

**TICA Board of Directors
Annual Meeting Agenda
September 1 – 3, 2021
(Telephonic)**

Wednesday, September 1st 7 am CDT

Welcome and Introductions

Consent Agenda 7:00 – 7:15 am

1. Approve Minutes - July 6, 2021, Special Meeting
2. Set Winter Meeting Dates - January 26 - 28, 2022 (Houston, Texas)

Executive Session - Judging Program, Protests/Complaints, Contracts 7:15 – 8:45 am

Open Session 9:00 am

Governance 9:00 – 11:00 am

1. Appointment to Cornish Rex Breed Committee (select 2)
Teresa Carroll-Childers
Bruno Chedozeau
2. Update on Online Breeder Listings/Outstanding Cattery Program - Brown
3. Update on the 2022 Annual - GL Region - Brown
4. 2024 Annual - MA Region - Dickie
5. Update on Legislative Committee – Adler
6. Trend Report.....3
7. Follow up Report.....4

Thursday, September 2nd (Open Session Continued) 7:00 – 11:00 am CDT

Proposal - By-Laws

1. Amend Bylaw 122.2 (Complaints Procedure) – Adler.....5

Proposal - Clerking Program

1. Amend CP 51.6 (Compensation) – Fralia8

Proposal - Judging Program

1. Amend JP 49.4 (Master Clerk experience for Judges Transferring) -Fralia.....11

Proposals - Show Rules

1. Amend Show Rules (Remove “sale” references) – Wood15
2. Amend Show Rule 212.3.1(Reconsider AB Alter Finals) – Fralia17

Proposals - Registration Rules

1. Add Reg Rule 31.7 (Define “actively breeding”) – Wood21
Genetics Committee Comments.....22
2. Add New Reg Rule 33.1.2 (Duration in Experimental Record) - Kruszona- Zawadzka23
Genetics Committee Comments.....26
3. Amend Reg Rules 33.3.1 and 33.4.4 (Experimental Breed Names) – Kruszona- Zawadzka.....27
Genetics Committee Comments.....30
4. Amend Reg Rules 33.3.2 and 33.3.3.6 (mutation ownership voting) - Kruszona- Zawadzka.....31
Genetics Committee Comments.....35
5. Amend Reg Rules 33.6.3.2, 33.7.4.5, 33.8.16 (New Breed Reporting) – Wood.....36
6. Amend Reg Rules 33.9.2.3.3 and 39.9.1 (Use of “Blue Slip”) – Wood39

Proposals - Standing Rules

1. Amend Standing Rules 103.3.1.3 (Prorated Membership Fees) – Hawksworth- Weitz40
2. Amend Standing Rules 106.2.1 and 106.4.2 (Judging Committee) – Fisher44
3. Add Standing Rule 106.4.1.6 (Standards Committee) – Hawksworth-Weitz47
4. Add Standing Rule 106.4.1.7 (Mentorship Committee) – Brown50
5. Amend Standing Rules 109.2 (Board Meetings) – Faccioli/Wood53
6. Add Standing Rule 209.1.1.7 (Non-licensed Ring Clerks) – Fralia56
7. Add Standing Rule 501.6.3 (Ring Clerk meal breaks) – Fralia58
8. Amend Standing Rules 901.4.2.1, 901.4.3.2 and 901.4.3.5 (LA Awards) – Brown60
9. Amend Standing Rule 1012.1 (Regional List) – Vlach62
10. Amend Standing Rule 1017.1.2 (UCD Changes) – Wood63
11. Amend Standing Rule 1022.2 (Complaint Filing) – Adler64
12. Add Standing Rule 1022.2.1.4 (Complaint Filing Fees) – Brown66
13. Amend Standing Rules 1022.5 (Hearings) – Board Directive69
14. Amend Standing Rule 2012 (Finals Awards) – Board Directive.....70

Friday, September 3rd (Open Session Continued) 7am CDT

Administrative & Fiduciary 7:00 – 9:30 am

- 1. Marketing Report
- 2. COO Update - Nevarez
- 3. Financial Reports - Fisher
- 4. Proposed Budget FY 2022

Breed Reports 9:30 – 10:00 am

- 1. Aphrodite
- 2. Highlander
- 3. Serengeti
- 4. Tennessee Rex
- 5. Toybob

Other Business and Discussions 10:00 – 11:00 am

- 1. Discussion of extending “isolated status for 2022-2023”
- 2. Show Application presentation – Van den Bunder

Members Open Meeting

Adjourn

TICA TREND YEARLY REPORT FROM AUGUST-SEPT 2020 THRU JUN-JULY 2021 (6 ISSUES)

ITEMS	AUG/SEP 2020 VOL 40, NO. 5	OCT/NOV 2020 VOL 40, NO. 6	DEC 2020/JAN 2021 VOL 42, NO. 1	FEB/MAR 2021 VOL 42, NO. 2	APR/MAY 2021 VOL 42, NO. 3	JUN/JULY 2021 VOL 42, NO. 4		TOTAL YEAR 6 ISSUES
PAGE COUNT	60	52	36	36	36	44		264
TOTAL PRINT QUANTITIES	4,712	4,798	5,536	5,894	6,171	3,546		30,657
PRINTING COST	\$8,334.30	\$7,649.65	\$6,080.73	\$ 6,186.37	\$6,330.60	\$5,557.27		\$40,138.92
AVERAGE PRINTING COST	\$1.77	\$1.49	\$1.10	\$1.05	\$ 1.03	\$1.57		\$8.01
TOTA PRINTING CHARGES WITH US/OVERSEAS SHIPPING	\$20,312.72	\$19,242.81	\$16,897.94	\$ 16,838.06	\$ 17,453.23	\$13,353.14		\$104,097.90
COST PER ISSUE WITH PRINTING/ MAIL PREP/POLY SHIPPING-US/OVERSEAS	\$4.31	\$3.75	\$ 3.05	\$ 2.85	\$ 2.83	\$ 3.77		
ADVERTISING FROM EDITOR	\$ 1,460.00	\$ 1,031.50	\$ 851.50	\$ 761.50	\$ 736.50	\$ 701.60		\$ 5,542.60
ADVERTISING MARKETING	\$5,400.00	\$5,400.00	\$5,400.00	\$5,900.00	\$5,900.00	\$5,900.00		\$33,900.00
TOTAL ADVERTISING	\$6,860.00	\$ 6,431.50	\$ 6,251.50	\$ 6,661.50	\$6,601.50	\$ 6,601.60		\$39,407.60
EDITOR SALARY	\$3,150.00	\$3,150.00	\$3,150.00	\$3,150.00	\$3,150.00	\$3,150.00		\$18,900.00
TREND MEMBERS \$15.00** 6 ISSUES AVE								\$13,815.00
TOTAL COST MINUS ADS	\$13,452.72	\$13,311.31	\$10,646.44	\$10,176.36	\$10,851.73	\$6,751.54		
TOTAL COST WITH EDITOR SALARY	\$16,602.72	\$16,461.31	\$13,796.44	\$13,326.46	\$14,001.73	\$9,901.54		
COST PER ISSUE WITH ADVERTISING/EDITOR	\$3.52	\$3.21	\$2.49	\$2.26	\$2.27	\$2.79		
TREND ONLINE ACCESS	1,408	1,657	1,799	1,922	2,062	2,098		
ESTIMATED % OF MEMBERS ONLINE	23.00%	25.67%	24.52%	24.59%	25.05%	37.17%		
INKJET MAILING PREP	2,212	2,396	2,584	2,729	2,843	1,675		
INKJET MAILING PREP	\$ 398.12	\$ 389.47	\$ 398.11	\$ 403.36	\$ 408.36	\$ 356.80		\$ 2,354.22
INTERNATIONAL, CANADIAN	2,208	2,402	2,587	2,755	2,892	1,622		
INTERNATIONAL, CANADIAN	\$ 10,320.78	\$ 12,385.11	\$ 8,953.44	\$ 9,510.41	\$ 9,964.58	\$ 6,753.01		\$ 57,887.33
INTERNATIONAL, CANADIAN, FIRST CLASS	216	256	299	335	361	174		
INTERNATIONAL, CANADIAN, FIRST CLASS	\$ 1,050.62	\$ 1,117.71	\$ 1,338.73	\$ 612.22	\$ 619.22	\$ 568.49		\$ 5,306.99
EO (75), TREND EDITOR (5), ETC	\$ 153.32	\$ 76.55	\$ 78.67	\$ 78.80	\$ 80.75	\$ 79.08		
PLASTIC \$.15 PER ISSUE NOT DOMESTIC	2,424	2,658	2,886	3,090	3,253	1,622		13,509
PLASTIC \$.15 PER ISSUE NOT DOMESTIC	\$363.60	\$398.70	\$432.90	\$463.50	\$487.95	\$243.30		\$2,389.95

*** On average, US mailing costs run about \$1,500 and Overseas to include Canada costs run about \$6,000-\$8,000 per issue

****MARKETING ADVERTISING CHARGES ARE AVERAGED FOR EACH ADVERTISEMENT****

**MEMBERSHIP \$15.00 MEMBERSHIP INCOME PER ISSUE DEPENDS ON ONE, TWO, THREE, OR LIFETIME PAYMENTS (ESTIMATE)

TOTAL PRINT QUANTITIES DOES NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT COPIES SENT TO OFFICE (75), EDITOR (5), ADVERTISERS (5) = 83

ESTIMATED % BASED ON EACH ISSUE QUANTITIES

NUMBERS BASED ON SOME DOMESTIC MAILINGS WITHOUT PLASTIC

Task
 Adler – Update on Chinese Translations (Show Rules, Registration Rules and By-Laws)
 Committee - Lies, Chair - to look at revising TICA's pedigree to include more genetic information. Brenda, Liz, Vicki Jo, Elaine, AC, Danny, Lorraine Shelton, Roeann
 Discuss with JC how long a trainee could be inactive before being removed from trainee Judging Program
 Harrison/van Mullem - send notice to clubs that as borders open the flexibility of guest judges will be restricted.
 Health Insurance benefits for EO employees - research for Annual Meeting.
 Adler/Fisher/Harrison/Nevarez - come up with structure for Legislative Committee and come back to Board with formal proposal for the Annual.

Owner	Date created	
Adler	05/26/20	Ongoing
van Mullem	05/18/20	Ongoing/New System
Lopes	09/04/20	Ongoing/After pandemic
Harrison	05/26/21	Annual 2021
Nevarez/Cardona	05/23/21	Annual 2021
Adler	05/21/21	Annual 2021

Amend Bylaw 122.2 (Complaints Procedure) - Adler

Rationale:

The phrase “Non-documentary” is unnecessary and very unclear. The new declaration on the front page of the Official Complaint Form will cover statements as well as evidence.

The current language in the Bylaws is very “U.S. centric” as affidavits involve notaries which have different duties and responsibilities depending on which country they are licensed. Additionally, penalties for perjury are criminal and TICA has no such power.

The rule on Show protests, as originally written, is unclear. Clubs do not hear complaints. Show complaints are handled exactly the same way as other complaints, however because any action by TICA may affect year end scores or points may be removed, there is an additional requirement that they be filed and handled as quickly as possible. The words “protest” and “complaint” have no real difference in procedure.

The Declaration on the Official Complaint Form (which also needs updating) makes clear that TICA may issue penalties for false statements. Whilst not part of the official Rules of TICA, it is included for completeness.

Amend Bylaw 122.2:

122.2 Procedure. Disciplinary power may be exercised only after due notice and an opportunity to be heard are first given to the party accused.

122.2.1 Complaints. The complaining party must submit the complaint on the official form set forth in the Standing Rules to these Bylaws. The complaining party must state the specific By-Law, Show Rule, Registration Rule or other rule alleged to be violated by the accused party, and attach all documents and other evidence which they contend supports the complaint. Any complaint must be filed with the Executive Office not later than 180 days after the alleged incident occurred and be accompanied by a non-refundable filing fee as set forth in the Standing Rules.

Contd/...

122.2.2 Show Protests/Complaints. Complaints/Protests charging misconduct or violation of the rules of the association, arising in connection with a show, shall be submitted in writing with any evidence and a filing fee as set forth in the Standing Rules, ~~to the Show Committee~~ within 10 working days following the completion of the show. ~~If the protest is against the actions of the club, the show committee of the club, a member of the club or show committee, or production company, the protest can optionally be filed with the Executive Secretary of the Association, with the filing fee as set forth in the Standing Rules, to be handled by the Board of Directors pursuant to this article.~~ A copy of the ~~protest~~ **complaint** shall also be sent to the show committee. ~~The Board of Directors shall commence action on the protest, pursuant to this article, within 60 days from the date of receipt of the protest in the Executive Office.~~ **The Board of Directors shall consider a complaint brought pursuant to this article at the next scheduled Board meeting provided that the responding parties have had adequate time to respond.** These fees are non-refundable. The filing fees shall not apply to protests filed by the Feline Welfare Standing Committee in its abuse protocols.

122.2.3 Any ~~non-documentary~~ evidence in support of a complaint or a response must be ~~submitted in the form of a declaration or affidavit, signed or sworn under penalty of perjury by the person providing that declaration or affidavit, and include a statement that the facts contained therein are within the personal knowledge of that person.~~ **accompanied by the following statement or by substantially similar language:**

“I declare that the foregoing is true and correct and that all documents (including videos) attached are true and correct copies of such documents. I declare that I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this complaint. I understand and acknowledge that TICA may issue penalties against me should any statements be deliberately false, including but not limited to forgery of signatures.”

122.2.4 **Rule Deleted** ~~Any documentary evidence in support of a complaint or a response must be declared or sworn, under penalty of perjury, to be true and correct copies of such documents.~~

122.2.5 The Board of Directors may refer the matter to the Legal Committee for a finding before any action is taken. The findings of the Legal Committee shall be advisory only and not binding on the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors may conduct a hearing itself or appoint a Legal Committee or person to conduct the hearing. All parties shall have the right to be present, in person, with or without counsel, or to be represented by counsel and to present a statement, evidence or witnesses in their behalf.

Amend Official Complaint Form:

The statement on the form currently reads:

“I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States of America, that the foregoing is true and correct, and that all documents attached are true and correct copies of such documents.”

Change this to read:

"I declare that the foregoing is true and correct and that all documents (including videos) attached are true and correct copies of such documents. I declare that I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this complaint. I understand and acknowledge that TICA may issue penalties against me should any statements be deliberately false, including but not limited to forgery of signatures."

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

None

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

- (A) This looks like a good change
 - (B) Yes this is much better wording.
 - (C) I agree with Susan's changes
 - (D) I like this wording much better. Very clear
 - (E) I agree as well
 - (F) I am happy with the proposed changes. Pleased to see 122.2.2 revised – I always found that rule a bit ambiguous.
 - (G) Question: If a person is appointed by the board should that person be acceptable by both parties?
 - (F) That's a very good point. Given that complaints are heard by the Board anyway, should that part of 122.2.5 be deleted as no longer appropriate? Is there any circumstance where the Board would appoint someone to conduct a hearing? Legal Counsel could not conduct it as they would be representing TICA in any hearing.
 - (H) Yes there are situations where we would appoint someone, for example if too many Board members are too close to the situation and we decide to send to an outside arbitrator. It should stay.
- In response to (G) - No they do not have to agree. It is in our rules that we can appoint a hearing officer. TICA would pay. If they [complainant] feel there is a conflict, they can raise it.

Amend CP 51.6 (Compensation) - Fralia

Rationale:

If a clerk does not have a ring steward, then they must clean the cages themselves; this goes without saying. They are essentially doing two jobs, ring clerk and steward. Clubs usually have budgeted for stewards so it is only fair that since clerks are doing two jobs, they should be paid for both.

Amend CP 51.6

51.6 Compensation.

"Master Clerks and Head Ring Clerks **and stewards** ~~who are in the Clerking Program, and all TICA judges holding current licenses,~~ shall be compensated" (Standing Rules to the Show Rules). **Ring clerks that are performing the job of ring steward shall be compensated for that job as well.** Assistant Ring Clerks and non-licensed clerks may be compensated at the discretion of the show management.

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

(A)

Standing Rules 501.6 (Version C 13-May-21) should be updated to reflect the changes agreed at the Annual 2019 Meeting (Motion 49): *"501.6 All head ring and master clerks holding current clerking licenses, and all TICA Judges holding current judging licenses shall be compensated as directed by the Board of Directors of this Association."*

Standing Rule 501.6 should also be updated to reflect the proposed changes in 51.6.

(B)

Again - I think this belongs in the Show Rules, not the Clerking Program. Standing Rules 501 deals with clerk compensation

(A)

Yes, however there is an existing link from Show Rules 29.1.1.7 to Standing Rules 501.

Show Rule 29.1.1.7 specifically only refers to Clerks, so that would also need to be updated to be consistent with the proposed changes to 501.6.

(D)

I agree with (B)

Contd/...

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

- (A) I do feel that this proposal is merging two different items (1) adding compensation for all ring clerks (regardless of whether they are licensed or not and (2) adding extra compensation for stewards.
- (B) I do think it should have been presented as two different proposals.
- I feel clerks should be compensated for having to clean the cages - doing double duty isn't easy - ideally you would always have stewards
- Is there anywhere we mention compensation for stewards in the rules?
- I couldn't find the word Steward anywhere in Show Rules.
- (C) Yes - stewards are not mentioned anywhere in our Show Rules. Rule 29.1.1.7.1 specifically refers only to "clerks" so that would also need to be updated.
- (D) The vast majority of European shows only have clerks. Only clerks with physical issues (bad backs etc.) would have a steward, so conditions are very different.
- (E) This brings up an interesting point - different parts of the world doing things differently. What is the clerk compensation like in Europe?
- (D) I haven't clerked often, but as far as I know the standard is one free entry per day.
- (E) So, this is contrary to what Caroline is proposing - since that is the guideline for clerk compensation.
- (F) Clerks in the UK get £25 per day plus lunch. The UK does not employ stewards.
- (G) I think this is another matter that is between the club and the clerk. There are no rules requiring stewards and not every club does budget for them.
- The Clerking Manual plainly states that cleaning cages may be a part of the Clerk's job. If that is not something a Clerk wants to do, they decline the job or the Club pays them. I don't think we need a rule.
- (H) Also stewards don't necessarily receive monetary compensation. Sometimes students do it for badges, rescues exchange stewarding for space etc.
- (E) This is a good point - at one time, one of my clubs had scouts and they were not individually paid, rather we made a donation to the troop as a whole.

Contd/...

- (I) I agree with (G). Sometimes exhibitors and judges pitch in to help.

Amend JP 49.4 (Master Clerk experience for Judges Transferring) -Fralia

Rationale:

While guest judges from other associations have met requirements to hold a license in their respective associations, they need to be extremely familiar with TICA colors, divisions and mechanics. All TICA licensed judges have been master clerks and taken and passed the master clerking exam at some point in their TICA careers. It is only right that guest judges do the same.

Master clerking provides valuable experience in training in colors, divisions and show mechanics.

Rules Chair Note:

Although the rationale talks about Guest Judges, the proposed rule change concerns the Master Clerking experience of judges applying to TICA from other Associations.

Amend JP 49.4:

49.4 Applicants must meet all of the following requirements prior to submitting their application for a TICA Judging License:

49.4.1 Must be a member of TICA in good standing at the time of application.

49.4.2 Must be a working member of an active TICA club

~~49.4.3 Must be a licensed TICA Master Clerk or must have judged a minimum of 5 TICA shows as a TICA Guest Judge and passed the TICA Master Clerk Exam.~~

49.4.3 Must have master clerked at least once AND passed the TICA Master Clerks Exam. More experience is encouraged.

49.4.4 Must have judged a minimum of 5 TICA shows as a TICA Guest Judge.

49.4.5 Be familiar with TICA By-Laws, Registration Rules, Show Rules and Breed Standards.

49.4.6 Successfully complete the applicant examination.

49.4.7 In the 2 years prior to applying, must

49.4.7.1 Attend a TICA judging school.

49.4.7.2 Attend a TICA genetics seminar.

49.4.7.3 Attend a TICA breed seminar.

49.4.7.4 Must have an Approved Allbreed Judge for a sponsor.

49.4.7.5 Must provide documentation in the application packet verifying fulfillment of all requirements as listed above.

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

None

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

(A)

I agree with the Chair's note. This rule change is not about "normal" guest judges. And if it were, I would disagree with it. Guest judges should acquaint themselves with any differences in standards, but not with all TICA procedures, before they guest judge.

It would be in everybody's best interest to give a guest judge an experienced clerk, though.

(B)

Seems to me this section was changed only recently and I frankly see no reason to change.

(C)

I am ok with this for transfer judges

(D)

it is appropriate.

(E)

As probably the most recent "transfer judge" to work my way through the TICA program, I did much more than what is being requested to receive my TICA master clerk's license.

As someone who was a member of the CFA judging program committee for several years just prior to coming to TICA, the CFA rule was that transfer judges need only pass the CFA master clerk license exam and then could apply. That was the only clerking requirement. The thought process behind this was that any applicant, regardless of association affiliation had sufficient clerking experience and as long as they retained the knowledge it was satisfactory for admission into the training program.

It appears that Caroline is proposing a similar methodology for TICA?

(F)

These all good points. My main concern is that not all associations judge the same way as TICA and the rules cannot assume that that the judge is coming from a North American association. The rules have to be applicable world-wide.

Contd/...

(F – contd)

In terms of the actual proposal, I am really struggling to see any merits in changing the existing Judging Program requirements for Transfer Judges. It removes the requirement to be a Licensed Master Clerk as one of two options.

(A)

I agree with (F).

FIFe, which is very large in Europe, does not do ring judging and while they use stewards, they don't use clerks in the same way as TICA and CFA. The same applies to LOOF in France and - I believe, but am not 100% - GCCF. And that more or less has Europe covered.

I also agree with the fact that the change is so small, it's difficult to see the merit.

(G)

What I find confusing is she's talking about Guest Judges in the rationale and then changes requirements for transfer judges..

And she takes and 'or' options and breaks it into 2 'musts' options.

I would assume at some point a guest judge was judging and the clerk didn't know colors, divisions, etc which is a requirement of being a clerk! The clerks are supposed to know mechanics and what color patterns belong in which divisions, not just the master clerks.

(C)

I too assumed something must have triggered this.

(H)

The rationale behind her proposal was that TICA judge trainees go through a myriad of steps before becoming judges including Master Clerking several times before taking the test. Maybe it's not written the way it should be and maybe it should go to the Judging Committee also but I have to agree that if you are transferring from another association, just taking and passing the Master Clerks exam should be a requirement AFTER actually Master Clerking. All associations have different rules and guidelines. Master Clerking is different from association to association.

Plus I feel the more you put in to getting into the judging program, the more buy-in you will have with the association instead of it just being some vehicle so you can judge (which we have judges like that now and it shows, but that is a whole other story).

(D)

This rule appears to be for international guest judges - not for a judge coming over from a domestic association. Up until recently no CFA judge or judge from another association could guest judge 5 times.

Contd/...

(F)

(D) - that makes a lot of sense. So 49.4 as it currently stands has two options to qualify - either become a Licensed Master Clerk (e.g. judges from a NA association) or guest judge 5 times and take the Master Clerk Exam (e.g. judges from elsewhere). Again, I really don't think Caroline's proposed amendment is needed.

(H)

I still think the rule is ambiguous. If you were a guest judge trying to transfer, why wouldn't you have to master clerk? Maybe I'm missing something but why should they be any different? They should have to Master Clerk just like everyone else not just take the test. There is a lot of knowledge to be gained by master clerking.

Amend Show Rules (Remove “sale” references) - Wood

Rationale:

Following the success of Proposal 6 in the 2020 Ballot which removed the designation of entries “for sale”, a number of show rules need updating for consistency with that change.

In addition, for consistency there should be a definition of “Exhibition Only” entries.

Amend Show Rule 21.7

21.7 Benched Cat - Cats, kittens, alters and household pets present and qualified for competition **or Exhibition Only** during an entire show.

Add Show Rule 21.75:

21.75 Exhibition Only – A cat (see 21.74) that is entered in the show but is not judged in any class.

Amend Show Rule 23.8:

23.8 The show committee may permit cats or kittens 3 months of age or older to be entered for **“Exhibition Only”** ~~or sale~~.

23.8.1 No kitten under the age of 3 calendar months is permitted in the show hall under any circumstance.

23.8.2 The show committee, at its discretion, may require a TICA litter registration as proof of age for kittens under the age of 4 months of age entered as Exhibition **Only** ~~or For Sale~~.

Amend Show Rule 25.2:

25.2 Vetted Shows. A licensed practicing veterinarian acting for the club must examine each cat or kitten including household pets and entries for ~~sale or~~ **Exhibition Only** prior to benching and shall disqualify any cat that shows evidence of fungus, fleas, ear mites, or any infectious or contagious illness

Amend Show Rule 26.1.2:

26.1.2 No more than two kittens or one cat may be benched in a single cage, whether entered for competition, or for **Exhibition Only** ~~or for sale~~.

Amend Show Rule 210.6:

210.6 No exhibitor shall bring into the show hall any cat, whether for show, **Exhibition Only**, ~~sale~~, or otherwise, which is infested with any parasite, including but not limited to fleas, ear mites, lice or ticks.

Contd/...

Amend Show Rule 211.9:

211.9 Catalogs shall contain the number of cats in each of the following categories:

LH Kittens, SH Kittens,
LH Adults, SH Adults,
LH Alters, SH Alters,
LH HHP Kittens, SH HHP Kittens,
LH Household Pets, SH Household Pets,
Preliminary New Breeds,
Advanced New Breeds, and
New Traits classes

As well as optionally list each entry present for Exhibition Only, *including for sale cats and kittens* (unless listing of all cats and kittens present in the show hall is required to meet local laws, regulations, or club needs). If all cats and kittens present in the show hall must be listed in the show catalog, a statement must be included in the show's information provided to exhibitors (for example, the show flyer) that no cat or kitten may be in the show hall unless the cat or kitten information is provided to the club in advance and the cat/kitten information is included in the show catalog.

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

Rules Chair Note:

The only comments related to the need to define "Exhibition Only", which has now been incorporated into the proposal. Other rules were then updated for consistency with this defined term.

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

- (A) This change is basically good housekeeping, so I agree.
- (B) Looks good to me



Amend Show Rule 212.3.1(Reconsider AB Alter Finals) - Fralia

Rationale:

This rule is still very confusing to exhibitors and judges alike. Judges still have a hard time knowing how many to final whether you are in a Specialty or All Breed ring.

The original rationale was to increase new members and counts for the Alter class in shows. This has not happened (see figures below from TICA website).

While exhibitors enjoy the final, many judges feel that they are finaling cats that are not deserving of a final. TICA is progressive enough that it should be able to admit that maybe this rule change was not in the best interests of the association and put it back on the ballot for the members to re-evaluate it. **[Rules Chair Note: It was implemented on 1 May 2018].**



Amend Show Rule 212.3.1:

212.3.1 Household Pet Adult class, **and** Household Pet Kitten class, ~~and AB Alter class.~~

The following places shall be awarded for finals of these classes depending on number of cats present and competing:

Number of Cats	Number of Final Places
Fewer than 10	Equal to Number of cats competing
10 or More	10

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

None

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

(A)

Well as a judge I do know who I'm supposed to be finalising but yes some are not of sufficient merit.

I totally agree with this.

(B)

I agree with it totally but it sure is hard to put that genie back in the bottle-;)

As a judge, I do feel like I have placed less deserving cats.

(C)

I completely agree with the proposal.

I have seen judges who were confused about how many finals they could award and I know that a lot of alter exhibitors feel (and felt when it was originally discussed) that it devalued their finals, because at many shows it meant guaranteed finals in all AB rings as soon as the cat passed the vet check. At many shows in Europe it has also made it easier to get AB finals, because the number of final placings in the SH rings was left at 5.

(D)

I believe we tried to repeal this a couple of years ago and the board felt that there hadn't been enough time to see how it is working.

While there have been a couple of times where I've felt that the quality of the bottom 5 didn't deserve a final, for the most part, the alter class is very strong.

Contd/...

(D- contd)

What I don't like is treating different classes differently. I wasn't for increasing HHP and HHK to 10 no matter what, nor the alter class. Personally, I think if we are going to do top 10 it should be across the board - top 10 for all AB rings.

(E)

I went back and checked - Top 10 for HHP was introduced following the 2013 ballot – as a way to increase alter entries. The evidence from Caroline suggests that over several years that entries have not increased dramatically for HHPs, although entries have increased for HHPKs - not sure if the change was the reason or some other factor.

Because of the curtailed show year, it is difficult to assess the figures for 2020/21. I wondered if a metric of (number of alters entered per year)/(number of rings per year) might be a fairer comparison across all the years. I don't know how easy it would be for the EO to identify the number of rings (Caroline has sent data for the number of alters per year).

(F)

I don't like to see classes treated differently but the membership is not likely to vote for this change

(C)

There are only a few countries in Europe with high or relatively high alter counts and they haven't increased in the 2 seasons this has been in place and I doubt they ever will.

(G)

Here in the Southwest we have a very strong Alter class and we aren't awarding cats that don't deserve it

I was worried about that initially, but not anymore.

(H)

Two comments:

1. An award is not "undeserving" to the person receiving it and that might be the award that keeps someone in the cat fancy.

2. As to the first chart, unless I'm missing something, I don't think it proves much. Without seeing what percentage the alters are to the total entries, you really can't say if the alter entries are increasing or decreasing. I'm assuming these are show years, so the reason 2020 dropped off is that the season ended before April 30. We all know what happened in show season ending 2021. There isn't any proof in the chart that alter entries didn't actually go up.

The membership can certainly re-evaluate the rule, but I think there should be better arguments than people are confused, some people think the awards are undeserved, and flawed statistics.

(A)

I agree (H), everybody's cat is the best, however having to final cats that are not deserving is not right

(G)

If you feel they are not deserving, then don't final them - hang 'down' or WW

Contd/...

- (A) You can't [hang down/WW] if you don't know how many you are going to have that are decent
- (B) Exactly...the whole point is not to be forced to have to final top 10.

Add Reg Rule 31.7 (Define “actively breeding”) - Wood

Rationale:

The definition of “actively breeding” should be added to the definitions and applied equally to all breed advancements, not just for advancement to PNB. Currently, this is the only advancement stage where the term is currently defined.

Since one aim of the New Breed program is to demonstrate a critical mass of breeders across TICA, then it makes sense that only one of any co-owners count towards the number of breeders required.

Add Reg Rule 31.7:

31.7 For the purposes of breed advancements, "actively breeding" is defined as breeding at least one litter within the 2 years prior to the date of the application. If a litter or cattery is co-owned then only one person will count as “actively breeding” in the count of breeders required.

Amend Reg Rule 33.6.1.3:

33.6.1.3 At least five TICA members in good standing, in at least three different regions are actively breeding the breed (~~“actively breeding” means breeding at least one litter within the previous 2 years~~)

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

None

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

- (A) I agree with this, it's definitely needed.
- (B) Agree
- (C) Agree
- (D) Looks good to me.

Add Reg Rule 31.7 (Define “actively breeding”)

This is a good idea. Genetic diversity is critical in the process of breed development and maintenance. Multiple breeding programs is a step in that direction and the current rule is for multiple people, not multiple breeding programs. -Heather Lorimer, Massimo Picardello

Add New Reg Rule 33.1.2 (Duration in Experimental Record) - Kruszona-Zawadzka

Rationale:

The Experimental Record's purpose is to track the development of breeds that might in future progress to the next stages of recognition, up to and including Championship. TICA states that cats in this record are not recognized by TICA, just registered for tracking purposes, but for an average person, that buys a kitten with a paper with TICA logo, it doesn't matter that this paper states "Experimental Litter registry". They see TICA logo, they see no difference between "recognised" and "tracked", they don't really understand the significance of "Experimental".

Therefore some people purposefully use TICA, submitting registrations for Experimental Breeds they have no intention of progressing to the next steps of recognition, just to be able to obtain papers with TICA logo for their kittens. And TICA currently has no rules that allow striking such a breed from its records.

Therefore I would like to propose the following change, that would ensure that breeds that either have no hope of being recognised due to outside factors (like lack of consent from another breed group to use their structural mutation) or just no intentions of progression, could eventually be removed from the list of breeds accepted in Experimental Record (and not immediately signed back in).

Rules Chair Note: This is a modified version of the proposal first submitted at the Spring 2021 meeting and modified, including a suggestion from the Genetics Committee. Their concern was that 5 years may not be sufficient, and the proposal now provides for extensions of that period if justifiable.

Add new Reg Rule 33.1.2 and re-number existing 33.1.2:

33.1.1 Experimental New Breeds - New breeds which are in development and which do not have an approved breed name. Experimental New Breeds are tracked in the Experimental Record. Formal approval of the Board of Directors is not required.

33.1.2 An Experimental New Breed shall be tracked for an initial period of 5 years from the date of the application. That initial period can be extended by the approval of the Board. If, at that time, the experimental breed has not advanced to Registration Only status the breed will no longer be tracked and may not reapply for a period of 5 years. During this period, no Experimental New Breed of similar name and breeding program shall be accepted by the TICA Executive Office.

33.1.2.1 Each 5 year period as an Experimental New Breed can be extended for a further 5 years by a vote of the Board of Directors. An application for each extension, providing justification for the proposed extension, must be submitted to both the Rules Committee and Genetics Committee at least 90 days prior to a scheduled TICA Board Meeting. The date of that Board Meeting must be before the end of the current 5 year period.

33.1.2.2 For breeds already on the Experimental Record as at [effective date], the initial 5 year period will count from that date.

33.1.32 Transfer New Breed - A breed accepted for championship competition in another cat association. Transfer New Breeds shall be registered in either the Stud Book Registry or the Foundation Registry (See 36.2, 36.3, 36.4, 36.5, 36.6). Formal approval of the Board of Directors is REQUIRED for Registration Only Breed status

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

Rules Chair Note: There was some internal discussion on wording and appropriate rule placement and the consensus view is reflected in the proposed amendments above.

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

- (A) I like it – but is this needed if the proposal to eliminate breed names passes?
- (B) We can't assume that the other proposal will succeed, plus any possible second application is likely to use a breed name so the rule needs to use "name"
- (C) Looks good to me - I assume the existing breeds will get a notice of some sort with applicable dates?
- (D) Looks good.
- (E) I like this revision. Allows for experimental breeds but keeps them in check with advancement.
- (F) My only concern is that it puts the responsibility for tracking the five year period on the board and not the group making the application. Is the appropriate mechanism in place for the EO to track and notify the board when an experimental breed is coming up on their five year deadline?

How many of the current experimental breeds are past a five year window already?
- (B) I'm sorry (F) but I think the opposite is the case - it is the breed's responsibility to track the 5 year period, not the Board.

Contd/...

(B- Contd)

As this is a new rule, I doubt that the EO have such a mechanism in place (nor one for notifying a breed contact - if one does exist), but I'm sure it could be developed (subject to the funds being available for that).

For those existing breeds, the proposal is that their 5 year clock starts at the time the new rule is implemented. This might be arbitrary but I can't see any easy way of doing something else without a lot of work to assess suitable deadline periods.

(G)

This is the natural result of any moratorium type rule. Some get more time.

(H)

According to the list in Standing Rules, there are some 38 Experimental breeds listed. I'm certain that, of those, 20 of them are over 5 years in development.

(I)

I agree with this proposal. I think the people who want this new breed should be doing the monitoring.

(J)

I think this can go a couple of directions. The first is to simply develop a spreadsheet that identifies dates and requirements and manually track those and manually update the contact as dates come near. I am sure we could build some automation into it. The cost for this is next to nothing, but it does require someone in the EO to monitor the spreadsheet and stay on top of it.

The second way is in Salesforce. We can set up a process that identifies and tracks timelines, contacts, allows for file upload and one that includes reminders for upcoming and important dates, and possibly even providing an interface to allow users to request an extension. The cost for this could be fairly significant and time consuming, as it will be a custom programming job within Salesforce.

We may be able to look at a simplified version within Salesforce depending on basic requirements.

I think the direction we go depends on the frequency of this happening and how many happen congruently.

(B)

The spreadsheet solution sounds like a good first step - I'm not sure TICA should devote lots of time and resources to automate this in the short term.

Genetics Committee
Comments on proposals for the Annual Meeting

July 12, 2021

REVISED Add new Reg Rule 33.1.2 (Duration in Experimental Record)

This looks good. 5-year extensions possible. -Heather Lorimer, Massimo Picardello

Amend Reg Rules 33.3.1 and 33.4.4 (Experimental Breed Names) – Kruszona-Zawadzka

Rationale:

The Experimental Record's purpose is to track the development of breeds that might in future progress to next stages of recognition, up to and including Championship. TICA claims that cats in this record are not recognized by TICA, just recorded for tracking purposes, but for an average person, that buys a kitten with a paper with TICA logo, it doesn't matter that this paper states "Experimental Litter record". They see TICA logo, they see no difference between "recognised" and "tracked", they don't really understand the significance of "Experimental". Therefore some people purposefully use TICA, submitting registrations for Experimental Breeds they have no intention of progressing with to the next steps of recognition, just to be able to obtain papers with TICA logo for their kittens. And TICA currently has no rules that allow to strike such a breed from its records.

The addition of alphanumeric codes in place of breed names during the initial stages of recognition will ensure that the possibility of being tracked by TICA will not be abused even in the short term.

Rules Chair Note: This proposal is based upon a suggestion put forward by Genetics Committee at the Spring 2021 Meeting. They noted that the alphanumeric designation could be Experimental shorthair breed A1S or experimental longhair breed A1L or something similar. They recommend that there should not be an official list of breed names for "breeds" that have not moved forward towards championship status.

Amend Reg Rules 33.3.1 and 33.4.4:

33.3.1 Experimental New Breed. The Experimental New Breed shall be tracked in the Experimental Record by making application to the TICA Executive Office. The following information must be included in the application for tracking:

33.3.1.1 A brief description of the proposed breed. (This is to enable the office to identify the breed. It could be a paragraph written by a breeder, a standard from another association, or another means for identifying the cats included in the breed.)

33.3.1.2 A proposed breed name that is unique.

33.3.1.2.1 Upon acceptance of an application of a new Experimental New Breed, an alphanumeric code identifying that breed will be assigned by the TICA Executive Office. The code shall be used instead of the breed's name on all documentation issued by TICA for that breed. The code shall be used until the breed advances to Preliminary New Breed status, at which time it shall be changed to the Board-approved breed name.

33.3.1.2.2 For breeds already on the Experimental Record as at [effective date], alphanumeric codes will be assigned by the Executive Office and shall be used for all documentation issued after [effective date].

33.3.1.2.2.3 The proposed breed name ~~used~~ **supplied** for tracking in the Experimental Record is not in any way to be considered an official breed name accepted or approved by TICA and may be changed, removed or revoked at any time.

33.3.1.3 A proposed breed contact person.

33.3.1.4 A processing fee as specified in the Standing Rules

33.4.4 Experimental breeding programs which do not have an approved breed name shall be designated by the code EX **followed by an alphanumeric code (see Reg Rule 33.3.1.2.1).**

33.4.4.1 Cats tracked in the Experimental Record shall be designated with EX preceding the **assigned alphanumeric code** ~~proposed two-digit breed prefix~~.

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

(A)

The name should be given at Registration Only status. This is the first "official" level.

(B)

I checked back and that came from Heather originally in GC comments for the Spring Meeting. Genetics will need to comment on why PNB was suggested.

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

(A)

Fine by me

(B)

Putting the proposal in the context of the series of applicable rules, I don't think they are properly placed. I think they should be under 33.4 – Names

Also I think 33.3.1.2.2 should instead be Standing Rule 303.3.1.2 as this doesn't seem like a Rule to be voted on by the Membership but rather the implementation of such rule.

Is the EO supposed to re-code all Experimental Record cats for all of history?
Are they to re-issue all certificates?

I think that we should run this by the EO.

(C)

I can understand that logic [placing under 33.4]. However, given that someone looking to add a new Experimental Breed is more likely to look only at 33.3.1 and that there is a cross reference in 33.4.4 back to 33.3.1 for EX breeds, I think the original placement is appropriate.

This [to re-code all Experimental Record cats] should be possible to do as an automated process as a one-pass through the database (although might need to update the database schema first). I don't see need to re-issue old certificates unless a client specifically requests one - and the proposed rule qualifies that it only applies after the effective date for existing EX records.

I certainly think we should get Danny's take on this by the date of the meeting (although I know he is going to be very busy as go-live approaches)

(D)

My only comment is this...and it's my opinion.

When breeds are developing, whether they are experimental or not a name is sometimes the defining factor in appearance or location of origin.

Giving everyone a generic code will, in my opinion, lessen the importance of the breed. It's not for us to decide if it's important, viable etc. - it's important to someone.

And I totally understand that people are passing these off as "TICA" approved but I'm sure there is some way to come up with a system, certificate, etc. that could include the breed name and/or code.

(E)

I think it's a good move as long as it doesn't create any technical issues with the creation of a new coding process for these experimental breeds.

(F)

I understand what this is trying to achieve, however I think we need EO input on the easiest way to achieve this. As (B) has said, we have plenty of pre-existing certificates with breed names

(G)

I agree with this proposal.

(H)

This is easy enough to do in Salesforce.

We [The EO] can set up a zoom to develop a list of specific requirements and get a better quote on what something like might cost.

Amend Reg Rules 33.3.1 and 33.4.4 (Experimental Breed Names)

Ellen Crockett thinks that the place that a breed should get a name on a registration certificate might be better going from experimental to registration only. Massimo Picardello and Heather Lorimer think that PNB is better. There are few requirements for going from experimental to Registration only. There is more vetting at going to PNB. There are no approvals needed to go from experimental into registration only.

Amend Reg Rules 33.3.2 and 33.3.3.6 (mutation ownership voting) - Kruszona-Zawadzka

Rationale:

Currently it is not specified, how and at which point during the recognition process of a new breed rule 33.9.4 (the rule regarding "mutation ownership") should be enforced.

So just for clarity's sake, so no one can argue about that, I propose to explicitly add that a positive vote is a requirement for advancement (for new breeds that fall under the rule), and that it has to be done at "entry level", not "just sometime before championship". The requirement should be added in two places, to cover both Experimental New Breeds and Transfer New Breeds,

Rules Chair Note: This is a modified version of the proposal first submitted at the Spring 2021 meeting and modified to reflect comments from Rules Committee regarding the logistics of the ballot.

Amend Reg Rules 33.3.2 and 33.3.3.6

33.3.2 Transfer New Breed. A Transfer New Breed may apply for acceptance as a recognized breed for Registration Only by making application at least 90 days prior to the Board meeting at which acceptance is sought by submitting an electronic application to each member of the Genetics Committee and each member of the Rules Committee. Following approval of the application by the Genetics Committee and Rules Committee, the application will be submitted by the Chair of the Rules Committee to the TICA Executive Office at least 60 days prior to the Board Meeting for inclusion in the agenda. Any comments of the Genetics Committee or Rules Committee must be included. Application for Registration Only Breed status must include the following: (applications available from the TICA Executive Office or at tica.org.)

1. A brief description of the breed distinguishing it from other breeds recognized by the association.
2. A standard of the breed from another established cat association.
3. A proposed designation of Breed Classification (See 33.2).
4. A proposed breed name that is unique.
5. A proposed two-letter registration code.
6. A proposed breeding program.
7. A proposed provisional Working Group Chair.
8. A processing fee as specified in the Standing Rules.

33.3.2.1 If a Transfer New Breed includes one or more structural mutations that are "owned" by an existing breed (see 33.9.4), then immediately after submitting the application to Rules and Genetics Committees a poll must be requested from the Executive Office to obtain consent from the affected breeds. The poll can only be carried out once for each breed/breed group affected and the result of the vote shall be final. A positive vote is required for recognition as a Registration Only breed. The cost of any poll shall be the financial responsibility of the individuals requesting the poll.

33.3.2.42 It is understood that acceptance for Registration Only implies only that TICA agrees to provide registration facilities for development of the breed in question. There is no explicit or implied guarantee that TICA will accept the breed for championship either simultaneously or at any time in the future.

33.3.3 Advancement from Experimental New Breed to Registration Only New Breed. An Experimental New Breed may apply for approval of the Board of Directors as a Registration Only Breed upon completion of the following:

33.3.3.1 At least 1 year has passed since the initial tracking of the breed in the Experimental Record.

33.3.3.2 At least 10 cats of the breed have been tracked in the Experimental Record.

33.3.3.3 At least 5 litters of the breed have been tracked.

33.3.3.4 At least 3 TICA members in good standing from 2 different Regions are on record.

33.3.3.5 Submission of an electronic Application for Advancement to Registration Only Breed 90 days prior to the Board meeting at which recognition is sought to each member of the Genetics Committee and each member of the Rules Committee. Following approval of the application by the Genetics Committee and Rules Committee, the application will be submitted by the Chair of the Rules Committee to the TICA Executive Office at least 60 days prior to the Board Meeting for inclusion in the agenda. Any comments of the Genetics Committee or Rules Committee must be included. (Applications available from the TICA Executive Office or at tica.org.)

33.3.3.6 Application must include the following: (Applications available from the TICA Executive Office or at tica.org.)

A brief description of the breed distinguishing it from other breeds recognized by the association.

A proposed breed name that is unique

A proposed two-letter registration code.

A proposed breeding program.

A proposed designation of Breed Classification (See 33.2).

A proposed provisional Working Group Chair.

Documentation of 33.3.4.1 through 33.3.4.4.

A processing fee as specified in the Standing Rules.

33.3.3.7 If a breed includes one or more structural mutations that are “owned” by an existing breed (see 33.9.4), then immediately after submitting the application to Rules and Genetics Committees a poll must be requested from the Executive Office to obtain consent from the affected breeds. The poll can only be carried out once for each breed/breed group affected and the result of the vote shall be final. A positive vote is required for recognition as a Registration Only breed. The cost of any poll shall be the financial responsibility of the individuals requesting the poll.

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

(A)

Reg Rule 33.9.4 is currently located in the section relating to New Traits of a Championship Breed. This is clearly inappropriate and from the relevant ballot paper the rule was originally intended to be numbered as 39.4 (with the existing 39.4 and subsequent rules re-numbered)

If this goes forward to the ballot, the current 33.9.4 should be moved to Article 9 and any affected 39.x rules re-numbered. The proposed changes above should then use the correct reference.

(B)

It came up on Genetics that WCF has accepted for championship some of our EX breeds for Championship based on the EX registration in TICA - so we might need to clarify that Transfer breeds are subject to the same rules about mutation combination as EX breeds.

(A)

TNB at the RO level are covered in this proposal. However, potentially a TNB could come in at ANB level if at least 2 WCC members have approved it for Championship for at least 5 years.

So, to cover this loophole, the language in the proposed 33.3.2.1 could also be included as a new 33.10.3.7

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

(A)

While I support the intent, I think this needs a lot more work. And, yes, there is the issue of 33.9.4.

I don't think this resolves the issues with process, procedure and timing. There is a perfectly good process outlined in 33.9.2 (etc) that might work. I also don't understand the rationale of adding that the poll can only be held once.

(B)

33.9.2 is specifically about New Traits, so I'm not sure it is totally suitable to refer to that. I do feel that this version has addressed process, procedure and timing - albeit at a high level - and that the original 33.9.4 did not refer to a specific voting process either.

I believe that the rationale for only holding the poll once is that the decision on whether the "parent breed" allows the use of the "owned" mutation is decided once and once only at the start of the New Breed journey. In other words it cannot be overturned at a later stage.

Contd/...

(A)

Sorry I wasn't clear. I'm referring to the process timing in 33.9.2

- Submission of an electronic Application to each member of the Genetics Committee, and each member of the Rules Committee, at least 120 days before the applicable Board meeting.

--Following approval of the Genetics Committee and the Rules Committee, and at least 90 days prior to the applicable Board meeting, the approved application shall be submitted to the Executive Office for polling

[Referring to: "In other words it cannot be overturned at a later stage"] I don't think this is wise as rules can change. It needs some words to allow for advancement if rules are changed.

(B)

Yes - I follow what you mean. The standard timeframe for the RO stage is 90 days prior. The proposal states the poll must be requested immediately after submission (but not approval) to the two Committees. If we keep that (and not complicate the existing rules by making it a conditional 120 days for an advancement needing a poll) then the poll result should be available before the agenda is published, but after Rules and Genetics have commented and submitted their comments. No doubt both group's recommendations would need to be conditional on the poll outcome.

Because the Working Group requests a poll after submission to Rules and Genetics, there is a risk that either Committee could flag the application as non-compliant once the poll is underway. I guess that could be seen as an incentive to get the application right first time.

(C)

I agree with (A) regarding allowing for future changes, including rules changes and people's opinions changing - change is inevitable. There should not be a restriction to allow only one poll (how many times were the MC breeders polled before poly was accepted?)

Amend Reg Rules 33.3.2 and 33.3.3.6 (mutation ownership voting)

33.3.3.7 If a breed includes one or more structural mutations that are “owned” by an existing breed (see 33.9.4), then immediately after submitting the application to Rules and Genetics Committees a poll must be requested from the Executive Office to obtain consent from the affected breeds. The poll can only be carried out once for each breed/breed group affected and the result of the vote shall be final. A positive vote is required for recognition as a Registration Only breed. The cost of any poll shall be the financial responsibility of the individuals requesting the poll.

Why can the poll only be done once? If there is new information, then a new poll should be allowed, I would think.

Ellen Crockett expressed concern about Transfer New Breeds (TNBs) that might come in at the higher levels, such as ANB level. They should still be subject to the “mutation ownership” rules. TNB at the RO level are covered. However potentially a TNB could come in at ANB level if at least 2 WCC members have approved it for Championship for at least 5 years.

So perhaps the language in the proposed 33.3.2.1 could be also included as a new 33.10.3.7?
Heather Lorimer concurs

Heather Lorimer would also like to point out, as always, that our use of the term “structural mutation” is imprecise and the typical interpretation is not genetically correct, nor does it address possible genetic health problems well. Persians are Persians and Siamese are Siamese due to structural mutations. Additionally. Coat colors and fur textures can be associated with health issues depending on the genetic cause (as in merle dogs, lethal white in horses, nude mice). We need better definitions, but that is not a topic for here, just a point that I will repeat until we fix it, hopefully, eventually.

Participating Genetics Committee members:
Heather Lorimer, PhD
Massimo Picardello, PhD
Ellen Crockett

Amend Reg Rules 33.6.3.2, 33.7.4.5, 33.8.16 (New Breed Reporting) - Wood

Rationale:

With the introduction of the new IT system, it should now be easier for Breed Chairs to receive the information from the Executive Office in order to prepare their annual breed reports for the Annual. This information is mandated in existing Registration Rules.

Although the current rules talk about “years” it is not clear for PNB or ANB whether these are show years or calendar years. The New Championship Breeds rule (33.8.15) specifically states it is a “show year”.

As reports are presented at the Annual Board Meeting, it would be both more consistent and make more sense for PNB and ANB breeds to use show years, since that reflects the latest position rather than a calendar year – which by then would be 9 months old data. It would also give the Board a more realistic understanding of the status of each New Breed.

This would also require a rule change to specify the correct meeting in 33.6.3.4 and 33.7.4.5. This anomaly may be a leftover from the times when the Board only met twice a year.

For new Breeds in the first 3 years of their Championship, the existing rule 33.8.16 should also contain a deadline and also require that the information be corroborated by information from the EO. Without that information, the Rules Committee cannot fulfil its duty to audit those reports.

The wording of 33.8.16 regarding possible demotion also needs changing to be consistent with other rules for PNB and ANB.

Amend Reg Rules 33.6.3.2, 33.7.4.5 and 33.8.16:

33.6.3.4 The Executive Office shall forward a report on litter registrations and individual cat registrations for the breed **during the show year just ended** to the Preliminary New Breed Working Group Chair each year after the ~~Winter~~ **Spring** Meeting. This information shall be used in preparing the required breed report for the Annual Meeting.

33.7.4.5 The Executive Office shall forward a report on litter registrations and individual cat registrations for the breed **during the show year just ended** to the Advanced New Breed Working Group Chair each year after the ~~Winter~~ **Spring** Meeting. This information shall be used in preparing the required breed report for the Annual Meeting.

33.8.16 It is the responsibility of the Breed Committee to document that all requirements have been met by providing a report to the Genetics Committee, the Rules Committee and the Executive Office **at least 60 days prior to the Annual Meeting. The report shall contain information supplied by the EO that corroborates the requirements of 33.8.15.** Failure to meet the requirements of 33.8.15 ~~will~~ **may** result in the breed being returned to Advanced New Breed status.

Add Reg Rule 33.8.17:

33.8.17 The Executive Office shall forward a report on individual cat registrations, cats shown and a list of active breeders (and their Region) for the breed during the show year just ended to the Breed Chair each year after the Spring Meeting. This information shall be used in preparing the report required in 33.8.16 for the Annual Meeting.

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

No comments

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

(A)

I think these are good clarifications. I wonder about the workload for the EO?

(B)

I don't think much of a workload - it's only for ANB. PNB & new breeds (for 3 years)

And the new software should make this information easy to pull.

(C)

Also, several months ago I flagged these requirements to Danny and Ralph - I'm assuming they will have been built into the new system.

(D)

I think these are great recommendations! I remember when I worked with new breeds there was always a dilemma over trying to figure out what "year" TICA was referring to.

You might also want to add 'shows that cats have been shown in' as well as 'a list of judges who have handled the cats' (I believe these can be pulled together as one report) under the ANB section since these are requirements for ANB to advance to Championship.

(E)

This looks good to me, I think clarity is everything.

Contd/...

(C)

(Responding to D's comment) I'm a bit torn here. I don't want everything given to the breed working group on a plate - I'd expect some level of effort from them to progress their breed rather than just getting the numbers right. If the new system provides these easily, then I'm not sure the rule needs amending right away.

(F)

I have to agree with (C). They should be doing some footwork. If you have to do a little research it makes it a little more worthwhile.

Amend Reg Rules 33.9.2.3.3 and 39.9.1 (Use of “Blue Slip”) - Wood

Rationale:

As time has gone on and procedures and systems revised, the term “Blue slip” is no longer appropriate and should be replaced by the term “breeder slip”

Amend Reg Rules 33.9.2.3.3 and 39.9.1

33.9.2.3.3 When registering a cat with a new trait other than color, the “non-standard” box on the ~~blue~~ **breeder** slip must be checked and the trait(s) indicated on the ~~blue~~ **breeder** slip in order to facilitate tracking.

39.9 Application for Registration. Each application for registration must fulfill one of the following:

39.9.1 Be made by submitting an individual application for registration of a cat of a registered litter issued by TICA (TICA ~~blue~~ **breeder** slip).

[remainder of rule unchanged]

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

- (A) Upon passage of this proposal, there should be an administrative review of all TICA public material and changes made, if appropriate, to ensure terminology is consistent.
- (B) I agree with this. Forms and public material are sometimes forgotten when rules change.

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

- (A) I don't see any problems with this essentially a housekeeping change.
- (B) Agreed - just cleaning up to reflect current verbiage
- (C) Agree too
- (D) Looks good to me
- (E) I agree

Amend Standing Rules 103.3.1.3 (Prorated Membership Fees) – Hawksworth-Weitz

Rationale:

For many years, TICA has had a policy of no prorated dues regardless of when a person joins – See Standing Rule 113.3.1.3. Currently people who join TICA for one year as a regular or international member in the later months of the membership year, do not receive the full benefits of yearly membership.

For example; a person joins TICA on March 15th and pays full year's dues. But in reality, they only have approximately 6 weeks of membership benefits after paying the full membership dues for a year. They then have to renew again May 1st. If the prospective member reads the membership rules on the membership application on-line form, TICA's process of non-prorated dues is highly inequitable and actually discourages people to join TICA except for the April-June time frame.

If passed, this proposed amendment will provide an equitable dues schedule that reflects their actual usage while maintaining dues renewals as of May 1st.

Amend Standing Rule 113.3.1.3 (Two options):

103.3.1.1 No matter when in a membership year (i.e. May 1 – April 30) a person joins TICA, he/she must renew that membership on May 1st in accordance with By-Laws 113.1, 113.1.1 and 113.1.2.

113.3.1.2 Memberships paid in April expire on April 30th of the following year.

Option 1:

113.3.1.3 In the initial year of membership and when membership lapses and is reinstated after June 30th, Membership dues in the month of joining are prorated as follows:

April to June	100%
July	90%
August	80%
September	70%
October	60%
November	50%
December	40%
January	30%
February	20%
March	10%

113.3.1.4~~3~~ Membership dues are not prorated **for 5 Year or Lifetime memberships.**

Option 2:

113.3.1.3 In the initial year of membership and when membership lapses and is reinstated after June 30th, Membership dues in the month of joining are prorated as follows:

April to June	100%
July to September	75%
October to December	50%
January to March	25%

113.3.1.4~~3~~ Membership dues are not prorated for 5 Year or Lifetime memberships.

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

- (A) Does this proposal impact the required 6 mo membership prior to the October ballot? We need to understand any practices the EO has relative to "new memberships" as of April 1.
- (B) No - everyone's renewal date is still 1 May, as now.

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

- (A) Before I would vote for this, I'd want to have a report from the EO on how it would affect business. Seems like it would be a nightmare to administer. In addition, why would the dues for 5 year and life be prorated on the full term - should only be for the first year.
- (B) It might be a nightmare under TDS, but I'm guessing that Salesforce will be a different matter.

It seems to me that leaving the 5 year and lifetime terms at the full cost reflects that both are already effectively offering a membership discount anyway.
- (C) It seems terribly confusing to me.. I'm a fan of 'simple' - I would say something like new memberships after Oct 31 be 50%

We also have to remember the cost of the Trend in this. Do the membership fees cover the cost of the Trend? (They should)
- (D) The whole thing is confusing. Plus there are some rules regarding voting, membership, etc .that need to be looked at.

Contd/...

(D – Contd)

Maybe instead of prorating etc. it might be possible to build in an auto-remind to renew.

Also, RD's should be sending out reminders for renewal through their respective channels.

(E)

Reminders will be built into the system but that isn't the issue this proposal is wanting to address. The issue is that people pay for a full year's membership for a month or two, etc. The "simple" solution is to make membership dues effective for a year, but that really screws up the whole timing system that is set up for voting. Of course, that could be changed, too.

I think that Option 1 is a non-starter. Getting down to 10% of dues is \$2.50. Option 2 makes more sense to me. Frankly, I'd suggest either leaving our system in place for making only full fee or 50% fee categories.

(F)

My biggest concern is the timing on this. Salesforce has not been launched yet and there will be a lot to do before we start taking on other projects.

Second is that we will still be in phase 1 after we go live. We need to finish phase 1 of the salesforce implementation to automate and increase the level of self-service in our current system. Doing so, will ensure that TICA can grow without the pains we have experienced in this last year in terms a growing backlog and frustrated members and clients.

With Salesforce, we do have the ability to PAY for new features that were perhaps not possible in TDS. IMO the question is, is this a show stopping problem that justifies diverting monies and effort away from putting TICA in the best position to grow?

I am sure this is possible and our implementation team can help us work through the details and develop a more equitable system along with a cost estimate. There will be some logistical issues we need to consider in the EO, but for now, I would recommend we finish phase 1 and add this item to the backlog of post phase 1 projects so the board can vote and prioritize the post phase 1 projects.

It is my strong opinion that we should stay focused on the projects that make us more efficient before we start on other items unless they are preventing us from doing business.

That being said, I completely understand the reasoning and need for a change like this. I think we may be losing out on potential members and the current practice is a bit outdated.

(A)

I also think that this is a "nice to have" feature and that it might best be tabled until Sales Force is up and running. It also would be good to have a cost estimate to make the change.

Contd/...

(A – Contd)

We have had the current system for 45 years - there are a few people who complain every year when they join late and then are told they need to renew - maybe we can make what they are buying clearer?

(F)

We will be auto sending 90, 60 and 30 day reminders with a link to pay within Salesforce.

(G)

Perfect!

That will help a lot of people. I know many European breeders/exhibitors who are members and want to remain members, but are still very new to TICA and regularly forget to renew, because they're used to getting reminders from their main association. It will help a lot.

(B)

Just because we had had this for 45 years doesn't automatically justify it as something to stay with forever. We need all sorts of things to attract and retain new members and this could be one of those improvements.

I think for me, the problem is that there is no clear way of finding out just how many potential members we lose through the current system. Or exactly how many do complain/vent at the EO/vent on FB etc. That would give some element of benefit to set against the costs.

That said, I do think this change is worth further consideration once Salesforce Phase 1 is well underway. (F)'s points about priorities are very valid.

(G)

I think there'll be less administration involved in option 2 and it still gives the member a discount that will encourage them to join during the year.

(B)

I agree that Option 2 is preferable. If justified, TICA could move onto Option 1 in the fullness of time. If Option 1 is used and then is found to be unworkable, rolling back to Option 2 could cause more upset

Amend Standing Rules 106.2.1 and 106.4.2 (Judging Committee) - Fisher

Rationale:

The formative first cycle of the Judging Committee will be ending within a year and elections will be held. This proposal addresses three issues which should be discussed and considered.

1. Continuity
2. Optimum size
3. Representation

Continuity. It would seem prudent to provide a system of staggered terms in order to maintain continuity of work and thought. This proposal sets in place a rotation cycle which provides an initial transition period and results in only 50% of the Committee being subject to election in any cycle.

Optimum size. This proposal provides for a Committee size capped at 10 members. The Judging Committee is a working committee. Its work is defined and it is task focused. While the Committee needs to have sufficient members to complete its tasks, it also needs to be at a size that allows all members to meaningfully participate, develop a cohesive group, and go about its tasks as efficiently as possible. Studies seem to suggest that, for a committee of the nature of the Judging Committee, a size of 6-8 members is preferable though 10 seems to be preferred by the Judging Committee.

Representation. There are many options for determining the makeup of the Committee. The current rules provide for a division of the judging panel into 4 geographic areas: North America, Europe, Asia, South America/Independent. Each area is guaranteed a member. As it is felt that the current division of representation is fair and changes in the size and location of the judging panel are not likely to change in the foreseeable future, a set number of representatives are allocated to each area with a required review by the Board each 4 years.

(This is a reworked version of the proposal originally presented at the Spring 2021 Meeting and withdrawn for further work.)

Amend Standing Rule 106.2.1:

106.2.1 Every 4 **2** years and beginning *at with* the ~~2018~~**2022** Spring Meeting, the Board of Directors shall appoint the members of the Judging Committee following the process outlined in Standing Rule 106.4.2.1.

Amend Standing Rules 106.4.2:

106.4.2 Board Administrative Standing Committees. The following committees are created by the Board of Directors in order to perform certain delegated duties on behalf of the Board. Unless otherwise specified, a member of a Board Administrative Standing Committee may not concurrently serve as a member of the Board of Directors.

106.4.2.1 Judging Committee. The Role of the Judging Committee is to administer non-disciplinary matters related to the Judging Program. This includes, but is not limited to, acceptances into or advancements within the program, continuing education and testing. The Committee may make recommendations to the Board of Directors for changes to the Judging Program.

106.4.2.1.1 The Judging Committee shall be comprised of **10 members** ~~Ring and School Instructors and/or experienced Approved Allbreed Judges~~ representing four international areas: North America, Europe, Asia and South America plus International (non-voting Regional Area).

106.4.2.1.2 The Judging Committee members shall be elected by **a ballot of** the participants ~~of~~ **in** the Judging Program of the international area where they reside to serve a term of 4 years ~~or until a successor is appointed in~~ **.In** the event of a vacancy, ~~the~~ **The** Board of Directors shall appoint a qualified judge from the international area where the vacancy occurs to complete the balance of the unexpired term.

106.4.2.1.3 **Beginning with the Committee election in 2022,** ~~The~~ number of Judging Committee members representing each international area shall be **set as follows:** ~~determined by the number of participants in the Judging Program for that particular area as of January 31 of the election year. The following formula will be applied: Under 20 participants of the Judging Program: 1 committee member; 20-45 participants of the Judging Program: 3 committee members; over 45 participants of the Judging Program: 5 committee members.~~

North America – 5

Europe – 3

Asia -1

South America/International – 1

106.4.2.1.3.1 Every 4 years thereafter and prior to the election, the Board shall review this allocation for appropriate area representation.

106.4.2.1.4 In the event of a two-way or greater tie, the Board of Directors will determine the final appointment(s).

106.4.2.1.5 Candidates for election to Judging Committee shall provide documentation of having met the following requirements for election:

106.4.2.1.5.1 Have met the requirements to vote in any TICA election and serve on any TICA Committee which requires extended membership.

106.4.2.1.5.2 Be a licensed TICA Ring and School Instructor ~~and/or~~ an Approved Allbreed Judge with a minimum of 5 years' experience as an Approved Allbreed judge.

106.4.2.1.6 Time of the Election. Beginning in April ~~2018~~ **2022** the election of the Judging Committee members shall take place **on a rotational schedule** every ~~4~~ **2** years ~~by ballot of the participants of the Judging Program.~~ **so that no more than half of the Committee is subject to election each cycle. For the initial election, three (3) of the committee members attributable to North America and two (2) committee members attributable to Europe, will serve two-year terms. Based upon the election results, members serving two-year terms will be comprised of those with the lower number of votes. Members serving four year terms will be comprised of those with the higher number of votes. For subsequent elections, all members will serve a four year term.**

106.4.2.1.7 Announcement of Candidates. ~~Any Ring and School Instructor and/or experienced Approved Allbreed Judge shall be eligible as Judging Committee member and~~ **Eligible candidates** shall declare ~~his/her~~ **their** candidacy in writing to the Executive Office not more than 4 months nor less than 2 months before the election month.

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

None

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

(A)

This proposal is simpler than the previous version and achieves the objectives set out in the rationale. The committee size is capped at 10 and there is provision to change the representation if required. The initial election process to handle the introduction of rotation is clearly defined.

I'm happy with the proposal as now submitted.

(B)

Fine with me.

Add Standing Rule 106.4.1.6 (Standards Committee) – Hawksworth-Weitz

Rationale:

It has been many years since the TICA Breed Standards have been reviewed for consistency in terminology and formatting. Breeds going through the championship approval process (Preliminary New Breeds/Advanced New Breeds) would also benefit from guidance and review from experienced standard writers for the development of their breed standards. In addition, many of the existing breed standards have not been updated/revised since 2004 (or before), nor rewritten to provide standardization of terminology. This new Standards Committee would provide the needed guidance to improve our written breed standards.

Add Standing Rule 106.4.1.6:

106.4.1 Advisory Standing Committees. The following committees serve in an advisory capacity, bringing unique knowledge and skills that aid the Board to make more effective decisions on behalf of the Association.

[Rules 106.4.1.1 to 106.4.1.5 unchanged and excluded for brevity]

106.4.1.6 Standards Committee. To assist new breeds in developing well written and understandable breed standards; act as a liaison between the existing Breed Committees, the TICA judges, and the Board of Directors, to ensure that the terms used in existing Standards convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology through the existing Standards of the Association; and to make certain all updates and new standards are incorporated into the Standards and on the TICA website.

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

(A)

The proposal seems to imply that the committee is formed to be a part of a process, similar to Rules and Genetics - i.e., dealing with standards for new breeds and changes to current standards. Current rules don't really provide for inserting a third committee into the procedures. That would need to be considered.

(B)

I agree – this seems to be inserting an additional committee into the Standards revision process and also the New Breeds Program. If so, there are several rules that would need to be revised and then go on the ballot for membership approval.

Contd/...

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

(A)

Seems sensible to me.

(B)

The proposal seems to imply that the committee is formed to be a part of a process, similar to Rules and Genetics - i.e., dealing with standards for new breeds and changes to current standards. Current rules don't really provide for inserting a third committee into the procedures. That would need to be considered.

The other implication is that the committee would conduct a rewrite of current standards? It would seem to me that, if so, that should be done by an ad hoc committee which is given the specific duty, authority, and timeline for completion.

(C)

A bit of history - in 2004 the TICA BOD mandated the standardized format for all standards. Ellen Crockett was pretty much the lead on the process. Many breeds did it on their own, but quite a few breed committees did not even with significant prodding, so she did them. New breeds since then have been sent the document and have been worked with during the new breed process to ensure that they abide by the guidelines.

I am a bit disturbed by the comment that "standards haven't been revised since 2004" - Why would standards need revision if the breeders are satisfied? Our established breeds don't need change just for the sake of change.

Personally, I agree with (B) that Rules and Genetics are the committees that already handle this as part of their duties.

(D)

I agree with (B) and (C) - there's no reason to create a new committee to do what existing committees already do, and there's no reason to change/update a standard that already works well for a breed.

(E)

I read a bit more into this, I guess. In the first place, who would be an experienced breed standard writer? We've always said the breeders are our experts...they have composed the standards and in turn trained us as to what we should be looking for.

I see this as a control issue to some degree. I don't want to have to jump through more committees to get a standard changed.

I agree with (C) -.we don't need to change standards for the sake of change. The SI breed standard has been so well written that it's been used as a model for others and has had no major changes but is written as such to allow for changes over time to the breeds involved.

I don't really think this is a necessary committee.

(F) Exactly. Changing a standard for the sake of change itself is likely to encourage following trends rather than keeping a well-established long term standard

(G) Is there a problem? We have the Breed Committee, Rules and Genetics.

(H) I do not believe this additional committee is necessary.

Isn't one of the duties of the Board Liaison to a new breed to guide them through the advancement process? To my mind, that includes developing and refining their breed standard based on the established guidelines.

Add Standing Rule 106.4.1.7 (Mentorship Committee) – Brown

Rationale:

This unofficial TICA program was established in 2009 and has grown in size over the years. The work of receiving applications, reviewing applications, approving mentors, matching protégé with mentors and promoting the program should have the benefits of a full committee of members to assist with the work. It is expected that with changing this to a formal standing committee of TICA, more resources and opportunities will be available for its growth and subsequent promotion of TICA.

Add Standing Rule 106.4.1.7:

106.4.1 Advisory Standing Committees. The following committees serve in an advisory capacity, bringing unique knowledge and skills that aid the Board to make more effective decisions on behalf of the Association.

[Rules 106.4.1.1 to 106.4.1.6 unchanged and excluded for brevity]

106.4.1.7 Mentorship Committee. To assist new breeders and exhibitors through a matching program with established breeders and exhibitors in TICA for the purposes of education and guidance. The Committee shall be responsible for developing and maintaining guidelines for both mentors and mentees for review and approval by the Board.

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

(A)

This proposal assumes that the proposal for a Standards Committee passes. If that does not, then this rule should be numbered as 105.4.1.6.

(B)

I would suggest that, grammatically, the name of the Committee be: Mentorship Committee, rather than Mentor Committee. I'd be a little hesitant to turn over to the Committee: "*developing and maintaining guidelines for both mentors and mentees*". If this is an official Standing Committee of the Association, the Board should be reviewing and approving "guidelines".

(A)

It is a fair point that the Board should be involved in approving any guidelines developed by this Committee.

Rules Chair Note:

These wording changes have now been included in the wording of the proposed rule;

Contd/...

Rules Chair Note – contd)

As noted in the discussion below, in 106.4.1 the phrase:

“serve in an advisory capacity, bringing unique knowledge and skills that aid the Board to make more effective decisions on behalf of the Association.” should perhaps be amended to read *“... bringing unique or specialist knowledge and skills ..”*

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

(A)

Works for me.

(B)

And me.

(C)

While an important program, I don't think it meets the definition of a Standing Committee per our Rules:

“serve in an advisory capacity, bringing unique knowledge and skills that aid the Board to make more effective decisions on behalf of the Association.” I don't see this Committee as supporting the policy decisions of the Board

... “shall appoint persons knowledgeable in the fields specified to serve on standing committees”. Don't see what the unique knowledge, skill or special "field" is that would define membership on the committee

This Committee, at least to me, fits more the definition of: *“Any other committees, which from time to time may be necessary and proper for the effective and efficient operation of the Association, may be created by the President and appointments to them are made by the President, with the advice of the Board.”*

(D)

Agree with (C) - this committee has been functioning well for a number of years on more of an "ad hoc" basis.

(E)

However, as was discussed at the recent Board Meeting and as noted in the rationale moving it from an "ad hoc" basis (with perhaps only one volunteer doing most of the work) to a formalized TICA project will increase visibility and also help spread work amongst more resources.

(C)

I don't think it should be an ad hoc committee. I just don't believe it fits our current definition of a Standing Committee. We have programs that are not Standing Committees.

I think that the better approach is for the Board to formally adopt the Program - i.e., like Junior program, Clerking Program, MC Program, etc.

(E)

“unique knowledge and skills” I think would cover expertise in breeding and showing, plus mentoring skills. Not everyone has those skills. I would argue that the "Feline Welfare Committee" could be argued from the same viewpoint, yet that is in our rules under this section.

Contd/...

(E – Contd)

The phrase *"serve in an advisory capacity, bringing unique knowledge and skills that aid the Board to make more effective decisions on behalf of the Association."* was introduced when differentiating the standing committees from the Judging Committee. Perhaps (as a side issue), *"unique"* could be expanded as *"unique or specialist"* in 106.4.1

(A)

I think if given "official" status there would be a little more oversight and could do things "in the name" of TICA being official.

There is really no reason why it can't become an official committee.

Amend Standing Rules 109.2 (Board Meetings) – Faccioli/Wood

Rationale:

Standing Rules for Bylaws Article 9 should clarify or add detail to the related Bylaw. Over time, the numbering in this section of the Standing Rules has moved away from the normal format and should be corrected.

In addition, to add efficiency of conducting Board meetings, selected non-members of the Board should be able to be called upon to speak during Open Sessions or to participate in Executive Sessions (known as closed sessions in our Bylaws) without requiring specific motions during each meeting.

Amend Standing Rules 109.2:

109.2 Meetings of the Board.

109.2.1 Meetings of the Board shall be held in January (Winter Meeting), in May (Spring Meeting) and the week immediately preceding Labor Day weekend (TICA Annual). All of these Board Meetings shall be scheduled for a minimum of 2 days.

109.2.1.1 A detailed Agenda for each regularly scheduled Board meeting shall be supplied to all Board members, and also published on the TICA web site, at least 30 days prior to the opening day of each Board Meeting.

109.2.1.2 The Winter and Spring meetings may be held in person, or electronically at the discretion of the Board.

109.2.1.3 Any club may apply to the Board to hold a show in conjunction with either the Winter or Spring Meeting.

109.2.1.3.1 The meeting venue must be at or near a major international airport at a hotel with adequate meeting space, full restaurant service and airport shuttle.

109.2.1.4 Additional meetings of the Board may be held in accordance with By Law 19.2.1.

109.2.1.5 In open sessions, Legal Counsel, the Chief Operating Officer, the Executive Secretary, the Marketing Director and the Standing Committee Chairs are allowed to speak during deliberations if called upon by the Chairperson.

109.2.1.6 Legal Counsel, the Chief Operating Officer, the Executive Secretary, the Judging Administrator and any translators needed for any of the Directors are allowed to participate freely in closed sessions if called upon by the Chairperson.

109.2.1.7~~3~~ Time Limit for Board Meetings. Any input to any subject being at issue before the Board of Directors by anyone, other than a duly elected Regional Director or other duly elected officer of TICA, unless requested by the Board of Directors, shall be limited to a maximum of 2 minutes total. **This provision shall not apply to those specified in 109.2.1.5 and 109.2.1.6.**

109.2.74 Minutes of all meetings of the Board of Directors shall be completed within 10 working days following the meeting.

~~109.3 Time Limit for Board Meetings. Any input to any subject being at issue before the Board of Directors by anyone, other than a duly elected Regional Director or other duly elected officer of TICA, unless requested by the Board of Directors, shall be limited to a maximum of 2 minutes total.~~

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

None

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

(A)

I don't have a problem with this.

(B)

Does there need to be verbiage about "committee of the whole"?

(C)

I think the whole idea is to not have to go to 'committee of the whole' each time a key person (COO, judge admin, marketing admin, legal, etc..) wants to talk - and then leave [committee of the whole] again..

(D)

[109.2.1.5] There is no restriction on these people speaking now and most do. We don't need a rule; the Chair can simply call on someone. If we really think we need to give guidance to the Chair on how the Board would like the meeting conducted, I'd suggest an additional policy to the Board Governance Policies.

[109.2.1.6] This is not needed as there is no restriction on these people speaking in Executive Session currently

[109.2.1.7] This addition is not needed as the Board has already requested these people to be participants in the meeting

[In response to C] There is only "tradition" to change.

Contd/...

- (E) If I've understood your comments correctly (D), you are saying that it is only "tradition" that the Board agrees to go into "Committee of the Whole" to allow non-Board members to speak, and that there is nothing in the current TICA rules that requires this.
- Having looked this up in Roberts Rules (12th Ed), it seems to see "Committee of the Whole" as a different beast to how TICA currently uses it anyway.
- (D) You are correct on your understanding (E).
- I think the best thing to do is draft a Board Governance Policy in re guidelines for conduct of meetings. There is nothing that says the Chair can't vote, either, and I believe somewhat misunderstood.
- I'm happy to take on the task.
- (E) I think it would be better to table this task until we know the outcome on this proposal after the Annual meeting. Thank you for volunteering to do this.
- (B) My point was that these rules address the "normal" board meeting attendees. I'm wondering about the people who are called upon from time to time to weigh in. For example, Heather Lorimar for Genetics, Working group chairs of breeds up for advancement, etc.
- (E) Heather is already covered by the proposed amendment as she is a Standing Committee Chair. I'm assuming that, for the other instances, the Board would formally agree to let someone speak to a specific topic. I believe that Luiz Paulo was trying to save time in meetings so that there was no time wasted in securing consent from the Board if (for example) Genetics Chair or Rules Chair wanted to speak on a proposal under discussion.
- (F) Just a dumb question since I've never been privy to a closed session - does 109.2.1.5/6 mean that these folk can only participate if called upon, they have no option to let it be known they would like to speak even if they feel they have something relevant to add?
- (C) They can raise their hand if they are in the meeting - just like an 'open' meeting

Add Standing Rule 209.1.1.7 (Non-licensed Ring Clerks) - Fralia

Rationale:

Licensed TICA Clerks fall under the responsibility of the TICA Clerking Administrator for counseling and training; unlicensed Clerks do not. While preference is given to licensed Clerks, shows must sometime enlist the help of Ring Clerks that have not been properly trained. It needs to be the show management's responsibility to train these people.

Add Standing Rule 209.1.1.7:

(Show Rule 29.1.1.7 shown for context)

29.1.1.7 The show committee shall provide a Master Clerk and Ring Clerks for the show.

209.1.1.7 If a show committee contracts a non-TICA Licensed Ring Clerk, it will be responsible for ensuring proper training making sure that the clerk is familiar with, but not limited to, a clerk's duties and activities, ring protocol, show mechanics and show rules.

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

Rules Chair Note: There was a discussion on the original proposal wording, which has now been corrected to ensure that the correct terminology was used. The rule has also been moved from the proposer's original suggested placement to 209.1.1.7.

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

(A)

This is OK in an ideal world but quite often we are dragging someone off the floor. Maybe add "when possible "

(B)

I think this again falls into "nice to have".

I would say that we have quite a number of very experienced, long time clerks who aren't licensed. Some of this tracks back to the previous clerking administration, which was very "unforgiving" of anyone who missed a deadline.

(A)

Wearing my MC hat. Quite often the non licensed clerks make fewer mistakes than the licenced. I quite understand what Caroline is trying to do. When is a clerk contracted? When they sign a written contract or when they are dragged into the ring at the last minute when there is no time to train. I would like to see us clarify as much as possible

- (C) I guess she is looking for a way to be able to correct the issues and believes that if they are not licensed, that they will have no incentive to do better
But I agree with you, a license does not mean someone is better, it means they paid a fee and took an exam

Rules Chair Note: The following comments were made following revision of the wording to be consistent and use correct terminology.

- (B) While I believe that the rule is now written correctly - I feel that it is a rule that will not be followed, nor penalized when it is not.

If a club is short on clerks and is pulling someone from the floor - it is unlikely that anyone will have time to do even minimal "training" on all of the suggested topics, let alone make someone competent.

Rings cannot run without clerks, and every judge has experienced a clerk that is at best marginal and at worst totally clueless.

- (C) I agree with this and what would be the penalty if the club can't ensure this or tries to and fails ?

- (D) Exactly (B).

We may get fewer volunteers with this going through.

- (E) There aren't any penalties. I think she just wants someone, besides the judge helping these people.

Judges can't look in the catalog to explain things so someone, whether it be show management, entry clerk or master clerk or another ring clerk, has to give a crash course.

Plus if the show management isn't trying to help these people, it's left up to the judge and then there becomes the possibility for more errors because the judge is trying to help the clerk and judge at the same time.

It's kind of a vicious circle...clerks are really important because they allow judges to do their job to the best of their ability.

- (A) So many good comments. I know what it is like to be a Master Clerk dealing with errors and I still remember over 20 years ago being dragged off the floor to clerk. The judge wasn't kind and I am sure out of sheer frustration because I didn't have a clue about colour and division changes

Add Standing Rule 501.6.3 (Ring Clerk meal breaks) - Fralia

Rationale:

It is the judge's decision to break or not break for a meal, however, the clerk needs to be afforded the courtesy to have a break or not.

Add Standing Rule 501.6.3:

501.6 All head ring and master clerks holding current clerking licenses shall be compensated as directed by the Board of Directors of this Association.

501.6.1 Master Clerk - a minimum of \$15 or one free entry per day, lunch, and a fully marked catalog.

501.6.2 Head Ring Clerk - a minimum of \$10 or one free entry per day, lunch, and a catalog marked with finals and clerk's breed(s).

501.6.3 Should a judge elect not to break for a meal (lunch or dinner) the club will be responsible for providing someone to stand in while the clerk eats their meal.

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

(A)

I'm not sure that this is the appropriate place for this -

Maybe it should be in 209.3.1:

209 Responsibilities of Show Management.

209.3 Each judge shall be assigned a ring clerk.

(B)

I agree - this is a more appropriate placement

(C)

I'm going to bring this issue up before we go further. I don't think there should be "Standing Rules" to a program. I don't know when we started doing "Standing Rules" to the Clerking Program but I think the handful that are there need to simply be inserted into the Program document directly.

(D)

I agree with (C)

(B)

May 2004 is the earliest copy of Standing Rules that I have. It contains more rules in the 50x section (Labelled "Clerks") but the rules in this proposal are already there (albeit numbered 501.16).

Contd/...

(B- Contd)

I agree with you that those remaining 50x rules really ought to be moved out and placed in the Clerking Program document directly or (if more appropriate) moved to be Standing Rules relating to Show Management responsibilities.

Neither the Judging Program or the Clerking Program should have any Standing Rules associated with them, as they don't fit the pattern of "clarification or implementation details of rules subject to membership vote"

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

(A)

Is this a rule that is being proposed to deal with one specific situation or is it a prevailing problem?

(B)

I have no information on whether it is a one-off or a more general problem.

(C)

I think that this is something to be decided between the Judge and Clerk. There is nothing in the show rules relative to judges taking breaks.

(B)

On balance, I agree with (C) – it should be agreed between the Clerk and Judge.

(D)

I think it's a show management issue. No rule required.

Amend Standing Rules 901.4.2.1, 901.4.3.2 and 901.4.3.5 (LA Awards) - Brown

Rationale:

The Lifetime Achievement Award is our most prestigious of show awards. The cats earning this title have shown for multiple years and earned multiple Regional and International awards. Owners spend more time and money working towards this show title than any other due to the requirements. The cats deserve more recognition by the Association than a listing in the Annual awards booklet. While I recognize that many regions honor these cats at the regional level with awards, not all do and because these are our very best cats, they should all be recognized on the international stage.

I acknowledge the concern of the time needed to present these awards at the Annual, these cats deserve this recognition, and the BOD can work to establish how to best accomplish this in a timely manner.

Amend 901.4.2.1:

901.4.2.1 The TICA Board of Directors shall establish the Lifetime Achievement program to recognize cats who have excelled in the show ring. These special cats will be awarded the title LA on a certificate, suitable for framing, and will be recognized in the TICA TREND, the Yearbook, and ~~is~~ **at the Annual Awards Program Banquet with an award**. Cats certified as earning this award shall be eligible to use the title LA before their name in the following fashion LA OD SGC Babsy's Baby.

Amend 901.4.3.2:

901.4.3.5.2 The Top 25 longhair and shorthair cats, ~~and~~ the Best Cat in each breed, **and Lifetime Achievement recipients** are honored at the Annual Awards Banquet.

Amend 901.4.3.5:

901.4.3.5.3 International Best of Breed winners **and Lifetime Achievement recipients** are pictured in the TICA YEARBOOK **and on the TICA website**.

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

(A)

Note that, if passed, the Board will need to submit changes to Standing Rule 903.1.8.3 once it has decided how to accomplish this proposal.

Contd/...

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

(A)

I'm a bit torn on this one. On the one hand I fully agree that just getting a mention in the booklet is quite deflating after all the time and money spent on obtaining the highest title in TICA. On the other hand, I was at the Annual in Vegas which was the first Annual where Kitten and Alter Breed Winners were mentioned and it took forever. In fact, by the time Best Cats were announced, a lot of people had left.

But I'm all for including them in the Yearbook.

(B)

These are good and I agree with (A) on the announcing of the breed winners - that brought everything to a halt. Can we not do that ?

(C)

I'd hate to prolong the evening but an LA is special. If this were to come into effect wondering if we could apply retroactively to have the same award assuming something is given out. In NW we have nice plaques (at our own cost)

(D)

First, Thanks to Liz for sending this in. This is the highest title a cat can achieve. It is hard to get, especially if the cat is whole.

I have always felt that these cats should be recognized like the others. Not just printed in the program.

As far as adding to the evening...this whole night is supposed to be about honoring those animals that have done what we asked them to do...not seeing how fast we can run through it and get out and go party. That goes for honoring our breed winners as well...that may be the only award someone gets and just might keep them coming back. We are supposed to be celebrating our cats.

I think it's fine the way it's written and those cats should be honored at the banquet.

(E)

Not to prolong the evening but why give the least recognition to the highest awards?

(F)

I agree 100% with everything (D) has said.

(G)

I think this is an excellent proposal. Currently LA winners are acknowledged in their respective regions - and those awards are not at all standardized.

(H)

From the proposal rationale, it is clear that the proposer fully understands that more work needs to be done by the Board to incorporate the LA Awards whilst managing the banquet length.

I agree with and support this proposal.

AMEND STANDING RULES 1012.1 - Regional List - Vlach

Rationale - Currently a lot of Arabian countries are part of the Europe South Region. Those fit in my opinion better into the International Region. I have talked with the Board Member who is responsible for the International Region and she agreed with my thoughts. This would affect 14 according to the membership list from April 2021. Concerning Armenia - this country is still not officially in Southern Europe, but I found the chartered club already on the club-list of Europe South Region.

MOTION -

- 1) Remove following countries from the Region Europe South and add them to the International Region:
Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, United Arab Emirates
- 2) Add following country to the Europe South Region - Armenia

Amend Standing Rule 1017.1.2 (UCD Changes) - Wood

Rationale:

Although the rule as currently written includes the Uniform Color Descriptions (UCD), it should be made explicit as the UCD is primarily maintained by the Genetics Committee.

Any changes to the UCD must be reviewed by the Genetics Committee to ensure the Board makes appropriate decisions on any changes proposed by members.

Amend Standing Rule 1017.1.2:

1017.1.2. Proposals to amend Rules or Policies (other than the Bylaws, Show Rules and Registration Rules) shall be considered by the Board of Directors at regularly scheduled meetings. Proposals from the membership must be in writing and received by the Rules Committee and Genetics Committee where applicable (including, but not limited to, **the Uniform Color Descriptions and** Standing Rules affecting a Registration Rule) no later than 90 days prior to the opening day of the meeting to allow time for review in order to reach the Executive Office 60 days prior to the opening day of the meeting. Proposals received by the Rules Committee (and Genetics Committee where applicable) after the 90-day deadline will be placed on the following meeting agenda. Proposals must contain a rationale for the change plus the new rule wording (or the original rule wording and the amended version).

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

- (A) I would suggest that UCD be spelled out.
- (B) I like (A)'s suggestion
- (C) Agree with the words spelled out

Rules Chair Note:

Amendment now spells out UCD in full

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

- (A) Looks fine
- (B) Agreed
- (C) Agree with the proposal

Amend Standing Rule 1022.2 (Complaint Filing) - Adler

Rationale:

The page number rules were written at a time when complaints were submitted in paper form and multiple copies were made for Board meetings. This is no longer the case. The heaviest burden is created when the complaining party submits multiple small files as opposed to larger pdf files.

There is no longer any need to specify payment methods (which currently exclude PayPal anyway).

Amend Standing Rule 1022.2:

1022 **Discipline.** (By-Laws, Article Twenty-Two)

1022.2.1 The fee for filing a complaint or protest shall be based upon the number of ~~single-sided pages~~ **electronic files** submitted, **which must include** ~~including~~ the complaint form and any attachments and documentation. ~~All fees shall be payable by cash, credit card, certified check or money order.~~

1022.2.1.1 The filing fee for ~~ten pages or less~~ **a single electronic file** shall be \$75.

1022.2.1.2 The filing fee for more than ~~ten pages~~ **a single electronic file** shall be \$75, PLUS \$5 for each ~~page over ten~~ **additional file**.

1022.2.1.3 There shall be no fee for filing a response **as a single electronic file** ~~of ten pages or less~~. For each ~~page over ten~~ **additional file**, the fee shall be \$5 per **file** ~~page~~.

1022.2.1.4 In the event that a hard copy of the complaint is filed, the filing fee shall be \$75.

1022.2.1.5 The Executive Office and/or Legal Counsel may reject any files not submitted in a readable format or request that they be reformatted so that they become readable and/or easily transmittable.

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

None

Contd/....

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

- (A) I think this makes perfect sense and brings the rule up-to-date with the process.
- (B) I think this works, although I could envision someone "computer challenged" having problems combining pages into one file.
- (C) Could it be changed to electronic submission? As in if you send it all at once even if it's multiple attachments?
- (D) What creates the extra work is the multiple attachments in different formats. The biggest problem is when Counsel receives complaints with 20 attachments, some with multiple photos because they include Facebook messaging - this creates very large files so making it "one submission" won't solve the problem.
- Also if the person submits multiple files, Counsel needs to reconstruct the complaint and attachments and it might differ from how the person meant to send it.
- Some people send huge jpeg files that don't download and transmit easily (i.e multiple jpegs of text conversations).
- All complaints and attachments are provided to the Board in electronic format and the more altering and reconstructing that needs to be done as well as opening multiple attachments, the more difficult the complaint is to review.
- (E) Looks OK.
Perhaps the new system will allow electronic uploading?
- (F) Looks good to me.

Add Standing Rule 1022.2.1.4 (Complaint Filing Fees) – Brown

Rationale:

While the complaint/protest filing fee is quite justifiable, many pet buyers are hesitant to pay additional money to TICA for a complaint that could possibly not go in their favor. As an example, a TICA breeder takes money for a kitten and never produces said kitten, or a refund, to the buyer. The buyer is already out a substantial sum of money and now is being asked to spend more non-refundable money to bring this issue to light.

Add Standing Rule 1022.2.1.4:

1022 **Discipline.** (By-Laws, Article Twenty-Two)

1022.2.1 The fee for filing a complaint or protest shall be based upon the number of single-sided pages submitted, including the complaint form and any attachments and documentation. All fees shall be payable by cash, credit card, certified check or money order.

1022.2.1.1 The filing fee for ten pages or less shall be \$75.

1022.2.1.2 The filing fee for more than ten pages shall be \$75, PLUS \$5 for each page over ten.

1022.2.1.3 There shall be no fee for filing a response of ten pages or less. For each page over ten, the fee shall be \$5 per page.

1022.2.1.4 ~~The entire filing fee will be refunded if the final Board decision is in favor of the complainant.~~ The fee paid by the person filing the complaint will be refunded if the Board finds that the complaint is proven.

Rules Chair Note:

If the proposal to amend 1022.2.1 (which amends the costs as per electronic file rather than per printed page) passes, then this should be re-numbered as:
1022.2.1.6

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

(A)

This needs to be clarified as there are multiple filing fees. I assume that Liz is referring to the filing fees paid by the person complaining and not including the filing fees paid by someone responding. Also, am thinking that "in favor of" might need a bit more explanation also. Is "complainant" easily understood or should we use "person filing complaint"

(B)

Good points. How about:

1022.2.1.4 The fee paid by the person filing the complaint will be refunded if the Board finds that the complaint is proven.

- (C) I like that wording which is a bit less "legalese", so non-native English speakers may find it easier to understand.

Rules Chair Note: Proposal amended to reflect the revised wording above.

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

- (A) An alternative would be to have it payable by the respondent
The complaint fee is meant to partially cover the work for TICA created by complaints
Also we don't necessarily take the sort of complaint described [in the rationale]

- (B) Interesting thought - make the respondent pay if proven.

I agree that the example in the rationale is not necessarily correct but it doesn't detract from the intent of the proposal.

- (C) While I like the idea of having the respondent pay the fee, to reimburse the complainant - is it practical? Generally when the BOD fines someone, we NEVER see that \$\$.

Additionally, the filing fee helps to eliminate frivolous complaints. It was instituted to offset the time that the EO and Legal Counsel spend dealing with this. The price per page came later.

We now have a legal committee that helps to "vet" complaints so that we don't take complaints that are unlikely to succeed.

- (A) The problem is that no one thinks their complaint is frivolous so it's not much of a deterrent.
Does anyone know if there was ever a successful filing fee refund in place? It seems to be an urban legend

- (C) I haven't heard of it - you might check with Leslie Bowers

- (B) On the other hand, I've had instances in the past when people (with a valid complaint, IMO) have been deterred because of the filing fee. I think it a reasonable step to offer a conditional refund as has been suggested.

Also, the Board can always add on the filing fee as part of any disciplinary fine.

Contd/...

(B – Contd)

And, before anyone suggests it, increasing the filing fee further is not the way to cut down frivolous complaints. It just suggests complaining is only for the well-heeled.

Amend Standing Rules 1022.5 (Hearings) – Board Directive

Rationale:

This amendment was originally passed at the 2020 Annual Meeting, however the placement was only specific to one type of hearing and needs to be adjusted to apply to all hearings. Bylaw 122.5 only covers disciplinary action by other Associations.

Amend Standing Rules 1022.5.1 and 1022.5.2:

(Bylaw 122.2 provided for context)

122.2 Procedure. Disciplinary power may be exercised only after due notice and an opportunity to be heard are first given to the party accused.

1022.~~2.2~~ ~~5.1~~ For the purposes of **Article 22 of the Bylaws** ~~Bylaw 122.5~~, “present, in person” may include the use of audio and/or video or other electronic conferencing where all parties involved in the hearing can be simultaneously connected.

1022.~~2.3~~ ~~5.2~~ The Board of Directors shall determine the most appropriate means of conducting the hearing.

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

None

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

- (A) Looks good
- (B) I think it is fine
- (C) Happy with this amendment

Amend Standing Rule 2012 (Finals Awards) – Board Directive

Rationale:

Article 12 (including the Article title) was changed following the 2020 membership Ballot.

These Standing Rules now need to be updated for consistency with Article 12.

Amend Standing Rule 2012:

2012 Prizes and Trophies, Ribbons and ~~Rosettes~~ **Finals Awards**. (Show Rules, Article Twelve)

2012.2 ~~Rosettes~~ **Finals Awards**. Clubs cannot require that a judge hand out ~~rosettes~~ **any Finals Awards** that do not count.

Rules Committee Comments:

1. On "other rules affected by the proposed change and to ensure that the proper terms are used to convey the meaning intended and to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout"

None

2. Opinions on the merits (or otherwise) of the proposal (i.e. "to review proposals" as per Standing Rule 106.4.1.1)

- (A) I am happy with that wording
- (B) Wording is fine for me
- (C) All good by me
- (D) Looks good to me