



Member of the World Cat Congress

MINUTES of the 40th Annual General Meeting of the New Zealand Cat Fancy Incorporated, held 9th April 2011, commencing at 9.00 am, at the Brentwood Hotel, Tawa Room, 16 Kemp Street, Kilbirne, Wellington

Chairman opened the meeting extended thanks to those who have taken time to attend and sincerely hoped that the weekend would be pleasurable and a productive time for all.

Item 1 Attendance & Apologies

Apologies: Jan Gray, Kay McArthur, Helene Rowlands, Samantha Pratt, Debbie Chesterfield, Kay Hood & Marion Petley.

Paddy Smith/Lyall Payne: "That apologies be accepted."

Carried

Roll Call:

Annette Dunn (Chairman)
Zena Pigden (Vice Chairman)
Christine Lowe (Executive Council Secretary)
Maree Roy
Sue Ford
Rob Shirley
Denise Grace
Lyall Payne
Janice Davey
Diane Holtom
Arthur Rowlands
Christa Krey (arrived late)
Suzanne Gordon
Judy Wereta
Colleen McCready
Jenni Paul
Cheryle St Clair-Newman
Paul Flanagan
Ian Gray
Patricia Smith

Ian Gray/Janice Davey: "That the minutes of the 39th AGM be taken as read."
CARRIED

ITEM 2 Corrections to the Minutes:

Rob Shirley

Page 15 3rd line "vibrate" to read "vibrant"

Page 15 Saxon/Paul - motion to read "That 2011 annual plan will focus on the maintenance

Pg 15 Budget 2011 what does – only \$800 of a \$5000 was expended last year – mean?

Chair: it means that only \$800 of the budgeted amount of \$5000 was spent.

Pg 19 3rd paragraph "passed" to read "past"

Pg 19 4th paragraph insert a semi-colon after "expensive"

Page 19 onwards Chair please explain – how we conducted the meeting from that page on. Recording of the decisions made – by consensus would have become extremely difficult for the secretary to keep up with –
In the new constitution we just use the 10 members or the removal of **affiliate** came from and there is nothing in the minutes.

Secretary - the minutes don't state it but the document does.

Rob is there a change that wasn't discussed but it has been included in the document?

Janice Davey – I do not believe that change was made at the AGM

Chair: but it may have been in the draft that is what I am saying.

Arthur – is it likely that items in the draft were not formally moved or voted on – there is a de facto record of what was voted on – with piece meal changes - if there was no motion then they were not debated. The meeting could have done a lot better and hope that any decisions made today are formally moved and voted on, thus ensuring that the Secretary can record the resolutions correctly.

Chair: I'd rather not comment on what happened last year and I was not in the chair, but I will say that the recording of motions passed will be recorded better.

Janice – for this meeting if there are any Constitutional motions discussed at this meeting that they are written down and handed to the Secretary.

Chair: that is exactly the way the meeting will be conducted this year. We have the dictaphone and we do need to keep it in order.

Janice– the draft copy was I believe going to be sent out a month after the AGM to the membership but I do not recall this having been done. It was part of the AGM decision.

EC Secretary - It was the general rules document that was supposed to have been circulated as it was actually handed out to everyone on the morning of the AGM – it was the issue with the general rules document as nobody had seen it.

Rob - The draft shows EC 8.C.1 (27.2) is a change from the old constitution but states quite clearly any proposed change shall be signed by 15 people and given to the secretary at least 28 days before the meeting – we did change the 15 members to 10. In actual fact because of the motion passed which is 10 it is in the present constitution we have removed the right of the Affiliate clubs to move a motion at the general meeting, this might need to be readdressed.

Lyll - there may be occasion where we did not think of things that we might have wanted to but should not detract from what was discussed the matters that we did discuss I feel that the meeting was aware of what they were voting for, especially relating to the changes to the document.

Arthur – the clubs have been disenfranchised in this part of 27.2
10 people could lodge a change 30 days before the AGM and the secretary has the problem of getting it out on time to the membership – who was drafting this thing they should have looked further ahead when they put the document together.

Ian - Point of Order – we are discussing changes to the minutes and not debating what is in the constitution.

Chair: we are discussing changes to the minutes as recorded at this stage, we will get to that discussion Arthur, and certainly there are issues there

Rob – the query I had has been resolved Madam Chair thank you.

Page 22 7th paragraph replace should with shall

Janice - quoting what Margaret Bean said at the meeting - shall appoint – the next highest polling candidate on availability shall be appointed. Those that were in attendance agreed the next highest polling candidate shall be appointed to EC. You know I resigned and it was the belief of those in attendance that the next highest polling candidate shall be appointed. The next highest polling candidate was Lyall Payne and not Ian Gray who is now sitting on the EC.

Chair: with regard to the wording in the minutes - the wording was changed from may to “shall”. That is what was asked for – that is what has been replaced there was no other change indicated at that meeting.

Janice – I believe there was, as recorded in the minutes.

Rob –this matter is the most contentious one of all listed here. In the draft there was flexibility in terms of what the EC could do – in terms of the appointment of EC members when there were resignations. If you look through the pages from 22 on this is Arthur’s issue about how we made that decision.

Now I was at the meeting and others here were also and I clearly remember Janice speaking and that is recorded in the minutes and I spoke and it is recorded – what has been put in the minutes the wording should be shall it was the consensus of that meeting or we would not be discussing the constitution at this meeting today - the good will of the meeting last year was extraordinary – But the decision of the meeting was not to put a motion (none of the stuff from page 19 onwards right up until the formal adoption was put into a formal motion – my clear memory is that particular thing in the draft was definitely changed. It was agreed that you have to follow the appointment of the next highest polling candidate, and I definitely used the example of “Janice falling of her perch” and that the next highest polled would be Lyall.

Then followed by the flexibility.

Diane - there was clarification at the meeting by Rob using the scenario if Janice “falls of her perch” then automatically Lyall as the next highest polling candidate would be appointed and we all agreed that to be the case.

Chair: I do not remember that at all.

Lyall - The feeling of that meeting was quite clear that should this occasion arise and that clarification description was given with Janice falling off her perch are the words used – certainly demonstrates quite clearly how that would work. Going back historically EC discussed this at their meeting in July 2010 Janice Davey stated that the position would be filled by the next highest polling candidate. The EC may appoint carried 4.2 by that meeting there was no addition onto that word.

Rob - Pages 22 onwards this is Arthurs issue as to how we made the changes – the wording should be “shall” consensus of the meeting we would not be discussing the new constitution now...The decision of the meeting was not put to a motion – adopting the constitution was done at the end – my clear memory was definitely changed to the next highest polling candidate followed by the flexibility.

Lyall - I am clear that the next highest polling candidate description was definitely used demonstrating clearing how that would work in the July EC 2010. So clearly Janice spelt out the intention.

Paul /Janice that the EC may appoint the person who was the next highest polling member carried 4.2

Clear sense appointing the next highest polling candidate – there was no indication of the adding of another option. And the discussion at the meeting was a clear sense.

If you let EC do what they want to, then why state anything else – why not just say power to co-opt you would not have to put anything else in. Why list out any options they have that power to co-opt.

Jenni – The EC does not have to appoint the next highest polling candidate – shall! At the end of the day the EC shall appoint OR another ordinary or life member to fill the vacancy. Needs to be read in its entirety that does give the EC flexibility - As worded it does not say that the EC has to appoint – it has to be read in its entirety not just one section – worded so that the EC has the ability to do as they see fit.

Janice – There are two remits in this agenda about this very matter regardless of who was in line for the position you had 76 people voted for a person – who they were expecting to be appointed as the next highest polling candidate - your members spoke and they voted for that person – it is not about who the person is. You have totally ignored them, they can't even be bothered turning up. We changed the location for meeting this year to allow for more members to attend – they frankly are not interested, look at the number of people in attendance even less than last year – your members spoke and they voted for that person “it is not about whom this is”.

Chair: Have you got anything new to say Janice?

Janice - I am just saying how people feel – we changed the AGM to Wellington and it is quite pathetic really.

Lyll - You have disenfranchised the membership.

Sue Ford - I attended the AGM in Napier and the general feeling of that meeting regardless of what went on after “shall” it wasn't mentioned it was very clearly stipulated it would be the highest polling candidate we have disenfranchised at least 70 odd people of that vote. And I have to agree with Janice - every person whose vote I have got here I will put very bluntly have had a guts full.

Rob - to formalize this I intend to move a motion – but on the basis of this discussion that takes Arthur's point again, it was really hard to get what we had decided there, and that is what this discussion is about.

Arthur - corrections to the minutes we are doing aren't we? – Rob: Yes!

Rob - And in this case here there is a feeling amongst people in this room as what is recorded in the minutes is challengeable. I therefore will move that the minutes on page 22 the 8th paragraph and that is the underlined section should be “shall” is that the wording “shall be shall be changed – that means that the present constitution is registered wrong it is written wrong if passed now the EC will have to redraft to make it really clear of what the intent of the meeting was. At this stage I move that formally and obviously need a seconder.

Rob Shirley/Janice Davey – ‘That the minutes on page 22 8th paragraph the underlined section the wording should be shall – the wording “shall” be “shall” .

Lyll – I am a bit lost here what is the motion?

Chair: The motion on the floor is the wording should be shall – the wording “shall” be “shall”. But that is what was adopted as such – we have a seconder to that motion so we need to discuss and vote. I am sorry this is what happens we start to go off on our own track and think what we have said and what someone who wants us to say and not recorded.

EC Secretary: I have the audio tape which I saved the very first time I have done this, I did so because I knew that that there was going to be issues with how the constitution was being dealt with so if the EC would like to listen to the audio tape it is here.

Rob - The intent of this motion the EC will need to redraft the present clause in the constitution 12.3 – I believe that.

Chair: The issue we are looking at is the correction to the minutes the words in your proposed amendment on your piece of paper.

Rob - No! as I see it the wisdom of the meeting is not clear enough. Shall appoint a person.

Chair: so the motion on the floor to change the minutes is incorrect you want to withdraw with the leave of the seconder.

Rob - Yes that is correct. And I am moving

Chair: with the leave of the seconder.

Rob – Because of the clarity thing the motion is

Rob Shirley/ “That 12.3 in the present Constitution reads if the position becomes vacant.... between ‘Shall’ appoint the next highest polling candidate at the last election to full the vacancy. (Full stop)

Chair: this is not in the minutes – we are looking at the changes in the minutes

Arthur -point of order there are remits in the agenda this can be discussed later. It is on the agenda.

Chair: so your proposed change is?

Rob - Those minutes are wrong I have got as far as the ‘full stop’ at the word election. Then we need to consider the case where the next highest polling candidate has already been appointed.

Ian Gray - Point of order – this amounts to a rewrite the meeting did not rewrite the clause. The clause was voted on clearly without the full stop that is an addition to the minutes that was not in the minutes.

Chair: thank you Ian we are going through the minutes.

Janice - EC need to go and listen to the tape – that is not how it is recorded in the minutes. I was at that meeting and that is not what is in the minutes, this needs to be dealt with now we need to deal with this it is a correction - now otherwise these minutes may not be accepted.

Sue - These minutes cannot be accepted in their present form because they are incorrect that is what we are trying to do is correct them in the present form they are not correct – we need to correct them and Janice is right.

Zena - I support what Janice has said in order to resolve this particular question of whether the minutes accurately reflect from happened at the meeting, EC should listen to the relevant part of the tape.

Chair: Chris has taken the minutes from the recorded transcript there was no discussion at the time about going through the constitution clause by clause. Regardless we got to the end of the constitution and the meeting passed that the wording was to change from may to shall that is what we are debating at this stage there was no reference to taking off the other part of the clause at all.

Lyall - The Chair misrepresents what happened at the last meeting – we got through that because there were people who started off by saying that I will not support the constitution as it stands but at the end of the session they were happy to vote for it. Because of the changes made.

The important thing here is not the word may or shall it is the feeling on that day being accurately recorded. Was that the next highest polling candidate is appointed and you have now gone through a process which may reflect badly back on the original decision of that meeting. In fact I am really disappointed that the likes of EC members Zena & Cheryle who were at that meeting are not contributing to this matter.

Chair:

I don't think pointing fingers to the top table or any other people in the room who attended the meeting is the right way to go. The meeting decided to pass the constitution. The minutes have been written to the best of Chris's ability from the discussions that took place it is not the feeling of this meeting or a few of the people at this time to now record that feeling of that meeting. The feeling should have been recorded clause by clause at that time and that was not done – so we are relying on Chris to have taken from the transcript what has happened that is where it lies. The minutes are here we are discussing the wording should to shall, that has happened

the rest of the stuff in the clause was discussed but not recorded that you wanted the last part recorded so we are left with the situation and that is how it is.

Lyall - Madam Chair as I was saying It is important to record and rely on people's memories from that meeting so that we can then ensure that the recording is accurate or not, that is why I am calling on people who were at that meeting.

Chair: And also along with the 1 or 2 or 5 people that said things at that meeting does not make it that a vote was taken and their take on the meeting was correct, there were other points of view put across and the minutes were written from the transcript and you would by removing those words from the clause make the whole election to the EC unworkable allowing the EC to fall over what if there was no other person next in line that is why the flexibility was built into the Constitution.

Sue G - I was not at the meeting and if we have the original tape that is evidence and I think it would be fair that we hear what was recorded.

Janice - If I recall the meeting when it came to the minutes I believe that Paul and Gaynor helped to put some of the changes together and Paul passed onto Chris – at that time the piece of paper that was supplied by Rob listing all the changes to the Constitution written by Ian Gray – these changes actually arrived from Paul to Chris am I correct?

Paul - No they were not

Chair: The minutes I can tell you the minutes were put together by! I think it is quite funny too Sue to be honest. Gaynor approved the minutes as Chair of the last meeting.

Janice - Excuse me Annette can we please ask the secretary?

Chair: It does not matter Janice. Chris has written the minutes to the best of her ability.

Janice - Sorry Annette that is not the question I am asking through the Chair of Chris if she received changes from Paul.

EC Secretary: I did not receive the changes on the day – I sought clarification on a number of issues, as when I went through the transcript there were a number of references missing and I needed to get confirmation. It was not just Paul it was an EC thing for a number of days after.

The transcript is recorded word for word however, when you transcribe into a readable document it is not possible to put every detail in unless you want 100 pages of minutes. I have had enough of being criticized about full minutes that is why I am very careful about what I put in the minutes. Yes I did seek clarification on several things.

Chair: We are back to the changes

Rob - Suggest a way forward there will be other bits that are less contentious than this issue let's get them and let's vote and if the vote to accept these minutes is lost we can go back to the issue.

Maree - From Rob's hand out we are at the moment pg 22 8th Paragraph replacing the word should with shall – on pg 22 expressing what Lyall Payne actually said what we are actually arguing about is whether or not the word should be shall or shall be shall obviously Lyall's intention was that the item should be 'shall'.

Chair: we can move on - we have shall in the document and that is the result of what was discussed.

Arthur - Page 27 5th paragraph
Where is it in the constitution? Is this business arising or corrections?

Chair: we are talking corrections to the minutes.

Rob - that being the case I will raise it later.

Page 30 insert 2nd last paragraph's'

Page 31 Zena – is definitely what was said

Page 32 – will deal with later

Chair: Why? Not a correction that is right

Zena: Pg 19 Bi election spelt with an "i" not "y"

Chair: "That there being no further corrections the amended minutes of the 39th AGM be approved as a true and correct record."

Sue F - what is the voting strength Madam Chair? We cannot vote until that is declared.

93 can be utilized registered proxies – general remits only but also have two extra members arrived this a.m. they are allowed to vote $93 + 2 = 95$

Proxy is 93 voting strength postal constitutional = 45

Voting strength within the room is 16 because a number of delegates put in postal votes

Constitutional remits 156

General Remits = 115

Arthur - the current matter we are to vote on is the acceptance of the minutes – if I am correct the proxy won't have a ghost of it – if not present I should not be voting, we should not be voting only those who attended should be voting

Rob - this issue has been raised on a number of occasions over a number of years – proxies count. There is nothing in any set of rules associated with this organization that say that motions cannot be voted on by the proxies.

Refer: to appointment of proxy form – read out by Chair
Appointed on your behalf which include the options on the form free to vote as seen fit on remits/yes/no/abstention.

That proxy form does not allow members not present to vote on matters that are not on the agenda.

That is my ruling.

Lyll - If nobody turned up who was at the meeting you should still vote.
Proxy vote is a trust in you to vote on their behalf it is a private arrangement between the parties – instructions are either given to the delegate by the proxy – proxy is simply giving their vote to be used for anything that is voted on at the meeting.

Rob/Lyll: moved “a procedural motion to disagree with the Chairs’ ruling.”

Rob - Question who votes on that motion: if you over rule the use of proxy voting

EC Secretary : What I was hoping to find looking at the last two records of the AGM voting strength was normally the second item under ‘announcements’ followed by minutes - not recorded it was just carried. I do not recall ever seeing people abstain from the voting of the minutes.

Based on Arthur’s scenario only eleven (11) people here today can vote.

Maree - Now if we are voting, the motion originally put to pass the corrections to the minutes the only people who vote on that are those present at this meeting and people who were at the previous AGM. So the voting on corrections to the minutes can only be done by those people. People who are here present at the meeting. Proxies make no difference.

Jenni - Corrections and acceptance of minutes - proxy votes are not used. Only motioned by a person who was there and accepted by those in the room

Chair: This is standard meeting procedure

Rob - the motion that the meeting disagree with the Chair's ruling and that is who votes – I have been to a lot of meetings in my time the story about voting for the minutes are not in our standing orders this organization does not say anything.

If the Chair's ruling is passed here then you need to stand up and make that ruling as well, then as an EC you can change the standing orders of this organization can be changed, I suggest you do so.

Proxies I have used at all the things that I have ever done, as have a great number of Chairs of this organization. Richard many years ago ruled (and wrongly so) if you amend a motion here then all of the people voting for the old motion by postal would automatically be voting against it. Sorry this is wrong with what you are doing, that is why I am taking the unusual step to vote against this ruling.

Janice - Proxies I am holding here gave me instructions, which included all matters relating to the meeting including corrections to the minutes and all other matters on the agenda so they do count.

Maree - "point of order" – those people who put in a proxy agreeing to the corrections in the minutes is impossible. They are not here.

Janice - Proxy they are giving you the trust, Annette actually read that statement out.

Chair: On those remits in the agenda that is what it is for.

Janice - Motion is a motion it is not only about remits

Zena - An interesting discussion, I think it is not comparable to have proxies give you power to vote as you see fit is fine on what is included in the agenda but as far as corrections to the minutes they would have no idea at all what you would be voting on. It is a different case. We are attempting to vote on the accuracy of the minutes and whether the corrections are accepted - Logically those present at the previous meeting would be the ones who vote.

Chair: What we are actually voting on is whether the Chairman's ruling is correct or not and whether or not people are going to support Rob.

Sue G - And who may vote on that motion?

Chair: The people in the room can vote on that.

Rob - You have just made another ruling that I disagree with –

I will move therefore **Rob/Lyall: "That we disagree with the ruling that only those present can vote."**

Chair: All those in favour of the motion –

Rob - How are you counting the votes on this?

Chair: This is ridiculous.

Rob - The chair has ruled – who is voting which says only people in this room can vote. That has not been passed yet that and who is going to vote for that – we are going to sit here all day.

Chair: That being the case I might as well close the meeting now that is absolutely pathetic. I am not changing that ruling it is noted that you disagree and we have a seconder and that has not voted on it.

Janice - These people have entrusted me with their vote – how can you say how these people have told me to vote this is what I am trying to do. People do not want to vote for incorrect minutes, with no disrespect to Chris, they want it to be done right.

Sue G - if they were not at the meeting how do these people know that the minutes are incorrect?

Jenni - Are you giving a proxy vote as to what is in the agenda – in that case that person, included in the minutes are apologies, matters arising are on the agenda. They do give you the right to vote on matters arising in the minutes, so they would then have the right.

Lyll - An agenda is not set actually for a meeting until the agenda is set by the Chair at the meeting – the current constitution lays out, and what an ideal meeting says.

Approve the general business items that are to be brought up at a meeting – my point comes back to the definition of a proxy it is a thing that people need to learn, let's say I ask Denise take my vote to the meeting and vote as you wish. It is not only on the remits it is giving a vote for the AGM.

Diane - The proxy form talks about any amendments to the motion and proxy gives approval for the delegate to vote as they may.

Chair: That is the motions within the agenda as listed or amended motions.

Rob - This is frustrating a number of us here have been to meetings previously being put and voted on procedural motions have always been voted on – Annette is saying that this year this is not going to happen so you are changing what the NZCF historically have done in ruling that way that is the issue.

Maree - I have attended several NZCF AGM'S but not the last one, but at all the AGM'S I have been to the corrections to the previous minutes and motions put to

accept in my experience we have never used votes other than those at the meeting. Which is surely standard meeting procedure?

Arthur - Proxies did not come in until 2001. We had a vote on accepting the apologies; we have lost sense on where we are going. Take the point those who were present, can accept the minutes.

Lyall: - Could do vote on both and record in the minutes

Chair: I am reluctant to take a vote using both methods the challenge is going to go on all day two people at this stage have disagreed with me, I am not changing that ruling we have done the corrections to the minutes but now we are relating too acceptance of the minutes. The recording of the vote will be of those at this meeting only.

Meeting adjourned for morning tea 10.48 reconvened 11.15

Diane - We all agreed the change would be made.

Chair: We agreed that it will go through to the draft – we had no input what was put in to the constitution. No you cannot say that the meeting agrees with anything at the meeting there was no word for word that constitutional changes were voted on.

EC Secretary: Then why am I here! If that constitution was not voted on and passed then why did I register this as the governance document of the NZCF and why are we sitting here at this April AGM? I do not believe that is a correct statement - the amended constitution was voted on.

Arthur - You acted in good faith by registering the document.

Janice - We voted for the changes at the end – we voted for those changes otherwise the document would not have gone through, and this particular issue was talked about. Margaret Bean talked about this particular issue when it came to agreeing and passing it – Rob put the clarification of the situation all those in the room agreed on it. The tape confirms that it was discussed – the tape is the true record of the meeting.

Chair: You cannot say all those at the meeting agreed on it – you cannot say that. The constitution was passed at the end of the meeting.

Janice - The constitution was passed at the meeting with all the changes, and this was not included in the registered document.

Arthur - 24% did not agree – the constitution was not voted on clause by clause.

Chair: please be specific that change was not voted on.....the const. was past that change was not voted on that is what I am getting at.

Sue F - I know the feeling of that meeting and I remember distinctly saying that none of these votes that I am holding will count unless we went through the constitution and corrected a number of things. Which we did in good faith this was done in good faith and in legal terms in good faith means exactly that. In good faith the meeting wanted that change this is that change that is not recorded in the minutes. You must take that change Annette as the democratic right of all those people we were representing there.

Chair: I am quite aware you had the votes at the meeting and your choice to use them. What I am getting at is that the individual clauses in that constitution were not voted on clause by clause - this is getting out of hand.

Janice - I pay a membership to belong to this organization – we voted on that and passed it.

Rob - for those who were not there – we got to lunch time it was obvious that the constitution in the form it was presented in was not going to go through – people decided as a meeting to get together and decide what to do so as a meeting it was decided that we would get through the document by getting rid of the clause by clause process and that we deal with the intent of those items raised.

We did not individually say yes or no to every question. Because of that approach the words were not in front of us – we asked Paul at the beginning of the meeting we could not have the exact words – we were working on the will of the meeting.

Now we are in the situation that the will of the meeting is not reflected in the minutes. Only a couple of EC have spoken you were at the meeting (except for Paddy Smith) can you speak to this or do you have no memory?

Paul - The meeting did not ratify every single point we should have done in hind sight however, I took it from Rob's bit of paper and the minutes I got from Chris that is where the wording came from which is in the document at present. If you did not state the actual wording at the time – the wording is 'shall' at this point what I can feel is that the wording is going to force the EC to accept the next highest polling candidate when an EC member leaves

If that person drops dead God forbid we have to have wording in there somewhere that we must have something in there if the person is not available.

At this point in time we have said OR that perhaps is an unfortunate word, if the elected member is not available should have been put there. We are debating the minutes of the meeting the minutes do reflect that 'shall' will be inserted – to ensure that the interpretation is to be included it is difficult – I do believe that we have done our job to insert the word 'shall' there was no query at that point of time.

Arthur - Can I ask directly of Paul in relation to what he said regarding 12.3 and what was in the draft? You did have the word may and that was changed to shall and the

only thing you changed in 12.3 is may to shall no recognition of what you consulted with the secretary.

Paul - I said I got the minutes from the secretary.

Arthur - did you challenge the wording "failing their availability the EC shall co-opt" that is not what is in the minutes – you are therefore contesting the minutes. Paul you have not really listened to me Para 6 pg 22 failing their availability the EC shall co-opt is what is in the minutes but it is not in the constitution.

The Secretary says failing the availability then the EC shall co-opt – I do not believe there has been a connection between what you have interpreted from the minutes that Chris has given you.

Paul - I only worked on the information given from the minutes.

Chair: A lot of people (at least some people) had things to say during that meeting – the thing that Margaret said was part of the general discussion around the clause. I do not know or understand why it is underlined or in bold. The wording shall be shall and that came from Lyall at the very end and that is what is in the document.

Diane - This is all about the intent of the meeting which has been clarified by Chris on the tape that should Janice fall off her perch then Lyall as the next highest polling candidate would be appointed – the meeting agreed to the clarification that Rob gave. That is the intent of the meeting.

Chair: But it was not put –

Lyall - I was attending the same meeting as Chris attended – we did not vote on it point by point however I have a question too whether feelings were recorded correctly we have ended up with words recorded there. There appears to be no other words having been challenged except this one – I do not understand that logic I heard and expected to see as the outcome and the practice that should have taken place since and I have not seen that.

Ian - Point of clarification what do you think should be in the minutes?
The words that Chris heard? – Yes

Janice - Last Dec meeting I attended the Privacy training and if I believe correctly the transcript is actually a true record of the meeting if it takes all day to find that on the tape then so-be-it. That is what the lawyer said at that meeting – if those not attending a meeting ask to hear the tape then you are required to provide it.

Chair: Yes! We were advised to be careful about keeping tapes around
If anyone asks under the Privacy Act they have the right to request.

Janice - That recording is the actual recording of the minutes

Sue - If you go into committee anything that is in committee must be made available to the people you are talking about. If you don't keep minutes you have to at least provide a summary. I understood the intent of that meeting the document was voted on in block.

Zena - It appears we are less arguing what is or is not in the minutes there is nothing in the minutes that is inconsistent with what the intent of the meeting wanted, it is about what was registered as the document, the clause should have been amended slightly differently to than it was.

Rob - Once the minutes are approved they are fact – that has been tested in court time after time – taking lead here how about we put verbatim and put in that last statement I agree with Chris that statement was there – and it should be in the minutes. Can we wind back a whole bunch of time and stop

Notice of motion

Rob/Janice “That the statement made by Rob Shirley be placed in the minutes.”

Chair: I believe that the whole transcript relating to this issue should be included and certainly from my own personal view point it led us to the fact that as the wording **OR** was still there it gave us the flexibility as an EC and certainly in my role as Chair not to allow things to go into the document that potentially can damage NZCF and with if the OR was not in there and EC ‘shall appoint the next highest polling person’, there are a lot of scenarios when this could not happen.

Because it was raised and suggested through an EC discussion the option the next person in line may have died may have been convicted may not now be a member from one year to the next.

The major issue is it is not all about their availability is comes down to suitability they may not be suitable – this allows for EC to have the flexibility.

Janice - Common sense should prevail on resignation names would be banned about by EC and those people would be approached. Common sense was applied and appointed.

Chair: There were processes that we went through that you may not be aware of and at this stage we are not going to go into this. We are looking at whether these minutes are correct – the flexibility was there you are not tied to accept the next person in line – there was no other talk about what happens if there was not the case. The word shall be shall – that was the end of the discussion and that is what Paul has put in the constitution.

As far as that is concerned the discussion probably and should have gone on a lot longer the intent of the meeting did not get voiced.

There was no vote taken. We have got to fix it. It was a nightmare we have to move forward I do not want to see the good intent dissolved by this being the issue - We have an instruction to come to EC to redo a constitution or clause to the next meeting.

Jenni - I remember that the wording was like that for the very reason that from that time that a person was elected or to when "they fall off their perch" that things do come up that perhaps people are not aware of and there could have been that the EC felt that the next person should not be voted onto to EC because of things going on behind the scenes I feel that a clause like that needs to be left in so that the EC can say that they cannot have that person on EC because of whatever.....

Chair: that is not what we are talking about the flexibility needs to be there for any organization to appoint in someone's absence. The motion which I think needs to be dealt with first is the voting.

Rob - this has brought this up but it needs to be debated that is the last motion that was accepted, separate to what has happened since the conduct to how things have been run over the years is different

Moved Rob/Lyall procedural motion as to the voting.....

Voting has to be clarified on – we have not advanced 12.20

EC Secretary: So that I get it right – so what you are discussing is the procedural motion re: the acceptance of proxy voting for the minutes?

Chair - that the amended minutes of the 39th AGM be accepted is what was moved from the chair.

Rob - We are in Wellington let's ring up the Disputes Coordinator of the NZCF A motion to disagree with the Chair's ruling cannot be ruled out of order therefore we are in lock down.

Chair: That is correct with leave of the meeting but then that can be challenged. All I wanted to do was to have the minutes approved as amended put to the meeting. We have had major discussion I still think those in attendance are those – who can vote.

Paddy - having been to many AGM's I think that everybody voted and they included proxy votes.

Chair: I do not have an issue with proxies – we have voted on apologies voices in the room - I just want that same courtesy now.

Sue G - What happened in the past does not mean it is right.

Rob - Because they have trusted people with their proxies.

On 21.9 on any given motion at NZCF meeting, the Chairperson shall in good faith determine whether to vote by: Voice, Show of hands or Secret Ballot.

Proxy in or out is not stated the definition of a proxy must be given – proxies have been used every time we vote that has occurred year after year, this year it changes because of Annette's ruling I have moved that be challenged – that has not been passed so you use the stuff that is used now – that proxies are used.

Christa - I am highly amused 21.9 as read if the Chair shall in good faith voice, show of hands, secret ballot, if the chair now decides by a show of hands proxy cannot vote.

Rob - Secret ballot – proxies are in.

Chair: We have voted on the apologies this morning –

Janice - if you want to be pedantic what about the start of the meeting which was incorrect – no voting strength was declared and it should have been right at the beginning.

Ian: - I have just consulted privately with the Chair and suggested that under 21.7 to hold the voting strength of 40 you must hold it with proxies.

Rob -To take your point this meeting is inquorate if there are not 40 votes here for the quorum you are o.k. if you only count the number of people here – 21.7 you are quite right.

Ian - My advice to the chair is to allow proxies for all voting.

Chair: then that is the ruling – that proxies are in.

Motion withdrawn by Rob with the leave of the meeting.

Chair: With regards to “with leave of the meeting” proxies do not count standing orders state present at the meeting “with leave of the meeting” interpretation leave as in of the motion carried by at least $\frac{3}{4}$ of those present.

EC Secretary: But in your constitution it actually says something different **made up of those in attendance and by proxy** – those present at an AGM includes proxies – otherwise you would never have an AGM with a quorum. That is my interpretation. If the Constitution is different from the standing orders then the standing orders are overridden by the Constitution. That is my interpretation, rightly or wrongly.

Rob: - Withdraw the motion without the leave of the meeting. (That is the two procedural motions).

Rob/Janice “That the statement made by Rob Shirley be placed in the minutes (Secretary to release a transcript of the meeting relating to automatic succession and clarification) CARRIED

Chair: “That the amended minutes of the 39th minutes of the AGM be accepted as a true and correct record.

CARRIED (3 ABSTENTIONS)

Meeting adjourned for lunch 12.30 reconvened at 1.25 pm

Matters Arising from the Minutes:

Voting strength – 155 (Christa absent)

Rob/Sue: “That the Executive Council be directed to prepare and present to the next General Meeting of NZCF changes to clause 12.3 to the effect that Executive Council vacancies be filled, in numerical order, from the unsuccessful candidates at the most immediate past election before any other Ordinary or Life Member to fill that vacancy until the next AGM.”

Rob - We have gone through a tortuous process to get to this stage – the present constitution is in error, cannot change here and now the EC are those who consult and do all the bits and pieces, that will be the time when the membership get to say yes or no because if one quarter of those members who want to retain what is now there.

Sue F - This brings everyone into line with what the member’s democratic right to vote in their own way.

Lyll - What do you mean by numerical order?

Rob - In legal terms it means simply that 1, 2, 3 4 etc. in other words if number 1 declines the number 2 is next in line.

Chair: There being no more matters arising the motion was put:

CARRIED 82 (majority passed)

Item 3 EC Chairman Annual Report

Chair: “That the report be received and open for discussion.”

Sue G - Congratulate you on your report it is informative, in particular I liked the caring aspects, with the disaster in the Sth and realistic decision regarding the withdrawal of the National show and the decisive decisions made thus far PPCF commend you.

Lyall - Disputes & Discipline procedure – noted in the minutes of EC Meeting Dec page 21) the mention of inviting Mr. J H Lloyd to be made part of the review group.

Chair: DDP under action – we have been looking at I admit not as fast as we should since the last Dec meeting. John Lloyd has offered some words of wisdom at this stage. Kathryn Dalziel is not a cat fancy member she is a lawyer and she conducted the Privacy seminar, and she will be assisting with this process.

Lyall - Work on the cattery accreditation – and believe that Jody Robinson-Wildey did a lot of work on preparing the review, was the intention to have inspections on an annual basis or every two years?

Chair: At the moment it is every two years, but this may be reviewed.

Rob - WCC has that meeting happened this year?

Chair: To be held in Sth Africa in July 2011

Rob - Page 15 of the minutes adopted an annual plan because of the paucity of the reports that came through can you please run through the progress that has been made –

Chair: in response -

- Webhosting changed
- Judges Council Meeting – face to face meeting replaced with Telecom conference call
- Removal of cats for supervision – the Junior Judges can judge the whole section rather than go through the whole process the total number of cats has not changed.
- Change in delivery of Flash cats – not sure what that meant?

Lyall - Somewhere along the line the second two issues of the year be combined with a year book –

Chair: NZCF cannot afford to put out a yearbook this year – at the Dec meeting it was decided to defer until 2012, we may not even get to it then.

- Meeting of Registrars took place
- Show software is well under way – at the trialing stage
- Continue with initiatives for growth and retention

Rob - What did the EC do different in the last 6 mths as to what has been done in the past re: growth & retention?

Janice – The EC had decided that some pamphlets/brochures would be sent out to Clubs have they been done?

Chair: these were sent out June last year – I know that they were available for placing in our exhibitor’s packs for August – maybe this needs to be followed up. Cheryle has the balance of the stock available.

EC have looked at the appropriateness of liaison with Masterpet – we ran into issues with the Privacy Commission – Masterpet wanted to provide a kitten pack, when a transfer was done, what we could do is have a voucher so that the pet owner can authorize for the pack to be sent out. At this stage further follow-up is required, it is being worked on and hopefully this will result in people wanting to join NZCF from the pet side of this.

Rob - when is the next EC meeting and will you be discussing this as an item at the next EC meeting?

Chair: The next scheduled meeting (post AGM EC meeting) part of tomorrow and part of the budget process is cutting back on our EC meetings in stead of having three meetings we are going to have two the first early July-August and perhaps bring the December meeting forward but this has not been discussed as a group yet.

“Chair: that the report be adopted.”

Carried

Portfolio Manager Business & Administration (Annette Dunn)

(Lyll Payne: Marion’s apology to be recorded **with the leave of the meeting**)

While Marion is not here she knows the feeling of the Executive Council – her usual stance throughout the year to put things together despite the loss of her husband (Harold) was amazing. I am delighted with the unqualified audit. We know there will be huge challenges over the next couple of years re: the loss of shows etc. The Membership is slower this year.

Cattery accreditation – Thanks extended to all those breeders who took time to contribute to this excellent review process.

Health & Safety – Sue Mackay is working on the manual and the first document is to be looked at with EC meeting tomorrow

Sympathy to Chris – The EC on behalf of the membership extended their sympathy on the loss of her mum.

Christchurch Earthquake – rocked the EC as regards to our performance it has been a bit tough getting communication together – my promise to you will be that we will do better – we have found it difficult coping with things ourselves. Definitely it is very much a team effort with this portfolio.

Chair: “That the report be opened for discussion.”

Sue G - would it be appropriate to discuss the registrations now or later?

Chair: Later

Lyll - Focusing on the membership subject the Judges Council developed an exit interview for departing judges somewhere along the line it was suggested that it be used in other sections of the membership.

EC Secretary: EC agreed in principle that it would go across the whole of the membership – the intention is that it will happen. This has been deemed part of my responsibility and I just have not had time to get it sorted.

Lyll - Just as an observation with membership – perhaps it would be worthy of consideration to send out an invoice to the current members on or about six weeks before the expiry of their membership.

Arthur - the issue with this is that things change on an annual basis – by sending out the membership form with the December Flash cats it invites you to be a member for the next year. The sending out of a separately raised invoice is probably not going to be useful and means a lot more work.

Zena - The suggestion regarding sending out an invoice, this does jog peoples memories, might work with someone like me. I don't always have time to look at the magazine when it arrives and by the time that I do get around to it, it may well be too late to meet the deadline. Some Clubs do send out invoices to prompt the appropriate behaviour.

Cheryle - Just wanting to agree with Zena I am involved with a club that does send out an invoice and that does work to remind you – bills come in the mail they are more important.

Ian - Just wanting to clarify does the Secretary see any of the membership results coming through? And what would the level of errors be?

Chair: Chris administers the process.

EC Secretary: There is a large number of errors on a day to day basis the most common being underpayment. The make up of the membership does change on an annual basis there have been a lot of changes this year with only one person choosing to join when in the past they held family membership.

Lyll - This was just an idea for EC to look at.

Rob - A number of people do respond to the notice in Flashcats if they join up again they are retained but the invoice would be perhaps an opportunity to send out the

exit interview form at the same time – rather find out some stuff – two jobs one post.

Chair: this could certainly be looked at.

Financial Report

Chair: Marion has already asked about any questions - there were none received from the membership

Chair /Lyall “That the Treasurers report y/e 31/12 2010 (amended) be accepted.”

Rob - Sorry I failed to get a question to Marion in time – we had some bad debts at the end of the last financial year are these written off or are they still outstanding?

Chair: they have been reduced in size and are continuing to do so.

Arthur – gone backwards and forward between the Chair’s report and the financials. Last year it was reported a drop of 1/5th last year and I have a feeling that we don’t know what the membership actually is for this year. Treasurer gives details with regos up, shows down – or don’t we want to talk about it?

Chair: depending on flow of the meeting this afternoon I intend to hold an open forum to discuss these issues on membership retention with those in attendance to look at ideas hopefully we will get some time together to do that.

Arthur - Expenditure 2009-10 meeting expenses, the demographics on EC with several in the Sth island no longer someone from Taranaki or Hawkes Bay, mind you the Treasurer is reporting on the last year and the concern with show entries going down.

It is my fear that if the size of cages is locked in it will lead to some Clubs not holding a show because they will not be able to apply the change – should the NZCF be forced to change as soon as the code is enforced. Whether or not a waiver of perhaps two to three years could be implemented, like what has happened with poultry and cage birds.

EC Secretary: at this stage it is draft number 7 and I believe it will have to come back and NZCF did put in a submission – cannot recall what the dimensions are at present.

Arthur - Can we look at a question of when this is going to apply for a cat show can this be part of the submission?

Chair: this was part of the submission – Arthur can the membership be told this.

EC Secretary: At the last EC meeting I actually bought it up that the code as it stands was supposed to have been circulated to all clubs.

Chair: this has not been handed over by the Gaynor – EC Secretary will follow up on this for release.

Lyall - I would like to do my annual thing for the Treasurer thanking her for presentation of her report and for the outstanding job that the Treasurer does for us particularly the unqualified report and I hope that the strong warning in the accounts this year – there must be change we simply cannot sustain the same level of expenditure.

Received with acclamation

TREASURER'S NOTES ACCOMPANYING THE 2011 BUDGET
REVISION FOR PRESENTING AT 2011 AGM ON 09/04/11

In my report that accompanied the Financial Report for YE 31/12/10 I flagged my intention to revisit the 2011 Budget that was adopted at the October 2010 AGM. It should be noted that our Auditor in his Management Letter following the audit also expressed concern about our potential erosion of equity.

In terms of our revenue we are all aware that since the last AGM we have had the 2nd major earthquake in Canterbury, and this has meant the cancelling of six 2011 South island Shows including the National, plus one North Island Show which has meant a significant reduction in both Show Application Fees (\$1,000) and Benching Fees (\$4,000). In the Publication Activity it had been decided that the proposed Yearbook would be shelved for 2011 with a net negative effect on the budget of (\$1,270). This, along with the continuing trend of a falling membership (\$4,300), a downward adjustment in budgeted Calendar Sales (\$3,000), all this reducing revenue by \$13,570; thus increasing the existing deficit of (\$9,850) to over (\$23,000) - an untenable situation.

The EC Portfolio Managers were asked to assess their areas of responsibility to reduce expenditure; and the Chairperson and Treasurer then went through and made the required reductions to the expenditure items where required. A total of \$17,920 was pruned from the expenditure with the significant items being:

- Information Technology – Resource Development items of Advertising (\$1,800) and On-line Shop (incl Registrations) (\$1,000) will be held over until 2012
- Shows – IT Programme Development plus \$1,000
- Admin - AGM Expenses – reduced by \$1,390 in-line with actual costs and quotes
- Admin – Annual Plan Items reduced in total by \$4,000. Working Parties from \$3,500 down to \$500 and Membership Growth & Retention from \$2,000 down to \$1,000
- Admin - Awards Dinner – Entertainment cost of \$750 deleted
- Admin – EC Expenses – reduced by \$4,700 by reducing the 3 scheduled Meetings down to 2
- Admin – Calendar Costs reduced by \$1,000 – in-line with reduced income

- Depreciation – recalculated and reduced by \$820

So we now have a revised deficit of (\$5,500) for the 2011 year. While this is not the desired break-even position, I am comfortable with it as historically we have tended to come in under budget by around \$5,000 each year for the last few years.

Looking forward to 2012 and beyond I would recommend to the EC that it take time to seriously re-evaluate our financial position and in particular to review our sources of income and cut our cloth to meet our ever reducing income. Currently our regular overhead expenditure items of honoraria, meeting costs, printing, insurance, etc, are at such a level making it very difficult to sustain viability. Obviously increasing membership numbers and show entries are key as corresponding increases in registration fees should flow on from this.

Marion Petley

Treasurer

07/04/11

Revised budget – Discussion

Janice – a lot of our costs used to go out in complaints – so once we fix the DDP document giving it some teeth we should recover this.

Chair: should benefit by \$2500 DDP review.

Sue G - Being a cat fancier is becoming an elite hobby with costs going up everywhere. Pedigree Persian Cat Fanciers concern is that you have made it compulsory to register which is fine however, it is very greedy re: taking the compulsory stance to register and transfer. \$31 to transfer for breeding making it a compulsory certified pedigree has tipped the scale for a lot of breeders – who are now saying you might as well hock them off for pets....the club is concerned that you have hit the pocket of the same people again.

Chair: As you say the amount of breeding transfers is not huge – there are ongoing discussions surrounding that – the areas that we have not even thought about i.e. joint owners with one partner wanting to get out will require for this to be looked at again. People are breeding with cats they do not know what the pedigree for these cats actually are, more often than not there probably are mistakes in the pedigree a certified pedigree is what people are after.

Janice - Thanked Sue for bringing this up again NZCF put this rule in they pay for it – mandatory payment must happen so you pay for it.

Chair: Last AGM decided that this should happen

Janice - I believe it was done at an EC meeting.

Rob - The AGM motion came and said transfer and a breeder generated one and an encouragement to provide that is very different to what the Dec EC meeting decided to do.

Janice - I did speak for the membership and voted against this happening at that meeting.

Diane - 'point of clarification' Paddy as the Portfolio Manger confirm that when a change of a registration is done is it one push of the button at that stage.

Paddy - the registrars have to check the document before completing.

Chair: It is also paying for the details that have been entered into the database initially. You do not get a certified pedigree all over the world for nothing.

Sue G - Certified pedigrees are a mark anyway – different terminology between registries, e.g. certified pedigree – e.g. Brown Tortie Tabbies. How dare the registrar put down 'seal' went to a registration body in Australia they call it something else. Brown meaning seal so they changed our certified pedigree to seal. That was their registrar's mistake it should never have been changed how valuable therefore are certified pedigrees having to add \$70 odd dollars to the cost.

Lyll - but I am glad that EC made it compulsory for new breeders in particular for people starting off or even to the experienced breeders they should have certainty of the breeding of the cats....

Jenni - As Annette has alluded to I have been caught in the trap, by an associate breeder, her name and my name I have to pay a considerable amount of money for pedigrees I do not need to have the cats transferred back to my name only. Paying a \$10 pedigree would be a lot better than \$30.

Zena - This idea came from the registrars themselves – intermittently over a number of years however, because they come across enough instances when the owners are not provided with the correct pedigree - I do find myself in disagreement with other EC members - it should be cheap... that is my personal view it is not a significant source of revenue to the NZCF we are not losing money by reducing the price but I do feel it is a good rule.

Ian - Saying that they have seen other incidences of other registries unlike us we get a simple transfer they actually get with every transfer a generation pedigree, so they know when they have been transferred – not just a simple thing with the cat's name entered, they would like to see that happen.

Sue G - Used to get parents and grandparents in the old days.

Jenni - Note the comment about the reduced revenue because of cancelled shows – will find that revenue will be will down on numbers attending shows 25-30% drop off not only the cancelled shows.

Arthur - Show fees 2011 and work again from there – refunded fees to clubs. Take show fees for 2011 down to \$0 pay every one out and then they apply for new ones.

Chair: They are all to be refunded – you cannot carry over any show fees anymore. Affects the cash outflow we cannot hold the money over.

Zena/Paddy’ “That the revised budget for 2011 be adopted. CARRIED

Chair - AGM RESPONSIBILITIES is to appoint an auditor for the following year and propose to do that now

**Lyll/Zena: “That DS Small of (Small & Company) be appointed auditor.”
CARRIED**

**Chair /Sue G: “That this AGM adopt the 2010 financial accounts as before us.
CARRIED**

Arthur - Thinking about the two reports tabled that is Chair & Business Admin where there is a mention of thanks to Chris Lowe – the thanks to the Treasurer has been formalized with a vote of thanks and I really feel that the meeting should also record the work done by Chris with attention to everything else that she does.

Received with acclamation

PORTFOLIO INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (Paul Flanagan)

Paul - That the IT report be open for discussion

Lyll - I feel a little bit insulted one sentence on some pretty major issues – was in this room I think ten years ago \$10,000 was approved to get the show package under way year after year we have pushed for this and we are really looking forward to it. To say you are evaluating and checking for errors isn’t enough perhaps you could here and now tell us what has been happening. I cannot tell from one sentence what is happening.

Paul - Brendon has adapted the programme model I provided him with – altering that to suit the needs of the NZCF because my one was a basic model. Working on by Brendon – altering that to suit the needs of the NZCF because my one was a basic model. You will be supplied with the registered numbers entered, which will generate details automatically. People and cat details etc. into a Word format. It won’t produce a catalogue itself – it would not have any of the adverts but it does have the ability to do that. It will also record results using Access & ROCAP Excel and Word.

Chris - As Brendon lives in Napier I spent time with Brendon on the data that Paul provided such as the breed codes generic list for the system and it has worked, and he has done a great job on it – hopefully it is going to be all go it is supposed to be trialed for 2011.

Paul/Ian: That the IT report be accepted CARRIED

PORTFOLIO REGISTRATIONS (Paddy Smith)

Paddy: “that the report be opened for discussion”

I do not have any more to add except I have listened carefully to the concerns expressed today regarding the fees for certified pedigrees etc.

Arthur - Situation has come through regarding the breed that I specialize in the matter has been sent to BSC with a cat coming in to NZ with a suspect pedigree and the Cat Fancy has gone ahead and registered kittens.

Chair: send a letter to EC Secretary if you have any queries.

Lyll – re: request for Ragdolls to have intermateability with Balinese. Lynda Elson Haigh asked for this to be rescinded.

Zena – I can confirm that this intermateability was approved for a one off experimental programme, it definitely is not a general intermateability and this has not been addressed by an EC meeting as yet.

Paddy/Janice: “That the Registrations report be adopted.” CARRIED

Portfolio Report Publications/Marketing (Cheryle St.Clair Newman)

This has been a challenging 6 months with the preparations for the National shows were progressing very well with the management team.

It was very pleasing to have Royal Canin come on board as the naming rights sponsor. Their offer of \$12500 sponsorship deal was very generous. Hopefully this will carry through to next year.

Printing of the schedule, catalogue, prize cards and other printing requirements relating to the show was also another great sponsorship offer.

Super Pets had also agreed to the sponsorship of the special Rosette/Sashes for each of the Top Twenty All Breeds and the Top 10 Domestic & Companion cats/kittens.

The trade area was also filling fast which included three confirmed Australian stall holders. Other stall holders being: Mobile Vet, Mobile Nurse, Proud Paws Pet Store, Handcrafts, Jewellery.

Negotiations had just started with a large Canterbury Corporate organization to sponsor judges' airfares. Unfortunately my continuation of progress crumbled with the City.

Many others that were offering sponsorship now no longer have buildings to continue their own businesses. Hopefully they will be in a better position next year.

The latest information on the venue is, it too has been pulled down and it is not being replaced.

EC Secretary: I have been communicating with Royal Canin and they have recently confirmed a commitment to honor the sponsorship for 2012 National Show.

Janice - On behalf of Sacred Temple I offer with sincerity support to Cheryle and the team, working on the National Show – taking on board the huge level of stress the earthquake has caused. Congratulations on the work that you have done.

The meeting endorsed support – with acclamation.

Lyll - I wish to thank Cheryle for the work that you have done in the last 6 mths and commend Cheryle in the short time that she has been on Executive she has shown that she is a real achiever.

Cheryle thanked the meeting for the support. Reporting that a venue for the proposed 2012 show is going to be an issue. A possibility could be Riccarton, the Westpac arena is very big but it is also very expensive. The team is there and ready to go for next year. The printer (Ross) will be there to assist.

Sue G: Do you not think that Canterbury to hold a show next year is just too soon? Perhaps consideration should be given for 2013 and let the show go to another area.

Chair: most of the things are in place, it is a big effort to run a National but there is a team in place. As far as sponsorship goes we may not get many of those back on board, we just do not know. The people that I had spoken re: the judges airfares, the whole family have been terribly affected by this earthquake.

Ian - The other aspect about this is continuity it is important that we support the staff there is an act of faith in what CHCH is doing. NZCF should not move away there is definitely an act of faith in what Christchurch is doing.

Jenni - this disaster could take a number of years to get over, so how likely would it be to have the National with this going on? Perhaps the combined clubs of Auckland

could get together for 2012 and then once Christchurch has a more secure footing they could hold perhaps in 2013.

Cheryle - Got to give people time – I will approach sponsors in say August/September and if it is not viable then we will make effort to look for other sponsorship –

Chair: Perhaps we could defer decision on the 2012 national venue (as in city) and look at it at the next EC meeting.

Jenni - With that bracket bearing in mind is it going to affect the terms of your sponsorship. If we have to shift to another area would you continue with your sponsorship? The other centre could just do the preparation of the venue only with Canterbury doing everything else.

Chair: decision not taken lightly, we had an offer – it was not a goer over the three short months left – so for next year we will look at it at the next meeting.

Ian - Important that we remain focused on CHCH at this point until such time there is an understanding of what their situation is.

Jenni: - would it be out of order to talk to other clubs within the Auckland area, perhaps to prepare or at least flag it with them.

Judy - maybe clubs all in NZ could contribute \$ to the running of the National.

Janice - It is not only the National but the earthquake has affected a lot of other clubs in the area it has been a disaster for other clubs – clubs have paid airfares already, and not all airlines are honoring refunds etc.

Portfolio Report - Publications:

(Cheryle St. Clair-Newman)

Cheryle : - that the report be opened for discussion

This is a very new role for me. Gaynor continues to do an excellent job, and has an excellent rapport with advertisers we have.

With Gaynor leading the way for Flash Cats I hope I can bring more advertising and information that is interesting and helpful to our members.

This I believe is a specialist's position as strong contacts need to be on going to successfully maintain the development of the Flash Cats Magazine.

With circumstances the way they are it was decided that the year book would not go ahead this year.

Diane/Cheryle – “That a special vote of thanks goes to Gaynor for all the on going work she has done in this role.”

CARRIED

Portfolio Breed Standards Advisory Council

(Zena Pigden)

Zena: “That the report be opened for discussion.”

Sue G - The standard of points changes that were submitted to the December EC meeting are they going to be considered at the next EC meeting?

Zena - Yes they will be – bearing in mind that the meeting may now not be until July/August.

Lyll - I am absolutely against a regular review date regarding breeds being reviewed. I would like to think that you adopt more of an approach that fashions change standards don't. Breeders rather than Judges should be involved with standard changes. I just want to make a point to have a regular review date for standards.

Zena - Address the general point you are making Lyll – is that standards should not change. We are on opposite sides of the fence on this, not making standards to fit the cats, some of the standards were ideal standards, other standards are very brief and not very informative e.g. Russian standard the desired standard for this particular breed, is more accurate, that is why standards may need to change be more accurate, judges are looking at the required aspects for type, colour etc.

Lyll - Are the cats poorer quality, for the cats with breeds that have descriptive standards?

Zena - Breeders sometimes find that judges do not judge their breed as well if they do not have a good standard to go by.

Sue G - fashions may change – standards do to! E.g. Turkish Angora, would you believe that Persian cats evolved from Turkish and that was the original standard. The bicolor standard was presented to the BSC by breeders, and brought to the regional judge's refresher simply to get their opinion.

Arthur - re: the regular review of the standards, regular review actually is talking about experimental programme terminology. Intermateability dates.

Chair: the review process was talked about at the last meeting the number of standards that keep being put forward one of these was the Maine Coon. If a standard is reviewed we do not want to be looking at the same standard year after year, need to have a time factor.

Arthur - Thanked Zena for Burmese breed section review – and the assistance that she gave in setting up a consultation process, on the Yahoo group.

Ian - A couple of our Club members are concerned that a number of the breed standards have been changed quoted the Exotic one – I was asked to raise the issue and asked that we are ensured that no standards are changed without due consultation.

Chair: There have been no changes to the Exotic standard.

Arthur - Could we have a report on the Breed Code Review –

Zena - only a handful of responses received however they were strongly in favour of change. The survey was put out in Flash Cats but because of the very small number of people who responded I cannot accept that as an appropriate response from the membership.

Janice: Extended thanks to Zena for the job that she does in this portfolio, it is a difficult portfolio. Accepted with acclamation.

Zena /Arthur: “that report be adopted. “ Carried

Portfolio Report Judges

(Paul Flanagan)

Paul: “That the report be opened for discussion”

Overview: the last few months have been a settling in period for me in this portfolio and unfortunately with the earthquake not very productive although all appears to be o.k very quiet with no problems reported through me.

Judges: At present all judges are financial so can be contracted for shows and meet their obligations. With the recent earthquake in Christchurch there have been quite a few shows that have been cancelled so many judges may not have a full show calendar this year. As things settle down we hope that a few more shows happen in this region later on in the year.

Issues: No issues have been brought to my attention over the last two months but I do need to apologize to Arthur Rowlands for the lack of response that he has had over the last few weeks unfortunately his email address had been redirected to my junk email by accident, this has now corrected.

Lyll - last year’s budget deferred a planned judge’s seminar that it would move 2011 to 2012 what planning is in place?

Paul - Still looking at March 2012 the plans were put in place by Janice Davey

Arthur - Janice, Sue and others from the Nth region held two or three seminars some being held late in the season, the view point in CHCH was always that they

wanted it in autumn and that would be prior to the next show season. Do you think that the best time to hold is late in the year?

Annette - speaking as someone that has held a seminar in November, simply because we could not settle on anything earlier – it did not matter, has not been an issue. It is mandatory that we have to have one in any one calendar year. There is nothing stopping senior judges holding a seminar for other judges in their own area.

Maree - two opportunities within one calendar year – is great one early and then one later in the year, thus giving you the opportunity to either attend both or at least one.

Janice - what Maree has said you can go through new stuff at the beginning the later one talk about what has happened over the show season. Different breeds, what is coming up etc..? In the Central Region we asked for calendar dates – already booked a refresher later in the year.

Rob - Judge's refresher/steward-handlers training to me cries out for someone a portfolio holder to actually say I want you to run it – it seems that the volunteer things over the years has been a bit hit and miss.

Chair: Judges Advisory Council should be taking a role in this – perhaps targeted by the portfolio manager.

Sue F - I held a steward/handlers course in February with 18 participants. I am really concerned about two things - did not know what the records cards were, and I would ask EC to ensure that secretaries are informed that cards go out at the beginning of the year....we are not running enough courses and believe that for 2012 we should have at least 2 handlers/stewards courses, and should be published now. People are asking when are the courses there is not enough publicity.

Janice - the record card comes from the Judges Registrar it is not up to the secretary. They have to sit a course first, to get their badge and then the record card is supplied.

Chair: to be entitled to sit the exam they must have handled several times first.

Janice - The handlers/stewards are actually listed for 2012 to attend a refresher (workshop) course as well as judges.

Chris: the original concept was the complete opposite to what you are saying Janice we used to have people applying to be a handler and you still had pre requisite requirements to do before the course. The card was brought in when we needed a reporting process for those who were going to go onto Judges Training. It was not intended to be used for the steward/handler qualification – so it would appear this is where the confusion has arisen and perhaps the record card needs to be reviewed to ensure that the steward/handlers are covered.

Sue G - A group of us in Wellington were happy to run a steward/handlers course you do need at least minimum of 5 attending. Unless we had a minimum of five applicants the Cat Fancy could not support. The cheapest hall in Wellington would still be around \$100 per day and then there is the organizing and time and effort into the preparation of organizing a course.

Arthur - a year ago judges' council meeting, redraft of the record file was done I have not seen that in print as yet – that is the one that was approved by EC at the meeting in June or December.

Janice - the record file was given to me at the National Show in Napier a copy of the record card,

Jenni – a number of our club members went all of them spoke exceptionally highly of how the course was run, how easily they understood her thank you very much Sue Ford for having that course. **Accepted with acclamation.**

Paul/Judy: “That the Report be accepted.” Carried

Adjourned for afternoon tea 3.31pm reconvened at 3.45

Portfolio Report - Shows (Paddy Smith)

Paddy – “that the report be open for discussion.”

Lyll – my usual annual issue re: the approval of show dates every time I turn around I see another show has been given approval – we have rules to go by. Clubs apply for a show date two years out and approved at the Dec meeting each year – by which time all clubs know exactly what shows are being held and then 12mths from that approval the show is held. It seems that any club can write to the portfolio manager and apply for a date, not showing any respect to the process, so why are we going through that process, because EC are going to break the rules anyway.

Sue G - It is just as will that some Clubs are having extra shows, why hit those clubs that are running shows -

Sue F – having extra shows is not the problem it is about the planning, the plan needs to be in place. Notification needs to go out to everybody, need to have some formula in place.

Paddy/Lyll report be adopted. Carried

Item 6: Life Membership Ballot

Life membership ballot

Chair: I am pleased to announce and welcome Chris Lowe to the ranks of Life Member of the NZCF. Sue did not get up to the 75% mark.

Rob - is there going to be a declaration of the numbers?

Chair: I don't think that is really necessary.

Rob - the last time when Joan was elected the numbers were given.

Chris Lowe 95 Yes & 23 No
Sue Gordon 64 Yes & 54 No

Arthur - did the Returning Officer offer any comments regarding the lateness of the ballot?

EC Secretary: John Lloyd did send a statement through he accepted the South Island votes right up to the following Monday. There were 12 invalid votes, from other parts of the country most of which were declared late.

Arthur - thanked John Lloyd as returning officer for his diligence.

Item 7 Constitutional Remits

Item 7.C1 submitted by EC (not seconded)
EC remit 21.4 sub clause b & c amended to read (as detailed in the agenda)

**“That 21.4 sub clauses (b) and (c) be amended to read:
21.4 The Secretary shall give all Members who are financial at the date of the notice at least 21 days written notice of a Special Meeting and 42 days written notice for an Annual General Meeting. The notice shall include:**

- (a) The business to be conducted at the NZCF Meeting;**
- (b) A copy of the Annual Report and Statement of Accounts, if the NZCF Meeting is an Annual General Meeting and**
- (c) A list of Nominees for the Executive Council, and information about those Nominees if it has been provided and**

Ian - Point of Order Madam Chair – I received an email from Gaynor, it has been published without the entire clause in that (d) & (e) are not included on the agenda. Her concern was that there were bits missing I endeavored to send her the full details.

Chair: there are no changes to (d) & (e)

Ian - Based on the fact that not the entire clause is included I therefore ask EC to withdraw this remit.

Chair: I have no intention in withdrawing this remit. I also spoke to Gaynor and she understood that the underlined details are what are being changed in the remit; the other bits remain the same. I therefore do not agree with your point of order.

Janice - through the chair I think it a matter of principle here, it is incomplete. At the December meeting the EC disallowed standards of points that were not agended correctly. It is not there in its full capacity – it should follow on. Breed Standard Advisory Council items were declined for the same reason in that it was not agended correctly.

Maree - hopefully a resolution would be to take notice on the bottom of the previous page outlines the details (b) & (c) there is no rationale in the remit for changes to (d) & (e) so it does make sense.

Rob – I agree with Maree however, if we are planning to put the word ‘and’ underlined in (b) & (c) should they should also occur in (d) & (e) delete part (a) entirely and include the word ‘and’ we only have part (b) & (c)

Paul - the attempt there is to made to cover the 21 days for SGM and 42 days for general meeting – (b) & (c) related to the general meeting. Also include e & a

21.4 This is an attempt to cover the 21 days for the SGM and 42 days for AGM, (b) & (c) is for the AGM.

Rob - that (a) existed there at all – we are only amending (b) & (c) and the pieces at the top therefore the ‘and’ is irrelevant. The SGM and AGM are the guts of the remit.

Jenni - clause ‘and’ written notice of a special meeting, with 42 days written notice of a General Meeting. Still need ‘and’ in (b) & (c).

Rob - which means you also need it in (a) & (e) what is happening at the meeting if there is no ‘and’ after (a) what are you referring to and looking at (d) notice of any motion.....if you don’t put an ‘and’ at the end there is no consistency.

Lyll - Nothing has been learned about the use of small words – EC how did they get it wrong? What is stated here the underlining is in the agenda it does not go into the constitution.

Chair: What is stated here is actually what should go in. Replacing sub clauses – only if read in a very perverse way. What is stated is what should go into the constitution.

Rob/Paul: “That the “and’s” be deleted. We delete part (a) on the agenda and we delete the words ‘and’ after the (b) and the ‘and’ after the (c) (that 21.4 (b) & (c) be removed.”

Amendment 90

Carried

Chair: deleting them out of the agenda not the constitution to delete the 'and' and the (a) (b) & (c) out of the agenda. This does not change the meaning at all. Sub clause (b) & (c) are not being amended to make sure the 21 days & the 42 days is in the preamble at the top. "That 21.4 be amended to read.....

Annette/Sue G: Substantive motion:

**"That 21.4 reads - The Secretary shall give all Members who are financial at the date of the notice at least 21 days written notice of a Special Meeting and 42 days written notice for an Annual General Meeting." Carried
Substantive Motion Carried 100%**

7. C 2 – Submitted by Patches & Pointed Inc.

Chair – Under 27.2 ruled out of order Clubs cannot put forward a change to the constitution.

EC Secretary: did not realize that Clubs were not able to put in remits to alter the Constitution, the Clubs are disenfranchised. I am horrified that this has happened it is really embarrassing I did not go back to that Club and advise them to resubmit with 10 members' signatures. I know how passionate the club was about those two remits. It is more unacceptable when Affiliate Clubs are permitted to put remits under 12.7 in General Rules & Policies, but the Constitution overrides.

7. C 3 – Submitted by Patches & Pointed Inc.

Chair – Ruled "Out of order".

EC Secretary: the thing that I am having issues with I have acknowledged all the work that was done by those at the last AGM I have listened to so many people complaining about aspects of the registered constitution and I am appalled that only one remit came forward from the EC. I cannot work with the document the way it is currently written all I am saying is that I hope you all understand I have no choice I have to work with that document as it stands.

Sue F - I am also surprised that only one remit came from EC there are errors in the governance documents – the issue appears to be with the overlap between the Constitution and the Rules & Policies.

EC Secretary: I sent a report to the EC that highlighted issues that Marion and myself had with the document and only one has been acted on. I must admit it is a major thing because I could not work with that document. Do we sit back until everyone falls over?

Arthur - I have worked with the old constitution in particular the closing date for voting procedures if it was not broken then why was it changed putting a band-aid on a broken wrist is ridiculous. Was this not an exercise more haste less speed – should go back to the 2010 document. As an example 10.1 of the old constitution it

says 15 working days before the AGM in returning officers hands (members duty to ensure vote is counting) 11.8 it is o.k. at 14 days before the AGM.

My rights as a voter should be included in the constitution only ordinary members can vote for a life member. They have made a hash putting this together.

Janice - It was agreed at the 2008 AGM that the Constitution needed to be changed.

Chair: We have a new constitution and we are working with it. Put them through as remits and they will be looked at next year.

Diane - Was there any valid reason why Chris's ideas did not get carried through?

Chair – This was due to lack of circumstances with Chris not being able to be available when this was discussed.

Janice - Has this been lack of communication (not Chris's fault) take into account that this has to be brought to the attention of the EC has this been lack of communication?

Chair: Yes

Item 8 General Remits

8.C1 Submitted by Pedigree Persian Cat Fanciers Inc

Moved Sue Gordon/ Judy Wereta **“That Show Bylaw 5.6 (a) be deleted and replaced with: All kittens entered in a show, or an exhibition, display or a breed promotion shall be a minimum of three (3) calendar months old on show day.”**

Chair: this is a general remit a member's motion therefore an Affiliate Club can put through a general remit.

Sue G - Pretty explanatory breeders would enforce, most of the kittens thrive on it, and in Australia kittens are shown at 10 weeks of age. LH breeds are not bred all year round like the shorthairs. Very few Persians are 4mths old by April this would be extra revenue for the clubs and ultimately for the NZCF.

Rob - amendment to motion in recognition we need to train our membership that there is a governance issue that is EC decide how to do it.

Rob/Paul: “That this AGM recommend to the EC that the motion be amended that this AGM recommend to the EC “That..... Amendment Carried

Rob - Point of information – before the new constitution came in the EC did have to take notice what was said. Yes EC had to take notice what this meeting said part of the reason that the constitution split in 2008 onwards the general remits here had the right to tell the EC the right to amend was removed.

Lyall - shocked to see this remit yet again when it was tried in 2006, 2008 and was resoundly lost each time – what about the timing of injections etc.... Vote no to this remit.

Zena - speaking in support of this motion, with simple reasoning when we did allow three month old kittens, I judged 3 month old kittens and can say I did not meet one kitten to be distressed. If we seriously believe that it is too stressful to go to a show then what are we doing rehoming them to an entirely different household at 10 weeks old? We know that it is o.k. because we hear back from our owners, so how is it they cannot be taken to a show?

Sue G - right of reply I would like to suggest what Zena actually said at least if they have their Mums & Dads at the show they thrive on the attention at the show being well looked after. Most vaccinations are done at 9-10 weeks and you cannot show unless the vaccination has been done 7 days prior to the show – you do not have to show that is your personal decision.

Substantive motion **28.79** **LOST**

8.G 2 Submitted by Jane Biddulph (1226) Sue Davis (0670) Jan Allott (1196) Anna Arnold-Finlayson (1043) Dot McManus (1262) Peter McManus (1455) Chris Lowe (0123) Jo Austin (0888) Sandra Melville (0638) Janine Cripps (1561)

Moved Chris/Lyall: “That the NZCF review the National Annual Awards Points System”

Chris - This remit actually came following my recommendation to this group of people who had sent in letters of concern regarding issues over points scoring. I asked Jane Biddulph to come back with a remit for the AGM so this would allow EC to have a look at the current process with a view to perhaps increasing the numbers of eligible rings counting towards awards.

Marie - does that mean any suggested changes would come back to the next AGM?

EC Secretary: submission would be made to the EC any recommendations would be placed on an agenda. It is up to the EC as to how they manage the review – I think it is a very proactive way to look at an issue that is out there for a lot of exhibitors and it is overdue.

Arthur - There are two elements here the points given 10 points for BIS could be doubled or trebled that might assist smaller shows. That EC could put to Joan Hill that the NZCF wants an increase favoured to small shows, because small shows suffer and exhibitors might be absent from their own show to attend a larger show. You could argue cheap championships from small shows. You need Joan Hill’s input.

Chair: Joan Hill has submitted a comment (via email) on this remit in that a lot of people do not know how the system is worked. I realise the remit is about the annual awards only but the same system is used. The bonus points was bought in so small shows already have the advantage to try and strike a balance between people dragging their cats all around the country the base number of rings could be looked at currently at 6 rings but could be increased to say 8 or 9.

Lyll - Point of order – we are not actually taking the review it is about giving the EC the terms of reference or the process to go through let's not take a review here and now.

Rob/Lyll - Amendment: "That this AGM instruct the EC to

Amendment Carried (5 against)

Substantive motion: "That this AGM instruct the EC to undertake a review of the National awards points system."

Substantive motion Carried (10 against)

Item 10 NATIONAL SHOW 2013

Arthur - Bearing in mind that people might not want to come to CHCH when it is still shaking, I think 2012-13 should be bracketed together and let EC decide.

Arthur/Colleen: "That EC be authorized to bracket the 2012-2013 National show together."

Chair: thus giving EC the delegated authority to deal with this depending on the 2012 location."
Carried

Chair: EC to set the date for 2012 AGM

Sue G /Lyll:

"That the 2013 AGM be held in Palmerston North."

95/ Carried

Lyll - The power is given to the EC to set the date.

Paul - The date is flexible according to the Constitution must be held within 6 months of the end of the financial year.

Rob - last year in Napier we had one more person attend than here in Wellington. We talked about main cities we talked about people coming to these meetings we need to go to the South Island. CHCH there should be evidence that says going to the main centers gets more people there based on the attendance at this meeting it could be rubbish – so the rotation may have to be looked at yet again.

Jenni - the cost of fuel, recession is a bigger factor to take into consideration for the poor attendance.

Zena - feedback from more than one person is that they would like the AGM to occur in Auckland Wellington or CHCH because there is more choice of flights. So would like it to be in a main centre. Following what Rob has said it should be CHCH in 2013.

Chair: Sorry folks on checking the Post AGM EC Minutes the 2012 AGM is CHCH

Motion put: "That the 2013 AGM be held in Palmerston North."

Carried 95/9

Item 12 – Any Other Business

Lyll Payne - Touched on by a few others that is about Governance documents tidy up work. For example you go past the constitution at the front and you get this introductory section thus repeating a pile of rules that appear in the constitution itself. For example life membership – governance document (my copy is not numbered so cannot get you a page number). It would appear that my copy is not what you all have in front of you. In principle the same thing probably applies, we should not be redefining stuff.

Paul - there has to be references in the rules, sections were taken out of the constitution it does not go into the procedure to be a member they are in the rules book not the constitution. Terminology in the constitution is that we have Ordinary Members; Life Members etc. were taken out of the constitution it does not define any of the rules relating to terminology.

Lyll – To be a member you follow constitution a–b and a new remit will upset the numbering and they are then redefined sometimes differently in the rules book – the definitions should not be different.

Arthur – It was as clear as crystal in the old constitution for membership it is definitely clouded in the new documents. Voting Members should be used instead of Ordinary Member.

Lyll – There is work that needs to be done in a review. (Lyll to have a look at the governance documents with Arthur). All I am pointing out is that there is work to be done.

**Lyll/Arthur "Instruct EC to re-evaluate the rules and policy document."
(Not voted on)**

Any Other Matters:

Lyll - Making an observation there have been a few reports today and a few people who possibly have taken a bit of caning we know it took a long time to get through

Chris: Annette I agree with you there is a remit for the next AGM – and that we have a Constitutional document that is registered. However, the current constitution says OR. From what Lyall has said and I certainly know what happened in my own club the EC should have given the opportunity for the highest polling candidate to take on that role I believe he is now asking why you did not appoint him am I right or wrong?

Lyall - yes that is right. What are you going to do about it?

Chair: That makes it very difficult we are talking personnel issues the process is that we as an EC acted in accordance with the Constitution.

Sue F - we should be talking about process issues, not people issues.

Janice - If that is the case acting in accordance with your constitution it also says until the next AGM so what happens now.

Chair: The EC meets tomorrow and we have no intention of appointing Lyall tomorrow.

Sue F - How do you know that – have you already done a straw vote?

Chris - it is the process it is not about the people it has to be right that is why my own club felt that their votes had been disenfranchised because they voted for who they thought the person they wanted at that time because they believed that was the right thing to do – in fact nine of those people have not rejoined NZCF that is coming from the membership and they thought they had voted for the person they felt was right to go on the EC irrespective of what the EC said – it is about process it is not about people.

Lyall - A couple of NZCF EC members said that if Lyall comes on then they will go – It is the membership that puts those people on the front table called a democratic process.

Chair: The EC appointed Ian until this AGM.

Sue G - My understanding he is appointed until the end of the meeting then the EC has to make a new appointment but there is no next highest polling candidate now – because that was from the last AGM there is no voting for this AGM so the EC has to make an appointment again so they use their discretion again.

Chair: That is exactly right there was no voting for this AGM.

Janice - I resigned on 17th January and if the position was vacant and to be filled after this AGM why was it not advertised? There was time for this to happen. That

notice for that position should have been advertised that there was one vacancy that has not been done.

Chair: it was decided that there would be no elections for this AGM and that appointments would be rolled over because of the short time between October and April.

Lyll - I did ask for an explanation if it was you would have surely called for expressions of interest across the whole membership – if you had no intention of appointing me then you appoint Ian Gray tomorrow – I cannot believe that Ian did not stand at the time and I do question how he can represent the membership.

Rob - That fact that it is not well known that there is a EC meeting tomorrow to appoint a person the EC has really failed the membership by not telling them – I was on the EC when people jumped the ship at the same time and that would leave the EC inquorate, I rang the people which included people that stood the last time even though I thought a couple were unsuitable we were fortunate that the next highest polled was already on EC we did that because of the abbreviated timescale. You have had months and therefore it makes my suspicions about the intent the openness of what you are doing that is really quite nasty that is affecting my confidence in you guys to run the organization that is my concern.

Chair: Duly noted

EC Secretary : This sort of relates to this, we also have Breed Standards Advisory Committee that are now non existent they should have been part of an election process it was in the minutes of the December EC meeting and it was not done the BSAC will all have to be appointed not elected. Judges Council is different there was a member who stood it was all itemized in Dec minutes the one that stood out was BSAC to go to an election process for this AGM.

Janice: This should have been put on the agenda for this AGM.

Chair: No nominations were received.

EC Secretary: That was a failing of the Portfolio Manager who should have contacted people on that advisory council it did not happen I am sure that Zena will acknowledge that.

Lyll – Madam Chair I have decided to take an extraordinary step I am toying with myself whether to move a vote on no confidence in the entire EC but I feel it would be very destructive to do so because there are some valuable members on EC – I think you and the EC have mismanaged this to an extraordinary extent so I am therefore going to move a vote of no confidence in the Chair.

Ian – point of order we are talking about the Breeds Council are we not – why have we changed the discussion?

EC Secretary: I bought the BSAC as a notation as another appointment which has to be done tomorrow – because an election process was not put in place – when it was required to have been done.

Ian – Clearly the Constitution clause 14 means that BSAC is part of the appointment process managed by the EC.

Zena - Breed Standards Advisory should have happened it should have been on the agenda they will now need to be appointed by the EC.

Chair: We have also got an appointment to be made tomorrow because of no election being taken, when in fact it should have been.

Lyll/ Rob (seconded proforma) “Move a vote of no confidence in the Chairperson.”

Rob: Just to clarify ‘proforma’ means I want this discussion to happen I will not commit myself to vote for it until the discussion is had.

Lyll - I probably covered in my intro a moment ago there has been terrible and unnecessary mismanagement of the process of the vacancy on the EC. The document sent away was not what the AGM intended. We come to a situation now – the open and transparency as our constitution requires for a replacement this had not been taken advantage of.

I too can only assume we can do what we like, what we want to do, I do not have confidence any longer in the Chair only in the way this matter has been handled I have mentioned that some of the other EC members have not been strong and forthright – I do not do this easily I am quivering in my voice you have not only let myself down but those people that voted for myself and Gaynor Saxon you cannot assume that I would have taken on the role the process has not been open and transparent.

Chair: (In reply) when Janice indicated her resignation from EC the EC were gob smacked at that loss and it was certainly not a thing we wanted to happen at that time – that was her right. I led them to the registered constitution we acted within the bounds of the constitution we had no choice in what we had done – we cannot go outside that constitution by now instructing that this person be appointed we sought legal advice and the advice was:

“12.3 clearly indicates a discretion which may be exercised by the EC in terms of the next appointment.” The issue came with considering other rules – i.e. no election to be held this year to manage the position. Janice and my position were to come up for election 2012 so it was deemed the best option was to appoint until this AGM, this is what we have done the discretion was that the EC shall appoint the next highest polling candidate or co-opt.

We consulted with the next highest polling candidate we asked for his thoughts his reasons as to why he should be appointed. We considered the reply that he gave and we chose to not appoint Lyall we chose to appoint Ian Gray the meeting vote was not recorded (and I know that has been discussed out there) if I have permission of the EC to announce the vote, I will do so, are people happy for that vote to be divulged?

Lyall - Not if the decision was done in committee.

Chair: All I am trying to do is to clarify because someone questioned why in the minutes there was no vote taken. The EC motion was carried "That Ian be appointed to the EC", I do not see how this EC apart from appointing Lyall that we have done anything that is illegal we certainly have not in terms of what our lawyer advised so I have no more to add to that fact.

Rob - I don't like doing this I will firm up my seconding, and in doing so I would like to read the motion carried by the EC at that meeting -

"After consultation the EC resolved to appt Ian Gray to the vacant position on EC the term of the appointment is until the 2012 AGM." It does not say tomorrow! This definitely does not state until tomorrow therefore I believe that you have misled us badly in this instance yet again.

Lyall/ Rob: "move a vote of no confidence in the Chair."

70/27/6 CARRIED

Sue G - it is very unfortunate situation a horrible situation – I have attended many AGM's of the NZCF and this is a horrible one. Annette you are a member so you still hold the seat on the EC am I correct?

Annette: I have to vacate the Chair only, and this meeting shall elect a temporary Chair.

Zena – on the vote of no confidence the Chair would vacate to allow appointment of temporary chair for the duration of the meeting.

Rob/ (seconder not recorded): "move that Zena Pigden take the Chair."

CARRIED

Rob - I believe the meeting has come to a decision – the wording that Lyall has used is very careful here I agree entirely with Sue it is the motion of no confidence in the Chairperson it is not a motion of no confidence in a person elected the person is not named it is the position that is named and therefore tomorrow the EC choose a new Chair – so from that point of view it is a message from us that this has been seriously mishandled. Now you guys as EC tomorrow pick a new Chairperson you also have an issue because of the wording in the minutes. You have got a very hard job to do tomorrow my heart goes out to you.

Sue G - from your heart! I think that is funny –

Chris - It is really a serious issue from the bottom of my heart I sit here as a new life member and I could burst into tears. Because I have watched the memberships of this organization erode by over 230 people and it is because of what happened at that meeting I will stake my life membership on it. I have watched clubs falling over because their members are no longer interested in being involved with NZCF. It is about saving the organization because by 2012 AGM the membership of the organization could be gone.

Rob - there are five people here as an EC you have had some very clear messages and to fail to follow those would I suggest be very foolish.

Chair: I think that we have understood the messages that are coming from this meeting at this time.

Janice - Point of clarification - so tomorrow is Ian Gray in until 2012 as per the minutes, or are you going to appoint Ian?

Jenni – the reasons they made the decision that they did in my opinion was because they did not want another mass exodus off the Executive Council by appointing the wrong person.

Lyall - the speaker's comments are highly inappropriate and should withdraw.

Chair: The EC made the decision for the benefit and to preserve the EC at the time rightly or wrongly I believe we made the right decision. As part of the EC meeting this will be discussed.

Other Matters: Presentation to Janice Davey

Chair: Janice on behalf of the EC I would like to extend heartfelt thanks for your contribution to the EC and for all the work you did on Executive Council.

Received with acclamation

Janice - Leaving EC was not taken lightly if I knew it would cause so much of a problem I would not have gone. But because of my personal situation I had to go.

Chair: The Executive Council will begin our meeting tomorrow at 8.30 a.m.

There being no further business the AGM closed 5.55 pm

Chris M Lowe

Executive Council Secretary

Attachment: Transcription of Discussion AGM 2010 (inserted into the Minutes of the AGM 2010 by resolution of AGM 2011)

FILE AGM1005 TRANSCRIPTION 13.59 to 19.46

01:33:47

12.31

Sue Ford - Lyall made a comment before which was a very sensible one (Lyall you are sometimes very sensible) that a group of people – have a look at these things and get it in order before we vote it would be a sensible thing to do because I have to say that at the moment if it stays as it is I will be voting against it all along with my proxies if these are changed with some of these things that I think are errors then I will be for it.

Gaynor Saxon - That the membership is happy to set up a group of people to sort this out maybe?

Annette Dunn – No! This is all about now do a half an hour now

Gaynor Saxon - That is what I am saying. That we do this in the next half hour or overnight what do you want?

Margaret Bean - We need to have time to read this first - we have not had that chance to read this.

Lyall Payne – I just want to pick up on the point that Annette raised regarding the confliction statement about the next highest polling candidate.

The appointment of the next highest polling candidate that it is a tradition that we have had to implement and had to implement on a number of occasions over the years as well but it is in one of a number of options as will we need to set it in stone if we need to do something different a challenge to that would certainly be upheld on the basis that you have a tradition – that might be another one we look at between now and tomorrow morning as well.

Annette Dunn - With regard to that - accepting the next highest polling candidate in actual fact our constitution at the moment does not allow for that at all.

At the discretion you can appoint anybody you like to that role that fact that the wording has been included this time gives the option you do have the option to take the next highest polling candidate or you may want to appoint a person with specific skills at the moment you have not got the option to set it in stone or otherwise.

Lyall Payne - But it is a tradition which has been established.

Janice Davey - this was of concern when we went through this “may” should read “shall” people have gone to the trouble to be nominated and put forward by who ever, it should be cut and clear it should be shall, not may, that is the point.

Gaynor Saxon - Normally we would have said that is the end of all the discussion but we are really getting something really positive going here I can see we need to go ahead and continue.

Margaret Bean - my friend has written here – that the word should be changed to “shall” appoint the person who is the next highest polling member or failing his or her unavailability then the EC shall co-opt.

Janice Davey - which is what they have done in the past.

Annette Dunn - but they may not be available

Gaynor Saxon - that is dead right

Janice Davey – yes but you must give the choice.

Gaynor Saxon - what is the suggestion here how to do this?

Lyll Payne - can we have the list of numbers that we have talked about so far?

Gaynor Saxon- off Rob’s sheets...

Lyll Payne - just the numbers that concern us

Gaynor Saxon - Robs sheets the numbers which 22.1 and 5.4

Annette Dunn - 22.1, 5.4 (think we have sorted that one) and then 12.3 is the highest polling candidate one.

Ian Gray - also 20.1 the auditor selection –

Margaret Bean -there are others further on that should be changed to shall in the document?

Rob Shirley – now In addressing Lyall’s point about the next highest polling candidate between 12.3 in new constitution and or 7.4 of the old constitution there has been a change of focus the change of focus comes I believe with the dropping of the by-election ...clause quoted: “In the event of an Executive Council position becoming vacant during its term the Executive Council has the power to appoint a person to fill a vacancy until a by-election. The by-election will take place at the same time, and using the same nomination process and ballot form as the annual election of Executive Council members.....

When Lyall says tradition I think he is using the right word but it is customary practice to do it this way - to appoint the next highest polling candidate because if we suddenly change it, we are in trouble straight away if we don’t appoint and we

need a new person and go outside the next highest polling candidate- case law has driven this and in a court of law you would be dead straight away.

So say if Janice suddenly falls of her perch (sorry Janice) and we need a new person and we go outside and appoint Sue to the EC so under customary practice Lyall should be offered the position first it is not written in the rules under the Constitution –

The wording should be 'shall'.

And based on Janice's argument people are willing to put themselves up and people might fall off their perch.

Janice Davey - yes that is correct and I might fall off the perch."

END OF TRANSCRIPTION REGARDING HIGHEST POLLING CANDIDATE