



MINUTES

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

Friday, 25 June 2021



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

Mrs Lynda Ashmore	Mr Steve Crow
Mrs Hilary Dean	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	

BD4104 MEETING INTRODUCTION

1. **Apologies for absence.**

1.1 There were apologies for absence from Ms Sarndra Devereux and the OM was on annual leave.
The Vice-Chair could only be present for part of the meeting because of work commitments.

2. **Chair's opening remarks**

2.1 The meeting began at 11.06 am as the Chair welcomed those present. He believed that on this occasion it would be a relatively short meeting and hoped to finish before 3pm.

INFO

BD4105 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

1. **The Minutes of the Board meeting of 28 May 2021**

1.1 These had been circulated and some corrections and amendments made.

1.2 A correction was made to the time the Vice-Chair left the meeting.

1.3 The minutes were approved unanimously as proposed by CK and seconded by SC.

Action: to be published on the website

JL/RF

2. **Matters arising from the previous Board minutes**

2.1 BD4092.2.2 HD confirmed that the last circulation to BAC Secretaries to include all updates to the Judge Appointment scheme had taken place in October 2020.

2.2 BD4101.3.5 The Breeder Scheme applicant had not accepted that she had not gained approval. She had continued to write to the Office and had recently asked for all records relating to her personal data and information via a Subject Access Request (SAR). There were 40 days to make a response to this and the Chair reported that the IC/DC Secretary had begun work on it, with legal support.

INFO

BD4106 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

INFO

BD4107 FINANCE

1. **P/L to 31 May 2021**

1.1 The ytd profit was just over £83K an increase of over £40K when compared to the same period in 2020.

1.2 It was observed that once again this was because of a significant increase in income from core business.

Expenditure was significantly above that for May 2020 due to the rise in salary costs and to an increase in IC/DC legal fees.

1.3 It was agreed a check should be made with the bookkeeper to see if more detail could be given on this month's legal costs, and the hourly rate for advice should also be queried.

Action: queries to be put to the bookkeeper and responses circulated

JL

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

2.1 There had been an increase in core business overall of 15% approx to the previous year, and the comparison graphs reflected this.

2.2 Registrations and import figures had risen, but transfers had grown significantly by 30%.

INFO

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

3.1 The figures were correct on the following as at 24.6.21 (as circulated to the Board the previous day)

Aldermore	£77,119.00, with a fixed interest of 0.55%, until March 2022 as rolled over. (signatories SF, SC, RF, and the bookkeeper)
-----------	--

Cambridge & Counties	£88,369.87, a 95 day notice account with 1% interest. (signatories SF, SC, RF, OM and the bookkeeper)
----------------------	--

Redwood	The interest rate had dropped from 1.49% to 1% £83,023.60 a 95 day notice account with 1.34% interest (online access SF, RF and the OM and bookkeeper)
---------	--

NB	The interest rate was due to drop to 1.05% on 13.7.21. Monmouthshire BS £84,227.84, 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)
- 3.2 The figures were correct on the following as at 24.5.21 (as circulated to the Board the previous day)
- | | |
|------------------|------------------------|
| Lloyds (current) | £250,450.94 |
| Lloyds (Supreme) | £950.95 |
| Lloyds (Euro) | €17,352.28= £14,903.44 |
- (signatories SF, SC, RF, SH the OM and the bookkeeper)
- 3.3 RF was thanked for her presentation of these figures. INFO

4. Review of 2021 budget

- 4.1 At the February Board meeting it had been thought sensible to consider the budget midway through the year as there were many unknowns at the time due to the pandemic.
- 4.2 It was commented that FC could have given an in depth opinion at its May meeting to make recommendations to the Board in June, and that this should be done if necessary in 2022.
- 4.3 The Board considered that although IC/DC spending was greater than planned there was no special need to make adjustments to the budget. There were no large amounts of unexpected spending and income was greater than anticipated at this point in the year.

Action: referral to the FC September agenda

JL

BD4108

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 by Zoom-Pro. An assessment would be made of how well this worked.
- 1.2 There was a discussion on the position of delegates for clubs that required some form of dispensation. At an actual meeting they would wait at the side of the hall until this was decided and only then collect their voting papers and take a seat.
- 1.3 It was reported that this could not be replicated for the online meeting. These delegates would be admitted and not expected to vote until dispensation was granted. As voting was anonymous it would only be seen from the total number whether there had been compliance. The Chair confirmed that this was not ideal, but the best that could be arranged. He did not anticipate problems. INFO

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 was satisfied that the projects for the year were now being actioned. INFO

3. Reports on news from Business partners and future possibilities

- 3.1 The Chair reported that in the past month discussions had taken place with both Royal Canin and Purina. Both had shown some interest in collaboration and neither had demanded total exclusivity.
- 3.2 RC had shown some interest in continued sponsorship of the Supreme and did expect exclusive rights in the event in return for that. They had withdrawn vouchers with kitten registration, and although suggesting a sum in support of breeders that could be spent on a project of choice, had not given a definite on any suggestion mentioned.
- 3.3 Purina had seemed more positive and responsive to suggestions of the possibility of sponsorship for the commemorative video, support for shows and breeder/owner education.
- 3.4 RC had been asked to provide back cover advert for the new GCCF booklet, but as there had not been a response Purina would be asked. There was also mention of that company's 'new puppy' emails with information and advice for new owners, and the possibility of something similar for kitten owners would be discussed.

Action: discussions with both food companies to continue

SF

- 3.5 It was reported that the relationship with Agria continued to be positive as there was benefit from the increase in kitten sales and transfers. INFO

- 3.6 'Petpath' had recently made contact with the Chair. He would circulate information, but was not confident that what they had to offer would be of benefit to GCCF.

Action: a discussion on the information supplied to be on the agenda for the next meeting.

JL

4. Report from the ITG

- 4.1 SC had circulated a written report that had been sent out with the Council agenda. This had summarised the work of the past few months, including the inbreeding co-efficient, an update and the website and registration policy projects and commissioning of videos.
- 4.2 It was noted at the meeting that the New Zealand Cat Fancy had now signed non-disclosure agreements and a test database would shortly be released to them.
- 4.3 Earlier that morning the Chair had circulated specifications produced by Andrew Barton for IT support. These scoped out what was required to be in place for the operation of Phoenix should the IT consultant be suddenly unavailable. Ian Macro had had the opportunity to review these prior to Board circulation.
- 4.4 The next action was to find technical support companies who would be interested in submitting a tender. It was noted that AB could probably give a name, and expected that IM would have contacts. It could also be mentioned on the GCCF website. Companies that expressed an interest would be vetted for their potential as it was thought that full estimates would need to be paid for due to the amount of work involved.

Action: finding and assessing suitable companies to obtain tenders

ITG

- 4.5 It was commented that this was work that was vitally important to GCCF's stability and therefore swift action was required, and it would be money well spent. INFO

5. **Website upgrade project - update**
 - 5.1 On the previous afternoon RF had circulated a report that gave a project update.
 - 5.2 There had been a meeting with 3mil on 16 June to discuss the project aims, particularly in relation to the the different users of the site. Persona profiles had been drafted.
 - 5.3 Feedback had also been provided on preferences for imagery, fonts and layout.
 - 5.4 There would be access to a royalty free photo library, but there would also need to be liaison with show photographers for additional pictures.
 - 5.5. The next meeting was scheduled for w/c 28 June which would be a focussed discussion on home page visuals.

Action: continued liaison with 3mil **RF**

6. **GCCF email addresses - feedback from testing**
 - 6.1 Both Board members who had not been successful in getting access to a GCCF email address had intended to contact Systemagic, but had not yet done so
 - 6.2 There were mixed reports from others using a GCCF email address on the level of difficulty.
 - 6.3 It was also observed that the Code of Conduct was not thought suitable for use on a privately owned computer. This had made others decide not to engage in the project.

Action: liaison with Systemagic **JL/SC**

7. **Risk assessment - June 2021**
 - 7.1 The risk of sudden loss of the IT consultant with mitigation as described at 4.4-4.5 above.

Action: specifications to go to tender **ITG**

 - 7.2 Depletion of staff numbers - with additional problems in the coming months due to a maternity leave and the restart of shows

Action: HR Group meeting planned for the coming week following the OM's return - preparation **JL**

BD4109 CLUB & BAC MATTERS

1. **Update on the 2020 club returns and Council representation**
 - 1.1 SH reported that one more club had submitted examined returns for 2020. Kensington CC was now eligible to be listed on the supplementary agenda, with other clubs that had had an extension granted, and they would also need dispensation for having a membership that was below 100 (80).
 - 1.2 Three other clubs with extensions had not yet sent paperwork (Scottish CC, Edinburgh & East of Scotland CC & the Old-Style Siamese CC). The Nor' East of Scotland had sent accounts for 2019 and 2020 that had not been examined and the Abyssinian CA was wanting a delegate, but had sent no paperwork. All had just under three weeks to meet the requirements.
 - 1.3 Nothing more had been heard from the Southern Counties & Croydon CCs, the Oriental LH Breed Group and the Toyger Group (provisional).
 - 1.4 Ulster Siamese and All Breed CC had given notification of problems and would be late finalising, but were not wanting a delegate.

Action: details forwarded for the Council agenda if any other club meets its requirements **SH**

 - 1.5 It was noted that there had been no news from the Turkish Van Cat Club. **INFO**

2. **Update on the BAC returns**
 - 2.1 Three BACs still had outstanding returns: Snowshoe, Sphynx and Suffolk.
 - 2.2 All had responded to prompts and were intending to sort out any problems.
 - 2.3 One of the two Singapura clubs had made a response to the letter sent on the status of the BAC to inform that it had not been the intention to dissolve it, though it was inactive. **INFO**

3. **The Ocicat Club - rules and disciplinary procedure**
 - 3.1 IC had requested that the Board give careful consideration to the Rules and Disciplinary Procedure of The Ocicat Club to examine how these differed from the GCCF's generic club rules.
 - 3.2 It was noted that although TOC rules made reference to GCCF at various points they did not have a clause that specifically bound the club to the rules and disciplinary powers of the Council as was a requirement for GCCF membership in the ByeLaws (4:2), and stated in the generic rules at section 11.
 - 3.3 It was considered that this correction had to be made, and that if carried out there would be no need for TOC to have a separate lengthy disciplinary procedure. The process set out in the generic rules at clause 2 (c-f) was sufficient.
 - 3.4 2diii) of the generic rules gave members who were disciplined access to arbitration via the GCCF Appeals Committee, which was known to have been a cause of contention, which would operate effectively if the club was bound by GCCF's disciplinary powers. Arbitration via the the Committee of TOC (3xvi) could not be impartial if the committee itself, or any member of it, was involved in any dispute with another committee or club member. Arbitration and appeals needed to be conducted independently.
 - 3.5 These were the major points, but it was thought that while TOC was giving consideration to its rules it could make specific provision for electronic meetings (committee, AGM, and SGM) and electronic circulation of paperwork, particularly in respect of inquorate AGMs, (7b ix) of the generic rules). It would also be useful for it to have a rule, as some other clubs had, giving the committee power to manage the club's business in any eventuality not covered by the rules (generic rules 5h). This had proved useful in the pandemic, enabling a committee to be flexible with arranging meetings and elections.
 - 3.6 The intention stated within the 'Aims and Objects' of the club at (v) needed to be brought up to date with reference to GCCF rules on the selling of kittens.
 - 3.7 It was agreed that The Ocicat Club should be given the option of rectifying and updating its own rules, or adopting the GCCF's generic rules (modified as required), by the time of the club's returns in 2022. Board approval of the rules submitted at that time would be necessary for continued GCCF membership.

Actions: a letter containing these points to be circulated for Board approval
an approved letter to be sent to TOC **JL**

1. **Staff report**

- 1.1 Some discussion on Office staffing had taken place within the budget review. Concern had been expressed that as one member of staff had left and another would be taking maternity leave the Office would not have sufficient trained staff to continue functioning efficiently once shows restarted.
- 1.2 There was some debate on the usefulness of temporary staff. It was agreed that this would be discussed by HR and it was an OM decision on whether temporary or permanent staff should be engaged, but agreed that support should be given if additional staff were required.
- 1.3 There was concern expressed that one of the probationers engaged in 2020 had not been given a permanent position, but there had been no prior indication that she was failing in the job. It was queried whether both of those appointed more recently were successful, and agreed HR should consider a fast-track dismissal if it became quickly apparent any newly appointed employee was not suited to the job.
- 1.4 It was queried if steps had been taken to determine why a Newsletter had been circulated in May without Board approval. The Chair confirmed it had been made clear this should not have happened. It was agreed that the process to be written into the staff manual was that the Newsletter should be circulated prior to publication with a date (7 days later) by which any amendments or objections should be received. The onus had to be on Board members rather than Office staff to make contact by the stated date.,

Notification of the protocol to the OM & staff**SF**2. **An update on the Office building and equipment**

- 2.1 The trademarks that had been requested for the GCCF and Breeder Scheme logos had been published online at the beginning of June. In the absence of opposition it was expected they would be approved two months later. If there were objections another month would be needed.

INFO1. **Report from the Show Review Group**

- 1.1 LR had circulated a report the day before the meeting. This summarised the proposals received except those that clubs had taken directly to the Council meeting.
- 1.2 She reported that confirmation had been received from the VAC that the recommendation for show disinfectant was Safe4. New dispensers would be required and the SRG recommended that the initial outlay for both disinfectant and the equipment should be responsibility of GCCF as this would help all of the clubs.
- 1.3 There had been an SRG meeting with a member of the SNAP group to discuss seven suggestions. Some of these already existed as options for SMs (eg. in respect of miscellaneous classes & judge allocation) and others were considered not really practical (eg. a split show day would prove difficult for Olympian classes and require extra pen cleaning).
- 1.4 There was agreement on judges being able to sign two certificates towards a title, and removal of restrictions on judges taking engagements within certain geographical areas within three months and there had also been discussion on the Best of Breed (possibly replaced with a points system) and Best of Variety awards.
- 1.5 Data had now been collected from 42 all Breed Shows which it was thought gave a broader picture. It was suggested there should now be BAC input, as BACs would have ideas on what would work within their own sections and be seen as fair.
- 1.6 It was noted that although there had been a lot of discussion on social media it had resulted in very few actual proposals, particularly as some suggestions did not need rule changes, and those in respect of Covid were more to do with the positioning and organisation of people than show rules.
- 1.7 The Chair had made enquiries on purchasing Safe4 and the required square sanitiser dispensers for the three penning companies (150 in total). The cost would be around £1960. SC proposed, CK seconded, that a budget of £2,500 be set for purchase. This was unanimously agreed. It was noted that the logistics of distributing to the penning companies from a central delivery point would need to be worked out.

Action: arrangements to be made with the disinfectant company**Chair**2. **Proposal to Council for Board endorsement on spot checks for vetting-in**

- 2.1 The Veterinary Officer had sent a statement to Council and to the Board expressing opposition to the introduction of spot checks as proposed by the SRG. It was observed that from the comments made the VO seemed to think that the proposal would be put to Council and, if agreed, it would be implemented immediately. Its introduction would actually be dependent on a Board vote to allow show management to use it.
- 2.2 Opinion was given that if the proposal was amended to include 'in consultation with' or 'in conjunction with' with the VAC there would be a better chance of approval in Council for whenever it needed to be used. Ultimately, the Board did not have to take the opinion of its advisory committees, but it would need a very good reason why it was not doing so and be held to account for this by Council.
- 2.3 There was comment on whether vets would be insured to vet in at shows. The VO had stated that vets she had contacted were looking forward to being at shows, but the number she had spoken to and whether they would be in a position to attend was unknown.
- 2.4 It was thought the proposal could be put in an amended form with 'in consultation with the VAC' added and 'vaccination certificates' substituted for 'vet cards'.
- 2.5 There was thought there should be further consultation with the VAC in advance of rewording, and concern was also expressed that the wording currently allowed Board decisions on a major issue without reference back to Council. The Board would determine both whether exceptional circumstance existed, and then what action would result from it. The proposal was unusual in that respect, as although the Board often made decisions on business matters it was understood that Council wished to retain authority in respect of show rules.
- 2.6 It was suggested that the proposal was withdrawn and reworded to take accounts of the concerns raised. It was also noted that there were much wider issues raised about vet availability for shows both before and after the pandemic and thought there should be discussion between SMs and the VAC.

2.7 Withdrawal of the proposal from the Council agenda was agreed and the VAC would be informed that the proposal was not specifically for the pandemic situation, and asked for details for the future of the number of vets, where they were based and confirmation of insurance cover. It was thought that there would be very few shows unless/until the future availability of vets was known.

Action: withdrawal of the proposal from the Council agenda and contact with the VAC JL
expressions of concerns and suggestions for alternative wording to the SRG All

2.8 The SRG and JASRG requested the archiving of old documents on the website page to avoid confusion with the new information being presented.

Action: removal of outdated files from the website RF

3. **The 150 Anniversary Celebration Show - update plans**

3.1 LA and SF had visited Stoneleigh. It was reported as less than half the size of the hall used for the Supreme, but had plenty of space for the number of cats expected. It was difficult to estimate how many cats would be shown, particularly as a TICA show had transferred to the weekend before it. It was hoped to encourage less exhibitors to bring more cats. It was thought that the number of people allowed in the hall under current restrictions was 1000, but the show would aim for a limit of 500. Everybody's safety and the comfort of the cats would be paramount. The cats of each exhibitor would be penned together. It was not planned that the event would be open to the public.

3.2 The estimated grand total for hire of the hall was £16,777. It was unknown what local conditions would be in force on the day, or whether the intended lifting of all restrictions nationally would have taken place. The commitment had been made based on what was known, and if the event was cancelled by the management it was possible a future date would be offered,

3.3 It was reiterated that caution would be exercised even if national restrictions were totally removed. Masks would still probably need to be worn inside, and attention would be paid air flow

3.4 It was commented that the show on the August date had possibly compromised the plans of one or more clubs and queried whether those show managers could ask for another date if it was known one was available. The Chair remarked that a show manager could make request for the Board to consider the circumstances.

3.5 There was discussion on maintaining anonymity while cats were penned if exhibitors carried their own cats to the judge's table. It was stated this already happened for Olympian classes at AB shows, and therefore did not require a rule change. The onus was on the judge to turn away as cats were penned and not to engage with individual exhibitors. It was thought that as long as it was stated within the schedule that the show would be different, and exhibitors could decide to attend knowing the procedure, there would be transparency. It was hoped the exhibitors would understand it would be for the comfort of the cats.

3.6 It was proposed by JL, seconded SC, that the show should be a dual certificate event in order to encourage exhibitors to show again and in celebration of 150 years of cats shows.

HD, SH, ER, LRT, LR voted against the proposal. SH wished it to be on record that her reason for doing so was that it was unfair on clubs who could not make a similar provision to attract exhibitors.

LA, SC, RF, TG, JL, PW voted in favour and JH & CK abstained. The proposal was approved.

Action: Continued preparation for the show LA & team

4. **The GCCF Virtual Show - update**

4.1 JL reported that as far as she was aware this was proceeding according to plan. Carol Walker had a team ready, and was preparing a schedule. Judges had been invited and all classes were covered. Prize money had been arranged and Agria had been contacted re BIS support.

4.2 The additional website costs to improve ease of entry would be covered by GCCF.

4.3 It was asked if the SM was aware that the YES classes need to be included in the schedule with provision made for the fact that the exhibitors would be under 18. Also, that it needed to be clearly stated that winner's names would be published on the website, so that exhibitors gave consent for this with their entry, and there was therefore no GDPR infringement.

Actions: checks to be made on these points with the show manager JL

5. **Change of venues for licensed show**

5.1 The Wyvern CC had requested a move from Worcester to Tamworth as their usual venue was unavailable.

The Birman CC had informed the Board of a move from Southam to Lutterworth.

5.2 There were no objections to either of these.

Action: the Office to notify the clubs concerned JL

5.3 It was asked if venue changes could be taken as accepted seven days after Board notification if they remained within the geographic area and there were no obvious clashes with other clubs. This was agreed.

Action: The office to be notified JL

BD4112 **JUDGE APPOINTMENT SCHEME REVIEW GROUP (Previously Judge Training Review Group)**

1. **Reports on meetings**

1.1 The minutes of the meetings on 9 May and 6 June had been circulated ahead of the Board meeting. CK also reported that there had been a meeting on 19 June, but the minutes were not yet finalised.

1.2 Discussions that had taken place to date were summarised:

- Plans for judge training from pre-Covid, with the introduction of Grand Groups within the sections
- A trial meeting with BACs to discuss a pilot would be arranged to be lead by the Vice-Chair and HD. This was based on work begun earlier.
- A review of actual training with the need for it educative - to include tutorials and assessments
- Collaboration with BACs, GC and VAC for online tests that would examine and improve the candidate's knowledge base

1.3 The proposed word change for the Accelerated Scheme was on the Council agenda. There had been discussion on inclusion of wording to ensure an FJP had sufficient experience of a breed. This would be dealt with as a separate entity for a future proposal.

- 1.4 The stewarding scheme had been recently updated, but there had been requests for consideration of inclusion of a fast-track scheme for experienced stewards. Also, online open-book testing for stewards was under consideration.
- 1.5 There had been referral of the apparent suspension of the Singapura BAC (despite FJPs) from the Board to JASRG so that it was aware advice and support could be needed. The JASRG had noted that there was nothing within the JAS currently that gave guidance to BACs that found themselves in difficulties for any reason. A proposal to rectify this had been sent for Board information **INFO**
(The Vice-Chair had arrived during the presentation of the report. 2pm approx)
- 1.6 The one query that was raised following the report was whether there was any particular initiative to attract younger judges. The response was that shortening the qualification process, making it easier and less complex to work through, would enable it to attract candidates in greater numbers.

2. **Proposal re the responsibility of maintaining BAC continuation**

2.1 The wording for the proposal was:

"In the event of constituent clubs of any breed being unable to form or sustain an effective working BAC, the BAC must approach the Board for assistance to resolve the issues. This must be done at the earliest opportunity and no later than twenty-eight days after the issue is raised."

The rationale was based on recent experience with more than one BAC and it was thought probable that others could run into difficulties in the future.

2.2 The wording of the proposal was not discussed at this point, but there was a query on the type of action envisaged to support a BAC in difficulties. CK observed that recently one BAC had been successfully re-established following Board intervention and she thought this type of action should always be the first step.

2.3 However, if an operational BAC could not be established by the club(s) concerned then it was thought that the Grand Group would take over responsibility for the candidates and also for the SOP and registration and breeding policies.

Action: the wording for the JAS to be on the agenda for the next Board meeting

JL

BD4113 REGISTRATION, TRANSFERS & SOP ITEMS

1. **Application for name recognition for the German Longhair**

1.1 There had been an application from a breeder of German Longhairs in the UK for name recognition so that the breed could be registered with GCCF and be on exhibition at shows. She had provided extensive breed information and pictures with a draft registration policy and SOP.

1.2 The application was supported by the Genetics Committee with comment that there were no known health issues, with the recommendation that the decision should be based on whether the breed was sufficiently different from others already recognised.

1.3 it was concluded that it was, with the Siberian closest to it in appearance, but with noticeable differences.

1.4 There was some concern that the variety of breeds given as potential outcrosses could weaken type. It was concluded there would need to be advice given on this if there was an application to progress the breed, but thought that at present there would be a sufficient number of cats in this country to be used, and it was a well established breed in Europe so that imports could be made rather than outcrosses be required.

1.5 It was unanimously agreed that name recognition should be granted.

Actions: a letter to inform the applicant

notice to be given on the electronic agenda and at Council

JL

2. **Rule clarification - Section 1:7**

2.1 The Office had asked for clarification on whether rule 1:7d, (referring to the offspring of two GCCF registered cats being entitled to be registered according to the registration policy for the breed), took precedence over rule 1:7g (importing cats already registered with another authority) as there was a breeder who wished to register some of a litter already registered with FIFe.

2.2 It was agreed that any breeder could dual register, regardless of whether GCCF was used first or not. However, if the breeder did not own a GCCF prefix then all rules for registering without a prefix would apply, and an administrative prefix would be added to the name(s) registered elsewhere.

2.3 Alternatively, the breeder could import any cats onto the GCCF register following all rules and requirements necessary for this, including any DNA tests required by the registration policy. In that case the names would be kept as registered elsewhere with IMP added.

2.4 These conclusions meant there were two separate options, with slightly different outcomes and costs, but one or the other should be used, not a mix of each.

Action: the office to be informed

JL

3. **Prefixes for approval**

3.1 The prefix list with 36 applications had been circulated. It was noted that most of these were from new or potential British SH breeders.

3.2 The list was agreed unanimously.

3.3 It was suggested that future lists could be circulated with a seven day period allowed for any objections.

Action: the prefix applicants to be informed

Office

BD4114 HEALTH & WELFARE

1. **Report from the Breeder Scheme Group**

3.1 PW reported that wording for the website on the update to the Scheme, and its closure to new members, had been agreed by the group. He needed to finalise this and would then circulate it to the Board.

3.2 The survey would then be launched. It was agreed that this should be on the website and FB page to reach as many as possible from diverse groups.

Action: circulation of letter and survey launch

PW

2. **GC meeting notes**

2.1 SC reported briefly on the meeting of 12 June. He noted that there had been little BAC action on breeding or registration policies, but this had been expected in a period when there had not been the usual regular meetings. It had been a good opportunity to make assessments and future plans, and he anticipated there would be another meeting in the autumn.

2.2 The most disappointing news was that the Animal Health Trust's biobank had been lost when the institute closed meaning that the DNA records of cats tested for deafness had been lost. A Board member with links to the principle researcher stated that she would make contact with her to see if any useful information had been retained.

Action: contact with Julia Freeman

CK

2.3 It was noted that a familial link had been established for juvenile neuropathy in Siberians so there was the possibility of research to enable DNA testing in future. A correction was needed to the draft meeting notes as they stated a gene had been identified.

2.4 There were no further Board queries.

INFO

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

3.1 SC had circulated a report for Council and there was also a welfare update in the GC meeting notes.

3.2 At the recent C&FSG meeting it had been reported that the guide to cat breeding had been to Defra, but was unlikely to be published from there. Any Defra comment from the review would be included and it would then be issued by the C&FSG.

3.3 The proposals for breeder licensing in Wales had been published on the Welsh government website and the Office had received queries from breeders which had been passed to SC. He noted that it was very similar to the English version, but currently lacked the guidelines and definitions that gave interpretation of the intentions. As far as he was aware no opportunity for consultation had been provided so it was a matter of waiting to see if further information was issued.

3.4 The Scottish proposals had received comment and legislation was due to be published in the autumn, but there had been no news and it was possible this had been delayed.

INFO

BD4115

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

PW drew attention to the leaflet that had been put together using GCCF website information on breed profiles and a guide to sensible kitten buying, to be given away at the promotional stand at TICA show and the GCCF's own show. It was agreed it should be circulated to the Board in advance of publication.

DATE & TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Friday, 20 August 2021 at 11am

The meeting finished at 2.40pm.