

Date: February 21, 1994
To: Stu Tooredman
Composite Group
From: Becky Meyer
Re: Input to the 1994-1995 Inventory Plan

I am not clear on what the protocol is for sending input to the Composite Group but I trust that you will get this to the right place. Before I put in my two cents, I need to say that I think that this group has worked very hard and deserves our thanks. You have performed miracles with an unworkable, last minute plan and inadequate discussion at the conference to provide clear direction for this project. Thank you. My strongest desire is to see this inventory be a successful step in getting us down the road to becoming willing to change. All eight conferences that I have attended have discussed that what we have is unworkable but we haven't yet been able to make that next step.

At the world services meeting in January, there was limited discussion about the Inventory Plan Revision that is in the CAR. Most of us had not had time for adequate review but there were still concerns raised. One of your panel members expressed a desire to avoid another working group during the conference week which most of us concurred with. The only way that I see that this is avoidable is to either be able to address the concerns voiced by various conference participants and alleviate those concerns or to provide conference participants with options for different portions of the revised plan. My hope is that you will at least consider allowing the conference room for choice.

The original idea for the inventory that was developed in March, 1993, had the various pieces of the inventory project assigned to different groups. The first decision was that no one that was involved in creating the original motion should be involved in the composite group. Further, the fellowship forums were to be attended by a cross section of conference participants, the composite group was to develop tools and be responsible for the gathering and presentation of the inventory material and another group was to be selected by the conference to develop resolutions to the problems identified through the inventory. These decisions were made to maintain integrity, real and perceived and as an acknowledgment that no human being is totally objective once they are involved in a project. I still agree with the principles involved in making that recommendation.

The plan as outlined in the CAR has the same group who formulated the inventory making the recommendations on where we go from here. Principally, I was and am still opposed to that idea. Our experience with the Guide to Service seems to say that the conference is also wary of any one group assuming this role. In my opinion, this project is too important to be plagued by the perception of a closed group making all of the decisions when it is so easily remedied. Logistically, I do not believe that it is possible to evaluate the inventories received from the fellowship, boards and committees and to write resolutions that are developed enough to allow informed discussion in the six months between the WSC and the CAR. When I asked a member of the Composite Group if he thought it was possible, he said no. This is an example of a piece of the inventory that given no other option, does not allow me to be supportive of the proposed plan.

I am not very clear on how you plan to evaluate the committee and board self assessments. Since we did not see part II ahead of time, we answered each section in abbreviated speak. Since we could not go back and review our answers for clarity, I do not see how anyone who was not part of the discussion in our board meeting would know what we were trying to say. Perhaps this was a problem only experienced by the WSB?

Another area that I am unclear about is the purpose of the forums or workshops. The original idea was to have these before the boards and committees took their inventory, allowing the fellowship to say what they need or don't need from world services and whether those needs are being met. The purpose changed at the conference and now again. I assume that the current purpose is to discuss the resolutions? I agree that this needs to happen but I question the timing. If we really want broad discussion in the fellowship, I believe that it will require well developed and well written ideas and material in the fellowships hands long enough for thorough review. The FIPT, the Guide to Service, etc., etc., have all proven this to be true. I do not believe that this plan allows that to happen. Perhaps they are a conference year too soon?

Again, thank you for all of the work that you have done this year. I know how frustrating it can be to work on something, communicate about it each step of the way, receive little to no input and then receive criticism at the eleventh hour. I am trying to not do that. The only reason that I am sending this is because we were asked in New Orleans to put our concerns in writing and send them in before the March meeting.