

**Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.**  
**Draft World Board Minutes**  
**WSO Chatsworth**  
**10-13 October 2007**

Wednesday 10 October

World Board: Craig Robertson, Michael Cox, Paul Craig, Mary Banner, Ron Hofius, Arne Hassel-Gren, Franney Jardine, Tonia Nikolinakou, Tom McCall, Piet DeBoer, Mukam Harzenski-Deutsch, Ron Miller, Jim Buerer, Mark Hersh.

Staff: Becky Meyer, Anthony Edmondson and Eileen Perez

Meeting opened with moment of silence followed by the Serenity prayer. A few announcements made: It is imperative that everyone be familiar with motions list, comments on service pamphlets and the Youth IP/Parent piece. Majority of today will concern NAWS update, Friday and Saturday preparation for the conference, and Thursday is Jim DeLizia all-day. At some point this week we will talk about frequency, rotation, and location of future conventions and board corporate responsibilities.

The board action group topic was on God's will vs. my will.

### **Business Plan Group Recommendations**

The BP Group and the EC had a call on the Tuesday, October 9, 2007 to make recommendations for 2008 pricing increases. Literature price increases won't take effect until later; however, this will be articulated at the November Literature Distribution workshop.

#### **NAWS Update**

Update about current NAWS activity provided, including literature distribution information.

#### **Contributions**

Group contributions should be a principle source of funds for NA services. BPG believes the focus needs to currently be on changing the fellowship culture regarding contributions. One of the pushes from the BPG is that there is nothing wrong with asking members to contribute to something they believe in. The trick is finding the right vehicle(s) to convey that message.

Regional plot line basically depicts the four largest financial contributors, the largest single contributor being Northern California. Because we cannot afford to continue relying on a single contributor, we want to see if it's possible to affect group contributions.

**Agreement** for the next 3 years *NA Way Magazine* will be used as a vehicle to communicate the message about contributions; next issue will focus on non-North American contributions – board ideas welcomed.

#### **Proposed Ideas by Board**

- Donations - Give groups a formula (specific amount) on NAWS, Inc. goal
- Include more interesting pieces of AP data from the Annual Report in the *NA Way Magazine*
- Send a map illustrating what is cost for each segment of our fellowship to groups – something like a fold out map

Plot of Key Balance Sheet Indicators shows the survivability of the business at any given time.

In the last 10 years we have quadrupled literature provided to communities that cannot afford to pay for it. However, in order to continue fulfilling our core philosophy we must increase revenue.

There was some discussion on fund flow and how communities fund services, e.g. from literature sales (cost of Basic Text). Example Franney recently participated at an event and observed the Basic Text being sold for \$25.00, which made it near impossible for the average member to meet the expense of a book. Anthony pointed out that communities have to be willing to sell literature at a lower cost making literature readily available to the member. This will be discussed in more detail later this afternoon.

**I = issue** Philosophical discussion regarding self support and contributions: 1) Is there a common belief amongst the board? 2) How does it apply to NAWS? 3) How does this play out for the different communities? Spell it out for them.

### **Literature Sales**

437,262 copies of the Basic Text distributed last year. Sales over two years are disproportionate due to the sales in Iran. Without Iran, sales ranged from 318,000 to 320,000. The same applies to *It Works, How and Why*, which sold 168,458 copies last year. Without Iran, sales range between 90,000 and 100,000. *Just for Today*: 108,000 copies, 40,000 in Iran. *Step Working Guides* sales numbered more than 100,000, without Iran: 96,000.

We have the legal registration for Iran. We print literature at NAWS Iran and distribute via the service office. Siamak sends monthly financial statements to NAWS. Because monies have no value outside of Iran, Siamak has been directed to use proceeds to fund fellowship development events. We also continue to find effective ways to use experience of Iranian members to help other communities; however, there are inherent challenges and impediments we must adapt to. We are also working with an attorney to obtain an employee visa for Siamak.

The board informed that Anthony and Fatia will travel to China at some point to develop a relationship with manufacturers. Fatia gets kudos for keeping the cost of literature down!

### **Continuation of the Business Plan discussion and Operational Update**

October board book pages 74-75 excel list referenced.

In this session we will cover: items being recommended for removal from active inventory, must-carry items, translated literature costs, and pricing recommendations. The price of goods should be reassessed every 3 years. Just as a reminder to all, price increases have been put in abeyance twice. By now, literature prices should have increased by 10%. All booklet prices based on a 30% price of goods, other pricing based on what it cost to print.

“Must-carry” items are made available for philosophical purposes. These items are made available at certain costs. An example is the large print IP #1. It costs \$.30 to print but the allocated costs are \$.09, making the actual cost \$.39 – we sell for \$.21 each. Consequently we lose \$.18 per copy sold. Because members who have sight challenges should have the same information available to them, we provide at that cost. There are several items like this (i.e. losing money on must-carry items).

Green highlight is only used to highlight a point regarding the cost of literature translations. Red highlight means we want to remove item from active inventory either entirely or as part of an item. These items cost money to produce and inventory but have not been deemed must-carry items. Items highlighted in orange are recommended for price change. No price change on other highlighted items.

Convention guidelines have been removed, gold medallions also recommended for removal.

Translated NA literature is a challenge for us. Example Finnish Basic Text, Book One cost \$4.80 to print and we sell for \$5.50. The challenge is the disparity of the economic standards for individual countries. However, philosophically and practically Book One should cost the same as the regular priced Basic Text. This pricing change will most likely be affected by continent.

**Agreement** other than beginning communication about price changes and what it may mean via our reporting vehicles, there are no other changes right now. The Business Plan Group will review the shipping/handling policy after the November Literature Workshop.

**Decision** the World Board agreed with BP Group recommendations to remove some inventory items and change the prices of items listed below. The board agreed to review and make a decision regarding pricing recommendations to the 4 PR items via email.

**Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.**  
**Draft World Board Minutes**  
**WSO Chatsworth**  
**10-13 October 2007**

The following changes made:

15 set Wallet cards price - \$2.25

Items #9071 to #9076 Posters - \$1.25 each

*Group Booklet, In Times of Illness and Behind the Walls* price - \$.81

*IP Self Support* to price - \$.48

Item #1164 *The Twelve Concepts of NA Service* price - \$1.75

Keytags price - \$.45 each

Bronze Medallions price - \$2.75

Group Reading cards item #9130 prices - \$4.00

The following will no longer be inventory items once sold out:

PI posters both large and small

Individual recovery tapes 1-5

Gold Plated medallions will be removed from inventory.

### **Year End Financials**

The Board provided with a copy of the rough draft year-end financials for the fiscal year. Final audit will show the adjustments, actual sales, expenses, total annual budget, etc.

Year to date for all sources roughly \$7 million and net literature income roughly \$6 million. NAWS overall financial commitment is \$7 million. In this particular financial cycle the gross revenue all sources was about \$8,492,000 + \$879,530.00 + \$100,000.

In the next budget cycle, the numbers will show the dollar amount for the conference, but because this was an off-conference year, figures are different. Convention gross income depends on the response of pre-registration activity.

**Decision:** the board will review and make a decision on the final audit via email.

### **Organizational Chart Presentation**

Anthony gave a succinct explanation of NAWS, Inc. Organizational Chart. Not actively looking to fill the vacant positions of Executive Assistant, Manager of Meetings/Events, or Webmaster/tech-support. One of the two vacant Project Coordinator positions has been filled. There are currently two Fellowship Services staff members out, one not expected to return. There is also a vacant Translation and Production Assistant position.

Asset Management and staff flow chart are easy to follow. Employees of the Canada, Iran and Europe Branch offices are quite extraordinary and we are very fortunate to have them. There are possible staff changes in the Europe office due to moving. For Iran, we will need to do something about the issue of buying a building; there are concerns about outgrowing the space and other local issues.

The board met in a closed personnel session. No record taken of this segment of the meeting.

Thursday 11 October

Key Result Area: All

### Round 3 in creating the 2008-2010 Strategic Plan

Jim DeLizia facilitated the all-day session with board and staff on refining priorities, assessing resources based on priorities, followed by measuring and evaluating (tools).

Priority Common themes: Better engaging the fellowship and strengthening services.

Brief discussion on instances where there were differences in staff and board priorities; example: more board members selected (L) *Have a more holistic discussion about the service structure as a system/form to achieve vision*, possibly because board believes more discussion will provide more direction, while staff selection showed readiness to make actual changes because concepts of the issue have been discussed for 4 year.

This led to an acknowledgment by the group that (H) and (L) are connected. Group asked to consider recasting (H) and (L) as an approach. The challenge is that the *Guide to Local Services* was written years ago but it's the only thing we have (which is a problem) to train and indoctrinate. Some people make it work, but we don't know why or how they make it work.

- Challenge will be finding a way to do (H) if we can't get the consumer to get on board – creating permission. We are dealing with World Services having changed but other pieces of the structure haven't. Can't do (H) without (L).

World Services                      Regions                      Areas                      Groups

- We will ask the fellowship to tell us their successes and challenges and then present information back to them at the conference.
- The thought is to also summarize and catalogue prior discussion, issues, challenges in the structure, drill down to the success factors and the identify the variables (geography, etc). Include information from the effective RD discussions (teach). Giving specific steps is most helpful to the population we are communicating to.
- Have to give an idea of what success looks like (pictures/stories). Something prescriptive but promotes creativity for local needs. Translate the core operating principles into local practice, how to run local service structure, standard operating procedures. Communicate what we are trying to do.
- Service Tool box

**Agreement** all of this will translate into new approaches for H, L, and S to be accomplished in 2008-2010, create a type of service tool box.

**Agreement** Obj. 9, (V), discussion around providing more tools/mechanisms to do what's outlined.

**Agreement** Obj. 12, (CC) –evaluating not necessary; we already know the IPs have produced little to no result. The Self-Support IP attempted to give the philosophy. We have to improve the information, give practices, clarity as well as philosophy. This would just be a type of rewriting assignment.

### Resource Assessment vs. Priorities

There is the workload on top of routine services, and the question is how much the board can really work through and discuss while meeting 4x a year. Many of the priorities selected are not 1x type discussion topics. There are items on the list that will not get accomplished and will be handled with discretion. A charge for the accomplishment of priorities is critical.

- Service System and starting something for the fellowship
- Updating *In Times of Illness* a higher priority because of the many requests for an update. Board needs to be aware of what this will mean, i.e. input, fellowship discussion, discussion at events, along with the board's own review and input process
- With the time required to complete a book-length piece, one should be in progress at all times

Briefly touched on (Z), evaluating essential services. What they are and how to accomplish which includes assessment, cost benefit and staff capacity. Every year this approach becomes important and one that "we" don't want to deal with.

Bending the laws of space should be #1.

**Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.**  
**Draft World Board Minutes**  
**WSO Chatsworth**  
**10-13 October 2007**

Project plans will need the board's review and input. They will contain timelines, etc., and developed to include carryover work priorities, routine services (routines services do not need a project plan). Project plans include specific details and who. The charges are a direct correlation with project plan. The group was asked to consider "If you were a delegate, what type of information would you need to approve a charge/project plan?" Goal is to figure out what would be more helpful with understanding what it is that World Services said they were going try to accomplish. Brainstorming ideas:

- Specific outcomes
- Show strategic plan link
- Fellowship needs
- Measure benefits
- Format differently with emphasis on outcome

The following were suggestions as ways to improve the understanding of material:

- Move purpose and scope to come first in the project plan
- Material lacks expectation, what is it supposed to do, what qualities should be listed. Develop clearer expectations for intended outcomes, what are the benefits
- Create a clear picture of what success looks like
- Workshops – write out specific bulleted lists as ways to prepare for local realities, local issues/things to know
- Checklist as a standard way to record approaches – a way that captures information. Could use charge to track progress against approaches
- Milestones – tasks - status
- Measuring to track progress and measuring to track success are two different things

**Friday 12 October**

**Key Result Area: Communication and Fellowship Support**

Meeting opened with moment of silence, Serenity prayer, and announcements about schedule.

**Service Pamphlets**

**Discussion of process and fellowship Service Pamphlets issues**

At the 2006 WSC, the board was given the ability to develop and approve service-related pamphlets and tools for distribution to the fellowship. Board must discuss thoughts on what to present in the CAT. Everyone reminded that this was going to be somewhat of an experiment, taking into consideration what has and has not worked.

There were some thoughts about sending service material to delegates before the conference. The problem is that delegates think that the only way to impact material is in approval at the conference, which is incorrect – time to impact an item is during review and input. Purpose or intent of *Introduction to NA Meetings* piece was aimed to replace material put out by Hazelden that tries to explain NA.

- Sees the initial reaction to pamphlet as knee-jerk, and that this body is overreacting to some input. The fellowship has not been given enough time to absorb the material. Further believes that many questions in correspondence logs could be resolved with service pamphlets. Agrees there are legitimate concerns, but overall the pamphlets are good. Tweak them and move on.

- After reading some of the input about the definition of clean and glossary history, the pamphlet *Introduction to NA Meetings* seems to fit better with other PR material. Feedback from a session on medication in Australia was that examples in *NA Groups and Medication* were not helpful for specific situations. Would have split DRTs out.
- Suggest removing terms and adding a blanket sentence stating something like “*there are terms like clean...*” letting the conference know that we hear what’s being said. Wonders how we address the large population that knows nothing about meetings. Concerning the pamphlet *NA Groups and Medication* – agrees that maybe DRTs should be separated.
- It’s difficult to consider the medication pamphlet as service piece because of the topic – not sure, does however suggest removing the term “clean” from *Intro* completely.

Just state that we need to say we think we are pretty clear on one part, but not clear on intended use vs. intended audience, add that our rationale was intended use, but after distribution we started getting challenged on this. Suggestion was made to place something on the outside of pamphlet to explain our rationale. Maybe this pamphlet should look more like a PR piece?

**Decision:** intended use or intended audience - explain this as the dilemma to conference participants. (between now and January)

**Decision:** *Introduction to NA Meetings* - this pamphlet has already been pulled from distribution; agreed to discuss where it falls (use or audience) with delegates first.

**Decision:** exemplify delegates’ roles and responsibilities about both disseminating information and getting involved in feedback. E-blasts, *NAWS News*, bulletin board, etc will be used to send message.

Group refocused to talk about the service material approval process. This group was given the ability to be more expedient in providing service material in the hopes of responding to a need for service material. Want the boards to focus to be more on process.

Some thoughts on approval process for service material:

- Need to respond to fellowship input but stick with the process. Don’t personally believe apologies are in order; we, the board have followed WSC direction in good faith.
- Recollection of an action group discussion and in it a suggestion made to create a type of beta test group material could be passed to for review –creating a partnership. There’s an enormous portion of fellowship that thinks there’s this perfect literature process that will produce everything they want the way they think it should be. Don’t believe we have it nor should we foster the fantasy of a process that is not a process. Believe we should just report to the conference and acknowledge the input.
- Believes the only flaw of process was not having a separate group review the information. We lose perspective when we review material in the r&i process so many times. We had so many discussions that it would have been better to have a fresh group read and report back. The disclosure we have on them is useful. Is there a way to find out if we were helpful – measurement on material.
- This was a first attempt at something we were encouraged to do with no process in place. We gave it our best shot and we got feedback. We welcome input, and will be highly responsive, communicating that we are a team learning together. Input tells us what the fellowship thinks.
  - We need to figure out who the pamphlet is intended for - a little convoluted and concerned with clarity. No clarity or agreement amongst everyone on content matter.
  - Approval process. Not sure the fellowship understood board approval does not mean production in isolation. There is a process we really don’t use: “pending conference approval.” This might be a way to deal with recovery vs. service material approval.
  - Believes that some of this material could have been dealt with via bulletins. We could decide which vehicle is appropriate depending on intent of piece.

**Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.**  
**Draft World Board Minutes**  
**WSO Chatsworth**  
**10-13 October 2007**

- Suggest asking delegates at WSC to decide if they want to discontinue the publication of service pamphlets via a vote. It was an honest attempt and we did a good job with what we had, we should not negate our efforts. At times personally becomes confused by the bigger picture. This material concerns members all over the world and everyone should not forget that – we need to compare the bigger picture to the input – what’s more important?
- This body did as delegated to do; no apology is necessary. The intended target is the only portion of process which seems unclear.
- Besides a loud response to a single statement in one of the pamphlets, a couple of interesting things happened here. The first being that the distribution process clearly illustrated the detachment between service representatives and an average member! Yes, in hindsight some things could have been carried out differently, like the use of delegates as a barometer; also, how we conveyed the message about the material. There is confusion on what can be done with the material. We should keep in mind that there was some energy regarding a statement in one of the pamphlets – which is remarkable.
- Introduction to NA Meetings seems to be the pamphlet people object to.
- The problem is the myth the approval process being the point where an impact is made– the review and input is where we the impact needs to be made, before conference approval. The other point is our logo but that could be corrected by changing to World Board Approved. We need to take this opportunity to frame a discussion and to talk with delegates.
- Believes that part of the energy is a reaction to what this actually means and looks like. This is a great time to have a discussion with delegates about moving forward and getting there together. In approval we have fellowship approved; conference approved and sees this as a wonderful opportunity to get more clarity on all the approval titles. Also agrees with the possibility of incorporating a second pair of eyes to review material in this approval track.
- Agrees with sentiment that people are reacting to something new, and not surprised by the reaction, it’s part of the learning in a growing process. Otherwise, he has heard good things. Expressed concern with creating an additional review stream as it may become bigger than we want, will lengthen the process and create expectations.
- Just need to engage in a discussion, being extra vigilant about our communications and deal with content input. Believes the bigger problem is that the fellowship is not aware of what’s been delegated to the board. Additionally, wonders how to draw line between service and other material, do we need to put a disclaimer of sorts regarding intent like “intended for”?
- We have a responsibility to keep the focus on our vision. We acted with complete integrity and did what we have been charged with by conference action. Each pamphlet has been well done and helpful to the fellowship. He would only recommend completely removing the terms in *Introduction to NA Meetings* because they seem to promote confusion. Interestingly enough, we don’t have a definition for *recovery* either, and not sure we should. Doesn’t believe others around the world are going to have the same concerns.
- Would not agree with terms from material because of the large influx of individuals from recovery centers who are confused about language. Just explain terms and how we use them, not what it may mean to an individual addict.

Need a consensus about 1) the process and fulfilling obligation with service material to be presented in the CAT and 2) where we go with *Introduction to Narcotics Anonymous Meetings*

**Decision:** to not change the policy for the Service material approval process adopted at WSC 2006.

**Decision:** add descriptive text to help explain the policy that has already been adopted so that it captures the essence of what we are attempting.

## Key Result Area: Fellowship Support

### 2008 World Service Conference

#### Outline of the *Conference Agenda Report*

CAR headers will be modified because many of them are the same as in the previous CAR. Staff discussed how to make the CAR interesting, usable and also relevant for what we want to accomplish at the conference with delegates.

#### *Building Strong Homegroups*

- Struggling with trying to line out the next steps. 2<sup>nd</sup> step to Strong homegroup idea developed, followed with group worksheet. What we want them to know and where do we want to go? What is the next logical step?

**Decision:** add footer on every page directing them to visit [www.na.org](http://www.na.org). Ask members if they are using worksheet, is it helpful, would they like material repackaged like the service pamphlets? Develop something that requires responses.

#### *Our Service System*

**Decision:** ask delegates to gather from service entities information on what has/hasn't worked and why. This will help with the development of the local service tool box.

#### *Who is Missing from our meetings and why?*

Our most significant impediment is cultural. We have convinced ourselves that we get unity by unifying everything and not addressing specifics, i.e., we lose unity if we acknowledge differences.

- Report what we've heard; ask if there are other obvious targeted populations we are not aware of. Ask what has been attempted to welcome the missing, was there resistance, etc. did attempt work? Successes/push backs.
- What do delegates think our impediments are to reaching certain populations? Ask for ideas on targeted literature, and ask about inclusiveness.
- Find a way to incorporate delegates speaking on what has worked for 10 minutes at the conference (case study examples). Aha moments/new ideas for targeted literature list.

**Decision** report what we've heard; ask if there are other obvious targeted population we are not aware of. Ask what has been attempted to welcome those who are missing, was there resistance, etc. did attempt work? Successes/push backs. What do delegates think our impediments are to reaching certain populations? Ask for ideas on targeted literature, and ask about inclusiveness.

#### *Sponsorship book*

There is an obvious lack of utilization. Why does this not meet the needs of the fellowship when there was an overwhelming acceptance on the project? The sales dropped off a year after publication.

We want to know why people haven't found this piece helpful, and/or what it is about this book that people either like or don't like. Need to know for future literature; challenge - avoid leading questions.

- Engage fellowship in dos and don'ts discussion. There are things that we can say do or don't.

FYI: The #1 fellowship request is material on the Steps and Traditions.

**Decision:** ask delegates open-ended questions which includes pros about the Sponsorship book and other ideas on literature

#### **NAWS Motions List WSC 2008 WB\WSC\WSC2008\**

**Decision:** we will create another motion that addresses everything else because of the separate motion to address the stories.



**Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.**  
**Draft World Board Minutes**  
**WSO Chatsworth**  
**10-13 October 2007**

Motion #1: **Decision** accepted as presented.

Motion #2: "Our Members Share" was missed in the table of contents of the mailed out approval draft", therefore we decided for our members share to now be titled "Introduction to our members share". Or the book one and two titles can be combined in motion. **The board decided** to combine motions 2 and 3 explaining why in the intent.

Motion #3 Statistical...**Decision** was to accept as presented.

Motion #4 JFT... **Decision** is to correct the spelling of word *foreword*. It was decided to wordsmith sentence and send to the board for final approval.

Motion #5 Index... **Decision** is to accept as presented.

Motion #6 Copyedits... **Decision** is to accept.

**Decision Date Carried**...section is not a motion but an explanation, this isn't new practice or policy it just places it in the guide so it can be seen. Proposing to have this section be a footnote with presented text. The reference to *Board of Directors* will also be footnoted in the CAR and Guide.

Becky informed the board regarding the story from a woman from Farsi; the issue is that the translated version states that she is the 3<sup>rd</sup> woman to get clean in her country. If submitter and board concur we will change section of translation to say *as one of the earlier* woman in recovery or something like that in the CAR.

**Decision** Also add and call out in the essay ...that we put something out in the approval form that was not an accurate translation.

Changes that will not require motions are regarding changing book price, increasing the page count, increasing the trim size, changing page numbers and another kind of paper stock.

**Decision** New sample of dust jacket for Basic Text 6<sup>th</sup> edition will feature a change in how the white line is laid – January deadline 2008.

**Decision** Changes to #7 *Youth IP & Parent* piece agreed to by the board.

WB book, pg 27, **Decision** in *living NA's the NA message*... Text box pg 31 only a formatting issue.

WB book pg 35, bottom right, to the right ...*In NA we focus on addiction not a particular substance*. Understands what we are trying to say, but NA really focuses on addiction. **Decision** to change to *In NA our recovery focus in is on the disease of addiction, not the substance*.

Page 37 There was discussion regarding changing or removing part of sentence about literature being sold or given away at meetings.

**Decision** Replace *also* with *usually*. *NA literature can usually be purchased at NA meetings*.

### **Regional Motions and response from the World Board**

Beginning thoughts are shown in purple (text).

**Motion A & motion B** from Tri State and Region of Virginians motion are about the same thing, i.e. reinstate roman numeral bronze medallions to NAWS inventory. Both motion makers were informed that NAWS is creating medallions and sending samples out for review.

**Decision:** recommend to not adopt. Reiterate that conference delegates business and production aspects of NAWS to the office. Express willingness to receive ideas, but not through regional motions.

**Motion C** from Northern New Jersey. *To direct the World Board to provide financial support to the Northern New Jersey Region in the amount of \$36,000.*

Concern expressed regarding members possibly being persuaded by the fact that there's an entity in NA that cannot afford to do this and that we *can* afford to assist.

**Decision:** recommend not to adopt. Cite that we are active litigants in lawsuit. Rationale will focus on issue (which is assuming centralized control) rather than specific lawsuit, explain dilemma without divulging details and add the financial impact. The board must pay attention to the draft response.

Will develop talking points to address how board should respond to related questions.

There was another motion which was removed regarding the hard cover Basic Text. Mutual agreement to try it once and see the need.

**Motion E** from New Jersey. *To require that all NA Service pamphlets intended for group and individual use be included in the Conference Agenda Report for approval.*

**Decision** recommendation is not to adopt and state that we are looking forward to having discussions at conference regarding service material approval.

### **Outlining what will be in the *Conference Agenda Report (CAR)* and what will be in the *Conference Approval Track (CAT)***

**Translation policy** it is the board's intent to say that with adoption of the 6<sup>th</sup> edition Basic Text that we believe we have a text that now better reflects NA as a truly worldwide fellowship. Communities will have the option of translating some or all stories of the 6<sup>th</sup> edition. This decision would mean no indigenous stories – we would prefer all stories or but would accept some of the stories translated from the 6<sup>th</sup> edition (with prior communication with NAWS). If they don't want to translate stories then the 5<sup>th</sup> edition is already available. For versions already produced (French, Dutch, and Swedish) they would not be affected – until they choose to do otherwise. General points:

- We have to agree on what "some" means. Should we be okay with a community that can only get a portion of the stories translated, recognizing that it is incomplete?
- Drive for this is from language groups that don't want to be treated differently.
- We don't want to be seen as forcing everyone into the same box. Our dream is to one day all have the same book, but it isn't going to happen overnight.
- It's one thing to say no more indigenous stories and another to take away what has been in existence for 20 years.
- Don't see any problem with requiring all future translations of the 6<sup>th</sup> edition to either contain some or all the stories.

Issue before the board concerns the Translation Policy as it relates to the 6<sup>th</sup> edition – either rewrite policy or leave as is. There is no clear agreement among the board on requiring that 6<sup>th</sup> edition translations have some or all stories and the ability to translate the 5<sup>th</sup> edition (chapters 1-10) without the stories if they chose. More discussion:

- Many communities don't feel capable to create or know how to select personal stories when they all know who wrote stories (small community). The other reality of an LTC is who in community has the experience/knowledge to take this type of project on.
- A compromise could be for communities to at least translate the first 6 stories but at the same time don't believe communities should be penalized.

**Decision:** for the time being, policy would be that we would produce translated version of the first 10 chapters subject to discussion with NAWS, calling it the 5<sup>th</sup> edition (as it currently is). For the 6<sup>th</sup> edition some or all the stories will be required.

### **WSC Seating Moratorium**

**Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.**  
**Draft World Board Minutes**  
**WSO Chatsworth**  
**10-13 October 2007**

Offer the same motion with the rationale, original intent of policy. Still offer the communities for seating that have been forwarded. Profiles will be handed out for board review this evening. The regions being recommended for seating are El Salvador, Poland, Nepal, Nicaragua, and Egypt. Not being recommended for seating is South Brazil and North Carolina.

**Decision:** will keep the seating policy moratorium and not recommend regions for seating that were split from another region. Keep moratorium and explanation for CAT, board will look at profiles before codifying recommendations tomorrow.

**Agreement:** to talk about bringing in communities not being recommended for seating.

#### **HRP Sections**

They are meeting next week, have revisions that must be reviewed by the board.

#### **CBDM and Rules**

**CBDM** input submitted by Jim S. Becky noted that his statements are on making material clearer. The more we can explain conference approval track the more we can enforce it. Staff will go through input, clean it up and present to board.

#### **Revisions to Guide to World Services**

*Travel and budget* section need to be rewritten. Board informed that staff unsure if this will get done.

*Annual report* change of date will reflect conference will to include audit and final donations report.

*WCNA Site Selection* – Continue with current rotation schedule until 2015, and when there is more information available. This rotation would be Latin America, west coast, east coast, Asia, west coast, east coast, and then Europe. Will propose the expansion of the Asian zone to include Africa and the Middle East. The board will have to consider the next site location soon.

#### **2008 World Service Conference**

##### **Idea Themes for conference and conference cycle**

1. Broadening the focus of our vision
2. Our freedom our responsibility
3. Our vision our responsibility
4. Our strength living our principles
5. Integrity is our strength
6. Common needs, common purpose
7. New horizons of service
8. Our personal recovery depends on upon...
9. Reaching beyond our solutions
10. We can only keep what we have by giving it away
11. Putting our 12<sup>th</sup> Step into action
12. Maturing, communicating, supporting
13. Wisdom

14. Drinking from the fire hose
15. Wise is beautiful
16. From vision to Wisdom
17. W = wisdom, S = support, C = ?
18. Our common ground
19. Growth
20. Every Addict in the world
21. Our touchstone our common ground
22. Love in Action

## Saturday 13 October

Meeting opened at 9am with moment of silence, the Serenity prayer, followed by announcements: World board nominations to be forwarded by the end of month, Jim B name being forwarded on behalf of board for WSC 2008.

The board started the meeting with themes for the 2008 World Service Conference: Additional ideas

23 Nurturing the spirit of service 24. Fully self supporting. The list of 24 narrowed down by each member selecting only 2, the theme with the most dots will be chosen.

**Decision:** Our Freedom Our Responsibility

### **WSC Seating**

The board discussed some of the regions proposed for seating, policy and proposed moratorium. In previous years there was a group to evaluate regional profiles that made recommendations to the board. Criteria found in *A Guide to World Service*, page 23 top of 25. Some members affirmed names proposed; others felt they had limited information or had concerns.

Some discussion points:

- The moratorium will help the conference not get so big that it becomes non-functional - agrees with the seating policy. The proposed moratorium is a step in the right direction in order to talk about the structure. This body should not be so shortsighted about continuing to add delegates and it not affecting how the conference will function. As much as we like to be amicus – everyone thinks that success is being seated at the conference.
- By looking at the profiles, would not agree that we should automatically put forth a couple of the regions for seating. However, not clear on assessment – needs measurement tools.

**I = issue** at some point this body has to talk about a service system.

Rationale for proposing So. Brazil is same as many others – too big and recently 200 groups out of 1800 split off, they are looking for guidance.

**Decision:** the board agreed to move forward with proposing the moratorium and will report in the CAT. Moratorium will also be reported in NAWS News –

**Decision:** it will not contain any of the regional seating recommendations.

El Salvador –board supports recommending for WSC seating.

Poland –board supports recommending for WSC seating.

Nepal –board supports recommending for WSC seating.

Egypt –board supports recommending for WSC seating.

Nicaragua –need more information; Anthony and Tom will provide upon return from the LAZF.

Southern Brazil –understands the moratorium but asks for our assistance. If we are not providing the support they need how do we help them?

**Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.**  
**Draft World Board Minutes**  
**WSO Chatsworth**  
**10-13 October 2007**

North Carolina –not recommending for seating.

**Corporate Responsibilities**

**Adoption of July minutes**

**Decision:** July minutes approved as written.

**Review of Action Item List**

Items updated on actual sheet. **Decision:** forward the updated list to the board.

**Decision:** start the review and input of Trustee Bulletins, beginning with Methadone. This bulletin will be forwarded to the board for comments, followed by staff framing board comments for discussion upcoming meeting.

**Decision:** have an action group to talk about and understand the difference between support of board values; what does this mean and what the pitfalls are. This discussion will also include consensus vs. individual board behavior.

**Plans for review of the audit and release of the annual report**

The Audit and June financials are currently being worked on. The world convention financial overview of will be presented as a separate one page document.

*Benefits of Service* Draft Service Pamphlet

After being at many events and frequently hearing a need on how to attract members back into service and/or assistance with helping to connect with NA members who haven't connected, the board thought this could be done via service. World Board input

- Likes it for people in early recovery. Would change title to *recovery and service* or *how to bring recovery into service*. Teaching newer members how to get involved in services. Would add something about using informational pamphlet at group meetings and provide ideas.
- This seems to be an informational pamphlet for any individual. There are many long-time members not involved in service and this would be informative to them. Raises caution about what the review and input of this mean really means, could be setting precedence.
- Useful perspective, exciting and overall it's great, loves the title.
- A few members thought the piece leaned more towards being recovery piece.
- Not clear on target audience. Page 2 under heading *In All Our Affairs* talks about practicing the principles in our homes and workplaces... Doesn't feel statement accurate also doesn't agree that Sponsorship being service material even though our literature says it is.
- Does not believe this is new information. Has seen all the information in other pieces of our literature. Needs an infusion of some humor, something to be uplifting. Long sentences.
- Last page, full paragraph: there is a sentence regarding prayer. We have to be very careful about what we say when it comes to prayer.
- Insert qualifiers.

6 members did not consider the pamphlet *the Benefits of Giving Back* service material.

- Select an item between now and April as the piece to engage the delegates in discussion about. This is not an attempt to slip something through, reiterate what we said we would report in NAWS News about intended use vs. intended audience, inform that this would be second look at this piece and point out process issues.

Because the board is split on intended use vs. intended audience, split with moving forward with draft or not, and how to engage delegates, the board will break for lunch and make a final decision after upon returning.

After lunch Craig tried recapped discussion points of *Benefits of Giving Back*.

**Decision:** report these weeks' discussions, use *NAWS News* to notify regarding some topics, add the dilemmas that capture the spirit of what we are doing and trying to do. Use *What is NAWS* as an example and the *Benefits of Service* draft that talk about service material process, intent, use, etc. Inform that know there is a need, have beginnings of drafts, but because of our discussions, process has not been finalized.

## Project Plans

There is some concern with having the ability to report what we want to say about approach H and P, and the combo HLS became (Service system and book-length piece).

## Approaches H, L, S

Staff not clear sense of board thought on priorities because of differences in ideas and various directions of discussions.

### *The Guide to World Services*

- A couple of board members thought to start with S (common vision) for guidance as a way start, followed by L (system), then H (whatever falls out in guides/tools) last. Create a dialog for ideas for a system, not going to get to details, but will engage in that discussion.
- Unclear of dilemma, thought the tool box would simulate a process with something helping to put little pieces together and letting the form develop, or do we need to envision the form of a new service system and how the process works first?
- Not ready to say things are or are not functional; does not know that. Believes we should create a group to investigate communities (cultural, areas) to see what does and not work.
- Fellowship tries to use the Guide when seeking direction and this sometimes is not helpful. One size doesn't fit all. Where do we start so that we can make a practical advance with that? Maybe a workgroup that could get some of these issues down, frame discussion for the board tell the here is where we are and where we need to go. Jim Delizia attempted to help us with this and thought we ended up with idea that an area tool box was the place to start.
- This is a very complex issue when we were talking about the scope there really didn't seem to be any disagreement about doing S first and report what this would require. When we identify the scope we are trying to say what the project is.
- There are those who believe one of the problems with the NA system is that there is no clear understanding of the service structure purpose. Before you can design a system in NA you need to get those affected by the need to buy in. Members don't see the vision statement connection - something using the importance of local service efforts as a matter of principle (it is the same philosophically) should be developed. What the fellowship does has a direct correlation to the vision statement. Have to try to get the fellowship to agree to have their institution of service reexamined.
- Believes the struggles lie in not knowing what a healthy service system looks like. Suggests developing something that we know is not working and ask what they think would work. We have lots of work with group, but don't feel enough for/from the areas. Do we need to work with areas within this piece, making our next IDT building strong areas? The in-between piece would evolve from that. Start discussion on what a healthy area looks like, etc.

**Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.**  
**Draft World Board Minutes**  
**WSO Chatsworth**  
**10-13 October 2007**

- There are definite deficiencies in our service system – a part of the system changed and another did not. The vision was all the things that said.

**Decision:** we already decided to gather information from delegates on what is or not working.

**Decision:** feeling that if we want some guidance as a way to figure out where to start we need to just start with S (common vision), followed by L (system), then H (whatever falls out in guides/tools) last. Create a dialog for ideas for a system, not going to get to details, but will engage in that discussion. Focus of system is carrying the message.

### **Book-Length Pieces**

- 1) 7 selected Living clean
- 2) 3 selected Step working guide
- 3) 3 selected Tradition working guide
- 4) 1 selected Sponsorship revisions

Thoughts about what's more important:

- Hear many always bad mouthing *the Step Working Guide*.
- Believes the fellowship has been asking for something on living clean. Has vision of having a group working thru the applications that could possibly found in something like living clean book. Would prefer Living Clean.
- Based on personal experience believes many members not really familiar with the Twelve Traditions and feels we have massive amounts of information that could help with this. This could be targeted for members who are not newcomers, something fresh, and something that focuses on unity, the spiritual part of the program.
- Not clear on how we would write a book on living clean when we are not clear on what happened with Sponsorship. Would prefer playing with the Step Working as they tend to have more value to our members.
- History Book
- We have the resources to only do one book-length piece; this does not include all the other items in the priorities list. We can always inform the conference of all the additional ideas.

**Decision:** develop a project plans for book length pieces on Living Clean or Life on Life's Terms in Recovery. Jimmy K, the Best of the *NA Way* and History will be kept as ideas for the future. Project plans will be developed and the board still has the option to remove any of the ideas.

**Decision:** the website item will be sent to the board asking for their impressions.

### **WCNA 32**

#### **Debrief about WCNA 32 and event overview**

We do know that the participant numbers were lower than initially expected in San Antonio, TX - we really do not have all the data at this time. Can say that San Antonio had the highest ratio of registrations to non-registered ever and we received many compliments from satisfied members.

✚ Brainstorming the future:

- What is the purpose of WCNA (our philosophy)

- Impact
- Future of event
- Uniqueness
- What is the value of WCNA
- Overall city cost, what it cost to put on this type of event
- Can the average member afford to attend the World Convention (affluence) and financial ramifications for NAWS if they don't
  - member expectations
  - should we continue to incur cost
  - keeping the event at the size of San Antonio, no long lines, members seemed more manageable – accommodate customers better
- Keeping at every 2 years or changing to every 3 or 4 years
- Location desirability

✚ Future of the convention rotation plan

*WCNA Site Selection* – Continue with current rotation schedule until 2015. This rotation would be Latin America, west coast, east coast, Asia, west coast, east coast, and then Europe. Expand the Asian zone to include Africa and the Middle East. Board will have to consider next site location soon.

✚ Illicit Basic Text discussions

Anthony reported new developments re: Illicit Basic Text and seeking fellowship resolutions.

**Decision:** This will require talking points – deadline November 2007.

**Decision:** Medallions visuals will be sent the WB via PDF files.

✚ Complaints received about member websites

Sharing Sessions will be scheduled at the board's discretion.