Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.

Approved World Board Minutes

15-18 June 2011

APPROVED

OCT 22 2011

BY:

Wednesday 15 June

Corporate Responsibilities

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

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

World Board Sharing Session

1. Nominations to the HRP for WSC 2012

An excel sheet containing names of those submitted was sent to the board via email; from that list, the board indicated that they supported 13 individuals. After a next step discussion, the board agreed to take the list of 13 and check names of the individuals to move forward. The second tally sheet was completed and seven people received substantial support.

A member of the board engaged the body in a dialog about wanting to add a name to the list of candidates but everyone agreed that the deadline passed and not the time to add names.

Discussion ensued regarding next steps for the seven proposed candidates; some board members agreed to move forward with seven while others were concerned that seven is too many names to put forward.

Board members brought up additional names of individuals they would have wanted to see supported on the possible candidate list.

Overwhelming majority want a list of five

Decision: <u>to select five from the list. Depending on availability and willingness of those selected, there will be two people as a fallback. The selected candidates will be contacted for availability.</u>

<u>August 1 is the deadline because the HRP must have all service resumes.</u>

2. Financial Overview of NA World Services

Anthony provided an overview of where we currently are:

- BPG is forwarding a recommendation to suspend the Emergency Action Plan and continue within normal conservative operations.

- Currently operating at $500K for the year and will soon start to reinvest in some areas that we've pulled back from like Public Relations travel and Fellowship Development, as well as some items in the office that need to be replaced/updated. We currently operate at $22,5K a day and right now, we had 28 days in reserve. At one point, we had 89 days in reserve, which totaled about $1,5M.

- We have starting systematically reinvesting in our saving accounts.

- Currently looking to fill the two open positions in Fellowship Services department

- The Iran funds segregated in the financial statements because there is no access to those funds.

○ WSO Iran funded all of the expenses for the Middle East meetings last year.

- Account Receivable is healthy $860K, as a general rule our loss ratio is about 1% or less. In respect to our operating ratio, accounts payable in good shape.

- Service offices and the practice of working with those entities briefly talked about.

- The numbers of group, individual and area contributions are up but still pale in comparison to regional contributions.

- There is $1M deferred revenue for the World Convention, after 1 July, it will move to active accounting.

a. Approve new tri-plate medallions and soft cover Miracles Happen

A couple of samples of the soft cover of the *Miracles Happens* passed around. There are two different samples – one with the CD cover in the back and one without, both have an inside flap.

The one principle difference is the addition of the NA Archive CD Rom to the back of the book. The majority of the board felt this was a great idea.

Decision: to produce the soft cover Miracle Happens, to *give away*/include the CD in a sleeve in the back of the book.

Decision: produce the orange/black, green/pearl, gold/pearl, violet/pearl medallions.

E platform material

Discussion concerning the fellowship's energy about the proposed motion that would allow the compilation of already approved material. Seems most of the energy is a result of not understanding the proposal.

Anthony reported on his recent trip to DC; discussions at the conference resulted in his decision to shift to hiring a company that specializes in e-content. The new trend is mobile applications. We currently have someone working on an app – waiting for a beta version.

Action: Anthony will send the board a link to the website of the company he met with.

b. Approve January minutes

Decision: the January 2011 World Board Minutes accepted.

c. Action Item List

The action item list cleaned in May by the Executive Committee (EC).

Project ideas considered:

	Colored wristbands	April 22, 2011	Good idea and will look into
	10 Frequent Objections to NA	March 2011	Good idea Would have to become part of literature priority process

Decision: no objections with EC recommendations on the two above project ideas.

d. Adopt recommendation from the BP that we now are out of the Emergency Action Plan

Decision: <u>There was no objection to moving out of the Emergency Action Plan.</u>

e. 2011-2012 Corporate Resolutions

Decision: <u>2011-2012 Corporate Resolutions adopted.</u>

f. Other corporate responsibilities

Not discussed

3. Election Survey of RD's

Ron M briefly reported on the call he had with Anthony, Valarie and himself. Valarie stated the HRP would be giving the board an HRP report and on Friday, there will be a meeting with the HRP.

Yesterday the EC talked about there not really being anything in the RD survey results needing discussion ahead of time. Everyone agreed with not releasing the survey results to the fellowship because the document is confusion but instead provide a summary of information. We will however take this opportunity to report the statistical probabilities with behavior.

Decision: <u>the survey will not be released only a summary and statistical probabilities with behavior.</u>

There was also discussion regarding providing CPRs to conference participants ahead of time on a password-protected site. This point was indicated on the survey as well as at the last conference. The board went on to discuss the pros and cons of this. After a long discussion, the board decided to provide the CPRs on a password-secured site. We will tell both conference participant and candidates that this has never been done before; if we find that someone's candidate profile information compromised, we will not do this again.

Decision: <u>CPRs will be provided on a password-secured site ahead of time and not be downloadable. Expectation will be provided.</u> We will talk about this with the HRP, getting their thoughts.

4. WCNA 34

We are still planning an event for a maximum of 17,000 people but the center can accommodate 19,500 people, if necessary.

All board members will be assigned to an area for 8 hours each day. Some dialog about two Service System workshops, one a presentation and the other a Q&A. In addition, still trying to plan an H&I Basics workshop, there will be a workshop on how to effectively cooperate with drug courts and criminal justice professionals.

We will use crowd management personnel to enforce badge only convention. A badge must be worn at all times; otherwise, you will not be allowed on the premise as well as be escorted off, if caught without a badge.

All the entertainment contracts signed as well as transportation for disabled completed.

Convention badge, registration bag and items that go in the bag presented. Also presented was the eyeglass cloth (for pre-registrants) that states, "don't forget WCNA 35 Philadelphia". Pre registration men's camp shirt shown as well as the women's pre registration patch shown. We will also sell things like cups, magnets sets and individual magnets. A reminder that the convention center is registration badge accessible only and you must wear your badge at all times.

Sold as of June 2011:

WCNA 34 Update as of 13 June 2011		
	Booked	Max
Blues Luncheon	1906	2540
Jazz Brunch	1421	2535
Comedy Show	2553	4675
Saturday Night Concert	1864	4675
Sunday San Diego Padres	593	640
Thursday Midnight Boat Cruise	871	965
Wed Dinner Boat Cruise	460	485
Coffee Mug	2052	2500
Men's Camp Shirt	225	247
Men's Embroider. T-Shirt	1335	
Men's Printed T-shirt	572	
Women's Camp Shirt	79	86
Women's Emb T-shirt	833	
Women's Printed T-shirt	313	
Newcomer Donation	11115	25000
Registrations	7494	

Decision Staff will look into creating JFT quotes cards for WCNA 34 sales.

The program group for WCNA 34 has concluded their work on speakers and the list sent out to the board in an email. Decision selected speakers agreed upon.

5. Literature Survey

Literature survey handed out. This will be discussed at the October World Board meeting (action item). Comments listed if said repeatedly. We will provide data on comments as well as some of the comparative analysis. The data is interesting and there are very fascinating splits between the Iranians and the rest of the world. We will report this information to conference participants.

6. IDT's for this cycle

Issue Discussion Topics emailed and posted online. This is only a reminder that they are out.

7. Process for regional motions and seating requests

Regional motion input from conference participants should go to Ron H and Franney. Regional motion deadline is August 1.

In October, the Brazil and Siberia seating requests will be discussed more (action item)

8. Social Media draft

The hope is to have the Social Networking draft out before the world convention as a service pamphlet.

- Add language about the principle and real meaning of anonymity. How as a fellowship do we embrace anonymity and the danger of social media? That paying attention to the spirit of anonymity has served us well.

- Narrative should be more relatable for our members.

Board members with input are to send it in as soon as possible.

Agreement to incorporate input about making it more relatable to our members and once finished with edits, draft will go out to the board for a final sign-off.

Thursday 16 June

Strategic Planning Session I

9. The day spent with Jim DeLizia for the first planning session

Full group discussion on trends:

Common Trends

- Monitor for where next 'explosion' of demand might come in the world
- Potential change in the practice by members of the principle of anonymity
- Economic and healthcare mega trends and their impact
- Impact of cashless society impacting group as well
- Relationships w/pharmaceutical companies
- Marketing approach: external and internal
   - Product
   - Brand
- Long term strategy for decentralized delivery with fellowship development
- Retention of members - relevance of NA ↓ w/ longer term clean time
- Assistance to local groups/attention on non-profits – tax, insurance etc
- Technology's influence on text production/composition and the way people read

In the environmental scan majority chose R, D/E, I/N, group is to spend more time discussing the possible implications and possible responses of those. Also expanding I/N to be a broader discussion about technology in general. The concept H&I will include retirement communities.

D/E: Increase in request for H&I sources and need to shift resources to healthcare and treatment to handle influx-changing definition of H&I. Fellowship frustration and confusion regarding ramifications from referral and treatment trends.

Potential Implications

- Overwhelmed groups and inconsistent responses
- People see opportunity as a problem → d/c from primary purpose
- What drug courts need isn't what H&I does
- Perception that those taking meds can't come to NA
- Chaos and desertion
- Lack of relations with policy makers and local coordinators
- Lack of information on elderly in ALF/NSG homes in need of NA meetings

- High school H&I

Potential Responses

- Be more proactive / NA open to all
- Communication of available resource e.g. chapter 7 of PR handbook, PR Basics, H&I Basics
- Tools, resources digestible by members
- Focus on opportunity and how trusted servants fulfill primary purpose
- PR efforts to address concerns of local fellowship and to educate
  - o Drug Court personnel
  - o Newcomer orientation for Drug Court clients has been very effective in some places
- Keep and maintain partnership with policymakers and coordinators requires combined approach; H&I, PR, local ASC
- Assess and gather information

I/N Impact of continued advanced in technology: publishing, communication/anonymity, cashless transactions, etc

Potential Implications

- Facebook
- Pocketbook
- Communication opportunities: data storage, e-blasts, electronic, business meetings
- Creates potential of mass communication to fellowship very quickly – information and misinformation
- NA member and their information become part of social media database
- Social media offers NA a unique marketing opportunity
- No need to attend meetings anymore
- We must produce e-books loss of revenue stream for local services
- E-formats may encourage use of translation software that doesn't maintain fidelity of message
- Unintended affiliation/endorsement of other literature, e.g. Amazon recommends...
- Blurring of brand clarity as we get identified with other recovery messages
- Reduced shipping and production costs
- Leadership needed to offer options for groups
- Tax issue for groups and members with cashless contributions
- Electronic transactions put members information info external databases-risking anonymity
- After course of fund flow—members →areas →groups

Potential Responses

- Create our own delivery platform
- Use delivery platform to solicit input on new projects – "if you bought the Basic Text you might like to input Living Clean..."
- Set up text contribution for member – Text this number to donate $XX (text "NAWS $ to donate)
- Create multiple electronic formats for different platforms
- Create different items in e-format (audio, video, text, image)
- Mobile version of NA.org
- Identify "headline news" and use it to create a book or other messages, e.g. "who playing at the world convention?"
- Use hypertext etc. within literature – reading doesn't have to be linear – connecting us to other resources
- Explore use of QR codes and tag readers

R Increase in income that falls short to increase in expense and continued demand for resources in places different from where we receive the bulk of our revenue

Potential Implications

- Fewer services available
- ↑ Feeling of completion for resources
- ↑ Demand on fellowship that has resources
- Resentment and → ↑ fostering of "what's in it for me?"
- Perpetuating culture of recipients vs. givers
- Diminished developmental effectiveness
- Creative means of creating resources
- Help create a state of autonomy (on their own) – maturity
- ↑ Challenge to protect intellectual property
- USSC – sense that communication needs are ignored
- Fellowship fatigue related

Potential Responses

- ? community strategy to effectively and emotionally carry our message through service system
- Constantly plan to grow our recourse base
- Establish a philosophy of self-support in the early stages of NA community development
    - o Individual evaluation/benchmark to process

- To continue to reinforce key messages about self-support (contribute vs. donate)
- Realistic practical, community practices about self-support

After lunch, the group came back to discuss assessments and where improvements can be made. Questions are: 1) where are the themes for improvement and 2) what are the weaknesses to work on in the cycle?

- Some themes mentioned:
- World Board preparedness inconsistent
- Internal World Board development/team effort disconnect
- Communication use: fellowship, internal/awareness
  o Sense of unity
- Continued focus on World Board relationship and clear shift of roles
- Personal accountability and preparedness
- Some maturity of our personal performance
  o Awareness
  o Coaching
  o Mentoring
  o Support
  o Evaluation on performance

★A key factor in the evaluation process is having conversations with individuals about who they are, what they offer and how to continue their development. It is okay to ask new board members questions like, why are you here and what you want this experience to offer.★

The board should make more time for emerging philosophical discussions and being knowledgeable about the process.

Next activity for the group is to identify implication for communication, fellowship support, recovery literature, leadership, and resources.

Communications

- Need better use of technology for product delivery and communication
  o e-space
- Develop a social media strategy
- Better, frame key messages...
  o Strong 'connection' [internal] between audience and NAWS/NA
  o Emotional and intellectual
- Better listen/monitor pulse of the fellowship and delivery of NA message locally
- Better target PR efforts, including policy makers, contextualize the message

- Limitations on resources drive the need to be creative about communication approaches (on more strategic when can't be face to face).
- Continue to encourage and engage other levels of the Service System relationship to do this...

Fellowship Support

- Some emphasis on long term strategy for fellowship development – including benchmarks for community development / procedures
- Increase PR effort overall
- Address loss of revenue stream at local level
- Some information on group options regarding use of technology
- Decentralized fellowship development approach
    - o Use of technology etc
- Information available about:
    - o People taking medication at meetings
    - o Elderly – H&I strategy
    - o High school H&I
    - o Relationship between drug courts and H&I
- Resource implications communities left behind
- Improve ways to have philosophical issue discussion with the fellowship
- Better resources / tools for service provision (service system)
- Pressure based on copyright infringement to act

Recovery Literature

- Development of literature for target audiences
    - o Elderly
- Use of technology in the development of recovery literature
    - o Cultural challenges
- Process of delivery and distribution of recovery literature
    - o E-books, etc
    - o Distribution relationship
- Identification of users of recovery literature and development of multimedia integrated literature
- Different formats – MP3's
- How to capture fellowship engagement in literature development without hindering the process of literature development (living clean book example)
- Issue of impact of others' translation software and impact for context

Leadership

- Use of technology – tools and training for development of leaders

- Renewed focus of World Board development beyond evaluation

- Sharing the results/analysis of the scan with the broader leadership

- Expand leadership training initiates, including train-the-trainer and to H&I, PR leaders

- In training on roles/principles of leadership, address emotional fears lead to step out of comfort zone.

- Leadership basis' tool ★

Resources

- Continued need to raise consciousness/thinking regarding need for self support

- Reality of growing global demand and need for creative solutions (e.g. technology)

- Not lose sight of impact of e-pubs on local offices

- Tired of the 'ask' …need a different approach/message

    o Challenge to change mindset about giver, not just takers

    o Care about the whole (especially outside the US)

    o Report positively where the behavior / attitude has changed

- More resources devoted to PR…

The meeting ended at 5:15pm.

Friday 17 June
Service System

The chair opened the meeting with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity prayer.

The first item of discussion is about our recommendation to the USSC and the appendix about fund flow and the agreement in principle.

Later in the afternoon, the HRP will join the meeting and the Service System is welcome to stay. There is not a lot of meeting time so we are asking that everyone be conscience of time.

Today's handouts are a paragraph on the United States Service Conference and a summary of the World Board and Service System discussion from January 2011

The WB, Service System Workgroup, and Staff will meet together Friday and Saturday. The days will be spent much like the January meeting - Friday will be discussions and Saturday will be the decision making day with Jim DeLizia.

10.   USSC and how NAWS response

Discussion began with stating that this is a challenging issue to frame. Travel has usually been an EC decision but because this is a bit more complicated, we are asking the full board to discuss and decide. Depending on the decision, a response will then need to be framed.

The Executive Committee recapped their discussion regarding core group and the invitation from Tulsa and some well-intended members. The EC thoughts are not to attend, we do not support the idea or spirit of USSC and creating the USSC is not the answer. We continue to invite them into the process and to the spirit of wanting to do something about the local disconnect and let us collaborate in discussions about the Service System project.

Board discussion:

The EC talked about presenting the rational about not attending area functions but thought against that because we want to be forthcoming about why we are not attending.

Response Ideas

- Respond saying we hear you, however there are a set of proposals that moves the system to a better direction. Keep the response tone pro Service System and not con anything.

- Encourage members to try to take a closer look at the proposals.

- This could be an opportunity to tell a story about Service System and explain why we believe this project is the answer to what they want to accomplish and talk about the project with them. Maybe we should go and do a workshop. We can take the opportunity to tell everyone in attendance that the project is driven by the conference; we did not come up with this on our own. In favor of attending if, they are interested in talking about the Service System project, no to attending if we are not going to be useful or helpful.

- We have to find a way to focus everyone back on the Service System project and start telling story. We need to make sure that areas become more informed. Having several workshops at the convention will help. Want people to be engaged in finding the answer. We can try webinars, which would allow people to talk to each other. Would not attend Tulsa.

- Invited to a Service System workshop in hosting region; but at the same time knew that it would be a USSC discussion. Believes the person that extended the invitation really thought USSC and Service System was the same thing. Clear that at the level of area, there are serious difficulties that are hard to confront as well as with the region. A major difficulty is the capacity of those to understand a WSC supported project for a service system and a proposal from individuals for a US Service Conference. Most think that a way to support a group is by allowing them to vote and tallying that vote. They did not understand the Service System proposals but neither did they understand the USSC. This is a serious matter and not sure who we can communicate with when we do not understand how to help others understand.

- It bears repeating that there are those that were excited about what we were saying and doing with the Service System. We can address the fundamental issue about the fellowship being the ones that requested this work. No to Tulsa.

- Respond to the literature portion in a way that helps everyone to understand. There should be information about one thing. Maybe consider some of their ideas that work for the Service System. Send information about the importance of keeping the fellowship in one piece. It is possible that maybe all they want to do is participant because they feel their ideas have been discarded and split because they do not feel important enough. However is very concerned with selling of other literature because that separates us, too.

- There has been an ability to participate. Move Service System project discussion possibly to the delegate board. Also agrees that there are some good ideas in the USSC, one being an event at a national forum that is training focus. Attended a Convention/Literature Distribution workshop and it was so beneficial and wonders if can create something like that for H&I etc.

- The focus of the USSC is taking away from everything we do and should not discuss any further. We have talked about many changes and the real focus is at the area and group level. We took a holistic look at how to serve the fellowship best and it is the Service System project. We have a flattening in the US. If anything, this is looking at something different and doing something different. There are a few examples of some trying the proposal already and that is very exciting. Do not think we need to say anything more if we want to embellish it is all right with that. No, to Tulsa

- Some agree that this is an opportunity for us to meet with them and talk about the Service System project.

Straw Poll regarding attending Tulsa

Unanimous support to not attend Tulsa

Response to Tulsa: honor the spirit of those with positive intentions and invite them into discussions about the proposals, etc. Staff will draft letter to get board approval, as well as frame this story a bit as well.

To fellowship: approach to multiple forums – engagement in the Service System proposals, driving the focus to the local level. Do things like webinar, WCNA workshops Service System session. Stop releasing proposals and tell stories.

Idea: (for future) create some type of communication forum opportunity that allows people to talk, be heard and engage.

11. Funding and Literature Distribution

A summary regarding the range of things we may offer people about the idea of not having a monthly area service meeting. The majority of groups already find a way to get what they need.

We will tell people to think about how they might envision getting their literature in the new system.

*   Statements are confusing, first we say that what we believe it will undermine then on the next page, and statement is opposite.

    Response: this will probably be a US issue only; do not think it will affect those outside the US. These are only ideas for the future; the next group will have to hammer out all the details.

*   Generally, it is a fine summary of what has been brainstormed. Local communities do this in vastly different ways. Did notice on the "order from LSU meeting" perhaps the board have a literature coordinator or literature workgroup? Paragraph stops business to collect money. Also references completely having no business at the GSU. When we are talking about GSU being training ground does not see a problem of having someone doing the literature.

*   Regarding electronic bank account and bankcards being ok at group level. Rub against what they think they are doing right now. Somehow this says you can do something different. Australia actually does electronic banking. "Say that a lot of our stuff is out dated" these are ideas that have to be flushed out...

*   Very sensitive to business at the GSU and having said that likes the idea of giving a variety of options, encourages people to talk together and encourages them to come up the with best for them

*   Whatever we do decide to offer, hopes members really reflect, but is concerned that they should reflect really well on the funding practices. It's critical that the next group understands market research.

*   Possibly reword currently written portion regarding the electronic portion.

Staff summarized what she captured.

12. Agreements in Principle

Executive Committee talked on Tuesday and began capturing agreements and principle. This will help to identify the points of agreement or disagreement.

The agreements are capturing ideas; we will then have small group discussions about what will go in the CAR. The support documentation will be available for participants. The set up piece will also have more about Tradition 1 and the Concepts.

Agreement in Principle - Edits

*   Add a definition of "agreements and principles."

*   Add to the opening sentence; "Ultimately achieving our vision" as a lead to what they are adopting.

*   Opening sentences; instead of using the word "exception" suggestion to use something about the vision as well as adding "synchronization service bodies" and about being purpose driven.

*   Change order of the bullets; plan-driven need to have a clear purpose.

*   Agreement to combine bullet two (2) and bullet four (4)

- We may want to change "not self determined" in bullet two (2) because everything else is written in a positive tense.

- Everyone understands and agrees that we expect people will have a variation in the ideals or application of the ideals.

- Bullet 5 seems too ambiguous. Be clearer on the process for making that determination (implementation)

- Bullet 6; should be more clear.

Discussion about how the board wants to talk about ideas for presenting the *Agreement in Principles*. The vision and key principles will be in the set up; pointing out *this is what the system will look like if this is adopted...*It will be beneficial to include an essay in the Conference Report.

The group broke for lunch.

Discussion continues

After lunch the meeting opened with moment of silence followed by the Serenity prayer

In January, everyone agreed to recommend seating by state, nation, or province. Discussion opened to discuss zones, which someone brought up earlier.

Question posed was why close the door to zones if several nations wanted to do and/or wanted to be represented in a zone or something that would allow this to occur. Think an opportunity is being missed by neglecting this issue.

The decision in January by the World Board with Service System was to have one option and report that to the fellowship, but also agreed to report the idea of keeping the notion of zones on the table.

An agenda item for tomorrow is to talk about places like Brazil or places in the United States that may not fall neatly into a category and how will they be handled and how do we explain that situation.

Discussion:

- The fact that it is states, Province and Nation does invite, this is a natural progression versus being forced. Think it is already in place; it is just not called a zone.

- It really is about allowing the option for them coming together if they so choose and know of many communities in Europe that would benefit from this type of option. Only suggest removing word 'zone' because it is misleading.

- Certainly can say we should have spent more time by reducing seating size of the conference but the current proposal is complementary to the best practices of services. We are encouraging people to structure their community in State, National, and Province (SNP). What we are offering is what we thought would be best.

  Staff summarized that in January we agreed that yes we are going with SNP but not shutting the door on something like a zone, but for now, going with SNP.

Decision: The decision made in January will remain. Add a sentence stating SNP being at least the criteria.

Brainstorming Session

The group brainstorming will further define details; we are trying to get member's pulse and what some of those granular ideas are. Ways that we have talked about the principles being

more concrete to put into action.

Post-it responses

Group 1

Group Focus: separate dedicated body that exclusively identifies the needs and support group, non-business oriented discussion based in grass roots training

Geopolitical Bodies: Intermediate body established by approval of appropriate service body subject opt pre-determined criteria

Service Bodies: consensus based plans synchronized with other levels of service

Seating at the WSC – based on geopolitical boundaries determined by the WSC

Group 2

#1 How GSU directly supports the group

#2 Geo – city, county, state, province, nation, what do you think or have in mind?

Pre-determined

Who decides local service bodies and which local geographical base

#3 more guidance/information for Intermediate Body and who decides to form it

#4 How does this apply to local service? How does collaborative apply on a local level?

Synchronization / planning cycle

#5 Purpose based and plan driven

- •Plan driven = elaborate
- ✭Training required = what might that look like?
- -- Local = 1 year or 2 year cycle as part of the synch?

#6 Temporary solutions, it is evolutionary

Group 3

- Some group issues do not belong @ the LSU e.g. children in meetings offer further examples...
- Offer sample GSU agenda
- GSU offers an opportunity to become involved in service and to experience benefits
- GSU provides basic education, like what is H&I
- GSU could provide liaison opportunity with facility managers
- Define local service board (do we need to change the name to something more palatable?)
- Explain it, what it does, explain what happens at an LSB meeting
- Clearly define how ongoing services work e.g. H&I and what we mean by ongoing
- Define how sub-committees will function e.g. activities does something every month or

quarterly are they ongoing or project based services. Offer sample project guidelines

- Group involvement: groups influence where local services are delivered by involving themselves in the planning assembly.

- Groups supply information and issues for environmental scanning and then prioritize needs

- Groups approve, oversee, evaluate project and have quarterly meetings

- Explain how some services are ongoing and others are projects, e.g. MN has PR calendar of same events every year making this an ongoing service. N. Dakota does PR events one by one-making them projects

- Strategic planning produces both projects and ongoing services. Establishing a new area of H&I or PR panels could be a project – servicing them is an ongoing service

- Give examples

- Relate new ideas to existing service bodies e.g. project vs. ad hoc. Ad hoc has a defined end but project is different because it is the direct result of a planning process.

- Geographic – reduces duplication of effort and expense

Group 4

Service bodies / Geo based

- Do we agree that ease of interacting, interfacing, with government and social entities is important to providing services?
    - Locateability
    - Relationship
    - PR
    - Suitable (matching size) bodies i.e. state prison, state H&I, county prison, county H&I

- Service bodies, plan driven, and planning

- Do we agree that the autonomy of the service group is impacted or shaped by a broader vision or mission focused guided conscience?

- Do we agree that an inventory of need is an aspect?

- Do we agree that an inventory of resources is an aspect

- Do we agree that we collect information (inventory) and consider our vision as an aspect of planning

- Do we agree that an assessment and evaluation is an aspect?

- Do we agree that problems we are working on will tell us they are the problems we should be working on? How do we know?

Groups

- Separate group support function from service provision - agree or disagree

    Agree not to lose groups focus by including details of providing services

17

Agree that service system must support groups in its message to carry information

For instance, how to deal with different members

Seating

- Do we agree that Geo based is valuable perspective / organization principle?

Group 5

Group focused

- A place where group needs and concerns are addressed
- Helps to build strong home groups by giving direct support to the group's greater focus on supporting groups
    - Support groups in fulfilling their primary purpose

Geographically based

- Conforms to established boundaries of boroughs, cities, countries and states
- Makes it easier for potential members to find NA
    - Enhance our PR efforts

Plan Driven

- Looking at the needs of the whole not individual wants and desires
- Planning process includes as many as possible to address common concerns
- Greater engagement – enhanced involvement in service
- Can involve entire NA community in the process
- LSB can provide oversight to implementation

13. WB and HRP meet to discuss election survey

Joining the meeting are the Human Resource Panel (HRP) members Valerie Douthit, Mark Williams, Margaret Hardman-Muye and Pat Pate. Staff support is Steve Rusch, Roberta Tolkan and Keri Kirkpatrick.

The process of soliciting feedback from conference participant was undertaken and reported as being done as a joint effort between the World Board and Human Resource Panel (HRP). What we need to talk about here is where we go from here and what we jointly want to say.

Candidate Profile Reports (CPR)

Of all the ideas from the last World Service Conference (WSC) is the idea of allowing access to the CPR's seemed to be the one that had considerable amount of energy and although the board is recommending posting CPR's, this is not without concern. Hope to get the support of the HRP. Valerie also added discussing this with the other members of the HRP and came to the consensus that this was a valuable idea as well as having concerns about privacy. HRP also felt the survey validated their process.

Valerie added that the HRP talked about the FTP site and how to prevent printing CPR's. The CPR's will not be available until a month before the conference so there will be a period attached

to posting. Some thought there was not much of a difference between conference participants having the ability to make copies of the paper copies handed out for a week. HRP also talked about the survey responses asked for what the board needs but that is not something the HRP can provide.

Suggestions

- If someone wanted to be on the board, individual should be knowledgeable of what is going on with the World Board, e.g. knowledge of projects, etc.

- Candidate will have the option to have information published or not.

- At first convinced that providing more time would help delegates with elections then read survey and it said that we live in Never, Never land and the sky is blue. However, remembers asking people at the conference if they knew people on the ballot and they did not. Can a tool be created that allows people to meet?

HRP thought it might be difficult to navigate page after page on the computer making notes on individuals. Can a paper copy be given and ask them to protect that. Other thing is that last names are used to hope them navigate paper copy better than electronic and do they really need the last names?

There was a conversation about mailing rather than posting. Roberta stated that whether we mail or not they are still going to have a paper copy when they vote.

The conference supported an experiment for a cycle. There is still the *March Conference Report* so in that we can <u>ask delegates what they want and tell them that if abused (electronic or paper), this will not be done again. We will also report in *NAWS News* as well as point out that if a candidate is opposed, the HRP would honor that privacy by providing his or her candidate profile information at the conference only. Add a disclosure sentence about candidate or person elected to the board will have their name as part of a public record.</u> Agreement

Valerie pointed out really liking the idea of asking candidates whether they are knowledgeable about Strategic Plan, current projects etc.

Board Demographics

The World Board has spent a great deal of time discussing what is missing from the board and talked about reporting this in *NAWS News* about why a group of people get nominated and the board's needs. Valerie added the HRP talked about wanting to create a tool that gets the perspective from a World Board member that is rolling off the board.

We will use this as a way to start engaging in discussions about actual practices/behavior and create some analysis on leadership.

Meeting ended for the day at 6:00pm

Saturday 18 June

Joint Meeting with the Service System Workgroup

One of the things discussed earlier in the week was the need and importance of being able to craft a message We need to talk about the SS in a compelling way, in a seamless way, need to tell the right message

A. LOCAL LEVEL

1. Boundaries for Local Service boundaries

a. To what degree do we want to define who sets LSU boundaries? (Do we want to offer a recommendation? Options? Suggested Criteria/Considerations?)

Discussion about looking at boundaries for local groups and thus far agreeing that boundaries defined are geographic in nature, with consideration for factors for density, size, and #of groups – flexibility.

Discussion regarding clarifying what is being asked, Travis stated that we have a criteria but it not clear. When we say not self determined then the question is then "who does determine"? If we are portraying a system then we always portray what the idea is. We do not leave it up to the system to figure out. The board overwhelmingly supports wanting to offer options.

Recommendation rationale: This ideal is one we need to be more direct about to help everyone understand. If we are telling a story, there does not need to be any uncertainty. Here is one of those times that we need to be clear on why and its ramifications. We need to give recommendations that relates to one of the core principles. We as a group will start with criteria consideration and come to an agreement we can then propose. Jim stated that the question is "who". Like recommendation that there should be established boundaries, that help give clarity. Jim stated that maybe this would be an instance that something is so important enough to the success of the system to give recommendation.

As a table start at level of criteria or consideration: what would be an importation factor in considering who, example criteria is someone that has a bigger picture view – 2 minutes

When thinking about whom, what in that is important, what the how has to have:

Boundaries for Local Service Bodies; Thoughts from the group

Process: awareness of needs, collaborative, should include parties not directly involved by the decision as well as those affected, an ad-hoc (special) purpose driven body (maybe intermediate), capable of making informed and non preferential decision (balance), a larger group key stakeholder (e.g. trusted servants), state province

Perspective: knowledgeable/understand the new service system, should have larger view of service provisions, wider system vision, perspective

Skills: planning and scanning, established experience, administrative, local knowledge, PR awareness

Viable options that meeting those criteria – post it

— A regional delegate team

— SNP assembly

Later down the line

A workgroup of the SNP

Next page – post it

The next level of service (intermediate body)

Whatever will be recommendation, we will have to include who + process. Added was that part of this recommendation needs to identify the creation of tools for the transition. Where we are at with this project and there seems an importance to agreeing in principle and not sure how we do not put the ideal in principle forward to the fellowship. Once the conference participants agree or not, that gives the implementation group what they need to go forward. All we are supposed to be doing is to agree to the idea in principle.

WHO: Local Boundaries & Intermediate (what we are communicating)
Agreement starting points

- It is at the SNP level that the authority lies to coordinate and determine LSU boundaries.

- Body uses collaborative needs based, informed groups process to build consensus include those affected by the decision for this decision to work with those members who are affected by decision

- Transitory steps , evolutionary will need to occur to move from current structure to ideal (e.g. to initially redirect LSU's)

- Evaluation of continued need for bodies identified (e.g. intermediate bodies)

- Criteria to be used to make decision re: an intermediate body e.g. Density, diversity and distance

---

2. Shared Services

Discussion questions

> **a. We have determined that the purpose of an Intermediate Body is not to provide "shared services". However, if two or more service bodies want to collaborate to provide specific services, how should decision-making and accountability function in the new system? (Do we want to offer a recommendation? Options? Criteria? Alternatively, just examples of circumstances or situations where a shared service process would be beneficial?) [Discuss recommendation options, criteria or examples as appropriate.]**

How should decision making and accountability work for shared services bodies.

The group is to discuss what the essentials are about shared services that we would recommend about any shared services, include charter.

Group 1

Sydney (Australia) Metro ⇨⇨LSU

Four (4) areas to the Metro that have PI, H&I, convention and phoneline. Sydney combined area conventions. Agreement on who is responsible to whom

21

No planning – purely administrative

Areas still independent

Metro delegate usually RCM/Area Chair

Clearly defined scope, accountability

No big deal – happy for Metro to TCB

Group 2

Collaborative procedures, (agreed to) about who what when purpose

Writing a best practice

Some decision by committee – shared services

Some decision to establishing bodies

Included in planning process

Outcome of planning process

Informal undertaking possible

Group 3

Decision making > collaborative, approved purpose and scope [phoneline area code, conventions]

Accountability to the body who created or approved, shared services

SNP: approval and conflict resolution

Pay –today accountability: bodies coming together, charter and funding agreement

Group 4

In a plan driven system, some existing "shared services" may go away, the plans will be developed at the assembly ⇨⇨

⇨⇨ Accountability – LSB (member bodies) LSB is the central point –OR– SNP in some cases

Depending on needs: workgroups/projects accountable back to the LSB (or SNP) broader accountability

Not self-driven

Agreement as a minimal statement

✭ There should be an agreement charter between bodies

    o Scope of services

    o Roles

    o Funding

    o Clarity re: communications

✭ Clarity regarding the level and type of authority (decision-making) of shared services [e.g., when conflict occurs come...]

✯ Agreed upon process to resolve conflict

✯ Shared service born out of a collaborative need based process with regular evaluation of success.

✯ Shared service body ultimately accountable body(ies) that created it... happens in the majority/evaluation process

  o See needs, plan, monitor, evaluate, input... decision making and accountability

B. INTERMEDIATE AND STATE/STATE/NATIONAL/PROVINCE (SNP) LEVEL

1. Further Definition of Intermediate Bodies

Discussion Questions

a. We have already determined that the existing proposals do not adequately address the service needs of large states like California and New York, or large countries like Brazil, Russia and India. Similarly, the proposals do not address the needs of smaller states and countries, such as the New England states or the Balkan countries, so, to what degree do we want to address this issue? (E.g. Offer a recommendation) Options Suggested Criteria/Considerations) [Discuss recommendation or suggested criteria/considerations.]

Dealing with small and large SNP's (green card)

- Common Sense practicality and No good result (sense) in WSC unity e.g. Germany? (language)

- Large geographically, large distances (smaller communities too far apart)

- Size e.g. Russia, Brazil, but see Australia. Vast geographic distances, e.g. Siberia – isolation

- Small, closely-knit community that function together. Smaller communities benefit from experience of neighboring communities

- Sense of community and sharing spiritual resources. Sense of adequate participation (representation of WSC)

- Cultural barriers (national, racial, language, religion). Multi language groups w/in one community

- Language and geopolitical boundaries

- Effective service delivery. Needs based (two or more smaller communities that need each other)

- Planned evaluation of service provision by SNP and reevaluation of boundaries. Practicality e.g. Balkan States, VT/NH

- Needs based purpose driven, need

- Meeting density and extreme population

- Member density, California

- Financial limitation and challenges, communicator, coordination (large and small SNP's)

- Who decides? Bottom line is GTFU

Post it/Group discussion points agreements

- Process – steps / principles to help us to deal with larger/small SNP issues…And some examples of possible outcomes the process might generate.

- Rest of specifics to be fleshed out in the transitional phase.

C. WORLD LEVEL

1. Further Definition of Intermediate Bodies

Discussion Questions

a. Without regard to the seating issue, how do we envision Zones as a productive part of the Service System?

b. What are their possible roles? [Discussion Ideas]

Without regard to the seating issue, think of the Zone as intentional value added part of the service system and what would they look like?

Are they self determined?

What is the next step for the parking lot with this conversation?

Seems that there is agreement that there is some value in what we call zones, whether that resembles or called a zone is another question. What do we want to say about zones?

Zones Group Discussion Points – Brainstorming

+Zones as part of the fund flow system:
Fellowship Development e.g. translations, local community development, outreach, PR Support, etc.
Uniform practices
Information clearing house
Experienced trusted servants level training venue, specific targeted training.
Are they self-determined geopolitical body?
Has an admin body
Plan and project driven
Resource for NAWS <-> SNP
Decision making body – consensus
The value of zones is that they offer a central point for the coordination of NA service amongst member communities.

Group 2

Coordination of SNP meetings
Training
Sharing session networking
Service coordinator e.g. translations, literature distribution, events, fellowship development, Public Relations, etc
A recognized service body
Unity

24

Newsletters

CCOG

Fund Flow

Issue Discussion Topic (IDT) workshops

- Worldwide Workshops

Literature Review

Cooperative Delegates

Group 3

Pooling of resources (e.g. translations)

Inclusion of PR Forum/events and other local events

Beneficial to hosting communities

World services discussions (IDTs and other issues/input, etc)

Planning

Leadership development (shinning stars✶)

Trusted servants (TS) performance assessment

Unifying body, unity link, especially for small, emerging communities and larger communities helping each other

Provides services

Provision of training through sharing of services, tools, ideas, (like Florida symposium)

Not gathering of delegates but bringing together of trusted servants of similar background/'purpose – shared experience beyond delegates.

FD planning

Group 4

Fellowship Development

Pool for training and development (if necessary), decision development, de4livery materials and experience, tell stores

Point of connection between geo related communities

Support and encouraging communities, coordinate when relative translations, or discover other structural development growth.

Convention: Fellowship unity functions

Point of connection to greater NA fellowship (WSC, NAWS), interested people

Other: intermediate body (seating), sharing on common issues, solution center, environment scanning

Group 5

Training (local)

Open forum

Dissemination of information

Wishful thinking – dreaming

Leadership ID and development

Literature translation

Fellowship development

"Symposium" likes events

PR efforts (regional/national events)

Coordination of services especially border fellowship

Federal planning (non US)

Exchange of best practices, information conduit, fellowship development

Zone: If they are going to be part of a SS then we need to ask. Is this a question we are asking of the conference to be discussed? At this point we discussed ideas like, we are highlighting to those that think all is well. We talked about increasing the value, as an intentional piece of the service system.

SEATING CRITERIA (orange cards)

History of delivery and maturity of fellowship with history of service delivery

Stage of development

Degree of infrastructure, stage of development

Isolation, degree of isolation from others

Size matters, density (number of NA members, number of groups), clustering of demographically similar entities (DSES)

Functionality and Purpose

Perspective not already present at WSC, potential capacity to contribute (culturally/diversity), value added "voice not heard",

Unification, common language

What do they take away?

The body asked if there was a next step needed with this conversation. staff reports what has been discussed.

PART 2

Decisions about material in the proposals and in the CAR

1. Planning Process

Discussion questions

   a. What are our thoughts on ways and to what degree the planning cycles should

synchronize within the Service System? [Discuss ideas and what to include in proposals]

What are the (key) benefits of synchronizing the planning cycles?

- Better scanning information for better decision -making

- Sense of connectedness in the service system

- Collaboration

- Maximize efficiency /value on each service body has to offer

- Greater impact on furthering goals and priorities system wide

- Better ability to monitor and evaluate progress and success

- Improved participation/ability to shape NA!!

How important is synchronizing our planning cycles: out of 20 scores, there are 20-5, 4-4 and 1-3

How best could we synchronize and how could we achieve, what would we have to do: small group disc.

Planning Process - How to best synchronize/process

- Establish a planning schedule (calendar)

  o Survey

  o Plan development

  o implement

  o Assessment

  o Adjustment /re-plan

- Process at each level would include:

  o Input from above in the system

  o Prove input to level below

- Sensitivity to conflicts in calendar

  o Across communities

  o ↑↓ communities

Starts with World Service Conference (WSC)

- Plan adopted at conference...

- Goals move through the system; each level integrates approaches as needed to meet their local needs or has implication locally...

- Feedback moves back up the system to monitor /evaluate progress up to WSC

- Cycle operates all the time

- Strategic alignment

★ Depends on skill / attitude and expectation at each level for the value / how to of planning

★ Translation – criteria needs and skill to make work

27

- Benchmarks within the process – WSC, CAR, etc
- Plan driven means –
  - o Plan directs/drives
  - o Action / priorities focus
  - o Financial resource alignment (budget development, e.g.)
  - o Synch with election of leadership
- Synch planning from state and local level can improve communication, collaboration and planning for local services (like PR), events, etc. … (calendar)

2. Agreements in Principle

Discussion questions

a. What does an 'agreement' in principle' look like?

b. What are our ideas on the agreements in principle that are needed?

c. What do we agree should go into the CAR? [review examples, disc and confirm]

PART 3

Future discussion/decisions that will be needed [agree on list and on how/when discussion will take place]

Meeting ended at 5:31pm