



MINUTES

For the Meeting of the **BOARD OF DIRECTORS** **THE GOVERNING COUNCIL OF THE CAT FANCY**

Friday, 28 May 2021



Present: Mr Sean Farrell - Chair
Dr Peter Collin - Vice-Chair

Mrs Lynda Ashmore	Mr Steve Crow
Ms Samdra Devereux	Mrs Rosemary Fisher
Mr Thomas Goss	Mr John Hansson
Mrs Shelagh Heavens	Mrs Catherine Kaye
Mrs Jen Lacey	Mrs Elaine Robinson
Mrs Lisa Robinson-Talboys	Ms Lyndsey Robinson
Mr Peter Williams	

BD4091 MEETING INTRODUCTION

- 1. Apologies for absence.**
 - 1.1 There were apologies for absence from Mrs Hilary Dean, Mrs Heather McRae and the OM was on holiday. The Vice-Chair could only be present for a short time because of work commitments and John Hansson left the meeting about half way through.
 - 1.2 There was a delayed start because of a technical difficulty.
- 2. Chair's opening remarks**
 - 2.1 The meeting began at 11.28 am as the Chair welcomed those present, and thanked them for giving time to attend. He noted that there was a long agenda and asked people to be concise where possible. **INFO**

BD4092 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

- 1. The Minutes of the Board meeting of 23 April 2021**
 - 1.1 There was some discussion on the purpose of minutes and the format in which these should be presented. Opinion was given that if verbatim remarks were used, then all had a right to have their remarks on record. Others stated that it was sufficient to have brief summary to give the subject of each item with the outcome of the discussion and any action that needed to be taken.
 - 1.2 The Chair said he didn't wish for full or partial verbatim minutes taken from the tape because of the length, but Board members had a right to include remarks important to them. It was thought that initials should not be used within the minutes unless a Board member was giving a report or had made a particular request for a statement to be included.
 - 1.3 There was a request by a member to listen to the recording to check wording.
 - 1.4 It was agreed that a verbatim record of BD4085.3 should be published as a minute addendum as the summary could not be agreed.
 - 1.5 It was agreed the minutes could be published when these actions were complete.
Action: to be published on the website once finalised **JL/RF**
- 2. Matters arising from the previous Board minutes**
 - 2.1 BD4085.3 Those designated to bring forward an amended proposal had not had an opportunity to talk, but there had been discussion within the JASRG and wording drafted. It was agreed this should be brought to the next meeting, once finalised by those responsible for the action.
Action: finalisation of amended wording **SD/PW**
 - 2.2 BD4085.4.3 It was queried whether the version of the JAS on the website had been circulated to BACs so that they were aware of the renumbering. It was preferable for a 'word' version to be sent or made available to each, in addition to the master copy for reference as a pdf on the website. The present version needed updating with the amendment approved in March 2021, and a list of the clauses at the end where BACs could insert their own information was useful for new BACs and those updating their own master copy.
Action: update of the JAS and circulation to BAC Secretaries **JASRG**

BD4093 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 1.1 SD declared an interest in BD4099.5 as she could be affected by the decision made.
- 1.2 She did not comment in the discussion or take part in the vote. **INFO**

BD4094 FINANCE

- 1. The FC minutes of May 2021**
 - 1.1 These had been circulated to the Board after the FC meeting so that discussion and decisions could be referenced.
 - 1.2 There were no questions
- 2. The 2020 accounts**
 - 2.1 It was noted that the version circulated contained textual inaccuracies that had since been corrected.
 - 2.2 There were no comments or questions.

2.3 The Chair gave an update to inform that Monahans had now sent Albert Goodman the information required for completion. There had been a lengthy delay, but Monahans would not need to be contacted again.

Action: The 2020 accounts to be proposed for acceptance on the agenda of the July Council meeting JL

3. **Recommendations from the examiners to management**

3.1 The account examiners (Albert Goodman) had made seven recommendations with a 1-5 priority rating. These mostly concerned financial processes within the Office and had been discussed at length by FC (FC905.2)

3.2 AG would be informed what actions were to be taken and when these were completed.

3.3 There were no comments or questions from the Board.

INFO

4. **P/L to 30 April 2021**

4.1 The ytd profit was almost £61k, compared to £21.5K for the same period in 2020.

4.2 It was remarked that this was now because income had been considerably increased. Expenditure in the two previous months was slightly up on that for 2020.

INFO

5. **Volume graphs to illustrate core business**

5.1 Core business transactions had increased in all areas, which equated with the increase in income.

5.2 Transfers and imports were showing a significant increase.

INFO

6. **Report on investments & statement balances**

6.1 The figures were correct on the following as at 26.5.21 (as circulated to the Board the previous evening)

Aldermore £77,082.99, with a fixed interest of 0.55%, until March 2022 as rolled over.
(signatories SF, SC, RF, OM and the bookkeeper)

Cambridge & Counties £87,296.62, a 95 day notice account with 1% interest.
(signatories SF, SC, RF, OM and the bookkeeper)

Redwood NB The interest rate had dropped from 1.49% to 1%
£82,929.10, a 95 day notice account with 1.34% interest

(online access SF, RF and the OM and bookkeeper)

Redwood NB The interest rate was due to drop to 1.05% on 13.7.21.
Monmouthshire BS £84,000, an easy access account with 0.5% interest
(online access SF, RF, the OM and bookkeeper)

Shawbrook £80,000, 2 years fixed notice account with 0.85% interest
(signatories SF, RF, OM and the bookkeeper)

6.2 The figures were correct on the following as at 26.5.21 (as circulated to the Board the previous evening)

Lloyds (current) £215,894.47

Lloyds (Supreme) £957.95

Lloyds (Euro) €16,811.48 = £14,484.97 (exchange rate €1.11 to £1)

(signatories SF, SC, RF, SH the OM and the bookkeeper)

INFO

BD4095

BUSINESS ITEMS

1. **Arrangements for the Council meeting of July 2021 and the 2021 elections**

1.1 The Chair confirmed that the Council meeting would be in a video-conference format rather than as a webinar. It gave less control, but the viewing of speakers would be as requested by delegates.

1.2 The plan for the election process and its approximate timetable had been circulated with the quote from Civica. In response to the one query it was confirmed that the elections would take place after the actual meeting.

This would mean requests for club dispensation would be made at the meeting in the usual way.

Action: appointment of Civica and electoral arrangements

SF/OM

2. **Business Plan for 2021 - update**

2.1 PW reported he had one possible contact for a facilitator for a strategic meeting and he would be in discussion to enquire what could be provided and at what cost.

2.2 He now had more information on projects, particularly the investment in the website and plans for videos.

There were also new Terms of Reference for inclusion.

INFO

3. **News from Business partners and future possibilities**

3.1 The Chair reported that Purina were very anxious to to have discussions with GCCF, but no mutually convenient date had been found in May

3.2 He, and two Directors had held a meeting with Royal Canin. RC wished to discontinue the offer currently circulated with registration cards, but wished to invest in another project and continue to support the Supreme. Their emphasis was on health and support for educational videos on health and welfare had been discussed as a possibility.

3.3 It was queried whether the contract would include exclusivity, and comment made that no commitment should be in place until there had been discussion with Purina. It was hoped that eventually a deal could be done with both companies, with any exclusivity restricted to certain areas.

3.4 It was noted that RC had revamped its kitten packs for members of its breeder club, and possibly were trying to recover lost ground. Purina had links with KC and probably would want a connection with GCCF 's breeders. They were known to be supportive of breeders generally.

Action: discussions with both companies to compare and contrast what was on offer

SF

3.5 The Chair had discussed the proposals for a link with a microchip company and concluded that they had nothing to offer GCCF.

3.6 They had no unique selling plan that would attract GCCF breeders to use their product instead of the chips they were familiar with.

INFO

4. **Report from the ITG**
- 4.1 SC had circulated a written report and asked if there were any questions.
- 4.2 The inbreeding co-efficient resource was being trialled, but had experienced some initial problems. Once it was functioning smoothly, it was the intention to offer breeders a feature to look at the outcome for matings in addition to analysis of cats bred and/or owned.
- 4.3 There had been further discussion with NRG Digital on producing a commemorative video for 150 years of shows. Historic materials were being researched.
- 4.4 Talks continued with the New Zealand Cat Fancy on developing a system based on Phoenix for their registry.
Action: check on the modification of the NDA agreement for signing on behalf of an organisation SC
- 4.5 It was queried if progress was being made to mitigate the risk of the IT consultant leaving suddenly. SC reported that there had been investigations and discussions, but no final report as yet.
- 4.6 It was proposed by PW, seconded by SC that an honorarium of £500 should be offered to the volunteer producing the report if he could complete it quickly. It was agreed this payment should be made. (To ensure total impartiality, the chair did not participate in this discussion.)
- 4.7 The Chair reported that he expected the report before the next Board meeting, most probably within the next two weeks. **INFO**
5. **Website upgrade project -update**
- 5.1 RF summarised that the website specifications had been considered by four companies. Two could not fulfil the requirements and the other two had provided quotes.
- 5.2 3mil had provided a great deal more detail for the design and technical specifications. They also had a good track record as well as an established business, and had been recommended by a satisfied customer. The IT Group and Chair were satisfied with the responses to queries raised.
- 5.3 It was agreed that the specifications and answers to queries should be circulated to the Board with seven days provided for any further queries. If additional questions were answered satisfactorily, and no objections raised, then it was agreed 3mil would be awarded the contract. It was anticipated that they would begin construction of the new site in mid June.
Action: circulation as agreed RF
- 5.4 It was asked if there could be the facility for discussion forums within the site for specific groups such as show teams or judges. This wasn't within the spec, and opinion was given that this could be difficult and/or could be at an extra cost, but the query would be passed to the company.
- 5.5 The Chair thanked RF for the work she had put into this project.
Action: liaison with 3mil RF
6. **GCCF email addresses - feedback from testing**
- 6.1 Two of the Board members participating in the test had found it very easy to follow the instructions provided by Systemagic, make the connection and receive email. One was using a PC and the other an iPad and iPhone so different systems had been tested.
- 6.2 Two others had not been successful, but intended to consult Systemagic and ask for assistance. They would report back at the next meeting.
Action: liaison with Systemagic JL/SC
7. **Risk assessment - May 2021**
- 7.1 A reminder was given with the above item that the storage of business related information on personal computers by volunteers remained a GDPR risk requiring mitigation.
Action: further discussion with the ITG SC
- 7.2 The risk of sudden loss of the IT consultant with mitigation as described at 4.5-4.7 above.
- 7.3 The Chair reported that the volunteer producing the report being made to mitigate the risk of the IT consultant leaving suddenly, had identified in the exploratory investigations that the IT Agreement with Systemagic in February 2014, had not been updated to include the backups, as agreed (and started) via email in August 2019. This had been rectified.
- 7.4 The financial risks identified were in process of mitigation as recorded at BD4094.3 & FC905.2. **INFO**

BD4096 CLUB & BAC MATTERS

1. **Report on the 2020 club returns - update on paperwork received by 1st May deadline**
- 1.1 SH noted that club numbers were listed for Board information, and it could be seen that quite a few had used their 2019 membership as had been permitted. In cases where this had not been done it could be seen that some club numbers had fallen, as could be expected in a pandemic year with no shows, but others had had notable increases.
- 1.2 Four clubs had made no contact by 1 May 2021, and there were an additional two (Southern Counties and Croydon CC) that also had their 2019 club returns outstanding. However, three of the four had responded to further prompting.
- 1.3 The figures for money held by clubs, together with the profit and loss details of their club and show accounts had also been circulated. The 2019 total showed clubs held a little over £1.6 million, although some clubs had gained and others lost.
- 1.4 2020 totals weren't supplied, as not all had been received, but it anticipated they would be slightly lower, though one cause of this would be the fact that some clubs had closed.
2. **Clubs with extensions/queries - update and consideration**
- 2.1 Six clubs (four hoping to send delegates to Council) had sent apologies for lateness, and were given an extension. Three remained outstanding, and it was anticipated they would complete. Two others had sent paperwork with unexamined accounts.
- 2.2 Two who had not yet had their 2019 or 2020 accounts examined had been told their returns were required for both years to be considered complete and signed off.

2.3 Three clubs (one wanting delegate representation) had sent paperwork that was received just after the deadline, but was complete.

3. **Listing on the Council agenda of clubs with extensions and requesting dispensation**

(JH left the meeting 1.45pm approx)

3.1 Those requiring dispensation because their membership number was below that which gave delegate entitlement would be listed as usual.

3.2 The clubs giving notice of lateness, but who had completed and paid by the time of the meeting were also eligible to request continued delegate representation, but by the terms of the temporary Byelaw provision in March could not stand for election to the board or FC.

3.3 SH proposed, seconded by PW, that the clubs who were late with paperwork and did not notify the Office of problems until after 1 May should be treated in the same way as those that did comply with the Byelaw regarding notification as they weren't regularly late in sending their returns. There was thought that the Board would be acting contrary to ByeLaw 5 (3) to treat the two groups of clubs in the same way.

3.4 The proposal was amended to inform Council that the clubs concerned needed dispensation, but had not complied with the terms of the ByeLaw this year. This was agreed by a majority. JL, ER, LR abstained.

Action: applications for dispensation to be listed on the Council agenda in 3 groups

JL

3.5 LRT proposed a large vote of thanks to SH which was unanimously agreed.

4. **Turkish Van CC - request for help**

4.1 The TVCC had not completed its returns, because the treasurer listed on the GCCF system had not responded, and the club's new treasurer had not received any information from her. Assistance had been requested.

4.2 Action on this had been determined at the FC meeting (FC906.3) and a letter agreed by the committee had been sent from the Office to the Turkish Van CC Secretary.

INFO

5. **Chartreux Cat Club UK - response to the Board**

5.1 A letter had been sent by the Treasurer in response to the Board's suggestion and an offer made from the SHCS. He wished the Chartreux breeders to retain control of their policies and SOP, and hoped to keep the Chartreux CC UK active with a new officers and committee members. Shortly before the Board meeting he named others who were willing to be committee members.

5.2 It was agreed that the club had to be given a chance to manage its affairs.

5.3 A new bank account had not yet been set up, but most of the club's funds (£1,000) had been transferred for safekeeping to GCCF as the Board had requested, until the club had its own account in compliance with the club's rules.

INFO

6. **BAC returns - update on paperwork received**

6.1 Most BACs had supplied returns and the four still to make contact would be chased. There had been a brief discussion in Finance (FC906.5) which confirmed those that were outstanding.

6.2 It was noted by FC that the Singapura BAC had been dissolved, but SH had had conversation with a club representative who confirmed that it was in abeyance until such time as it was required. The clubs had withdrawn nearly all of the accumulated funds, but the two clubs had agreed to share any future costs.

6.3 It was agreed that the clubs should be reminded that the BAC would need to reconvene to look after the Singapura FJPs on the Accelerated Scheme. Board members in that position confirmed they had heard nothing before the pandemic, but would expect to once shows recommenced.

Action: the BAC to be reminded of its responsibilities from the Board with the JASRG copied in

JL

7. **Judge Appointment Scheme revisions re Finance**

7.1 Withdrawn as to be further discussed by FC (FC906.6) to consider if amendments were practical.

Action: referral to the September FC agenda

JL

8. **Siamese Cat JAC - notification of amendments to the SCJAC's JAS constitution**

8.1 The SC JAC had given notice that it was amending its JAS in respect of 7fi) and 7h. In future each club would send one representative to meetings who would have one vote.

8.2 It was agreed this was matter for the SCJAC, no approval was required. They would be thanked for information.

Action: Letter of acknowledgement

JL

BD4097 STAFF & OFFICE

1. **Staff report**

1.1 The Chair gave an update on confidential HR matters.

1.2 It wasn't known exactly when a staff member's maternity leave would begin. The OM would update on this.

1.3 The two newest staff members were settling in well, and learning the job.

2. **An update on the Office building and equipment**

2.1 Trademarks had been requested for the GCCF and Breeder Scheme logos. It was expected they would be received around the beginning of July.

INFO

BD4098 JUDGE APPOINTMENT SCHEME REVIEW GROUP (Previously Judge Training Review Group)

1. **Meeting report**

1.1 There had been a meeting on 9 May, and the minutes of this would be confirmed at the next meeting scheduled for 6 June. One planned for the 23 May had been cancelled.

- 1.2 KK reported that a short time had been spent on the 'Discussion Paper' issued by the Judges' Guild, as confirmed by the JG Secretary. It needed to be clarified that this was nothing to do with the JASRG.
- 1.3 There had also been further consideration of the TOR for the group and how it could be opened to obtain and encourage additional input, plus further discussion on the wording of the proposal to Council re clarification of clause 14 of the Accelerated Scheme.
- 1.4 However, most time had been given to revisiting what had been proposed in the past, via the flow charts produced, with the conclusion that progress should be made to judge training by Grand Group or Section, with multi-choice on-line testing playing an important part. These would cover subjects such as GCCF procedures and protocols, genetics, health and breed specific issues. It was expected that the BACs would play a significant part in formulating relevant questions.
- 1.5 Ahead of this the process for driving delivery had to be defined, and another look would be taken at the stewarding scheme.
- 1.6 In response to a question KK confirmed that she would be responsible for issuing any communication from the JASRG to ensure there was no confusion in future.
- 1.7 It was requested that JASRG information should be published on the GCCF website, and FB page, and not on any personal FB pages. Others requested emails, and the Chair noted that these could be targeted to individuals or groups.

INFO

2. Proposal for Council - an amendment to clause 14 of the accelerated Scheme re tutorials

- 2.1 KK confirmed that originally it was intended that the certificate classes should be from the FJP's book. However, this had been misunderstood by a few and after considerable discussion it had been agreed that the classes could be from the either the FJP's book or that of the tutor judge.
- 2.2 It had been raised in the March Council meeting that this was a substantive change that Council should discuss, rather than a clarification (C2308.1.8), and the proposed wording was presented to go forward, as requested.
- 2.3 Comment made by Board members centred on the fact that judging certificate classes, and making awards based on that assessment, was substantially different from shadow judging another judge's classes and having a discussion. It was thought to be a more rigorous process, and no one present supported the change.

Action: the wording to be on the agenda for the July Council meeting

JL

BD4099

SHOW MATTERS

1. Report from the Show Review Group

- 1.1 LR had circulated a report on the evening before the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair reported that one of the things the SRG had thought was quite urgent was to put to Council a means by which vetting-in could be done differently, because it was possible there would not be sufficient vets in in the post-pandemic situation. The proposed wording (a note to the rules at Section 2:13a) was read:
In exceptional circumstances, as determined by the Board, show management may vary the rule relating to the examination of exhibits prior to entry of the show hall. Should such unprecedented circumstances be declared by the Board, formal vetting-in procedures may be dispensed with and replaced by spot checks carried out in a manner to be decided by the show manager. In such situations a minimum of 30% of all exhibits must be examined by a veterinary surgeon. However, all exhibits' veterinary cards must be examined. In the event that no veterinary surgeon can be engaged then the show manager may appoint a person or persons to officiate. (Refer also to Section 2:13n and Section 5:10).
- 1.3 The Chair commented that this was an extension to rules that already existed (if a vet was unavailable) and the availability of vets for shows was currently unknown. This allowed a move forward with shows in that eventuality.
- 1.4 It was observed that the Veterinary Officer was aiming to conduct a survey of vets and it would be useful to have that information ahead of a definite decision.
- 1.5 The Chair said the intention was that the wording should be circulated to the Board and he planned to take a vote on endorsement at the next Board meeting. It was agreed it should be shared with the VAC for comment.

**Actions: circulation to the Board
inclusion on the July Council agenda**

**KK
JL**

- 1.6 It was asked that all SRG information should be accessible on GCCF website and FB page, and not on people's personal pages. It was confirmed that all the information was there, as requested.
- 1.7 It was requested that statistics from all 59 All Breed shows of a show year should be listed when considering class amalgamation, rather than about 60% as it would be a sensitive issue and need as much data as possible to support plans for change.
- 1.8 There was some discussion at this point on relevant information being available at the Office or on the system and it was necessary to be able to access it. There was general consensus that more staff were needed. It was requested that an HR meeting be arranged as soon as was practical.

Action: consideration of an HR meeting

Chair

(The Vice-Chair joined the meeting)

2. Response on disinfectants from the VAC & proposal that GCCF should bulk buy

- 2.1 The VAC's response to a question from the SRG to the active ingredients of a disinfectant was that its effectiveness depended on the quantity of each ingredient and how they reacted with each other rather than a list of main ingredients wouldn't be that useful
- 2.2 The VAC's recommendation was that Safe4 should be used as it was safe for animals, but effective against the particular feline viruses that circulated at shows, plus corona viruses, human and feline. Anigene was equally effective, but needed to dry to be active, and was not recommended as hand sanitiser. Safe4 did not have these disadvantages. However, it was more expensive, but it was suggested that GCCF should fund bulk purchase for the penning companies so the cost did not fall on show committees.

2.3 PC thought the use of alcohol wipes should be considered, along with weak solutions of bleach. A possible compromise would be using Safe4 for the pens and tables and alcohol wipes for hands

Action: report back to the VAC for consideration on all points

SC

3. **Review of the date for the re-start of GCCF shows in 2021**

3.1 It was observed that it was not yet 21 June, and TICA had held a show successfully that was Covid compliant for venue and local Council regulations. Therefore it was time for GCCF to reconsider.

3.2 It was considered that clubs and their show managers could possibly be given the go ahead as long as:

a) it was clear that in each case this was their own decision for which they took all responsibility

b) there should be strict adherence to national and local regulations remaining in force

c) it would be necessary to make arrangements with the venue for covid-compliance,

d) no show manager should feel pressured into holding a show

3.3 The Vice-Chair stated that in his opinion it was too soon. It was too early to tell whether the spread of variants would have a serious impact as this was only just showing an increase in the number of cases. He urged caution as there were a number of unknowns.

3.4 It was stated that the intention would be to lift the ban on use of a show licence from a certain date. It was not an instruction that shows should take place, as to hold a show would have to be the responsibility of a club's show team who had considered what the regulations required of them, and whether putting on a show would be practical and financially viable for them.

(The Vice-Chair left the meeting)

3.5 PW proposed, SC seconded that 1 August should be the date of lifting the ban and the conditions of this (as listed at 3.2) and the responsibility for financial viability would rest with each club.

This was approved with two abstentions, ER & LR.

LRT wished it on record that she was prepared for the date to be 21 June (subject to government restrictions being lifted on that day as planned).

3.6 It was requested that any announcement should carry a statement of support for show managers who chose not to put on show for any reason. This was agreed.

Action: Preparation and circulation of the announcement

JL

4. **The GCCF show event to celebrate 150 years of cat showing**

4.1 LA reported that it had been extremely difficult to find a venue for the end of October. However, Stoneleigh Park was available for 13 & 14 August and LA proposed going with those dates.

4.2 There was concern that allowing a date change for the GCCF's own show while not letting clubs change dates would not be liked. However, it was pointed out that these were exceptional circumstances and it was GCCF leading the way back to shows with an event that would be different from the Supreme. It was known that the date was not wanted by the club that usually held a show at that time.

4.3 It was thought it should be made clear exactly what the show was going to look like if it was to be something completely different. It should not be the perception that this was a 'Supreme alternative'.

4.4 LA responded that there were plans, but nothing definite, as until she had the date and venue confirmed, and had an idea of the approximate number of cats that could be taken, it was impossible to specify detail. However, it would most probably be a certificate show, as it would need to be to be attractive to exhibitors. There was an idea suggested that the certificates could be made special in some way.

4.5 It was thought it would be different from other shows, and there would be no other event like it. Therefore this was not a reason to allow other shows to change their dates.

4.6 A vote to go ahead with the show on the chosen date at the available venue was proposed by KK, 2nd PW.

This was approved by a majority with abstentions from SH, ER, LR, LRT.

LRT wished it to be on record that she had asked about allowing clubs to apply for a date change, and it had been decided that there would be no other changes allowed.

SH wished it recorded that her abstention was because she did not know enough about the type of show it would be and what plans had been discussed.

Actions: statement preparation

JL

circulation to the Board of an outline plans for the show in about 3 weeks

LA

5. **A request that all Full Judges of Siamese become Full Judges of Foreign Whites**

5.1 This had been submitted by the Siamese Cat JAC. There were no comments or objections from the Board and it was approved by a majority with SD abstaining (BD4093).

5.2 This to be noted for delegate information on the Judge Appointment list on the website, and the judge records updated on the system

Action: list and record update

JL

5.3 It was queried why a name was on the website list of someone not a judge and noted that stewards could be listed (W). The Maine Coon BAC was the only BAC that had requested use of this facility.

INFO

6. **To request the merging of the Siamese and Foreign White lists**

6.1 This had also been requested by the SCJAC, and the Board had no objections.

6.2 There was a vote for approval which was carried with two abstentions, PW, SD.

Action: to be on the agenda for the July Council

JL

7. **The 150th Anniversary of shows - virtual event**

7.1 The Chair informed the Board that plans for this were going ahead as Carol Walker had agreed to be the Show Manager

7.2 She had requested £10 to upgrade the website for entries which he had agreed.

7.3 A report on the meeting had been circulated and the Board had no questions or comment.

INFO

BD4100 REGISTRATION, TRANSFERS & SOP ITEMS

1. **Amendments to the Russian registration policy**
 - 1.1 The Russian BAC had submitted a proposal for amendments to their registration policy. The accompanying rationale explained that that most of the revisions were made to remove anomalies identified by Mrs Turner-Russell to enable the policy to operate smoothly on the system. There were also some small changes to comply with the GCCF's outcrossing policy.
 - 1.2 The amendments were approved with two abstentions, KK and LRT.

Action to be on the electronic agenda **JL**

2. **Feedback from the Norwegian Forest BAC on Noynarock registrations**
 - 2.1 The BAC had expressed concern on the notification of falsified pedigrees, and queried whether other registries had been informed.
 - 2.2 It had no additional information to give at this time, but would let the Board have any substantiated information that came to it in the future.
 - 2.3 It was observed that the Board and BAC were in a similar position. Both had suspicions of inaccuracies in addition to those proved in DC, but were unable to act without definite evidence. **INFO**

3. **Application for the transfer of a cat from a deceased breeder**
 - 3.1 It was confirmed that the breeder was known to have died recently, and for some time prior to that she had been in a home and out of contact, although the cat's owner and GCCF had tried to get in touch.
 - 3.2 The cat had been registered by the breeder with active status after she had been sold to the new owner.
 - 3.3 It was agreed unanimously that the transfer should be made as requested.

4. **Application for the transfer of a pet cat from a suspended breeder**
 - 4.1 There was a recommendation from IC that a cat should be transferred with non-active status from a suspended breeder to a new owner, as the registration was in progress prior to the breeder's suspension for a reason not associated with this owner.
 - 4.2 It was agreed unanimously that the transfer should be made as requested.

Action: The applicants (3 & 4) to be informed **JL/Office**

5. **Prefixes for approval**
 - 5.1 The prefix list had been circulated and one addition was on the agenda.
 - 5.2 It was noted that the first three choices of one applicant should be considered without the hyphen.
 - 5.3 The list of prefixes was agreed with one abstention, LRT.

Action: the prefix applicants to be informed **Office**

BD4101 HEALTH & WELFARE

1. **Rule changes re the certificate of entirety**
 - 1.1 The Board was asked if members were satisfied with the wording for the proposal to go forward to Council. The amendments had come from IC and the VAC (separately). No changes were suggested, and it was agreed unanimously it should go to Council.
 - 1.2 There was a query on whether the requirement for the male to be at least six months old at the time of the examination would apply to exports, with the response that it was proposed in the current welfare bill to go to parliament by 2022 that puppies and kittens would need to be at least six months prior to travel so it would be applicable, but breeders would not be exporting prior to that age anyway.

Action: to be on the agenda for the July Council **JL**

2. **Update on the website publicity on kitten buying and any other advertising**
 - 2.1 RF reported that video was now complete (received the previous evening) and the Chair had seen it. She would send a link to view to other Board members, as the file had proved too large to email.
 - 2.2 The Chair commented that he thought it was excellent, and thanked RF for her work.

Action: circulation to the Board for comment **RF**

3. **Report from the Breeder Scheme Group meetings & survey proposal**
 - 3.1 PW reported that the BSG had come to the end of its investigation process and concluded it was not fit for purpose in that it was currently subjective and accepting of applicant's statements without substantiation.
 - 3.2 The Kennel club's Assured Breeder Scheme had been considered and was liked for its objectivity, with fixed criteria for acceptance that were validated via an independent inspection. It was planned to introduce something similar.
 - 3.3 A survey had been put together to get opinions from all on what was wanted from a Breeder Scheme and the responses would be influential in determining what the requirements for membership should be.
 - 3.4 It was queried whether existing members of the BS would remain on it, and confirmed that was the intention, but when the revised scheme came into operation they would be expected to prove they complied with the criteria and this would be subject to inspection.
 - 3.5 An application for membership that had been in process, but delayed, was considered. It was agreed that it should be deferred as it did not comply with the current requirements for high standards in breeding practice. The cats used for breeding were closely related, and one had been bred from three times in little over a year.

Action: a letter to the applicant to explain the reasons for non acceptance **JL**

4. **Updates from DEFRA, the Canine & Feline Sector Group and/or other groups**

4.1 SC had circulated a report and gave dates for meetings planned.

4.2 The Welfare Report covered the proposed legislation planned for late 2021-early 2022, which would include the import age as well as compulsory microchipping for cats. Details of this were not yet announced.

4.3 The maximum prison term for animal cruelty had been raised from six months to five years.

4.4 Charities had reported the reselling of unwanted dogs and cats via websites, rather than them being placed for rehoming, and there was also concern that there were young animals being bought from breeders so that they could be resold for a profit. **INFO**

BD4102 DISCIPLINARY MATTERS

1. **Rules of The Ocicat Club - response from IC**

1.1 A short response from IC had been received which was simply to endorse the Board's original suggestion that the club should use GCCF's generic breed club rules.

1.2 The club had not given any comment on the rules, but had queried why it should have to do this when there had been no action against it.

1.3 Board members asked for a timeline of the events of this action as it was some time since IC had initially referred it. It was also felt a statement from IC on why they had reached the conclusion that resulted in them making contact with the Board to give the recommendation would be useful. The matter could be considered in depth when this information was available.

Action: request to IC further for information and deferment to the June agenda

JL

2. **Response from IC re finance**

2.1 IC had acknowledged the Board's letter following the last meeting and would give the matter consideration.

2.2 The Chair reported that he had been made aware of IC contact with the Office to request that matters involving suspended breeders directed to the Board should be appraised by IC first in case that committee had relevant information. He was of the opinion that the Board could refer to IC for information if it was felt that it was needed, and IC had no remit to intervene otherwise, nor to recommend changes in Office practice. He requested Board endorsement for this decision and it was given unanimously.

3. **Publication of DC meeting dates -response**

3.1 The IC/DC secretary had published the date of the May DC meeting with a brief note of the subject of each case. She had queried whether the minutes should be published.

3.2 It was thought in their present form they contained information that could be challenged as a GDPR breach. It was accepted there had been no request for their publication. **INFO**

BD4103 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Board members informed the Chair that during the course of the meeting the May News from the GCCF Office had been circulated. It had not been seen by the Board in advance for approval and now was very much out of date because of decisions taken at the meeting. The Chair promised to address the issues with the Office on the next working day. He thought an update to the newsletter should be issued on 1 June. JL was asked to draft this in conjunction with the OM.

Attention was drawn to an OU paper on strategic business decisions. It was thought it could contain useful information and the Board could work through it when planning. PW and SD would look at this further.

DATE & TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Friday, 25 June 2021 at 11am

The meeting finished at 3.57pm.