



Minutes of the Business Meeting of the
World Cat Congress
Melbourne, Australia
3rd May, 2010

Present: Ms Pam DelaBar (President of WCC and in the chair and delegate of CFA)
Mrs Penelope Bydlinski (WCC Secretary/Treasurer)
Mrs Lesley Morgan Blythe (Delegate of ACF Inc.)
Mrs Cheryle U'Ren (Delegate of CCC of A)
Mr Eric Reijers (Delegate of FIFe)
Mrs Betty Shingleton (Delegate of GCCF)
Mrs Chris Lowe (Delegate of NZCF)
Mrs Ingrid de Wet (Delegate of SACC)
Mrs Vickie Fisher (Delegate of TICA)
Mrs Cornelia Hungerecker (Delegate of WCF)

The meeting opened at 9.30 a.m. The President asked the delegates to identify themselves, she was herself present as the delegate for CFA and Mrs Bydlinski was present as Secretary and Treasurer. Times for breaks and for lunch were then established.

The Treasurer had a point to raise and the meeting went into Executive Session for that point.

The business meeting resumed at 10 o'clock.

1. Approval of the Minutes of 2009.

Mrs Fisher made a motion to approve, seconded by Mrs Morgan Bythe and approved with one abstention. Mr Reijers explained that FIFe had abstained because they wanted it clarified in the Minutes when Ms DelaBar was speaking as CFA's delegate and when she was speaking as WCC President. The Secretary agreed this would be done in the future.

2. Matters Arising from the Minutes of 2009

Mr Reijers was not sure at which point the Secretary/Treasurer's report should be addressed but it did pertain to the previous year. The President invited the Secretary to comment on her report. (Annex 1) The Secretary said that according to the Constitution, the meeting should confirm the annual fee for each year and also the meeting. Apart from those points she felt that the past year had been pretty dull and hoped that something could be done about this situation. The President said that there was progress on the web site. The Secretary said she had sent out an e-mail many months before concerning the web site and it had taken her an extremely long time to get any response to it. The President said that she and the Secretary had talked about it on the telephone and the Secretary agreed that this had

happened but it had concerned only approval to get the site re-done and there had been no input concerning the contents of the site. She had had very little response from anybody on this subject. The President said it was up to the members to decide what they wanted on the site and excellent feed-back had been received at the Open Meeting. Mrs Morgan-Blythe had a note of the suggestions made at that meeting. She referred to Mrs Rivett's suggestion which was basically what the Secretary had suggested the previous year, The basic concept being a 'one-stop shop' or a sort of virtual library. The Secretary had suggested this in a letter sent by e-mail to all members on 11th October but had received a response from only three members.

Mrs U'Ren asked about the capacity of the web site and whether the WCC had access to photographs etc. She was assured that the site's capacity was enough for its requirements and photographs were not a problem.

Mr Reijers then referred to the report of the Secretary and her reports in previous years, all of which said the same thing, which was that there had been no input. He thought that an Executive Committee had been elected to carry out decisions. He agreed that input had to come from all members. FIFe was a little tired of reading that there had been little communication between the executive officers and the previous year it had been minuted that things would change but it had appeared again on the current report. He would like a statement on this. The President said that she and Mrs U'Ren talked quite frequently and if the Secretary wanted to speak to her she sent an e-mail and the President then called her. The Secretary said she did not understand why she had to initiate the contact and the President said it was so that she could ring on her cheap rates. The Secretary went on to say that it was not just a matter of telephoning, she did not feel she could work in this way – there were three people on the Executive and normally it was a matter of being in contact generally and discussing what was planned and what should be done.

Mrs Lowe commented that she did not know what was expected of the delegates. She referred to the motion that had been passed the previous year whereby each delegate would ask their members what they saw as the role of the World Cat Congress. The document she had circulated (Annex 2) gave responses from the members of NZCF. She had received various e-mails from the Secretary and she believed that the Congress had done certain things during the previous year.

Mrs U'Ren said that whilst she realized the Congress was not a regulatory body, she thought it should be aiming at getting a uniformity with regard to breeds and breeding policies.

Mr Reijers asked how Mrs U'Ren expected such uniformity to happen. Mrs U'Ren hoped there would be ideas from the table; she realized it could not happen overnight but thought it should be the direction to aim at. Mr Reijers spoke about the Seminar at which there had been some interesting speakers and commented on the fact that at the same meeting Mrs U'Ren had come with yet another breed: the Australian Bombay which he didn't feel was helpful towards uniformity. He cited the fact that at the FIFe General Assembly in May there was a proposal to refer to British Longhair as 'Highlander. He explained that TICA already had a breed known as Highlander and the board would be reminding the member concerned that they should not therefore use this name. In this way FIFe was trying to get some uniformity. He was concerned that another Bombay was being added to the list; the GCCF already had a Bombay in their Asian section but he considered the only true Bombay was the one in TICA and CFA.

Mrs U'Ren entirely agreed and had been opposed to the idea but explained it had been a majority decision. Mrs Shingleton felt that one had to be realistic; it was impossible for WCC to dictate standards on breeds or breeding policies and expect the members to comply because each member had its individual rules and would not be willing to conform to those of another organization.

Mr Reijers agreed with what Mrs Shingleton had said. However, he thought that the document on breed comparisons on which the Secretary had been working was meant to indicate what a breed was in one organization as compared to another. He thought this document could bring benefits and suggested that the Executive arranged for its completion. Mrs U'Ren thought it was the breeding programmes that needed addressing rather than the actual standards. Mrs de Wet thought it would be a huge task and proposed that the Secretary supply a template for the members to complete; these could then be married together in the complete document. Mr Reijers wanted to clarify exactly what was being proposed. The Secretary said that everybody had been sent a copy of the proposed table. There had been problems as to whether to include the known defects in certain breeds. WCF had not thought WCC should publish those facts and there was a difference of opinion on that particular point. Nothing more had been said about it. The document was fairly simple as it involved, for each organization, the name of the breed with a photograph, the recognized colours, recognized outcrosses, it could contain also the breed codes and any breeding restrictions. She had assumed that somebody in each organization would contribute for their organization as she did not have the knowledge to do this.

Mrs Lowe commented that one of the suggestions she had received from the New Zealand members had been that WCC took on one project a year. Mrs Morgan Blythe agreed and added that the project should also be completed as this was the complaint from their members, that nothing actually happened. Mr Reijers said that he had a record of the disagreement over the known defects where Mrs Wagner had not been in favour of publishing them, Mrs Sjödin was in favour of publishing and Ms DelaBar was against it. He felt that rather than torpedoing the whole project, he proposed that this project should be completed and whether or not the health conditions were to be included could be discussed later. He agreed that the views of WCC members were very diverse. FIFe believed that the critics of the cat fancy were well aware of those health conditions and that it looked better if the fact was admitted together with the measures which were in place in order to try and avoid or help the conditions. He cited PKD saying that there was nothing criminal about a cat having this condition as long as once it was known, it was dealt with correctly. He thought the decision whether to include these things in the document could be taken later and should not interfere with the entire project. Mrs Morgan Blythe seconded the proposal.

Mrs U'Ren wanted to comment on Mr Reijer's points, many of which she thought were very good. She referred to responsible pet ownership which now, under the laws of the Victorian Government, meant that any possible condition in a cat which was sold had to be declared at the time the sale was made.

Mr Reijers amended the proposal to include that all sitting delegates be provided with a template for the project. The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr Reijers added that he did not think it was helpful to put one's head in the sand; rather it was better to admit to the world that the problems were there but show what was being done about them. He was aware that the organizations had different rules in place. He agreed that a sub-document could be made but that could be decided later. The President added that also the fact that there were genetic markers for many of these conditions made them easier to identify and control.

Mrs U'Ren referred to another matter in the Secretary's report concerning the fact that an international speaker had not been engaged for the Seminar. She explained that CCCA had expected to have one from Royal Canin but had been let down at the last minute; she apologized for this but it had been beyond their control. Mr Reijers said that there had been some interesting speakers and psychology and the cat was something he had not thought of before.

Referring further to the secretary's report, he thought that that this showed a lack of communication. The group was small and there was a need to liaise together, which brought him back to his former point that although in the last year he had stood back a little in order that others could take up matters, the points he had made the previous year were still valid. He apologized for the fact that he had been a bit harsh the previous year, but he had been facing personal problems that threatened his livelihood at that time. However, the points he had made were in the Minutes and he asked the members to take note of them.

The Secretary said that she was still waiting for information for the Table of Disqualifiers on the web site, she thought the members concerned knew who they were.

Mrs Fisher asked for clarification on the web site project. Mr Reijers said that the web site would contain what the members thought it should contain. Mrs Fisher had been referring to upgrading the site and whether there was money available for that. The Secretary explained that the web site had been made at a time when there were only five members and as the membership had expanded, certain things could not be accommodated. The site had therefore to be 're-jigged.' The previous year the meeting had discussed the possibility of changing the direction of the web site, which would mean a more thorough overhaul of the existing site. The work was in progress and she had a link if anybody would like to have a look.

The meeting broke for a coffee break at 10.45 and reconvened at 11.00.

Mr Reijers asked if there could be another Executive session immediately after lunch concerning some of the things that the Secretary had said. He thought this would be less disruptive to the onlookers.

Referring to the general statement which she had been asked to draft. (Annex 3), Mrs Morgan Blythe said it had been difficult to create something short on cat welfare and self-regulation. She had done this and it had been circulated. Mrs Shingleton commented on the final paragraph of this document, quoting "the concept of the cat as an indoor pet which therefore poses no threat to native fauna" she said that this concept did not really exist in the UK. She thought it more appropriate for some countries such as Australia where cats were not allowed to roam. She thought that point should be explained as people reading it in the UK would wonder what the World Cat Congress was talking about. Mrs Morgan Blythe said that in the covering e-mail she had said members should feel free to adapt as necessary. Mr Reijers suggested that instead of "All member bodies" at the beginning of the paragraph it should read "Some member bodies," in some countries it could be considered animal abuse not to allow the cat out. Ms DelaBar said that there was a pamphlet in CFA stating that the cat was an indoor pet and discouraging people from letting them out.

The Secretary referred to Mrs Wagner's statement in the last Minutes whereby she suggested that the aims raised in 2007 should be further considered and that something should be prepared for the next meeting rather than waiting to see if points arose. The Secretary had circulated the list of aims from 2007 as requested. Mrs Fisher had put in a 'white paper,' which would be discussed later. Mr Reijers referred to the list of aims and said that the suggestion to make a list had actually come from him at the prompting of the FIFe treasurer, Mr van de Haterd. Mr van de Haterd's firm had employed such an idea. He would like the record corrected that the idea had not come from the Executive but from a member.

It had been agreed that Royal Canin should be approached concerning an advert and on the 11th October the Secretary had written to all members with the outcome of her talks and with further suggestions (Annex 4). The idea had been to make the web site a sort of gathering point at which people could get to the information they needed without having to search a number of sites. In principle the same idea which Keryn Rivett had voiced at the Open Meeting.

Ms DelaBar said that, as a follow-up, CFA was more than willing to provide all its legislative strategies and the papers used in combating restrictive breeder ordinances. The Secretary said that she thought primarily the Congress's site would provide a link to a specific subject rather than having it all on its own site. She could only describe the idea as making the site a sort of clearing house for information.

Proposals

1) Mrs Morgan Blythe presented the ACF proposal of which she had given notice the previous year. The Secretary explained that she had put it on the Agenda as she had known about it, but the new version, which had now been received, was slightly different. This had been circulated. The proposal read as follows:

In accordance with our notice of motion at the meeting in 2009, the Australian Cat Federation (Inc) proposes that the following be inserted into the World Cat Congress Constitution after 5.1.

- i) The President shall be elected on odd years.**
- ii) The Vice-President shall be elected on even years.**
- iii) The Secretary and Treasurer or Secretary/Treasurer shall be appointed in the same year as the Vice President.**

It is immaterial to ACF which officers are on odd or even years but we feel it is important to ensure that there will be continuity and not a total change of officers in any given year.

The President pointed out that the proposal did not give a date to become effective if it were to be passed. Mrs Morgan Blythe thought it would become effective as soon as it was ratified at the subsequent meeting. She clarified that it would be effective in 2011 when the Minutes were ratified. Mrs Fisher, in order to clarify this, said that if this proposal was adopted the meeting was effectively changing the Constitution to extend the period of office for the Vice-President and the Secretary/Treasurer until 2012. Mrs Fisher then asked for further clarification as she was not clear on the reason for the proposal. Mrs Morgan Blythe explained that prior to the re-vamping of the Constitution in 2005 this provision had been in place but it had then been omitted. Mr Reijers said that in effect this was to correct a mistake made at that time. Mrs U'Ren said that her understanding was that this would avoid a situation where all three officers could change at the same time, which would mean there would be no continuity of the Executive. The Secretary agreed that this was the reason. Ms DelaBar said that they had a similar rule in CFA. Mrs Morgan Blythe made the motion and it was seconded by Mr Reijers. The motion was passed with one against and one abstention.

2) Mrs Hungerecker presented the proposal from WCF which read as follows:

The WCF proposes that the date and place of the coming meeting shall be announced not later than 2 years in advance.

Motivation:

A reasonable timing - The WCC member associations / the WCC delegates usually prepare and fix the dates of their own events 2 – 3 years in advance. The judges' attendances to the major cat shows should also be planned in time.

Mr Reijers was a little mystified as this was already in the Constitution. He thought it would be wiser for WCF to have written and reminded the members to observe this rule. He did not

think it could be in the Constitution twice. He also thought that circumstances could arise where it was not possible to keep to this rule. He agreed it was alright to have this in the Constitution and quoted the next years that were arranged as being South Africa in 2011 and the GCCF in 2012 but Mrs Shingleton interrupted to say that GCCF was in 2013. It was said that WCF was down for 2012. He agreed that the date was important. Traditionally the meeting had been in March and that month had been agreed as a good month by all the delegates at the time. There had been reasons to vary it in the subsequent years. Mrs U'Ren also thought it important to know the month. Ms DelaBar said that in the US there were also difficulties in finding venues to support the requirement of a show and a meeting. The Secretary said that as the proposal stood it changed nothing in the Constitution and she thought it might have been better to have been more specific and ask for the month, year and venue as date and place can be interpreted in different ways. Mrs Hungerecker put the motion but there was no seconder so the motion was not placed to the meeting.

Mr Reijers thought that for the record it should be made clear which month was planned. He asked Mrs Hackmann about the month for 2012 and she replied that it could be in Dubai whenever the delegates would like it. Mrs de Wet said that the Meeting in South Africa would be in the second week of July, that was the 8th, 9th and 10th in Johannesburg.

Financial Matters

The Treasurer said that for the first time in many years she had the hard copy of the accounts at the meeting if anybody would like to look at them; usually she had been unable to bring them all because of weight restrictions. The bank balance at 8th April showed AU\$ 33,875.84. The Royal Canin sponsorship money was to be added to that figure as she had been advised it was being transferred. Because of the exchange rate between the Euro and the Australian dollar the amount was much less in the current year than it had been in 2009. When asked what the difference was she said that it had been around AU\$ 19,000 in 2009 whilst it was just under AU\$ 15,000 today, which was quite a lot less. However, the account was very healthy. She had circulated the Statement of Account with attachments (Annex 5). The Meeting had to establish whether to continue with the annual fee of AU\$ 340 and also the basic amount for each member's travel expenses. Mr Reijers moved to retain the annual fee at AU\$ 340 and this was seconded by Mrs U'Ren and carried unanimously. Regarding the basic amount which each member should pay towards their own travel expenses, the Treasurer said that it had in the past been fixed at Euro 500. She clarified that this meant that every member should pay Euro 500 towards its own travel and where the delegate had also judged the agreed figure of US\$ 500 would also be added to this figure. Any deficit between that figure and the cost of the travel would be reimbursed by the Congress. Mr Reijers moved to retain this figure and Mrs Morgan Blythe seconded. The motion was carried unanimously.

Mrs Fisher moved to accept the financial statement, seconded by Mrs Morgan Blythe and carried unanimously.

Member's Reports

Mrs Hungerecker read a report from WCF. (Annex 6).

Mr Reijers read out a report from FIFe. (Annex 7) For further explanation he stated that in Belgium taxes had to be paid by non-profit making organisations. With regard to Malta he said that it was the same group of people who had been I the FIFe member club who had now joined a different organization and they had enough evidence on this matter, which was why FIFe would not allow any of its judges to officiate at a show there. Mrs Fisher asked what a Neva Masquerade was and was told it was a name given to the pointed Siberian by some of the FIFe breeders. He added to the report that FIFe had 211 international judges, 162 student judges of which 96 were new students on their first category.

Mrs de Wet read out a report for SACC (Annex 8) . It was, she said, very similar to what she had given to the Open Meeting.

Mrs Shingleton said that her report for the GCCF was the same as the one she had given at the Open Meeting (Annex 9).

Mrs Morgan Blythe gave the report for ACF which had been circulated. (Annex 10). She then said that ACF was very disappointed that CCCA did not recognize the new provisional ACF member in Victoria and had not allowed their members to enter the show being held in conjunction with the WCC meetings. They wished to appeal for the open doors policy of WCC to become effective very rapidly.

Mrs Fisher reported that TICA's registrations were up a little and it was interesting that even though the economy had been bad, the number of clubs continued to grow and more shows were being held. At the same time it had been noted that the number of entries for each show was down and she thought that what was happening was that perhaps clubs were forming and putting on shows more locally because people were not spending money to travel long distances. The biggest problem she saw was that everybody needed to bolster their fancies. The Bengal was their most registered cat, followed by the Ragdoll which had knocked the Maine Coon down to third place. The Sphynx has suddenly become more popular with an increased amount of registrations. TICA had accepted the Thai cat into championship competition, she explained this was an old type Siamese, more of an apple head Siamese. Working out a standard for this breed had been difficult as there were breeders in both Europe and America who had been breeding them for some time and whose views on the standard differed.

TICA was once again requested to poll the Maine Coon breed section as to the acceptance of the polydactyl Maine Coon. The proposal had been defeated. Mrs. Fisher expected the issue would be raised in the future. Last year Mrs Fisher had mentioned that for the first time in TICA's nearly 31 years the best cat had come from outside the United States, it had been a Persian from Belgium; this year it would appear that the best international cat would again be from Belgium, this time a Maine Coon. Their main annual event and award giving will be held in California in September.

Mrs Lowe for NZCF said that her report was the same as the one she had given at the Open Meeting (Annex 11) apart from a matter of legislation, which she had referred to at that time. In New Zealand they now had a draft document which was targeting the showing of cats and there was a lot of concern about the proposal which gave a large cage size as being acceptable; this came under the heading of temporary housing for cats. NZCF had put in a submission but it remained a matter of great concern. It came under the welfare of animals and was worth looking at. The NZCF membership had dropped considerably, she was referring to individual membership but added that their registrations had shown minimal change. People were still breeding but not showing as much.

Mrs U'Ren speaking for CCCA referred to her report to the Open Meeting (Annex 12) but wanted to reiterate a couple of points. Firstly, she wanted to thank everybody for their participation in the national show and also for coming to Melbourne for the meeting. She was sorry that they had not been able to use Mr Reijers as a judge but this was because he had only decided to attend at the last minute. Mr Reijers responded that he had been grateful for a free weekend.

She reported that CCCA had eight member bodies and registries. The highest recording of breed registrations around the country seems to be in Ragdolls. There were not a lot being shown so obviously people were breeding and registering them in order to sell them. There was a particular requirement in the State of Victoria that a breeder must be with a body

which is recognized by the Victorian Government in order to breed cats. The member bodies hold around 160 shows annually, they have 150 judges and at this stage new requirements at a national level are being put into place. CCCA had now recognized Waratah's registrations providing they can be verified on their database and that they were for breeds also recognized by CCCA.

She referred to the lecture on Legislation given by Steven Moore at the Open Meeting, and explained that the Australian State Governments, particularly in Victoria, have a habit of following on with legislation put in place in one State, particularly where it generated more income for the Government. As responsible organisations it was necessary to produce a Code of Practice in which the Government could see that the organization was doing the right thing according to the law. The penalties for not observing the legislation which was in place, were very heavy both to the individual and to the organization as a whole.

The blue Bengal has again come up for recognition; the CCCA breeders had been surveyed and the majority did not want to recognize the dilute gene at this level. However, an official application would be submitted. The Australian Bombay had been recognized.

Mrs U'Ren asked the Chair if it was appropriate for her to reply to a point concerning CCCA which had been in the report of ACF. She did not feel it was appropriate to bring that matter to the present meeting. Mr Reijers said that he thought it belonged under Any Other Business as there were other similar matters to be dealt with under that heading. He had, however, no objections if Mrs U'Ren wanted to respond. Mrs U'Ren said that as it had been published CCCA would like to respond.

Ms DelaBar referred to the report she had given to the Open Meeting (Annex 13) and said that the 'Meet the Breeds' programme would also be presented on the third weekend of October in New York City; CFA is developing a further programme, which will actually be a show. The Annual Meeting would be held on 24th June in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Ms DelaBar said that she was retiring from political life in CFA as she wanted to get her knee fixed. This did not mean she was retiring generally, only from the Board of Directors where she had served for 24 years. The highest breed registrations in CFA were in Persians followed by the Exotic which had moved up in popularity. She thought this was because of the change of policy the previous year which allowed Exotics from Persian/Exotic breeding to be shown. The Maine Coon was in third place and the Siamese in fourth. A further point of interest was that the Burmilla breeders in the area would be having their Burmillas on exhibition at shows; this would be the first step before an application for recognition. Another programme that they are bringing was the Domestic Feline programme. This was intended to extend CFA's influence on homebred cats without pedigrees.

Finally Ms DelaBar said she would like to thank both WCF and FIFe who had assisted in providing judges to go to the first CFA show in Estonia. The problems had arisen as an affect of the volcanic ash which prohibited a lot of movement. She said that without the help of those two organizations, Estonia could not have put on that show. It also demonstrated to her that WCC did work and the members did work in harmony.

Matter's Arising from Members' Reports

Mrs U'Ren referred to the comments following Mrs Nell Evans' sign off of her December 26th announcement whereby ACF regretted CCCA's refusal to accept ACF's provisional member body in Victoria. Mrs U'Ren stated that the application they had received from ACF would be considered at their meeting in June which was normal procedure. However, they had been most concerned that when the previous ACF body in Victoria had been wound up a number of its members had applied to the Feline Control Council for membership. They had brought with them a letter from the people who were forming the new club which was signed by Janice Brasher; their concerns were that in this letter the signatory had stated, and Mrs

U'Ren quoted, "We will be starting with nothing; no judges, no money, no equipment." FCCV felt, and it had also been discussed at CCCA level, that it would not be responsible for them as an organization to accept a group of people which had nothing, particularly in the State of Victoria where the Government had very strict regulations concerning applicable organizations. Being an applicable organization in the State of Victoria allowed people to register, breed and show cats. This newly-formed group had not been granted that status with the Victorian Government nor was it, in fact, the Cat Authority of Victoria, it was Cats Victoria. In order to gain the status of an applicable organization it needed to have been functioning for a period of twelve months in order to be considered and then a further twelve months before it went into action. She explained that FCCV and CCCA were only acting in a responsible manner by not recognizing this organization at that stage.

Mrs U'Ren wanted to give the meeting this information as she thought that what they had received information which had been given in total ignorance, it was unfounded and defamatory. She added that she did not consider it should have been brought to the meeting in the way it had.

Mr Reijers wanted to voice his agreement with Mrs U'Ren and said that he thought such matters should not come to the present table at all. It was the same as the SACC and WCF matter the previous years and what had come ad infinitum with Waratah and some other members. It did not belong at this level. There was also, he regretted to say, a letter concerning WCF in Sweden which was of the same ilk, but FIFe would come to that later.

Mrs Fisher asked what the difference was between the Australian Bombay and the American Bombay. Firstly, Mrs U'Ren said that no breeding between the two were allowed. She said that Bombay in the United States had been developed from American Shorthairs and American Burmese. The Australian Bombay had been bred from the British Shorthair and he 'Euro Burmese'. In other words, it was a different recipe. CCCA were trying to be responsible and not merge the two together. Asked if it was a black cat, Mrs U'Ren said that she believed that only the black were recognized as Bombays, the dilutes and the chocolate gene were used purely for registration. Mrs Lowe said that NZCF had been following the same formula for three years; they referred to the two breeds as 'American Bombay' and 'Australian Bombay.'

Mr Reijers said that he believed it was all a result of a very unfortunate decision in the GCCF in England whereby a group of breeds called 'Asian' had been recognized. They had decided to call the black ones Bombay and also there were others were called Burmilla. It was a problem for FIFe to accept this as it was a group of diverse cats. He referred further to the question which had been raised earlier about the Neva Masquerade in FIFe, he pointed out that this was already an established breed in WCF and the FIFe breeders had taken it from them. He was also disturbed that in their report CCCA had stated that there would no longer be outcrosses allowed for Devon Rex. He felt that the outcrosses were there in order to save the breed and should not be abolished. He then asked Mrs Lowe what size the Government wanted the cages to be in New Zealand. Mrs Lowe replied 80 x 80 cm. Mr Reijers said that the European cages were nearly that size and he added that if in Europe they tried to have cats in cages the size of those in the show the previous day, the show would probably have been closed by the animal authorities who would maintain they were fit for rabbits, but not for cats.

Mrs Morgan Blythe returning to the subject of the Australian Bombay said that ACF had it in their Book of Standards because when application had been made, they had agreed to it providing the end product would be the same as the established Bombay. However, it was only provisionally recognized. Mrs U'Ren said that CCCA did not allow experimental breeding of an established breed and they considered the Bombay to be an established breed.

Addressing Mr Reijers' concern over the Devon Rex issue, Mrs U'Ren said that she totally agreed with him but, again, it had been a majority decision. She thought outcrosses promoted hybrid vigour and particularly in Australia where there was a small population in the cat breeds. Mr Reijers said that he had seen the Devon Rex breed die before his eyes and felt very strongly about this.

Ms DelaBar said that the lab that CFA was using for its cat genes programme was now starting to do breed profiles like DNA. This raised some concerns in some areas but developing a DNA library was where this was ultimately heading so that a DNA registry would be possible. It will be interesting to see what will come up when, for example, an American Bombay is put against an Australian Bombay or an Asian against a Burmilla. She mentioned this as being something to think about.

Mr Reijers commented on a lecture at a recent Congress concerning geographic origins of breeds and having found out that the Birman gene was a dominant gene. Ms DelaBar said that Dr Leslie Lyons has now established CatPhurr, which will be an international data base. She didn't know yet at which university this would be but CFA would be working together with her, getting the DNA samples analysed. Ms DelaBar found this very interesting, as it would give support to protecting the cat fancy if it were seen to be taking a scientific approach. The more it could be shown that the fancy were doing things scientifically and not in an emotional way, the more it could show it was breeding away from identifiable conditions.

Matters Raised at Open Meeting

Mrs Morgan Blythe had recorded the suggestions: the first one had come from Mr Denis Turner who would like to see worldwide standardisation of breed standards and format of standards. She thought this point had been well aired since 2002. The President said that she thought there were probably 9 organisations present because there were probably 9 or more different visions; organisations were formed because of people's visions and what they wanted to adhere to. She thought that a reason that she and Mrs Fisher got on so well was because they recognized the differences in each other's organisations and at the same time the areas they had in common and they worked with that knowledge. Mrs Morgan Blythe said that ACF and FIFe had changed the Javanese to the Oriental Longhair and spoke of the body of origin being the criteria. Whilst agreeing to some degree, Mr Reijers said that decisions in FIFe were made by the members. He did not think it was possible to have standardization and if this was achieved, there would be no point in having different organizations. The different organizations also recognised different breeds and this was sometimes the reason for a person to join one or the other organisation. He thought that as long as there was a way of showing what was meant in some of the differences in some breeds and making this information available to our members, that was as far as the Congress could go as the name giving and recognition had already been done.

The second point had been made by Mr Rod U'Ren who had admitted it was quite radical but he would like the standards to catch the essence of a breed giving the look which was agreed to be specific to that breed. In some organizations there were breed councils which dealt with such things. Mr Reijers said there was also the problem of the so-called 'common language.' He had looked at the standards for the Birman for example where some of the terminology was very strange to him with his knowledge of British English but no doubt meant something to the Australian English speakers. Mrs de Wet said that she thought the purpose of all standards was to describe the cat concerned.

Another matter raised, this time by Mr Brian Edwards, was the possibility of using electronic transfer of certified pedigrees rather than physical hard copies between members of WCC. Mr Reijers said that FIFe pedigrees were issued by the members and it was one of the largest sources of income to the member and consequently this would not be possible. Another matter would be official transfer of ownership document which touched on the legal

position of ownership which had been the subject of a lecture the previous year. Mrs Fisher wondered what was the purpose of this suggestion. It might just be to speed matters up a little but all registries had different methods. Ms DelaBar said that in CFA to send a transfer electronically would not be a problem. Mrs U'Ren said that even in the different affiliates of CCCA there were different registrations issued; some issued a Certificate of Registration which gave the name of the breeder and the current owner, but others issued a certified pedigree and a separate document stating the ownership. This meant that even within one organization it was not straightforward and she thought this might apply also to ACF. Mr Reijers said that another aspect was falsification of pedigrees; this had happened on occasion and some FIFe members had incorporated holograms or special copyrighted paper to protect their pedigrees. However, a pedigree could be scanned and sent electronically to a new owner as a provisional measure until the original was received in the post.

The body of origin as being the basis for a standard had also been raised again at the meeting. Mrs Morgan Blythe emphasized 'body' rather than 'country.' Comments had also been made about transferring the format of a standard from one body to another citing an example of the points for a head being broken down to so many for muzzle, so many for eyes etc. as opposed to a total for the head. Mrs U'Ren thought that CCCA would definitely agree over the 'body' of origin and she would take it to her members as their regulations currently stated: 'country' of origin. Mr Reijers said he did not object to the points being broken down so specifically even if FIFe did not do that but the important thing was that the standard should describe a cat which looked the same in all organizations. Mrs Shingleton said that there were some words which could not be used in a cat standard in Great Britain and quoted 'pelt' as an example; this was a word with other connotations in the UK. Ms DelaBar said that there was not always agreement even within her own organization, she cited black which described a colour in all breeds except one, where it suddenly became 'ebony'. This was largely because of the breed councils and most of the WCC members had breed councils. Ms DelaBar said that in CFA the Executive Board could not change a breed standard without the consent of 60% of the relevant breed council. Rules on registrations or shows could be changed, but not breed standards. Ms DelaBar added as a point of interest that when CFA had recognized Siberians, it had also recognized the pointed varieties.

Mrs U'Ren referred to diversity of colour descriptions and wondered if the Congress could work at least to uniformity of those. Mrs Lowe said there had been a lot of discussion in New Zealand about the names describing colour in the different breeds. They had set up a universal colour standard discussion group to look at what others around the world were doing. Mr Reijers asked what was meant by 'broken kittens' as he had seen it in the catalogue. Mrs U'Ren said that where breeds did not have a specific requirement for colour or pattern, CCCA put them into groups. The 'broken group' was for the tabby patterns. Patched was used to mean a colour with white. Ms DelaBar referred to Jeannie McPhee, a CFA judge, who had done a lot of work on colour uniformity, which was so different both within CFA and around the world.

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.45.

The meeting re-convened at 15.05 following an Executive Session and the afternoon break.

Meeting of the World Cat Congress in 2011

Mrs de Wet announced that this would be in Johannesburg on the second weekend of July, the 8th, 9th and 10th. The weather at that time would be summer days and freezing cold nights. Mrs Morgan Blythe asked about the structure of the meeting and was told that this would be announced later.

Any Other Business

The President said she would turn over the chair to Mrs Fisher to present her 'white paper.' (Annex 14). Mrs Fisher said that a lot of things had been discussed at the meeting which she thought were helpful. She referred to the previous meeting when it had been said that some time would be given to thinking of the future of the World Cat Congress. She had prepared her paper with two questions; one being whether or not to continue and the other being that, if it was decided to continue, then what would it be when it 'grew up,' She thought that with the first question, the sense was that it should continue and she thought it would be helpful to discuss what the actual benefits were to the members. The basic question was whether it was better for the cat fancy that the organization existed or not. She wanted to discuss the kind of things that the members found useful in having the organization.

Points that arose were:

- The web site
- Exchange of information
- Exchange of judges
- Acceptance of each organisation's pedigrees
- Problem solving
- Promotion of pedigree cats
- Interaction with other members
- Animal welfare
- Uniformity in experimental breeding programmes
- Official Statement showing a united front
- Addressing restrictive breeder legislation
- Wider view of the fancy
- Developing protocols on health issues
- Dealing with heritable defects

This led to the next question which was how to make it work and on what to concentrate. What was the main function. She reverted to her first question which had been whether the organization should go on.

Mrs Shingleton said that she thought it could be assumed that the organization was going on *ad infinitum*, but in the next year it had to prove to itself that it was achieving its aims.

Following on from this Mrs Fisher said the meeting should identify its role. Was it to promote harmony and, if so, how could harmony be promoted? Was its responsibility to the larger cat fancy or just to the member organizations?

Mr Reijers commented that there were also some organizations in the cat fancy that hindered the WCC, and he was not referring to any of the WCC members. He gave an example of organizations in Russia which organized baby salons where 8 or 9 week old kittens were shown. That was another aspect to consider and how the Congress should deal with that part of the cat fancy. There was a large independent cat fancy in Europe with many small clubs with pedigrees made in someone's back room particularly in Germany and some other countries. France had tried to regulate it with the formation of LOOF. There were also clubs such as the Cat Club de Genève in Switzerland and a Dutch club, NVVK; these clubs were founded in about 1900, and were very serious independent clubs from which there was still much to be learned - many WCC members had actually stolen a lot from them. So there was a great diversity but there were many tiny clubs formed by people who had fallen out with one or other of the WCC members and which then went on being independent.

Mrs de Wet suggested that the meeting listed the things that had been talked about during the day, e.g. Mr Reijers had mentioned that the welfare of young kittens was not really served or we want to start the project of comparative breeds and perhaps advise on a protocol on what a breeder should do if he or she discovered he had an heritable disease. She suggested the meeting could make a list of projects and then handle them one by one. Mrs Fisher concluded that Mrs de Wet was seeing that as an educational role.

Mrs Fisher quoted what had been said earlier when the meeting had listed:

- Open shows
- Co-operation in registrations
- Health in cats
- Legislation regarding cats
- Educational material
- Recognition of pedigrees
- Co-operation over show dates

The object of the World Cat Congress was to work openly and honestly together in a spirit of co-operation to improve the health and welfare of all cats and increase the sharing of resources to promote the interest and to educate the participants in the cat fancy throughout the world.

The President said that sounded like a mission statement.

Mrs Fisher said there clearly was an educational aspect and that was probably one of the easiest aspects for the Congress to pursue.

The President suggested expansion of the web site to include the promotion of animal welfare. She thought a members only section could be useful for the sharing of information that could not be in the public domain. She also mentioned making available materials to assist people in fighting restrictive legislation. She added the breed information which all delegates would be collecting to show how the breeds or the breeding practices may differ from organization to organization.

Mrs de Wet referred to the pamphlet which GCCF had produced to try and combat restrictive measures against cat breeding.

Mr Reijers liked the idea of a "Members Only" section which could also be used for putting up warnings, for example, of complaints that were in progress but could not be officially announced. The members would have direct access to such a section.

Mrs Fisher thought that a lot of pictures on the web site would be a good idea. Possibly using pictures of Best Cats in any organization in the Breed Section.

Regarding a Children's Section, Mrs Fisher said that Mrs Wagner had mentioned the previous year doing something along those lines, she had been a teacher and perhaps she would be willing to look at that section. Mrs Fisher had also had a colouring book made comparing cats and dogs and something of that nature might be fun to incorporate.

Mrs de Wet referred to the idea of a Quarterly Report from each organization which the President had suggested earlier. This involved nine pieces of information spanning the globe.

The Secretary said they had discussed previously having a description of how each member's shows run.

Mrs Fisher said that they had sometimes published member's videos which could be very interesting, for example a judge describing a particular breed.

Mrs de Wet asked about the treatment of cats and dogs in China. She suggested the use of links. Mr Reijers said that links of that nature were labour intensive as they changed all the time. He thought links should be confined to permanent sites such as the Winn Foundation or the FAB.

Mrs Morgan Blythe suggested advice to the public on what to expect from a responsible breeder when buying a kitten. Mrs Fisher thought that could be very useful if there was unanimity on that subject. Mr Reijers said a general document would have to be drawn up with suggestions such as visiting the breeder, ensuring that the breeder is registered with one or another organization, that there was a proper vaccination paper signed by a veterinary surgeon. There were of course national differences but Mrs Fisher thought that if it stayed generic, it could be done. FIFe forbade its members to sell kittens in pet shops but Mr Reijers understood that the situation in other countries, where people lived in isolated conditions, could be very different and there were pet shops, which were approved by the cat organizations.

Mrs U'Ren suggested information about importing and exporting between different countries. As the regulations changed often, this would mean publishing the appropriate links.

Ms DelaBar mentioned also what was needed if members were planning to show in specific areas. Mrs Shingleton thought that on that particular subject it would be necessary to link to the relevant government bodies as those regulations also changed from time to time. Mr Reijers agreed and said he could provide the link for instance to EU countries and indicate specific countries such as Sweden.

Regarding importing and exporting, Mrs Fisher asked if the meeting would want to mention contractual matters. At the seminar the previous year it had been made clear that the essential thing was to identify the seller and the buyer and the object of the contract. It might be better to put that under buying a kitten by saying that the purchaser may be required to sign a contract outlining conditions. Many problems arose when people had no contract and indeed in some cases had forgotten the name and address of the person from whom they had bought the kitten. Mr Reijers said that he had learned from the seminar the previous year that a contract containing restrictive conditions would not stand up in a court of law. He considered that many of the contracts were ruining the fancy and he felt very strongly about it.

Mrs Fisher asked if any of the organizations had foundations they supported such as the Winn Foundation which was supported by the CFA. CCCA also supported the Feline Health Research Fund. There were other foundations to which links would be useful.

At this point Mrs Fisher thought there was enough to be going on with and suggested splitting up some of the work. TICA had a brochure about what was to be expected when buying a pedigree kitten and she would be happy to forward that to anybody for ideas on that subject.

Mrs de Wet mentioned the breed comparisons and the President said that the Secretary would send out templates. Mrs de Wet thought that should be one of the projects. She then mentioned advice on how to deal with an heritable disease. She meant sensible advice as a starter. She felt that not everything could be done at once particularly as all the delegates had intensive commitments but it should be made a manageable task, with six month aims. This would be preferable to being overwhelmed by the amount to be done.

Mrs U'Ren thought somebody, other than the secretary, was needed to whom the members could send the information to be compiled. Regarding the members news feature, it might be that two or three people sent it in and the others hadn't, it almost needed somebody to chase up such things.

Mrs Shingleton would like to support what Mrs de Wet had suggested which was to start off with one or two projects. Mrs U'Ren agreed but thought the point was it should not all come back into the Secretary's lap. The President asked if maybe it should be in an Excel format which could be uploaded to the web master. Mr Reijers asked about the News feature, he hadn't understood if something should appear from everybody each quarter or whether they should rotate. There was a discussion about the length of each contribution which should be confined to one page and if pictures were included, they should be very general. The News should come from each member each quarter.

Mrs Fisher suggested that whilst work was going forward on the breed comparisons, other ideas could be considered and fitted into a time line also.

Mr Reijers said he could provide the links for the requirements of the EU countries with the special links to the Swedish and Finnish authorities and to DEFRA in the UK. Between Europe and America there was no problem, between Europe and Australia were many problems etc.

Mrs de Wet suggested that a date be set by which time one group in the breed comparisons would be finished, she gave Persian & Exotics as an example, with the Semi-longhairs and other groups following on. She thought it would be a good idea to ask the breed group secretaries to do this in that way it would not all be down to one person.

The President suggested a date to go on the first quarterly news, 1st July for example. Mrs Fisher then asked who would be the person to be responsible for collating this. Mrs Lowe agreed to do this.

The member's section would be up to the web master to set up.

Mrs Fisher asked if any members had children's areas on their web sites.

The Secretary thought that the show descriptions could be done fairly quickly also and Mrs Fisher agreed. TICA and CFA had something on their web sites which could be downloaded. These should be submitted by 1st July.

Mrs Hungerecker agreed to ask Mrs Wagner about the children's section.

Mr Reijers thought it would be nice if someone who had judged in all organizations could write a sensible article about what to expect in the different organisations. Things for example as to how the winner is arrived at. He had seen such an article somewhere but he couldn't recall where. He would try to locate it.

The Secretary asked if each delegate could undertake to produce an introduction to their organization in no more than 200 words for the web site. Currently there were long and rather turgid descriptions on the web site and these were to be replaced with something briefer which would pop up in a box.

Mr Reijers thanked Mrs Fisher for her contribution.

The President said that Mrs Lowe would like to share the comments she had received from the NZCF members with the caveat that these were not her words.

Mrs Lowe said that these responses were a result of the white paper that Mrs Shields had sent out. She had now gone through them and apart from the ones that were no longer relevant because of the on-going work which had now been decided upon, some had mentioned universal standards, universal colours etc. which had already been touched on in the meeting. She asked if anybody saw anything that should be discussed further. Mrs Fisher said that a lot of it involved information on the web site. Mr Reijers wondered what was meant under point 11 about sponsoring additional delegates. Mrs Lowe did not really know and would have to go back to the person concerned, she thought that the members didn't appreciate the facts and thought the delegates were all sponsored. She thought that almost all the points had been covered during the white paper discussions.

Mr Reijers referred to point 19 concerning the use of overseas judges and the fact that New Zealand judges were not invited overseas. Mr Reijers said he noted that the CCA National, the ACF National and the WCF World Show, all of which had hosted WCC weekends, were prestigious shows but, for instance, the equivalent would be the FIFe World Show and its rules did not allow for any other than FIFe judges to officiate. In reality these things worked differently. Mrs Bydlinski had an invitation to judge in Norway which he had heard about and he then tried to see if anybody else needed an extra judge during the month she was in Europe. Naturally one had to know about it in advance and he could not force clubs to take on a judge. Invitations were very haphazard, sometimes because somebody knew a particular judge or a particular judge had judged somebody's cat etc. There was no system.

Mrs Lowe said that she thought what was meant was that in New Zealand they used a huge number of overseas judges and out of their judges there were eight all breed judges and of those only one had judged overseas, she did not include Australia as being overseas. She said that at their next national they had the following judges: two from Austria, two from America, three from Australia and two from New Zealand. This was done on a regular basis in New Zealand. They held 140 championship rings annually and for 2010 only 37 of these rings were covered by New Zealand judges.

Mr Reijers said that for example in the previous year Mrs Lowe had judged for the first time in Europe when she had judged British Blue in Holland. That was a strong breed there and people had been rather nervous but were in fact very happy with her judging. There were other clubs in Europe with strong British exhibitors and if one knew that a person would be coming to Europe, one could recommend them but it was necessary to know in advance.

The Secretary said this was a matter of organization especially with anybody going from Australia or New Zealand as it was a very long journey. Some years ago things had been organized, Mrs Morgan Blythe had arranged for a number of judges from Australia who went to different European shows and were often accommodated in between shows in peoples homes but it is a big undertaking although it could be done.

Mr Reijers thought that at that time Mrs Morgan Blythe had had good contacts in Europe and Scandinavia and that had made it possible. They had recently arranged for a South American judge to come to Europe where he judged three shows and was able to rent a very cheap apartment in between.

Ms DelaBar said there were also problems such as she had encountered in Houston when it was not possible to invite some judges because of the way the show was structured.

Mrs Lowe thought that the point had been made because it was felt that if New Zealand, which was a small cat fancy, could bring in so many overseas judges, then it was a pity there was no reciprocal activity. She thought that the points raised by her members had been well dealt with at the meeting.

Mr Reijers raised the question of early neutering. He was aware that early neutering was being recommended, particularly in Australia but there were views that this was dangerous for the gene pool. If one of three males in a litter was kept for breeding and the other two neutered, the genetic make up being different, those genes were lost to the breed. It was a difficult subject because it came back to property and basically the cat is somebody's property. In Sweden for example if cats come in with strict restrictions, they lifted the restriction on the grounds that the person who buys the cat has the right to that cat. He cited people who asked between Euro 1200 and 2000 for a cat and then did not allow the new owner to breed with it or to sell everything which they breed as pets. In his dictionary that was baking a cake, eating it and then selling it which was not a pretty picture. Of course he had neutered male kittens on occasion for a good reason but he had then practically given them away to a pet home and had not asked ridiculous sums or forced contracts on people. He wondered how everybody had started with their cats in the first place.

Mrs Shingleton said that in the UK there were some people with very restrictive contracts. Mr Reijers commented it was so much harder to get a cat than a dog.

Mrs U'Ren said that she knew of very restrictive contracts where people had imported a stud, for example the breeder might be allowed to keep one female and everything else had to be de-sexed. She thought it such a pity as the new line could increase the gene pool but in fact it was just for the benefit of the person importing it and not the cat fancy as a whole. Mrs U'Ren also commented on Mr Reijers point that if there were three males in a litter, although the parents were the same, the genetic make up of each kitten would be different, she thought a lot of people did not appreciate that point.

Mrs Morgan Blythe related that she had been mentoring somebody who now had litters from somebody else's stud and the breeder of the stud did not allow the sale of entire kittens from that mating without her agreement. Mr Reijers interjected that nobody had that right and thought it better to let the matter go to court as the breeder concerned could not win. Mrs de Wet thought there was a fine line between responsible breeding and breeding oneself into a corner. She appreciated the fact that the legal system would be different in each country, but wondered if it could be found out, even through a chat list, how people were thinking. She thought that sometimes with the best intentions people made mistakes and she felt if people started to think about it, it could be for the benefit of the breeds. The President said that the fancy had often shot itself in the foot, giving the example of when PKD testing had first emerged and people had spayed everything, also euthanised extensively and lost a huge amount of the gene pool only to find out a little later that it was a dominant gene which could easily be bred away from.

Mr Reijers related a recent experience of his when he heard about an older neutered boy in Sweden that had an HCM related condition. He acknowledged that this could happen but said it depended how one reacted. He had had his females tested including an eight year old female and they were found to be HCM free and the male he had used came from three generations of HCM free cats. He then sent the results to the owners of the cat concerned and asked them for similar tests. It was then found that it had not been HCM but it was something to do with a valve and there was a suspicion of HCM which didn't make much sense since HCM was a condition which could be tested for. However, he explained that a cat could test clear for several years and then develop the condition later in its life and he thought that was not a reason to get rid of all the lines. He thought there were some diseases which could develop later in a cat's life. Mrs U'Ren commented that the point was whether one 'knowingly' bred with a positive cat. It was not possible to do anything before one knew. This was why Mr Reijers thought there should be something in a contract. What a person did with a cat he had sold to them was their business but if they did something nasty, he would not sell them another one. The only restriction he had on males was that they should mate only four females and this was because he thought it was not sensible to keep on using the same male as this reduced the gene pool. He did, however, not forbid them to

breed. Another problem was that if one had a male cat and people expected to have matings; he didn't take cats for mating as he did not want strange cats in his house neither should his male want to mate everything he saw. It was not because he wanted to keep his lines for himself,

The Secretary reported that the difference in Australian dollars in the Royal Canin sponsorship money in the current year was AU\$ 4,740.00 less than the previous year. She then went on to ask the delegates to read the new 'Sponsorship Agreement' which had been circulated. As the World Cat Congress was not registered Mr Reijers suggested that the Secretary's address should be used. It was confirmed that it was a five-year contract. Some small technical amendments were made in the wording. Mr Reijers thought it was a very fair Agreement. The President said that it would be nice if, at some time in the future, it were possible to negotiate with a Sponsor who would actually put the WCC logo on their product. Perhaps another company such as a litter company or a microchip one. Mr Reijers raised the point where Royal Canin would be granted free space in the hall and it was established that this was in the hall for the Open Meeting and not a show hall. Mrs Fisher moved to approve the Agreement with amendments, seconded by Mrs U'Ren and accepted unanimously. It was agreed that the Secretary should sign the Agreement on behalf of WCC.

Mrs Shingleton said that on behalf of her organization she would like to thank Mrs U'Ren and her team for giving the delegates a wonderful weekend and for all the hard work with particular thanks to Mr and Mrs Sargent . This sentiment was endorsed by all present and applauded.

Mrs U'Ren said it had been an honour to have the delegates there in Melbourne, she knew that the exhibitors had really enjoyed the opportunity of meeting people who had previously been only names to them. She thanked the delegates for taking the time and for traveling so far. She was hugely indebted to Mr and Mrs Sargent and the rest of a wonderful team.

Mr Reijers said also special thanks to Mr U'Ren who had not only judged at the show, but had also driven the delegates back and forth to the show hall and other destinations. Mr U'Ren then asked if anybody would like to go anywhere the next day as he needed to know about the hire of the bus. The President also reminded people about going on a joint dinner that evening when Mr U'Ren would pick everybody up at 7 p.m. from the hotel.

The President, in winding up the meeting, said she thought it had probably been the most productive meeting she had known in the Congress and she thanked Mrs Fisher for putting together the white paper and conducting the consequent discussion, which had put the questions correctly and drawn out the answers. She thought that was indeed a gift.

The meeting closed at 5.30 p.m.

Ms Pam DelaBar (President of WCC, delegate of CFA and in the chair)

Mrs Lesley Morgan Blythe (Delegate of ACF Inc.)

Mrs Cheryle U'Ren (Delegate of CCC of A)

Mr Eric Reijers (Delegate of FIFe)

Mrs Betty Shingleton (Delegate of GCCF)

Mrs Chris Lowe (Delegate of NZCF)

Mrs Ingrid de Wet (Delegate of SACC)

Mrs Vickie Fisher (Delegate of TICA)

Mrs Cornelia Hungerecker (Delegate of WCF)