

MINUTES

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

Friday, 30 October 2020 by videoconference



Present: Mr John Hansson - Chairman
Mr Sean Farrell - (Vice-Chairman)

Dr Peter Collin	Mr Steve Crow
Mrs Hilary Dean	Ms Sarndra Devereux
Mrs Rosemary Fisher	Dr Gavin Eyres
Mr Thomas Goss	Mrs Shelagh Heavens
Mrs Catherine Kaye	Mrs Jen Lacey
Mrs Heather McRae	Mrs Elaine Robinson
Mrs Lisa Robinson-Talboys	Ms Lyndsey Robinson

BD4018 MEETING INTRODUCTION

- 1. Apologies for absence.**
1.1 Apologies had been received from the Office Manager who was taking her annual leave. An effort was made to contact Mrs Ashmore, but without success.
- 2. Chairman's opening remarks**
2.1 The meeting began at 11.09am as the Chairman welcomed those present,
2.2 He noted that it was his final meeting as Chair, before handing on to his successor Sean Farrell, current Vice Chair, who had been nominated for the position unopposed.
2.3 JH announced he planned to put a farewell statement onto the website to mark the end of his term in office.

BD4019 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS THE MEETING

- 1. The Minutes of the Board meeting of 25 September 2020**
1.1 These had been circulated some amendments and corrections made and acknowledged.
1.2 SH reported that she had requested an amendment at BD4013.1.4, but the wording she had supplied had not been used, although different wording had been inserted.
1.3 JL responded that following advice from the Officers she had listened to the tape of the meeting and tried to reword the minute as closely as possible to the comment made on the day. It was agreed that SH should listen to the tape to confirm the words she used and adjust the minute wording if necessary.
Action: the appropriate section the tape to be made available **SF**
1.4 The remainder of the minutes were approved on the proposal of TG, 2nd HM. Abstentions made by HD, RF, ER.
1.5 It was noted that if there was a problem with amendments the proposer should be notified to give more opportunity for a check on the tape in advance of the meeting. SH objected to the fact that she hadn't been told that her amended wording could not be accepted as it was not sufficiently close to what was on the tape.
Action: the minutes to be sent for website publication once the tape had been checked **JL/RF**
- 2. The minutes of the Board meeting of 2 October 2020**
2.1 This meeting had taken place solely for the purpose of proposing new examiners for the GCCF accounts.
2.2 They had been circulated and no comments had been received.
2.3 They were accepted on the proposal of RF, 2nd SD and the Chair thanked JL for her work. PC & GE abstained.
Action: the minutes to be sent for website publication once the actions were completed **JL/RF**
- 3. Matters arising from the previous minutes**
BD4013.1.4 It was observed that work on the club and BAC returns should be considered again after the elections for the FC Committee had taken place. A meeting of FC was scheduled for 25 November. **INFO**

BD4020 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

INFO

BD4021 FINANCE

- 1. Management p&l accounts to 30 September 2020**
1.1 The profit and loss accounts to the end of September had been provided by the bookkeeper and circulated to all in advance of the meeting, and a summary sheet was available for comparative purposes.
1.2 It was noted that income had increased once again, and expenditure lower than at the same point in the previous year. Therefore gross profit had risen once again, £152,180.58 from £65,331.45 in 2019.
1.3 The one comment was that this was an extremely satisfactory position. There were no queries. **INFO**
- 2. Volume figures (core business)**
2.1 The comparative graphs produced by the OM showed continued growth in registrations, and although transfers and imports had dropped slightly they remained above the levels at the same point in the previous three years, reflecting the increase in core business income.
2.2 This excellent position was noted, without further query or comment. **INFO**

3. Statement of accounts balances

- 3.1 Aldermore £76,539.23 with a fixed interest of 1.49% until March 2021.
(signatories SC, RF and the bookkeeper)
- Cambridge & Counties £79,810.65 95 day notice account with 1% interest
(signatories JH, SC, RF and the bookkeeper)
- NB the rate had dropped this month from 1.49%, as had been previously notified
Redwood £70,355.89, 95 day notice account with 1.54% interest
(online access SF, RF and the OM and bookkeeper)
- Monmouthshire BS £84,000, an easy access account with 0.5% interest
(online access RF, the OM and bookkeeper)
- Lloyds (current) £214,160.20
Lloyds (Supreme) £1019.50
Lloyds (Euro) €12,840.69 = £11,567.62
(signatories JH, SC, RF, SH the OM and the bookkeeper)
- 3.2 RF was thanked for her report.

BD4022 BUSINESS ITEMS

1. The 2020 Elections

- 1.1 GE reported the deadline for nominations was past and those received had been checked in the Office, and then published on the GCCF website.
- 1.2 Civica had then sent a request to candidates for their nomination statements and these were now in, and presented on the Civica website for testing in preparation for going live on 2 November for the election.
- 1.3 SF reported that he had visited the site and found it very well presented. He thought that Civica had done an excellent job. He had just one concern which was to ensure there was wording to explain that it would be necessary to 'drag and drop' to make a vote.
- 1.4 GE remarked that this was the action for those using a computer, but on a phone the voting would be by ticking a box. It was agreed that the explanatory wording should state that.
- 1.5 SF also observed that delegates could alter their candidate choices and preferences until the time they were ready to 'submit'. It was thought that this should be noted.
- 1.6 There were several queries on the ranking for Board members as this was so completely different to Council elections. Delegates were used to voting for whom they wanted to be a Board member, and did not consider whether they wanted one person more than another. It was also noted that although someone could limit their vote to fewer than five, as at Council, they could vote for all candidates presented, as it was the ranked order that was important, rather than the number of boxes ticked, and that was a completely different concept. The purpose of the single transferable vote was to allow all votes to count so that if a candidate was unavailable (having been elected as an officer) then that vote would be transferred to the next preference rather than lost.
- 1.6 It was concluded that it was impossible to achieve an exact replication of Council voting, and this system was as it had been agreed and it was too late to make any changes. The important thing would be to ensure that there was a sufficient explanation on the website for delegates, with contact details available so that any queries could be dealt with promptly.

Action: circulation of the introductory wording for Board input

GE

- 1.7 HD proposed a vote of thanks to GE for the work he had done with Civica preparing for the election. GE noted that the OM had also worked extremely hard. It was agreed there should be thanks to both on record.
- 1.8 It was observed that very few people had made nominations and it would be interesting to know what proportion of delegates had voted - the turn out figure. GE believed Civica would be able to supply this information.
- 1.9 RF reported that she had received the nomination statements ready to publish on the website, and asked if this should be done once she had received the information as a delegate that the Civica site was accessible. This was confirmed and she was asked to include a notice to delegates that the elections were underway and they should have received an email from Civica to allow them to participate. There was concern that not all delegates would receive the message from Civica (or it would go to a junk box) and the more contact with delegates to ensure they had received Civica notification the better.

Action: publication of electoral information on the GCCF website

RF

2. Agria news

- 2.1 The Chair reported that Agria seemed to be satisfied with the level of business generated from the breeder policies as he had received no adverse comments. However, there hadn't been a meeting for some time. Notification had been given on the elections and that the Vice-Chair would become Chair.
- 2.2 JL reported that there had been a video conference for breeders arranged by Sarah White to discuss new insurance products for breeders (RF and CK had also taken part.) It had gone well and generated goodwill.
- 2.3 JL asked for confirmation that Breeder Scheme members were to be asked to use the Agria five-week-free cover notes. They could give those for other companies in addition, but Agria was GCCF's partner and the the only company to cover kittens for five weeks.
- 2.4 Others remembered this had been discussed and agreed. However it was noted that at present the information was sent to new members only and that there was nothing on the website or with renewals. It was agreed that updates should be made.

Action: renewal notice and website to include the information on the expected use of Agria fwfs.

JL

3. IT report

- 3.1 SC reported that he and the OM had carried out the annual review of the consultancy. Ian was happy with the job and hours worked, and his input was much appreciated. There were no problems on either side, except that it was known that IM was working longer than his 15 hours per week at times, so there were occasions when he did extra hours, but it was known he was not charging for them.

3.2 It was proposed by SC that an addendum in the form of a letter should be added to the contract that specified the hours and rate of pay specifically, and this would be revised on an annual basis.

Action: addendum to be drafted

SC/OM

3.3 There had been a cleaning up of the bug fix list so that it was now up to date for work on the system.

3.4 Future developments had been discussed with the focus on the website. It was known that a search engine for the site was required and IM was considering whether he could build it or if a contractor should be employed for that purpose, (if it would take IM too much time).

3.5 A different platform for the website (complete with search engine) was discussed as an alternative. Wordpress was considered practical and easy to use and would be an upgrade on the current platform. A site could be built alongside the existing one and then a transfer made. However, IM had to consider the cost and practicality of the transfer of the financial processes, and the site was working satisfactorily at present.

Action: Further research on the latest software developments and costs for this as a future project

ITG

3.6 No issues were reported with Caroline in her business analyst role. It was noted that her skills would not be suitable for website construction.

INFO

4. **Yearbook progress**

4.1 The previous evening had been the deadline for copy for the Yearbook and SD reported that there had been an excellent response. The target of one third of the pages for paid for advertising had been met.

4.2 If all advertising was paid for (and most fees had come in) it would have raised a total of £3620. The printing costs were to be £1992 and there would be a courier charge to take them to the Office. Apart from those the only other major expense would be postage and packing, and pre-orders had begun to come in.

4.3 Chris Stalker had received a wide variety of articles and advertorials to make it interesting and SD thought they were on course for an excellent publication. She was feeling confident and excited and encouraged all to make their purchase direct from the GCCF online site as it was very easy to do.

4.4 In response to a question SD confirmed that arrangements had been made with Agria for their pages, and that Purina had been generous and would have front and back cover slots. Royal Canin had not been interested.

4.5 The Chair and Vice-Chair both thanked SD for her work and asked that thanks be passed on to Chris Stalker. **INFO**

5. **An electronic Council meeting**

5.1 RF gave it as her opinion that there was a certain amount of disquiet amongst GCCF people because they felt disconnected from the centre (Board & other committees). Without shows or Council meetings there was little chance for them to engage, and it was felt there was not much happening. A new Board presented a good opportunity to engage.

5.2 She felt that use of zoom could give the opportunity for a Council meeting even if it had to be a very different format from usual. Some she had attended operated via presentations, with questions taken in advance and answered on the day if possible. Attendees were muted most of the time, but it was thought there could be some organised discussion if delegates were prepared to accept limited time slots to speak, but there could also be written input.

5.3 There was concern expressed that those without the technology or a good internet connection would be disadvantaged, and this was acknowledged. It couldn't present the same opportunity as a physical meeting, but would be offering something for the circumstances, as it wasn't known how long it would be before Council meetings in London could resume.

5.4 Cost was discussed as it was known the small business version of zoom came at the much higher fee of £159.90 per month. However, it was thought worth investigating add on packages to enable a limited number of larger meetings in a year. It would enable a connection with the wider Cat Fancy that had been lost.

5.5 SC suggested looking at alternatives, perhaps running a series of short limited number meetings, starting a blog, or anything that created interaction.

Action: investigation of possibilities

All

(Post meeting note: the Vice Chair ascertained that evening that an add on plan for zoom could be purchased for £40 each time it was needed to allow for a meeting of up to 500.)

BD4023

STAFF & OFFICE

1. **Report from the Office Manager**

1.1 In addition to the figures and graphs to produce the volume statistics Denise had given a short report to update on actions from the previous meeting and confirmed all was well with the staff. The newcomers were learning and developing and it was a stable situation in the Office.

1.2 There was just one item of maintenance to note. The LED lighting would be fitted on Saturday, 12 December, and she would be present to enable this. It would ensure no staff working time was lost. **INFO**

2. **Staff bonus recommendations**

2.1 Figures were presented after discussion in FC and HRG to put a proposal on bonus amounts to the Board.

2.2 It was queried whether the the bonus figures were related to salary, and salary increases for April 2021, and confirmed that these were stand alone amounts given to some staff based on extra effort and commitment, as recommended by the OM.

2.3 It was acknowledged that the newer staff members were not being rewarded in this way, but thought that one other long term staff member should not be omitted.

2.4 There was discussion on the current process of payments made. At present staff received an annual salary and those who had gone the extra mile were rewarded (not all staff). This had been the practice her several years. It was acknowledged that a general increase could be made in April to ensure all were on at least the living wage (£9.30 per hour) and then there would be no need for bonuses. However, this removed an incentive and increasing the size of the salary pot generally meant the possibility of redundancies if there was a downturn and not all staff could be afforded. With the bonus system little or nothing had been be paid in difficult years, and the staff had accepted that. Further thought could be given to this, but in the spring of next year.

- 2.5 There was also comment on the levels of salary paid. There was one opinion that they were low, but another that they were fair for youngsters. It was observed that they were commensurate with rates for similar jobs in the Bridgwater area.
- 2.6 After discussion on how the rounded figures from the HRG meeting derived from the percentages produced by FC there was concern expressed that the OM should not receive less of a percentage of her salary as a bonus than another staff member did for hers, although it was a higher actual figure.
- 2.7 The conclusion was that the OM's figure was lifted on the HRG recommendation, those for two other staff members were reduced, two remained the same and a small sum was introduced for another. These final figures were proposed by CK, 2nd GE and agreed by a majority with 2 abstention (SD, LRT).

Action: the OM to be informed so that bonus payments could be introduced for the staff in December. JH

2.8 It was thought that FC and HRG should look at introducing the living wage as a project in the next year,

3. **Report & recommendations from HR re the Committee Secretary**

- 3.1 The Vice-Chair outlined the conclusion from the HRG meeting of how the continuity could be maintained for the services of the Committee Secretary. The two possible scenarios were that JL was re-elected to the Board in which case she would continue to provide the service on a voluntary basis until such time as a replacement was appointed and trained, or that she did not retain her Board position and would need appointment to the position for a temporary period during the recruitment and training.
- 3.2 There was reference to the 2020 Business Plan in which the need for a replacement Board/Committee Secretary had been identified. From this discussion ensued on whether such a role needed to be full time and if the person appointed needed to be based in Bridgwater. It was reported that the OM was planning for a full time person who would be based within the Office to gain GCCF experience, and once capable of doing the secretarial and administrative duties there could be the addition of marketing work.
- 3.3 It was thought that it would be more suitable to merge the role the IC/DC secretary role with that of the Committee Secretary rather than marketing, but it was understood that the member of staff concerned had full time responsibility and would not necessarily want this. It was stressed that the conversation about the future of staff positions should be had with the OM when she returned from leave and was in a position to explain what she required for any addition to the team.
- 3.4 It was suggested that Becky should cover the Comm Sec role for the first meeting if JL was not re-elected, and the possibility of a separate meeting with the OM present, but not JL, to discuss the matter further was also put forward. However, other Board members remarked on the importance of JL to the Office team until she had a successor.
- 3.5 It was proposed the HR recommendation should be accepted, although there would be a review after three months rather than automatic continuation until June 2021. If not a Board member JL would work for as many hours as were necessary and be paid at £18 per hour. This was agreed with one abstention (JL) **INFO**

A lunch break was taken at 13.42 HM was unable to return to the meeting

BD4024 SHOW MATTERS

1. **Future of the 20-21 show season**

- 1.1 It was thought that given the worsening Covid 19 situation there wouldn't be shows in the first months of 2021.
- 1.2 It was known that TICA had held a show and had at least two more planned. Some GCCF exhibitors were annoyed that there were no GCCF shows, but others, and some TICA people, thought it irresponsible to travel from one area to another with the risk that infection could be carried from high to low risk areas.
- 1.3 There was thought to announce no shows until after the end of March, but after discussion it was agreed to remain consistent and state no shows until after the end of January, but add that it would be unlikely for shows to take place before the end of March. This was agreed unanimously.

Action: update made to website notification

RF/OM

2. **Show licence amendments for the 2021- 2022 season**

- | | | |
|-----|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 2.1 | 2.10. 21 Seal & Blue Birman CC | the addition of Ragdoll classes |
| 2.2 | 25.9.21 South Western Counties CC | Sally Tokens to be SM |
| 2.3 | 18.8. 21 Maine Coon CC | C Kemp & J Rogers as ASMs |
| 2.4 | Previously approved by circulation | |

3. **New show licence application for the 2021-22 show season**

- 3.1 14.8.21 Chester & North Wales
- 3.2 20.11.21 Cheshire Area CC
- 3.3 Previously approved by circulation

4. **Request for show licences to be issued with 'to be confirmed'**

- 4.1 It was agreed that clubs should put forward a possible venue, which could be amended at a later date if necessary, and/or have a show manager in place prior to their show licence being issued.
- 4.2 Both were rule requirements (Section 2:1 d & e) **INFO**

5. **SM qualifications if a break for a number of years**

- 5.1 Two show managers who had not managed for more than five year had asked if they could be on a show licence application without having refreshed by being an ASM
- 5.2 It was agreed that if the application form was filled in correctly the Board would be aware of that, as the date of the last show managed was required if more than three years earlier. The Board would then decide whether the SM was suitable based on the size of the show and their previous record of successful management. It was therefore a matter of Board discretion.

Action: this to be reported to the Office for reference

JL

6. **Report from the Judge Training Review Group**

- 6.1 HD stated she had revised the Judge Appointment Scheme documents and forms to simplify them and make sure the numbering was consistent and matched with that on the forms. She would be sending it to the BAC secretaries and asked RF to put it onto the judges' section of the website. The intention was to get everyone using the same version.
- 6.2 The new stewarding forms from earlier in the year were not on the site yet and HD would also send those.
Action: website publication of JAS & trading scheme paperwork RF
- 6.3 PC explained that some clarification was needed for the Accelerated Scheme as BACs were making different interpretations. This related to tutorials in section 14. They could be on exhibits from the FJP's book or that of the FJ.
- 6.4 It was asked why not all members of the JTRG were invited to attend the meeting. The response was one person was not asked to attend for two different reasons. He had not been involved in earlier discussions and this session was to clarify decisions made at the time, and he was involved with the SCJAC and there was discussion planned on the problems connected with that BAC. (SD was also an FJP with the SCJAC, but it was explained that she was aware of the problems from being a Board member, and she was concerned with the Foreign White only and qualified as a Siamese Judge.)
- 6.5 HD outlined the thinking for the JTRG suggesting virtual tutorials to BACs. It was thought that there could well be a gap of 18 months between shows ceasing and restarting, and the fear was a loss of interest and momentum in the judges who were training, to the extent that a number would not begin again. It was acknowledged that it was a compromise as coat qualities could not be assessed, but it maintained a connection between judges and BACs and provided a learning experience.
- 6.6 There had been a mixed response. The Burmese BAC had been enthusiastic, several others had expressed sympathy with the intention, but did not think virtual tutorials were a substitute for the real thing, as there was no opportunity to feel the cats or examine them for faults. It was thought that if the purpose was stated as being educational, rather than proposed as counting towards tutorials as required by the JAS it would probably have a better reception.
- 6.7 RF outlined the Kennel Club's educational program of having teaching sessions online by judges or longterm breeders as training and general information for breeders & exhibitors as well as judges. It prevented expertise being lost. It was acknowledged that these could be specific to discuss a breed's SOP or, for example, veterinary defects.
- 6.8 It was thought this would be a good area for the JTRG to explore further as there were groups of judges who could demonstrate breeds and were enthusiastic. Once the videos were made these could be shared and would provide an example for others.
Action: further discussion of online learning and initiation of sample videos JTRG
- NB JH had connection problems and could not participate in the discussion. He would email queries he had received for feedback to the JTRG after the meeting.

BD4025 REGISTRATION, TRANSFERS & SOP ITEMS

1. **An amendment to the SOP for the Suffolk**

- 1.1 In September the Suffolk BAC had proposed an amendment to better describe the profile as it was felt that the inclusion of the word 'stop' was inappropriate. The Board had agreed, but it was thought that the proposed alternative was not a sufficiently clear description.
- 1.2 It had been suggested to the BAC that they should consider the wording of the Ocicat SOP.
- 1.3 The response from the BAC was that this description was liked and the SOP revision now included it with brief wording for an allowance of jowls in males.
- 1.4 The amended SOP was unanimously approved and would be proposed to delegates via the website.
Action: letter to the Suffolk BAC, and an addition to the electronic agenda JL

2. **Amendments to the Chartreux SOP**

- 2.1 The Chartreux Breeder Group had submitted an amended SOP which removed an historical note and revised description of the head (primarily) with minor re-wording in connection with the muzzle, ears and coat.
- 2.2 It was appreciated that the Chartreux BG had included a detailed rationale for each change.
- 2.3 The amended SOP was unanimously approved and would be proposed to delegates via the website.
Action: letter to the Chartreux BG, and an addition to the electronic agenda JL

3. **Amendments to the Chartreux Registration Policy**

- 3.1 The Chartreux Breeder Group had submitted an amended registration policy that deleted from the reference register section allowance for imports that had European SHs, British SHs and/or Chartreux LHs visible in their background within three generations.
- 3.2 At the time of the application for breed recognition these had been allowed for the purpose of breed development, to ensure a variety of lines could be imported.
- 3.3 The rationale provided for the deletions was that preparation for championship status was being made and it was felt that this allowance was no longer necessary. Different lines had been imported and there was diversity in the European population for future selection.
- 3.4 The amended registration policy was unanimously approved and would be proposed to delegates via the website.
Action: letter to the Chartreux BG, and an addition to the electronic agenda JL

4. **Certificate of neutering as a requirement for HHP registration**

- 4.1 RF reported that she had not yet looked into the rules to see where/how this could be implemented in a way that continued to allow domestic cats to be used as occasional breeding outcrosses and the showing of entire pedigree kittens in some circumstances (as STAR required registration).

4.2 She had discussed with Caroline possible changes in registration that would provide a distinction between domestic cats that were being registered for breeding purposes as allowed for in a registration policy, and pets (that were required to be neutered) registered so that they could be shown.

Action: circulation of this information

RF

BD4026 CLUB & BAC MATTERS

1. An update on the 2019 club & BAC returns

1.1 Two clubs had now completed: Ulster Siamese & AB had sent all paperwork and paid. The Colourpoint & AB Society of GB had supplied the missing balance sheet.

1.2 The Northern Birman CC had sent completed returns. There was a minor discrepancy on membership numbers, for the purpose of system entry, but SH was satisfied the information was in order. It was agreed that the club could have its returns accepted.

1.3 Clubs at 1.1 and 1.2 had applied for show licences and it was agreed these could now be considered.

Action: check with Rhian and circulation of show licence applications

JL

1.4 It was noted that the Nor' East of Scotland returns were complete with the exception of having their accounts examined. Capitation and delegate fees had been paid. During discussion of the electoral processes (BD4022.1), SC had mentioned that the club had queried why they had no delegate listed. When he had explained examined accounts were necessary there was an objection to this because it was thought allowance should have been made because of the pandemic, and GCCF was possibly at risk of legal challenge for disregarding exceptional circumstances. However, it was noted that the majority of clubs had complied, and all clubs voting for the Byelaw amendments had agreed the proposal that moved the deadline from May to August, but did not alter the requirement for examined accounts.

1.5 It was noted that other clubs who had not submitted examined returns by the agreed 31 August deadline, but had since supplied them, and wanted their delegate to participate in future Council meetings, would require dispensation for this. The usual practice was to state a request on the next meeting agenda.

1.6 No responses had been received from the Oriental LH Breed Club.

The LH Cream & Blue Cream had reported they had sent returns and payment at the beginning of October, but there was no record of this so the Office was making checks.

The Southern Counties CC & Croydon CC had not sent the required returns, but had submitted payments and show licence applications. These could not be considered.

1.7 SH observed that clubs would need guidance about making returns for 2020, particularly with respect to their balance sheets and membership numbers. Some clubs would want to pay subs based on their 2019 membership and retain their delegates while others would seek dispensation to pay a reduced amount. It was thought simpler if there were not options, and suggested that there should be simplification of the whole returns process if no normality was in sight at the beginning of the year. It was noted it would need further discussion so that any Byelaw suspension or change could be put to Council in February.

Action: item to be on next FC and Board agendas

JL

2. Siamese Cat JAC problems

2.1 CK reported that a virtual meeting was arranged for 8 November, and that it had been ascertained via the accounts that all the constituent clubs were eligible to participate. Therefore all would be invited, whether they had stated an interest in a virtual meeting or not.

2.2 Some nominations had been received (though not for secretary) which would be circulated, and CK was willing to take further nominations on the day.

2.3 CK observed that most clubs saw the Board's intervention as a fresh start, but others were holding on to past grievances and wanted to be very sure that the meeting would be run according to JAS protocols.

2.4 Consideration would be given to a letter from IC that set out 13 points of complaint. She had worked out with the previous secretary that he would draft a reply that could then be discussed at the forthcoming meeting. Otherwise this was for electoral purposes and to set the date and time for a full meeting.

2.5 It was thought that excellent progress had been made, but CK was certain this was only the beginning and there would be plenty of difficulties ahead.

Action: meeting of the SCJAC

CK

3. Provisional membership application for the Suffolk CA

3.1 The club had applied for provisional membership using the generic rules and supplying a set of accounts that stated membership. It was noted that there were 50 members, but it difficult to verify that all were paid up.

3.2 It was also observed that many of those looked as though they had paid for three years. Subsequent returns would need a check to ensure some (not all) were carried forward and others were added so that membership was in order by the time of the application for Full Membership.

3.3 It was agreed unanimously to grant provisional membership.

Action: the club to be informed and a notice to be published on the electronic agenda

(SD & RF left the meeting at 3.15pm)

BD4027 HEALTH & WELFARE

1. Updates from the Canine & Feline Sector Group and other groups

1.1 SC reported that there had been no meeting of the C&FSG since the Board's September meeting. He had met with a KC representative and Chair to discuss advice from DEFRA on shows, and already reported to the Board that there would be no specific DEFRA guidance.

1.2 There was a DEFRA call for evidence to C&FSG on puppy and kitten importation and smuggling, with comment on any possible post-Brexit implications. This was purely for notification he thought no actual Board response was needed currently.

- 1.3 The draft Animal Welfare regulations for Scotland had just been published for final stakeholder consultation. The draft was a statutory instrument, but in SC's opinion was very poorly written. It would apply only to breeders resident in Scotland and he'd begun contacting them for opinion which had to be returned by 11 November
- 1.4 The key issue was that licensing was said to apply to businesses, but there was no definition of a business. It seemed as if it could be anyone breeding three or more litters, but this could apply to a hobby breeder equally as well as a commercial one.
- 1.5 There was further confusion as it was stated that a local authority inspector would have no right of entry to domestic premises. That indicated that licences were needed solely by those who did not breed and sell from their own homes, but this wasn't actually specified.
- 1.6 SC aimed to point out the anomalies with the help of Scottish breeders.

Action: GCCF response to the draft publication of regulation for breeders in Scotland

SC

2. Information request from a local authority

- 2.1 The Chairman reported a very recent request for data on breeders within a particular local authority area.
- 2.2 It was known that HMRC had legal authority to ask for disclosure on a particular individual when they had evidence for an investigation, but not to make general enquiries. It was thought that it would be the same in respect of local authorities. They would need specific authority via regulation or GCCF could be at risk of breaching GDPR by disclosure.
- 2.3 It was also remarked that GCCF held data on cats rather than people, and had no knowledge of a breeder's premises, breeding practices or personal finances.

INFO

3. DC request for clarification re action with regard to Breeder Scheme members

- 3.1 SC confirmed that if Breeder Scheme members were found to be in breach of the higher Code of Ethics they had signed up to then they could be suspended or expelled. This would be brought to the attention of the Board if new owners reported it via feedback to the Office via the Scheme rather than made an actual complaint to IC for welfare, lack of paperwork or any other cause.
- 3.2 It was thought if any BS members went to DC and a complaint was proven then they were in fact bringing the Scheme into disrepute and DC should act on this fact, whether by suspension or expulsion. It did not need to refer back to the Board. It could also take into account that the BS members should have been aspiring to a higher Code of Ethics
- 3.3 It was queried whether the Board endorsed applicants to the Scheme, and stated that the purpose for the application coming to the Board was for assessment to see if there were any objections rather than endorsement. It was agreed there should be a statement to this effect on the website information.

**Actions: letter to DC
website check**

**JL
RF**

4. Request for action on internet advertising

- 4.1 Sympathy was expressed for the points the British Ragdoll CC had made
- 4.2 It was noted that they had a rule change proposal to go to Council in respect of stud owners and unregistered queens, but this needed delegate discussion rather than fast tracking.
- 4.3 They could also be told that the rule at Section 1:10b applied to all kittens sold by a breeder who used GCCF's services. It was not specific to the kittens they registered. Therefore complaints on welfare grounds could be made to IC if the breeder could be identified with certainty.
- 4.4 The club would be informed that the Board was interested in contacting internet sites that marketed breeder advertisement and after the elections it was hoped to have a project leader on this matter.

Action: Letter to the British Ragdoll CC

JL

5. Request for support re rescue website

- 5.1 Before leaving the meeting RF had pointed out that the letter writer was not running a rescue website. She took advertisements from breeders for a fee so that it could be deemed a business interest.
- 5.2 SF observed there was no mention of rescue on the website and nothing that provided a reason for GCCF to select it to give support. It provided information, but so did the GCCF website.
- 5.3 The instances of malpractice provided as a list within the document were allegation rather than evidence. If evidence existed with the breeder identity provable, then IC could be used in some instances and Trading Standards or the RSPCA in others. GCCF did not have an inspectorate.

Action: Letter to Miss Dickens

JL

BD4028 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

1. JH confirmed that he had spoken to the WCC and told them it was very unlikely that the celebratory event would go ahead in 2021, but he had not yet told them it was absolutely ruled out. At present the NEC wasn't taking any bookings and it was difficult to know what the future would bring, but as the event required months of planning rather than being instantaneous it did not seem feasible. People coming from abroad could not be expected to commit to travel.
2. This led on to discussion of whether there would be a Supreme Show, but there could be no commitment on this either because the future was uncertain.
3. There was a request from a recent prefix applicant to change from WEBBERPAWS to PEDIGREEPAWS. There had been no approval yet for the first choice. This was agreed.

Action: information to the Office

JL

DATE & TIME OF NEXT MEETING

There was no discussion on this. It would be determined post meeting.

The meeting finished at 3.39 pm.