

**BOT INTERNAL COMMITTEE MINUTES  
DRAFT ONE  
AUGUST 1991**

**Thursday, August 15, 1991**

The meeting was opened by Becky M., Acting Chairperson, with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer.

Trustees Present:

Becky M.  
Chuck L.  
Jamie S-H.  
Garth P.

WSO BOD:

Bob McD., Chairperson

WSC:

Mitch S., Policy Chair  
Dave T., WSC Vice Chair

WSO Staff: Hollie Arnold, Anthony Edmondson, George Hollahan, Steve Sigman

In addition, there were many visitors in attendance, including several members of the WSC Policy Committee.

A **review of the agenda** showed that the following items needed to be added.

- 1) *Criteria for the International Development Forum*
- 2) *WSO Sales Policy Discussion Questions*

Since Stu T., Chairperson, will not be here until later in the weekend, it was decided to hold off on the previously developed agenda items until his arrival.

**Interaction of the Internal Committee with the WSC Policy Committee** was the first item discussed. Mitch S. gave an update of where the policy committee is on each of their projects beginning with the synopsis of the **survey results on RSR participation**. The policy committee intends to develop a plan for year-round RSR participation and involvement. They are also considering making the RSR panels a formalized part of the conference, although the WSC Chairperson has indicated that she wants to use this year as an "experiment" and hopes nothing will be set in stone on the RSR panels. Also discussed was what was meant by RSR participation--discussion groups vs. work groups, creative vs. review and input role. Also there was concern that these groups would be a new "working body" which will contribute to the duplication of effort on projects. The fact that conference committees were originally created to be made up of RSRs was also discussed, but the membership of conference committees has changed over the years for all the committees except Policy. No one questioned that involvement by RSRs was desired and necessary throughout the year, but the type of involvement and the best way to accomplish it was debated. The issue of surveys, how they are laid out, and what you can read from them was discussed in length. Several people stated their feelings that the questions led respondents in a specific direction. The decision was made to send a copy of the survey results to each member of the Internal Committee. (see attached)

This discussion led into concerns from the visitors regarding development of a vehicle which would increase the communication between RSRs and world

services, such as a newsletter that would allow for sharing alternative viewpoints on issues. A suggestion was made for RSRs to send their input to the WSO for inclusion in either the regular monthly mailing to conference participants or to ask that their reports be included in the Conference Report. Some concerns were voiced that any reports which are sent out be accurate and truthful, but the general feeling was that this could be a viable option for getting out information other than just from world services.

**Seating of regions** was the next project reported on, along with the survey results. Two trustees indicated they feel regional formation and participation at WSC are two separate issues. They feel the only realistic proposal is participation based on geo-political boundaries, with extra voting rights for regions with large numbers of meetings. Additionally, there is the issue of newly formed regions and regional splits which occur as a result of power and control battles. It was recognized that most regions split to serve the needs of their areas and groups, as they do not see other options currently provided by the service structure to provide the needed services. The suggestion was made to place a moratorium on seating of new regions from the U.S. in an effort to force the issue of regional definition. Another trustee sees the issue as participation/representation, not regional formation. There is also the issue of non-U.S. participation. There was general agreement that any non-U.S. representative attending the 1992 WSC would stand a good chance of being seated at the Conference.

There was no input from the trustees on the BOT section of the report on **Rotation and Continuity** which was presented at the conference last year.

The **WSC election process/procedure** was discussed as a work in progress. All agreed that some changes need to be made to provide for lots of choices, openness and fairness in the process. Mitchell indicated that they are discussing the option of separate ballots for each position.

*At this point Becky indicated she feels the Policy Committee should be included on the Internal Committee mailings, and the Internal Committee should be on the Policy mailing list.*

The **WSO Sales Policy Discussion Questions** were the next item discussed. These questions are items currently being discussed by the BOD with input due to Bob McD. by September. George gave a short synopsis of both the past and present sales policies, which have been limited and inconsistent. He feels that a uniform sales/discount policy needs to be developed. He also touched on the possibility of established international communities printing and distributing literature to less established communities in their portion of the world. Discussion then focused on the nonproductiveness of the existing service offices throughout the world. Most offices exist on the discount offered on bulk literature purchases, but the local communities rarely see a reduction in the cost of literature, and may even see an increase in price. In addition, very few offices offer services to their "area" other than literature distribution. The overwhelming support given by European representatives during the ECC for the continuation of the European Service Office was discussed. One question that was posed was whether the ESO would be financially self supporting if sales agreements continued to be signed with individual countries. A straw poll was then taken on the discussion questions with the following results:

- 1) Should we have sales agreements with emerging international N.A. communities?--0/6/1 The only abstention was out of concern that countries should have an option to license to print in their country.
- 2) Should we develop a different pricing structure for fellowship and non-fellowship customers?--7/0/0
- 3) Should we develop different prices based on an N.A. community's ability to pay for merchandise?--7/0/0 This was seen as a necessity for those countries who have a lower socioeconomic status, such as India.
- 4) Should a fund be established to provide subsidies rather than subsidizing through price reductions?--0/7/0 It was felt that this would enable communities to not be self supporting, rather than assisting them to work toward self sufficiency.
- 5) Should our Sales Policy integrate business and service goals or should we separately define business and service goals?--It was decided to throw out the entire question as it is redundant.
- 6) Does the current discount structure accomplish the intended goals?--7/0/0
- 7) Is our current credit policy appropriate?--0/7/0 There was concern that the current policy enables area/regional offices to behave irresponsibly by not paying their bills in a timely manner.
- 8) What general philosophy are we trying to communicate with our sales policy? What are the goals of the WSO sales policy? No vote was taken on this questions but the following points were raised in regards to the issue: need to deliver services to addicts worldwide--assist with growth throughout the fellowship--decrease credit and possibly increase cost of Basic Text--RSOs eat up any benefit from discount.
- 9) Should the WSO be willing to absorb the Australian Fellowship Office? As above, this issue needs broad discussion as this brings up many more questions: don't make hasty decisions--begin long term planning for branch offices wherever necessary--begin centralization of literature distribution worldwide.
- 10) Should a system of branch offices be planned? If yes, on what basis? By region, country, or continent? And to what extent? Distribution center vs. service center? 7/0/0 Set up continental offices with exceptions and then decide case by case on service office vs. distribution office but be supportive of both.

The meeting broke for supper from 7:15 to 9:25 P.M.

To begin the discussion on the **International Development Forum**, the two motions committed to the Interim Committee which the trustees presented to the WSC were read. Since these motions were committed for consideration to the Interim Committee, this body is not locked into the specifics as laid out in either motion. Additionally, the motion specifying that a **Multi-National Development Forum**, instead of IDF, be made an annual event at WSC was read, which specifies that two days will be focused no international development. Anthony then informed the group if the present rate of spending for the WSC continues, the final figure for the year will be \$243,000 with the conference budget set at \$260,000. He indicated a decision will have to be made during the Interim

Committee meeting to spend these funds, and to transfer funds from the fixed budget to the discretionary budget. After considerable discussion the following motion was adopted for presentation to the full Board of Trustees.

**M/S/C** "That the Board of Trustees strongly recommends that the Interim Committee make every effort to fund the participation of international representatives to attend the Multi-National Development Forum at the 1992 World Service Conference." 6/2/0

Along with this recommendation, it was decided that Jack will write a letter to the fellowship that the commitment has been made to fund participation for these members, so there is a need for increased donations which need to be received by December of this year. Also planning needs to begin now and communication must begin with the fellowship in non-U.S. countries. Some discussion was held at this point regarding the cancelation of some fixed budget items to provide funds to finance this event.

Considerable discussion was held on the criteria for attendance at the MDF, in accordance with the motion which specifies thirteen members being funded for travel with one-half of their room and meals being funded. Several different countries were suggested as meeting the requirements for attendance, with either an RSC presently in existence, or an ASC which is functioning as an RSC. All were reminded that the motion specifies random selection from continents.

A short discussion was then held regarding trustee participation in the mini-IDF in Sydney. Garth indicated that the representatives from Hong Kong and Malaysia will be attending, and possibly someone from India. These members will be sharing during the forum. He also will be asking for participants from world services (RSRs and others) to do a presentation on U.S. development.

This session was closed with the Serenity Prayer at 11:15 P.M.

### **Saturday, August 16, 1991**

Trustees Present:  
Stu T., Chairperson  
Becky M.  
Jamie S-H.  
Garth P.  
Chuck L.

WSC:  
Dave T., Vice Chairperson

WSO BOD:  
Tim B., Secretary

This meeting opened at 12:20 P.M. with a review of the agenda and work plan for the year. The discussion then focused on assignments and how to finalize the agenda items.

The development of a **position paper on the relationship of the BOT to the conference committees** was assigned to Chuck in June. Input was given to him regarding the seeming evolution of this relationship from proactive to reactive and philosophical to administrative/project oriented. It was decided to keep the paper as simple as possible, focusing on what is working now with no hierarchy and the interactive relationships. This paper also needs to discuss committee membership involvement on both sides, not restricted to leadership; rather to

invite involvement with the committees through comparing agendas and reviewing work.

A short meeting was held with WSC Admin this morning regarding the **Literature Trust Document**. This project was turned back over to the BOT. It will be on the agenda for both the BOT and BOD at their respective meetings in October. The study notes for this document will be developed by Stu and George and the entire document, with the study notes, will be mailed out for input by 9/1 with input due by 12/1. This input will then be factored in and it will be included in the Conference Agenda Report for action in April.

Development of a **Conference Charter** which will define the current working relationships of Conference Boards and Committees was assigned to Stu and Tim B. This will be in outline form only. This will be a different document from the Charter for N.A. Service such as was initially developed by the Ad Hoc N.A. Service Committee. No decision was made on whether to include issues such as the rights of the different boards and committees, ie: redress, appeal, participation, etc.

**Committed motions from WSC** were then discussed. Jamie will have a preliminary paper on **direct donations to a translation fund** for review by early October. This will discuss both the positive (power of the purse) and negative (unruly to manage) aspects of taking this action.

Jamie will also work on the **Zonal Trustees** motion. This paper will include ideas for how this position would be applied, possible consequences and future application at the world service conference. The general feeling is that the idea has merit even if it is not now applicable. Jamie will also cross reference his discussion with the Policy Committee.

The **direct funding by group contributions** motion will be worked on by Becky. Several different options for donations will be discussed (birthday donations, etc.) but the direction of the paper will be pro.

The **RSR only vote** issue, which was assigned to Stu, was next on the agenda. Discussion revolved around the issue of representation and who represents what group. Who do the trustees represent? What about WSC Admin. and Committee Chairs? Are these members in the chain of representation? If the Conference is not a representative body, what is it? The discussions at this years WSC related more to how things are done at home, such as voting at ASC and RSC. The difference between groups, areas and regions has to do with representation. Much more discussion followed with the decision being made to describe representation in the paper as it is presently, then debate in the full board.

The **BOT operational guidelines** are almost complete, except for the committee descriptions. Garth will work on a description for External, Chuck will write the description for Internal, and Literature Review needs to provide a written description also. The Board implementation of the BOT Policy that was adopted for a one year trial period will be up this October. Input is needed from a full board review in October.

A **report on the Guide to Service and the Ad Hoc N.A. Service Committee** was given by Dave T. He related that the only actual work being done this year is on the Concepts. The question was raised of where the ad hoc should be and/or remain? Discussion was then held regarding the feelings of the ad hoc members

regarding roadblocks that exist within the committee and the perception of this committee within the fellowship. There was also a question of whether this committee needs "fresh blood." Duplication of work being done by the Ad Hoc, WSC Policy and BOT Internal was also raised, along with the different angles to be addressed by each of these bodies. Becky will continue to liaison with the Ad Hoc.

International Development was an item assigned to each member of the committee; Jamie for Europe, Stu for the Pacific Basin, Chuck for Canada, and Becky for Central and South America. Jamie gave a short report on his interaction with the European fellowships and the European Service Conference and Convention. Each of the members will be reviewing information from their assigned areas and will have a report ready by the October meeting.

A discussion was then held on the four ideas the Policy committee is planning to present at the Conference including national/continental/zonal conferences, a moratorium on the seating of new U.S. regions, a transition plan to more effective service structure, and an interim regional seating plan, for now, with non-voting conference participants. Questions seen as needing further discussion include whether a moratorium on regional seating will be presented as a motion, or simply as a work in progress pointing a way for a new direction? Would this be in lieu of adopting an interim seating plan? The final consensus of this group was to stop the merry go round and address the alternative of where we go from here.

A decision was made to have an Internal Committee conference call at some point prior to the meeting in October. The meeting was then adjourned so the members could rejoin the Board Of Trustees open forum, presently in progress.