

**TICA Board of Directors  
Spring Meeting Agenda  
May 21-23, 2021  
(Telephonic)**

---

**Friday, May 21<sup>ST</sup>, 7am CDT**

**Welcome and Call to Order – Harrison 7 – 7:15 am**

**Approval of Consent Agenda**

1. Approval of March 10, 2021 Special Meeting Minutes
2. Set Annual Meeting: September 1-3, 2021, Telephonic

**Governance**

1. Conflict of Interest Statement - Annual Certification ..... 3

**Executive Session - Judging Program, Protest/Complaints, Contracts 7:15 – 9 am**

**Open Session**

**Governance (Continued) 9 – 10 am**

1. Appointment to Abyssinian Breed Committee (select 1)  
Jean Hannum  
Gary Hoffman
2. Appointment to American Curl (SH/LH) Breed Committee (select 3, name Chair)  
Linda Bull  
Joe Ruga  
Grace Ruga (Chair)  
Kathryn W Sottile
3. Appointment to Australian Mist Breed Committee (select 2)  
Andrea Schlicker  
Karen Henneke
4. Appointment to Burmese/Bombay Breed Committee (select 2)  
Theo Mitchell  
Beata Broing
5. Appointment to Devon Rex Breed Committee (select 2)  
Ellen V Crockett  
Denise Bachman  
Robin French  
Michelle Piatt
6. Appointment to Donskoy Breed Committee (select 1)  
Alisyn Garza  
Lilya Kovalenko
7. Appointment to Havana Breed Committee (select 2)  
Cornelia Schofield  
Geraldine A Mckerlie
8. Appointment to Household Pet Breed Committee (select 3)  
Judith Milling  
Patricia Clary  
Michelle Whiting
9. Appointment to Lykoi Breed Committee (select 1)  
Desiree Bobby
10. Appointment to Norwegian Forest Breed Committee (select 5)  
Donna Armel  
James Armel  
Melissa Waller  
Tracy Hisel

11. Appointment to Persian/Himalayan/Exotic Shorthair Breed Committee (select 2)	
Angela Millican	
Brigitte Pouliot	
12. Appointment to Scottish Fold/Straight (SH/LH) Breed Committee (select 3)	
Margo Upham	
Paul Harrison	
Sauncha Romey	
13. Appointment to Toyger Breed Committee (select 2)	
Sofia Larabi	
Zhong Li	
14. Review Follow-Up Report .....	6
Genetic Registry - Van Mullem.....	7

**Proposals - By-Laws 10 – 11 am**

1. Amend By-Law 17.4 (Breed Committee Duties) - Hutcherson .....	9
2. Amend By-Laws Article Ten and Delete Standing Rules 1010.1 And 1010.1.1 (Board Ballots) — Faccioli ..	13

**Saturday, May 22<sup>ND</sup> (Open Session Continued) 7 – 10:30 am CDT**

Genetics Committee Comments on proposals for the Spring 2021 meeting .....	16
--	----

**Proposals - Registration Rules**

1. Amend Reg Rule 33.3.1 (Genetics Review of New Experimental Breeds) – Crockett.....	20
2. Add New Reg Rule 33.3.2 And Re-Number 33.3.2 Etc (Duration in Experimental Record) - Kruszona-Zawadzka .....	22
3. Amend Reg Rules 33.3.2 And 33.3.3.6 (Mutation Ownership Voting) - Kruszona- Zawadzka.....	25
4. Amend Reg Rule 36.6.1 And 37.2.1 (Outcrosses Within Cat I) – Brooks and Committee .....	28
PowerPoint Presentation	
5. Amend Reg Rules 37.1.2.5, 37.6,37.8.3 (Amend Cat V Definitions) – Crockett, Brooks And Ad Hoc Committee .....	31
6. Add New Reg Rule 39.16 (Transfer Documentation) – Van Mullem/Adler .....	38

**Proposals - Judging Program**

1. Amend Judging Program Article SIX (Provisional Allbreed Judge) – Judging Committee .....	43
2. Amend Judging Program Article SEVEN (Approved Allbreed) – Judging Committee.....	47

**Proposals – Standing Rules**

1. Amending Standing Rules 106.2.1, 106.2.2 And 106.4.2.1 (Judging Committee) – Fisher .....	51
2. Amend Standing Rule 106.4.2.1.10 (Selection of TICA Judging Administrator and Deputy Judging Administrator) – Fisher .....	58
3. Amend Standing Rule 109.1.1 (Annual Rotation) – Board Directive.....	62

**Governance Continued 10:30 – 11 am**

1. Approval - Postpone The 2021 Annual Awards Banquet and Presentation to January 2022
2. Approval - Suspend the Annual Show/Awards Banquet Guidelines for the 2021 Awards Ceremony

**Sunday, May 23<sup>rd</sup> (Open Session Continued) 7 am CDT**

**Executive and Fiduciary 7 – 9:30 am**

1. Financial Report
2. Proposed Budget FY 2022
3. Regional Rebates
4. COO Update

**Other Business and Discussion 9:30 – 11 am**

**Adjourn**

# The International Cat Association

## ***Conflict of Interest Policy***

### **Article I: Purpose**

The purpose of the conflict of interest policy is to protect The International Cat Association's (the Association) (a tax-exempt organization) interest when it is contemplating entering into a transaction or arrangement that might benefit the private interest of an officer or director of the Association, might result in a possible excess benefit transaction or may be a non-financial perceived, real or potential conflict which might preclude an interested person in performing impartially their responsibility to the Association. This policy is intended to supplement but not replace any applicable state and federal laws governing conflict of interest applicable to nonprofit organizations.

### **Article II: Definitions**

1. Interested Person. Any director, principal officer, or member of a committee with governing board delegated powers, who has a direct or indirect financial interest, as defined below, is an interested person.

2. Financial Interest. A person has a financial interest if the person has, directly or indirectly, through business, investment, or family:

a) An ownership or investment interest in any entity with which the Association has a transaction or arrangement,

b) A compensation arrangement with the Association or with any entity or individual with which the Association has a transaction or arrangement, or

c) A potential ownership or investment interest in, or compensation arrangement with, any entity or individual with which the Association is negotiating a transaction or arrangement. Compensation includes direct and indirect remuneration as well as gifts or favors that are not insubstantial.

A financial interest is not necessarily a conflict of interest. Under Article III, Section 2, a person who has a financial interest may have a conflict of interest only if the appropriate governing board or committee decides that a conflict of interest exists.

3. Non-financial conflicts of interest. Situations and influences which may present the risk that an interested person might make a decision based on, or affected by these influences, rather than in the best interests of the Association. Voting on judging acceptances and advancements, disciplinary actions, hiring employees or contractors and voting on complaints may give rise to non-financial conflicts of interest.

### **Article III: Procedures**

1. Duty to Disclose. In connection with any actual or possible conflict of interest, an interested person must disclose the existence of the financial interest and be given the opportunity to disclose all material facts to the directors and members of committees with governing board delegated powers considering the proposed transaction or arrangement.

2. Determining Whether a Conflict of Interest Exists. After disclosure of the financial interest and all material facts, and after any discussion with the interested person, he/she shall leave the governing board or committee meeting while the determination of a conflict of interest is discussed and voted upon. The remaining board or committee members shall decide if a conflict of interest exists.

3. Procedures for Addressing the Conflict of Interest.

a) An interested person may make a presentation at the governing board or committee meeting, but after the presentation, he/she shall leave the meeting during the discussion of, and the vote on, the transaction or arrangement involving the possible conflict of interest.

b) The chair of the governing board or committee shall, if appropriate, appoint a disinterested person or committee to investigate alternatives to the proposed transaction or arrangement.

c) After exercising due diligence, the governing board or committee shall determine whether the Association can obtain with reasonable efforts a more advantageous transaction or arrangement from a person or entity that would not give rise to a conflict of interest.

d) If a more advantageous transaction or arrangement is not reasonably possible under circumstances not producing a conflict of interest, the governing board or committee shall determine by a majority vote of the disinterested directors whether the transaction or arrangement is in the Association's best interest, for its own benefit, and whether it is fair and reasonable. In conformity with the above determination it shall make its decision as to whether to enter into the transaction or arrangement.

4. Violations of the Conflicts of Interest Policy

a) If the governing board or committee has reasonable cause to believe a member has failed to disclose actual or possible conflicts of interest, it shall inform the member of the basis for such belief and afford the member an opportunity to explain the alleged failure to disclose.

b) If, after hearing the member's response and after making further investigation as warranted by the circumstances, the governing board or committee determines the member has failed to disclose an actual or possible conflict of interest, it shall take appropriate disciplinary and corrective action.

**Article IV: Records of Proceedings.** The minutes of the governing board and all committees with board delegated powers shall contain:

1. The names of the persons who disclosed or otherwise were found to have a financial interest in connection with an actual or possible conflict of interest, the nature of the financial interest, any action taken to determine whether a conflict of interest was present, and the governing board's or committee's decision as to whether a conflict of interest in fact existed.

2. The names of the persons who were present for discussions and votes relating to the transaction or arrangement, the content of the discussion, including any alternatives to the proposed transaction or arrangement, and a record of any votes taken in connection with the proceedings.

**Article V: Compensation**

1. A voting member of the governing board who receives compensation, directly or indirectly, from the Association for services is precluded from voting on matters pertaining to that member's compensation.

2. A voting member of any committee whose jurisdiction includes compensation matters and who receives compensation, directly or indirectly, from the Association for services is precluded from voting on matters pertaining to that member's compensation.

3. No voting member of the governing board or any committee whose jurisdiction includes compensation matters and who receives compensation, directly or indirectly, from the Association, either individually or collectively, is prohibited from providing information to any committee regarding compensation.

**Article VI: Annual Statements.**

Each director, principal officer and member of a committee with governing board delegated powers shall annually sign a statement which affirms such person:

- Has received a copy of the conflicts of interest policy,
- Has read and understands the policy,
- Has agreed to comply with the policy, and
- Understands the Association is a not for profit entity and in order to maintain its federal tax exemption it must engage primarily in activities which accomplish one or more of its tax-exempt purposes.

**Article VII: Periodic Reviews**

To ensure the Association operates in a manner consistent with tax-exempt purposes and does not engage in activities that could jeopardize its tax-exempt status, periodic reviews shall be conducted. The periodic reviews shall, at a minimum, include the following subjects:

- Whether compensation arrangements and benefits are reasonable, based on competent survey information, and the result of arm's length bargaining.
- Whether partnerships, joint ventures, and arrangements with management organizations conform to the Association's written policies, are properly recorded, reflect reasonable investment or payments for goods and services, further charitable purposes, and do not result in inurement, impermissible private benefit, or in an excess benefit transaction.

**Article VIII: Use of Outside Experts**

When conducting the periodic reviews as provided for in Article VII, the Association may, but need not, use outside advisors. If outside experts are used, their use shall not relieve the governing board of its responsibility for ensuring periodic reviews are conducted.

**Task**

Fisher and Adler will craft a letter to see where we are with the translations(Show Rules, Registration Rules and By-Laws) from Ying Chien Wang.

Fisher establishes Committee - Lies, Chair - to look at revising TICA's pedigree to include more genetic information. Brenda, Liz, Vicki Jo, Elaine, AC, Danny, Lorraine Shelton, Roemann

Discuss with JC how long a trainee could be inactive before being removed from trainee Judging Program and what will it take for them to come back. Come back with proposal for Winter Meeting.

**Owner**

Susan Adler

Lies van Mullem

Carlos Lopez

**Notes**

update 2021 Spring Meeting - Executive Session

update 2021 Spring Meeting

Working with Rules, timing not perfect, bring back when the world is back to "normal"

## **Update Genetic Registry – Spring meeting 2021**

### **Members of the working Group:**

Liesbeth van Mullem (chair), Liz Brown, Roeann Fulkerson, AC Joseph, Adriana Kajon, Danny Nevarez, Brenda Russo, Lorraine Shelton, Sarah Louise Walker, Elaine Weitz

This working group was formed on request of the Board of Directors at the Spring meeting 2020. In the first few months we discussed several topics, e.g. the DNA data we would want to register as TICA, the responsibilities of the parties involved, and which information should / could be added to the official pedigree. To further develop our ideas we looked at other registries and their pedigrees as a benchmark.

As the space on our TICA pedigrees is limited we discussed which DNA data we thought would be the most valuable for our clients.

### **Our findings can be summarized as follows:**

- Available DNA data related to health can be a vital tool to improve breeding programs and the health of cats in general.
- At this moment different laboratories already offer a large number of different DNA tests. The number of different DNA test results will only increase in the coming years with new technology and further research.
- Any data is only as good as its input and as such a solid identification procedure, like a vet ID verification before the data is entered, is important. However, at this moment there are a lot of cats tested without such a verification process and it would be a loss when these data could not be incorporated in our database.
- As a group our priorities for adding DNA data to our pedigrees would be:
  - I. Confirmed parentage
  - II. Breed Specific diseases
  - III. Blood type
  - IV. Coat colour (generic)
  - V. Breed Specific Morphology
  - VI. Breed Specific coat texture (e.g. rexing)
  - VII. Coat colour (specific)
  - VIII. Coat length
- However, the available space on TICA's pedigree to add DNA test results is limited, especially on the 5-generation pedigrees.

### **In light of these findings our advice is to:**

- Expand our database to be able to incorporate all available DNA results per registered cat;
- Include an indicator per DNA result whether or not this data was obtained by a sample taken by the owner or an independent third party, e.g. vet (with chip identification);

- Add a code to the pedigree of a cat (e.g. QR code or web link) which will link online to all available DNA data of the cat, its parents and grandparents in our database;
- Involve the Breed Committees and the Genetics Committee to provide guidelines and advice to breeders on the recommended DNA tests per breed.

### **Other observation**

During our discussions one other topic came up which is related to this discussion. At this moment it is possible to register a cat / kitten as non-standard at the time of registration.

Two observations:

- This information is not always correctly registered at the Executive Office. The good news is that we were informed that with the implementation of the new IT system Salesforce this first issue should be solved.
- Once it is registered this information does not show up on our registration slips or pedigrees. This is an omission in our registration while this can be valuable information for breeders. E.g. a non-curly Selkirk Rex is registered as a non-standard Selkirk Rex but after registration this information is not “available” anymore.



## Amend Bylaw 17.4 (Breed Committee Duties) - Hutcherson

### Rationale:

Rationale #1: To better define the role of the Breed Committee to assist to TICA in education and advocacy on the benefits of pedigreed cats as these tasks have consistently been performed by members of the breed committee.

Rationale #2: To assist breed section members to better identify Breed Committee candidates who can provide the functions most often done by the Breed Committee.

Rationale #3: To assist interested parties in being better able to understand the tasks and duties most often performed by TICA Breed Committees.

Rationale #4: To provide empirical data from which breed committees may inform, assist and guide their breed through education, encouragement and engagement activities

### Amend Bylaw 17.4:

#### 17.4 Duties of the Breed Committees.

**17.4.1** It is the duty of the Breed Committee to represent the Breed/Breed Group Section members on any proposed Breed Standard change, amendment or deletion, submitted by any bona fide voting members of the Breed/Breed Group Section. Any proposal submitted to the Breed Committee must be approved by a majority vote of the Committee prior to the Breed Committee Chairperson forwarding the proposal to the Genetics and Rules Committees for review and approval. It is the responsibility of the Breed Committee Chairperson to forward any approved proposal to the aforementioned Committees within 5 days of approval by the Breed Committee and to return any proposal not approved by the Committee to the person or persons originally submitting the proposal. Individual Breed Committee members may attach comments to any breed proposal submitted to the aforesaid committees or individuals. Upon approval of the Genetics and Rules Committees, the proposal must be forwarded to the Executive Office for balloting of the Breed/Breed Group Section in accordance with 118.2.

**17.4.2 It is the duty of the Breed Committee to educate the general public about the distinctive qualities, unique history and value to society of their breed via means identified by the TICA Board of Directors such as the TICA website, TICA publications and TICA events.**

**17.4.3 It is the duty of the Breed Committee to educate and provide resources for breed section member breeders to hone their breeding programs to produce better examples of the breed via breed seminars authored and approved by the breed committee available online and/or in person.**

**17.4.4 It is the duty of the Breed Committee to provide resources to TICA breed section members and judges to assist in the evaluation and ongoing improvement of the breed.**

**17.4.5 It is the duty of the Breed Committee to provide representation whenever possible when requested by the TICA President.**

**17.4.6 The breed committee shall be provided with reports every year by the Executive Office showing annual registration statistics for the immediate past show year and the two previous show years.**

**17.4.7 The breed committee shall hold a minimum of one meeting per three year term in person or via an online medium. The agenda and informal or formal minutes shall be available to breed section members via a medium provided by TICA.**

#### **Rules Chair Note:**

As well as the issues raised below on this proposal, it would be beneficial to completely review how and where Breed Sections and Breed Committees (e.g. membership, function, election process) are mentioned in our Bylaws.

For example, Breed Committees (17.4) are listed under "Article Seven – Duties of Officers". Some Breed Committees are taking on some challenges with other breeders and TICA assuming legal risk as people then think that the Breed Committee members are "officers/officials" of TICA.

It is recommended that the Board request the Rules Committee to review and prepare revisions to address the issues raised, ideally in time 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"**

(A)

This list is more suited to Standing Rules, as Bylaws are for overall policy. Bylaw 14.2 also mentions duties of Breed/Breed groups, so this proposal should also be consistent with that.

(B)

I feel very strongly that this is not an appropriate Bylaws amendment - it should be a standing rule at most, and a guideline at best.

Bylaws are the highest in hierarchy of all of our rules, and should be the ones that change the least over time - Standing Rules are to support higher ranking rules, clarifying and/or supporting those.

(C)

I agree that this proposal isn't consistent with a Bylaws revision.

(D)

I agree with (C). I would rather see them as "guidelines" Enforcement could certainly create some legal issues.

## 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 think the idea of having more Breed Committee duties described, so people know what they are committing to, I can also see a lot of people refusing to stand as candidates if they have to comply with all these duties.

Many Breed Committee members will have problems complying with this duty:

*"17.4.5 It is the duty of the Breed Committee to provide representation whenever possible when requested by the TICA President."*

I know it says "whenever possible", but representing the breed at specific events on another continent is often not possible for Breed Committee members.

Another duty which I can see becoming a problem for many members is this one:

*"17.4.7 The breed committee shall hold a minimum of one meeting per three year term in person or via an online medium. The agenda and informal or formal minutes shall be available to breed section members via a medium provided by TICA."*

In-person meetings are really only possible between members who live relatively close to each other or are able to meet up at a show. Again, most members only show in their own continent, so would not be able to comply with this. And with regard to online meetings, there are many US members who do not correspond in any other way than by email.

I like many of the duties, but I don't like having them described as duties and I'm quite certain that if this proposal is accepted, I will not stand for Breed Committee again, because it is simply not possible for me to take time out to fulfil all these duties.

(B)

There are a number of issues in my mind:

1. Currently, the only duty of the Breed Committees is to conduct the procedure that results in Breed Standard Changes. Presumably, the duty of presenting Breed Seminars would have to fall to the Committee as the "organizer/leader" of the effort.

2. We have no enforcement of the current Standing Rule 104.2 or consequences. What would be the enforcement means to compliance with a whole laundry list of additional "duties."

Contd/...

(B – Contd/...)

3. I am a bit concerned that Breed Committee is listed under Elected Officials. We already have some Breed Committees taking on some challenges with other breeders and TICA assuming legal risk as many folks think that the Breed Committee members are "officers/officials" of TICA.

4. Some of the listed "duties" would seem to imply some financial consequence and perhaps some legal issues.

5. Some of the breed sections are large and have larger committees; some very small. It would be a huge responsibility and daunting task for some committees to accomplish all the stated duties.

(C)

I agree that guidelines would be best. Once I read it my immediate thought was "are we trying to discourage participation"?

(D)

I think this is due to some frustration - whose job is it to present education to the Judges and new breeders? That is just one aspect but all our rules say now about a breed committee is they deal with standard changes. Period.

There are some people that think it's much more than that, but it isn't. And maybe it should be somewhere in between - Guidelines with this list of items would be a good compromise.

(E)

As a whole these rules are potentially overbearing and overwhelming. I'm sure all of the breed committees could do some of these things, but all of them? That's asking quite a lot. If we want to expand the responsibilities of the breed committees I would recommend changing "it is the duty of..." to "duties may include..." Also, 17.4.6 is not a breed committee responsibility, it is directed at the EO so should not be included.

(F)

I agree with the proposal completely but am concerned that only 4 or 5 breed committees will manage to accomplish this. This creates a situation where people will actually have potential very valid complaints against their breed committees and then what do we do? Many of them are being appointed because of failure to fill the committees

(E)

I agree completely with (F), especially regarding committee members becoming open to complaints. I think even the word "should" may be too strong and again would recommend using the term "duties may include" rather than "should".

## Amend By-Laws Article Ten and Delete Standing Rules 1010.1 and 1010.1.1 (Board Ballots) — Faccioli

### Rationale:

Board Ballots are a valuable tool for actions that cannot wait for a meeting to be taken and they have been used more often than normal on these days of great challenges for our business. By-Laws Article Ten was drawn considering essentially a mail ballot, which is even mentioned on its title, and the possibility of balloting by fax or any suitable electronic media is the exception, not the regular process. However, we don't use mail ballots anymore and the exception became the regular process. Balloting today, and for a long time, is done exclusively by e-mail. Considering the agility provided by the electronic tool and the desired speed in decision making by a Board Ballot, the deadlines defined on Article Ten are obsolete. This proposal aims to provide a necessary update on the process.

There's also some ambiguity regarding the role of the Vice President on the process. By-Laws 110.2.1 says clearly that "the President and Vice President may submit any matter to the Board Members directly", but it's not specified whether the Vice President should be acting as President to have such a prerogative, and, in that case, it's implicit and the mention, therefore, unnecessary.

### Amend Bylaws Article Ten:

Article Ten – Board of Directors Action by **Electronic** ~~Mail~~ Ballot

110.1 Board Ballot. For business conducted between meetings the Board of Directors may take any action within its jurisdiction by ~~mail, fax or any other~~ suitable electronic media in use by the Executive Office.

110.2 Board Ballot Procedures.

110.2.1 Proposals for ballot action may be originated by any Board Member. The proposed action shall be submitted **in writing** to the Business Manager/Executive Secretary **containing a rationale** with as full an explanation as possible and a request that the matter be submitted to the Board Members for a vote. The President ~~and Vice President~~ may submit any matter to the Board Members directly. The ballot shall note the date it is ~~mailed~~ **sent out**, the date it is returnable, and whether it is returnable to the Business Manager/Executive Secretary or the President as the case may be. The ballot shall contain a space for "yes", "no" and "abstain" vote, the date and the signature.

110.2.2 Except as otherwise provided in these By-Laws, adoption of any proposal by **electronic** ~~mail~~ ballot shall require an affirmative vote of a majority of all Board Members holding office after all Board Members have been balloted for the shorter of a period of ~~10 days~~ **72 hours from the date the ballot is sent out** or ~~3 days~~ after a majority vote has been attained and the remaining uncast ballots would not affect the outcome of the voting.

**110.2.3 Notification. The Board shall be notified of the Board Ballot results within one working day of the ending date of the Ballot and the Ballot result shall be published in the TREND and on the TICA website.**

110.2.34 Effective Date: All action by the Board of Directors by ~~mail~~**electronic ballot** shall become effective immediately upon adoption unless some other effective date is specified by the By-Laws, Show Rules or Registration Rules of the Association or in the proposal itself.

**If Adopted, also delete Standing Rules 1010.1 and 1010.1.1:**

~~1010.1 Board Ballots. Any Board Ballot submitted to the Executive Office shall be in writing, or it shall be disregarded. The Ballot must also contain a rationale for the Ballot.~~

~~1010.1.1 Notification. The Board shall be notified of the Board Ballot results within 72 hours maximum of the ending date of the Ballot.~~

**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 Board Governance Policy document needs to be made consistent with the amended Bylaw. This could be achieved at the 2022 Winter Meeting.
- (B) Frankly, given that the Article defines Board Ballot, perhaps the title should be "Action by Board Ballot" and references are to "Board ballot" rather than "electronic ballot".
- (C) I agree with the title as well.

**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, clarification is warranted. I would leave all of the forms of balloting in 110.1 alone - having them there does no harm.

Rather than say electronic ballot, which ties us to current technology, maybe replace mail with "official TICA"

- (B) I am not comfortable about the removal of the Vice President in 110.2.1. Whilst updating these Bylaws to take account of advances in electronic technology (and their associated speed) is sensible, making any changes to the basic policy of the Bylaw is not, in my view, desirable. It was set up like this originally for a reason and I see no reason to change that.

Contd/...

(B – Contd)

Whilst it is difficult to see ballots going back to "snail mail", I also see no reason to exclude these options.

(C)

I agree with both (A) and (B). I'm uncomfortable omitting the Vice President, also. The Vice President might be called to handle issues having to do with the President.

I also see no reason to exclude all types of methods of conducting the business between meetings.

(D)

I have nothing to add and concur with (A), (B) and (C).

(E)

Seems fine to me

(F)

I also agree with (A), (B) and (C).

(C)

(A) - I'm not sure I agree with the term "Official TICA Ballot". This article is about the Board taking action between meetings. There is nothing to preclude the Board from taking action on something in a meeting by ballot. We used to "ballot" judging advancements and I think we did a ballot to select an Annual location. I'm sure there have been many times. We've even done electronic voting in online meetings.

Also "Official TICA Ballot" sounds a lot like a term to describe the fall membership voting.

(A)

Sorry - I thought we were talking about elections - in that case I think just "ballot" suffices

Genetics Committee Comments on proposals for the Spring 2021 meeting.

## Proposal 2: Experimental Breed registrations

Heather Lorimer recommends a friendly amendment to this proposal as follows:

**33.3.2 Any Experimental New Breed shall be tracked with an alphanumeric code. That code may be changed to a breed name upon advancement to Preliminary New Breed. ~~for a maximum of 5 years from the date of the application for tracking. If, after that time, the experimental breed has not advanced to Registration Only status, the breed shall be removed from the list of tracked breeds and any application for a breed with the same proposed name or the same proposed description shall not be accepted by the TICA Executive Office for a further period of 5 years.~~**

**33.3.2.1 For breeds already on the Experimental Record as of [effective date], alphanumeric codes will be assigned and instituted for all registrations and pedigrees issued after [effective date] until the breed is advanced to Preliminary New Breed. ~~at the 5 year period will count from that date.~~**

Rationale: First and foremost the Genetics Committee as a whole strongly advocates for the continuation and preservation of data. A 5 year moratorium would be a substantial loss of potential data on genetic diversity, numbers of cats, litters, breeders, and could result in falsification of information. Additionally, not all breeds are the same. Some start rapidly, some are slower to develop momentum. The real goal here is to avoid Experimental New Breeds from passing themselves off as if they were approved by TICA to pet buyers. Having alphanumeric codes instead of breed names should solve that issue. The alphanumeric designation could be Experimental shorthair breed A1S or experimental longhair breed A1L or something similar. There should not be an official list of breed names for “breeds” that have not moved forward towards championship status.

Individual committee member comments: Anthony Hutcherson pointed out that an advantage to the original proposal would be to get a fire under people working with experimental breeds, recruit new breeders, move forward. Adriana Kajon pointed out that the original proposal could provide a roadblock those who put multiple mutations into the cats they are breeding and who have no intention of going through processes to get permission to do so. Ellen Crocket recommended a review by the genetics committee as a minimum if there was not going to be a total moratorium on registration after 5 years (see below).

Another option could be as follows:

**33.3.2 Any Experimental New Breed shall be tracked without additional review for a maximum of 5 years from the date of the application for tracking. ~~If after that time,~~ the experimental breed has not advanced to Registration Only status during the 1<sup>st</sup> four years of**



experimental tracking, the Experimental New Breed must petition the Genetics Committee and the Board of Directors for approval to continue tracking. If the breed fails to do this or fails to get approval the breed name shall be removed from the list of experimental new breeds, ~~the breed shall be removed from the list of tracked breeds and any application for a breed with the same proposed name or the same proposed description shall not be accepted by the TICA Executive Office for a further period of 5 years.~~

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

**Proposal 3: The Genetics committee is in favor.**

**Proposal 4 and 5: The redefining of category 5 and the issue of non-domestic cats in TICA breeds.**

Individual members of the genetics committee have differing opinions on this topic. As a whole the Genetics committee is aware that each of the hybrid-based breeds are unique and face different issues. Bengals are a very successful championship breed. Savannahs seem to have a disconnect between the number of cats registered and the number of cats shown. They are fairly rare in show halls. Chausies are a much smaller breed overall. It seems like a “one size fits all” approach may end up being a poor fit. The Genetics committee would also like to point out that championship cats have only a small % of non-domestic DNA in their genomes. The vast majority of the genetic diversity in the cats actually is from the domestic cats, not the other species. An argument for continuing non-domestic outcrosses to keep genetic diversity is not justified. No one on the Genetics Committee likes the idea of TICA registering non-domestic cats.

Individual comments:

Ellen Crockett has no problem with the proposals as written. Individual locations have regulations on the keeping and breeding of non-domestic cat species and TICA does not have jurisdiction in that area. She is also concerned about rules that might cause people to falsify registrations.

Anthony Hutcherson is not in favor of the proposals. He states that TICA is a domestic cat registry and we should not be registering non-domestic cats. Bengals wanted to be category 1 to emphasize that they are domestic cats. He also points out the following: Genetic heterozygosity, akin to genetic diversity, of breeds who have utilized historic non-domestic cat species x domestic cat hybrids can not be calculated in the same manner as breeds wholly derived from recent domestic cat ancestry in the last two centuries. According to William

Murphy, Gang Li, Brian Davis [et.al](#), the most recent common ancestor of domestic cats and Asian Leopard Cats (*Prionailurus bengalensis*) is 6.5 to 7 million years ago (<https://repository.si.edu/handle/10088/32616>). New data (<https://academic.oup.com/jhered/article/112/2/165/6030926?login=true> published March 2021) in the Journal Heredity provides a detailed genetic analysis of the Asian Leopard Cat will allow for commercial and academic applications identifying subspecific and even regional Asian Leopard Cat contribution to any cat's genome.

Leslie Lyons, PhD and many others have published and stated the importance of preserving genetic heterozygosity within pedigreed breeds OF A SINGLE SPECIES. The dozens of inter-species hybrid crosses over multiple decades for Bengal Cats in multiple regions, countries and continents exceeds the possible genetic heterozygosity possible within a single species allowing for genetic diversity with even the most remedial attention to genetic heterozygosity for untold generations.

For comparison, the Chimpanzee (*Pan troglodytes*) last shared a common ancestor with humankind (*Homo sapien*) between 6 and 8 million years ago (<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-017-00548-3>).

Adriana Kajon, Dragana Petkovic, and Massimo Picardello recommend no new outcrossing to non-domestic species in the future, and agree with Anthony that TICA should not be registering non-domestic cats.

Massimo Picardello also recommended no new outcross breeds and ones currently in existence have 2 years before shutting down non-domestic outcrosses, no F1's to be registered after 2 years, and possibly genetic testing for confirmation. A possible future process might be to do a genetic test on any "unknown" outcross used to make sure that people are not using TICA's outcross policy to illicitly bring in non-domestic cats.

Heather Lorimer wants to emphasize that the number of non-domestic cats available for outcrossing is tiny relative to the domestic cat population. In addition, non-domestic cats either have to be taken from the wild or acquired from people who are breeding them from a relatively small number kept in captivity. This is not a good source for genetic diversity. However the situation in a minority breed like Chausies is very different than that of Bengals.

Lorraine Shelton likes the idea of Category V for non-domestic hybrid breeds other than Bengals. Bengals are a full-fledged successful championship breed and should remain in category 1.

Participants in this discussion:

Ellen Crockett  
Anthony Hutcherson

Adriana Kajon  
Dragana Petkovic  
Massimo Picardello  
Lorraine Shelton  
Lies Mullen, Board Liaison  
Heather Lorimer, Chair

## **Amend Reg Rule 33.3.1 (Genetics Review of new Experimental Breeds) - Crockett**

### **Rationale:**

Right now anyone can pay a fee and have an approved "experimental breed". There are no oversights to this process, so TICA ends up with quite a number of breeds that are never going to be advanced due to violations of our Registration Rules. Putting this Rule in place allows the Genetics Committee to disallow these crossbreeds.

### **Amend Reg Rule 33.1.1 and renumber existing 33.1.1.x rules:**

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.) **This description and a breeding plan shall be submitted to the Genetics Committee prior to making the application to the Executive Office.**

**33.3.1.2 An acknowledgement from the Genetics Committee that this proposed breed is not in violation of either Registration Rules 33.2.1 or 33.9.4**

33.3.1.23 A proposed breed name that is unique.

33.3.1.23.1 The proposed breed name used 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.

33.3.1.34 A proposed breed contact person.

33.3.1.45 A processing fee as specified in the Standing 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"**

(A)

Standing Rule 303.3.1.4 to be re-numbered as 303.3.1.5 if this proposal passes

**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 a great addition to TICA's rules.
- (B) Looks well written to me
- (C) I agree with (B). And it sends a good signal to people outside TICA.
- (D) I am fine with the addition
- (E) I think this would be a good thing because if you're going to try to create a new breed, you need to have a plan
- (F) I'm all for it

## **Add New Reg Rule 33.3.2 and re-number 33.3.2 etc (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).

### **Add New Reg Rule 33.3.2 and renumber existing 33.3.2 to 33.3.6:**

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 The proposed breed name used 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.

**33.3.2 Any Experimental New Breed shall be tracked for a maximum of 5 years from the date of the application for tracking. If, after that time, the experimental breed has not advanced to Registration Only status, the breed shall be removed from the list of tracked breeds and any application for a breed with the same proposed name or the same proposed description shall not be accepted by the TICA Executive Office for a further period of 5 years.**

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

(Existing 33.3.2 is re-numbered as 33.3.3, and so on. Note that the cross-references in 33.3.3.6 as listed in Version E, 09/04/20 will not require re-numbering.)

If the above change is approved, the following Standing Rules will also need re-numbering:

303.3.2 as 303.3.3

303.3.3.6 as 303.3.4.6

### **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)

If the above change is approved, the following Standing Rules will also need re-numbering:

303.3.2 as 303.3.3

303.3.3.6 as 303.3.4.6

(B)

This seems to meet the requirements and doesn't pose conflict with existing rules

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

(A)

First - there is no TICA logo on the paperwork for Experimental Record, nor does it say "registration"

I don't think 5 years is long enough. This is written to address crosses of existing breeds, which would have fairly substantial gene pools. A totally new mutation might need a lot more time to establish a broad genetic base.

(B)

Re the logo - understood; I've asked Frances to send me copies of typical documents so we all know what we are discussing.

If 5 years is not enough, what time period would you suggest? (And is it the same for both the instances of "5 years"?)

(C)

When you deal with people who don't have English as a first language and where many of them don't even speak or understand it at all (such as a lot of the members of Agata's club), there is no difference between the words "registration" and "recording" as they don't understand the nuances, so even though TICAs logo doesn't appear on the form, if TICAs name appears there, the cat in question is by their definition TICA registered and is sold as such.

I agree with (A) that some genuine breeds may take longer than 5 years to advance, but I think 5 years is a long time for the breeds that will never advance due to TICA's registration rules.

- (A) For existing experimental breeds, the EO should have a record of when they first paid their fee to be recorded - I think the time should be the same for all.
- Not sure what the time frame should be - maybe 10 years?
- (B) My issue with this approach is that is effectively a retroactive law. So (assuming it is passed) a breed could then become immediately un-recordable on the date this comes into the rule book. I don't think that is fair. As currently drafted it gives all pre-existing experimental breeds the opportunity to potentially advance to RO.
- Genetics has been sent a copy of this proposal and their advice on timescales would be useful.
- (C) I, too, think 5 years is way too short of a period to try to develop a new breed, especially since acceptance to Registration Only is not guaranteed. I also don't think we can state that an experimental breed will "never" move forward. It is possible that a breed may not move forward in the stated 5 year period, but all of our rules can be changed at any time.
- (D) I also agree that 5 years is too short of a time to expect significant development of a brand new breed. It's possible that it could happen but I don't think it should be the expectation.

**Rules Chair Note:**

The Committee has also reviewed the current format and content of the certificates associated with individual cat records and litter records. Several suggestions have been made to the project team for the new system to improve the wording and format of these documents. These suggestions were positively received by the project team.



## **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:

### **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(See33.2).
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. **If the breed includes one or more structural mutations as described in 31.6, a positive vote of the affected breed sections as described in 33.9.4.**
9. A processing fee as specified in the Standing Rules.

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.

**If the breed includes one or more structural mutations as described in 31.6, a positive vote of the affected breed sections as described in 33.9.4.**

A processing fee as specified in the Standing 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"**

(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 39.4 and the existing 39.4 and subsequent rules re-numbered. The proposed changes above should then use the correct reference.

(B)

I don't see any conflicts

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) Is she wanting it added that the breed section that "owns" the mutation hold a section vote on if the new breed should advance? I'm a little confused;-)
- (B) What she is saying is to formalise that such a vote happens at the beginning of the recognition process - and is a one-time only vote. No approval from breed section means no advancement. We already have a rule in place that says the "owning" breed section must vote on whether they are happy or not (33.9.4).
- (C) I think this proposal would be very fair on the breeders of the new breed as they would then know quite early in the process whether they have a chance of advancing or not.
- (D) I think this is good, but I'd like to say that even before the first experimental breed or advancement , if a mutation, gets a vote before we even register the first of it's type.. Why should we keep these on the books and validate these wild crosses?
- For instance - add **33.3.1.5: If the breed falls under the provisio of rule 33.9.4, the result of a vote of the affected breed section.**
- (B) Looking again, it does mean that the applicants need to liaise with the EO to hold the poll and get back the results to include in their application. And a less than positive vote means that TICA may not see the application at all.
- (E) I have had the same thoughts about the logistics. The way it was originally set up, the polling came as a result of some action by the Board - authorizing the EO to incur the time, trouble and expense of putting out the poll. With changing the process to be "earlier" where is the official instruction to the EO to conduct the poll? Someone, out of the blue, contacts the EO and says I need a poll and in a hurry because I have to submit paperwork. The EO just drops everything and does the poll?
- It almost seems that, if the process is going to change, there is a missing piece relative to the poll.

## **Amend Reg Rule 36.6.1 and 37.2.1 (Outcrosses within Cat I) – Brooks and Committee**

### **Rationale:**

TICA was created to be an open studbook, genetic registry.

The purpose of the Foundation Registry is:

- to provide an accurate, precise chronicle of a breed's progress and development
- to give an analysis of any genetic problems inherent in a breeding program
- registration of hybrid crosses and outcrosses (not currently explicitly specified in the Registry's purpose)

The registration code of the offspring clearly delineates its outcrossing. Changing the registrations would cause confusion to the following:

- Breeders
- Buyers
- Owners
- Law Enforcement Officers

Those breeding offspring of Domestic x Non-Domestic Source Species and wanting to include new non-domestics to improve breed diversity may identify the non-domestic cats as "unknown" which would result in the following:

- Fraudulent Pedigrees
- an increase of fraudulent sales
- confusion when dealing with infertility
- ambiguity with the law

Many places around the world limit the ownership of Bengals, Savannahs, and Chausies based on how many generations a cat is removed from the non-domestic outcross.

- These laws are proof of a worldwide trust in TICAs registration process.
- Discontinuing the current process will leave these breeds with no respected method of proving they are domestic, pedigreed cats.
- Cats who cannot be proven to be legal will be abandoned or confiscated as people move to places with different legal requirements.

Dr. Leslie Lyons has stated that many of our established breeds are in trouble genetically and need to be outcrossed.

- Limiting genetic diversity is wrong.
- Forcing responsible breeders who want to increase genetic diversity to register their cats inaccurately goes against TICAs purpose.
- More breeders have become aware of the need to focus on type and correct structure which is essential for the long-term health of these high energy breeds.

If the changes are approved, then Standing Rule 307.6.3 should be deleted as it is no longer appropriate.

## **Amend Reg Rule 36.6.1 and 37.2.1:**

### 36.6 Foundation Registration.

36.6.1 Purpose. The Foundation Registry is for new breeds which are in an early developmental stage and in which record keeping is vital to the history of the breed. The registration of these breeds will provide an accurate, precise chronicle of the breed's progress and development, and may prove or disprove its future acceptance as a viable, healthy breed as well as providing analysis of any genetic problems inherent in a breeding program. Use of both hybrid crosses and outcrosses to cats of unknown or unregistered parentage is permitted. There are no limitations or restrictions on the breeding programs for these breeds. **The Foundation Registry is also used for registering cats that are a non-domestic species or cats which have a non-domestic species as a parent, grandparent, or great-grandparent.**

### 37.2 Category I: Established Breeds.

37.2.1 Purpose. This category is for established breeds which are approaching the present goals as set by their standards. These breeds have a sufficiently large available gene pool within the breed that outcrosses to other breeds (other than within a breed group) for improvement of type, increased stamina, addition of new colors, etc., are largely unnecessary. Likewise, the likelihood of finding cats of unregistered parentage which would significantly improve the breed is minimal.

**37.2.1.1 Championship breeds that were in Category V during the New Breed process may continue to register and outcross to non-domestic species used to create that breed in accordance with Registration Rule 311.3.**

**Add Reg Rule 311.3 (and delete Standing Rule 307.6.4.1 which 311.3 then replaces):**

**311.3 The progeny of a domestic X non-domestic source species cross cannot be registered in the Foundation Registry as any breed other than the breed associated with that specific non-domestic source species. For example, Serval Leptailurus serval can only parent a Foundation Savannah, Asian Leopard Cat Prionailurus bengalensis can only be a parent of a Foundation Bengal, and Jungle Cat Felis chaus can only parent a Foundation Chausie.**

#### **Rules Chair Note:**

Following internal discussion, and with the agreement of the proposers, Rules reworded 37.2.1.1 to refer not to Standing Rule 307.6.4.1 but instead to a new 311.3. This rule replaces Standing Rule 307.6.4.1, which the Committee felt was in the wrong place.

#### **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 were no comments on this area following the discussion on the replacement of 307.6.4.1 by the new 311.3.

**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 have a question...I'm still trying to make sense of the whole thing. If the 3 breeds in question are going to continue using non-domestic outcrosses and call them foundation breeds, do judges have to sign off on them as that is the practice with the foundation registry. And are the cats just going to be registered in Cat. I and no longer in Cat V?

(B)

Foundation cats do not need to be signed off by judges as long as their parents are registered. Foundation cats are simply cats that are not SBT, but the vast majority are all registered with TICA, including the nondomestic species being used for the breed, so no need to sign off on the progeny.

(C)

Outcrosses don't need to be signed off on - ever - For example in breeds that have DSH/DLH as their outcross - they don't have to have any type of approval

(D)

In my common sense view, an outcrossed Cat 1 is still a Cat 1 breed - it just cannot be shown.

(E)

What (D) said

(C)

Exactly - no permissible outcrosses just means you cannot show a cat with a non-permissible outcross for 3 generations.

(F)

Could it be a HHP?

(C)

Yes it could be shown as HHP - Heather Lorimer is showing her non-permissible outcrosses in HHP. There are rules that disqualify wild species outcrosses until the "c" level even in HHP

(D)

After thinking about it, I see this and the Cat V proposal as two different ways of tackling the unhappiness over Standing Rule 307.6.3 in its present form.

In my opinion, the second proposal seems a more comprehensive solution (albeit a bit radical). It offers a route to stop new non-domestics being registered if a breed section agrees it is no longer necessary, whilst allowing outcrosses to new non-domestics if a Championship breed still feels more diversity is needed.

## **Amend Reg Rules 37.1.2.5, 37.6,37.8.3 (Amend Cat V Definitions) – Crockett, Brooks and ad hoc committee**

### **Rationale:**

TICA was created to be an open studbook, genetic registry.

The purpose of the Foundation Registry is:

- to provide an accurate, precise chronicle of a breed's progress and development
- to give an analysis of any genetic problems inherent in a breeding program
- registration of hybrid crosses and outcrosses (not currently explicitly specified in the Registry's purpose)

The registration code of the offspring clearly delineates its outcrossing. Changing the registrations would cause confusion to the following:

- Breeders
- Buyers
- Owners
- Law Enforcement Officers

Those breeding offspring of Domestic x Non-Domestic Source Species and wanting to include new non-domestics to improve breed diversity may identify the non-domestic cats as "unknown" which would result in the following:

- Fraudulent Pedigrees
- an increase of fraudulent sales
- confusion when dealing with infertility
- ambiguity with the law

Many places around the world limit the ownership of Bengals, Savannahs, and Chausies based on how many generations a cat is removed from the non-domestic outcross.

- These laws are proof of a worldwide trust in TICAs registration process.
- Discontinuing the current process will leave these breeds with no respected method of proving they are domestic, pedigreed cats.
- Cats who cannot be proven to be legal will be abandoned or confiscated as people move to places with different legal requirements.

Dr. Leslie Lyons has stated that many of our established breeds are in trouble genetically and need to be outcrossed.

- Limiting genetic diversity is wrong.
- Forcing responsible breeders who want to increase genetic diversity to register their cats inaccurately goes against TICAs purpose.
- More breeders have become aware of the need to focus on type and correct structure which is essential for the long-term health of these high energy breeds.

## Rules Chair Note:

It is not my practice to revise rationales (which are supplied by the proposer) but I do feel that the proposal needs some explanation from me to summarise what I understand to be the intent if the proposal passes:

- 1) Cat V will consist of three breeds that are in Championship (i.e. Bengal, Savannah and Chausie), and it will allow new non-domestics (of the appropriate species) to be registered and used as outcrosses for these Championship breeds.
- 2) At any stage in the future a breed can choose (by vote of the breed section) to transfer to Cat I. At which point, that breed cannot introduce any new non-domestics to create outcrosses as per Standing Rule 307.6.3 (for clarity, this rule is retained as part of this proposal).
- 3) Any future new breeds in Category V can incorporate an (as yet) unused non-domestic breed and work their way through the New Breed program.
- 4) The transfer of the three breeds without a vote of the relevant breed sections to Cat V is permitted by Reg Rule 37.9.5

## Amend Reg Rules 37.1.2.5:

### 37.1 Registration Categories.

37.1.1 The association shall provide categories for the registration of the various breeds. These categories shall determine specific requirements for registration and championship exhibition based on registration status (see ARTICLE SIX). The categories are designed to permit enough flexibility for continued improvement within a breed while maintaining the desired homogeneity which defines the breed and makes it distinct.

37.1.2 Six registration categories are provided as follows:

37.1.2.1 Category I: Established Breeds

37.1.2.2 Category II: Natural Breeds

37.1.2.3 Category III: Variant or Mutation Breeds

37.1.2.4 Category IV: Domestic Hybrid Breeds

37.1.2.5 Category V: **Domestic X Non-Domestic Source Breeds** ~~Non-Domestic Source Breed Hybrids~~

37.1.2.6 Category VI: Experimental (Developing) Breeds

## Amend Reg Rules 37.6:

37.6 Category V: **Breeds with** Domestic x Non-Domestic Source Species Hybrids. **Ancestors**



37.6.1 Purpose. This category is for breeds ~~which~~ **that have been or** are ~~being in the process of being~~ developed by means of deliberate foundation crosses between domestic cats and a single non-domestic source species. A Non-Domestic Source Species is a species other than Felis catus/Felis domesticus.

37.6.2 Requirements for Championship Exhibition. There can be no ~~non-permissible outcrosses~~ **outcross to other breeds except within a breed group** within the three-generation pedigree. No unknown or unregistered cats may appear within the three-generation pedigree. These cats must have an SB registration code.

37.6.3 Limitations on Championship Exhibition. The breed must apply for championship as a Category I breed **or Category V breed**.

37.6.4 Requirements for Registration. **New breeds with a non-domestic source species hybrids ancestor** may apply for Category V Registration status ~~during the new breed process~~ and may be registered according to the following rules:

37.6.4.1 A cat with a Non-Domestic Source Species parent, grandparent or great grandparent is a hybrid cross\* and is considered a domestic cat. It will be considered a P Foundation \*Breed Name\* if the cross is permissible within the breeding program. It will be considered an N Foundation \*Breed Name\* if the cross is not permissible within the breeding program. It will be designated by S (36.7.2.5) indicating the Non-Domestic Source Species is still on the pedigree.

\*Hybrid cross: An animal resulting from the crossbreeding between two different species or types of animals. Crosses between wild animal species, such as lions and tigers, are wild animals. Crosses between wild animal species and domestic animals, such as dogs and wolves or buffalo and domestic cattle, are domestic animals. (Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA, Sub Chapter A: Animal Welfare, Part 1: Definition of Terms).

37.6.4.2 A P Foundation bred to an N Foundation will result in an N designation. For a P designation, there can be no N designations in a three-generation pedigree.

37.6.4.3 Any cat with a parent, grandparent or great grandparent that is a non-permissible domestic outcross (i.e. a cat of any breed not specifically listed as a permissible outcross breed in the approved breeding program) will have the term N Foundation \*Breed Name\* in its description if the non-permissible outcross is within the three generation pedigree.

37.6.5 Requirements for Showing Category V cats in Championship Advancement Classes.

37.6.5.1 A cat with a Non-Domestic Source Species parent or grandparent may not be shown in any class. (See 23.9)

37.6.5.2 A cat with a Non-Domestic Source Species great grandparent may be shown in Preliminary or Advanced New Breed with permission of the Board of Directors. (See 23.9 and 203.9.1.1.)

37.6.5.2.1 Category V breeds must have the following registration status codes to be eligible to be shown in the Advanced New Breed Class: SB, CO or C3.

**Amend Reg Rules 37.8.3:**

37.8.3 Upon application for recognition for championship status, the members of the breed section shall vote which of ~~four~~ **five** categories (I, II, III, ~~or~~ IV, **or V**) shall be used for determining eligibility for registration and championship competition.

**In addition, the following Standing Rules 307, 307.2, 307.6 shall be amended:**

307 Quick Reference Chart for Permissible Outcrosses and Registration Status Codes for Championship Exhibition. –

**DELETE Bengal, Savannah & Chausie from Category I in Table in 307.1.**

**Add new column for Category V Domestic x Non-Domestic Source Breeds:**

Championship Eligibility - **SBT/SBV**, Outcross Policy - **Only within a Breed Group**, Breeds: **Bengal, Chausie & Savannah**

307.2 Category I Breeds. The following breeds are included in Category I:

**DELETE** Bengal, Savannah & Chausie from list (remainder of list not shown for brevity)

307.6 Category V Breeds. The following breeds (together with their permissible outcrosses or source breeds) are included in Category V:

~~There are no breeds currently in Category V.~~ **Bengal, Savannah, Chausie**

307.6.1 A breed requesting an outcross that is part of a breed group must specify whether it wants to include only that breed, or the entire breed group.

307.6.2 Category V breeds advancing to championship ~~as Category I~~ must have the following registration status codes to be eligible to be shown in the Advanced New Breed Class: SB, CO, or C3.

307.6.3 After the transfer of **a** breeds out of Category V to another Category it is no longer possible to register any additional non-domestic source species **relevant to that breed** in the Foundation Registry. The only possible registration is offspring of TICA registered cats with a non-domestic feline in the three-generation pedigree which are only registered with the aim to breed out the non-domestic source species. This 307.6.3 takes effect December 31, 2021.

307.6.4 For registration as ~~a non-domestic source species hybrid~~ **Category V**, a first-generation hybrid **MUST** have one parent that is a non-domestic source species **and one that is a domestic feline**.

## 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'd suggest the rationale address the proposal - it doesn't provide any real explanation as to what the proposal is about.

(B)

I agree - though normally the rationale is included as written by the proposer rather than have Rules make any changes to it. It is one of the reasons I put my summary up front.

(C)

I'm good with the proposal.

(D)

First off I find the proposal a little confusing. I'm still not sure what they are wanting except to be able to use non-domestics and remain in Cat 1.

It was my understanding based on conversations during the board meetings last year with regards to the rule that is in place now, due to go into effect in Dec. that they were supposed to develop a transition plan to move away from the non-domestic sources. I don't see that in the proposal. I would like to see a transition plan on moving away from these cats.

TICA is a domestic registry; not an exotic registry. I think we are viewed by the world as allowing anything and everything to be registered and I would like to see us move away from that reputation.

(E)

I disagree a bit with your statement (D).

TICA is a cat registry – when we began registering species outcross breeds, we didn't formulate any rules that put a limit on those breeds, nor any additional breeds based on species that would lead to the domestic cats only opinion.

Category I only means that any outcross must be off the 3 generation pedigree to be shown. There seems to be a "everyone knows" opinion that it means NO outcrosses.

There also seems to be an opinion that all breeds should aspire to be Category I. In all of TICA history, there has only been one breed that moved to Cat I (other than BG, CU, SV). Extra credit if you know what breed :)

Contd/...

(E – Contd)

We are hearing that the ability to use species is going to come to a natural end in the next couple of years with international laws that are coming online to prohibit private ownership of these cats.

I'm of the opinion that the proposal we have before us "cleans up" the rules we currently have.

(C)

I have to agree with (E), she is right on spot.

(F)

As one of the people who regularly has to defend my membership of an association where "everything goes" I very much agree with (D) and would also like to see a plan to transition away from using non-domestic cats (especially, I'd say for the Bengals as that is a relatively old and well-established breed).

I don't think that enough countries will ban private ownership of non-domestic cats anytime soon - in fact I doubt very much that all countries in the world will ever agree on that and as long as some people are allowed to keep them privately, this type of breeding will continue.

(G)

When the committee was formed to address Standing Rule 307.6.3 there was NO directive to "develop a transition plan".

We were told to educate the various breeds involved on the standing rule - which we did - and to come up with a 'solution'.

Our solution consisted of this proposal to allow continued use and registration of the non-domestic species.

It's very true that the Bengal, which has been in development since the 1980's may very well be in a position to no longer use the ALC - this is not true for SV & CU

Without this solution, this is the death knell for the CU and maybe even for SV - In reality the non-domestics will still be used by those who want to - either paper hanging will happen or they will just be registered as 'unknowns' or register in another registry - the BG, SV & CU make up more than a third of TICA's membership

We are simply asking for allowing the MEMBERSHIP to vote on such a radical change to TICA's policies rather than making a Standing Rule that allows the Regional Directors to decide the fate of the membership.

(A)

In my mind, the real issue is that TICA is a membership organization. The ByLaws specifically give the membership the ultimate authority to set Show Rules and Registration Rules. "What TICA is" is what our founders and members have made it. (TICA is the only North American registry to sustain steady growth over 2 plus decades, by the way)

Contd/...

(A – Contd)

The rules in place brought us the Bengal and a number of other breeds - most of which other registries followed suit to adopt.

So, all of that to say, as I just see (G) just posted, the issue is that the Membership has the right to vote on major changes in the rules of this Association. Membership put rules in place. Other Members followed those rules. These are rules that define the organization and are depended on for consistency and stability. Standing Rules are under the purview of the Board and serve the purpose to define, explain and set procedure. They can be abolished, created and "waived" from one meeting to the next without Membership involvement. Rules that change the very nature of TICA should be voted on by its members.

(B)

In response to (D), I think you've misunderstood the proposal.

1) Cat V will consist of three breeds that are in Championship (i.e. Bengal, Savannah and Chausie), and it will allow new non-domestics (of the appropriate species) to be registered and used as outcrosses for these Championship breeds.

2) At any stage in the future a breed can choose (by vote of the breed section) to transfer to Cat I. At which point, that breed cannot use any new non-domestics to create outcrosses as per Standing Rule 307.6.3.

No, they are not using non-domestics and staying in Cat I. These three breeds will move back to Cat V but remain a Championship breed (but as with Cat I, only SBT/SBV cats can be shown). At some point, any Championship breed can elect to move to Cat I, which would then prohibit them from using any new non-domestics.

Although that was not asked for, it does give a transition plan. In this proposal the contentious 307.6.3 can stay (though I would prefer that it became a Reg Rule and not a Standing Rule).

It is also clear that a "one size fits all" solution will not work for all 3 breeds. This proposal allows each breed to decide for itself when it no longer needs to introduce new non-domestics into a breeding program.

## **Add new Reg Rule 39.16 (Transfer Documentation) – Van Mullem/Adler**

### **Rationale:**

At this moment there are no rules regarding the transfer of the registration of a pedigreed cat or kitten after the cat or kitten is sold by the breeder.

When a breeder/seller refuses to transfer the registration, or even to register the cat/kitten, the buyer has no option to file a complaint against the breeder as there are no rules regulating this process at this moment.

Till now TICA's view has been that TICA is a registry and does not get involved with disputes on this subject between breeder/seller and buyer. However, these kinds of actions affect TICA's reputation in a negative way and it is time to have a rule on this subject so at least the breeder/seller who does not comply can be suspended from services.

This new rule might have the added benefit of cutting down on resales of cats in violations of contract where there is another co owner or where the original breeder is still the owner.

### **Add new Reg Rule 39.16, renumber current 39.16 and 39.17:**

**39.16. Unless there is a written agreement to the contrary, the breeder/seller will, at the time of the transfer, provide the buyer with the breeder slip or the certificate of registration and signed transfer of ownership. In no event will the breeder/seller be obligated to provide the breeder slip or registration slip until payment is complete.**

~~39.16~~<sup>7</sup> Record of lease on cats registered in this association should be filed with the registrar.

~~39.17~~<sup>8</sup> A certified three- or five-generation pedigree, of any cat registered in the stud book, ancestry record, or hybridization record, as and to the extent the pedigree is shown therein, will be furnished by the registrar upon a request signed by or consented to by the registered owner of the cat and accompanied by the required fees.

### **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 think that the last sentence of 39.16 is worded in a legal manner and I do wonder if there is an alternative wording that would be better understood by people who do not have English as a first language.

- (B) "In no event" can easily be replaced (and perhaps better understood by non-native English speakers) by "never" and for ease of understanding, perhaps "obligated" should be replaced by "have" - and then the sentence would be:

**"The breeder/seller will never have to provide this documentation until payment is made in full"**

- (C) Not sure I'm wild about the use of "never" - I have always said "never" say never. I'd prefer: **"The breeder/seller does not have to provide this documentation until payment is made in full"**

- (D) I prefer this wording.

- (C) The relevant article is about registering cats, and not about selling cats. The rule just prior to the proposed is:

*39.15 The registered ownership of a cat may be transferred to another owner upon filing with the registrar a written assignment of ownership, surrender of the certificate of registration, and payment of the transfer fee.*

This section has nothing to do with registering litters and giving blue slips. The article has to do with how the EO gets a certificate of registration in someone's hands. Once done, you can transfer the ownership of a registered cat by surrendering the certificate of registration (and signing the back which shows the transfer of ownership).

- (A) I do think that is a narrow interpretation of the article. Perhaps the proposal would be better as being numbered 39.15.1 rather than as a stand-alone rule.

- (A) I also note that "blue slip" is used in 33.9.2.3.3 and 39.9.1 so we will need to get that on the Agenda for the Annual as "breeder slip" is now used instead by the Executive Office.

## **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 absolutely agree with this wording. Change of ownership takes place upon receipt of full payment, so for me it's self-evident that registration papers or breeder slip is handed to buyer at that time and I think it will benefit TICA to have a rule enabling buyers to file complaints against sellers who don't comply with this rule.

- (B) While I understand the problem and the desire for a solution, I don't believe this proposal is the appropriate way to proceed. It is in General Registration Rules which are instructions on how cats are to be registered and have nothing to do with contracts between people.

Contd/...

(B – Contd)

I think consideration should be given to either creating a new Registration Rule Article 12 which might address this type of matter or to look at Discipline under ByLaws.

If the intent is actually to give the EO instruction on what they may do, then I think the rule needs to be worded towards what TICA can/will do rather than what a buyer/seller will do.

(C)

I'm not happy with this at all. I register the kittens fully with the new owner once they are in their new homes.

Whilst I try exceptionally hard to select the right people I have on two occasions changed my mind on the day of collection.

As a good breeder I consider it my right to change my mind to benefit my kittens.

Therefore:

1. It is not possible for me to always register the kittens in advance.
2. The time it takes to get kittens registered by the EO takes way too long.
3. I do not want to introduce further "paperwork" agreements on the sale of my kittens that do not benefit me, the new owner or the kitten.

There is a lot of work to be done by TICA with regard to education on the proper movement of kittens before we even get to this stage.

The first stage is the proper use of welfare rules for breeding as in the GCCF.

This suggestion is cutting corners.

(D)

I think timing is a valid point. In a perfect world, registrations would be accomplished in a timely manner by both breeders and the EO. We have streamlined processes with online registrations, but there are certainly cases where a breeder might not have the paperwork available by the time the kittens are ready to go.

(E)

If it is just the breeder slip, there should be no wait time for EO - but I see your point about changing your mind

This would be a definite "con" - there is a problem with the kitten, the breeder takes the kitten back and has to fight to get the papers back from the pet owner

Contd/...



(F)

As regards timing, surely this can be covered in a contract of sale. "Registration paperwork will be forwarded on when received from TICA" or something like that. That was the way we worked back in the day and we never had any objections from new owners.

I see the delays at the EO as a temporary blip - which the new system will be addressing. This should not hinder the introduction of this rule (as was pointed out the first time in the comments for the Winter meeting).

I see this proposal as a useful and proportionate first step. Yes, there might well need to be more, but better this than nothing.

In response to (E), on the very rare occasions that a kitten came back to us after placement, there was always a written signed agreement by both parties confirming the transfer of ownership back to us.

(G)

I'm going to be very honest. Unless someone buying a kitten asks for the blue slips, we don't give them. We register all our litters but keep the BSN slips unless requested, which when they are, unless it's a breeder, proof of spaying and/or neutering have to be furnished.

Most people that buy kittens could care less about the slips...they just want to say their cat is a purebred. Because most people that buy pets aren't going to show them so they don't see the point in registering.

While the intent is good, it seems this is directed at the people that deal in breeders and have paper issues. To me that's a contract, needed to be discussed before money exchanged hands.

(F)

On the merits or otherwise, I am trying to recall the discussion the Board had at the Winter Meeting, as I didn't take enough notes at the time. I believe some RDs were positive about the proposal as an aid to dealing with issues that take up far too much of their time. Legal Counsel then raised concerns about the wording and Lies then withdrew her proposal for re-work.

(D)

I think we need to understand that RDs will eventually be dealing with these issues at BOD meetings when buyers escalate to protest level. I envision 2-3 protests per region per meeting if this rule is passed.

(H)

I have read everything twice to make sure I was understanding correctly as I am not a breeder and I am a Canadian (different contract law). I do not agree with this proposal. Thanks to all who have worked hard on this

(I)

The original form of this [at the Winter 2021 meeting] was:

*39.16. The breeder will at the time of the transfer (unless otherwise agreed upon by both parties in writing) provide the buyer with the breeder slip or the certificate of registration and signed transfer of ownership.*

Contd/...

(I – Contd)

The main purpose was to get a rule on the books about delivering registration papers as the RDs get many complaints about delays on getting the Breeder slip or registration certificate.

I think the above proposal was too broad - as it did not take payments into account.

(E)

(F) - Yes this is a correct recollection

## **Amend Judging Program Article SIX (Provisional Allbreed Judge) – Judging Committee**

### **Rationale:**

The Judging Committee was created at the 2018 Winter Meeting to oversee, administer and update the Judging Program. The Board's intent is that the Judging Committee assumes administration of 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.

The 2019 Spring Board Meeting initiated the process of setting the Board's expectations for the Committee and defining the process with the transfer of administration of the new applicant program. The Preface was reviewed and updated to reflect the creation of the Judging Committee. A new Article ONE established the duties of the Judging Committee, revised the JA role, created the DJA role and set out the guidelines for meetings of the Committee. This Article also established a review process by the Board for appeals from decisions of the Committee. Old Article ONE, role of the ABS, became new Article TWO. Old Articles TWO and THREE, relating to applicants coming into the Judging Program, were combined into a new Article THREE, updating the requirements for both established and remote areas.

The process continued during the 2020 Winter Board Meeting with the review of Article FOUR updating the whole trainee period regarding the minimum number of different judges to train with, either for the established or remote areas; limiting the number of training sessions to one per calendar day and defining the number/conditions under which a trainee may train with the same judge during a weekend show. The new Article FOUR clarified under what circumstances a Remote program candidate may acquire approval to transfer to the full program, and the term "Trainee Coordinator" was also defined in Article ONE.

At the 2020 Annual Meeting the Judging Committee Article FIVE was addressed by taking the responsibility of granting Specialty Judges licenses and clarifying under what circumstances a Remote Specialty Judge may apply for a full license.

At this point, the Judging Committee is willing to address Article SIX and SEVEN which govern Allbreed Judges:

- adding appropriate references to the Judging Committee,
- taking the responsibility of granting licenses,
- deleting 47.3.2 since is already covered by 47.3.1.1,
- extending the examination period for the applicant to PAB/AAB Judges to a maximum of 6 months to include corrections where needed,
- clarify that if examination is not passed by the stated deadlines the applicant must reapply for advancement at a following scheduled Judging Committee meeting.

Contd/...

## Amend Judging Program Article SIX:

### 46 Advancement from Approved Specialty Judge to Provisional Allbreed Judge

46.1 Names of applicants MUST be published in two issues of the TREND. Notices must be sent to the Judging **Committee Administrator** and received by April 15th for application at the **August meeting Annual**, August 15th for application at the **December Winter** Meeting or December 15th for application at the **April Spring** Meeting. The **Deputy** Judging Administrator will then place the notices in the TREND. TICA members shall be invited to send comments, favorable and/or unfavorable, to the Judging **Committee Administrator/Designee** and to the applicant's Regional Director.

46.2 The applicant must have completed **all of** the following before applying for advancement:

46.2.1 Have judged at least 30 TICA shows as Approved Specialty.

46.2.2 Obtained a letter of endorsement from his/her Approved Allbreed Sponsor stating his/her approval of advancement.

46.2.3 Passed the advancement examination (95 percent correct answers are considered a passing grade; however, all questions missed must be answered again correctly).

46.2.4 Met any special requirements as set forth by the Board, ~~Judging Administrator~~ or **the** Judging **Committee Administrator Designee**.

46.2.5 Paid a \$20 processing fee to the Executive Office no later than May 15th for application at the **August Meeting Annual**, October 15th for application at the **December Winter** Meeting or January 15th for application at the **April Spring** Meeting.

46.2.6 The Application for Advancement to Provisional Allbreed Judge must be completed and received by the Judging **Committee Administrator** no later than May 15th for application at the **August Meeting Annual**, October 15th for application at the **December Winter** Meeting or January 15th for application at the **April Spring** Meeting. Applications received after the deadline will be presented at the following scheduled ~~Board~~ **Judging Committee** meeting.

46.3 An **Approved Specialty** judge may request an examination anytime within 1 year of the time planned for advancement.

46.3.1 ~~Examination must be completed and returned within 4 months of receipt of examination and no later than.~~ **Once received, the applicant may complete and submit the examination in sections for grading; however, all sections must be initially submitted within 4 months. Sections, as received, will be graded and returned to the applicant if they require additional work or correction. Applicants will have up to 2 months from the initial examination return deadline to resolve any outstanding issues and receive a passing grade. The examination must be passed before the submission dates of** May 15th for application at the **August Meeting** ~~Annual~~, October 15th for application at the **December** ~~Winter~~ Meeting and January 15th for application at the **April** ~~Spring~~ Meeting.

46.3.1.1 If the examination is not ~~completed~~ **passed** by the above stated deadlines, and/or if all other requirements have not been met by June 15th for application at the **August Meeting** ~~Annual~~, November 15th for application at the **December** ~~Winter~~ Meeting or February 15th for application at the **April** ~~Spring~~ Meeting, the applicant must reapply for advancement at a following scheduled **Judging Committee** ~~Board~~ meeting.

46.3.2 Upon reapplication, all advancement requirements must be met, including successfully passing the advancement examination and payment of all fees.

46.4 The **Judging Committee** ~~Board~~ shall consider the applicant's knowledge, ability, training, experience, show and club activity, personal appearance, deportment, attitude and any other factors it deems appropriate and may grant the Provisional Allbreed License, deny the applicant, or require additional work.

46.5 If an applicant for advancement is denied, the applicant may not apply for reconsideration for 1 year. **If the candidate decides to file an appeal with the Board of Directors for review, the appeal will normally be heard at the next scheduled Board meeting. The final decision on acceptance or denial is solely at the Board's discretion.**

46.5.1 Upon reapplication, the applicant need only furnish proof to the **Judging Committee** ~~Administrator / Designee~~ that any requirements set by the ~~Board~~ **Board** have been met. The **Judging Committee** ~~Administrator~~ has all the documentation and fee-paid information and will advise the TREND editor to continue the listings in the TREND.

46.6 The license fee of \$25 shall be sent to the Executive Office no later than May 15th for application at the **August Meeting** ~~Annual~~, October 15th for application at the **December** ~~Winter~~ Meeting or January 15th for application at the **April** ~~Spring~~ 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:

The majority of the discussion was about clarifying the wording of 46.3.1 to reflect what actually happens in practice and to provide for a time limit of 2 months to complete any corrections. Once resolved and agreed with the JA, the same wording was also applied to Article SEVEN.

(A)

JP 41.1.10 should be updated: "Approving acceptance into **and advances within** the Judging Program"

(B)

Agreed

**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 good.

(B)

No comments from me

(C)

I think it is the right time for the next step - that is the JC taking over this aspect of the Program from the Board. There is appropriate provision in the amended rules for an applicant to appeal to the Board if denied advancement.

(D)

Originally they had all these requirements being sent to the Judging Committee -- I objected because is a person supposed to send it to all 10 people? - So the language in 46.1, 46.2.6 and 46.5.1 was changed to Judging Administrator or Designee - now they are changing the wording back. I object to this as it just doesn't seem right to have to send to all members of the Judging Committee.

## **Amend Judging Program Article SEVEN (Approved Allbreed) – Judging Committee**

### **Rationale:**

The Judging Committee was created at the 2018 Winter Meeting to oversee, administer and update the Judging Program. The Board's intent is that the Judging Committee assumes administration of 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.

The 2019 Spring Board Meeting initiated the process of setting the Board's expectations for the Committee and defining the process with the transfer of administration of the new applicant program. The Preface was reviewed and updated to reflect the creation of the Judging Committee. A new Article ONE established the duties of the Judging Committee, revised the JA role, created the DJA role and set out the guidelines for meetings of the Committee. This Article also established a review process by the Board for appeals from decisions of the Committee. Old Article ONE, role of the ABS, became new Article TWO. Old Articles TWO and THREE, relating to applicants coming into the Judging Program, were combined into a new Article THREE, updating the requirements for both established and remote areas.

The process continued during the 2020 Winter Board Meeting with the review of Article FOUR updating the whole trainee period regarding the minimum number of different judges to train with, either for the established or remote areas; limiting the number of training sessions to one per calendar day and defining the number/conditions under which a trainee may train with the same judge during a weekend show. The new Article FOUR clarified under what circumstances a Remote program candidate may acquire approval to transfer to the full program, and the term "Trainee Coordinator" was also defined in Article ONE.

At the 2020 Annual Meeting the Judging Committee Article FIVE was addressed by taking the responsibility of granting Specialty Judges licenses and clarifying under what circumstances a Remote Specialty Judge may apply for a full license.

At this point, the Judging Committee is willing to address Article SIX and SEVEN which govern Allbreed Judges:

- adding appropriate references to the Judging Committee,
- taking the responsibility of granting licenses,
- deleting 47.3.2 since is already covered by 47.3.1.1,
- extending the examination period for the applicant to PAB/AAB Judges to a maximum of 6 months to include corrections where needed,
- clarify that if examination is not passed by the stated deadlines the applicant must reapply for advancement at a following scheduled Judging Committee meeting.

Contd/...

## Amend JP Article Seven:

### 47 Advancement from Provisional Allbreed to Approved Allbreed Judge

47.1 Names of applicants must be published in two issues of the TREND. Notices must be sent to the Judging **Committee Administrator** and received by April 15th for application at the **August Meeting Annual**, August 15th for application at the **December Winter** Meeting or December 15th for application at the **April Spring** Meeting. The **Deputy** Judging Administrator will then place the notices in the TREND. TICA members shall be invited to send comments, favorable and/or unfavorable, to the Judging **Committee Administrator/Designee** and to the applicant's Regional Director.

47.2 ~~Before applying for advancement, applicant must have:~~ **The applicant must have completed all of the following before applying for advancement:**

47.2.1 Been a licensed Provisional Allbreed judge for at least 2 years and judged at least 60 TICA shows as such (60 LH and 60 SH or 60 AB or any combination thereof).

47.2.2 Obtained a letter of endorsement from his/her Approved Allbreed sponsor stating his/her approval of advancement.

47.2.3 Passed the Approved Allbreed examination (95 percent correct answers are considered a passing grade; however, all questions missed must be answered again correctly).

47.2.4 Met any special requirements as set forth by the Board, ~~Judging Administrator~~ or **the** Judging **Committee Administrator Designee**.

47.2.5 The processing fee of \$25 shall be sent to the Executive Office no later than May 15th for application at the **August Meeting Annual**, October 15th for application at the **December Winter** Meeting or January 15th for application at the **April Spring** Meeting.

47.2.6 The Application for Advancement to Approved Allbreed Judge must be completed and received by the Judging **Committee Administrator** no later than May 15th for application at the **August Meeting Annual**, October 15th for application at the **December Winter** Meeting or January 15th for application at the **April Spring** Meeting. Applications received after the deadline will be presented at the following scheduled ~~Board~~ **Judging Committee** meeting.

47.3 A **Provisional Allbreed** judge may request an examination anytime within 1 year of the time planned for advancement.

47.3.1 ~~Examination must be completed and returned within 4 months of receipt of examination and no later than.~~ **Once received, the applicant may complete and submit the examination in sections for grading; however, all sections must be initially submitted within 4 months. Sections, as received, will be graded and**



returned to the applicant if they require additional work or correction. Applicants will have up to 2 months from the initial examination return deadline to resolve any outstanding issues and receive a passing grade. The examination must be passed before the submission dates of May 15th for application at the **August Meeting** ~~Annual~~, October 15th for application at the **December** ~~Winter~~ Meeting and January 15th for application at the **April** ~~Spring~~ Meeting.

47.3.1.1 If the examination is not ~~completed~~ **passed** by the above stated deadlines, and/or if all other requirements have not been met by June 15th for application at the **August Meeting** ~~Annual~~, November 15th for application at the **December** ~~Winter~~ Meeting or February 15th for application at the **April** ~~Spring~~ Meeting, the applicant must reapply for advancement at a following scheduled **Judging Committee** ~~Board~~ meeting.

~~47.3.2 If the examination is not completed and returned prior to 90 days before the next scheduled Board meeting, and if all other requirements have not been met, 60 days prior to the Board meeting, the applicant must reapply for advancement at a following scheduled Board meeting.~~

47.3.2~~3~~ Upon reapplication, all advancement requirements must be met, including successfully passing the advancement examination and payment of all fees.

46.4 The **Judging Committee** ~~Board~~ shall consider the applicant's knowledge, ability, training, experience, show and club activity, personal appearance, deportment, attitude and any other factors it deems appropriate and may grant the Approved Allbreed License, deny the applicant, or require additional work.

47.5 If an applicant for advancement is denied, the applicant may not apply for reconsideration for 1 year. **If the candidate decides to file an appeal with the Board of Directors for review, the appeal will normally be heard at the next scheduled Board meeting. The final decision on acceptance or denial is solely at the Board's discretion.**

47.5.1 Upon reapplication, the applicant need only furnish proof to the **Judging Committee** ~~Administrator/Designee~~ that any requirements set by the ~~h~~**B**oard have been met. The **Judging Committee** ~~Administrator~~ has all the documentation and fee-paid information and will advise the TREND editor to continue the listings in the TREND.

47.6 The license fee of \$25 shall be sent to the Executive Office no later than May 15th for application at the **August Meeting** ~~Annual~~, October 15th for application at the **December** ~~Winter~~ Meeting or January 15th for application at the **April** ~~Spring~~ 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"

- (A) JP 41.1.10 should be updated: "Approving acceptance into **and advances within** the Judging Program"
- (B) Agreed

### 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 it is the right time for the next step - that is the JC taking over this aspect of the Program from the Board. There is appropriate provision in the amended rules for an applicant to appeal to the Board if denied advancement.
- (B) Originally they had all these requirements being sent to the Judging Committee -- I objected because is a person supposed to send it to all 10 people? - So the language in 47.1, 47.2.6 and 47.5.1 was changed to Judging Administrator or Designee - now they are changing the wording back. I object to this as it just doesn't seem right to have to send to all members of the committee.
- (C) I too think it isn't right to send to the entire committee. Maybe that needs to be clarified. "Judging committee" is too vague
- (D) IMO, there should be one "designee" to receive the materials - rather than the whole committee.
- (E) We have only one email address for the applications. Only the JA and DJA have access to this email through the ticketing system. Applications don't go to all members. Candidates will find the proper email address using the application form.
- (A) And when members comment on an application, what address should they use? It is unrealistic to expect members to search JP Application forms to find the right email address. At present, the Articles say to email the Committee.

## Amending Standing Rules 106.2.1, 106.2.2 and 106.4.2.1 (Judging Committee) - Fisher

### Rationale:

The formative first cycle of the Judging Committee will be ending within a year and elections will be held. Giving time for dialog, 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.** The current "formula" which provides for an initial 10 members is not capped at 10 members and could cause the Committee membership to grow over time. The larger the size, the less efficient the Committee. This proposal reduces the overall size to 8 and caps the Committee at that size.

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 over 10.

**Representation.** There are many options for determining the makeup of the Committee. The current rules provide for an arbitrary division of the judging panel into 4 geographic areas: North America, Europe, Asia, South America/Independent. Each area is guaranteed a member.

Using the most current statistics from the Judging Committee, the judging panel divides, geographically as follows:

Area	Licensed Judges	% Total Panel	Members on Committee
North America	83	58%	4.64
Europe	36	25%	2.00
Asia	15	10%	.80
South America/Independent	10	7%	.56
Total	144		

Applying the formula outlined in this proposal, North America would receive 4 members, Europe 2 members, Asia 1 member and South America/Indep., 1 member (As it is today)

Contd/...

If areas continue to develop at the same rate, the outcome in subsequent years will remain about the same. If, however, relative percentages change, this proposal includes a safeguard that the areas with the highest percentages of the judging panel will not have their representation diluted. In other words, the proposal provides a rounding cutoff so that if an area has a half or less representative, that area would be combined with the next smallest area for purposes of the election process.

Another way to look at the representation issue is to ask the effort and difficulty of a candidate in being elected and the percentage of qualified candidates who can be selected.

	Qualified Candidates	# seats	% Represented
North America	61	4	7%
Europe	23	2	9%
Asia	9	1	11%
South America/Ind	3	1	33%
Total	96		

#### **Amend Standing Rules 106.2.1 and 106.2.2:**

*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.*

*106.2.2 ~~Every 4 years and beginning at the 2018 Spring Meeting~~ **†**The TICA Judging Administrator and Deputy Judging Administrator will be selected as provided in Standing Rule 106.4.2.1.10.*

#### **Amend Standing Rules 106.4.2.1:**

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 **8 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 the participants of 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: ~~T~~, **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 The number of Judging Committee members representing each international area shall be determined by the number of **licensed** participants in the Judging Program for that particular area as of **October 1 of the year prior to the election** ~~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.~~ **Each international area will receive membership on the Committee based upon their percentage of licensed participants to the total licensed participants on the judging panel. In the event an area only qualifies for a fractional membership of between half and one member, the membership will be rounded up to one. In the event that an area qualifies for a fractional membership less than one half, that area will be combined with the next smallest proportion of the judging panel. For all area(s) with members greater than one, the number of members will be rounded down to the nearest whole number.**

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 **years so that no more than half of the Committee is subject to election.** ~~by ballot of the participants of the Judging Program~~ **For the initial election and subject to the allocations outlined in 106.4.1.1.3, half of the committee membership attributable to North America and Europe will serve two year terms. If Asia is afforded a representative under the formula, that representative will serve a two year term. 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 **their** ~~his/her~~ candidacy in writing to the Executive Office not more than 4 months nor less than 2 months before the election month.

106.4.2.1.8 All voting of the participants in the Judging Program shall be by secret ballot and known only by the firm counting the ballot.

106.4.2.1.9 Electronic Ballots are sent to Judging Program participants on April 1st. Voting will close on 1 May, after which the ballots are counted.

106.4.2.1.10 The President, with the approval of the Board of Directors, shall appoint two members of the Judging Committee as TICA Judging Administrator and Deputy Judging Administrator. The TICA Judging Administrator is the chairperson of the Judging Committee.

106.4.2.1.11 Removal from the Judging Committee. The Board may remove a member from the Judging Committee for the following reasons:

106.4.2.1.11.1 A member no longer holds a valid TICA judging license.

106.4.2.1.11.2 A member is under disciplinary action by the Board.

106.4.2.1.11.3 Two thirds of the members of the Judging Committee (the total number of members includes the subject member) petition the Board to remove a member for any reason, including (but not limited to) lack of participation, poor behavior, or breach of confidentiality.

106.4.2.1.11.4 Two-thirds of the participants of the Judging Program of the same international area of a Judging Committee's member (the total number of members includes the subject member) petition the Board to remove the subject member for any reason, including (but not limited to) lack of participation, poor behavior, or breach of confidentiality.

## **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 sentences in 106.4.2.1.3 were changed from "partial membership" to "fractional membership" as this was considered a better term to convey the proper meaning. A clarifying sentence was added to make explicit that numbers above one are rounded down to the nearest whole number.

**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 like this [continuity] idea. But the question is this committee is coming up for re-election soon. Is there going to be a determination as to who stays and who has to go for re-election?

Contd/...

(A – Contd)

While there is the possibility for the committee to grow, I don't think it is going to exceed 10-12 members. The number of judges that are retiring or moving to emeritus status seems to be pretty consistent with the new ones coming in. I think this could be re-visited if we get an explosion of judges in the future.

I think Asia and SA should each keep their own representative. Every region has representation and they should also.

There is also the fact that maybe not all members participate in discussions and meetings as well so if the committee is full with 10 members, at least you will have a quorum more than likely when voting on something.

This is going to get extremely confusing. Why should some serve longer than others? Why can't everyone serve 4 years? I don't have a problem with rotating the membership, but I do have a problem with some will serve 2 years while others will serve 4 years. I think it should either be 2 or 4 but not trying to keep up with who does what and this is going to create extra work for the EO in the fact that someone will have to keep up with this.

(B)

Taking (A)'s points in turn:

The entire committee is up for re-election next year. This proposal says that, after the election for ALL members is completed, those with the fewest votes serve a two year term and highest votes a 4 year term.

In my mind, this is the perfect time to prepare for future growth. The issue in my mind is the best size for a functioning committee. Where the members come from is really a separate issue.

*"I think Asia and SA should each keep their own representative. Every region has representation and they should also."* This is incorrect. Every region does not have a representative. The Committee membership comes from 4 geographic areas.

According to research, the smaller the committee, the more likely members will feel included and engaged. If there are 10 members, a quorum is 6 people and with 8 members, a quorum is 5.

I'm not wedded to 8 members - it could be left at 10.

Everyone can't serve 4 years and set up a rotation cycle. Either half serve 2 year terms initially or 6 year terms initially. After the transition, everyone serves for 4 years.

We rotate positions on the TICA Board now; don't see this as any different.

(C)

Like (A) I disagree with the difference in "Served time", if they are elected they are elected no matter how many votes.

(D)

The point of this [2 year and 4 year terms ] is to handle the initial election under the new rules - so that in future elections only half of the JC are being elected at any one time and also in future years everyone is elected for 4 years.

There has to be some way of handling this initial election, and this is the proposed approach. The only people who serve 2 years is the half with the least votes in America and Europe for the first election under the new rules. They then have an opportunity to be re-elected after 2 years if they want to.

The principle of continuity is already embedded in the Board elections, and I agree with the principle for the JC.

(E)

I agree with staggering the elections which is already done with the Board. I don't think differentiating the terms by number of votes will work very well, some of the elections will be very close.

(A)

Logically because there are more judges in North America, the judges from there will always serve longer terms just because of sheer numbers. Number of votes should have nothing to do with length of term.

(F)

I agree with (D) as well - I suggested that we needed this before the first election. With the current rules it is entirely possible to have the entire judging committee replaced at every election - this provides no continuity.

(B)

I'm thinking perhaps the transition process is not clear as worded. The selection of those who will serve a 2-year term is confined to the geographical area and the outcome of the vote - it has nothing to do with someone in N America getting more votes than someone in Europe.

Example: Using the last election and applying the proposed transition:

North America:

Candidate A :43 votes - 4 year term

Candidate B: 34 votes - 4 year term

Candidate C: 29 votes - 2 year term

Candidate D: 29 votes -2 year term

Europe

Candidate E: 34 votes - 4 year term

Candidate F: 25 votes - 2 year term

Under the proposal, SA automatically gets a 4 year term. At the moment, there are only 3 candidates in that area, one of which is not eligible to run. I'd find it hard to imagine that the current JA wouldn't be re-elected.

Guess I really see this as the fairest and easiest way to transition.

Contd/...



(G)

My comments regarding this proposal.

1. Continuity. I like the idea of a rotation cycle and the proposal provides a good solution for the initial period. However, I would like to see what will happen with the 2022 election before to put in place a change like this. The Judging Committee elected/appointed in 2018 has shown great stability, so far we had only one resignation in 3 years.

2. Optimum size and Representation. The current formula works properly and guarantees a good representation for all international areas (North America 5 members, Europe 3 members, Asia 1 member, SA/International 1 member). The formula in this proposal is complex and doesn't guarantee representation for South America or Japan, I strongly think each International area (what means different cultures and problems to deal with) needs at least one member on the committee. We can always correct the formula in the case a region grown too much ... but the numbers are pretty constant for the last decade for the total of judges/trainees.

(B)

I don't totally buy the "culture" argument. "Asia" is not just Japan. "Asia" is Japan, Korea and China. "International" includes Taiwan and Hong Kong. If we are truly looking at geography, "Asia" would include all the far eastern countries. As to South America, Mexico is included with the US and Canada, and I dare say some might argue that there is a myriad of "cultural" differences between countries in Europe. I like to think that TICA will grow, not shrink.

**Rules Chair Note:** Some Committee members objected to the way the initial election was handled. There was some discussion on alternatives, but no-one was able to put forward an alternative method that was acceptable.

## **Amend Standing Rule 106.4.2.1.10 (Selection of TICA Judging Administrator and Deputy Judging Administrator) - Fisher**

### **Rationale:**

The rationale supporting the creation of the TICA Judging Committee in 2018 included the following:

*“TICA has one of the most educated/well-trained judging panels in the cat fancy. Our judging program is known world-wide for excellence.*

*That being the case, it is time for our judges to govern themselves and take full responsibility for the judging program. This will allow the board of directors to deal with the operations of the association during board meetings instead of spending copious amounts of time on judging matters such as advancement of judges, education, training and other things pertaining to the judging program.”*

To that end, the Judging Committee was created, utilizing an election process within the judging panel. Since, unlike the prior system which depended on an appointed Judging Administrator who could select his/her own “team”, the success of the elected Judging Committee depends upon their ability to quickly recognize everyone’s unique interests and abilities and form a collegial team, it is no longer necessary or reasonable for the Board to choose among the elected group and decide who shall assume the duty of Chairman and Deputy. The Committee, itself, is in the best position to make the determination.

### **Amend Standing Rule 106.4.2.1.10:**

106.4.2.1.10 ~~The President, with the approval of the Board of Directors,~~ **Upon election or in case of a vacancy the members of the Judging Committee shall appoint from among themselves** two members ~~of the Judging Committee to serve~~ as TICA Judging Administrator and Deputy Judging Administrator. The TICA Judging Administrator is the chairperson of the Judging Committee. **If the Judging Committee is unable to reach consensus on any of these appointments then the President, with approval of the Board, shall make the necessary appointments.**

Contd/...

## 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)

From a rules point of view I see a problem regarding the appointment/selection process itself. I would like to see more details regarding the process, this means:

When? during a Judging Committee meeting? Electronic ballot?

How? simple majority, 2/3 vote?

I also think the expression "unable to reach consensus" needs a further explanation.

(B)

In response to (A), IMHO, this is way more detail than needs to exist in Standing Rules. If there is a need to establish a procedure, I think it would go into the Judging Program where the activities of the Committee are described.

As far as "consensus" is concerned, I suggest substituting "general agreement" instead.

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

(A)

It seems to me that teams always work better by using and recognizing each other's strengths and weakness to work as a whole to achieve goals.

That being the case it seems wholly sensible for them to make their own decisions regarding their leadership.

Completely agree with this.

(B)

While I agree with what (A) said as teams do work better sometimes when they can drive themselves I'm not so sure right now for this committee.

Maybe when they have complete control of the judging program, yes, but right now there are still things that have to go through the board and I believe this is one of them.

(C)

While the judging committee is taking the role of assuming responsibility for the housekeeping functions of the program, to allow them to select their own judging program administrator and deputy from their ranks gives the committee a level of power that I do not think that they have demonstrated that they are ready to assume at this time.

Furthermore, the President of TICA needs to have the ability to assemble a leadership team that they can work with. This proposal might have merit at a later date, but not now.

(D)

Regarding the merits of the proposal, I agree with (B) and (C) regarding the timing of this proposal is not the best.

Members of Judging Committee are elected by their pairs and then appointed by the Board. There is a reason for this two-step process, the JC is a Board Administrative Standing Committee created by the Board in order to perform certain delegated duties on behalf of itself. The role of the JC is to administer the Judging Program, but the Board remains the ultimate judicial authority for the rules, procedures and operations.

The president and the Board represent the membership, TICA is a Member-driven organization and as such, the membership needs also to be involved, this is why a collaborative appointment by the President with the Board approval is appropriate for this committee regarding the JA/DJA positions.

The current rule is a good balance between the Judging Panel governing themselves and the Board of Directors as ultimate authority.

(E)

In response to (C), their role is more than housekeeping in my opinion and their remit in Standing Rules makes it quite clear that the Board is delegating responsibility for many aspects of the Judging Program to the JC.

(B)

I think (D) has points and concerns that are spot on. I also agree with (C).

I think the Board/President should have the final say on the JA, with the input and recommendations from the committee.

(F)

The stated goal of all of the changes which created the judging committee was the hope that the judges could govern themselves.

I see this change as part and parcel of that - let the judges decide who should be their leader. Maybe it should be decided by the vote of all the judges, rather than within the committee.

(G)

(B) said "*I think the Board/President should have the final say on the JA, with the input and recommendations from the committee.*"

I don't see how this is much different from having the committee make its own selection of its Chair and Vice Chair. Either the Board respects the recommendation of the Committee or resorts to "other" factors to override the recommendations and make alternate appointments.

(G)

(C) said "*Furthermore, the President of TICA needs to have the ability to assemble a leadership team that they can work with*"

It is quite clear that the President does not have the authority to appoint these two positions. Unlike the provisions in the Rules which allow the President to appoint members of other committees, the appointment of the two JC positions is totally within the power of the Board.

(E)

Some have commented that this is not the right time for this change but to wait until they have further responsibilities. However there are proposals on this agenda to extend the Committee's responsibilities and further proposals are likely to follow in subsequent meetings.

It is my opinion that it is better to address the rules for the selection of the JA and DJA now rather than wait until closer to the next election of the Judging Committee.

## Amend Standing Rule 109.1.1 (Annual Rotation) – Board Directive

### Rationale:

Because of the current pandemic situation, the 2021 Annual has been cancelled. At Special Board Meeting on 10 March it was suggested that EN hold their Annual in 2025 as this is the earliest opportunity that will not impact other Annual locations already agreed.

With the cancellation of the Annual for 2021, Standing Rule 109.1.1 is no longer necessary for the 2021/2022 show year.

### Amend Standing Rule 109.1.1:

109.1 Annual Convention.

109.1.1 **For the 2021/2022 show season only, this rule is suspended.** Annual Convention. Labor Day weekend each year is reserved for the Annual Convention. No other shows may be held the weekend of the Annual Convention with the following exception. A club may receive permission to hold a show on the Annual weekend upon application to the Board. Application must state specific reasons for the request for exemption and why such a show would have no impact on the Annual.

109.1.1.1 The rotation for the Annual Conventions shall be: ~~Northern Europe – 2021~~, Great Lakes - 2022, Northwest - 2023, Mid Atlantic – 2024, **Northern Europe 2025**, Northeast - ~~2025~~**2026**, Southwest - ~~2026~~**2027**, Southern Europe – ~~2027~~**2028**, South Central ~~2028~~**2029**, Southeast – ~~2029~~**2030**, Mid Pacific - ~~2030~~**2031**.

### 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) This looks like appropriate wording to accomplish the desire of the BOD
- (B) Looks good to me.
- (C) This looks fine to me
- (D) I agree
- (E) Looks straightforward to me.

(F)

Guess if it were me, I would not clutter the Standing Rules and simply do a Board Ballot to lift restrictions for clubs wanting to hold shows on Labor Day weekend this year. Or even pass a motion at the meeting

(G)

I can understand that point of view - but I think that a rule change is clearer and is much easier to find than a motion passed at a meeting. It is easier for the latter to get forgotten about as time passes on.