

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
13-16 January 2010

MAR 20 2010

BY 

Wednesday 13 January

World Board: Antonia (Tonia) Nikolinakou, Arne Hassel-Gren, 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 (Mukam) Harzenski-Deutsch, and Tom McCall

Staff: Anthony Edmondson, Becky Meyer and Eileen Perez. Additional staff joining the board for specific discussions throughout the board meeting: Jane Nickels, Travis Koplrow, Steve Rusch, Chris Corning and Nick Elson.

The World Board began their meeting with a session that allocated time for them to catch up with each other.

Financial Update

Proposed budget for fiscal years presented.

- Every year several major customers wait to purchase literature; these customers target a specific time frame in order to obtain additional discounts and this accounts for figures which reflect being under projected budget amount. There has also been a decline in purchases from customers like the State of California and Hazelden this year. However in keeping with the past purchasing pattern, we expect literature orders to rise in January and February.
- This is the second year there has been a decline in regional contributions; but there has been an increase in both the number and amount of group donations. We believe the *NA Way* article campaign has had some impact in direct contributions from groups and the Business Plan (BP) workgroup talked about rekindling contribution articles in the *NA Way* magazine.
- The 2008 WSC cost \$518,000.

Acceptance of the 2008-2009 Audit

On Friday, Jan 8, 2010 Audit Committee Members (Susan Chess, Bob McDonough and Khalil Johnson) met with Auditors and were presented with the 2009 draft Audit.

- As a result of this interface, there will be changes as well as a recommendation regarding rotation of Auditing partners for the next audit.
- Auditors will always make sure that observations are duly noted in confidential report to the corporation and its officers. Audit entries reviewed.
- Accounts receivable note: Auditors always recommend the elimination of certain entries pertaining to carrying balances forward for as long as 2 to 3 years. However, NAWS operates under the premise of expecting communities to pay their debt – therefore in that sense of this accounting practice, we do not conform.

Decision: It was the decision of the World Board to adopt the 2009 Audit as presented and for its inclusion in the *Annual Report*.

Canadian Corporate Resolution

2010 Canada Intellectual Property Trust Resolutions presented and reviewed. As the norm for legal purposes, trademarks are routinely registered, listed, and application of those names filed for their use. This is the provincial resolution that authorizes use in Canada.

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
13-16 January 2010

Decision: The World Board adopted the 2010 Canada Intellectual Property Trust.

Approve October 2009 WB Minutes

Correction: language should be "to take at home" *In Times of Illness* section on page 112 of the World Board (WB) book 1. Decision: The October 2009 World Board minutes approved with *In Times of Illness* edit.

Conference cycle travel report correction: staff will reinsert Michael Cox name for the October 2009 and January 2010 World Board meetings.

Budget 2010-2012

The presented draft budget will be discussed on Friday which includes the draft WCNA 34 budget. It is important to remember that the WCNA draft budget is a fluid document before any real plans and costs have been made.

There was an overall discussion about revenue, allocations, cost containment and funding projects.

- There has been an increase in literature income for the budget. Without this, there would be no way to fund the overall projects in budget.
- July 1 2010-June 2011, July 30, 2011-2012 ver. 1; mistakenly omitted WSC expense in budget and then when inserted again; WSC expense was entered in wrong column; however, the cycle total net is the same.

Action: A corrected copy of the budget will be sent to the board.

Decision: It was the decision of the board to approve the draft budget for 2010-2012 for inclusion in the 2010 CAT.

WCNA 34

The draft budget is an initial approach to the upcoming convention. Estimate about 10,000 pre-registrants and about 4,000 onsite registrants. The original plan was to procure space for about 28,000 attendees. Obviously the procured space will change to accommodate the number of registrants and we will reduce costs where possible.

Our message to the fellowship will be: WCNA 34 will be planned with a fixed capacity and seek to produce a limited number of registrations (sell out) for this world convention. If space allows, attendees (on site registrations) will be accommodated but space will not be added to accommodate those who "might" show up. San Diego is drivable for a large number of NA members and a contracted space 'sold out' will not deter from the spontaneous action of members deciding to attend the convention at the last minute. Communications about this registration plan need to begin early.

The first world convention held in San Diego had an excellent turn-out; proprietors are willing to make certain adjustments to have NA members back in their area. The board continued to talk about penalties to release space if not needed, how producing a limited number of registrations would be ideal for event planning and many other regions are doing this, and reporting to the fellowship. Other questions regarding the difference in AV costs on and offsite expenses were asked.

Some discussion regarding an Event Manager for San Diego, plan is to outsource a portion of the event.

Decision: to accept the presented WCNA 34 draft budget on its initial changes.

Action Item List

Not undertaken at the January World Board meeting.

Emergency Action Plan

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
13-16 January 2010

The Emergency Action Plan was created in 1996 as a foundation for an approach to meet a financial crisis. This is the board's plan and needs to be treated as a confidential document. The board discussed implementing plan phases, if necessary, and about other ways to continue to reduce costs.

The fellowship will be informed regarding plan, financial status and that we are currently in phase 1 of this plan.

Action: an update to this plan will be developed and presented to the board at the March 2010 meeting. A talking point will be created regarding action plan.

Strategic Plan 2010-2012 and Project Plans

The first 14 pages is the Strategic Plan, starting page 15 is the *Status of Projects Adopted for 2008-2010 cycle*, followed by the actual project plans.

World Board Input:

- Suggest creating a bulleted view of purple and yellow items, possibly a paragraph for each of the six projects - a simplified cheat sheet right after page 17.
- Page 19, New Approach for 2010-2012 (U): *Create self support session profiles and tools to aid local communities in their understating of self-support. As part of this, introduce and discuss the two new pamphlets on self-support being presented to WSC 2010 for adoption.*

Suggest IDTs be pushed back until later in the cycle. This is a cycle with too many issues and not enough time. The items that fall out of the conference need to be addressed first; further in the cycle (September) we can delve into the IDTs. IDTs will be discussed again, yet these do not have to be finalized.

- An IDT release idea is to utilize the convention as a spring board.

Decision: 2010-2012 Strategic Plan and Project Plans draft approved for inclusion in the 2010 CAT as amended by the WB.

CAT Cover Memo and Motions

CAT cover speaks to proposing changes to *A Guide to World Services in NA* (GWSNA) existing policy by removing details for *NA Way* and World Convention Support Committee, addresses list of motions (cheat sheet) and developing motions for both the *NA Way* automatic distribution cessation and WCNA support committee to workgroup change; intent for these motions will be included.

The board has been talking about *The NA Way* publication for some time, e.g. automatic distribution processes and finding ways to reduce mailing expenses. The desire has always been to create and have a communication strategy, not be bound with policy that isn't working. Flexibility to try different approaches, something that works will be asked of the conference. Fellowship will be asked for input and this was all covered in the 2010 *CAR*.

WCNA Local Support Committee wording is carry-over language from the old system that isn't a reality nor implemented as written currently. Current written policy has a built in conflict with what is put into practice. The desire is to have a workgroup accountable and selected by the board, resources could be from local community as well as from outside the local region, creating a greater resource for a successful event. Many of the ideas in this model were tried in Spain and it was found to have worked much better.

Some board members also shared having less than positive experiences with WCNA Support Committees e.g. contention within region, inability to be involved because they are not from hosting

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
13-16 January 2010

region (example Texas), and inexperienced members from local support committees. Full board was in agreement with proposed changes for *NA Way* and *WCNA*.

Contained within the budget narrative, there are a couple sentences informing the fellowship of ways *NAWS* continues to lower expenses. Executive Committee (EC) recommends *NAWS News* contain this same information.

Decision: no objection to the presented 011310 draft CAT cover. CAT will be sold for \$10.00; and material can be downloaded for free. The CAT scheduled to go out January 26th, 2010.

WSC Seating Cover Memo & Seating Recommendations

The board reviewed cover memo and recommendations. Challenge was to capture what was said succinctly, policy recommendations, followed by actual community profiles.

WSC 2008 resoundingly supported the World Board reinstating the old policy that concerns bringing regions recommended for seating to the conference before the conference votes on the WSC seating motions.

- Malta; remove the exclamation point (!) after *Not Yet*.
- Malta; change the language to say "we are not recommending that Malta be considered for seating at WSC 2010."

Decision: no changes to WSC Seating Cover memo and recommendations aside from the two bullets points above.

Basic H&I Guide & PR Basics Discussion and approval

Basic H&I Guide piece has been around and posted to the internet for some time, but because it predates any formal approval track (CAT, Board Approval); this resource has never been through a formal review. No philosophical changes were made to the H&I Basics piece, it is simply an update.

PR Basics is a newer tool and the narrative is taken from the *PR Handbook*. This would replace the current PI Basics. Our hope is that this is the first of many tools for PR in this format. Recently, PR Basics draft was presented at Washington/N. Idaho Learning Day and Western Services Learning Days; members were asked for input. Everyone very pleased, providing favorable comments and appreciation.

Thought is to send material to delegates in draft form providing an input opportunity before publishing. *NAWS* will report material being sent out for 90 days as a courtesy FYI to delegates. Entities most familiar with these service materials are not usually delegates and intended for service bodies. But because we do not have reliable service committee contact information, it is the hope delegates forward to the service committees. This material would not be published in final form until after the conference.

If these resource pieces mailed with the CAT, this may create an expectation that something must be done with material. This may also initiate setting a precedent that a 90 (courtesy) review will be done for other material too. Therefore everyone agreed to mail with *NAWS News* rather than the CAT to eliminate confusion. A separate cover with background information will be developed.

Decision: The drafts of the Basic H&I Guide and PR Basics will be included with the February *NAWS News*; drafts will have a separate cover that provides background information as well as stating that the World Board wants to provide the opportunity to review and input.

Regional Report template

The board reviewed and made changes while going through document.

- Agreement to change questions throughout document asking for descriptions. For example the

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
13-16 January 2010

question "what can you share about your workshop efforts?" can say "please describe your workshop efforts".

- Agreement to change title for section 'Donations and Literature' to 'Contribution and Literature'
- Agreement that form should include a question about regional contributions. Delegates should know this answer and if they don't it will prompt the question.

The board reflected upon the motion that was passed regarding funding all seated regions to the conference. There was a desire to create an equal participation 'playing field' as well as trust that regional contributions would increase. Rather, regions are funding travel to multiple zonal forums, worldwide workshops, etc. with minimal contributions to NAWS. This prompted the following input:

- Ask for a yearly donation to assist funding their local delegate to the Conference.
- Agreement to include a question in the template asking what's being done within region to raise contributions, or what is contributed? This is a good way to enhance the awareness of service provision as a whole.
- As a way to gather information, a Business Plan member suggested contacting groups who have increased contributions to NAWS and ask why they've started to contribute to NAWS.
- In the future create Group level display material.
- In the future an analysis will be done to assist with knowing what questions are helpful.

Decision: changes will be made to document when modifications occur and the regional report will be mailed and online.

Thursday 14 January

Service System and WSC Seating

Today's Service System (SS) session is a project status update. More detailed discussions will continue in a joint session with the workgroup facilitated by Jim DeLizia on Saturday. There is a great deal of information to summarize on SS work done since October 2009 meeting; the World Board will be brought up to speed with workgroup ideas. No decisions are necessary today.

Travis began recapping points from the January 2010 Service System workgroup report: In November the workgroup worked on models using the WB's October input; two models were removed because they were not in line with those discussions and it wasn't sensible to work on a model that most likely wasn't going to be considered.

Agreement: once the function for each unit/body is resolved those types of decision (details) will be worked out in the actual diagram.

The *Structural Options for a Redesigned Service System* outlines four significant drivers for all the presented models.

1. Purpose-driven
2. Group focused
3. Defined by geopolitical boundaries (as much as possible)
4. Flexibility

Comment regarding considering geopolitical boundaries and how intermediate bodies can be formed

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
13-16 January 2010

due to language needs a permission or acknowledgment that there are different needs within a specific language group. NA communities are at various points of development and community needs; therefore, options need to include room for different structures, different systems.

Group Support Unit (GSU)

One of the most significant changes is the group support unit with its focus being group support, helping to fulfill primary purpose of carrying the message to addicts. Workgroup's idea of a GSU is that this should be empty of all other focus and discussion will be around group issues, basically administrative work and training ground. If the GSU is not a decision making body, there is some concern about accountability to another body. There is a differing thought regarding the group support unit and its functions.

World Board input:

- A core structure is needed at the base level to have the link.
- Still need clarity – should the GSU be like a neighborhood type meeting or be structured.
- Proposed Model 4: has anyone considered whether the entity that does service can be connected; two entities: LSU local support unit and the GSU one of them is connect to the next level of service and the other is not.

Caution regarding unintended consequences; seems we are considering and discussing with the GSU a division and crystallization (segregation).

Local Service Unit (LSU)

LSU defined by county boundaries and like our current ASC the difference is the logical boundary and this entity is a project driven structure rather than committee service structure; more sophisticated and accountable with regard to interfacing with institutions and would expect far more from this plan driven body. There is a fair amount of public relations work; hopefully, a structure where all the different demographics would come together. A big part of the planning is the environmental scan. This would help this body to look and see what's going on and try to address.

For example New York City; is too large and would have more than one LSU because of density.

- Point made regarding the LSU being ideal for teaching, training, interacting, socializing; basically teaching and learning how to 'play in the sandbox' with each other.

Intermediate Body

The reason for the creation of an Intermediate body would be distance, it's a body based on needs with a lot of flexibility. Intermediate body could coordinate or provide services and function as a forum for communication in certain situations. This body could be formed or dissolved, is determined on a state or country level and focus depends on the reason it was created. This is not a new idea and could be compared to a Metro, the difference is the ability to integrate into the decision making process.

Geopolitical Unit

Consist of one or more countries, states, or provinces. Unit could send delegates to the global body. Rather than have a committee structure this body coordinates and plans service provision through projects addressing a prioritized need. This is more of a training body, possibly a high degree of planning here; more seasoned service members are involved. Geopolitical Unit could also assist LSUs providing centralized resources, service office or website.

Zone

The purpose of the zones (or "delegate meetings" as one member suggested they be called) vary

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
13-16 January 2010

from model to model as well as within the model themselves. Some zones have limited service delivery tasks including translations, fellowship development, and workshops. If zones have a participation role at the WSC, it may be that their composition is defined by the conference rather than leaving it up to Geopolitical Unit.

Global

Changes to the makeup of the conference body including changes to the seating policies are beyond the purview of the SS workgroup.

WSC Diagram Models 1-4

Travis recapped each individual model. The board then started talking about how different models can be mixed and matched to make a better system. Once the structure fundamentals are grasped then it would be safe to say that the other components are flexible and that the only portions not flexible are the basic principles outlined in numbers 1-4. The current system is ill-equipped for socialization, working together, oversight, planning, etc., and see the one crystallization as the GSU models closing that gap.

No matter which is selected it must all work together, have the conceptual capacity. It's important that everyone understand what is currently written in our *Guide to World Services* in order to compare that to what actually works.

WSC Model 1 freezes all current seating, except for seating whole countries in the future. Ideally the US would decrease but that would be an ideal. There would be a need to think more clearly for additional seating criteria, for example, would all be reviewed on the same criteria or would it be modified based on individual location. This is a Transition Group carry over model.

WSC Model 2 closely links up with the first two service system models and is more prescribed. This model has seating by state but some larger states could have 2 representatives; non US regions would be seated by countries, although no one is clear on what that specifically entails. The ability to have more than one representative would be decided by the conference. This is a Transition Group carry over model.

WSC Model 3 has one representative per 1000 meetings from each zone and has zonal representation at the conference. Delegates would be chosen by the zone or geopolitical entity rather than by attending regions. Goal is to establish the number of delegates by meeting in a way that serves both the zone and the WSC, ensuring size of WSC increases slowly.

WSC Model 4 allows representatives to be existing delegate representatives within the zone. The conference body is made up of a mix of regional and zonal delegates. All selected by zone to create mix. Conference establishes a number of delegates from each zone based on some density criteria and also makes allowances for those who don't belong to a zone.

- Philosophical agreement regarding delegate purpose at the WSC and why a delegate brought to the WSC will help deciding which model is best. The other presumed issue is that people believe that what is done now does not work
 - WSC seating issue is separate from the purpose of the WSC.
- May want to develop a statement regarding what is not desired and be clear about that so there's no misunderstanding
- Don't want to emulate the AA decision making structure.
- Seating criteria will need to be thought about in detail, for example, have a standard and a modified version for a country like Angola.
- Create a phasing in process, for example, starting with one model and phasing into another

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
13-16 January 2010

model.

- WSC model 4 seems more flexible and a probable model, maintains the sense of connection and the most important thing about that model is that allows both entities to change and grow without over populating the WSC. However, there will also be a type of unfairness to another country.

The board encouraged to evaluate systems with items listed under *Ideas about Means Testing* making sure whatever model is selected fits. After lunch World Board will continue discussing options presented.

Service System will talk about operating ideals in their meeting on Sunday and Monday – the board encouraged to send staff input.

WSC Models - Hybrids

The board was led through a discussion to introduce any new models or hybrids of the presented models, which was followed by a straw poll to remove any of the WSC models 1-4 for consideration. After the straw poll, the board will look at strengths and weaknesses for models still being considered.

- Model 2; would be helpful to add multi state regions and multi delegate (New England idea). Which means two delegates for one country, this then begs the question about how to handle Canada, México and Brazil. Does the multi delegate, multi state constitute another box with two lines coming out of it for the WSC?
- WSC model 1 criteria: doesn't like the geopolitical structure having such a large impact. Suggests removing criteria for (all) models that freezes one and not the other; otherwise, at some point there will be countries that will be like the US. Have to be careful about what we select.
- Would like to see a hybrid between model 3 and 4, likes 4 but doesn't want the WSC to have to debate who will attend every conference cycle. Believes the 1000 number coming from zone reflects the density.

Straw Poll: to remove WSC models

WSC Model 1	9 World Board members	voted as liking the least or to remove
WSC Model 2	12 World Board members	voted as liking the least or to remove
WSC Model 3	11 World Board members	voted as liking the least or to remove
WSC Model 4	3 World Board members	voted as liking the least or to remove

Following the straw poll, the board focused on ideas to be developed further for WSC; viable options and ideas to be developed on models for WSC presentation. Additional discussion on models ensued.

- Some want to see a regional based WSC, one wants zonal representation, and the numeric model isn't how we want to describe what we want. Although murky, there is some geopolitical representation.
- Wonder if it's premature to start talking about zonal representation as in Model 4. Think it's a bit complex and chaotic.
- Voted to remove 1; sees this as a conference dominated by US business and US delegates. Don't believe we all want a WSC dominated by the US delegates and issues, with a few invited guests. Seems difficult to make a good decision grounded in principle without talking about that first or prep work for WSC representation ideals.

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
13-16 January 2010

- The US accounts for over 70% of the fellowship so it makes sense that there should be more US related issues. At the same time that is an issue within itself, yet we pay very little attention to US other than zonal forums attendance.
- Believe we need to pick one model and/or create a model that accommodates as many variances as possible.
- Hesitant to remove models and just be in favor for a structure that is very much like our current regional structure. Concerned we are choosing to mandate support of a structure that is not going to be an efficient structure for the type of work needed.
- There is something to be said for geopolitical unit, something to be said for what a region ought to look like as well as a zone. However struggling with models not defining certain details and until such details worked on doesn't matter what model selected. Would like to know how a community grows up in each locations, what does it mean and what does it look like? Details needed.
- Seeing what goes on at the APF not sure they want a good portion of their business to include WSC issues because presented models would essentially asks they become involved. Wouldn't be in agreement with including this type of business at zonal forums.

Strength and weakness of each model

To help focus discussion, for the next hour all agreed to brainstorm models pros and cons for 15 minutes each. However, before moving to strengths and weaknesses there was more discussion about the models.

- The challenge becomes ideally wanting to see model 4 in future but being a realist knows what this will take. We have to be prepared to articulate the future of our service structure because it is not as simple as a particular model being preferable.
- We are a volunteer organization and we have to make the most efficient use of what we have. More use can possibly be made of zones and everyone does not have to be at the conference. Believes if we can show the conference what we are thinking, we can also help them.
- Thoughts about zones:
 - Many references made to zones but it is really regions. And originally foresaw zones being one way of putting a cap on growth.
 - Envision zones being a reformatted entity, and being a real benefit and value in doing that. Not talking about zones as they presently are.
 - Seems we are talking about 2 different things in model 4; one is zonal representation at the WSC which would involve changes to zone function and focus, the other is regional representation whereby the number of regional delegate is proportion to each zone.
- Given CAT motion regarding a moratorium on WSC seating, Model 1 is what we do now and a hybrid would be countries which don't affect anyone, what we do at the conference will have an affect to everyone. We are also saying that the geopolitical unit will help carry the message.

Model 2 depicts US regions by state. We could add zones to models; we don't want to collapse what functions in some countries. We could add something for developing zones. Sees a mix between model 2 and model 4 and whatever model is created, those reps/delegates go to the conference as well.

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
13-16 January 2010

Having exhausted discussion, everyone moved forward with a brainstorming session (pros and cons) for each model with a set time limit for models - 15 minutes dedicated to each.

- Could eliminate regional proliferation of US regions, which assumes the energy of a region is to become seated.
- Culture already there – it's familiar.
- Simple and good.
- Partially interfaces with service system models.
- Measurable funding.
- Forces creativity.
- Helps communication flow because there is no new level.
- Easily adaptable for improvement and evolution.
- Probably no harm if this model kept for the future.

Model 1 Cons

- Expensive
- Continues representation of non geopolitical entities (contrary to work being developed by Service System). If this accepted, it puts Service System in a box. – disconnect. And if we go with this assumption, it completely erases most of all the pros.
- Potential to become cost prohibitive.
- Logistical size – large.

- Same pros as model 1, e.g.
 - Could eliminate regional proliferation of US regions, which assumes the energy of a region is to become seated.
 - Culture already there – it's familiar.
 - Simple and good.
 - Partially interfaces with service system models.
 - Measurable funding.
 - Forces creativity.
 - Helps communication flow because there is no new level.
 - Easily adaptable for improvement and evolution.
 - Probably no harm if this model kept for the future.
- Support Service System change to goals.
- Supports regional unification in the US.

Decision: everyone in agreement with inserting Geopolitical Unit (GPU) in all little boxes in each model—later to be defined.

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
13-16 January 2010

- Trying to minimize the layers between the group and the conference.
- Logical criteria to seating
- Degree of decision making is far less.

Model 2 Cons

- Dilute an effective conscience some experience lost.
- We are assuming the groups that serve will be open to the huge culture change – we have no information from those we serve.
- No mechanism to control growth of the conference – eventually we end up where we are now.
- Geopolitical driven.

- Kill 3
- Reduces the number of delegates.
- Zonal Forum reignited and empowers.
- Establishes a seemingly objective standard for seating.
- Concept of proportionality.

Model 3 Cons

- Complicated and inflexible.
- Numeric is in conflict with our Concepts.
- Relies on undefined service entities.
- Another layer of service and complicates fund flow.
- Increase the number of US delegates.

- Flexible
- Allow the number of delegates to be decided.
- WSC expense containment.
- Allows for long term adaptability.
- Zonal forums recognized and empowered.
- Rotation of regions in zone.
- Allows for non regional delegate participation at the conference.
- Allows for regional representation – connects people sense of fellowship.
- It forces the issue of conference to think about who is sent to the WSC it's not a representative process maybe from the discussion – forces the issue of delegation versus representation.

Model 4 Cons

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
13-16 January 2010

- Complicated
- Relies on undefined service entities.
- Adding 2nd layer of service.
- Lack of clarity with model – zone, GPU
- Complicates the fund flow.
- Could possibly promote zonal splits.
- Creates an ongoing requirement to do a type of number evaluation process – constantly re-evaluate criteria.
- Changes the nature of zones from 2010 focus.
- Weakness – zone elects.
- 2 various representatives – regional and zonal.
- Potential for US conference – attention, layers, communication.
- Human Resources drain.
- Stimulus conference – could or could not be a negative effect.

Living Clean Update

Chapter on *Our Physical Selves* has been signed off for fellowship R&I. Next for board review and sign off are *Living Spiritually* and *Relationships*.

January 2010 Living Clean (LC) report to the World Board handed out. Online discussion extremely helpful for the chapter and hopes this type of input continues. Discussion showed that people had the experiences to share. Added was that the writer is very good at synthesizing information. World Board Input:

- Book direction is great.
- Title for the first chapter seems too long; wonders about changing to *Living Clean* and the last chapter to *The Journey Continues*.
- Suggestion to add an index; book contains a lot of material and believe it will be used daily by many.
- An individual board member will send staff input regarding input on LC book being a vision, a story of recovery. Hopes book reflects wonders of being a part of something very special in recovery.
- Two (2) board members think content of material is excellent; in their view problem is material how constructed or the form. Feels like a bunch of generic experiences is being read and something about that loses connection with individual story. Also believe everything we write doesn't have to be written in 8th/9th grade reading level. It should be more sophisticated.
- Would really like to see this book be a best seller and thinks a balance between using chapter headings and getting too cute is necessary; can use quotes, vignettes, we can make this interesting to read. Also agrees with input regarding the form.

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
13-16 January 2010

- Would love to have humor in book because recovery is funny.
 - Offered title *life on life terms*.
 - Asks that workgroup provide a chapter outline

In March staff will provide the board with an updated schedule and chapters outline (Action).

The board reaffirmed tone and style are to be consistent with original instructions.

Friday 15 January

WSC Week – Begin to frame the week of the conference

Dialog is to focus on topics, World Board forums, and any other conference detail. The particulars will be finalized by the EC and staff.

Jim B walked the board through the week, pointing out World Board open forums.

- The EC will meet to discuss any amendments, develop recommendations and feed back to World Board as a whole. If it's thought a meeting is necessary at the conference, board can meet as a group in a suite.
- The Saturday World Board Open forum will be the same and open for anyone to attend.
- Monday: HRP is after lunch; would it be helpful to change with FD which would allow everyone to be more focused. Jim responded that many have asked that the WSC begin with FD.
- Tuesday World Board forum will be different; more of an interface with conference participants. Change is that the board will not sit in forum to discuss motions. Will ask participants to place their numbers in a box if they want to ask questions (keeps the interaction).
 - This year trying to accomplish reporting, forums, etc in a fraction of the time we would have normally had therefore comments or responses need to be succinct and clear.
- New business motions closes at 6pm on Wednesday. EC will do the same with new business motions; run by the World Board and any discussion beyond that will be offline, trying to take emphasis off motions.
- RD forum will be Thursday.
- Language specific WSC orientation is on Saturday – not currently on the schedule
- Forum set up: many board members do not like the current sitting behind the table set up. Ideas offered
 - Set up like at the convention in Barcelona.
 - Standing tables
 - That whenever appropriate the chair basically assign the World Board member to respond to question, navigating or be the team leader.

World Board asked to point out anything missing or anything they'd like to see added:

- Would like to see more interactive sessions with participants, helping them and gathering information from them.
- The possibility of proposing the removal of mandated zonal reporting brought up.

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
13-16 January 2010

Session Assignment ideas:

- Junior asked to be paired up with Franney for Literature Development
- Pair people up, get topics and let those assigned become familiar with material and session partner.
- Partner board members with RD and use them in sessions.

2010-2012 Discussion Topics

The thought is to focus on *In Times of Illness*, Living Clean, Service System rather than creating another issue discussion. Everyone is in agreement to not add IDTs at this time because it would not be beneficial.

Building Strong Home groups is still the most requested topic.

After lunch the board reconvened at the Marriott to discussion the future of the board leadership, conduct, etc.

Saturday 16 January Discussion Notes

Present for the facilitated session with Jim DeLizia: World Board, Service System Workgroup and Staff members; Travis, Nick, Chris, Shane, Steve R, Steve L, Anthony, Becky and Eileen.

Today's session is to finalize concepts of both structural and seating models; we'll also talk about transition strategies and engaging WSC. Challenges will be to not get mired in details, but remember principles. By the end of the day all upcoming work for project should be outlined.

- Everyone in agreement to have Local Service Units (LSU) also be geopolitical.
- Principles 1-4 as outlines necessary and important when considering models
 - Purpose-driven
 - Group focused
 - Defined by geopolitical boundaries (as much as possible)
 - Flexibility
- Design criteria critical for how models designed
- Variables (handout with agenda) must accommodate – good for means testing

As far as structural models 1-4 on wall for structural form for WSC seating options, other service system models, structural models for seating options (opposite wall) everyone referred to model handout.

Do models fall in line with service system models 1-4?

- Everyone agreed with changing 1 box geopolitical entity that says geopolitical unit prescribed not self defined changed to state that GPU defined by conference and can evolve as factors change, criteria or factors to be established decision making process to be determined.
- All boxes that say "currently seated regions" will be changed to Geopolitical Unit in all models.

Focus of zone: how they would work for models 2 and 3

- Sharing session

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
13-16 January 2010

- Elect delegates to the conference outcome becomes manageable.
- Fellowship Development, training function
- Issue discussion function (prepare, delegate, etc. scanning / planning)
- NAWS interface (part of NAWS planning proves, part of our interface)

Distinction between regional and zonal delegate, WSC piece page 28 what said in option 4 read. "What does this mean?" World Board discussion followed.

- Number of delegates can be effectively managed by conscience choice (conference sets number of delegates to be sent to conference, number of GPU in the zone).
- Name or term zone should be different because zone as it is currently understood as event.
- Concern expressed with zones becoming a political body
 - Zones as defined in models means Multilevel Service (MLS).

A few comments made about some of the mechanical differences between zonal delegate elections and regional delegates, what hat is being worn?

- Constituent models, geography could be a criteria, however caution must be used when using the word 'representation' – could take you to into a linguistic hocus pocus - huge implications for model. As of right now it could something that is transitioned to.
- Model 4 seems to disrupt connection, a two part conference and making it work may be a challenge.
- We give much importance to "world" level and being at that level. We need to place more importance on the lower/beginning levels of service. Size does not always equal effectiveness or quality.
- Distinction between two: create two different models.
 - Option 4a – zonal delegates

Alternates

- Purpose of alternate within the current system
- Value of alternate at the World Service Conference-what are some of the disadvantages of having alternates at the conference
- Can the value of having alternates at the conference be addressed in other more efficient and effective ways?
- Are there other more valuable roles alternates can play within the service system?
- Do these require attendance at the World Service Conference

Alternate Current Purpose:

- Serve with another (support, team, same language)
- Learn and training
- Continuity in representation and increase conference experience
- Inspiration (personally and to share with one another)
- Regional Delegate back up

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
13-16 January 2010

- Different perspective
- Split workload

Value of an Alternate

- Resource
- Training and support for Delegate
- More voices, perspective, report
- Benefit to fellowship

Disadvantages of an Alternate

- The value is received based on ability – inequitable
- Additional funds used
- Conference size less manageable
- Not active participant in formal sessions
- Confused accountability
- Length of service commitment
- Takes away from the Delegate when having to support/train Alternate-focus distraction
- No interaction with other participants, insular, myopic
- Limits stepping into leadership role
- Are they really being trained, acclimated, etc?

Can value be met otherwise?

- Technology
- Better information system (input, communication process)
- Refine tools to help with reporting

Are there more valuable roles for an Alternate?

- Share Regional Delegate burden of facilitations (Alternates take on duties of planning, separate functions and roles)
- Connection to the Local Service Unit (LSU)
- Service as mentor in Service System (leadership development)
- Improve communication

Inherently we resolve Alternate in World Service Conference model 3 and 4 which includes then in other things (more of a prescription in 3 and 4). Everyone agreed that Alternates would not be included at the World Service Conference in models 3 and 4.

Model 3 Option 2:

Dotted line means outside the decision making flow.

GPU: reunify those distinctions and provide services.

- External relationship needs limit growth, reunification of neighboring communities

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
13-16 January 2010

- The WSC delegation role of the GPU can be implemented in conjunction with other GPU's. (part of flexibility, defining in GPU seating option 2)
- Service functions fall through the cracks – coordination
- State province or country with all the adaptations needed – in most circumstances stability role
- Needs will be met by nearest Local Service Unit (LSU) or Geopolitical Unit (GPU) depending on need

Zone Redefined (losing the word “zone”)

- Delegation role
- Additional grouping of GPU that come together to coordinate and perform services as needed
- Approval process by the conference

Discussing and reevaluating where we are and what the board wants the Service System workgroup to discuss during their meeting this weekend:

1. World service presentation material to send out in advance, what happens at the conference
2. Selecting two fundamental models and flushing out each one
3. Change the word 'zone'
4. More discussion about zones and what they should be in order to be effective

Session ended at 5:00pm.