



MINUTES

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

Friday, 23 April 2021



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

Mrs Lynda Ashmore	Mr Steve Crow
Ms Sandra Devereux	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

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

BD4078 MEETING INTRODUCTION

1. **Apologies for absence.**

1.1 There were no apologies for absence. The Vice-Chair could not be present at the beginning due to work commitments and PW was not there throughout and left early for the same reason. SC & TG had to leave at 2.30pm and RF at 3.45pm because of other appointments.

2. **Chair's opening remarks**

2.1 The meeting began at 11.12am as the Chair welcomed those present, and thanked them for attending. He asked for brief comments as he aimed to conclude by 3pm.

INFO

BD4079 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

1. **The Minutes of the Board meeting of 26 March 2021**

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

1.2 Corrections were made on the day to BD4073.1.3 to add missing initials and BD4074.2.2 to improve the sense.

1.3 The minutes were approved unanimously as proposed by LR, seconded SC .

Action: to be published on the website

JL/RF

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

2.1 BD4073.4.1 RF reported contact with NRG Digital who could produce a video to commemorate 150 years of cat shows. There were three different styles, a pictorial montage of film and pictures, a longer animated video, and one that would involve live talk and action. The price range was £4000 to £10,000 with increments of £2,000 for each tier.
At present it could be produced to go live on the weekend of the 150th anniversary in July, but that would mean a quick start as there would need to be a preparatory collection of material from various sources. Therefore a vote was taken on the principle on spending on this project which was agreed with one abstention, SH.
SD proposed, SC seconded that as there was money saved for the WCC it would be worth spending to obtain the best historic production that could be used for any events in 2021 and for years to come. SC proposed, KK seconded a spend of up to £10,000. Both proposals were agreed together with one abstention, SH.

**Actions: circulation of examples from NRG Digital at the lunch break
information on the spend, using money saved for WCC to be shared with FC members
information gathering for the project**

**JL
RF&SC**

RF

2.2 BD4074.1.4 Ian Macro had confirmed that the overstamp wording for the Genetic Register could be put in place to follow the rules more closely, as suggested by the Ocicat and Aztec BAC.

2.2 BD4074.4 The Tonkinese BAC had responded to implement the changes to their registration policy that had been put forward by the Board. It was therefore on the electronic agenda for delegate approval. No comments on this or the Sokoke registration policy had been received to date.

2.3 BD4077.2 The Appeals Committee had been contacted re revising their Code of Conduct so that it was amended in the same way as DC's. AC did not wish to make any changes.

INFO

BD4080 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

1.1 JL & JH confirmed they had been present at the disciplinary hearing re The Ocicat CC in November 2012.

1.2 They noted there had been no discussion on the subjects mentioned in a letter from the club as discussed at the time. It was the published recommendations that had been referenced in correspondence from IC.

INFO

BD4081 FINANCE

1. **Management p&l accounts to 28 March 2021**

1.1 The p&l sheet had been circulated electronically prior to the meeting. It was observed that the gross profits for the first three months of the year to date, £47,007, were as much as had been achieved in some years previously .

- 1.2 There had been some savings on expenditure, especially as no physical meetings were taking place, but income had also improved considerably too with £104,791 achieved in 2020 and £133,017 in the same period in 2021.
- 1.3 It was noted that the Agria income had improved in line with additional registrations, with an increase of almost £2000 in March which was pleasing.
- 1.4 There was an observation that plans for spending the money for the benefit of GCCF had to be kept under review, which supported the decision taken to take action on the historical video. **INFO**

2. Volume figures (core business)

- 2.1 These provided supporting information for the increase in core business income, showing a total of 631 additional registry entries in 2021. The graphs showed growth in all areas compared to the last three years.
- 2.2 April's figures indicated that the overall increase had dropped to around 300, but there was another week to go.
- 2.3 The OM observed she was pleased that the level of imports had been sustained and there was a further increase indicated for April. Many of these came from TICA, and it seemed it was liked that GCCF had a UK based office, and gave efficient service. **INFO**

3. Report on investments & statement balances

- 3.1 The figures were correct on the following as at 22.4.21

Aldermore	£77,048.16 with a fixed interest of 0.55%, until March 2022 as rolled over. (signatories SF, SC, RF, OM and the bookkeeper)
Cambridge & Counties	£86,226.62 95 day notice account with 1% interest. (signatories SF, SC, RF, OM and the bookkeeper)
Redwood	£82,752.71 95 day notice account with 1.34% interest (online access SF, RF and the OM and bookkeeper) Interest rate was due to drop to 1.05% on 13.7.21. Monmouthshire BS £84,000, an easy access account with 0.5% interest (online access SF, RF, the OM and bookkeeper)
Shawbrook	£80,00 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 20.4.21

Lloyds (current)	£218,034.59
Lloyds (Supreme)	£964.95
Lloyds (Euro)	€15,670.952 = £13,486.02 (exchange rate €1.11 to £1) (signatories SF, SC, RF, SH the OM and the bookkeeper)

- 3.3 It was observed that Redwood Bank still gave a good rate of interest in spite of the decrease. **INFO**

4. Budget allocation for the Autumn Event

- 4.1 LA queried the amount allocated as she needed to be sure of this particularly for consideration of possible venues.
- 4.2 It was confirmed that the amount in the budget for a possible autumn event was £25,000. There had been no designation of what form this would take, as it was unknown at the time whether this would be the Supreme, or an event that replaced it.
- 4.3 There was some discussion on the total amount available for celebrating 150 years of shows. It was concluded that the £25,000 had been allocated for the 2021 show, and almost the same amount (approximately) had been saved in Cambridge & Counties particularly for the 150 celebration which it was presumed at the time would be done in conjunction with hosting the World Cat Congress.
- 4.4 JL proposed, seconded by JH, that the autumn show should have a budget of up to £25000. This did not mean that all of it would be spent, nor that the show would definitely go ahead, as this would depend on the pandemic situation and whether it was feasible for any shows to take place at the time.
The financial allocation was agreed with one abstention, LRT.
- 4.5 There was brief discussion on whether there should be a budget allocated to the virtual event. It was agreed that this couldn't be done until there was more information on what would be involved.

BD4082 BUSINESS ITEMS

1. Business Plan for 2021 - plans for the strategy meeting

- 1.1 PW reported there had been a meeting with the Chairman and SC and there was a recommendation from that for a strategic planning day, hosted by an independent person
- 1.2 The cost for such a facilitator would be in the region of £500-£750 per day and in addition to the meeting there would be preparatory work and the write up of recommendations. Conflict of interest prevented him making any recommendations, and he was hoping contact with others would supply a name(s).
- 1.3 People who could have possible contacts were suggested, as was an adviser who had assisted GCCF some years ago. A vote was taken as proposed by PW, seconded by SC to approve going ahead with such a meeting as soon as a lead was found and this was agreed by a majority with 1 abstention, LRT.

Action: liaison to find an independent lead for the strategy day

PW

2. News from Business partners and possible future partners

- 2.1 The Chair reported that both Purina and Royal Canin wanted to have a meeting, but suitable dates had not yet been agreed, so discussion was ongoing.
- 2.2 RF reported that the Van Cat litter company had advertised in the monthly electronic newsletter and had been pleased with the take up they had received for vouchers that were offered. They had mentioned some sponsorship for the Supreme, but would transfer this to an alternative GCCF event if necessary.
- 2.3 The Chair mentioned there had not yet been any response from the microchip company marketing a chip combined with GPS tracking. It had now been several months since the initial contact.

2.4 SC reported that he had received an email from representatives of a microchip company that had previously had preliminary discussion on a partnership with GCCF. They had not been in touch for some time but wished to resume contact. He had recently forwarded the message to the Chair.

Action: a response to be made

SF

3. **Report from the ITG**

3.1 SC had circulated a written report and asked if there were any questions. It covered:

- Bug fixing
- The breeder co-efficient resource to be trialed
- An update on the registration policy project
- Further liaison with the NZ Cat Fancy on using Phoenix as a model for their registry
- Training videos for new judges and new exhibitors
- Mitigation of the risk of losing the IT consultant suddenly

3.2 A draft technical specification of the revised website had been created in conjunction with a website designer and was discussed with further refinements agreed. The use of Word Press would enable tagging to produce the desired search facility.

3.4 LR reported that the hyperlinks on the current website couldn't be picked up on all computers as many of the links were not the standard blue used on nearly all websites, but GCCF purple. However, although all devices could read the blue that wasn't true for any other colour.

3.5 It was agreed a change would be made as this was something relatively easy to do.

3.6 The next ITG meeting was scheduled for 7 May.

4. **Website upgrade project - update**

4.1 RF reported the website specification had been sent to four designers. One was not interested and another had not made any response. Solnspired had made a quote, and recently there had been a meeting with 3MIL, a long established company recommended by NRG and used by Crufts. A second meeting was planned so that there could be a presentation on the interface with Phoenix.

4.2 There was discussion on the nature of the revision. RF confirmed that it wasn't just a rebrand, although this would be included, but a complete new look. The aim would be to have a website that was easily accessible to the different groups within GCCF and the general public.

4.3 It was queried whether there would be a change so that documents were centrally accessible with links to them, which meant that if a change was required it needed to be only once. Quick links for show managers and the possibility of a show managers' forum were also suggested.

4.4 There was consensus that a new website was required rather than an update of the old one, making use more intuitive and with stronger branding.

Action: circulation of the specifications

RF

(The Vice Chair joined the meeting, 12.05)

5. **GCCF email addresses - revisions to the code of conduct**

5.1 SC confirmed that he had taken no further action as the Code of Conduct had been presented and revisions proposed. However, the trials suggested at the previous meeting had not yet taken place and SC believed now that several Board members were not interested in having an address.

5.2 The Chair expressed an opinion it made good business sense for the Board to have GCCF email addresses, but there could be practical difficulties that made it unworkable for some individuals as all were using their own computer equipment with a variety of software and internet providers.

5.3 LR suggested adding clauses to the Directors Code of Conduct to govern the use of business emails and their retention on the personal computers, with or without a separate address, but it was concluded that the decision to be made was whether the addresses should be available to Board members as a business principle and then individuals would have to see if they could work with them.

This was proposed by PW, seconded by JH and agreed with three abstentions, SH, ER, HD.

6.4 It was then agreed that those who wished to trial an address should contact the OM by 30 April so that Systemagic could be informed and make the connections the following week.

Action: liaison with the OM to make the necessary arrangements

SD, JL, SC, PW

6. **Risk assessment - April 2021**

6.1 Action had been carried out to mitigate two fire risks identified. Two others remained, but were in the process of being rectified.

6.2 The GDPR risk of the storage of business related information on personal computers by volunteers was identified as a risk. A relevant addition would have to be made to an existing Code of Conduct, or a separate one prepared with the advice of the IT consultant.

INFO

BD4083

SHOW MATTERS

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

1.1 LR had circulated a report on the morning of the meeting. She apologised for its lateness.

1.2 She first reported concerns that people had reported pressure. Some who had put in forms to make proposals to the SRG felt threatened as did some show managers. There were those who had decided not to go ahead with shows in 2021 who needed support for having made that decision.

1.3 LR then observed that the news that day had confirmed the death of a Ragdoll kitten from Covid and that a Siamese had been diagnosed with the virus, but recovered. It was thought human to cat contact was responsible and covid-positive owners were asked to be aware of the risk of transmission to pets. How many cats had a mild form of the disease, and the frequency of cat to cat contact were unknowns, but had to be considered as risk factors in a show situation and exhibitors should be aware of them.

1.4 PC advised that the disinfectant he had mentioned at the last meeting was safe for pets, and was far cheaper than the brand recommended by the VAC (Invirtu) that also had the disadvantage of needing special dispensers.

1.5 It was agreed there should be liaison with the VAC on whether Invirtu was effective against Covid.

Action: brand names to be circulated and information shared with the VAC for discussion on disinfectants PC

1.6 It was requested that the detail of the proposals under discussion would be listed in future minutes so that there would be understanding of the conclusion that were made on each. LR gave a commitment that this was the intention.

1.7 A proposal for a show change from the Siamese SCC that had been approved in principle (without an actual Rule change being made, followed by a counter proposal and referral to the first SRG) in Council in 2014 had been resubmitted and passed to the SRG for their consideration. It was agreed that it was correct that the SCC's proposal should be referred back to the next Council meeting, but also preferable that the SRG should consider its advantages and disadvantages in advance to inform Council of these along with any conclusions.

Action: the item to be on the July Council agenda

JL

2. A proposal to open the Show Review Group to non-Board membership

2.1 JH made the proposal as he believed the SRG was currently too restrictive (Board members only) and there were others groups that had done a lot of work some of whose members would have a lot to offer. He preferred GCCF to show that it was inclusive

2.2 It was stated that the SRG was working well under LR's direction, especially as she was drawing information from a range of sources and liaising with people from the other groups mentioned. It was therefore preferable for the group to stay as it was and not become too large.

2.3 LR confirmed that she was now a member of the SNAP group, so taking information directly and working with others as well. Her intention was that the SRG was the central point for working through all ideas and she was happy to listen if told of ideas to improve in this.

2.4 PW commented that nothing was being done wrong, it was matter of perception, taking one or two from outside the Board would send the right message to the wider Cat Fancy. This would assist when it came to making proposals to Council.

2.5 SC suggested to prevent the SRG becoming too big associate membership could be offered. SD gave support to this idea.

2.6 LR concluded that it was inclusive because ideas were invited from and information was fed back to all. She believed the SRG was very well perceived because of the amount of contributions and interest it was receiving.

2.7 PC commended the SRG on being inclusive and said he appreciated the effort made to reach out to all. He also observed that if groups were to be increased beyond the Board it should be done democratically rather than people being selected.

2.8 PW seconded the proposal put by JH and a vote was taken. Six were for, eight against and one abstention, JL, LA, SC, TG, RF, JH, PW requested a record of a vote in favour.

INFO

3. A proposal to allow shows to restart from 21.6.21 subject to venue and government requirements

3.1 It was noted that the SRG had found that there were show managers that wanted support from pressure exerted by exhibitors anxious to have shows re-started as soon as possible in 2021. SMs had to think of the club's bank account and practicalities. PW commented that in making this proposal he wished to back those clubs who had a show manager and wished to try. The decision to go ahead or not had to be taken based on venue conditions and financial viability, but could be at a club/SM team level.

3.2 There was a query on whether the insurance policy would be affected, and it was thought that its renewal on 1 May would bring no change. No insurance policy would cater for any detrimental impact from Covid-19 (or any pandemic) and clubs would have to be aware of that.

3.3 The Vice-Chair commented that it was his understanding from present data and modelling that it would be unlikely that the summer opening up would go as fast as planned. There was already some indication of a third wave at that time (NERVTAG), and although it would be mitigated by the vaccination programme careful thought had to be given to encouraging travel and indoor events at that time. If as an organisation GCCF encouraged clubs it could result in some planning and spending only to be disappointed.

3.4 RF seconded the proposal and a vote was taken. There were six for and six against with three abstentions: TG, SH, KK. A record of a vote in favour was requested by LA, SC, RF, JH, JL, PW.

3.5 The Chairman commented that he had listened to the debate that had unfolded before him, and having considered the advice given, he was going to use his casting vote against the proposal and it could be reviewed at the next Board meeting as was the usual practice. Therefore the proposal was lost.

3.6 SF then stated the matter would be reviewed at the next meeting, and as it could be that late July, early August would be in the middle of a third wave then it seemed sensible to take the earliest possible date to be 1st September, which PC agreed.

3.7 There was comment that the Cat Fancy should be informed clearly at the earliest possible opportunity on the reasons for decision, which were concern for human and feline health and welfare taking account of the latest data available. JL was asked to prepare a statement to send to the officers and circulate the Board.

Action: statement preparation

JL

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

4.1 There were none to report.

4.2 A query was made about whether the fun show planned by the Suffolk Breed CC needed a licence, and it was reported that the club had been contacted by the Office to ask whether it running this or wanting to continue with the show it was licensed for in January 2022 as a club could not have two shows in the same season.

4.3 It had been confirmed that the club was not involved in the September event as this was being organised by a private individual. The club was then informed that this should be absolutely clear and its name and logo should not be associated with the event in anyway

4.4 It was thought this had been understood, but it was reported that the club's name was still used in connection with the show on social media. The committee would be asked to make a check and remove all reference to the club within seven days (30 April) or risk losing their show licence.

Action: Office liaison on contact with the club

JL

5. **Plans for the 150th Anniversary
(a) an actual event**

- 5.1 LA had put in a show licence that requested the Supreme date of 24 October, though would have preferred an earlier date so the show could have been the first GCCF event after the pandemic. At present venues contacted were either booked or not responding so nothing was named. It was also impossible to state cat or judge numbers. *(SC & TG left at 2.30 approx)*
- 5.2 It was observed that a show should not be licensed without a venue and queried whether a licence was needed at all as no certificates would be awarded. However, although it could be classed an event LA noted that some competition was planned and the conclusion was that it would be preferable to licence it in case plans changed to include certificates, and to ensure it was covered by GCCF's insurance.
- 5.3 The organising group were hoping to find a venue in the midlands (smaller than the NEC) with Stoneleigh Park thought suitable. This was determined as the probable venue to add to the licence.
- 5.4 A vote was taken on the issue of a licence. It was agreed with 5 abstentions: HD, SH, ER, LRT, LR.

(b) a virtual show

- 5.5 The approach had been made to a known successful organiser of virtual shows. Her response had been positive, but she had an April event organised and wished to complete the commitment to that before entering further discussions.
- 5.6 It was believed that from dates given she should be available for a meeting shortly and contact would be made to arrange this.

Action: meeting arrangement

JL

5.5 It was noted that there needed to be official confirmation on the website and FB page of the Supreme cancellation, with some information on the alternatives being planned, to remove the uncertainty and provide exhibitors with something to look forward to.

5.6 This should include information on the historical video as people could be invited to contribute pictures, documents and memories that could be useful.

Action: a notice to be drafted and circulated to the Board prior to publication

JL

6. **Presentations by Zoom for YES candidates**

- 6.1 LA noted that there had been nothing arranged for the youngsters of YES throughout the pandemic and there was a danger of losing the interest in the scheme. She proposed that they could present their cat to judges via Zoom with arrangements made with their parents.
- 6.2 It was thought that an adult should be physically present (and visible) within the room while the presentation was made to protect all concerned.
- 6.3 In further discussion it was decided that a consent form should be drafted that gave permission to record the presentation, as it could be sent to the candidate to keep and share, as well as being another level of protection for the judges involved.
- 6.4 Several Board members and the OM (if available) were willing to host the presentations which would most probably be held at a weekend.
- 6.5 The proposal was agreed unanimously.

Action: consent forms to be drafted and circulated

LA

BD4084 JUDGE APPOINTMENT SCHEME REVIEW GROUP (Previously Judge Training Review Group)

1. **Minutes of the meeting**

- 1.1 These had been circulated on the afternoon before the Board meeting.
- 1.2 An update had been made to the Accelerated Judges Scheme for clause 14 (Process) as had been requested by the Board in December (BD4034.5). This could now go forward to Council as was stated as the correct course of action at that time.

Action: to be on the agenda of the July Council meeting

JL

1.3 There were no further proposals or stated actions within the minutes and no queries were raised. The next meeting was scheduled for 9 May.

Action: publication of the minutes on the website

RF

2. **Revised Terms of Reference**

- 2.1 These had been circulated with the minutes and PW had responded to query what was new, reiterating this at the meeting.
- 2.2 KK responded by explaining that as the primary remit was unchanged the aims also remained as they were. Given the change of Chair, it was time to pick up the threads and move forward which was the 'new element.'
- 2.3 She drew attention to addendum one that specified the issues driving the need for change to encourage new GCCF judges.
- 2.4 KK stated that the new TOR provided a simple framework that would be fleshed out. She also stated that a tremendous amount of work had already been done and this would provide a basic platform which the committee would use to build on. Kate was happy to provide her email address to take comment from anyone who wished to contribute.
- 2.5. HD asked permission to put this onto the Guild of GCCF Judges & Stewards' website (without allowing comments to be taken) in addition to the publication on the GCCF website, and the Chair gave consent so that the information reached as many as possible quickly.
- 2.6 It was thought there had previously been a dedicated FB page and this would be checked.
- 2.7 KK was asked about the name change for the group and she confirmed this as a conscious decision, commenting that discussions about judge training were centred upon the Judge Appointment Scheme, so that it was sensible to include it within the group's official title.

Action: website publication and FB page assessment

RF

1. **Update on 2020 club & BAC returns**

- 1.1 There were 62 club returns (40.5%) and some from BACs. On 1 April a note had been sent to clubs as planned and it was expected that many would arrive at the last minute. SH reiterated that receipts to the Office would be date stamped and anything stamped from 5 May onwards would be late.
- 1.2 The Office would be asked to write to clubs who submitted late paperwork to inform them they were not entitled to a delegate for 2021-2022.
- 1.3 However, if clubs had made partial returns, including their delegate's fees, and had sent an apology they were entitled to an extension, and it would be for Council to determine the necessary dispensation for each delegate to join the meeting. The 2021 Byelaw provisions meant that these delegates could not nominate or be nominated for the Board or Finance Committee.
- 1.4 It was agreed that all clubs funds had to be listed, accounted for and visible which included show accounts. The balances on each had to have been signed off by the independent examiner.

Action: information on the clubs to be circulated in May after checking

SH

- 1.5 The examined return from the Chartreux CC UK had been received, and as expected did not show the transfer of money to a private account as this had taken place in January 2021. The full membership fee (£15) had been paid following a request for the additional £5.

INFO

2. **Chartreux Cat Club UK - update**

- 2.1 A reply had been received from the club explaining why club money was held in a private account. Money had been transferred from an account that was closed and was there until a new one could be opened.
- 2.2 The information supplied also indicated that apart from the treasurer and his immediate family there was no one willing to form a committee.
- 2.3 It was agreed that an offer should be made to take most of the money into the GCCF accounts for safe-keeping, returning it when there was evidence of a new bank account opened with the remaining small amount. A vote was taken and this action was agreed unanimously.
- 2.4 There was concern about the stability of the club and its ability to ensure the breed progressed. It was thought possible that the SHCS could assist and KK was willing to take this to a meeting the following day.

Action: discussion with the SHCS

KK

a letter to be sent to the breed club once the outcome of the SHCS discussions was circulated

JL

3. **Judge Appointment Scheme revision re 'Complaints'**

- 3.1 PW proposed that if a BAC was subject to supervision following a complaint it should receive regular updates from those appointed to do this, to enable improvement and completion.

* Verbatim report for this item is attached verbatim, as a summary for this item was not agreed.

Action: a new proposal to be brought forward to the May meeting

PW/SD

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

- 4.1 JL had been asked at the previous meeting (BD40761.5) to draft a proposal for the JAS BAC constitution to allow BACs with a large accumulation of funds to share these with the constituent clubs that had contributed payments for part or all of its existence.
- 4.2 There was some thought that this was already covered by an existing clause that allowed the repayment of club levies if sufficient funds existed (JAS 10i). This had been circulated by SG prior to the meeting.
- 4.3 It was observed by HD that the JAS clauses had been renumbered and the proposal did not have the correct heading of BAC constitution or clause number. The most up to date version was on the website.
- 4.4 SH raised the possibility that the wording would not be sufficient in certain instances and an amendment could be necessary to cover all situations.
- 4.5 The Chair concluded that reference had to be made to the most up to date version of the JAS and any additional amendments should put forward with this in mind.

Action: referral to the May FC agenda

JL

(RF left the meeting at 3.50 approx)

1. **Staff report4**

- 1.1 A letter had been received from a member of staff with a request. Advice had been sought from the company's HR advisors who had supplied information. It was unanimously agreed that there should be no change to existing policy as defined in the Staff Handbook.

Action: the staff member concerned would receive a written response

OM

- 1.2 Another staff HR issue was discussed. Advice had been sought and received from the company's HR advisors. The action required would cost £900.
- 1.3 The newest recruit had been at the Office for three weeks and seemed to fitting in as part of the team. She was learning the role and gaining in confidence.

INFO

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

- 2.1 Trademarks had been requested for the GCCF and Breeder Scheme logos. The process would take about three weeks.
- 2.2 The fire risk assessment report had been received. A longer extension lead had been provided to remove the need for two (red hazard) and a hook had been removed. Arrangements had been made to ensure a door closed properly and to relocate a smoke detector
- 2.3 The Office had received an HSE spot check. No issues had been raised, or feedback given later, so it was presumed all was in order as no contact was made to give advice or require action.
- 2.4 There was no new equipment required at present.

INFO

BD4087 REGISTRATION, TRANSFERS & SOP ITEMS

1. **Amendments to the Persian LH registration policy**
 - 1.1 The Persian LH BAC had introduced a DNA testing schedule to ensure smokes that were on the active register were proven to be non-agouti.
 - 1.2 It was confirmed this was something that breeders wished to do to ensure genetic separation of smokes from shaded going forward. It was expected the testing would need to be carried out for about three years.
 - 1.3 This was agreed unanimously with the addition of 'one of the following applies' to the first line of the new wording.
Action to be on the electronic agenda after consultation with the PERLH BAC on the amendment JL
2. **An addition to the Persian Longhair Standard of Points**
 - 2.1 This gave the Pewter and White its own identity within the Persian bicolour range. It would not mean an extra class as it would be with the Tabby/Smoke/Cameo & White Persian Class.
 - 2.2 There were no queries or comments and it was approved by a majority with one abstention, SH
3. **Update on Noynarock registrations**
 - 3.1 Print-outs from the register produced by Ian Macro had been circulated. They showed Noynarock registrations varied in several ways when compared with statistics for other NFC breeders.
 - 3.2 It could be suspected that inaccurate registration information had been supplied, but it was impossible to prove.
 - 3.3 There was no legal advice to act upon the suspicion. INFO
4. **Application for the transfer of a stud cat from a suspended breeder**
 - 4.1 A new owner had bought a stud cat from a breeder who was suspended at the time of sale. The breeder was aware when she was selling him that there could be no transfer, but did not pass that information to the new owner at the time. Details of her suspension were published on the website.
 - 4.2 It was agreed that the advice given by the solicitor in March had to be applied in this case as well. It was unfortunate, but there were no particular mitigating circumstances for discretion.
 - 4.3 It was unanimously agreed that the transfer should not go ahead.
Action: The applicant to be informed JL/Office
5. **Application for the transfer of a pet cat from a suspended breeder**
 - 5.1 In this case the new owner had not bought a kitten directly from the suspended breeder and it was accepted that she probably had no knowledge to assist in finding the suspension listed on the GCCF website
 - 5.2 However, (although it could not be certain in this case) it was known that suspended breeders used third parties to secure sales and therefore there was a risk of providing them with a loophole to do so.
 - 5.3 A vote was taken and JH, KK, JL voted against the transfer, other Board members present abstained: LA, PC, SD, HD, SH, ER, LRT, LR
Action: notification to the applicant of the transfer refusal JL/Office
6. **Prefixes for approval**
 - 10.1 The prefix list had been circulated.
 - 10.2 It had been noted that Graceful-Aura did not comply with the existing rules. The applicant had been informed and asked for her second choice to be taken as her first.
 - 10.3 With this amendment the list of prefixes was agreed with one abstention, LRT.
Action: the prefix applicants to be informed Office

BD4088 HEALTH & WELFARE

1. **Update on website publicity on kitten buying & any other advertising**
 - 1.1 The Chairman had contacted other organisations to see if they were interested in sharing publicity on responsible kitten buying. So far TICA and Cats Protection had responded favourably.
 - 1.2 RF had left a message to say NRG Digital had almost completed the animation for the Kitten Buying video, and the voice over artists had been chosen. INFO
2. **Report from the Breeder Scheme Group meetings**
 - 2.1 PW had left a message to report discussions were going well and minutes had been distributed. A survey was being planned to ask for views and suggestions. It was hoped there would be good participation.
 - 2.2 A meeting had been arranged to talk to a Kennel Club representative on 26 April to discuss their Assured Breeder Scheme, particularly how this was developed.
 - 2.3 There was a recommendation from the meeting of 12 April that the Breeder Scheme should be closed to newcomers while the review was taking place as the intention was the entry process would be considerably different.
 - 2.4 A vote was taken and this was agreed with 4 abstentions: KK, JL, LRT, LR.
 - 2.5 It was agreed that the one applicant who was outstanding should be considered, as she was known and her application carried an endorsement from the breed club secretary. It was approved.
Actions: the applicant to be informed JL/Office
preparation of a website notice of temporary closure of the Scheme JL/PW
3. **Updates from DEFRA, the Canine & Feline Sector Group and/or other groups**
 - 3.1 SC had left a message to report there had been no meetings since the previous Board meeting.
 - 3.2 Current discussion concerned the licensing of welfare and rescue organisations which was not so relevant to GCCF.

3.3 The next meeting was scheduled for 7 May 2021.

INFO

BD4089 DISCIPLINARY MATTERS

1. Rules of The Ocicat Club - referral from IC - response from the club

1.1 There had been another letter from the club and the club's rules and disciplinary policy had been submitted as requested. It was known TOC had contacted IC directly

1.2 It was also understood that IC had prepared a reply to the Board's queries, but it had not yet been finalised and sent. It was thought this would be important when considering the club's latest response.

1.3 Therefore the item was deferred to the next meeting so that all the relevant information was available. **INFO**

2. Publication of DC meeting dates

2.1 When DC had meetings in London dates were published so that anyone who wished to attend could do so. The meetings were public, except for the period when DC was discussing the evidence to make a decision on the outcome

2.2 The IC/DC Secretary had confirmed that it was possible for DC to discuss privately via video link, completely separate from anyone else in attendance so that there was no reason why the meetings should not be open as the conditions of an actual meeting could be replicated.

2.3 It was thought that as well as dates a case list should be provided on the website as it was possible people would have a particular interest in a case, or type of case, if they knew when it was scheduled.

2.4 The IC/DC Secretary to be informed so that these points could be put to DC.

Action: letter to DC

JL

BD4090 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None taken.

DATE & TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Friday, 28 May 2021 at 11am

It was agreed the following meeting would be:

Friday, 25 June 2021 at 11am

The meeting finished at 4.42pm.

BD4085.3

PC

This proposal is just an addition to say that if a BAC is being monitored it should have regular feedback to say whether they're good, bad or ugly. I don't want a discussion on this because of the time. Could we just vote unless someone has something specific to say?

SD

Can I comment on this? Having been one to the people appointed by the Board to go and monitor and observe one of the BACs, and since we started the programme of setting up terms of reference for things so we're bringing this into the modern world. In my work, and in a lot of other businesses we have a system of self appraisal where if anyone is told they're wrong and groups disciplined, and such, they are expected to self-appraise, recognise their failings in writing, and then put into writing a plan to prove their compliance. So I really seriously think it's a two way street. As well as the monitors sending reports to the BAC, the BAC needs to set up self appraisal which is regularly reported on from them to the Board.

SF

I'm getting uncomfortable now. This is a re-issue of something that has already been decided by the Board. This matter has already been dealt with.

PW

It's got nothing to do with what has been decided by the Board before. It's a new thing for BACs.

SF I haven't had any complaints about this.

HD

Sean, the only BAC that has experienced this is the Rex. I think we should leave, and leave the Board to discuss it. I'm quite happy to.

PW

This is not a proposal to do with the Rex. It's a proposal for all BACs, because it's a failing at the moment with what's in the complaints procedure for any BAC that has any action, monitoring or whatever. They need regular reports back to them to say good, bad, or ugly. I agree Sandra, and if you want to put another one in next month to say they should put in their own self appraisals as well, I'm happy with that as well.

HD

Self-appraisal works really well, so the BAC understands what it has done wrong. So many BACs do wrong, maybe unintentionally, but they either don't know where they've gone wrong or refuse to understand where they've gone wrong and put the blame elsewhere. So they need to sit down together as a group, and analyse what they've done, see where they've gone wrong and then address it. Then the monitors can look at the items they've listed and see whether the BAC is improving or not. That would work. Great one for self-appraisals, me.

SD & HD Both comment they work on their own self appraisals.

SD I'm really used to it

HD I think it's the way forward. It's the way we should be going. I'll shut up now, Sean.

SF

I was just getting uncomfortable as I know the issue that went before. It does seem to keep re-raising itself. If we are to have a discussion on that then there are people who need to leave. In terms of a new idea for self appraisal if there are any complaints.

PC

At the end of the day this is a bit like self event auditing, isn't it really? At the end of the day when something has gone wrong you've got to decide what that thing is and how you learn from it so you don't do it again. It's an educational thing. It's not actually about name calling and blaming. It's about learning and treating people better, so I'm absolutely with Hilary on this really and I think it would be great if we could get some wording done really.

HD Yes, I'll sort that out.

SD Could it be taken back and maybe Peter and I will work on wording together?

HD Oh even better, well done.

PW

No I want this voted on. I'm in full agreement on what you guys are saying about self appraisals, but I think we need to give the BACs feedback in some shape or form.

HD

I can't accept your proposal in its current form. I'd accept it if it suggested self appraisal, but I couldn't agree with what you're doing if you want a vote.

SH

If the proposal and the addition are the same thing I do not see the point of going through with the proposal because to me what they are saying is all going to be tied to the same point. Why would we bother to vote on one point when what we're saying is not a second point, but the expansion of the first point.

HD

You're better off holding it over, I would have thought, Sean, because we can expand on it and have a proper proposal, because personally I'm going to say no to this, but I might say yes if we developed it.

SD

Yes, it's a good idea in principle, but adding the appraisal bit to it will make it a really solid thing to help BACs as well as us.

JH

In response to Hilary's comment I don't see how you can say with one breath you'd say no to this proposal, but would say yes to another proposal without knowing what the proposal is.

LRT She said what the proposal is.

JH

No, she said if it was amended in some shape or form. If you don't know what an amendment is how can you say you will vote for it?

HD

Well I won't then. I'll wait until it comes to the next meeting and then I can not for it. I'm not going to vote for the proposal in its current form, but if Sandra and Peter developed it then there will be something to work on and it could be voted on.

PW Which Peter are you talking about?

HD Peter Collin

PW Why not Peter Williams whose proposal this is?

HD Because it can go to judge training

PW I proposed this one.

HD Well the three of you can work on it together and can I join in?

SD

I was going to work with Peter W. I thought it would be a good idea to work with Peter W as we're seeing things from different sides.

HD Oh that's fine.

PW I will withdraw it if I can work on whatever the new proposal is.

HD I think you're right we just need to look at the whole thing.

SD I'll work on with Peter W and then we can bring the whole thing back.

HD

We need to bring it to judge training as well though. We've got a meeting in a couple of weeks and I need to run it past them

SD We'll have it finished it a couple of weeks, won't we?

JL

If you're going to expand this and look at it in more depth putting in self appraisal, then I would include the fact that monitoring can happen, because at present as far as I'm aware, in the JAS there is no actual remit for this. A complaint at the moment is supposedly dealt with through the IC/DC system, or it goes out through the Judges' Panel, but previously, and I stand to be corrected on this, it hasn't come to the Board. So if it is the Judges' Panel doing monitoring, or if it is the Board doing it, then it should be part and parcel of whatever is being discussed and be part of the complaints procedure.

SF

I have no objections to PW and SD coming back with something for us to look at, but I'm not going to venture into anything that's previously happened. We need to finish this and move forwards. I'm not prepared to go further. We've got a suggestion. PW has said he will withdraw in order to work together with SD let them do that and come back to us. I intend to move on to the next item