Wednesday 19 January

Present: Ron Miller, Mark Hersh, Mukam HD, Ron Blake, Tom McCall, Junior, Paul Craig, Mary Banner, Jim Buerer, Arne Hassel-Gren, Tonia Nikolaou, Franney Jardine, Ron Hofius and Iñigo Caljun Unceta

Staff: Anthony Edmondson, Becky Meyer and Eileen Perez. Additional staff will join for the joint Service System and World Board discussions on Friday and Saturday.

Corporate Responsibilities

Financial Update

Anthony began this session with pointing out structural changes in the 'current asset' column; Iran is no longer shown in that category (current asset) because those assets are not accessible to NAWS Chatsworth.

Presently, there are 56 operating days in reserve and the current financial status is satisfactory. The Consolidated Financial Statement shows how NAWS is operating as of 31 December 2010. Year to day amount is a positive net, which is a result of continually cutting costs.

There is $1.3M cash accessible to NAWS; $750K is owed to us in receivables and we have $1.2M in inventory items. Short-term liability and accumulated payroll expenses equal $370K. Total current liability is $373K.

There was discussion about NAWS relying on literature sales for financial income and the need to base the economic model on a more balanced economic type is the ideal.

Board talked about the possibility of selling our books in bookstores, having the Basic Text in libraries and digital media. Anthony responded that selling our books is not possible for a couple of reasons, e.g. their return policy and for other philosophical reasons. Digital media is something currently being developed (phone apps) and the Basic Text is being converted. A project idea for future consideration and discussion relates to a book length humorous piece about 'getting clean'

Additional digital media ideas: meeting shuffler, the *Just for Today* (JFT) that you click on and it allows you to read more. There are many ideas that do not require modifying fellowship approved literature, for example a meeting shuffler or a Basic Text reading on a particular step. There are myriad of ideas that we can use that do not involve adding new material.

Another fiscal issue is that over 90% of our contributions come from events or literature and this is fellowship wide. Right now, the target is the contribution IPs but this does not address money from events.

Staff Action: International member's inability to contribute via our online portal still needs to be fixed.

More discussion about additional ideas for NAWS, like soliciting, anything directed to the member and has a link to contribute.

Staff Action: add a sentence to the online contribution portion regarding having to call staff if the donation amount needs to be changed.

The trends of RSOs were questioned; obviously, the economy is affecting everyone. Our practice now is to contact any regional delegate from the delinquent RSO and they are now included in the discussions.

Review of the 2009-2010 Audit (already accepted via email)

The public Audit is included in the Annual Report.

We have rotated Auditors and each auditor functions as a single entity within their firm. This is a required change with the relationship between NAWS and auditors.

There has also been a change in some of the Auditors practices which is now a requirement, e.g. it seems that our property value has decrease by $1M. The change is that our Xerox machines are rental property; therefore must be accounted for in a different manner.

Approve October 2010 WB Minutes

Decision: Minutes unanimously approved

Proposed literature price changes for 2011

The recommendation is that literature price increases take place at the beginning of our next fiscal year July 1, 2011. That gives us ample time to communicate to our members and customers. We estimate this change, if accepted, will increase annual revenue approximately $206,000.

It is also the recommendation of the EC that the scheduled price increase for WSO Europe be held in abeyance for now. The increase would net us a small amount of revenue, a large amount of discussion and resistance. Currently WSO Europe is "breaking even". That 'break even' is largely because they do not get charged for production costs beyond cost of goods.

Mark wanted it noted for the record that he is struggling with the recommendation.

Decision: recommendation approved.

Copyedits to US Canadian Sales Policy

Found on page 48-49.

Decision: changes accepted.

WCNA 34 Update

Page three of the Executive Report - list shows the registration experience as of January 13, 2011. Flyers have not been distributed in print from yet so this represents primarily web sales. This was the first time we have e-blasted 80K people.

An additional inexpensive hotel was added. The room rate is comparable to the Omni. Most people seem to be selecting the Marriot.

WCNA 36 for 2015 Selection Process

Thus far, it has been a struggle to receive timely information about many of the potential locations and the hope was to have additional information by the time this meeting approached. The goal is to whittle the list down to a smaller number of serious potential candidates. Page 60 is a current list of countries:

Have to make a philosophical decision concerning what this convention is (about). If you look at the history of conventions outside the US, we have had a convention in Spain and Colombia. It could reasonably be stated that we have accommodated the Spanish culture. Does that push us to look at other language groups?

If we concur with the sentiment that we are looking at having a convention in Brazil, instead of a Spanish speaking country, then, the focus would be on two: Salvador, Brazil or Florianopolis, Brazil.

Two months ago the Rio government started strong action against the Favellas but Rio de Janeiro is

still listed as one of the most dangerous cities; therefore, it will not be considered

Average travel cost for an airline ticket from US to Florianopolis Brazil is about $1,200.

Decision: to have Management focus on Florianopolis, Brazil as the first choice, Guatemala City, Guatemala and Salvador, Brazil as backups.

Service System

The Yellow book is Book 2 and contains information for Service System material. The next book (3) will be the service system raw data.

Strategic Plan Process for this cycle

There is going to be a survey and material between now and June via email. It will be necessary for everyone to respond quickly for a quick turnaround.

Decision: the June World Board meeting will be a four-day meeting. Meeting dates EC June 14 and June 15-18, 2011 for the World Board.

Annual Report

Mailing the *Annual Report* next week

FIPT clean up / Bundle already approved literature

We would like to see two motions. One regarding copyedits for items like *Meeting by Mail*, which no longer exists. We talked about this in the last *CAR* and we heard no objections but we did not get a straw poll or a decision. The second motion is about repackaging already approved Fellowship literature. Something that would give us the latitude to change items in the *Introductory Guide* or print step excerpts, or create new items based on existing approved literature.

We also recently approved changes to *The Loner* for translation that went further than simply removing *Meeting by Mail*. We will provide you with a copy of the changes and we can discuss how to proceed with the English in the future.

Decision: proceed forward with motions for FIPT clean up and bundling of already approved literature. This will be reported to the fellowship in *NAWS News for* feedback.

Plans to publish the approval draft of Living Clean

Tom shared his thoughts regarding the book chapters being too long; loves the content has continuously struggled with the attractiveness of book because the length of the chapters. Offers solution: make new sub headings and when it gets to that place stop the page. Becky responded that the approval draft would not be laid out like the actual book.

Decision: There was unanimous approval on the chapters 1-5.

Decision: We will ask both the workgroup and the copy editor to look at breaking up the paragraphs with subheadings.

Decision: Board agrees to have the EC finalize subheadings.

WB Internals

The board talked about page 88, last paragraph; regarding *Consensus Based Decision Making*. The desire of some board members is to have more written in detail articulating a secondary standard regarding unanimity and 51%.

The board has the principle by which discussions are to hear all voices and if necessary go with 51% of the body's decision.

However, there is agreement that there is something missing when we say if we can achieve unanimity then we do, any dissenting members of the board stand aside and the protocol jumps to 51%. Maybe, we can say if we cannot achieve a certain level of agreement and the matter can be deferred as one of our values. We do not rush a decision.

Others disagree and understand that there are processes in place for said circumstances. When a decision is needed and not reached then the process is that the board goes with 51%. Consensus does not mean that all will agree.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30pm.

Thursday 20 January

The World Board meeting opened with a moment of silence and the Serenity prayer. This was followed by a review of the agenda and a lengthy discussion regarding having or postponing the Sharing session scheduled for the end of the day. The agreement is to wait until the end of the day and see if anyone would like a sharing session.

EC Elections Page 106

Discussion began on the draft election proposal.

Idea: to have the EC interview board members every year instead of having a session of asking what each person wants to do.

Idea: include EC recommendations in the new process.

This discussion will continue on the bulletin board. Decision: Staff will set up the bulletin board for this discussion and the EC will initiate the discussion. Each individual needs to set up his or her personal preferences. Bulletin board will not have an assigned moderator, one way or another this discussion will be kicked off on the bulletin board. Remainder of the WB internals approved as revised.

World Board Nominations

The bulleted list is reflective of what the board sees as needed on the world board. The board asked to look at the world board criteria to see if they agree with the list of bullets:

- add racial and ethnic diversity from developing communities
- add non academia, big hearts instead of big brains
- remove "engage in philosophical debate" but have the ability to listen with open ears, have articulate discussion
- Under essential qualities – a sense of humor.

Decision: Becky will send the nominee form to be completed to the board with a deadline date. Discussion and finalization will occur at the June meeting.

EC also struggled with what to do for World Board members standing for reelection. The suggestion is to provide each board member a list with the names of those who want to stand for reelection with columns with options for *support, do not support*, and *do not know*. The list is to be turned into staff on the first day of the meeting. No objections voiced.

Somehow, we need to communicate with the conference that certain qualities are important and the list of individuals encompasses those qualities, the board needs to talk about looking at the gaps and the mechanics.

Nominations to the HRP for 2012

Election Survey

- Whenever possible all questions will be scaled.
- Question 5 will be split into three separate questions; region, board and zonal

- Survey intended for current Regional Delegates, Alternates as well as 2010-registered RD or RDA.

- Add two more questions 1) how many conferences have they attended, 2) if they are a RD or RDA

- Add a don't know to every question

- Add to question 3 add a reason "cost of a world board member" and "we don't believe we need more board members.

This will be an electronic only survey and format is not final.

Decision: above changes will be incorporated and the revised document will go out to the World Board and the HRP.

Update on Planning Basics

The hope is for this piece to be a user-friendly version and a smaller piece from the Area Planning Tool, like the PR Basic, etc. A separate attachment will contain the service inventory and a couple of different examples. This will allow them to come up with what works for them on their own. The format is not final.

Mukam thanks staff for working on/writing Planning Basics.

Decision: The board agreed to send Planning Basics in an email with a deadline date for board input. Sentence "while it is important to set goals and prioritize, it may be easier to drill down in a small group". This will be highlighted in call out box. Board agreement with staff making suggested change. There will not be another board review.

If anyone has a problem with any of the deadlines please let us know.

WCNA

The idea is to provide reminders for those that want them. We are proposing post cards and a poster and to send upon request. We will post them on the web.

We also are working on the election survey which will be done in the near future; remind them of the literature surveys, and that WCNA is looking for workgroup ideas and the post cards and posters. The desire is to have a link on web and that they are available upon request. Decision: proceed with post cards and posters. Post on the web and send upon request. A line will also be added that states "flyers printable."

Action Item List / Project idea Submissions

Baruck P	Our Thoughts, Dreams, Signs and Enlightenment Book	Mar. 31, 2010	Encourage to participant in the literature survey
Houlton	Spiritual Principles IP	March 18, 2010	Encourage to participant in the literature survey
Mike P	Basic Text (English); divide the Basic Text into 2 books as book one and the stories are another book	May 12, 2010	Conference dealt with in 2008 and said no its one book, not two.

Marcelo L	Children's anti drug comic	July 12, 2010	We support the idea of developing a cartoon or comic. This would be dependent on resources and WSC priority. We focus on getting literature to those members who need it and do not develop prevention related material.
Maron C	NA Flag	July 26, 2010	Although you may see a flag at the WCNA, it doesn't seem to be a reasonable product idea at this time
Dustin V	Literature Review Process Handbook	Dec. 9, 2010	All handbooks are on our priority list but unable to devote resources at this time. We have prioritized Events/Activities as the first handbook to be addressed because of level of need.
Paul C	Gift Cards: paper, plastic or electronic contribution cards	Nov 2010	Like the idea of having an alternate ideas/ways to contribute. Would like to discuss this a bit more with the BP

Those submitting a literature idea will be asked to complete a literature survey. Action: staff will find out what happened with the response to the member the 10,000-day medallion. Decision: As a standard, project idea responses will be included in the correspondence book. No objection: to the recommendations.

Report on the issue of regional motions for WSC 2012

The board workgroup is developing a proposal for regional motions. The purpose is to solve a problem of regions submitting motions and regions getting the false sense that all motions not submitted by the board are rejected. The outline reviewed the proposed and experimental process.

Discussion

- Question's whether board comments are enough (no recommendations). Also concerned that we are only changing the name of the process. We could argue that motions are clearer; if we call it ideas, does not see how this would lower the number of ideas; who prioritizes before it gets to CAR. Motions are very clear. Maybe we need to add what the possible outcomes are so people are not left hanging.

- No objections to any of the bullet points but wondering how new (business) ideas will be allowed to mature, rise or fail on their own? Want to hear the new ideas but do not want to spend time on ideas that have no support. So somewhere in the process there has to be a vetting process.

Template is that workshops are done in their region, and ideas must be workshopped and voted on in their region. Ideas would have to be submitted to World Services by a date, after being approved by their region. Given that, the point about possibly receiving an unlimited number of ideas is valid.

Another point added was that all ideas have to be translated.

- Motions from the floor are what could be worrisome. Maybe they should be called regional considerations instead of ideas. Believe the issue is that the reaction to board 'rejecting' motions. Maybe say we use "don't support" instead of "reject".

- Delegates feel it unfair that they are restricted to a certain number of words and the board is not.

Maybe the board should also be limited to 150 words for response.

We are not going to fix everything. For instance, when we stated to participants that the region has to adopt the motion, what often happens is the region never workshops and adopts. Feels the delegates were saying that they want a different process for the entire week and then the entire process changes. We have put this in *NAWS News* twice and not one delegate has responded. Therefore, the question is what do we think is a reasonable idea for one conference. Reiterated that there needs to be a process, one just cannot submit there is a template. The mirror of this action may encourage members to solve their own problems. Think that a couple of RDs need to be brought in to this process at this point.

Idea: add a sentence that says, "If this is successful maybe we won't have any motions at all."

- Suggests a combination; if they have workshopped their idea and it has risen to the top, then we find out which of those ideas they want us to focus on. Also likes calling the motions "conference considerations" instead.

- Seems the issue is that delegates need to be involved and we need to pay attention to a discussion that members need to be heard.

The task needs to be simplified because we will not meet again until June. The board needs to talk about the ideal, which is about the systemic approach presented. That is what will be tried at the upcoming conference.

Suggestion: we are not looking for the experiment to be complex. We just need to refine what we have, make sure that it stays simple so we may have to eliminate processes like Likert scales. Why limit what the board can and cannot do? This should have as few changes as possible and keep it as simple as possible.

- Wants to be sure that we keep giving our recommendations from the board.

We will need to be clear that at some point we need to have a way to dispose of ideas. In the end of process, what we have is a set of ideas that have been given weight, which may possibly be for the board. These would be bigger ideas that require planning from the board. Then, there are those when a motion is not needed, as long as it is the will of the body.

Decision: The draft will be included in the January NAWS News.

Service System Proposals / USSC

The agenda for tomorrow is the discussion. We plan to do the workgroup report, recap what was said about LSU, GSU, and then the input will be reviewed via small group discussions. The yellow book contains a lot of material/information.

It also seems the easiest way to deal with the USSC issue is with other fellowship input as well as discuss if the board wants to have an official statement regarding USSC. Everyone did agree that the one official conference for Narcotics Anonymous is the World Service Conference.

Decision: Staff will draft a paper and send it out to the board. It will be sent to the board for review. Once that is done the World Board will decide if the statement is solely for the board or for reporting in our communication vehicles. It is okay for the office to not have an opinion.

Framing IDT's for the cycle on Self Support, in Times of Illness, Vision Statement and a possible group topic

Need to come up with that topic and were hoping to get feedback. We get many questions on court

cards and CBDM. We talked about make a creating an area with links on topics, organizing a bit better.

- Invest in our vision
- What is membership in the group and how does that tie into the greater of NA?
- Relationship on powerlessness and unmanageability over the group powerlessness and how does that lead to unmanageability to your group
- Working together, honesty, transparency and working together in NA
- NA unity or something to do with unity/fellowship
- Paid in advance what do we owe
- What does the spiritual principles applied daily in my life really mean
- What does group membership mean

The board adjourned their meeting at 6:15pm

Friday 21 January
Our Service System

A full day of discussion spent with the World Board, Service System Workgroup, and staff

Today will be spent discussing the remaining components of the service system in small groups. We will also cover the input received and recommendations from the workgroup.

The chair of the board opened the meeting with a moment of silence followed by the serenity prayer. Becky then walked everyone through what needs to happen for the next two days.

Travis directed everyone to yellow book (1), pgs 22 – 27, which goes into the idea, discussions and recommendations. These are some of the things talked about at the October meeting.

Concepts/Systems

A question asked about *group autonomy* on page 23, 2nd paragraph. Junior added that group autonomy has to be flexible otherwise; fears will jeopardize the Service Systems implementation.

In Greek *autonomy* means "*I make the law,"* we should offer a philosophy of what we do (practical and the combination of all things and how they work).

Some board members wanted to hear what others are responding when many say 'the system works right now'. Part of the answer is asking what they mean by that; ask them to define what that is. More times than not it means they don't want to confirm to the state wide system and/or boils down to motives and a means to justify not changing, being close minded. They may say that because of familiarity. However, the fact is that some places with small population will have fewer changes.

The board went on to talk about group conscience and how each community will have to find what works for them but to some extent LSU will have to have some autonomy.

Beta Testing/Proof of Concepts

This should start with recovery because everything else can be learned. We always create rigid structures and containment because we feel safe in those structures and this newer system allows for more freedom. The difficulty will be the people that still need the rigidity to continue to feel safe. This is where we have to communicate about moving forward, being honest and open.

Leadership Principles in the NA Service System Broadly Stated (Yellow book)

- *PR handbook* has a lot on Leadership and it can used a resource

- Funding will need to be discussed by someone other than the Service System workgroup, possibly the Business Plan Group (BPG)

- Internal Communication on page 31 (yellow book) will need to be decided on Saturday

- One of the biggest deficits we have is the lack of information on how we stabilize the supply of literature to the groups and asks if anyone envisioned the GSU providing that service. Response is that both funding and literature distribution are things that need to go to the EC/BPG for more discussion. Craig added this is a practical function that happens locally. When we discuss changing the flavor, of a LSU and GSU he is often asked where do I get my literature from and who gets my contribution. This will be discussed more between now and June.

- Under *Information Management and Issue Management* would suggest using friendlier terms throughout and less business speak. The other suggestion would be to use Layman terms and better explain planning and project driven. Form will follow function.

- Page 25 states the fellowship is not particularly fond of 1st bullet, group donations could go to the LSU and the LSU could administer the GSU, suggests deleting 4th bullet that says GSU could meet where the LSU meets.

- Also added was that the GSU will be based on culture, language, and ethnicity and it will bring in the unifying component.

Small Groups

Task before the group is to review the discussion had in October 13, and the material on 2-5; and talk about what about the LSU and GSU needs to be called out or better explained, issues that need to be called, found during workshops:

This is a component discussion; but, if a principle needs to be called out, identifies gaps and lack of clarity.

GSU/LSU

Table 1

Diverse leadership/LSU

- Assigned LSU members attend GSU's
- Service mentors (to get GSU off ground)
- Demographics as one consideration for leadership identification/outreach
- Diversity at LSU unifies GSU's
- Strong emphasis on collaboration with GSUs
- Diversity demands special attention to communication

Components and functions of the LSU un-clear

- LSB (local service board)
- Assembly vs. +business meeting
  - Crucial to overcoming "territorialism" of GSUs

Table 2

- Way to insure inclusion of minority voice and needs in LSU
- (highly value diverse participation)
- Dispelling the fear that GSU separates the groups from decision-making.
- Planning events would remedy; fosters and encourages participation (inclusion).
- Some GSUs will need more support from LSU (or neighboring GSU) depending on level of emerging development.
- Needs of emerging development defined by funding, TS availability isolation, numbers of population etc.
- Activities (FD events, some services needs)
- GSU is a specific focus of support not of service

- LSU creating a "buzz" by being plan driven!

Table 3

- Street/communicate flexibility supplies by GSU models
  - Size
  - Frequency of meeting
  - What happens there/function e.g. service position
- Linear GSU – distance created between group and service. How to address this?
  - Why do we have an issue with distance?
  - Creating different places for different purposes is more effective for group support and service provision
- How does having a GSU enhance the system? How does not having one affect the system?
- The planning process more closely involves groups in the decision making process
  - Bringing issues that are affecting them
  - Prioritizing where to provide services
  - Evaluating and overseeing projects
- GSU creates broader pool of members that extends beyond a single group. Creates flexibility in terms of use of human resources – e.g. groups may share a treasurer or bank account
- GSU may enhance community in a way that we see in times of disaster e.g. Brisbane floods led to group (A) having to move to group (B)s venue temporarily.
- Dealing with philosophical differences over hot button issues e.g. money – between groups or service bodies
- Enhance the understanding that GSU has an informal participation thereby creating a wider pool of experience to offer solutions.
- GSU is a commitment to group support – not just a structural element "where groups go when they need a meeting"
- How to address mid-cycle issues that may arise? How to fit them into the planning process in a timely manner?

Table 4

- What needs to be further explained re GSU LSU (gaps, lack of clarity) solutions ok?
- We use both the concepts & traditions (they work together)
- Provide the identified "musts" to illustrate the need for the proposed change
- Put emphasis on bullet 2 in the vision (recovery)
- Use references to the "how" of the program (fear of change) recognize the emotional attachments – promote benefits of growth and change.
- Clarify difference between LSB/LSU and local planning conference. Describe how the work would be done at each.
- GSU – just as important. Needs really good leadership; otherwise, it is too easy to focus on LSU service stuff.
- Statements that address points of resistance. Understanding the true roots of resistance i.e. feeling of loss of meetings, one every three months, 1/3 as often, has its advantages.

- Examples of how either linear or two track could work is based on local need.
- Fund low/literature

Table 5

- GSU – Mentoring/training – who is training/mentoring – define and give examples
- Upside down pyramid (sacred?) Address it as product of theory of representation no delegation
- Planning-define in simple terms
- GSU Who administrates or facilitates
- GSU is more orientation to service
- Do not lose the fluff!
- Where do groups get activity information flyers?
- LSU – Have mechanism to keep focus on common purpose and groups concerns are addressed
- Clear, simple destinations and offer benefits of each, linear and 2 track
- Planning define in simple terms.

Question: how does someone affect business in the middle of a cycle?

Mary would like the difference between local service board and the local planning events clarified.

Ron H Some group support function could be performed by the GSU.

Becky AA's experience was that they would put resources into existing functions.

Mark doesn't want us to get too formal with the GSU would like it to be a place with more learning

---

After lunch, the body came back and went into small group to talk about Intermediate Bodies, State National, and Province.

What excites you about Intermediate Bodies and State Nationals?

What are we most unsure or confused about? What happens there? Who is there? Who selects them?

Intermediate

State/national/providence

What happens there? Who is there? Who selects them? What excites you? What concerns you? What are we most unsure or confused about?

Table 1

Intermediate

- How does it differ from Regions?
- We have a tendency of over analyzing the results of an environmental scan

- There is a misperception that intermediate bodies are the "escape clause" to change
- Confused about intent

State/national/province

- Border services
- How to do service with people so far away
- State level service to travel all over state?

Table 2

Intermediate

Concerns

- Become rigid and not make good use of flexibility design
- The need for an Intermediate Body needs to have some prescribed purpose.
- Scope "creep" – might grow and take on more than designed to do.
- Authority to define need and scope of intermediate body
- Language of new system allows bodies to remain the same

State/National/Province

Concerns

- Finance and cost – resource
- What countries defined by states/country and who decides?
- Communities that straddle boundaries (LSU-IB?)
- Purpose and scope clearly defined re: coordination of service not necessarily delivery

Table 3

Intermediate Body

- Create examples of different types of IBs to provide clarity
- Citywide Intermediate Body – e.g. NYC
- IB #2 means a loss of "votes" at the regional or SNP body for the constituents LSUs.
- Need to stress that there are clearly defined reasons why one would form an Intermediate Body, like distance and density.
- The connection between IBs and the SNP body isn't dependant on representation – SNP must participate with IBs
- How is IB funded?
- Who forms the IB?

    - Region could recognize need and form/fund IB to answer that need.
    - Adjoining LSUs could form and fund IB
- Identifying need is one thing – funding it is another
- Challenge the "philosophical divide" myth – expose it as a "personality before principles" reality

State/National/province

- Current statewide service bodies that provide services that are not statewide will have to let go of providing some services
- Some regions cover more than one country – Florida also covers Bahamas and Bermuda
- SNP fosters communication

Table 4

Intermediate Body

Concerns

- Name might change but structure won't (excuse to stay the same)
- What determines the need for intermediate body (what is the mechanism)
- Lack of examples re: variety and diverse uses of intermediate bodies
- People setting it up just because they can: Should only exist in cases of need (could put it to sleep) (last resent)
- Black hole

State/National/Province/fiefdom

Concerns

- Border communities – rural-St Louis, Kansas City, upper Michigan
- We are being over prescriptive (perception)
- Dialogue (need for us to talk about) regions with geographically inconsistent entities, like Free State.
- Excited – NA will present a rational face to the outside world (PR)
- Clear boundaries

Table 5

Intermediate Body

- Activities committee – not IP
- Convention Board – Not IB
- Temporary in time/LSU in development
- Accountability to the body that form it
- Part of delegation stream
- Geographic entity
- Rural/dense city

State/National/province

- Tie in personal recovery and spiritual principles to reunifying regions
- Benefit from healing split is efficient service delivery
- Role of delegate throughout system is the same.

Small group discussion is proceeding into WSC Seating issues, which can be found on page 10

What are we most unsure or confused about WSC Seating? What happens there? Who is there? Who selects them?

WSC Seating

Table 1

- Which is more efficient? Zone/state
- Many not sure what WSC is
- Who decides on zonal boundaries?
- More clarity needed from board
- Affected by secondary issues
    - Power (votes)
    - Money
    - Etc
- Proposal providing an unintentional affirmation of a US zone
- Does funding delegates still work?
- Representation is a core value (challenge)

Table 2

- Zones would intro another level of service (resource)
- S/N/P – risk of growing too large to be effective or productive
- Lack of trust in decision of a sample of NA population; they want everybody involved in decision (reliability of sampling)
- Zonal rep introduces level of politic that does not currently exist. New set of challenges.
- Perception of loss of alternates. Where mentorship will take place?
- One zone-one rep (how many zones)
- Communication – less or more! Is it a conduit?
- Model of changing others votes but zero address of #WB votes
- Zonal rep can be right sized = right size conference may make local communities feel less represented.

Table 3

- Number of delegates from populous states – single or multiple? Currently undefined in proposals report.
- Each NA entity sends a participant to the WSC regardless of size
- Multiple delegates from one are a possibility
- Would the WSC offer a choice for states regarding the number of delegates they send
- Delegation over representation
- Being a country/state only creates the possibility of seating and does not guarantee it
- The WSC has had the responsibility of deciding who is seated for a long time – stress this.

Table 4

- Why are we talking about anything but zonal seating?
- Why are we talking about zonal seating?
- Criteria for seating could be many and different
- What do people bring to the conference? What do they take away?
- How does new seating impact the distance between my group and the conference
- More toward long term vision
- Are we downsizing
- US regions lose their vote to the board/foreigners

Table 5

- Do "we" loose our vote or representation?
- What issues will be dealt with at WSC?
- Is density of population impact number of seats?
- Would a smaller conference support CBDM?
- Will USSC provide FD?
- What benefits do we gain by reducing size of WSC?
- Why are there is 50/50 split in choice in responses?
- Will selecting zonal choice allow keeping structure at home?
- If we approve portion of proposal what happens to seating issue?
- How will zones be prescribed?
- Would zones become intermediary bodies?

Note made regarding the proposal being less clear about the zonal representation than the state representation.

The body asked to affirm which is their preference as individuals choosing Zonal representation or State/National.   State/National – 23 and Zonal – 11, this was followed by a discussion on why each chose zonal or state.

Zonal

- Ideally seems better
- It is much simpler to envision zonal representation rather than trying to get state representation. Also in the ideal believes state representation will only perpetuate the problem we have now.
- Seems more defined, but in general thinks we are not ready to do the zonal representation, yet will have to do because we will only perpetuate the same thing/problem with state national.

Travis believes that whatever choice we make must be where we want to end up. Eventually we all have to believe that we want to be represented in a certain way. Believing that a vote for moving toward whatever is what is best for the fellowship whether it looks like Zonal or State.

- Envisions that the zonal sticks better with the Concepts in our Vision. Downsizing the conference will help with a project driven conference which will serve our fellowship better. The zonal representation fits better to what the Service System is all about in the way we have imagined the Service System.

17

- Thinks the State/National leaves us where we are now. The impractically with moving into zonal is fear factor. Thinks this will not be accepted because of fear creating uproar. Why can't it work the other way, with all the good feelings being brought to the WSC?

- Seems that a lot of discussion that tend to favor the Zonal model more is because they believe that the State model does not go far enough. Wonders if the State or Zonal model would be more palpable as a US assembly. Hard to envision zones as we currently have them, they as a feeder to the conference compared to the fellowship community those others have.

State/National

- Intellect chooses zonal, but the other part does not want the change. The intellect says zones want to respect the way people feel about coming together in the zones.

- Seem that State National would be more attractive only because we know more about it. Does struggle that we are going to continue to increase the number of people at WSC. Not sure what it is but we have to have a cut off. Then make adaptations after that. Seems if we go state nation province how manageable will that be. Zones have to be completely out of the box of what it is today if we are going with zones.

- This is really an American thing. There is no way that the State model will affect, for example, Australia, or anywhere outside the US. At the moment, State seems a reasonable way of dividing the delegates – simple.

- Chose the State National as matter of coherency.

Tomorrow: points of agreement will be identified by using straw polls of the board; they are the group that reports to the fellowship. Ron M thanked everyone for his or her participation.

The meeting adjourned for the day at 5:20pm

Saturday 22 January
Our Service System

Full day spent making decisions with the World Board, Service System Workgroup, and staff Jim DeLizia

Jim D went over the agenda goals for the joint World Board and Service System workgroup meeting. The first part is about decisions that need to be made, along with changes. Part 2, has to do with decision about adding material on process and part 3 is an accounting for future decisions/other decisions that need to be made along with discussion about what needs to be in the CAR.

Today is a day of decisions. When we are at those decision points, the board will be asked to weigh in on those points. Decision will be based on consensus based decisions, but cards 1-5 can be used be used for anyone to say how important something is them.

Service System Foundational Principles:

- Purpose Driven
- Group Focused
- Defined by Geographic Boundaries
- Flexible
- Collaborative

First question on page 1 of the agenda

Local 1. A. 1

Linear vs. Two Track option

A. What is the preferred option? In October, it was decided that the board wanted to state a preferred option so the question before the body is what is the preferred option?

B. Do we want to amend the proposals to include only our preferred option or offer both options, or offer both options (stating the one we prefer) so that communities can determine which one will best meet their needs.

How many prefer the:

Linear – 0   Two Track

How many feel that there is no need to advance a preferred option – 22.

Discussion from those who preferred wherever possible the two track and from those that did not vote:

Preference

- There is a value in providing a recommendation and believe in the end, over time each community will do what works best for them. What will be important is the GSU.

Jim B concerned that there are plenty of people but only a few want to be of service. Thought the whole thing was to create the exposure. Think we have to find something that says we have to have a place that is not all business but a place to focus on the group.

Didn't vote/No preference

- Sees no reason to suggest that there is a preference, believe there is a need for the GSU but not tied to the structure that the GSU is.

- We have a problem and no matter how much we talk about it, it will not be resolved because the fellowship does not want to be told what to do. This is a fellowship with many different needs and we cannot fix all those needs.

Suggest: Adding concrete examples could be provided to help them see what may possibly work for each community.

The body asked if there is a way to keep the GSU clean in the Linear model.

Matt responded possibly but it may be difficult. Becky added there being a mix of options if we are going to explain a system that develops something that focuses on GSU.

Straw Poll (WB)

- Recommend a preferred option only – 0

- Recommend a preferred option but present all the options – 0

- Presents all the options with some contextual examples, consideration, etc. "conditions" under which one option might be preferred – Consensus 14 (based on clarity of what a GSU is/a LSU does)

Local Level 2

Relationship between the Groups and the GSU (small groups)

a. How can we better define this relationship? Suggested discussions:

      i. What happens at a typical meeting of the GSU?

      ii. Who attends the GSU?

      iii. Who administers the GSU and how do they get appointed and/or elected?

      iv. Other aspects that need to be defined?

Typical GSU Meeting (orange card)

- Issues that have been talked about at group business meeting x 13

- Discussions about what issue to pass on to the LSU from NA groups

- Wrap up: who hosts next time? Help needed before next meeting

- Two track local service provision

- Agenda, but no business

- Service without political or administration relationship and attachments x 4

- Outreach - welcomes new groups and new members

- Training learning 30-45 minutes principle based SGD workgroup, GSU workbook with profiles x5

- Discussion about what issue to pass on to LSU and groups

Agreements

- ➢ Informal, training and mentoring
- ➢ Discussion of group challenges, issue and possible solutions group reporting, no business
- ➢ Welcoming and outreach to new groups members regarding NA, principles and service etc.
- ➢ Informal information, discussion (e.g. upcoming events, LSU activities, new merchandise, NAWS issues topics. It's a nurturing place to have an orientation; information dissemination i.e. upcoming activities, new merchandise NAW issue topics, etc. and its brief
- ➢ In some instances or circumstances, GSU may be involved in some service

Who Attends?

- Who attends / invitees (special skills)
- Someone designated by the LSU
- LSU representative, longer term members LS liaison x7
- Linear GSR, group appoints representative x 4
- Everybody's welcome, any addict, interested, etc.

Agreements

- ➢ Everybody welcome/any interested member
- ➢ At least one member designated from each group (who this is can depend on the 2 track vs. linear option)

_ _:

- ➢ LSU liaison   options
- ➢ Veteran members   ↓
- ➢ Invitees (special skills, relevant to topic, etc)

Who administers/Who get elected or appointed?

- Rotate facilitator
- And needs to be some leadership
- Member that attends does not have to be the same person that facilitates (leadership management person).
- Choose from GSU Administrator for next meeting or for a period of time
- Coordinator needs to have some leadership and recovery experience to backup facilitator
- Host group administers, take turns
- LSU or the GSU and LSU in conjunction

Agreements

- ➢ Rotating meeting facilitator (Function)
- ➢ Hosted by a group

- ➢ Hosted/administered by LSU
- ➢ Have a "format" for the meeting and other tools (but not too much structure)
- ➢ Coordination/admin/coordinator from the GSU and appointed from...
    - — Logistics
    - — Simple recording .../simple tools

Balance informing vs. structure simplicity, doesn't have to be more or less formal than group

Other

- No fund flow
- How is it financed?
- Hosting meeting picks up the tab
- On a rotational bases GSU meets at host group venue – limited expenses covered by the group or basket
- Is it a point for literature distribution?
- Can GSU create task or work for groups?
- Clarify what mentoring/training can happen
- Environmental scanning (for planning conference)

    Agreements

    - ➢ How funded
    - ➢ Point for literature distribution

    - ➢ "Can create workgroups to do other tasks (e.g. H&I).
      (Should this be overseen be the LSU/coordinated.
      This will be kept as in current proposal)"

3. Further definition of the of LSU (goal is to say what are the two or three points that enhance the issues)

A. from the last meeting there seems to be consensus around reimagining the LSU as a planning conference and a local service board. How can we further define a reimagined LSU? Suggested discussions:

   i. Who attends the planning conference and how often are they held?

   ii. What happened at a typical planning conference?

   iii. How does a need or issue that arises outside of a planning conference get handled?

   iv. What is the purpose of the local service board?

   v. How is the local service board structure? How often does it meet?

   vi. How do the members of the local service board get appointed and/or elected?

   vii. How do ongoing services such as the phoneline get administered in this kind of project-driven system?

The board broke for lunch; after returning, Jim went over the changed agenda: results for further definitions of the LSU, then the group will go into Intermediate SNP level 1 Further Definition of Intermediate Bodies (Page 4); followed by Intermediate SNP #4 Dealing with Large States (page 6); followed by the C. World Level Seating Options (page 6) . We will end by discussing what will go in the CAR, followed by adding some processes.

1. A. 3

LSU Planning Conference (orange card)

i.   Who attend the planning conference?

- Anyone may attend, the group delegates participate in decisions making. Coordinators are a part of the LSU delegate also they meet quarterly or less depending on needs.

- LSB members

- Coordinators – ongoing service projects

- GSU Delegate(s)

- Encourage all members particularly at the scanning stage where they have a voice

- They would meet a minimum of 3x a year or less depending on their need

ii.   What happens at the Planning Conference

- Each meeting would be different

- They elect the board

- Brainstorm

- Selection of coordinators

- Scanning and set goals

- Budgeting

- Planning and prioritization

- Process/evaluation, inventory

- Reporting and record keeping

- Training

- Session for the interface with State communities and with World (like CAR workshop)

iii.   How a need /issue the handled outside of a planning conference

- GSU/LSU liaison etc. communicates issue/opportunity to appropriate service coordinator or LSB member

- Decision made

- Any action reported back to LSB at next meeting

- If crisis issue an emergency meeting of LSU can be called

iv.   What happens at the Planning Conference?

(Circle diagram) Franney

- Starts with the assembly with all members attending, they would review the process, input and coordinate planning at their level. Followed by prioritize, create workgroup, budget, monitor and report, change direction is necessary, interface-feedback, reporting fellowship evaluation and elections and back into the process. Also talked about a workshop that interfaces with the world with an assembly planning conference that gets input from this inputting and coordinating, planning at their level, stages and functions: this contains core functions and core principles.

- Who: group delegate, project workgroup, ongoing service workgroup, LSB participates in the decision making process. All members particularly at scanning.

- When: quarterly or less, 3x a year at a minimum

Local Service Board (orange card)

v.   Structure; how and how often do they meet?

- Delegates to the next level

- Varies based on human / financial resources

- SNP or intermediate body who are nominated

- LSB members should be: chair, treasurer, secretary, delegate and service coordinators for essential services

- Project coordinators who oversee workgroups, volunteer pools, others as needed, etc.

- Generally meet monthly or as needed by individual communities, communicate regularly

vi.   How the LSB get elected

- Elected by the reps at the planning assemblies and by the LSB? (staggered elections, terms→further flushed out)

vii.   How are ongoing service administered

- Not project driven but plan driven

- Planning process drives needed projects and essential services

- Budget developed based on plan and guided by the Assembly's need for essential services and resources available

- Service is plan driven not budget driven and the budget is done by the LSB

- Service coordinators are responsible for following the plan (accountability)

- LSB oversees service coordinators some of whom may be a board member

- Plan process drives needed projects and essential services.

viii.   Core function/Purpose

- Further the mission: facilitate the growth of NA in the community

- Oversee the workgroup which include points of contact for project coordinator, on the LSB

- Coordinate Planning Assembly

- Oversee routine services

- Development an maintenance of external relationship

- LSB is to oversee the workgroups and routine services (also discussed what that means exactly) some routine services may or may not require a workgroup.

B Intermediate /SNP Level)

1. Further definition of Intermediate Bodies

What they are

- Geographic solution to a density based, large and small. Density becomes the driver

- Above or below the LSU

- Part of the delegation stream is one of the functions to gather the groups, if group conscience is involved that needed.

- Coalesce group conscience

- Level of service

- Communication link if needed

- Planning body

- Service office

- Activities or convention would

- If there were too many LSU in the state (reason)

- Convention and large event management

- Literature management protection against tax, corporation, insurance

- District level interface

- Language/cultural

Who determines, permanent/longevity

_ :

Vs. need for coordinated/shared service – this is more temporal, who determines?

— Conventions

— Literature distribution

— Risk management

— PR, interface with government, professionals, etc.

What they are not

- Not there to maintain or replace regions

- Protect the legacy of 'turf" of regions

- Is not an escape clause

- Really not needed

- Shared services

- Not part of the delegation stream if sole purpose is to coordinate services

Discussion

Intermediate body: We need to indentify the need, purpose, scope; charter document. It has to exist because of a specific need.

Intermediate bodies were to be about geographic, but soon workgroup started to think about creating something that would be flexible for those with a particular need.

Jim's post-it for Intermediate Body

Vote

In favor of combining the two functions (shared services community [not permanent] and density need [permanent]) calling it intermediate body – 1

Recast how we define intermediate bodies to cover two needs - 11

After more discussion there was an another vote

In favor of combining the two functions (shared services community [not permanent] and geo need [permanent]) calling it intermediate body – 0

Recast how we define intermediate bodies to cover two needs – 14

What would characterize an intermediate body as if you establish an LSU along city lines there may be reason to establish intermediate body.

B. Intermediate / SNP Level

4. Dealing with Large States

Becky reported that it seems that everyone seems to believe that states mean states, province means province, etc. want the agreement from everyone that allows for a rewrite to the description that is more flexible, that acknowledges and says we don't know yet.

SNP

Agreement that it can be flexible to include other than "US states" to mean 'state' and other than Canadian providences for "P".

— Could be applicable to countries like Brazil, Russia and Mexico with lots of meetings
  → or reverse to consolidate 'states into New England into one state.

— Acknowledge that this is an issue and have not gotten to discussing yet.

C. World Level

1. Seating Options

A. which one of the two seating option do we want to forward, what is it that we want to advance

- How many WB members want to advance in 2012 the option of the SNP version – 11

- WB that feel that right now we need to further the zonal seating approach – 3

A.

Possible conference participant sprawl

— Define seating criteria

— SNP immediate

— Eliminate Alternates reduces numbers significantly

B.

Possible controversy as to whether countries can declare 'states' --?? Lack of definition of 'state'

— Seating criteria to handle abnormalities of 'States'

— Have to satisfy criteria

C.

Assumption – zonal options can sides' zones that exist and not possibly a difficult faraway configuration

— Difficulties with certain zones in getting representation (e.g. APF)

— Practice now → SNP if needed to reconstitute zones for the zonal seating option overwhelming, not practical

— Could define logically geographically

D.

Will be forced to evaluate this when hit a threshold – so institute zonal now

E.

Quantity versus quality participation at the conference

Forward an SNP seating model in the proposals

— Acknowledge SNP has a shelf life

— Have continued intent in further exploring zonal seating model or questions fix for the seating concerns

— At the same time keep looking

Agreement: show of hands for approval of concept discussed above – 13 / Opposed – 1.

A member of the board wanted it noted that these proposals seem ambitious and that we should slow down and develop a better plan.

Principle approach is a good one, like what will be developed for leadership, along with adding principle processes and what Travis said – need something based on principles that is just nuts and bolts that tells people what to do.

What are the WB thoughts for including in the CAR-what do we see as proposal and what do we see as texts. Agreement to go ahead and forward the items that were agreed upon, there are also things that still need to be discussed more….

Reiterating what is being communicated:

- Root of what anyone is saying is the decision that has been made at this meeting and there are other things that need more hashing out.

Changes/Refinements to Proposals - Agreement

Local 1. A. 1

- Present all options with examples, consideration and possible conditions for each that might direct you to one option or the other.

- Is it part of the CAR as a decision? Not right now will have the first 3 discussions and see what comes out.

Local 1. A. 2

-

Deferred Discussion/Decision - Agreement

Local 1. A. 1

- Develop all options for structure of GSU with accompanying considerations and possible conditions

Local 1. A. 2

- How GSU is funded (thoughts, ideas)

- How the GSU fits in the fund flow picture

Local 1. A. 3

- Is it 2 year or 1 year planning cycle more important to sync with SNP or the world

---

Meeting ended at 5:00pm.