

Minutes of the Meeting of the Annual General Meeting of  
FELIS BRITANNICA  
**Held at**  
**Stoke Rochford Hall,**  
**Stoke Rochford, Nr Grantham, Lincolnshire**  
**On the**  
**18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup> of February 2006**

**Members Present:**

**Executive Committee**

Mr Neil Gardner	President
Mrs Julie-Anne Payne	Treasurer
Miss Frances de Courcy Rolls	General Secretary
Mrs Sarah Errington	Vice-President

**Aristocats CC**

Mr Eddie Kitching	Delegate Chairman Rules Commission
-------------------	---------------------------------------

Mrs Margaret McCrerrick	Advisor
-------------------------	---------

**Garden Of England CC**

Mrs Penelope Bydlinski	Delegate Chairman Show Commission Chairman of Judges Commission
Mrs Sarah Johnson	Advisor

**Viking CC**

Mrs Melanie Gardner	Delegate Chairman Breeding, Health & Welfare Commission
Mrs Lisa Crowe	Advisor

**Heart of England CC**

Mr Fredrick Linden-Wyatt	Delegate
--------------------------	----------

**Maine Coon Guild**

Mrs Kerry Butterworth	Delegate
Mr Ted Turpin	Advisor

## **Observers**

Mrs Jennifer Briggs  
Mr David Brincombe  
Mrs Tina Clark  
Mr John Cunningham  
Mrs Valerie Davidson  
Mr David Green  
Mrs Susan Hart-Jones  
Mr Robin Hart-Jones  
Mrs Nicola Loughran  
Ms Birgit Solstein  
Mrs Jan Upton

From hereon in the clubs listed below will be referred to by the following abbreviations;

Aristocats	Aristocats
Heart of England	H of E
Garden of England	G of E
Maine Coon Guild	MCG
Scottish Breeds Association	SBA

The AGA opened at 10.12am

### **1. President's welcome**

The President welcomed everyone for attending this years AGA and hoped the meeting would be constructive. He went on to ask the meeting if there were any comments on the call to the meeting, there were none. He then asked the Treasurer to confirm that all clubs had paid their fees. The Treasurer stated that the SBA had not paid their fees in due time and had subsequently been suspended. However, they had brought their payment to the AGA. Since their fees had now been paid their suspension was lifted.

### **2. Roll call of Delegates**

Aristocats	4 votes
G of E	4 votes
H of E	3 votes
MCG	1 vote
Viking	3 votes

As the SBA had failed to submit a membership list, by the 31<sup>st</sup> of January as set out in the Statutes, they had forfeited their right to vote.

The H of E asked if the meeting would be voting on the forfeit of the SBA votes. The President stated the statutes clearly laid out the need for a membership list by the 31<sup>st</sup> of January and receipt of Fees. The H of E went on to clarify that the meeting could vote to have an exception of the rules. The President stated that it would make the Executive Committee's job very hard throughout the year ensuring that the statues are abided by, if the statutes were to be overridden at the AGA.

The President asked the SBA to address the meeting. The General Secretary confirmed that membership list updates from the SBA had been received up to the previous September. The

President explained that the need for the membership lists was to enable crosschecking of the full members to ensure there were no duplicates.

Mr E Kitching asked the SBA if they have had a computer problem as no response from emails sent, had been received by the Rules commission.

The SBA stated that they had not to their knowledge had any problems.

The Viking asked if the SBA had held a meeting to discuss the agenda, the SBA stated that no they had not, as they had not received the agenda on time.

The General Secretary asked the SBA if they had received the agenda electronically, this they confirmed. The General Secretary then explained that the agenda had been sent out only once to all clubs and commission members. This had been done electronically and within the time scales, therefore the SBA had received the agenda in time for a meeting to be convened for its discussion, as had the other recipients on the distribution list. The G of E stated that the SBA should have notified the General Secretary if they were having computer problems.

The MCG queried their vote as they currently had 26 full members and were therefore entitled to 2 votes. The President stated that the figures had been deduced from the membership lists sent in to the General Secretary, these lists had subsequently been compared for duplicates. The MCG list had now changed from that submitted but it was too late to accept it and to check against the other club's lists. This was even more critical as some of the other clubs lists were on the border line for voting levels and a change could affect the numbers of votes.

The MCG wished to clarify whether they then needed to pay for the extra members. The President stated that this might be an area for the Executive Committee to sort out at a later date.

The President read out the individual club's votes again and stated that an absolute majority for this meeting would be eight. The Aristocats queried how an abstention was counted and the President stated it would be counted as a 'NO' vote.

### **3. Appointment of two scrutinisers**

The President asked for proposals for the two scrutinisers.

Mrs Hart-Jones and Mrs Davidson were proposed by Viking and seconded by the Aristocats, this was accepted unanimously.

### **4. Election of a meeting chairperson and secretary**

The President then asked for proposals for a secretary and chairman of the AGA.

The H of E proposed Miss de Courcy Rolls for Secretary and Mr Gardner for Chairman. This was seconded by the Aristocats and accepted unanimously.

### **5. Approval and Amendments to Agenda**

The H of E asked for item 17, Proposals from members in particular their proposal, to be moved to the beginning of the agenda as, if it were passed, it could affect the way in which the clubs voted. The President stated that the positions referred to in the proposal would be filled by co-option and not by election at this meeting but asked the meeting for a seconder for moving the item forward. There was no seconder and the request was therefore dropped.

The G of E proposed that item 13, clarification on the previous year's voting regarding the Show and Competition Rules Commission, to be dealt with as part of the acceptance of the Minutes. This was seconded by the Viking. Unanimously accepted.

The President proposed that item 16 and 17 be reversed in order (16 moved to 17 and 17 moved to 16) as Mrs Linda Griffin, Chairman of the Investigations commission would attend the AGA the following day. The H of E seconded this and it was unanimously accepted.

The President told the meeting that Mrs Linda Griffin had withdrawn her candidacy from the position of Chair of Investigations Commission.

The Viking asked for the time of breaks during the meeting to be established. The General Secretary confirmed that Lunch was at 1pm and the afternoon coffee break was at 3.30pm

### **13. Clarification of the previous year's voting regarding the Show and competition rules.**

The President stated that as item 13 has now been moved forward in the Minutes this would be dealt with first. He went on to explain that the clarification was needed on the G of E's proposal from the previous year's AGA which was on Page 21 of the Minutes, under proposal 2. It was to increase the number of the Show Commission members. The President stated that it was understood to be five full members plus the chair and two supplementary members; however, the minutes showed something different. Mrs Bydlinski had been operating the commission as having five full members.

The President asked the meeting today to decide the intent of the Statute change that was made last year in this regard. He asked the H of E what their intent had been at that time regarding their proposal. The H of E stated that they had intended five full members, the President pointed out that no statement had been made on the two supplementary members. Mrs Bydlinski-suggested that perhaps that maybe there should be two reserve members and they should not be called supplementary. This change in wording to substitute to reserve was agreed, the President proposed that the intent of the previous year's proposal was five full members and two reserve members, this was seconded by H of E. Accepted unanimously.

The President said that Ms Lisa Crowe's name should then be removed from the candidate list in the agenda, and the wording should be changed to reflect the number of positions being voted on to two full members and two reserve members.

H of E asked for clarification of which the current members were the President confirmed that the current members were Mrs Clark, Mrs Crowe, Mrs Hart-Jones, and Mrs Shackell with Mrs Bydlinski as chairman. Mrs Clark was the member up for re-election at the current meeting.

### **6. 2005 AGA minutes**

The Aristocats queried why on page 14 of the Minutes, under ratification of the Show Rules, where it had been agreed that a 4-part carbon copy of the Judge's Report form would be made, this had not been undertaken. The President confirmed that since the number of blank report forms had been running low, a further 5000 had just been printed as three carbon copy. He went on to clarify that the reason for this was that although they had been ordered as four-carbon copies, the firm had gone into receivership. This had left no report form and as the order had to be done at short notice a mistake had been made for which he apologised.

The G of E queried the third paragraph, line four on page 14. The word 'show' should be removed and the word 'is' to be removed and the word 'be' inserted further down.

The Viking stated that on page 10 under election of general sec it should read 'by majority' not as it appears 'unanimous'

The Aristocats asked for an update regarding page 16 with reference to the first paragraph

'The President agreed and said that notes for guidance of exhibitors and show managers should be drafted and then put before the expert. He asked Miss Kirk if she would take on this responsibility. Miss Kirk agreed but was not sure of the wording. The Viking stated that according to procedure it should be left to the Show Commission to provide the draft wording'

The President asked Mr Turpin if he had any further information regarding this, Mr Turpin stated that it had not been done and was unlikely to be done. Mrs Bydlinski stated that the wording had been received and the Show Commission undertook to check into the wording and to circulate it to the clubs. The Aristocats asked for this to be done as a matter of urgency.

The G of E stated that on Page 16 'VCC' should be exchanged with 'G of E' later in the paragraph.

The Aristocats pointed out that on page 18, proposal 2 from the Executive Committee, half way through the paragraph the statistics given last year were incorrect. The President brought a point of order, stating that the meeting was currently going through the Minutes for corrections and that this was a point which should be brought up later.

The President asked if there were any other corrections and as there were none he proposed the acceptance of the Minutes subject to the mentioned amendments, the G of E seconded the proposal. Unanimously accepted.

The VCC pointed out that the vote for a checker of the minutes had not been carried out.

The President proposed Mrs Bydlinski, seconded by H of E. Accepted unanimously

The President then proposed Mr Hart-Jones, seconded by the VCC. Accepted unanimously

## **7. President's report**

*"Welcome to our third Annual General Assembly, and our first at Stoke Rochford Hall. This is our second AGA spread over two days, and I am pleased to say that Gala dinner and presentation of our annual winner's awards tonight is better attended than last year. It is gratifying to see that our members appreciate this format, and I hope it will become a well established annual tradition.*

*We had not intended to come quite so far north to this venue for the AGA this year, but there is a major event held at the NEC each year at the same time as our AGA, making venues in the Birmingham area either impossible or expensive. Next year we may well be at an alternative venue, but this will be very dependent upon what is available. Identifying alternative venues will be under way soon in order to allow plenty of time.*

*We have much to get through over the next 2 days, some items that may require much debate, so I will end my welcome now and move onto the procedure points"*

## **8. General Secretary's Report**

The Secretary highlighted that the show insurance for the year had been increased to five million as several venues had required this amount in the previous year.

She stated that Felis Britannica had taken stands at both the Supreme G.C.C.F show and the National G.G.C.F show. This had been a first in many respects and had caused some surprise to a few G.C.C.F exhibitors but had enabled many to ask questions about FIFe and FB in particular.

The clubs had been asked to provide information on both their clubs and their forthcoming shows, this together with various FIFe standards and colour books, made up the information available on the stand. She went on to state that FB should endeavour to take stands at these shows again in the current year.

At this point the VCC pointed out that the only members who had helped at the Stand on both occasions were from the VCC and the G of E.

The MCG suggested that an article explaining about showing both GCCF and FIFe would be useful.

The Aristocats stated that one of their members had attended the Supreme show but nobody had asked him for help, and furthermore he had not been aware of the need for help.

The General Secretary reminded Mr Kitching that he had been present at the Executive Committee meetings, and had also received the minutes of the meetings, where not only the discussion and decision to take the stands at these shows had occurred, but also the discussions on the need for help and task assignments. Therefore, he had been well aware for the need of help and could have relayed this to his members. The General Secretary went on to state that a request for help had been put on the FB list twice with only a couple of people coming forward offering help which did not in the event materialise. The G of E confirmed that this had appeared on the list and was further confirmed by Mrs Errington.

The Aristocats stated that there had been a MCG member who had not been able to ask a question at the stand as it was too busy. The VCC stated that this accentuated the lack of help and the need to improve things for the current year.

## **9 & 10. Treasurer's Report and Discussion.**

The Treasurer apologised for the wrong set of figures having been circulated; they had not been put before an auditor and the final set were still in fact with the auditor, but due to various issues she had not kept up to date with the accounts hence the delay.

The President asked whether the fact that the accounts were still being dealt with by the auditor would change the balance sheet. The Treasurer stated that the bottom line would not change.

The President asked the meeting if there were any questions.

The VCC queried what was meant by the statement in the report that the invoices for the FB magazine had been incorrect. The Treasurer explained that it referred to the fact that the amount invoiced had been higher than the amount quoted before printing and that this was being queried with the printers.

With regard to the reference to fees being on hold until payment could be made, the H of E asked which clubs this pertained to. The Treasurer replied that the MCG and the Semi Longhair Cat Club had made a recent request which had been agreed with the President the previous week.

The Aristocats stated that they had many queries and would like to cover them together. The President agreed to this but made it clear that he would invite comments from the meeting on each query.

It was remarked that the FB newsletter was quoted as an income but this was subsequently not reflected in the accounts. The Treasurer explained that this was because the final fees, although received, had not been banked. It was then pointed out that the fees by FB paid to SVERAK whilst under patronage had been received back, but it was unclear where they were in the accounts. The Treasurer stated that she had included it as income. The President stated that it had to be listed separately.

The Aristocats went on to ask the Treasurer to what point were the accounts up to date and what was in the Current account as at the end of January. The Treasurer replied that the accounts were up to date to the previous Friday and that the current account held £6474.95 as of the end of January.

The Aristocats then stated that the accounts were an important matter and that this was the time within the twelve months when the treasurer should get the accounts up-to-date and correct. They then asked if the first set of accounts had been seen by an accountant, the treasurer confirmed that they had not and admitted that they should not have been sent out for circulation.

Discrepancies between the amounts in the two balance sheets were then highlighted and the Treasurer was asked what point there was in a balance sheet if not to give a reflection of the year's activities and a balance at the year end. The President said that he and the rest of the Executive should have been requesting a report from the Treasurer for each EC meeting, thereby bringing to light earlier these errors in the accounts. He went on to state that in future he would like to see a summary and balance sheet at each EC meeting.

The Aristocats then pointed out that in the report the figures were different to the first set of accounts. The Treasurer stated that she had to take into account the accounts payable and receivable. The President read out that there had been £7206.32 in the bank at the end of 2004 and the balance as at the end of 2005 was £5692.88. He went on to explain that it was not a fair comparison to make between the two as payments payable and receivable, have to be taken into account and full accounts are needed for a complete comparison.

The Aristocats went on to state that the refund paid to all the clubs was shown in the first accounts but did not seem to appear in the second set, the Treasurer was asked where the item had gone. The Treasurer explained that she had not separated it out; The G of E asked if it had been included in the registration department's figures. The Treasurer could not immediately answer this.

The Treasurer was then asked if the figure stated for the FB outlook magazine, which was £600 more than the original quote included the cost of printing the winner's catalogue. The Treasurer stated that she had yet to remove that fee from the figures and it was an amount of £219.12.

The Treasurer was asked why the invoice was paid if the invoice was substantially more than the quote and who authorised payment. In reply the treasurer stated that the order had been placed by the President but the invoice was sent to the General Secretary who then forwarded it to her; upon receipt she had made the payment by cheque.

The Aristocats asked why the FB stand at £235.25 and FB club fees at £289.25 were in the first Profit & Loss report but do not appear in the second report. The Treasurer stated that it had not been included as a separate line but was essentially still in the accounts.

The 'winners show' entry fees were queried as they were £1000 more than they should have been. The Treasurer explained that some of the 'Worthing show' fees had been banked in amongst some of the 'winners show' fees, therefore the 'Worthing show' should be increased by £1000 and the 'winners show' should be decreased by £1000 but she emphasised the fact that the net amount did not change.

The H of E asked why the sponsorship money had yet to be received, the treasurer stated that Royal Canin had been invoiced but apparently had not received the invoice, a point of which the Treasurer had been unaware of until recently. The VCC asked for the amount for which Royal Canin had been invoiced for sponsorship, Mrs Bydlinski stated that for the 'Worthing show' approx £600 and the 'winners show' £394. The VCC went on to query why the amount received for adverts was so low regarding the winners show, especially as there were so many adverts in the catalogue, the Treasurer stated that they again had not been separated out from the entries.

The Aristocats highlighted the statement in the report regarding information being lost with respect to FIFe show and FB Fees, as they appeared to be lower in the latest accounts. The Treasurer explained that both sets of fees had been banked together and therefore information on the respective amounts had been lost.

The Aristocats asked what authorisation had been given with respect to placing the two clubs fees on hold. The treasurer stated that it had been at an Executive committee meeting when the request from the MCG had been discussed and agreed to; this was reflected in the respective minutes. Regarding the SLH this had been a recent request and had been discussed with and agreed by the President.

The Aristocats further remarked that the FIFe show fees and FB fees for its two shows in 2005 were not on the Accounts receivable, although they had been paid but the cheque had not been processed. The President stated that whilst this point was a valid one, it was not for discussion within this meeting and should be discussed privately.

Break for Coffee

During the break the Treasurer had distributed a copy of the accounts which bore the Accountants signature.

The Aristocats stated that the Treasurer had been heard to state during the break that she had had various pressures during the previous year which had affected her job performance. They went on to ask if this was also the case in the current year.

The Treasurer stated that circumstances had now changed. She would be running fewer shows in the future in order to concentrate on the treasurer's job. The G of E, speaking in the

Treasurer's defence, stated that she had had a lot to do in December and January as she had been running almost single-handed the G of E show in Lightwater. The club went on to state that the Treasurer would not be running any of their shows in the coming year.

The President asked for any further comments on the accounts.

The G of E stated that 2004 had been a great year when the initial enthusiasm had been high but 2005 had been very hard work as there were too few people to do the many jobs. It felt that the Clubs should be aware of how much the EC and FB had achieved. The MCG seconded this. The H of E moved to vote on accepting the accounts, as the bottom line would not be changing.

The Aristocats thought that the errors they saw within the accounts were more errors and learning faults than deliberate actions and would like to second the H of E.

The President stated that on looking at the accounts for the first time it was hard to answer any questions due to their format and suggested that the Treasurer revisit the accounts and reformat them, in order to answer the questions raised at this meeting. They would then be re-circulated to the clubs. The Treasurer undertook to do this by the next EC meeting at the end of April.

The H of E proposed the most recent accounts circulated, these were seconded by the Aristocats.

The accounts were unanimously accepted

The G of E asked whether the accounts were accepted with the proviso that the new accounts would be circulated by the next EC meeting. The H of E commented that this could not be done as this would infer that the accounts were wrong and therefore could not be accepted, yet the vote had already been taken.

## **11. Discharge of Executive Committee's responsibility for previous year's finances**

The President asked for a proposal to discharge the EC of responsibility for the previous year's finances. The Aristocats asked if the meeting could do this with further accounts yet to be circulated. The President stated that he was more comfortable with doing this in order to ensure the accounts are corrected, he then went on to put it to the vote.

The result of the vote was:

Against 12; Abstain 3.

The Executive Committee's responsibility was therefore not discharged.

## **12. Commission Reports**

### **Judges commission report**

This had been circulated prior to the meeting. Mrs Bydlinski asked for any questions, the VCC queried the steward voucher system and asked if the details of the scheme could be circulated to the clubs, so they understood what to do with any vouchers received with a show entry. Mrs Bydlinski did not realise that it had not been done and agreed to undertake to do so.

The Aristocats asked the progress on steward of the year. Mrs Bydlinski stated that it would be awarded at the gala dinner that evening. The Aristocats asked if more stewards could be progressed on to being chief stewards and show managers. The President stressed the need for more volunteers for the chief steward training, the VCC went on to add that the clubs could do more to encourage stewards at their shows, hence more enrolling on the stewarding scheme. The President expressed the opinion that clubs should be able to run autonomously with their own stewards.

The H of E asked for a clarification on the progress with the FIFe judge Mrs Val Gane. Mrs Bydlinski explained that she had not had any contact from Mrs Gane; the H of E stated that for 2005 her FIFe fees had been deducted from her judge's fees but so far she had not paid 2006 FIFe fees and she was no longer a member. Mrs Bydlinski explained that if Mrs Gane was no longer an FB member she would have to make a special application to FIFe in order to judge and that the H of E should write to the General Secretary who, in turn, would inform FIFe of the situation.

### **Rules commission Report**

Mr. Kitching read out his report to the meeting.

*"This year if the AGA agrees the Rules Commission will be suspended. The reason for this is that it is felt that FB isn't big enough to warrant this commission, and the small amount of work involved can easily be maintained by the Executive Committee. The commission will only be suspended and the reasoning behind this is that if necessary it can be resurrected at some future date.*

*This year I requested Club Rules from all clubs. Some I have received and others I have been assured have not changed. I am satisfied that most clubs presently comply with FB/FIFe requirements. However I have not heard from the SBA.*

*It is also important that the clubs be aware that it is highly possible that their rules will require changing this coming year after the introduction of wording re the Data Protection Act and Disciplinary matters.*

*Finally just to say that I have had an enjoyable two years in my position as Chairman of the Rules Commission and to thank everyone for their support."*

The President asked if all of the Commission Rules had been circulated after the previous AGA. Mr Kitching stated that he had no idea; the President reminded Mr Kitching that that was one of the few jobs of the Rules commission. Mr Kitching stated that he had asked the President if it was his responsibility to update the various rules, to which he had received a negative reply, the President confirmed that this was the case for updating but not for collating and circulating to the clubs. Mr Kitching explained that he had sent an email the previous week to all commission Chairs requesting that they circulate their respective rules. Mrs Bydlinski stated that the Show and Competition rules had been circulated in the spring.

The President then broke for Lunch at 1.05pm for an hour

## SHOW COMMISSION

A report had been circulated prior to the meeting and Mrs Bydlinski asked for questions.

The VCC queried at what point had the free cat litter at shows been started, Mrs Bydlinski thought that it had been in place for most of 2005 but not at all shows and this would have to be looked into.

The Aristocats queried, with respect to the judge's commission, the practice of a steward taking his/her accreditation with Mrs Bydlinski at a show where she was judging. Mrs Bydlinski confirmed that this was the case, to which the Aristocats went on to point out that Mrs Bydlinski would not be judging at many shows in the forthcoming year. Mrs Bydlinski explained that there were judges whom she thought would be willing and whom she could approach to do the accreditation if this were required.

The Aristocats referred to the report which stated only three committee meetings had been held in the past year and only one of those had all committee members in attendance, they went on to ask Mrs Bydlinski if she waited for a date where all members could be present before convening a meeting. Mrs Bydlinski stated that this could not be the case.

The Aristocats requested an update regarding the sponsorship of FB clubs by Royal Canin, Mrs Bydlinski replied that this was imminent. They then went on to ask the status of the stewarding coats being sponsored by Royal Canin, Mrs Bydlinski explained that they had been in use since August and every FB steward was to have their own which they would look after and bring to every show at which they were stewarding. The Aristocats asked why they had not received any for their stewards. Mrs Bydlinski explained that it was a logistics problem as they were stored with one person who had not been in attendance at all shows.

Mrs Bydlinski went on to explain that there should have been a meeting between the President, Royal Canin and herself, however it had not taken place. Royal Canin were still honouring the agreement made the previous year, but a phone conference would be held the following Monday as Royal Canin wished to have everything resolved by the World Cat Congress.

The President went on to add that Royal Canning had initially agreed to a £1000 per year in sponsorship for all clubs (aprox £60 per show). Mrs Bydlinski added that Royal Canin had broken their alliance with Symlee Pets.

The Aristocats referring to the report where it was stated that a few problems had occurred with clubs, said that they were aware this included the Aristocats. They went on to refer to the 2004 Minutes which stated that reports on new show managers would be reinstated and Mrs Bydlinski had agreed with this and to a representative being appointed if she herself could not be in attendance at the relevant show. The Aristocats asked why this had not been carried out. The President stated that he had undertaken and completed a report for Mr Kitching's show the previous year. The Aristocats stated that a report was meant to be completed on Mr Kitching at their Bognor Show and asked why this had not been undertaken. Mrs Bydlinski explained that it was because it had been overlooked and apologised for this.

The Aristocats stated that the Show Commission had insisted that a show commission representative be in the secretariat for their Thornbury show, however they had concerns that the show commission did not have the expertise to train people within the secretariat. The

President at this point told the Aristocats CC that this was not the forum in which to discuss this and that it should be brought up under AOB, the meeting was currently discussing the report of the Show and Competition Rules Commission. The Aristocats argued that it was within the report, the President pointed out that no reference had been made directly to the Aristocats within the report, therefore those concerns should be brought under AOB. The Aristocats asked for a note to be made that they wished to bring up the Show Commission under AOB. The President made a note.

The Aristocats asked if they could bring up advertising at this point, the President again explained that this was to be brought up under AOB, again the Aristocats asked for a note to be made that they also wished to bring up advertising under AOB. The H of E thought that as advertising had been mentioned in the report, the Aristocats should be allowed to discuss advertising at this point in the meeting. The President agreed but stated that the Aristocats should be concise and direct in their comments.

The Aristocats referred to an EC meeting at which it had been agreed on £100 for advertising. At this point the Aristocats paused for some time to read through their notes, the President then told the Aristocats to bring up their points under AOB as the meeting did not have time to wait whilst they read their notes. He went on to request assurance from the Aristocats that they would prepare their questions in advance. The Aristocats disagreed and stated that the President just did not want the points to be heard. The President asked if the Aristocats wished the meeting to vote on this point. The Aristocats then asked to bring up the rest of their points under AOB.

The President asked to move on.

The Aristocats asked why the point's awards and results posted on the website were late being posted because of delays in checking. Mrs Bydlinski stated that most of the points had been posted fairly quickly. The H of E commented that there had been a slow period but it had improved recently. The President explained that the reason for the delays in that period had been sorted out; the Aristocats stated that it had not. The General Secretary reminded them that the up to date results had been posted on the website just before the last EC meeting.

The Aristocats asked for the items 'FB Outlook' and 'World Cat Congress' to be brought up under AOB. The President made a note.

The President made a point to Mrs Bydlinski that a stricter eye needed to be kept on the geographical distribution of shows. The Aristocats then asked the show commission if they believed that the shows should be licensed according to club location. Mrs Bydlinski replied no, however to ensure that all shows do not occur in one area it was taken into consideration. The Aristocats made the comment that the decision on who undertook the Worthing show had been based on geographical location and that some clubs had been declined a show in the south, this they disagreed with and asked where it was a rule that only certain clubs could hold shows in certain places. They went on to ask if the G of E, Mrs Bydlinski club intended never to hold a Northern show. The MCG commented that a decision by a club where to hold a show was also based on the number of club members on the ground, within the local area of the show venue. Mrs Bydlinski felt that that the Aristocats were picking on things out of context; some shows had had to move so as to ensure no clashes with other club's shows and a fair distribution of shows across the country for FB members who wished to show.

The President asked the Aristocats what point they were trying to make.

The Aristocats made the comment that the show commission were dictating that certain show venues should be given to certain clubs within that area and other clubs within the same area, who had been pushed to, had held a northern show out of that area, whilst some clubs were not undertaking northern shows.

The President reiterated the MCG's point that holding a show in the north is dependant on having club members on the ground near the venue. He went on to ask whether the Aristocats point was that FB, and in particular the show commission, should ensure Northern shows were put on. The Aristocats confirmed this was their point and added that the show commission should not refuse licences to clubs within a geographical area, for shows in venues where they have previously held a show, such as the Bognor venue in the South East for the Aristocats.

Mrs Bydlinski said that she could not exactly remember the decision process as it had taken place some time ago but she believed that it would have been based on more than geography. The Aristocats handed an email to the President regarding the Show Commission's refusal to grant the Aristocats a licence Bognor show. The President read out the email to the meeting, and then pointed out that nowhere in the email did it state that the Aristocats could not hold a show within the South East. The President asked if the meeting agreed with this comment. Mrs Bydlinski said that this particular application had obviously been refused because of the number of show in the south east at that time. The H of E asked to move on with the meeting.

#### **Disciplinary Report.**

There were no representatives from any of the Disciplinary commissions present; however reports had been circulated prior to the meeting.

The President asked if the clubs had any comments on the report from the Investigations commission that they would like minuted.

#### **Investigations**

The VCC queried why email is not acceptable as a form of evidence, since it was accepted within a court of law. The President stated that would be a question for the new Investigations Commission chairman, once elected, to answer.

The President stated that on the first page of the report, within the penultimate paragraph the suggestion that clubs could delegate responsibility to FB is incorrect and that FB should only be involved in disciplinary cases, involving the clubs as a whole and that the clubs should discipline their individual members.

The MCG made the comment that, that was assuming the rules of the clubs were all the same and they felt in some cases it might need to be heard by FB. The President stated that he could not think of an instance in which a club could not handle a disciplinary matter, the G of E asked what would be the case if the club were small and had no independent person to hand it to and what should the club do in that circumstance. The President thought that situation could occur within any of the clubs and they should have processes in place to deal with that occurrence. The G of E asked what should happen if there was a dispute on an interpretation of a rule between the club and the member, or furthermore, if the complaint was against a club officer, they felt that in such cases there should be an independent body available. They went on to suggest that there be two disciplinary processes to be in place to cover such eventualities.

The MCG said that the G of E was meaning that FB should deal with some disciplinary cases, in order to provide impartiality. They were in agreement with that point but felt that clubs should deal with a case in the first instance.

The President emphasised that the meeting was discussing the report, but that over the coming months those views would be considered at length.

### **Hearings commissions**

The President asked the meeting for any comments the clubs wished to be minuted.

The MCG referred to the third paragraph in which it was stated that complaints had failed due to rules not being circulated. They queried if a member could claim ignorance. The President explained that this was not what the comment meant, but understood the point of view expressed.

### **BREEDING HEALTH AND WELFARE COMMISSION**

A report had been circulated prior to the meeting and Mrs Gardner asked for any questions.

The G of E asked what was meant by the phrase 'verification and amendment' within the report. The President stated that it referred to the cats in the pedigree, behind the cat being registered.

The H of E asked about the progress on the newly appointed deputy registrar. The President explained that the new deputy, Mrs Rose Kitching was just waiting to undertake the software training.

The President adjourned the meeting for a fifteen minute break at 3.20pm

### **14. Elections**

The President explained that there had been some debate on how the voting was to be undertaken, as in the past two years different systems had been used. He went on to suggest that now FB was receiving more applications for positions, it should adopt the FIFe system. Within this system the clubs vote on which candidates were to fill the full member positions and the remaining candidates to be voted on as reserve members.

The President went on to remind the meeting that an abstention would be counted as a NO vote and that an absolute majority was needed to be elected, which for the current meeting was eight votes.

VCC enquired about the procedure for absent candidates. The President explained that absent candidates would have their reason for absence voted on as and when they came up followed by, if their candidature was accepted, the full vote.

### **General Secretary**

Frances de Courcy Rolls	YES	15	NO	unanimously elected
-------------------------	-----	----	----	---------------------

The President announced that Mr Linden-Wyatt had withdrawn his candidacy for the following position.

**Deputy General Secretary**

Tina Clark	YES	8	NO	7	elected by a majority
------------	-----	---	----	---	-----------------------

**Treasurer**

Julie Ann Harris	YES	8	NO	7	elected by a majority
------------------	-----	---	----	---	-----------------------

**Vice President**

Eddie Kitching	YES	4	NO	11	elected by a majority
Rob Hart-Jones	YES	11	NO	4	

**Deputy Vice President**

Sarah Errington	YES	15	NO		unanimously elected
-----------------	-----	----	----	--	---------------------

**Chairman of Show Commission**

Penny Bydlinski	YES	11	NO	4	elected by a majority
-----------------	-----	----	----	---	-----------------------

**Show Commission members (Full x 2)**

John Cunningham	YES	4	NO		elected by a majority
Mrs Tina Clark	YES	8	NO		
Mrs Nicola Loughran	YES	3	NO		unanimously elected
Mrs Jan Upton	YES	15	NO		

**Show commission members (reserve x 2)**

John Cunningham	YES	10	NO	5	elected by a majority
Mrs Nicola Loughran	YES	8	NO	7	elected by a majority

**Chairman of Breeding Health and Welfare Commission**

Melanie Gardner	YES	15	NO		unanimously elected
-----------------	-----	----	----	--	---------------------

**B, H & W Commission members (Full x3)**

## Vote on absence

Mrs Carole Gainsbury	YES	15	NO		unanimously accepted
Ms Sylvia Hauser	YES	8	NO	7	accepted by a majority
Mrs Sally French	YES	8	NO	7	accepted by a majority
Mr Stephen Linden-Wyatt	YES	8	NO	7	accepted by a majority

## Vote (on full x 3)

Mrs Carole Gainsbury	YES	3	NO		accepted by a majority
Ms Sylvia Hauser	YES	4	NO		
Mrs Sally French	YES	9	NO		unanimously accepted
Ms Birgit Solstein	YES	11	NO		
Mr David Brincombe	YES	9	NO		accepted by a majority
Mr Stephen Linden-Wyatt	YES	3	NO		
Mrs Margaret McCrerrick	YES	6	NO		

## Vote (on reserve x 2)

Mrs Carole Gainsbury	YES	11	NO		unanimously accepted
Ms Sylvia Hauser	YES	4	NO		

Mr Stephen Linden-Wyatt	YES	8	NO		accepted by a majority
Mrs Margaret McCrerrick	YES	7	NO		

**Election of Chair of the Judges Commission**

Penny Bydlinski	YES	15	NO		unanimously accepted
-----------------	-----	----	----	--	----------------------

**Election of Chair of Investigations Commission**

Ted Turpin	YES	15	NO		unanimously accepted
------------	-----	----	----	--	----------------------

**Election of Chair of Hearings Commission**

Pat de Courcy Rolls	YES	7	NO	8	not accepted by a majority
---------------------	-----	---	----	---	----------------------------

**Election of chair of appeals Commission**

Vote on absence

Keith Butterworth	YES	8	NO	7	accepted by a majority
-------------------	-----	---	----	---	------------------------

Vote

Keith Butterworth	YES	8	NO	7	accepted by a majority
-------------------	-----	---	----	---	------------------------

The President asked if the meeting wished to proceed for the next two agenda items before closing for the day as it was five pm. The meeting agreed to carry on.

**14. Determination of fees for the period 01-01-2007 – 31-12-2007**

The President made the comment that the fees should have been set for the coming year as it was currently 2006. He asked the meeting if it should be determining fees for this year, as per item 6.20 k in the statutes.

The Aristocats disagreed with this, as this current year 2006 was voted on at the last AGA and the current AGA was to vote for the year 2007. The G of E commented that it was probably a translation difference that had caused the issue, and that it depended on when the AGA were held; if it were held in December then the coming year would mean the following year. The President asked if it were only a grammatical issue and did not need a proposal to change it in the statutes to read 'the next fiscal year.'

The President asked for someone to propose a change to 'the next fiscal year'. The G of E proposed the change and it was seconded by the Aristocats and MCG. The change to 'the next fiscal year' accepted unanimously

The President asked the Treasurer to present the budgeted fees.

The Aristocats asked if the Treasurer recommended an increase. The G of E stated that there would have had to have been a proposal for any increase. The President asked why they were always included on the agenda; the G of E explained that they were included as they had to be agreed every year in case a member wished to discuss them.

The H of E suggested that item 15 be discussed before item 14. The President agreed, however the Aristocats expressed disagreement as the accounts had not been presented correctly. The H of E stated that a £2000 profit was a big enough safety net upon which to

decide such things and they thought that figure should increase over the coming year due to the increased number of shows being held. The G of E thought that the budget had been based on the figures from the previous year so there was no need for the Treasurer to make any increases. The President emphasised that with no proposal for an increase in fees before the AGA, there could not be a vote for an increase.

The President proposed to accept the fees with no increase; this was seconded by the G of E and was unanimously accepted.

The President made the comment that again with no proposal to increase the honorarium for the registrar a vote could not be taken to increase the fee. The G of E proposed that the fee be accepted as it stood, this was seconded by the H of E. This was unanimously accepted

### **15. The Budget for 01-01-2007 – 31-12-2007**

The H of E commented that the registration fee was indicated as increasing yet it had been voted on for the fee to remain the same. They went on to ask if the fee included the deputy registrar. The President explained that the figure would be split between the registrar and deputy registrar depending on the amount of work undertaken respectively. The H of E asked if the registrar and deputy registrar were happy with that method. Mrs Gardener replied that it was her understanding that it had always been carried out using this method. The Aristocats commented that at the last AGA a proviso had been made to make a discretionary payment to the Registrar. The President asked if such a payment should be based on performance rather than the amount of work. The MCG felt that it should be based on performance to which the President replied that the clubs should have their own performance criteria in place. The H of E commented that that created more work and in fact just needed the job completed. The President pointed out that the meeting needed to consider that as the clubs grew in the future and the work load increased that, as in other countries, a full-time registrar would need to be appointed. He went on to suggest that a method could be put in place, where FB would be in the position to pay a performance related fee to the registrar using a figure based on all income,

At this point the President and Mrs Gardner offered to leave the room in order for the meeting to discuss the matter. The meeting did not think it was necessary. The G of E agreed with the suggestion made by the President and stated that it was not the amount but the structure by which it would be paid that needed to be discussed. They then referred to the previous AGA where the EC had been given the ability to make a discretionary payment based on the figures placed before them and that the fee was an honorarium, not a wage. The President agreed with this and commented that it was a good point. The G of E asked if such a decision was for the AGA or the EC to make. The Aristocats commented that the only subject that could not be openly discussed at an AGA was personal voting. The President pointed out that this was about voting and was not just a discussion.

Mr E Kitching the Aristocats delegate left the meeting at 5.40pm, leaving Mrs McCrerrick the advisor representing the Aristocats.

The VCC suggested that this matter was perhaps a proposal for next year and until then the clubs had to trust the EC to make the correct decision. They also suggested that the President could absent himself from the discussion if he felt he should not be present. The MCG suggested that a committee which would include the President could be formed to undertake the decision.

The G of E commented that the amount of £150 a month is a very low figure for the amount of work being done and appreciation of that should be reflected in an increase. The H of E agreed with the MGC's suggestion that a sub committee be formed. The President stated that this would be something for the EC to discuss at its next meeting.

The VCC queried the amounts in the budget for the FIFe AGA and the budget for the EC expenses, since the accounts showed a discrepancy. The President explained that those decisions could not be made or discussed, as the accounts were currently not correctly attributed to the right headings. The VCC asked if, in that case, the meeting were able to vote on the budget. The President stated that the meeting could vote. The President asked for someone to propose and second the approval of the budget. The H of E proposed and the MCG seconded. The budget was accepted unanimously

The President then closed the meeting at 5.50pm

### **Sunday 19<sup>th</sup> of February**

The President opened the Meeting at 9.17am

The President reminded the meeting of the change agreed to the agenda whereby the club proposals would be dealt with prior to the commission's proposals.

### **17. CLUB PROPOSALS**

#### **Maine Coon Guild**

The President asked the Guild to put their proposal to the meeting.

The MCG explained that they were finding it increasingly hard to finance their shows and that they had written to the EC regarding this proposal. The EC had rightly turned down the request but had stated that the MCG could put it as a proposal to the AGA.

The MCG stated that the proposal is to help all the clubs by having FB pay for some of the expenses, for instance the vet's fees, involved with running shows.

The President opened the proposal for comments from the meeting. The H of E expressed sympathy for the MCG and the increased costs they were incurring running their shows, making them difficult to stage. However they did not agree with a blanket acceptance of a proposal such as this. The VCC stated that it would cost FB approx £2850 for 2006 if this proposal were to be passed and that this would be a substantial amount to be deducted from the accounts. They also pointed out that clubs were getting sponsorship from Royal Canin. The Aristocats commented that they would rather see FB help clubs on an individual basis, if a club found itself in a position of having had a very bad show financially.

The President explained that FB would currently do this. The MCG commented that the original proposal had been a request prior to the show for FB to agree to underwrite any losses the club made; a modified proposal was being presented. They went on to explain that they were concerned about sustaining any further losses that they might incur and watch the club flounder, without foreseeing some of the problems and requesting help from FB. However they appreciated that FB was still a relatively young organisation, and that a fixed amount rather than a blank cheque, would be easier for the clubs to agree upon at the AGA.

The President pointed out that FB would have to budget for such a proposal, he went on to express the understanding that clubs were finding it hard to break even and that when asked for advice, he advised clubs to have a bank balance of around £2000 in order to safely run a show and cope with any losses that they might incur. He explained that he was hesitant for FB to undertake set expenses for clubs. The Aristocats commented that under this proposal even if the club made a profit FB would have to pay the expenses.

The MCG explained that they were looking to advertise more and perhaps an advert in Our Cats needed to be taken. The H of E stated that it was £82 for a ¼ page in Our Cats, the President at this time informed the meeting that FB had allocated approx £2000 to publicise FB shows, the first advert had already been placed in Our Cats in which all shows were listed. He went on to explain that in order for FB to fund this proposal, if passed, they would have to cease this advertising.

The MCG commented that they needed to go back to their committee and discuss measures that could be taken to minimise losses. The President asked the meeting if there was anything else the MCG could do. The H of E expressed the problem that late entries caused. The Aristocats asked if clubs could risk a show, for example a club to close entries on the show date as published and risk low entries. The MCG stated they had done this with their last show and had received the required entries for an international show. The President explained that many of the clubs still take entries the week of the show. The Aristocats commented that it was necessary to enforce receipt of entries by the closing date, in order to allow clubs to process the paperwork and make any advance payments.

The H of E suggested that the clubs should all agree that late entries would only be accepted at a premium. The G of E made the comment that this had all been tried before, the early bird discount had been brought in to encourage earlier entries but people still send in entries late. The President suggested that it may be time to increase the cost of an entry, the H of E stated that they did not think that was an option at the current moment in time but might be something to consider in the future. The President stated that an increase of 10-15 % would help with the lack of entries if clubs enforced a closing date. The G of E asked what would happen if after the closing date the club still did not have enough entries for an international show, for example 90 cats. The Aristocats suggest that in that situation FIFe would have to be approached. The President stated that if the entry was below 120 cats, then FIFe would not consider dispensation for an international licence.

The MCG suggested that location was the critical factor that could be looked at as the way forward in increasing the number of cats rather than increasing the cost of entries which might discourage exhibitors.

The President expressed the opinion that the clubs were too timid in increasing prices and that the early bird discount had been removed for the latest VCC show and they had only had one complaint, he further considered that an exhibitor would probably pay a late entry penalty fee. The Aristocats asked what the current practice within the GCCF was. The G of E explained that the distinction between the two organisations were the exhibitors, the GCCF exhibitors were used to entering shows a month in advance of the due date and as there were more exhibitors within GCCF, they were able to return late entries. The current average price of entries at a GCCF show was £26.00 which included 3 additional classes, plus catalogue at £4.00 with all rosettes provided.

The MCG commented that they had come to the end of their early bird time frame for their next show and currently only had 9 entries. They had toyed with the idea of not allowing cats to share pens so all cats would be in a single pen as they do at GCCF. Mrs Errington suggested that the shows should avoid being held within the same area and timeframe as other larger GCCF shows.

The H of E disagreed with the MCG regarding the idea of single pens as exhibitors with cats in category two wanted a double pen. The G of E stated that advertising needed to be undertaken a lot earlier than it was being done currently as GCCF exhibitors plan which shows they are going to attend months in advance. The President added that a reason for exhibitors choosing an FB show was that they can pen several cats together. The H of E also commented that it was more cost effective to enter multiple cats in an FB show.

The President asked if the MCG wished to amend or withdraw the proposal before it was put to the vote. The MCG withdrew the proposal. The President suggested that the MCG discussed the subject with other clubs in the coming months, maybe at EC meetings.

### **Aristocats Cat Club**

The President asked the Aristocats to put their first proposal to the meeting, it read

Clarification of Statute 4.10.i) ii) should read: Issue show licenses and can also revoke show licenses with the prior approval of the Executive Committee and based on non-compliance of Felis Britannica Show Rules.

#### **Motivation:**

The revoking of a clubs show license is far too big a responsibility for the Show Commission to handle alone. There are too many far reaching consequences which need to be taken into consideration, affecting more than just the clubs, from such an action. It can also affect the venue, stallholders, penning companies, judges, exhibitors etc. all of whom will have planned and made their arrangements for the show date. It is not a decision that should be taken lightly and it should not continue to be allowed to be used as a threat to clubs as a means of forcing any unnecessary compliance from them regarding matters that are not in the show rules.

It is important therefore that any threat to revoke said license should have the agreement of the Executive Committee before it is made.

Any appeals can still be made against the revocation to the Executive Committee through the Office of the General Secretary.

The VCC stated that this was not a clarification but a change; they went further to state that the show commission would be best placed to decide on the matter of licences as the motivation behind the proposal contained far reaching considerations. They then asked what the point of appealing to the EC was. Mrs Bydlinski stated that EC agreement was not needed for a show licence. The H of E highlighted that the right of appeal to the EC over a decision would be correct and they would be in agreement with this. The Aristocats clarified that they were meaning licenses that had already been issued.

The Aristocats withdrew their proposal and the VCC wished it minuted that they objected to the Aristocats making things personal within the AGA. The President agreed and stated that there was no need for this.

The President asked the Aristocats to put their second proposal to the meeting, it read

That a database is set up enabling non FB/FIFe members to validate their show successes without having to join a club, but still use a Full Member club to do so.

**Motivation:**

This is a service which is used by some of our European counterparts such as Felikat and it is felt that it would strengthen our 'open doors' policy if we were to do the same. It would eliminate one of the reasons that GCCF people use for not showing with FIFe i.e. not wanting to join a FIFe club in order to claim their show successes.

It would need to be made clear that they would need to process their validations through one of the Full Member clubs. They could purchase a validation certificate and a rosette, and they would have the Certificate of Award and Judges Reports endorsed by the club. The club could send a notification of validation through to Registrations as they do now. However, they would not have the pedigree endorsed. It is felt also that a by-product of this service would be a tendency for them to join the club with which they are validating.

The principle behind the proposal is to encourage more GCCF members to show with FIFe and hopefully eventually join us.

The Aristocats believed that more people would show more if they did not have to join an FB club in order to validate titles, hence the need to set up a database. The VCC made the comment that this would be a complete nightmare to process, and why offer a service validating titles that would avoid the members paying subs, the H of E agreed with this point of view. The President asked the Aristocats to clarify their motivation for this proposal. The Aristocats explained that it was seen as blackmail for exhibitors if, in order to validate titles, they had to join a club. The President stated that FIFe do validate titles if the exhibitor is not a member of a FB club, and that it is not stated that clubs must do this service. The VCC asked what did exhibitors wish to do with these validations, since they do not get a pedigree and currently they could add the title on the pedigrees they produce themselves, so what was the point.

The Aristocats withdrew their proposal.

The President asked the meeting if they objected to Mr David Brinicombe addressing the meeting from the floor, the meeting did not object.

Mr Brinicombe expressed the opinion that the reason people from within GCCF do not join FB is the need to register all kittens first with FB. The President considered that whilst this was partly true, there was also some misrepresentation since they could just declare their litters. He thought that maybe FB should look into the fee for doing this and even consider waiving it completely. The G of E asked if, from a registrar's point of view, this would be feasible. Mrs Gardener stated that it would not. The President then suggested that this matter be looked into within EC meetings if it was acting as a deterrent to new members joining FB.

## Heart of England Cat Club Proposal

The President asked for the Heart of England to put their proposal to the meeting, it read:

It is proposed that the FB Executive Committee be increased from four (4) to six (6). The Statutes are to be adjusted as follows:

### **Article 4.1 a) be amended to read:**

The Executive Committee shall comprise of an elected President, Vice President, Treasurer, General Secretary *and two (2) other executive officers.*

*These six (6) executive officers shall not hold any other office within Felis Britannica.*

### **Article 4.1 c) be amended to read:**

If the Vice President, Treasurer or General Secretary are unavailable, or otherwise occupied, and therefore unable to fulfill their official duties on a particular occasion, then their deputy shall fulfill their duties. The Vice President deputises for the President, should the President be otherwise occupied. *The deputies may also deputise for either of the executive officers without a named office, providing they are not already deputising for another executive officer.*

### **Article 4.1 d) is amended to read:**

*For decisions to be taken at any EC meeting, the President or Vice President, General Secretary and two (2) other executive officers must be present. In other circumstances only recommendations may be made, to be ratified at a future meeting.*

### **Motivation:**

During 2005 the executive committee was made up of 3 Garden of England members plus a Viking Cat Club member. This, although it worked, was in our opinion too heavily biased towards one club. The H of E accepts that the executive was made up of the best, most willing and available members at the time but on reflection the EC could be seen to being single minded.

If accepted the two extra members could be co-opted at the first EC meeting following the AGA. These co-opted members would then stand for election at the following AGA. It would be nice if willing members filled these two extra positions from clubs not represented by the four elected positions.

The H of E explained that the main reason for the proposal was to ensure a better spread of club representation at EC level. The VCC asked for a clarification as to whether this proposal was to enlarge the EC or to limit the number of positions filled from the various clubs. The President expressed the opinion that he had no problem with the proposal but as FB was struggling to fill the current vacant positions, this proposal would only exacerbate this problem. The H of E pointed out that more candidates had come forward at the current AGA. The MCG commented that they would like to think that the EC had the integrity to be above club alliances. The President explained that the reason for the current spilt of club representation amongst the EC was due to the fact that these were the only members willing to put themselves forward to undertake the various roles.

The VCC stated that the idea of a member from each club sitting on the EC would be unmanageable in the long term as FB grew and new clubs were formed. The H of E disagreed and stated that the proposal was to increase the wider spread of club representation within the EC.

The President asked if the H of E would like to amend or withdraw their proposal before it was put to the vote. The H of E wished the proposal be put to the vote. The result of the vote was YES - 4, NO - 11. Proposal not accepted

Viking Cat Club

The President asked the VCC to put their proposal to the meeting. It read:

That all full member clubs of Felis Britannica shall be required to run at least one show per year in their name only.

**Motivation:**

Shows and registrations are the areas that are of most importance to FB members and are those that showcase FB. When choosing to become a full member club, clubs currently commit to provide a registration service. We believe that they should also commit to providing shows for their members.

The H of E expressed disagreement with the proposal as some of the full member clubs are not strong enough to afford to hold a show. The VCC stated that if a club runs a show that makes a loss they can approach the EC as discussed earlier. The H of E commented that it might prevent some clubs moving across from the GCCF if they are required to put on a show as a requirement.

The G of E expressed agreement with the proposal however as some clubs will not comply, what would FB do in that instance. The President stated that he saw the pros and cons of this proposal and that we did not want to discourage clubs forming; however FB needed the full clubs to provide all the services of FIFe and that included a show. He went on to suggest a more structured development plan for clubs to enable them to run such shows. The G of E highlighted that within the old CA this mechanism was in place. The President expressed the need for a re-look at this in more detail.

The VCC withdrew their proposal for rewording.

The President asked the VCC to put their second proposal to the meeting, it read:

Amendment to Statute 6.28c

That statute 6.28c is changed to read as follows (additions in italics):

- “c) The Member Clubs shall distribute the Felis Britannica AGA paperwork to all its Full Individual Members and arrange a club meeting to discuss the forthcoming AGA, determination of the club’s delegate plus advisor and the club’s policy on the AGA proposals/nominations. *The meeting shall be held at such time and place as to make it possible for the largest number of members possible to attend. At least 21 days notice shall be given. A copy of the notice of the meeting shall be sent to the FB*

*General Secretary. FB shall have the right to send an observer to any club meeting. Clubs failing comply with this statute shall forfeit their rights as outlined in Articles 4.10b, 6.3 and 6.10."*

**Motivation:**

It is vital to ensure that as many members as possible are able to attend the club meetings to express their views and ensure that these are represented at the AGA. It is also important that FB has a way of monitoring adherence to the rule and that clubs are made aware of the consequences of non compliance.

The MCG asked what happens in the event of only 4 people turning up. The VCC stated that this would be acceptable as all the members have been given the opportunity to attend the meeting at a location that is amenable.

The President expressed agreement with the proposal as it stops the clubs deliberately putting their meetings on a date and at a location which is inconvenient to the majority. He suggested that maybe the meetings should be on an RSVP basis as seen before in the old CA.

The President asked if the VCC wished to withdraw or make any amendments to the proposal before it is put to the vote but this was not the case. The result of the vote was YES 11, Abstentions 4 (counted as No votes). Proposal accepted

Garden of England Cat Club

The President asked the G of E to put their proposal to the meeting, it read:

Proposal

That the following proposal is brought to the General Assembly of FIFe:

Addition to Breed Council Rules:

New Article 8

**Communication procedure**

The Health & Welfare Commission, the Judges & Standards Commission, the LO Commission or any FIFe Member may, when consulting a Breed Council in its advisory capacity, make direct contact to the relevant Council, via its Secretary, providing that the FIFe General Secretary is copied in on all correspondence.

A Breed Council Secretary seeking to forward a proposal which has been accepted by that breed council in accordance with the rules, may contact the relevant Commission direct providing that the FIFe General Secretary is copied in on all correspondence.

**Motivation:**

The stated purpose of the breed councils is to serve as advisory bodies on breed standards and breeding rules. In order to achieve this, a means of direct communication needs to be established.

At present it is very difficult and time consuming for the Breed Councils to make contact with a Commission regarding any proposals they might wish to bring concerning their breed. Under the current structure of FIFe it is not possible for a Member's member to have direct access to the Commissions. However, since the Members voted to have breed councils, it is logical to find a way for them to work. If the Breed Councils have to go through the General Secretariat, this increases its workload and creates a time delay which is not necessary. An official list of all Breed Council Secretaries or their representative must be made available to the Judges & Standard, LO and Health & Welfare Commissions as well as to all FIFe Members so that there will be no confusion. As long as the General Secretary is copied into all correspondence the Board will be kept informed and is thus able to oversee the BCs and comply with its obligations of care to the Members.

The G of E asked if the meeting objected to Mr D Brinicombe addressing the meeting in order to explain the reasons behind the proposal. The H of E stated that they saw no reason for an explanation regarding the proposal with which they were in favour. The President asked the meeting to vote on not having a presentation of the proposal and putting it put to the vote directly.

Unanimously accepted. The President then put the proposal to the vote. Unanimously accepted

## **16. COMMISSION PROPOSALS**

### **Executive Commission Proposals**

#### **Proposal One**

It is proposed that FB adopts a Data Protection Policy and Data Protection Declaration, this to include a Data Protection Statement to be used in all FB communiqué, including the website, and to be adopted by all FB member clubs.

### **FELIS BRITANNICA Data Protection Policy**

#### **1. Introduction.**

All organisations of any size and status that hold computer records are subject to the provisions of the Data Protection Act although most hobby clubs, such as FB and its member clubs are exempt from the regulatory provisions of the act. FB advises all member clubs to make a declaration of its computing policy to its members.

#### **2. What Computer Data Does FB Hold Regarding Club Members?**

- **Personal Data.** We currently hold on computer records the following data :-
  - Member name address phone number and email address.
  - club membership status – FB club, date of joining, membership type,
  - disciplinary information
- **Show Results.** We currently hold in our computer systems the results of club shows by exhibitor name for any exhibit attending an FB show, together with totals of these results.
- **Registration Data.** We currently hold in our computer systems the details of all breeding cats registered with FB, used for a mating and/or resultant progeny and any ancestors imported as part of such registration.

### 3. Purposes for Which FB Holds Membership Data.

The above data is held by the club for the following purposes:-

- Management of membership records and the federation's income from member clubs.
- Preparing and distributing to members amendments to rules, notification of statutory meetings, and other such information on member matters.
- Monitoring adherence to FB Statutes/rules.
- Sharing disciplinary and welfare matters with like minded cat registries.
- Preparation of the club Web Site.

### 4. Undertakings.

The federation undertakes to ensure as far as it is able that computer records of personal data are accurate and mutually consistent.

The federation undertakes to use member computer records for no other purposes other than those described in this document.

The federation undertakes not to communicate this information to third parties for any purpose other than pursuant with FB objectives and obligations, without the members consent.

The member undertakes when joining the federation to abide by the federation rules. These include an acceptance by the member of the federation's policies and undertakings with regard to the Data Protection Act, as declared in this document

#### Data Protection Declaration

FELIS BRITANNICA is not registered with Data Protection, since it is exempt as a not-for-profit organisation processing data only in such a way that is necessary in order to conduct federation business, obligations and purposes. There is no need for any member club to register independently, but they are free to do so voluntarily if they so wish. However there is a requirement for all clubs, countries and districts to comply with the principles of the Act which are listed below:

1. fairly and lawfully processed
2. processed for limited purposes
3. adequate, relevant and not excessive
4. accurate
5. not kept for longer than is necessary
6. secure and
7. not transferred to countries without adequate protection.

The Data Protection Act also now include restrictions on the use of data for commercial and marketing purposes without the explicit consent of each individual.

There is also a requirement to obtain consent for the collection and storage of data. **However, this is less restrictive and implicit consent can be obtained by ensure that members are given the opportunity read the appropriate clause, for example by publishing it on a website, membership form or notice board at the club headquarters.** There is also a requirement to obtain consent from individuals if their data is to be transferred to a country outside the European Economic Area.

The data protection notice used by FB is below and member clubs are encouraged to use the same wording on their own documentation and to ensure that all members are advised of this clause. It is posted on the FB website; [www.felisbritannica.co.uk](http://www.felisbritannica.co.uk) and printed on FB forms which collect personal data. The current Act also states that parental consent is required for the collection of data for children aged below 12 years of age. As a hobby club we feel that 12 years of age is too low and we have decided that we should obtain parental consent for the collection of data for anyone below 16 years of age.

Please ensure that your members are aware that this clause allows for the collection and use of the data to fulfil the objectives of the organisation only. It does not allow the data to be used for any commercial or marketing purposes.

FELIS BRITANNICA will not use the data, or share the data with any third party for marketing or commercial purposes, without firstly obtaining the explicit consent from individual members.

### **Data Protection – Membership Data Collection – Consent**

*The Data Protection Act 1998 (“the Act”) sets out certain requirements for the protection of your personal information (i.e. information about you) against unauthorised use or disclosure. The Act also gives you certain rights.*

*By virtue of your membership direct or indirect to FELIS BRITANNICA (FB) you agree to your personal data being made available to FB and its member clubs, subject always to compliance with the Data Protection legislation. This does not include sensitive personal data such as health or medical conditions, which require the explicit consent of the data subject i.e. a signature for this specific purpose.*

*Except to the extent that FB is required or permitted by law, the information which you provide in this form, and any other information obtained or provided during the course of your membership (“the Information”) will be used solely for the purposes of processing your application and dealing with you as a member.*

*If you cease to be a member of FB, the information will not be held for longer than is necessary, after which time it will be destroyed.*

*You agree to use all reasonable endeavours to keep FB informed of any changes to your personal data.*

*Revised 1st January 2006*

The President explained that FB has claimed exemption from the Data Protection Act on the basis of being a non-profit making organisation. The stipulations were stricter due to this but he had conversed with the Data Protection officer, who agreed that this proposal covered FB for the records that were kept on file.

The H of E stated they had no problems with the proposal having gone through it with a fine tooth comb. The President explained what the three components of the Data Protection act were. The VCC clarified that the entry forms would have to be amended to include this, the H of E pointed out that it would have to be put on the website. The Aristocats stated that the commission rules were not on the website, the President replied that this was in hand.

The G of E asked on which forms the statement had to be included, was it all those in which a member gave personal details. The President clarified it was to be included on anything that contained names and addresses. The G of E enquired whether the show commission would only be responsible for changing the entry form. The President agreed.

The H of E asked if the member had to tick the box on the back of an entry form. The President stated that it was an auto option declaration and by signing the form the member has opted in. The VCC asked if the clubs had to put it on their own websites. The President explained that it should appear on the FB website and the clubs.

The President put the proposal to the vote and it was unanimously accepted

## **Proposal Two**

Addition of new Statute, 6.18 g)

1. It is obligatory that every full member club shall be represented by a delegate at the AGA.
2. Any full member club failing to comply with 6.18 gi) shall be suspended, with immediate effect, and an explanation for non-attendance shall be submitted, in writing, to the FB GS no later than 21 days after the AGA.
3. Reason(s) for non-attendance shall be considered at the first EC meeting following receipt of the explanation. If found to be reasonable grounds, the suspension shall be lifted with immediate effect, otherwise the matter shall be referred to the DC for consideration of expulsion.
4. If no letter of explanation is received in the required timeframe, the matter shall immediately be passed to the DC.
5. A club so suspended shall be barred from all FB activity during the period of suspension.

**Motivation:** FB is a democratic hierarchy, with individual members being represented in FB and FIFe through the club in which they are a full member. It is therefore an obligation of any FB full member club that they represent their membership at the primary statutory body of the federation, the Annual General Assembly.

The President explained that the proposal was to ensure representation of all members views within FB. The VCC asked what happened regarding club members if the club were to be subsequently suspended, the President replied that the relevant members would be contacted and informed that they could not register kittens through their club but that they had a right to move clubs. He went on to say that there would be period of grace extended to the members for registrations.

The General Secretary pointed out that when this proposal had been discussed at EC level it had been minuted as needing rewording by the President before being brought to the AGA, it had not been.

The President withdrew the proposal which would be re-worded and brought to the next AGA.

### Proposal Three

To be added as an Annex.

The duties, obligations and responsibilities of the Rules Commission shall be passed to the Executive Committee until January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009.

#### Motivation:

FB is still a small organisation, with limited volunteers to fill all the available posts, and doesn't justify a separate commission to deal with rules co-ordination. Until such a time as FB is large enough to justify the need for a separate commission, the FB Executive Committee should deal with such matters. This policy should be reviewed in three (3) years.

The President asked if Mr Kitching wished to say anything. Mr Kitching indicated that he did not wish to add anything.

The President explained that because of the current size of FB it was not big enough to warrant a Commission like this but it would automatically come back in three years time or earlier if the clubs wish for it to be reinstated as a proposal could be brought to the relevant AGA. The President put the proposal to the vote.

The proposal was unanimously accepted

### Proposal four

Article 6.29b should be amended to read *"The Executive Committee is obliged to call an EGA when asked to do so by the accountants to Felis Britannica or when **Member Clubs with at least half the voting rights (as determined by the most recent AGA)** request an EGA. Any demand for an EGA should be made in writing and must state the reason for the request."*

#### Motivation:

The FB clubs have voting at the AGA, based upon the number of Full Members in each club. This form of proportional representation should be reflected in the right to call an EGA; otherwise clubs representing a small minority of the individual members might be able to call an EGA.

The President explained that as FB had a structure of proportional representation, if there were five clubs with a joint membership totalling 200, they could under the current rules force an EAGA despite a total membership within FB of over 650. The H of E had no objections to this proposal.

The President put the proposal to the vote and it was unanimously accepted.

1 Priority Registrations Processing

*Proposal*

That a priority registrations processing service should be given to those full member clubs who have a qualified pedigree checker. Optimum turnaround times between registrar and club to be less than 2 weeks for clubs with a qualified checker and less than 4 weeks for clubs without a qualified checker.

*Motivation*

Qualified pedigree checkers relieve some of the burden on the Registrar and make it much quicker to process registrations. For this the club takes part of the fees. Despite FB taking the whole fee from registrations where the club does not have a qualified checker, the amount retained does not compensate for the extra time these registrations take the Registrar to process. This extra time also holds up registrations from the other clubs as registrations are currently processed in the order they are received.

The H of E asked how long the registrations had been taking in the previous year. Mrs Gardner stated that it took on average 12 days; however the registrations from the clubs with no pedigree checker were taking considerably longer. The President explained that it was in the clubs best interest to have a pedigree checker in place as it boosted the club funds. The MCG stated that they now had a pedigree checker in place so things should improve regarding their club.

The President put the proposal to the vote and it was unanimously accepted

**Proposal 2**

2 Timescales for Club Pedigree Checkers

*Proposal*

That new full member clubs should be required to have a qualified pedigree checker within 12 months of their becoming a full member, and that existing full member clubs should have a qualified pedigree checker within 6 months of the date of this meeting. In the event that these timescales are not met, the club would have their registrations licence revoked.

*Motivation*

The FB Breeding & Registration Rules currently state that a registrations licence will only be issued to full member clubs AFTER the pedigree checkers exam has been passed. In practice this has not been the case, and the first full member clubs were issued with licences without taking the exam.

The existing full member clubs have had 2 years for their pedigree checkers to gain the qualification but only half have done so. It is essential to have a timescale in place to prevent the current situation carrying on indefinitely and to ensure that clubs take registrations processing seriously.

The President expressed the opinion that 12 months was long enough for a club to get a pedigree checker and asked for any further comments.

The President put the proposal to the vote and it was unanimously accepted

### **Show Commission**

#### Addition to Show Rules

Each club, when holding a show, must possess an official stamp indicating the awards "Best in Show" and "Best Opposite Sex"; the Certificate of Award cards of the winning cats must be stamped officially by the Show Manager or his/her representative.

It is also recommended that similar stamps are obtained for the awards of "BIV" and "NOM."

#### Motivation

When titles are validated, particularly those of "Junior Winner" or "Distinguished Show Merit" these awards have to be checked. The process is facilitated if they are obviously officially stamped on the card and not written on by hand. The same applies to BIV and NOM as all these things are recorded on the Diploma.

Mrs Bydlinski stated that this would reduce the time taken to check validations. The H of E asked if it would be easier if on the back of the cards BIV was printed and could be crossed out if not awarded. The President stated that he liked the H of E lateral thinking. Mrs Bydlinski was concerned that if a club omitted to do this, then the work load would be increased. The Aristocats commented that they had just received some award cards from overseas for a title validation and that the stamps were so big they made a mess of the award card, they went on to ask for the size of the stamp to be specified. Mrs Bydlinski agreed this would be done. VCC expressed agreement with the proposal of a stamp as it looked more official than hand writing. They went on to suggest that the award card be printed on the day. The President stated that if the proposal were to be accepted, then the award card would be redesigned to include a square space for the stamp, he went on to comment that printing the award card on the day could be done but as at most shows the secretariat is pushed for time at the end of a show but it might be something to consider again in the future.

The Aristocats suggested that instead of having a stamp or crossing out something, there should be one stamp with it all on and then just cross off the awards not required. The VCC asked about the possibility of stickers. Mrs Bydlinski stated that this could be done as well, as it would be more official than the current practice.

The MCG asked what would happen if the wrong section was crossed off; the Aristocats commented that this already occurred. The President suggested that the individual clubs could be left to decide what method they preferred, stickers or stamps, but not handwritten.

The H of E asked regarding the motivation of the proposal why it mentions DSM etc. as the clubs did not have many of those. Mrs Bydlinski stated that they did take up the most amount of time however all validations took time. The President said that it was the principle rather than the application which was being discussed. Mrs Bydlinski clarified that the reference to a stamp meant an official mark that was not handwritten.

The President put the proposal to the vote and it was unanimously accepted

The H of E asked for a time scale in which the clubs had to implement this decision. The President suggested the 1<sup>st</sup> of July 2006. This was agreed.

The President adjourned the meeting for a break of 15 minutes at 11.05am

### **Rules commission**

Proposal for a statute change.

4.11 a) 'decision making' to be changed to 'advisory'

The President stated that although the rules commission was now disbanded this proposal should still be discussed.

Mr Kitching stated that the EC had requested this change be brought to the AGA as a proposal. He went on to explain that the Disciplinary Commissions findings are recommendations to the EC which are normally rubber stamped by them. The VCC commented that it would have been easier to have the motivation with the proposal for discussion at club level within the meeting with members.

The President put the proposal to the vote and it was unanimously accepted.

### **Disciplinary Commission**

The Aristocats stated that they were concerned by the validity of these proposals as they had not been put forward in the correct proposal format for ratification or as separate proposals. However it was mentioned in the report that Mr C Bennett had offered to help whoever took over his position as Disciplinary Hearings Chairman. The VCC reminded the meeting that the DC rules had been passed at the last AGA as an interim measure.

The H of E stated that the meeting should deal with these due to the urgent need to have some rules. The President agreed as the Disciplinary Commissions needed to have a set of rules to work within. The Aristocats proposed a vote of acceptance, on the validity of the two disciplinary commission's papers before the meeting for discussion. The G of E seconded this proposal. The President put the proposal to the vote and it was unanimously accepted.

The President asked if any of the clubs objected to Mrs Linda Griffin joining them at the table in order to participate in the discussion. The meeting agreed.

Linda Griffin joined the table and the discussion

## **Procedures**

The President asked Mrs Griffin for the background to the formulation of the guidance. Mrs Griffin explained that things have come to her notice whilst doing various investigations that are in need of being sorted out. She went on to explain that it had become apparent, that the individual clubs needed procedures and rules put in place, since many of the complaints were supposed to be dealt with at club level, however, some clubs were not equipped to do this. It had been noticed that the clubs had very limited penalties, there only appeared to be suspension and expulsion, therefore there is a need for them to be constructed. When an appeal comes for hearing then there needs to be clarity of thought and the penalty needed to be looked at separately to the disciplinary offence, as the penalty even if the club was wrong in its procedures, could be correct.

The President stated that it had been suggested that the original model was wrong and it was too much to expect of the clubs.

Mrs Griffin explained that investigating the complaints was a long and hard process. The H of E felt if the complaints were to be referred back to the club, they might need to seek legal advice as there was no-one within the club to deal with it. Mrs Griffin thought that most of the complaints should be fairly low level and that upon writing to the complainant first. The clubs might find some do not respond.

The President asked for comments on the procedures.

The G of E asked why the procedures were not entitled rules. The President explained that they are procedures for the members within FB to follow.

Mrs Griffin stated that the various clubs had rules and only if a complaint was passed to FB would there be a need to have a set. She went on to comment that on looking at the club rules some have added sections unique to their club, for example some clubs state that if a member is not happy they have the right to appeal to FB, this is in fact incorrect and the club should have an appeals process in place.

The President asked the G of E what they would like them to be named. The G of E stated they would like to see the use of the word rules. The MCG expressed disagreement as they did not think that this was necessary. The H of E said that the clubs needed to sort out their respective rules with the help of the disciplinary commission. The President expressed the opinion that at the present moment FB could not process any complaints as a full set of rules had not been passed and circulated.

The G of E queried if the document in front of the meeting were the procedures of how to enforce the rules or the actual rules. Mrs Griffin clarified that it was the procedures. She went on to explain that the clubs needed to ask themselves whether their rules were good enough to deal with complaints in order to give a fair and open hearing.

The VCC asked if FB had the fundamentals of the disciplinary rules correct in the first place, they wondered if the clubs should be dealing with complaints.

The President stated that Mrs Griffin had explained that the idealistic federation model that FB has been trying to create might not be correct. He went on to say that the GCCF deal centrally with all disciplinary matters, however this would mean FB had to do a major shift in emphasis and direction. Mrs Griffin stated that in the cases which had come to the disciplinary investigations and which had then been returned to the clubs, they panel had felt sorry for the complainant who had been referred back to the club.

The President asked the meeting in which direction it thought FB should go as there was no proposal for a change before them. The VCC questioned if there was anything that prevented a proposal being put to the meeting at that point. The President replied that there was not, however he was mindful that the clubs had not had an opportunity to discuss this with their members, therefore it might need to be taken back to the clubs leaving the EC, in conjunction with the disciplinary commission, to draw up a new structure.

The Aristocats asked for a list of what was to be drawn up in order to clarify what the clubs want to be drawn up. The President stated that it was the fundamental question of what disciplinary structure FB was to follow before going further into details. He went on to state that Mrs Griffin's participation in the discussion had been very helpful. Mrs Griffin commented that even though the clubs have different rules which were pertinent to their club, FB had to support the clubs rules as being inclusive and not exclusive. However this would undermine the clubs rules as all clubs would not need the different inclusions, as FB is only the sum of each of its clubs and their rules.

The President agreed that this could not be addressed unless all club rules are the same, which could prove unworkable. The MCG expressed the opinion that a member joins the club and on doing so agrees to abide by that particular club's rules, which did not however preclude FB supporting the club with their rules. The President stated that currently if a member is disciplined within a club for a registrations issue, the other clubs are notified and then decide if they wish to accept that membership if an application is received by that person(s). Mrs Griffin stated that if a club had given a suspension, then that club obviously felt it was just and needed.

The President reiterated the need to answer the question regarding what structure FB was going to follow for disciplinary purposes. The VCC proposed that at this meeting a sub committee be set up to look directly at how FB is going to deal with disciplinary matters, whether as was currently being proposed or whether centrally.

The Aristocats made the comment regarding the situation with the clubs having individual rules, it felt that if had to be standardised, it could be a very long and drawn out process. The MCG pointed out that if FB were to deal with all minor problems through the clubs, based on one set of rules, it would not be workable and they were wary of the size of the organisation to adopt a central structure.

The H of E expressed agreement that there needed to be a central FB disciplinary procedure for anything that infringed an FB/FIFe rule.

The President referring to the VCC proposal made earlier agreed something had to be decided at the current meeting. The VCC asked the G of E advisor Mrs Johnson to explain the GCCF system.

Mrs Johnson briefly outlined the GCCF system. All clubs have their own rules, which they were given guidelines on how to construct. Some items had to be included within the club rules that referred to the GCCF rules. The GCCF then has a set of rules governing registrations, showing, breeding etc. If the club member broke the club rules the club dealt with it, however, if they broke the GCCF rules it was dealt with centrally by a disciplinary board, which all members had been elected to sit on, not just the chairman.

The Aristocats clarified that the clubs have their own set of rules and if these are broken the club deals with the matter, if the matter involved GCCF rules, it could not be dealt with at club level but was passed on to disciplinary, but at the same time the disciplinary body recognised the club rules.

The G of E clarified that the GCCF were in control of enforcing the rules that applied to everyone within the GCCF, the clubs were not. The Clubs are only in charge of enforcing their rules; any breach of the GCCF rules was passed on to the GCCF disciplinary investigations board.

The VCC stated that this appeared to be a very sensible system. The G of E clarified that the system in order to work would have to be scaled down within FB. The President asked if this system would be able to accommodate FIFe documents. The G of E said that the rules were in sections so could be included at the relevant points.

The Aristocats clarified that at present the clubs have their own disciplinary rules, and that the meeting has two proposals in front of them. They went on to request that a discussion take place on how to move things forward. The President brought to the meeting's attention that the GCCF sent out a document to defendants at the beginning of the disciplinary process, which was very similar to the document before them at this meeting.

The Aristocats made the proposal that the clubs use the disciplinary rules currently in use as they stand and that the current proposed rules were to be looked at subsequently. The VCC said that they could not make that decision as the SBA was not present at the discussion regardless of whether or not had a vote at the meeting. The G of E queried in what area would a club govern that would not be governed by FB if the different structure were to be adopted. The President commented that this was a question that needed to be discussed along with everything else. The H of E commented that they did not think that the current rules could cope with a large disciplinary case.

The President stated that this was not what was under discussion but rather if the structure should be changed. The MCG commented that the discussion was steering towards a generic set of club rules being in place and that every club could then add any pertinent rules they wished but the general basis was to be the same for all the clubs.

The VCC asked for clarification on what the proposal was. The Aristocats explained that all clubs would have their own set of rules which would be based on a generic set; FB would then undertake to create a new set of FB rules. The President disagreed as this was not what was being discussed since a set of rules was already in existence.

The H of E clarified that there were three sets of rules needed a club set, a set for FB and the FIFe set. The President agreed with this however the fundamentals of the club rules needed to comply with FB rules.

The President proposed to the meeting that a body be created to draw up a structure that FB could implement which would in general follow the GCCF system. The system would be discussed and finalised in conjunction with the EC at its meetings. The EC would then bring the complete system back to the next AGA as a final proposal.

This proposal was seconded by the VCC and H of E and was unanimously accepted.

The VCC then proposed a vote of thanks for Mrs Griffin and Mr Bennett for all the hard work they had put into the disciplinary rules. This proposal was seconded by the meeting.

Mrs Griffin queried if the clubs were going to be asked to have in place a disciplinary procedure in order to cope with complaints. The President clarified that this would form part of the sub committee discussion.

VCC asked what was to happen to the existing cases currently in the disciplinary pipeline. The President asked Mrs Johnson what her thoughts were. She stated that the process of dealing with them would have to carry on as it might otherwise disadvantage the defendant. The President expressed the need for the sub committee to agree on a system as soon as possible. He went on to ask who the meeting would propose to be on the sub committee, he proposed Mr Hart-Jones, Mr Butterworth and Mr Turpin. As advisors Mr Bennett, Mrs Griffin and Mrs Johnson. These proposals were seconded by the VCC and were accepted unanimously.

The President stated a need for a time scale; he asked Mr Hart-Jones and Mr Turpin if they could have a skeleton draft by the next EC meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup> of April. They both agreed to this date.

The Aristocats asked what was the process now with the disciplinary original proposals before the meeting. The President asked Mrs Griffin as the disciplinary representative present if she wished to withdraw the proposals. Mrs Griffin withdrew the proposals.

The meeting broke for Lunch at 1.10pm for an hour

### **18. A.O.B.**

The President stated he had several notes for items to be brought up under AOB. He went on to point out that the meeting had not dealt with apologies; therefore they would be dealt with now. Apologies had been received from Ms S French, Mrs C Gainsbury.

The President read out the 4 items on his list that had been made regarding matters the Aristocats had requested to be brought up under AOB. These were the World Cat Congress show, FB Outlook magazine, the Show commission and advertising.

The President started with advertising and asked the Aristocats for their comments. The Aristocats asked who had been responsible for arranging the adverts. Mr Linden-Wyatt stated that he had placed the first one but Mrs Bydlinski had then taken over. The Aristocats then stated that the first advert had been good but the rest had been 'crap'. The President asked for clarification, the Aristocats read out the adverts that had been placed and pointed out the differences between FB advertising and the GCCF advertising. They went on to ask why the adverts were so late for the FB shows. The H of E clarified that the GCCF does not advertise as a whole, it was the individual clubs which advertised.

The issue deadlines did not correspond with our shows but we accept later entries which compensated. He went on to add that the adverts in Cat World were not going after GCCF exhibitors, to this end it would be better to advertise in Our Cats.

The VCC explained that the GCCF clubs advertise at the back of Our Cats. The President highlighted that at an EC meeting it had been decided that the advertising for FB would be in Cat World. Mrs Bydlinski explained that the agreement with Cat World had been for a feature article and an advert; this deal had not been honoured by Cat World. The President asked at what point she had become aware that the agreement was not being honoured. Mrs Bydlinski stated that unfortunately since she did not take Cat World herself, some time had gone by before she was aware of it. She understood that in fact only a couple of articles had been published... The President commented that this should have been chased up at the time and Mrs Bydlinski agreed.

The President moved on to the item of the World Cat Congress, he asked the Aristocats for their comments. The Aristocats indicated they had nothing to say.

With this the President moved on to the item of FB outlook magazine, and again asked for the Aristocats comments. The Aristocats indicated that they had no further comments to add.

The Aristocats had no further comments for the item of the Show Commission

The President asked if there was anything else for AOB.

Mrs Gardner stated that the clubs should be reminding their members that the FIFe rule regarding micro chipping will be coming into force as at 1<sup>st</sup> January 2007, therefore in order to register kittens the parents need to be micro chipped.

The President explained that FB was in the situation that four of their clubs had not paid their membership fees for over 12 months, one of these being a full club. Prior to the last AGA the Millennium had been contacted and their fees had been waived, nothing more had been heard from them. The Bob Cats, Albion and Snowshoe clubs had not paid their fees for the current year and were thus currently suspended. The President explained that, in accordance with the statutes, these clubs were considered to have relinquished their membership as a club within FB. Any members of these clubs who were known to FB would be contacted and informed of the situation.

The President asked if there were any other matters under this heading and as there were none, he closed the meeting at 2.27 p.m.

Minutes of the post AGA EC meeting,  
Held at Stoke Rochford Hall,  
19<sup>th</sup> February 2006

**Present:**

Neil Gardner (President)  
Frances de Courcy Rolls (General Secretary)  
Julie-Ann Harris (Treasurer)  
Rob Hart-Jones (Deputy President)  
Penelope Bydlinski (Chair of the Show Commission)

The President opened the meeting by welcoming Rob Hart-Jones as the new Vice President to the EC

**Election of an FB Advisor for the FIFe GA**

The statutes state that the delegate will always be the President of FB, however an advisor needed to be elected, the President proposed Frances de Courcy Rolls and this was unanimously agreed

**FB Accounts**

The President expressed the need to have the accounts audited and completed by the next EC meeting and asked Mrs Harris if there would be any problem with this. Mrs Harris stated that they needed sorting out with regards to itemising line items. She went on to comment that the accounts had been a struggle for her in the current year as she had had many other commitments. If she were to have a deputy this would allow her to pass on some of the work, thus lessening the load and, if the deputy were capable, in the long term he or she could take the Treasurer's position whilst she could take another position within FB. The President asked what accounting system she was currently using. Mrs Harris stated that it was QuickBooks and that it was proving hard to use. Mrs Bydlinski suggested asking the Treasurer of the G of E, who is an accountant, for some help in understanding QuickBooks. The President asked why QuickBooks were chosen and had Mrs Harris considered the Sage accounting system. Mrs Harris explained that QuickBooks had been recommended as the system to use and that she had not heard of the Sage accounting system.

The President suggested that Mrs Harris, because of the need to save time and get the accounts completed by the 29<sup>th</sup> of April, hire an accountant for whom FB would pay, to ensure the accounts were correct. Mr Hart-Jones and Miss de Courcy Rolls agreed that this would be the best course of action to help Mrs Harris.

The President then requested that at the EC meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup> of April a full breakdown of the current year's accounts be presented, as mentioned at the AGA the EC should have been asking for financial reports on a regular basis to ensure they were being kept up-to-date.

Mrs Bydlinski brought up the matter of the defeated H of E proposal regarding the enlarging of the EC. She stated that the motivation was incorrect for the proposal brought by the H of E; however, she thought there was a need to increase the number on the EC and that the simplest way of doing this would be to incorporate the deputy General Secretary and the

Deputy Treasurer into the EC. Both the President and Miss de Courcy Rolls pointed out that as the proposal was defeated at this AGA, it could not be brought back as a proposal for two years. Mrs Bydlinski stated that she was raising it as a matter for discussion at some point in the coming year. The President commented that it could be brought up at a later date. Mrs Harris suggested Mr Linden-Wyatt for the position of deputy treasurer; the President stated that this should be discussed at a full EC meeting as there might also be other candidates for consideration.

Miss de Courcy Rolls pointed out that the signatories needed to be changed on the bank account as Mr Hart-Jones had been elected to the EC. The President undertook to sort this out.

The President closed the meeting at 3.45pm

FB AGA 2006 minutes