APPROVED

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. Approved World Board Minutes 21-24 October 2009



Wednesday 21 October

World Board: Antonia Nikolinakou, Craig Robertson, Franney Jardine, Jim Buerer, Mark Hersh, Mary Banner, Michael Cox, Odilson Gomes Braz Junior, Paul Craig, Piet de Boer, Ron Blake, Ron Hofius, Ron Miller, Sharon Harzenski-Deutsch and Tom McCall. Arne Hassel-Gren not present

Staff: Multiple staff members participated in Wednesday's Strategic Plan, Resource Assessment and NA Way session facilitated by Jim DeLizia.

World Board chair; Jim Buerer opened the meeting with a moment of silence and the Serenity prayer. This was followed by NAWS milestone acknowledgments and announcement for the desired outcomes for week, after which the meeting was turned over to Jim DeLizia for the facilitated third session of Strategic Planning.

Jim D started the session by stating that the current Strategic Plan version incorporates recent World Board and staff input by changing language throughout the document to be more meaningful and approaches for cycle more specific.

A quick activity identified the following as helpful considerations when prioritizing:

- 1. available resources
- 2. feasibility
- 3. primary purpose
- 4. the benefit/synergy
- 5. emotional component

- 6. opportunity + needs=results
- 7. direction
- 8. spiritual education
- 9. ability to reach consensus

Strategic Plan draft review

There were no changes to Objectives 1 and 2. There was a discussion on Objective 3 Approach F and two ideas contained within:

- 1. Creating ways to teach local members how to carry out a Pubic Relations (PR) scan, how to develop a strategy.
- 2. Using and/or working with professionals in certain situations.

Decision: language will be more specific and Approach 3F separated, becoming New Approach 3F and New Approach 3G. Additionally, it was agreed to remove evaluate the Spain Test and translate into a road map... wording.

Objective 4.2 There is a commitment to try to update service tools at least one per cycle (e.g. WCNA Guidelines) discussion and the importance of following through with the commitment this cycle.

Decision: strike out e.g. WCNA guidelines

Objective 5: no change

There was an exchange of ideas to split Objective 6 Existing Approach and reflect publishing existing material e.g. In Times of Illness (ITOI).

Decision: change word pieces to In Times of Illness. Language will also be added so that it calls out

collecting best practices in response to Drug Courts, targeting the service structure and groups, cooperative effort between NA communities dealing with court cards in the community.

There was further discussion on removing or editing approach as well as addressing drug replacement philosophically in some way. Added was that there is previous agreement regarding existing material that is more contemporary and will not be adding drug replacement as a focus.

Decision: to remove Approach J in Objective 6

Objective 7: discussions about creating an abstract otherwise no change

Objective 8: discussions about removing Approach M from its high priority and the board trying inhouse first, Approach N only translates into broadening the format to be more than just electronic.

Decision: to remove 8.2 and Approach M

Objective 9, 10, 11 and 12 had no changes

Objective 13.1 Turn the corner on fellowship contributions language will be changed to be more explanatory

Idea - credit card terminal as a way to also get group donations

Typo in Objective 14 will be corrected, nothing else was noted

Objective 5, Approach I discussion and the importance of its clearness. Approach is only meant to be a way of collecting data consistently allowing for better informed decisions when developing strategies to help communities. More and more regions are providing reports since standardizing on the web.

The next session was for the World Board to assess resources. List of items includes existing and new approaches as well as projects that have now become essentials services. Currently essential services outnumber the number of staff resources as it presently stands. This list encompasses 8 years of continuing to add work. There is a need for direction that allows management to make decisions on where and how resources are allocated and needing to be more efficient about the use of assets we already have. The board led through activity to cull and prioritize.

The board led through an exercise to evaluate the NA Way processes, e.g. by responding to questions.

NAWS Program Evaluation Questionnaire

	Program: NA Way Magazine						
Ge	eneral				paxine exist? Diving in significance, becoming more al. The NA Way represents the personal way. The core purpose of aders and staff agree that the grand as sense of community and amon issues and needs are') ad? (general impression) HIGH 4 (0%) gned as that need is changing? (general HIGH (30%) 4 (30%) efined purpose, vision, goals, priorities? HIGH (40%) 4 (50%)		
1.	Does the need	d for which this	program was de	esigned still exist?	till exist?		
	YES (100%)		NO	(0%)			
		a.Is the need changing in any way (e omplex or diversified, etc.)?		e.g., lessening or growing in significance, becoming more			
	one service the magazin current publi	that reaches the e has evolved of cation serves: To unify and engonnectedness a	e most members over the years, hage the fellowshand a means to as an organiza	s in a direct, personal nowever. Leaders and hip, providing a sense address common issution ('who we are')	way. The core purpose staff agree that the of community and		
2.	Is the program meeting the need for which it was designed? (general impression) LOW HIGH						
		1 (0%)	2 (0%)	3 (100%)	4 (0%)		
3.	Can/will this program meet the need for which it was designed as that need is changing? (general impression)						
	,	LOW					
		1 (0%)	2 (40%)	3 (30%)	4 (30%)		
4.							
		1 (0%)	2 (10%)	3 (40%)	4 (50%)		
5.	Does the program have a high degree of ownership by/commitment from the leadership and staff LOW HIGH						
		1 (0%)	2 (60%)	3 (30%)	4 (10%)		
Sp	pecific						

- 6. Is the program meeting this need efficiently (i.e., evaluation of cost time, \$\$, facilities/equipment, outside resources, diversion of resources from other areas/priorities)? See Efficiency/Effectiveness Grid
- 7. Is the program meeting this need effectively (evaluation of benefit -- as defined by the intended outcomes)?

See Efficiency/Effectiveness Grid

Other

8. What other considerations (negatives or positives) exist that impact objective evaluation and decision-making regarding this program? (e.g., positive consideration – the program generates revenue that helps fund other priorities; negative consideration – the program has high degree of ownership by leadership/staff to the point of being blind to its lack of effectiveness or efficiency)

Positives:

Negatives:

- Accuracy of the database
- Need for reader survey/feedback to assess the real value of the magazine

Efficiency/Effectiveness Grid

High Efficiency

High Effectiveness

Low Effectiveness

Low Efficiency

HIGH Efficiency, HIGH Effectiveness	LOW Efficiency, HIGH Effectiveness
0%	56%
High efficiency, high effectiveness: we've got it right; how can we replicate?	Low efficiency, high effectiveness: getting results, but paying dearly for it
LOW Effectiveness, HIGH Efficiency	LOW Effectiveness, LOW Efficiency
11%	33%
Low effectiveness, high efficiency: doesn't cost much, but not getting results either	Low efficiency, low effectiveness: do away with it and use the resources elsewhere

Aggregate "Low Effectiveness" = 44%
Aggregate "High Effectiveness" = 56%
Aggregate "Low Efficiency" = 89%

Suggestions for Action

To Improve Effectiveness

- 1. Enhance content to increase readership.
- 2. Enhance format through use of statistics and visuals.
- 3. Conduct reader survey to identify value, use, etc.

To Improve Efficiency

- 1. Implement procedure requiring renewal of subscriptions (paid or not).
- 2. Encourage voluntary contributions to support publication of the magazine.
- 3. Communicate the cost of the magazine to encourage contributions.

Thursday 22 October

World Board chair; Jim B opened the meeting with a moment of silence, the Serenity prayer and announcements.

WSC Seating (small groups)

Before breaking into small groups Jim pointed out that fundamentally the previous board input discussion has reiterated WSC's description in the *Guide to World Service*. Everyone reminded that this is not the decision making point rather it's the time to come up with ideas to be further explored in the January 2010 joint meeting.

Structured discussion - who can sit at the table and why-question proposed to all

If you didn't have to worry about salesmanship, what do you think the ideal composition of the conference should be? Who should be at the table and why?

Table 2

Geopolitical model considers representation, is sensitive to diversity, with culture and political boundaries, almost like the WCNA boundaries, it would not be easy to just break up by country or state. Group found selves talking about current seating criteria and also tried to find ways, as we do with WCNA and zonal forums, to create or mimic the service related magic. Realizing that model would have to be flexible enough to accommodate the dynamic changes on the fellowship.

Table 3

Group struggled a bit trying to find things they agreed upon. They did agree on a finite number because of the external realities. Less US delegates, no more US regions (stopping and changing what is). Balance between US and International will change. Geographic adjustments and changes could possibly come from a (geopolitical) zone or something similar. There would be a cap on the number of attendees at the conference. The conference would take responsibility for establishing seating boundaries, creating a possibility for a global vision of which 'community' is coming next as well as taking responsibility for the dynamic process.

Table 4

Number of participants would be defined by the number of meetings in fellowship. For example it could be one representative per thousand meetings. Those representatives would be elected by some entity or by some zone process. Geography decides entity. Group did struggle with finding a number for WSC cap size, but if process used above then it would grow, but at a much slower pace. Group envisioned a structure with a certain number of zones.

Table 1

Conference becomes a mixture of regional and super delegates. Group embraced the delegate at large title. A separate decision to be done by super delegate. This would allow for zonal representation that agreed with the number of participants. The mathematical process to allocate the number of participants, maybe the math is only the idea for densely populated areas. It was also thought inappropriate to disenfranchise less fortunate people/places. Thought to possibility separate the function discussion conference and conference could rotate.

Who should be there are both well established and less established communities, community would not have to be a region or country, but must be some type of service body, nor does it have to be

called a region. Until we remove the delegates thinking as stakeholders this issue will never change.

One person at the table added regional delegates and delegates at large: EDM would be given delegates at large – rotating within type of selection to be done by the zone. Maybe the delegate at large could vote at the decision process. Conference decision process would be a bit leaner.

Zone like entity and a region like entity

Structure: is basically what we have now, a region can't be a region when it says. The missing key is that this and Service System ideas come together. For process have a few ideas:

- Don't blow up but tweak
- Something with larger geography, define by mix and another way
- A lot of process ideas
- Question asked: if zonal rep, how are different factions or voices represented thru zonal rep? APF great example within the same zone. Response: this could be done with rotation of delegate at large and some within. On a rotation basis, each has an opportunity to represent.
- Representation by diversity

Commonalities (check marks indicate other tables coming up with same idea)

- Geopolitical
- Established by WSC ✓✓
- Adaptable
- Less US / more global
- No more US delegates
- Less US delegates
- Adjustment
- Cap on number of representatives
- Not blowing current system up
- Defined by the number of meetings.
- Elected by zone or some established boundary or outside group i.e. 53 total for 53000
- Representative of larger segments (zone or something) and delegates of those who do not belong to one of these
- Cap based on math but not precise
- Community / region mix
- Rotating set of RD and ZR from zones
- General agreement that the possibility of having no alternates would need to be explored.

WSC Seating

Agreement - staff will further flush out today's discussion material, then by the Executive Committee to help move material along.

The board affirmed their commitment to what has to occur at the January 2010 meeting; developing a

level of definition since the transition plan cannot be created without having an idea of 'who sits at the table' within a structure. This is also needed for CAT and CAR reporting.

Decision: no objection to staff culling material and further recapitulated by Executive Committee.

Decision: to develop a level of definition for WSC Seating at the January 2010 meeting

❖ Approval Draft of Vision Statement for 2010 CAR

Craig reported receiving a few comments on the Vision Statement but nothing that elicited any real energy. The Vision Statement is at the center of this project and workgroup members ready to move forward. Mukam and Mark thanked for their collaboration.

Decision: approve the Revised Vision Statement for inclusion in the CAR with a motion.

Service System Proposed Models

Proposed Models

Craig reported that the Workgroup has taken big steps forward with proposed models and Vision Statement. Much time has been taken to develop models flushing out structural components of system; e.g. structure, people, process, along with foundational and function pieces.

Models have been measured against design criteria put together in the foundational period of the project and the listed challenges in system must be addressed. Example is having a list of attributes to compare against when electing a board member. Everyone has some attributes but not all. Therefore models will be the same but there won't be one model that fits all needs or that is perfect but have to go with something that best fits NA World Services. Workgroup is also means testing on present system because everyone will need to articulate research and results.

Although nothing will be presented for WSC approval, everyone must become familiar with models in order to present ideas and other options at workshops, etc. Today's goal is break into small groups gathering input.

Mukam and Mark added that hopes everyone looks at process, desire and needs during this complex process. Workgroup members thought about service system needs and tried to capture a more mature interaction of external forces. The desire is to provide groups with the ability to mature as service people. All the proposed models say group support which is a different definition and meant to be a place to discuss what happens at meetings.

Comments

- Challenge will be to not compare models to our current system. Focus should be our principles, Concept One and what the service structure was initially created for.
- People are always inquisitive; therefore knowing why and what was done to reach such conclusions etc. will create a great discussion and not a debate about structure.

Report starting page 97 captures main ideas. None of the models completely address all items listed under Essential Components, but there were commonalities as well as varied elements.

Geopolitical means country, state, province, city, basically a word used to describe a boundary and used in the Webster as such. Brief recap of represented models

Model 1--Linear Representation

Groups are not represented in this model as well as in model 3. In both model 1 and 4 there are a larger amount of units (group it serves) that feeds into the group and this will also depend on where and the needs on individual place. Structure of group support is not administrative body, functions

very different, and very needs driven. Intermediate body is optional in system, based on need. Dotted line means no services provided.

Model 4--Linear Assembly

This model is similar to 1 in that it has a linear chain of representation. Because groups are little further from service provision the annual assembly allowed them to steer that. Annual assembly allows all groups under the local service unit to attend. Body takes care of services best coordinated on a state / national level

Model 2--Geo Numerical

This model uses the number of groups as a criterion for service body formation, therefore when you reach a certain number you become a region. Boundaries are defined between service groupings on a numerical basis. Service unit totally focuses on group support; mainly a discussion based body and attended by interested members, Service portion taken up by the group project unit.

Model 3--Two Track

Difference is between model 2 and 3 is that in 3 there is no group project unit and the numerical representation aspect. The local service unity provides the link for the group to the Geological unit and global NA. This structure is similar to AA intergroup body and may include a local service office.

Model – 3a (no drawing)

This model has a two part WSC and an additional level of representation added in between the geopolitical and global unit. First part of the conference consists of delegates from zones and World Board and focused on decision making. The other part of week is an assembly of delegates from Geopolitical Unity and Board members focusing on elections and discussion type items.

Model 3b (no drawing)

3b also has a two part conference. The first part of the conference is the World Board and delegates from Geopolitical Unit that hold elections and discusses other issues. There is also the provision for online voting on some CAR items via the web. The other half of WSC consists of World Board making the strategic decision based on the discussion held at the beginning of WSC with delegates.

Means Testing (small groups)

Service Systems Models -- Means Testing Exercise sheet will help everyone understand models as well as be a way to talk about them, understanding they are in their initial stages and presented for input. Four challenges from the Service System report will serve as the questions to means test.

- 1. Breakdowns in communication within the system
- 2. Handling explosive growth
- 3. Stimulating stagnant fellowships
- 4. Lack of clarity in roles and functions

Notes from WB Session on Service System Structural Models—October 2009

The board reviewed the four structural models forwarded by the Service System Workgroup using an abbreviated means-testing exercise in small groups as a way to begin digesting the differences among the models. Much of the feedback was, predictably, similar to the input the workgroup had already given when they did their own means-testing of the models. The summary below doesn't attempt to

capture all of the duplicate mean-testing results, but focuses on input about what seemed particularly notable in the structural models or what might be missing.

Note that the input from the small groups does not represent a board consensus and as such should be taken as impressions or food for thought, but not necessarily as directives.

<u>Input on Specific Components:</u> In general there was a sense that the roles or purposes of the different service bodies or units need to be better defined, especially the intermediary body (the accordion piece).

- Group Service Unit: Many people really liked the idea of having a body devoted to group needs
- Group Project Unit: At least one member said this was problematic. Another group said that the GPU could mirror some of the advantages and functions of the assembly in Model 4.
- Assembly: See below.
- Accordion pieces: Many thought these were a plus and made the models scalable and improved communication. There was some thought that the models that didn't have these needed them added.
- Zones: There was concern that zones do not always excel with planning, PR and fellowship development, and that they might not be the best bodies for delivering these services.

Communication Challenges: There was some feeling that the communication links in some of the models (1 & 4) were too thin with too few links—that communication could be compromised in these models. On the other hand, there was some input that the models with many different units could also suffer from communication difficulties because there were too many different bodies to communicate to and from. More clearly defined roles and purposes could alleviate this difficulty because not all information needs to be communicated to each body and clearer definitions would help avoid information overload.

<u>Two-track Models</u>: There was some concern that there are not enough bodies to fill the seats in a two-track model. One possible solution was the notion that the two track models could schedule the GSU and GPU for alternate months.

Geo-Numerical Model Feedback: There was mixed feedback on the numerical model. Some liked the fact that it could "force" people to work together who might not otherwise do so. Others felt (and some fairly strongly) that it could undermine our spiritual principles, that group conscience is not a numerically-based principle. Another concern was with the distinction between numbers of groups and meetings. Some groups have many many meetings and so determining service bodies or representation by numbers of groups may mean very different things in different communities.

<u>Linear Assembly Feedback:</u> The reaction to the assembly in Model 4 was very mixed. Some thought it improved communication. Others thought it wasn't a workable idea and that our experience with assemblies so far shows that they rarely work in densely populated areas and that they are not effective planning or decision-making bodies.

<u>Composite Model</u>: There was some sense that a composite model might work best. One suggestion was to use Model 4 combined with the intermediary body from Model 1 and the global piece from 3a. Another suggestion was simply to combine Model 1 and 3a.

Need for Flexibility: In both presenting and reporting models, it will be important to bear in mind that one size does not fit all. Even with intermediary bodies in a model, not all communities will fit neatly into any one of these models and so there needs to be enough flexibility to ensure that communities can adapt in ways that best meet their needs. A couple of different groups talked about offering the opportunity for flexibility at more levels of the models.

<u>Input on Diagrams</u>: At least one board member wondered if it might be better to put intermediary bodies off to the side or put a line through the body to indicate that they are not part of the stream of representation and decision-making

Friday 23 October

World Board chair; Jim B everyone asked to join in a moment of silence followed by the Serenity prayer before delving into the morning activities

Literature Approval Pieces for 2010 CAR

Two Self Support Pieces

The board agreed with including IP 25 Money Matters in the CAR.

Decision: IP 25 Money Matters approved for CAR inclusion with a motion to replace IP 24 and 25. Brief discussion regarding language contained in IP 25, line 146-149 calling out the possible discomfort it may cause some in the fellowship. Everyone reminded this language was specially requested; everyone can expect a push from some but have to decide to stand behind what is published.

- Some members make arrangements to leave a specified amount to NA in their will or estate. For more information contact NA World Services. Change to be a single bullet instead of two and /or simplified language.
- ♦ If you need more information write to NA Services it was decided to remove sentence.

Decision to approve IP 25 as amended

Self support graphic piece

Jim asked everyone to turn their attention on the interior panel of IP 28 Funding NA Service, reporting the Executive Committee talked about the input which indicated artistic map representation being incorrect. Anthony added that the representation was never intended to be an actual geographic representation because there is always the concern of unintentionally upsetting people by missing their part of the world. And for this reason the picture was only meant to be an artistic rendering with numbers.

Therefore the EC decided to recommend removing that section and adapt the regional map that we usually use, creating a casual geographical appearance to outline.

Continents will be solid, the number of meetings will be shown — it will be a more true representation of data but simplified. Decision: the board agreed with change.

 Travis pointed out that word <u>ideally</u> added in an attempt to deal with Paul's issue concerning the question of wondering if groups sending money directly to each level is an actual practice.

World board Input

- Suggest calling out the section about it being acceptable to donate anything because knows many members are stuck on the 30/10/10 donations pie. Travis responded that descriptive information will be added for the CAR.
- Board agreement to change word goal to our vision
- Board agreement to change word work to efforts in sentence "conducting public relations efforts"

- Funding our Primary Purpose suggested as the title instead of Funding NA Service.
- Idea to create a one sided table top piece, poster or NA Way pull out proposed.

Decision: As amended the board agreed to place in the CAR. No change to the title.

The body asked to reconsider title, wanting that further consideration be given to changing the title of the IP *Funding our Primary Purpose*.

Additional changing the title discussion

In Favor

The importance of the way we portray our vision emphasized and sometimes the way we describe what we do is less than adequate. Additional input was to instead use title Funding our Vision instead because it may encompass our language much better.

Not in favor

Changing title would involve altering IP language to compliment title, which would then need additional time for board review and approval. The current title is simple and clear there is no time for this type of rewrite with CAR timeline.

Decision: no change, keep as Funding NA Service.

Decision regional division map will be the map in self support graphic piece with Central America being a different color. Parenthetic will state not intended to be an accurate geographic depiction or something to that affect.

In Times of Illness

Mary reported that the final draft provided to the World Board at the last board meeting, with input incorporated.

- Page 179; center paragraph. A couple of concerns expressed regarding take away medication possibly causing confusion since it is uncommon to receive take away medication outside United States. Everyone agreed to remove take away.
- Page 178; discussion about the sentence which states informing health care providers about being an addict and having the knowledge of many member experiences that once that is done the medical care changes.

Explanation; statement included to provide alternatives, to be partners with doctor in personal care, not to hinder. Everyone agree with keeping as is.

Decision: remove take away. Sentence now reads my dentist on several occasions offered me pain mediations to take at home which I didn't find necessary.

Decision ITOI as amended will be included in the CAR for approval.

CAR Outline

This is the detailed outline for what will be included in the CAR to be approved by the World Board and finalized by the Executive Committee.

Introduction will help everyone familiarize themselves with what can be expected.

Service System-the EC talked about emphasizing on what we heard in the past and how we got here as a way to provide background. This will prepare fellowship for what's coming and what's to be discussed over the next 2 years.

 Suggest changing word <u>experiment</u>, word seems to cause confusion and has been somewhat of a point of contention.

NAWS Resource-the topic of money has never been discussed so centrally in the CAR, we are at a point where our finances affect the level of services we can provide. We will report areas we are cutting expenses, report publication discussions as well as inform about World Board thoughts on changing the automatic distribution. This year will also be the first time we'll have very few projects because most are all carryover projects.

 Would prefer conveying responsible spending or we are operating at a higher expense level than is coming in instead. Otherwise people will think we are expending frivolously when we are not.

Everyone agreed to change how we convey that NAWS is operating at a higher expense level than is coming in; background information will be included as well.

In Times of Illness-will include background material and will also have a CAR motion.

Living Clean will include some background material including where project came from, effort to include fellowship in process and next steps. No changes

Literature Development-will address things like our lengthy literature process. For example there are a number of places in our NA Fellowship Approved material that contain inaccurate information for example some of our material mention things like cassette tapes which is inaccurate but not conceptual. Our current process is lengthy requiring that a whole piece to be placed in the CAR for approval.

We basically want to start a conversation to create a better process for these types of things. The fear is that delegates in an attempt to help want instant fixes and may just write a motion to deal with this. Therefore it bears stating that the board has no plans to introduce a motion regarding this but definitely want to start dialog.

4th bullet sentence keeping "workgroup focused on one topic consistently for more than
four years does not seem very realist or beneficial". Sometimes the way we word a
sentence can be problematic, maybe worrisome is a better word. We want to share ideas
as well as provide background information on why. The idea is to back up a step, frame an
idea about this and come to talk about at conference.

The problem with a lengthy project is having a whole inexperience body reviewing a 4 year long work in progress and the risks of reinventing the wheel – don't think we can really sustain. The Strategic Plan listed the Literature Development process as a key objective for 3 cycles and nothing was done, the premise for bullet is to step back and talk about the complete process and to then choose.

IDTs-discussion questions will not be included in this CAR. Leadership is the only IDT we have a plausible next step for and have elements in Strategic Plan that address this area. We have very unusable information from <u>IDTs</u>, next steps not clear and not sure how to entice more participation. We are also getting more requests for different topics. People are more willing to do sociable things in NA then having to deal with these types of questions because it feels more like step work. If anyone wants to get this material it is available on the FTP site – location will be reported to conference.

Headers about key points and issues will be included to highlight and refer back to material.

 Believe we can add a question or just ask them to tell us what is being done in their community to prepare them for this discussion. A header can be used to accentuate

questions. Continue to tell them we are looking for ways to have a more discussion based conference and continue partnership.

- A session that captures their input.
- The delegate's session is something for them to share experiences and it will be interesting to see what topics the conference delegates want to talk about.
- The delegate survey is it still useful.

Decision: the outline approved as amended. Final sign off will be by the EC

Regional Motion responses from the WB

Page 163; each region contacted twice and provided with assistance. 3 motions were declined because they did not meet conference policy. All like motions have been grouped together and anything written in blue text needs board attention.

Highlights concerning pricing policy motion given; motion maker refused to make changes that would make it CAR ready according to conference policy therefore it was not accepted. Believe this will be brought up at the conference.

Motion 6

The intention would be to create a minimum threshold purchase commitment before producing. Additional challenge with motion is setting a precedent for how to get an item produced and/or creating a keytag for all occasions. There is also an absence of fairness for groups that will never meet the number criteria disadvantaging them from getting the keytag in their language.

- Explain history behind keytag.
- Approach should focus on cost, prudence and our statement of always welcoming ideas for improving our process
- Say we don't have a strong preference.

Motion 6 Approach: response will be expanded to include where we've been with issue, concerns (what/why), explain the disadvantage for others. State understanding there is not a very good process to let us know fellowship desires, etc. but want to know what the desires are for tag. Also elaborate on knowing motions are not a good way to manage the business of NAWS.

Additional Motion 6 approach thoughts

- Many want NAWS to produce because it's an issue of integrity hence the motion and where the emotion and energy stems.
- Ask for the conference to reaffirm desire

Motion 7

Motion 7 Approach current response will be rewritten and strengthened, restate the Latin American Zonal Forum having knowledge of the pulse of priority stream/projects.

Motion 8

Motion 8 Approach remove up to we have not surveyed the fellowship....

Motion 9

Motion 9 Approach no change

Motion 10

EC tried to work with motion maker on clear language but encountered resistance, did however receive a response containing profanity about NAWS staff.

The World Board did report as trying this. Believe there is still a fundamental disagreement on the CAT itself and its process because there is a small population that still doesn't understand its purpose.

Motion 10 Approach includes an explanation of both the CAT and CAR as part of the board response, providing detail on both processes.

Motion 11

Motion writer expressed feeling disconnected from process and workgroups activity. Rationale behind motion was this allowing fellowship to link into the literature review process in what is believed will be real-time as well as that minutes will provide a specific set. EC explained that this would not provide the level of details he is seeking. The passing of this motion will change the way records are taken and just does not make for a good decision making process. Workgroups are not project administers. There is a misconception about the process that we have to find a way to dispel including the misunderstanding of how literature is developed today.

- Our approach should acknowledge their request and explain the process.
- It just seems like a misunderstanding because the way we report gives a false impression that we are doing this project together.

Motion 11 Approach describe workgroup process, relationship with the board, and who is ultimately responsible for the workgroup. Motion says they want data, but at the same time what they actually want cannot be assumed. Writing the anonymity process would be really hard to write. Material will be lost and blended with everything else.

Motion 12 and Motion 13

- Emphasis in beginning is about holistic and that the 2 full paragraphs on page 171 are more of a footnote nature. Don't know which two paragraphs are being referred to.
- 2nd paragraph from end of page 170...in a two year conference cycle... reword so that World Board project is called out, needs more clarity towards end of paragraph so that it doesn't seem like a workgroup project.
- Suggest that first paragraph be moved to the top as a lead.
- Referencing the process maybe the right way to engage Motion 12 and 13, saying we hear
 you want more time, but these are our dilemmas about more time in the process
- The last paragraph is a great opportunity to provide additional explanation, seems like a polite paragraph and when we write like this it tends to not stick. Be more clear; because there are many the assumptions we make, have different expectations project processes, and fellowship is of the idea that if input is given it will be lost with other material.
- Be frank about saying that no matter what we do, we receive little to no response from fellowship. The online discussion board and survey were the only two things that got more participation. We don't see any pattern on input that suggest it being more helpful, reiterate better planning, etc discussion. Include the major changes already made to the approval timeline and it doesn't seem to have helped.

Staff added that when we talk about the literature process we need to be a little more frank about

not being able to address everyone and that when someone gives its to NA without a signature, believe we should start and end strong.

Motion 12 approach and Motion 13 approach the board needs to see if content of what is currently written is acceptable. Response for this is the same as 12, 13, and 14. Motions 13 and 14 intent is for review and input to be 6 months. We don't know yet how much of the literature development discussion portion will be placed here.

Motion 14

 Motion 14 is slightly different but it will include some of the shared responses as well as need a piece that is separate.

Fellowship review is currently 90 days and the introduction can state that, but right now conference approved could mean it may or may not have gone out. This is about conference and board approved material. The motion if approved would double our cost and double our time.

Motion 14 approach is to report the philosophical reasons conference approval was developed. We would have added these pieces that are easily changed, that fellowship will get everything in the first pass. State that we need to reinforce the direction of why this distinction was created, give reasons, this motion will create one broad stroke, and distinction was thought out for each one and for a reason: provide descriptions. The board spent 4 years taking about all this.

Living Clean Update

Franney and Bob J reported on the Living Clean project and the most updated report passed out as a handout. Board informed that a workgroup member resigned early this week for medical reasons. Chapter 1 and 2 are out for review and input. Much of the Chapter 1 input is in line with what board has mentioned. Chapter 2 input resoundingly positive and supportive. The workgroup has worked out a new proposed chapter order and the board will need to review and approve.

Bob added input regarding the joke was felt to be crass, also received usual input on word choices.

Decisions needed from the board:

Support reorganizing outline moving the Living Spiritually material to the #3 spot, and begin reporting this revision to the fellowship ASAP.

Decision: no objection to the reorganization of the Living Clean outline.

Agree to timelines and deadlines for board review of:

**Sign off to forward to fellowship review and input:

Change October 28 changed to Friday October 30th.

Our Physical Selves - receive 1 November w/ a deadline of 9 November.

Review and input by the board

Relationships – receive 13 November w/ a deadline of 23 November

Living Spiritually – receive 11 December w/ a deadline of 21 December

Determine review and input schedule based on above recommendations. Begin reporting the dates for review and input to the fellowship.

** = added to report 22 October

Decision: Three chapters will be sent to fellowship by April 1 with a deadline of June 30th

Decision: staff will send out deadline reminders to the board via outlook.

- Our Physical Selves will be sent to the board by 1 November w/a deadline of 9 November.
- Relationships Chapter will be sent to the board by 13 November w/a deadline of 23 November.
- Living Spiritually Chapter will be sent out to the board by 11 December w/a deadline
 21 December.
- Chapters to be sent to the fellowship by April 1 with a deadline of June 30th
- Next workgroup meeting is 5-7 November 2009

CAR 2010

Theme for CAR and the 2010-2012 cycle

Theme is for 2010-2012 and should be short and concise. Brainstorming ideas followed by a poll:

Together we'll go far

Willingness to seek change

Together - a spirit of unity

Our vision evolves to reality-1

Old dogs, new tricks

Our vision (broaden, expands)

Follow the vision

You and me, we have a vision

The courage to change-5

A vision of change-1

The will to change, the courage to lead-3

Building a bridge to the future

New challenges new possibilities

Our primary purpose

Our vision our future-12

Dreaming our vision-1

Decision: Our Vision Our Future chosen as theme for 2010-2012 cycles

Trip Reports

Mukam and Ron H reported on their individual trips. Mukam's trip was to India accompanied by Shane C in September 2009. Ron H reported feeling the experiment to send a single traveler worked very well.

Saturday 24 October

WSC Seating Proposals for 2010 – based on current criteria

Jim reported the Executive Committee discussed commitment to conference, regarding considering regions not resulting from a regional split under the current criteria and honoring that. Also states there is an issue of credibility and we reported this is what we would do. The EC also discussed wanting to report taking some time (moratorium) to talk about the current seating criteria for the subsequent cycle.

Denmark

Recommendation: to seat Denmark and fund travel to the 2010 World Service Conference.

Reported: Denmark has 133 meeting per week, 130 groups and 5 areas. However, they do not have H&I or PI service at this time. Denmark is organized and provides more service then many of the regions already seated at the EDM. It seems as if local services aren't provided because the Guide to World Services states these services should be done in a particular way and they are trying to follow what it states. They carry the message and have approved and published literature

History: They have done extensive work to overcome growing pains; it has been a long painful journey. By publishing the Basic Text, we took the position of supporting members and that this group of members speaks for NA Denmark.

Board had a lengthy discussion on topics centering on things like seating process, re-evaluating WSC, current profile not allowing for accurate community depiction, and what support does being a part of the conference bring a community and community meeting criteria.

Action: staff will request Denmark financial information

It was the decision of the World Board to recommend that Denmark be seated at the WSC 2010 conference. Denmark will be funded to attend the conference as well.

Lithuania

Recommendation: to seat Lithuania and fund travel to the 2010 World Service Conference

Lithuania has a population of 3.7 million people with about 10 cities. Region formed in 2002 and part of the EU. In 2008 Lithuania had 30 meetings with 12 groups and 12 areas. Lithuania is small but a more experienced region. In 2008 150 members attended convention. Lithuania will never be a large fellowship but have developed own identity and practices from Russia. There are neighboring Baltic's communities with geopolitical barriers and not attached to Lithuania. Community has their own language, produced literature which has been occurring for some time now. EC explained how decision to recommend seating made.

Some of the topics again discussed were seating process, current re-evaluation process, WSC, size of community, if seating really provides a community with what it needs, what support does being a part of the conference bring a community and community meeting criteria.

 A question asked about Lithuania not having any areas therefore how does community function or provide necessary services

Further explanation provided; there are many communities that do not have areas but provide services. Puerto Rico and Greece are examples of well functioning regions that do not have areas but provide all necessary services. In smaller communities there is no need for all the different structure parts.

Financial Information: It's a poor country therefore submitting financial information will tell us nothing. What would it be compared to, how would it be evaluated.

After a lengthy discussion concerning seating regions in midst of current conference and system challenges/changes the question was called. After which it was decided to continue discussing why and why not any community should be seated.

WHY NOT

- Based on the number of groups as identified community does not seem to have services and support for a large enough population
- Not believed to bring a new voice to the WSC and a small community
- Board still not clear on parameters
- Would add to the current challenges
- Philosophical divisions on issue amongst board
- No clear selection process; not saying no just wait until there is a clearer criteria.

WHY

- Many years of providing service
- Direct experience with Lithuania community would add value to WSC and WSC to community
- Direct experience with Lithuania linguistically, ethnically, and culturally distinct. In a sense isolated, but strong and a long standing established community that is still growing
- Benefits would impact local development
- Uncomfortable with excluding solely on size
- Community meets the current criteria in this process for this cycle. It may not be what
 we want or where we are going but today we have a process with criteria and being
 met.

This led the board to contemplate if technically there is a seating process.

The question called and the board asked to state objections to recommend that Lithuania be seated the upcoming WSC 2010 -none noted. Lithuania will also be funded to the conference.

Action: Request financial information

Decision: No objection to propose Lithuania be recommended for seating at the WSC 2010.

Malta

Recommendation: propose that Malta not be seated at this time as they are a fairly new community.

Population is 405,165 (July 2009 est.), island is located in the Mediterranean Sea, in Southern Europe, south of Sicily (Italy). Meetings began in 1995/1996 and the region formed in April 2007. Malta has been participating in the EDM for 2 years. They speak Maltese; have 9 meetings per week and 5 groups, very small community.

World Board discussion centered on Malta still developing as a community in regards to recovery and service. There is very little material translated and minimal in the way of service, it thought that

inclusion at the conference at this time would be quite overwhelming.

- 1 objection noted to not seating Malta at this time because there is not much difference between Malta and the other regions being considered. The growth rate is similar and because they are an isolated island and seating would greatly and positively impact the local fellowship.
- They have not yet matured nor been a fellowship for very long. Community has very little translated and not much recovery and service experience.

Decision 1 objection noted, however everyone else consented to proposing that Malta not be seated at this time. Everyone also agreed to report and be of one accord concerning recommendations. CAR introduction will contain as much as possible of the boards discussion.

WCNA

Recap of WCNA 33

Draft WCNA 33 financials passed out and everyone reminded that the financial sheet is an internal document. Convention expenses span over two-years, it includes prior planning as well as the actual event. Overall the WCNA 33 Barcelona convention was a tremendous success. Statement is through August 30th, and the amounts are in Euros not US dollars, and the following items highlights provided:

Expenses

- Part of the increase is due to facility expenses ballooning at the very last minute.
 - o Traditional summary for WCNA will be produced at a later time.
- The AV cost in association with a double in the number of translation booths provided
- Most of the entertainment allocated under registration
- Hotel cancelation fees will change the way we arrange future hotel contracts. We've also historically had problems with how US members book their hotel rooms but adding the \$50.00 last minute cancelation fee has helped to dissipate that.
 - Hilton we have not received any claim pursuing their initial assertion.
- Our interaction with the PR firm provided us with the most positive press relationship we've had. Our contract is till end of December 2009 and a follow up with firm is being arranged.

Event

- There were 6,000 attendees that came from 65 different countries with more international members in attendance that Americans. To date this was the most diverse convention.
- 5,500 full registrations which included 167 Newcomer badges and this overshadows Atlanta in registration per attendee.
- We received a lot of positive comments regarding the NA Cruise, everyone had a great time. Believe our long standing working relationship with the travel agency worked very well. If practical the cruise will be something we will look at having at a future convention. There were also a few complaints from the members who made arrangements via the cruise line regarding not receive supplementary gifts. This is because they made their arrangements with the actual cruise line itself.
 - Next NA cruise may be at WCNA 34, San Diego.

Merchandise

Merchandise that never arrived is reflected on the invoice. If we had received all the merchandise as ordered, we would have been at the budgeted amount. The problem became that the vendor never communicated his inability keep his fulfillment.

- Items were produced and created to the standards of Europe.
- The calendar is only item that will be made available via the online shopping cart

Decision the board will send staff any ideas for changes and improvements for how things are performed for WB.

Decision Reminder: board decided to the plan future WCNA events as sell out which means procuring space for the number of badge only registrants and accommodate attendees without badges only if space allows.

WCNA Tabled Issue a future meeting agenda will allocate time to discuss World Board ethics, behavior and commitment when traveling as WS traveler.

WCNA 34 Theme Ideas

Brainstorming of WCNA 34 theme ideas

- Journey Continues
- Decades Clean
- Personal recovery depends on NA unity
- Unity = Recovery
- Stepping into freedom
- Winds of change
- A new way of life
- Together in gratitude
- Message of recovery
- Atmosphere of recovery
- Spirit of unity
- Keep coming back
- ◆ We do recover
- Recovery works
- Mary will send Eileen her list of ideas

Decision A theme list will be created and the board agreed to choose two.

Financial Update

Anthony provided a financial update, first stating that a July-August 2009 financial report draft will be sent by staff via email as soon as it's ready.

• Biggest concern coming into this financial cycle was the uncertainly of an economic

downturn starting to show itself. NAWS Daily operating expenses are \$28,662 and in spite of cutting expenses wherever possible, it still higher than income. Making it necessary to continue utilizing reserves, currently there are 35 days of operating reserves. Our goal is to obviously reinvest and build this back up.

• 22 WS participation requests have been received in a 90-day period that will need planning and funding.

Staff Resources

• There are currently 5 vacant positions. The only position looking to be filled is the Event Manager position. This will however be held off till the new calendar year.

Action: The org chart will be provided to the World Board -

Approve June Minutes

Clarify EC minutes to reflect that Michael Cox will not be attending the June World Board meeting.

World Board June 2009 Minutes approved as presented

Overview of new items produced

Production update provided; redesigned Just for Today gift edition cover.

Action Item List

Two project ideas received. Due to the agenda focus on conference, the project ideas will be reviewed in time for the next conference call and presented later for the board.

Legal and Audit Update

The audit is complete which means within the next 6 weeks a meeting will be scheduled. The World Board will receive the audit electronically.

Miscellaneous Decisions

- Craig is the bulletin board moderator till the next world board meeting.
- Small groups Ground Rules / World Board value reminder to the board.
- All necessary Talking Points will be ready for travelers by November 1st
- World Board meetings for the next cycle –

??? New Board Orientation

28 July Executive Committee

29-31 July World Board

18 October Executive Committee

19-23 October World Board

19 January Executive Committee

20-22 January World Board

16 March Executive Committee

17-19 March World Board

1 April 2011 Approved Draft Living Clean

15 June Executive Committee

16-18 June World Board

1 August 2011 Regional Motion Deadline

1-4 September WCNA 34 San Diego, California

18 October Executive Committee

19-22 October World Board

20 January 2012 CAT Material

14 March Executive Committee

開催的時代では、シンドスを対象のませれ

15-17 March World Board

21-28 World Service Conference

World Board Travel

There are 3 events in December 2009 on the same weekend; therefore, EC will mix and match travelers based on availability. World Board will let the staff know travel availability.

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