



Member of the World Cat Congress

MINUTES OF THE 38th ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF NEW ZEALAND CAT FANCY INC HELD AT THE SOUTHERN CROSS HOTEL, DUNEDIN 10-11th OCTOBER 2009

The Chair welcomed delegates to the Annual General Meeting and asked for the roll call to be read:

Item 1: Attendance & Apologies

Apologies: Jan Gray, Val Ball, Joan Hill, Wendy Moir, Helene Rowlands, Amelia de Ridder;

Chair: "That apologies be accepted." Carried

The Chair welcomed delegates to the Annual General Meeting and asked for the roll call to be read:

Deb Armishaw	Margaret Bean
Deb Chesterfield	Elizabeth Currie
Janice Davey	Annette Dunn
Paul Flanagan	Lynne Ford
Pauline Fraser	Sue Gordon
Ian Gray	Diane Holtom
Kay Hood	Dorothy Horton
Stuart Johnstone	Toni Jones
Chris Lowe	Wendy Moir
Kay McArthur	Jennie Paul
Lyall Payne	Marion Petley
Zena Pigden	Pauline Pullan
Valerie Richards	Maree Roosing
Arthur Rowlands	Maree Roy
Rob Shirley	Vicki Walls
Lesley Watson	Diane Whittle
Wanda Kent	

Item 2: Announcements

The Chair asked the meeting to refer to the Agenda
Calling 37th AGM of NZCF – this is incorrect, in 2004 the meeting number was recorded as 33rd and so was the 2005 AGM so this AGM is the 38th Meeting.

Note: the Notice of Motion – re: Constitutional Clause 14.3 - the Executive Council have presented a remit to this AGM

Re: 9.G.7 from last years AGM this matter will be discussed with the report from BSC Portfolio Manager

Election Results read by the Secretary:

Annette Dunn	102
Paul Flanagan	121
Peter Hanley	58
Diane Holtom	63
Zena Pigden	122
Rob Shirley	52

The Chair congratulated Zena Pigden, Paul Flanagan and Annette Dunn on their election to the Executive Council.

Item 3: Confirmation of the Minutes

Corrections to the Minutes: 37th AGM 2008

Page 17 - lines 12/13 & 22 “descent” to read “dissent”

Page 20 & 21 –

Lesley Watson the amendment to the motion was moved by Lyall Payne/Kay Hood – “that this be referred to the BSC for breed section consultation.” This should appear before the discussion notes this was definitely voted on and passed 92/41.

This is required to be referred back to the BSC for breed section consultation which is were it belongs.

Deb Armishaw – “Point of Clarification” Foreign White being moved out of the Oriental – why would you not want a Foreign White being judged with the Orientals.

Lyall Payne – “Point of Order”– we are discussing what actually happened at the last AGM this is not the place for that discussion – we are only discussing what needs to be altered.

Page 21 – last paragraph talks about it going back to the BSC (6 lines from bottom) referred back to BSC – that is what was voted on.

Page 26 – Chair: At this point we are of the understanding that Napier (Patches & Ptd) will be holding the National show.

Chris Lowe - Pg 26 – The bid was done to hold the AGM & the National show as a combined weekend. But no Constitutional change was forthcoming for this to happen. The AGM will also be in Napier.

Pg 27 – Amelia de Ridder – letter tabled re: Correction to the Minutes
Read out to the meeting by the Secretary.

Discussion:

Sue Gordon – the lady did say that she had access to ROCAP at the meeting
– I certainly heard it we were quite shocked at the time.

Lyll Payne – asked the question through the chair specifically – if she had
accessed the ROCAP database I eyeballed her and she sheepishly answered
'yes' I am quite happy with the recording of what is in the minutes. There is
an acknowledgement that she has accessed the back end of ROCAP and it
was clearly her answer.

Arthur Rowlands – my recollection is exactly the same.

Deb Armishaw – I have to disagree with all of these learned members – I have
to say that I disagree NO I am just not going to bother to answer people who
are as closed minded as you are.....

Chair – called the meeting to order.

Moved from the Chair: “that the minutes are accepted.”

Rob Shirley: asked for clarification as to whether the Chair is only referring to
this item in the minutes or the amended minutes

**The Chair: “That the minutes for this item remain the same – no changes to be
made.”** **Carried**

Lyll Payne/Arthur Rowlands: “That the minutes as amended be accepted.”
Carried

Item 4: Matters Arising From the Minutes

Chair: 2 areas here – one was the motion put through by Val Ball let this one
slide as being dealt with under the constitutional remits for this meeting.

9. G 7 re: consultation BSC – refer to Zena who will address this through her
report.

Arthur Rowlands – page 9 asked about the budget deficit for 2009 is there an
up date on this – Marion Petley confirmed that she will be making a mention
in her report.

Constitutional Review – Chair to report

After we get through this today I would like a meeting with the folks involved
with the Constitutional review group – I will set up a full communication
network to achieve this.

Kay Hood – referring to 9.G.4 page 20 remit put forward by NZ Siamese we
withdraw the remit because a Poll had been implemented, no results have

ever been given to that poll. At the December EC meeting it was voted on and accepted for change without the consultation. The EC voted with the poll in mind. Siamese/Oriental people had put in submission and they were ignored.

Zena Pigden - there was a change of Office Holder –

Kay Hood - People where voting on breed standard matters that the clubs involved knew nothing about – both were in support of the remit.

Zena Pigden -you don't think that the process was carried out correctly?

Kay Hood – Yes, then the EC ruled on this without consultation we are happy to see Balinese winning challenges and being shown as variants. We are not happy with the Balinese and Javanese in the breeding base of the Siamese.

Zena Pigden – the results of the poll were not passed onto the current Port Folio Manager. Some people will have developed breeding programmes based on what had been accepted.

Rob Shirley - referring to the Balinese/Javanese review on page 11 of the EC minutes the Portfolio Manager Richard Nelson reported that opinions were clearly divided and what ever was done will not please all parties. Rob moved from the chair (carried 3.0.2) that the decision of the EC at the time was that the status quo remain – the fact that Richard reported in that style – is that recommendation which was worked on at that time, in essence a whole year has gone by, another show season – what you are asking is that you want it done correctly at this time.

Zena Pigden I am happy to follow through with another consultation but I must alert you that there may be difficulties when people have been operating on a different basis.

Arthur Rowlands – page 23 Change to Show Bylaw 17.2 does not appear to have been included in the revamp. Needs to be updated in the Show Bylaws for 2010: -

“When the host Club bid has been accepted at an AGM (in conjunction with Constitutional Clause 11.2.2.7 there shall be a completed signed contract presented to the December Executive Council Meeting after that AGM for ratification.”

Chris Lowe - Previous one talks about rotation this will be done with the next update.

Item 5: Executive Council Chairman – Report

Report has been circulated –

Rob Shirley – we have been reassured by the IT Portfolio Manager that the ROCAP security changes will occur – have the things that were undertaken to be done at the last AGM relating to the tie up between the financial system with ROCAP been done and if not why not – I only ask as Paul has not circulated an IT report.

Lyll Payne – how are these matters being addressed?

Paul Flanagan – An IT report has been circulated on the agenda for this meeting. To answer your question an invoice number will be generated on ROCAP – that will mean you cannot get out of the scene to action transfers etc until the invoice number has been generated; this is not very far away from being completed.

Rob Shirley – Re: Constitutional Review – I was Chairman of the review committee we received the material in July with the AGM deadline was August. December EC agreed to the process which required the writing group to present by a certain date and then to be given 10 days to complete was patently unfair on us there was a lot of anger and frustration by the group – it did not occur in the required timeframe. How come we are sitting here a year later what we were presented with was not something that we could use.

Lynne Ford – speaking as part of the group I am aware that we tried to get a response from you Rob and that was a long time coming, before we could actually set it up and get going.

Stuart Johnstone – Rob realising it is not long since you left the position how come you are being so critical when you were leading this group as chairman. Simplistically that was the roll of the chairman surely to follow up on the completion – this question should be to you as to why it did not happen.

Rob Shirley - Simply because the EC asked every meeting which was monthly when is this going to happen. In Paul's case the response was "that it is happening". The review group was of the opinion that they were put upon.

Paul Flanagan - I asked you many times who was to become part of the group and the response was that you required nominated people to be part of the review group – we ended up with Me, Deb Armishaw and Lynne Ford and I can confirm that 6 days work was done on the document and the Disputes & Discipline Process. Yes I acknowledge you did receive it late which was also due to illness problems with Ian Gray.

Ian Gray – Paul is quite correct illness did take me out of the group – Paul also had health issues this could not be avoided – all we can ask for is your understanding going back inside ourselves discussing some ones right some ones wrong is not the correct way to deal with this.

Chair – yes we need to do this together I am going to see all members of this group after this meeting, and set to and make sure this is completed.

Item 6: Portfolio Managers Reports –

Finance & Administration - Gaynor Saxon

Marion Petley – presented the Financial Report
Speaking to financial report y/e 31/12/08 will touch on 2009 and looking forward to 2010. The report has been circulated for some time.

The level of profit is a perfectly acceptable result in relation to the projected profit.

Auditor limited control over Registrars records - taken far too long for this to be actioned.

Each Portfolio is divided into a particular activity. Activity statement (page 5) Publications had a loss. Registrations were budgeted at \$32,000 but came in at \$33,000 – Noted that the Longhair registrations exceeded those of the shorthairs.

Shows benching fee higher than the previous because the 2007 National included the benching fees. Separate benching fees in 2008.

Other revenue slightly down on 2007 partially because the membership revenue of \$7000 was transferred to publications.

EC expenses over budget by \$4400 – that breakdown of expenditure for venues for EC meetings clearly shows that the best place for EC meetings is Palmerston North

Legal expenses over \$9000 against a budgeted amount of \$0.

WWC – Houston was significantly higher as the delegate did not judge, therefore no accommodation was reimbursed.

Retained earnings with adjustments \$158,000

Rob Shirley – retained earnings that we have managed to in affect keep on a level field as to the level of retained earnings, has anything been discussed about the retained earnings or are they just a source for Interest.

Marion Petley– we are budgeting for another loss for 2010 but in terms of something specific no!

Lyall Payne– like to congratulate you on your accounts, and also thank you for your the voice when dealing with issues referring to page 10 – debtors seem to fluctuate from year to year – are they generally constant or do the debtors fluctuate – is there anything significant within certain portfolios?

Marion Petley - Normally there is some fluctuation but it is about when I have received the invoicing details for instance for flash cats – at a certain recording date you have a debtor recorded but a couple days later the invoice may have been paid. Couple relate to what EC classify as major debtors are still sitting there - there are two particular on going debtors. One

we are receiving payments one we are not. I am awaiting further instructions from EC regarding this.

Chris Lowe - one of the debtors is in the hands of the Privacy Commissioner there is nothing that can be done at the moment – worked on for over 12mths weekly ongoing exchange between myself and the Privacy Commission.

Lyall Payne – “That a vote of thanks be extended to the Treasurer.”

Received with acclamation

Marion Petley – “That the financial statements for y/e 31/12/08 be accepted.”
CARRIED

All Officers reports were circulated prior to this meeting – updated with some information relating to the following headings

- Communications have been greatly improved over the last year and teleconference calls have been will utilised.
- National Show – terms of reference are been worked on

Information Technology – Paul Flanagan

Arthur Rowlands– Do we have an operating manual for ROCAP?

Deb Armishaw – Peter Hanley was asked two years ago to produce an operating manual price quoted was \$5000 for each manual at that stage the IT Portfolio was handed to Richard Nelson.

Chair – it should have been included in the original contract – I have made approaches regarding the original contracts etc....this work is on going.

Paul Flanagan/ Pauline Pullan –
“That the IT report be accepted.” CARRIED

Registrations –

Paul Flanagan/Maree Roy – “that the Registrations report be accepted.”

CARRIED

Judges – Janice Davey

Ian Gray - Invariably there have been supervisions which involved considerable travel – in terms of best practise and duty of care who organisers these – Janice confirmed the Judges Registrar and herself. Two Judges were tacked onto a show after the schedule went out – we bought in an all breeds judge to do that particular supervision.

Kay McArthur – said the Judges were definitely listed on the show schedule.

Janice - Wellington – show schedule came out with two new judges appointed for this show – the cheque was enclosed with the show schedule –

not the correct way of doing it. The Judges Registrar and the Portfolio Manger where not aware that a supervisor was required. The first muted cost was in excess of \$500 that is why the replacement supervisor was sorted.

Ian Gray – thanked Janice for the useful example.

Janice Davey – we are trying to give all those who are qualified to do supervisions do in fact get the change to supervise.

Deb Armishaw – training which was muted for adult training – is it going to happen and is there a training package written up – are external qualification being taken into account.

Janice Davey – it is a yes to all questions – Judges Council Meeting scheduled for 2010 will be on the agenda.

Ian Gray – With regards to Stewards and Handlers is there any interest in training in this area?

Janice Davey- There has not been any for this year. Normally those wishing to hold a course are applied through the Judges Registrar. With a budget provided. Normally the course is held over two days. Noticeable that clubs are finding it difficult to get trained stewards. Perhaps EC should look at this. This could definitely be put on the agenda for the Judges Council Meeting. Kay McArthur was asked sometime ago to take ownership of coordinating the Steward/Handlers listings – Kay said that to date she has not received anything and apart from sorting out some badges nothing else has been done, she is still in willing to take on this role.

Arthur Rowlands - Tutorial for Judges School – the logistics to run is a major effort. There is a class going for a handler/stewards course this year. It is like a military exercise to put it all together. Requiring steward & handlers to hold a current certificate is a great initiative.

Wanda Kent – getting the trained stewards and handlers to work – some have been criticised for the work that they have done, but it is not working it is not working at the level we wished it to be.

Ian Gray - Convert training on a CD disc – could be explored.

Chris Lowe - Trained a couple of online tutorials with the student judges - the overall look of training judges it is a huge exercise to put together the on line tutorials did work very well could probably be extended to include steward/handlers courses. Practical side – part of the training you must still have fingers in fur.

Deb Armishaw – 2007 adult education I had to design assessments, along those lines I designed one for handlers and stewards based on NZQA standards. This could be extended on.

Arthur Rowlands – Judges Council meeting in Feb the horse has bolted the Council needs to meet towards the end of the show season.

Janice Davey – It is budgeted for next year – but if we meet before the end of the year (2009) it has not been budgeted for. This could be discussed further by the Executive Council.

Janice Davey/Deb Armishaw – “That the report is accepted.”
CARRIED

The meeting adjourned for morning tea 10-15 reconvened at 10.30

Breed Standards Council – Zena Pigden

Lesley Watson - Why is there an experimental Breeding programme for Bi colour Balinese when there is already a standard for bicolour Siamese and Orientals?

Zena Pigden - People are entitled to apply for any breeding programme they wish to pursue and we then consider the pros, cons and alternatives– providing it will not be harmful it may not be the quickest, easiest or best route.

Verbal addition to the report – at last years AGM there was a request that the EC & BSC review the role of the BSC and brought back to this AGM this process to include the membership – this has not happened due to the change of the portfolio manager – nothing was done for this by the previous manager – I apologise that I have not picked up that this had not been done I will follow up for next AGM.

Arthur Rowlands– Burmese should Tiffany be named Burmese LH – progress forward should still include breed rep – nothing has come across my desk as Burmese breed representative.

Zena Pigden - The relevant Breed section in this case was the Tiffany. BSC only possibly considering a name change only not a change to registration or breeding. Outcome from the Tiffany breed section was that they be left as Tiffany – this also included the Burmilla Breed section.

Deb Armishaw – in regards to the Amercian Curl being accepted as a new breed going through preliminary breed process.

Zena Pigden – applicant has not come back if it had been considered it would have been done under preliminary breed status.

Deb Armishaw - All new breeds – may I quote from Registration Rules – 9.4 Imported Cats – page 23 9.4(h) quoted 9.4 (n) Re: challenge status 2007 argued successfully that the Siberians were brought in under that rule.

Zena Pigden - Intended that it apply to any new breed that is not currently accepted for showing in New Zealand – the purpose of it was to allow Judges

to gain familiarity with the breed before requiring to judge it – unclear that (n) should not be there – for example 'munchkin', that we might have serious concerns about accepting. There is a conflict there and I am concerned about it. It is not consistent with what is being practised or our philosophy.

Breeds that have CH status in two or more bodies would normally be accepted for challenge status, there was still a word in there to not give challenge status if we had concerns of acceptance – Preliminary breed status process is about familiarisation for judges. This was fully researched.

Arthur Rowlands – Paragraph (n) was a hotly contested clause – if anything it is an anomaly and does negate all that is reported. This should be placed on the agenda for the December meeting.

Lyall Payne – appears to be a conflict – EC or BSC need to attend to this.

Arthur Rowlands “That 9.4 (n) is placed on the agenda for the Dec EC to be reconsidered.”

Lyall Payne – asked Deb through the chair that may still leave a conflict in place – I would rather recommend that EC look at the possible conflict.

Deb Armishaw – currently if you import a cat from overseas you can ask for dispensation for showing – Annette Dunn responded yes, if it is an accepted breed. Deb said that she has brought this forward to have it clarified and to have work in progress.

Maree Roy – mentions only section (n) section (h) is unclear at the moment if someone imports and seeks dispensation as a recognised breed – it is not written clearly – this needs to be included.

Deb Armishaw With Arthur's permission I would like to move an amendment:

Deb Armishaw/Lyall Payne - That the EC look at all of registration rule 9 Imported cats rewording in conjunction 7.2 , 7.3, 9.4 how it interacts with 7.2 & 7.3.

CARRIED

Zena Pigden / Lesley Watson “that the BSC report be accepted.”

CARRIED

SHOWS: Deb Chesterfield

I wrote a brief report because I was hoping that I would have more response from the show questionnaire. I am very grateful to some of the clubs who took the time to answer the questionnaire – it is difficult to write questions that cover all concerns. I am still hoping that more people will take part in the questionnaire. It is relatively clear that

1. retention of show dates – apply to have show date on a given year, a number of clubs for one reason or another have not had their show if

this goes for two long there are clubs holding show dates for more than a year – this could be picked up by other clubs - not hold over any longer than a years grace – some do not believe that they can hold over the date at all. Refund yes or No!

2. What are peoples thoughts on queens birthday date – interestingly most responses were for that particular weekend – long weekend, travel wise etc. one club completely the opposite. Not necessary that travel and timing did not actually add benefit as a set weekend – most felt leave it at Queens Birthday weekend.
3. Should we continue to hold National show – one per year? How do we make the National show the event of the year? Should be the show case of the year. Most agreed that it should be the show case of the year. Clubs and EC should work together on the National EC should be responsible for the pursuing of a National sponsor. A number felt that a way to recognise with engraved plaques signify that your cat of this year was a national show winner.
4. How do we revamp – again trophy presentations were mentioned. One National supreme winner. Not much support for double points for the national show.
5. Concern – show application fee is a set fee across the board smaller and speciality clubs struggle to pay the fee. Based on the number of entries etc....fees could be halved for small/specialist clubs – some asked for a smaller ring charge some felt it is just as difficult to raise funds for a large or small show, why should there be any difference

Marion Petley – the key fact is that a specialist club can only attract a LH or SH entry – or one breed which means they can be disadvantaged.

6. Should there be a limit to the number or rings – concern about the size of some of our shows – what impact is it having on smaller clubs with larger clubs attracting larger number of exhibitors.

7. Should we be looking at extending our show season – would not be governed by winter shows. There is a show in Masterton at the end of October – concerns were based on breeding season concerns.

This needs to be taken back to the EC – maybe further consultation may be needed. I am very interested in how to make the National show better, and address the concerns from speciality clubs - It would be detrimental to NZCF if the smaller clubs do not hold shows.

Draft show manual – John Wilson has spent many long hours on the writing of this manual – and it has been utilised by many clubs – has asked for input from many over the years. A working document that clubs can use / new club how they go about running a show – progressively working through to show day –it is his intention to ask through the portfolio manager to ask for updates to the manual on an annual basis. The document is a living document so it is important that this be kept updated. The first one coming out is only a portion of what the manual will end up being. Copies are available here today.

Marion Petley – a document produced that new pages can be added on updating.

Deb Chesterfield - something that is able to be copied to allow clubs to copy for their officers e.g. show secretary etc. Health & Safety, 1st aid etc... has not been extended on at this stage. We owe him a great debt of gratitude for this document.

Chris Lowe – because I am involved with the administering of the show calendar – I have had questions asked recently by Clubs firstly regarding show fees being paid well in advance, why are our show fees paid in advance (2011 due in December) clubs are having difficulty paying so they pay for one ring to secure a date.

Clubs having two or three bites at the cherry with big ring shows in detriment to smaller clubs. Bigger clubs in various areas that are holding more than one show a year some are holding 3 shows with multiple rings in detriment to smaller clubs within their own area.

Ian Gray – what is happening with the overseas trends, American, Australian trends should be explored number of rings – market trend?

Deb Chesterfield - there are a number of clubs in Australia struggling to get people to attend shows economic climate has affected – I will follow up on whether or not larger ring shows are affecting.

Sue Gordon – re: multi ring financially to enter 6-8 rings is expensive Detrimental step to reduce number of rings – NZCF are right up there on a world stage, they have 20-25 rings in the States.

Also a detrimental step when you find that say Wellington & CHCH are allocated the same date. That needs to be looked at. Please don't knock a club that wants to run a 6 ring show.

Deb Armishaw – multi ring having been at the helm of one 8 ring show this year – work that goes into that event is huge, In conjunction with our animal welfare act to be in that environment over two days needs to be taken into account.

Lyall Payne – being able to have certainty both as an exhibitor or an organiser I think paying show fees now for 2011 is great because then we can see the show date calendar well in advance, allows for sharing of judges etc.... a fine system should be put in place for those clubs that do not hold their shows or loose venues etc.....gives ability to do planning.

Jenni Paul – they are having an impact on clubs, week after Alpine we had exhibitors who went to Alpine because of the many rings and local members did not attend Auckland and Geyserland. Big shows are having an impact in your own back yard.

Wanda Kent – our club pulled the plug this year due to a large show being held in the same area. Then to be slapped with a fine on top of it – especially when the reasons as to why the club pulled the pin are not taken into consideration.

Lyll Payne - love to see clubs in these regions these are the areas that have lost these shows – because it is sensible really if you live in CHCH why would exhibitors take a 4 hour drive to show at a three ring show. We are destroying Small clubs.

Ian Gray - Cause and affect – course people are chasing points Clubs are chasing exhibitors to come to the show. Those with financial capability are going to go to the large show saying that clubs are allowed to hold what ever show they have. The true issue is the affect on what is causing this to happen.

Jenni Paul – it is the sudden extra shows popping up that are definitely affecting clubs – if you have booked your show two years in advance then clubs should not be able to upgrade.

Arthur Rowlands – referring to set show dates, decide judges, 1969 windup petition print out taken from constitution before we had show dates in the constitution. If two clubs have a conflict of date the clubs shall communicate with each other. It was in the Constitution that show dates are shifted through it should have not come out of the constitution for the 2001 document. Those who won't go by the lesson of history are doomed to repeat the failures. Got to be better organised.

Rob Shirley – It is really neat to see that the cat fancy after 5 years finally accepting John Wilson's document and this year we have finally accepted it.

Rob Shirley/ Deb Chesterfield - That the AGM express its appreciation of John for donating his years of work to us at no cost." CARRIED

Chris Lowe in response to Arthur - 2010 CALENDAR on the website – 19 queries on the current show date calendar. There are Club issues that had to be dealt. There are clubs who have not held a show for 2-3 years but they continue to hold what they consider to be their traditional date.

Maree Roy – how set in concrete is this calendar?

Chris Lowe - what ever the Clubs or issues that have been resolved – it is still a living document. It constantly changes it shouldn't but it does. For example the National show over the last three years, circumstances change. Like show committees falling over etc...

Chair - we have acknowledged that this will be discussed at the next meeting.

Deb/Pauline Paulin that the Shows Portfolio report be accepted."
Carried

Publications/Marketing – Gaynor Saxon

Judging of the website cats is now will underway. Disappointed in the photos that have been sent in. Not of all good quality, judging was done on yes type! Yes the best example of the breed! But also what the public would like to look at when wanting to purchase a cat. Membership email to be sent out to follow up for more photographs.

Website design – draft available here today. Great idea to have photos of each breed on the header page – the person going on ‘Joe public’ points on it and will be taken straight into the breed listing – adult version and kitten version. Breed details, temperament etc....

Flash cats – doing a subtle change to try and get it out into the public. Have included dogs in the last issue.

Marion Petley– question about flash cats putting more animals in to make it more acceptable to the public – is the intention to be an in house magazine or the intention for it to become an out there on the magazine shelves?

Gaynor - Maybe just in pet shops, vets, to get more noticeability to the public for our breeders and clubs.

Rob Shirley – The EC called for submission as regards spending money – we immediately adopted one ditching the membership card. The other one that attracted a lot of comment was flash cats. Budgeted at 17.78 + GST per member towards that and people correctly identified that each member was paying that much each year. That huge ranch of responses did not have a theme and because of that the EC (Dec last year) said it is time to ask the membership what we want from flash cats. Through from ditching the magazine, to extending it. In actual fact the membership has not spoken not in a way the EC can work with. Gaynor has come up with what she thinks should happen – the membership should have a chance to look at what we want perhaps flash cats needs to do the same thing along the lines of the show survey –

Gaynor - Prior to going onto EC I did do a marketing proposal out to the membership which included flash cats – if another needed I am happy to put one in place –

Lyall Payne – commercialise but for doing that there has been some sort of consultation but it needs to be appropriate for the time at this stage we have a magazine now serving an in house purpose. To take it into the market place is a very competitive place to be. I really want us to engage experts and to pilot test the market that we are dealing with. We have been down the same track with the annual. The yearbook we thought would work – if we do it again the publishing world is cut throat and we need to get some damn good advice.

Gaynor - I would never do that without getting advice – a company in Auckland does do this (free of charge – very educational, there is no way we would do that again especially on a claw back situation it just does not work. I cannot see it going to a public circulation in the near future. Needs fine tuning first.

Sue Gordon (Ped Per) we were actually wondering about reinstating the yearbook – something really special. That you could purchase yearly or bi annually something special. Would like the EC to look into the possibility –

Gaynor I will check the viability and costing of a yearbook, taken from the last magazine issued.

Diane Holtom– I think what you have been doing with the website is great but what has been done to make the public aware of the cat fancy web site.

Gaynor - I think more could be discussed on this at the end of the day with general business when we look at ways to attract members etc.

Deb Armishaw – can you give us an update on the 2010 calendar?

Gaynor - not enough time to complete it is coming it will be 2011 if the membership here is still interested before the end of the month a option to purchase the little CD calendars that we did once before.

Deb Armishaw– using the CD calendar format would be the pride of choice to use the top cats of the year.

Arthur Rowlands - can NZCF have a position on Trade me?

There are a lot of registered breeders or accredited catteries listed on Trade me.

Chris Lowe - the big issue are the number of breeders who say they are NZCF registered – they are not current members. I know because I am getting the complaints. Ian Gray suggested that the EC Secretary Lodge a complaint with Trade me.

Deb Armishaw - You can put ads on Trade me perhaps IT can look at putting popup ads back to the cat fancy website.

Paul Flanagan – have thought of checking out if Trade me would put a registered breeders section so they would have to come back to NZCF for approval – registered and the others.....

Maree Roy – an investigation to how the NZ Kennel club do in terms of advertising in terms to what the NZCF is doing in terms of marketing.

Lyall Payne - If you do look at NZCF registered site on trade me you will need rules. At the moment you can register a prefix not be a member not register and animals not pay anything and still advertise – needs policing.

Chris Lowe – If they are not financial then the kittens are not registered. Public thought they have brought pedigree kittens from NZCF registered breeders but they are not.

Diane Whittle – they are actually committing fraud.

Chris Lowe - The last five complaints without exception were unregistered breeders selling to the public that had been on the website and used our DDP process to lodge a complaint.

Margaret Bean – has a listing in the yellow pages for the CHCH area and I do refer them to website and the complaints process.

Deb Armishaw - If you don't have your membership number you cannot put your cats on the site.

Lesley Watson - Membership numbers are the same number every year.

Paul Flanagan - the number has to change by changing each year – this would work.

Gaynor/Deb Armishaw “That the Publications/Marketing Portfolio Report is accepted.”
Carried

Rob Shirley – I am reading these reports and it appears that there are bits and pieces which have spoken about the 2009 objectives of this body because 11.2.2.7 to consider and adopt a budget for the coming year that reflects the appropriate parts of any plan adopted under clause 11.2.2.5. This is the time that the AGM gets to tell the EC what we want done and I'm looking at the list of stuff which is in Gaynor's report which talks about the plan, so is now the time to look at what the fancy did in opposed to what we planned to do and is this time to discuss what we want to be done in 2010. Because the next item after this is the budget and as we all know if we don't budget to do stuff it does not happen.

Chair: decided that this matter will be the first item after the lunch adjournment.

Meeting adjourned for lunch 12.00 reconvened at 1.00 p.m.

Rob Shirley - Can you encapsulate the lot for us please – budgeting and IT development particularly in terms of registrations and financial aspects.

Gaynor - I believe that we have greatly improved the communication level we are great team now – on a monthly basis teleconference calls have been held but that is an expensive option.

- Judges – Training school very successful school running this year Chris, there are 8 trainee judges.

Chris Lowe – we had twelve the others have gone either choosing not to continue or haven't kept up to scratch and they have gone.

- National show document – Deb is at present getting that under way not necessarily a contract – 'terms of reference', so that everybody is fully aware of their responsibilities.

Budgeting then IT development considering I took on this role in the last three months I would ask Rob to answer the question.

Rob Shirley - Something that we as an organisation suffers from the EC did what it wanted to do, we never actually got a formal chance to say what the membership wanted. Three years ago constitutional amendment went through stating that EC had to put forward a plan for each year – last year was the first year when that happened. The EC of that time listed 5 items - this is the first year and that is partially why it did not make the agenda, looking at Gaynors report there is a list of stuff that EC is recommending that the Executive should concentrate on this year the membership of course can contribute to this.

The budgeting thing under Marion's guidance we really nailed it down and this year is the second year that Marion has done this – this will drive what fees we can expect to pay this year. Last year the AGM said that we want you to continue with what has been planned but we want other things to happen that is why the budget was changed.

Should reflect what we decide in the budget – budgeting really appreciated Marion's guidance there. I don't see any changes to what was done last year – so I guess we nailed it last year.

Gaynor - IT we have stated what we want – wrought with issues this year and IT has suffered, the intention of getting this IT situation sorted – we have the prices of what we want to do In the last month I have gone back to the original source – we have no knowledge or contracts regarding ownership, proposals what we have for what we paid for. Awaiting clarification of what is still outstanding. By 2010 online registrations, online shopping as much as we can get into the package for the least amount of money.

Sue Gordon who owns ROCAP – because at the BSC meeting it was mentioned that it would cost between \$9-10k to do updates that were needed on the system.

Gaynor - NZCF owns the website but if you want to add pages you have to pay. I personally do not know what was paid for and what was promised; there are a lot of areas that we want now that may not have been foreseen. Peter Hanley was the developer of ROCAP and still handles the backend of ROCAP. A lot of hard work is being done to ensure this all happens.

Deb Armishaw – The inception to ROCAP and on line show system etc. was first brought to the attention of the membership 2004 AGM there is a full

document regarding inception, what the layout was like etc. At the Dec 2004 EC meeting it was adopted.

Rob Shirley – because this is the first time what we need to do now is to accept Gaynor's report because that does conclude with the material that EC is looking at this year then there is a piece that is not in the agenda and that is. Do we accept what the EC is recommending, followed by the budget?

In July we came up with what we think EC can deal with – do you think there are different priorities.

Gaynor/Stuart Johnstone: "That the report be accepted."

Carried

Rob Shirley – Constitutional clause says to consider and adopt if thought fit a plan for 1-5 years. The EC has discussed 2010 and parts of 2011 this means that we can now start looking at a view longer than a year. There is stuff in the 2010 recommendations that actually will mean that there will need to be work done – I think you should share that with this meeting now – the plan down the track is to commit ourselves to those items.

Ian Gray – I feel we may be at cross purposes to what Rob is trying to achieve in that 9.G7 & 9 G.9 in the remits would be better to put forward and discuss now rather than leaving them where they are – Feline would like them to be set aside and discussed now.

Rob Shirley - because it is not listed on the agenda your point Ian is very pertinent I wonder if setting the budget is the last thing on the agenda.

Rob Shirley /Ian Gray: "That Item 7(b) budget is moved to the final item of business and the word budget be placed with adoption 2010 plan & budget."

CARRIED

Item 8 Remits – seeking alterations to the Constitution

8. C.1 Executive Council

That Clause 3.1.1 is amended by:

Deleting the words "shall be open" and replacing with the words "may be granted". At the discretion of the NZCF (Inc) Executive Council" in the first line.

Rob Shirley - a question first this is from the EC and I don't see in the minutes anywhere it does not says that you are going to do anything about this clause I know that we have discussed it and it is important to do. The votes that I have are in favour of change – we have had stuff ruled out of order over the years when the process has not been done correctly...

Sue Gordon – is this not the Notice of motion from last years AGM?

Chair - these were discussed at a teleconference that you were involved with.

Rob Shirley – I note from the teleconference minutes of September that there are three items listed and this is not one of them. You have not bought it through from the EC.

Janice Davey - It was done in Hamilton and at the last teleconference meeting that your chaired Rob.

Stuart Johnstone - does it really matter? Were it came from to what extent does it matter?

Lyll Payne - If you or I wanted to bring something forwarded to the AGM there is a certain process that needs to be done.

Chris Lowe – I actually believe that these were discussed and voted on the EC forum not a teleconference – I do not take minutes from the email forum.

Diane Whittle – wasn't this discussed at the AGM last year – people voted against it being wiped out – every year we had to renew our membership just for the sake of one person.

Deb Armishaw - Discussion is whether the remit is valid in this forum –

Lyll Payne - we have to be guided by what the Chair says but if people are not confident that the correct process has been used I do not believe it should be dealt with – it is flawed anyway that rule as it stands is about the pool of people that membership can come the second one is about yes or no response. Now you want to change the first one. There is a major flaw and if that helps anyone to make a decision on that basis.

Arthur Rowlands – Looking at the minutes 13/07 remits AGM 2009 read bullet points definitely does not list this remit. Clearly was a discussion but the amending details are not on the minutes.

Chair – “ruled that the remit be withdrawn.” WITHDRAWN

8. C.2 Executive Council / Dorothy Horton

That Clause 3.1.2 is amended to read:

The Executive Council reserves the right, on behalf of the NZCF, to grant membership, renew membership subject to such special conditions as it sees fit on a case by case basis, or to decline any application or renewal of membership". *Of membership subject to such special conditions as it sees fit on a case by case basis, or decline any application or renewal for membership.*

Chair – advised the meeting that there is a typo in this remit – take out the line of double wording “of membership subject to such special conditions as it sees fit on a case by case basis or decline any application for renewal for membership.”

Arthur Rowlands – moved an amendment take out the part “decline the application for renewal” – because 3.1.2 seeks to deprive someone of membership – right to appear right to be notified – you are against the constitution you cannot take away membership without due process and the clause is later on in 3.11 which talks about cessation of membership.

Deb Armishaw – the way I read the intent of the remit is to do with a new membership because renewal is done under 3.11. That is what I thought was the intent.

Chris Lowe - Arthur actually said remove the word decline. To read **The Executive Council reserves the right, on behalf of the NZCF, to grant membership, renew membership subject to such special conditions as it sees fit on a case by case basis.**

Rob Shirley – I don't see how the amendment changes the present clause – the EC reserves the right to decline on a case by case basis. It is the renewing bit of present members that has brought this into focus.

Zena Pigden – My understanding was in fact to enable the NZCF not to renew membership in some cases when we may feel that this is a person we do not wish to accept membership for – they may have been a prior member. Our current constitution does not provide well for that situation. Does of course also mean that it could be abused seen to take rights away from existing members – I think there is a bit of dilemma here. So I am concerned about your amendment Arthur because if you take that out we still have no recourse.

Stuart Johnstone - Given the uproar of the EC not dealing with a particular case we seem to be fighting against what we wanted from two years ago.

Chair - I believe this is giving NZCF 'bigger teeth'.

Lyall Payne - knee jerk reactions lead to difficult situations this we all know relates to the David Balfour case –

Chair – Lyall please refrain from using names this is a privacy matter.

Lyall Payne – there are two situations here, people becoming members and a renewal situation. Renewing your membership or subscription is a troublesome area in our rules it is not clear. I am reluctant to make changes to this knowing what ever we do now could will be challenged or affected whatever the outcome of the case I referred to – it has to be addressed by the constitutional committee - members on an annual basis full stop – every

year your apply for membership, with a new number issued. That is not the issue on the table at the moment.

Rob Shirley - point of information for Stuart – last year we did debate something similar to this it did not make the ¾ basis vote to change – a case of a person who had crossed the line of tolerance to how people treat animals. The judge has reserved the decision it is waiting – that is the situation the argument against the amendment that the EC put up last year was that if you are not liked then the EC are going to deal to you – and that is the renewal argument the person at the centre of this then all will suffer – there are laws of the land that affect us all.

Stuart Johnstone – I knew enough about the background behind it two years ago there was a lot of negative feedback about the members of the EC not taking action – and the membership wanted someone to be crucified, and now there could be something nicely in place that a lot of members want and we are arguing against it now.

Chair - Damned if you do damned if you don't', we were criticised because we could do nothing with the constitution the way it is – this is not necessarily for one but for many. You can do anything and the NZCF cannot do anything we can't even suspend.

Ian Gray – one of the points that Arthur raised is that there is a process there already to deal with members my suggestion to you the target at which this is being aimed at is not quite correct – the area that you want to place this would be better placed under cessation of membership. It gives them the right of appeal so-to-speak; a fair hearing is a necessary process. Extract it from 3.1.2 and put it as a separate clause into 3.11 an element of allowing with a right of review.

Lyall Payne – want to make it clear I do totally sympathise with what the EC are trying to achieve. I agree with the last speaker it does belong with the cessation of membership area. Should have something along the lines of offensive behaviour type description – always upheld if challenged because offensive behaviour in respect of animals would be offensive to an organisation such as ours.

Diane Whittle – Shall we start with Clubs – they could decline their membership you cannot belong to NZCF unless you are a member of a club – clubs could give a good reason and notify all club secretaries and EC that there is a membership issue stopped at club level –

Chair - you are stepping on the Privacy Act.

Rob Shirley – this remit was put last year and defeated in affect I have a question of what legal advise you've taken in the drafting of this v the legal advise that I took last year (it is similar – so there is an issue there) our goals as an organisation in that we chuck someone out for welfare issues we have a major revamp of our constitution that is required the lawyers took our present constitution and hacked it to bits, which NZCF paid for. I don't think 3.1.2 is

the right place; this motion has been defeated many times previously we are on shaky grounds.

Chair - called for an amendment to the remit –

Arthur Rowlands/Deb Armishaw – “That 8.C.2 on text of the remit of amending 3.1.2 stops at the word case by case basis to delete the remainder.”

Lyall Payne: Aren't we substantially altering the meaning of the remit

Chair - Lyall are you moving that this be withdrawn –

Lyall Payne - I am asking you to rule on the acceptance of the amendment.

Chair – ruled against the acceptance of the amendment

Diane Holtom –ask that it be withdrawn and ask that it be forwarded to the constitutional re-write group – it pays to get this right.

REMIT WITHDRAWN

8. C.3 Executive Council/Sue Gordon

That a new clause 3.9.2 be added as follows:

“Any person holding any elected, appointed position or a position as a Judge within the NZCF (Inc) must be a financial or life member of the NZCF (Inc) with the exception of the Disputes and Discipline Coordinator.”

Rob Shirley “Point of order the EC has not authorised this motion” – the minutes do not reflect this. Again I think it is an important thing to happen this year we had judges judging NZCF shows that were not members – high profile members sat up here that they had accepted judging assignments for 2009 and at the moment they do not have to be members of the NZCF.

Chair – refer to the September teleconference minutes

Rob Shirley - you mean after the agenda closed!

Chair - Ratified the decision made when you were chair Rob –

Janice Davey – said that she asked when the EC were reviewing the Constitution about the judges who were not members and Paul Flanagan said that something could be done about this – along the same lines as discussed at the Judges Council meeting. All EC voted in favour of it – it was not recorded it was ratified at the September teleconference meeting.

Rob Shirley - the problem is the accuracy of the minutes – did you not check them as chair.

Janice Davey – taking a personal dive at the chair is not appropriate we all make mistakes – we are all accountable as EC members – it has been picked up, we have dealt with it.

Chris Lowe – As Secretary at that meeting I was not in the room when that was discussed – therefore it was not minuted. I agree it is up to the Chair to ratify you were in the Chair Rob and what did you do – you resigned.

Rob Shirley – I do believe that you have missed informed the meeting Janice - Judges membership of NZCF motion was put forward carried unanimously to insert the clauses in the judges manual however, I do heartedly appalled the passing of this motion.

CARRIED 195.5.0

8. C.4 Executive Council/Deb Armishaw

That clause 3.11.2 is amended by:

Adding after the words "membership fees" in the 4th line the words "or any other indebtedness to the NZCF (Inc) as set out above."

Ian Gray – Question for clarification please what you are saying is to take away membership when someones owes us money

Chair - Any type of debt where else in the constitution can you recover the money if you have terminated their membership – Reserving the right to recover the debt – I do not believe that we need it in the Constitution.

Sue Gordon – (Pedigree Persian) felt that there could be extenuating circumstances as to why a person owes the Cat Fancy money it would be more charitable to allow a debt to be paid in small amounts – this should be an arbitotory decision - charity begins at home.

Chair - The EC are already very mindful that arrangements could be made depending on circumstances to pay a debt of.

Lyall Payne – the current rule says EC may – is already covered there, but I do notice that you have mentioned 90 days in your rationale but not mentioned in your rule.

Marion Petley– The rationale that the debt will be referred to an external agency but just by referring does not mean the debt collection agency will actually pick it up – the history of the person means that the debt collection agency will not accept the collection.

Remit put to the vote – calling for abstentions Rob Shirley stated that he was holding 17 abstentions the Secretary requested confirmation of the number of proxy votes rob Shirley is holding –

Rob Shirley – I object to Mrs Gordon's statement I now request that you formerly ask her to cease the barrage of comments –we do not get on I am very upset that you to allow someone to behave in this way.

Chair – said that the comment was not heard up the front - called the meeting to order

Chris Lowe - Sorry Rob I only asked because the recording on here is not correct. Meeting took a short adjournment to check the proxy summary sheet.

Rob Shirley - asked for the results of the investigation – the Secretary responded – one Club was not on the breakdown

Carried 138/41/0

8. C.5 Executive Council/Diane Holtom

That clause 3.11.3 is amended by:

Adding after the words "membership fees" in the 4th line the words "or any other indebtedness to the NZCF (Inc) as above."

Rob Shirley – the words in the constitution I believe are being misinterpreted abstentions are neither for nor against – so I think that both motions have past. To amend the constitution the abstention is not casting a vote.

It was an AGM decision when Richard ruled that any motion that has been amended – and motion who voted by postal vote Rob dissented from the ruling so for the next 5 yrs we had that meaning. Dara was the chair that changed it – postal votes did come into it and abstentions did not come into the count.

Arthur Rowlands - a percentage of total votes cast – is an abstention a cast vote or not. It is cast 11.1.5 we have not debated that.

Lynne Ford - abstention is a choice to vote neither way but is a vote cast.

Rob Shirley – in that case I chose not to cast the 17 votes that I hold, and request that the vote is recounted.

Carried 139/40/0

8. C.6 Executive Council /Deb Armishaw

That a new Clause 3.11.4 be inserted:

"The Executive Council may by a majority vote suspend the membership of any member against whom a charge has been laid in a Court for alleged animal cruelty or neglect."

"OR terminate the membership should the member be found guilty and convicted."

Sue Gordon was this not the Notice of motion put forward at the last AGM?

Arthur Rowlands - without the safe guard to allow a person to be advised – put it in 11.2 11.3 then

Lynne Ford /Annette Dunn: “that they be left to the working party and legal opinion.”

Lyall Payne - there are two options here may suspend or terminate. Someone gets charged so EC decides lets suspend that person. The EC can then not terminate because they have already exercised one option. My option would be to have some form of 'offensive behaviour' option again this is flawed.

Jenny Paul – can we not reword this remit? Vote yes or no with an amendment.

Zena Pigden – addressing Arthur's comment – bi passing due process in this particular category of people against those who have charges laid against a person in court, it is ok to do so the Police and SPCA do not lay charges lightly. There is a degree of protection in the rule. By using and/or – it will not change the intent of the motion – clearly to enable both paths to be taken not just one of them.

Deb Armishaw – majority to suspend and unanimous to determinant these people have been charged by the Police or SPCA it is just not the general average membership you are talking about people who have broken the laws of the land under our Animal Welfare Act.

Rob Shirley – clarification to table this amendment – the amendment has been seconded amendment tabled. **70% - 71% LOST**

Rob Shirley– no vote needs to be counted, chairman asked to call for the "against tabling the motion".

Chair tabling the motion was lost 71%

Chair - Amendment – and terminate the membership by a unanimous vote should the member be found guilty.....

Lyall Payne/Jenni Paul

(1) The EC may by a majority vote suspend the membership of any member

(2) EC may by a unanimous vote terminate the membership for animal cruelty or neglect...

Rob Shirley – are abstentions for or against – this is vital you have used that ruling

Chair – “no counting of abstentions”

Amended motion - Carried 180/17

8. C.7 Executive Council/Margaret Bean

Amend Constitutional Clause 5.2 to read

All appointed positions shall be up for one (1) calendar year - 1 January to 31 December - these appointments shall be made or renewed at the meeting of the Executive Council held after the AGM, at the discretion of the Executive Council.

The Executive Council shall have the power to appoint committees within the provisions of the Standing Rules to this Constitution. No person who is an officer or official of another similar organisation shall be eligible to hold office in the NZCF.

Carried 186/10

8. C.8 Executive Council/Lyall Payne

“That Clause 6.3 is amended - to read

“The reasonable travel, accommodation and meal expenses incurred by

Members of the Executive Council and the Executive Council

Secretary and Treasurer in attending meetings of the Executive Council, and General Meetings of the NZCF.....

Maree Roy – clarification is the word Treasurer correct shouldn't it be – Financial Administrator –

Chair – Treasurer is correct

Lyall Payne – is there any logical reason why the Treasurer is not included.

Margaret Bean – when this Constitution was written Gaye Teague was Secretary/Treasurer.

Deb Armishaw – I believe that there is no reason for the Treasurer to attend the meeting every other officer/official reports to the Portfolio Manager. As a past Treasurer of Cat Fancy Marion plays a very big role at meetings and I believe when I was Treasurer that Albie Jobson put this forward - believe the Treasurer is a very big part of the management.

Stuart Johnstone – with the reasonable travel and accommodation as such, the question was raised about the venues where the meetings are held at. The Chair confirmed that this particular venue was by far one of the cheaper options, and that every effort is made to get good prices.

Lyall Payne - it is not about Marion it is about the Treasurer to attend, as of right you have exactly the same coverage if the EC want the Treasurer to be there.

Deb Armishaw – 2000 Constitution 10.4 talks about the Nat Treasurer – all duties shall attend all meetings etc..... therefore I suggest that the wording of the remit and the intent is to bring us back into line with that constitution.

CARRIED 178/16

Lyall Payne – asked the question was the correct process taken prior to submitting this remit. Chairman - all discussed at various meetings

Ian Gray – that 9.G 4 be split to read as (a) and (b) secondly that the meeting agree to move 7 & 9 to general business for discussion. Withdrawing 9.G.5 & 6 and moving to general business.

Maree Roy - Ian mentioned that the club wishes to withdraw with the provision that they be discussed in – general remits what happens to those who did postal votes.

Chris Lowe - do not have postal voting for General Remits – proxy votes are at the discretion of the holder.

Item 9: General Remits

9. G.1 Executive Council

Registration Rule 7.2 + 7.3

“That the EC determine when preliminary status breeds that have met their Exposure Point's requirements shall become eligible to be shown and to win Challenges, but this shall be no later than the following show season”.

Rod Shirley – Procedural Motion **“the EC already have this right that this motion not be put it is already covered - why bring it to the AGM at all**

Zena Pigden said that this was an original decision by an AGM so it needed to be brought back to this AGM.

Motion withdrawn

Deb Armishaw - 11/12/ Oct 2003 CABCC/Arthur Rowlands moved that no new colours or breeds may be added during a calendar year.....

Zena Pigden– spoke to the remit which was a previous AGM decision it allows us the possibility for a breed that has met the appropriate exposure points to be shown during the show season - Turkish angoras were displayed extensively mid season and many Judges saw them. There did not really seem

any good reason why this update could not be done mid season when the Judges would have had the Turkish Angoras, fresh in their mind.

Deb Armishaw - A new colour within an existing breed – they are already out there – on the show bench without challenge status they are not going through a preliminary status. Secondly the preliminary status exhibits are out there on display with a standard.

Remit is asking for challenge status – the intent of the remit once a year is enough. Cannot be shown once they meet their exposure points - the remit does not cover that

Zena Pigden – she wants to add in the provision for new colours –

Arthur Rowlands - 7.2 exposure points don't come up to 7.3 can't amend 7.2.

Zena Pigden - the numbering not actually put in by me – we are trying to add something not amend. It should be under 7.3

Rob Shirley – obviously issues with some parts of the words
What we have read and the proxies have made their decision
Question is if the motion goes through without the colours words is it worth doing separately – or is it only worth while with colours in.

Amendment - Rob /Janice: “that the meeting give leave of the meeting to include new colours.”

Lesley Watson – I feel they still need a year and should only be done at the end of the show season, not mucked around with in the middle.

Deb Armishaw – question of clarification, are we talking existing breeds – fully covered in 7.4 of the registration rules. There are problems there.

Zena Pigden - Currently new colours in existing breeds we do have a process for existing colours- an application comes to BSC – following breed rep consultation a recommendation goes to the EC if accepted the challenge status is accepted but it does not take affect until the next season.

This remit comes from the BSC – mid season acceptance for a new colour mid season as to new breeds.

Stuart Johnstone – number of shows dropping of we are supposed to be promoting the showing of cats - don't understand why apart from procedure why would we want to stop people showing cats when we are losing numbers anyway.

Maree Roy – with these new breeds and /or colours that Judges are provided with a clear SOP and ensure that that actually takes place if this remit is past will this take place without the standards?

Zena Pigden - there is a case in point new colour – don't currently have a standard for a colour – for new colours of AOC Burmese and in that particular case may take many years.

Maree Roy - If this remit is past some provision should be made –

Zena Pigden - you cannot have challenge status without a standard. Judges should receive a correct updated standard for any new breed or colour and that could be one of the reasons to decide not to accept this change mid season.

Annette Dunn - It is really important that Judges have the standards the tools to do the job. When CABCC put the remit through allowed for the process for SOP to be released to all clubs and Judges – it was really important that we had the opportunity that the paperwork was done –should not expect a judge to judge 3 weeks after you send them the standard. It may be beyond the expectations of those Judges on the floor.

Amendment – Carried

Zena Pigden /Janice Davey That the EC determine that when a preliminary status breed has meet.....Or new colours in existing breeds that have completed the process for acceptance and have been accepted become eligible to be shown.

Substantive Motion Carried 91/51/0

Meeting adjourned afternoon tea – 3.15 and reconvened at 3.30

9. G.2 Canterbury All Breeds/Arthur Rowlands

Show By-Law 8.3-'NZCF Judges shall at all times' and By-Law 8.4 'Judges once contracted to judge at shows shall'

- 1. From 8.3 remove clauses (e), (f), (g) and (h)**
- 2. To 8.4 (i) add the words "Judges may not bench their own exhibits and must stay away from the floor prior to judging."**

Margaret Bean – when we first saw this at a Judges seminar we thought it could be a typo but did not want to risk it. 8.3 states NZ Judges NZ at all times should.....

8.4 states once contracted to judge at a show shall.....

If you are not contracted to judge –

8.4 words transferred from 8.3 to 8.4 re benching should be over the judges who are contracted to judge at the show not those or are not contracted. That is why this needs to be sorted.

8.3 remove clauses (e), (f), (g) and (h)

8.4 (i) add the words "Judges may not bench their own exhibits and must stay away from the floor prior to judging."

Ian Gray – The word Judges may is of concern. It is not a directive it is an option – shall not is a directive:

Moved an amendment: Ian Gray/Deb Armishaw – 8.4 (i) that the words may not be replaced by "shall not".

Amendment CARRIED 140.0.0

Rob Shirley – this has obviously sat there for a couple of years – is this an error or was this deliberate to ensure that we do well as we can to have judges who are staying with friends – who don't get any idea of being biased because 3mths before the show because they have seen every cat in their buddies cattery if it was deliberate that that is so from two years ago, if it is a mistake then it seems silly for it to be there.

Chair – this looks like a copy and paste situation – Judges who are not judging at that particular show it basically says that you can't even go to the show at the moment.

Kay McArthur – that a judge cannot judge family members cats. We have all got people around NZ I don't know when this came in – seems to me to be a rather stupid rule.

Chair - the motion before us does not relate to the judging of family members cats, it is a separate issue.

Jenni Paul – is this just judging on the day?

Arthur Rowlands - responded that this is a change that was done 2007 changes were amended 2008 what you should do when you are contracted – and by error has also appeared in 8.3 appears to be a cut and paste issue. It was shoved through at the Judges Council meeting.

Jenni Paul – when I first started showing I was of the opinion that you should not put a cat under a judge who bred it – should not put a cat under a family member - should not on the day travel to the show with an exhibitor – I think this particular ruling that there are a couple of people out there friend travelled with the Judge stayed in the same accommodation – that our club paid for and then put the kitten in the show under the judge this is a matter of ethics.

Chair – this remit relates to non contracted judges.

Rob Shirley – Speaking to Sue & Kay's point Judges are not stupid (I agree) the fact remains that we have this dichotomy appearing in our rules – cut and paste error but why are we bothering putting anything in the rules travelling up staying in the same accommodation – if they know who the cat belongs to are we fooling ourselves? Perhaps we need to go to the situation the

kennel club – the person is holding the animal that has operated for years. Putting problems within our way – if you are a judge you will make friends with other judges. – I think we are wasting our time dealing with the second part of this.

Chair - do you judge cats or people – this is not the issue here.

Margaret Bean – right of reply I do think this is a typo the other issues could be bought up at another annual meeting.

SUBSTANTIVE MOTION – 138.3.0

9. G.3 Canterbury All Breeds

“That EC introduce a scheme where a small number of individuals from major centres become involved in EC meetings. These individuals would report to EC and back to their local membership on all issues.”

Chair called this out of order 8.2 (o) & (p) as frivolous under standing orders 2G –

Margaret Bean – I do feel disadvantaged we used to go to EC meetings in CHCH – but since the meetings have moved out of the south island I cannot afford to go to Wellington or Palm Nth just to be an observer but I personally still feel disadvantaged.

Lyll Payne – I feel it bizarre that you have ruled it out of order – and less bizarre than the remits stands anyway. I attend a number of EC meetings I have been given full opportunity to speak on issues – anything that could be gained by the process that we have now is already available.

Sue Gordon – the previous Chairman was very generous to have a say at the meetings – we have been stifled in the past – it was pleasant to be made special – and contribute.

9. G 4 (a) Lyll Payne/Janice Davey

“That within the Domestic Section of NZCF shows, that there be one combined Top Ten for Longhair and Shorthair exhibits.

Jenni Paul - At the clubs choice or discretion – should not be told what we have to do.

Deb Armishaw – clubs should be able to choice – if they want to combine the sections however, the show rules also stipulate that there are top ten national annual awards. Combined top tens would then have to be split by the show secretary.

Wanda Kent – speaking against the motion if you have a large number of domestics in each section why not have a separate top ten – do not discourage.

Zena Pigden – opposed to this motion (on behalf of my Club) we want to encourage exhibitors we felt that Domestic exhibitors would not appreciate this. A percentage of domestic owners do go on to be owners of pedigree registered cats.

Dorothy Horton – domestic and companions people need to be encouraged – we are trying to foster the care of all cats. We should not only concentrate on pedigrees, they take great pride in their domestics – I think it is wrong to combine the sections.

Janice Davey – Really up to the clubs what sort of cats are at their show some areas get a bigger draw card of domestics v companions. This is a draw card for future pedigree owners. Just like we did with the N/S pedigree section – this section has grown, people are passionate about showing.

Lyall Payne – hold proxy for these two clubs and would prefer to stay as the remit is worded – I personally am not a fan to include the words “at the discretion of the club” – we are not talking about combining domestic and companion sections – just LH & SH by combining the sections they can gain more points if they are that competitive.

LOST 37/92/2

**9. G 4(b) Lyall Payne/Janice
Metropolitan SH Cat Club/Abyssinian&Somali Cat Club**

“That within the Companion Cats section of NZCF shows, that there be one combined Top Ten for Longhair and Shorthair exhibits.”

Ian / Janice closure motion to put the motion carried

LOST 21/120/0

9. G 5&6 put aside – to be discussed in general business.

9. G.7 Feline Cat Club/Val Richards

**“By 2011 all clubs have standardized stationery including the following:
for all judges books; show forms; reducing the amount of Challenge cards
to be awarded.”**

Maree Roy – clarify the wording standardised stationery – challenge cards it does not seem to fit into the wording of the motion.

Ian Gray – the essence is at least the Club Members are hopeful that standard forms throughout each club stewarding or judging you do not have to adapt to different forms – catalogues would have some similarity these could be downloaded from the website.

Sue Gordon – Pedigree Persian are very much against this remit, some clubs have already got programmes in place – it is the clubs individual right to do what they want. Judges have to get used to different Judges Sheets especially if they are going overseas.

Janice Davey – specialised clubs for instance the Birman Club – we have our own judge's sheets set up for specials – totally unnecessary.

Deb Armishaw – concur with Sue and Janice – one club does not have the right to tell another club to run their shows as long as the club abides by the rules.

Lyll Payne - NZCF has every right to tell their Clubs how to run shows, what is required – I agree with Feline in principle it is fraught with difficulty because Clubs have developed systems over time because NZCF have not developed systems for them – ROCAP may or may not be conducive to be used for entry forms. This is a business opportunity for NZCF to the work for the Clubs – there is a huge amount of work at Club level that could be saved.

Diane Holtom – however, I do see in the budget software programme to assist clubs NZCF are obviously addressing this in the future.

Zena Pigten – My Club wondered should this have come through an AGM anyway after all anything that is past an AGM cannot be changed until presentation back to an AGM for changes. We would prefer an instruction to clubs that NZCF develop standardised stationery so that clubs can use if preferred.

Lyll Payne – I disagree with Zena's understanding of things being past at an AGM can only be changed by a subsequent AGM with the General Remits these are only a recommendation that goes forward to EC.

LOST 21-110

9. G.8 Feline Cat Club/Margaret Bean

“That the show rules are amended to allow all club's entry forms to have a “yes/no” box electing to get, or not, a challenge certificate, if awarded. That the catalogue, judge's book and results record notes only those entries saying YES.”

Margaret Bean – we have done this at our last show on the entry form we had a tick box to nominate if they wanted a challenge certificate. On the award card there was a box to indicate if they had been awarded a challenge certificate. Out of over 115 entries only 15 requested certificates.

Three of those exhibitors had cats that were already Gld Dbl Grand Champions.

Arthur Rowlands - NZCF cardboard/ paper – judges sheet challenge yes or no it is not talking about the piece of cardboard. Cats already with a title of CH/PR/ etc....are not offered
Bylaw says certificates need not be written out.....
NZCF 14.2 certificates are only given out certificates to untitled cats.

Interjection by many this is not so --- Arthur meant that NZCF should put this into the show bylaws.

Maree Roy – should not include Judges book it is imperative that those words be removed. Ian Gray - With my seconds acceptance I am happy to remove the words Judges Books

Lyall Payne Show rules are amended to allow – you don't even have to fill in an award card.

]

Chair - Already have that right – Ruling out of Order

Ian Gray - Point of Order – ruled against it under the awards section in the existing rules Challenge certificates shall be awarded on the day- the existing rules state shall be awarded on the day and signed by the show secretary there is a directive there.

Jenni Paul we are not saying we are not going to issue we are saying that you indicate on your entry form by ticking the box if you do not wish to receive a certificate.

Deb Armishaw – 14.1 (b) that Challenges & BAM issued on the day – this is only the entry forms that they are talking about.

Rob Shirley– did you rule this out of order – Chair so why are we discussing it
Chair – because Ian raised a point of order.

Zena Pigden – in regard to the rule re: signed by the judge/show sec does not require if a club has not opted – it does not imply they must issue – those certificates that are issued must be signed on the day.

Chair – Ruled the remit out of order.

9. 6.9 Feline Cat Club/Val Richards

“That the NZCF become more pc savvy - we should adapt the same method as that of the New Zealand Kennel Club website, where people can view pedigrees, pay for registrations online, membership etc. The EC would need to be prepared to spend funds to develop a website capable to delivering the functions necessary.”

Deb Armishaw – in conjunction with Rob Shirley's earlier motion re: moving the budget forward and the way forward with IT.

Ian Gray - With the consent of the seconder – move to be discussed with the budget.

9. 6.10 Feline Cat Club/Wanda Kent

"That photographing of exhibits at cats shows be prohibited to only those authorised via the NZCF affiliated club(s) holding the cat show."

Ian Gray– this has been discussed in conjunction with other clubs – Is that there was considerable feeling about consents being given to professional photographers particularly at the National show – were EC appoints a specific photographer to be there but the other aspect is that photos are being published on the web without the exhibitors/owners consent.

Sue Gordon –spoke against the original remit – I think people should be able to have the enjoyment of taking photos at cat shows –

Kay McArthur – amendment shall not be permitted without the written permission of the exhibit/owner

Kay McArthur/Stuart Johnstone - Amendment – "that the publishing, reproduction and circulation of photographs following the photographing of exhibits at cat shows shall not be permitted without the written permission of the owner/ exhibitor being given. "

Lyall Payne – The Copyright Act and Privacy Act applies to publishing on the website. There have been tests cases about publishing of photographs. You can have a contract with an official photographer but you cannot stop members of the public unless it relates to the Major Events Act – they have rights over their fame comes under the Copyright Act – Laws of the land.

Jenni Paul - Already covered under the copyright act. We are just wasting time.

Deb Armishaw – agree to an extent about increasing our public exposure – increasing our membership then we are going to nail them at the door and tell them they can't take a photo. How can you police this?

Janice Davey – open the door and advertise there is such a thing as the "the fair trading act" people have paid money to come and see the cats. Judges and students who learn from taking photo's at show. If one of my cats was published on a website I would be happy and promoted for me.

Wanda Kent – penguin colony at home as a sign up 'no flash photography to be taken while the penguins are coming ashore'. The signs are there but they still get ignored.

Chair: Amendment ruled out of order because it changes the intention of the remit.
Amendment ruled out of order

LOST 20/123

Rob Shirley/ Lyall Payne – I move that we adjourn until tomorrow morning.

Rob Shirley - speaking on the basis of what happened last year the meeting fort for an extension. I am sorry I believe that this meeting is now making decisions under pressure.

Jenni Paul - Scheduled for two days – advertised the 10-11th October Jennie Paul because I thought it was a two day conference – I have booked flights for Sunday.

Deb/ Rob Shirley – with leave of the meeting the amendment to read – decide a time to start tomorrow and then adjourn until 8.30 a.m. Sunday.

CARRIED

Sunday reconvened 8.30 a.m.

Apologies - Val Richards, Lyall Payne, Maree Roy, Sue Gordon, Kay McArthur, Wanda Kent, Diane Whittle.

Rob Shirley what is our voting strength, (may not be quorate) – count the votes that are here – 113 is the voting strength.

Any Other Business

Ian Gray – wrap around the thought that currently cause and affect of having points count of certain shows is the cause and the affect is that people want bigger shows which attract more points – open up the points system to all shows as an accumulative affect. People will be encouraged to go to a three ring show simply to accumulate their points. Exhibits are currently being encouraged away from smaller clubs. With the 6 ring points system

Zena Pigden - When the six ring best rings was bought in many shows were one ring only and you had to go to 6 or more shows to get the points – then multi rings happened you can now go to one show and have six good rings. On the animal welfare issue I agree that there is an issue if the cat does not have the temperament to multi ring shows. Most of the major registries have a accumulate system – there does not appear to be reports of animals suffering or becoming stressed as a general rule.

Stuart Johnstone - Club level don't totally agree with the six ring system opening it up will encourage those with the most money to go to the most shows you win – it has nothing to do with the cat.

Chair – Three issues here do we restrict the number of rings and risk the over showing of our cats if we open it up. Some people cannot afford to go to more shows. Do we say restrict the number of shows a cat can go to in one year to enable all the cats going to the same amount of shows?

Kay Hood – at a Multi ring show that the points from one ring is counted

Jenni Paul – six ring system makes it fair for everybody – equal across the board I might choose to go only to the National which is the biggest. Can't afford to travel but you can still have an equal playing field for everyone.

Annette Dunn - We need to make sure what we are talking about here. To the detriment to the smaller clubs – were the best result that you have at a show that is the result that goes forward towards your National annual award. What ever is the number of rings only your best ring goes towards the National annual awards.

Pauline Pullan – as a new breeder I'm not really interested in the national points as such and there are pet owners there it gives me more delight to gain a BAM and meet prospective owners.

Rob Shirley – huge discussion at Mid Island Club very much tied up with the status of the National. The National is not the pinnacle of the season. The National – the status and we have this 6 show limit. A minimalist approach the national champion is the national champion and that is the reason you would go to the national – I think the present situation does encourage people with money who can get to a lot of shows – Auckland/Waikato within commuter distance than what would be the situation for folks in Dunedin. If we are going to do something where the criticism does not go far enough we would like to see the National show as the premier event of the year.

Stuart Johnstone – rather than ditching one would be to have National totally separate the National show in itself is a separate entity. That would mean that points would not be awarded at the National.

Lesley Watson – needs to be in one of the main centres – so expensive for the exhibitors – Napier next year to expensive.

Kay Hood – don't discourage the running of these 8 ring shows – the benching fees certainly contributed to the NZCF funds.

Ian Gray – title should not be in the remit – National points system (titles to be left as they are) encourage you to be thinking along those lines addressed by Rob in Australia they do not have points for the National and to be a National winner is the status. We don't have people coming in from the bottom – the aging exhibitors – we are growing ourselves out of a job.

Ian Gray - We are trying to give some direction to the EC.

Jennie Paul – up until now always had the national ring in conjunction with a club show – been at a national but most of the time – one ring is the national ring at the show – need to be a little careful 2 or 3 rings might be club rings and you want to exclude points from those rings at a National show would be unaware on the Club.

Rob Shirley – I was not aware we are not making decisions this morning so we need to deal with the decision making items and those are Item 10 & 11. And the budget

Ian Gray/ Arthur Rowlands – “That we move to the budget.”

Chair – I would prefer to deal with Item 10 – Expression of Interest Hosting National 2011 Show and the AGM Location before the budget.

Item 10: 2011 National Show

Margaret Bean – speaking as an individual would like to suggest a group of people NZ Cat of the year associated with that show some subsidiary rings associated e.g. Siamese of the Year, Burmese of the Year. A judge would take the 12 BIS plus the e.g. Birman of the Year etc...chooses the NZ Cat of the Year

I would like to see a committee made up of all the CHCH Clubs working together – bury there differences so that cat people should work together with that in mind I would like to apply for CHCH to hold the NZ Cat of the year 2011 National

Margaret Bean / Rob Shirley – “that this AGM directs the EC to organise a committee in CHCH to hold the 2011 National show.”

No vote recorded

Ian Gray – spoke against this because there is already a Persian of the year staged by Pedigree Persians.

Rob Shirley – we have told you guys what we want – lets move on

Item 11 2011 AGM

Rob Shirley – when we began the AGM moved around the country it is good to see a number of people coming to this meeting who have not been there before – I personally am glad that we are down here, the National and the AGM 2010 are not and I think it has caught us a little flat footed – the idea of the rotation is to allow the fanciers to meet the faces of the EC.

One area as having both I do not remember, and I chaired the meeting and I do not remember it is not in the minutes If we decide to stay in Napier I think that is a bit of a shame.

Chris Lowe – You know very well Mr Shirley the reason that Patches & Ptd expressed interest was because they wanted to bring a new concept into NZCF by holding an AGM seminar/national in one weekend and the reason that has not happened is because the constitution has not been completed, and I thought we are talking about 2011.

Janice Davey/Diane Holtom – “That the 2011 AGM be held in New Plymouth.”

New Plymouth has never hosted an AGM – good conference centre, good airfares.

Zena Pigden – AGM should move between the north and the south islands however, if you put it into a small centre – if you don't happen to live in that small centre I would rather like us to think about having our AGM's in Auckland, Wellington or Christchurch.

Janice Davey – there is a motion on the floor and it has been seconded – we need to go to vote. New Plymouth has never hosted an AGM – good conference centre, good airfares.

CARRIED 61.41.1

Chair - my reasoning for bringing up Other Business first there one or two items that were set aside from yesterday that could have had an affect on the budget.

Rob Shirley – can we go to the plan for next year first – how the cat fancy has done in 2009.

Chair – excuse me Rob I wish to proceed with the Budget

Rob Shirley – “Moved that we dissent from the Chairman's ruling.”

Not seconded

Marion Petley – Budget presented to the meeting in a draft form – it is the intention that the EC will pick up on items discussed and new items coming through. Extra activity expenditure – deficit of \$35k
At the December meeting reduced down by \$6000 for SGM and the changing of the fee structure.

Activities Budget –

BSC meeting

IT develop (no expenditure)

JC meeting

Judges Curriculum development meeting not held due to difficulties sorting date.

National shows contract

Constitutional working party

Increased legal bill

Communications - increased Officials and EC subsidy to make communication better.

Increased fees have had an impact on membership with none of those meeting the budget potential.

It has been difficult to predict what was going to happen because a lot of fees were paid prior to the price increases taking place – so a best guess has been used. As far as the 2009 year is concerned we have come in at a \$10,000 loss as I said there is a lot of expenditure that has not been taken up.

2010 - Budget

Deb Armishaw - point of clarification – note in the list that the chair mentioned with the focus on next year –that is Judges training that is now not budgeted for 2010 –

Marion - probably for Gaynor to mention this, those items listed here two of those items have been dropped of when a further teleconference meeting in September and individual consultation with Portfolio Managers.

Janice Davey – with the JC meeting there will be a Tutor Judges meeting followed the next day by training.

Deb Armishaw – asked that the Treasurer retract the statement that membership fees were increased across the board - the people that were hit were the breeders none of the other fees assoc, affiliate were.

Rob Shirley – done this on the assumption what the EC think they should do – when we have finished this process – hence my point about the plan now we are budgeting for stuff that this meeting may not want you to do. It is the budget that you guys use to set the fees. That is why the fees went up, if we don't know what we want you to do or accept what you have said we don't have a chance to address the items. That is my concern I have a suggestion what a group of us want to be done.

Marion – my understanding of the budget process when it is brought to the AGM it is really an indicative budget in theory we could have had three new members on the EC – brought forward as a discussion, this is exactly what happened last year we met we slashed the budget and yes, fees were increased apart from the ones already mentioned so we reduced the deficit from 35k to 20k. But that was assisted by the fact that we had reduced some of the expenditure.

Rob Shirley – Excuse me Madam Chair please consult the Constitution, we have to approve an annual plan please what time you are going to deal with that.

Chair – after the budget.

Overview budget loss of \$35k made up from:

- 25k activities IT development (trading)

- Admin loss
- BSC
- IT 20k
- Judges - \$2500 (discussion JC meeting/training + \$500 carry over from 2009) my best understanding what the requirements were.
- Publications – nothing extra ordinary in there
- Registrations – meeting \$1500
- Shows – put in full (a) benching fee figure of \$33k with a possibility of reducing the benching fee by \$1 at some stage the fees putting up were a temporary measure and have never been reduced as what was probably the original intention.
- (b) Shows IT software \$5000 the idea is to initiate 2010, trial 2011 implement 2012.

Continuation of the Clubs Insurance cover – virtually no feedback at all there could be a possibility of dropping that and reducing the benching fees.

National show - \$0 there would be a break even budget on that

Revenue \$19k surplus against a \$40k projected for this year and the \$26k budgeted for this year.

Other revenue – sales promotion NZCF Calendar

The membership fees projected coming in and take of \$10k back into publications is what was decided last year.

Total income \$57K

Administration Expenses –

AGM projected (Napier)

Annual Plan Items - constitution working party, membership growth, EC very mindful of reduction of membership, information kits for breeders and new owners.

National show contract – memorandum of agreement –

Officials – working individually 3 registrars that can mix and match but there are other areas for e.g. Joan Hill, Chris, Marion do need backup for the roles still an item for discussion.

EC expenses \$19600 – meetings + reimbursements for subsidy broadband and telephones.

Liaison – WCC Melbourne (assuming the cost to be about the same)

Legal fees \$500

Depreciation \$3100 (+ 3 items of capital expenditure – 6 external hard drives + 1 PC & Printer just in case one of them falls over somewhere – probably that wont be expended.

Expenditure - \$92000

I am comfortable with a loss of \$35000

With retained earnings of 151,000 projected is around \$140,000 this has not ever really been discussed what we intend to do with these retained earnings – many years ago the council was considering purchasing a building – our best option is to use it coming in with a deficit budget I would imagine after this year our ROCAP should be pretty much up to scratch national show memo in place our shows package up and running.

Marion/Deb Chesterfield: I will move that the meeting adopts the circulated budget as presented in its draft form as at 11/10/09.

CARRIED (17 abstentions)

Rob Shirley – existence of the Insurance scheme BASH was quite central to the financial success nature of our inaugural show. We applied for funding on the proviso that we had all risk cover - On behalf of BASH we were really raped that NZCF did that.

Marion - the Broker came up with \$114+GST for each individual club I think one of the local clubs in Wellington have always done their own insurance – and there are some clubs who don't even bother but you really do need it. This particular club are paying somewhere in the region of \$500

Deb Armishaw – This was forward thinking of the EC I would like to acknowledge the effort put in by the EC and Marion.

Margaret Bean – as proposer of this at the last AGM I would also like to express thanks.

Jenni Paul (Auckland CC) – we had to produce that we had public liability ACC does have its own but we have two from that point of view it was very useful.

Rob Shirley: I want the chair to move the motion what the Executive Council want to achieve. On the basis of the constitutional requirement to do so.

Chair – forward plan

Communication – between EC Members

It Planning – on line registrations/website/on line shopping/on line membership which we have just discussed recently.

All in all what we are doing in that area is forward thinking that is why we have asked for the budget of \$20K

Show calendar – under review

Judge Training – incorporation of meetings

National show document – now being done

Membership growth & retention – I wanted to see feedback how are we going to get the younger ones into the NZCF looked at putting brochures out there that is why we have budgeted \$5000

Putting into Chris's home 0800 number with an automatic answer line – in all phone books – TV ad a no go/ newspapers – phone books are still the great way to go.

Welfare fund – looking at how we deal with this – just what we do towards welfare funding.

Marion Petley – we did have a feline emergency fund reserve within our balance sheet, I am not a big fan of keeping a reserve fund within the budget you are better to keep it within your operating so we moved it back into the operating account. This year we have put in a \$2000 welfare fund budget if there is an emergency we at least have something in the budget.

Kay Hood – At the present time you do not have to be an NZCF member to show your cat at a show would that be an avenue to explore for funds. The Breeders are bearing the brunt of the risers.

Chris Lowe – more of a proactive approach could be taken since taking over the Membership Co-ordinators role – which has been incorporated into the Secretarial base. I have noticed that breeders of quite long standing have not bothered to renew their membership but they suddenly want to renew because they have cats in kitten– in some cases they actually have kittens on the ground, and then they need their membership renewed.

Arthur Rowlands– May be we should be looking at the N/S owners whether they should be members or not. As soon as you win they should then join (like what TICA does) so that they are considered for National annual awards purposes.

Jenni Paul – should be an early bird registration fee if you register after that period of time there should be a penalty. That would encourage them to renew early.

Ian Gray – if you are not financial how can you accumulate points?

Zena Pigden – Arthur I am not sure you are quite correct about TICA – I understand that CFA & CATZ you can show at their show without penalty – but if you want to keep your awards you have to register your kitten which owners can do it does not have to be the breeder. We all know that many people have found their way into the cat fancy by showing and I think we should not put in a financial penalty to show.

0800 number – of course whoever, is going to be the person – fantastic idea, for purposes of registrations, authentic breeders etc. obviously would need to get the word out through the media transfer that info through the clubs and through the shows – I think it is a great idea.

Ian Gray – referred the meeting to the NZ Cricket Assoc web there they have the means for individual clubs to manage their affairs, accounting package, ability to register their results (on a weekly basis) membership application as will – becomes part of their shop window. Suggest that EC take a look at this example.

Education – breeders take the opportunity to promote their animals through schools – meet with the school present a series of cats – lend lease option occurring children have a cat to show and encourages mums , dads 7 kids together into the show scene

Margaret Bean – ASET endorsed the NZ Dog Owners Manual and they want one on cats to be endorsed by ASET particularly aimed at young people. I have been to schools and kindergartens – there is a lot going on in the education world to have cats there. When I was teaching I used cats as part of my lessons. Last Sunday I had a cat at the world animal week church service. There are things that we can all stick in and do and if anyone is interested in helping with getting a cat manual together geared towards the younger people in NZ, I would like to hear from you.

Rob Shirley - the EC report at the next AGM on the status of the contractual arrangements between us and the other providers – such as show management, ROCAP, Printing of Flash cats and the website.

Rob Shirley/ Ian Gray - move that your motion be amended by the attention of contractual arrangements carried

Rob Shirley - WCC annually NZCF spends a fortune on it. July minutes came out survey came out and then there was the report from Chris Lowe of the WCC – my impression was that there was a whole lot of points scoring by two of the big organisations FIFE CFA international not based like us Aust etc.... I can't see we are getting value for our money.

The other things that happen when we sent a person who is not as widely regarded in Judging circles – simply costs us more.

Chris Lowe – I was delighted when EC asked me to go and wondered what WCC did and still feel like that – it was a wonderful experience, 700 cats at a normal show, obviously a highlight for me and attending an international seminar – top table of all delegates seminar audience used them to bounce of ideas. However, moving to the closed meeting of WCC. I was very vocal in areas that really concerned me – very much an elitist group apart from one person (all are high profile judges) – I believe that it could be seen to be a way of promoting themselves. WCC is fully supported by Royal Canin. At the conclusion of the closed meeting I moved a motion calling for all delegates to go back to their affiliates to discuss what they want out of WCC. Hopefully this will be addressed by the EC in December meeting. Royal Canin needs more profile in NZ – for the seminar for the National next year we are hoping to get sponsorship for a geneticist to attend.

Rob Shirley/Chris Lowe “that the EC report to the next AGM on the continued membership of the WCC.” Carried

Arthur Rowlands – 2001 WCC NZCF uniform disqualifiers – how far ahead is that.

Chris Lowe - NZ was in the firing line not only because of our acceptance of polydactyl Maine coons and our wonderful new colours – unfortunately there is still significant debate with what one organisation classify as a deformity. One organisation believes that there should be no white cats on the show bench, and Scottish folds are definitely not appropriate. The first question at the seminar was fired at me regarding the Polydactyl but it was also noted that the panel asked what are you worrying about it is not a lethal gene worry about the terrible genetic illnesses that you have in breeds.

Marion – commended Chris on her report from WCC.

accepted with acclamation –

Deb Armishaw – do we not need to deal with the AGM accounts?

Marion Petley –at this stage I do not have any details.

Chair on closing I would just like to thank you all for your patience - this is the first meeting I have chaired all my life and thank you for the odd pointers as we went along – I wanted to hear everyone's point of view because you are all important – this EC team are the best to work with.I would like to thank every one for working with me

Ian Gray - On behalf of the membership we know that the EC have had a difficult year we have another year a head remember to delegate...
received with acclamation

Kay Hood – wish also to extend a vote of thanks to Rob – for trying to stare the NZCF in the right direction.

Meeting closed 10.20 am



MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING HELD IMMEDIATELY
FOLLOWING THE CLOSURE OF THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING, SUNDAY 11TH
OCTOBER 2009

Gaynor extended a welcome to those delegates who stayed for the meeting, also congratulating Annette on her new role on Executive Council.

In Attendance: Debbie Chesterfield, Janice Davey, Annette Dunn, Paul Flanagan, Zena Pigden, Gaynor Saxon, Marion Petley (Treasurer) Chris Lowe (Executive Council Secretary)

Election of the Chairman:

Gaynor vacated the Chair and handed over to the Vice Chairman. Janice called for nominations for the Chairman.

Deb Chesterfield/Zena Pigden – nominated Gaynor There being no further nominations Gaynor was declared elected.
--

Election of the Vice Chairman:

Gaynor Saxon/Deb Chesterfield – nominated Janice Davey – there being no further nominations Janice was declared elected.
--

Financial report - Marion Petley

Reported to the meeting – (report circulated)

Financial Statement for the P/E 30/06/09 was approved by the teleconference meeting and posted to website.

Management letter – from Auditor – follow up from July report Marion is still in disappointed that the ROCAP update has not as yet been done, to enable the receipting function.

Charities Commission – Clubs applying for grants draft paper being prepared for distribution to clubs – basically what it is with the rules all changing on July 2008 all exemptions that were held were all wiped and you had to reapply. NZCF is not eligible – If a club wishes to apply they must be an Incorporated Society, have Charities Commission registration or an IRD income tax

exemption or registered with the CC. You have to have a clause in your Constitution firming up that none of the profits benefit the members – seeking clarification with IRD regarding the windup clause.

National Show Accounts – have exchanged payments – \$3900 benching fee. NZCF had to pay one airfare back due to one Judge not coming to Judge and the replacement of that Judge.

I have not received anything from ACC - Jenni Paul was asked what the status was – she said that she had to admit that some of the accounts were exceedingly late coming in. Certainly I think NZCF has a right to ask – Auckland Cat Club made a loss but they had budgeted for it anyway. We made a loss because we did not get the door take on the second day due to such terrible weather.

Marion – The Draft Budget – needs to be revisited formerly at the Dec face to face EC meeting – we have not properly discussed the benching fee and Insurance and the fees need to be finalised before the EC meeting, because flash cats is due out before that date.

Gaynor – said that she has every intention of holding a teleconference prior to the face to face meeting.

Cash position – \$168937

Item 8 – Membership currently (8/10/09) 745 (823 2008) so there has been a drop in membership.

Outstanding major debtors 5

B – At this point still under the Privacy Commissioner

C – Automatic payment – need some advise

Gaynor /Deb moved that an invoice be drawn up for that account.

CARRIED 6.0

Janice/Deb 'Moved that the Treasurers report be accepted.

CARRIED 6.0

Portfolio Allocations –

The meeting were advised what Portfolio each member had held over the last year. Where possible Gaynor said that she would like to maintain continuity and with that in mind she recommended that all Portfolio holders remain in the same areas for this coming year, with the exception of Business Administration, and possibly Registrations.

Janice – Judges (are there any objections to that)

Paul – are you happy for registrations to stay there with IT – would much rather see it separated.

Paul - IT

Zena Pigden - BSC

Deb – Shows - slowly but surely John has been very good in letting us using the manual and the contracts – 'them & us scenario" is an awful situation "a memorandum of understanding "would be great. Marion had assisted with the writing of the memo for ACC.

Annette - said that she did not see any point in Portfolio's being held by the same person on a continuous basis and that she would prefer to hold the Judges Portfolio not to cause any conflict but to offer herself with confidence in having the expertise to manage the Portfolio, She felt that she would be wasted in Registrations.

Deb – I thought we had already put Janice into the Judges portfolio
Janice – there will always be teething problems – I do have a good relationship with judges – older systems are being changed and not everyone likes change.

Zena – said that she always considered that the Registrations Portfolio can be held in conjunction with BSC, they often overlap so she would be happy to take on both Portfolio's.

Deb said that she had concerns about the Chair taking on a large portfolio such as Admin/ Finance – publications/marketing can be shared – don't encompass yourself with such a large portfolio, you would become Annette's buddy if she takes on Admin.

Annette – Said that EC should be careful that they don't just slot new EC members into the Portfolio that the person held for the vacancy just because you guys want to be in the same portfolio –

Janice – It definitely is all about continuity. BSC is a good example – now that we have Zena who has been able to sort things out.

Annette – I have the skill to be able to utilise within the area especially with people relations I certainly have the skills – you asked for an indication of where I am.

Chris –said that you have two Members wishing to hold the same Portfolio therefore to be fair to all parties a ballot should be taken, and there is no reason why this should not be by a show of hands.

Following a show of hands (4:2) Janice was allocated the Judges Portfolio.

Gaynor – asked Paul Flanagan if he would be happy to release Registrations to allow him to concentrate on the IT Portfolio as there will be considerable workload with all the upgrades required. Paul said he would prefer to just hold IT. This would then mean that the Business Admin/Finance Portfolio will be allocated to Annette.

Business Administration/Finance – Annette Dunn
Judges – Janice Davey
Shows – Debbie Chesterfield

Breed Standards Council – Zena Pigden
Registrations – Zena Pigden
Publications/Marketing/PR – Gaynor Saxon
Information Technology – Paul Flanagan

Appointment of Officers:

Deb asked if this part should be done in committee.

It was considered not necessary unless there was a need to take a contentious vote this should be an open process -

Annette Dunn – said that she was aware that a Constitutional Change had been done at the AGM but that would not take affect until next year so why are the appointments being done at this meeting?

Gaynor – said that the NZCF have been in contravention of the Constitution for a number of years, as appointments should be done at the first meeting following the AGM – so it is in order to appoint at this meeting. This helps with the lead in to the position – effective date is 1/1/2010

Executive Council Secretary- Chris Lowe
Membership/Standard of Points-Chris Lowe
Treasurer – Marion Petley
LH Registrar – Kaye Dixon
SH Registrar- Sue Starrs
Provisional Registrar – Avon Aspen
Prefix Registrar – Joan Hill
Honours Registrar – Joan Hill
Stationary – Anna Finlayson
Ast. Editor – Deidre Walsh
Editor Flash Cats- Gaynor Saxon (I hold that because I do the job the honorarium is passed onto the Asst.Editor)
AISET – Margaret Bean
Health & Safety Officer – Deb Armishaw
Webmaster – Scott Walker
Historian – vacant
International Liaison – Chris Lowe
CAC & SPCA Liaison – Val Ball & Iris Baker
Privacy Officer – expression of interest, Christine Yeung /Marion Petley
Judges Registrar – Paddy Smith

Marion – Re Privacy Officer - there was never any indication that the position was available for application – Gaynor said that this has been enforced by the Commissioner they have now given instructions that it is mandatory to appoint a privacy officer – who must at NZCF expense do the workshop training run by the commission. We have an expression of interest.

Lynne Ford – It is far more prudent to have someone involved with the EC – Annette agreed with the school board – it is one of their roles it is not contracted out – they need to have full access to the data in front of them.

Chris – said that this needs to be advertised it can be circulated and an appointment can be deferred until the December EC meeting. Also please note that those currently not holding the advertised positions were required to provide a CV.

Appointment deferred until the December EC Meeting.

Contested Position – CAC/SPCA

Annette said that Iris had done a good job prior to her resignation – Janice – Val has also done an excellent job with good reporting functions. There are two very good applicants for the position.

Chris – some people may see that as a conflict of interest Val carries two hats as she is a warranted Officer of the SPCA – however, subsequent to her appointment last year there has been no evidence being presented that this was the case.

Gaynor - is there ever likely to be an issue between CAC/ SPCA?

Paul – Do the SPCA carry our best thoughts forward – thinking about the recent draft it was very much a vets/spca type document and what happens at shows was not included. Gaynor said that Bob Kerridge has since confirmed that show details were accidentally left out.

Deb Chesterfield- Bob Kerridge chairs the CAC, his baby as you will is the CAC at the moment – the SPCA and CAC would not particularly be thinking along the lines of cats in cages.

Paul Flanagan- Iris probably had the better prospective of what NZCF needs would be than Val.

Deb Chesterfield- The way we are going we the NZCF have to be very careful along animal welfare lines – we cannot just think about chooks, pigs etc...there are many cat people that continue to put cats in cages. Palm Nth SPCA are looking at not housing cats in cages – our shows are a period of time in a cats day – we are now actively addressing show cage size and an emphasis needs to be placed on Clubs that continue to use small old show cages that a mandatory upgrade should be done to meet minimum recommendations.

Gaynor – vote taken 3.3

Ian Gray – said that the Chair does not have a vote.

It was confirmed that the Chair holding a portfolio definitely does have a vote. The Constitution over rules the Standing Orders – the chair has a substantive and a casting vote.

Lynne Ford – as already identified there is a huge conflict of interest with one of the applicants.

Gaynor - what would be wrong with keeping one in the south and one in the Nth – who can work together. These are liaison roles quite good for the South Island breeders who can report directly to Iris.

Pauline Pullan– Iris was part of the original writing group – and because she lost the position her role in the writing group went to.

Gaynor Saxon/Deb Chesterfield – “That the Officers are approved”.
Carried 6.0

Meeting Dates: December

As the National is being held in Napier – the EC need to be given the opportunity to go over the venue etc... 5-6th December

Chris - bearing in mind the December meeting is huge all the governance documents and AGM stuff we normally start at dinner time you would have to be in Napier by 6.00 pm.

Other Business

Application for dispensation to transfer – deferred to Dec meeting

Request for a Review or Appeal against a decision made by a Club re: a show complaint. The party involved – wants this dealt with ASAP. That is why it is tabled at this meeting.

Janice – identified that Gaynor had a conflict of interest, Janice took the chair.

Janice - The first two paragraphs have nothing to do with the complaint.

Club has apologised to this person because at the time there were not enough people available to assist on the day. The Club has decided not to take the matter any further, this is confirmed by the letter that the Officiating Judge and handler have provided. Show day issue the club took care of it.

Chris Lowe – the show committee met within two hours of the incident – subsequently have exchanged communications with parties involved and a further committee meeting was held after the Clubs AGM were the Club declined to take any further action.

The complaint was based on the incident at Patches & Ptd but it also identified that there have been issues all year with stewards, some of which were not qualified to act as stewards. The Club has acknowledged that they have worked outside the rules – however, they request that it be minuted that the Club stated that they are at fault by using an unqualified steward with an international judge. There is nothing in our rules how it is to be dealt with – it is also noted that the complainant has also indicated three incidences at other shows – which do not relate to the issue at Patches & Pointed.

It would appear that the complainant has been seething about it all year – this is the straw that broke the camels back feels he has been victimised all year – he is an exhibitor who pays a lot of money to show all over the country and has every right to express the concerns.

Janice Davey/ EC would like to instruct the Secretary to write to the complainant and we feel that the Club have pointed out the issues – they have apologised and no further action will be taken: (show bylaw to be quoted).

Chris Lowe – This is an opportunity for EC to address an issue which is causing concern. A proactive approach would be the best way forward EC have acknowledged that there is an issue with unqualified stewards and it should be referred to the Judges Council for follow up.

Paul – dealt with sufficiently by the club which is backed up with the documents tabled.

Annette – the EC acknowledge that there are issues with the using of unqualified stewards. The Judges Council does have an overview of the training of the stewards.

Other Business:

Meeting Expenses –

Gaynor Saxon moved as the Chair: 'that the 2009 AGM expenses of \$9,747 (incl GST) = \$8,676 (excl GST) v Budget \$9,500 be approved'. CARRIED 6.0

Zena – BSC appointments – possibilities discussed at BSC meeting last weekend but Sue Gordon, Kim Mattler who were at the meeting and due to continuity I would like these confirmed now. They have agreed to continue.

Gaynor – happy to confirm those two appointments,
Sue Gordon & Kim Mattler others to be confirmed at the teleconference

Breed Section Reps – held over to the teleconference.

CARRIED 6.0

Marion – we are paying an account Solution Second – web hosting 6mthly to 31/12 to be paid that will have to still remain in place – Paul confirmed that was correct.

Marion asked for confirmation of the start date for the webmaster position. Chris said that Jane was supposed to have finished on the 30 September however Jane has been very good to me – providing me with several updates to the show calendar since then.

Marion Petley declared an interest as the appointee is her son-in-law. Webmaster date will be from today.

Ian Gray - Just an observation it is nice to hear from Marion that you have a buddy system as so many of you have so much work to do – do you have a buddy system outside of EC - do you not think that some role should be outsourced.

Meeting closed – 11.40