

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.

Approved World Board Minutes

13-15 March 2008

Thursday 13 March

Discussion with Human Resource Panel and WSC Cofacilitator

World Board—Craig Robertson, Franney Jardine, Jim Buerer, Mark Hersh, Mary Banner, Michael Cox, Mukam Harzenski-Deutsch, Paul Craig, Piet de Boer, Ron Blake, Ron Hofius, Ron Miller, Tom McCall and Tonia Nikolinakou. Arne Hassel-Gren not present.

HRP members—Greg Smith, Mindy Atkins, Sergio Rojas

WSC Cofacilitator—Jimi Stewart

Craig opened the meeting with a moment of silence, the Serenity Prayer, followed by a couple of announcements. The HRP, 13 staff members and the WSC Cofacilitator joined the board for this morning's discussions in preparation for the upcoming World Service Conference.

Discussions to Prepare for WSC 2008 with the HRP

The following points represent discussions for possible presentation to WSC 2008. The identified issues are all being offered for discussion initially. If a decision is reached for the topics, the items will be offered at WSC 2008; these enhancements will be forwarded on a trial basis for this conference cycle rather than offered as a policy change. The premise: the WB and HRP have spent the last cycle talking about possible changes to the system. Options outlined in this session were discussed previously and reported on *NAWS News*; however, no decision or recommendation was made. The issue that kept rising to the top was - any system is hindered by the ability to affect the confidence of participants with voting for a candidate that they may not know. These are a few options to offer the conference on a trial basis that may help. The conference will also be asked what they believe would help.

- Possible use of a past WB member as a resource for the HRP this cycle

Greg, HRP, began by highlighting some points from HRP discussions. The HRP members believe having a past board member would be a good resource; the desire is to find a better process for the selection of candidates. Some questions proposed for discussion are: 1) what are the advantages and the disadvantages; 2) what is the resource role; 3) who selects this resource member and what does that mean; 4) at what point in the cycle, does this resource become utilized.

Greg went on to say the HRP does not think the current process is flawed; the desire is to enhance the HRP nominating process which may contribute to increased credibility with the process. HRP members have not served as a board member; they feel somewhat challenged when selecting nominees for a board since they possess minimal experience and understanding of the board. HRP believes better decisions would be made having an experienced board member to work with them.

In an attempt to focus the dialogue, everyone was advised to focus their ideas to: 1) what this group would like to propose for the next cycle; 2) how to affect the confidence of the electorate; and, 3) ideas to enhance the current system. These agenda items have already been reported; ideas on reporting and making this work are what are needed for this meeting.

More thoughts were expressed with believing the process has been substantially fixed and the process is working; also the best path to becoming a board member is to be a conference participant (familiarity).

Discussion was again refocused by restating what has been previously reported and now the need is to discuss and develop improvements to the system.

Upon returning from break, everyone was directed to work in small groups to brainstorm parameters for the possible use of a past board member as a resource for the HRP, ideas on how to and how this would be explained to the conference (who, what, how and why). Ideas were captured on post-it notes and reported back to the full body.

table reporting-Franney

- If we are going to consider this option, ask conference participants to support on a trial basis; and, if the participants are unwilling to support this experiment, ask them to disclose why.
- Interaction between the board and the HRP has improved; therefore, suggest continue working together. If we continue working and meeting together, there may be no need for a past board member but only liaison to help identify current needs of the board.
- Past board members with recent familiarity of process and needs would be the ideal, if we choose to utilize them.
- The problem within the HRP lies with the end list of nominees and whether the HRP is skilled with identifying the needs of the board.
- Conference views have changed and grown; therefore, the addition of a former board member may be better received now.
- Don't want to lose sight of current temperament and always being ready to flow with it.
- Include the HRP on fellowship development trips/ workshops so they can see what it takes to be a board member (time commitment, travel, event participation/preparation, etc)
- Disadvantage: a board member may actually limit or restrict selections

table reporting-Anthony

- Possible use of a past WB member as a resource for the HRP this cycle is a good idea therefore just do it
- Recognize the resource is necessary but at specific points in the process and not the entire process
- This would provide the actual experiential component to HRP, possibly as an adhoc of the panel
- How: some collaboration
- Do not use the services of a current board member; start with a time frame window, i.e., off the board for one cycle yet no more than two cycles, to keep experience up to date

table reporting-Becky

- Do as an experiment for this cycle
- Give the HRP the same latitude to do as they are charged, going with the authority and responsibility they have to bring any resource they want/need; whether it is a past WB, past HRP members etc., as long it's a transparent process and the conference is told who and why
- That it not be a current board member
- Not just one former board member because no one person speaks for body

table reporting-Travis

- Support ideas proposed by 3rd table (Becky reporting table)

table reporting-Ron B

- Two HRP resources: a current board member and a past, but it could be any combination

- That the resource be exactly that; a resource as opposed to fully fledged members of the committee
- Include a past RD
- Roll off after 6 years

table reporting-Tom B

- Agreed with bringing in the resource at a particular point, not from the beginning of process
- Disadvantage could be the perception of the lack of rotation of service and confidence; and it might seem like the good old boy system

Ron H added that the Resolution Group had the ability to bring any resource they needed for their work and how extraordinarily effective it was, e.g. bringing in an individual(s) for specific discussions. Based on the fluidity of the process, Ron would think a current board member could be included—keeping in mind that a current board member is a voting participant of the conference.

Greg also added how valuable the phone calls between, Craig, Anthony and himself, have been and would hope to continue this relationship.

Agreement: utilize resources already within the HRP charge, going with the authority and responsibility they have to bring any resource they want/need; could be past board member, past HRP or RD as needed-exercise flexibility. Do not use one board member, HRP or RD, as no one person speaks for the body. Experiment for this upcoming cycle. This will be a transparent process, who and why will be reported to the conference.

- [Having reasons or rationales for nominations provided by the RBZ's \(regions, boards, and zones\) as well as the HRP](#)

The group directed to take 15 minutes to discuss reasons or rationales for nominations by the RBZ's. The following represents reporting from each table discussion.

table reporting-Steve L

- Completely remove the HRP from having to provide the reasons or rationale. But do create a section of the packet that allows for this
- Providing reasons or rationales would be helpful with balancing lack of information; conference participants may have increased information on a nominee.
- Disadvantage: expectation could push the body to explain why and may not be able to do this well
- Support idea to provide conference participants with as much information as possible
- Develop a standardized questionnaire or set of questions to be given to region or zones when providing a nomination

table reporting-Bob J

- Process would require adjustment for how things are done – some level of uniformity
- This is positive and would give candidates more credibility
- This will hopefully engender a more thoughtful process for regions' and zones' nominations. Action may help to raise the bar a little bit
- Some sense of vetting for the nominee
- Support removing the HRP from the rationale action

table reporting-Travis

- Agreed with a lot of what has been said especially with developing a standard questionnaire

- RBZ seems to help the HRP but at the same time those candidates went through a process not including the HRP
- If its going to go to the conference, it should include the HRP
- Rationales may look like recommendations

Ron H mentioned that he noticed some conference participants stating that some candidates have a gold star. This is not troubling if the 'gold star' process is meaningful and helpful and if something is provided to the region that assists them go through the process he is okay with that.

Anthony and Mindy are not sure this would be a good idea for the HRP to follow same rational/recommendation action. Although, we may just want to ask the conference to experiment with this for a conference cycle, we still believe it's a problem to have HRP panel provide rationales. Anthony went on to say that there is no way for the HRP to forward names that were not self selected. The only candidate that would not have a recommendation is someone that introduced themselves into system.

Tables continue reporting on their small group discussions.

table reporting-Tom M

- Agree with a standardized form
- Query is to whom the information will be made available – internal process, external process? Once answered this might easier
- Inconsistency with recommendations
- This should be a process that the HRP can employ to give themselves the latitude to do as they want/need in this process

table reporting-Ron B

- Get reasons from regions and zones for the benefit of the HRP
- Motion that reflects nominee is endorsed would help this issue

table reporting-Becky

- The first question to conference participants should be to ask what information this body wants to know about a candidate and based on that create questions
- Something that is handed out and collected at the conference
- Not clear how helpful questions like "why does the region or zone believe this person would be an asset to the board or HRP" would be; conference participants already have these types of hotel room discussion during the conference
- Whatever is decided it should be public, something that gets beyond the CPR and includes the HRP

Upon returning from a 10 minute break Craig and Greg did a recap of common thoughts.

RBZ's rationale: good for internal process only, standardize questions that go out in the RBZ; this would then be reported to the conference. Again, exercise the ability to be creative.

Because there was some disagreement with the above recap, both the HRP and board members resumed discussion.

Ron H asked how can questions be developed when there are none for elections, thought everyone was more inclined to agree with external. Travis shared her understanding that there is still disagreement in the room regarding external and internal and Greg decided to start with internal.

Becky added that she thought the set up was for WSC discussion - one of the things that would help is for HRP to have support from the body for what they already have ability to do; because there was some

struggle figuring out what this would actually mean, we wanted to bring to the conference for more discussion. We want to know what conference participants think would be helpful when you have that ballot in your hand and know nothing about the nominee. We struggled with this, one of the HRP ideas was standardizing questions, not sure about the specifics of this yet, do want to try questions/internally for one year.

Steve R pointed out that the conference has already informed us they want a regional perspective of the candidate. This supports moving forward incrementally with that. We really have to be careful of how we word questions.

Mindy stated that the RBZ process belongs to the regions, zones and the board individually, so wonders if the question should be is there anything we could do to help in the RBZ process. The HRP does not take a RBZ candidate automatically because the HRP really does not know what that process entails. Is there a way to level the playing field?

In an attempt to move discussion forward Greg and Craig summed up what is thought to be common agreement with having reasons or rationales for nominations provided by the RBZ's (regions, boards, and zones) as well as the HRP.

Agreement to only use the RBZ rationale form internally, HRP exercising responsibility given to them and also ask what else would be needed to help participants in their process. Report that this is a baby step toward a possible future outcome or a next step with having a standardized form.

Agreement that discussions continue in next conference cycle with HRP and WB

- **HRP responses to the 2 motions committed at WSC 2008** (no time to discuss their responses which were printed on the day's agenda)

Motion: That the Human Resource Panel present to this conference the evaluation criteria, grading or weighing that were used in order to select the candidates that qualify in order to be able to be eligible as members of the World Board and Human Resource Panel and that the candidates are informed in a prudent way the reason why they were not selected for the final list.

Motion: That any nominee for a WSC position be endorsed in writing by an RSC. During the reference interview phase a letter will be sent to the RSC listed on the candidate's World Pool Information Form requesting a written recommendation. In the case where no RSC exists then the candidate will reference their ASC.

The issue of current HRP members being excluded from the nomination process was raised during the review of the current policy and will be discussed at a future meeting. There was not enough time to continue having dialog regarding the issue of current HRP members being excluded from the nomination process.

NA World Service Lunch

Lunch at Maggiano's for all of NA World Services – World Board, staff, HRP, and WSC Cofacilitator. Lunch will end with a group picture.

World Board

The board met in a closed session to talk about the next cycle at the Marriott.

Friday 14 March

WSC 2008

The chair opened the meeting with a moment of silence, Serenity prayer and announcements. Jimi Stewart—2008 WSC Cofacilitator welcomed.

Update on CAR Workshops

This session is to provide travelers an opportunity to report any issues of concern that were raised at CAR Workshops.

Index

Many participants at the Northeast Zonal Forum seemed frustrated with the fact that they did not have an opportunity to review the draft index prior to the WSC.

CAT

Paul shared that Northeast Zonal Forum participants did not seem to be familiar with the CAR and CAT process. Although Franney did not experience this at Southern Zonal Forum or Sierra Sage workshops, she did see emails to this affect.

CAR

A Southern Zonal Forum participant mentioned believing that wording questions differently would possibly encourage more members to respond or give input to CAR questions.

Staff shared not being certain what the lack of responses and/or the lack of input to CAR questions and motions really signify. To date there have only been 63 regional reports submissions.

Medallion

The Autonomy Zone workshop participants had issue with the medallion and increase of cost.

A question posed at MARLCNA was whether the medallion survey results would supersede any decision made, regarding the medallion motion at the conference.

Basic Text

Muk shared her thoughts on how there seems to be a communication disconnect; even when, we are speaking to members directly. She saw an email regarding someone wondering when they could read the Basic Text stories, as if they were being kept from the fellowship. She used this example to illustrate the disconnect members in our fellowship are experiencing.

Mary sat in a local area CAR workshop and shared how members are having the same energy around the Basic Text stories and wonders whether we are now providing too much information for delegates to have to report on. Maybe less and clearer clips of information is what's needed.

MARLCNA had comments about not properly splitting the Basic Text motions and may bring forth a motion to do that.

Craig asked everyone to hold their thoughts regarding communications; the EC did have some discussion regarding communication and will be brought up later in the board meeting as well as at the conference. Board asked to continue bringing up the CAR issues.

Mary's experience has been that once participants are told the conference can split the motions all energy is dispelled. Splitting the motion would allow for a clearer record and allow delegates to have their vote recorded on a particular part of the motion. The issue seems to be a minority number of people having an issue with one item in the motion but do not want to kill the entire motion. The board has no issue with that possibility.

Sponsorship

During a workshop, Franney participated in a *Sponsorship* book review session. Process used: split the group up into 2 groups - those that have read the book and those who have not. Only 6 participants from the larger group had read the book. Everyone was asked to discuss support of the book, opposition or problems. Their answers were to leave it as it, add a prefix that has a best practice preface or to just remove the book from inventory. Franney saw the issue as the book has not been effectively marketed and consequently no way to determine the real value of book.

FYI: there was a comment made at the Australia Worldwide Workshop to align the *Step Working Guide* with the *Sponsorship* book as a way to enhance its use.

Book length piece

There were a couple of comments of concern made regarding the current working title for the book length piece e.g. the title is possibly causing confusion with Bo's book; however, it was noted that Bo does not own the title *Living Clean* and that the title of Bo's book is *NA Way of Life*.

Jimi shared hearing that NAWS is trying to preempt Bo's book; conspiracy theory. Someone else added that part of the reason Bo and other people worked on Bo's book was - at the time World Services wouldn't write anything for people dealing with life on life's terms clean. There is interest on sharing experience strength and hope.

Other comments heard at workshops:

Australia may present a motion regarding gender specificity in the steps, and something regarding *under no surveillance*.

There seems to be a growing sentiment regarding reinstatement of board committees. The thought is this will fix the disconnect with world services. This is a result of believing that the flow of information is not happening because we no longer have world services committees.

Review of correspondence relating to the WSC—pages 35 to 48 book 1

- Conference Participant Bulletin Board: After some discussion, everyone agreed to leave the audience base to the Conference Participant Bulletin Board unchanged.
- It wasn't clear on what Steve S is referring to in his email when he talks about *perfect opportunity to use pool members* (for what?). If Anthony's thoughts are correct, this is to use resources outside the board to help with teaching 'how to be effective communicators'; then, the board's response is yes; it is an issue and scheduled to address this matter.
- CAR responses - the submitter will be directed to send responses to regional delegates - staff will provide email address.
- Motion amendment for the *Just for Today* references is an attempt is to save the board from having stickers—stickers are not going to be created.
- Email regarding source material. Don L content after speaking with staff and understanding that staff is willing to provide him with material:
- *Just for Today* error: Someone from the board will post on the bulletin board a thank you for catching February 10th mistake; it is a production error which occurred with the cover change in 2000.
- Greater NY Regional Literature chair just wanted to send workshop input as FYI.

Schedule for the Week of the WSC—sessions and focus review

Changes will be made directly to version 4 of the WSC agenda, as the board goes through the document – thus it will become version 5. The Conference Report gives a walk through of the week. A new idea for this conference will be to help participants by noting where material can be found in preparation for discussion. Once the Conference Report is completed and sessions are flushed out, board members will receive individual material for the conference.

FRIDAY: Includes board members' arrivals and depending on arrival times, a board meeting may occur. There will be a need for 1 or 2 board members (with 1 or 2 staff members) to attend the CAR sessions on Friday night, especially the English and Spanish speaking workshops. These workshops are for delegates that don't have experience with the conference. The board needs to send Elaine travel information as soon as possible. Friday mid-day arrival is appropriate.

The Executive Committee will meet with the HRP; a meeting with Don Cameron (parliamentarian) and the Cofacilitator will occur on Friday or Saturday.

SATURDAY: OPEN BOARD FORUM is the only time the board has an open forum where non conference participants attend, ask questions and interact with the board.

There will be at least one, if not two, Spanish speaking workshops; this will hopefully connect the Spanish delegates and local community. There is also a variety of activities scheduled for Saturday evening.

SUNDAY: EVALUATION FORM - a better job of encouraging participants to complete evaluation form needs to happen and develop a shorter evaluation form. Statistically, it is hard to say how effective the evaluation form is; members tend to love everything. The HRP session was the only session they struggled with during WSC 2006. Maybe, we can ask participants what ideas they may have, at the end of the conference to see if anything new pops up. There has to be a way to capture information that is not just busy work.

- Ron H suggested bringing this up during the open forum or create a session to address this specifically. Tonia suggested assigning a time for each board member to facilitate a group discussion with delegates on what their ideas are.

FIRST THINGS FIRST session: always try to assign tables to the best of our ability on who has and has not been to a conference. Board members will be spread throughout tables.

COMING TOGETHER session: is more about hope, experience at WSC, reporting back to group. Letter will be to their sponsor as opposed to the group. Other ideas proposed:

- Franney wonders whether we would benefit if their letter was addressed to the regional body about their experience at the conference. Key is to ask them repeatedly about how many groups they've facilitated, how many PR roundtable have they done, planning tool.
- Ron H thoughts on letter – suggest following the outlines as presented in WSC agenda but addressed to the newcomer addict (now), and hopes for future: what are we doing here, what is our hope for this person's recovery?
 - Ask participants to address how they are helping to pave the road for their future delegates (five years from now)? The theme is *Our Freedom Our Responsibility* and this is how service works in conjunction with that. *My time and commitment today helped to ...*
 - Ask participants to share an *ah-ha* moment of over-whelming gratitude. Taking that moment and moving forward with the sense of responsibility to make sure that moment is available to another in the future. *How do I accept the responsibility to leave this position in a better place, making sure delegates are better prepared in the future?* Call them the Freedom Keys, or something that ties into the theme.
- The Question box.
- Ask participants to turn their letters in if they were willing.
- Difference between gratitude and 10 years from now... gratitude will come more from the heart, community building is always better when you come from the heart. Then, believes that this session, using the 10 years from now, could be 'what does it mean to me to work on the behalf of others' – this comes from the heart. Make questions so that it's not an intellectual process. The difference will be in how we facilitate and describe these letters.

Everyone in agreement to use a combination of both ideas for letter which includes the gratitude of working on behalf of others and preparing a place for them in the future.

NAVIGATING THE WSC; ORIENTATION: Didn't add a lot of material, people liked what was done in the past.

JOINT SESSION PRESENTATION: last session of day. Move old business motion deadline to end of day (6pm). This session will be framed based on yesterday's discussion with HRP.

FELLOWSHIP DEVELOPMENT SESSION: based upon participant input in the evaluation, this session has been moved earlier in week.

- Serenity prayer being read in English and different languages.
- History video (Steve Lantos)
- Highlight location of future participants

NAWS REPORT session will be broken up between Anthony and Craig.

APPROVAL TRACK FOR NA MATERIAL: this body must understand the dilemmas and issues because there is a lot of material to cover in session, e.g. existing service pamphlets, ideas for future. Imagine delegates have much to say about this; although, it may not be succinct.

The Executive Committee talked about possibly straw polling the room as a way to check the pulse, but how to frame the discussion to get their ideas has not been resolved. To date only 2 conference participants have submitted input, we need delegate ideas. How do we get an idea that includes a buy in? Want to create an opportunity to ask for ideas that would improve process. It was pointed out that the majority of members, who are unhappy with material, are not the delegates; the energy seems to be about their thoughts on the board overstepping boundaries.

This body should be prepared that participants will perceive session to be an input and review session; inform them that input to written material is not accepted on the conference floor, turn their input into staff. Session structure:

- First 45 minutes: conference participants will get 20 minutes in small groups to go over FIPT list, then come together to talk about common disagreement, agreements, etc. and future of service pamphlets.
- Last 45 minutes of session, focus ideas toward 'where do we go from here' – future. This will need a nimble facilitator.

WB CONFERENCE FORUM: Get through reporting quickly enough to get to questions from participants and deal with anything that has to do with old business motions.

- We need to be mindful of who is complaining regarding the lack of time for participation (who) because we *are* doing something about getting members to participate and not getting much response. Also, emphasize that the question box allows those that are microphone shy to participate, but also open to ideas.
- Better use of the cards, including for hand votes.
- Change color of cards to black and white (accommodate color blindness)

WSC 2008 OPENING BUSINESS SESSION DISCUSSION: In some capacity, the conference will be asked if they want to try to new Rules of Order. They are not different from practice, but different from policy. This will be reported again in another mailing that has reminders about WSC preparation like remembering to bring conference binder.

- This will be brought up in Orientation.

OLD BUSINESS FOR WSC

NA WS BUDGET AND PROJECT PLAN: Brief overview of Strategic and Project Plan. This is where we ask for names for the shining star list that includes relevant information like why they believe person is suited for ...

HOW TO BE AN EFFECTIVE RD & FACILITATION MODULE: Jim DeLizia facilitating session. There will be a conference call between him, Anthony and Becky to flush out details next week.

CALAMIGOS RANCH LUNCHEON: is open to everyone after 2:30 pm. Otherwise, it's only WB, HRP, staff and conference participants. Board will be used as bus hosts. Luncheon open to everyone at 2:30 pm and this will be stated in the conference orientation.

New business motion deadline changed to 6 pm.

ZONAL MEETINGS forum representatives will be asked to inform us if they plan to report and/or meet while at the conference. The board is welcome to attend zonal meetings, if they individually chose.

OUR SERVICE SYSTEM is the opportunity to focus on delegates, finding out what works, doesn't work, ask how we can help with communication in their region, partnership with WS and role in fellowship, etc.

- Teach delegate team that this is their job.
- Play whispering down the lane game – keeping in mind that delegates already know what the problems are, they keep asking for solutions.

Additional comments regarding Communications:

- At several CAR workshops, Mary heard that information is received up to the RCM level and seems to stop there. Seems like the RCMs receive the information, but do not know what to do with it. Wonders what they may need so that it's functional at regional level.
- Tom suggests using service pamphlets and the Basic Text to illustrate the communication challenges as examples, tell participants how we and where we reported. World services has done lots of different things to get information out, therefore we should ask them where the breakdown is.
 - Becky expressed that the delegate is the link with World Services, so if it's not the link with world services; then, we need to redesign how we communicate.
- Seems that the problem lies with the RCM and forward through area and groups.
- Jimi shared his experience as a delegate, and knows most GSR's never received information being provided to the RCM.
- Tonia believes that we are working off the assumption that we are communicating the same and this is not true because we are a specialized group. Somehow, we need to find a way that shows a need to grow in communications. Recalls the process and progression and evolution of the board and world services. This was not something that occurred overnight.
- Mary believes we have become efficient broadcasters but it seems that we are only broadcasting to one distributor. At MERLE, participants noted getting a lot of information and not being sure on how to break it up and disseminate. RCMs believe the groups are not interested; therefore, they are not sure how and how much to disseminate.
- Michael shared thoughts of newer member finding little interest in service. When we first get here, we are taught to work our program and not how to be of service. There aren't many interested in service and no enthusiastic audience. What is NA's culture, what will they really listen to, how can we make this information interesting (a really good share)?

Discussion refocused; this session needs to focus on our service system... this is our opportunity to have discussion with delegates about our role with them.

- Ron B believes that we need to work on letting everyone know how to get the information via the website themselves.

- Tom thought we give delegates the board's how to's, the board process, tell them that they are the link, use examples of what we have done and how it improved.

Discussion again refocused and Becky inquired 'what about our partnership does the board want to talk about with delegates?' this is not a specific topic session. We've heard snippets, etc. about how we can help, what we can do and how can we help each other. We can not help people do their jobs better, if they don't care.

- Make session more interesting by doing a skit or role play to illustrate the problem.

Everyone broke for lunch at 1:30 and returned at 2:45.

Everyone agreed with Travis' idea about how to act out a telephone game that incorporates everyone's idea. Staff will develop further and the board will do the role playing.

FYI; the purple salons a-e means round tables. Salons f-j means you're in bleachers. **Decision** the board will send staff ideas for the WSC 2008 agenda.

ELECTIONS: everyone given a deadline, straw polls will have been done, along with the prioritization and approval of the budget. Election results will be provided right before lunch.

WORLD BOARD MEETING AND CONFERENCE FORUM: first time this has been done in the afternoon. This will be on new business.

ZONAL REPORTS: Because this can be a long session; wondering if we can ask them to limit reporting to a 5 minute summary of the written report. This change will be reported to them in the next mailing.

PR: this is the only place we will have time set aside for who is missing and survey results.

08-10 IDTS: the "mystery" of all time because right now there are no ideas. Will come back to this.

NEW BUSINESS FOR WSC 2008: everyone agreed with asking participants to write a post script to their letter after new business.

MONEY AND SPIRITUALITY: workshop type session to gather as much information as possible. Service symbol. Spirit of generosity. This will be developed further and sent to the board – EC sign off.

MOVING FORWARD... this session gets framed during the week.

CONFERENCE LUNCH & CLOSING: no changes

THE VOICE OF NA: nothing noted.

There were no other comments about WSC 2008 week.

[Review of Rough Draft Basic Text Index](#)

The handout is the proposed index that is the combination of what was added and removed. This is not a final draft. Index will help with learning the buzz words and to get a better understanding of what each item is.

Red text means it was added, bold text means we have some questions and the blue text are items deleted. It was also noted that there are not many page numbers after the entries because indexes do not usually contain the secondary references but this will be changed. The board reviewed the index.

Feelings are slated as separate terms e.g. like grief, resentment, anger, etc – board wants these crossed referenced.

Add: Death / Loss. Add Sponsorship in italics next to Sponsors

Reword, Questions About the following: Facility – see outside enterprise. Financing – restructure wording so that it's more about not financing others. Addiction?

Narcotics Anonymous Fellowship is weird capture; Travis tried to explain the belief of how she used Narcotics Anonymous Fellowship to describe all aspects of our organization and/or fellowship.

Someone asked if there was time would the draft index be posted on the internet. No final decision posting to web.

Decision the index will not be sent to the board again for review due to time constraints. The board having no other input or comments agreed with the EC being the final signoff; unless, there is a major change that needs to be brought back to the board.

2007 Membership Survey

In this session, the board reviewed results of the online, mailed, and WCNA 32 combined results for release and inclusion in *Information about NA* and the *Membership Survey* pamphlet. Anthony reported that 9,000 members took the opportunity to complete this survey and this is the highest number received. 4,300 surveys were received from convention attendees and by making this available online received 3x that amount. There was a much higher interest and responses are primarily from the U.S.

There is a lack of dramatic difference in the data source between year 2003 and 2007 and we are going to try and find out why.

This is the first time we asked members to identify *Areas improved since coming to NA* because this is the one question professionals ask – they want to know about the quality of life. Changes that will occur to the graphs:

- Graph bar colors will be matched.
- Attending other 12 step fellowship question will be rephrased to be more specific because a lot of the responses included church as another 12 Step Fellowship.
- Percentage numbers will be added next to the little colored boxes
- *Drug of choice* will be changed to *Preferred Drugs*
 - Suggestion we examine the data members are responding to and use for other things like literature review and future marketing.

Anthony noted that it seems that people will take the opportunity to talk about themselves. This is a way to participate without having to be in an all day meeting.

The surveys received from the inmates provided a data stream of about 60 inmates and we might want to use the information for an article in a future *NA Way*

Decision to move forward with production of the 2007 Membership Survey and Information about NA pamphlet.

- Staff will investigate the ability to e-blast regional webpage that are linked to NAWS, Inc. this would be a great way for us to send important information.
- RSS feed is an automated service that sends out updates

Saturday 15 March

Action Group

Responsibilities of being a board member at the conference

This agenda item was moved to be the topic of the action group on Saturday; the board met together as a group following the world service luncheon on Thursday.

Saturday 15 March (cont)

WSC 2008 (cont)

2008-2010 Issue Discussion Topics

This discussion may impact other sessions at the conference.

Before leaving for the APF, Tom shared his thought for the IDT's discussion. Tom shared that there seems to be a gap between what is being done within the service structure and what members know. Everyone seems to be aware of not being up to date with information and resources; the question becomes "how can we inspire trusted servants to make information important to more members and bridge the gap in communication?" He would like to see an issue discussion topic that gets into desperation (new and need help) to passion (love for) and ties into the conference theme. Also, Tom liked discussions focused on spiritual principles and the service symbol.

Everyone directed to brainstorm ideas for the IDT and the details can be flushed out later. The body decided to work in small groups and will come together as one group to report. Becky wrote ideas on post it notes (blue), expanded ideas written in small groups in black.

table reporting—Ron B

Freedom and Responsibility As a member of NA what am I responsible for? How do I put these responsibilities into action? What are the benefits of my recovery by practicing responsibility, what would my recovery look like? What would the fellowship be like?

Vision/Visioning the conscience of the general member having a vision of NA. A meaningful discussion regarding the vision of Narcotics Anonymous What would we look like – evolve

Self, Service, Society and God, no real details, Perspective of recovery: connecting, responsibility

SPIRIT OF GENEROSITY self support, reciprocity, perspective of recovery

Where is the new frontier? And what are you pioneering? Self support, reciprocity, perspective of recovery.

- Planning - No details

table reporting—Mary

What does clean time mean? Benefits and challenges?

Who is not staying and why?

Desperation to passion

Spirituality being practical and solution oriented applications and benefits.

table reporting—Ron H

Supporting each other in preparing for being of service

Fresh assessment of needs is about being of service because the need exists, not because the box exists. Its needs versus structure issue.

- Board leaning towards doing something with *where is the new frontier/what is your pioneering and desperation to passion*.
- From *Passion into Action*

There was more discussion about how to help get people excited.

The spirit of generosity Becky said we've tried to get this dialog about contributions but have not been able to frame something that is interesting... either we do or quit saying we are going to do it.

Ron H home group discussed the use of their funds, local needs, and what the group wanted was some guidance on this topic.

The board was asked whether they wanted to take on the 3-year dialog on contributions—it seems that currently it is not practical. Not sure a 3-year dialog is necessary but maybe a constant reminder. If we keep at a level about responsibility and contribution, then it seems to be more effective. Believe *Freedom /responsibility* help the contribution topic. Becky and Anthony discussed the general member and assumptions of what that may mean to someone.

It seems the board is not ready to take on a 3-year dialog concerning contributions, maybe keeping the issue in the forefront is sufficient.

There was general agreement from the board to discontinue with the BPG 3-year campaign to talk exclusively about contributions, but will keep issue active in our discussions with the fellowship.

Mary wanted to add **1st Tradition, Common Welfare**

The board broke for lunch and upon returning recapped and gathered more details on IDT's. Ideas captured on post it notes in **green**.

Take **desperation to passion** and develop a set of questions, then **passion into action** with another set of questions.

Desperation to passion is more personal and gets into benefits (how you move from, the process of which you move from desperation to passion)

People come to the program of NA, get clean, get jobs, get a life, etc. Somewhere along the lines people start to become less responsible with service, etc. From **desperation** to (remaining) **passionate** in recovery, this is about staying here, more than just staying clean.

Personal Responsibility

Moving from **desperation to passion** in recovery – nurturing, sustaining, and growing, rite of passage

Benefits of membership –practicing person responsibility

Passion into action is about interaction with others (service).

Personal responsibility

Desperation and the passion is the same thing. You take the two and create a crucible.

- What are my responsibilities as a member of NA, my second responsibility is to NA and what benefits come from both.

Freedom and responsibility - what is our responsibility as individual for the gift of freedom. How do we explain that a gift brings responsibility with it? What is the focus for what is personally being put into action?

Outcome drives the method. There is a way to challenge the group to get them thinking about putting into action on a personal and group level.

Freedom and responsibility as a member – our responsibility for the gift of freedom, put into action personally – benefits to my recovery. The second part is what the fellowship would look like.

Personal responsibility (Tom and Tanya to provide focus because they are so passionate about this)

Moving from desperation to passion in recovery – nurturing, sustaining, and growing, rite of passage, Benefits of membership practicing person responsibility, keeping recovery constantly fresh and new. The board now wants to use the excellent staff questions to fit into the framework of topics offered by the board.

Under freedom and responsibility, a sub-heading **Common vision, common welfare**: what are the ties that bind us, 1st Tradition.

How do you engage the fellowship in a two year discussion – can we start talking about culture no matter where you are. What defines the NA culture, what defines our local culture? Local NA culture is different within the global NA culture (tribal service); what are the ties that bind us together. What is your experience for working for the benefit of others; supporting each other in preparing and being of service.

Agreement to develop something along the lines of personal responsibility is personal freedom, responsibility is local and common vision is global.

March Conference Report

We only received 60% of regional reports; therefore, the Executive Committee talked about ways to inform conference participants. There is value in regional reporting; information is used for framing portions of conference sessions. An e-blast was sent out last week, a follow up will be sent out this week. There is a template, complete on online or do on their own.

Tom shared how the APF has begun to not fund anyone that does not submit a report (accountability). Therefore, the thought was to print a list of regional reports not submitted and to ask delegates for an explanation as to why.

Understand that many regions wait until the regional meeting occurs, but it should not be this way because this is not information (data) that requires a meeting.

The board is in agreement with the premise of accountability; it's about how to get them to submit reports. The March Conference Report will contain a list of reports submitted; we will also talk about the importance of the regional reports as well as determine what we can do to help.

2006-2008 Issue Discussion Summaries

Building Strong Home group, Who's Missing and Our Service System. Summary is basically a synopsis of material that has been collected over the conference cycle on the topic. This was a way to provide information about the fellowship seems to care about.

Decision: Because of time constraints, board members are only to identify points that are blatantly incorrect. This is a fast turnaround.

WSC 2006 Minutes

This draft will be sent out for final proofing. The board **decided** to send the final proofed draft to the chair for final sign off.

Corporate

Draft 2008-2010 WB Schedule

Send proposed WB calendar meeting dates to the board electronically. Conference Cycle 2008-2010 Calendar –Preliminary outline to present to the board

2008

New WB Orientation Meeting June 27-28, 2008 and will include EC members

EC meeting August 6, WB meeting August 7-9, 2008

EC meeting October 22, WB meeting October 23-25 2008

2009

EC meeting January 20, WB meeting January 21-24, 2009

EC meeting April 21, WB meeting April 22-25, 2009, (4 day meeting)

EC meeting June 24, WB meeting June 25-27, 2009

WCNA 33 August 20-23, 2009

EC meeting October 20, WB meeting, October 21-24, 2009 (4 day meeting)

CAR deadline November 25, 2009

2010

EC meeting January 12, WB meeting January 13-16, 2009 (4 day meeting)

CAT deadline January 25, 2010

EC meeting March 17, WB meeting March 18-20 (3 day meeting)

WSC April 25 to May 3, 2010

Schedule for EC and BP Meetings

EC meeting June 4, 5 and BPG meeting 6, 7 2008

Decision to accept the proposed meeting dates as set for the next cycle which will be presented to newly elected board members.

Adopt January 2008 Minutes (change to page 19 from email version-corporate resolutions)

- Change beret to *berate*
- Page 22 in WB, Book 1 and page 19 in the computer document – Debbie’s authority changes with Anthony discretion.
- Page 19, insert Greg’s name to list of conference call names.
- Page 25 *in most instances Basic Text being* \$500 – change to \$5.00

Decision is to approve the January 2008 World Board minutes as amended.

Action Item List

#25 the JFT was written before any of our newer literature was published – good idea and will be added to the list of literature items for discussion.

#26 will be added to the list of literature items for discussion.

Change *under discussion* to *being considered* instead

#27 good idea-for a pullout for a GSR and will be added to the list of literature items for discussion

All literature action items will say; although not literature priorities at the moment, all the literature ideas are kept for consideration in the future. All like ideas will be combined e.g. literature items

Decision everyone in agreement with above action item recommendations.

Contract Writer

When looking at scope of work and resources available, there are a couple of deficiencies, one being the lack of resources to work on one of the upcoming projects and a writer with a fellowship friendly voice, which brought up the issue of pursuing an external resource in order to avoid sacrificing in other areas. This person would follow the direction of a committee and would attend any workgroup meetings. This is a person that has the ability to take a group discussion, internalize and produce comprehensible material.

The broad outline of objections (if any) is usually voiced from members of the ‘way back’ machine when contract writers were a negative experience. If asked by the fellowship, the response is that the writer is not being hired to provide the content, but to provide the skills, voice and workgroup support, etc.

There were no objections with pursuing the contract writer.

Medallion Recommendation

Survey responses overwhelmingly indicate a preference for the roman number, as it relates to the finish, it is bronze. Bronze is a more stable cost for us; as a raw material, there has been no rising cost. Total responses received to date - 5,739 - 98.3% were individual members.

Decision will recommend that we produce Roman numeral bronze finish medallions – to be reported in the March conference report. Will also report generically where the responses came from as well as the number of responses.

Discussion regarding motion on the medallions: one of the regions that submitted the motion pulled their motion because of the survey. Unless there is some significant fellowship demand, from the business perspective, creating a specialized medallion does not make sense.

- **Idea of tri plate medallion**

Over the last couple of years, we've received a substantial number of requests for NAWS to produce tri plate medallions. We looked into production costs for tri plate medallions. There seems to be some agreement that tri plate is more attractive; we have lowered the price of the silver medallion which has not increased sales. Many do not believe that silver medallions are a viable inventory item. We sold 866 silver medallions last year. Therefore, we would like to replace the silver with the tri plate medallion. A couple of comments were made concerning there appears to be no competition for items being sold by NAWS. Will possibly do a survey to test marketability.

Decision There was no objection with adding a tri plate medallion to NAWS inventory.

- **Youth IP cover**

The board was given a handout for what the proposed Youth IP would look like. There were no objections. The price proposal will be sent to the world board for sign off.

By-Laws

Decision The board will be presented with Bylaws that are consistent with current board practice.

Corporate Resolutions

A decision at the January 2008 WB Minutes noted management given authority to amend the existing 2007-2008 Corporate Resolutions to incorporate Deborah Hall as the replacement for Tom Rush (everywhere Tom's name appears). These resolutions will not be amended until such time as specific employment details can be worked out.

Decision Left out: With the timing of this change, Debbie Hall's authority is left to Anthony's discretion.

German Speaking Region

Decision to advance 3,400 Euros to the German Speaking Region; will also communicate that although we appreciate the German Speaking Region repaying the office we believe they will struggle, therefore to reduce the debt literature will be used for a period. All requests are considered based on the viability.

Sixth Edition Basic Text

Hardcover and soft cover size with intended paper (80 pound paper) passed around. The third sample is given to everyone as an idea for a special edition of the Sixth edition Basic Text. It would be a smaller size, embossed finish, blended colors on the cover and 100 pound paper.

While at the printing facility in China, we were provided with information about their standards for manufacturing ISO 9001, the standards used relative to the environment as well as their adherence to several international standards for labor. Production of the 6th edition will be done in China and have a savings per copy of 0.24 cents, including shipping.

Decision A PDF version of the Sixth edition layout cover will be sent to the board for signoff.

Decision to approve the proposal for a special Sixth edition Basic Text.

Use of Resources for Travel

In 2002, we reported that world services would only attend events where we were given a particular amount of time and were multi-regional events. A question was posed that concerned the use of resources when planning the budget.

Anthony reminded the board that we have gone to extraordinary lengths to meet the needs of all requests to the best of our ability. Decisions are made on merit of request. We try to attend events where there has been a previous adversarial relationship; the community is in crisis; we have never attended an event or have never been asked to attend an event previously; however, Anthony pointed out that this level of participation cannot continue.

Mark shared his experience at the one regional event that he attended by himself. The entire day was scheduled for a NAWS workshop which was attended by 75-100 people. WS was very well received and he believes it was well worth WS efforts. Perhaps, the solution needs be focused more toward potential outcome as opposed to a technicality.

The travel request form will be revised because many areas are requesting WS participation at their events/workshops

New Website

Possibility of having forums for fellowship service efforts – literature distribution, convention, H&I, PI/PR,

The board was shown the layout for the new website and **agreed** to submit precise and specific input to Stephan L.

Board meeting ended with a Sharing Session which is a closed gathering of the board.