

Minutes of the 47th Annual General Meeting of the New Zealand Cat Fancy Incorporated, held Saturday 12th May 2018, at the Plaza Hotel, 40-44 Oriental Parade Wellington

Welcome

Health & Safety briefing from Janice

Chair: Housekeeping. Phones on silent or off please. All members have speaking rights here I encourage everybody to speak. We have Peter Davidson who will present a demonstration immediately following lunch. Confirmed that all present at the meeting are members of NZCF. The purpose of the recorder is to enable the Secretary to complete the minutes and then the recording is destroyed.

Item 1 Attendance & Apologies

- **Roll Call** – in attendance

Chair: Jane Webster

Secretary: Chris Lowe

Treasurer: Marion Petley

Executive: Debs Armishaw, David Colley, Janice Davey, Diane Holtom, Jo Woodrow

Delegates:

Ian Gray	Jan Gray
Emma Kimberley	Alex Ladyman
Sue Lane	Dianne LeBas
Kay McArthur	Colleen McCready
Bronwyn Main	Linda Morgan
Barbie Muller	Lyall Payne
Marie Prendergast	Maree Roy
Sheree Russell	Ross Townshend
Vicki Walls	Cathy Webb
Christine Yeung	Mushfik Yeung
Judy Wereta	

Honorary Members: Kathryn Dalziel, Peter Davidson

- **Apologies:**

Sue Gordon	Sue Ford
Roy Griffiths	Lew Clarke
Lyn Clarke	Gaynor Saxon

Chair / Lyall Payne: “That the apologies are accepted.”

Carried

- Voting strength: 31 delegates holding 179 proxy votes + postal = 194 (constitutional remits and meeting procedure)
- Voting strength: 178 (general remits)

Item 2 Election Result

In accordance with Constitutional Clause 21.10 (a)

Chair: The candidates (apart from one who is not in attendance) have been advised – I would just like to thank you all for standing for election, it is a real passion of mine that the NZCF is best served by having an election enforced by numbers standing. This makes the choice of the NZCF quite clear.

Elected are:

Sheree Russell 127 (3 year term)
Alex Ladyman 108 (2 year term)

Marie Prendergast 116 (3 year term)
Jo Woodrow 107 (1 year term)

Next Highest Polling Candidates:

Ross Townshend 92
Cathy Webb 80

Lyall Payne 88
Shirley Stephenson 21

Item 3 Matters arising from the minutes of the 46th AGM 2017

• **Corrections to the 46th AGM Minutes**

Page 2 – middle Marie to read Maree

Page 6 discussion: items, 1st bullet point - underutilisation to read under-utilisation
9th bullet point EC “band” about to read bandied

Page 10, 3rd line - nobody one word

• **No Matters Arising**

Ian / Janice: “That the Minutes of the NZCF 2017 AGM as amended be accepted as a true & correct record of the meeting.” ***Carried***

Item 4 Chairpersons Report: Jane Webster

Chair: “That the Chair & PM reports be taken as read.” ***Carried***

I think we are making positive changes and some of the things we have done we are putting in review dates – sometimes you can see a solution but if it does not pan out we have the ability to review to make sure it is working.

The establishment of the Breeders/Registration PM is one of the significant changes that we have made as we have not had a specific person responsible for breeders support. Breeders are the core of what we do and why we do it. It is a very big portfolio again it has a review in 1 year. The other change, of course, is removal of portfolio manager responsibility from the chair.

The Auditor also advised that consideration needs to be given to how we send out by post the AGM documents this could be done electronically.

Thank you to all the workers and volunteers and would just like to reaffirm when people are rude or hostile in their emails or phone calls it undermines the motivation you have to do the job; you need to be polite. I am sure that the people in this room are not rude when dealing with Officers and Officials - it would be great if you would all do that.

The makeup of the EC does change over the three year term and I am very pleased to say that this EC has been the best of the three year term that I have worked with.

Lyall / Jo “That the Chair’s report be accepted.”

**Carried
(Bronwyn: requested abstention noted)**

Item 5 Portfolio Managers Reports

The reports of the remaining members of the Executive Council, particularly in terms of the immediate past year and how that affects the NZCF plan for the next 5 years.

(a) Business Administration and Finance: Diane Holtom

Lyall: I would request that you withdraw one word from your report – because of two of our disgruntled members – is a subjective term. PM agreed to amended the report to read “two of our members”

Sally requested a report on what that statement is all about, expressing a concern about the \$9500 spent on legal expenses. This was referred to the Chair to respond.

Chair: We are bound by confidentiality agreement which puts EC in a difficult position particularly when we are reporting, and more so if there is a high level of conflict in the cat fancy as there is at the moment. As the historian I am always aware that the loss of the NZGCCF came about from what happened at an AGM and I have invited the NZCF lawyer to be here today. The bonus of having her here is that the EC are very constrained by the confidentiality agreement but we are happy for the NZCF lawyer to discuss things with the meeting. The EC have spent a majority of their time dealing with disputes and discipline.

Lyall: I totally appreciate the position that you are in, being able to explain about the NZCF lawyer. This is unheard of – I think it is an important point to make and I assume to allow that to happen you have made her an honorary member but that in itself surely is a conflict of interest as the NZCF lawyer. This is an extraordinary move to invite the legal adviser to be here, and I am ill at ease at making her a honorary member to be here.

Kathryn Dalziel (Taylor Shaw) extended her thanks for the opportunity to address the meeting and advised that she didn’t need an honorary membership to attend as the New Zealand Bill of Rights allows anybody the right to have a lawyer present and further that she was absolutely here to offer the assistance to the Society.

Kathryn: There has been a need to be involved with members, privacy act matters, personal information, disclosure, membership, disciplinary – and there is also currently a judicial review that is with the insurer at the moment. In a very unusual position the insurer has read Taylor Shaw’s response and they are in support of me remaining as the lawyer instead of going to a panel. This is a society which wants to move on towards meeting the values of the organization and if there was an enquiry as to an issue raised that I can assist the members with, that is why I am here at the meeting. We can work through what should be or should not be disclosed.

Bronwyn to the Chair: That you invited Kathryn here as an honorary member – is she charging NZCF for this, or is it *pro bono*?

Chair: Kathryn is charging for this attendance - I would reiterate the protection of the organization at the time of high conflict is the motivation to have Kathryn here.

Ross: We can confirm that the actions are unresolved and that the action is heading for High Court judicial review and that these costs will be higher than the insurers anticipate them to be – so the conflict continues.

Kathryn: Thank you Ross I can confirm that the proceeding is continuing. The easiest way to explain that is that it could not simply be concluded. The EC and insurer hope that it will be settled but, if it cannot, it will be defended and the insurer will fully fund that to be defended.

Ian: Wishing to clarify this to help answer the first member's question - How many recommendations have you had to withdraw from legal proceedings and settlement that have not been accepted by EC?

Chair: I can assure you that the EC have followed legal advice at every step - that is the only thing we can do as guardians of the organization. There is nothing else that we can do, and if you would like to confirm that with Kathryn please do.

Ian: The question is how many recommendations that you had to settle have been taken on board and confirmed and decided not to settle.

Chair: None.

Ian: I am sorry that is not true.

Diane: That could be turned around how many times have they offered a settlement.

Ian: No! Not at all. It is how many times have they been offered a settlement and simply not taken.

Chair: Ian, please, I am going to hand this over to Kathryn. It sounds like a semantic argument and I do not think I can answer that. As you do not feel I can give you the answer that you want so I am going to hand it over to Kathryn.

Lyll: Point of order – that is a question that the EC can answer.

Chair: I have.

Lyll: No you haven't.

Chair: My answer is none.

Lyll: I want this supported by a statement in the minutes, you are misleading the membership.

The question was passed to Kathryn.

Kathryn: I am not aware of any recommendations and anyway, at the end of the day, you should know that the discussion or legal advice is fully reviewed by the insurer and so when you contact your insurer and using insurer's money subrogation applies. The other lawyer will know that the insurer is part of the decision as to how these matters are managed so the Executive Council has the benefit of all the info and arguments in the settlement agreement - it is not as simple as just saying it is settled without knowing the terms and basis of what the settlement is all about.

Ian: Madam Chair, I have a point to be made and I made it quite clear that I have had a conversation with the solicitor for NZCF during that conversation it was made quite clear to me that there was going to be a recommendation to not to proceed with one particular action. That is not what you are saying the council has received, and I don't believe that the council has made any decision. I don't believe it, sorry.

Chair: I will happily reiterate that when legal advice has been received we have followed that.

Ian: The recommendation was not to proceed.

Kathryn: The NZCF did not institute any proceedings what-so-ever, they are defending proceedings.

Chair: I would like to move on as I do not think we are achieving anything.

Ross: There is no contingent liability in the accounts or provision or any budget for this continued litigation. I ask is that 100% funded by the insurer? If that is the case, why is there \$9,000 plus shown as an insurance claim.

Diane: Some of these relate to different claims.

Clarified by Marion that there is a balance of \$2550 which is the net of the legal fees, less the insurance claim.

***Diane / Barbie: "That the amended report be accepted." Carried
Ian, Kay, Ross, Judy, Bronwyn requested
non-acceptance of the report to be noted***

Lyll: I would just like to point out that you are not necessarily endorsing statements in the report.

Chair: You are accepting the report, not necessarily agreeing to it. This has been pointed out at previous AGMs.

Debs: Out of order.

Lyll: It is not out of order it is an absolute statement of fact.

(b) Breed Standards Advisory Council (BSAC): Jane Webster

Jane: Without a doubt the BSAC has suffered somewhat by my attention to other things.

Lyll / Christine: "that the report be accepted." Carried

(c) Information Technology (IT): Debs Armishaw

The IT Manager Peter Davidson will give a demonstration (after lunch) of the changes that have been made on the ROCAP system in general.

Lyall: There were concerns around security of the online voting and what plans there may be in the future – at present all someone needs to do is know someone's membership number to vote on their behalf – which is not that secure and wonder if there are any plans to perhaps have a pin number on a phone or something like that to help the security.

Debs: I trust the integrity of the membership not to do what you suggested, but would ask Peter to address your concerns.

Peter: The online voting was originally given to me pretty quickly so was a quick put together and then updated this year – there will be some more suggested updates put in place for next year and later on today we are looking at having a proper registration page to have membership number and it will have to have a return email reference to confirm registration so that will be a onetime process which will create a onetime login which will then allow you to complete whatever it is on the site - in this case vote it is being addressed further on down the track. It is not as secure or perfect. Those from the first round did not know the membership numbers were – names and numbers are not as accurate as it could be. By putting in your email address and it will email back to you a link confirmation to allow you to proceed to create a user name and password.

That will also be used for registrations and transfers. It only takes you to the voting at the moment - online registrations, will bring up all your details. There is a lot of other stuff; the database is not as accurate so there is likely to be some pain for the members until such time that the program is complete.

Chair: I would just like to make a comment that our returning officer does a lot of checking who votes, both online and postal. We have seen a huge increase in voting it has made it so easy for people to vote which is a step in the right direction for NZCF and if each year it incrementally improves that is not a reason to slow down on the development.

Peter: There is a level of security in that it does not allow you to attempt to vote more than once. It tells you that you have already voted.

Debs: The only person who sees the online voting is Peter – he sends results directly to the returning officer and nothing past the terminating of the voting procedure is kept. Nobody on EC has that access.

The online gateway will allow you to renew your membership, registrations, voting further down the track hoping to incorporate the kitten message board and also allow you to do breeders advertising – once we get to that stage – graphic design will be needed to improve the website.

Ian: Are you going to include judges' assignments so that a club can register an assignment on line.

Debs: Peter is about to do some training in LMS (learning management system). Clubs would have the same registration process as any member – online, you fill out the contract. Peter has been tasked with many changes in the future.

Peter: We will be going from a heavily manual system to a heavily electronic based system.

Chair: Marion will confirm that postage is going up the more we can save the members money the long term by putting AGM voting online, and the ability to engage members electronically will save us time and money down the track.

Lyall: Let us appreciate step by step. What has been achieved in the IT area? I have heard years of what IT was going to deliver and it has failed on so many of them so let's appreciate what we are getting done.

Peter: I remember some time back when ROCAP was first shown at a number of National shows and when taking over it, it was like a 1970s horse still trying to run in 2018. The IT industry has moved on - what I am doing with the programming and website – the vision is to give back the control to EC members Portfolio Managers. I appreciate a lot of promises have been made without moving forward.

Debs / Diane: "That the IT report be accepted."

Carried

(d) Judges Portfolio: David Colley

Lyall extended his thanks to David and conveyed that he didn't believe that he had experienced the efficiency and helpfulness in this position that there is now.

Received with acclamation.

Handlers and stewards - there is a plan to run one this year, centrally in the North Island. It was confirmed that there will be an element of practical assessment. It is not intended to place a time limit on the qualification – mainly because it is hard enough to get people to help.

Barbie: Some concern was expressed around the 50% New Zealand judges at NZCF shows. It is sometimes very difficult on a cost prospective when we want to use All Breeds judges. It is difficult and costly especially if we have to appoint a Shorthair and a Longhair judge.

Lyall: The EC have imposed no time limit on that – little bit bizarre. It would be quite good to have a straw poll on this.

Chair: We are just discussing the report it could come up as General Business. Clubs are entirely welcome to put in submissions as every submission that goes to the EC is agonized over. There are a lot of show secretaries here in this room and the EC will welcome submissions from Clubs. I am not trying to push this away – we are always interested in feedback.

Christine: I am concerned that it appears that NZCF are not going to run a judges school anytime soon. It is disappointing that for myself I am the wanting to extend my license to All Breeds. The NZCF has run a school in the past for one Longhair person.

David: I am mindful that we are short of All Breeds judges.

Debs: Christine is quite correct there was a school run for one Longhair student and the EC at the February 2016 meeting revised the rule removing the number of people required before a school can be convened. All is needed is a submission via the portfolio manager to create that dispensation.

David confirmed that there are significant updates needed to the Judges Manual, and that submissions will be called for judges' feedback. Jane (Governance Documents Officer) has offered to assist with the rewrite of the manual. However when the draft rewrite was presented two years ago only one response was received, so it is important that judges do make submissions.

David: On the negative side what is the point of having codes of conduct and rules and people are seriously out of control you only have to look at the wilful or blatant offending we are dealing with. We need an organization that functions and flows easily and gently and people are not criticized for doing jobs they are doing and on the other side people are being condemned for doing things they are doing – it is time the organization got behind people that work tirelessly for putting on a fantastic show – this has to stop.

Received with acclamation.

Lyall / Debs: “That the report is accepted.”

Carried

(e) Registrations Portfolio Report: Debs Armishaw

In 2017 there was an outstanding matter regarding outclassing of kittens at shows. Because there are often issues with kittens who have been registered with incorrect colours we need a system to make sure that exhibitors are not wasting their money showing and having their kittens technically outclassed because they are the wrong colour. A change needs to be put to the Registration Rule 15.2.2 to allow for colour changes to be completed on the day of the show, with the kittens then being able to compete under the new classification.

This will be placed on the agenda for the August EC meeting.

Debs / Jo: “That the report be accepted.”

Carried

(f) Shows Portfolio: Janice Davey

Ian: There are a number of matters that are not in the report. There were a number of complaints raised during the year. There were complaints that you lodged after a show, after the time limit had expired, without clubs being given an opportunity to participate. I believe there was complaint material withheld – there are omissions. There were considerable delays in getting the National Show contract in place.

Janice: Regarding the complaints procedure – I do not know some of the particulars that you are mentioning. Even though they have occurred at shows – I have not made those decisions as far as I am aware. They do not go into my report. The National Show contract was signed off by you (as Chair) and me, with the club so I am not aware of what issues there are regarding that.

Ian: I am not happy with your report.

Janice: Just to confirm following on from the Palmerston North remit at the 2017 AGM the new points system is in place although they do not currently show on Joan’s summary but Peter will be bringing this up in his report. The Honours Registrar is calculating the new points.

Bronwyn: Am I correct in thinking that when a cat has achieved Gold status that the points will continue to accumulate so you will get a lot of cats that are being shown now and once this kicks in they will have a leap in their titles?

Janice confirmed that the system is cumulative and will happen when the database recognizes the updates. Peter is working with Joan on this matter.

Janice/ Linda: “That the report be accepted.”

**Carried
Ian noted against**

(g) Publications & Marketing: Jo Woodrow

Jo conveyed her amazement at the amount of work that is done in the background to produce a good magazine and thanked Gaynor and Marion for their support and assistance when she was taking on the portfolio manager’s role.

There was discussion regarding the ongoing likelihood of producing Flash Cats in an electronic format – this will be part of the IT upgrade. This may also be driven by the huge increases in postal costs which may move ahead the online process on a lot of things.

Jo / Janice: “That the report be accepted.”

Carried

Item 6 Treasurers Report: Marion Petley

Part of the budgeting process is that the key thing is just the numbers game – when we have a full and family membership they are the breeders which impacts on the registration numbers and they also impact a little impact on the shows. Associate members impact on the shows. Affiliate membership is down to 26 clubs – they are really the key in that they are the ones that run the shows.

We have four main income streams; members, publications, registrations, and shows. Our three key revenue streams comes from registrations, shows, and the third stream is the membership fees.

A firm message to the incoming EC members they need to be considering all the tasks, the key is the membership - look after the membership.

Ian: What an absolutely brilliant job that you do. You are a little bit of gold amongst a lot of other things.

Jane: That is pretty much what the auditor said as well.

Lyll: Just a comment to add to that I would like to point out we are just over \$100k outfit and a national cat organisation. The national dog organisation is \$1million industry and I would like to put that challenge to the EC as to why.

Marion: The total of the schedular payments remains at the same level they have been since 2013, i.e., \$43,920 or 33.3% of our income.

Chair: Many of our officers do not get payments. There are a large number of positons that remain unpaid and although we do pay some of our people for the extensive work that they do, a number of our people do not get paid. The honoraria were reduced and some roles were combined since 2013. There has been an effort to make sure they do not overtake the income flow.

Discussion followed regarding the possible differences in the management of the ‘dog world’ versus the cat fancy.

Chris: Candidates have campaigned on the loss of membership however people die and breeders retire. There is natural attrition to incorporate. Look at the new EC they are all

kids they can all be my kids it is wonderful. In an aging hobby with the lack of young people coming through we have to work twice as hard to work on those people for a long term future.

Marion / Ian: "That the financial statements for year ending 31/12/2017 be accepted." **Carried**

Budget Discussion:

- Membership numbers
- 115 show rings - slightly down on previous two years
- Postage increase discussed. A4 sized envelopes for Flash Cats, 415 copies x 4 times a year with an upcoming increase of 60 cents per item sent. We will have to put up some of the membership fees. Some of the fees might need to go up by \$3.00.
- Maybe Flash Cats becomes a choice or we not produce it at all.
- The WCC the figure may be adjusted due to an insurance claim.
- AGM expenses for 2018 are very high 32 x \$16 (morning/afternoon tea).

Lyall: This looks like 'same old, same old' to me I expect this Executive to make some serious management decisions.

Discussion:

- Whether or not we need to send AGM documents by post.
- NZCF do currently have rules in the constitution that we are bound to be posting certain items out to members so the rules need to be addressed.
- Breeders could be sent registrations / transfer copies in one posting or annually, though there is a rule that states that they are sent out to the new owner.
- Flash Cats in electronic form only?

Debs advised that there are steps within the new IT work to move away from posting items. Sending a pdf to the new owner, etc. Another saving would be on the special watermark registration paper.

Marion /Janice: "That the 2018 AGM of the NZCF accepts the 2018 Budget as presented and that the 2019 forecast is endorsed." **Carried**
(Barbie abstention noted)

In accordance with Constitutional Clause 20.1

Marion / Jan: "That the 2018 AGM of the NZCF approves the appointment of Fluker Denton Ltd of Levin to carry out the audit of the NZ Cat Fancy Inc. year-end financial statements for the year-ending 31/12/18." **Carried**

Item 7 Proposed Constitutional Amendments

7.1C

Debs / Janice:

"THAT the following be added as para 11.2 of the Constitution (and the existing para 11.2 and subsequent paras are renumbered):

11.2 Removal by majority vote must meet the following criteria:

- a. The Executive Council member being removed must have been advised of the intention to vote to remove at least 14 days before the vote,**
-

advised of the reasons for it, and have been invited to submit a response to be considered.

b. The reasons for such a vote must be serious misconduct (including breaches of confidentiality) or significant and/or sustained non-performance of Executive Council duties.

c. The vote may only occur at a face-to-face meeting or teleconference. The member being removed is entitled to be present (with a support person if desired).”

Chair: This did open up the possibility of voting to remove someone to bring on the next highest polling candidate. We have had problems with this before and unconstitutional decisions have been made. It was highlighted in 2015 that there was still a hole in our process. The current wording was absolutely open to allow for people to vote to bring on the next highest polling candidate. This issue was identified in 2015 as a weakness in our process.

Lyll: The EC have addressed the number of days but don't think that the reason why has been addressed. It says serious misconduct - all these subjective terms as to what has to be defined as significant. I am not a fan of EC voting out one of their people of each one of you. Only the voting membership should take those people away - if you have a poor performance issue.

Jo: So how would you propose that the membership is involved in that decision?

Lyll: I am just speaking to this remit.

Chair: Lyll it was you and me who raised this matter at the 2015 AGM identifying that subpara b. is weak. I am not taking your point because in 2015 you wanted there to be guidelines and limits but now you are saying you want the membership to be able to vote members off.

Ian: Can I ask that the EC consider withdrawing the remit and taking it back to reconsider the definitive statements as to how to measure and define - guided better. Maybe the EC has not had time to consider this.

Chair: We would need the leave of the meeting to withdraw it and I do not believe that we have had enough time to discuss this - I would be uncomfortable with withdrawing it. Lyll has concerns about the weakness - is that major? You are essentially happy with a couple of the clauses and we have postal votes in hand on this. You can discuss this in the meeting but you cannot affect the postal votes.

Kathryn: 11.2c serious misconduct is in many constitutions, breaches of confidentiality has to be absolutely serious. Process must be made very clear an opportunity to answer the allegation and provide a response is a matter of law natural justice. But it does need to be spelt out.

Barbie: Essentially by withdrawing it you are taking it back to that "an EC member may be withdrawn by a majority vote" which is going completely against what this remit is actually calling for. As Kathryn said the proposed Constitution implies that if that went to legal litigation the lawyers would read it that way - this is a huge step forward.

Chair: We can take an amendment to this that does not alter the intent. Subpara a. covers the advising - the time limit so they cannot be ambushed -, the reasons, and response. EC have made an effort to have a process that is fair. It cannot be a long process. The intent is fairly clear.

Discussion:

- Suggest for para c the member will be given an opportunity to answer “On reasonable notice at either a face to face meeting or teleconference....etc.”
- Covered in clause a; difficulty is that you have a process.
- The difference between responsibility and considered decision. The response should be considered at a face-to-face meeting. (Optional in writing or in person.)

Ian / Marion: “That this matter be left on the table”

Carried

Adjournment for lunch 12.30 – 1.15

IT Management Presentation: Peter Davidson

Some of the changes I have already done on the pages as there were hard coded buttons which will now update based on the database. Events calendar is now updating automatically. Back-end of the database needs more work.

- Screen displays were used to demonstrate issues that the registrars have.
- Duplicate handling of all information (i.e., memberships).
- Moving forward members will all end up receiving a login page, confirm user name, login and they will come into the admin panel. From there, there are main points of interest icon, messages, etc. EC members will be able to use this to send messages directly to registrars.
- Basic dashboard information can be changed dynamically, driven by the role that they are doing such as the number of registrations that have been done for the week, month etc.
- Registrars would get a minimum 4 - 5 per day (this is a huge workload for Kaye). Avon is now doing the importations which are a big area of concern as this is a bit of a mission to do at the moment.
- Consideration should be given to the adoption of EMS codes. Currently the NZCF codes are not matching up with the universal codes of EMS so the Registrars have to manually go in and select breed colour code.

Chair: NZCF has not made the decision to move to EMS coding at this stage – it is in the database but we are still using NZCF codes.

Peter: As the database does end up rejecting colours – we can redress that. ROCAP database is in table format but some of the tables have multiple pieces of data which is not really good. Registrars are already using this page, and they can at least make changes which gives the person the ability to sort errors rather than sending each change to the IT contractor.

- Judges and stewards/handlers pages will also feature, feedback will be needed from those using this feature.
- Role-based access; established of level 1 - 3 of each user to access and change the data. Some levels would be read only, others actively going in and changing, and an admin level (IT contractor only).
- Judges contracts – clubs could do these on the database.
- Show management – currently there are too many variables as to the how each user is putting the spread sheet together, and there are also issues with 2013 v 2016 versions of Access being used. A simple spelling mistake can ruin the import of the information – this is of major concern to Joan Hill.
- Registration page – you will not have to re-enter information.
- Microchip numbers have been included into the transfers.
- Feedback requested on the online registration form.

- There will still be a mechanism for breeders who do not wish to utilise the online systems.
- Manual over-rides will be in place.

Presentation received with acclamation.

Item 7 Proposed Constitutional Amendments (cont.)

7.1C (cont.)

Debs / Janice: “That the motion be amended.”

Amended motion (prepared by Kathryn Dalziel):

“THAT the following be added as para 11.2 of the Constitution (and the existing para 11.2 and subsequent paras are renumbered):

11.2 Removal by majority vote must meet the following criteria:

(a) At least 14 days prior to such a vote, the Executive Council member that is proposed to be removed must receive notice as follows:

(i) the proposed motion to remove the Executive Council Member;

(ii) the reasons why it is proposed to remove the Executive Council member and any information upon which the Executive Council will make the decision;

(iii) the date and time of the meeting to determine the motion which may be at a face-to-face meeting or teleconference at the Executive Councils discretion. The Executive Council member who is the subject of the proposed motion may submit a response in writing instead of attending the meeting or in advance of the meeting.

(iv) the right of the Executive Council Member who is the subject of the proposed motion to have representation and/or support at the meeting.

(b) The reasons for such a vote must be serious misconduct (including breaches of confidentiality) or significant and /or sustained non-performance of Executive Council duties.

Secretary: Clarification requested - if you move an amendment to a Constitutional remit does that amendment still have to be 75% in favour?

This was confirmed from the floor.

Maree asked if Kathryn could give the meeting some legality about the term significant or non-performance. It is an objective statement – significant and sustained.

Kathryn: Whenever we draft these things there is a general statement in that it has to be significant or sustained non-performance of EC duties. The EC would have to assess that at the end of the day they would have to look at the role of the EC that would be the duties that they would be expected to do - delegated duties, e.g., treasurer not providing a report for each meeting. Alternatively it is based on the values and objects, with some

wonderful words for the purpose in the constitution as well as acting with integrity, honesty, and respect. They can make that decision – that is an equally acceptable way to draft it. If it does not cover all options it is better to leave it general.

Amendment Passed 82.9%	160	33	0
Substantive Motion Passed 78.8%	152	37	4

7.2C

Janice / Debs:

“THAT para 21.2 of the Constitution be amended to read:

21.2 The Annual General Meeting shall be held no later than 6 months after the end of the financial year. The Executive Council shall determine when and where the NZCF shall meet but the second full weekend falling in May each year shall be reserved for the use of Annual General Meeting.”

Motion Passed 82.9%	160	33	0
--------------------------------------	------------	-----------	----------

7.3C

Janice / Marion:

“THAT para 23.7 of the Constitution be amended to read:

23.7 Executive Council meetings may be conducted:

- a. at a venue specified by the Executive Council face-to-face, or if not determined at the prior meeting then by the Secretary giving the Executive Council not less than 48 hours’ notice, by telephone call, or email message, or in writing, or other media; or**
- b. by the use of a telephone or video conference call or other media whereby all the Executive Council may be deemed to have heard what each attendee is saying; or**
- c. by use of email to obtain a vote, whereby all Executive Council voting members may be deemed to have read what each Executive Council member has written and acknowledge that by using a voting format to record their decision.”**

Chair: When you hold a business meeting over from February to August it is a very large gap in our day-to-day business; this allows business to be on-going all the time.

Kathryn: It could be clarified more that ‘the meeting’ can be by email as is defined in the constitution whereby the Secretary will set up the meeting – but it might recognised that there is going to be an exchange and any matters or motions are discussed during that time.

Lyll: while I agree with the proposal that has just been made that is not what this remit is about, it is not the intent of this remit – email voting this is what this is about although I support an email meeting I have been instructed by my people it is about email voting. That is not what is on this paper.

Kathryn I think that you are quite right as the voting is earlier on in the section so if you wanted to change the voting the intent of the Executive Council is exactly what I am proposing. The place where they would put it contemplates a third type of meeting but if you are right it would need to go into the section were the voting is mentioned.

Debs / Jo: "That the motion be amended."

Amended motion (prepared by Kathryn Dalziel):

- (c) **by email, whereby the Secretary will set a time for the email meeting (e.g. 8 hours on 12th May (year) starting at 3.00 pm) in which nay matters or motions are discussed by email which must be sent around all Executive Council members participating in the meeting. It is deemed that by the sending of an email to the last notified email address of an Executive Council member, the email is read unless otherwise notified by an Executive Council member participating in the meeting.**

Lyll: I am asking for a ruling on the intent – I disagree this is about an email meeting and this is about the voting.

Chair: As I believe this has been moved and seconded we have the right to discuss this. I only need to declare it out of order if the intent has been changed – it affects the postal vote and the direction of your proxy votes.

Lyll: Can you state why, and can we have that recorded in the minutes please.

Chair: The purpose of 'obtaining a vote' was to allow the business of the EC move on in a more even-handed way without a teleconference and the changed wording changing it from an email vote to an email meeting is formalising it in the way that the EC perhaps did not realise but Kathryn's wording clarifies. The clauses all fall under the section that is about meetings, so it is a correction to the wording not to the intent – the intent was as the rationale states, that we would use email as a method to obtaining a decision and whether it is a meeting or a less structured vote, I do not regard that as a change of intent.

Ian: For the purpose of clarifying you are ruling that it is designed to call a meeting?

Chair: The use of email to call a meeting is the same as using a teleconference for that purpose.

Jo: And at that meeting a decision can be made by a vote.

David: If you are going to vote you have to be in a meeting.

Debs spoke to the amendment – intent to allow the EC to conduct meetings outside the current face-to-face / teleconference due to the escalating costs. Moving forward this method will allow us to hold an email meeting to conduct the day-to-day running of the cat fancy and hopefully not add extra cost to the running of the business.

Dianne: I have been instructed to vote in a certain way – now you are implying that it is about email meeting rather than emailing voting – perhaps the EC should have sought legal advice before submitting it to the AGM.

Chair: All of our remits do not go to the lawyer as the legal costs will simply blow out amazingly. We are a group of quite ordinary people trying to put in place a very reasonable rule that will help the organisation going forward. We genuinely could - and

we have in a number of cases this year - run things by the lawyers but it is prohibitively expensive, so the reason that we have Kathryn's advice on this is that we already have her here today.

Lyll: One is already on the table for further legal advice and one has been altered with legal advice I think it would be very wise to put EC constitutional remits past the lawyer before they are put to the membership at an AGM.

Ross: I cannot just understand why you need this rule you can send yourself emails until you are blue in the face. Why do we just keep making rules after rules half of which we never put in place, half of which we never regard. But that is beside the point, this does not need a change for you guys to make a decision.

Jo: Yes there is because it is to make a decision in a certain time. The constitution does not permit us to make a decision vote via email, it only allows face-to-face or teleconference and that is not always possible.

Lyll: What type of business is discussed are you likely to make a quick and wise decision?

Maree: In my opinion this is perfectly clear as to what the additional c. has to do (rationale gives a clear reason as to what is required) when a decision does not require a full meeting – I do not believe that the amendment is needed.

Diane: Cost of a teleconference – around about \$200-\$300 - email is free and there is always a written record.

Chair: We have had legal advice on this one and we should not ignore advice.

Ian: Clarification when the forms were sent out asking for proxy votes does the instructor say that there is room for a remit change?

It was confirmed they did.

Amendment Lost 66.8%	129	64	0
Motion Lost 65.8%	127	66	0

Lyll: Recommend that the EC bring this good work of Kathryn Dalziel back to the 2019 AGM with a well-worded remit.

7.4C

Janice / Barbie

“THAT para 5.1 l of General Rules & Policies be deleted and para 21.8 of the Constitution be amended to incorporate the requirements of both rules, so that para 21.8 will then read:

21.8 All NZCF meetings shall be chaired by the Chair. If the Chair is absent, the Vice-Chair shall chair the meeting. If the Vice-Chair is also absent, the NZCF shall elect another Council member to chair that meeting. Any person chairing an NZCF meeting has a casting vote (which shall be used to

preserve the status quo, in the event of an equality of votes) in addition to their right to vote as a member."

Lyall: Don't know why we are putting it into words at all. The Chair always uses the casting vote to retain the status quo.

Debs: This is used for all NZCF meetings - AGM & SGM – separated when the Constitution and General Rules and Policies were split. All we are doing is putting it back into where it should sit.

Ross: I just see this as another rule we don't need to have. I see it in conjunction with 7.1 which is defending people's right to stay on Executive Council.

Chair: Thank you for your comments Ross. This is a small alteration, just to have this included in the correct document.

Motion Lost 74.6%	144	49	
------------------------------------	------------	-----------	--

7.5C

David / Lyall:

"THAT para 12.4 of the Constitution and its sub paras, be amended to read:

12.4 Vacancies.

- a. If the position of any Executive Council member becomes vacant between NZCF meetings, the Executive Council shall appoint the person who was the next highest polling candidate for an Executive Council position at the last election. These appointments of the next highest polling candidate run for the unexpired term.***
- b. If no next highest polling candidate is available the Executive Council shall appoint another ordinary or life Member to the vacancy. These appointments to Executive Council vacancies run until the next AGM.***

Noted: Depending on when the vacancy occurs and how much term is remaining, the next highest polling candidate might serve as much as 3 years or as little as a few weeks (if the term of the person they are replacing was due to end at the next AGM).

If passed, this change will take effect from when the new Constitution is filed with the Registrar of Incorporated Societies, in accordance with para 27.5.

Lyall: I support this on the basis that people have put themselves up for a three year term this makes perfect sense.

Ian: Point of clarification – in the situation where there is no person to succeed as a result of attrition, you are saying that person they pick will stay on for three years.

Chair: No. Refer to subpara b. They would have to stand down at the next AGM as they have not been voted on by the membership.

Motion Passed 77.2%	149	43	
--------------------------------------	------------	-----------	--

Debs / Marion:

“THAT the following changes are made to Section 4. Types of Membership of the Constitution to clarify the position of associate members (with renumbering as required):

4.2 A member of the NZCF will either be an ordinary member, an affiliate member, an associate member, a junior member, or an honorary member.

4.3 An ordinary or affiliate member has the rights, privileges, recognition and responsibilities set out in this Constitution.

4.4 The classes of ordinary member are:

- a. full members; who having paid the required fees, subscription and levies are eligible to vote and is restricted to applicants whose primary place of residence is within New Zealand**
- b. family members; who having paid the required fees, subscription and levies are living at the same address of a full member, are a member of the full member's family (family member is as defined by current Family Laws in New Zealand), are aged 16 years or more, and who will have voting rights but will not receive any NZCF publications.**
- c. life members; longstanding members who have been acknowledged as having made significant contribution to the NZCF and have all the rights and privileges of full member (including the right to vote), but do not have to pay subscriptions, or levies.**

4.5 Associate members, having paid the required fees, subscription and levies, are not eligible to vote, cannot be granted nor use a NZCF prefix and cannot hold office in the NZCF.

4.6 Junior members, having paid the required fees, subscription and levies are under the age of sixteen years, they live in New Zealand, and have the same rights as an associate member.

and THAT the following changes are made where the Constitution refers to ‘an ordinary or a life member’ to reflect this change:

12.1 e. All nominations for Executive Council shall be restricted to persons who are:

- i. primarily resident within New Zealand; and**
- ii. an ordinary member of the NZCF with voting rights.**

12.4 b. If no next highest polling candidate is available the Executive Council shall appoint another ordinary member to the vacancy.

and THAT the equivalent amendments to the General Rules & Policies are made.”

Maree / Barbie:

“That 4.6 be amended to read ‘whose primary place of residence is within New Zealand’ instead of ‘they live in New Zealand’ to follow the wording used elsewhere.”

Amendment Passed 78.2%	151	40	2
Substantive Motion Lost 74.6%	144	47	2

Item 8 General Remits (other proposed motions)

8.1G

Debs / Denise:

“THAT the heading of paras 17.6 – 17.9 of Registration Rules be amended to read:

Sale and Rehoming

and that a new para, 17.6a be added before para 17.7 of Registration Rules which reads:

17.6a Where an ex-breeding cat is sold or gifted for rehoming, the cat:

- a. shall have received at least one current (within the preceding 12 months) vaccination against Panleukopenia, Rhinotracheitis, and Calicivirus and the vet’s certificate shall be provided by the breeder at the time of delivery of the cat;**
- b. shall not be showing signs of illness which may be considered infectious or contagious; and**
- c. shall be desexed prior to rehoming.”**

Barbie: Absolutely agree this is the correct intent – but do have issues with the requirement around vaccination within the preceding 12 months which are not the current vaccination protocols. Vet certificate to be changed to read the vaccination card or booklet. There should also be a stand down period for males to ensure that they are absolutely not able to sire kittens.

Jo / Barbie:

“That subpara c. be amended to read: ‘Females will be desexed prior to rehoming and males will desexed with a stand down period of 6 weeks.’ ”

Chair: Although there are a number of changes people would like this can go into our Registration Rules and can be changed by the EC based on a submission to them. This has only been brought to the AGM to give it a higher profile.

Kay read out a statement from Suzanne Gordon – she was happy with the remit in part only but expressed concerns with the vaccination protocols.

Lyll felt that meeting should stick with the wording as presented – the intention is quite clear that people who have no further intention to breed with the cat then rehoming is a good thing.

Ian: The writing of such rules should be as standards of practice, guidelines for sale of cats / kittens, etc. That can be part of a code of conduct.

Amendment Passed 97.8%	174	4	0
Substantive Motion Passed 94.4%	168	10	0

Passed with acclamation

Afternoon tea 3.30 to 3.50

8.2G

Debs / Janice:

“THAT para 5.1, subparas f. – i. of General Rules & Policies are amended are amended to allow for online voting on Constitutional remits as follows:

- f. Voting at all General Meetings shall be by a show of hands holding voting cards (unless a poll is demanded by at least 10% of the members present at the meeting who are entitled to vote). Members may cast their votes in person or appoint a proxy for changes to the constitution. Members may cast their vote by postal ballot, online voting, in person, or appoint a proxy.**
- g. Any eligible member not in attendance, and who has not nominated a proxy, must have returned their ballot with a postmark showing a date on or before the due date for ballots to be returned as shown on the ballot paper(s) for their vote by ballot to count, or have submitted their vote by online voting prior to the close of the online voting process for their vote to count.**
- h. Any member having already cast their vote by ballot or online voting may not be issued with a voting card on the day of the meeting. They may attend, may be called upon to speak and make motion or second a motion, but may not vote.**
- i. Votes by ballot or online voting shall be recorded prior to the meeting. The results of ballot counts cast on an item on the agenda shall not be made known until after a vote from the floor has been taken. Scrutineering (if any) of the ballot paper or online voting count shall be by whatever method is determined as appropriate by the Executive Council.”**

Bronwyn advised that Hamilton Cat Club (for whom proxy is held), although they are a ‘Yes,’ wish to qualify this with the words ‘electronic means’ to 12f to 12.i rather than online voting and wish to propose this as an amendment.

Debs: Clarification on the wording of what Hamilton Cat Club require. 8.2G with an amendment to the General Rules and Policies electronic is to marry up with the Constitution wording states 12.f and i ‘using electronic means’ to standardise voting – ‘h’ says electronic means.

Bronwyn / Kay (on behalf of Hamilton Cat Club):

“That ‘electronic means’ replaces ‘online voting’.”

Amendment Passed 97.2%	173	4	1
---	------------	----------	----------

Substantive Motion Passed 97.8%	174	3	1
--	------------	----------	----------

The Chair thanked Hamilton Cat Club for their amendment.

Debs / Maree: “That we take it as read that the remaining remits use the same amended terminology ‘vote by electronic means’.” **Carried**

8.3G

“THAT paras 5.2 j and 5.3 f of General Rules & Policies are amended to give timeframes for online voting as follows:

5.2 j. At least 28 days before the Annual General Meeting, the Secretary shall forward the agenda for the Annual General Meeting to the secretary of each club and to all members of the Executive Council. In addition, and with the assistance of the Treasurer, the Secretary shall also cause an agenda, any remits, and an alphabetical list, by type of office, of all eligible candidates for elected positions and any nominations for life membership, together with a ballot paper, to be sent to all eligible voting members of NZCF and they will be advised that voting by electronic means is open. The postal ballot paper or voting by electronic means shall be in such form as the Executive Council shall approve.

5.3 f. At least 14 days before the Special General Meeting, the Secretary shall forward the agenda for the Special General Meeting to each club and to all members of the Executive Council. In addition, and with the assistance of the treasurer, the Secretary shall also cause a ballot and a form for giving proxy, along with an agenda, to be sent to all eligible voting members of the NZCF and they will be advised that voting by electronic means is open.”

Motion Passed 97.8%	174	3	1
--------------------------------------	------------	----------	----------

8.4G

Debs / Janice:

“THAT para 5.1, subpara f. of General Rules & Policies is amended to remove a conflict with the Constitution as follows:

f. Voting at all General Meetings shall be by a show of hands holding voting cards (unless a poll is demanded by at least 10% of the members present at the meeting who are entitled to vote). For changes to the Constitution members may cast their votes in person, by postal ballot, voting by electronic means, or appoint a proxy. For other business members may cast their vote in person, or appoint a proxy.”

Motion Passed 98.3%	175	3	0
--------------------------------------	------------	----------	----------

8.5G

Debs / Jo:

“Change to the show bylaws to give N/S kittens a breeders award of merit to the neuter/spay cat section and one to the neuter/spay kitten section.”

This by-law if passed will come into effect at the start of the 2019 show season.

Debs: For a very long time we have had our neuter / spay cats and kittens lumped into one section for the Breeders Award. As a judge I have seen a number of excellent kittens on the bench in the neuter / spay section and it is not a fair playing field for them to have to compete against the adults.

Discussion:

- Neuter / spay class can be really small.
- Issued at the judge’s discretion.
- Think it should have a minimum number of exhibits.
- It is not a numbers game it is for quality.
- The club does not have the right to insist.
- It is an encouragement it is not always for exceptional cats.

Motion Passed 94.4%	168	10	
--------------------------------------	------------	-----------	--

8.6G

Sheree / Jan:

“That the Mid Island Cat Club proposes the NZ Cat Fancy Inc. membership hereby directs the Executive Council without delay to amend Rule 13 of the NZCF Show Bylaws by replacing Schedule D with the process circulated to all members.”

Chair: An amendment document has been provided by Ian which includes tracked changes relating to the Appendix D. I will give you a bit of a visual. *Holds up paper.* This gives me some concern as Chair as the amendment cannot substantially alter the remit

Ian: I am happy to run through the changes. It does not substantially change the remit. It is changing ring number 1 to the best of one ring only – in other words the best ring will count towards annual awards.

Chair: Ian, I will probably rule this out of order – but before you put this amendment to the meeting, which you are entitled to do, may I suggest you submit your changes to the EC for the next EC meeting because you will still have enough time left to get this in before the next show season.

Ian / Ross: “That the amendment be made.”

Ian: The amendment is from ring 1 being the sole ring to being the best you have in any one ring at a show. It simply gives you a number of opportunities to have being awarded points to your national awards for the year.

The Chair ruled amendment out of order as in her opinion it altered the intent of the remit.

Chair: I have made a suggestion to you so if the substantive motion passes you have been given a way forward for this.

Janice read an email submitted by Joan Hill, Honours Registrar:

“Feel free to say that I do not support either of the awards remits and I believe they are not workable. Should Mid-Island suggest that their remit had my support in any way I really would like that corrected. I am quite annoyed about the email(s) they circulated to clubs mentioning me (or Barbara Hill) and I conveyed that here at the 2 remit meetings I went to in Christchurch. I'd hate the Mid-Island one to get through if someone thought it had my support.”

Lyall: That is also very inappropriate to read that email out – it is hearsay.

Janice: This email has been provided by an officer of the Fancy as an item of concern.

Sally: I would like to comment on the two remits – I understand that they consider that there are serious anomalies regarding the awards. As it was Sacred Temples 20th Anniversary show I decided to show my entire boys. How many cats have beaten 15 cats of the same colour at a show? I have been accused of entering large numbers of cats to boost numbers. I have never owned 11 [entire] cats - they were 6 of my own and 5 of another breeders who had transferred her stock into my name because of personal circumstances simply to allow for the registering of kittens with the breeding season approaching. Those same cats would have been at the show anyway if circumstances at been different in that breeders name.

If the rings at Sacred Temple affected the annual awards to the extent that some are saying please explain how come Birman's don't win every year?

Motion Lost 83.1%	30	148	
------------------------------------	-----------	------------	--

Jane vacated the Chair; Debs assumed the Chair.

8.7G

Denise / Ian:

“That Show Bylaw Appendix D is amended by adding the underlined wording to D.3:

D.3. A set number of ring results are used in the calculations and that number is decided by the Executive Council from time to time. The best point scores from the set number of rings during the show season will be used to calculate placings in the NZCF Annual Awards at the end of the year. The total number of points are added together from the best placings, i.e., only the best scores from the set number of ring results will be used even if a cat has additional top ten placings. Except that no more than 3 ring results (or half the total number of ring results as decided by the Executive Council should they decide on an even number of ring results to be used to decide Annual Awards) obtained in a Single Breed ring may be used by any cat.”

It is where the whole ring is only one breed (specialists) and this is not intended to affect a colour-based club or any multi breed rings (for example the Burmese Club caters for other shorthair breeds) because those other breeds of cats cannot compete against other breeds in those rings.

Janice: It says single breed ring and 'leaving this up to the EC'. We have a working points system in place. I don't understand why you would be leaving it up to the EC.

Denise: The rationale says NZCF awards should reflect the best cats and kittens across all breeds that is cats that are competing against all cats. It does not mean they are competing against their own breed. If competing in one ring with the single breed ring only one of these rings are counted.

Janice: You are talking about specialist clubs therefore you are excluding clubs like Metro, NZ Siamese, etc, therefore believe this should be ruled out of order.

Chair: I cannot rule a substantive motion out of order – it must go to the vote.

Christine: NZ Burmese central we often have 5 rings with one ring for Burmese breed only.

Chris: Patches & Pointed are a specialist club based on colour. My club are concerned - are you then going to reflect that against a colour system as well?

Denise: No. Definitely did not want to take this to any multi-breed rings. Metro include several shorthair breeds. We are disadvantaging other breeds of cats that cannot compete in other rings at specialist clubs.

Lyll: No points system is going to be perfect the intent of both of these remits was to have a system to award cats that performed best over the entire show season. The intention of both was good (not perfect) but would rather see 7 or 8 rings. I am also disappointed that the chair did not stop the comment that supposedly came from Joan Hill it is hearsay and hope that you put that out of your minds.

Janice: It is presented by the Shows portfolio manager from of her Officers, by email, noting her concerns.

Jo: I can confirm that Joan Hill attended the AGM of CABCC and LHCB Association and she was very concerned that it appeared that she had agreed with the proposals.

Discussion:

- Would never take away the importance at winning at a specialist show.
- Winning at a specialist show is not the same as winning at an all breeds show.
- Annual awards are supposed to reflect the winnings over the whole season not a cat who has won well at one show.
- 3-4 times all breeds – when most of those points came from specialist single breeds shows (from the catalogue) bigger than a national
- Exhibitors feel they are missing out on the opportunity to have enough rings to compete against for the annual awards.

Chris: I think that NZCF should think about our future direction in showing especially our shows should all be all breeds they all should be Top 10. That is why you are all coming to the National next year which is only one ring.

Motion Lost 65.2%	62	116	
------------------------------------	-----------	------------	--

Jane resumed the chair.

Emma, Sue, Kay, & Judy left the meeting.

The chair thanked Kathryn Dalziel for her attendance today as her presence added value in a number of areas and allowed the members to hear from the lawyer directly, without any presumed 'EC filter'.

Kathryn replied that there was valuable input from the members and to keep up the good work.

Received with acclamation.

Item 9 Discussion & Approval of Plans

Discussion and approval of plans for the balance of the current and next five calendar years.

This is what the EC use the Business Plan for, to set out the direction and project work of the organization over the next five years.

Cathy: I wish to congratulate you on the Business Plan. A club of our size to have such a document set out as it is, is commendable.

Chair advised that credit should go to Roy Griffiths for setting the NZCF up with the document.

Ian / Jane: "That the 5 year plan be accepted."

Carried

Item 10 Any Other Business

The leave of the meeting is required to raise any general business. Would anybody like to raise, with leave of the meeting, any general business?

A presentation was made by the Secretary to the retiring EC Members:

Diane Holtom – "Not all who wander are lost - some know where the pub is" thanked for stepping up again when she was most needed.

Debs Armishaw – "Moo-ving-on" was thanked for her absolute dedication and the sharing of knowledge, be safe be happy on your next adventure.

Jane Webster - Story of Jane's life (cat and mouse / multi-tasking); thinking this card depicts life in balance. We were all very quick to learn your team leadership skills, your strength, your ability to look outside the square which was at times very large. We are sincerely sorry to lose you, however are grateful that you will continue to work alongside the organisation in your Governance Documents Officer & Historian roles.

Responses:

Debs: I have been given an awesome opportunity to live and work in Australia through an internal transfer with the company I currently work with. I am passionate about this

organisation, thank you to the EC for the support over the last three years in particular. I appreciate the support I have had from the members, and as a judge and look forward to catching up with you on the judging circuit. Sincere good wishes to the incoming EC.

David: Speaking for myself and Janice – when Jane stepped into the position the performance and understanding that was needed with literally three people with the honour and respect that we have gained of each other, and we are bound by confidentiality and I can honestly say we begged Jane to stay but she has another life. She has been a god-send.

Jane: Thank you for all those who have attended today and those who stood for election. as that has been an absolute passion of mine. Remember that we do not all have to agree - I have said that time and time again. A split vote is not a failure; it simply means that we have other opinions which is good so we do not have one person making all the decisions. Even when we come here and have remits that don't make it, and having a disagreement about them. It is fantastic to see so many people at an AGM - we want people here. Going forward, please encourage people to stand for EC – and to stand for appointed positions, so that succession training can be put in place. Put forward submissions ... write that idea down ... give us your thoughts about a solution. We appreciate all the feedback that we get, even when the minutes go out.

Meeting declared closed at 5.08 pm

Chris M Lowe
Secretary NZCF

Jane Webster

Jane Webster
Executive Council Chair