



Member of the World Cat Congress

MINUTES OF THE 39TH ANNUAL GENERAL MEEING OF THE NEW ZEALAND CAT FANCY INCORPORATED, HELD 9TH OCTOBER 2010 AT THE BLUEWATER QUAYSIDE CONFERENCE CENTRE, WEST QUAY, NAPIER

Item 1	Attendance & Apologies	
Roll Call:	Gaynor Saxon (Chairman)	
	EC Secretary – Chris M Lowe	
	Marion Petley	
	Margaret Bean	Deb Chesterfield
	Janice Davey	Annette Dunn
	Paul Flanagan	Sue Ford
	Ian Gray	Diane Holtom
	Dianne LeBas	Colleen McCready
	Jennie Paul	Lyall Payne
	Marion Petley	Zena Pigden
	Val Richards	Rob Shirley
	Cheryle St Clair-Newman	Vicki-Marie Thomson

Apologies: Jan Gray, Paddy Smith, Val Ball, Kay MacArthur, Sue Gordon, Kay Hood, Robyn Morrison,

Lyall Payne/ Diane LeBas: “That the apologies be accepted.” CARRIED

Item 2 Announcements

- Election Results read by the EC Secretary
(7 invalid votes 167 votes registered)

Breed Standards Council – Roy Griffiths
Judges Council – Lyall Payne
Executive Council – Lyall Payne 70, Cheryle St Clair-Newman 76,
Gaynor Saxon 55, Paddy Smith 86

Item 3 Confirmation of the minutes of the 38th AGM 2009
Ian Gray /Lyll Payne “That the minutes are taken as read & received” CARRIED

Corrections to the minutes – tabled by Rob Shirley

Pg 6 Lyll Payne (2nd bottom paragraph) like to congratulate you on your accounts, and also thank you for being the voice

Pg 7 Lyll Payne **received** with acclamation
communications have been will

Pg 8 (re: Janice Davey) delete the word in (to read is still willing to)

Wanda Kent – delete (2nd) it is not working

Page 11 at the top – too not two

Page 14 – Rob Shirley (line 5) range of responses not ranch

8th line Rob Shirley – delete the word membership has not **spoken not**

Page 23 3rd paragraph line 1 – missed informed to read misinformed

3rd paragraph line 3 “appalled” to read “applaud”

Page 23 – last line rob to read Rob Shirley

Pg 25 – conversation ratio of votes – motion 77 71% needs fixing up 70.71 motion lost

Page 31 Sue Gordon speaking – **to feel** special

Deb Armishaw – to choose rather than choice

9.G4 (b) Davey (add the surname)

Page 33 Lyll Payne – Passed not Past

Pg 36 adjourning Deb Armishaw

Pg 38 did not second the motion – Margaret said that “you make it a motion” happy to let it stand as Rob Shirley

Pg 42 “raped” to be “wrapped”

Pg 44 **motion** – attention to read addition

Pg 45 – Ian Gray on behalf of the membership – carried with acclamation

Kay Hood – stare to read steer

Add to the Apologies: Elizabeth McGraw

Margaret Bean/ Jenni Paul

“That the Minutes as amended of the 38th AGM be approved as true and correct record of the meeting.” CARRIED

Item 4 Matters arising from the minutes – there were no matters arising that do not make up part of the agenda for this meeting.

Item 5 Executive Council Chairman – Annual Report

Lyll Payne/Ian Gray: “That the Executive Council Chairman’s report be received and opened for discussion.” CARRIED

Lyll Payne – I would like to congratulate the whole Executive Council on some of the wonderful work done by the Executive Council in the last year. The highlight for me

was the incorporation of the Catz Inc and Waratah registrations. There needs to be greater messages coming from the Executive Council regarding that great work.

With the EC concentrating on the ability to do things on line, I would like to see the next EC have greater focus on the good work and just how they come to the decisions. I attend the meetings as an observer – and I have witnessed just how difficult some of the decisions have been to make. My recommendation to go forward is to put some messages out there as to why you have made the decisions. This will stop the negativity and keep members better informed.

Chair: It is communication there are a lot of people who would not appreciate the struggle that the EC go through to make the right decision for the membership. I would like to thank you Lyall and I know that the EC are appreciative of your comments.

Gaynor Saxon/ Ian Gray that EC Chairman’s report be adopted Carried

(a) Business Administration & Finance – Annette Dunn

Annette Dunn/Lyall Payne “that the Business Administration report be accepted and opened for discussion.” Carried

Rob Shirley – re: the Portfolio Managers comments re: changes being worked on regarding disputes is this in terms of the wording in the document that we have just received?

Annette Dunn - EC have been in discussion for sometime regarding the costs of the Disputes Process therefore this will become part of the review of the document – specifically the disputes process, even if the case is proven against the member we need to be able to recoup at least the costs \$250 at this stage nothing is in concrete – Another working committee could be set up to look at the DDP (Disputes & Discipline Procedure).

Rob Shirley – so are you saying that this will be a revamping of the unmanageable discipline process that we have at the moment?

Paul Flanagan – rules have been taken out and linked and combined in the constitution. All the rules have been moved into the separate rules booklet – as far as the DDP goes the main body of the document needs to be reviewed. The DDP itself will still have some conflict with the constitution – because it is not a fully workable procedure.

Lyall Payne – I am not sure that it is that the DDP is not workable it is about the cost to the cat fancy there need to be clearer rules about the DDP process – it has to be

quite clear about the difference between the types of complaints. The EC Secretary has to decide if this is a complaint or not. There should be very clear rules about how the case has been laid out. Member complaints against a member – correct justice is free but there should be a minimum fine to the person involved – it should cost. A members complaint when a complaint is proved – the cost \$250 should be imposed for doing the wrong thing.

When the complainant is a member of the general public against an NZCF breeder – a perfect place for those should be with the Disputes Tribunal. When it does not necessarily work under our process, they are then taking the NZCF file to the Disputes Tribunal. Let’s face it we all know each other and sometimes when a complaint comes back to EC on appeal how they can be objective in the decision making.

Annette Dunn – EC need to be a lot more proactive when dealing with issues under the DDP especially with repeat offenders – we acknowledge that there are major issues with the process.

Chair: The DDP is part of the focus for the coming year. The cost is being enforced on the membership when a member of the public comes to the NZCF website or Trademe they see the name of NZCF being advertised and therefore think that NZCF is the correct path – NZCF has a responsibility to protect its reputation.

Lyll Payne /Val Richards “That the Business Administration report minus the Financials be adopted.”

Carried

(b) Information Technology Report

Paul Flanagan

Paul Flanagan/Diane Holtom “That the IT report be accepted for discussion.”

Carried

Rob Shirley – can you update us re: the ongoing development – fill us in on more details of what things we are looking at.

Paul Flanagan - developing the show package - on line shop, registrations, part of the next process – ROCAP next thing is the on line packages, this unfortunately is not a five minute job, the webmaster has a base line package to work with and he is working on the adaption of the packages. I would like to extend thanks to Brendan Woodhouse for all the work he is doing for NZCF his current focus is the on line registrations/show package and the online shop -he wanted things completed before the end of the year, and is confident that early in the new year is manageable.

Jennie Paul – to ensure cost effectiveness a \$50 fee should be charged for the clubs to use the show package.

Chair: this could be provided free to clubs – with access on line but the finalities of this has not been discussed.

Paul Flanagan – this package will make available all the required information to produce a catalogue. –

Chair: The EC believes it is time that we give something back to the membership – Marion Petley - It would be a good way of utilizing the benching fees. Brendan is to get the package to a point it can be trialed early next year.

Margaret Bean/Ian Gray: “That the IT managers report be adopted.” Carried

(c) Registrations –

Zena Pigden

Zena Pigden/Janice Davey: “That the report be opened for discussion. “ Carried

Lyall Payne – as already mentioned it was an exciting move in NZCF re: the recognition of Waratah and Catz Inc. pedigrees – huge congratulations on that. What has been the impact the huge fear was that there would be issues, are you able to give us an update?

Zena Pigden – to the best of my knowledge there has only been a few Catz Inc. applications and none from Waratah. As we thought might be the case there are some cats with not the same names registered – Avon Aspden is verifying these to make sure that no double ups are on the database.

Lyall Payne - we are not seeing falsified pedigrees?

Zena Pigden- There has been some human error – but with the process that we go through with the verification there is no likelihood of this happening.

Sue Ford – Under breeding and transfers reference to rule 12.4 (d) we already have that requirement within our rules – it used to be clearly stated in our rules – somehow somewhere this rule has been taken out, that a four generation pedigree is supplied within 14 days.

Zena Pigden - There has been a lot of issues around this paragraph – one issue being that it is listed under Export of Pedigree cats and kittens - it does not specify that it be a certified pedigree – EC feels it would be better that it be a certified pedigree. And there has been further confusion when people have revisited this; I have been informed that it had been taken out of the registration rules – EC have decided to reissue so when transferring a cat for breeding an extra cost will be charged for the certified pedigree to be sent out by the Registrar with the transfer certificate.

Rob Shirley – Has there been any repercussions from Australian registries with the NZCF acceptance of Waratah registrations?

Chris Lowe - Australia legally had to accept - this was discussed at the World Cat Congress.

Rob Shirley - Does that affect our Judging, and is there any possibility of our judges being used in any other part of the world.

Chris Lowe - Waratah & Catz Inc are affiliated with WCF who in turn are members of the World Cat Congress. Until such time that Australia & NZ accept Catz Inc & Waratah Judges there would not be a cross over but now that the Waratah registrations are being accepted it would seem logical that our Judges would be the next follow on.

Zena Pigden /Lyll Payne: "That the Registrations report be adopted."

Carried

(d) Publications & Marketing

Gaynor Saxon

Gaynor Saxon/Janice Davey: "that the report be accepted for discussion." Carried

Gaynor Saxon - The brochures that we did are great and ready to go - another idea which could assist with membership growth is for a small flyer to be placed with all kitten transfers which cover things like "how to show", becoming a breeder, becoming a member, this would target all pet owners.

Lyll Payne - congratulated Gaynor on the new look website.

Gaynor Saxon /Ian Gray: "That the report be adopted." Carried

(e) Breed Standards Council

Zena Pigden

Zena Pigden/ Dianne LeBas: "That report be opened for discussion." Carried

Siamese group registrations at the time of writing was a work in progress but it has now been completed and implemented with a small addition to ROCAP automating the (l) - carried in perpetuity unless removed by DNA testing.

Lyll Payne - on behalf of NZ Siamese proxy - but something that I would raise year after year just to get people slowly use to the idea. The whole issue where NZ stands with rules that breeds should or should not be intermateable, in relation to other countries using Persians & Exotic for example and Birman seal & blue used to get other colours going. The seals and blues of those matings should not be back in the main pool again - this trend of course is quite an acceptable option for Siamese breeders.

Sue Ford - Burmese - as most of you know there has been a very controversial survey re: the Standard of Points for the Burmese, it has just been a mess - if the BSC can put

out some sort of format about how to go about sorting this out. I know that not all breeders received the document, and they are entitled to vote.

Zena Pigden – There is a breed rep information package and it is made available to all Breed Representatives. To be fair to Arthur he did follow the appropriate process because it was not a full rewrite of the whole standard – there is no evidence from the feedback received that there were more than a few people that did not receive the survey within that breed group. The voting period was extended to ensure that those people had the opportunity to vote.

Lyll Payne – is this a NZCF sanctioned survey?

Zena Pigden – It is a breed section consultation paper sent out and a forum set up to allow people the opportunity to discuss that feedback was quite valuable and email vote was sent out and asked to be returned by snail post. The email forum is specifically for breed section consultation.

Zena Pigden/Sue Ford: “That the report be accepted.” Carried

(f) Judges

Janice Davey

Janice Davey/Lyll Payne: “That the report be accepted for discussion”. Carried

Janice Davey – an up date to the report NZCF does have 6 new judges - 4 LH & 2 SH judges and the Registrar has reported that invitations are coming in nicely.

Rob Shirley/Gaynor Saxon: “That the NZCF acknowledge the work and leadership of the lead tutor judge Chris Lowe in this matter.” Carried with acclamation

Rob Shirley – believe it is a weakness in our rules in regards to rules for Judges – people can run things. Chris has done it for the last two years – except in individuals minds – in two years something will happen whether or not there will be a stewards course re: planning for future how we manage our people – something for the scribes etc. part of the process for EC working for EC planning – steward courses/ judges school/ would make it a lot easier to tag people for future training – a nation wide refresher for all judges to attend. It is a little hit and miss as to how we manage our people as part of the process of the EC working could consider that perhaps that there will not be a judge’s school in 2011 but will be one in 2012 – this would make it a lot easier to tag people to participate.

Janice Davey – A nation wide refresher has been discussed for all Judges – I am working with Cheryl St Clair-Newman who has run some very good seminar/refreshers and this is being planned for.

Lyll Payne- same applies to judge's refreshers themselves - there needs to be more certainty around the dates when they are to occur -I would like to know the dates for 2012 for instance - end of the year refresher - certainty around dates - focusing on dates. This applies to so many things.

Ian Gray - to reinforce what is going on at this level there needs to be more communication particularly to clubs themselves regarding training - stewards/handlers and those types of courses.

Janice Davey - a Steward/Handlers course was held in the South Island this year with Arthur Rowlands. And a further approach has been made to hold a course in the North Island. Jo Millar has put all the programme material onto a CD, the holding of a course is driven by the number of applications required before a training session can be held.

Ian Gray - People are holding their tickets but there is no requirement for practice, and many do not work in the showing year.

Janice Davey - Kaye MacArthur was appointed to coordinate the steward/handlers list but Kaye does not have the right to censure someone who has not been active.

Ian Gray - Perhaps a tier level acknowledgment could be put in place. So that if they are not active they lose the gold card and must attend a refresher and be involved in practical work to get it back.

Margaret Bean - without trained stewards and handlers the judges have nothing. Because a lot of people think that they are forgotten workers.

Janice Davey - Handlers/Stewards award 2010 was presented at the National show and it is hoped that this will be continued.

Jennie Paul - you could also look at implementing a master scribe or master clerk certificate - this is all about recognition of people.

Janice Davey /Ian Gray: "That the Judges Portfolio report adopted." Carried

(g) Shows

Deb Chesterfield

Deb Chesterfield/Lyll Payne: "That the report be received and opened for discussion." Carried

Lyll Payne - Clubs need to have certainty about their show dates - for 2012 I would like to see show dates set in stone - Kapiti-Horowhenua are particularly distressed with a club planning to hold a show at a door step venue - this has not happened before. I

would like to see where clubs stand with shows – Kapiti normally has their show on fathers day weekend – the show entries are affected by multiple shows every week in the Central area.

Ian Gray – It is nice to have certainty around show dates – where shows are being held. If holding a show in April and then one in September it is kind of raising the chance of a conflict – we need to look at the balance of the show calendar – there are elements that we are concerned about – Feline have made an application to move their date for 2011 to try and capture that market that is out there – or they are otherwise attracted to another show – people are travelling extensively throughout NZ. Something in the Sth Island can affect a show being held in the Nth – would appreciate some clarity on this maybe there should be a time limit on date changes.

Jennie Paul – the ACC used to have 350 cats and now we struggle to get 120 – 150 cats now – we have had to put up with a change of date because of Auckland holding a National show and then CABCC moving their date we are now competing for entries. Our entries have dropped 50% because we don't get the entries from the South Island. We are also competing with the 6-8 ring shows being held with exhibitors not attending shows on their own back door step. In Auckland as a LH breeder and exhibitor we only have 5 shows for the whole year we all have to travel to get the rings – we are really disadvantaged – we have the fewest number of shows.

Gaynor Saxon – there is only a certain amount of money in the country. A small club cannot compete with 8 ring shows – small clubs are losing out. There is only this much money – one club putting on three shows a year helps no-one, we need to start thinking smart – cut down the rings, be considerate of the other clubs.

Lyall Payne – my point was all about certainty about knowing that shows are to be held on certain days – definitely believe that the points made by Jennie Paul of course are relevant I am also not a fan of clubs holding three shows in one year.

Rob Shirley – the original thing that started this conversation – the very concept “our date” is flawed. We are always on fathers day – we always have the second Sunday in October – when we are looking at planning something suggest that NZCF install a counting system which says the first Saturday of the year is Saturday 1 or the 35th Saturday of the year. Then suddenly you avoid the traditional date and that will avoid the week back and forth problem of the year.

Rob Shirley: Re: the recommendation regarding the handling of the National Show – Thinking about the Hauraki Feline Assoc who wanted to hold a national in Rotorua – the timelines we wanted to keep to we had major problems as to when we were allowed to do things – holding a National is possible for relatively small groups of people to do if you have one person working full time or a group of people with enough time to do it. Timeline issues – Patches & Pointed in 2007 picked up the show, it is all about EC

& Club expectations - I do not think that there is only one way to run a national show you need to allow that diversity of approach - when we are doing this, we are going to do it in eight weeks time - P&P did it. Please reconsider.

Gaynor Saxon - when Patches & Pointed took over the 2007 National pickup Chris Lowe and I worked full time.

Deb Chesterfield - your point is valid Rob there are some groups that have run some excellent National shows - Palmerston North ran one of the better national shows - as Shows Portfolio Manager I have noted that it is more of a struggle to get someone to take it on. Somebody has taken it on because no one else has taken it on. They start out on the back foot - and EC has allowed for that pressure to be put on the Club. Next year will be a test case - workable relationship - around the world there are professional bodies running events - this could be done for our National shows - EC needed to take the pressure of the club especially regarding the finances etc

Rob Shirley -You have conveyed a different impression than what has been included in your report to this meeting.

Jennie Paul - helped organize 2 national shows - time is the essence, from the point of view of the club it took too long for the EC to respond - club went ahead and did the bookings etc. timeline is too long you've got to have a response before the next club meeting. NZCF show case show really needs to be more involvement from EC.

Sue Ford - Mid island- Hauraki what we wanted from EC this is the amount of money - end of story that is all we needed and we could have just got on with it. Left in limbo and we simply could not afford the time commitment to make it work.

Deb Chesterfield - responding to Jennie Pauls statement - the biggest issue has been communication. The hope is that if the EC were to adopt this method or process there is a full set now becomes a working document so that you have a very good process, very good point if this did not work next year, Marion will have a very good picture as to what the cost will be to run the show next year - nothing stopping the EC and saying that this did not work - they may will ask that Clubs put your hands up with this \$ value. It is being a work in progress.

Ian Gray - key communication person from the Club point of view. If you did not produce a budget - you need to have a plan have to make the decision - forward planning - cost - you guys can then sign off of what you are going to give the club - things like major sponsors do not become an issue. Club needs to produce a budget associated with forward planning and proposals. EC can then sign off about how much money is available.

Lyll Payne- I have recently ended 12mths of work to secure an exemption status through IRD. Charities will not accept Cat or Dog clubs as a charitable organization. Probably funds from external public bodies are decreasing, but with the exemption and good relationship with the funding body it can be done. A guide was put out by Marion Petley regarding what you have to do to secure an exemption status from IRD.

Chris Lowe - re: funding -12 applications for funding for the national show this year were made and the club has had an exception for quite some time - almost without exception the holding of a show was not considered a project. Funding for prizes, they were concerned that the prizes were being taken out of the bay - Hawkes Bay has the highest rate of gaming machines per head of population but because our registered office was not in Napier funding was declined. It was really tough to secure the \$2000 funding; it may be a different story if you are presenting a project.

Deb Chesterfield/Janice Davey: "That the shows Portfolio Managers report be adopted."
Carried

Meeting adjourned for morning tea at 10.40 reconvened at 11.00

Item 7 Business and Finance (In accordance with Constitutional Clause 11.2 Annual General Meeting)

- Consider and adopt, if thought fit, the Balance Sheet and accounts of the NZCF and any reports thereon,
- Consider and adopt, if thought fit, a plan for the coming one to five years.
- Consider and adopt a budget for the coming year that reflects the appropriate parts of any plan adopted.

Annette Dunn/Deb Chesterfield "That the Treasurers report be opened for discussion."
Carried

Marion Petley - A detailed report was written for the agenda for this meeting. Highlighting some of the items, the operating result for the year was a net operating loss of \$12555 against a budgeted loss \$20170. This loss followed on from the recorded profit of \$7590 for the 2008 year. Fee increases met with some resistance particularly membership and registration fees.

The auditor expressed a qualified opinion based on the limited control over the Registrars records, and in his management letters he has made specific mention of the requirement for the ROCAP registration database needing to be integrated with the accounting system. The urgent need for this to be addressed finally lead to the appointment of Brendon woodhouse - there has been considerable progress and I am pleased to report that the required enhancements to the accounting and auditing - ROCAP database has been trialed and is now live! This is really positive.

- The retained earnings reduced to 151,000
- Current assets \$160,000
- Debtors – slightly up on 2008 three aged debtors \$2480 flash cats \$5900

Rob Shirley – what are the bad debtors under Flash Cats.

Marion Petley - these are commercial advertisers, there are eight or nine commercial advertisers and some of them choose not to pay.

In summary a loss of \$12555 for 2009 was an acceptable result however, with another budget loss of \$35000 approved for the 2010 year I would recommend returning to something closer to a budgeted 'break-even' result for the 2011 year.

Lyll Payne – Will the ROCAP enhancement resolve matters sufficiently for the auditor? And if so with the financial year ended 31/12/09 we are now talking about 6 weeks or so for this year. Can that checking be backdated so that this auditor's statement would be an unqualified report?

Marion Petley - No I do not consider that could be applied but it should mean that there will be an unqualified report next year.

Rob Shirley - Do we not take our insurance for National show judges?

Marion Petley –in regards to the \$2000 loss was because that judge decided not to come – not all aspects are covered under travel insurance. In this case the judge decided very late that he would not be coming, so a replacement judge had to be found at very short notice.

Chris Lowe – this went to disciplinary hearing in CFA and they came back with the finding that there were issues identified on both sides so the request to reimburse NZCF was declined.

Jennie Paul - always said to the NZCF that they would be underwriting the show we had money in reserve so that is what we used to stand the loss. Auckland Cat Club lost \$7000 because we did not get the door take because of the weather on the Sunday.

Rob Shirley – mentioned fee increases a number of the big picture items were not covered –the three that I looked at were the Judges training, working group for the Constitution and IT. IT stuff we collected the monies to make this happen two years ago – it has happened this year – is there an approx cost for this years development – was it carried over from 2009 to 2010 so the extra money just went into the general fund.

Marion Petley – Judges training was budgeted for two years ago for – teaching tutor judges, and to be fair the Portfolio Manager had targeted money to go into training next year for judge’s refresher and adult training targeted by the PMT

Rob Shirley – requested an update on the three outstanding debtors.

1. Balance owing \$235
2. Credit note issued (debt no longer there)
3. \$550 with regular weekly payments

Lyll Payne – I would like to say to Marion how much I and I am sure others, appreciate the professional way in which she has presented the statement of accounts and management of them is very much appreciated. **Received with acclamation**

Marion Petley – Budget discussions

EC are happy for me to start this discussion the budget we are presenting to you at this meeting is in draft form and it is the intention of the incoming EC to make a start on the final process at the EC meeting following this AGM, and to have it ready for final approval at the December meeting.

Background – at last years AGM the first draft of the 2010 budget which included extra activities of expenditure of \$25,000 plus 4 annual plan items of \$12,000 resulting in a deficit of (\$40,000). The extra items that became part of the final approved budget were

Activities:

IT development for ROCAP \$20,000 (projection \$12,840)

Show IT Programme \$5000 (projection \$2450)

Annual Plan items totaling \$12,000 – National show contract \$1000 (no expenditure)

Constitution Working party - \$3500 (\$490 expended)

Membership – growth & retention \$10,000 (actual \$800)

In terms of revenue for this year, following on from 2009 when the fee increases had an impact on membership and registrations revenue; the trend has continued for 2010 but this time rather than the fee changes it is more probably due to the recessed economic climate making an impact rather than carry over from the fee increases. I have calculated a projected result for 2010 which looks like coming in at a loss of around (\$30,000) – that is (\$10,000) down on the budgeted loss of (\$40,000).

2011 Budget when compiling this we were mindful of the improved result for 2010 and if we continued to go down the track of negative results we have to be mindful making considered steps to do the right thing. We have managed to get the budget down to deficit (\$9850) of which I am happy with. The annual plan items for IT – shows, \$1500 for monitoring the trial process for the show package. Disputes process, membership & growth.

Various activities: BSC meeting will be held if funding becomes available
Judges - PFMT and Judges Council very keen to hold a one off Judges training/seminar now deferred to 2012. Judges Council meeting to be deferred to teleconference meeting.

Flash cats - 2 issues + the reintroduction of the Yearbook

Lyall Payne - are these your recommendations?

Rob Shirley - 'point of order' process in what we are doing now - to consider and adopt if thought fit to adopt - to consider adopt a plan for one to five years. In reality what Marion is verbalizing now is in fact annual plan so we have flicked into the other part of the reporting - presenting the double thing before we adopt the budget
The Chair needs to move the recommendation for the year ahead.

The plan for EC to lead us - and into and through next years, a change in Flash Cats, BSC and Judges Council meetings, change to move the 2011 AGM from New Plymouth to Palmerston North or Wellington. Is that how you are thinking?

Annette Dunn - These items have been raised over a period of some months trying to look at what the strategic plan would be for the next 1-5 years basically it was felt for next year we could not continue to operate with a deficit of (\$30,000) it cannot continue to happen. There were items that Portfolio Managers wanted to happen for this year - whilst not wanting to put them off we need to consolidate and retrench for the year, cutting costs and spending as little as we can get away with. i.e. the combined judges refresher, adult training has been put back to 2012 there are other things to.

Rob Shirley - We can as an AGM decide not to decide to adopt a plan for the coming year. That really does concern me the plan is to hold our ground for next year, is that a vibrant organisation moving forward? Perhaps we should adjourn and come up with some words.

Chair - It would be foolish of us to spend x amount of \$ for next year - with great fancy plans we need to hold fast we cannot be foolhardy and spend - when at this point we need to look at growth more than anything else. We are going to pull back with our spending then look at the first 6mths of the year - what we are offering you now is a way - we just want to retrench but we do not want to spend your money at this time we feel it would be full hardy for us to do so.

Lyall Payne - I was just really wanting clarification if these were a Treasurers recommendation or did EC agree on this and that they have been recorded in the minutes.

Janice Davey - this consultation has taken place in the last week.

Ian Gray - Rob does make a point that you have not quite separated things correctly - the facts are there , nuts and bolts - talking about a vibrant organization - there is also a smart organization about making decisions as to ensure steady as you go! Rather than dipping further into reserves.

Rob Shirley - A motion needs to be presented that reflects a communication to the members in a written form.

Gaynor Saxon/Jennie Paul:

“That 2011 annual plan will focus on the maintaining and enhancement of the present services through:

- New web hosting
- Judges Council Meeting replaced with teleconference
- Removal of the number of cats for supervision
- A change in the delivery of Flash Cats
- Meeting of all registrars
- Show software programme
- Continue with the initiatives for the growth and retention of members

Carried

Budget – 2011

The annual plan items are reduced this year mainly because the majority of the work has been completed or about to be completed on ROCAP. IT Development On-Line Registrations has a budget remaining of \$6500, the Shows IT Programme has \$1500 to cover the 2011 trial period, and under Administration we have an amount of \$3500 set aside for Working Parties - mainly for Disputes and \$2500 has been set aside again for Membership Growth & Retention. Only \$800 or a \$5000 was expended last year.

Breed Standards Council - a planned BSC meeting for 2011 has been put on hold with a rider that it can be held but only if funding is available.

Information Technology - the proposed IT Development budget is reduced down to \$6500 to cover the final end of the ROCAP upgrade.

Judges - The Judges Council face to face meeting has been replaced with teleconferences (\$700) and the planned one-off Combined Judges Refresher & Adult Training estimated at \$8000 has been deferred until 2012.

Publications - the current 4 x issues of Flash Cats is planned to be replaced with 2 x Flash Cats for March & June and the reintroduction of the Year Book for December to replace issues 3 & 4 of Flash Cats. There will be no extra cost to the members.

Registrations – the meeting of the four registrars is planned to continue although the BSC meeting is not. (\$1000)

National Show – In 2011 the EC will take over the management with a host group contracted to assist. It is anticipated that a break-even will result.

Shows – as mentioned work is commencing this year on the Shows IT programme and \$1500 has been set aside for the 2011 trial period. It is expected that the programme will be implemented in 2012.

The Club Liability Insurance Scheme continues.

Other Revenue – Marketing Sales relates to a new promotion for an NZCF Calendar generating sales of \$6000 which was proposed for 2009 & 2010. The contra costs of \$2500 are shown under administration.

Administration – AGM – It is proposed at this meeting to seek approval to move the 2011 AGM from New Plymouth to either Palmerston North or Wellington and reduce travel costs for members and EC.

Annual Plan – already covered

EC Expenses – It was planned to increase the number of EC meeting from 3 to 4 however, this was cut in the ‘pruning process’. A reduced \$15630 is budgeted over \$19600 budgeted last year. Costs savings are a priority.

Liaison – as for 2009-10 AASET \$750 CAC \$600 AND WCC (AGM to be held in Johannesburg RSA) \$2000

Honoraria – not just an admin expense – total for 2009 & 2010 \$52850 it is proposed to increase these by 3.7% +\$1950

Rob Shirley – you did not mention any income from the Micro chipping thing.
Marion Petley – the NZCF paid \$6000 when the scheme was set up but this has been refunded in full.

Rob Shirley - We have a representative on that body and has the NZCF made any application for a grant?

EC Secretary – the report has only recently been received so there has not been much time for the Executive Council to have a look at the grant possibilities. The funding criteria states for “welfare projects”.

Chair – at the EC meeting last evening this was discussed and the EC have an intention to apply for funding.

EC Secretary – there is also mention of an opportunity for people to be trained in micro chipping.

Chair – there could be a possibility that NZCF could have a representative at our shows to do the micro chipping. This is an opportunity for NZCF.

Annette/ Rob Shirley: “That the adoption of the 2011 draft budget be accepted.”
Carried

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

Item 8 Constitutional Remits

Voting strength declared 141

8. C.1 Submitted by the Executive Council

“That the amended Constitutional document be accepted by the 2010 AGM.”

Chair: called for those who wish to speak recorded as Margaret Bean, Ian Gray, Lyall Payne, Sue Ford & Rob Shirley. Paul Flanagan presented the document.

Ian Gray/Lyall Payne: “That the remit be put as read and go directly to discussion.”
Carried

Margaret Bean – has consulted with two people with legal knowledge, one of whom has done a lot of work with disputes and the like. From a legal point of view they have identified several concerns that should go back to the working committee.

10.1 There are simple problems – grammatical/ spelling etc.

More importantly - 10.4 should be simplified it is too complex – should they change the date of the AGM to June they had to work out what would happen to the current EC members – quoted the Commencing with theto be extended where applicable to align with.....the next sentence was not necessary

7.1 old Constitution – EC a lot of the reasons are important but are not included in the new draft document. Misconduct is important it is not there – dismissal right of appeal according to what is written in our statutes. 5.3 EC shall have complete discretion regarding applications for membership.....any one turned down must have the right of appeal – similarly there should be a right of appeal

11.2 EC member absent from two consecutive meetings - **May!** Should read **shall** declare the position vacant - has to be seen to be fair. **They feel the old 7.6 national justices & conflict should be included.**

12.0 The Club of which the candidate is a financial member has voting rights concerned about the discipline sections.

Paul Flanagan - the discipline procedures are part of the Disputes and Discipline Procedure.

Time Called

Ian Gray - this document was actually written by me not Paul Flanagan - EC have gone through it and there have been Skype meetings with Paul & Gaynor. Also consulting with Joan Hill for feedback. It has been written along the lines with bringing NZCF into the business world. There are certain elements that might need tweaking mildly. The items that Margaret mentioned about the rights of appeal around membership and Disciplinary hearing - would form part of the DDP document. Consultation with the EC would take on advice from members and would not be likely to change anything without consultation. It is one that EC would take on advice from the members - there has been considerable amount put on the forum for those who wished to read it - unfortunately there were several misquotations made regarding this document. It is a document to stand a lone and is a document to allow EC to progress forward.

Rob Shirley - tabled a prepared document to the meeting re: my analysis between changes to the present document and the document that has been proposed - factual document, in terms of what has occurred or suggested and then goes into a second which includes major or minor changes. I applaud us getting to this stage - the original plan was June last year to have both documents to present to this meeting. I am struggling that I have not seen the rules booklet until now.

These are changes to the intent identified

9.0 allowance of EC to increase in size

12.3

13.1 (f)

13.1 (m)

17.1

21.2

21.8

21.7 40 people in the room not the intent (remove)

21.9 can't hand vote at AGM - removes that by voice or secret ballot

21.10 (d) and (g)

22.1 makes my blood run cold - the ability of the EC to gate keep motions put to the AGM (that is my reading of it - obviously need clarification of this)

And all the sections that are no longer addressed I am assuming that they are in the rules booklet. I have not had time to read this document.

Sue Ford – the proxies that I am carrying are all opposed to this document, while I agree that we need a new constitution this came to us without having “draft” written over it. This draft should go back to the writing committee. The constitution gives the EC far too much power – Life membership is one for course of concern, not to use the next highest polling candidate. Relating to the quorum of an AGM – you just need to look at the lack of attendance today. We are under way which is good – it would be a disaster if this is accepted in its present form.

Lyall Payne – I would be quite interested to hear a reaction to some of the Questions asked from Ian. I would like to acknowledge the work that Ian Gray has done on this document.

Accepted with acclamation.

We realise what the constitution is, it is a members document – it does not need to be the nuts and bolts that belongs in the operating documents that is the EC documents That is why we have AGM’s remits that are past with 75% majority the others are 50% pass rate none of which that EC have to put into the rules. EC are responsible for the day to day running of the fancy. For me personally there are a couple of things that I would have liked to have seen in the document. One of which would be to provide rules for the registration of cats, it needs to be stated clearly – rules for the appointment, training & promotion of NZCF Judges, Discipline should also be part of the document. I cannot expect to get exactly what I want in the document.

As I see it the meeting has a couple of choices – the document could go through the process of a select committee, who would shuffle it around then it comes back for voting on. I do not want to see NZCF in this same position a year down the track – A Special General Meeting (expensive) there is another option in that between today and tomorrow this group could get over the barriers to ensure that the issues raised are accounted for. There will always be the opportunity to do developments down the track.

Gaynor Saxon – on behalf of the EC there are minor things that need fixing – we are prepared to put a motion forward that a select committee is put together to check the governance documents to ensure consistency, and that rules books are just how the membership want them to be. Changes to rules books will be on the agenda thus allowing the membership to have their say – the EC do not want to see this and future EC’s with too much power.

Ian Gray (Right of Reply) the goals of the NZCF:

- be a proactive and vibrant organisation so that all people involved with cats wish to be a member
- provide a friendly, supportive, informative and educational environment for its members

- be an organisation that acts in an ethical and professional manner in all dealings with all parties
- be an organisation that has, and practices, fair and transparent procedures and processes
- be effective and efficient managers of resources to ensure financial viability
- promote and provide quality services based on best practices

Fundamentally their rights they are membership driven – around being supportive of the EC – to provide a supportive environment for the members. An organization that has fair and transparent procedures and processes. EC has to act in accordance with those principles

Paul Flanagan – thank you Ian for the assistance in producing this document. Basically there are a lot of the rules missing I can assure you that a lot of the points that Rob Shirley raised are included in the rule book – the main purpose is to provide a document that we are not constantly bogged down due to conflict within the Constitution and rules of the Fancy. Far more standardized type of Constitution – that large incorporated societies have these days. Rules must still stay in place, I apologize for the lateness of presenting the rules book...the rules have all been put back into the rules booklet they have not been taken out.

Lyll Payne – we as a membership have to hand over the power for the EC to run the organisation – members have prevented the EC from doing this job – if we don't like what they do we don't vote them in next time around. We are detailed people and this is strategic stuff handing it over to the EC to run the body.

Margaret Bean – the Regions have been abolished for years – but the list of the clubs are still shown in regions. It is strange that we still have them printed in the document.

Chris Lowe – I think these were retained because these area are still relevant to Judging.

Lyll Payne- I would like an answer to a couple of questions that have been asked – in particular Rob Shirley re: 22.1 claims that it allows the EC to gate keep by giving them the power to not allow motions to be discussed.

Rob Shirley - Any member may request that a motion be voted on, the member may also provide information in support of the motion BUT the EC has absolute discretion whether or not that a vote will be taken that is called gate keeping.

Ian Gray – that is certainly not the intention, the EC does have a very serious obligation to be fair. There would have to be very sound reasons to not to adopt. But there is the opportunity of the members for a ¼ of them to sign it – this pushes it through anyway.

Lyll Payne – we need to know where the definition of a Members motion is. What is a Members motion if there is no support what so ever, then there would be a reason for it not to be discussed.

Rob Shirley – the decision of the chair is that it stays as it is.
There is a process written in amongst the rules that says to get a motion of the general meeting there has to be 15 people to sign it – it used to be 10 people.

The way round it delete “that the council may have the absolute discretion. To decided

Ian Gray therefore the sentence comes out of the document”

Lyll Payne – re the question regarding life membership process – with the EC have absolute right to appoint.

Rob Shirley - 5.4 if you don't have the absolute right of the EC to say no then this as written is o.k.

Chair read out the clause – a simple majority can not be used, it must go through all the processes.

Rob Shirley - possible for us (membership) to say a certain person is to be a life member EC talks about it and EC makes a recommendation. Under these words with the sentence removed – one way or another EC must make a recommendation.
A recommendation does not mean ‘Yes’ you recommend a course of action – it may mean rejected. At the moment the EC does not have the right to stop a recommendation for life membership to go through.
Should EC have the right to stop a recommendation going through?

Chair – absolutely yes, applaud the fact that members like to have the power however; EC should have the power not to accept because they are the group that knows if a life membership should or should not be put through. **The simple majority is an error** it should be a 75% vote.

Ian Gray - asked if Rob Shirley was looking for an amendment to this clause?

Rob Shirley - I am actually proposing it **with the leave of the meeting – that no person dissents.**

Sue Ford - we need to read the rules document before making a decision, between now and then we need to agree to look at these things before it is voted on.

Lyll Payne: The next highest polling candidate that is a tradition - that the appointment of the next highest polling candidate has been used but it is in ore of some other options as will. This needs to be set in stone in the rules. A legal challenge would certainly be upheld on the bases that you have had a tradition. This needs to be looked at.

Annette Dunn - in actual fact our Constitution does not allow for that at all. You can appoint anybody that you like to that role - we are trying to give the option to take the next highest polling candidate - but you may not have a next highest poller if it does leave it open to appoint someone based on skills.

Lyll Payne but it is a tradition that has been established.

Janice Davey - the wording needs to be 'shall' not 'may' appoint... it is clear that people have accepted nomination and they have received votes from the membership.

Chair: normally at this stage I would have called time however, we are getting something really positive done here and I propose that we continue with these discussions.

Margaret Bean: the wording should be "shall appoint the person who was next highest polling candidate or failing their availability the EC shall co-opt."

Rob Shirley - just addressing (next highest candidate) 12.3 & 7.4 old document there has been a change of focus - comes with the dropping of the bi election.....tradition! Custom & practice is to do it this way.

Lyll Payne - tradition using the right word but custom & practice to do it this way and if we suddenly change it we are in trouble straight away - if we don't appoint and we need a new person and go outside whoever, the next highest polling candidate - case law has driven this. The wording should be 'shall'.

Working from the document tabled by Rob Shirley - listing points to be noted:

Margaret Bean - re: postal vote - elect the EC - notify the results of the 12.2(a) - should that be notify the results? 12.2 (a) says postal vote - over further it talks about the AGM on page 14 clause 21 d. (two (d) listed by the way) Election of EC members postal should read announcement of the result or something to that affect.

The AGM shall appoint an auditor - 20.1

Margaret Bean - May to read "shall" appoint

Appointment of an Auditor - should have a 7 day timeframe for the availability for the appointment 20.2 shall

Ian Gray - 20.2 the timeframe is of no purpose, the EC authorizes. To appoint another auditor on the grounds that one is not available it is not needed.

Marion Petley - 9.8.1 current Constitution -calls for an EC to appoint it is probably more normal for an AGM to appoint.

Rob Shirley - 12.1(e) the ability for life members to be a member of the Executive Council - does the meeting think it is o.k. for life members to be on EC? Are you happy with that? Traditionally they would have ceased an active part in this case we think it is o.k. for Life Members to be a member of EC?

Lyll Payne - can take on any role they wish - if people are o.k. so be it.

Jennie Paul -13.1(g) may or shall I can't see why the EC member can be turned down on expenses.

Chris Lowe - It happens if they do not have required documents for reimbursement - on presentation of receipts....that is why the **wording is 'may'**.

21.7 Zena - "40 members was not the intentionin person **there is a voting strength of at least 40**"

Chris Re: financial members - full members should be stated - it depends if the definition is correct or not. Affiliate members do exercise a vote as do life members.

AGM - **21.8 remove secretary**

21.9 show of hands - or secret ballot - **withdrawn by Rob**

Rob Shirley - 21.10 (d) (i) & d (ii) if this stays it means that the chair only has to present a report.

21.10 d 1 leave as is 21.d.1 **chairperson & all EC reports.....**

21.10 (g) this shortens the 5 yr strategic plan down to 18 mths should read **from current and the next five years**

Ian Gray - 21.6 re: the requirement for a proxy to be registered - using the last few days as an example person becomes sick and can't transfer proxies. This clause should be amended to allow for a person on written application, with consent of the nominee to allow the proxy to be transferred (in not less than 24 hours) prior to the meeting.....

Lyll Payne - lots of things go wrong, acts of god are acts they can be mean and cruel we cannot build in all situations. This could be used for the swapping around of votes.

You register your proxy, if you can't get here. We are working to hard to pick up the situation – that is why they must give reasons, must give EC discretion. Register the proxy if you can't get there you should not be able to transfer the proxy.

Chair – The EC Secretary and I spent quite a lot of time looking at how we could allow this to happen under our current constitution when two people holding proxies were unable to attend. If you are carrying 10 proxies you would have to have the ability to transfer within in a very short timeframe – that is why the 7 days rule is there.

Ian Gray - the membership asked me to table this.

Rob Shirley - **13.1 roll of the EC part (f)** this is times and dates for meetings – I think the AGM have a right to say where the meeting is to be held – as the AGM is the members meeting I recognize that there are issues with location because of cost – but I do favour moving around the country.

When the motion is put to adopt the constitution – can you give me a chance to put a motion if it is defeated it is defeated!

Chair - you have basically answered your own question – too move around the country
Rob Shirley - in Otago we had a number of people that attended that normally would not have attended. What we thought was to restrict to main centre's only, our greatest concern the reason being the people being those sitting on EC we need to be able to say at some point EC have the ability to move.

Zena Pigden – AGM setting the meeting 2 yrs ahead people get carried away at the time when they are bidding for the AGM. There needs to be a north & south balance – setting two years in advance is not always a good idea.

Chris Lowe – When you hold the AGM is the issue - the timing of the AGM.

Rob Shirley - You can for argument sake hold the AGM earlier – in terms of the financial management, I do not believe that the receipt and signing off the set of audited account is the best reason for making this change. The EC supervises the figures, and I am heartened today to hear that there is good thinking happening with the money side of things. To suddenly say that we are going to put the AGM in April, May or June which is right in the core of the show season so your are taking out the people who the fancy rely on to attend.

Marion Petley - It is not only the financials it is the whole reporting to the membership we are nearly 10mths down the track with the financials, it is much more timely...why wait 10 mths down the track. Report on the same period –allowing for management this gives normal flexibility.

Rob Shirley - based on that argument then logically we move the terms of all of our Appointments and Officers appointment - officers will work for a calendar year. 17.1 more or less than a year.....you have changed your powers under this clause appointments would occur at the same time as the AGM is that not what is intended?

Ian Gray - the clause stands on its own so it is not a time written clause it is designed so the EC can make the appointments to fit.

Margaret Bean - we could look at holding the AGM at the end of February in conjunction with an awards dinner that would probably help with attendance numbers.

Marion Petley - end of February would be alright for me - but if the Treasurer is only a book keeper it would be a big ask because the books would have to be handed over and time would not allow for this to happen.

Diane Holtom could go to the end of March.

Jennie Paul - clause should be reworded so as the EC shall determine for the term of the elected duration.

Annette Dunn - these are appointed persons not elected positions

Lyll Payne - reappointment comes up every 12 months

Marion Petley - we are wanting the year to go from January to December

Jennie Paul - it is alright to say what you intend but you should stipulate terms and conditions - on the contracts there is no specific time stated so how can you remove? The EC should stipulate terms and conditions - it should say it is for one year

Rob Shirley - suggest the wording

Annually appoint terms and conditions

Rob Shirley - for amendments to the Constitution $\frac{3}{4}$ = 75% **27.1 says 2/3rd should state 75%** the new Constitution says 2/3.

Ian Gray- Best practice states 2/3rd it is standard looking at other organizations.

Lyll Payne - because we have had that higher standard we should stick to that for this document but there is no reason why this could not be brought forward for an amendment to the next AGM.

Rob Shirley -Putting remits to the AGM gone up to **15 members 27.2 should be 10**

Lyall Payne – same reason why not keep what we already have should read 10.

Margaret 3.1 (c) register with NZCF the pedigrees of all breeds of cats – should it not state recognized breeds of cats. In the purposes of the NZCF – can't we use that terminology recognized breeds of cats.

Lyall Payne – the purpose cannot be to register all breeds of cats.

Zena Pigden - we would find a way we have provisional registered cats – experimental programme cats and we want them to continue with their programme cats.

Rob Shirley – use the word NZCF sanctioned.

Lyall Payne - the current wording works.

Zena Pigden – can't we just leave it alone we are not getting people coming along to register all breeds of cats – I think we are getting bogged down with something that does not happen.

11.3 EC meetings face to face – definition of a meeting! Is the problem here if you have Skype or telephone meeting. Future proving naming the means of communication – emails, telephone conferences, Skype, **23.7 needs attention.**

Paul Flanagan - **Add the words Or other media (b)**

Proxy Voting says to use **Schedule b or similar** – proxy voting is o.k.

Lyall Payne - Defining rules for registration – purposes for appointment, training and development of judges. There is nothing about Judges at all.

Ian it is included in the rules booklet – Under 14 is the Judges Advisory Council – objective comes to the team running and setting themselves up they may have their own set of rules – the Breeds Council is also set up the same way – they are an advisory council to the EC. You would appoint the members for a certain term, they have the qualifications. The rules and powers would have to be determined. There is a vacuum by passing this document but at this point there is not anything set in concrete but..... The Breeds Council and the Judges Council are with in their own right , grounds, qualifications, role of each advisory council to be determined.....

Lyall Payne - We have no reference to Judges other than three words Judges Advisory Council – 3.0 (i) to provide rules and regulations for the appointment, training, promotion and development of NZCF Judges.

Annette Dunn: Lyall why do you need the appointment of judges we don't actually appoint judges why do you want the word Judges in there?

Lyll Payne - appointment may be not a good word it is something about recognition – the judges are not in the constitution. Take out appointment so to read for the training, promotion and development of NZCF Judges.

Deb Chesterfield – a lot of documents that kind of work together references should be in all documents – definitions, so that we have definitions so is it possible to show that there is another booklet that there is a booklet on discipline etc

Lyll Payne - Not in a constitution this is the document that you play around with every year – so that would mean changes probably annually, my preference is not to have them listed in the constitution. Names of documents get changed.

Major aspects continued....

Rob Shirley - there are two areas that we need to look at – nuts and bolts one – rights of the EC to fix.

Fixing typographical errors somewhere - give the right to the EC to fix under 8.2 (1)
The right of the EC to fix 8.2 (1) should come across to the document.

3.4 (i) Rules & Policy - members of the EC to have other members of the fancy actually present.

Ian Gray - if you start to introduce a rule then you need rules to back up – common sense thinking - you can invite people to an EC meeting. Open meetings but you need to have rules if they are done.

Chair: Members have the right to come to EC meetings – should be in the rules procedures.

Sue Ford – Members have the right to attend but the EC have the right to go in to committee.

Paul Flanagan – typo 8.4 (i) typographical errors is in the document in the rules booklet.

Sue – the reading of all other documents in relation to the Constitution could carry a rider – this constitution should be read in conjunction to all other governance documents.

Rob Shirley – Members have the right to attend – but no right unless you are invited to speak – we had EC's that would not let members attend EC meetings this helped with the them and us situation, poor practice on their part being told by an AGM that members should be able to attend should be in the constitution – not in the general rules be aware that this can be changed at the whim of the EC that is why it should be

in the constitution. The general rules can be changed at the whim of the EC at their meeting – that is why because it was an AGM that said that members can attend it should be in the constitution.

Role of the Executive Council –

13.1(f) Decide the times, dates **and places** for Meetings

Meetings –

23.7 EC meetings – members of the NZCF may attend EC meetings

Asking the council to regulate its own meeting and provide the opportunity to attend in accordance with those regulations.

Ian Gray – **23.6 to regulate its own meetings** – and that the opportunity for members to attend EC meetings.

If you are doing it on a video conference – how do you attend – face to face meetings

Have the right to attend face to face EC meetings

ADD “Members have the right to attend face to face EC Meetings” add

Adjourned – 3.10 pm for afternoon tea reconvened at 3.35 pm

Rob Shirley re: votes of no confidence in members of the EC is that ability in the new constitution – cessation of membership I don't think is the right clause –

Zena Pigden - It is under the powers of the EC 11.1 (b)

Rob Shirley - Cessation of membership – does that include the powers for vote of no confidence in the **EC.11.1 b** states that a member of the EC can be removed

12.0 concern about the discipline procedures –

13.1 (h) decide the procedures for dealing with complaints – the new constitution removes the requirement that you have to work with the DDP so that can be changed in this next part.

Margaret Bean - there is nothing in the document about discipline and the legal folks I consulted with were very concerned about that.

Chair: The DDP is the document that is going to be revamped to allow for all of this.

Margaret Bean - **Voting for EC to 12.1 (h)** each member shall be responsible to ensure that the ballot is properly completed signed**ADD** to an appointed independent appointed returning officer – suggestion that should be put in **to the appointed returning officer** no later than 14 days prior to the AGM.

Lyll Payne - the mechanics of how it works will be on the ballot paper otherwise you are defining too much detail again.

Jennie Paul – delivery service to the appointed returning Officer – that would clarify simply.

Annette Dunn - why would you send it to anyone else other than the returning officer.

Margaret Bean - requested clarification re: 5.1 that everybody who has not paid up by certain date - membership annually does that mean people who have not paid up have to reapply for membership (it is not very clear) in which case is EC looking through all applications checking them all anyway.

Gaynor – reapply every year now – EC Secretary as Membership Coordinator spends time going through each application.

Dianne Le Bas – just **for consistency** within the document the numbers ten and under should be written in full – **five and then (5) in brackets.**

Margaret Bean - **9.1.5** the Chair shall be the sole official spokesperson for the NZCF what happens if the chair is not able to do so - **or any other person appointed by the EC.**

Ian Gray – it anticipates that the EC appoints the chair – so therefore if there is not Chair there they will appoint.

Chair read out a Notice of Motion - what I intend to do if this meeting passes the motion to adopt the 2010 Constitution, is to move:

“That the EC be directed to set up panels of self nominated persons to review the governance documents. Such review to occur before the end of October and Paul Flanagan to collate and have circulated to the Executive Council Membership for decision at the 10-11 December 2010 meeting.”

We will be asking people to put themselves forward to peruse and check. If the constitution is not passed then this motion will not be necessary. This relates to the Governance document not the Constitution. We will seek expressions of interest in being part of this review. We still need the governance documents checked it is not the constitution.

If the constitution is not passed I will not need this motion – if it is passed I will put this motion.

Chair/Lyall Payne: “That the 2010 constitution as amended be adopted.”

Passed 107/34 (75.89%)

Lyall Payne – I wish it to be noted that a huge thank you be given to Ian Gray & Paul Flanagan and of course the meeting for putting this Constitution through.

Ian Gray – responded with thanks to Gaynor Saxon for being the driving force behind getting the document to this meeting.

Chair /Lyll Payne: “That the EC be directed to set up panels of self nominated persons to review the governance documents. Such review to occur before the end of October and Paul Flanagan to collate and have circulated to the Executive Council Membership for decision at the 10-11 December 2010 meeting.” Carried

Chair: with the passing of Remit 8.G.1 – Remits 8 G.2 /8.G.3/8.G.4 are withdrawn.

Item 9 General Remits

9.G.1 Sue Ford/Dianne LeBas: “That this Annual General Meeting of the New Zealand Cat Fancy direct the Executive Council, and future bodies that fulfill the general role of the present Executive Council, to include in the 2011 and subsequent documents of the Fancy directions to fulfill the intent that all pedigree kittens born under any NZCF prefix, are to be both registered with NZCF, and when transferred to other owners, all such transfers are to be recorded in the NZCF Registry.”

Sue Ford – the background to the remit is that members are subsidizing members who report to be registered breeders and are selling kittens as NZCF registered kittens they are purebred kittens but are not registered – if I was a breeder, if I sold my kittens they have to be registered and transferred – other breeders might and do not register – somehow this rule has slipped out of our documents. As a breeder I belong to an organization that does not at this time have a rule in place that requires all kittens to be registered. Some say that the transfers should be optional that is wrong also – you own that cat (point of law). Some are saying that this is not possible to police, just like in law we can complain I as a registered breeder can complain that they do not register or transfer their animals. We have two Senior Judges that oppose this remit this is unethical we are supposed to be a professional body.

Rob Shirley – speaking as a member of a Club that wants the transfer bit deleted – “That the transfer section of this remit be removed.”

Chair: Ruled out of order because this changes the intent of the motion.

Lyll Payne - From a strategic position I support – it can be policed if you gets to court, people will get court out. They are trading on the good name of breeders within the cat fancy when they are not registering their animals.

Gaynor Saxon - I cannot believe that the cat fancy does not tell me to register it should be part of the rules.

Zena Pigden – another reason for supporting it hopefully it will decrease the number of complaints that EC Secretary receives.

Cheryle St. Clair-Newman – there are a number of breeders who use shop sales of pedigree kittens – members of the public are buying up these pedigree cats, double the price - Christchurch also has a member of a club only selling to shops and apparently, giving a pedigree of a “designer breed”.

Chair – the meeting will vote on the remit as it stands.

Passed 96/15 (86.49%)

9 G.2 Sue Ford/Rob Shirley: “That this Annual General Meeting of the New Zealand Cat Fancy direct the Executive Council, and future bodies that fulfill the general role of the present Executive Council, to include in the 2011 and subsequent documents of the Fancy, advice to the intent that all pedigree kittens registered under any NZCF prefix, and which are sold as pets, have some form of breeder generated record of their pedigree, supplied to the new owners.”

Sue Ford – the discussion this morning only related to the supplying of a pedigree for breeding cats – as they are registered animals some form should be generated This should be worded in such a way that EC can change in that every owner has the right to know where their cats have come from. The rules allow for future breeding stock to have a four generation registered pedigree forwarded to the new owners, but pet kittens whether for showing or not do not currently have to have a pedigree issued to new owners. All pedigree kittens should have proof of their heritage supplied so blood lines can be traced and for improving stock records. Furthermore new owners should be entitled to see their kitten’s status and lineage. This is also a move to keep breeders honest with the public and enhance the status of pedigree cats in our society.

When they get the pedigree their opinion, maybe they should not be certified. There are a number of people who are positive and believe this is a way to enhancing our organization.

Ian Gray – I personally have a kitten contract and we sell with several options a pet with no papers/ pet with papers/ show animal with papers. Anybody who buys knows the conditions – they pay less and they wont buy the papers....they are buying with full knowledge this is becoming quite directive.

Lyall Payne - Papers means different things to people – when proof of neutering/spaying is provided I then provide the papers. This is a basic right of that animal – it is also a public relations exercise as will.

Sue Ford – picking up on Ian’s point – money is changing hands they are entitled to have those pedigree papers they could be selling a kitten with the rights to show it.

Passed 102/8/1 (91.894%)

Item 10 2012 National show

Rob Shirley/ Lyall Payne – “that the EC be empowered to select a group and location for the 2012 national show” Carried

Item 11 2012 AGM

Janice Davey /Lyall Payne 2011-“That the AGM be moved to wellington”. Carried

The date of the AGM will be set under the terms of the new constitution.

Lyall Payne /Zena Pigden – “That as the majority of the EC membership are in the South island the 2012 AGM is to be held in Christchurch.” Carried

Item 12 ANY OTHER BUSINESS which may be lawfully brought forward.

World Cat Congress (International Liaison Report) Chris M Lowe

Rob Shirley/Lyall Payne – “That the WCC report be received.” Carried

Rob Shirley (no seconder) – moved “that the EC be directed for the 2012 AGM to move a motion of withdrawal from WCC.”

The WCC membership \$500 + delegate fees (if the delegate is not a Judge) we are talking some thousands of dollars here to go to the meeting. The EC of the time said find out what we get out of the WCC – this year there has been sufficient progress – to continue so my concern it will just drop of the radar. So this will give until 2012 for WCC to prove the worth on continuing membership.

The power to the arm of the delegate – this is what the national body is going to be discussing – agree that this is an extreme position. Enough is enough – we are not saying definitely moving – just considering too move away.

Lyall Payne - Acknowledge the high profile of those reports that Chris produces – potentially enormous value to be part of an international organization – we should not be saying that we should step back.

Chris Lowe - the Executive did discuss the continued membership of WCC at the meeting last evening, and the recommendation to this meeting was that the membership continue.

Ian Gray - Recommend gives notice of motion to be lodged at the next AGM.

Rob Shirley - notice of motion is a requirement of an individual to act.....

53/56/3 LOST

Companion Animal Trust

(Val Ball)

Rob/ Annette Dunn: "That the CAC report be received."

Carried

Janice Davey: Extended a vote of thanks for the work that Deb Chesterfield has done during her time on the Executive Council, and wished her all the best for the future. A vote of thanks was also extended to Gaynor Saxon and for the effort of making sure that things kept moving particularly with the constitution. She will be sadly missed on the Executive Council.

Gaynor Saxon - it was my pleasure, it has been a hard drive at times, especially when we all have other lives to lead at times it felt like the NZCF had taken over. We are pleased to welcome Cheryle St.Clair-Newman and Paddy Smith to the EC and I hope that the good work will continue.

Lyll Payne - wished to extend his congratulations to Cheryle specifically and wished her all the best and hopes that she enjoys being part of the Executive Council.

Meeting closed.....5.20 pm

Executive Council Secretary, Private Bag 6103, HBMC Napier 4142 Phone: +64 6 839 7811 Email: secretary@nzcf.com
--

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1. Minutes of Executive Council Meeting 8th October 2010*
- 2. Minutes of Executive Council Meeting (Post AGM) 10th October 2010*