR INFORMATION ONLY

1. Board of Directors: 8 September 2015 and 17 November 2015 No questions **INFO**

C2091 FINANCE

1. Financial report

- 1.1 The Chairman informed delegates that some questions that had been raised by a delegate before the meeting had been sent to O'Hara Wood so that definitive answers could be supplied.
- 1.2 The Office Manager stressed that the financial details presented were management accounts. They were produced for the Board to indicate the strength of business performance, and therefore did not contain information that was fixed throughout the year, such as the club loans.
- 1.3 He gave apologies, as the totals on the income/expenditure and balance sheets varied by £24. The explanation was that he and the bookkeeper had taken the figures from the computer at slightly different times. However, he would try to ensure there was a tally in future.
- 1.3 The management accounts to November indicated that 2015 had been a good year for GCCF. There had been a rise in income, and savings made meant reduced expenditure.
- 1.4 However, some of this was from planned staff training that had not yet taken place, but would do so in the following year.
- 1.5 There was one query. It was asked why the expenditure for 'computing' was 157% of the budget estimate. The OM explained this included maintenance on the existing computer system. The volunteer who had worked on supporting this was now giving all his time to Project Phoenix and so commercial expertise had been brought in. **INFO**

2. Presentation of the volume figures for core business in 2015.

- 2.1 The data presented was for the final six months of 2015.
- 2.2 For the first time in several years registration figures had risen. Overall they had increased by 1%, but those for non-prefix registrations were at an all time high.
- 2.3 The proportion of registered kittens now being transferred into new ownership was also at a record level. The marked increase had begun in June so that it was clear that it was the result of the transfer incentive introduced in partnership with Royal Canin.
- 2.4 Figures for import registrations had been very good in 2014, but also had improved in 2015. The number leaving GCCF was far lower than coming onto the register, a further indication of overall growth.
- 2.5 Prefix applications had shown only a very modest rise. **INFO**

C2092 BUSINESS MATTERS

1. Business Plan for 2016

- 1.1 Mrs Rainbow-Ockwell apologised that this was late. It was ready for Council, but delegates had not an opportunity to read it in advance.
- 1.2 Much that was in the plan would be familiar, as a plan until 2020 had been produced the year before, and this year's was an update that indicated where progress had been made and those projects that remained on the starting blocks.
- 1.3 Analysis of GCCF's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats was made with reference to the current economic situation.
- 1.4 A risk assessment and risk management strategy were included, with the recommendation for review by the Board at least twice a year.

Action: An opportunity for questions on, and ratification of the BP to be included on the June agenda. JL

2. Progress on Project Phoenix.

- 2.1 Mrs Rainbow-Ockwell said she had hoped to be giving the news that the new system was going live shortly after Council, but she could not yet give a date. However, she believed it was the final time that she would be giving an update.
- 2.2 Delays had been caused by staff problems at the software development company. The Board had agreed to extra funding for the GCCF contributors and it was thanks to their work that the project was nearing completion. The system was being tested and staff were being trained to use it.
- 2.3 Registration policies were still being uploaded. The definition of variants had caused some problems, as BACs did this according to breeder preferences, and there was a noticeable lack of consistency.
- 2.4 SRO stressed that it was the staff who find the changeover most challenging. Breeders and owners had only to get used to slightly different screens, and would find they could access more information on their cats, such as genetic make-up. There was almost 30 years between the old and new systems and staff would have to make that transition, and would also be expected to become more proficient at handling customer enquiries, so would need to understand and interpret the information provided on screen.
- 2.5 Just ahead of the launch there would be a period of a few days when there would be no online services as the changeover from the old to the new system was made. Delegates were asked to spread the word on this, so as many as possible knew to be patient. **INFO**

2.6 Questions that were asked focussed on ascertaining whether the new system would cope with situations that the present one could not deal with, such as male torties, and breed and show codes. SRO confirmed that it was far more flexible, and also could be manually overridden so corrections could be made in cases where previous data was obviously inaccurate.

Action: Launch of Phoenix by the end of April

IT Team & Office

3. Feedback on Royal Canin Transfer Incentive

- 3.1 The Chairman confirmed the information from the volume graphs. The incentive had been extremely successful, exceeding the targets set at the beginning of the year. The good uptake indicated it was well liked. There would be continued monitoring on the trend of transfer figures.
- 3.2 RC had also been pleased by the response. It had proved to be one of their most successful campaigns.
- 3.3 It was announced that 'Pets At Home' would now take the vouchers, to remove some of the difficulties of redemption. Concerns about this were passed to RC regularly and the possibility of online redemption would be discussed.
- 3.4 There was a query on certificate design, and it was agreed this could also be discussed with RC, though it was believed that RC was satisfied with what was currently being produced.
- 3.5 RC was continuing to sponsor the Supreme and was interested in supporting a new award to attract young exhibitors who wanted to compete without the commitment of the YES scheme.

INFO

4. The partnership with Agria

- 4.1 This had now matured and had provided GCCF with over £40,000 in 2015 from commission on policy conversions. It was anticipated that would continue, with some increase possible. Agria wanted GCCF to push for continued growth.
- 4.2 There was support for club welfare with insurance provided to cover rehomed cats. The company's liaison would be alerted there were those who expected involvement, but hadn't yet heard from Agria.
- 4.3 It was anticipated there would be Supreme sponsorship for both the show and Gala Dinner.

INFO

C2093 CLUB MATTERS

It was requested that items C2093 1 & 2 be taken in reverse order. This was not agreed.

1. An amendment to Byelaw 5(3)

- 1.1 The purpose of the change was to allow the introduction of an administrative charge for late returns.
- 1.2

Member clubs who have a problem completing the return for any reason should inform the Board **prior to May 1st for assistance. Those that do not and have to be contacted in order to obtain all or part of the listed paperwork will be charged an administrative fee.** This was agreed: **1 against 3 abstentions.**

2. The level of administrative charge

- 2.1 Following discussion in Council in October it was proposed that this should be £50. (C2076.3.4)
- 2.2 This was agreed. **1 against 2 abstentions.**
- 2.3 A reminder was given that club committees should ensure their accounts were in preparation and inform the Office immediately of any problems, so that assistance could be offered.

Action: A notice to be prepared for the website and an email sent to club treasurers.

OM

3. Devon Rex Owners Club

Council was informed that the Board had granted GCCF Provisional Membership to this club.

INFO

4. Publication of club accounts

- 4.1 Opinion was sought from delegates on whether club accounts should be published by the Office on the GCCF website once they had been approved. There had been some concern at the Finance Committee that these were no longer made readily accessible to the membership by some clubs.
- 4.2 It was considered that clubs should be responsible for publishing their own accounts and this was done by various means: electronic, post and presented at an AGM. What was important was that they should be available to any member.
- 4.3 There was concern that HMRC would investigate any reserves of money held.

Action: to be a matter for the next Board agenda, as directed by FC.

JL

C2094 RULE CHANGE

1. To ensure all white cats used for breeding have normal hearing

- 1.1 Section 1 - The Register - new 1g

Before any progeny may be registered from any breed of white cat, male or female, this cat must have had a BAER or OAE certificate of freedom from unilateral or bilateral deafness submitted to the GCCF Office. White cats without such certification will be registered on the non-active register until such time as the required certificate is sent and an application for transfer to the active register is made. Cats should be microchipped when tested with the number recorded on the test result and the cat's own veterinary records.

- 1.2 The Genetics Committee had considered results from scientific research which were shared with delegates:
- blue eyed white cats were most at risk of deafness
 - white cats with other coloured eyes could be deaf but the risk was considerably reduced
 - Foreign White cats with blue eyes had approximately the same risk as the second group
- 1.3 Some BACs had already included this rule in their breed's registration policy. The experience was that it worked. Incidence of deafness was not known in GCCF registered cats of this particular breed, although the problem had been reported in Europe where there was no testing regime established

- 1.4 It was confirmed that this was not to be retrospective action. White cats with active registration would not lose it. Also breeders would not have to test young kittens if they did not wish to do this. A cat could be registered non-active and transferred to the active register at a later date.
It was not considered practical at present to remove the fee for a register transfer for this.
- 1.5 Council was informed that there was excellent information on deafness testing accessible via the Persian BAC website.
- 1.6 The rule was approved with an implementation date of 1st June. **0 against 1 abstention.**
- Action: Information to be published on the GCCF website.** **OM**

C2081

SHOW MATTERS

1. Report from the Supreme Show Manager on the 2015 show, and plans for the 2016 Supreme

- 1.1 The report was given by Chris Wood (Hall Manager) as Mrs Leighton could not be present
He said that the show had been well received, with a reasonable gate and plenty of stalls creating a good atmosphere. The 'Meet the Cats' area had been particularly busy. However, overall there were 120 cats less than the previous year and more were needed for a break-even to be achieved.
- 1.2 There had been a £5,000 donation from an anonymous donor. This reduced the loss to £9,700.
- 1.3 The 2016 Supreme would be the show's 40th (ruby) anniversary therefore there would be special class for red cats as well the kitten presentation class.
- 1.4 As it was special show each certificate winner would gain two certificates from the same judge, making it possible to achieve a Champion/Premier or Grand title on the day if the cat had one certificate previously. (This would not apply to the Supreme UK Grand Certificate).
- 1.5 Liaison was ongoing with Tenth Planet to have costumed actors present to attract a more varied gate.
Care would be taken this did not upset the cats. There would be no balloons around the pens.
- 1.5 The Gala Dinner would take place on the evening before at the Metropole and the Cat of the Year Awards would be presented. Ticket and room price information would be available from the GCCF website. **INFO**

2. Report on the survey results from the Show Structure Review Group

- 2.1 Over the past month there had been analysis of the results of the survey sent to GCCF breeders and exhibitors.
There had been 1445 results, with 96.6% confirming they were currently showing with GCCF.
- 2.2 The overall level of satisfaction was good with 72% satisfied or very satisfied, some neutral and only about 10% unhappy with the experience. The majority went to enjoy the social aspects of the day.
- 2.3 It was more difficult to define specific dislikes. Many aspects of the show day had received comment, and were thought possible to improve, but nothing was particularly outstanding. There was no single issue that received a majority negative rating. Venues, a shorter day, concern about the overall quality of judging, and the Supreme headed the list with 100+ expressing dissatisfaction.
- 2.4 Over 300 pages had been read with comments sorted into six themes: the show day, judging, process & rules, section/class structure, BIS/BOV and the Supreme.
- 2.5 Several delegates who spoke in response to the survey presentation observed that many who replied did not seem to have much knowledge of show processes. If they were more involved they would have a better understanding of a show day. Others remarked that certain changes, such as better quality venues, could easily be made, but the consequence would be more expensive entry fees.
- 2.6 There was a particular observation that change should not be introduced if based only on the dissatisfaction expressed by a few.
- 2.7 Mrs Kaye thanked the team who had worked on producing the survey results, particularly the two who had analysed the lengthy written contributions.
- 2.6 There was a request for the survey results to be available on paper as well as electronically as there were internet access problems in some areas. It was agreed that they could be provided on request.

Actions: Further discussion by the SRG to make rule change recommendations to the Board and Council Surveys to examine some aspects of showing in greater depth **SRG**

3. A survey on the Supreme Show

- 3.1 The Supreme Show had received 100 negative comments and there was a definite need to attract more exhibitors to show there. Therefore the SRG had determined that this should be the first topic to be examined in depth, to learn more in order to recommend features that would be welcomed.
- 3.2 It was planned to send out the survey in mid March. There would be a shorter time allowed for response as most had responded in the first weeks to the first survey.

Action: survey distribution

OM/SRG

4. Royal Canin Annual Junior Championship

- 4.1 RC had offered an award for the 2016/2017 show season based on scoring for a miscellaneous class to be open only to cats owned or co-owned by those aged 16 and under.
- 4.2 The cats could be pedigree, pedigree pet or household pet, but all would need to be GCCF registered.
- 4.3 Ordinary GCCF rules of entry would apply, and results would be entered online so that a tally and leader board could be published.
- 4.4 Judging would be to HHP class criteria for all, with the show allocating the class to a judge from any section.
- 4.5 It was proposed that it would be voluntary for clubs to put on this class. However, there was some concern that the procedure, as outlined, was not sufficiently detailed. There could be problems having both pedigrees and non-pedigree cats in the same class. A suggestion was made that there should be two awards, one for pedigree and another for pets.
- 4.6 A delegate responded that the format proposed would not create difficulty as the YES class was already operated in this way, and the procedure for that could be followed.

Action: Further discussion to take place at the next Board meeting so that the procedure detail could be circulated to SMs wishing to put on the class. **JL**

C2096 JUDGES**1. JUDGES FOR APPROVAL** BACs NEW

| | | |
|------------------------|-------------|--|
| Abyssinian BAC | Pupil Judge | Mr Mark Pearman |
| Birman BAC | Full Judge | Mrs Linda Dutton Mrs Pat Perkins Mr N Porter |
| Ragdoll BAC | Full Judge | Mrs Lynn Fryer Mrs Chris Bamford |
| Siamese Cat JAC | Pupil Judge | Mr Neil Carter Mrs Michele Codd Mrs Barbara Prowse |
| Russian BAC | Pupil Judge | Mrs Sally Tokens |

All approved with one exception. Mrs Tokens was not already a Full Judge in the Foreign Section, and therefore did not qualify to go onto the list of a breed at preliminary status.

Action: Judges to be informed.

JL

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

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Balinese BAC | Full Judge | Mrs Joan Pounds Mrs Sally Tokens Mrs Barbara Prowse |
| British Shorthair Group Committee | Pupil Judge | Mr John Harrison |
| Burmese BAC | Full Judge | Mr Gerald Martin Mrs Sally Tokens Mrs Janet Tonkinson |
| | one year extension as a Pupil Judge to October 2016 | |
| Egyptian Mau BAC | Full Judge Pupil Judge | Mrs Sally Rainbow-Ockwell Mrs Sylvia Rose Mrs Janet Williams |
| Exotic BAC | Pupil Judge | Mrs Sandra Moore |
| Oriental BAC | Full Judge (Oriental Non-Self) | Mrs Sally Tokens |
| Joint Rex BAC | Full Judge (Devon Rex) Full Judge (Cornish Rex) Full Judge (Selkirk Rex) Pupil Judge (Selkirk Rex) | Mr Mark Pearman Mrs Rosemary Fisher Dr Peter Collin Mr John Harrison |
| Maine Coon BAC | Full Judge | Mrs Celia Leighton |
| Siberian BAC | Full Judge Pupil Judge | Lady Audrey Saye Mrs Helen Hardwick |

INFO

3. JUDGE WITHDRAWALS/REMOVALS None. INFO**C2097 BREED APPLICATIONS****1. Application for Preliminary Recognition for the Suffolk chocolate & lilac (SUF b & SUF c)**

1.1 The delegate for the Havana and Lilac CC made an objection.

1.2 The Chairman responded that the Board had considered the breed sufficiently different from other breeds to merit breed status. They would be shown in the Foreign Section, not the Oriental.

Approved by a majority. 6 against 16 abstentions

2. Caramel to be an accepted colour for Australian Mists.

2.1 Council was informed that this had been approved by the Board.

INFO

C2098 REGISTRATION & SOP MATTERS**1. Ragdoll registration policy revision**

1.1 The need for more stringent DNA testing for Ragdoll HCM, and for imports, was explained.
Unanimous approval

2. Registration policy and SOP for the Suffolk Chocolate & Lilac

- 2.1 There was some concern that the registration policy permitted outcrossing to Siamese.
- 2.2 It was explained that it was expected this would be revised by the time the breed was ready to apply for Championship Status, and that the pattern gene could be tested for in order to eliminate it from future generations of Suffolks.
- 2.3 There was an objection to the use of 'modern counterparts in the Oriental section' in the opening paragraph of the SOP. It was agreed that a breed should not be defined by comparison to another, and the Suffolk breed group should be asked to remove this term. It was accepted that this could be referred back to Council in June, as there was no objection to the standard by which the breed could be judged.
- 2.4 At the same time a correction was required to the fourth point of the list for withholding all awards as 'one or' needed to be inserted before 'both testicles'.

Approved by a majority.

12 against 17 abstentions

3. Amendment to the SOP for Australian Mist

3.1 This was to include a description for caramel.

Unanimous approval

4. Amendments to the Standard of Points for Oriental SHs and LHs

4.1 This included a description of the eye colour for SHs and the replacement of GCCF breed numbers with GEMS code throughout.

Unanimous approval

5. Amendments to the Standard of Points for Nebelungs

5.1 More detail was added, particularly to the description of the head. **Unanimous approval**

Action: C2097.1 & C20198 1-5 the BACs or appropriate breed groups to be informed.

JL

6 Policies with minor updates since October published on the GCCF website

6.1 Abyssinian (EXP & provisional removed) Burmese (wording clarification), Norwegian Forest Cat (to comply with 5 generation rule) Sokoke (EXP removed)

INFO

C2099

DISCIPLINARY MATTERS

1. Declaration of Office & Code of Conduct for those on the Disciplinary committees

1.1 These had been drafted to comply with Bylaw 11.11. There were no questions or comments.

2. Declaration of Office & Code of Conduct for GCCF Officers and members of the Board

2.1 There were observations made on the final two paragraphs that stated the principle of collective responsibility following majority Board decisions, with the right for dissent to be recorded, but with a protocol established should a club represented by a Director wish to express a contrary view. There was the option of another club representative attending to speak, or the Director doing this, but informing the Chairman of the intention to speak and of the comment to be made.

2.2 It was considered by some to be too restrictive to directors as individuals, and could breach the Articles of Association. However it was also observed that any director had an opportunity to express opinion during Board debate, with the vote taken at the conclusion of this determining the Board's position.

2.3 The Chairman remarked that the Codes of Conduct had been published so that the who wished to stand for any GCCF committee in June would be aware of their responsibilities. Codes of Conduct and Codes of Ethics were established governance in both private companies and public service.

INFO

C2100

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

These were deferred until the next meeting due to lack of time. The Chairman remarked that delegates should ask their club committees to discuss the Surrey & Sussex CA's suggestion for a reduction in the number of club members required for representation in Council along with what limits there should be, and whether there should be a clearer definition of what constituted a club. Should it be only a committee arranging a show, for instance?

C2101

ANY OTHER BUSINESS OR INFORMATION

Mrs Fisher informed Council that Mr Anthony Nichols had been appointed to the Cat Welfare Trust to fill the vacancy brought about by the loss of Mrs Sharp.

The meeting closed at shortly after 5pm

NEXT MEETING:

Wednesday, 15 June 2016 at the Conway Hall, Holborn, London.
The AGM of the GCCF commencing at midday.