

**TICA Board of Directors
Spring Meeting Agenda
May 20-22, 2022
Harlingen, Texas**

Friday, May 20, 8 am CST

Welcome and Call to Order – Harrison - 8 – 8:30 am

Fiduciary Duties - Adler

Approval of Consent Agenda

1. Corrections/Approval minutes of April 21, 2022, Special Meeting
2. Set Annual Meeting dates: August 31 – September 2, 2022, Chicago, IL

Executive Session – Judging Program, Hearings/Complaints 8:30 – 11:30 am

Open Session 1 – 4:30 pm CST

Board Governance Policy:

1. Add Article 10 (Actions on behalf of Board)3

Proposals - Registration Rules

1. Add New 33.10 (New Color Process)5
2. Amend 34.3 (Clarify status of new colors).....14

Proposals - Show Rules

1. Amend Show Rules 22.1.2 (Approving Show Dates)19

Proposals - Standing Rules

1. Amend Standing Rule 106.4.1.2 (Genetics Committee Role).....23
2. Amend 2014.1.1 (Judges Fees).....25

Standard Changes

1. Toybob Breed Standard.....30
2. Rules Comments31

Board Discussion

1. Official TICA Calendar

Saturday, May 21, 8 am CST

Open Session 8 – 11 am CST

Review Follow-Up Report

Executive and Fiduciary

1. Financial Report
2. Proposed Budget FY 2023
3. Regional Rebates

Open Session 1 – 4 pm CST

Executive and Fiduciary (Continued)

4. Marketing Report
5. EOO Update Report

Other Business and Discussion

Sunday, May 22 – 8 – 11 am CST

Business Strategic Planning – Executive Session

Adjourn

Add Board Governance Policy, Article 10 (Actions on Behalf of the Board) - Brooks

Rationale:

There have been rules changes submitted to the Rules committee originally designated as 'Board Directive' which carries with it the inference that the Board as a whole approves of the proposal. It is not always the case that the board members have even heard of the suggested proposal. I propose the following article be added to the Board Governance.

Add Article Ten:

Article Ten – Actions on Behalf of the Board

Article Twenty-Four of the TICA By-Laws provides that any member may submit a proposal to amend or modify the By-Laws of the Association. Corresponding provisions within Show and Registration Rules provide similarly. Standing Rules extend to members the ability to submit proposals to add or amend any Rule or Policy.

Long standing practice has been to include, for the information of the membership, reference to the maker of the proposer. At times, during consideration of a specific proposal, the Board will return a proposal to the Rules Committee for amendments or clarification of language. The Board may also formally request the Rules Committee to develop a specific proposal on their behalf.

Policy: When, during consideration of a specific proposal, the Board returns a proposal to the Rules Committee for amendments or clarification of language or when the Board formally takes action to request the Rules Committee to develop a specific proposal on their behalf, the resulting proposal may be attributed to the Board through the designation "Board Directive." Requests made by individual Board Members are not considered a "Board Directive" and will be attributed to the individual Board member(s).

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 pretty straightforward to me.
- (B)

- Looks fine to me
- (C) A good clarification, I think
- (D) Yes, I agree this will make it more transparent.
- (E) Looks good to me, I have nothing to add.

Add New Reg Rule 33.10, Amend Definitions, Amend 34.3 (New Color Process) – Shelton/Bright/Abraham

Rationale:

- TICA has well-defined processes for adding New Breeds and for adding New Traits to existing breeds, including the addition of existing colors to breeds that don't currently accept those colors. TICA does not have a comparable process defined for adding New Colors to the UCD.
- The potential for New Colors is growing all the time. Recently we have added Charcoal to the Bengal, CORIN to the Siberian/Kurilian/Toybob, and Karpati to the UCD. There are more to come and we need an easy to understand and follow process for breeders that is not restricted by our computer systems.
- Rule 34 is very clear that there are Limitations and that just because a New Color is added to the UCD, it does not necessarily mean it is accepted for championship competition. For example, Mocha is in the UCD but is not accepted for championship competition however there is nothing to indicate that.
- The process needs to add Provisional to those colors in the UCD that are not eligible for Championship competition. Breeders of Provisional Colors will then need to complete the 2nd part of the New Color process in order to advance the color to Championship competition.

There are different ways to add New Breeds and the same should be true for New Colors:

1. Well characterized genes with published, sequenced variants
2. Transfer color from another WCC organization with standards equivalent to TICA's
3. Other where the color is newly identified in the feline population arising from a mutation in specific breed(s) or a naturally occurring mutation in the domestic population.

The first two would follow a fast track and the third would follow the full process.

Multiple breeds exhibiting the New Color would be able to exhibit in the New Trait class with the total across breeds counting towards satisfying requirements. Today the rules do not specify whether multiple breeds can be used or whether each breed working with the color has to complete the New Traits requirements.

Registries that are at the forefront of New Color development gain registration dollars from the work developing colors. TICA needs to document a clear, flexible and proactive process for adding New Colors that will drive registration revenue and strengthen the reputation of TICA as a leader in the cat fancy.

In order to enable this rule change, both TFMS and entry clerking systems will need to allow the addition of a new "Other" free text field to identify the new color (i.e. new trait) during the registration process so that cats can be shown in New Traits before being formally added to the UCD.

Amend Reg Rule 31.7:

31.7 For the purposes of breed **and New Colors** 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.

Add Reg Rule 31.8:

31.8 New Color - The result of a new mutation affecting the coloration of the cat. The mutation may occur in a specific breed, multiple breeds, or in the domestic population. For example, it may be, but is not limited to, a unique Color, an Agouti Shift Modifier, or a Pattern Effect.

Add associated Standing Rule 301.8:

301.8 Examples of a new color include:

- **Mocha: a color resulting from an allele in the albino series**
- **Brown Marble Charcoal Bengal: Breed specific mutation resulting in Pattern Effect**
- **Blue Tortie Karpati: Pattern Effect mutation originating in the domestic population**
- **Black Gold CORIN Tabby: 3 Breed Specific - Agouti Shift Modifier**

Amend Reg Rule 34.3:

34.3 Limitations. Acceptance of ~~a cat of~~ a color ~~and~~ **in a** breed for registration purposes does not imply eligibility for championship competition. **New** Colors which are recognized for registration are not necessarily recognized for championship exhibition **until they have completed the New Color process** ~~by the breed in question~~. (For a list of colors recognized for championship one is referred to the appropriate sections of the TICA Show Rules, Registration Rules, Standards and the Uniform Color Descriptions.)

Add New 33.10 and re-number existing 33.10 section (and any cross-references) to be 33.11:

33.10 Adding New Color Mutations to the UCD

33.10.1 When the breeder notifies the Genetics Committee that they are working with a new color:

33.10.1.1 The Genetics Committee works with the breeder on the name for the new color. If breeders are already working with the color, the breeder will be advised of the current name in use.

33.10.1.2 The Genetics Committee notifies the Executive Office of the new color name to add to TICA's systems.

33.10.1.3 The Executive Office adds the new color name. Cats can now be registered with the color and shown in the New Traits class as Other or the new color name.

33.10.1.4 The Genetics Committee notifies the Judging Administrator so judges can be alerted about the new color.

33.10.2 Choice of New Color Process

33.10.2.1 Regular Process: New Colors that do not meet the requirements in 33.10.2.2.for the Fast Track process.

33.10.2.2 Fast Track Process: A New Color that meets one of the requirements below:

33.10.2.2.1 A scientific paper has been published with the characterization and sequence of the gene variant. A copy of the paper in English should be given to the Genetics Committee as supporting information for the fast track request.

33.10.2.2.2 The new color is accepted for championship competition in another WCC member with standards at least equal to TICA's.

33.10.2.3 New Colors meeting the Fast Track process are added to the UCD as Provisional and go directly to Stage 2 of the Regular Process ensuring that judges see the New Color.

33.10.3 New Color Regular Process Stages

33.10.3.1 Stage 1: Apply to have the New Color added to the UCD as a Provisional New Color

33.10.3.2 Stage 2: Apply to advance the Provisional New Color to Championship Status

33.10.4 Regular Process Stage 1: Requirements to Add New Color to the UCD as Provisional Status:

33.10.4.1 At least 5 individual examples of the new color have been shown in the New Traits class as Other or with the assigned color name.

• 33.10.4.2 At least 5 TICA members in good standing actively breeding or showing the new color.

• 33.10.4.3 A minimum number of cats with the new color have been registered in the three years prior to the application to advance to Provisional:

33.10.4.3.1 Five (5) cats in breeds registering fewer than 100 cats OR

33.10.4.3.2 Five per cent (5%) of the cats registered, not to exceed 25, for those breeds registering 100 or more cats.

33.10.4.3.3 For those new colors where multiple breeds are working together on acceptance, 10 cats total are required.

33.10.4.4 An electronic submission requesting Advancement to Provisional shall be sent to the Genetics Committee and the Rules Committee at least 120 days prior to the Board meeting. The submission must be signed by 5 TICA members in good standing breeding or showing the new color.

33.10.4.4.1 A proposed color description for the UCD must be included in the application.

33.10.4.4.2 A processing fee as specified in the Standing Rules.

33.10.4.5 The Board of Directors may approve, disapprove or impose additional requirements for the New Color at their discretion.

33.10.5 Regular Process Stage 2 (and Fast Track applications) to advance a Provisional New Color to Championship

The requirements to apply for Championship status for the New Color are:

33.10.5.1 At least 5 individual examples of the new color shown in the New Traits class as Other or with the assigned color name.

33.10.5.2 At least 5 TICA members in good standing actively breeding or showing the new color.

33.10.5.3 A minimum number of cats with the new color have been registered in the three years prior to the application to advance to Championship

33.10.5.3.1 Five (5) cats in breeds registering fewer than 100 cats OR

33.10.5.3.2 Five per cent (5%) of the cats registered, not to exceed 25, for those breeds registering 100 or more cats.

33.10.5.3.3 For those new colors where multiple breeds are working together on acceptance, 10 cats total are required.

33.10.5.1 Submission of an electronic Application for Advancement to Championship should be sent to each member of the Breed Committee(s) and if part of a Breed Group, to each member of each Breed Committee in the Breed Group), the Genetics Committee, and the Rules Committee, at least 120 days before the applicable Board meeting. The application must be signed by at least ten TICA members in good standing (applications available from the TICA Executive Office or at tica.org).

33.10.5.1.1 Any required standard changes must be included in the application.

33.10.5.1.2 A processing fee as specified in the Standing Rules.

33.10.5.2 When the Genetics and Rules Committees approve the application for Advancement to Championship for the New Color, and at least 90 days prior to the applicable Board meeting, the Breed Committee(s) Chair(s) shall submit the approved application to the Executive Office for polling of the breed section(s). The application shall include the comments of the Genetics Committee on the genetic validity and viability of the New Color and any comments of the Rules Committee.

33.10.5.2.1 Breeds that accept all colors AND specify that a domestic outcross is permissible do not need to conduct a breed poll as the New Color is automatically accepted.

33.10.5.2.2 Breeds that accept all colors BUT DO NOT specify that domestic outcross is permissible will need to conduct a Breed Poll to add the New Color to the standard.

33.10.5.3 Upon receipt of the application marked as approved, the Executive Office shall issue a poll to all members of the related Breed Section(s). Polls must be returned to the TICA Ballot Judge no later than 30 days from the date of issue. In cases of a Breed Group, a majority of the Breed Section Members voting in EACH of the Breed Groups, must vote to approve the new trait or traits in order to advance to Championship status. The results of the poll shall be included in the meeting agenda with the application.

33.10.5.4 The expense of any poll shall be the financial responsibility of the individuals requesting the poll.

33.10.5.5 A Notice of Intent to Apply for Advancement to Championship Status must be published in the TICA TREND at least 120 days prior to the meeting at which the application for advancement will be heard, and which invites comments about the New Color to be forwarded to the Executive Office.

33.10.5.6 Submission of an application does not imply acceptance to advance the New Color from Provisional to Championship status. The Board of Directors may approve, disapprove or impose additional requirements for the New Color at their discretion.

33.10.6 Reporting after Advancement to Championship: Not all colors are benign in their effects; some may have a malignant effect that only becomes apparent over time. Consequently when New Colors are advanced to Championship they will be monitored for a period of 5 years from the date of advancement. Breed Committees working with the New Color will provide a formal report to the Genetics Committee and the Rules Committee at least 60 days prior to the date of the Annual Board Meeting. The report should include photographs, illustrations, statistics, health and breeding reports along with any other relevant materials.

Amend Standing Rule 303.1:

Quick Reference Chart for New Breeds.

	Registration Only	Preliminary New Breed	Advanced New Breed	New Trait	New Color	Championship
Registrations required for advancement		15 adults 10 litters Must have been recognized for registration for at least 2 years	100 adults: 50 must have a registration code eligible for CH or can produce offspring eligible for CH 25 litters	10 cats if fewer than 100 registered OR 10% of cats registered not to exceed 50 cats	5 cats if fewer than 100 registered OR 5% of cats registered not to exceed 25 cats.	200 adults registered in any full WCC member association of which 50 must be registered in TICA and be potentially eligible for championship
Active Breeders		5 in 3 regions	15 in 5 regions	10 total	5 total	15 in 5 regions
Entries in TICA shows prior to			25 unique cats shown in PNB	10 unique cats shown	5 unique cats with New Color	25 unique cats in at least 25 WCC

	Registration Only	Preliminary New Breed	Advanced New Breed	New Trait	New Color	Championship
advancement				with New Trait	shown in Other; 10 unique cats with New Color shown as NT	shows and at least 10 TICA shows
Entry Class	Not Applicable (can be in hall with approval of show comtte)	Entry in PNB Class	Entry in ANB Class	Entry in New Trait Class	Entry in New Trait Class Other until Provisional then as Color	Championship Class
Judging Procedures	Not handled	Judged in PNB Class	Judged in ANB Class	Judged in NT Class	Judged in NT class	Judged for championship Awards
Awards		Class awards and PNB Merit Final	Class awards and ANB Merit Final	Class awards and NT Merit Final	Class awards and NT Merit Final	Color, division, breed and final awards
Annual Award Scoring	Not Scored	Not Scored	Not Scored	Not Scored	Not Scored	Scored for Annual Awards

Add associated Standing Rules:

303.10.4.4.2 For New Colors following the Regular process, a processing fee of \$25 for the Stage 1 application.

303.10.5.1.2 For New Colors following the Regular Process, a processing fee of \$25. For applications using the Fast Track process, a processing fee of \$50. Each fee is required at the time of the application.

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 rationale says that "Multiple breeds exhibiting the New Color would be able to exhibit in the New Trait class with the total across breeds counting towards satisfying requirements"

I completely disagree with this interpretation. My reading of the rules is that the New Traits process is to add a novel trait to one breed only (as evidenced by the process described in 33.9) and that each breed should continue to be addressed individually.

(A – contd)

If the proposers want to modify the New Traits process, it should be done as a separate change and not combined with this proposed change.

There is a step missing in the Fast track process, namely the Board approving that a New Color should be added to the UCD, since the Genetics Committee is still an advisory body to the Board.

Looking at the comparison between New Traits and New Colors, I am very concerned that the requirements for New Color are less than those for New Traits - whilst I could understand a lower requirement for Provisional Status, I think the requirements at Stage 2 (i.e Championship) should be consistent with those of New Traits.

Again, this proposal mirrors that of the proposal to change 34.3 and automatically add a new Color without a Breed Section poll. I see this as undesirable - just because a new color is capable of being added to (for example) AC/ACL via the domestic population, that doesn't mean that it should be. That was the whole purpose of 34.3.

In addition, I believe these proposed rule changes conflict with Bylaw 118.2 which governs changes to standards for breeds in Championship. Whilst a Standard may say "all colors", the inclusion of a new color, Agouti Shift Modifiers or Pattern Effects is effectively changing what colors are eligible in the Breed Standard.

(B)

This fragment (33.10.5.3.1 to 33.10.5.3.3) literally means, that if ONE breed with 300 registered cats want to recognize a new color, they need 15 cats (5%). If THREE breeds, with 300 registered cats EACH (so 900 cats in total) want to recognize a new color, they need only 10 cats. It doesn't make sense, at least 25 should be required in this case. I think the last option was supposed to be for multiple breeds, but each with less than 100 cats.

Also, in general terms: requirements for Stage 1 and Stage 2 are exactly the same. What's to stop the applying party from copying the same info as on Stage 1 to Stage 2 application and sending it as Stage 2 to Championship application? It doesn't make sense to me.

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

(A)

33.10.5.2.1 and 33.10.5.2.2 are also confusing. Which breed sections are supposed to be polled here? Those that asked for the color to be added or just all the "all colors" breeds in TICA? If this is the latter, are we really making the requesting party to pay for polls (as 33.10.5.4 suggests) for a dozen or so breeds (unless many polls run at the same time are basically priced like 1 poll)?

Contd/...

(A – contd)

And also this is basically making any breed that is not an "all color" breed to separately go through the "New Color" process and then immediately go back and go through the "New Trait" process, while an "all color" breed gets to vote immediately on recognition of a new color in their breed. Or this whole part is NOT to be interpreted as a call to poll all "all color" breeds in TICA, but then it's even less clear to me.

Also, this whole proposal doesn't address at all breed specific colors. The "Clarify status of new colors" proposal at least mentions them (at least this is how I interpret the additional limitations resulting from genetic testing in 34.3.2).

If we add something like charcoal in Bengals, which is clearly a breed-specific color "inherited genetically" from the breed's wild ancestor (ALC), we don't really intend or want it to be universally recognized and available for all breeds.

If we add a new color that is a spontaneous mutation in a population of domestic cats (like the Karpati pattern), then yes, the general availability and polling of "all colors" breeds to see if they want to remain "all color" or not makes sense.

I feel like this whole proposal needs some clarifications.

(B)

I agree with the various comments you've made - if the proposed changes confuse even us, then how will the general membership be able to work it out for themselves.

(C)

I had to read this in pieces and parts and still think it's way too long, confusing and is going to really frustrate people that are working on new colors. Can it go back for some simplification?

(D)

I agree with (C). I have tried to read these proposals several times and I just can't get my head around them. They need to be much simpler.

(E)

Return to submitters for re write. If we cannot understand the intent how do we expect the membership to be able to do so?

(F)

I agree although it is not that the wording is really extraneous

(G)

No new comments from me; agree with all.

(H)

I agree that these proposals are unnecessarily complex and should be simplified so that they will be more understandable to the membership at large.

(I)

I find this proposal too wordy to fully understand. I have read it many times.

(J)

I also agree that it is too long and complicated to easily follow.

(K)

I have to agree with (C) - way too confusing and complicated.

Amend Reg Rule 34.3 (Clarify status of new colors) – Shelton/Bright/Abrahams

Rationale:

The current Limitations section is unclear:

- The wording addresses the addition of an existing color to a breed that does not currently accept it (eg can register a Russian Blue as White but cannot show it in championship)
- The wording does not address the addition of a new color that may be developed across multiple breeds (eg CORIN which is limited to Siberian, Kurilian Bobtail & Toybob based on genetic testing; or Karpati which originated in the domestic population)
- The current rules do not address the situation of a new color being added to the UCD. This can result in confusion since breeds that accept all colors can perceive that the acceptance of the new color for championship automatically accepts it for championship competition; while others may interpret it differently and think that each breed needs to add the New Color separately via New Traits. No existing rule states this is the case, no existing rule states this is not the case.

[Rules Chair Note: The current Reg Rule 34.3 explicitly excludes new colors from being eligible for Championship competition. It is implicit (but not explicit) that the New Traits process should be used in current Championship breeds to progress that color. Also, it is not clear that the term “color” in the present rules should also apply to an Agouti Shift Modifier or a Pattern Effect.]

Not all breeds that accept all colors may want to include the new color being added to the UCD.

Prior existence of the new color in the breed(s) as established through genetic testing may indicate it is appropriate to limit the new color to the specific breed(s) where the mutation originated.

New colors can also come in via the domestic gene pool and for those new colors, the color should be permitted for breeds allowing outcrosses to domestics.

The following table shows which breeds (accepting all colors) and with permitted outcrosses to domestics would automatically accept a new color:

Breed	Accepts All Colours	Allows outcross to Domestic	Karpati Example – Auto Accept
ABT/ABS	YES	YES	YES
AC/ACL	YES	YES	YES
DSK	YES	YES	YES
HG/HGS	YES	YES	YES
JB/JBL	YES	YES	YES
LP/LPS	YES	YES	YES

Breed	Accepts All Colours	Allows outcross to Domestics	Karpati Example – Auto Accept
MK/MKS	YES	YES	YES

Amend Rule 34.3:

34.2.3 The color of the cat in question is not one which is recognized for registration by the association. In such instance the color shall be accepted as a new mutation following approval of the Genetics Committee and the TICA Board of Directors. Emendation of the Registration Rules (See 34.2, above) shall be made and a color name and code assigned, with notice of such emendation to be printed in the next available issue of the official newsletter.

34.3 Limitations.

34.3.1 Acceptance of a cat of a color and breed for registration purposes does not imply eligibility for championship competition. Colors which are recognized for registration are not necessarily recognized for championship exhibition by the breed in question. (For a list of colors recognized for championship one is referred to the appropriate sections of the TICA Show Rules, Registration Rules, Standards and the Uniform Color Descriptions.)

34.3.2 When a new color is added to the UCD, it is automatically accepted for all breeds that specify they accept All Colors AND that also specify Domestic LH/SH as a permissible outcross provided that additional limitations resulting from genetic testing have not been applied.

34.3.2.1 Breeds that accept All Colors but DO NOT permit Domestic LH/SH as an outcross but want to include the new color will need to follow the New Traits process UNLESS the mutation for the New Color originates in that breed or breeds. These standards will be amended to exclude the new color until the New Traits process has been followed and the Breed Section has voted to include it.

34.3.2.2 Breeds that do not accept All Colors today will continue to follow the New Traits process to add a new color to those accepted by the breed if they want to include the new color added to the UCD for their breed.

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)

If rather than pure "color", the rule is also to apply to Agouti Shift Modifiers and Pattern Effects, then this needs to be added as a definition in 31.x

Contd/...

(A- Contd)

This proposal does not really make clear that the intent of 34.3.2 is that the new color is automatically eligible for Championship without going through a NT process for some breeds.

Frankly, I do think that is acceptable - just because a new color is capable of being added to (for example) AC/ACL, that doesn't mean that it should be. That was the whole purpose of 34.3.

The administrative burden of the proposed 34.3.2.1 in adjusting standards to exclude the new color may be significant.

In addition, I believe this proposed rule conflicts with Bylaw 118.2 which governs changes to standards for breeds in Championship.

(B)

the "provided that additional limitations resulting from genetic testing have not been applied." in proposed 34.3.2 is too vague for me. What exactly would the limitations entail and how would they be marked? Maybe it should be explained in the "New Color Process" proposition, except it isn't. I suspect this is for colors that are very "breed specific genetically", like charcoal in Bengals, but that needs to be spelled out somewhere and it isn't in either proposal.

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

(A)

Two thoughts:

I might suggest that eye color needs to be addressed due to the inclusion of Altai and Topaz mutations into numerous breeds.

The only problem with limiting to breeds with a permissible domestic outcross is that many breeds use non-permissible domestic outcrosses

(B)

I may have misunderstood, but if a non-permissible domestic outcross is used, surely the offspring would be ineligible for Championship competition anyway?

(A)

In the first generation - but once the gene is introduced, after 3 generations it would be SBT [and the gene would have been introduced into the breed].

(C)

I'm a little confused on this. I see what they are getting at by adding a new color to the UCD but I'm not sure why the new color would need to go through the New Trait process.

For example if the SI breed group gets off our tails and work up the proposal for the caramel colors, which are a dilute modifier, does that mean we would have to take a whole bunch of cats through new trait?

(A) The question is for breeds that currently accept all colors of all divisions - the point with these breeds is that potentially, they wouldn't need to go thru NT for each of those breeds when a new color is put into the UCD.

For example - we just added Karpati - and so any breed - for example Devon Rex - that accepts all colors of all divisions theoretically wouldn't need to go thru NT to accept Karpati pattern.

(D) This change delineates between those cats with domestic outcross and those without - IF yes to domestic outcross then they won't need to go thru new traits..

If NO to domestic outcross they would need to go thru NT to accept the color UNLESS the mutation for the New Color originates in that breed or breeds.

So Yes, Devon Rex would need to go to NT to accept Karpati color if this rule were to pass.

(C) So (A) says no, theoretically, DR wouldn't have to go through New Trait but (D) says they would.

I think this shows how confusing this proposal is.

(A) No - I was explaining why the proposal was made - under current rules - there wouldn't be any restrictions on new colors/patterns for any breeds that accept all colors of all divisions.

(E) Sorry but I don't interpret our rules that way. 34.3 clearly states that recognition for registration does not imply recognition for Championship. Secondly, Reg Rule 33.9.1 clearly states that any New Trait in an established Championship breed should be shown in the New Traits class. Karpati, for example, is quite clearly a trait and one that is new to TICA.

The idea that "there wouldn't be any restrictions on new colors/patterns for any breeds that accept all colors of all divisions" seems to be a "traditional" view without any actual TICA rule that allows that. If you believe there is a such a rule, please specify it as I (and others) have searched for it and failed to find it.

And to answer (C)'s original query, the SI/BA/OS/OL breed group would also need to go through NT in order to add a dilute modifier.

Whilst I understand that clarification of our current rules would be helpful, I think this solution is too complex. I think it would be simpler (and clearer) to add a clause saying that any new color (including Agouti Shift Modifiers and Pattern Effects) should go through a New Traits process before being recognised as a Championship color by any breed.

(F) I'm not sure breeds that accept "all colors" and domestic outcross should have a color automatically added. Either poll them, like other "all colors" breeds or just make everyone go through the New Traits process. I can see pros and cons of both solutions (polling all color breeds versus making everybody go through the New Trait process).

(G) I can't really see why any breed should have a new color added "by default".
I found this confusing

(H) I have tried to read these proposals several times and I just can't get my head around them. They need to be much simpler.

Amend Show Rule 22.1.2 (Show Dates) – Goulter/van Mullem

Rationale:

In general, everyone is happy with more shows as more shows means more opportunities for exhibitors to go to shows at different times during the year.

However, putting up a show is a large financial risk for most clubs especially when two shows are scheduled too close each other. Currently our rules only cover the situation when shows are scheduled on the same weekend.

The proposal is to add a rule which covers the situation when two shows are scheduled within one week of each other. It will help prevent two shows targeting the same local exhibitor population. Clubs with large financial funds can carry a loss but smaller clubs cannot (and may have to close down in the end).

Amend Show Rule 22.1.2:

22.1.2 Show Dates. When a club desires a show date from the Regional Director, they may request that date in writing. After 30 days, there being no response from the Regional Director, the club may proceed with the show date, scheduling it through the Executive Office by providing the Executive Office with a copy of the written request.

22.1.2.1 The Regional Director may ~~only~~ deny a club a specific show date if there is a previously scheduled TICA show within 500 miles (805 kilometers) or in the same region on the requested weekend.

22.1.2.2 If there are multiple show requests for the same show weekend, shows may be held within 500 miles (805 kilometers) of each other only with both A and B below:

- A. Written permission from the show managers, and
- B. Written permission of the regional director or regional directors if the show requests are from multiple regions. The first club that requests a show date is authorized to have the show.

22.1.2.3 The Regional Director may deny a club a specific show date if there is a previously scheduled TICA show within 200 miles (321 kilometers) and within ~~one week of each other~~ 10 days of the requested show.

22.1.2.4 If there are multiple show requests for ~~the show weekends~~ shows within 10 days ~~one week of each other~~, such shows may be held within 200 miles (321 kilometers) of each other only with both A and B below:

- A. Written permission from the show managers, and**
- B. Written permission of the regional director or regional directors if the show requests are from multiple regions. The first club that requests a show date is authorized to have the show.**

22.1.2.3 ~~5~~ The provisions and restrictions of 22.1.2.1, ~~and~~ 22.1.2.2, **22.1.2.3 and 22.1.2.4** shall not apply when one or both of the scheduled shows for the same date is part of a Pet Expo in which the Pet Expo determines the date of the expo, and when the show is limited to a maximum of 125 entries.

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 quite like this but I think that the scheduled within one week needs to be changed to within 13 days because parties may argue correctly that Monday to Sunday is a week and therefore the following weekend is a new week and therefore another show is ok.
- (B) They could say subsequent weekends
- (C) I like the suggestion of "subsequent weekends" - it is better, IMO than the proposed wording.
- (D) And I agree with (A) - the time between the shows is best described as within 13 days to avoid any misunderstanding.
- (E) If we adjust the wording, we also need to ensure that we cover a one-day show on a Friday (as alternate shows are considered separate shows) and anything held the following "weekend" – not all shows are held on a Fri/Sat/Sun.

I'm not sure 13 days works - wouldn't that cover 2 weeks?
- (F) Technically, I find nothing wrong with that proposal, except I would also change the wording of timing to avoid confusion. "within 9 days" would be enough, that will even cover one show falling on Saturday only and the other on Sunday only next weekend, while not preventing 3-day shows happening 2 weekends from each other.

Rules Chair Note:

The original wording has been modified from "and within one week of each other" to "and within 10 days of that show" with the agreement of the proposers. The 10 day period applies both before and after the relevant show date.

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 except my question is why change the 500 mile rule?

(B)

And I kinda agree with (A) - why 200 miles and not the 500?

But I like this as a way to keep clubs from stepping on each other.. We've always tried to keep a 2 week span between shows in our region (SW) and the MP region ... back to back weekends seem to hurt both clubs.

(C)

Personally, I think this is a matter for clubs to work out - there are limited venues that are affordable and available for cat shows.

(D)

I agree with (C) about letting clubs work this out.

The 200 miles is pretty arbitrary. There is no proof that two shows a week apart and within 200 miles of the same location is as much competition as two shows at the same time and 500 miles apart. There is no rule that restricts a cat from being shown two weekends in a row.

(E)

I asked the proposers. 200 miles prevents shows on consecutive weekends in areas such as EW. A 500 mile distance is too big in such areas.

(F)

Yes, in geographically smaller regions, the lower distance makes a lot of sense. And I can even see it making sense in areas where TICA shows are not the exhibitors' first priority, such as Scandinavia.

Clubs there need FIFe exhibitors to break even and shows within a distance of less than 200 miles compete for exactly the same group of local exhibitors. They're not going to go to two TICA shows two weekends in a row, where one is e.g. in the Copenhagen area and the other is in the south of Sweden.

(C)

And 200 is probably too small in other regions.

(E)

Which is presumably why 22.1.2.4 has been added. The option is there to allow shows if the relevant Show Managers and RDs agree. It is a well-established process and I don't see the problem with the reduced distance.

(F)

Contentwise, I understand it's to prevent club B from scheduling a show a week earlier than club A, within close proximity to club A's show, therefore stealing their "thunder" and gate (and maybe also some exhibitors, but mainly gate, I think). That's why the 200 miles limit, because no visitors will travel farther to see a show (most people would not even travel that far, but the limit has to be set somewhere).

500 miles is too much in this case, if this rule had 500 miles in it, every third or fourth European show (I mean EN and ES now, not just EW) would have to sign an agreement with another European show to get the date ;) So I think it's reasonable that this new addition has a different limit than the original part of the scheduling rule.

Contd/...

(G)

There are regions which cover a large geographical area. Example in the NW region Calgary is 1,000 km from Vancouver. In the past Edmonton (a couple of hours drive from Calgary but more than 200 miles) would have a show the following weekend and exhibitors would make a holiday of it so yes people do travel long distances. Anchorage in Alaska is a 42 hour drive from Seattle. Somebody would travel 500 miles to a show and I travel more than 200 miles 95% of the time to go to a show. I say let the clubs decide.

Also we have a tough time getting show halls and hotels so we have to take what we get and often have to fly during winter. I don't object to a change to 200 miles.

Rules Chair Note:

From discussion it was clear that the financial impact of visitors varies among regions. However, although gate is one of many factors, it was not the primary driving force behind the proposal.

It was also clear that while campaigners will travel long distances to attend shows, non-campaigners may not. Shows (and clubs) need a balance of both types of exhibitors to survive.

Amend Standing Rule 106.4.1.2 (Genetics Committee Role) – Lorimer/Shelton/Bright

Rationale:

Genetics is core to TICA's foundation as a registry. This genetic foundation is a key differentiator for TICA as an organization. Today genetic research and knowledge is growing in leaps and bounds. TICA needs to grow with it and use it as a strategic advantage for growth.

Currently information from all the research flows into the organization but is used primarily to inform the advice that the Genetics Committee provides to the Board. We are proposing a more active role for the Genetics Committee that would see more involvement with breeders in the actual development of New Traits and New Colors.

Benefits of this change include:

For the Board:

- Strategic differentiator: why do I want a kitten from a TICA breeder
- Strategic differentiator: why do I want to register with TICA

For Breeders:

- Access to genetic guidance from the start of their efforts
- Faster decisions regarding acceptance
- Improved access to genetic information

For the EO:

- Improved communication allowing for earlier information about potential changes
- Reduce confusion and the number of surprises
- Allow for faster response times to add/modify systems

For Judges:

- Improved communication about changes
- Improved availability of information earlier in the NT/NC development process

Amend Standing Rule 106.4.1.2:

106.4.1.2 Genetics Committee.

The duties of the Genetics Committee shall include, but not be limited to:

106.4.1.2.1 To advise the Board of Directors in any matter relating to breeds, breeding, colors, deformities, changes in Registration Rules, or any other matter in the field of genetics.

106.4.1.2.2 To advise the Board on the addition of New Traits and New Colors based on the most current information available

106.4.1.2.3 To work with and provide guidance to breeders developing New Traits and New Colors from the start of their development program to the approval decision

- 106.4.1.2.3 To advise the Executive Office of the New Traits and New Colors so the appropriate systems can be prepared**
- 106.4.1.2.4 To notify the Judging Administrator about New Traits and New Colors so the judges are aware of them**
- 106.4.1.2.5 To provide a written annual report about updates in genetic research to the Board on an annual basis at the Winter Board 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"

Rules Chair Note:

As originally submitted, this proposed a hybrid committee that was both advisory and with (some) delegated authority. The consensus from Rules was that this hybrid model would be inappropriate. With the agreement of the proposers, the proposal was revised so that Genetics Committee remains purely as an Advisory Committee.

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 find anything terribly wrong with this. Sets out more expectations for the Genetics Committee which I think is good.

As a general comment: I do think that TICA needs to be cognizant of the fact that, while we are a genetic registry, we can go a bit overboard. We are approaching a point where breeding and showing might conflict. TICA will need to decide if showing "colors" follow "genetic" colors or not. What I'm saying is that there comes a divergence of what breeders know and expect from breeding and what people and judges actually see.

(B)

I agree with (A) - I'm happy about the changes.

(C)

Yes looks good

(D)

Some of the things they listed as being helpful should be things they should be doing anyway such as helping with genetic information, guiding breed sections on getting new colors/traits accepted.

Amend Standing Rule 2014.1.1 (Judges' Fees) – Vlach/Dickie

Rationale:

35 years ago the Judges Fee for an Approved Allbreed Judge was USD 1,- per catalog-entry. Taking in account the inflation this would equal in 2022 now USD 2.45 with an cumulative rate of inflation of **145%**. (Source "US Inflation Calculator"). Since this time the Judges Fees of AAB-Judges have been **only raised 10%** to USD 1.10

Therefore it is time to adjust the Judges Fees. While adjusting them to the cumulative rate of inflation might burden the clubs too much it is still a necessary step to be done, therefore I propose following compromise as seen above.

- Adjustment of the Judges Fees by 45%
- At the same time not the entries in the catalog, but only the cats actually handled must be counted.

I made 4 Business Cases which will show the effects of this adjustment (with an average of 10% of cats entered being Absent)

Business Case for Clubs - Current

	# Entries	# Rings (AAB)	Judges Fees	Entry Fees *	Net for Club
Case 1	60	12	792	3900	3108
Case 2	100	12	1320	6500	5180
Case 3	150	12	1980	9750	7770
Case 4	200	12	2640	13000	10360

* Average Entry Fee - USD 65/Cat for 12-Ring Show

JF - USD 1.10 per cat in catalog

Business Case for Clubs - Proposed Changes

	# Entries	# Rings (AAB)	10% Absentees	Actual Cats Judged	JF 1.60	Entry Fees *	Net for Club
Case 1	60	12	6	54	1036,8	3900	2863.2
Case 2	100	12	10	90	1728	6500	4772
Case 3	150	12	15	135	2592	9750	7158
Case 4	200	12	20	180	3456	13000	9544

* Average Entry Fee - USD 65/Cat for 12-Ring Show

JF 1.60 per cat

Business Case for Judges - Current

	# Entries	# Rings (AAB)	Judges Fees
Case 1	60	1	66
Case 2	100	1	110
Case 3	150	1	165
Case 4	200	1	220

Business Case for Judges - Proposed Change

	# Entries	# Rings (AAB)	10% Absentees	Actual Cats Judged	JF 1,60	Difference	in %
Case 1	60	1	6	54	86,4	20,4	30,91
Case 2	100	1	10	90	144	34	30,91
Case 3	150	1	15	135	216	51	30,91
Case 4	200	1	20	180	288	68	30,91

Amend Standing Rule 2014.1:

NB: This change is to take effect from 1 May 2023.

2014.1.1 Judges Fees.

Based on number of entries in the catalog eligible for competition based on status of judge, not type of show judged.

Based on the status of the judge, not the type of show judged, fees are payable in accordance with the following schedule:

2014.1.1.1 Approved Allbreed Judge *and Licensed Guest Judge* - ~~\$1.10 per entry~~ **\$1.60 per entry judged.**

2014.1.1.2 Provisional Allbreed Judge and Guest Judge - ~~\$.85 per entry~~ **\$1.25 per entry judged.**

2014.1.1.3 Approved Specialty Judge - ~~\$.65 per entry~~ **\$0.95 per entry judged.**

2014.1.1.4 Probationary Specialty Judge - ~~\$.55 per entry~~ **\$0.80 per entry judged.**

2014.1.1.5 Household Pet Allbreed - ~~\$.85 per entry~~ **\$1.25 per entry judged.**

2014.1.1.6 Household Pet Specialty - ~~\$.55 per entry~~ **\$0.80 per entry judged.**

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 wording of 2014.1.1 was amended by Rules to be consistent with the changes in 2014.1.1.1 etc.

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

Contd/...

(A)

Many years ago, the rule was that judges were paid by cats judged not entered. It was changed for ease of calculation by the club, and it was pointed out that the club was paid for cats entered, not present. Since, currently, TOES calculates for us based on entered cats, any change would require individual calculation.

While I think an increase in fees has merit, I think this large an increase has little chance of success. Every time an increase has been proposed it has been defeated, until the increase to \$1.10 a number of years ago - and as I remember, the proposal at that time put AAB at 1.25/cat and the BOD knocked it down.

In addition - do we still have any HHP only judges?

(B)

I don't think this is the right time for such a steep increase in fees, while it would be nice, just not a good time.

Also, budgeting to pay judges us a lot easier with total cats than having judges count cats in every ring. I realize it's not going to change a whole lot but it makes it easier on the person judging and the person paying.

It has been discussed on the Judging Committee adding another step to those that are ring and school instructors...pay them a little more for the effort to get that license.

(C)

I agree with (B). I think an increase in fees is necessary, however 45% can be a challenge for the many clubs, I would suggest maximum a 15% effective 2023.

What I really think it's necessary at this point is a fee for instructors for each trainee they have in their rings, and TICA should paid for this, not the clubs. Every time we educate a new judge it's for the best interest of TICA as an association, also we need to recognize the dedication and effort of our AAB judges to become Instructors.

(D)

This is a truly terrible time to increase the fees and incredibly burdensome on the clubs.

Many venues and areas still restrict outside attendance and every show is a risk right now

(E)

This would mean the club treasurer would not be able to complete payment cheque's until after the judge has completed judging.

(F)

I agree with everyone else - while the proposed rule is written appropriately, I think requesting a 45% increase at this time of economic uncertainty is poorly timed. I do think that adjustments aligning with inflation is not an unreasonable thought... Perhaps add a caveat that it be reviewed on a routine basis, e.g., every five years, so that it would not be felt necessary to request such a large jump in fees all at one time.

(G)

I am in agreement with all the others - I particularly think it should be on cats entered, not handled as well as it's too steep of an increase.

I also like the idea of fees starting in May of 2023 - gives time to adjust for it.

And the incentive to pay licensed ring instructors more is a very good idea because otherwise, there really are no incentives to take that step... especially with it becoming even more difficult to earn that license.

I would not adjust the Household Pet fees . And a lesser increase would be good - I also like (F)'s idea to review every 5 years..

I would suggest:

2014.1.1.1 Ring/School Instructor - \$1.40 per cat

2014.1.1.2 Approved Allbreed Judge & Licensed Guest Judges - \$1.25 per cat.

2014.1.1.3 Provisional Allbreed Judge & Guest Judges - \$1.10 per cat

2014.1.1.4 Approved Specialty Judge - \$.90 per cat

2014.1.1.5 Probationary Specialty Judge - \$.75 per cat

2014.1.1.6 Household Pet Allbreed - \$.85

2014.1.1.7 Household Pet Specialty - \$.55

(H)

I think that a proposal to increase the judging fees has merit, but I do not agree with the complications of adding "cats judged "not "cats entered " to the process.

(D)

On the one hand, I think it is beneficial to base the fee on cats judged but the judge's fees can be lowered if a group of exhibitors decides to withhold

(A)

This is a good point, (D).

(E)

I think judges deserve an increase and a review every x Years. Would this be for the Judging Committee to look after?

(I)

Most of the comments so far have been from a club or exhibitor perspective. I wanted to look at this from a judge perspective.

My understanding is that the purpose of the judging fee is to help the judge offset any expenses not related to travel that the judge incurs from being away from home - for example pet-sitting fees. Such expenses have also risen with inflation over the years. Our judges invest their own time and money to become judges. It is unreasonable for them to have to dig into their own pockets beyond annual TICA fees to carry on judging.

As proposed, the increased cost is 50 cents (or less) per ring. So a maximum of \$10 per entry per show - less for shows holding fewer rings. I can understand that clubs may not wish to pass on the full cost of that to their exhibitors and that exhibitors may not want to pay the increase either. Nevertheless, increasing those fees has merit in my opinion.

(I – contd)

Judges have always had the option of donating all or part of their fees back to the club as well - though that should not be seen as the norm if fees increase.

I am not sure that changing to entries judged is necessary. I saw it as a compromise by the proposers to reduce the impact on clubs. Perhaps a slightly smaller increase and retaining the current process of counting entries would be better.

There is never a good time to increase fees but I do feel an increase is justified.

(J)

The amount of increase is a matter of debate for the Board, but basing the fee on cats judged is a nightmare with no meaningful benefit over the current process.

TOYBOB BREED GROUP TB/TBL

The Toybob (TB) is a small cat with proportionally balanced features, medium muscularity, and bone structure. The cat's bobbed tail is owed to a natural mutation(s) found in **feral native** cats from Russia. The Toybob temperament is very gentle and the cat amenable to handle. Toybob Longhair (TBL) is the semi-longhair version of the breed.

HEAD	40 points
Shape	9 -10
Eyes	10
Ears	5 -4
Chin	3
Muzzle/ Nose / Chin	3 -6
Nose	4
Profile	7 8
Neck	2
BODY	40 points
Torso	10
Legs/ Feet	4 6
Feet	2
Tail	10
Bones	7
Musculature	7
COAT	20 points
Length	5
Texture	10
Color/Pattern	5

CATEGORY: All

DIVISIONS: All

COLORS: All

PERMISSIBLE OUTCROSS:

Russian-Domestic Shorthair and Longhair with similar phenotype and **no structural mutation**. The outcross policy is currently permitted during the breed development and recognition process to ensure the genetic soundness of the breed.

HEAD:

Shape: Medium sized modified wedge with rounded contours and a flat plane above the eyebrows. Head is slightly longer than broader with rounded cheekbones curved inward from

face to mid muzzle, to create a slight to no whisker pinch and ending in a round, modified square shaped muzzle. Jowls are prominent in adult males.

Ears: Medium tall, high on the head, one ear width apart and wide at the base. Ears must be as tall as wide in length, with rounded tips and slightly tilted forward.

Eyes: Eyes are big must be large, rounded with an open expression, oval and with a slight upward slant. The line across the corners of the eye leads to the outer base of the ear. ~~When wide open, eyes can appear larger and round.~~ The big-eyed expression is what gives the Toybob its sweet-faced look.

Eye Color: Traditional eye color is related to coat color, pointed divisions are blue; sepia is gold/green, mink is blue/green eyes.

PROFILE:

Distinctly: Gently curved profile with a dip from the forehead to the nose at the eye-middle level. Definite stop is not allowed. **Full forehead is preferred.**

Muzzle/ Nose: Moderately short, rounded, modified square shape in proportion to the face. **Nose is Roman, square shaped in appearance with gently rounded contours and a smooth transition into the cheek bone. Nose can be straight or with a slightly curved bridge.**

Chin: Strong with moderate depth, so as to still be in line with the nose tip. Chin must be neither receding nor protruding.

Neck: Short and Thick. Allowances must be made for longer necks in kittens

BODY:

Torso: Short and square shaped ~~Small and compact~~ with a solid chest. Broad rib cage and slight depth of flank add to the solidness of the overall body balance. Back is almost straight when viewed from the side when the cat is in natural walking position.

Legs: Strong, medium in proportion to the body to complement the square shape look of the cat's mid section. Hind legs are slightly longer than front legs.

Feet: Rounded with elongated toes on the hind legs.

Tail: Bobbed with kinks and curves in any combination but also may be almost straight. The tail minimum length is ~~4 inch (minimum two vertebrae)~~ at least two vertebrae to the maximum length (without stretching) down to the hock. ~~The last bone may gently be felt to be pointed, not blunt.~~

Musculature: Firm, solid and well developed with clean lines and no bulging appearance.

Bones: Strong, moderately refined and proportional to the body. Neither heavy nor delicate.

COAT:

Color/Pattern: All

Texture/Length —

TB: Coat is short, soft and slightly plush to the touch, dense but not thick. The coat is rather resilient and not close lying to the body. The coat has developed undercoat where the topcoat is almost the same length as the undercoat. Stomach hair is shorter and softer, while fur texture on the spine area is slightly thicker and coarser. Kittens can have a somewhat woolly coat.

TBL: Coat is semi-longhair in length and softer than the short-coated variety. Topcoat is slightly longer in length than the undercoat but also giving it a plushy but not too thick feel through the entire body. The coat has very minimal ruff if any over the whole cat's body with visible ears and feet furnishings. No ear tufts.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION:

The Toybob is a naturally small, bobtailed cat primarily developed in the Rostov and Ural Regions of Russia. The Toybob name is derived from two words, where "Toy" is meant to describe a playful small-sized cat breed, and "bob" refers to a bobbed tail. Toybobs have compact, muscular bodies with short bobbed tails consisting of several kinked vertebrae. The Toybob body should not look nor feel refined or delicate. The cat's bobbed tail is unique to the breed and due to a spontaneous mutation(s) that appeared in

feral native cats to Russia. The Toybob has a pleasant temperament and is affectionate while also obedient to their human companions. Despite their small size, they are active, playful and agile.

ALLOWANCES: Jowls in adult males, males smaller than females White spotting on feet and lockets in all color classes. **Darker coat shading in the pointed coat divisions. Slightly softer coat texture on other than pointed coat divisions.**

PENALIZE:

TB: ~~Small eyes. Longer necks in adults.~~ Too foreign body type. Oversized cat. Tail length past hock. **Flare ears. Too big ears.**

TBL: ~~Small eyes. Longer necks in adults. Too foreign body type. Oversized cat. Tail length past hock. Long Persian like coat.~~

Same as for the short-hair. Tufts on ears.

WITHHOLD ALL AWARDS (WW): ~~No flexibility to the tail.~~ Crossed eyes. Complete absence of tail vertebrae.

DISQUALIFICATION (DQ): ~~Any sign of the "Dominant Blue-Eye" mutation (e.g. Ojos Azules, Russian Altai Topaz).~~ **Blue eye color in cats other than pointed, solid white or bi color divisions. Short Munchkin like legs. Short dwarf-like legs. Docked tail. Undernourished or frail.**

▼ ▼ ▼ ▼ ▼

Temperament must be unchallenging; any sign of definite challenge shall disqualify. The cat may exhibit fear, seek to flee, or generally complain aloud but may not threaten to harm. In accordance with Show Rules, **ARTICLE SIXTEEN, the following shall be considered mandatory disqualifications:** a cat that bites (216.9), a cat showing evidence of intent to deceive (216.10), adult whole male cats not having two descended testicles (216.11), cats with all or part of the tail missing, except as authorized by a board approved standard (216.12.1), cats with more than five toes on each front foot and four toes on each back foot, unless proved the result of an injury or as authorized by a Board approved standard (216.12.2), visible or invisible tail faults if Board approved standard requires disqualification (216.12.4), crossed eyes if Board approved standard requires disqualification (216.12.5), total blindness (216.12.6), markedly smaller size, not in keeping with the breed (216.12.9), and depression of the sternum or unusually small diameter of the rib cage itself (216.12.11.1). See Show Rules, **ARTICLE SIXTEEN** for more comprehensive rules governing penalties and disqualifications.

Toybob Breed Group TB/TBL

Proposed 09/2020

Rules Committee Comments on Toybob Standard Change

Summary

The Rules Committee has reviewed this application to modify the Toybob Breed Standard.

As a New Breed, if approved by the Board, these changes are effective immediately. The Working Group is advised to acquaint judges with the new standard for shows held during the first few weeks these changes are effective.

The standard has also been reviewed by the Genetics Committee and the Board should also seek advice from them before making a decision.

The rationale for the changes were previously provided at the 2020 Annual and are reproduced below

From a Rules perspective, the Standard is approved by the Committee.

Comments:

One member commented that:

“Under Penalize I might say: Ears too big or flared.

And under TBL I'd say: In addition to the penalties for TB, Tufts on ears

Comment: Don't all longhaired cats grow ear tufts?

And under Allowances: Is the darker coat shading apply to the body color? or hips? or points?

I am also confused by the nose/muzzle (profile is defined above that so this isn't talking about profile) - it says: nose can be straight or with a slightly curved bridge - what does this mean?

And not really changed in this version but under DQ: "Undernourished or frail" - Isn't that covered by Section 16? and just general condition on all cats? Is it really needed?”

Rationale:

This provides the reasons for each of the changes to the standard under the relevant heading. It has been transcribed word for word from the PDF standard received in 2020, as these have now been deleted from the standards document.

Description:

Change of word feral to native as the foundation cat originated on Russian territory

(Comments on Toybob Standard Change – Page 1 of 3)

Points:

Points consolidation

we changed and consolidated the points in Head and Body descriptions to easier scale the pointing while judging

Outcross:

Permissible out-crosses. We added no structural mutation as we want to make sure the Toybob tail mutation is preserved.

Eye description

added word big and rounded shape as this is a feedback from breed committee and judges

Profile

Changed distinctly to gently and full forehead preferred as an extra description lacking before.

Muzzle/Nose

Muzzle and nose was - extra description was added to be more descriptive of the muzzle and uniform with other standards of the Toybob breed in other associations

Torso:

More descriptive words added of invasion the desired torso shape

Legs

Added description to the legs to address the overall proportion to the body

Ears

Ears: "High on head" was removed as the sentence over ride the proportions already described in the next section

Tail

Tail length description the inch measurements was removed to be replaced by a better measurable key checks. The last sentence was removed as this will motivate judges to not necessarily feel and pull on the tail too much. In addition, the docked tail section was addressed in disqualification section.

Penalty

small eye was removed as we often see that kittens grow into their eye size. Desired size of eye was already addressed in the eye description. Flare ears was

(Comments on Toybob Standard Change – Page 2 of 3)

added as to be more transparent that the cat head should not have an influence of Thai/ Oriental flare ears.

Disqualification

Novel blue eye mutation in the past associated with Ojos Azules breed was moved to general description instead of direct referral to the breed. The same as the word Munchkin was removed.

Allowance

Added some slight variance to other colors of coats