

NAFA® Board of Directors Meeting, August 27-28, 2011, Las Vegas - Nevada - Agenda:

Officers' Reports

Chair's Comments:

Executive Director's Comments

Treasurer's Report

Secretary's Report

Standing Committee Reports

Marketing Committee:

- Website - CanAm and NAFA Champions

Finance:

- Budget

Judges Committee:

- C.17/C.18 - add number of dogs measured
- Inside Interference
- John Fairbairn, Murphy TX - Approved to Supervising
- Peter Wesdyk, McLean SK - Approved to Supervising
- Dianna Jaynes, Napanee ON - Provisional to Approved

Rules Committee:

- Knocked jumps
- Breed challenge process
- Definition of "course"
- Request for change to aggression excusal to give judge option to excuse dog for weekend, rather than just tournament
- Inside interference

- Penalty for enforcement of rules regarding child in ring
- Limited tournament draws
- Rules clean up
- Changes to forms
- Clarification regarding forfeiting of races by teams from the same club

Disciplinary Committee:

Election Committee:

- Abstention
- HOF percentage calculation
- Election Process Documentation

Nominating Committee:

Review Panel:

- Lindsey - 080546, 04/02/2011
- Ginger - 100203, 04/03/2011
- Kaylee - 110282, 05/14/2011
- Dexter - 110597, 05/21/2011 - Appeal
- Gabby - 110570, 05/22/2011 - Appeal
- Roxie - 051102, 05/22/2011 - Second Excusal - Upheld on Appeal

Special Committee Reports

Technology Committee:

- New Database

NAFA/Flyball History Committee:

Delegate Accrual Committee:

- Recommendations

Old Business:

- Iron Dog Award
- CanAm Venue

New Business:

- Regional Tournament Mileage Restriction
- Election Period Dates and Deadlines

Rules Committee Recommendations

August 27, 2011 Board meeting

1. Proposal regarding knocked jumps – Bruce Stone

The Rules Committee received the following request from Bruce Stone:

I have concerns over the rule governing the issue of jumps being knocked over in the lanes. There seems to be inconsistencies in the judging circle whether a race should be stopped to prevent injury to your dog. I know the handler has the perogative to run their dog or not with risk of losing the heat. In region 5 we witness the situation first hand and the answer seems to be "it is up to the discretion of the judge." Being concerned with the well being of my dog and in fairness to everyone, wouldn't it be logical to have the rule written where the races are stopped, so all judges have only one option with the welfare of the dog being the only concern? Please consider this option at the next NAFA board meeting.

*Regards,
Bruce Stone*

The Rules Committee considered a related issue at the August 22, 2009 meeting regarding a request to permit judges to award a no-finish when a heat was called for knocked jumps. The Board declined to adopt that proposal and modified Section 8.3(j) to add the final sentence (underlined here for emphasis).

Section 8.3

(j) Knocked down jumps. A team whose dog(s) knocks down a jump(s) during its run shall not be penalized, provided all dog(s) clear the jump(s) as if it were standing. A "runner" or handler may set up knocked down jump(s) if so doing does not interfere with either team or guide the dog in any way. Even if the judge does not stop the heat for a knocked down jump(s), it is up to the individual competitor to decide whether it is appropriate to run his or her dog, or to accept a no finish.

There was discussion that requiring all heats to be stopped when a jump is knocked is not appropriate and might be especially problematic where a team has a dog that habitually knocks jumps. Our current rule requires a judge to restart the race when it is stopped for safety reasons, including knocked jumps. Such a requirement might also require judges to stop a heat and re-run it even where the final dog on the losing team knocks the last jump.

The Committee recommends that the rule remain as currently written. We think it is appropriate for these calls to remain at the discretion of the judge. There should be an actual safety hazard for the race to be stopped. Judges have the discretion to determine whether they believe a safety hazard exists. If none exists, the judge should not blow a whistle. We rely on the experience and discretion of our judges and believe they appropriately call this issue. If judges are not calling this issue fairly or appropriately, it can be dealt with on a case by case basis, rather than through a rule change.

2. Breed Challenge Process – Lee Heighton

This was a carryover from the April meeting.

As part of the review of the Breed Challenge Process, the Committee felt there was a need to reorganize and redraft Chapter 3 – Team and Timesheets to make some of the sections more coherent and 6.2 of the Corporate Policies.

The proposed revisions and new rules include:

Substantial modifications & redraft to Chapter 3:

Chapter 3 – Dogs, Teams and Timesheets (current NAFA rulebook, p. 5)

Section 3.1 -- Dog Registration (CRNs)

- (a) A Competition Registration Number (CRN) must be obtained from NAFA (use NAFA Form C.8) before the dog competes [or warms up] at a NAFA sanctioned tournament. The fee for a CRN is \$20.00 in US currency or equivalent. The CRN is not transferable to another dog.
- (b) The CRN shall identify the breed of the dog or declare the dog a mixed breed. If a breed is claimed, it must be a breed recognized by one or more of the following kennel clubs: American Kennel Club (including Foundation Stock Service), Canadian Kennel Club, United Kennel Club, Mexican Kennel Club, American Rare Breed Association, or American Herding Breed Association. A dog's breed designation may be changed at the owner's request once in the lifetime of the dog. A dog's breed is subject to challenge as provided in section 7.7 of the Corporate Policies and Procedures.
- (c) Any dog listed on a timesheet in a NAFA sanctioned tournament without a valid CRN will result in forfeiture of tournament placements as well as forfeiture of all NAFA points earned during the tournament for all dogs entered on the timesheet.

Section 3.2 – Clubs, Teams, and Timesheets

- (a) A Club must have a NAFA Club Number to enter a team in a NAFA sanctioned event. To obtain a club number use NAFA form C.11. If a Club Number has not been obtained prior to the closing date of the tournament in which the Club has entered, the teams entered by the Club will forfeit all NAFA points and tournament placements.
- (b) A current time sheet (NAFA Form C.2) shall be completed and provided to the tournament secretary before the start of racing.
- (c) Here insert sections c, d, e, and h of the current chapter 3, pp. 5-6, except in incorporating 3(h) change "penalty specified in Section 7.6" to add "of the NAFA Corporate Policies and Procedures"

Amend Section 6.2(d) of the NAFA Corporate Policies to state:

- (d) In the Multibreed class, each team running in a heat must consist of dogs of four different breeds, or three different breeds and a mixed breed. A dog's breed or status as a mixed breed must match what is declared on the dog's CRN pursuant to section 3.1(b) of the NAFA Rules of Racing.

Add section 7.7 to the NAFA Corporate Policies as follows:

Add a new Section 7.7:

Section 7.7 – Breed Challenge Process

- (a) A dog's breed is subject to challenge by a NAFA Supervising or Approved Judge who officiated, or a Club Owner whose team competed, at a tournament at which the challenged dog competed.
- (b) To bring a challenge, the Judge or Club Owner must submit a completed form C-__ and any supporting documentation to the Executive Director with 14 days of tournament at which the challenged dog competed. The challenge, if brought by a Club Owner, must be accompanied by a \$100 (US) fee.
- (c) A dog's breed may be challenged only once during the lifetime of the dog.
- (d) On receiving a breed challenge, the Executive Director shall verify its sufficiency and promptly forward the challenge to the owner shown on the CRN and request a response within 30 days from the date the owner receives the challenge, or such additional time as the Executive Director may allow for good cause shown.
- (e) An owner who receives a breed challenge may:
 - (1) Establish the dog's breed by furnishing either:
 - (a) A pedigree, including at least three (3) generations, from a registry accepted by a kennel club listed in Section 3.1(b) of the NAFA Rules of Racing; or
 - (b) An ILP/PAL or the equivalent issued by a kennel club listed in Section 3.1(b) of the NAFA Rules of Racing;
 - (2) Concede the challenge and change the dog's breed designation listed on the dog's CRN to a mixed breed or to a breed for which a breed may be established under paragraph (e)(1) above; or
 - (3) Request a NAFA Breed Review. Such a request must be in writing and be accompanied by at least five identical packets each containing 3 current photographs of the dog, providing an unobstructed view of the dog from both sides and a frontal view, and any other written material, including affidavits or declarations from recognized breeders or conformation judges, that the owner wants the NAFA Breed Review Panel to consider.

- (f) On receiving a timely Breed Review request, the Executive Director shall, with the approval of the Board of Directors, convene a Breed Review Panel. The Panel shall consist of at least three (3) impartial members who have specific knowledge of the challenged dog's breed by being either an established breeder of that breed, a qualified conformation judge of dogs in that breed, or another expert in the breed. Each Breed Review Panel member shall review the materials submitted pursuant to paragraph (e)(3) and make one of the following three findings:
- (1) The photographs are not acceptable for determining probable breed and what the deficiencies are;
 - (2) The photographs are acceptable and the challenged dog is likely to be the breed declared on its CRN; or
 - (3) The photographs are acceptable and the challenged dog is likely not the breed declared on its CRN.

A majority vote will determine if there is sufficient evidence to warrant a breed change. If additional photographs are required to produce a majority, the owner shall be notified and asked to submit additional photographs curing the deficiencies noted within 30 days of receipt of such request. If a majority vote still cannot be obtained, the Panel shall, by majority vote, select an additional qualified breeder, judge, or expert to decide the matter by plurality.

- (g) If the Breed Challenge Panel determines that the dog's breed is correctly declared on its CRN, the owner and the challenging party shall receive written confirmation of that finding. If the dog's owner does not timely respond to a breed challenge or to a request for additional photographs by a Breed Challenge Panel, or a majority of the Breed Challenge Panel determines that the dog is not correctly declared on its CRN, the breed designated on the dog's CRN will be changed to "mix." If the breed is changed to "mix" as a result of the Breed Review Process, the fee, if any, paid to bring the breed challenge shall be refunded to the Club Owner who remitted it.
- (h) NAFA will publish all breed status changes. No other penalties shall be pursued other than the breed of the successfully challenged dog shall be changed to "mix."

A concern was expressed in the committee regarding the burden of proof for the Breed Challenge Panel:

One of the concerns I have is that "likely" implies "with 51% certainty." If a challenge is going to result in a breed change, I believe that the evidence should be much more substantial. I realize that the notion of "sufficient evidence" lacks precision, but I would be more comfortable with the following wording, perhaps replacing (in)sufficient with a more precise term.

- (2) The photographs are acceptable and there is insufficient evidence to conclude that the challenged dog is not the breed declared on its CRN.

(3) The photographs are acceptable and there is sufficient evidence to conclude that the challenged dog is not the breed declared on its CRN.

3. Request to define "course" – Dave Walt

This was a carryover from the April meeting. The Rules Committee received the following request from Dave Walt to add a definition of "the course" to the glossary. The issue came up in a discussion of training in the ring and the Board's May 8, 2010 explanation of what conduct would constitute training in the ring.

IF we were to define "course" in the rule book, based on what we actually want it to mean, would we not be better off saying the course starts from the point were one releases their dog and ends at the finish line? I feel this would clear up EVERYTHING and give no room to not understand what NAFA means.

There was concern that defining the course to begin where the dog is released might have ramifications on other rules. For instance, the second page of the rulebook discusses it being a 51 foot "course." It might also cause problems with how runback is defined and other ways in which the term course is used throughout the rules.

The Committee expressed concern that the minutes from the May 8, 2010 meeting have been repeatedly provided to judges and competitors for guidance as to what constitutes training in the ring to no avail. In light of the continued confusion, the Committee recommends that this language be formally included in the rulebook. Suggested changes are underlined below.

Chapter 3 (page 5 of the current rulebook)

(c) Each team is to consist of a minimum of four dogs and four handlers, with a maximum of six dogs and six handlers, plus a box loader and at the discretion of the team, a runner or two, to pick up loose tennis balls, to set up knocked down jumps, or to otherwise assist the team, provided doing so does not interfere with the judges or the opposing team and does not in any way assist the dogs in navigating the course or violate the rules. Other people may assist the dogs and handlers, but may not assist the dog in actually navigating the course. A person helping catch the dog in the back area, or revving the dog up before they run would not violate the rules. But, a person funneling a dog into the jumps or running alongside the dog as they run over the jumps (even outside the ring) would not be permitted. Using food in the ring is permitted, as are tugs and other motivators.

4. Request to modify aggression excusal rules to permit a judge to excuse a dog for the weekend, rather than a tournament – Mike Miller

The Rules Committee received the following request from judge Mike Miller:

Currently how the rules are worded and applied, if a dog is excused for aggression on one day of 2 of consecutive one day tournaments, the dog can compete the following day. I think it should be up to the head judge(s) to have the excusal for one or both days of the consecutive tournaments on the same weekend. If it is a 2 day tournament, the

dog is excused for both days, but a technicality allows the dog to run on day 2 of 2 one day tournaments. The head judge should be able to determine if the aggression resulted from a heat of the moment and allow the dog to return the next day or if the aggression is likely to be present the next day, ie bites a person.

As a TD, we had this situation arise this past weekend. The dog in question bit a person in the crating area and left bruising and puncture wounds through jeans. The same dog has bitten several other people in the last 3 years that I know of, but had not been reported to the head judge for excusal for whatever reason the person may have had at the time. Now that there is a paper trail on day 2 of the same tournament, my liability and NAFA's liability greatly increases since the problem is a known issue and the problem was willfully ignored and our insurance would have likely denied paying out if someone would have sued if it happened again. Fortunately it did not, but it was a big risk.

The C.12 form could be modified to add a box for the excusal to be for the day only or weekend to be assigned by the head judge. It could be marked as for aggression only.

The Rules Committee considered this request and was concerned that there were allegedly prior instances of aggression where the dog was not excused. If someone witnesses an incident that might be appropriate for excusal, it should be brought to the attention of the judge. A judge has the ability to excuse a dog for aggression even when he or she does not personally observe an incident. The incident may occur outside the ring, but still on the tournament grounds. A judge may issue an excusal based on witness statements and/or physical evidence where the judge believes an excusal is warranted.

The Committee does not recommend that the current rule be changed. There are a multitude of examples of dogs excused once who never again exhibit aggressive behavior. If a dog is excused a second time, the dog is banned from competition.

5. Inside interference – Judges yahoogroup

There was an issue raised on the Judges list about a dog from the same team re-running themselves while the team is still racing. For instance, the first dog successfully completes her run and then gets away and re-runs while dog 3 is running. Some judges were not calling a flag on dog 3 as long as he successfully completes the run, despite any interference from his teammate dog 1. Other judges believe that if anything crosses the line, including a dog, it must be flagged. There appears to be some split on whether these judges are calling the early pass on dog 1 or calling it as a flag on dog 3. The judges in the first camp believe that once a dog has successfully completed her run, she cannot later flag and any re-running by her is only to the detriment of the team. All agree that it should not be called as interference because a team cannot interfere with itself.

The Rules Committee was split in its assessment of this issue. Some members of the Committee believed that a team cannot interfere with itself and any additional re-running of dogs was only to the detriment of that team. Those members believe that no flag should be called as long as the correct dog on the course successfully completed all aspects of the run. Other members of the Committee believed that it was inherently dangerous to have two dogs on the course at the same time and that the heat should be blown dead for safety. These members believe there should be an exception to the safety rule to permit judges to call a no finish in instances where two dogs were on the course at the same time, rather than re-running the heat. There was some concern raised that this would require heats to

be stopped even when the dogs were not close enough to each other to truly create a hazardous situation (e.g., Dog 3 at the box while Dog 1 briefly crosses the start/finish line before returning safely to the handler). There was also discussion that other aspects of racing can be unsafely executed, such as extremely early passes or dogs and handlers colliding in the runback area.

Ultimately the Committee decided to refer the issue to the Board for further discussion and determination of whether any rule changes or clarifications were appropriate.

6. Penalty for children in the ring – Judges Committee

At the April meeting, the Board made a new rule effective immediately regarding children in the racing ring. The language was adopted at the January meeting and was originally scheduled to be effective October 1, 2011, but the Board decided to make it effective April 17, 2011 because of the strong safety concerns. The new rule provides:

Children who are too young to be able to participate safely, (e.g., children in strollers, car seats, baby carriers, or being held in a person's arms) are not permitted in the ring during racing or warm-up periods.

The Judges Committee was contacted by a judge who encountered some resistance when enforcing this rule. The competitor claimed that a prior judge had allowed her child, who was not yet two years old to be in the ring. The current judge indicated he would not permit the child in the ring and discussed the situation with the competitor. She reluctantly removed the child from the ring, but then allowed the child back in the ring during the warm-up period for a subsequent race.

Essentially the question that the Judge and the Judges Committee had was what penalty is to be imposed for violation of this rule. Is it excusal of the parent or guardian for unsportsmanlike conduct for failing to comply with the judge's ruling excluding the child? Should the team suffer a penalty such as forfeiting the heat or forfeiting the race? Or would some other penalty be more appropriate?

The Rules Committee considered this issue and unanimously recommends that there be a penalty specified for this rule. The safety issues inherent with children who have been deemed too young to participate safely are serious. There was a split in the Committee as to whether a penalty should be imposed if the child re-entered the ring with a team or parent different than the team or parent who was in the ring when the initial excusal occurred. Some members of the Committee also believed that whether any penalty was imposed should be left to the discretion of the judge.

The majority of the Committee recommends the Board adopt the following addition to the rule:

If a judge excuses a child and the team either refuses to have the child leave, or the child later re-enters the ring at that tournament during warm-ups or racing, the team will forfeit the race.

The Committee acknowledged that this could constitute a hardship for other teammates, especially in the Open and Veterans classes, but the majority felt this would also provide greater incentive for the team to ensure all of its members were complying with this important safety rule.

The members of the Committee who objected felt that it would be inappropriate to punish an entire team in the situation where a child re-enters the ring with an adult who may be unaware of the judge's prior ruling.

There was also an issue raised after the Committee's teleconference as to the timing of a violation. If the child re-enters the ring after some heats of the race have been run, would the team still forfeit the entire race, or would they only forfeit their remaining heats.

7. Proposed change to limited tournament draws – Dirk Elber

I would like to propose a slight change to chapter 6 section 6.1(k) limited tournaments.

As the rules currently state if any limited class overfills at the time of closing of entries then an automated draw will be held for all limited classes. The teams then have 96 hours to notify the tournament director if they would like to pull a team, and the next team on the alternate list then gains entry into the tournament. However at this point if one or more classes have teams withdraw and open slots for the assigned number of teams, and the remaining classes still have an alternate list waiting on entry into the tournament, the tournament organizers have no ability to adjust slots around.

My proposal is:

a) if any classes are no longer fully filled after the 96 hour mark due to teams having withdrawn, and other classes still having teams on the alternate list, to allow the tournament organizer (TD/Secretary) to request to manual reallocation of the vacant slots to the other divisions with the following rules

1) these slots, never to exceed total number of slots originally sanctioned for this specific tournament, would be reallocated with preferential order given to Regular, Multi-Breed, vets, open and then other classes.

2) To prevent any unfair advantage related to Regional Pts or cross listing of dogs, the current requirement that all teams that wanted entry at the completion of the automated draw would remain enforced.

Justification for change is to allow the maximum amount of teams to participate in any limited tournament, up to the original number set at sanctioning, without penalizing the organizers or applicants for higher demand in certain classes than was expected. This allows the organizers to maximize not only the number of teams that can participate in the tournament, but also maximize the potential that hosting a tournament is a profitable venture for the clubs. The reason to keep the Regional pts and cross listing rules as they are is to prevent any manipulation of the entries, post automatic draw, to change the status of the tournament.

Thanks for taking the time to review this proposal.

Dirk Elber

There was discussion that this issue is currently being addressed on a case by case basis through requesting a waiver from the Executive Director. The Committee discussed whether this change would allow clubs to gain an unfair advantage during the draw period. After due consideration, it was determined that any abuse of this rule could be dealt with on an individual basis. Therefore, the Rules Committee recommends adoption of the proposal.

8. Rules Clean up - CRN

During discussion of another topic, the Committee noticed that CRN is referred to in two different ways in the current version of the rulebook – Competition Registration Number and Competition Racing Number. It appears that Competition Registration Number is the correct language. Therefore the Committee recommends the instances of Competition Racing Number be changed to match. Those include:

- Corporate Policies & Procedures Chapter 1 Section 1.1 (iii), page 17, PDF page 27
- Appendix A Schedule of Fees, PDF page 63

9. Changes to NAFA Forms – Karen Oleson

I've taken the time to look over the forms that are most frequently used and have attached suggested changes to the forms as needed.

C.3 Sanctioning Form

- *Currency specification redundancy removed.*
- *Form is changed to assume all classes are unlimited unless otherwise noted. This change due to how people tend to fill out the form and what they generally miss.*

C.6 Tournament Results Form (form not attached as I don't have a copy)

- *Please consider removing "EJS Shipping Cost (attach receipt). Specify payment in USD or CDN funds." as it tends to cause confusion.*

C.10 Height Card Form

- *Alisa requested wording from the rulebook be added to this form in an effort to make the signature requirements more clear.*

C.11 New Club Form

- *References to 'Team' changed to 'Club' as 'Club' is more accurate.*
- *Removed the "Team Captain" line. The database only allows information for a Club Owner and Club Contact. People send in this form with a "Club Owner" different in name*

and address from the "Team Captain". The database tracks only the Club Owner and Contact.

Karen

The Rules Committee recommends that the requested changes to the forms be made.

10. Clarification regarding forfeiting of races by teams from same club – Dave Walt

Dave Walt posed the following questions:

1. If a club's A team and B team are scheduled to race each other and the A team has an injury (either before or during the race), and after the injury, the A team cannot field a team, what is the ruling?
2. If a club's A team and B team are scheduled to race each other and the A team shows up more than three minutes late after the warm up period (and has no excused ring conflict), what is the ruling?

The rule that applies is:

CHAPTER 6 - REPORTING FOR RACES

- (a) If a team is more than three minutes late from the conclusion of the designated warm-up period, the Head Judge will declare a forfeit of that race by that team unless an excused ring conflict exists. Any ring conflicts must be reported to the Head Judge or the Head Table prior to the race in question.
- (b) Teams that win by forfeit must complete the minimum required heats scheduled to qualify for points awarded in round-robin or to advance in double elimination competition. If another team is not available to compete, the team shall race without an opponent.
- (c) Forfeiting teams that do not show just cause may be excused from the tournament by the tournament director and may be subject to further discipline. Forfeiting teams may not run any dogs in the heats that are forfeited. If a team forfeits a heat and then subsequently runs a dog(s) in violation of this rule, they will automatically be considered as For Exhibition Only (FEO).
- (d) If a team has to forfeit when its "A" and "B" teams are in the same race, the faster seeded team must run and the slower seeded team must forfeit.

The Committee was split in its assessment of the questions. Some members believed that the rule should be read strictly to indicate that the club's B team would be required to be the team to forfeit regardless of the status of the A team. Justification for this position included that the rule was put in place to prevent clubs from giving their B team a benefit in placements by forfeiting the faster team. Allowing the A team to forfeit instead of the B team just encouraged teams to adopt such conduct to get around the rule.

Other members believed that in neither situation should the B team have to forfeit. If the A team had an injury, then that team was not capable of racing, therefore, the club did not have two teams in the same race. There was no indication of whether this would apply if the A team was able to complete later races against other teams.

As to the scenario where the A team is more than 3 minutes late to racing, some committee members believe that the B team should not have to forfeit because the A team had already forfeited. Others thought that both teams would be required to forfeit under the current language of the rule and to avoid circumvention of the rule to gain an advantage.

The Committee referred the issue to the Board for ruling and to see if any additional language was needed in the rule.

Election Committee Recommendations

August 2011 Board meeting

1. Ratification of results – Under the previous election system, final votes were tabulated at the Annual General Meeting and results were announced to the Board and the general public at the end of the meeting. The Board then ratified the results at the next in person Board meeting, which was usually several months later. With the transition to an online system administered by outside company, we now have to close the polls on a business day prior to the AGM, generally at midnight on Thursday. That gives the election company Friday to compile results and send us the information. Because the results are available sooner, there doesn't seem to be any reason to delay ratification. The Election Committee unanimously recommends that the Board receive the results in executive session at the Board meeting held just before the AGM (generally held on Friday, the day before the AGM). The Committee recommends the Board ratify the results during the meeting and then announce results to the general public at the Annual General Meeting the next day.

2. Creating standard operating procedure for calculation of votes – During the transition to the outside online voting service, we realized that a number of issues are not specifically covered in bylaws regarding how votes are allocated, primarily in regards to number of team entries. In order to preserve institutional knowledge about how the votes should be calculated, the Election Committee recommends the creation of a standard operating procedure for how votes are calculated. The overall recommendation is that if NAFA fees are collected, it should count as a team entry for voting calculations. Examples would include:
 - a. *Performance team entries*: The host club still pays a fee for these teams and they receive NAFA points. Therefore, they would count toward delegate vote calculations.
 - b. *Teams who forfeit*: If a team races a single race which is scored, then the host club has to pay tournament fees and this would count towards vote calculations. If a team enters, but withdraws prior to racing, no tournament fees are collected and the entry would not count towards vote calculations. If a team forfeits an individual heat or race, but still completes at least one heat which is scored, then the host club pays tournament fees and the entry would count towards vote calculations.
 - c. *Teams who go FEO*: FEO teams would generally count towards delegate votes because they are required to run at least one heat before going to For Exhibition Only status. The host club would be required to pay tournament fees so the entry counts towards vote calculations.
 - d. *Open teams*: Open team entries count as a vote calculation for the club they are entered under. The same would apply for veterans teams.

3. Creating standard operating procedure for how ballot is drafted – The Election Committee also recommends that there be standardization in how ballots should be drafted. This would ensure consistency between future elections.
 - a. *Abstain or None of the Above options* – The Committee discussed whether an abstain or “none” type option should be provided on the ballot. The overwhelming consensus was that this seemed almost unsportsmanlike in some situations, especially where one dog is nominated for MVP, etc. Voters have the option to skip voting in a race if they decide they do not wish to vote for any of the candidates.
 - b. *Hall of Fame tabulation* – The Committee also felt some clarification was needed in tabulating Hall of Fame results. The rule indicates that a dog must receive “35% or more of the ballots returned and validly voted.” The rule is silent as to whether it is 35% of the ballots returned and validly voted in that race, or whether it is of the overall election return. The Committee researched prior elections and unanimously recommends that the tabulation be made from the number of votes validly received in the HOF election itself.

4. Creating standard operating procedure for how results should be reported – The Election Committee reviewed how results are reported and the options available through the outside online election company.
 - a. *Percentage returns* – with the new online system, it is difficult for the company to filter for unique voters in elections where a vote is split out. For instance, when a person votes a portion of votes for one candidate and then goes back and votes other votes for another candidate, the online system may read that as two voters when giving overall results. Similarly, the filters are difficult to set to capture which region a person voted from if a vote is not lodged in the MVP race, or if that region did not have MVP candidates.
 - b. *Raw numbers* – Should just the raw numbers be disclosed, rather than actual percentages? And, which numbers should be released – actual number of voters or numbers of votes or both.
 - c. *Additional statistics* – what additional statistics, if any do we want to release publicly? Have to make sure that online system is set up to filter for those parameters ahead of time.

After reviewing the available data and capabilities of the outside online election system, the Election Committee recommends that for future elections the results be reported as number of votes received, rather than by voter.

The Committee recommends that the following data be collected and reported:

Overall – total number of votes outstanding and total number of votes returned.

By each race – total number of votes outstanding and total number of votes returned.

For each region – the total number of votes outstanding and the total number of votes returned.

In each case, the percentage may also be listed for overall return and number received for each candidate.

The Election Committee contacted the outside online election company. The company has indicated that it can set up this information to be reported for this election. There is a small fee for generating the custom reports.

5. Progressing to fully online election – At the July 12, 2011 Board teleconference, the Board adopted the Election Committee’s recommendation to progress to a fully online election this year. This would mean that all ballots will be distributed digitally via email through the outside company. All ballots would be voted online through their service. No paper ballots would be mailed. This will save our organization over \$1,000.00 in costs, as well as conserving paper. Voters are encouraged to update their email and other contact information with NAFA. A push will be made late summer/early fall to update voter contact information via the new database.
6. Election Company – At the July 12, 2011 Board teleconference, the Board adopted the Election Committee’s recommendation to again retain BigPulse as our outside online election service. They are familiar with our complicated election structure and have committed to capturing the statistical data we have requested regarding results and voter turnout.

Delegate vote assignment proposal

Goals:

- Make delegate vote assignment more directly linked to benefit provided to NAFA®
- Treat regions and Clubs equally regardless of tournament format (multiple single day events in a week or one multi-day event)
- Make all clubs that participate in NAFA – regardless of size – feel involved

Primary changes:

- Change the primary unit of measure from event to week
 - Hosting one or multiple tournaments in the same NAFA week is treated the same
 - Credit for scored teams entered during a NAFA week is restricted to maximum scored teams in any single event that week
- Extend the range used for calculating number of delegate votes per team entry - one vote for every five entries or fraction thereof, with a minimum of two.
- Remove the cap on the number of delegate votes that can be earned by a Club
 - No longer any concern over a single Club dominating a region or NAFA
 - Remove penalty on larger Clubs who make a significant contribution to NAFA

Conclusion:

The proposed changes accomplish the goals of aligning delegate votes more closely to contributions to NAFA while removing penalties for large Clubs and allowing more small/new Clubs to participate in the election process without diluting the value of a vote.

Further analysis

The analysis used the statistics from the 2010 racing year as it is the most current year for which complete statistics are available. The following table shows the percentage of total votes assigned to each region under the current and proposed formulas. Some regions gain and others lose – but changes are proportional to the participation in NAFA (hosting and competing) and remove the imbalance from single day and multi-day events.

	Current	Proposed			
Region 1	5.4%	6.1%	Region 12	3.7%	3.7%
Region 2	8.2%	10.4%	Region 13	6.0%	6.6%
Region 3	4.0%	3.8%	Region 14	5.0%	4.4%
Region 4	5.9%	4.9%	Region 15	7.1%	9.4%
Region 5	6.1%	5.8%	Region 16	8.2%	6.7%
Region 6	0.8%	0.5%	Region 17	0.0%	0.0%
Region 7	7.4%	5.9%	Region 18	0.6%	0.6%
Region 8	6.4%	5.1%	Region 19	4.2%	3.3%
Region 9	4.6%	7.3%	Region 20	3.3%	4.1%
Region 10	3.3%	3.4%	Region 21	4.3%	3.4%
Region 11	5.4%	4.6%		100.0%	100.0%

Further analysis was conducted to look for any other unexpected results caused by the change in calculation. The following table provides additional insight into the changes with the proposed method:

	Current Votes	Votes Prop.	Clubs With Zero Votes	Clubs w/Fewer Votes	Clubs w/More Votes	Clubs w/>8	Was 0 now more	Was more now 0	Max Votes for a Club	Club Max % Region	Club Max % Total
Region 1	85	94	2	2	7	2	2	0	12	12.77%	0.77%
Region 2	130	161	6	1	13	6	4	0	15	9.32%	0.97%
Region 3	63	59	1	8	2	2	0	0	13	22.03%	0.84%
Region 4	93	76	1	14	1	1	0	0	16	21.05%	1.03%
Region 5	97	90	0	9	4	1	1	0	9	10.00%	0.58%
Region 6	12	7	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	42.86%	0.19%
Region 7	118	92	0	16	2	0	2	0	8	8.70%	0.52%
Region 8	101	79	1	14	1	1	0	0	12	15.19%	0.77%
Region 9	73	113	1	2	8	3	2	0	30	26.55%	1.94%
Region 10	53	52	4	7	3	3	0	0	13	25.00%	0.84%
Region 11	86	72	0	11	4	2	0	0	9	12.50%	0.58%
Region 12	59	58	0	4	4	2	0	0	11	18.97%	0.71%
Region 13	95	102	3	2	9	0	0	0	8	7.84%	0.52%
Region 14	79	68	0	11	2	2	0	0	11	16.18%	0.71%
Region 15	113	146	1	0	14	5	1	0	16	10.96%	1.03%
Region 16	130	104	5	19	3	2	1	0	10	9.62%	0.65%
Region 18	10	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	77.78%	0.45%
Region 19	67	51	0	11	1	1	0	0	14	27.45%	0.90%
Region 20	52	63	1	1	7	2	2	0	13	20.63%	0.84%
Region 21	68	53	0	12	1	1	0	0	13	24.53%	0.84%
	1584	1549									

Note: Analysis uses entries and hosting data from the 2010 racing year and current Club assignments to regions.

The total number of delegate votes remains almost constant – declining only slightly (bottom row). For each region, you see the current number of delegate votes earned (Current Votes) as well as the new number earned (Votes Prop.) under the proposed change. You can see that voting power remains well-distributed among the regions – proportional to participation (entries and hosting).

The next several columns show the number of Clubs receiving zero votes, fewer votes, and more votes respectively under the new system as compared to the current. The following column (Was 0 now more) illustrates the number of clubs receiving one or more votes with the new system that have zero under the current system. Conversely, the next column shows that no clubs drop to zero which had votes under the current system. Column Clubs w/>8 shows the number of clubs which will have more than 8 votes under the proposed system.

The last three columns provide some insight into Clubs that might have power to dominate an election. This was the primary concern of NAFA when the old maximum of 6 votes (later increased to 8) was instituted. The Max column shows the maximum number of delegate votes that would be earned by a Club for the 2010 racing year under the new system. The 30 earned by one Club in region 9 is an outlier, with 20 and 16 being the next two highest values across NAFA.

The second last column looks at the ability of a single Club to dominate a regional election. Other than regions that presently have the issue due to too few Clubs, no Club is granted dominance by the proposed system. Likewise, across NAFA, the highest percent of total vote assigned to one Club is just under 2% showing that no single Club can dominate a NAFA-wide election.