

MINUTES

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

Friday, 20 August 2021

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

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

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

BD4118 MEETING INTRODUCTION

- 1. Apologies for absence.**
1.1 There were apologies for absence from Hilary Dean and Heather McRae. The Vice-Chair apologised for a late arrival and John Hansson gave notice he would have to leave early.
- 2. Chair's opening remarks**
2.1 The meeting began at 11.12 am as the Chair welcomed those present. He remarked that it was good to see people again and it had been special to have had an opportunity for an actual meeting with several at the GCCF Sesquicentennial show on the previous weekend. **INFO**

BD4119 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

- 1. The Minutes of the Board meeting of 25 June 2021**
1.1 These had been circulated with some corrections and amendments made prior to the meeting.
1.2 The minutes were approved, as proposed by LR and seconded by SC, with one abstention SD.
- 2. Matters arising from these Board minutes**
2.1 BD4105.2.2 The Chair informed the Board that a response to the SAR had been completed with legal support.
2.2 BD4107.1.3 It was noted that the legal charges remained as agreed in April 2020. Work was always carried out by Ms Ebbutt who had been proactive in advising IC & DC on rule and Byelaw updates.
2.3 BD4109.3.7 The Oicat Club had acknowledged receipt of the letter from the Board. **INFO**
- 3. The minutes of the Council meeting of 17.7.21 - to take corrections**
3.1 It was noted that the presentation from Michelle Ferris of Albert Goodman had been extremely effective. It could be recommended as an example for other Council and Board meetings.
3.2 It was agreed that these minutes should now be published, proposed by LR and seconded by SC.
- 4. Any Matter from Council not on the agenda** None **INFO**
- 5. Minutes of the Board meeting of 17 July**
5.1 These had been circulated in advance and no amendments had been received.
5.2 They were approved unanimously as proposed by LA and seconded by TG. **INFO**
- 6. Matters arising from these Board minutes**
6.1 BD4117.1.7 It was queried whether it was known if a show was definitely going ahead in Scotland before the end of the year. It was thought the next would be in April 2022.
6.2 BD4117.3 The Chair stated that the disinfectant ordered had been received in time for the show the previous weekend. It was the odourless type and no issues at been raised when used. The cost was just under £1000.
6.3 The Committee Secretary was thanked for her collation of the meeting paperwork.
Action: the three sets of minutes to be published on the website **JL/RF**

BD4120 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 1.1 It was requested that this item should be in advance of the discussion of previous minutes on subsequent agendas.
- 1.2 No declarations were made. **INFO**

BD4121 FINANCE

- 1. P/L to 31 July 2021**
1.1 The ytd profit was almost £127,341K, with payment for the show hall (£16232) included within the expenses. At the same period in 2020 it stood at £101868. The Chair observed it had been another pleasing month.
1.2 It was commented that the budget for 2021 had been very conservative due to the unknowns of the pandemic. FC would have the responsibility for considerable revision for 2022.
1.3 It was requested that FC should put forward a Board lead to go through the P&L at each meeting to direct attention to trends and put forward FC recommendations.

- 1.4 It was thought there could be some return to actual meetings in 2022, but there should be caution, because of the use of public transport. There was no urgency.
- 1.5 It was suggested that the spending on videos should be allocated to promotion rather than training and the 2021 budgetary allocation be adjusted accordingly.
- 1.6 It was agreed that the income and expenditure for the Anniversary Show should have its own income/expenses account as was customary for the Supreme.

Action: the budget and others matters raised to be on the agenda for September FC meeting **JL**

2. Volume graphs to illustrate core business

- 2.1 There had been further increase in core business overall of 17% approx to the point in the previous year, and the comparison graphs reflected this. It was good that breeders wished to use GCCF to register and many appreciated the framework of registration rules.
- 2.2 Comparative figures had been presented for the previous three years showing the increased growth, and it was noted that this brought an increase in work load for the Office staff.
- 2.3 It was noted that there were a large volume of queries by phone and email. Preparation to cover show input was now in place with one staff member as the lead. As the re-introduction was gradual it allowed for an adequate training period.
- 2.4 There was a query on whether there could be an identification of trends for queries so further information could be on the new website, but acknowledged that many customers preferred verbal explanation.
- 2.5 It was agreed that there should be a record of thanks to the Office team, and the OM noted that this would be appreciated as the team were interested in and committed to GCCF.

INFO

3. Report on investments & statement balances

- 3.1 The figures were correct on the following as at 24.6.21 (as circulated to the Board the previous day)
- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| Aldermore | £77,189.90, with a fixed interest of 0.55%, until March 2022 as rolled over.
(signatories SF, SC, RF, and the bookkeeper) |
| Cambridge & Counties | £89,516.66, a 95 day notice account with 1% interest.
(signatories SF, SC, RF, OM and the bookkeeper) |
| Redwood | £83,197.03 a 95 day notice account with 1.34% interest
(online access SF, RF and the OM and bookkeeper) |
| NB | The interest rate had dropped to 1.05% on 13.7.21. |
| Monmouthshire BS | £84,227.84, an easy access account with 0.5% interest
(online access SF, RF, the OM and bookkeeper) |
| Shawbrook | £80,000, 2 years fixed notice account with 0.85% interest
(signatories SF, RF, OM and the bookkeeper) |
- 3.2 The figures were correct on the following as at 24.5.21 (as circulated to the Board the previous day)
- | | |
|------------------|---|
| Lloyds (current) | £298,079.09 |
| Lloyds (Supreme) | £943.26 |
| Lloyds (Euro) | €18,523.64 = £15,772.56
(signatories SF, SC, RF, SH the OM and the bookkeeper) |
- 3.3 RF was thanked for her presentation of these figures. There were no queries.

INFO

BD4122 BUSINESS ITEMS

1. Strategy meeting update

- 1.1 PW confirmed he had spoken to a business consultant who could look at a plan for business strategy over a 6-8 week period. A statement of work had been prepared. There were two other possibilities that the OM had found and he would be liaising with her to obtain similar presentation from these so the Board could select the person they felt was most appropriate and they could work with.
- 1.2 It was observed that the company was at a critical point now going forward from the pandemic and it would be a useful to time to develop a five year strategy from which annual planning could be derived. Member clubs needed to know how money would be invested for use and how the company could grow.
- 1.3 It was agreed that planning needed to recognise immediate necessities, such as a higher business profile, and medium term goals over three years and the more aspirational aims.

**Action: liaison with the other business consultants
circulation of the first presentation**

**OM/PW
PW**

2. Reports from Business partners and future possibilities

- 2.1 The Chair reported that there had not been a meeting with RC since that reported in June. However, it was noted by the SM that they had given BIS prizes at the Anniversary Show and it was possible that there could be further sponsorship. They had attended the show.
- 2.2 Purina were interested in taking on support for shows and there needed to be further discussion on how they would do this.
- 2.3 The relationship with Agria was currently strong as policy figures were good.
- 2.4 The Chair described a meeting with Pets4Homes who had proved very willing to listen to GCCF's concerns and were looking to verify claims from sellers that cats were registered with GCCF. They had accepted the promotional video and activated it almost immediately. Those searching for kittens would see it, and it was known the site had millions of hits per month so this would promote GCCF to the buying public on a scale never previously achieved.
- 2.5 RF reported that she had also asked the store Pets At Home to use the video and this was awaiting a decision from their Digital media team.
- 2.6 Contact was also planned with the BVA as they had an educational site.

2.7 There was general comment that education was the way forward. There was little use fighting against the pet selling sites as they would always be there, but the public needed to know about GCCF and responsible kitten buying. It was suggested that RC and Purina should be approached, and the possibility of an approach to Preloved and Gumtree should be explored.

Action: ongoing contact with possible companies to use the video

RF/SF

3. **The Pet Path proposals for a partnership with GCCF**

3.1 The general impression given from the paperwork presented was that proposed company's aims and intentions (kittens bought from responsible breeders) was well-meaning, but not realistic. It seemed aimed more towards the commercial rather than hobby breeder.

3.2 SC reported telephone contact with the person aiming to establish the company, and noted that she was making a considerable amount of effort with good intentions. She seemed willing to listen and learn, though there was a lack of knowledge at present. She wanted two things from GCCF. One was to be able to verify breeders claims to be registering with GCCF and also some general support. He believed that as the aims were good and it was a service that was needed it was worth keeping in touch rather than dismissing the effort. GCCF could benefit from the association if the enterprise was successful.

3.3 It was felt that the company had nothing to offer GCCF at present so partnership or endorsement was not possible. However, there was no reason not to maintain links and offer general support. There could be discussion within the ITG on online breeder verification that did not compromise GDPR.

Action: continued contact with Pet Path and verification referral to ITG

SC

(the V-Chair arrived 12.20 approx.)

4. **Report from the ITG**

4.1 SC had circulated a written report following the ITG meeting on 17 August.

4.2 Bug fixes, updates and modifications continued for the Phoenix system as part of a well-established process. The system itself was stable and running effectively.

4.3 The recently introduced inbreeding coefficient and trial mating functions were operating smoothly and seemed well used. It was queried whether it was useful for test mating, with the response that as long as use could be made of a registration number without it causing a GDPR issue. The next update for breeders was for titled cats to be printed in red on certified pedigrees. This feature was to be introduced in response to requests.

4.4 It was thought there could be increased functionality by providing more cat data (not subject to GDPR) in the same way that the Kennel Club provided health information on dogs to potential puppy buyers and stud users. It was agreed this should be explored.

4.5 The project to review all registration policies was progressing well. 29 policies had been reviewed, tested and implemented; four were tested and ready for release; nine others had been reviewed and discussion was ongoing with the relevant BAC to finalise the necessary changes; three remained to be started

4.7 Liaison continued with the NZCF and feedback was positive. It was hoped that there would be a decision shortly on whether they wished to work with GCCF or not so that plans for 2022 could be made.

4.8 The STAR system had been used to run the GCCF Celebratory Show in August and feedback was expected on whether further amendments to the manual were needed. The next step for this was a review of the the draft charging policy ahead of its introduction.

Action: STAR pricing policy to be on the next FC and Board agendas

JL

4.9 Two expressions of interest had been received after publication of the spec for the IT Business Systems project. One had resulted in a costed bid, and there was to be a meeting with others on 25 August. Other companies who might be interested had been identified and the OM would make contact with them in the hope of generating further bids.

Action: OM to circulate the spec directly to the IT companies identified as potentially interested

OM

5. **Website upgrade project - update**

5.1 RF reported the site map had now been drawn up.

5.2 The next meeting with 3mil was scheduled for the following week and this would be to review the first pages: Landing Page, Getting a Cat and Content Page and Basic Cat Genetics, to consider how the content types would be designed.

5.3 Once there had been a sign off on this 3mil would begin to construct the site and other templates would be designed and built within the site.

5.4 Content would be copied over and edited once in place, and new content would need to be written.

5.5 RF promised to circulate access for sight of the pages once they were fixed, probably during the next week.

Action: continued liaison with 3mil & NRG Digital & Board circulation

RF

6. **GCCF email addresses - feedback from testing**

6.1 The Committee Secretary now had a GCCF email address and was finding it easy to use and useful. Others had reported similar ease of use, but for one member it was difficult.

6.2 There was no consensus on the use of a code of conduct and not all Board members wanted to use a GCCF email address although opinion was given that for those in contact with outside agencies it was professional.

6.3 It was agreed that IC & DC should be offered the use of a GCCF email address for use as governed by their individual Codes of Conduct.

Action: liaison with IC/DC

OM

7. **Byelaw changes to allow online meetings and voting for Council**

7.1 These had been prepared to prevent having to suspend the Byelaws concerning elections for a third year. The aim was to put to the Council meeting in November the basic changes necessary for electronic meetings and voting.

7.2 Meetings of Council - the following amendments were proposed:

The Annual General Meeting shall be held in June each year in London **as soon after 1 June each year as is practical** and shall be called the "Electoral Meeting". One meeting each year may be held outside London. **Any meeting may be held by videoconference** if it is the wish of the majority of the delegates.

7.3 Procedures at Council Meetings - the following amendments were proposed:

Any Resolution put to the vote at any a physical meeting shall be decided by a show of hands of those present and voting, unless a poll, taking the form of a paper ballot is demanded by not fewer than six delegates or called for by the Chairman in which case the same shall be taken at such time and in such manner as the Chairman may direct. **At a videoconference the electronic polling facility should be used unless the Chair directs otherwise.** The Chairman's declaration that a resolution submitted to a show of hands or on a poll has been carried or lost shall be conclusive evidence of that fact. Scrutineers **(when required)** shall be appointed by the Chairman.

7.5 Standing Committees - the following amendments were proposed:

(1) **Board of Directors**

(a) The Chairman and Vice-Chairman ex-officio, Treasurer and one or more representatives from the Council Office ex-officio together with fifteen delegates elected by the Council at its Electoral Meeting, **or by an online process as agreed by the Council at its meeting prior to the Electoral Meeting.**

(2) The deletion of the paragraph concerning the **Board of Management**

(3) **Finance Committee**

The Chairman and Vice-Chairman ex officio, Treasurer and one or more representatives from the GCCF Office ex-officio and five delegates elected by the Council at its Electoral Meeting, **or by an online process as agreed by the Council at its meeting prior to the Electoral Meeting.**

7.6 These changes were agreed unanimously.

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

8. **A review of days and times for Board meetings**

8.1 There were differing views on the need for flexibility. Some thought it was necessary in order to be as inclusive as possible, others that it depended on those wishing to stand for the Board to prioritise their time.

8.2 All agreed that weekends would be difficult once there was a full schedule of shows once again, and it was noted that OM attendance should not always be necessary for evenings or weekends.

8.3 It was thought that evenings could be included for one hour maximum mini-Board meetings to deal with time sensitive essential items on occasions, and weekdays and times could vary.

8.4 It was agreed that the meeting schedule should be kept under review and this would be reported back to Council.

Action: short report to Council

SF

9. **Risk assessment - August 2021**

9.1 There were no new risks reported to this meeting, and action was noted as ongoing on those that existed.

9.2 The Chair gave assurance that he and the OM were managing the noted risks.

INFO

BD4123

CLUB & BAC MATTERS

1. **Update on the 2020 club returns**

1.1 SH reported that:

- The Abyssinian CA was planning a collection of the paperwork from the treasurer who was now inactive
- The Secretary of the Toyger CC was trying to resolve the account issues and make returns.
- The NE of Scotland CC still had to find an examiner
- The Scottish CC was in the process of sending their paperwork to an examiner
- The Edinburgh & East of Scotland had a new treasurer who needed to obtain access to the accounts
- There was no recent news from the Old Style Siamese CC

1.2 The Ulster Siamese and All Breed Club had completed for 2020. They did not require a delegate.

1.3 There had been no response to the letter to the Turkish Van CC, but they had now submitted returns and given details of their committee membership. SH observed that she had checked that the balances matched with those of the previous year, but the accounts did not follow a standard format and present a balance sheet.

1.4 SH said she had sufficient detail to produce a balance sheet and could support the club by showing what was required going forward. It was agreed that this would be helpful, particularly as there no other clubs representing Turkish and the club functioned as the BAC

Action: help and support to be offered to the TVCC

SH

2. **Action re clubs without 2019 returns**

2.1 Southern Counties CC, Croydon CC, and the Oriental LH Breed Club had produced no returns for 2019.

2.2 The NE of Scotland CC had sent returns that were not yet examined. It was agreed they should be given until the end of November before non-active status was imposed.

2.3 PW volunteered to speak to Sue Deane of Croydon and Southern Counties. However, it was thought a letter of suspension should be sent to all three clubs and the lifting of the suspension would depend upon the receipt of the 2019 returns (which included a show) and those for 2020. There was unanimous agreement.

3. **Temporary Byelaw amendment in respect of the membership numbers for club representation**

3.1 A query had been raised by a delegate at the Council meeting to ascertain whether the 2019 club membership figures could be used to validate delegate representation for 2022 as it had been for 2021.

3.2 It was proposed that the relevant Byelaw (3) should be amended for a further year and this should be put to the November Council meeting:

Clubs may base their entitlement to delegate representation on the membership numbers stated on the 2019 'Club Returns' form, unless the number of members is greater in 2021 than in 2019, which must be provable by the 2021 examined club accounts, submitted by 1 May 2022.

3.3 This was agreed unanimously

Action: this proposal to be on the agenda of the November Council meeting

JL

4. **Update on the BAC returns**

- 4.1 The Snowshoe BAC: the money for the BAC was in the club and had been since 2018 as they were having problems opening a back account. They had been informed that the creditors should be named and the balance identified.
- 4.2 The Suffolk BAC had not yet sent examined accounts. They had stated there had been no changes to the account in 2020. **INFO**

BD4124 STAFF & OFFICE

1. **Report on the HR meeting of 1 July**

- 1.1 The meeting notes had been circulated to the Board for information and to provide an opportunity for questions.
- 1.2 There were no queries. **INFO**

2. **An update on staffing from the OM**

- 2.1 The trademarks that had been requested for the GCCF and Breeder Scheme had been approved.
- 2.2 The most recent member of staff to start had now been with GCCF for one month and to date was doing well. Another appointee was due to start on Monday, 6 September.
- 2.3 It had been noted at BD4221.2.3 that staff training for probationers had to fit into the Office schedule. **INFO**

3. **A report on the Office building and equipment** no new information.

BD4125 SHOW MATTERS

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

- 1.1 LR had circulated a report with the meeting paperwork. This gave details of the proposals that had been rejected and those that remained. Those remaining were:
- Yearly competitions, possibly regional
 - That judges should be allowed to show in any section
 - That at CC/PC level two certificates could be signed by the same judge
 - The removal of the part of the 13 day rule that applied to the days after a GCCF show
 - A split of the Olympian levels into three different classes
 - A reduction of class number (by amalgamation) at All Breed shows
- 1.2 Also recommended were the removal of the guidance on the three month/100 mile guideline for area. It was also noted that no further comments or suggestions on vetting in had been received since the June Board meeting.
- 1.3 There had been a further meeting following the report. LR reported that responses were coming in from BACs concerning the amalgamation of classes.
- 1.4 There had been discussion on the point made in Council on the use of first time PJs by SMs at All Breed shows. It had been determined that many shows could not afford to do this (multi-breed judges being far more cost-effective, and there was consideration of a subsidy directly from GCCF as an incentive, as it was in GCCF's interest that these PJs were trained. A programme had been worked out that would cost around £7200 pa.
- 1.5 There was some support for this, but it was thought it should be part of package wherein new PJs progressed to training by section, and not for an indefinite period.
- 1.6 Anonymity had been discussed in respect of the show format. It was understood that a show format could be varied to shut an area or venue as long as the judge and exhibitor were not directly engaged in the presentation of the cat or any conversation.
- 1.7 The Show Managers' pack had been deleted from the website. There was a query whether it existed on file. The OM would make a check.
- 1.8 There was a discussion on show finances and whether clubs should change shows in style and format to enable a break even or modest profit situation. It was noted there would have to be changes and these would include rises in fees and gate charges to take account of an increase in expenses. **INFO**

2. **Feedback from the publicity stand at the TICA Crystal Palace Show**

- 2.1 PW reported that from his experience on the day there was a strong demand for GCCF to be at such events with informative and educative material. The stand had looked good on the day with banners, pictures and plenty of leaflets.
- 2.2 There were several comments on the need for this type of publicity and for someone within the Office to be responsible for promotion and advertising.
- 2.3 It was thought this should be a topic for the strategic meeting as there many different forms of promotion that could be tried. **PW**

Action: Marketing, promotion, education aimed at the cat-interested public noted for the strategic meeting

3. **The 150th Anniversary Celebration Show - report**

- 3.1 LA reported that she had had a lot of positive feedback. However, there were some things tried that had not worked as expected and she was currently collating to take to the SRG.
- 3.2 It was noted that a £5 entry charge (pre-paid) had been charged for the few members of the public who had been allowed to come and there was no quibble on this. Gate charges for show could almost certainly be increased.
- 3.3 She had noted how much penning had increased (almost £17 per cat), but as yet could not give any report on the show's profit/loss as there was still a lot of information to come.
- 3.4 The Chair commented that he had thoroughly enjoyed the day, and thought most exhibitors seemed happy. There was some concern that rules had been mentioned initially in the schedule, that had not been written out in full. LA observed that points in the schedule had been left there from the Supreme.

Action: Supreme rules to be published in advance on the website.

3.5 It was confirmed that two certificates were awarded and if the cat had moved up a level, one was for the new level. The two certificates from a single judge would be counted towards a future title.

Action: acceptance on the system to be checked with Ian Macro **OM**

3.6 There was discussion on the Covid security. The Vice-Chair recommended the use of lateral flow tests where possible in the future as immunity from vaccination would gradually wane. However, it was noted the show had done everything possible to make checks and keep people safe.

Action: Continued preparation for the show **LA & team**

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

4.1 JL reported that was reaching its conclusion, with the result for the BIS winner expected later that day.

There had been a total of 450 entries from GCCF and WCC exhibitors.

4.2 She expressed gratitude to the judges who had worked extremely hard to keep to deadlines and produce results. She had seen some of the reports and was sure these would be much appreciated. RF noted she was currently working on producing certificates to 10th place in large classes, so that nearly all exhibitors would receive a commemorative of the show.

4.3 It was proposed that Carol Walker (SM) should receive an honorarium, and that most of the income should be donated to the CWT. It was expected that the prize money should be paid from savings reserved for the WCC event which did not take place. It was agreed this should be discussed at the next Board meeting when the show accounts were available.

Action: an agenda item for the next Board meeting **JL**

4.4 It was unanimously agreed that £50 voucher should go to the bookkeeper as a thank you for looking after the PayPal finances on a regular daily basis (which included her days off and weekends) so that the event could be administered smoothly.

Action: a gift token to be purchased **OM**

5. **Implementation of the Council decision to allow a choice of class for titled cats**

5.1 It was suggested if this could be implemented as soon as it was practical for show managers.

5.2 It was thought the only problem would be resetting the STAR system. Ian would need to be prompted to do this as a matter of priority to enable the choice of classes online.

5.3 It was proposed the implementation would be immediate for shows that had not yet published a schedule, providing that it was made perfectly clear within the schedule (using bold lettering) that exhibitors had been offered this choice for their titled cats. This was agreed with one abstention, JH.

Action: contact with IM for a STAR system update re implementation **OM**

6. **Implementation of the Council decision to align the show year with the calendar year.**

6.1 After some comment on the difficulty with fitting the show licensing into a new schedule that would have to show licenses for a future year in the March of the previous one, while still considering whether clubs had up to date returns the Chair summarised the it had to be 2022 or 2023 for implementation.

6.2 The majority were in favour of 2023 with 4 in favour of 22 and 7 preferring 23. A vote then confirmed the implementation in 2023 with one abstention, JL

Action: a website announcement **RF**

7. **Requests for 2021-22 show licence dates or changes to existing licences**

7.1 The Maine Coon CC had applied to move from the Saturday to a Sunday on the same weekend.

7.2 However, the club had later cancelled their show. **INFO**

BD4126 JUDGE APPOINTMENT SCHEME REVIEW GROUP (Previously Judge Training Review Group)

1. **Reports on meetings**

1.1 The minutes of the meetings held on 19 June and 25 June had been circulated ahead of the Board meeting.

That of 19 June had focussed on a way forward to deal with BACs in difficulties with suggested wording put to the Board at the June meeting (BD4112.2). It also gave an outline of future judge training topics:

- Parallel/Shadow judging
- Training modules/seminars
- Self evaluation
- Role of BACs - Tutorials/Assessments

1.2 On 25 June there had been feedback from the Council meeting given to ensure all input had due consideration.

Therefore there had been discussion on the use of novice PJs at shows. Preliminary discussion on reforming judge training had just begun with the possibility of the stewarding element being removed from the JAS. Parallel and shadow judging had been defined, with parallel preferred, and there would be contact made with BACs and the Genetics Committee to assist with the formulation of relevant subject matter for online tests.

1.3 Both sets of minutes had been made available for website publication and KK presented further detail of the discussions to the Board

1.4 As only four group members had attended the second meeting there was a query on whether the group had set a quorum level. It was explained there was not, and this was the reason that the establishment of a portal for the group was being investigated which would enable better participation for working members. It was stressed that the topics were still at discussion level with opinions expressed that were not yet formulated proposals.

1.5 Opinion was expressed that there should be delegate consultation and a major revision formulated based on this that could replace or be worked into the existing JAS, rather than taking very small steps amending the current JAS. It was explained that all efforts were being made to introduce changes that would be accepted and to get acceptance for and something truly radical could be more challenging. All contributions to the JASRG were welcome and would be discussed.

1.6 There was thought that there should be consultation to determine the barriers to people becoming judges.

1.7 The Chairman concluded the discussion by reiterating how necessary it was to get new judges if shows were to continue. Because of this there would have to be acceptance of radical change . **INFO**

2. Judge query on discounted time

2.1 An initial proposal was that it should be for two years, which would make blanket discounted time finish in March 2022.

2.2 The Vice Chair gave opinion that this was probably too soon as several judges were extremely cautious about returning to shows and had good reason for this. He suggested a three year period was preferable, allowing for a slow return for some and others who were happy to be out having the opportunity to get on completing their PJ/FJP requirements.

2.3 This was unanimously approved.

Action: publication on the electronic agenda

JL

BD4127 REGISTRATION, TRANSFERS & SOP ITEMS

1. Application for Championship Status for the British Longhair

1.1 This had been agreed in principle in March 2020 with the conditions that the BLH Breeder Group amended its registration policy so that no progeny of registered BLH should lose breed status because of an unwanted colour or pattern, and its Breeding Policy to include notes on the A and B blood groups and their relevance to BLH breeding.

1.2 The Genetics Committee supported the application and in response to a query it was confirmed there was no genetic reason why there had to be three generations of BLH as a requirement for full registration. It was thought to be Breeder Group preference, possibly based on observed coat quality, and it was also standard to other policies that BACs opted for at least three generations of breed only cats for full registration. Those on the supplementary register were shown as differently bred, but not disadvantaged.

1.3 A vote was taken and it was agreed that the proposal for Championship Status should be put to Council with a recommendation from the Board.

Actions: a letter to inform the BLH Breeder Group and a proposal on the electronic agenda

JL

1.4 It was noted that if there were no objections approval would be before the end of September, and shows after that date could offer appropriate classes. The Grand Group for BLHs would be 3B **INF**

2. Revised Ocicat and Aztec registration policies

2.1 This was re-presented to the Board with amendments that had been requested in March to bring certain terminology in line with what was standard for GCCF registration policies, and to include testing for imports for the diseases associated with Burmese as did the policies for Burmese and Tonkinese.

2.2 The Genetics Committee supported the revised policy and recommended it for approval.

2.3 A vote was taken and it was agreed that the policies should be put to Council via the electronic agenda.

Actions: a letter to the BAC and a proposal on the electronic agenda

JL

3. Additional wording for the German Longhair registration policy

3.1 Additional wording was required for the acceptance of the outcrosses onto the computer system as PER and BLH could have EXO and BSH in their background.

3.2 The Genetic Committee proposed 'as defined by the registration policy for the breed' to follow the two names outcrosses.

3.3 A vote was taken and this was agreed unanimously.

Actions: a letter to the owner of the GLH and information on the electronic agenda

JL

4. Prefixes for approval

4.1 The prefix list with 18 applications had been circulated.

4.2 There was an objection for all choices with one that sounded the same as an existing prefix despite spelling variations, to another in which all contained an inappropriate word and a third that made the breeder sound as if they had a cat selling company. These were to be asked to rethink entirely.

4.3 One applicant was given a second choice and another a third because of the other choices sounding very similar to existing prefixes. There was also a fourth choice where the others had similar sounding or inappropriate terms

4.4 The remaining twelve first choices were agreed.

4.5 The Vice-Chair remarked on the number of new BSH breeders. The BSH CC had 45 new members over the previous two months taking membership to around 400. It was agreed there was cause for concern and there could be some discussion to form guidance.

Action: the prefix applicants to be informed

Office

5. Discussion on prefixes

5.1 In the discussion on prefix names several Board members commented that some breeders were applying for prefixes without having registered any cats with GCCF and that ownership of a cat should be a condition of application.

5.2 As requested the Committee Secretary had put together notes from Council on the prefix discussion that had taken place there with information from the suspension list and adverts.

5.3 It was agreed there should be a separate one hour meeting to look at the issues concerning prefixes and it was asked that an invitation to all should be sent for a time to be agreed with Chair.

Action: arrangement of a meeting

SF/JL

6. Registration for the progeny of a possible dual mating

6.1 There was a referral from the Office in a case where two kittens of a litter of four could not be registered because they were not genetically possible from the sire named on the mating certificate The stud owner had

eventually admitted to GCCF that there could have been a dual mating, but was not cooperating further.

- 6.2 The breeder had registered two kittens active that were possible from the named sire. However, it was also possible that all four could have been produced from the other mating.
- 6.3 It was agreed that these kittens should have their status changed to non-active until their sire was established by DNA testing. The other kittens could be registered with the other male named as sire, but only on the non-active register unless DNA tested.
- 6.4 A DNA test for cs would establish which male sired each kitten. Those that were carriers had to be progeny of the cinnamon pointed male. If they did not carry the gene they could not be his offspring. The DNA should be taken from each kitten at a veterinary practice after microchipping, if this was not already done. The results would enable registration with the correct sire and the breeder would then have the option of active status for each. This was agreed with one abstention (SD)

Office/JL

Action: contact with the breeder with a recommendation she makes a complaint against the stud owner

BD4128 HEALTH & WELFARE

1. Report from the Breeder Scheme Group

- 1.1 PW had circulated a summary of the findings from the survey. There had been 433 respondents.
- 1.2 At the meeting he commented that there was diverse opinion, but it could be said that most wanted a breeder scheme and of those who did most were in favour of some sort of accreditation and inspection. They were in favour of inspection carried out by a qualified person. Many wanted a free scheme and it had been commented that large breeders were in a better position than small ones to afford to join the Scheme.
- 1.3 There was agreement that the intention of the Scheme should set members apart from BYBs, and with this aim the BSG was currently working through the KC Accredited Breeder Scheme to see what could be used to apply to cats.
- 1.4 He noted that a statement needs to be prepared to inform participants and thank them for taking part, that there were many view points but eventually proposals would be developed.
- 1.5 The conclusion was this would be difficult as there were some strongly held opposing viewpoints, and if the Scheme was too stringent in its demands it was possible it would attract only a small number and not raise standards over a broad base.

Action: contact with survey participants

PW

(JH left the meeting during this discussion, 3.20 approx)

2. Meeting reports from the C&FSG and Cat Group

- 2.1 SC had circulated a written report to give an update on the report presented to Council on 17 July (C2320.3)
- 2.2 The C&FSG had held an online 'Big Tent' meeting on 2 July which he had attended to participate in a working group which considered what more could be done to improve breeding standards and genetic health in dogs and cats. Two documents concerning dogs were circulated for this, with the Code of Practice for Cat Breeding ready for sign off for publication. In the meeting SC commented on this that there are new people on the group, who were not sympathetic to cat breeding. He had had to work at keeping the guidelines realistic in respect of stud ownership and the number of litters for any one queen.
- 2.3 The group that had produced the Code would begin work shortly on Guidance on Cat Conformation. SC would be representing GCCF on this. The next C&FSG meeting was planned for 7 September.
- 2.4 A Cat Group meeting on 6 July had focused on each group reporting their pandemic experience. All had noted an increase in demand for cats. Cat Protection gave an estimate that the population of owned cats in the UK had risen to be 600,000. The next CG meeting was scheduled for 12 September.
- 2.5 It was noted that GCCF had been involved in helping to alert cat owners to the food recall issued because of safety concerns relating to pancytopenia in cats as given by the Foods safety Agency and RCV, INFO

BD4129 DISCIPLINARY MATTERS

1. Revised Byelaw to clarify points 3 & 4 of the Disciplinary Powers

- 1.1 DC had proposed revisions to Byelaw 12 to clarify the terms and conditions of suspensions. This was following cases heard where in the view of the GCCF solicitor the restrictions imposed were not sufficient.
- 1.2 Ms Ebbutt of Royds Withy King had drafted new clauses as required (retained as a minute addendum).
- 1.3 The Board voted unanimously that these should be approved.

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

JL

2. Fixed Penalty - for stud owners without a certificate of entirety

1. Following the rule change in Council to make explicit that a stud owner had the responsibility to obtain a CofE before visiting queens were accepted it was proposed that the penalty imposed should be doubled.
2. There was discussion on the responsibility of a queen's owner to make advance checks, but it was agreed that some protection should be in place,
3. It was agreed unanimously that the fine should be raised to £100, with other wording unchanged.

3. Fixed penalty - for stud owners taking non-active/unregistered cats not part of a BAC breeding programme

1. There had been a rule change at Council (C2219.2) to make it a stud owner's responsibility to check a visiting female's registration and breeding status. It had been requested that there should be a stringent penalty.
2. It was considered that this was a serious offence as there could have been health or welfare reasons for a female being placed on the non-active register that could affect any progeny she had. Also it was a simple matter for a stud owner to make the necessary checks.
3. A fine of £250 was proposed for the first offence with any subsequent offence referred to the Disciplinary Committee. This was agreed unanimously.

Action: IC to be informed of the change to the Fixed Penalties and these to be publicised

JL

(ii) – (vii) remain unchanged

Any suspension or disqualification under this Byelaw 12(4) may be imposed for such a period or periods as the Disciplinary Committee shall order. During any period of suspension under Byelaw 12(4)(b)(i):

A. a defendant shall not represent themselves as being in any way affiliated with or connected to the Council;

B. a defendant shall not be eligible to become a member of any Member Club, but shall nonetheless remain bound by the Rules and Byelaws of the Council;

C. except where the Disciplinary Committee orders otherwise, the Council shall not:

I. register any cat or the progeny of any cat owned by a defendant;

II. register the transfer of any cat to or from the ownership of any such defendant;

or

III. register at any time the progeny of any cats that are born or conceived during the period of suspension.

provided always that the Board of Directors may in its absolute discretion allow the registration of any cat or the transfer from the ownership of such defendant where it is satisfied that not to do so would be deleterious to the welfare of the cat or would cause hardship or injury to an innocent third party who had acted at all times in good faith. Should the suspended owner be the breeder of the cat an administrative prefix will be substituted for the registered breeder's prefix, if one such is on record as part of that cat's name; and

(D) a defendant shall not:

I. be permitted to access their GCCF account;

II. procure a third party to operate a GCCF account on their behalf; or

III. administer, operate or be connected to the GCCF account of any other person bound by the Rules and Byelaws of the Council.

For the avoidance of any doubt, during any period of suspension or disqualification a defendant shall remain bound by the Rules and Byelaws of the Council.