Thursday 4 November

Opening of the Meeting

Present: Bob Jordan, Craig Robertson, Jim Buerer, Piet De Boer, Ron Miller, Giovanna Ghisays,
Saul Alvarado, Ron Blake, Daniel Schuessler, David James, Michael Cox, Mary Banner, Ron Hofius, Mukam Harzenski-Deutsch, and Tom McCall

Staff: Anthony Edmondson, Becky Meyer, Elaine Wickham, and Eileen Perez-Evans

Action Group

Tom led the board in an action group asking the board to share their vision of the board and how the body can keep from fragmenting because of workgroup projects.

Agenda Review and Discussion

The board reviewed plans for the weekend and had a general overview of what has occurred since the last board meeting.

Key Result Area: Communications

World Board and NA World Services Communications

Jim B facilitated a discussion about framing issues for publication, capturing the board's voice, and providing input to written documents. He asked the board to look at the topic in the Executive Report "2004-Discussion Topics."

- How do we start out in brainstorming discussions where staff can gather what we are saying and best convey points and issues?

- The Leadership article: How the article came about seemed to be an issue and how the board had to realize that, they all do not have the same vision of what goes into the articles.

- Issues are communicating and getting input to staff, which can be turned around and written so the board agrees with the written material.

- Framing Issue Discussion Topics for publication and the web.

- Noted was that it may not speak to you, but it may speak to someone else. In addition, that this is just the beginning of many articles to come from the board and this body needs to come up with ideas, processes, and procedures for a unified voice - coming together as a board when communicating to the fellowship.

- The full body will not always agree with everything but has to find a way to come to a consensus.

Board Discussion Points Regarding Board Input:

- Is there an evaluation tool that determines that this is the voice of the board? Question asked *what if the board feels as though presentation/discussion points are great, but there are modifications*, again - at what point do the staff make or not make modifications and view that as the voice of the world board?

    > Response was that staff do what they think can reasonably be done with provided input, however, some input must be decided by the Executive Committee. Material is then back to the EC for a final decision/sign off.

The thought for the discussion topics article was to publish something that would provoke thought. The staff wrote an article with that in mind, however, it still did not seem that the Executive Committee was at a place of consensus with publishing and against a publication timeline; therefore, the article nearly pulled.

- The Executive Committee making decisions and those decisions not communicated to the board is a concern.

Additionally noted was that the *grayification* process of literature comes when someone has an objection, removing the color and character. Understood is that when a board member gives input this does not mean it has to be included. However, some board members liked the article, some made no comment, and a significant amount of input did not agree with the chess analogy.

There was a question about the strong input from the board and the Executive Committee decision and process utilized to make the final decision to continue forward with the chess analogy. At the same time agrees with the Executive Committee being the final point of authority when deciding on input and publishing of articles.

- We cannot continue to homogenize written material, need stronger statements.

- Agrees with the chess analogy, the player is the leader - to find leadership in the game is not smart; this is what makes the article interesting.

There was a concern that some members will not understand chess and consequently will not be interested in reading the article. There was a feeling that the article was important enough that more NA language should have been used and specific direction on Leadership should have been provided.

> Staff responded that the challenge was capturing the voice of the board because of how the board frames and executes a discussion. Staff knows that they have to capture the discussion or issue quickly because of all the competing resources.

> The choice put to the Executive Committee was either to publish the article provided or to pull it. NA does not have a good history of capturing philosophical discussions and then putting thoughts into words and onto paper.

>> The question is "How does staff do a better job at capturing the board's discussion points/issues without homogenizing?" In the schedule of items to be completed, the review part is too late to have objections. We have to do a better job of capturing information up front.

There was no objection noted from the board to the general protocol of a "no response" from a board member as being okay with what's written.

There was also no objection regarding the premise of providing input and it being okay if the input is or is not used.

- Opinion shared that it seems that the article has statements that are *written in stone*, example being "we can learn to be leaders in NA."

- Appreciated the statement written in *The NA Way Magazine* that, *"Even your World Board does not necessarily agree on everything here, which tells us that the topic of Leadership is even more important to talk about as a fellowship."*

  o Wants and likes ways to have energized fellowship discussions from our articles.

  o We cannot pretend that the analogy does not speak to us in NA. Thought is provoked for the different levels of service and this was a very creative way to talk about Leadership.

- o Did not think it was a big deal and not bothered by the analogy. Surprised the chess analogy provoked such feelings from some board members at the same time, was surprised that the article printed because of such provoked feelings.

- Already opinionated by the comments received prior to reading the material. If four people said, they did not like it then it should have been taken into account.

  - o However, additionally shared that the board started the day by looking at the big picture and this is not what is currently occurring. The actual process is about making the body aware of what's going on. There was a feeling that the board was trying to do what they said they did not want to do an hour ago in their action group.

- The chair shared that the decision to publish or not publish the Leadership article was different because the Executive Committee had come up against the publication deadline for *The NA Way Magazine.*

- Noted was that there seemed to be an agreement on how input is given, received, proceeded with, etc., but what still needed to be discussed was the relationship of input to the final product.

- Discussion seems to be mostly about perspective and not concerned with article but more interested in process:

  - o Glad the board led through how input may or may not be used as well as the body agreeing to a *no response* meaning agreement with material.

- It seems this body needs to talk and agree about the items "I cannot live with this and I am blocking this." How do we communicate a strong objection? Looking at the process and putting a mechanism in place for objections.

- Appreciate discussions because the board talks about having philosophical discussions but there never seems to be time in our agenda to have them. However, here we are reacting to publishing an article that has some philosophical meaning.

  - o Many times, we don't know what the consensus is and what it really means.

  - o The article is not translatable.

- An individual board member believes that "we" should not have the ability to block a decision. Makes point regarding the body giving input, which is good, and believes staff does a great job in capturing the board's thoughts.

- Thinks no one individual board member should have the ability to block what is trying to be communicated and trusts that the Executive Committee is the final point of authority.

- Did not feel the article should be pulled because some didn't like the analogy. Nevertheless, have to figure out a way to capture process.

  - o A thought was that maybe in the future the EC could review the board input before the staff makes input decisions.

- Questions the ability to have some kind of tool that says that material has been read, okay or can the material be reevaluated?

  - o A thought shared regarding having to re-read the material after reading the board's input

- Staff put the item on agenda to frame the discussion, not to make process more cumbersome. Agrees that staff do a great job, but in the beginning, the board hired a consultant to help frame issues for the board.

Staff is interested in how to effectively frame discussions that gives a new voice, promotes thought, as opposed to reporting decisions. The idea is to streamline processes as well as make process on both ends successful.

- The board discussed cultivating Leadership-some that were consensus points and referred to when the article was first created. However, most don't remember the discussions and outcomes because there are just so many items the board deals with. Then when material is turned back to the board that is not what they recall.

Staff is going to pursue the board for actual decisions. Hopefully making clear what the board is communicating and trying to capture what the board is trying to talk about.

- It was recalled that at the August meeting Jim D facilitated two different sessions regarding cultivating leadership and that the discussions were some what nebulous.

Board Input, Post It Points:

How does staff encapsulate modifications from the board?

Input: Not bound-can take it or leave it.

Someone has to make final decisions—Executive Committee entrusted with final decision

More weight given to strong input received by several members

Use more Inclusive analogies

Be clearer in what is being asked

Frame discussion – execute it and review

How do we frame board discussions and capture input?

Does no comment mean you're okay with it? – YES this may mean the material was not read

Strong objections need to be communicated via telephone, emails? Some type of mechanism

What is the ability to block or not?

Be cautious about making statements in stone, perhaps pose as a question

Fellowship should receive more diverse input-board doesn't have to agree on everything

Problem receiving input before having read piece

Past input considered – hesitant to keep inputting

Replaying to all helps get other members perspective

Better system to use so it does not come down to pulling the article or leaving it alone

Possibility for EC to review before staff makes input changes

Some kind of mechanism for:

Yes or No – strongly agree, agree, etc

Additional Comments:

More explicit instructions to draw input

Focus on faming and streamlining the process, capturing the voice that asks questions and presents challenges, etc. Not to just report decisions

Capture other voices

Key Result Area: Recovery Literature

Basic Text

◆   Is the board open to using different language for "personal stories" in solicitations from and reports to the fellowship?

    ◆   Discussion of the "hot button" issues identified in the Basic Text report.

Ron H reported on the first workgroup meeting, where the workgroup discussed plans to accomplish the project. This included proposing content revisions, plans to collect stories, tools needed, and evaluation material. The most important foundational idea for the workgroup was that this project has to be different for it to be successful.

This session is to get direction from the board on capturing philosophical issues, what is a workgroup, and how it relates to the World Board and the fellowship.

- A question asked regarding the Basic Text charge and if the charge states to call the stories *Personal Stories*? Is the workgroup changing that? It was further asked if it is a good idea to make these creative changes if it's not stated in the charge.

  Response was that the *CAR* would be used to communicate any changes and decisions as well as reported as soon as they are made. What the board is referring to is the type of communications so members understand that the project may be approached differently.

- The workgroup will communicate to the board, and the board to the fellowship. The board has the final authority on project.

- If the board has strong feelings they would like to know now. All ideas and thoughts from the board would be discussed within the workgroup and brought back to the board.

- Because Book Two has not been discussed with the fellowship it will still be called Book Two.

Basic Text—what to call the "Personal Stories"

Ron H reported that currently the workgroup thinks the title *Personal Stories* would encourage the old way of thinking and as a result would receive the same types of stories/experience. The workgroup recommends not using the *Personal* Stories title. Hence the workgroup is asking for direction and a general sense of the body on keeping the title *Personal Stories* or would the body agree to call the stories in Book Two something different.

10 World Board members agreed to call it something different and 0 raised hands to wanting to call it *Personal Stories,* proceeding with reviewing the options on what to call the *Personal Stories* – list of options was passed out.

Basic Text—List of options

The board asked to "vote" for two. Below are the results. The underlined topics were added by board members.

In Order of Preference

        3—Voices of recovery

        3—Many voices, one message

        3—Experience, Strength, and Hope [a board member asked if this is an AA expression?]

        2—Shared experience

2—Stories…of recovery

2—Many members, one fellowship

1—Experience

1—Voices of experience

1—Members' experience

1—Our voices . . . our experience, our message

1—Our Experience, Strength, and Hope

1—Voices of Experience, Strength, and Hope

1—Experience of Recovery

1—Getting Clean, Staying Clean, Living Clean

1—Members Share: Getting Clean, Staying Clean, Living Clean

Ideas with no Votes

Voices of the fellowship

Members share

Our common theme

Our voices of experience

His, hers, ours…voices of experience

Ideas added to one ballot but not voted for:

The Road to Recovery

From Darkness to Light

Grouped by Similarity (with ideas duplicated)

Voices (9)

3—Voices of recovery

3—Many voices, one message

1—Voices of experience

1—Our voices . . . our experience, our message

1—Voices of Experience, Strength, and Hope

Experience (7)

2—Shared experience

1—Experience

1—Experience of Recovery

1—Members' experience

1—Voices of experience

1—Our voices . . . our experience, our message

Recovery (6)

3—Voices of recovery

2—Stories…of recovery

1—Experience of Recovery

Experience, Strength, and Hope (5)

3—Experience, Strength, and Hope [One member asks: Is this an AA expression?]

1—Our Experience, Strength, and Hope

1—Voices of Experience, Strength, and Hope

Members (4)

2—Many members, one fellowship

1—Members Share: Getting Clean, Staying Clean, Living Clean

1—Members' experience

Getting Clean… (2)

1—Members Share: Getting Clean, Staying Clean, Living Clean

1—Getting Clean, Staying Clean, Living Clean

Basic Text—Organization / Structural Issues

The workgroups thoughts for organizing sections of the stories could be "Getting Clean, Staying Clean and Living Clean (Dying Clean)." The workgroup wants a diversity of input and wants the collected stories to represent early recovery, middle recovery, and living recovery experiences-a life style choice being committed to NA.

A member of the board does not prefer "Dying Clean" as an option, as well as "Getting Clean, Staying Clean and Living Clean, " wondering if the thoughts could be separated in some way. The words don't seem to capture the diversity this body is seeking.

Another suggestion proposed was: Part Two - Getting Clean, Staying Clean and Living Clean, also suggests: ° Experience, Strength and Hope   ° Experience of recovery   ° Voices of experience, strength and hope

The board agrees with the general operating premise of sections.

Basic Text—Drug Specific References

Ron H noted that the workgroup discussed NA's commonly held ideal that drugs are not mentioned and the bond is created via the experience of addiction and recovery. However, it was noted that there were some workgroup members who thought there is value in using drug specific references and some did not.

Staff stated one of the reasons some of the workgroup members warmed up to the idea of possibly using specific drug recovery phases was that there could be sections with more emphasis with drugs, then moving out of specifics as recovery continues. Yes there is an underlined principle when we share that we use drug specificity, but in practice we haven't written in that manner. A way to deal with this could be to explain the different phases in the book.

Ron H further clarified that more generic phrases like "intravenous drug use" as opposed to "heroine addict" could be used. The workgroup feels this would make the stories more inclusive.

Disagree with idea of drug specific reference:

- Believes this will be a hot spot and of the opinion that the stories can do without using drug specific references, further thinks this only enhances the differences. Question where the references would stop.

  o Feels strongly that we should do without drug specificity/references in submitted stories.

- Would not prefer the drug specificity in the stories and believes they wouldn't be essential to recovery.

- Understands both sides of utilizing drug specific references, however recalls personal experience of identifying with a person who shared and got the individual to be their sponsor. The flip side of that is that most of our literature speaks of us being disease specific rather than substance specific. Leans towards focusing on the universal as opposed to the specific drug use.

Open to idea of drug specific reference:

- Feels differently because there could be a section on our diversity that encompasses the diversity in our drug use. Feels that any excuse that we can find that we are special and different is good. When we come into recovery we look for what makes us different and diversity and this may help overcome the thought of "I'm different."

- This may be a good way to use snip it's for drug specificities - different paragraphs on sharing about drug use.

- Experience with the White Booklet shared and remembers the Basic Text Stories and how some thought about all heroine addicts. Drug specificity shouldn't make a difference but does for some.

- Questions the passion/authenticity of the individual's story if the reference of a particular drug was removed. Further stated that it's understood that decisions would be made to make certain edits, but poses the question again; would it really be their story.

- Opinion shared that what works for one member does not always work for everyone else. However, believes that if something that speaks to a youth/anyone will help them get clean, even if it doesn't work for him then willing to go in that direction.

  Additionally, personally thinks that it does not matter what or how much someone used...but would be concerned if many stories were left out because of the drug references.

- Agrees with the idea of using more generic terms. Sometimes its pertinent to the story that the generic term be included otherwise the sense of the story can be lost. Thinks drug references would most likely be most appropriate in the "Getting Clean" section.

- Questions the appropriateness of the Part Two Basic Text stories including drug specificity when the Translations Evaluations Guidelines (TEG) does not? In the past many stories have been rejected because of this.

Ron H posed the question to the board: should we be talking about changing the TEG evaluations?

Staff shared that the background on the Translation Policy only became so because a former World Board member felt passionately about an issue therefore it became policy. This body has to create a way to develop stories that speak to our members and if we don't know how to create snip it's or a way to speak to our members then that needs to be communicated.

- It was essential for him to identify with drug specificity. Whether we like it or not we have to think about where the newcomer is coming from, how they may talk and think about drugs, etc. This does not have to be in all of the stories, but only in a section as previously stated. Thinks it's important that we think about who is going to read this-drug specific references is sometimes essential to identification.

- Different drugs are an actual part which some of our members identify with. Many members express themselves colorfully—identifying that way, e.g. *Hope to die dope fiends.* It may not be recovering in a manner that he would, but it works for them.

Ron H summarized the general consensus: the board is not firmly deciding anything right now as there is one strong objection to using drug specificity. Further reminding the board if the policy to not use drugs specificity is adopted then all the current stories would have to be changed because they refer to drugs.

Regarding drug references and specificity, it was agreed that depending on the board's decision, the Translations Evaluation Policy will conform to the World Boards' consensus – not the other way around.

Basic Text—Language

Ron H explained that slang is a language with a relatively short shelf life, example used was *ecstasy,* and that a colloquialism is a more long-standing established expression. The board asked if they agreed to the general rule of using colloquialisms, however, when translating that the appropriate phrase be used in their language to express the same thing; translating the meaning not the literal. Footnotes and explanations would also be used whenever necessary.

- Experience with the Sponsorship book shared and how certain colloquialisms would not be appropriate, used the word *brother* as an example and how this term is not appropriate in Sweden.

- Suggestion offered to create a list of colloquialisms and their meanings (like a key word list), because the phrase *work the* steps – *work* in Germany means labor only. In addition, questions content usage and editing. Example was, "if you are in the *grip* of addiction, the meaning would be that there is no way out, and that is inconsistent with being able to recover."

Ron H explained that the "die model" for these stories is different because the stories will be from different languages and not only English. Further, responses were yes, there will be some editing for phrases and words used in the wrong context.

The WB did not object with proceeding with the use of colloquialisms.

Basic Text—Anonymity issues

The policy has been to eliminate reference that could identify members (place names). The workgroup feels that in order to show diversity, it may be wise to keep some specific references like age, general geographical references etc., and deal with anonymity issues on a case-by-case basis.

- The desire to possibly see a story with drug reference(s), and the next story possibly having none expressed. Would not want to see this body create criteria that will remove diversity, can we incorporate a *Narcotics Anonymous* Basic Text that everyone feels comfortable with?

Ron H answered that the workgroups vision is to create a type of book that everyone will want to translate, being of that quality and diversity. It is also not the desire of the workgroup to produce stories containing culturally sensitive slurs.

The board had no objection to dealing with anonymity issues on a case-by-case basis and allowing general geographical, etc. references.

Basic Text—Specific Religious Terms

The workgroup discussed recommending the use of general "Higher Power" references and not the use of anything that designates a particular person or prophet.

Ron H gave an example that, "My father was a Hindu and wanted me to proceed in that way, but I found a higher power." That would be okay.

- Beware of being anti-religious in tones or practices. Reference to one's religion by name should be okay.

- There needs to be clarity regarding this: where is the line between the *God greater than ourselves* and a *Higher Power?*

- Comfortable with members sharing in a way that doesn't offend others.

- How one references their tradition is the key as long as that it's not expressed as a placard or badge.

- It's about how we were raised and how, irregardless, we hear things.

Basic Text—Evaluation Criteria / PR Implications

The workgroup had some disagreement about the one item brought up in a list of potential PR implications. For instance, the language used experiences that may be controversial, etc. Some workgroup members felt strongly that the Basic Text is "by addicts for addicts," others felt that it is perhaps our most public piece and PR implications should weigh heavily into the editorial decisions.

Prefer not to use profanity:

- when we use offensive language in our Basic Text, what image is portrayed? It is the most public face of NA. Profanity in the Basic Text is something we know we do a little of but we need to look at where we draw the line.

- Would like to keep book very clean and believes no one who will loose anything by not using profanity. "Can't save your face and ass at the same time" is already in the book and should remain. Doesn't believe anyone will suffer or miss the message of recovery for lack of vulgarity, however, some may miss the message in its presence.

- Can hear the message no matter what language is used, will tune out at times due to vulgarity usage, etc., and possibly missing something needed to be heard.

- You can change the words with out changing the impact. If you do change a word to avoid profanity, maintain the tone and color.

Okay with profanity usage within limits:

- This is a book by addicts for addicts, for and about us.

- Questioned why and higher standard is what attained in everything done, independently of PR implications.

- Are we are trying to convey a message: believes that it depends on this and how it will affect/influence the story. Strategically placed cuss words should be ok. We should not be afraid to be who we are, but at the same time doesn't believe gratuitous foul language has to be used.

- Removing all off color language-references misrepresent may in some way the actual nature and flavor of NA.

- In a personal story, we don't want to take anything away from a person's story. Use common sense editing.

- Leans more towards letting people express who they are. Sometimes people need that kind of language in order to relate and some means of expression work. Are we going to start setting standards?

- Why do we want to change the way addicts are? Don't believe a non-stop swearing (words) story will be received.

- May be tougher getting clean today.

Summary and consensus of the board is that the book is by addicts for addicts, maintain color but be cautious and judicious in use of off color language.

Basic Text—Reading Level

The board agreed to not limit submissions to an 8th grade level. The idea is to capture the fellowships diversity, which means allowing for a higher reading level in some pieces – not putting a limit on the reading level.

Basic Text—Story Solicitation

This project will rely on a variety of methods to solicit personal stories. The workgroup will pursue a more active role with interviews and local contacts who may recommend members from whom to solicit experience or perhaps help soliciting from select communities. The workgroup also discussed tools such as interviewing templates, tools to assist individuals write down their experience, and speaker jam's (members asked to share experience then session transcribed and turned in).

Because these methods are more active ways of solicitation than done in the past, the workgroup will communicate highlights explaining from the very beginning what's being done in NAWS communications vehicles.

The workgroup also discussed putting the existing stories through the same evaluation process as a new story, contacting the authors of the old stories and asking them if they would like to be a part of the new stories or updating their stories.

- It really makes a difference in what we get back from the fellowship. Asking questions may work: may try focusing on general and targeted areas of peoples story/experience:

- Audience format

- Tapes-this really does not work and it is expensive

- Some level of collaboration with the author

- Possibly board members and or RD's bring names forward that they think

The board had no objections to the workgroup using new and different ways of soliciting stories as described above.

Forwarded to Eileen at eileen@na.org all board ideas concerning local members who can assist with solicitation and collection of experience.

World Convention

WCNA-31

A definite decision about the WCNA-31 theme was made in August; however, the body is now revisiting the decision and requesting more flexibility in how the English and Hawaiian versions used in the future.

There was no objection to changing the previous decision from the August meeting; how we use the theme and allowing variations of the translation of the theme, "One Fellowship Many Friends."

Budget presented in Book 2, page 98-100

Mike Polin gave an overview of Wednesday's Executive Meeting and Program Group's discussions. Some of the ideas presented

- Move *Unity Day* to Sunday-not having too many activities going on at once. Mike Polin explained that the idea would be to end the convention with *Unity Day*. He further explained that this issue be left with the program group to discuss further.

- The Program Group would like to have the same type of kick off meeting and festival like in San Diego.

- Flyers never get to the fellowship in a way we want them to so we are trying something new by sending them directly to the areas as well as to the individuals who've already signed up to receive them. The flyer has also been included in the *NA Way* Magazine which should help in getting them out to a broader audience.

- Mike will be meeting with the hotels next week when he goes to Hawaii for the first meeting with the new WCNA-31 support committee. He also gave a brief report about the make up of the support committee.

WCNA-31 Support Committee:

Co Chair—Charlie Quesnel – Maui	Co-Chair—Steve Miyahira – O'ahu
Treasurer/Secretary—Catherine Francis - O'ahu	Bob Weissman – O'ahu
DJ Colbert – Kauai	Deby Anderson – O'ahu
Sharon Quesnel – Maui	Claudia Fristoe – O'ahu
Bob Peterson – O'ahu	Rose Kopp – O'ahu
Berwin Nyuha – O'ahu	Jerry Aguirre – O'ahu
Anthony Shields – O'ahu	

The board asked if there were any questions; none noted.

WCNA-33

Discussions moved to Friday afternoon.

The board needs to make the final site selection for WCNA 33, held in 2009.

WCNA-34

If time permits, the board will be asked to narrow the list of cities presented in Book Three with recommendations for the board to review and consider.

The board had no objections to eliminating Phoenix, Arizona and Houston, Texas

The board ended their day in a sharing session, which is not recorded session of the board.

Friday 5 November

NA World Services Financials

Present: Bob Jordan, Craig Robertson, Jim Buerer, Piet De Boer, Ron Miller, Giovanna
     Ghisays,
     Saul Alvarado, Ron Blake, Daniel Schuessler, David James, Michael Cox, Mary Banner,
     Ron Hofius, Sharon (Muk) Harzenski-Deutsch and Tom McCall

Staff: Anthony Edmondson, Becky Meyer, Elaine Wickham and Eileen Perez-Evans

The meeting was opened with a moment of silence, the Serenity Prayer, followed by a brief closed session updating the board on pending lawsuits.

NA World Services Finances

The board asked to be provided with a list of basic information regarding how many meetings there are in a particular community, communities where the NA name is registered, how many languages is NA translated into, etc.

The board will receive the monthly Management update, which includes the Monthly Sales Order report. These currently are provided to the Executive Committee and the Business Plan Group.

Provide the board with a quick summary regarding focal points in financial statements so the board knows the meanings and where to focus.

An update and orientation to current and 2004 fiscal year-end financial reports was provided. Anthony recapped the financial information presented in Book One, pages 27 through 78.

- Net literature income: after taking all into account the overall income is ahead of budget.

- Noted was that as long as the total of accounts receivable and inventory (shelved items) is greater than accounts payable (what we owe), NAWS is in good condition. This illustrates that the company is maintaining financial stability, however, there is a piece that is an overhead trend which will be reviewed during the slide presentation. The body should always stay mindful of what is owed; this would be just another factor to see overall effect of company debt.

- NAWS approaches budgeting by always trying to *conservitize* income and *liberalize* expenses. Which means you should always perform more than planned. If not, than there is a problem. Noted was that as business practice, NAWS always strategically makes an effort to save money.

Although detailed NAWS Company financial information provided at this meeting, the board previously advised and agreed to discontinue getting all the individual detailed reports from all the different companies - agreeing to receive the Consolidated Reports for individual companies from here on.

Graphs to be provided to the board: Total Orders, Orders per day, Average Dollar Value and Shipping days vs. Total Days graphs.

Anthony went through the financial PowerPoint presentation showing the board the comparisons of numbers to the graphs.

- The board informed that for the first time in our history the number one purchaser is the Northern California Service Office and not an outside entity.

- Thoughts about possibly looking into shipping and handling policy's and secondary literature distribution points expressed.

Anthony responded that the Business Plan Group is looking into these areas as well as at segregating the effectiveness of give away literature-recommendations will be provided to the Board for consideration.

- Anthony noted that this body may want to look at how we review donations and possibly communicate this to the fellowship.
  - o Also noted was the challenge on getting money to and from non North-American members.

<u>There was no objection to one of the upcoming *NA Way* Magazines containing a box stating the accessibility of credit card donations.</u>

- Gross sales vs. discounts graph showing that we are maintaining, the objective is nonetheless shrinking.

- Noted was that we are stating to buy literature from secondary distribution points but at the same time to buy from NAWS – this is a contradiction.

  It was further asked if the Business Plan Group is or has considered the shipping cost versus the cost of production. Is there any profit on production? How much of profit is eaten up by donations, shipping and handling, etc.? Are alternative ways to accomplish tasks considered when profits are being taken?

  <u>Would really like the analysis of production and shipping/handling cost reviewed.</u>

  Anthony responded that Tom Rush and Bob McDonough are currently working on creating an analysis threshold which states if an order placed is or not beneficial for NAWS.

- The Unit Cost-Recovery Books graph signifies the cost of production and storage. FOB is included in the unit cost. Slower moving inventory and records are kept offsite in a secondary storage unit.

- Plot of Literature Income Less Discounts vs. Expense graph - board needs to watch the yellow line crossing the red line. That is when NAWS had to lay off employees. Therefore, this line is tracked. Despite the fact that we have done well we have to be conscience of spending money (that the yellow line does not cross the red).

- Plot of the Key Balance Sheet: noted was that the board always wants to see the red line under the yellow.

- Plot of WSO Sales to Hazelden graphs shows how they are back in the market.

- *Narcotics Anonymous* Basic Text, *It Works...*, and *Just for Today* sales graph shown.

- It was pointed out that since 1992 there has been a trend and it seems to continue to decline. Does that concern Anthony?

  Anthony responded that it is always expected that the literature sales will even out at some point. However, there will be some unit sale on the revised *Just for Today* because of the minor changes and the *Step Working Guide* seems to continue to sell.

- Medallions, keytags, etc. sales is one that the body always wants to see go up.

- Anthony noted that graph with languages shown gives us the overall reminder that we have not nearly fulfilled our vision of every addict having the NA message in his or her language.

2003-2004 Annual Audit Report

The Chair introduced Mike Quackenbush, who was a partner of the Lindquist LLP Firm and has performed NAWS' auditing since 1995 or so. Board introductions proceeded. Mike informed the body that he has since resigned his partnership from Lindquist LLP and has now joined the Miller Caplin firm. Miller Caplin has offices located in Burbank, San Francisco, and Las Vegas.

This will be the last audit performed by Lindquist LLP firm. <u>There were no objections to this being the last year that NAWS will employ Lindquist LLP as auditors and in affect be switching all auditing contracts (forensic processes and financial reviews) to Miller Caplin Certified Public Accountants.</u>

The board was informed that the approach done this year has not changed, however, last year NAWS was selected by an outside firm that audits the Lindquist LLP firm and no problems were noted.

Mike Quackenbush went over the *Consolidated Statement of Financial Position* on page 19 (Audit handout). Under *Property and Equipment*: Furniture and equipment/Leasehold improvement amount shown is because equipment is leased the other recognized as capital leases. Mike went over his detailed sheet of what is owned by NAWS and leased etc.

Fellowship Development and *Events* on page 21, columns for 2004 amounts transposed. <u>The error on page 21 will be corrected and a new Consolidated Statement of Functional Expenses will be provided to NAWS.</u>

Literature Production, WSC support also shows break down.

Consolidated Statement of Cash Flow on page 23: numbers inside the parenthesis signifies cash spent.

Letters

Audit Communication Letter on page 1. The purpose of the letter is to show if there were any difficulties with Management in performing the audit. None were noted.

Noted was that as a standard the *Management Letter* is a communication only between the auditor and the board. <u>What is published for the fellowship is only the audited financials with qualified letters.</u>

Comments and Recommendations on page 5. Mike Quackenbush noted that in all honesty some items are far reaching. Mike briefly recapped the comments:

> *Employee Performance Appraisals* - Mike noted that although Lindquist LLP is not an expert in Employee Performance Appraisal issues, Lindquist does recommend addressing this issue with NAWS Legal Counsel. As reported in the letter, NAWS may benefit from documenting employee performances.

> *Bank Reconciliations and Journal Entries* - suggests the Controller document (initialing and dating) as well as perform a separate review of the monthly reconciled bank statements- journal the entries entered to adjust NAWS' cash activity.

> *Travel Expense* – noted was that the travel agency used for travel arrangements does not provide a detailed report of airline tickets purchased on NAWS' account.

> <u>Staff is to provide a copy of the detailed Montrose expense report in order to address the recommendation.</u>

> *Documentation of Antifraud Programs* – NAWS has procedures and controls to prevent, deter, and detect fraud. However, during the review of these procedures it was noted that NAWS does not have a formal *written* antifraud program, suggests that NAWS simply document the procedures for NAWS. This would help show that the proper program policy is in place.

World Board Q&A regarding Audit:

- It was asked if it was worth keeping Xerox machines after the lease, as a piece of equipment with value. The difference between a down payment for a purchase, retained value, and leasing was discussed.

  > Mike Quackenbush stated that no matter how much use NAWS gets from the machine it will not hold its value of equipment at end of lease. Anthony further explained how we were able to procure a piece of brand new equipment at a certain price.

- There was a brief discussion to help to clarify how the leased equipment is shown in audits and financial statements and how it affects the overall balance sheet and affects the bottom line. The balance sheet shows what is owed on existing leases. The auditors set up property and equipment as assets but the balance sheet does show what is owed on leases. Mike noted that he imagines that in the future more and more companies will have to show leases and longer term obligations with explanations. Anthony is happy to review the financial statements with any board members who have questions.

- Is the number of employees or employee turnover disclosed in the audit?

  > Mike responded that it is not.

- Operating expenses in *Fellowship Development* – some of the bigger items included in this category consists of free literature (30%), shipping, bank service charges/merchant charges, insurance, interest expenses and employee training.

  > <u>Anthony will have Tom Rush insert details into a table that says what the totals for the major components are.</u>

- How can the Travel Expense recommendation be corrected? Does the opportunity for theft exist?

  > Anthony stated that a practical way to correct this step would be to have the World Board Chair review the Executive Directors expense report.

- As a board member, how has this body historically handled auditor recommendations? What's the process for follow up on auditor's recommendations?

  > Mike stated that in the past the board simply delegates action to the Executive Committee.

<u>The Executive Committee will follow up on actions taken or not taken on the Auditor's recommendations and report to the board.</u> Last year it wasn't that the items were ignored but they were not formalized on the action item list.

<u>There were no objections to accepting the 2003–2004 Annual Audit Report as presented by Lindquist LLP.</u>

Key Result Area: Communications

Public Relations/ Strategy

A presentation of reports from the PR Strategy and PR Handbook workgroups were given, followed by a discussion of the combined timelines.

David briefly recapped the PR Strategy report, giving an overview of where the workgroup is with project. This included a brief history of how the project came about. The PR Strategy workgroup is charged with coming up with something that this body and the fellowship can understand. The handbook idea is to help the fellowship move forward.

The Strategy workgroup has members with a lot of experience with the public and different groups of people outside the fellowship. The first meeting was spent discussing what PR is and how it can be accomplished.

"Strategy" is about building relations and means a crafted plan. The group spent a lot of time talking about what PR is and they did not really come up with anything solid. Since the meeting, staff has talked and generated a plan that will help to flush out what the strategy will be. The group decided to talk about all the items at every meeting, looking at the whole picture instead of working on pieces.

Part of the PR Strategy will almost certainly end up in the PR Handbook and the two groups have plans to meet together in the future.

- Is the vision for the final product of this charge a document?

  Response was that it is the hope that this is what it ends up to be, but divided into and for different audiences. It may be a report and not a document. What's being looked at is what the workgroup is currently doing, what the workgroup should be doing as well as setting long and short term goals. They hope to then devise a plan on where to go from there.

- What audience would the document/report be for - NAWS, members, area, the public?

  Response was that the workgroup thinks they will come up with something that discusses how to deal with the different audiences. The workgroup's idea for the two projects is that possibly the strategy should come first, followed by the handbook. There are several board members that are confused about what these two groups are supposed to do and how and why they are separate.

- It was explained that this was a topic the board was meant to talk about at a couple of board meetings and that never occurred. This is what came from that.

- There has never been anything put into place about why we do the public relations efforts so they all end up scattered.

- Strategy is like where NAWS wants to be with the medical and professional audience. What can we do to put NAWS in a better place with those audiences?

- The board's handbook discussion will ask things like "how you do it" – a type of guide. This will be a lengthy discussion.

  David shared that he is glad the workgroup has not come to this meeting with anything for the board to look at so that the board can have a discussion about what we are doing and how we are supposed to do it. Hopefully we can clear up some of the confusion regarding items like:

  o Is this a strategy for NAWS or the local fellowship?

  o We will produce a document that is targeted to NAWS and the handbook will use parts for other audiences.

PR Handbook

Ron M gave a brief report of their first meeting, sharing that the community building helped bring the group together.

- The Strategy workgroup role is to be the architects and the role of the Handbook workgroup is to be the contractors. It was further explained that the workgroup took time to go back and see where this all began and put together reference material in a notebook for the workgroup members to become familiar with. It was also made clear that the two groups are scheduled to meet together.

- The board was asked to review the timeline of significant events and it was explained how the timeline was created.

- Chapter two, "Core principles and Philosophies," is something the board needs to take the time to discuss. As stated in the report the drafts of these chapters may need to be modified as the remainder of the handbook is written. There is interdependence with chapter's one and two that needs to be woven throughout the entire handbook.

- The board will also need to discuss the blending and melding of all the committees as we know them today.

- Who we will target for review and input is a question that needs to be answered and taken back to the workgroup.

- Noted was that it seemed that there are places in this timeline that should not be worked on before the plans are written. There seems to be some confusion about the two groups and the fact that one group is building before the plans are done.

  Becky explained that staff went though this very thing and did an outline of how the two groups are really one, with two groups working on the same project. Staff has outlined how it all comes together and when the two groups should depend on each other.

- Ron M clarified that the workgroup looked at, modified, and rewrote the two first chapters and they also went over the rest of it briefly. He asked the board if they would give input on the timeline. Are there things missing?

- Noted was that review and input used to be done by Literature Committees and Delegates. Normally it would go to service committees, but with addresses and such being outdated what can the board suggests and do to change it?

- How can this body do it differently like online or any other suggestions? How can we make it as accessible as possible?

Board Suggestions for Review & Input, PR Handbook:

- A member can go to the NAWS website and put themselves on a list. The office sends out email on a regular basis. E-subscriptions are a vehicle that can be successful and then anyone can provide input.

- What about dealing with the part of the fellowship that is not online?

  Continue to do what is being done now and always add a print and distribute button on the site. Give people the option to do this online or by mail and ask them to make sure their address is correct.

- The EDM would be a good place to have a workshop on items that need input.

- Anthony shared that this will be a test on how we do this when the time comes for input on this project as well as for the Basic Text stories.

- Should this information be made accessible to a group? Further felt that home groups can benefit from the handbook and a way needs to be found to get this out to the groups for their input.

  The information will go out in the CAT material and the RD's should make sure that it is work shopped with group members.

- A concern was expressed regarding this project going to a group for input. Asking for input on something like this will create input that will not address what we need.

- It was suggested that this be viewed on an adhocracy basis and not literature committee specific. We can send the word out about the project broadly and provide suggestions on how to workshop the material.

- Concern was expressed about sending this out to groups and asking for feedback on something they have no clue about. Material should be accessible to interested members.

- Another concern is that this is a really tight timeline. Has the workgroup talked about how and when they will expect a return on this material?

  Review and input does not really ever drastically change a piece, but it does get people excited about the project.

Questions for the board regarding the review and input process:

- Sending information directly to the groups for input on PR Handbook—5

- Sign up process—9

- Explore other avenues—10

The board agreed with the material being categorized as adaptable service material and that it can be translated by local communities.

The board had no objections to the presented outline

The board had no objections to the presented timeline.

- How can the workgroup start with chapters one and two without the board having discussions on the core principles?

  Jane explained that this input will go back to the Strategy workgroup for review and input.

  Core Principles and Philosophies is one part that will have overlap with strategy so why doesn't the handbook group start with something that does not have any dependence on strategy.

- Ron feels introductions should be written last so that everything is included.

- The introduction is where you sell the idea of PR and we believe that all will end up being changed in the long run.

PR Strategy Workgroup Member

Ron M indicated that Stephen K was unable to attend the 1st and 2nd meeting. Therefore, it will be necessary to replace him. The willingness to serve was present and appreciated; however, thoughts for a replacement are Connor H and Joao (current RD) from Portugal.

The board agreed to allow the EC to make the final decision on identifying the individual to replace Stephan K and report that decision back to the board.

WCNA-33 Site Selection

Mike Polin gave an overview of the report and process for site selections, shared certain challenges in Europe (in the report), and again, briefly recounted the WCNA-33 selection process. He explained how things happened when the convention was in Paris and the challenges.

Daniel expressed his wish to challenge the decision to have WCNA-33 in Barcelona, Spain and shared his concerns. He expressed feeling uncomfortable challenging the selection but feels like the German fellowship was the first community outside the United States to be present and our Vision states that we should all be able to get the NA message in our own language and the world convention is a part of that. He feels this is a philosophical issue and not a business issue.

World Board Discussion Points, WCNA-33

- A board member asked if it was his job as a board member to defend Barcelona as he belonged to the Spanish region. Personally, he does not want to have to do that and feels really uncomfortable about the entire discussion.

- Another experience shared regarding being a board member, the world convention looking at Panama as a possible site and choosing Cartagena, Colombia.

- Another board member is open to considering Daniel's request but asked Mike Polin to explain some of the rationale and process for Berlin recommendations.

    Mike explained the Berlin, Germany experience.

Daniel asked if he could have a private discussion with Anthony Edmondson and Mike Polin about site selection away from the rest of the board. The response was yes, but the decision for the WCNA-33 location has to be made at this meeting.

- In the future can this body have discussions about the cultural issues before staff recommendations are made?

10 board members supported proceeding with the recommendation for WCNA-33 to be in Barcelona, Spain.

- Anthony expressed concern about this decision and pointed out that 1/3 of board did not act. He added that he has never seen such a board reaction; maybe it is because this discussion is occurring at the end of the day. However:
    - Suggest that this body may need to wait to make this decision until after talking some more about this tomorrow.
    - Pointed out that staff has the responsibility of choosing a site by looking at it in the business sense.

- Is there a need to change the process if the process is not trusted?

- Feels there the philosophical issue is important and that he wants the board to give Berlin more consideration. Daniel asked why he feels Germany is entitled to have the convention there. *Response:* Daniel feels that they are the oldest fellowship outside US and are entitled host a world convention.

After more discussion the chair proposed and asked if the board to agree to everyone thinking about issue further and discussing again in the morning – no objections.

Misc. – Thursday Night Dinner

The board has agreed to set aside time (if individual is available) to have a board dinner on Thursday evenings, this would include staff as well.

The board ended their day in a sharing session, which is a closed session of the board.

Saturday 6 November

Present: Bob Jordan, Craig Robertson, Jim Buerer, Piet De Boer, Ron Miller, Giovanna Ghisays, Saul Alvarado, Ron Blake, Daniel Schuessler, David James, Michael Cox, Mary Banner, Ron Hofius, Sharon (Muk) Harzenski-Deutsch and Tom McCall

Staff: Anthony Edmondson, Becky Meyer, Elaine Wickham and Eileen Perez-Evans

The board opened their meeting with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer. Mary read the *Just for Today* meditation for the day.

WCNA-33 Site Selection (discussion continued)

The chair asked that any board member express why they made the decision to not raise their hands for Barcelona, Spain during yesterday's discussion.

- There was no rational, no explanation other than to support a friend.

- Moved by statements about language and culture and stroke by the mandatory element. Couldn't agree to not factoring in thoughts in selection process.

- Felt the need for a discussion regarding making a decision in absence of having a philosophical discussion regarding fellowship needs.

Bob pointed out that a postponement can be made however; Barcelona may change their proposal due to not following through with the December deadline.

- NAWS has a system/process by which the sites are selected and have to believe that the system is valid. In no way discount Daniel's points and knows what a world convention can do for a community, but surmises that many other deserving countries are not present to make a passionate speech on behalf of their community. Feels that this body would be abandoning our evaluation process if we chose to not go with the recommendation. Truly believes that if we voted again we would stick to the system and recommendations put in place.

- Shared above sentiments. Doesn't feel this is the moment to change the recommendations put forth. He would vote for the best recommendation, not just for Barcelona, but for what's best. The message is for an addict to stop using.

- Completely accepts that the right reasons are being put forth in recommendation however, wants to explore considering other things when choosing a site. Seems that there are many other things to consider.

- Would rather not speak on this issue but it is a coincidence that Barcelona was chosen. Saw a lot of truth in what was said, but then asks why am I a board member who lives in Spain? It personally makes no difference where the location is. However, believes that the process put in place should be followed.

  Pointed out that the main language in Barcelona is Catalan and philosophically points this out because they happen to be in Spain—does the vision statement not apply to them? Do they not also have the right to have the message? This does not mean that the addict in Berlin does not also have the right to hear the message as well.

  Feels the problem here is ethics. Speaks of the other languages that also need to hear the message of recovery, but states that whoever gets it is what is important.

- On paper Barcelona is miles ahead of all the other communities so that is clear, what is not clear is the ethics. States that time has to put aside to talk about this, it's not just about the site. Trust that staff did the best in providing information.

Daniel stated he made his point yesterday and believes that he can distinguish between personal ego and something worthy of merit-philosophical belief. Believes that the convention going to Barcelona, Spain, which is another Spanish speaking community, is not appropriate and this point has merit. We need to have more philosophical discussions regarding how decisions are made. If this discussion had/has no merit we would have not engaged the body in more discussion.

- Would like to hear staff's input regarding the impact if a decision were not made at this meeting and made after the January 2005 meeting.

  Mike Polin first responded that the current Barcelona deal is good if signed by the end of the year (December). We would have to see if Barcelona would be willing to renegotiate terms. The other part is that if this body determines that another look is warranted then Portugal and Germany would need to be revaluated.

- Shared what keeps coming into mind, e.g. the board is the bigger picture, composed of different cultures, etc. and we are having a big picture discussion, believes that the collective experience is what helps us form some type of decision.

  Is having another four-hour discussion going to help make a decision? The fact that a board member feels impassioned about what he's saying even though another can not get it to make a difference for him.

- It is unfortunate when a collision creates the need for a discussion. The difficulty is that as a board we just look at a city based on financial impact. Would like to think that as a body we have not excluded thinking in a way of having a convention in a community where it's needed regardless on financial impact. Requesting that the board discuss existing criteria for future World Convention site selection.

  However, believes that no matter when the decision is made it will be painful. Would like to see a decision made today, but have the EC frame a future discussion for the board on site selection criteria.

Bob asked the body if there are any objections to selecting Barcelona for WCNA-33. Saul interjected a suggestion that a decision be made today regarding site for WCNA-33 and on a future agenda have a philosophical discussion regarding site selection criteria's.

- Knowing that we will continue to have a future philosophical discussion regarding WCNA outside the US – what is the purpose?

- A Straw Poll requested. As a compelling business case this is easy, but the substance heard from Daniel makes it difficult to make a decision at this point. Points raised in objection to Barcelona, Spain understood.

- Craig asked Mike – if the areas of concern in Germany can be mitigated?

  Mike responded that maybe some of them.

Anthony stated that factually the body should be aware that:

  o Germany is not the largest international speaking region, Sweden is.

  o Yes, Germany is an old European community.

  o There are other factors that should affect decision to place a world convention; specific details are secondary to this.

- Doesn't believe that having another discussion will make this decision easier. If we do not make a decision today, this means that we will have to go back to the drawing board with having to choose Germany, Portugal or Barcelona. Feels the body needs to either decide on Barcelona or Germany.

Straw Poll

<u>Those in support or WCNA 33 to be held in Barcelona Spain–9 voted yes. No one raised their hands to not being able to live with this decision.</u>

<u>Seeing no opposition the body agreed to have WCNA 33 in Barcelona. The body will have a future philosophical discussion on site selection criteria.</u>

Craig shared that as we go forward with discussions he would encourage everyone to bring ideas and thoughts to discussions long before decisions are made.

Key Result Area: Fellowship Support

Workshops and Fellowship Events

Book 3, pages 153-171, and Colombia's trip report and board session on page 181-187. Discussion of the information gathered at workshops and events, the Issue Discussion Topics, plans for the conference cycle and Talking Points will also be discussed.

Reports gathered show similar problems to what happens in a worldwide workshop, that the bulleted thoughts on a list don't give an actual idea of the discussion. However, in regards to having sent information out and getting something back it was a big success.

Before we get into framing the issue discussion Becky would like to hear from board members on what they saw and heard.

Western Service Learning Days

Over 300 people registered for the WSLD. There was also a one day meeting with the Department of Corrections which was attended by Freddie Aquino. Lots of information on Leadership was gathered. Staff was the primary presence at WSLD.

Southern Zonal Forum

In attendance were Mary B and Becky. Mary shared that the Southern Zonal Forum is her home zone and it was her first time out as a board member and she felt anxious. She was impressed by the number of members in attendance, the respect and also the eagerness to engage, learn, gather, etc. what they could do to learn to further the primary purpose. Mary and Becky had some discussion on key players but sensed that everyone wants to know more on Leadership as well as do better; therefore, it made it easier to have discussions.

Mary asked RD's to start discussion on Leadership since she did not have the previous board's discussions. This was followed by if this is what you want how do you get and foster it. This also led into infrastructure discussions.

Some of the things in discussing fostering leadership – starts with individuals and how they perceive and share those thoughts with others. How an individual carries the message of leadership. There was some side talk on changing perceptions, thoughts, and roles-was a very cohesive group. After presentation, Mary was amazed at the number of members that were in attendance and participated in that particular discussion.

Mary stated that members that were willing to facilitate discussions were used-using resources and accessing previous RD's, etc., as they are perfect for facilitating discussions at zonal forum meetings.

Members asked Mary and Becky about there being a State Wide Workshop and if so, if this workshop take the place of zonal meetings. Mary and Becky could not answer that question, but members were definitely interested to know.

Mary further shared that the forum was asked what they wanted in workshops, what they are looking for:

        o Some of the non delegates had ideas, Becky shared Travis Felton's thoughts (email) and how it seemed that WS was on same page regarding publication.

- o Two of the major thoughts were: looking for replacements and training your replacements."
  - And others wanted to talk about service issues facing the area and regions-interested members attended looking for information.

Board questions

- What tool was used to gather Leadership information; was the session profile used?

  Mary responded Post its and markers were used to capture information. The members were asked for thoughts on valued Leadership qualities, what are the obstacles in obtaining these, and how do we foster Leadership?

  Also made it very clear that WS was only trying to gather information and seeing where it goes.

  Bob reminded everyone that it's always good to inform participants that WS does not make any commitment to send information back notifying participants that session was to gather information.

- Recalled from the August board meeting was that the body discussed being able to request more WS participation time-utilizing WS further.

  Responded was yes and no; The SZF and WSLD workshops were decided prior to the last board meeting and had already set up their agenda. However the new Travel Request form does ask for more specific information on world services participation.

- Enjoys and appreciates what we can do with zonal forums but interprets the answer as being that the two forums were considered and approved via the old request form, etc. Also asks if there is any movement towards sending more people, using session profiles, etc.

- Having the session profiles sent to the World Board was to have everyone on the same page and to be utilized.

The board was asked if the sending out the questions and talking points was helpful.

- Giovanna stated that the LAZF has discussed giving WS time, being quite accommodating to WS needs.

CANA

Craig shared his CANA experience. In attendance were Craig R and Mike Polin. Craig stated that the talking points were very helpful. Infrastructure and Public Relations questions/discussions done in two sessions, also pointed out that the audience at CANA has more delegate participation which is different than having a mixed set of members.

The key to their discussion was that both Craig and Mike drilled statements down to the key issue. Example was that if someone said that committee meetings were a problem they asked why, until the committee issue response was down to its core issue.

Core issue was communications as Canada itself is a large geographical area. But some of the other challenges are that reports from RCM aren't informative, people are not getting the information back and, in an attempt to remedy this, they are attempting to develop a Fellowship Development Committee.

Mike and Craig assisted the participants in putting together a Fellowship Development Committee mission statement. The committee's purposes are to help the infrastructure, communication, support, etc. as well as help coordinate PI, HI, and Outreach. However, this committee would not take the place of these committees but assist in those areas.

Other issues in the CANA were sponsorship, leadership and leading by example. How sponsorship can be a tool for better leadership. Some side conversations with members revealed the thought that our fellowship today is 'soft' on newcomers; meaning that we don't or haven't kept the level of expectation of setting an example as when we came into the program, e.g. being involved in service (basic level-coffee, meeting set up), working the steps... now it's like "ah it's okay, just don't use today." Accountability and leadership used as further examples.

There is also an inventory going on in CANA and controversy about some RD's from the BC region with an anti-CANA sentiment. They believe they haven't' gotten their monies worth from the CANA experience. There also seems to be this vacuum for guidance of leadership and infrastructure. Craig thought that there seems to be an opportunity for us to provide guidance and help.

Becky stated that the EC had a discussion on how to take the next steps on Our Public Image and Infrastructure (see post –its). The board was asked what the points are they wanted to be captured for next the publication. Is there something missing? Do you want to remove something, etc.?

> *Infrastructure points:*
>
> - Communications: consistency, effectiveness and personal
> - Resources: people and tools
>   - Added was financial resources
> - Role models / leadership: accountability, passion, expectation of members
>   - Added was creativity (breeds passion) and tied to primary purpose based
>   - Added evaluation tools for local service committees

> *Public Image*
>
> - Responsibility of members: Integrity and reflection on NA
> - Infrastructure / service : tools, reliability, no targeted literature, attraction – core "PR" principles, the complete concept of PR – what's working, what's not
>   - Added evaluation tools for local service committees

What is the primary vehicle for getting information and is there a place that the PR project can be focused on?

Becky responded that the questions were standardized so everyone has the same questions-gathering the same information. The board will need an outline that helps the content.

Colombia

It was reported that the audience was diverse: RD's, newcomers with no service experience, and members from other countries, etc. In attendance were Jim B and Giovanna G; who did not really have the time to do what they wanted, however, did state that the questions provided to the board were quite helpful.

Participants were familiar with the workshop format and they got enthusiastic about it. Participants were familiar with Infrastructure; Jim shared some background topics, which was followed by an ice breaker, creating an atmosphere for a workshop.

The similarities between the Colombia and CANA outcomes were shared. Participants were asked if they could improve one thing what it would be: having more workshops, better tools for dealing with media, fund flow, getting members involved in service and more unity with area service committees.

Columbia just went through the legal process where they are registered.

Jim added it was only one group in town that put on the convention which was amazing. People wanted to come into workshops not fully understanding what was going on. Members in Colombia just had the hunger and were searching for knowledge on how things can be done better. The community is willing, open, and always appreciative of NAWS sending travelers.

Best Little Region

Bob reported that he attended a convention which held a workshop with about 65-70 in attendance—more came in after the break because when those in attendance went out on break sharing what they were doing, more members wanted to come in and participate. Participants were really excited about sharing their experience with NAWS.

The Chair informed the body that these will evolve as well as this being on the discussion board. Bob asks that board members participate as individuals on the discussion board.

Workshop and Fellowship Event

After some discussion the EC thought it made sense to recommend taking the Worldwide Workshop model and making it more service oriented. Having workshop and fellowship events:

- Recommend that WS facilitate something fellowship-workshop oriented at MARLCNA and at the Florida Service Symposium. Thought is to expand and connect a six-hour workshop to MARLCNA and Florida. There still needs to be some communication with Florida.

- Recommend trying two stand alone events; one in Southern California (March) and another in Nashville (May).

  o As well as have some type of interactive discussions at attended zonal forums.

- The thought is to also contact the LAZF to see if it makes sense to add a day or two and, if so, to create a funding pool. Details not worked out yet.

- Europe is still a question – will talk to Peter when he is here for the Basic Text meeting. Asia Pacific is not one where many can be gathered unless you go into Australia. By the time we get to the APF it will be as good as the people who are planning it.

- Upper Mid-West area not recommended as a site because of the driving distances.

  o Ron H proposes for MARLCNA that World Services be involved in the other service-oriented workshops or at least start that bridge for this.

  o David asks if we have fulfilled our obligations to the WSC after these trips.

  Anthony responded that we have hybrid kinds of formats-blending the workshops. Therefore, we have done the best we can in trying to do things differently. What qualifies as fellowship development are the Arabic speaking and Iranian meetings. There is also a possible proposal for Eastern Europe.

There were no objections to the recommended proposed workshop sites: MARLCNA, Florida-try to communicate needs, Southern California, Nashville, and ongoing discussions with Latin American Zonal Forum, Asia and Europe. Agreeing in principle with the idea and leaving the details to the Executive Committee to work out.

Corporate Responsibilities

Corporate

Approve August Minutes

The board reviewed the minutes and asked for changes. <u>No changes or corrections noted to the August minutes-approved as written</u>.

Review Action Item List

Project Ideas

1. Basic Text on CD (audio): body discussed idea. Anthony asked if anyone believes that the basic premise of having 7 CDs is unreasonable; we currently have CD-Rom and tapes. Ron H stated that he believes there is some way to package all the CDs in some way.

   <u>The board agreed to research the feasibility of packaging 7 CDs.</u>

2. Writing an IP on attitude and behavior.

   <u>The board agreed to a bulletin to be written rather than an IP given the current priorities for literature development.</u>

3. Glossary for Basic Text.

   <u>No objection since this was discussed and proposed at WSC 2004 and was not one of the items selected.</u>

4. Revision of Bulletin #27 "HIV and Aids in NA".

   <u>The board agreed to bulletin revision being a current project for this cycle, but not yet prioritized</u>.

This led the body into a discussion and everyone being asked if they've read all the bulletins in last month's correspondence book. The board was encouraged to read what is printed as the opinion of the board.

- Is the issue that the bulletins are out of date?

  Response: some believe yes and no. Again, it is suggested that the board review the views of the bulletins as currently published. Also, possibly in the future, public access would be limited to most of the bulletins except for two more recently revised.

- Is there any relevance to keeping the current bulletins as part of history-archiving in a way that reflects the fact that the bulletins posted on the web are x amount of years old? What's wrong with having those available as history?

  Response: would believe that the board would want to make the most current analogy on issues. However, also believe this is a discussion that the board will have.

  <u>Bob encouraged the body to give input on the bulletins.</u>

5. Smaller spiral bound version of the current line numbered Basic Text, this includes the pocket sized Basic Text.

   <u>The board agreed to evaluate all the ideas we have received for a small format of the Basic Text. Noting we have never decreased the price of the Basic Text dependant on the format.</u>

6. American Sign Language (ASL) Video of the Basic Text for the hearing impaired.

   <u>The board agreed to find members who understand ASL to assist. Will look into how this could be done</u>. Mary B and Bob J may have resources.

7. Online Digital Logos

The board discussed the issue regarding making the logo available for individual use and anyone having access to it once it is posted on the internet. This may suggest that everyone can do whatever they want to the logo.

The board agreed to look into this and report back to the body on how this could be done.

8. Translate IPs and Basic Text into American Sign Language (ASL).

The board agreed to find members who understand ASL to assist. Will look into how this could be done. (see #6).

9. Excerpt Step 1-3 of the *Step Working Guide* for institutions.

The board agreed to look into this further. If a decision is made to pursue it would require conference action.

10. Audio CDs & tapes of the *Step Working Guide* (from Connecticut)

The board agreed to: the Audio CD and tapes of the *Step Working Guide* in principle. The EC will report back to the body on accomplishing.

11. Creating a Gift Edition of the Sponsorship book.

The body agreed to create a Gift Edition of the Sponsorship book. The EC will report back to the body.

12. Two samples of a smaller Basic Text / pocket size.

The idea regarding production of this book was to assist in the earmarking of funds. The board agreed to evaluate all of the ideas received for a small format of the Basic Text again restating that NAWS has never decreased the price of the Basic Text dependant on the format.

Dates of board meetings:

January 26-29, World Board meeting and April 20-23 World Board meeting – there were no objections to the date change.

Responsibilities of the board as an employer:

Bob engaged the board in a discussion regarding their responsibilities as board members.

General update of fellowship activity around the world:

Becky handed out the Community Update - for "WB Only" to review document for any additions or changes. Anthony went through this document with the board.

The meeting closed at 6:00 pm with Anthony showing pictures South Africa... Lions and tigers and bears, oh my...