

ANCC Review Committee Report.

Thank you to the ANCC for the opportunity to review its operations. I would also like to thank my fellow members for their input and support.

We started this review by looking at issues facing the management of the fancy at a national level. Some of the issues we looked at were, how we treat abstentions, membership to the ANCC and the way the ANCC elects its delegates.

We offer you all the following proposals.

### **1. Abstention**

*“That Abstentions be counted as neither “Yes” or “No” but rather as abstentions and that the required majority for any motion shall come from the remaining deliberate votes.”*

We offer the following explanation to support this proposal;

The current system of ANCC representation is as follows. Each of the affiliated states sends 2 representatives to the meeting. Each state however has only one vote, making a total of 6 votes. For normal business a simple majority is required (50% + 1 vote). This is usually a minimum of 4 votes.

Changes to the constitution however require a 75% majority. This means that it must be 5:1 as a 4:2 is only a 66% majority. If one state isn't represented there have been occasions where a motion has still required the support of all 5 remaining states as the chairman has concluded that the absentee or abstention is a NO vote. Other chairmen have considered absentees and abstentions as NON votes and only included the remainder of the votes in the final count.

This inconsistency of the chairman's interpretation has been contentious. The current chairmen's interpretation is that an abstention is not a no vote. It is a deliberate choice not to vote. Where a state abstains and the vote is 4:1. We believe that we should interpret this as an 80% majority plus one abstention. We don't believe it should be counted as 4:2. It comes down to the question, is it 75% of all eligible votes or 75% of the active votes. As a quorum is required to conduct a legitimate meeting we argue that it is 75% of the active votes.

### **2. Membership to the ANCC.**

*“The ANCC only accept membership from a state council and that clubs currently directly affiliated to the ANCC be required to affiliate through membership of their state council.”*

Currently membership to the ANCC is as follows;

#### **4. MEMBERSHIP (From ANCC constitution)**

- (a) *Membership shall be open to :*
  - (i) *Cavy Clubs*
  - (ii) *State Cavy Councils*
  - (iii) *If there is only one member club in a state then that club shall be considered to be that state's council.*

Currently we have a matrix of clubs and councils affiliated directly to the ANCC. This has led to poor communication between the ANCC and its members. Many clubs it seems do not disseminate vital information to their members.

We believe that state councils are far better placed to deal directly with the fancy at a grass roots level in their state than the ANCC is.

State Councils will have a much more direct working relationship with their member clubs than the ANCC will ever have. They have opportunities to mix reasonably regularly, in most cases. The more organised states have only one magazine, the ANCC has nothing. The State Councils have far more opportunities to meet than the ANCC. There are far greater opportunities for members on State Councils to develop strong working relationships than for the ANCC.

If the ANCC only needs to work with six councils then it will be able to develop a more accountable relationship with that group, than has ever been possible with the 20+ clubs that it needs to deal with at the moment.

The ANCC will continue to get its revenue as it currently does, based on the number of clubs that a state council has under its control.

#### **3. Restructure of the council.**

We believe that the following system will benefit the fancy, ensuring that the ANCC has members that have something they wish to contribute rather than people selected by their state to make up numbers, or worse, vacant seats at the delegates meeting. We believe that this would realise a broader scope of interested people to fill ANCC positions. By having people that are more willing and committed to serve on the ANCC there will be more effective communication with state bodies, who are in a far better position to deal with the needs of the fancy at a grass roots level.

The following proposal would also only require a state council or it equivalent to send one delegate to the ADM. This may make it easier for the smaller states to find a single willing candidate, rather than two as is the current requirement.

Following is the proposed model.

- 1 representative per State:  
This person shall be elected/appointed by a process determined within each state.
- 6 Elected/Councillors:  
These people shall be elected by way of ballot. All adult members (over 18 years of age) of cavy clubs affiliated to the ANCC, through their state council, shall be eligible to vote. Each eligible person shall be entitled to one vote only and members holding memberships in more than one state can only cast one vote. This vote is to come from the state considered to be the home state or the state of residence. Vacancy of these elected positions which accrue during the term, shall be filled by a process yet to be determined.

The ballot will be controlled by a returning officer or committee similar to current ANCC committee format used by the SRP or this investigation committee. It is the feeling of this committee that this person should be ineligible to stand for the six councillor positions, thus avoiding any possible conflicts of interest.

All elected Councillors shall serve for a term of two years. From these elected Councillors the ADM will elect its Executive members, being the Secretary, Treasurer and the Chairman. State representatives will be ineligible to fill these executive positions. This is so as not to disenfranchise the state delegates in any way, rather it is to empower them and ensure that their primary focus is on representing their state without having conflicts of interest.

For example the chairman will not get a deliberate vote, only a casting vote if required. As the chairman does not have a deliberate vote, we consider it would be most inappropriate for a state not to have a vote. If for example the chairman was there as the Victorian delegate it would mean the Victorian delegate could not vote and thus Victoria would not get a vote, unless a casting vote was required. That may then create a conflict of interest. Further, the secretary and the treasurer have management responsibilities that may conflict with a states position on a matter, creating a potential conflict of interest. An example of this would be recommending that an increase in fees is required.

The new make up of the ANCC would have 12 members, with 11 votes and the Chairman having a casting 12<sup>th</sup> vote.

- Chairman. (Casting Vote Only)
- Secretary (Voting Member)
- Treasury (Voting Member)
- 3 Councillors (Voting Members)
- 6 State Representatives (Voting Members)

Thanks to all for your deliberation and I hope that these recommendations are received warmly.

Yours Sincerely,

ANCC Investigation Sub Committee  
Cory Haugh  
Chairperson