



## MINUTES

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

Friday, 15 January 2021 by videoconference



**Present:** Mr Sean Farrell - 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 Heather McRae
Mrs Elaine Robinson	Mrs Lisa Robinson-Talboys
Ms Lyndsey Robinson	Mr Peter Williams

**In attendance:** The Office Manager, Denise Williams (OM)

#### **BD4041 MEETING INTRODUCTION**

- 1. Apologies for absence.**
  - 1.1 Apologies had been received from The Vice-Chair, Dr Peter Collin and Dr Gavin Eyres, both were key workers in the NHS Covid vaccination programme. PC joined the meeting for fifteen minutes around 3.45 pm. JH left shortly after 4pm for a family event
- 2. Chair's opening remarks**
  - 2.1 The meeting began at 11.08am as the Chair welcomed those present,
  - 2.2 He hoped the meeting would be not be much longer than three hours.

#### **BD4042 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

- 1. The Minutes of the Board meeting of 11 December 2020**
  - 1.1 These had been circulated with some amendments and corrections made.
  - 1.2 BD4035.5.4 HD asked if additions she had requested to this minute had been included, with the response that it had been left for the Chair to listen to the recording.
  - 1.3 As he had not responded prior to the meeting JL proposed that as a point of order all reference to an extension (on the system) for Pupil Judges should be withdrawn as it was not related in anyway to the agenda item, as confirmed by the proposer, and should have been brought to the Board as an entirely separate item with the reason given for correction to an action undertaken on behalf of the Board.
  - 1.4 PW confirmed his item was to do with information supplied by the JTRG to BACs and judges, and this was acknowledged by other Board members making the point that there were two separate issues. However, the Chair stated that there was precedent for matters not directly connected to agenda items to be introduced and if information was on the tape, which it was, then it could be minuted.
  - 1.5 He proposed that there should be a separate meeting with HD, JL and himself to resolve exactly what should be recorded in the minutes at this point. This was seconded and there were no objections.  
**Action: meeting to be arranged by videoconference** **SF**
  - 1.6 BD4037.1.4 & 1.5 SH requested these two minutes with the possible explanation for the Nor'East of Scotland not sending accounts, as given by a Board member, should be deleted so that one minute remained with emphasis on the point that the club was not entitled to a delegate. It was queried why there should be a deletion, and SH stated that a long discussion had taken place with regards to the N E Scotland and inclusion of just one comment did not reflect the full picture. The Chair commented that not all points required minuting, and some would have a relevance to the person who made them, but were not sufficiently important to merit inclusion, although believed necessary by the person who had made them.
  - 1.7 It was confirmed that SH had circulated her amendment and the Chair observed that it was a reasonable statement. Therefore the amendment would replace the original minute wording.
  - 1.8 JL reported that since the minutes had been circulated there had been an alert given on the possibility of GDPR issues if the names of people not on the Board were published. She had removed them from the consideration of the Breeder Scheme applicants and would do the same for other instances pointed out.
  - 1.9 The minutes were then agreed once action had been taken to agree wording at BD4035.5.4.  
There were 2 abstentions JL, HD.  
**Action: once finalised the minutes to be sent for website publication** **JL/RF**
  - 1.10 It was observed by Board members that a considerable amount of time had been taken to discuss the previous minutes and this was not satisfactory. Accuracy should be sorted out in advance. **INFO**
- 2. Matters arising from the previous minutes**
  - 2.1 BD4032.5 RF and SH thanked the Board for the gift tokens they had received.
  - 2.2 BD4035.1.4 The show PW had referred to would not be taking place during lockdown, but would do later in the year. He had decided that as he made a written commitment to judge he would attend, but he had taken the engagement prior to being a Board member and would not take others.
  - 2.3 BD4036.2.3 IC had not yet responded to the Board's query.
  - 2.4 BD4037.3 The club had submitted an amended document shortly before the meeting.

This would be circulated for a final check and go forward to the Council's electronic agenda if there were no objections.

**Action: circulation of the Chartreux CCUK's amended constitution.**

**JL**

- 2.5 BD4035.5.3 PW observed that as far as he knew the actions agreed as a resolution to the point of order he had raised at the last meeting had not been made. He had requested wording that could go to Council to authorise the substantive changes made in respect of the tutorial requirements at clause 14. An explanation was given (commitment to the Covid vaccination programme) to explain why PC had not worked on this, but it was observed that the responsibility lay with another member of the JTRG, or he was happy to join the team to work on this in order for it to be on the next Council agenda.

**Action: referral back to the JTRG for this to happen**

**HD**

- 2.6 BD4037.5.1 The Vice-Chair had not given a definitive response, but the Chair reported that he thought it probable from limited discussion that further monitoring would be needed.
- 2.7 BD4039.3 A letter had been sent to the owner of the Ragdoll, but there had been no response to date.
- 2.8 BD4039.4 DC had been requested to work with the other disciplinary committees on the the revised Code of Conduct. There had not yet been a response.

**INFO**

## **BD4043 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

**INFO**

## **BD4044 FINANCE**

### **1. Management p&l accounts to 31 December 2020**

- 1.1 The profit and loss accounts to the end of 31 December had been provided by the bookkeeper on the day before the meeting, and a comparison sheet for the final two months and year ends 2019 & 2020 circulated.
- 1.2 Board members commented that the dreadful year for many people and businesses had proved good for GCCF which was something of a relief. The gross profit total was £205,849.66, a little over double that for 2019.
- 1.3 Considerable savings had been made by a reduction in meeting and other costs (almost £47770), but there was also an increase in income of almost £57,000 due largely to growth in core business.
- 1.4 It had been noted by the bookkeeper that the decline in profit in December was largely due to the payment in that month of staff bonuses and the honoraria for volunteers.
- 1.5 It was observed that as a priority the Board should be planning how to reinvest the surplus in the business for the benefit of GCCF as this would be expected by Council, and there was some discussion on using the Business Plan to introduce new projects and what these should be. IT projects were mentioned and it was thought that there should be particular focus on educating the kitten buying public.
- 1.6 The considerable reduction in bank charges was noted, and it was thought the bookkeeper was to be congratulated on making an accurate estimate of the savings to be made by changing card companies.
- 1.7 It was queried why meeting travel costs had escalated suddenly, but explained this was where the bookkeeper had been asked to record the Civica expense of £4665.25. It was proposed that FC should discuss a more suitable line.
- 1.8 It was thought that screen sharing would be useful when discussing financial and other documents, and agreed that FC should experiment with this facility as it would be useful to use for presentation to delegates.
- 1.9 It was observed at the same time that if items for the agenda were presented as reports there would be a time saving that would reduce the length of the meeting.

**Action: referral of the final points to FC for discussion & experiment.**

**JL**

### **2. Volume figures (core business)**

- 2.1 The comparative graphs produced by the OM reflected the increase in registrations and transfers that had brought the profits shown in the p&l. In total there had been 3547 more transactions than in 2019.
- 2.2 It was thought pleasing that there had been a substantial increase in the number of transfers made, as these had declined with the loss of the Royal Canin incentive. 2020 had proved better than previous 3 years.

**INFO**

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

- 3.1
- |                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| Aldermore            | £76,729.94 with a fixed interest of 1.49% until March 2021.<br>(signatories SC, RF and the bookkeeper)        |
| Cambridge & Counties | £82,021.98 56 day notice account with 1% interest<br>(signatories JH, SC, RF and the bookkeeper)              |
| Redwood              | £70,585.84 95 day notice account with 1.34% interest<br>(online access SF, RF and the OM and bookkeeper)      |
| Monmouthshire BS     | £84,000, an easy access account with 0.5% interest<br>(online access RF, the OM and bookkeeper)               |
| Lloyds (current)     | £250,701.90   |
| Lloyds (Supreme)     | £1007.50  |
| Lloyds (Euro)        | €13,450.23 = £12,927.36 (exchange rate €1.11 to £1)<br>(signatories JH, SC, RF, SH the OM and the bookkeeper) |

- 3.2 RF reported that she had gathered information on future investments that could be made as there was so much money in the current account. This included details of gilts that were a possible long term investment, but money could be lost if there was an increase in inflation.

- 3.3 It was confirmed that this had to be a topic for FC discussion to produce recommendations to the Board.

**Action: matter to be referred to the FC agenda**

**RF**

4. **Finalisation of the budget for 2021**  
 4.1 It had been checked with the IC/DC Secretary and ascertained that there were no plans for any committee to hold physical meetings in 2021. Therefore the estimate for costs in this respect could be reduced.  
 4.2 It was suggested that the saving be transferred to the IC/DC legal expenses because of their dramatic rise.  
**Action: referral to FC for further discussion and circulation to the Board** **JL**
5. **Examiners for the 2020 accounts - update**  
 5.1 The Chairman reported that Monahans had finally received the letter that dispensed with their services and the bookkeeper was in contact with Michelle of Albert Goodman, the company selected by the Board.  
 5.2 He reported that there had been some queries from delegates, particularly in respect of the selection process and had given assurance of this, and that there had been a clear winner whose services gave value for money and who had shown interest in GCCF's business practices. **INFO**
6. **Byelaw change to remove inappropriate terms**  
 6.1 Byelaw 9 (2) included reference to 'audit' and 'auditor/s' as it had not been amended when GCCF became incorporated in the same way that the Byelaws referring to club accounts had.  
 6.2 As there was a specific legal meaning to these terms the new accountant had requested an update to replace them with 'examined' and 'examiner/s'  
 6.3 This was agreed unanimously and would be put to Council at the next opportunity.  
**Action: the approved amendment to be on the agenda for the March Council meeting** **JL**

**BD4045 BUSINESS ITEMS**

1. **Plans for the March Council meeting by videoconference**  
 1.1 The Chair reported he had made various enquiries to gain more knowledge on this and taken advice from Zoom business users familiar with conferences, and from Ian Macro on technological issues.  
 1.2 It had become apparent that what was needed was the facility to run a webinar. As access was by invitation it would allow participation by delegates only.  
 1.3 There would be the opportunity to vote, but the questions would need to be formulated in advance so that they could be read and considered by all who could then carry out a yes/no poll.  
 1.4 Because of that the Chair concluded that it would be necessary to have a slimline agenda it was thought there should be an initial draft of that produced shortly.  
 1.5 It was reiterated that those wishing to speak would have to give notice in advance, or submit a written question. If remarks were taken from the floor it would be necessary to have a time limit.  
 1.6 It had been suggested that the Zoom Business Pro at around £40 per month would be suitable, but after the ongoing discussions SF had concluded that the webinar version at about £140 monthly would be more suitable. IM was willing to look after the technical side. The Board were happy with the cost, but following further discussion it was thought that an annual subscription of £1120 could be afforded, particularly if it was possible to facilitate licence sharing to enable webinars by BACs and other groups.  
**Action: further investigation and planning for testing as soon as possible** **SF**  
**licence queries with Zoom to enable use by individual organisations within GCCF** **OM**
2. **Possibility of a physical date for 2021 Electoral Council Meeting**  
 2.1 There was some thought that this could be possible in late October/November, with other opinion that there were too many unknowns and it would be sensible to consider only online meetings and remote electoral voting in 2021.  
 2.2 There was a suggestion that Council should be presented with the option in March of waiting to see whether an autumn physical meeting would be possible, with the safety net of a remote voting option in October that would be only one year on from the previous elections. However, there was concern it would make planning difficult and that it could encourage clubs to think the returns date would be put back.  
 2.3 It was concluded there should be further discussion ahead of decision of what to propose to Council. **INFO**
3. **Plans for an Electoral Process in 2021 (if a physical Electoral Meeting could not be held)**  
 3.1 PW had prepared a paper outlining options for remote voting with the advantages and disadvantages of each:
  - Civica used as previously with the single transferable vote system
  - Civica using a tallying system to count an absolute aggregate (as in Council)
  - The Office in conjunction with an external independent invigilator
  - The Office to administer the entire process
 3.2 He gave two main concerns of repeating the 2020 process: at almost £50 per vote it was expensive and delegates had not necessarily understood the importance of placing the candidates in order of preference.  
 3.3 Points made in response were:
  - Concerns about use of the post as there were problems currently
  - This would be a much simpler election as there were no Officer elections
  - Using the Office for administration incurred costs as some staff would not be doing their usual work
 3.4 It was resolved that:
  - a) costs for each of the four options should be obtained
  - b) once these were known there would be a single issue Board meeting to determine what the Board would put to Council.**Actions: costs to be obtained & circulated** **OM**  
**a Board meeting to be called for decisions on the 2021 Electoral Process** **SF**
4. **The Bylaw schedule for Council to prepare for the 2021 Electoral Process**  
 4.1 This item was withdrawn as the Board had deferred a decision on the electoral process until the costs had been obtained.  
**Action: to be represented at the special Board meeting** **JL**

5. **News from Business partners and the possibility of future partners**
- 5.1 The Chair reported contact had been made with Royal Canin but the representative was ill at present.
- 5.2 There had been a meeting with Agria on 4 December, but nothing afterwards to date.
- 5.3 An effort had been to contact Purina, but there was no response to report
- 5.4 RF reported she had been liaising with a litter company who were interested in having a non-financial partnership with GCCF. This would entail the GCCF logo on a page of their website and their logo on a GCCF page, and they were interested in using the monthly newsletter to carry discount codes to encourage breeders to try their product.
- 5.5 The Chair advised that this information should be circulated to the Board and there could then be a discussion and decision on establishing a working relationship with them.
- Action: circulation of information** **RF**
6. **Business Plan for 2021**
- 6.1 PW had reported that he had made an effort to contact GE on several occasions without success, and it was accepted that GE's work commitments were currently his priority. PW had the BP produced in 2019 by SC and believed he could use it as a base and wanted particularly to include projects with their terms of reference and time-lines. However, he did not wish to exclude GE.
- 6.2 The Chair undertook to contact GE to give assurance that his input was still required and recommended that PW should continue with updates. However, it made sense for PW to begin work.
- 6.3 It was acknowledged that other Board members would need to contribute to give project information, and this was needed as soon as possible to get the BP to Council.
- Action: progression of the Business Plan** **PW**
- 6.4 It was queried if there was a date for the Strategic Planning Meeting, and PW agreed to prepare for this.
- Action: circulation of a date for the Strategic Planning Meeting** **PW**
- 6.5 The Chair mentioned that he wished to hold an HR meeting shortly and PW queried whether the HR Group included someone with an HR qualification as there could be an issue arising from a meeting if that was not the case. It was thought not, since Michele Clare had retired as Chair, though there was the possibility Mrs Chapman-Ber did. It was agreed this should be checked, and that it would be worth asking if MC had time to be involved again now. The OM would check whether Critchleys (GCCF's HR consultants) would be willing to send a representative to a videoconference meeting.
- Action: contact with Critchleys and Ms Clare** **OM/JL**
7. **IT Report**
- 7.1 SC gave an outline of the major project planned, which was to revamp the website. This would include an effective search engine, and it was aimed at producing training videos, for judges and stewards and possibly for breeders.
- 7.2 Caroline Turner-Russell was continuing to work on the registration policies and it was possible that she would have worked through all of them by the end of the year.
- 7.3 Nothing further could be done with the STAR system until it was known whether changes would be made to the show structure for the restart of shows. It was possible it would then need updating.
- 7.4 IM was aware of the risk to the system if he was suddenly absent and was working on system documentation to mitigate this should any other consultant need to take over, but it was a high risk and that needed continued monitoring.
- 7.5 The NZ Cat Fancy had not responded after their initial enquiry so it seemed sensible to concentrate on the website and training videos if the Board was in support.
- 7.6 It was suggested by PW that the first video to be on the home page, and therefore immediately accessible, should be guidance for the public on purchasing a pedigree kitten. HD reported that a British SH breeder used to talk on this topic at the National Pet Shows, and gave a good presentation. It was possible she would do this for GCCF as she had a script prepared.
- Action: contact with the person concerned to discuss this idea** **HD**
8. **GCCF email addresses for Board members**
- 8.1 SC reported that giving Board members GCCF email addresses had been put to IM who had given assurance on absolute security. It would be administered by Systemagic and would be relatively easy to establish as it already existed. As well as mail it would feature a dropbox-like facility for document sharing.
- 8.2 He believed there would need to be a code of conduct for use that each Board member signed up to, but this could be based on the one in the staff handbook.
- 8.3 There was an expression of concern on the security of the emails and on using the dropbox, to which clarification was given.
- 8.4 A vote was taken on proceeding with the email addresses once the additional information on conduct, protocols for use and the retention mail for a given period had been determined. This was agreed with one abstention. JL
- 8.5 It was thought all members of FC and the three disciplinary committees could also be added.
- Action: contact with IM and Sytemagic** **SC/OM**  
**circulation of a code of conduct and protocols for email agreement** **SC**
9. **Board & FC meeting schedule to 31 May 2021**
- 9.1 JL had prepared a schedule of meetings for the Board and FC from January to 31 May 2021. There were no queries on these.
- 9.2 The Council meeting date for March had been published, but there was a possibility it would be rescheduled and so it was thought best not to list a provisional date for July.
- Action: list of meetings to be put on the website** **JL/RF**

9.3 As there was a six week gap between the January and February Board meetings JL proposed that if there were any minor customer service matters these should be dealt with at the FC meeting on 5 February. SC proposed an amendment to include circulation to the Board the outcome of decisions taken in this way to allow for objections. This was agreed by a majority. ER, LRT, LR & HD voted against and SH & KK abstained.

**Action: any customer service issues from the Office to be referred to the FC agenda** JL

9.4 There was comment that the Board should not be dealing with some customer service issues. HD, LRT and PW volunteered to look at the rules to see if the requirement for 'Board discretion' could be removed from some so that decisions could be taken in the Office.

**Action: report on rule changes to be prepared** HD/LRT/PW

## 10. Protocols

10.1 JL (as Committee Secretary) had proposed a six point protocol to remove conflict or challenge with another Board member in the production of the minutes which she hoped would sort out issues in advance of the next meeting, and would also be useful practice for a future employee.

10.2 There was an accepted amendment proposed by SH at point 4 so that it read, 'The Chair (or Vice-Chair)...' and the protocol was then agreed unanimously.

10.3 JH had proposed that only listed agenda items should be voted upon at Board meetings, and not items brought up on the day. There was comment in support from those who thought there was a risk of excluding those not present and approving something without due consideration, but concern expressed that it removed the flexibility to respond to an emergency, and that on occasions issues arose from agenda items that needed consideration, but had not been specifically mentioned on the agenda.

10.4 An amendment proposed by SC added, 'unless the business is agreed to be urgent by Board members at the beginning of the meeting. This was voted upon together with original wording and approved by a majority with 4 abstentions, SH, ER, LRT, LR.

10.5 JH introduced 'Working Group Procedures' as good governance. It was acknowledged that most groups had these, but recently there had been laxity in not ensuring that all did.

10.6 HM proposed an amendment at point 6 concerning the publication of minutes as some, such as those for the HR Group contained confidential information. 'Where appropriate' was added and amendment approved unanimously. The protocol was then approved with one abstention, SH.

**Action: agreed protocols to be put on record in the Board meeting folder on the Office server** JL

## 11. Risk Assessment - January 2021

1. It was queried whether this was a separate agenda item each time, or whether risk was to be considered with each business item. The Chair responded that the risk register and risks identified within the Business Plan needed to be reviewed at each meeting. It was observed that at present these were not circulated for each meeting.

2 PW suggested there should be an opportunity to identify risk at each meeting, so that action could be assigned to mitigate it. The Chair noted there should also be a note of conclusion.

3. SC remarked that the risks as noted in the BP should be reviewed regularly (every other meeting), and the Chair agreed there should be demonstration and minuted record of the reviews made.

4. Identified during the course of the meeting:

a) removal of names from the minutes because of possible GDPR issues - resolved

b) the need for professional advice at HR meetings - an issue to be addressed

c) the possibility of the sudden loss of IM - the main ongoing risk to be mitigated

INF

## BD4046 SHOW MATTERS

### 1. Report from the Show Review group

1.1 PC could not be directly involved with the group at present.

1.2 LRT reported that a meeting of those interested had been organised for 24 January

**Action: TOR & minutes to be presented at the February Board meeting** SRG

### 2. New show licence applications/amendments for the 2021-22 show season

None

INFO

### 3. Possibility of an autumn event to celebrate 150 years of shows

3.1 It was clarified that this was no longer anything to do with WCC. They would organise their own event in 2021 if that became possible.

3.2 It was thought unlikely that GCCF would be able to hold a Supreme Show in the autumn, because of uncertainty for the months when planning and preparation would usually be done.

3.3 It was decided to leave assessment on the possibility of an event open to monthly review.

**Action: item for future Board agendas** JL

### 4. Accelerated scheme

4.1 HR observed that action in respect of clause 14 had been discussed during 'matters arising' (BD4042.2.5).

4.2 There had been a meeting of the JTRG the previous week and minutes would be circulated.

**Action: minute circulation** HD

### 5. Further period of discounted time for Pupil Judges

5.1 JL proposed a further six months of discounted time for Pupil Judges to be added as a block to the year already proposed by the Board in March to prevent Pupil Judges being automatically removed from lists on the computer system.

5.2 There was considerable discussion on whether that action was acceptable as the Byelaw concerned with judge appointments by Council referred only to appointments and promotions and not to extensions or discounted time. However, Council had agreed that BAC matters, minor rule changes and other business could be dealt with by electronic publication allowing a period of four weeks for objections to be received.

5.3 It was finally agreed that as there was a Council meeting there could be both website notification and a proposal on the Council agenda.

**Action: request for ratification and advance notification block of PJ time out proposal re time-out generally, including judges on the accelerated scheme**

**JL  
HD**

## 6. Amendments to the Judge Appointment Scheme

6.1 Ten sections of the Judge Appointment Scheme had been either amended or deleted. There was a query on how urgent these were, and whether they needed to be at the next Council meeting.

6.2 There was brief discussion on whether the BACs should have input in advance, but the consensus was that it was for Council to consider JAS amendments and BACs could make queries via their representatives to Council if they wished.

6.3 Other Board members thought there should be a brief rationale to go with each of the changes, as they had not arisen from previous Board discussion or correspondence, nor was there reference to them in any previously circulated minutes.

6.4 There was also a question raised as to whether minor JAS changes were within the remit of the JTRG which had been established to produce more judges quickly for the higher classes (accelerated scheme) and to attract new people into training to become judges. It was responded that changes to the JAS were necessary to make the scheme more efficient.

6.5 It was agreed that most of the changes presented should be withdrawn, to be introduced with others at a future meeting. The exception was 11a) that removed the need for a BAC physical meeting annually as this was not possible at present, and might not be wanted in future.

**Action: 11a) to be put forward for the March Council agenda**

**HD**

## BD4047 STAFF & OFFICE

### 1. A report from the Office Manager

1.1 The OM had presented a breakdown on the income and costs for the Year Book. The total in from sales and advertising was almost £5000 and it was possible a few more would be sold. When the printing costs were subtracted it left £2,616 to go to the Cat Welfare Trust.

1.2 It was reported that the Office was quiet at present, with two staff working from home and coming in only occasionally. All government guidelines re Covid-19 were being followed.

**INFO**

### 2. Prefixes for approval

2.1 It was confirmed that once the prefixes were approved by the Board they were posted on the website with 28 days allowed for objections.

2.2 There were no objections to any of the prefixes presented.

**Action: all referred back to the Office for processing**

**OM**

## BD4048 CLUB & BAC MATTERS

### 1. To consider action in respect of clubs who have failed to complete their 2019 returns

1.1 The Oriental LH BC had made no response to the recorded delivery letter that had been sent.

1.2 The email correspondence from the one contact for both Croydon and Southern Counties had been circulated. This detailed the information that had been sent from the Office and the way in which it had been interpreted. There had been a reply to the recorded delivery letter

1.3 SH proposed a simple letter that summarised the situation to all three of these clubs: until they had their examined returns in and up to date no more show licences would be issued to them and they could have no delegates. This would be sent from the Office on behalf of the Chair.

1.4 It was agreed the Nor' East of Scotland was in a different position because their unexamined paperwork had been received, but the outcome was the same. They could have no delegate or show licence until the examined accounts had been submitted.

**Action: letters to all clubs, content as described**

**SF/Office**

1.5 It was noted it could cause difficulties to ordinary members if the clubs became non-active and there was concern that club funds should remain under GCCF jurisdiction. The Chair suggested a review of the position of these clubs in six months time.

**Action: matter to be returned to the agenda in July**

**JL**

### 2. The amended forms for the 2020 returns

2.1 The forms for the 2020 returns had been circulated with the revisions highlighted. The intention had been to keep them simple for clarity.

2.2 There was a query on the need for dispensation to be sought if it was already in place from the previous year as the basis would be the 2019 membership figures. It was observed the request was needed to be certain the club wanted a delegate in 2021.

2.3 With the correction of a typo the forms were then agreed for circulation unanimously.

**Action: forms to be sent out to clubs from the Office**

**OM**

3. **Terms & conditions for the North West CC becoming active again**  
 3.1 The Chairman reiterated that it was essential to safeguard the £8000 that was held. There had to be criteria in place that set parameters that prevented a random group claiming money for a one-off show.  
 3.2 it was agreed it should be referred back to FC to establish the financial requirements in detail.  
**Action: to be on the agenda of the next FC meeting** JL
4. **An application for provisional GCCF membership from the 2110 club**  
 4.1 LRT queried whether any one on the Board was a member. There was no response to this question.  
 4.2 There was an initial suggestion that as this was a different type of club, suitability to become a GCCF member should be put to Council, so that delegates could make a decision on its membership.  
 4.3 Other Board members were of the opinion that the difference gave reasons for a straightforward rejection: it was noted that:
  - it wasn't a cat club, but a focus or pressure group in very much the same way as other online groups
  - it set a precedent for a 'political' group that could create difficulties for future Boards
  - it was entirely acceptable that ideas relating to GCCF should be discussed by any group interested but they could be then put to Council via any member club
  - some of its stated objects were properly the responsibility of the Board and staff not alternative groups, as this could result in conflict and possibly GDPR issues.
 4.4 A vote on the application for the 2110 was taken and unanimously rejected  
**Action: the club to be informed** JL

**BD4049 HEALTH & WELFARE**

1. **Updates from DEFRA, the Canine & Feline Sector Group and/or other groups**  
 1.1 SC reported that there had been no meeting of any group since the last Board meeting.  
 1.2 The government was consulting on the compulsory microchipping of cats and he had been invited to sit on the Defra focus group. Two meetings were planned (20 January, 3 February). Board members were invited to pass on any comments they wished to be considered. It was noted that the last time the subject had been discussed in Council for breeding cats it had been overwhelmingly rejected, although it was introduced for stud cats to support the certificate of entirety.  
*(the Vice-Chair joined the meeting)*
2. **Breeder Scheme review - terms of reference**  
 2.1 PW had pulled together Terms of Reference for the group and presented it for approval. The intention was it should then go to Council. In the meantime the BSG would meet to plan further and invite others.  
 2.2 There were no questions and the TOR was unanimously accepted.  
**Action: next meeting of the BSG to be arranged** PW
3. **Breeder Scheme membership - applications and appeal**  
 3.1 There had been an appeal against non-acceptance of membership at the previous meeting. The reason given for the number of litters per year (increasing cat numbers) was of concern as a possible welfare issue for a novice breeder, and there was no personal recommendation.  
 3.2 There was a majority vote against acceptance with 1 abstention. SH.  
 3.3 New applicant 1: there were no comments and a majority vote for acceptance with abstentions from: PC, HD, SH, ER, LRT, LR & PW  
 3.4 New applicant 2: there were no comments and a majority vote for acceptance with abstentions from: HD, SH, ER, LRT, LR  
**Actions: letters to the applicants** JL/Office
4. **Discussion on the number of litters from one queen in a two year period to consider a ruling**  
 4.1 PW put forward the suggestion that like other organisations GCCF should only register three litters in two years from any female to take a clear stance on the welfare of the breeding queen.  
 4.2 SC outlined the need for flexibility, a guideline rather than an actual rule, as there were particular circumstances which could make another litter within this time beneficial, and his belief there was a strong possibility that most good breeders would comply (and already did), but those breeding more frequently would simply not register every litter.  
 4.3 The Vice-Chair accepted that point, but thought it preferable to take a clear moral position and have a definite rule. *(PC then left the meeting and JH left shortly afterwards)*  
 4.4 There was further discussion on whether there should a rule or guidelines, with the point that a rule carried sanctions, but guidelines could be ignored. However, it was felt that if a rule was in place then mitigating circumstances should be accepted if there was veterinary support.  
 4.5 Concern was expressed about guidance currently provided by the Office. It was known the computer rejected the registration that was within 17 weeks of a previous litter from the same girl. It was thought that was being advised as an acceptable minimum. SC stated he had advised three litters in two years previously and would produce a definitive statement for Office staff with the assistance of the GCCF's Veterinary Officer.  
**Action: initial guidance for Office staff to be written and circulated to the Board** SC
5. **Website pet sales - contact with site managers** deferred to the next meeting. INFO

**BD4050            DISCIPLINARY MATTERS**

- 1.    **Rules of The Ocicat Club - referral from IC - response from the club**
  - 1.1 The letter from the Board had been sent to the club asking for a complete rule revision.
  - 1.2 The response from the club was that it would be considered later in the year.
  - 1.3 It was noted that this was not an indication of compliance, but a period would be allowed to see what was sent once the club committee had had an opportunity for discussion. **INFO**
  
- 2.    **Request to transfer cats from a suspended breeder with active registration for the female**
  - 2.1 The female was now five years old. There was concern on welfare grounds that she should have her first litter at this age.
  - 2.2 Consideration was also given to the possibility that she could have been used for non-registered breeding and/or had not been acquired from the suspended breeder until after his suspension.
  - 2.3 It was agreed unanimously that active registration should not be allowed.
  - 2.4 It was also unanimous that the owner could transfer the cat into her name as long as veterinary evidence that she was spayed was supplied.

**Action: a letter to the owner** **JL/Office**

**BD4051            ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

None taken

**DATE & TIME OF NEXT MEETING            Friday, 26 February 2021 at 11am**

The meeting finished at 4.18pm.