

APPROVED

MAR 11 2004

BY: *Anthony Edmondson*

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.

Approved World Board Minutes

8-10 January 2004

Strategic Planning

World Board present: Jane Nickels, Bob Jordan, David James, Jim Buerer, Giovanna Ghisays, Tom McCall, Bella Blake, Ron Hofius, Susan Chess, Tony Walters and Craig Robertson.

Lib Edmonds, Saul Alvarado and Daniel Schuessler were not present.

Staff: Anthony Edmondson, Becky Meyer, Jeff Gershoff, Mike Polin, Bob Stewart, Travis Koplow, De Jenkins, Nancy Schenck, Kim Young, Tony Greco, Stephan Lantos, Roberta Tolkan and Eileen Perez-Evans

This was an all day session with Jim DeLizia to finalize the identified priorities for the 2004-2006-conference cycle and begin to frame issues for discussion with WSC 2004

The board developed key messages to help with WSC discussions at the October meeting. The board is to select five of the key messages thought to be the most critical and foundational of messages that delegates need to hear throughout the conference. Selected key messages are underlined

- The planning process can be useful to you in regional/local planning
- The plan helps us focus on our common goals not our difference or individual agendas keeps us focused on NA principles
- The plan demonstrates the connection between realizing the vision and the need for sound organizational management
- The plan is the vehicle by which the vision can be accomplished
- The planning process is fluid responsive and flexible
- You have an important role in the planning process – as opportunity to contribute
- The planning process supports delegates in fulfilling their role
- The plan is results oriented
- The plan is how we operate effectively – it guides us in doing the right thing

In small groups the board is to plan how, when, where, and by whom the selected messages can be delivered at the WSC. The results will be discussed in the large group.

Planning process is fluid, responsive and flexible

Key messages should demonstrate the nature of plan: the boards' responsibility, information on how delegates can contribute, as well as how the direction of the plan can be redirected in midstream if necessary. *How:* talking heads, large groups, written support material, which can also include graphics. *Whom:* the board.

Plan allows to be responsive, accountable and responsible partners

Where: small group fellowship session facilitated by board, using examples that illustrate what is provided to us. Possibly have a board member and a RD to recap as a large group. This depends on the board and delegates understanding and will illustrate a partnership.

The plan helps us focus on common goals, not our differences or individual agendas (keeps us focused on NA principles)

When: early in the week, use an icebreaker. Common goals would be placed on an overhead; the PR roundtable example could be used to show how the bigger picture of the plan fits into the strategy.

Plan process demonstrates the connection between realizing the vision and the need for sound organizational management

When: message should be given throughout the conference. Get delegates focused on the vision and make it real to them. *How:* examples during the board report, specifically how the vision is accomplished (systems, finances, staff, etc). Take a project plan they care about and itemize the process. *Whom:* the board.

The planning process can be useful to you in regional/local planning

When: The NAWS planning process can be used later in the week, and done in the roundtables area. *How:* by first asking delegates how they currently plan & set goals, and then ask how they could envision shaping the local level and even improving it with a plan. They will need a tool, a model, something in simple form—almost like a planning tool kit. *Whom:* possibly have delegates facilitate.

The planning is the vehicle by which the vision can be accomplished

When: this could be done early during the week. *How:* Give examples about items to be done and how the planning was used as a way to help the decision process. Use regional reports as a way to make a connection (it's also great way to know information going into WSC). Possibly provide history, and how the conference wanted to see a plan—this being another connection tool.

During the break it was discovered that a key message was missed: WSC is a culmination, not a time to affect the completed work plan

The WSC = a focus on input for being proactive in the next cycle. This is the first time the work reflects the new system. Communicate message that this is when delegates are to impact plan for the next conference cycle and ratify items. The board must figure out how to use the WSC meeting to be what the new system intends it to be. Make conference aware that motions are not an effective way to impact the system.

The foundational message from the *Guide to World Services, under Nature of the Conference* can be used to thread in when providing example of plan driven.

STRATEGIC PLAN – World Board Project Prioritizing Results

The process used by the World Board for prioritizing projects was explained. As before, more plans (1-11) are being forwarded to the conference than reasonably can be expected to be completed.

There was discussion on the prioritized items and what in fact can the conference do with something the board has put so much work into. Recognize the gap in their awareness—the list is 2½ years of work. Inform the delegates of the process, ranking, etc. to help them get to the same understanding, and that it represents something that the leadership of this organization believes can be moved forward.

There were no objection to the prioritized list and confirmed that this is the recommended result of the process.

The layout and content of the *2004 Strategic Plan* was explained. The black text explains why the key areas are present and blue text indicates current activity. The flow of the report should follow: long term goals, result areas, objectives, current activity, improvements for next cycle,

and priorities. The board was asked to input the blue text paragraphs, which are to concisely articulate the current activity, and are the only new material in the document.

- Introduction needs to be written.
- Headers need to be included before text.
- The two possible discussions for the conference are the planning results, then the process used to get the plan.
- Provide a copy of the *flow* to conference participants.
- Page 6, under key result areas: need better definitions or tie in to page 8 (it's more of a formatting issue). Also suggested to remove the black text areas.
- Page 6, suggestion to use a tree to categorize definitions.

Key Area Result Area: Communications

Internal Communication

- Qualify that the website section is being used, but not really up and running as we would like.

External Communication

- Paragraph will incorporate changes that reflect all the work carried out.

Key Result Area: Fellowship Support

Service Structure

- A sentence reflecting that written responses are given when requested will be added.

Key Result Area: Recovery Literature

Literature Content

- The portion reflecting translations will be removed.

Literature Process

- Articulate where the 7.2 bullet list (under objective 7) came from.
- Explain the process for literature production and how the individual project needs determines the process used.

Key Result Area: Leadership and Management

Leadership Development

- 2nd sentence, add *NA Way*, before Editorial board.
- *Before serving in a more official capacity* at the end of 3rd sentence will be removed.
- 5th sentence, *through this process* will be changed to *through these activities*.
- As a current activity it was suggested to add the World Service Conference and local communities, also explaining the systems aren't where we want them to be but working towards it.

Structure

- Change *realistic* to *effective* in 1st sentence.

- Change the word *workgroup-driven* in 2nd sentence.
- Reword 3rd sentence.

Operating process

- There was discussion regarding giving examples about what's currently being done or decided.

No other key result area changes were noted.

WORLD SERVICE CONFERENCE 2004 SESSIONS

Using *Local Infrastructure* as an example, the board and staff defined the issues that need to be answered. Things to think about:

- Who's the audience and what's needed in order to have a valued discussion? The core discussion question should achieve responses for objectives to be achieved in the next two years.
- Give them the context of why this discussion is being had-question could be how to make the structure a dependable entity to carry the message.
- What product or service is NAWS offering that would strengthen their local service?
- Need to find out what would be relevant for them – *what are the tools, information, or support NAWS could provide to help...*
- Ask *how do we maintain and develop and strong service structure that consistently operates at a high level.*
- Cultivating Leadership

Specific Discussion Outcomes (selected critical message's shown by underline)

NAWS

- Discussion model for next cycle (frame issue discussion for fellowship)
- What are the expectations of NAWS' support?
 - At this point we may possibly want to give solutions and get input.
- New ideas for specific products and services
- Model how to frame an issue for the fellowship.
- What can NAWS do to help participants?

• Better idea of needs, challenges at local level/ infrastructure.

Participants

- Sense of shared experience and power to effectively deal with our challenges
 - Awareness, understanding and buy in to the plan
 - Reinvigorated commitment to provide service at local level (how to do this)

Prior to breaking up into small groups to brainstorm the topic of *Local Infrastructure*, Jim asked for factors that might affect strategy in message development:

- Mixed profile of the audience:
 - Variance in tenure
 - Cultural and language differences

- Different perceptions of planning and the value of strategic planning
- History and experience of 'planning failures'
- What's in it for me – relevance of planning decisions
- Expectation for immediate action
- Some regions could be ready, willing to get further direction in planning, etc.
- Regional Delegate role in the planning process not clear
 - Need connection between NAWS activity

Local Infrastructure small group brainstorming

Group 1—

Start with a 10-minute introduction; post desired outcomes around the room as a focus point, followed by a local service delivery skit – icebreaker. Small groups could be used to discuss/exchange ideas about challenges, obstacles, & to get to a point of what the desired outcomes could be. Followed us with a synthesis of common challenges (using dots to identify). After a break, get back in small groups to brainstorm ways to identify solutions to implement plan.

Group 2—

A quick overview to talk about the ideal service delivery community, then into small groups to discuss "what is the ideal local NA Service structure." Use full body for a mind mapping exercise to identify major components of service delivery (using circles). Then brainstorm those (a picture would be the focus). Assign components to groups to discuss services, tools, etc. needed to accomplish, as well as what's needed for NAWS and the local level (joint/partnership). Small groups to report on local responsibility (vision as guiding principle), and use the gap analysis. The *CAR* would be linked in the overview.

- Jim suggested having an exercise to pair down lists so information is manageable when facilitating a large group

Group 3—

Since the group was already familiar with each other no icebreaker needed. There would be 10-15 minute discussion of questions on page 49 of the *CAR*. Use WSC key messages as focus questions, followed by the question: what do we want to accomplish here? Break into small groups to identify challenges in achieving vision. Full body would give solutions & feedback, vision of a perfect service body—talk about successes and end with some inspirational speaking.

- Jim stated that although this is a harder facilitation style it is more personal

Group 4—

Primarily used the small group format. Regional delegates and alternates would be split up. Session would begin with a 10-minute introduction, followed by a phone ringing for 3 minutes with no answer. Utilize a board facilitator at each table to discuss the needs and challenges at the local level. Then a break, followed by a focus on products and services & common ideas; each table would then come up with ideas about how to invigorate service in their area (no repeating of common ideas). Then spend brainstorming time on the common set of ideas, deliver an inspirational wrap up message that brings everyone back to the vision.

Jim additional thoughts:

- Is it possible to use delegates to facilitate?

- What data can be placed on tables prior to session (while at the same time not biasing the discussion by the handouts)?
- Give little cards that allow participants to write down the things they were committed to doing in their local area or have the cards be given to another, allowing the person to call the other individual following up on their progress.

Cultivating Leadership

What is wanted from the fellowship to help frame the question:

- The bigger issue is defining leadership requirements and getting everyone on the same page. The way we present questions must produce information needed to move forward?
- Post the concepts of leadership for all to see. All must realize what leadership is and that it's not a dirty word.
- Old structure had a way in which leaders were developed and seen. What is this in the new structure? What environments demonstrate leadership skills and/or to cultivate those skills?
- Cultivation starts from the beginning level of service. What are the ingredients, what is this about?
- What's the role of a leader in furthering the vision, and what kind of leadership does it take to achieve the vision of NAWs.
- Find a way to connect the nominations and elections as a way to keep this philosophical. The desired outcome would be the expectations.

Leadership and Management

Framing discussions about nominations & elections for WSC 2004

Overview of sessions at WSC 2004

The World Board agreed to the West End Area hosting the Unity Day event on April 24, 2004.

The session began by informing the board of the EC's various efforts to generate solutions for framing the WSC 2004 nominations and elections discussion. EC meeting points recapped:

- As human beings, we do not vote for people that we don't know or have confidence in (example: home group electing a GSR).
- Our exposure of other non-profit organizations shows that they do not use an outside entity to elect their board members.
- There was some sentiment about giving all the responsibility to one group, and fear that the same group has the ability to impact the process for elections and nominations.
- Premise of a pool of resources came from the desire that this system did not parrot the old system—the perception of being self-perpetuating or electing the same folks over and over again.

The EC sent the HRP a letter that outlined a list of ideas for consideration at WSC 2004. Although the HRP has not formally responded the request for written essays have been added to their second round process.

The body was then led through a discussion based on the 3 points listed under *Purpose of the HRP* in *A Guide to World Services*:

- Facilitate an election/selection process that will allow the World Service Conference to base trusted servant choices upon the principles of ability and experience.
- Allow members to be nominated from around the world without having to be present at the conference to receive due consideration.
- Create a more open opportunity for world services to benefit from our collective resources by providing an established and recognized process by which to do so.

The only point the board decided on from the previous discussion was that the current system was not supported and the consensus was that the board wanted change and/or possibly to eliminate but not clear on how.

Discussion points:

- Inform conference participants that this is where the information has to come from; this is where we are and we need your help to move forward.
 - HRP has to be able to provide the assurance that someone qualified on paper is also qualified in person.
 - Everyone needs to arrive at the point that just because someone is unpleasant does not mean this person is not a potential suitable board member.
- There is possibly a need to talk about the ability to discuss the nominee prior to the elections.
- Some believe the system does work, however they also believe the system has not gotten up to speed yet. One example is that it isn't believed that the current process generates the election of a person who has not been introduced to the conference in some way.
- Two board members would support the HRP function as being better suited as a subgroup of the board (if the board has no vote in the elections process). This same subgroup would choose people for workgroups, etc., identifying potentials and giving opportunities.
- Cultivating—once a decision is made on what that is, how do we base a decision on ability and experience will be how to cultivate.
- Don't believe the HRP is anymore successful and does anymore for the conference than when there was no HRP system.
- WSC discussions should be done with salient questions and then we'll see what comes up. The WB could give their comments, but not include conclusions in the discussion. This initial session could be a brainstorming session and from that gather information and bring back information.
- Proposed questions are:
 - Do we need to personally know a nominee to vote for him/her when the criterion is "...whom you have confidence in?"
 - Can a resume or profile give that level of confidence? Will "on paper" ever achieve that?
 - Is it believed that an entity such as the HRP, completely independent of the board, is needed for "check and balances?"
 - If we focus on Leadership Development instead of elections, would this solve the problem(s)?

- Is there confidence in the “vetting” process now? Do you automatically have confidence in a candidate if they are being forwarded by the HRP? If not, what would give you that level of confidence?
- What methods of nomination into the process could be used in addition to self-nomination (which is used now)? Regional or other local nominations, such as search committee?
- Should being in the pool be a requirement to be considered for nomination? Or should the pool simply function as a wider net cast to find more people to get involved?
- The board needs to make a case for leadership development, use of the world pool and be strategic in the future of our leadership.

Most of the board stated that they want to inform the conference of previous discussions, inform conference participants of not finding answers and not having clear solutions for what to do. Therefore the board has decided to present the conference with the same questions we've come up with and hopefully this issue can end at the WSC.

- Inform the conference that the board has consensus on the ideal. Lead a discussion with the board recommendations: pose questions, and philosophical issues. The board believes that the WSC will come to the same conclusions as they did by answering the questions.

Produce a document that has all the discussions regarding the nominations and elections discussion. The world board has agreed to Ron's suggested questions—to be developed further and reviewed in March for WSC discussion.

We will provide the board with background information & include leadership objective in Strategic Plan. Keep in mind that we also want to be able to report that we want to get questions answered.

KRA: Communications

PR Roundtable Update

Tony presented the Roundtable Workgroup Report. The board reviewed the common thoughts from professionals from the different roundtables. It was important to point out to the board that regardless of the report contents, every roundtable group felt that NA is important enough to attend and participate. Each group was cooperative and willing to give input.

Tony explained the tone of the third roundtable report, e.g. the perception is that NA is unreliable, was for hardcore drug users, not safe for newcomer women, and other themes of that nature. Anthony noted that in the report (under the Common Problems and Solution section) there are some things that could not be done because of our philosophy, however there are many steps that can be taken to improve.

Thoughts on the report

- NAWS should be a little more proactive in getting our literature to professionals.
- Hopes this provides a baseline for WSC Local Infrastructure talks (comments and/or discussion).
- The information from these PR reports gives us the opportunity to also address what is currently being done by NAWS.
- There seems to be the common thread in that our image needs to change. How do we change the atmosphere of recovery and how do we deal with predatory behavior? We

have an opportunity to create a report that would really get the fellowships' attention and wonder if this is currently possible.

- Anthony stated that some time ago he brought up an idea of using non-addicts as advocates and through the PR roundtables we have identified people who might be willing to be possible advocates. He also brought up the point made to him about creating some type of sub meeting (for example – professionals).

WSC 2004

2004 CAR & CAR Workshops

The discussion's purpose was for those who participated in *CAR* workshops to share experience, or anything they felt should be reported in the *March Conference Report*.

South East Zonal Forum

Susan and Bella shared that participants voiced concerns about the content of the Sponsorship book (e.g. different sex sponsors) and that they had questions about presenting motions to amend the book on conference floor. SEZF participants wanted the book to be more of a "how to" book. Bella shared that the book was like the Basic Text in that the stories are a collage of individual experience. The other member-issue was why the board always recommends not adopt regional motions.

Bella suggested that in the future we should provide background information about our literature projects--like how the process and contents were chosen. Basic Text information should probably be given to the delegates in preparation for the upcoming discussion.

Multi-regional Learning Event VIII (MRLE)

Bob and Tony experienced the same questions about the board not adopting regional motions. Bob shared how the board worked with the Southern California region as way to negate that train of thought.

Rocky Mountain Zonal Forum

Craig and David shared the same experience concerning the board not recommending any regional motions. However, after having gone through each motion the participant straw poll yielded the same results. Craig found it helpful to include the RD's input, whenever possible, in responding to certain questions.

Southern Zonal Forum

Ron shared that some were talking about the *Sponsorship* book and mentioned members' concerns because the contents did not provide a "how to" model. Ron explained that we are recommending publishing the fellowships experience.

WSC Seating

David started the report by sharing the struggles in obtaining responses to the workgroup's questions. The process was that the Seating Workgroup requested information from the regions, and based on the responses, a second set of questions were posed. The Seating Workgroup made individual recommendations for each region based on responses from the 2 sets of questions. In an attempt to really help a particular region the Seating Workgroup, although not required, asked for additional information (third round of questions).

David pointed out that the reference to *Resolution A* in their report was not intended for a particular region. But does wonder if the seating criteria should contain *Resolution A*. The board needs to have a future discussion about the Seating policy and it should contain *Resolution A* information.

David went on to explain that it was difficult to determine when the Occidente Region was providing services, but by all accounts the date provided by the region was four months after the deadline date.

This led the group into a discussion regarding whether or not the Occidente region was a break off from the Mexico region and whether or not the recommendation is based on a technicality. The workgroup felt that the Occidente region was a break away from the Mexico region because of the experience shared by a member from the Mexico region.

The following bullets are based on criteria found on page 24 and 25 of *Guide to World Services* and the thoughts about the Occidente region

- The idea is that the workgroup would follow policy and did so by following the criteria for the Seating Workgroup.
 - Issues are about policy and what we want it to be
- The Carolina region experience was brought up... the board decided not to consider them for seating because they did not meet the deadline. Further, it was pointed out that the Occidente region was given more latitude because more information was still being gathered (even though the current policy workgroup felt they did not meet the deadline).
- The policy was created to slow the growth of US regions when it came to funding. The issue is did we intend to use the policy to punish on a technicality. Is the policy being used in a way that is consistent with the original intent? What is the heart of the policy?
- There has to be a place where this body can deal with a community that is a region providing services for 10 years—to be brought in and have a voice.
- It was suggested that with all these discussions and rather than bending the rules, something on *Resolution A* should be included in the content of the WSC Seating policy.
- Ron shared that there was an intention to create a relationship with the region, which the workgroup discussed.
 - If the region is reaching out to NAWS in order to meet the criteria and we are not meeting the needs, then the policy is not being met.
- There was the sentiment that any kind of seating process should only help a community to grow. It is very important to bring in new emerging communities in some fashion, to help strengthen them. However, bringing a new emerging community to the World Service Conference is not the best way to approach this. The conference is not friendly or useful.
- The *law* of the policy should always be used with the *heart* (discretion) of the policy when following any policy. It seems that the heart of the issue is the region not being connected for at least another conference cycle.

The board asked if *Resolution A* should have some effect in implementing the seating criteria. They were also asked how to write the report to the conference.

- Maybe we should look at including the difference about a new emerging community, a break off community, and questions about the policy.
- This may not be the time, but we have to look at process on the cultural perspective when looking at essay questions.

WSC seating group is recommending the seating of Venezuela, Chile and to not seat the Occidente region.

The board is supporting the recommendations as presented by the Seating Workgroup report—
1 abstention based on the recommendation for Occidente.

The letter to Occidente will include encouragement to help them in seating process—keeping them on board, state the high probability for seating at the next conference, and ask for input on process. Communication to the Occidente region will come from the EC, and will be reviewed by a seating workgroup point person prior to sending correspondence.

- Another issue is new conference participants at WSC and dealing with matters they should know and/or their responsibilities as a seated region. Maybe the communications need to be refined to state ...being considered for 2006, between now and then there are services available to you, they are... give name of a contact person, however we typically don't provide these services proactively, we do this when requested. This is an invitation for you to contact us...

March Conference Report

Seating Criteria

At the start of the next cycle would like the board to consider allowing the Seating Workgroup to look at cultural issues—develop a letter to encourage the process. They need to begin looking at discussion points—the seating criterion is the end all to be all, it is too narrow—do we need to consider more when the regions respond? The WB will continue this discussion and come back with some type of recommendation for the next cycle.

Spanish Personal Stories

The deadline for providing input to the Spanish personal stories is January 30. The board is to either accept or reject (with input) however they are not to edit stories. NAWS message must be about the message/criteria.

Discussion points

- It's not easy to approve this type of work when it's subjective. Yes, there are a group of guidelines that must be followed for writing personal stories, however who are we to say this is or is not a good story.
- It's not believed that the guidelines are being referred to consistently as a reference tool for writing of the translated stories and the English stories.
- There are objections to two stories: one goes into too much sexuality detail and the other is too drug specific.
- We should set the expectation for the board to review and give comments and together come up with the best possible product.

Travis will draft something to address the Basic Text future efforts, however the issue about reviewing something in English when originally written in Spanish still needs to be addressed.

The board meeting was adjourned for the day with a sharing session, which is not a recorded portion of the meeting.

Budget & Project Plans

Draft 2004-2006 Budget

Anthony explained the increase percentages projected over the next conference cycle. Because of the timeline, this is a draft, after the projects are reviewed, etc., all exacts will be implemented.

There is a slightly different format change to the report and it is due to non-profit income law—to be in compliance this it will now be the new format for budget and reports.

There was discussion on how projections are developed, the occurring trends, etc. Also, about the board having NAWS financial knowledge and the how the *NAWS Annual Report* is a great resource for this.

- One of the Business Plan group's tasks is to present information in a way that simplifies financial reports. This is to give an individual with no financial background a way to understand budget/financials. A PowerPoint presentation is being developed that will help this process.
 - Bella asked if the PowerPoint presentation could be adapted for the conference.
- A question was asked about conference funding and how there's seems like no difference with increased regional donations.
 - It was noted that if the top 3 regional donators were pulled from the financial equation, NAWS would have a dilemma.
- Basic questions were asked concerning line items for fellowship development, specific event items and subsidized literature. Also that Hawaii is being projected as a break-even event.

The financial monthly update from Tom Rush will be sent to the full board.

Draft 2004-2006 Project Plans

There are two items that could be identified as project plans and will need the boards decision, one being the World Service Meeting and the other, Issue Discussion Topics.

The CTF update was written for the board, not as a public document, and needs more information from the board.

A discussion was had about what the board's decision is in regard to the CTF: provide the CTF to the fellowship, using it to engage the conference in a discussion, or keep as a tool for the board? This does not need to be done by WSC 2004; however since the number one priority is communications, the board will carry out some type of session at the conference. The board will be sent a reminder about the CTF and this will be discussed at the March board meeting.

The CTF led the board into a lengthy discussion regarding the actual priority of communications. How do you do that and what does it mean—how do we take the strategic plan and marry it to the project plans. Do the project plans go with the approaches and content – is this the way we want to accomplish the approaches?

Communications, page 5

- Reference the CTF report information to be utilized in this project plan—giving it a feel that it is a continuation.
- Agreed to change the word in the third bullet: *strategy* to *plan*.
- There was a discussion about adding a bullet for standardizing soliciting and receiving information—when looking at communications we look at our ability to solicit effectively. Newsflash used as an example. Statement that in NAWS communication history we have not been responsive with feed forward.

It was agreed to add *and other solicitations for input from the fellowship* to the second bullet.

Fellowship Issue Discussion, page 6

It was agreed to write it out as two-issue discussion.

Self Support & Service Structure Relationship and Definition

- Issues are to prioritize material presented and to present the information according to conference policy. How do we pair down list, additions / how to present?

Items on the list:

- What is NAWS and what happens at the primary service center? *NA Way Magazine did you know* column could be used to explain the WSO & Services.
- Suggestion to change/remove *honest* from in *Giving the Newcomer a chance to recover* (behavior at meetings)
- When presenting to the WSC, the bulletins can be left to show what is thought to be top priority, however we need to provide more information about the handbook projects.

The board discussed and agreed to offer *giving a newcomer a chance...* as a possible IP. The board then talked about the issue's importance and if the board really wanted to wait to publish this IP (because of the time it takes to publish a piece of literature) and if the board really wants to wait that long for this issue. The board agreed with the idea to write about the issue in the *NA Way*, other reporting vehicles, and as a bulletin offered.

The board agreed that the priority of the list is as follows:

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 1 st | Giving the Newcomer a chance to recover | | | | | |
| 2 nd | Disruptive people at meetings, | Activities & Financial Responsibility WSC for beginner | Revision of Existing Bulletins, | Medication & Recovery | Info on a range of financial issues. | |
| 3 rd | Anonymity | Consensus Based Decision making at the WSC | Common Needs | Convention Handbook | Literature Handbook | Other items under Possible Addition Identified prioritized |

Consensus Based Decision Making at the WSC

Board agreed to keep the purpose and scope as simply defined in the in the WSC project plan.

PI Handbook Idea

Craig explained the idea of combining all the handbooks (PI, Phonenumber, H&I, etc.) taking the best and creating one. The discussion was on the different opinions, if this should be done and if so, how to accomplish.

The recollection is that the fellowship would not want to wait any further for a PI Handbook—this would help with what PR Roundtables participants have been telling us, as well as providing the fellowship with something useful.

A show of hands was requested for wanting to move forward with something inline with a PR Handbook or a PI Handbook. PR Handbook—7 PI Handbook—3

It was decided to inform the conference that creating a PR Handbook is where the board would like to go but a minimal the PI Handbook will be worked on. The board will discuss with the conference to measure support of the larger focus. The board will talk more about this and report in the March Conference Report.

Self Support IP

There was discussion about the possibility of creating something new to replace *Self-Support* and *Hey, What's the Basket For?* The board decided that if this ideal were chosen, the input

and review period would be 90 days. Message in our project plan should be about creating a better tool with a better description.

Service Structure Relationship and Definition

Ron is suggesting that the project plan include a white paper to help define the issues included in the plan. Item noted because the board needs something defined, by the time of the conference, that helps to see how everything fits together—it was meant to look at how different communities did what they did, changing practices, roles, etc. This is only a first step in a bigger process but must have a defined result and process. Ron stated that this is only a paper to define an issue, and that has value in itself-to be used later.

The board agreed that this is an unprecedented approach to trying to create a foundation for probing issue, for use as a foundational base to look at how to describe the service structure in any and all places we do so. The board will develop something and take what will hopefully be the agreed upon basis & foundation for the service structure to conference for ratification at WSC 2006.

Service Handbook

The board agreed that the review and input period for the handbooks would be covered in the timeline explanation. Review and input will be for anyone who wants to participate. This is conference approval track material.

Service Material heading will be changed to reflect what it is.

Targeted Literature: The board agreed that the priority list is as follows:

- | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|
| 1 st | <i>Youth and Recovery</i> (will replace an item) | <i>Medication in Recovery</i> (will replace an item) |
| 2 nd | <i>The spiritual development of members with longer clean time and how to continue to engage them in the fellowship of NA</i> | <i>The benefits of service to personal recovery</i> moved to Page 12. |
| 3 rd | <i>Older members and recovery</i> | <i>Issues regarding gender.</i> |

Worldwide workshops

Page 15: remove the specifics and “up to five” allowing the board to discuss at a later point.

World Service Meeting:

A few board members felt that an opportunity is lost in not implementing the WSM. There is a large portion of WSC participants present and the gathered information from the event is important. It was also pointed out that the board is already struggling with the delegates feeling disconnected and to remove that interface will intensify the feeling.

The conference will be informed that the board will try to use the other venues to create a type of feedback loop. There was also discussion about what the meeting’s purpose was. Calling it the “World” Services Meeting when, in-fact, the majority of delegates in attendance do not include members outside the US. There was a suggestion to consider sending more board members to zonal forums when discussing fellowship interface in the next conference cycle.

It was decided to not include a World Service Meeting project plan.

Prioritizing

The colored text is arranged in order of priority: orange signifies 1st priority; blue is 2nd, and black is 3rd priority. The board is to prioritize only the orange items. Each board member was given 4 dots to place a single dot next to the orange items thought to be most important.

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Basic Text 8 | Communications 6 | Leadership development 9 | Leadership Requirements 0 |
| PR Strategy 3 | Self Support IP 0 | Service Structure Definitions 0 | Service Material-bulletin 6 |
| PI/PR Handbook 8 | Targeted literature 4 | | |
| Consensus based decision-making at the WSC | Fellowship Issue discussion | Historical Data | Worldwide Workshop |
| Literature Dist. & convention workshop | WSM | | |

Selected items are Leadership development (9), Basic Text (8), PI/PR Handbook (8), Service Material-bulletin (6), Communications (6), Targeted literature (4), PR Strategy (3)

Medallion Design

A medallion sample was presented, showing an increase in space for numbers. Other idea is to use Arabic numbers in the medallions as opposed to roman numerals. The proposal is to reconfigure the text on page (sample shown on page 71-73). In the meantime the existing dies will be improved.

Board agreed to procuring a sample with the Arabic numbers and making a selected sample available at WSC 2004. The board will be provided with a sample that does not have a pebbled back where the number is.

Literature on the Internet

The board approved the posting of Group Readings in all available languages on www.na.org.

In March the board will talk about what has become the policy to contact a community prior to posting the 6 IPs in a certain language. Some of the language communities have complained about this practice and complaints have been taken as a request to post and in each instance posting has been done.

Service Material

The board approved a limited trial of posting *A Guide to Local Services* and *A Guide to World Services* on www.na.org.

At the March meeting Anthony agreed to provide a structured timeline of when to propose posting books on www.na.org

WCNA update

Mike provided a brief report to the EC regarding cities to be removed for further consideration for WCNA. The EC has agreed with the removal of Athens and London for WCNA 33, Dallas and Las Vegas for WCNA 34, Atlanta, Fort Lauderdale and Miami for WCNA 35. The board agreed with recommended cities for removal.

Action Item List

The board agreed with changing the 3rd step prayer poster to start with... and they also approved the *We Do Recover* meeting reading, Samples will be created and presented at WSC 2004.

Inmate Correspondence

Primarily the only thing the staff was trying to do was to gather generic information from communities that provide an inmate correspondence program. However, after further thought staff is proposing that NAWS be a referral agency for the inmates. The board concurred with continuing further with this ideal and receiving more information. This discussion will occur at WSC 2004.

Appearance of Literature

Samples of new covers/art work for existing literature shown and discussed

- Try something more vivid that retains the original graphic concept. Prefers the red, white and blue sample.
 - Seems that the original concept was lost as more samples were produced.
- Suggestion for the fellowship to be utilized as a resource to provide graphic samples and to possibly make a contest out of this.
 - Agreed that in looking at the samples the style has not yet been found. Feels its about the color... current samples do not reflect correctly.
- The fonts should be changed to be larger and clearer. Feels that retro look is not good because once the trend is out, then our literature will look old and outdated. Must also consider the copying issue.
- Would not prefer that NAWS wait another year to create better-looking literature when yesterday we talked about a face-lift of our literature during the PR report.

Part of the reason management brought samples to the board is because they also agreed that the samples did not meet the needs. The comments will be provided to the graphic artists and another set of samples will be provided to the board.

Preferred samples: *Just for Today* (khaki green cover with orange fonts) and the red, white and blue samples made more vivid.

Suggestion to supply stickers for the 3 meditation days that are being proposed for change in *Just for Today* due to the Sponsorship booklet will be discussed in March.

Letter Head

The board reviewed the samples, however no decision or objection was made.

2004-2006 WB schedule

| 2004 | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--|--|--|-------------------|-----------------------|
| 8-10 January | 11-13 March | 25 April-1 May WSC (WB arrive April 23) | 25-26 June (New WB members only) | 29-31 July | 28-30 October | |
| 2005 | | | | | | |
| 27-29 January | 21-23 April | 14-16 July | 1-4 September (WCNA 31) | 20-22 October | | |
| 2006 | | | | | | |
| 19-21 January | 9-11 March | 23-29 April (WSC 2006) | | | | |
| The Executive Committee will meet before each board meeting with the following additions: | | | | | | |
| 9-10 March 2004 | 1-3 April 2004 | 4-5 June 2004 | 17-18 September 2004 | 10-11 December 2004 (Offsite meeting) | 20-21 May 2005 | 12-13 July 2005 |
| 30 September- 1 October 2005 | 2-3 December 2005 | | | | | |

The board approved the presented World Board schedule for the 2004-2006-conference cycle.

The meeting concluded with a sharing session, which is not a recorded portion of the meeting.

