

## Transition Group Proposals Supplement Input From World Services Meeting , August 29-31, 1997

A world services quarterly meeting was held in Providence, Rhode Island, August 29-31, 1997 for the purpose of presenting the preliminary Transition Group proposals to be placed in next year's Conference Agenda Report and gathering input from the fellowship. Following is a summary of concerns and ideas expressed by the regional delegates and world level trusted servants in attendance. It should be noted that the delegates in attendance represented a significant portion of the United States but very few from regions outside North America.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 2 , The Procedure for New Projects, paragraph 2*

Even though the World Board would report on *all* proposals, they would only recommend a few. Regional delegates expressed concern that the Conference would not be able override these recommendations and approve proposals it deemed more important. The TG responded that they envisioned the conference having that override power.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 2, Two-Year Conference Cycle*

Will the 2-year cycle really give more time for us to workshop/review CAR motions, etc., or will it just give the World Board and its committees more time to work on their stuff? The TG and world services says yes, but many delegates said that the TG process over the past 2 years has not been a good example of how it should be.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 3, "world wide workshop system"*

The regional delegates echoed the concern of the TG (TG proposals, pg 4) that a 2-year conference cycle would lose the value in the yearly face-to-face contact among regional delegates and world service members that the yearly WSC now has. The delegates felt that a world-wide workshop system in the "off" year would be essential to make up for this. A few delegates suggested some sort of issue-based yearly meeting, but there would probably be money problems involved with such a meeting.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 5, (world board) Membership*

There was much concern if we could really find 24 members qualified for the initial election under the new guidelines.

**We heard very loud and clear that the World Board should have only one vote as a whole and that the WSO co-directors should not be members of the board and if they are members should not have a vote at the board or conference since they are paid special workers and could have conflicts of interest.** This was one of the major concerns expressed by the delegates at the meeting. It should be noted that the TG rationalized the proposal for voting status by saying that the ratio of WB votes to delegate votes would never be more than 1 to 4.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 6, under qualifications and duties*

Some RDs said the qualifications were just too much and that it might not be possible to find enough qualified members to serve, especially in the initial election.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 6, Quorum and decision-making*

Although the proposed structure of the WB is meant to encouraged consensus-based decision making, there would be times when a vote would be necessary. If the quorum is only one-half-plus-one, there might be a time when a majority vote would be only nine out of 24 members, which would not be a genuine consensus.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 7, 3rd paragraph, item (2)*

Can our WSO really do all the work that the World Board directs it to do? This was a concern raised by several delegates. The answer is, yes, the WSO staff already does this, so it should be no problem under the new guidelines.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 9, Elections*

Regarding terms of service for WB members, it was suggested that maybe members should be limited to serving only one term to prevent burnout and 'good-ol'-boy'ism.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 8, Implementation*

A large number, perhaps a majority, of delegates felt that we might be moving too fast in trying to implement this proposal. Further, it was expressed by many that we do not have sufficient time to workshop and evaluate this proposal to make a just decision on motions that will appear in this year's Conference Agenda Report. This lack of time was one of the major concerns expressed at the meeting.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 8,9, Let The board design its own processes*

There was a concern about board coming up with its own guidelines, but we were reminded we would have chance to review and approve those in 1999.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 11,12, (the various standing committees)*

Regarding standing committees, many felt our message to TG at the last WSC was to keep the existing standing committees, H&I, PI, Literature and Translations. These committees would not be part of the board, but the leadership of the standing committees would be members of the board and, therefore, accountable to the board. There was concern that the proposed structure would have inexperienced members for the type of work their committees do.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 10,11*

Regarding the appointment of members of the standing committees by the board, itself, many delegates felt that the WSC should have the authority to elect board members to specific committees within the board. This is a viewpoint shared by the delegates from this region. If a member were to serve on the same standing committee for six years, however, it would interfere with the concept of rotation as expressed in the Fourth Concept.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 11, The Executive Committee*

There was a concern that the executive committee would become just another Interim Committee. The TG responded that the executive committee would be part of the world board and would not be able to act independently of the board like the Interim Committee can act independently of the conference today.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 12, The Guardians*

There was still much concern and confusion expressed over the role of the guardians. Would a special group like this cause elitism and conflict within the board? Some felt that only certain members of the board should have these duties. Some felt that a trustee-like group should be separate from the board. Others felt that each member of the board should have the spiritual makeup it takes to guard our FIPT (steps and traditions) and that there should be no special committee.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 13, Regarding "turf wars"*

There was some concern expressed that there would continue to be competition by the committees within the board for allocation of funds. The TG responded by saying the unified budget and procedure of prioritization of new projects by the world service conference should eliminate the need for any competition for funding.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 16, The Unified Budget*

On the whole there was very little negative input on the Unified Budget proposal. However, it was pointed out that the budget would not actually *save* any money. It would only allow the money we have to be spent more efficiently and perhaps provide more and better services.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 17, One Group Responsible*

There was some concern about prioritization of funding for WSO expenditures. The TG felt that funding for special projects at the World Service Office should be included in the projects approved by the fellowship through the WSC.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 19,*

How will candidates resumes be screened? What's to prevent an individual from mis-representing themselves to the Human Resources Panel?

The TG said they'd envisioned most of the resumes would be submitted through the regional service committees. Such resumes would be assumed to have gone through a screening process that could be "trusted". Resumes from any other source would require closer scrutiny, probably through further correspondence by mail, phone and personal interview. Several delegates suggested a reference section on the resume form.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 20, Composition*

**There was much concern from delegates about including members of the board on the Human Resources Panel. The delegates, including those from this region, felt that it would create a conflict of interest and a drain on the resources of the board.** This was one of the major concerns expressed at the meeting.

*Refer to TG Proposals, page 20, Term of the Human Resources Panel members*

The delegates felt it was inequitable to allow world board members to serve two consecutive 6-year terms while the HRP members could only serve one 4-year term. They also expressed concern that, even though rotation off the HRP would be staggered at 2-year intervals, the panel would have a completely different composition every four years.

*Refer to TG Proposals, initial implementation in general*

Would the Human Resources Panel have enough time after the initial election to write its guidelines, come up with enough resumes and be able to recommend enough nominees for board positions? This was a question asked by some delegates in discussions about the speed of implementation of this proposal.

*Refer to TG Proposals, (general concern)*

The TG proposals raises the question of non-addicts serving on world boards or committees. This has been done in the past, but not recently. Some felt that there could be times when a non-addict could present credibility in dealing with the professional community, as has been the case in the past. Many felt that as our fellowship has grown we have acquired all the necessary professionalism and expertise necessary from within our membership. Others asked about what kind of requirements, such as total abstinence from mind and mood-altering substances, would non-addict members have?