

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.

Approved World Board Minutes

19-21 January 2006

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

Not present: Giovanna Ghisays and Saul Alvarado are unable to attend.

Staff: Anthony Edmondson, Becky Meyer, and Carrie Ray

Thursday 19 January

9:00am: The Board chair opened the meeting with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer.

Action Group

Bob led the board in an action group; each member shared their greatest joy and greatest challenge since the last board meeting.

KRA: Fellowship Support

WSC Seating

The WSC 2006 seating proposals recommend seating five of the six regions who initially requested seating. The workgroup and the board both did not recommend that Region Mexico Occidente be seated due to lack of response to the questions asked. The board's recommendation differs from the workgroup's. The workgroup did not recommend the seating of either South Africa or Western Russia because they believed they didn't meet the criteria of being a region for three years. The larger issue is that the seating criteria does not explain the original intended purpose of the policy. The board is trying to match the original spirit of the policy and not the actual criteria.

The board chair conducted a Straw poll to approve the WSC Seating Proposals to be included in the CAT material. 12 votes —yes; 1 vote—no.

Discussion:

- Michael believes that the workgroup went by the criteria (and then some) and doesn't agree with the report. Further, he believes the group went beyond the criteria. Thinks that this is what the conference wanted based on the criteria and if the board wants to change the criteria than that's the main issue. As the criteria stands, he stands by the seating group's findings. He understands the criterion doesn't allow for South Africa and Western Russia to be seated but it wasn't just the criteria that lead the workgroup to their decision.
- If the criteria is not working than the policy should change at the same time the recommendation is made; in fact, possibly, prior to. Perhaps, the time restraints led the board to this predicament. Doesn't believe the board can make recommendations that are outside the criteria without changing the criteria. If it is the time restraint that keeps NAWS from changing the criteria than perhaps the board can make a commitment to changing it when the time is right.
- The purpose of a workgroup was clarified and it was explained that sometimes the board makes different decisions from what the workgroup recommends.
- Is not so much a concern about the criteria as long as it's quite clear that the board thinks these regions need to be seated. If something is not working, than fix the situation so it doesn't have to be repeated. The intent of the criteria was due to New York splitting into many, many regions and the conference growing enormously as a result. The intent was to curb new US regions. The board is here to make decisions like this and to make things run if we want to grow globally.
- Michael expressed that the world board is responsible to the conference and the conference created criteria and he feels a responsibility to follow that criteria. Knows he has limited

experience but feels we should be frank with the conference and follow the criteria and recommend changing the criteria. Russia and South Africa did not fit the criteria.

- Becky reminded the body of the first time the board had a discussion regarding these regions, which was the only reason that these three communities applied for this process. The next discussion was to invite them as non-seated participants. They wouldn't have entered into this if it wasn't for the board starting this process. We need them more than they need us. Russia has done more Fellowship Development than any region in Eastern Europe; they're huge. The board can convey to the conference that the criteria are wrong. The reason the board invited the three communities was because they have relationships with staff, but not with the conference or the rest of the fellowship. We lose our historical memory because of the volumes of information received, but we started this.
- Michael, on behalf of the workgroup, did not understand why the communities were invited since they didn't follow the criteria. To put somebody who doesn't qualify into the process, he feels, is asking for conflicting views between the board and the workgroup. The unnecessary conflict is the problem.
- In the *Guide to World Services* it states under, Criteria for Recognition of New Conference Participants, "on a case by case basis," which triggered thoughts about the regions' efforts and whose voice is not being heard. The voice and the value should go to the people not being heard. The board said from the beginning: that this is about trial and error and that they always reserve the right to say this isn't working. Is okay with the recommendation with those communities and the discussion to change the criteria at the conference; is okay with them being coupled together. The WSC Seating workgroup meets once every two years and the workgroup needs to have more communications with the group that it serves. There needs to be better communication since this isn't the last time the board will have this challenge with so many communities growing. This is the right time to make these recommendations and request changes to the criteria.
- This is a band-aid and there is a bigger issue that needs to be discussed regarding the vast amount of regions that try to attend the conference.
- The criteria are a mistake and it's time to stand in front of the conference as leadership and explain the issue. Places like Japan would have never connected with the conference had it not been for our contact with them; they would have stayed isolated. After all these years the conference has asked why Africa isn't present and why they're being ignored. Isn't the purpose of the conference to support communities like there's? This is an urgent matter and lives are at stake.
- Has confidence that the conference will agree with the board's recommendation for seating and that the regions will not be pulled into a political firestorm that they did not create. Likes the language in the report which states to the conference, it's really up to you. Regardless of the issue of seating, the issue of inclusion is what's most important.
- The board needs to take into future consideration how we ask questions to Americans and to non US members.
- The underlying issues have been addressed that we used to face: the size of the conference. Because the conference functions in a different way doesn't see the problem with seating 10-20 more regions. Asked Michael to appeal to going with this report and to agree with the board; to let go of it and move on.

Bob asked if there were any objections to the report to be forwarded to the conference. 12 votes —yes; 1 vote—no.

- Michael stated that he emotionally goes with this but his conscience tells him he can't. Believes it's principally wrong. This is when he needs to stand up for what he believes.

- There should be a stand aside premise—Michael should be able to block the recommendation but have an opportunity to provide reasons. We need a place for this in our decision making consensus process. Michael was asked to express his opposition once more for the body.
- Michael stated that if the criteria say no than the criteria should be changed. It was explained that it's the conference that makes this decision not the board.
- Becky raised the question of why there would be a need for a board recommendation if it was just about standing by the criteria.
- What keeps rising up for Anthony is that it's not about the workgroups actions, choice, performance, or consideration of the data. If Johannesburg tried to be seated they would make it based on the criteria. Board members can vote at the conference which is the inequitable right as a Conference Participant. He could have easily emailed Cheryl, the RD in South Africa, and told her how to fill out the criteria, which would not have been principally sound. We didn't change the criteria last time because we thought there was a blip in the system but it's clear that the criteria is not doing what it intended.

Future agenda item: Consensus process.

The World Board supports the recommendation regarding WSC 2006 Seating Report that will be forwarded to the conference.

2006 World Service Conference

CAT Items

2006-2008 Strategic Plan

The Strategic Plan has been updated and revised to reflect the next cycle. The only change is the carryovers have been added with no changes made to the objectives.

Objective 8.1

There was some discussion regarding the language of Objective 8.1 which reads:

"Better utilize the World Pool as a development strategy (such as inviting Pool members at events, increasing communication, adding benefits for being in the Pool, utilizing Pool members for things other than positions, including calls to action, draft review, workshop models they can deliver locally; response to surveys for input, etc.)"

Discussion:

- The language implies that we will be inviting folks out of the world pool to bring them to a workshop, for example. Suggests a revision of deleting everything in parenthesis, so as not to build an expectation which may set the board up for failure. The parenthetical was stating examples which aren't the exact strategy of what the board intends to do.
- Remembers several people in the staff/board day with Jim DeLizia being excited about this idea to utilize the pool and doesn't want to see the idea get lost. Argues for ways to have the idea not disappear under the door and to not forget what was meant by it.
- Anthony explained that nothing will be lost and that it's up to the board to make this idea be put to use.

Changes to Objective 8.1 include:

Delete "such as" and change to "possible examples."

Delete "added benefits for being in the Pool" and "inviting Pool members to events".

Revised Objective 8.1 will read: "Better utilize the World Pool as a development strategy (possible examples: increasing communication, utilizing Pool members for things other than positions, including

call to action, draft review, workshop models they can deliver locally; response to surveys for input, etc.)”

Anthony explained that there is significant amount of vague language in a number of the objectives in this plan and in the future one of the things that will need to occur in the cycle is to get more specific with the objectives or discern what is meant specifically. The April board meeting will include some of this work.

Budget & Project Plans

The only change made to the project plan is it states Basic Service Tools instead of Basic Service Materials. It was noted that in the published version the highlighted areas will not be published on page 37 of the plan.

Changes to the project plans will include:

Page 33; change “Again” to “as we indicated last cycle”.

The yellow color coding in the Workshops project plan is a third level of priority. This needs to be listed as such in the strategic plan and in the project plans. Color coding will be added to both documents.

Red color coding on page 38 that stated “Think Leadership was already covered in previous plans?” was deleted.

Future agenda item: The *Guide to World Services* policies need to be revisited, for example; the selection of Issue Discussion Topics.

PR Statement

It was explained that, if approved, the PR Statement will appear in the PR Handbook; one internal and one external statement.

Regarding the external statement, Tom believes the board has an opportunity to change the public’s perception of what an “addict” means. The public doesn’t see addicts as human beings, they see us as addicts and he thinks that’s harmful to Narcotics Anonymous and what we’re about. Feels the sentence at the end of the first paragraph which includes a quote from the Basic Text locks us into an image that’s negative to the public. The sentence reads, “Our message is that an addict, any addict can stop using drugs, lose the desire to use, and find a new way to live.”

Further explained was the deep philosophical problem that goes beyond changing the word “addict” in the PR Statement. To change it in the PR Statement would mean a complete amendment to the handbook since it continually uses the term “addict” to refer to our program.

Discussion:

- If the statement is going to be read by professionals it should be in language that they’re familiar with.
- The term “Alcoholic” had stigma behind it and AA stuck by the word and now it’s considered cool or acceptable. An option would be to take little opportunities to state what “addict” means in our PR statements resulting in perhaps changing the image of what the term means.
- Is inclined to mention the word “recovering addict” not just “addict.”
- Tom suggests leaving the statement as is and after the conference make a project plan to revise the PR Statement in the future.
- Becky states it doesn’t serve to change the cover memo if everything in the handbook says “addict”; doesn’t think it’s as simple as revising the PR Statement.

- Was of the mind that the external statement was for people who didn't know about NA. Further recalled this was designed to be the first piece of information a professional got about Narcotics Anonymous. It needs to be simple and concise and doesn't think the quote "an addict, any addict..." is the best way to represent the fellowship.
- Becky clarified that the statement will be in the PR Handbook and is not aimed at folks who don't know about NA at all; it's aimed toward treatment and correctional professionals.
- Suggests interjecting what our primary purpose is and editing this statement. Knows that people have a hard time identifying themselves as addicts but doesn't know how we could approach that problem today.
- Mary works in medicine and has worked with folks that refuse to use the term "addict" because it's a diagnostic term. They refer to them as "drug seekers" and not "addicts." She thinks the board needs to give this some thought especially if they want to focus as an organization on NA's image. NAWS uses the term "addict" as a reference and the rest of the world uses it as a diagnosis. Thinks the statement perpetuates that NA is only for addicts.
- Doesn't believe professionals will care about our message or our vision. Would like to see the sentence about our message (the quote) and our vision (last sentence) deleted.
- Becky requests deleting the quote that starts with "an addict, any addict..." Although she doesn't think it resolves Tom's issue, it is a friendly amendment to what was previously offered.

The PR Statement was approved to be in the CAT material as amended deleting the sentence; Our message is that "an addict, any addict can stop using drugs, lose the desire to use, and find a new way to live".

PR Handbook approval draft

There were no comments concerning the PR Handbook approval draft since it was material the board had seen before. The Preface and Conclusion was new material the board had not seen.

Michael wanted to express, for the record, his thanks and gratitude to the workgroup for the work that was done.

Preface & Conclusion

There were several minor copyedits suggested which staff will take care of but nothing conceptually noted by the board.

The preface and conclusion were approved for inclusion in the CAT after copyedit by staff.

Service Material Approval Process and Area Planning Tool

It was reminded for board members to review the conference's option to approve the chapters.

Area Planning Tool (APT)

The Area Planning tool will have a cover memo explaining its contents. The only people NAWS beta tested the APT on was Eastern Europe. The discussion at the conference should include the premise of creating a short form for the basics which would bring them to more information on the web.

Discussion:

- The document needs a heavy copyedit—language clean-up rather than content:
 - Hard to tell when paragraphs break; language issues such as "planning affords," "Benefits of planning to fulfill our fellowship's primary purpose" should state what that purpose is. Spell out all acronyms initially (GSR for example).
 - Suggests using language such as "area body" or "area committee".

- It was agreed to use service body as apposed to area body.
- Struggling with seeing his area using the APT. Feels they don't have the maturity to use a document like this; sees the size of it a little daunting. Thinks it's good but the size is overwhelming for addicts. Even though it's geared for areas he thinks regions will benefit from it as well.

APT needs a heavy copyedit including language clean up, spelled out acronyms, use of "service body" not "area body." Discussion at the conference should include the premise of creating a short form for the basics which would bring them to more information on the web.

Service Material Approval Process

The board will have to explain to the conference the challenges regarding the service material process. The current policy is confusing in that it states that service resources need to be conference approved, all being driven by how it's distributed, which shouldn't matter. All of the addenda in the handbook, for example, should be able to get updated frequently, especially technology and tools. The board has included the PR Statement, PR Handbook, the PR Preface and Conclusion, and the APT in the Conference Approval Track for 90 day review to have an intelligent discussion at the conference regarding the service material approval process. At the conference, the APT would be used as an example of service material that conflicts with the policy, along with the additional 80 some addendum items that will need to be updated. The need to make things available to the fellowship makes the case.

Discussion:

- Suggests connecting the goal of the service material approval process to the vision statement. This connections is similar to calling out a concept or tradition then stating what the concept or tradition is.
- Ron H recommends making the point that we don't approve it at the conference but ask the conference to give the board the ability to approve tools such as the APT. This could be the first example of this; suggests not asking them to approve the APT since we are asking them to give the board the ability to update materials similar to how we handle bulletins.
- David doesn't feel any ownership to the APT; feels it's too sterile for him to say that this is from the board. Thinks it's a draft document and needs review and input from the board.
- Ron H asked if we could state in the CAT that this is a draft document since we're not asking them for conference approval.
- Becky states that if it doesn't get approved at the conference then it wouldn't be available in the handbook; chapter three refers to the APT repeatedly. Agrees with Ron on how to offer it; this would allow the conference to say that they don't think it's ready or many other choices. This is a compromise that doesn't force the board into one action. Since the APT is not being offered as conference approved material, it could go through many different drafts and edits.

The text in the CAT will change with regard to the Area Planning Tool: the board is offering it for consideration and that they'd like to distribute it in a variety of ways one being with the PR Handbook. The board wants to have a discussion with the conference as to how they want to approve material like this.

CAT Cover Memo

A cover memo will go on the CAT material basically stating its contents, what is getting voted on, and what is not.

2013 World Convention

WCNA 35 Site Selection-Mike Polin

Mike Polin began by pointing out some considerations that weren't included in his report. This negotiation process has proved to be the most interesting one he's been in; at one point having four locations beginning to bubble then Philadelphia and Orlando bubbling beyond that. He is working to partner with these cities in harmony with our public relations efforts. There is a field in Section 2, called working relationships, that is relevant to this.

Mike explained that if it was important enough for NAWS to go to Toronto, members would need to accept spending a significant amount for hotels. Also the meeting space is awkward; we would have to use the hockey stadium where the maximum capacity is less than 17,000; after that we would have to move to the baseball stadium which is what AA uses. Even though Philadelphia isn't the biggest vacation spot, it will do the best numbers.

Discussion:

- *What's the difference between viability and accessibility? Thought viability is beauty.*

Mike explained that accessibility is strictly looking at transportation. Viability takes a look at more than that. He didn't think to put these two categories together.

- *Is either of these two cities places we could go back to if we continue to grow?*

Mike answered that the year 2013 is the last in this rotation. The board needs to have a discussion between now to 2008 about a new rotation.

- There's too much emphasis on picking a site that is a vacation site. Isn't too concerned with how the fellowship likes to take their vacation around this and would be okay with settling for less people. Further added, would be okay with a convention being smaller rather than it being a vacation spot. Reflects on what another board member has said regarding putting the convention in a small community that might mean so much to the area.
- Becky struggles with of our members; 20,000 want this location and 10,000 want another location. Struggles with what the constituency wants and where to draw that line.
- Mike explained that we have guaranteed prices with Orlando's and Philadelphia's hotels for 2013, which is unheard of. There is a trade off in the negotiating side.

The World Board unanimously approved to hold WCNA 35 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania in 2013.

The meeting ended at 5:30 with a board sharing session which is not a recorded session.

Friday 20 January

2006 World Service Conference

Staff and board spent the day discussing recent CAR workshops, tips for facilitators, CAT material and the WSC 2006 agenda.

Update on CAR Workshops

The board members and staff that attended CAR workshops so far gave a brief report on how they went. Overall the workshops went well with some points to be noted below:

- Believes a workshop needs to be held in the Midwest.
- Question 10 confused members.
- **Motion three** was a hot button due to the lack of knowledge regarding the history of translations.
 - The challenges that come with a longer review and input period need to be explained at CAR workshops. When board members attend the EDM and APF take questions from those folks.
- CAT Material needs to be worked in to CAR Workshop agenda.

- Convey in the Conference Report to have delegates decide how they want to vote on this motion based on the conversation at the conference.

Send Translations Basics to CAR workshops since there's a bigger story than needing more time.

Facilitation Tips:

- Have people change tables
- Icebreakers
- Improvise—change small groups to large groups if need be
- Be mindful of time

CAT Material at CAR Workshops: the general discussion at this time was the time crunch in the CAR workshop schedule. With the CAT out travelers will need to carve out time for some discussion based on the audience driving the workshop.

- For locations that NAWS frequently attends cut the NAWS update to talk about the CAT material.
- Offer a session after dinner if local fellowship doesn't have a meeting and/or dance scheduled. Cut lunchtime/ Reassess schedule
- There's a movement to have the CAT moved back with the CAR. There's a feeling of withholding information.

WSC Agenda

Revise WSC agenda to have the following: the date with each day, one day per page, and update all dates where applicable

Opening & Welcoming Session

- Suggests a two minute meditation to open up this session.
- Serenity Prayer in different languages—open with this so people can applaud as apposed to circling up at end of session.
- Have a ceremony-type performance of 3-5 minutes similar to Japanese fellowship at WCNA 30—touch us with NA in your culture.
- Read Strategic Plan or Vision Statement at the beginning of each session.
- Visuals—have country outlined on map during introductions.
- Open or close with multimedia history of conference

Coming Together

- Don't rush folks so early in the week; have more people roam around on microphones; use big screen for time countdown.
- For the questions in the session that focus on the theme of the conference the board and staff discussed these in order of appearance:
 1. When did you first get it or got the message in recovery? Your first "A-ha" moment?
 2. How did the message first get carried to you? How did you first carry it?

Navigation – Orientation

Not much creativity can be worked into this session.

Open House

Food and tours were explained. The World Board will serve food.

WB Forum

In the past the WB forum and the HRP forum ran concurrently. This conference the HRP forum kicks off the day then the WB forum immediately follows.

It was suggested to provide a walk-through of tools—specifically an Area Planning Tool orientation. This can be done at either the Monday am or Friday pm world board forum. To help encourage beginning implantation—take home. Help confirm delegate as a leader when at home—training opportunity.

Moving Forward

Reiterate what was talked about and what will take place—GTWS, Service Materials, etc. Provide a summary of what's been done during the week and what's been achieved.

Issue Discussion Topics

Brainstorm Post-it:

- Reaching populations currently underrepresented in NA. How to reconcile and are we in a different place?
- Planning at local areas
- Strong homegroups
- Clear NA message/language
- Being a leader vs. being in charge—shining star vs. meteor
- Leadership at group level
- Be mindful of set up for next cycle when selecting IDT's—some negative outcome from Atmosphere of Recovery—Predatory Behavior was something not foreseen.
- What would nourish/engage both newcomer and oldtimer in a meeting? Creating ways & possibilities to interact with each other.

- Desire to engage with newcomers and/or engage in NA
- Carrying the Message—How & Why: could have multiple topics under this such as:
 - Membership—privilege & responsibility
 - Meeting etiquette
 - Holistic approach to our service structure as a system which could be the next step out of infrastructure
- Carrying the Message is the overarching theme for all the IDT's
- Weave Strategic Plan into IDT's
- Create IDT's with bullet point themes
- Reach populations—next step once you reach them
- Strong homegroups—court mandated issue
- Inclusiveness vs. exclusiveness—Regardless of....Is this true?
- How to manage group conflicts: dogs, disruptive members, etc.
- Chair persons workshop
- Taking back the 12 Step Call

The board concurred on having the Issue Discussion Topic for 06-08 be the Who, What, How and Why on Carrying the Message. This topic encompasses many topics such as clarity of NA's message, membership responsibility, strong homegroups, being of service, and more:

Who: membership, (privilege and responsibility) language of NA

What: is our message

How: strong homegroups, strong message

Why: fulfillment of our 12th Step

Discussion Sessions

The CAR input collection will take place before the conference by posting of input via the website and at the conference, participants will give input early in week then staff will feed back.

Set up Leadership

- Icebreaker suggestion: Leadership vs. being in charge
- Benefits of Leadership—what we hope to gain—strong leaders
- What is the next action step—tools to offer
- Collecting data ahead of time will show common threads, which are tools
- If you could have the perfect toolbox what would it be?
- Come away with tools and solutions

Infrastructure

- Align with Strategic Plan
- Brainstorm ideas for local implantation
- How does the fellowship input the Strategic Plan?
- What works best and what works least

Public Image

- There are three big areas under this topic which can serve as a formula/equation:
 - Who we are
 - How we act

- How are we perceived?

Take any situation through this formula.

- Introduce PR Handbook as resource

Atmosphere of Recovery

- Role-playing utilizing delegates
- Bridge to new IDT
- This is the first session of the four in the week—intro of where topic came from why it's being discussed etc.
- Skit—good meeting/bad meeting by RD's and WB members.
- Tool—session profile for groups

Reaching Out—Common Needs—People that Aren't Present

- Do we believe there's a distinction between special interest and common needs
- Who is missing? Youths, professionals, etc.
- Acknowledge tension and validate each sound idea. Tie to targeted lit, WCNA, notion of special interest meetings in local meeting schedules.
- Navigate both sides of issue—no one is wrong based on principles
- PR Roundtable input
- Look at traditions as what we can do as apposed to what we can't.

Targeted Lit—feeding back session

- Narrow definition as of yet—use conference population to help us define the common need.
- Caution: slippery slope argument—how do you find the end of targeted literature?
- Ways to reach members not presented
- Who are we targeting? Principles behind this
- Common thread is cross cultures which might get rid of fringe

Basic Service Materials—feeding back session

- PRHB 10-14 dilemma

How to be an effective RD

- Involvement of current RD's (identify ahead of time at CAR Workshops)
- Panel with current and past RD's to open up session—10-15 minutes on how to be an effective RD
- How do you sometimes feel ineffective?

The meeting ended at 5:30 with a board sharing session which is not a recorded session

Saturday 21 January

Corporate

Bob opened the day with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer.

Draft 2006-2008 WB Schedule

The board reviewed a draft of the world board calendar for the 2006-2008 cycle. The body was asked to review meeting dates and identify if any board members have an anniversary, birthday, etc. Dates are as follows:

2006						
19-21 January	8-11 March	23-29 April WSC	22-24 June (New WB & EC members only)	20-23 July (First WB meeting)	19-21 October	
2007						
25-27 January	11-14 April (retreat style)	12-14 July	18-20 October			
2008						
16-18 January	13-15 March	25 April - 3 May (WSC 2008)				

Although the above dates are mostly scheduled for three-day meetings they could be turned in to four-day meetings. The body was advised to plan for four day meetings to be safe.

Becky pointed out the challenge with the July 2006 meeting; this would leave a short window for the Basic Text review and input period.

Board members were asked to take the dates home and, as quickly as possible, let the Executive Committee know of any conflicts.

The board approved the presented World Board schedule for the 2006-2008 conference cycle. Staff will send the board 2006-2008 cycle meeting dates via email.

Approve October Minutes

The October minutes as amended were approved by the board with no objection.

Annual Website report

The annual website report is simply a summary of data for those who have a specific interest in webtrends. Anthony suggested supplying the board, in the future, the overview/summary as apposed to the full report. The total page views are the numbers to pay attention to. Part of the data received is repeat visitors and first time visitors which is all data that is tracked.

- Based on the statistics, the value of the website is obvious. There was concern with the issue of how difficult na.org is to navigate. There was discussion regarding carryovers and if a website redesign is anticipated.

Becky anticipates a redesign happening this cycle.

The World Board agreed to review the summary of web trends rather than the 20 page report in the future.

Shopping Cart

The shopping cart has become the number one way to order literature. A week ago a new record was set of 154 orders processed in one day. At this pace, it won't be long before the board will have to reevaluate the staff processing these orders, since more small orders are being placed; heading to a threshold where the orders are costing NAWS money. The Business Plan Group is working on this issue; they may be coming to the board with changes in, not only the table of organization, but pricing structure due to our price of handling.

Discussion:

- Ron raised the issue that he thought it would be okay to have his group order directly from the WSO but now he's hearing that it's something to be discouraged.

Anthony clarified that getting orders of 40-100 is not the issue. Currently the issue is filling an order consisting of one information pamphlet or two keytags.

Anthony explained that we carry many items for spiritual purposes not business purposes; there is a balance between net profit and meeting the needs of the fellowship. At this time, the Business Plan Group does not want to ask members to fulfill the \$10.00 minimum on the website automatically.

If any board members need service materials, send an email directly to Carrie and she'll send it out. This way other staff members will not have to feel fearful for handling the situation incorrectly. Some of the other staff get flustered when talking to board members.

Meeting Registration

Frustration was expressed with regard to updating meetings and keeping them current.

Anthony explained that there was a time when he wanted to do away with the meeting locator but NAWS has been forced to reconsider doing so based on how many visitors we get. The office is investing in the database so that the web contact and/or the local member can send a flat file. Our policy is to not delete a meeting unless we're told that it doesn't exist. Also noted was that we receive more meeting information than group information.

Future Agenda Item: Registering groups.

Reading Cards

More and more communities are asking for reading cards to be translated. The Executive Committee wishes to forward a recommendation to the board that it is an acceptable practice for NAWS to produce group reading cards in languages other than English based on IP #1 and other translated recovery literature.

The intent is to create some latitude in relation to producing reading cards for communities that don't have the Basic Text translated. For new emerging communities it could have a positive affect on them to use a common language. Currently we consider it acceptable by NAWS to create reading cards for communities from IP #1; however this doesn't include "We Do Recover," the back section of the Twelve Traditions, and "Just for Today."

The World Board had no objections to make it an acceptable practice for NAWS to produce group reading cards in languages other than English based on IP #1 and other translated recovery literature.

WB Performance Evaluation

One of the processes of the Strategic Planning cycle that's deficient is performance measures; this includes the measures of the board as a body and individual board members. Currently, we only employ a single measure which is evaluating workgroup members. What has been lacking is the overall evaluation strategy and the world board evaluation strategy. At present, with Jim DeLizia, the Executive Committee is now focused on that last piece of measurement. Regarding assessing the board as a whole, the board could create standards by coming up with a set of questions; however, what's been challenging is assessing board members. Two things have to occur each cycle: board self assessment as an entity and a board member self assessment.

Discussion:

- Daniel objects to this exercise and believes a sheet of paper is not needed to tell a board member what's deficient. The board has a lot more strategic and procedural duties that are more of a priority. Would like to see the board speak about issues up front. Thinks a procedure will keep board members from being flexible to speak about issues openly. Further, he is wary of this process becoming like the Leadership discussion.

- Daniel recollects the evaluation process was to be about reassessing the board's performance in terms of the original idea and objective of the Strategic Plan. Thinks this is a Step Ten to do individually; not as a board.
- Anthony confirms that reassessing the board's performance in relation to the Strategic Plan is exactly the purpose of the world board assessment. The board member self assessment is a more personal assessment.
- Tom supports the idea, and feels that had there been more evaluation of the matter with Saul it wouldn't have been such an issue.
- Muk supports the idea of the evaluation but believes the board would have to commit themselves to conducting the evaluation over a number of years to regimen the process.
- Michael supports the idea and believes an inventory is necessary in his personal recovery and with the board. He struggles through what the day offers him and needs to conduct an inventory.
- Ron B would like to be able to have a say in what the board does. Regarding the world board member assessment, this concerns him—this is too quantitative and not qualitative—doesn't want to end up with a set of numbers producing a score. Further, he would hate to see it get reduced to numbers.

Anthony explained that the board has met for six years and has never assessed their performance. This says to him that either the members of the board don't care about assessing their performance (which he doesn't believe is the case), or the board's schedule will not allow it. Every board in the world assesses themselves because it's a piece of the organization's due diligence to ask the question: "Did we forward the organization's vision this cycle?" The measurement piece is the only one that's missing in the strategic plan which is so necessary to produce. He suggested producing a hard copy draft of the performance evaluation strategy for the March board meeting.

Becky explained that there in many ways the board is already doing what is being proposed and that there are two pieces Jim DeLizia is working on: one is an overarching evaluation of the Strategic Plan and the operating processes of NAWS; the other is formalizing how the board is doing as a board, how they're doing with the plan, are they on track or off track.

The World Board concurred that before the March meeting they will review a draft World Board Evaluation Strategy and will assess then if they feel it to be useful.

Business Plan Update

The Business Plan Group (BPG) met on January 6-7 2006. The body will stay in tact until May 2006, at which time Mario Tesoriero and Cary Seltzer will roll off.

Reserve Access Policy

A reserve access policy was never an issue for NAWS but now it's absolutely necessary. Before the BPG's next meeting in May they will forward a draft of the reserve access policy to the board.

Auditing Committee

In accordance with a new law titled the Non Profit Integrity act, we are required to have an auditing committee to be the overseer of the audit contract. That group, as of now, will be Bob Jordan, Susan Chess, Bob McDonough, and Khalil Johnson. A non-board member will be appointed as chair of the auditing group. The board does a review of all executive compensation which is another piece that needs to occur.

It was then asked if the primary source for replacing Mario and Cary will come from the world pool. Anthony explained that although the pool is always a resource we directly research, he directly gets recommendations for members.

There were no objections to appointing the creation of the auditing committee which includes Bob Jordan (board chair), Susan Chess, Bob McDonough, and Khalil Johnson.

Literature Distribution System

A literature distribution evaluation of our current system and its effectiveness has not been conducted in over ten years (since 1995). The BPG is initiating an evaluation. The first stage is to conduct an RSO questionnaire (which will take the next year to conclude), and at which point the BPG may forward a recommendation for any changes.

FTP

There is a folder titled Business Plan on the FTP site which the board can access and review any of the materials, such as the RSO questionnaire and any other drafts.

Staff will send the board username and password to access the Business Plan Group FTP site folder.

Margin Analysis

The BPG is conducting a cost of goods margin. In their conclusion, they might recommend an increase in price. Rather than a uniform increase in prices, the BPG is conducting this analysis to possibly raise individual product prices as needed.

World Convention

There are BPG members who are passionate and believe that the convention is not an effective cost benefit for the amount of resources used. The bottom line issue is that the convention does not offset allocated expenses; it offsets direct costs not indirect costs. There are those on the group who believe if you can't offset that expense then a reevaluation should take place. The amount for possible recuperation is \$800,000 dollars. The board, years ago, established the philosophy that the World Convention was not to make money; there are members of the BPG that believe this idea needs to be reconsidered.

Fellowship Donations

The BPG has waited for the board to give them some philosophical direction on how to raise the fellowship's consciousness regarding donations. The BPG will propose a draft of a Seventh Tradition reading card to the board.

Ron B will send a copy of his area's version of a Seventh Tradition reading card.

Contributions

One of the discussions that came from the Business Plan meeting was the perception that there may be some inconsistency with whether or not NAWS takes donations from outside enterprises. For example, if NAWS accepts discounts from a hotel then why can't they accept a contribution of time from an attorney? It was not raised as a challenge but more pointing to the need to examine our practices. A frame for this discussion will be created by the BPG, and then a dialogue with the board will be initiated.

New Products

- *Step Working Guide* on audio CD; this was a fulfilled commitment to the Connecticut delegate, who is deceased.
- *Narcotics Anonymous, Basic Text* on audio CD; which is the audio version of the cassette tapes to CD. The Production Team is currently working on re-mastering the *It Works: How and Why* cassette tapes to CD.
- *Behind the Walls* booklet has been created without staples in the spine. There were complaints from inmates that they couldn't receive them due to facility restrictions. Will create an additional

item called the institutional version but have both types available in stock. The booklet without staples falls apart which is why both will be available.

Medallions

The office has discontinued distribution of the old Roman numeral style medallions. Consequently, there is a stock pile of old medallions and the BPG is proposing, as an alternative to destroying them, to turn the old style stock into key chains offering them as a specialty item. The old style of silver medallions was the only metal that could be recycled. It would cost \$2.30 to produce an antique style and would sell for \$5.00. NAWS can get them in short term rounds and see how they sell as a trial quantity before producing all of the stock pile. We considered giving each Conference Participant a key ring after the conference as a marketing tactic. The BPG wishes to forward a recommendation to the board to produce some quantity of old style Roman numeral bronze medallions into key rings to sell for \$5.00 dollars.

If the issue is pushed at the conference to continue to have the old style key chains as an inventory item then the board could offer making the Roman numeral key rings in significant years.

The World Board had no objections to produce some quantity of the old style Roman numeral bronze medallions into key chains to sell for \$5.00 dollars.

Basic Text

A bi-product of the production of the miniature Basic Text is requests for a low cost version of the text, specifically a soft cover for institutional use.

Corporate Announcement

Anthony's contract which was due to expire in December 2006 was recently extended for three years to the year 2009.

Action Item List (items on page 36)

Date Submitted

20.	Changing from "men and women" to "people"	17 Oct 05
21.	Revise Living the Program IP	25 Oct 05
22.	Add Nicotine language to It Works	8 Nov 05
23.	WCNA Merchandise Process	7 Dec 05
24.	CD Version of H&I tape	9 Dec 05
25.	Paperback pocket sized Basic Text & It Works	20 Dec 05
26.	Medallion Booklet Album	20 Dec 05
27.	We Learn Reading Card	5 Jan 06

After some discussion and consideration, items 20-22 and 27 will be kept on file for future consideration. Item 23 is a process the board is already committing to research; Item 24 will get completed; Item 25 will be researched further; Item 26 is currently not seen as a priority at this time and will not be pursued.

Action Item General Discussion

It was asked why the board tells members that they will "keep on file for future consideration." Anthony reminds the body to read the bulletins posted on the website since these are reflective of the board's philosophical view. There are members that think the board is acting contradictory to their beliefs. This is a subtle reminder that the board hasn't reviewed the content of the bulletins on the website. It might be time to put it on their schedule. We let members who submit project ideas know, when applicable, that there is no way we plan on doing this now but in the future we may consider it, etc.

Action Item # 23: World Convention Merchandise: Increase in Accessibility

While discussing action item 23, board members suggested ways to improve the world convention merchandise process. Those suggestions included: online sales of merchandise before the World Convention, increasing accessibility, decreasing the cluster onsite, and the idea of producing a profit from the sale of merchandise. Also, offer pictures of merchandise online and have merchandise accessible to all our membership.

Anthony explained that selling beforehand undermines onsite sales at which time you would have no way to adapt. Selling merchandise after an event has concluded is a different issue. Further discussion will take place at the March board meeting or the following meeting.

Action Item # 25: Paperback pocket-sized BT

It was reiterated that the whole premise of increasing the price of the pocket-sized Basic Text was not to undermine the primary piece of literature, which represents approximately 70% of NAWS' income.

- David understands not lowering the price under the Basic Text but would possibly like to see the pocket sized version be the same price.

Anthony wishes to look, if and when the novelty of the mini-text wears off, at that time to reevaluate the price. However, he reminds all that the board can lower the price at any time.

The day ended with a sharing session which is not a recorded session of the board, followed by the close of the meeting.