



Meeting Minutes

Paco-Vicuña Association Annual Member's Meeting			
4.2.2018		8:00 P.M. Mountain Time	Telephone Conference
TYPE OF MEETING	Paco-Vicuna Association Board of Director's Meeting		
FACILITATOR	Jane Levene, Vice President		
NOTE TAKER	Amber Martin, Secretary		
ATTENDEES	Brent Cowan, Nicky Elves, Jane Levene, Amber Martin, Thomas Victor.		
AGENDA TOPIC: Appointment of Vacant Board Position - President			
DISCUSSION	Following the resignation of the President of the Paco-Vicuña Association, Don Smith, the meeting was brought to order by Vice President Jane Levene. The Vice President stated that an election would need to be held to fill her position as she took over the remainder of Don's term. Secretary Amber Martin raised a point of order and read from the bylaws which stated that the runner up from a previous election for the Board of Directors would automatically be appointed to any vacancies. Since Thomas Victor was the runner up in the last election for Executive Vice President held in February, the need for an election was forgone. Thomas Victor accepted the nomination and was appointed to the position of President. Congratulations were offered.		
CONCLUSIONS	Thomas Victor was appointed to the position of President of the Paco-Vicuña Association.		
ACTION ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
None		N/A	N/A

AGENDA TOPIC: Discussion of Thomas Victor's Proposal	
DISCUSSION	<p>Following up on the proposal submitted by Thomas Victor to the Board of Directors, the floor was handed over to the newly appointed President to present his proposal which touched upon six areas for standardization. The following discussion ensued on a point by point basis as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The need for standardized micron ranges and identifying Grades <p>Thomas presented the need for standardized micron ranges and their identifying mill Grades. With so many descriptive names representing different quality/micron ranges, there is the potential for PV to be misrepresented – potentially resulting in a negative image of PV fiber overall if coarser PV grades were not listed as such. Everyone agreed the standards were needed and a good idea. The use of the identifying Mill Grade ranges were also accepted. There was some discussion concerning the overall headings of “Premium”, “Standard” and “Seconds”. Also, the use of the term “Hairy” to designate non-dehaired fleeces was perceived as negative. Amber Martin proposed “Dehaired” and “Non-dehaired” for labeling purposes. It was decided that the exact wording for grade ranges and dehaired or non-dehaired would be presented to PVA membership and PV owners for final approval, but all agreed it was a good idea to institute standards that distinguished us from the alpaca industry, yet used a simple and familiar grading system already widely in use by the textile industry. (See Below)</p> <p>“Premium” PV grades 000 11-12.99 microns 00 13-14.99 microns 0 15-16.99 micron</p> <p>“Standard” PV grades 1 17-19.99 microns 2 20-22.99 microns</p> <p>PV “Seconds” 3 23 microns and over</p> Standardized Product Labeling for PVA Members <p>All product labeling must include the agreed upon standardized grades and be clearly marked as such. The proposal also recommended the use of the term “Member of the Paco-Vicuña Association” or “Member of PVA”. Amber Martin advised that the association logo be optional – since other luxury fibers don't use one. She also proposed that the label include the percentage of PV fiber to further protect the quality and marketing image of PV, should it be blended with lesser quality fibers. All were in favor of proposed labeling standards.</p> Pursue a Trademark for any Fiber Marketed as Paco-Vicuña <p>A discussion was had concerning the need to secure a legally enforceable trademark so that coarse PV, non-registered PVs, or non-PV fiber (i.e. fine alpaca) can not be sold or labeled as PV and damage the PV image. The idea was well received, with Amber cautioning the lack of enforcement since nouns can't be trademarked (i.e. “Paco-Vicuña”, since it's an actual scientific name). You can however, trademark an association to be representative of a quality standard. Jane will research this further. (Cont.)</p>



Meeting Minutes

DISCUSSION

- The proposal also stated that all PV fiber must come from a registered animal, as well as from a current PVA member in good standing. Amber, while agreeing that it was a good idea to require all PVA fiber to come from registered animals, stated in opposition that to require current membership in the Paco-Vicuña Association as a requirement for what can or can't be called PV fiber was completely overstepping the purpose of a voluntary association. Ms. Martin went on to further give the example of buying an American Kennel Club (AKC) registered dog, but then the AKC requiring continued membership and yearly membership fees in order to continue to be able to call it such or profit off of it in any way. She stated that it was an unnecessary burden on owners who had already made the investment of purchasing and registering their PVs, only to then change the rules and require yearly paid membership as a condition of ownership and profiting from the sale of the fiber. Jane Levene, Thomas Victor and Nicky Elves disagreed and believed it was a necessary step to control what could potentially be sold or represented to the public as PV. Thomas stated, "Not requiring being member of the PVA to use an eventual trademark would undermine both the association and the registry, which is owned by the association. One of the only real benefit at this point to members is the ability to use the logo, and that they are members of PVA in their advertising - which has been the only form of standardization, quality control, and "certification" of it actually being PV. I do not see that the PVA can support taking that away and endorse non-members equally, at least not without giving a greater benefit to members in return. The membership requirement is also about commitment about developing the breed and the fiber characteristics in these early stages". Brent Cowan agreed that it placed an undue burden and may deter the recruitment of future breeders and that the issue should be put before PVA members as well as current PV owners to decide.

4) Drop the Phenotype Nomenclature.

All agreed that the use of the previous animal classification rankings developed at the beginning of the breed had outlived their relevance now that most PVs could be classified as Premier Plus, along with the fact that there was no system to monitor and lower the classification once an animal fell outside of their micron ranking.

5) Discuss the Registration of Animals as it Relates to Maintaining the Integrity of EPD Data Collection.

- As a result of the discovery of a large number of unregistered PVs or delay in registering, the issue/concern was raised as to how it might effect and skew the results of the overall EPD. All agreed that it was in the best interest/practice for members to strive to achieve 100% compliance in registering their animals and submitting fiber samples for testing. However, the root cause of not registering appears to be one of financial burden. The reason given for high registration fees was to originally pay for the purchase of the PV registry. The issue of reducing the cost of registration needs to be revisited in order to encourage PV owners as well as association members to register all of their offspring regardless of their potential for future breeding. The current \$100 fee per animal is broken down as follows: \$40.00 goes to DNA analysis, \$13.00 goes to Mike for administration of the registry, and \$47.00 goes to the Association itself. For reference, the Alpaca registry only charges \$55 (including DNA lab analysis) for the registration of alpacas under 1 year of age, and \$80 (including DNA lab analysis) for those over 1 year of age.

All members were in favor of revisiting the lowering of registration fees to reduce the financial burden on farms and as an incentive to more complete EPD data collection. The exact figures need to be proposed and approved prior to notifying owners and the association. Amber put forth the idea of also including a slight price break on registrations for PVA members vs non-members to further encourage membership growth. Thomas stated that, "Comparison of registration (and membership) fees with alpacas is missing the point that the difference in price paid for the fibers differ greater than the difference in the fees. Being part of the early breeders, we stand to benefit financially down the road more so than others. Sale price of both animals and fiber likely will adjust due to supply and demand". Amber disagrees, as registration and membership fees have no correlation to animal or fiber value - it's purely an arbitrary number of registry administration and not based on individual animal value - or we might as well reinstitute classifications and base registration fees on classes (which she is not advocating - only referencing as a case in point).

- Jane suggested that the non-breeder category could be made cheaper in order to encourage that all animals are being registered and included into the EPDs, as that was the intentions behind the PVA and registry in order to successfully create this new breed. It would keep registry data more inclusive and comprehensive, allowing for better tracking of genetic outcomes.

6) Association "Best Practices" Guide

The need for an association developed "Best Practices" Guide with tips for new owners was well received. Jane Levene advocated for the inclusion of minimum staple length of what can be marketed as PV to be included in the guide. Amber Martin agreed that longer staple length does indeed result in higher tensile strengths, the same as combining similar staple lengths produces a smoother/less likely to pill final product; however she raised objection to the institution of staple minimums on what can be called/labeled PV. Jane pointed out that it was one of the positive characteristics of PV fiber verses vicuña. (Cont.)



Meeting Minutes

DISCUSSION	<p>Amber agreed that it was, but that just because US mills currently lack the machinery to handle shorter fleeces doesn't mean that those members who do ship their fiber overseas to be processed properly should be penalized and unable to call and label their fiber PV. She further pointed out that those farms residing in warmer parts of the country were unable to allow their slower growing animals to go unshorn for more than 1-2 years for their own health just to achieve the 3 inch minimum staple length being advocated. It was generally agreed that it would be included as a recommendation in the best practices guide to breed for longer staple lengths and to not combine widely differing staple lengths for a better end product, but not be made a mandatory requirement of labeling. Jane Levene, Nicky Elves, and Thomas Victor stated that they would begin to compile said guide to be reviewed.</p> <p>The proposal submitted by Thomas Victor was overall well received and agreed upon by the current Board of Directors. Compliments and appreciation was offered for his initiative. Discussion of aspects raised under each point (1-6) above will be presented for final discussion and adoption at a special meeting of PVA members and PV owners to be scheduled once the best practices guide is near completion.</p> <p>A motion was made by Amber to adjourn the meeting, Thomas seconded the motion, all voting in favor. Meeting was Adjourned.</p>
-------------------	--

ACTION	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
A special meeting of PVA members and PV owners is to be scheduled for final discussion and adoption of the proposal as presented by Thomas Victor.	President, Thomas Victor	TBD/Scheduled

MEETING ADJOURNED @ 10:35 PM MT