Approved World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

Wednesday 11 July

WB: Michael Cox, Ron Blake, Tom McCall, Franney Jardine, Ron Miller, Piet De Boer, Paul Craig, Arne Hassel-Gren, Craig Robertson, Mark Hersh, Mary Banner, Ron Hofius, Tonia Nikolaou and Jim Buerer

Mukam Harzenski-Deutsch unable to attend the July meeting.

Staff: Anthony Edmondson, Becky Meyer, Bob Stewart, Chris Corning, De Jenkins, Eileen Perez, Elaine Wickham, Fatia Birault, Jane Nickels, Johnny Lamprea, Kim Young, Nick Elson, Stephan Lantos, Tom Boscarelli, Travis Koplow, Uschi Mueller, Shane Colter, Tom Rush

Meeting opened by chairperson with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer. A few announcements concerning this week's meeting made prior to Planning session.

Jim DeLizia facilitated the discussion on stages two of three in creating the 2008-2010 NAWS Strategic Plan. Confirm objectives, measure success, review 2008-2010 approaches, identify initial priorities.

Thursday 12 July

Key Result Area: Leadership and Management

WB: Michael Cox, Ron Blake, Tom McCall, Franney Jardine, Ron Miller, Piet De Boer, Paul Craig, Arne Hassel-Gren, Craig Robertson, Mark Hersh, Mary Banner, Ron Hofius, Tonia Nikolaou and Jim Buerer

Mukam Harzenski-Deutsch unable to attend the July meeting.

HRP: Sergio Rojas, Greg Smith, and Mindy Atkins

Staff: Anthony Edmondson, Becky Meyer, Chris Corning, Eileen Perez, Elaine Wickham, Jane Nickels, Nick Elson, Roberta Tolkan, Steve Rusch, Travis Koplow, and Keri Kirkpatrick.

Meeting opened by chairperson with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer. Jim DeLizia facilitated recap discussions on Leadership this cycle and any future plans.

Key Result Area: Leadership and Management

A Walkthrough of the HRP process

Sergio R from the HRP presented the Human Resource Panel Nomination Process to the World Board. Points of discussion

Changes being considered based on current HRP discussions:

- Candidates must be fluent in English
- Consider each candidate based on:

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

- Service history (recent and past)
- Skills/talents
- Personal recovery
- Two overarching questions: one to get an individual's own understanding of what they bring to the table; the other to tap into their creative, skills, talents

Each HRP member scores every CPR

Blind CPR Score Evaluations

- Individual CPR scores are tabulated and an average score is determined for each
- HRP determines how many CPRs advance to interview process, based on:
 - Scores of CPRs
 - Number of Open Positions
 - Number of RBZ (region, board, zone) candidates (these candidates bypass blind scoring, provided that they meet clean time requirements)

(Impacts number of interviews)

Candidate and Reference Interviews (Handout is last cycle's questions)

- Each candidate and reference is interviewed by one HRP member
- Each member has the same set of questions with predetermined potential values
- RBZ candidates are included in this process

Final Determination of Nominees

- Individual scores are tabulated and compared
- The HRP uses scores as a foundation for discussions regarding final choices
- · All nominees are selected by consensus of the entire HRP

The final determination of nominees takes place in March.

The HRP would like to change some parts of the process with respect to the number of interviews done. The board can do two things to help with the HRP process: 1) continue to openly share on leadership and 2) talk to the fellowship about the process by which the board forwards names (i.e., the Shinning Star method, etc.).

Discussion on RBZ nominations and the best use of HRP's finite resources:

- Concerned with sharing the Shinning Star process and people then becoming upset if they knew their names were forwarded and not selected by the HRP as a nominee.
- Believe the blind CPR evals based on WPIF percentages is what the conference has been asking for as a way to being transparent. RBZ intent was to factor out the blindness, wanting to put the person into the process, not in any way to supersede the World Pool.
- Concern expressed with how the RBZ process has the ability to push out individuals from the world pool as well as how regional endorsements have more weight than an

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

individual going through the whole HRP process. Regional endorsements sometimes teeter on the "buddy" system.

- It was suggested to begin requesting references as a way to deal with regional endorsements (RBZ).
- RBZ candidates only bump individuals with low scores. RBZ process is only in its 2nd cycle; it should be important to recognize where the board is with the RBZ process and how they feel it fits in its evaluation of the process.
- Disclosure: report on the percentage ranking system currently used so everyone understands the process to forward names.
- There should be some caution in the degree to which we try to attain transparency
 with the percentages used in the culling process. In selections process, it is acceptable
 to refrain from disclosing why someone was not considered.
- The inclination to respond to questions from individuals who aren't elected is understandable, but no response is necessary, other than: "sorry; try again next cycle."
- The problem in conference elections is familiarity. Participants don't base their votes on qualification but on personal (or second-hand) knowledge of candidates.
- 1) If members' primary interest is in serving, they can be of great value in service at other levels; 2) notion of linear progression through service system from group service to world service is not a realistic scenario.
- Have honest conversation about not having an ideal system in place, communicate the 3 stages, and communicate challenges and opportunities we have to grow. More importantly where we want to go and be.

HRP will be reviewing their external guidelines, and will therefore inform the board if they will develop motions to change some of those policies.

The board will report the process used regarding considered names that have been used in the past.

Forward any Input to interview questions to the HRP.

Recap of the status of WB Nominees to the HRP process / Strategies to advance recommendations for 2008

There is nothing currently written in GWS that describes the current cooperative partnership between HRP and the World Board. Something should be written in *The Guide to World Services* that spells out the partnership between the two bodies.

Brief exchange on the bulleted items listed on page 6 of the *Proposed NAWS Leadership Identification Strategy* handout as a way to communicate to the fellowship.

The 3 steps as discussed this morning are what will be forwarded to the fellowship. The Leadership document will not be forwarded as board hasn't reached consensus on it.

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

- Suggestion to create a personal/team assessment tool as a strategy about personal involvement to be used by board, regions, zones, RBZ process. Utilize criteria already in use by the HRP, along with additional questions (e.g., finishing service commitments, etc.). This should be introduced in the CAT or CAR and would be a good way of modeling. Can also begin to express more collaboration and cooperation between the board and HRP.
- One section of the *Proposed NAWS Leadership Identification Strategy* refers to a leadership development workgroup. It might have been a good idea to have included the HRP in the board's process, allowing them to take an objective look at process and come up with suggestions, helping us perceive ourselves a little better.
- The practice of inviting everyone who meets clean time requirements may lead to false expectations. Could it be modified to state clear expectations/requirements upfront?

Both bodies need to identify how to cultivate leaders before presenting new ideas. There are no more good ideas about how to or what we want to say about this subject. Need to take action with leadership cultivation or move on to something else.

No objections to forwarding *Guide to World Services* revisions in partnership between the WB and HPR to the Executive Committee for final sign off, but reported to the board.

Before presenting a personal/team assessment tool to the fellowship, the board should use it internally, and wait until there is board agreement to pass it on to fellowship.

Anthony, Craig, and Greg have a conference call every third Wednesday. Additional thoughts and ideas can be discussed there.

The board ended their meeting with a closed sharing session which is not a recorded segment of the board meeting.

Friday 13 April

Key Result Area: Fellowship Support

WB: Michael Cox, Ron Blake, Tom McCall, Franney Jardine, Ron Miller, Piet De Boer, Paul Craig, Arne Hassel-Gren, Craig Robertson, Mark Hersh, Mary Banner, Ron Hofius, Tonia N and Jim Buerer.

Staff: Becky Meyer, Eileen Perez. Travis Koplow joined for the Basic Text discussion.

Meeting opened with a moment of silence followed by Serenity prayer.

Announcements made about travel availability for CAR Workshops now through February.

Approval form of the Sixth Edition Basic Text

Finalize the draft for release to the fellowship

Review of Basic Text report, plan is to discuss draft itself and hopefully get approval on cover essay along with the CAR motions. Also want to review production and distribution ideas, which include translations policy. All changes to draft spelled out in the *Summary of Work* report. Travis pointed out that a new copy of the Colombia story has been provided.

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

General process to create a larger than necessary draft, detect gaps so that when the gaps were identified there were more stories than needed. The process in which the decisions were reached explained.

1. Introduction

No comments from the board. There were no objections on the Introduction in the final approval Basic Text draft.

2. Approve stories to be added

No comments from the board regarding gap fillers. However there was some discussion on how to best paint the picture concerning stories selected and removed.

There were no objections to <u>approving stories to be added: The Only Requirement, Sowing the Seed, The Spirit of Service, Another Chance to Live, A Serene Heart, Just Say Yes, Mosaic, It Is Worth It, Sacred Places Inside, and NA is a Roadmap.</u>

3. Approve stories to be cut from R&I draft

Report in the blue book lines out stories to be removed. Ron H explained process. Everyone reminded that the fellowship is being asked to review stories that were not in the initial review draft and this may create discomfort.

We've been consistent in stating our intent and we as a body should express and reiterate the intention to make the best final piece possible. One of the review and input process benefits is to improve the final product. Everyone reminded about the importance of emphasizing the positive in the process.

A SEZF participant mentioned possibility of presenting a motion that requests all gap fillers stories reviewed.

There were no objections to removing the following stories from the final approval draft: A New Beginning, Part of the Solution, Now it is Possible, Sick and Tired at Eighteen, The Same Path, How Do You Spell Relief, The Miracle of NA, Picture not Perfect, God-shaped Hole, Free at Last.

a. WSO story

Uneasiness about various aspects of project decisions, especially how the WSO story was edited. Thinks fellowship will suspect we were trying to hide something.

Fellowship input helped dictate what was cut. If there is discomfort with something, when reporting, state how many discussions there were about stories. It's all in how the thought is expressed. The very fact that we reported on the WSO story shows that were not trying to hide anything about that.

The workgroup's intention was to create the richest draft possible. There was much lone wolf passion along the way, but there was also acceptance in the process, which is how the colorful draft we have today was developed. Workgroup gave a lot of credence to authors' input. WSO story author felt the suggested edits changed

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

the story therefore in being respectful, edits were not made. Workgroup stands by the integrity of the process in which the draft was developed.

Reflections

A description of *Reflections* included in the table of contents because there was a portion of members that were confused about what they are. Most of the fellowship input on the draft was about confusion, which the workgroup attempted to address. Some regarding the inclusion of *Reflections*, like "who gave you permission to touch the Basic Text." Some didn't like the *Reflections* idea, but there was no suggestion that it didn't fall under the charge.

It was noted that 7,500 review and input draft copies were mailed out to the fellowship and only about 300 plus pieces of input were received. The number is not an accurate representation of fellowship review. It has value, but not decision-making value.

An amazing number of people who workshopped the draft never sent input. This project is the only project that has had such a consistent job in reporting the steps to the fellowship. That type of reporting makes the fellowship happy.

There were no objections to including the *Reflections* in the final approval draft of the Basic Text.

No objections to using Basic Text Reflections replacement piece if necessary.

Abstracts

There were no objections to including the Abstracts in the final approval draft of the Basic Text.

Two grammatical errors were noted.

No objections to the final signers for the final approval draft being Craig, Ron H, and Travis.

There were no objections to the reinsertion of story *The Same Path* in the *Coming Home* section if there's room.

Basic Text Talking Points: include: historical, dialog in this discussion, some indication of individuals who contributed, (i.e. workgroup, staff, and authors of stories that did or not make it).

The board thanked the workgroup for the quality and work done on the draft. It will be a great day when a newcomer and present member are able to pick up the new edition of the Basic Text. Ron H took a moment to personally thank Travis' amazing ability to coordinate all the project work. Gratitude and thanks to everyone involved.

Proposed methods of distribution, size and cost

Estimate an additional 130 pages making book a total 416 total pages. Anthony showed an example of 2 book sizes, difference in paper type changes the size of the book. Therefore recommend using *Sebago* which is the same paper used in *It Works*:

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

How and Why. Trim size currently 5x8, proposed change is 6x11, which changes the pagination as well.

Font size will be about the same as right now, difference will be in line spacing.

Recommending the price \$11.00 retail (currently \$9.75) justified in that so much more content being added.

Cost of distribution also considered. There are 28 books in a case. Estimate it costing \$3.00 more per case to ship. If the trim size not changed then the book changes significantly and the cost is higher.

All versions of the 6th edition (large print, etc.) will be affected by additional 130 pages.

The Business Plan workgroup is considering a commemorative 6th Basic Text edition.

We are going to communicate that WSO will not take 5th edition books back. Given our history with the changes in the text that there will be a fall off sometime around September of this year, being that we have to go on the monies till it's approved, so we'll have to bleed off cash until that watershed of income starts to occur.

There are no objections to making the 6th edition 6x9 trim size, using the same paper as in *It Works: How and Why* and priced at \$11.00.

No objections to pricing the final approval draft version at \$8.00 & create online password accessibility for both Youth IP and Basic Text. Intent will be to get the final approval draft out by the World Convention.

CAR Motions and report

Ron went through the previously approved decisions in the *Summary of Decision Related to BT Motions* on page 59.

Separate motions to replace stories – no objections to previously approved.

Book one and Book two titles – no objections

Statistical information on Preface – no objections

JFT Quote Discussion

Repagination of the Basic Text is something the fellowship was not aware of. There was discussion about possible impacts of this. Board reminded to consider that various versions of Basic Text are paginated differently. No other points noted.

Revised Index – will come at the end, affecting page count, but not pagination.

Copyedits to chapters 1 through 10; hot buttons include changing N.A. with periods to NA and remove *A Guide to Public Information Newly Revised* references. These are housekeeping motions, but there's a small sector that come from place of little trust that will use this as a way to show that NAWS doesn't do what they say.

Conference Policy language also needs clean up in order to make the 6th edition current policy; this included allowing the 5th edition to be depleted until there are no

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

more. Conference has repeatedly made it clear that the purview of specific production decisions be left to the world service office.

There were no objections to motion word cleaning, and wording that allows for individuals to sell off their stock of the 5th editions.

Page 60: Footnote approved for under 'decisions that have not yet been made.'

Report will recap the complete history of the project and additional information that helps recall when certain decisions were made, etc.

Translations Policy

Topic brought for discussion because clean up motion will affect Translation policy. Thought is to provide better guidance, clearer expectations, etc. in the policy if we are going to do clean up.

Issue stems from the translation policy allowing a local community to use local stories in the *Little White Book*, Basic Text when they are not ready to take this type of task on. Followed by authorization for production process for stories being challenging and awkward. Current policy provides very little guidance.

Lithuanian and Filipino translation issues is simply that local stories reflect where they are in their development and the policy does not provide clear direction on what they should be working on as opposed to taking on such a large task like personal stories. More communities will be inclined to translate personal stories. Discussion:

- There is a contradiction for one portion of the fellowship to have different standards. The translated Basic Text should go out as the Basic Text English version. What's the point of going over all these stories so members can do what they want? Spirit of current stories should be applicable to all language groups. Giving communities an option, although done in a loving way, does no justice to developing community.
- It would be nice for NA to have only one Basic Text. It seems discriminatory that all
 would not be able to have the same words of the new Basic Text.

A number of local communities have chosen not to have personal stories. Not attempting to take away the ability of a local community to produce book one, but to look at providing direction, current policy allows for translations of some or all stories, this means if they chose to translate some of the stories there is that option.

Translation policy wording would only be changed to indicate that there will be a higher expectation when the local community decides to translate stories for the Basic Text. Policy should help members with information that gives guidance, etc. Because current policy states that, they take that on first without having other material which is not beneficial or useful.

 A finite resolution will have to be decided. What would be wrong with removing the blanket 3rd option, and creating wording for a process of translating the stories in their own language requiring a dialog first?

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

Straw Poll:

Alternative to translations policy

- Leave the Translation Policy as is 0
- They can make a request to the world board creating a dialog –1
- Remove the option in translations policy for LTC's to write own stories in the Basic Text only this does not apply to the White Booklet –13
- There were no objections to modifying the current translation policy making it more descriptive. Removing the option in translations policy for LTC's to write own stories in the Basic Text.

Professional translators issue is another topic that needs future board discussion.

Becky announced the piece Basic Text reflection replacement – board is to read tonight and make a decision tomorrow; if we don't have room to include that one story that we use this story instead.

Key Result Area: Fellowship Support

Approval form of the Youth IP and piece to Parents – Kim

Review of the summary of input and decisions made by the workgroup page 33

Jim, Franney, Kim and Chris facilitated the afternoon session on Youth IP and piece for Parents. The workgroup met Sunday and Monday and made decisions concerning fellowship input. Draft of the IPs will be sent to the workgroup for revisions, etc. Board issues on (conceptual) plan of direction should be addressed now. None noted.

Most revisions were to help refocus, make information more relevant and clear, this included minor edits, etc. Goal is to bring the size down from it current 19 pages.

There was a brief conversation regarding the IP not addressing the inner city youth and what modifications were made based on a workgroup members suggestions to help in that area. A piece with an inner city tone needs to be approached with that as the goal.

Opening piece on page 33; suggested changing "addicts" to "people."

Kim reported only negative from fellowship on Parents piece concerned 1) are we stepping out of charge and 2) is the piece addressed to NarAnon?

Workgroup thought that in the future there needed to be more interactive pieces, use of more technology, wanted to see more comics, cartoons, graphics in literature, a piece that addresses the inner city youth.

The next time the board sees the drafts it will be to sign off to go out to the fellowship. As previously agreed the IP will be available via the internet with password accessibility.

On a personal note the board wished Kim well in her future endeavors. Her contribution to NAWS will be missed.

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

Beginning Discussion of Service Pamphlets

Discussion on finalization of the two pieces, timeline, and role of the board as well as discuss possible remaining changes to Medication.

During the April meeting there was consensus on the Medication piece and as time went on all those agreements just seemed to disband. Need to know conceptual issues within board in order to proceed.

NA Groups and Medication

- 1st page, 3rd paragraph, "and medication for mental health" concerned with it being called out and emphasized.
- 2nd page, 1st paragraph last sentence, "feeling" was used when it's really a "thought" or "opinion"—make that change throughout document.
- 3rd page, "cultivating unity": that when we have a great first sentence we should not follow with "regardless..." part of sentence that follows lessens. Does not have a strong feeling about drug replacement wording.
- Ron B no problem with drug replacement wording. Where staple goes: A sentence should be in ital. 3rd paragraph 1st sentence "Some NA members have little tolerance for those on drug replacement..." Sentence should accommodate confusion as well as intolerance.
- 3 diamonds, last paragraph— move the diamonds to create the correct visual formatting break. Typos as well.
- Keep intolerant understand that this comes from fear, intolerance is more about behavior. Different behavior cause ... can acknowledge the fear it cause, but can also see what we can do.
- The sentence "possibly one of the most..." sentence might better fit under the last paragraph.
- Not in favor of having drug replacement on the same page with psychiatric medication; it's like mixing apples and oranges.

Disruptive Behavior

- Typo in 1st paragraph. Another typo in 2nd bullet "escalating..."
- Too many bullets formatting/layout.
- Lately many members...word "sympathies" should be corrected.

The copyright information will not be used on *Disruptive Behavior* piece. Will only use masthead and place that on back panel. Publication date for all IPs will be added as well because they are WB approved.

Logo "World Board approved" logo affirmed for all service pamphlets pieces.

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

Board approved writing a cover memo to conference participants, sending them a large supply, asking them to let us know how pieces were received, etc. Hoping to spark ideas.

 Franney handed her input to writers and wanted to point out that she likes that our literature makes references to other NA resources.

<u>An Introduction to NA Meetings, Disruptive & Violent Behavior, Group Trusted Servant Roles & Responsibilities, Group Business Meetings—pieces approved with edits along with format changes. Pricing will be the same as IPs in inventory, WB chose NA logo. Conference participant cover memo will be drafted.</u>

Piet recalled a previous board discussion that went along the lines of once the service pieces approved the bulletins should be revised as well otherwise material confusing. Quick exchange on pulling a piece until it is reviewed when we publish something that supersedes another piece. Jim disagrees because he like methadone bulletin believes this is a different tool.

Get copies of methadone bulletin to the board for review. Subsequent pieces are *Leadership*, *Benefits of Service* and *What is NAWS*.

Saturday 14 April

World Board: Craig Robertson, Michael Cox, Tom McCall, Mary Banner, Ron Hofius, Ron Blake, Arne Hassel-Gren, Piet DeBoer, Tonia Nikolaou, Ron Miller, Jim Buerer, Mark Hersh and Franney Jardine. Mukam HD was not present.

Staff: Anthony Edmondson, Becky Meyer and Eileen Perez

Chairperson made a few announcements and the board provided with May/June correspondence books and a copy of the July *NA Way Magazine*. Action Group led by Paul on intimacy and fear; getting to know you better.

Corporate Responsibilities

Required Business

Nominee Review

In April the board agreed on a list of candidates for submission (RBZ) to the HRP, discussion is to reaffirm list of names and remind everyone of agreement to not share list publicly.

From the list those who declined were Toby, Khalil and Cisco. Individuals who accepted were Moina B, Jose Luis, Susan Blaue, and Junior from Brazil. Yet to be determined is Vivianne Ronneman. We have provided her with a cover letter describing what it takes to be a board member and developed criteria. If she says yes she will be added to the list of names to be forwarded to HRP. An EC recommendation is required for board members who want to run again. Currently have 15 board members, with Jim running again makes 14, leaving 0-3 slots.

At this point, no other action is required. <u>The board reaffirmed if Vivienne accepts; Moina B, Jose Luis, Susan Blaue, and Junior (Brazil) will be forwarded for to HRP, with a recommendation from the EC for Jim Buerer.</u>

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

Reaffirm leadership for 2007-2008 fiscal year:

Reaffirming leadership on the agenda because the fiscal year ended June 30. Craig Robertson, Ron Miller, Tom McCall and Jim Buerer are willing to continue serving as officers for this corporation for another year (2 year commitment).

The World Board unanimously adopted Craig Robertson, Ron Miller, Tom McCall and Jim Buerer as corporate officers for 2007-2008.

Adopt corporate resolutions for 2007-2008 fiscal year:

Noted change is the removal of Wells Fargo entries due to consolidating bank accounts along with amending dates and address locations for institutions.

Noted that Banco Sudameris (20,000) is still used for transactions in Colombia and for cooperative events in Latin America. In order to keep that account open, a Colombian resident must be listed as an account holder; therefore Giovanna Ghisays still listed as such. We protect ourselves by minimizing account balance and there is a letter of agreement between NAWS and Giovanna G however there is no policy in place.

Page 81 designates the property trust and what exists. List addresses what is adaptable and not adaptable. CA means conference approved (CAT or conference). Not adaptable is literature that depicts Narcotics Anonymous core principles and philosophy.

PR Handbook needs to be listed as Conference Approved (CA). Convention Guidelines need to be removed; CA will also be listed for the items marked with an X. There were no objections to the adopting the 2007-2008 Corporate Resolutions as amended.

Approval of April WB Minutes for the record:

Page 14, sentence "our hope is to discuss these pieces between now July..." states a deadline, which is to be removed. There was board agreement to strike "between now and July." There was no objection to approving the April World Board minutes as amended.

Lithuanian and Filipino personal stories:

The Filipino and Lithuanian personal stories had many corrections. Lithuanian and Filipino terms in stories that were mandated were changed however community selected to not change suggestions they did not agree with.

At the June meeting the EC talked about weighing out the advantages and disadvantages and agreed with recommending the stories for approval, with some mandated changes and other suggestions, taking into consideration the flaws, etc.

This brings the discussion back the board needing to have better information in the creative part of the process. As long as newer developing communities develop their own local stories there will be the board expectation that they have something they do not have (recovery based experience and knowledge). Unless something in a personal story is really philosophical or helpful it should not be a discussion the board needs to have. Personal preference does not need to play a part in board process. To be helpful the board should

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

provide information on how to be creative. The board needs to think about what is helpful in the creation phase – waiting till the end is too late.

Two issues before the board 1) our process, 2) Filipino/Lithuanian stories – approving for production.

- Five members of the board thought that the Filipino stories should be approved for
 production because they have done what was asked. If it was the board intention to
 not approve stories unless all changes were made then this needed to be
 communicated. Extremely uncomfortable changing the process at this point. The
 board should allow them to move forward, help and support the community.
- Three members were not comfortable with moving forward with the stories; thought the
 board did not give the community an option about changing 1) Shabu, 2) references to
 treatment centers and 3) to unlawful interactions with the police. These are
 fundamental issues, one is the NA message and material will be representative of the
 NA community.

Other thoughts

- o Give the stories a finite shelf life like 1 or 2 years for changes, etc.
- Let's instead ask communities to develop experience with steps and traditions.
- Believes the process for considering stories needs to stop until the process is corrected.
- At this point we may want to not allow newly growing communities to create stories. We are not doing anyone any justice with allowing new starting communities to develop stories when they are not capable. Developing communities could be working on items that are more helpful.
- The problem is in creating their own stories. We should ask small communities to pick a couple of stories from the Basic Text.
- Their local realities are such that Shabu, references to treatment centers and unlawful interactions with police are things in their stories we don't understand and unacceptable to them to not allow them. We could say go ahead and once again articulate our concerns.
- Need to look at how we address our communications. Feels the board is divided on the Filipino stories therefore we should not be willing to approve.

Craig tried to recap discussions and bring group to a decision.

Filipino - ask that they reconsider some of the board's concerns, and explain why, particularly police interaction. However, absent their agreement, the world board approves for production. This does not mean that the board is going to wait for a response from them before moving forward with production.

EC June discussion on the Lithuanian personal stories: Took Mary's input regarding the Minnesota model being in contradiction with the 6th tradition, also the specific differentiation

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

for alcohol. The word board agreed to move forward with Lithuanian personal stories mandating the change for drug/alcohol wording, Minnesota model reference not an issue.

After lunch, Jim opened the meeting stating that before going into WCNA 32 discussions he would like to bring up points of a discussion that occurred over lunch between some board members. Thought is to recommend that no new stories be allowed for development for the *Basic Text* and the *Little White Book*.

Some board members are ready to make a decision regarding not allowing new stories for *The Little White Book*, but others are not. The board then went into a discussion on why they are or are not ready to make a decision about this now.

- Policy is a derivative of spiritual intent and policy reflects that is a belief. Therefore the
 root discussion needs to be about philosophy of policy and what the board believes
 that is or is not policy itself.
- Suggest framing topic for the CAR, then discuss at WSC when language groups are present, and then possibly make decision at subsequent WSC.
- Clarify the vehicle for them. Don't want to keep revisiting process.

After hearing no objections, the board agreed to rewrite the policy to state that the Sixth Edition *Basic Text* reflects our worldwide fellowship and should be used as the base for all translated versions. For communities that wish to create personal stories, they may do so for the Little White Book if they enter into a discussion with the board first. This should help to alleviate some of the issues that the board has had with personal stories that become NA literature in some of these communities.

WCNA 32 Discussion of status of the event

Logistical plan and assignments

Tony Greco brought in as a consultant till completion of WCNA 32; have hired two interns for convention onsite, also utilizing other stage managers/coordinators, Khalil J. who runs the Dome in Georgia has been asked to be a resource pool to help facilitate 3 events. Becky and Anthony are the other principle event oversight managers. An AA event planner; who has a longstanding relationship with Mike P, has also offered ancillary support if necessary.

Trying new things like making computer kiosk available for online merchandise orders, WSO onsite display will be unprecedented; there will be a coffee area inside the WSO Onsite, a multimedia. Literature sales will be back in WSO onsite.

Board assignments

Grid is only a fluid draft, workshop assignments are not yet designated. Need everyone to flexible.

Wednesday and Thursday registration area will be busy which is why there are more board members assigned on those days. Workshops will be on the 3 issue discussion topics and it is very important that board members assigned be on time.

A PR firm has been hired and is coordinating PR aspects of convention. Not sure what

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

the firm may identify as needs, but board should be prepared to be pulled during the course of week. Likely begin with meet & greet before 1st workshop, details to follow.

Budget

At this point we are taking steps to minimize cost for event. Have received 5,800 pre registrations; may fall short with the general registration population. Guessing we will get about 16,000 members for San Antonio. Number of tickets for events will be different; merchandise is usually sold out no matter what.

Anthony will travel to San Antonio on August 5th to meet with Support Committee; as well as other convention-related travel between now and convention.

Because there may be some penalty charges in regards to hotel rooms not bought out many staff and board members will be spread out in hotels blocks.

Because registration is so low, we may need to consider contemplating a lower-priced onsite registration.

WCNA travel days: international travelers-Monday August 27, U.S. travelers-Tuesday August 28. Depart Sunday September 2 at close of WCNA. Reminder to bring one outfit for possibly for PR.

World Board Process for Input

Issue is trying to meet a deadline with a piece, board starts discussions on something thought to have been agreed on and there's no clarity if it is input or discussion.

Initial discussions, like the one on Methadone, can be hashed out via email to sort out the relevant issues. It's a different story for pieces developed that require input for direction. A regular publication like *NAWS News* does not require reply all.

Using the service IPs as examples for process used – it took an inordinate amount of time for staff to decipher what was actual input or dialog amongst the board on a piece that needed to be finished. The dialog was beneficial; however, if this pace is kept, publication deadlines will not be met. There are times when "reply all" is necessary because a thought is being refined, but that time is not when final drafts are sent for review and approval. Dialogs in response create the impression that there prior decisions hadn't been made.

What the most effective process for staff to gather input?

Is it best to have philosophical discussions face to face?

- Many board members like "reply all" because it helps stimulate thought, helps with feeling
 part of the process. Also helps with others addressing same ideas. "Reply all" has value –
 creates discussion its more than individual sending thought through pipeline.
- Suggests sending one draft per email, the versions dated and ability to post comments to particular draft on the FTP site or something like that.
- When the board thinks they are okay with something, and then a dialog starts again on the piece, staff needs to cut it off to eliminate frustration.

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

- o A staff member could facilitate reply-all email dialog to keep everyone on track.
- Clarifying the two types of streams for world board:
 - 1) General discussion, everyone see it, dialog no deadline, etc.
 - 2) Service IP used as an example conceptual discussion took place at a face-to-face meeting giving staff direction on what to write. This could be put on the FTP site where the board could submit input based on standards but there is no back and forth.

Sometimes, people stumble on emails later after a deadline has occurred because they are busy. Board should just let staff know they are busy and want to know if they could respond later, will also use the one item for review/input per email with clearer titles and the WB being cognizant of what is dialog and input. WB is to clearly indicate when they feel strongly about a piece of input. We will use one or two of the bulletins as a way to experiment with email (reply all) discussions.

WSC Seating

The board decision on WSC Seating moratorium was to create a discussion with the conference on WSC Seating. The motion will fit best in the CAT, but the discussion will be in the CAR. We have only received feedback from Nebraska on this.

The other issue about the CAR is trying to frame initial ideas to get feedback on *Sponsorship* book, future literature projects ideas, and possibly getting what's working and what's not working for regional delegates, this would include idea on the next steps with issue discussion topics. Staff will start drafting for board review.

WSC Regional Motions

The EC is the go-between with motion makers, specifically Ron and Jim.

Motion: to direct the WSC to Publish the Spanish Basic Text in Hard Cover again.

Intent: To make the Spanish Basic Text more durable and easier to carry and handle.

Rational by the Region:

Financial Impact:

Policy Affected:

The decision to make all Spanish Basic Text soft covers came about because the major literature order purchasers only wanted soft cover. Motion maker will need to quantify need. Jim will be talking with motion maker from region.

Motion: To direct the World Board to provide financial support for legal fees in the amount of \$36,000 to the Greater Patterson Area resulting from a lawsuit in regard to a perceived infringement of our Traditions.

ı	n	te	n	+	•
ı	11	ιc	11	ι	

Rational by the Region:

Financial Impact:

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

Policy Affected:

Ron M will speak with motion maker.

Key Result Area: Fellowship Support

Service Pamphlets

Approval of the final versions for distribution of:

Items were dealt with and discussed Friday during staff's presentation on Service IPs with included board authorization, a new NA World Board logo, and pricing.

- a. Violent & Disruptive Behavior
- b. An Introduction to NA Meetings
- c. Group Business Meetings
- d. Group Trusted Servant Roles and Responsibilities

Discussion of where we are with the piece on Medication and the NA Group

Discussion on the Leadership piece, Benefits of Service, and What is NAWS.

Consensus Based Decision Making at the WSC

Finalize the draft for GWSNA

Nothing new noted on page 71, changes start from 72-73.

Ron H shared thoughts he had with the tone of the document, but overall like changes. Objections on how document refers to CBDS typically calling for unanimity, just wants a little more nuance.

Paragraph under *Consensus Based Decision Making*, consensus *refers to agreement*Consensus refers to the willingness of the group to move forward with a decision. 2) The foundation is the very essence. This is an excellent opportunity to refer to the concept.

Bottom paragraph on 73: believe that a straw poll hurts the dialog process; we should never say that on the basis of a straw poll there never a need for discussion. At the conference itself if we know that people are just trying to hear themselves, find a way to not discourage dialog by a minority voice based on a straw poll and requiring the body to allow it. Ron H gave an example of how to say something regarding not stifling discussion after a straw poll.

Agreement to accept with Ron H changes (Becky has hard copy of specific wording)

No objections to proceeding with this going into the CAT, but because that is so far off, it would be wise to send draft to conference participants for review and input before it goes into the CAT. Revisions would be sent to the board for sign off, and then go to conference participants. Draft would be mailed and posted on the bulletin board.

Revisions to Rules of Order

Steve R and Don Cameron (Parliamentarian for more than 20 years) did a wonderful job of shortening the RRO, final will also be sent to the board for review.

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

Miscellaneous

- Send Eileen travel availability from present to end of February 2008.
- Craig indicated that for future meetings a recap of decisions will be done for the board on Saturdays by end of meeting.
- Anthony informed the board of possible change of medallion manufacturer.
- Group Starter Kit box will be made available.
- The amazing job Sweden is doing with assisting neighboring communities spotlighted.
- Each board member given 2 pins with the Arabic logo made by a member who tried to get the local community to adopt the logo. It wasn't adopted; member produced logo pins.

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

WORLD BOARD DECISIONS JULY 2007

HUMAN RESOURCE PANEL

The board will report the process used regarding considered names that have been used in the past.

Forward any Input to interview questions to the HRP.

WB NOMINEES TO THE HRP PROCESS / STRATEGIES TO ADVANCE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2008

Guide to World Services revisions regarding partnership between the WB and HPR forwarded to the Executive Committee for final sign off and reported to the board.

Before presenting the personal/team assessment tool to the fellowship it will be important for the board to first try internally and should not impart to fellowship until there is board agreement.

Anthony, Craig, and Greg have a conference call every third Wednesday. Any additional ideas, thoughts, etc., can be discussed there.

THE SIXTH EDITION BASIC TEXT

The Board approved the following for the final review and input version of Basic Text:

Introduction, Reflections which includes the replacement piece if necessary and Abstracts.

Stories to be added: The Only Requirement, Sowing the Seed, The Spirit of Service, Another Chance to Live, A Serene Heart, Just Say Yes, Mosaic, It Is Worth It, Sacred Places Inside, and NA is a Roadmap. Reinsert story The Same Path in the Coming Home section if there's room.

Stories to be removed: A New Beginning, Part of the Solution, Now it is Possible, Sick and Tired at Eighteen, The Same Path, How Do You Spell Relief, The Miracle of NA, Picture not Perfect, Godshaped Hole, Free at Last.

Final approval draft signers are Craig, Ron H, and Travis.

Proposed methods of distribution, size and cost: final approval draft version cost \$8.00; create online password accessibility for both Youth IP and Basic Text.

6th edition: 6x9 trim size; same paper as *It Works: How and Why*; priced at \$11.00.

CAR Motions and report: Separate motions to replace stories, for Book one and Book two titles, statistical information on Preface. Revised Index (at end of book) affects page count, not pagination.

Copyedits to chapters 1 through 10; hot buttons include changing N.A. with periods to NA and remove *A Guide to Public Information Newly Revised* references. These are housekeeping motions but there's a small sector that come from a low trust place that will use this as a way to show that NAWS doesn't do what they say.

There were no objections to motion word cleaning (NA and A Guide to Public Information Newly Revised), and wording that allows for individuals to sell off their stock of the 5th editions.

Footnote approved 'decisions that have not yet been made'.

YOUTH IP AND PIECE TO PARENTS

Youth IP and Parent piece: the next time the board sees the drafts, it will be to sign off to go out to the fellowship. As previously agreed, the IP will be available via the internet with password accessibility.

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

SERVICE PAMPHLETS

The copyright information will not be used on Disruptive Behavior piece. Will only use masthead and place that on back panel. Publication date for all IPs will be added as well because its WB approved.

A cover memo to conference participants will be drafted and sent with a large supply of IPs, asking them to let us know how pieces were received, etc. hoping to spark ideas. Pricing will be the same as IPs in inventory, WB chose NA logo.

Pieces approved: An Introduction to NA Meetings, Disruptive & Violent Behavior, Group Trusted Servant Roles & Responsibilities, Group Business Meetings.

Subsequent pieces are Leadership, Benefits of Service and What is NAWS.

NOMINEE REVIEW The board reaffirmed if Vivienne accepts; Moina B, Jose Luis, Susan Blaue, and Junior (Brazil) will be forwarded to HRP, with a recommendation from the EC for Jim Buerer.

LEADERSHIP FOR 2007-2008 FISCAL YEAR: The World Board unanimously reaffirmed adopting Craig Robertson, Ron Miller, Tom McCall and Jim Buerer as corporate officers for 2007-2008.

CORPORATE RESOLUTIONS FOR 2007-2008 FISCAL YEAR: PR Handbook needs to be listed and as Conference Approved (CA). Convention Guidelines need to be removed; CA will also be listed for the items marked with an X. There were no objections to the adopting the 2007-2008 Corporate Resolutions as amended.

APRIL 2007 WORLD BOARD MINUTES approved as amended.

LITHUANIAN AND FILIPINO PERSONAL STORIES

Filipino - ask LTC to reconsider some of the boards concerns, explain why, particularly police interaction. However, absent their agreement the world board approves for production. This does not mean that the board is going to wait for a response from them before moving forward with production.

Move forward with Lithuanian personal stories mandating the change for drug/alcohol wording; Minnesota model reference not an issue.

TRANSLATIONS POLICY: Remove the option in translations policy for LTCs to write own stories in the Basic Text only – this does not apply to the White Booklet –13.

Modify the current translation policy making it more descriptive. Remove the option in translations policy for LTCs to write own stories in the Basic Text.

Agreed to allow personal stories in the Little White Book with contact with the board prior to beginning work.

WCNA TRAVEL DAYS: international travelers-Monday August 27, U.S. travelers-Tuesday August 28. Depart Sunday September 2 at close of WCNA. Reminder to bring one outfit for possible PR.

WORLD BOARD INPUT PROCESS: Board should let staff know they are busy and want to know if they could respond later, will also use the one item for review/input per email with clearer titles and the WB being cognizant of what is dialog and input. WB is to clearly indicate when they feel strongly about a piece of input. We will use one or two of the bulletins as a way to experiment with email (reply all) discussions.

WSC SEATING: Reaffirm that board decision on WSC Seating moratorium is to create a discussion with the conference on WSC Seating. Motion fits best in the CAT, but discussion will be in the CAR.

Draft World Board Minutes

WSO Chatsworth 11-14 July 2007

The other issue about the CAR is trying to frame initial ideas to get feedback on *Sponsorship* book, future literature projects ideas, and possibly getting what's working and what's not working for regional delegates, this would include idea on the next steps with issue discussion topics.

WSC REGIONAL MOTIONS Ron M and Jim B working with motion makers. Only two motions submitted thus far

CONSENSUS BASED DECISION MAKING AT THE WSC

GWSNA will go in the CAT, will send draft to conference participants for review and input before it goes into the CAT. Revisions would be sent to the board for sign off, to then go to conference participants. Draft would be mailed and posted on the bulletin board.

RULES OF ORDER: final will also be sent to the board for review.

MISCELLANEOUS

Send Eileen travel availability from present to end of February 2008.

Anthony informed the board of possible change from our current medallion manufacturer.

Group Starter Kit box will be made available.