Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
21-23 October 2010

Thursday 21 October

Corporate Responsibilities

World Board: Antonia Nikolinakou, Arne Hassel-Gren, Franney Jardine, Jim Buerer, Inigo Calonje Unceta, Mark Hersh, Mary Banner, Odilson Gomes Braz Junior, Paul Craig, Piet de Boer, Ron Blake, Ron Hofius, Ron Miller, Sharon Harzenski-Deutsch, and Tom McCall

Staff: Becky Meyer, Anthony Edmondson and Eileen Perez

World Board Sharing Session

World Board Sharing Session opened their meeting and continued through the first part of the morning.

Financial Overview of NA World Services

An overview of the last fiscal year and NAWS current financials were provided to the board

Balance Sheet Overview

- Operating days have increased but this is not an indicator of our overall financial health. Accounts receivable balance is high; inventory is $1.2M and it is forecasted that we will remain static through the first quarter of next year. 2011 January – February will tell if we've turned a financial corner or not.

- Doubtful accounts explained. NAWS ratio is 14.44, anything over 1 is good.

- NAWS is still between levels 2 and 3 of the Emergency Action Plan.

- The board had a brief discussion about regional offices; they are also experiencing the same financial downturn and reduction in sales.

- Dependency of literature sold to treatment/state corrections and PR were discussed. New business is always being sought in the Professional Relations (PR) arena and right now the target is Veterans Administration (VA). NAWS' technique has to adapt to the ever changing reality.

- In December the Business Plan group (BPG) will be asked to evaluate the 5% price increase that was put in abeyance.

- The next budget will be based on 0% growth and will be predicated on the lowest number ever proposed. Under normal circumstances, we should expect to grow.

- Currently we are running under budget for contributions by $70K. Member contributions are rising, but not enough to make a difference. The more we propagate *investing in the vision* it is believed members will rise up to the occasion.

  A few board members shared their home group contribution practices. Another point made regarding addressing the fellowship's fear about money, e.g. prudent reserve practice tends to illustrate their money fears. Possibly develop something as simple as a world goal and a local goal.

- There has been no progress to date with finding permissible financial transfer methods from Iran to the United States.

March 2011 Meeting

Chair opened this discussion by recapping the Executive Committee's (EC) discussions regarding the

proposed idea of canceling a meeting of the board as well as finding alternative ways to have issues discussed. A single board meetings costs $40K. There isn't anything in March that needs to be accomplished at that specific meeting; board would need to reshuffle agenda items to either January or June agendas.

The floor opened for discussion

Yes to canceling the March 2011 meeting

- Agree, there are issues that need to be addressed and there's not enough time; however, suggests talking about one issue via email or webinar as an experiment before we say it's not possible.

- Add a day to 3 day meetings and have the 4th day be topic specific

No to canceling March 2011 meeting

- Board internal development and several other issues have not been addressed by the board and canceling a meeting would further exacerbate this.

- Possibly extend other meetings to fit in more time.

Miscellaneous

- There are a couple of people that would only be able to attend a 4 day meeting if the meeting were from Thursday-Sunday.

Non binding straw poll taken: no consensus

Discussion continues

A consensus was not reached; therefore, the board will proceed with having the March 2011 meeting.

In lieu of time, the board agreed to continue this discussion again later.

WCNA 34

Originally, meeting management for this event was going to be outsourced to Conference Direct, but have since realized that this work still had to be done by Executive Management. Therefore, it was thought to forego Conference Direct for this work and to use members, at a much lower price, and contract with them. Conference Direct is still our housing provider and will have people present at WCNA 34 to prepare for managing much of Philadelphia.

We are also planning a cooperative effort with Nar-Anon as we have done in the past.

Registration

- San Diego information preparing for the registration flyer is up on the web.

- Formula for newcomer registration is: donation versus registration cost and that equals the amount of newcomer registration packages available.

- Raise issue of registration required (Australia's wording). Maybe provide an incentive for pre-registration. Biggest change is the inability to enter the convention center without a badge past the entrance point.

- Pre-registration merchandise will be a camp shirt (100%) embroidered t-shirt, print screen t-shirt and a mug. Looking at providing different type of tote bags.

Hotel

- The plan for San Diego is to use up to 8 hotels, about 4000 rooms. Once those rooms are sold, it

is not likely our room block will be increased because those rooms can be sold at a much higher rate.

Program / Entertainment

- Wednesday will be "soft" opening with a speaker meeting at one of the hotels, typically a dance, and a possible dinner cruise for about 500.

- Workshop number will be about the same as we had at the 2003 convention.

- We are reaching out to artists that have some type of tie to NA. Entertainment will be tailored around that because we cannot afford Tier 1 acts (cost $300K-$1M). The primary concert act will be the most expensive cost of the event.

- Marriott is under construction and they are willing to pay for space at the convention center.

- Plan to have a Blues Luncheon Saturday.

- Midnight Dinner cruises with no meeting, perhaps a DJ.

- Plan on having a dance in one of the ballrooms on Wednesday; we would have coffee house on Thursday, Friday festival and comedy show. Saturday is the concert and coffee house. Each night would be a different theme.

- Looking into Sea World or something at Coronado beach Wednesday or Sunday

- Except for a possible Saturday night concert at the Viejas Arena which will cost $40K alone, we will not have shuttle busing; transportation will only be for the physically impaired. This will be a walking convention.

- Details are still being worked out for a cruise after the convention

- Padres are in town the week of the convention and we are looking into tickets for a game. Stadium is directly across the street from convention center.

WCNA Budget

- Working with a budget for a fixed capacity of about 16,000 people. Working budget will be driven by about 13,000 person registrants.

- Working budget information is still being gathered and there was no objection to approving the WCNA 34 budget by email.

Workgroup

- Still soliciting volunteers from surrounding regions for primary workgroup that will be set up some time in February 2011.

  ### Board Discussion:

  o Flyer looks halloweenish

  o Because concerts usually end late would suggest that we try to have concert as close to convention center as possible, if not at the convention center.

  o Newcomer registration; suggest that newcomer distribution be in a different and segregated area,

    ▪ Reexamine newcomer criteria

EC reported on the discussion and recommending Mary and Arne to be assigned to WCNA 34 program. No objection to Mary and Arne assigned to the WCNA 34 program group.

Idea for an external membership survey

Becky and Jane recently attended ISAM; participants at the conference were a mix of government officials and doctors. Their input was that more data is wanted about NA. The president of ISAM suggested allowing a well known doctor in the medical field to conduct a survey. This particular doctor knows nothing about NA and is a very well respected researcher/physician. The current president for the American Society of Addiction Medicine stated that everyone in the medical field knows this doctor and addiction professionals throughout the world read his papers (published studies). The survey results not important; what is important is having the doctor conduct the survey which makes it official in the professional field. The doctor is fascinated with how spirituality plays a part in recovery and that is a survey focus of his.

He has conducted surveys at targeted events, is about 65 years of age and lives on the East Coast. He may prefer to do the survey somewhere close to him. Our involvement would be asking the local fellowship to cooperate with surveyor. Ideally we'd like to have a community that is enthusiastic about survey, well organized, mature, etc.

If approved, NAWS would assist the doctor with the survey at a regional event. This survey would not be lieu of our NAWS survey. The outcome of who owns the survey is not important, what is important is that it's done by the doctor because he is a well known and respected researcher in his field.

Question asked "what kind of reaction is thought we will get from fellowship". Becky responded. There are a lot of details that we don't know yet but a deliberate message on why we think it's important will be vital and it is better to take on realities of why this is important than to do nothing.

No objection to pursing a survey in NA with the doctor and as more information is known it will be provided to the board.

Meet the HRP and have a discussion about an election survey for conference participants. This survey does not have to be finalized on any schedule and this discussion is to help to frame the initial draft that both groups will see before it is distributed.

Election Survey

The HRP met with the World Board to start talking about the development of the election survey for conference participants. This will be a way to capture a general pulse, quantify information and engage in discussions for the future. With data, we can have a discussion on a different level.

The following questions were asked of the board and HRP; the results of this discussion are below:

1. Question to Conference Participants: What would make you feel more secure about the election process for you to elect someone that you don't know?

2. Question to the World Board and HRP: How can we get the necessary information so that we rely on process to elect qualified candidates?

Discussion

- Believes if the board reports that they stand behind the HRPs candidates more candidates will be elected to the board. Be direct and say the names forwarded for election is a slate supported by the board.

- Suggestion to create a slate and provide additional slots; conference participants won't feel locked in.

- Perception - conference participants don't vote because they are not familiar with the candidates and process; they do have enough candidate information. When motions for more candidate information were proposed, those motions were defeated. Conference participants don't know how

4

much time and attention the board spends on the names forwarded. Proposes that the board develop a summary that explains the process used to consider nominees.

- As we are thinking about our survey, we may want to go from community to community and talk to them about their election process. We may be able to understand what can be done to make this work for the conference.

- A point is echoed about CPs not understanding what the board does and what the board needs. Maybe talking more about the board's process and talking about the skills needed on the board is more helpful. Prefers to independently vote for candidates.

- Give examples of how other non profits elect their board.

Questions

- Main misconception is that conference participants don't understand that when they do not vote for someone on the ballot that vote affects the electoral vote. Ask: are you aware that by not checking a box next to a candidate's name you are voting against that candidate?"

- Thinks we can hand out a document to conference participants that have general information about the process and the election survey. Suggests: we ask 'how much is the process trusted' and provide a rating scale, for example, 1-5. Followed by: if you answered 3 or less, describe your reasons and give them a list to check all that apply. This forces a more granular response. Also, add information regarding the board presenting a list of candidates, and ask whether this process is supported. If they do not support this process, provide check boxes to best describe your reasons. Also gave thought to providing a ballot and asking conference participants to check off those they don't have confidence in.

- Ask: why it seems conference participants trust the process a bit more when individuals are nominated by the board.

- How do we best communicate the voting process, who is missing and how to fill those demographics? Ask if they have enough information about the needs of the board, as well as sufficient information about candidates, would that be helpful. Or is the amount of information too much?

- We need to craft questions that allow us to understand how and why they vote the way they do "what are the reasons you wouldn't vote for someone?"

- We need to drill down – did you vote for candidates that you did not know? Did you only vote for candidates that were friends you knew? Do you trust the process? Another question: "would you consider a consensus process where you only vote against people that you don't want to seat?"

- Ask how the CPR's were used. Did you vote for every person you consider qualified? Would fewer choices for candidates be helpful?

- Would like to see a question that asks if there was a way to give accurate candidate information via a secure website sooner than the conference, like sometime in March, would that be helpful and is this wanted by the conference participants. Is there any way to lengthen the process without jeopardizing the access?

Everyone thanked for their participation, reminded that this is a starting point and more will be revealed. The meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Friday 22 October
2010-2012 NAWS Projects

Meeting opened with a moment of silence followed by the serenity prayer. Bob J joined the meeting for Living Clean reporting

Living Clean

Franney recapped the Living Clean October report.

Workgroup has one more meeting to basically wrap everything up. At the last meeting, the writer incorporated changes to draft and all the board's input was factored into the drafts. Chapter 6, 7 and preface are currently out for review. The book draft is as presented on October 12th.

Board discussion recapped. Tom expressed the importance of continuing to talk about this book in the fellowship and there is still a great opportunity to impact now.

1. Title; discuss the issue raised about the book's name

   ▪ Hoped for a more adventurous title, a title with a bit of an edge and a title would have been generated by now. *Living Clean* mirrors the AA book *Living Sober*. Wants a title that provokes people to pick up the book, sparks an interest and speaks to the fellowship.

   ▪ Believe the fellowship should be approached regarding title; maybe have a title competition. It's been reported that this is a working title and of the opinion that the fellowships' thinking is that they would have a say in the title.

   ▪ Likes that the title which is similar to AA's book. But if we need to change, then maybe, just change *Living Clean* portion.

   ▪ Current title has been out in the fellowship and accepted; imagines approaching fellowship now would only confuse them.

Agreement: report in NAWS News and on the bulletin board that not much input has been received about the title. We will continue with the working title of *Living Clean - the Journey Continues.*

Staff - be clear (instructions) on what is wanted with draft (LC) when sent out to the board.

The first 5 Chapters are in the editing process which involves flow, punctuality, grammar. Bob stated the draft copy given to the board is the unedited version. In April, the draft will be sent out to the fellowship in what we hope will be the final form.

2. Discuss current work and plans for sign off of the book

The draft book will be available in January 2011 and the question before the board: would the board prefer to approve the book at the meeting or can the book be approved electronically.

The issue is giving the board enough time to read and comment on the draft plus giving time for the copy editor to factor in comments and polish. It was pointed out that electronically inputting seems to have received more consideration from the board. Reminder: the board needs to approve the book to be sent to the fellowship.

Agreement: To approve the chapters for the approval draft by email. The initial 5 chapters will be provided in January. The revisions to chapters 6, 7, 1, and the preface will not be until March since the workgroup is not meeting until February.

Regional Motions and Committed Motion about CBDM

Ron H recapped information and EC thoughts about the committed motion to not have regional motions or business sessions beyond what is already proposed in the CAT.

We'll need a draft proposal for the fellowship to consider by April 2011. The group will begin developing ideas to be presented to the board for further discussion.

Some of the things discussed were about finding ways for regions to have an effective way to submit ideas, e.g. possibly having local communities doing something first followed by another process at the conference. Maybe the ideas that rose to the top could be added to the strategic plan.

- Asks that other ways that are more inclusive as well as ways to collect input on their ideas, prior to starting something asked for.

No objection to Ron H, Ron B, Paul and Junior being assigned to work on regional motions and committed motion about CBDM.

WB Elections

We've talked about board evaluations and the Executive Committee selection/election process. After some discussion the EC thought to recommend Jim B who is familiar with election process.

The board can send their input directly to Jim B. No objection to assigning Jim to start work on WB Elections and Evaluations.

Service System - Review items in the report

Summary of Workshops

At this point, we are only trying to have brief recaps on the workshops that have taken place. All were different and each had its strength and weaknesses. We have Baltimore and Orlando left and will have a compilation of the input from the workshops as well as a compilation of fellowship input in the future. So far 99% of what we have received is not any different than what has already been discussed.

Changes to Profiles for Baltimore and Orlando (learning as we go)

- ❖ Less time for Set Up (overview of information) for each session
- ❖ More time for Q&A in each session
- ❖ Introduce any workgroup members present
- ❖ Workshops are not a place to debate whether the service system should change or not – it is to help members become clear about the proposals. Also trying to get their involvement after they leave this workshop with local workshops and by providing additional input by any means possible.

Other Issues discussed:

- ❖ Team Facilitation
- ❖ Use all travelers including staff to help facilitate and answer questions. Staff in a less upfront role but still participating and co-facilitation.
- ❖ Use all travelers in front of room for Q&A in each session and end of Saturday and Sunday
- ❖ Assign sessions this weekend for both workshops
- ❖ Host role a bit of a set up
- ❖ Have not found way to address difference in audience level of exposure to the material. Ideas have been to do an orientation late on Friday or over lunch Saturday both of which seemed too problematic.

Common complaints heard at the workshops so far:

❖ Quit reading the slides

❖ You are not willing to hear us and said this was an opportunity for input.

❖ Seems as if board does not really understand the proposals

❖ Impossible to decide without more detail

What excites them about the proposal?

❖ 2 track system LSU

❖ Idea of GSU separate of any other component

❖ GSU

❖ GSU

❖ Privilege of being on ground floor of this process and what we are actually doing taking workshops to people and the range of people coming to workshop is to have people join us in the restructuring of ss.

❖ Excited by whole project and GSU

❖ Group support and Serive System geographically sees this as an opportunity to quit doing things in a certain fashion and talk about what we want together.

❖ Opportunity that project presents for us to do a better job at achieving our vision statement.

❖ Shaking the NA tree, the way we are interacting with fellowship.

❖ LSU itself and the planning elements of it flexible structure.

❖ GSU and the opportunity for people to be successful in service. State and unification piece bringing unity back to state that was split due to issues.

❖ Group support in general – has been neglected for a very long time.

❖ Group and the LSU because this will give an opportunity to split things up, provide an arena for conversation. LSU is project driven.

❖ GSU, LSU, the whole project and the possibility of a universal change. The GSU and LSU will energize the fellowship. Sense of ownership and tie-in. Membership will feel they have control.

❖ WSC seating

What concerns them about the proposal?

❖ Conveying information about transition

❖ Give them hope about transitions

❖ GSU

❖ That people think having zonal representation is a good idea – lack of information or not an informed group.

❖ Presenting in Orlando, that resistance is so strong that nothing really changes.

❖ Intermediate bodies

❖ Nothing concerns him

❖ Resistance to change, closed mindedness and the potential for disunity for this

❖ intermediate bodies, fear is that we are being to hermetic with having ideas

❖ Not sure, maybe a bit idealistic. Not so sure about how that is going to work

❖ It might be an easier leap to conceptualize zonal representation rather than state province. They both bring challenges and might bring no change at all.

❖ Fear that this project will give the fellowship feeling of instability, will take a long time before changes simulated.

❖ The details of how some of this will unfold, policy, guidelines, elections policy…

❖ The effect proposals will have on money flow.

What confuses them the most or unsure about

❖ Intermediate

❖ Intermediate bodies and how to explain it

❖ The amount of flexibility in the whole thing

❖ Negotiating being a board member and workgroup member – keeping or even getting the difference between Service System being produced by Service System and the board.

❖ They way we deliver the message concerned about Orlando as well

❖ Not confused

❖ Confused about having a piece of the puzzle and not have the whole puzzle

❖ Vague presentation

❖ Intermediate bodies and state entities that are multiple regions in the US.

❖ Idea of zones and being able to break out of our existing perception of zones.

❖ The ongoing issues and how those fit into this process, for example H&I.

❖ The geography of it all, how will it all connect?

❖ Intermediate, state national changes are not clear, zonal changes not clear how they would come about. Timeline of project – don't think this can be done in 2 cycles.

❖ Unsure about the LSU and intermediate what a project driven LSU looks like

Plan to have a shortened profile for local workshop and FAQ soon.

Additional session profile input

Remind fellowship that input will continue to be gathered via small groups and bulletin board.

- Background and Introduction; page 3 suggest that we use an example people can relate to as oppose to saying *in the 70's*. Use a number they understand.

- Background and introduction; page 6 under local. There was no provision that allowed better delineating the two when answering the questions in red.

- Intermediate Bodies; page 5 on the top of page there are two questions; the first question is on State and it doesn't seem to flow. When looking at the other intermediate questions, people felt there was no example of a linear approach. Referring the intermediate body in drawing 2. Suggest cutting the group support unit off.

Craig asks if there was any discussion or energy around the intermediate body and what that means.

- Detroit; there was some energy but was able to use Metro Detroit and Chicagoland and two other different examples and how they would change to help people understand.

- Oakland; had energy abut regions that might become intermediate bodies to overlap states. Stressed that there is flexibility and that one won't automatically fit all things.

- Intermediate Bodies; page 3; 4th bullet on providing a communication link between the WSC and local NA communities was questioned. This needs more information to help explain.

- Healthy Service System sheet needs a bit more of its history explained.

- Seating, page 2 when explaining the existing structure majority of people in room had no idea what this meant and how many there are now. They also wanted to know what the board thought was the magic number.

Report from the Service System Workgroup

Need to understand recommendations but in depth discussions coming later. In depth discussions of all components in January

Craig and Travis recapped the Service System report.

There are some issues that the workgroup will need to know what the board thinks about a couple of issues/recommendations. Since the conference, the workgroup met with Executive Committee in June, then met alone in August. The August meeting focused on changes and modifications in the existing proposals. We also focused on process, people and resources.

The October Service System report has a section which addresses NA's sacred cows touching on long standing myths and/or ideas that need to be addressed, also have sections on planning assemblies, ongoing services, fund flow, linear vs. two-track, and many other issues.

- The upside down pyramid idea: It's really not an up/down system. It's a horizontal system.
- The term "group service representative": group delegate/GD is more in line with our concepts.
- The idea that "group conscience" refers specifically and exclusively to the vote that happens in a recovery group's business meeting: that relates to the delegation/authority/accountability issue mentioned later in this report.

Page 7 of the report has a Summary of Recommendation section that the board will need to discuss. There are 4 bullets; the board needs to focus on last 2 bullets to get through session today. The 1st bullet can be discussed jointly tomorrow and the 2nd bullet is something that can be talked about at a later time.

- Address upside down pyramid
- Replace term "GSR" with "GD"
- Reimagine the LSU as a planning conference and a local service board
  - Make the corresponding terminology change from LSU to LSB and local planning conference
- Include some sort of human resource panel or workgroup on a local level

The board discussing bullet 3 on *reimaging the LSU as a planning conference and la local service board*…

- Reimagine the LSU as a planning conference and a local service board
  - Make the corresponding terminology change from LSU to LSB and local planning conference

and bullet 4; *include some sort of human resource panel or workgroup on a local level.*

- Include some sort of human resource panel or workgroup on a local level

Points made include:

- Suggestion to include terminology for 4th bullet *Human Resource Panel on a local level,* what does that mean is it leadership development, cultivation.

- Not convinced about the quarterly meeting and how that might fit into providing services. Local HRP is a bad word for that level however understands is meant to be active head hunting. Loves the straight line thing (horizontal)

  Response; in terms of LSU, the GSR planning assembly is one thing but the actual hands on would be done monthly. Page 5 contains verbiage on issue.

- The number of options with the LSU is what is the most confusing. GSU also. Not that there are bad ideas, we just need to capture a bit more detail of them. Hopefully tomorrow we will all have to talk about these things

- The way we are doing this seems to be getting too sophisticated. Not having the Local Committee meet frequently will lose a big opportunity to help the change. Seems too ambitious, maybe we should take a step back

  Response was that they are meeting less often but making the times of getting together more fruitful, sees this as more enticing. Group Service Unit is structured differently and in a better way to integrate more into process. Sees this much better than what we have now.

- Read report and imagined the board focusing on structure and workgroup moving on to process. Seems the workgroup is still on structure and that we are still having trouble shifting to process.

  Response; workgroup did talk about process but didn't want to overwhelm the fellowship. It may seem that some of this is repetitive but it was because the workgroup felt some things may not have been fully understood by the board.

Agreement; that the board is clear on bullets 3 and 4. A decision will be made together with workgroup and another discussion will be had.

Timeline

- What we have said to date:
- Summer/Fall 2010: first discussions and workshops
- 31st December 2010: Input deadline for first round of proposals
- Early 2011: Revise and re-release proposals
- Late 2011: prepare for WSC

There were no objections to the timeline and what we are communicating, e.g. contemplating using the previous examples of Res A (in principle), Transition Group analogy for hammering out details, as a root way to explain what seems to be our intention with this process and in agreement in principle. In June the board and workgroup will know what will go in the CAR.

Craig wants to be sure that we remember that we are talking about a system that works together. Everyone thanked for the continued work and participation in process.

March 2011 Board Meeting

The issue of canceling the March 2011 board meeting was taken back up; chair informed that members of the board were willing to make a decision because they've changed their votes.

Straw poll to affirm not meeting in March 2011-12, want to continue having a March meeting–3.

Board will have a March meeting; board was using unanimity for their decision-making which was not consistent with the board's protocols. (*This decision was later changed by e-mail poll and the March 2011 WB meeting was cancelled.*)

The meeting adjourned at 6:00pm.

Joint Meeting with the Service System Workgroup

The discussions on Friday will frame much of the discussion on Saturday. Details will be provided that day. 9 am – 5pm

Lunch was ordered in and the HRP, Service System workgroup and staff assigned to that group will join us.

LSU

What is/should LSU look like?

- LSU exist based upon Geo Political links
- LSU is not where the work is being done
- LSU is a working body
- LSU is a planning body that is responsible for strategic cycle
- Point of accountability for projects, workgroups, etc
- Focuses on the BIG PICTURE
- Creates workgroups to accomplish work
- Administers routine services
- Collaborates with larger services body for planning
- Meets quarterly
- Some admin body will need to meet more regularly
- Point in fund flow system and delegation stem
- Formal communication responsibility (probably electronic)
- Flexibility
- LSU responsible for training and meeting (possible way station)
- Formal responsibility for H&I, PR, phoneline, events, literature, translations, archives and record keeper
- Smaller communities LSU could have to meet larger needs
- Who creates the LSU???
    o standard criteria
- Geopolitical Lines and Function, needs, resources

- Meetings of Local Assembly (LSU) take place as regular (monthly/quarterly/etc.) assemblies as a planning based event with little detailed nuts and bolts work
- Local services are delegated to Board that takes input/direction from Local Planning Assembly, and reports on work/progress of projects/strategies
- Local service Board may provide presentations at Group Support meetings about status of work, local services and projects
- Local Assemblies can use small groups processes to identify needs, set priorities, etc. and delegate that work to board

- Certain routine services might be reported on and overseen by coordinator positions, while Local Planning Assemblies would be focused on special projects, new endeavors
- For local fund flow, there won't be a single model that works everywhere, so options/templates could be made available to be tailored to fit local needs
- Local services wouldn't require so much of a Human Resource Pool function, but there should be some type of recruitment function
- Elections suck. Is there a way to incorporate censuses?
- Size of local boards will be determined by local needs
- Wherever possible, have distinct boundaries such as city/county/township, etc
- Linear or two-track may be determined as makes sense locally/optional. Both could be used in some places
- Local Service Assembly could be called "Reunion"

- LSU seems to be the work horse, providing services in local community
- Plan driven, priorities, environmental scan
- May have some standing workgroups and project based workgroups, more inviting
- Training and mentoring
- Will be bound by recognized geography
- Consensus based decision making
- Build knowledge of issues, locally. Will keep records, archives and resolve own issues
- Planning culture, project workgroups, etc. makes everyone take responsibility
- Manage financial resource better
- Local board is the entity responsible for service administration
- Local Planning Conference is an event not an entity
- Scalability: some functions constant regardless of size, but some structure compositions only needed at a certain size

- Uses planning cycle*
- GSR's prioritize planning
  - Determined by local needs
- Ongoing services
  - Administrative, bills, phone
  - Project coordinator (facility or task)
  - Resource allocation
  - Leadership
- Outcomes of Planning
  - Projects-Local & SNP, WS
  - Participation in larger system needs
- Develop/assign workgroups based on function
- Determine reporting frequency for workgroup or project coordinator (point person)
- Local decision for distribution of literature
- Local service board=
  - Admin (chair, vice chair, etc)
  - Project coordinators
  - Service coordinators (ongoing)

14

- LSU interfaces with intermediate body (if one exits) which may be the point of contact for external bodies (police the local, country, state, federal)

LSU How

- LSB like Board
- LSU like WSC
- Elects participants at LSU
- Assembly A-quarterly planning
- LSB coordinates: Admin, Convention, Office, IT, etc.
    - Group delegate assembly, projects, approval and assignments and training, IT electronic meetings
    - World Integration, scanning, assembly and group delegate
    - Report evaluation, training, group delegate
    - Human Resource coordinator
    - Fellowship development coordinator
    - Project coordinator
    - Terms: contingent meeting frequency staggered elections
    - Chair versus vice chair
    - Select trainer?

Delegation How do we have a discussion in a way that inspires people to think about it differently?

- Need to build confidence and trust
- How do we delegate? One main way is by not showing up for business meetings with car workshops
- Define a baseline understanding? Of group conscience-more than just a message carrier
- Explain and discuss the difference between basic text, 2nd Tradition essay and WHW
- Balance delegation w/accountability and the mechanisms built into the system for this
- Directing the service system
    - What does this entail?
    - Telling IT what to do, not how to do it?
- Tell story that says what group conscience is

- Find a way to allow the audience to release "stream"
- Go ahead and talk about the taboos
- The GSU is actually a perfect body to discuss principles
- GSU allows people to become more confident in their ability to serve which should better prepare them for the next level

- Analogy of tyrant boss
- Authorization better word
- Adequate leadership – 4th Concept
- Two leadership: delegation and accountability
- Make them feel valued. Partner ship

- Begin to create different processes that addresses delegation i.e. leadership development, training, planning

- Tell stories that illustrate trust, delegation to fill the gaps in what people are hearing, or to fill the gap left by no experience
- Avoid confronting misconceptions directly – too confrontational
- Group conscience and vote – the same thing or not? Is group conscience a democratic process
- Present the many different realities in the NA world of how we "vote" or form a group conscience

- Group is not literally a "group"
- Impossible for every NA group to discuss every issue
- Why we call Trusted Servants "trusted servants"
- Weave in spiritual principles associated with delegation and accountability
- What do we mean when we say "invite a loving God"
- Dispel the perception that NAWS is inviting this process: us/them
- Focus on the "we" factor in our principles
- Raise the premise of 2nd Tradition and 2nd Concept
- Provide a clear explanation of delegation

- State the position that some delegation is necessary within our system
- "group in group conscience isn't just NA group
- Reality is that there is delegation practice
- Different services at different levels is common practice in other countries – clearly define these responsibilities to promote understanding of delegation

- How often at your home group do you discuss?
    - Delegation
- Letter from fellowship - answer (aim at appropriate level)
- Sponsorship IP – group conscience t delegation
- Introduction to concept and comment about traditions
- Cult of personalities

- Ask about world issues at groups to discuss what the concepts are
    - To discuss delegation
- Use of concept related stories,
    - Session profiles depending on service body and level of services
    - Use fellowship letters actually based on real stories
- Create a glossary of terms so everyone is using same words
- Practice letting go, spiritual principles

What are the challenges or difficulties in having this discussion in the fellowship?

- Varying demographics of the audience – age, experience, culture, language, and NA knowledge
- Crafting new ideas onto closed minds

- Engrained with upside down pyramid in our service culture of decades /generation
- People that done care or that believe the myths
- Identifying the opportunity for input (old ideas)
- Overcoming representarial and de-presentation myths
- Definitions of group conscience, uniformed, misinformed, etc.

- Historical mindset of several myths and or ideals which are false
- Lack of experience with planning with creates resistance to change
- Fear of flexibility
- Member create structure to feel safe
- Many members know nothing about service, Traditions or Concept. And this would be the first exposure to this type of proposals
- The uniformed get caught up with the so called "Gurus" in the local fellowship
- Weak personalities are a problem and at the same time strong personalities are a problem
- We use one method of communication that does not accommodate the gap in experience or pour members

- Fear of abuse
- No accountability
- Might do things in a way not like by fellowship
- Trusted servants not ready to handle
- Fear of giving away control, there is a big misconception
- Challenging long standing beliefs – change
    - What people have been taught
- Requires trust and faith, vision, innovation, honest and open minds
- We are working within a communication system where communication is not good, but essential

- Addicts have a need to control to feel safe
- Distrust is our default position (particularly when new or 'untreated')
- New information produces fear initially – 'stages of change'
- Limited time
- The U.S. sociopolitical system – state vs. federal
- We equate 'voice' with 'vote'
- Creating a common understanding of group conscience and delegation and dispelling myths

What should we be sure to include in a conversation with the fellowship about this

- Tie the discussion back to our literature and the core principles it contains
- Facilitators/presentations of discussion are also NA member who want the best for NA
- Our practices need to be consistent with the message,
    o   we need to be prepared
    o   look to model this outside the workshop session too
- Clear written resources that clarify the key issues e.g. group conscience

- Attitude of inclusiveness
- Focus on vision
- Principally based examples
- Our common welfare comes first
- Appeal to members experience (good and bad)

- Appeal to the heart
- Outline

- Traditions/concepts and key points from other two questions
- Not a final decision but an ongoing dialog
- Address myths about how we didn't delegate in the past
- Having conversation with members is an integral part of this project
- Clarify how they can provide input to this process
- Introduce the spiritual benefits of service
- Opportunity to be involved in a historical part of our evolution!

- Inventory/survey
- Current operative beliefs and practices of group conscience and delegation
- Highlight
- Continuity with resolution group, transition period and commitment
- Educational function i.e. constraint 'belief' 'practice' with literature (tradition and concepts)
- Statement
- Myth buster
- Describe a range of motion (scalability) i.e. describe different models of achieving principled decision making
- Tell the story of the creation, address history of myths
- Delegation is carrying the 'voice' not the 'word' i.e. the ideas of the concerns of Africa not the conversation (???? Last post it B)

Delegation and Group Conscience

1. Provide real life examples of benefits/practicality of delegation that group conscience happens at every level

2. Educate members about how group conscience process has been a part of workgroup proposals and these discussions are inviting the fellowship to participate in that process

3. Inspire: engage people in our solution – discussion / lecture. Simplify delegation to hands on service efforts instead of political discussions

4. Challenge members frequently, view group conscience being tied to NA group

5. Challenge will be some member not considering anything other than every group participating in every discussion

6. Challenge: we need to have better education fellowship wide on meanings of concepts too much misunderstanding

7. Include: spiritual component that group conscience is not a decision making mechanism. Second Concept: groups have final authority; but it need not be exercised on every decision, but rather on issues of importance such as Steps, Traditions, literature

8. Include: encourage people to think beyond their own communities, to global fellowships participate in every discussion

9. Include: make it clear that it is impractical to include everyone in every decision; it's a hindrance to effective service

10. Include: we have had some bad experiences with delegation i.e. the f*#& us!) But with better application of 4th and 8th Concepts, delegation is more efficient

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.
Approved World Board Minutes
21-23 October 2010

Summary of Decision – October 2010

Type Legend:　　　A =Action　　　D =Decision　　　I = Issue　　　T = Tabled

Type	Date	Description
D	10/21	The board will proceed with having March 2011 meeting. (later reversed this decision)
D	10/21	**WCNA 34**, agreement to approve the budget by email.
D	10/22	**WCNA 34 Program Group**; Mary and Arne assigned
D	10/21	**External Survey**; agreement to pursue with Dr. Galanter
D	10/21	Developing initial discussion and questions for the **WSC election survey**
D	10/22	**Living Clean**; report in NAWS News and bulletin Board not having received much input on title otherwise continuing with Living Clean The Journey Continues. WB will review by email for approval draft.
D	10/22	Ron H, Ron B, Junior and Paul assigned to work on Regional Motion and Committed Motion about CBDM
D	10/23	Jim B assigned to work on WB Elections and Evaluations
D	10/23	**Service System** Timeline; agreed upon and what is being communicated, e.g. contemplating using the previous examples of Res A, Transition group as a root way as what seems to be our intention of this process and of an agreement in principle. In June the board and workgroup will know what will go in the CAR.