

World Board Report

This *Conference Report* is a detailed progress report from the World Board to fellow conference participants. First, we report the actual work itself. We highlight the status of work accomplished, work-in-progress, and work still to-do. Routine services are 90% of the budget of NA World Services. Projects make up just 10%. This report discusses both.

In part two, we discuss process issues. By this we mean the processes we are using to get the work done, including the ongoing task of making the board's committee system function well.

Part three of this report is from the Human Resources Panel (attached separately).

We hope our report answers many questions you have about what's going on in NA World Services. Other parts of our report are meant to raise questions and issues. We plan to turn to you for answers and ideas at the September World Service Meeting. For those who aren't able to travel to Vienna, Virginia, we encourage written input on any topic of concern.

The reality of our resource challenge is ongoing. This report was due in May, along with the *NAWS News* from the April board meeting. Other priority projects (e.g., the worldwide workshops) delayed this until now. We know that those of you attending the World Service Meeting will have a lot to process quickly. Thank you in advance for reviewing this report in the short timeframe

This is a long report. We've tried to make it interesting and break it up. Feedback is always welcome. The next *NAWS News* will summarize this report. Thank you also for your help explaining the work of NA World Services to the members you serve.

One of the main purposes of the *Conference Report* is to serve as a big picture

roadmap. We're always trying to tie together where we were, where we are, and where we are going. The big picture looks quite similar to what we laid out 18 months ago in the November 1999 *Conference Report*. So, because most of the process issues remain the same, rather than reinventing the wheel, we've included a number of sidebars that quote from the still relevant 1999 report.

Our purpose today—our first, second, and third priority—is to continue building a strong and stable foundation for NA World Services. Together we hope to secure a foundation that will allow our world services to support and ensure the continuation and growth of NA worldwide for the next 25 years and beyond, to achieve each and every aspect of our Vision Statement. And we recall that we are striving not for more of the same, but rather for a structure that we see as improved not only by virtue of its newness or stability or efficiency. We seek a significant improvement in the quality of the services that our structure is able to deliver. Change means we want different results. The service foundation our predecessors created in the late 1970s and 1980s was successful in helping our fellowship reach the stage of growth and development we have achieved today at the threshold of a new century. And throughout this time, our most primary services, now called routine/basic services in the Unified Budget, have expanded and grown much more complex. With these basic services we have continued to serve the needs of the fellowship without interruption throughout these years of inventory and transition. Nov.'99 Conf.Rpt.

Part One: What's Actually Going On?

NAWS NEWS COMING SOON!

We're past the halfway point in the first two-year conference cycle. It's been three years since the conference created the board and this new system at WSC 1998. Today, with WSC 2002 less than a year away, it really does look like we're halfway through a six-year process of transition that will take us through to WSC 2004, three years from now.

We only publish the *Conference Report* in English. The August issue of *NAWS News* will be a translated summary of this *Conference Report*. We are preparing that now as we go to press.

We've also preparing one more *News Flash* report about world convention speakers. *Flashes* covers a topic of fellowshipwide interest or importance. Please copy and distribute these freely. All flashes are on our website. Go to: www.na.org/nawsmain.htm.

**WORLD UNITY DAY
1 - 2 SEPTEMBER 2001
VIENNA, VIRGINIA
(NEAR WASHINGTON, DC)**

World Unity Day is an annual celebration of our worldwide fellowship that includes a main meeting with a telephone link around the world, a banquet, dance, workshops, marathon meetings, and fellowship all weekend!

Flyers are already out for this event. If you need more information, contact the WSO. You can also register now for World Unity Day and make hotel reservations (Sheraton Premiere) at the same time by going to www.na.org/events-reg.htm.

**WORLD UNITY DAY
TELEPHONE LINK
1 SEPTEMBER 2001 7:30 PM
EASTERN DAYLIGHT TIME**

Individual members, NA groups, area and regional functions, and institutions can join the celebration of World Unity Day on a two-hour, "listen only" telephone hook-up and hear the Unity Day main speaker.

The cost is \$50.00 US for calls within the US and Canada. For calls outside the US/Canada, there will be an additional charge depending on the rates of the country. All regions outside of the US and Canada are eligible for one free hook-up. Event information, including registration and lodging, are available online at www.na.org/events-reg.htm.

**WORLD SERVICE MEETING
31 AUGUST - 2 SEPTEMBER
VIENNA, VIRGINIA
(NEAR WASHINGTON, DC)**

The World Service Meeting is an opportunity for regional delegates and alternate delegates to interact with the World Board about current works-in-progress. This year the Human Resource Panel will also be present.

EXECUTIVE CODIRECTOR RESIGNS

After 15 years of tireless service as a special worker for NA World Services, George Hollahan, Executive Codirector of NA World Services, has resigned. George's deep love, devotion, and commitment to our fellowship,

August 2001 Conference Report

along with his creative vision, have aided us in working through many difficult times.

George attended his first World Service Conference in 1981 as the regional service representative for Florida. As WSC Vice Chairperson in 1983, George produced a report that then became *A Temporary Working Guide to Our Service Structure*. George has always been devoted to improving communications and relations with the fellowship. During his tenure on the WSC Administrative Committee, the first *Fellowship Report* came into existence, which today has evolved into this *Conference Report*. After serving as vice chairperson and chairperson of the WSC (a total of four years), Bob Stone hired him in June 1986 to work at the World Service Office. George assumed responsibility for conference services, and his leadership helped build the foundation for world services, as we know them today. His work as WSO staff with the Select/Ad Hoc Committee on NA Service was crucial to the creation of the *Twelve Concepts for NA Service* and *A Guide to Local Services in Narcotics Anonymous*. He became Executive Codirector in 1995.

George has remained a proactive advocate by suggesting changes to our service structure so that NAWS—both trusted servants and staff—could deliver more effective services. His continual fight to make world services function better, for the benefit of the fellowship, played a vital role in identifying the problems in the old world service system, and beginning an inventory process that resulted in the fellowship's adoption of the World Board and the new world service system in 1998.

George's heart was always, and continues to be, close to fellowship development. On his first trip to Latin America over ten years ago, he fell in love with the emerging NA community there. Ever a visionary, he saw right from the start, how the passion and energy of these new members of

our NA family would begin to change the worldwide fellowship. The last world convention in Cartagena, Colombia, was the fulfillment of a dream come true that George labored long and hard to bring about. Today, more than 15 Latin American nations have become seated regions at the World Service Conference. Both the board and the conference now represent the ever-increasing diversity of the fellowship.

He has also passionately worked for the preservation of the NA Fellowship's history and its archives. We and staff will all miss George's enthusiastic and compelling approach to management and service work in general. The fact that he has been out on medical leave since February 2000 doesn't make it any easier for us or staff to accept George's decision to resign. We take some comfort in knowing that his caring spirit will always be with us in all that we do, but this will not fill the gap his resignation leaves.

NEW AND FEATURED PRODUCTS

We have enclosed a flyer announcing the new and featured products.

You may also want to keep your eyes open (or should we say your ears) for the arrival of an audio version of the Basic Text in Spanish. It is time to create and make available recovery material in Spanish for our growing Spanish-speaking fellowship. We made this decision to respond to requests from eighteen countries, as well as drug courts and correctional facilities in the US. It will take some time to research the details and implement this. We will update you as developments arise.

LITERATURE ON WWW.NA.ORG

After discussions at the last two board meetings, we are proposing to take a major step

August 2001 Conference Report

forward and posting six NA information pamphlets (IPs) on the website (www.na.org). The recovery literature we're planning to post is: IP #1 (*Who, What, How, and Why*); IP #7 (*Am I an Addict?*); IP #16 (*For the Newcomer*); IP #17 (*For Those In Treatment*); IP #22 (*Welcome to NA*); and the information booklet, *NA: A Resource in Your Community*. These IPs seem the best choice to serve our purpose: to provide information about who and what NA is to the addict seeking help and to the public and professional community who deal with addicts.

We have received a great many requests over the years to make various items available online. We have taken an extremely cautious approach to moving forward in the past. The legal advice we have received from our intellectual property attorneys (who have particular expertise in dealing with Internet copyright infringement matters) have provided us with advice up to now that has bolstered the conservative position we have taken. Our responsibilities as trustees of the Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust (FIPT) compel us to safeguard the fellowship's intellectual property assets for the fellowship's benefit.

As the law pertaining to copyrighted material on the Internet has matured and we now believe we can protect the fellowship's property within that law, we will undertake, *as an experiment*, the posting of this limited number of items on www.na.org for the benefit of the fellowship. If we were to encounter infringement problems and/or significant new legal expenses or other problems because of this experiment, we would not hesitate to back away from this test.

By posting this material on our site, we can give areas and regions the ability to provide a direct link to these IP's from their sites. This would be a seamless link, one where the user is not aware that they have even left the area or region's site. This would resolve the current

problem we have with pieces of this material being posted on many sites in order to describe Narcotics Anonymous.

Our challenge will be to determine the necessary details of making this a reality. This will involve finding out what challenges exist with posting this material in various languages. At this time, IP #1 exists in 21 languages! We will keep you advised as we proceed with this and welcome any input that you may have.

INCOME UP SLIGHTLY

Now that we have reached the end of our financial year, we are pleased to see that income was higher when compared to last year, using Chatsworth as the basis of comparison. However, this is not really a result of higher literature sales. In fact, the majority of the \$197,803 of higher literature-related income seems to have more to do with the implementation of the 5% price increase in January. Actually, most of the unit sales figures for the Basic Text, *It Works, Just for Today*, and *The NA Step Working Guides* show only slight changes when compared to last year, with the exception of the *Step Working Guides*.

For example, last year (1 July 1999 – 30 June 2000) we sold approximately 166,961 copies of the hardcover Basic Text compared to 167,617 copies sold this year. We did see some rise in soft cover sales. For the same period, we sold 48,854 copies, compared to 60,571 this year. We sold approximately 5,000 more copies of *Just for Today* this year, but sold 4,000 fewer copies of *It Works: How & Why*. The *Step Working Guides* are down approximately 12,000 copies versus last year.

Alarmingly, donations (which totaled \$612,967 this year) are only \$1,082.06 higher than last year. This is the first time that donations

August 2001 Conference Report

have not grown at least 5% in many years. If we had kept pace with our past trend in donations, they should have increased \$36,660. This is alarming because even when literature sales were down, in the past, donations continued to increase by about 6% to 8% per year. We realize this may just be the effect of implementing a two-year cycle for the first time. Also, we know that many regions that are primary contributors to world services did not enjoy the same level of financial success that they are accustomed to. We will provide a more complete table of comparison in the annual report.

RESERVE SETS NEW RECORD!

Prudent management of your world service center means a commitment to remain a reliable, dependable, and stable resource for our fellowship. We are again happy to report that we have succeeded in meeting our savings objectives and now have more money in the bank than ever before. Our total reserve funds amount to about \$982,270. This is equal to 59.6 operating days. This is 66% of our stated Fellowship Development Plan objective to achieve a 90-day operating reserve.

However, we again need to point out that we are expecting to expend approximately \$350,000 in the next ten months. This will reduce our reserve funds since we will spend funds on things that we will not show immediate income from in return. During this period, we will make necessary deposits for the Atlanta World Convention and facilities deposits for the 50th anniversary convention in San Diego. However, since we expect to receive some offsetting income from pre-registration, we should be able to restore some of the reserve funds utilized. However, that income will not be recorded until next fiscal year.

NEW BULLETIN BOARD

We have completed testing on a new bulletin board for discussions by conference participants. The technology allows anybody to read and follow the discussions, but only WSC participants can post messages. What's new is that the system highlights new messages so you can see if anything new has been posted since your last visit. It also has a more user-friendly structure. We will provide additional information at the World Service Meeting. Afterwards, we'll send a mailing to all WSC participants with instructions.

TRY THE FELLOWSHIP EVENTS CALENDAR ON THE WORLDWIDE WEB

Another new feature that is working well is the fellowship events calendar (www.na.org/comingup-toc.htm). The only problem is that the fellowship isn't yet using the calendar to its full potential. We hope that as awareness increases, fellowship use will also increase. This web-based calendar is the basis for the events calendar still published quarterly in *The NA Way*. The great advantage, however, is that the online calendar lists all known events for years into the future. *The NA Way* only lists the next few months in advance. More frequent use by more registered groups, areas, and regions of NA events would make it a more helpful planning tool. Listing events farther in advance could help minimize scheduling conflicts. We hope the calendar will further communication in NA.

REGISTER NA GROUPS AND SERVICE COMMITTEES ONLINE

We are still testing the web-enabled database feature that will allow your designated

August 2001 Conference Report

trusted servants to update the information directly in the new database. It is a constant struggle to keep the backlog manageable. The long-promised mass mailing to all NA Groups and service committees is finally drawing closer.

One significant benefit of going to the trouble to ensure that all of the NA groups in your area and region are registered is intangible. This intangible benefit is fellowship unity. Accurate group registrations further our common welfare. Group registrations allow us to track the growth of the fellowship. As of May 2001, there are about 19,500+ registered NA groups holding over 29,000 regular weekly meetings in 108 countries and territorial possessions. We would have no way of knowing or reporting this statistic if NA groups did not take the time to notify us of their existence. Please help keep us up-to-date about your meetings.

Of course, there are also tangible benefits to registration. We hope every NA Group receives *The NA Way Magazine*. It's free to every registered group or interested member! Accurate registrations also ensure that, if it was ever necessary, we could contact every group. For example, if our fellowship ever decided to change the steps, traditions, or concepts, that process would require a "group tally." If groups are not in the system, then they would potentially get excluded in that process. Another benefit is accurate listing(s) of the meeting(s) of your groups in the International Meeting Locator at www.na.org/locator-toc.htm. (See story below.)

ONLINE MEETING DIRECTORY

Accurate listings of NA meetings and groups are critical to the usefulness of the new International Meeting Locator. We hope every NA group will want to make sure its meeting(s) are listed properly. The benefit to the groups

goes to the heart of NA's primary purpose. This is a tool to carry the message to the addict who still suffers. Help a newcomer or visitor find your NA home group!

We have heard reports that some are waiting to update group/meeting information until the web-based live update features are in place. There are several ways *right now* that you can update group/meeting information or register new NA groups. Please don't wait!

If you have Internet access, you can download the forms in English, French, German, Portuguese, or Spanish, and mail or fax them back to the WSO. These forms are also available upon request. Another online feature available now (in English and Spanish only) is an online form that you can use to register new groups or update existing group information. However, these are not instantaneous updates. Staff still has to enter the information you send into the new database.

FIRST EVER WORLDWIDE WORKSHOP SUCCEEDS IN VANCOUVER, CANADA

By all reports the first Worldwide Workshop, held in Vancouver, British Columbia, from 29 June to 1 July, was a resounding success. It was definitely something new that we've never tried quite this way before. Through emails, letters, and telephone calls members from as far away as Saskatoon, Baltimore, and San Diego, expressed their enthusiasm for the event, and the wish that a worldwide workshop come to their hometown someday. No fewer than 20 RD's and RDA's attended the Vancouver event, with a total attendance of approximately 400 members.

Friday night had a very non-traditional opening meeting. There was a combined

August 2001 Conference Report

recovery and service focus. The purpose was to introduce the weekend, to introduce the travelers from NA World Services, and to introduce members to each other. An overview of world services focused on breathing life into the event theme: "Making the Connection—NA Members & NA World Services."

Over Saturday and Sunday, there were twelve topic workshops. (We planned two to three per time slot, so there were many opportunities to make choices!) Topics included: general history of NA, accountability, conduct, sponsorship, literature development, medication in NA, court cards/attendance verification, and one other H&I/PI-related workshop. A general session on Saturday morning focused on local grassroots issues. Saturday night included a recovery speaker meeting. A dance sponsored by the host committee followed.

Sunday included morning workshops followed by a general wrap-up session. The input we received about the weekend was overwhelmingly positive. The weekend closed Sunday afternoon with a final recovery meeting featuring a panel of speakers selected by the Support Committee.

The worldwide workshop project is one big experiment. The subsequent program for each future event will have unique elements. We included many of the topics in Vancouver because these issues were of interest locally. Local issues in other parts of the world will vary. Our goals as a board for the other workshops may vary. We just wanted to let you know how the first phase of the experiment in Vancouver has progressed so far.

We feel the success of the worldwide workshops does not depend solely on the amount of people who attend, but rather on the quality of the event itself and what we all learn from this experiment in dialogue. All of the

NAWS participants were unanimous in their enthusiasm for this first workshop, and are convinced of the value these workshops offer for our fellowship now and in the future. The travel team included WSO Executive Director Anthony Edmondson, World Board members Craig R and Susan C, as well as the Board's Fellowship Relations Committee: Michael McD, David J, and Ron H. The staff support team onsite was Michael Lee, Eileen Perez-Evans, and Elaine Adams.

OTHER WORLDWIDE WORKSHOP NEWS

After Vancouver, we'll still have four other workshops on four continents to plan and execute. It's a huge task. We're excited!

Since the March issue of *NAWS News*, we've made the following plans for the four remaining workshops.

In the European Zone, we are working with the UK Region. We're set for 14-16 September at Goldsmiths College in South London. Flyers are already out (and online).

In the Asia-Pacific Zone, we are now working with the New Zealand Region. We are set for 2-4 November at Victoria University in Wellington, New Zealand. Flyers are already out (and online).

In Latin America, we are now working with the Brazil Region. Our target location is São Paulo. The target window is December 2001/January 2002.

In Eastern North America, we are now working with the Midwest Zonal Forum. We're set for downtown Chicago, Illinois. The date is 1-3 February 2001. Flyers will be out soon.

You can find out the very latest information about each of these events at

August 2001 Conference Report

www.na.org/events-reg.htm. Flyers are or will be posted there for each event, and online registration is also available there. As always, you may also contact the WSO directly for more information.

(In Part Two—Process Issues—we describe how and why we chose these particular locations.)

LINE-NUMBERED BASIC TEXT: A RECALL!

The Line-Numbered Basic Text was first published in September 1997 comprising Book One only, but priced as a complete book @ \$9.70. This new version now incorporates Book One and Book Two, with a revised numbering system, at the same price. (We responded to customer feedback about the original numbering system.) In order to do right with the customers who have already purchased the old version, we are asking them to send in the cover to WSO Customer Service for replacement with the new version at no cost. We published an announcement about this in the July *NA Way* issue, and a mailing is going to on-the-record purchasers of the old version.

NAWS EVENT REGISTRATION NOW ONLINE

One of the terrific features of the new NAWS database is the ability for members to register online for specific NAWS events. We're using this new capability now for the upcoming worldwide workshops, the August Literature Distribution and Convention Workshops, and the World Unity Day celebration in September. For certain events (e.g., World Unity Day), hotel reservations, with a credit card, are also possible. This is actually a live test using these events. We

plan to use this feature for the World Convention in Atlanta, Georgia (4-7 July 2002). Check out www.na.org/event-reg.htm.

LITERATURE DISTRIBUTION AND CONVENTION WORKSHOP NEWS

By popular demand, the Literature Distribution and Convention Workshops were held again at the Warner Center Marriott in Woodland Hills, California (near the WSO). The dates were 3-4 August 2001.

The purpose of the literature distribution workshop is to create a forum for areas, regions, and service offices to talk about distribution and literature availability issues. We again funded ten area customers (chosen by random drawing) to attend and participate. We do this because it brings a perspective to the workshop about literature distribution issues that otherwise would not be present. Continuing this practice and offering the workshop regularly has successfully improved customer service—for NAWS and for areas, regions, and service offices.

The convention workshop provided a wealth of information about the planning, execution, and accountability of NA conventions and convention committees.

Due to the anticipated workload for next year, we do not anticipate that we will sponsor a literature distribution or convention workshop. We are not planning the next one until sometime in 2003.

PLANNING OUR PARTICIPATION IN PROFESSIONAL EVENTS

Our participation in professional events furthers the fellowship's efforts to carry the message so that no addict anywhere need ever

August 2001 Conference Report

die from the horrors of addiction without having heard about the Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous and our program of recovery. We conduct all of our public relations efforts within the bounds of the Twelve Traditions of Narcotics Anonymous.

An essential link to establishing a more effective long-range public relations plan is to ensure that we continue to develop a proactive approach to planning attendance at professional events. We have made great strides in this particular area over the last six years or so. Many avenues have opened up for NA during this time. We have the chance to really make an impact on this market that is in contact with facilities which treat substance abuse in one form or another. One of our challenges here is to create a more dynamic event profile that will allow us to expand our opportunities for attendance so that we may have equal representation in national and international organizations.

What we refer to as marketing goes hand-in-hand with our public relations efforts to increase awareness and understanding of Narcotics Anonymous. Often there is a double opportunity (furthering our marketing and public relations goals) at events we attend. Our presence gives us the chance to explain NA, who we are and what we offer, including how to get our literature to people who deal directly with addicts. Different events provide different opportunities to accomplish these closely related goals. Today we have the means by which the public and/or professionals can find out about us. Over the past six years, we have been increasing our presence within the corrections and treatment fields. These efforts are starting to pay off in very exciting ways. By ensuring that these professionals hear and learn about NA, addicts who would otherwise have no contact with our program, are beginning to find the hope that so many of us have experienced.

We've attended a number of events since July 2000. Because of space constraints within this report, we would like to highlight only a few of these events. Look for a more comprehensive report presented in the upcoming *NAWS, Inc. Annual Report 2001*.

SUCCESS AT THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF ADDICTION MEDICINE

This past April we had our first exhibit at ASAM (American Society of Addiction Medicine). This event, like so many others that are titled "American", had members in attendance from around the world. ASAM held its conference in Los Angeles, California. The response to our program at this event was overwhelming! ASAM members literally swamped our booth requesting more information on Narcotics Anonymous. We had to replenish the books and pamphlets we use during these professional events, not once but twice! We had a couple of members from our fellowship in attendance who also belong to ASAM. Staff and these members operated the booth during the event. We were invited to return next year. We also received several invitations to other related conferences.

MAKING INROADS AT THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS (NIC)

On 8-9 May 2001, a member of our Public Relations Committee and a WSO staff member attended a meeting with personnel from the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) held in Washington, DC. The purpose of the meeting was to participate in a planning session for an August videoconference that NIC has asked NAWS to participate in.

August 2001 Conference Report

NIC is a federal agency established to assist correctional agencies at the federal, state, and local levels. They provide forums for the exchange of ideas and discussions. They also provide training, technical assistance, and program formulation to improve the correctional system at all levels. One of the technologies they incorporate into their training is the use of videoconferencing. NAWS has been invited to be a participant in this year's videoconference.

This is another excellent opportunity to heighten awareness about the NA program, specifically with members of the public in the criminal justice system. It can also serve to strengthen the relationship between the corrections community and our local H&I committees.

The objectives of the planned videoconference are numerous. These include providing criminal justice professionals with information about how to contact NA, and how to enhance the level of cooperation between them and the local fellowship. We would also hope to highlight the benefits of NA's twelve step program to the professional and the offender. On some issues, we would attempt to gain insights as well as sharing our insights. These include issues surrounding the problems inherent in holding NA meetings in correctional facilities without the participation of outside NA volunteers.

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON
ALCOHOL AND ADDICTIONS
CONFERENCE (ICAA)

We are also registered for the ICAA to be held in Germany this September. The ICAA (International Council on Alcohol and Addictions) Conference will take place in Heidelberg, Germany. The exact dates are 1-7 September 2001. Bob Stewart from the

WSO, Simon J, current Euro PI Chair, and Vivianne R from Sweden will represent world services. Our history of exhibiting or presenting at ICAA annual events stretches back more than ten years.

We are exhibiting at this year's ICAA, but will go with the thought in mind that we might be asked to do some sort of impromptu presentation at the last minute similar to what occurred in Bahrain at last year's ICAA.

We need to continue developing appropriate and effective methods of establishing new relationships, as well as maintaining our current ones, with the organizations and individuals that are in a position to direct newcomers into NA.

MARKETING NEWS:
TWO NEW MARKETING MAILERS—
ONE FOR CORRECTIONS, ONE FOR
TREATMENT

To improve our current marketing strategy and to continue to increase our presence in the corrections and treatment fields, we have designed two mailers (circulars for distribution to specific customers) that target these particular audiences. One is for treatment facilities. Another is for the correctional market. The product flyers contain recovery literature relevant to these markets.

We believe this will help cut down any confusion with these separate markets as they try to determine which of our literature products would best serve their clients. We let them know how we can meet their literature needs. Our marketing efforts help support public relations and foster goodwill by helping to place our literature into the hands of the still-suffering addict and helping to increase awareness of Narcotics Anonymous.

August 2001 Conference Report

ANOTHER NEW POSSIBILITY: WORLD FORUM ON DRUGS AND DEPENDENCIES

We have been invited to attend and participate at the first World Forum on Drugs and Dependencies (Montreal, Quebec on 22-27 September 2002.) This is an international organization aimed at providing a non-confrontational platform for interactions between approaches and disciplines of self-help groups. They work at looking at examples of the best responses possible to the challenge by drawing from the experience worldwide. We have an excellent opportunity to illustrate what Narcotics Anonymous has to offer.

MORE FELLOWSHIP DEVELOPMENT NEWS

Sometimes, when the daily grind of “life on life’s terms,” lulls us into that hypnotic state of putting one foot in front of the other and just making it to the end of the day—we can forget how really fortunate many of us are to have easy access to recovery through NA meetings and NA literature. So, it is not surprising that we get excited when we receive literature orders or requests for group starter kits from countries that do not have any Narcotics Anonymous meetings (as far as we know).

We are happy to announce that WSO-Europe has filled a literature order for the Hungarian fellowship. It was the first one they ever placed. Currently, there is only one registered group, located in Budapest, Hungary. But a member there said there are now two meetings being held.

Some other exciting “firsts” include sending group starter kits to Cuba and Kosovo. At the moment, we are unsure of any meeting activity.

We do not yet have any groups from these countries registered in our database.

The efforts and strides our translations staff has made over the past several years through working with local translations committees around the world has helped to facilitate the spread of Narcotics Anonymous. They are currently working on literature translation projects in Arabic and Farsi. These projects offer hope for other isolated countries and communities!

The Fellowship Services Team has recently been able to improve the response time to many of the requests they receive. Besides answering telephone calls and correspondence of all types, the team also produces two publications—*Reaching Out*, for treatment centers and NA members in correctional institutions, and *Meeting by Mail*, for loners. The July issue of *The NA Way Magazine* included a piece about these periodicals.

Here are a few excerpts from some of the letters Fellowship Services receives:

From Valley State Prison for Women:

“We are writing to thank you for assisting us with our need for NA supplies. We are very grateful for all that you have done for us.... May your year be as special as you are to us.”

A member from Barcelona writes:

“I wanted to tell you at the WSO, how thrilled I am with the Basic Text on tape. It has been a huge help these past few days. ...it reminded me a few times what I needed to do...it was such a relief.”

From State Correctional Institution at Mahanoy (Pennsylvania):

“Once again, I wish to thank you for the package of NA materials that was sent to SCI-Mahanoy. I am confident that the Hispanic members of Narcotics Anonymous will be

August 2001 Conference Report

grateful and that the material will be put to good use. Also, the copy of *Reaching Out* that was enclosed is great reading material and I'm almost certain that the inmates who truly want recovery will be writing to request copies."

FELLOWSHIP DEVELOPMENT AT ZONAL FORUMS

Since the last *Conference Report*, world services has attended many zonal forum meetings. These include: the Latin American Zonal Forum (LAZF) in Costa Rica, the Rocky Mountain Zonal Forum meeting in Boulder Hot Springs, Montana; and the Asia-Pacific Forum in Jakarta, Indonesia. We will have a report about our participation in these exciting events in the upcoming *Annual Report*. (The *Annual Report* is due around the end of September.)

HOW OUR MESSAGE GOES GLOBAL!

More exciting news from around the world! We've received a hand-written note from a group in Russia thanking us for the Russian Basic Text. Along with the note, the group members sent us a flyer of their group's second anniversary celebration held on 21 July 2001. The name of the group is "Kalitka," but we did not receive an English translation for the meaning of that word. The group has five meetings during the week.

The city where the group is located is called Ekaterinburg, a historical mining city in Russia. Known as the "Window to Asia," it has a population of about two million people and is located in the Ural Mountains. The Ural Mountains, alongside the Ural River, form the traditional division between Europe and Asia.

Welcome aboard!

TRANSLATIONS NEWS

We are happy to report that the Norwegian Basic Text (in hardcover, Book One *only*) was completed recently. There was a presentation of the finished book to the RD from Norway at the European Delegates Meeting in Quebec the last week of June. (See the enclosed new product flyer for ordering information.)

At the July board meeting, we reviewed a proposed set of stories for the Netherlands edition of the Basic Text. We decided to refer the stories back to the community for further review, to bring into compliance with the guidelines for personal stories. We hope to be able to approve these stories at a future board meeting.

August 2001 Conference Report

SUMMARY OF CAR 2002 PLANS

We are at the point in this first two-year conference cycle where the plans for the *Conference Agenda Report* for WSC 2002 are becoming clear.

We are planning to include a significant report about literature issues. This report will not contain any motions, however. We believe that a portion of our report to the fellowship in the *CAR* should focus on the fact that we have an unparalleled opportunity to look at why and how we develop literature in NA, get people to begin to look at the bigger picture, and then talk about the specific tasks in front of us: the sponsorship project and the Basic Text evaluation.

We are planning a motion in the *Conference Agenda Report* to discontinue the process of selecting issue discussion topics through the *CAR*. We do not believe this process has worked well over the years. More information about our rationale for this can be found in the process section of this report dealing with the Guardians Committee on page 27. We have not settled on a replacement process, but hope to receive input and discuss this at the upcoming World Service Meeting.

SUMMARY OF CONFERENCE APPROVAL TRACK PLANS

Other work-in-progress is headed down the conference-approval track for consideration at WSC 2002. As you may recall, this means all conference participants will receive materials in a mailing prior to the conference, but it won't be in the *CAR*. This is part of the new Process for Approval of Service Material (adopted at WSC 2000) which provides for this conference approval track.

As is normal and customary every conference cycle, you can expect a series of changes to *A Temporary Working Guide to Our World Service Structure (2002 Edition)*. There are a great many individual changes that we are proposing in this service material, including changing the title to *A Guide to World Services in Narcotics Anonymous*. As you know, in past years, changes to *TWGWSS* have been made through the *CAR*-process. We have certainly heard an outcry from the fellowship to not burden the groups with the details of world service policy and procedure matters. We will propose all of the proposed changes to *TWGWSS* (described below) using the new conference-approval track.

WORLD CONVENTION CHANGES IN TWGWSS

We are recommending two changes in the event rotation for the world convention. First, we think it would be more prudent to split North America into two zones from the current three zones. We are making this recommendation because as the size of WCNA has grown, whenever it is held in North America, fewer cities are able to meet our baseline criteria for consideration. Creating two zones will increase the potential sites in each zone.

The second recommendation is to change the current rotation by holding the convention in Europe scheduled for 2011 in 2009 instead. In reviewing the current WCNA rotation schedule, the frequency that upcoming conventions will be held in North America was discussed. While Hawaii is part of the Asia Pacific zone, it is in the United States. The WSC agreed in 1995 to allow Hawaii to be included in the Asia Pacific zone at their request. Nonetheless, the choice of Hawaii as the site for WCNA-31 (to be held in 2005) means that the convention will not be held outside

August 2001 Conference Report

North America again until 2011, unless this change is made.

☞ Current Zone Rotation Remains

2002: Zone 3 Atlanta, Georgia.

2003: Southern California (San Diego) Special 50th Anniversary.

2005: Zone 4 (Honolulu, Hawaii).

2007: Zone 5 (Central North America).

We have now narrowed the sites in Zone 5 under consideration for 2007 to New Orleans, Louisiana, or San Antonio, Texas.

☞ Proposed Zone Rotation Changes:

2009: Zone 6 (Europe, Africa & Middle East).¹

2011: Zone 1 (Western North America).²

2013: Zone 2 (Eastern N. America).
(No change recommended.)

2015: To be determined at a later date.³

We have not made any recommendation for the site of the 2015 world convention because we believe that the changing and growing nature of the convention will require us to revisit this rotation plan well before 2011. We can make decisions about 2015 at that time.

There will be some other recommended changes in *TWGWSS* regarding WCNA. These relate to a change in description of the support

¹ Currently, Zone 1 (Western North America) is set for 2009.

² Currently, Zone 6 (Europe, Africa, & Middle East) is set for 2011.

³ Currently, Zone 5 (Central North America) is set for 2015.

committee. We describe the rationale for that in Part Two of this report. Also, we reported in the last *NAWS News* our discussions on the world convention statement of purpose in *TWGWSS*, and we will include language about that.

COMMITTED MOTIONS
(UPDATED RULES OF ORDER AND
A GUIDE TO LOCAL SERVICES
SUMMARY)

The WSC committed two motions to the board at WSC 2000. One concerned putting standing rules of order for the conference in *TWGWSS*. The other asked for a simplified summary of the service structure in *A Guide to Local Services*. As we do every year, we are in the process of reviewing the rules of order for the next conference. We have gone back and forth about the pros and cons of putting them into *TWGWSS* at this time. We are leaning toward doing so, but as we have not made progress on the rules for WSC 2002 yet, we have not included anything in the current draft of *TWGWSS*. A simplified description of the service structure is a good idea. We're trying to create something that in itself will become a useful service tool. We're still working on a draft.

OTHER *TWGWSS* CHANGES

We are proposing other straightforward changes to *TWGWSS* that will be easier to explain when we release the draft so that you can see them. Briefly, there will be an edit to the travel section to reflect our current practice. There will be an update to the budget section, as we have promised you would be forthcoming since before WSC 2000. We are proposing changes to the election procedures (which have caused confusion in the past) that we believe will

August 2001 Conference Report

make this section easier for readers to understand. (In the past, the conference has approved specific election procedures at each conference. We have made minor changes to the improved procedures that went through a successful trial-run at WSC 2000—and it is this modified version that we propose adding to TWGWSS as standing policy.)

Another change concerns language describing the size of the World Board. We are proposing language that clarifies that the board may contain up to 24 members, which will allow the conference to always elect up to that number, but not feel that it is “violating” any policy if it elects fewer members than that to serve on the board at any one time. This suggestion actually came from the floor at WSC 2000. Similarly, to take into account the variable size of the board, the description of the size of board committees would change from “four board members” to “assigned board members.”

We also propose adding a helpful new reference section giving you the introduction, relevant timelines, and deadlines for the conference cycle, plus a listing of other documents of interest for conference participants. Other miscellaneous changes include: a new paragraph about regional reports for the WSC, changing the name of the HRP’s resume form to information form, clarification of the word vacancy for the HRP and the board, and other house-cleaning edits.

Again, you’ll see all these changes in context when you receive the draft later. We’ll look for feedback from delegates. We expect to get that feedback from those of you present at the World Service Meeting and look forward to face-to-face discussions then with those who are able to attend.

CALENDAR

- ♦ World Unity Day will be in Vienna, Virginia (near Washington, D.C.), **1-2 September 2001**. The World Service Meeting for regional delegates is **31 August-2 September 2001**.
- ♦ Service resumes for elections at WSC 2002 by **1 September 2001** to be considered by HRP.
- ♦ 1st Worldwide Workshop in Europe will be in London, England, **14-16 September 2001**.
- ♦ Regional motions for the *Conference Agenda Report 2002* for WSC 2002 by **26 September 2001**. Issue discussion topic ideas for *CAR 2002* by **26 September 2001**.
- ♦ Issue discussion papers for *CAR 2002* by **15 October 2001**.
- ♦ The first worldwide workshop in the Asia-Pacific will be in Wellington, New Zealand, **2-4 November 2001**.
- ♦ *Conference Agenda Report 2002* will be out by **29 November 2001** in English and translations by **29 December 2001**.
- ♦ Worldwide Workshop, Chicago, Illinois, **1-3 February 2002**.
- ♦ WSC 2002 will be **28 April to 4 May 2002**.

August 2001 Conference Report

From the Nov.'99 Conference Report:

We have a long way to go before we finish implementing the decisions set in motion by the 1998 conference. Our transition is not nearing its end. Unfortunately, we are only at the end of the first phase and the beginning of a second phase, one that may be even more crucial and difficult. Next, we will be implementing both the two-year conference cycle and the board's committee system, two momentous and complicated components of the new system.

PART TWO: PROCESS-ISSUES,
BEHIND THE SCENES

In Part One, we've tried to give you just the facts about the work that is actually happening. Most of you are more concerned about content rather than process. For others, it's the exact opposite. In this second part, we try to take you behind the scenes and discuss how the work is getting done. Here's an overview of the major process issues we discuss in this section.

First, we have continuously reported that the implementation of the committee system would be a major challenge this conference cycle. Twenty percent of the board is new since WSC 2000. We have successfully integrated new members and maintained our unity as a board at the same time we have divided our work among five new subgroups.

The committee system represents a primary resource for the board. (By committee system, we include the staff resources at our disposal and any subordinate workgroups that any committees administer.) The committee system is the main process by which we are accomplishing the work delegated to us by the conference. The board (including the WSO, which we oversee) is the resource to the conference and the fellowship. The board is the point of accountability for the conference and the fellowship. We describe where we are now with this task and where we are going. Process issues specific to each committee are also discussed here.

From the Nov.'99 Conference Report:

With 1998's decision to move to a two-year conference cycle at the end of WSC 2000, here again we can expect the settling in process of adjusting to this change to be a major feature of the next conference cycle. And our expectation is that it will be WSC 2004, not WSC 2002, before we—the board, the delegates, the fellowship—will have settled in with these changes to a point of comfort. By this we mean the point where all elements of NA feel a sense of security, trust and confidence in the stability of the new world service system that we are all still very much trying to create. It will probably take at least this long to evaluate fairly what works well and what could be done in a better way.

We have come quite a distance from that jumping-off point at the WSC'98 when we let go and made a long-long-long-calculated leap of faith. Nearly all of us remember the many years of taking inventory of our world service structure, beginning anew and in earnest in 1993, which led to that leap. Some of us remember how the problems we tried to take stock of and solve in the 1990s had worsened with our dramatic growth over the course of the 1980s until the level of dysfunction, inefficiency, and conflict stopped us in our tracks in 1993 and forced us to take a serious look at ourselves. Along the way, we all made the best of a bad system. We adapted Twelve Concepts for NA Service and A Guide to Local Service and accomplished much else that was good through the years. We finally became willing to try an entirely new way just 18 short months ago. When we summon our collective memory, we see that the efforts to improve and reorganize our world service structure have actually been continuous since 1976.

August 2001 Conference Report



August 2001 Conference Report

PUBLICATIONS PROCESS ISSUES

The Publications Committee has been enormously busy with the projects relating to sponsorship, making a plan to begin an evaluation of the Basic Text (subject to approval by WSC 2004), and the future of NA literature development. To assist with this workload, we added two new non-board members to the Publications Committee. Jim B (Illinois) joined in May. Jeff B (California) joined in July. Some of you may recall Jeff from his time working at WSO or from his service as a volunteer in the early 1990s. Jim has been involved in literature at the world level since 1987.

The board has been using non-board members on various workgroups for over two and one-half years. However, this is the first time the board has appointed non-board members to one of its committees.

We had long discussion at July meeting about non-board committee members. The board agreed to use its prerogative to appoint non-board members to board committees. We also agreed to the Publications Committee continuing forward with the two new members on that committee. We agreed that a board member remain the point person/chairperson of any committee to maintain the single point of accountability. The board agreed with its committees working with the EC in appointing future non-board members.

We discussed whether non-board members could serve as project leaders who would operate within clearly established rules/ guidelines of a project plan. We were unable to reach consensus on this point at this time.

LITERATURE DEVELOPMENT REPORT

Introduction/Summary

After fellowship discussion of four literature-related motions and a lengthy report that appeared in the *Conference Agenda Report 2000*, the World Service Conference directed the World Board to begin certain literature work. The conference approved by an overwhelming margin the first phase of a project to create new recovery material about sponsorship. That first phase asked the board to encourage area and regional literature committees to develop source material about sponsorship in 2000, with the board starting a preliminary evaluation of the issues relating to the sponsorship material in 2001.

The conference said yes by a narrower margin to a comprehensive evaluation of revisions and additions to the entire Basic Text and the Little White Booklet, and directed that this evaluation would not begin any sooner than 2004, if WSC 2004 authorizes a proposed evaluation plan. The conference funded a project to begin planning that evaluation, specifying that the World Board make a preliminary status report at WSC 2002.

Finally, the conference affirmed the general direction of the proposed literature development plan. This involved implementing the board's Publications Committee, working on the foregoing two projects, and beginning fellowship discussions on a number of important outstanding literature development issues, culminating in the preparation of an updated five- to ten-year literature development plan for WSC 2002.

SPONSORSHIP UPDATE: We received a tremendous amount of input in response to the December 2000 *News Flash*. We are grateful to all of the members everywhere who took the time

to contribute ideas and concepts about sponsorship literature. The board now plans to recommend to WSC 2002 that we develop a new book about sponsorship. From the book's material, a new IP would be created to replace the existing IP. And, to meet the fellowship's needs as quickly as possible, we're proposing a schedule allowing for adoption at WSC'04.

PLANNING THE BASIC TEXT EVALUATION: We are in the early stages of planning the Basic Text evaluation. Again, the conference directed us to come up with an evaluation plan for consideration at WSC 2004. More information will be in the *Conference Agenda Report 2002*.

THE FUTURE OF NA LITERATURE DEVELOPMENT: With two literature projects of such major importance, the board and our new Publications Committee have been quite busy. We quickly realized that preparing a five- to ten-year plan for literature development at WSC 2002 was premature. We decided against putting any literature-related motions in the *CAR 2002*. Instead, we plan a major report to stimulate discussion and dialogue about the foregoing projects and other literature development issues.

At the upcoming World Service Meeting, we want to make sure that we are all on same page about both the projects for sponsorship and the Basic Text evaluation, and begin to have a dialogue about literature development in the future.

For those unable to attend the WSM, we welcome and invite any input you may have. The theme continues to be communication, communication, communication.

OUR CAR 2000 PROPOSALS

We offered these four motions as a way of stimulating discussion about recovery literature development. Our rationale for these motions is in the *CAR 2000* report.

Motion 1: Shall the fellowship proceed with a comprehensive evaluation of revisions and additions to the entire Basic Text and the Little White Booklet? Yes or No? [CARRIED.]

Motion 2: When shall the World Board offer a detailed project plan to begin this evaluation (per Motion 1 above): (a) WSC 2002; (b) WSC 2004; or (c) WSC 2006? Choose one of these options: (a), (b), or (c). [CARRIED, OPTION B, WSC 2004, CHOSEN.]

Motion 3: That the World Board encourage area and regional literature committees to develop source material about sponsorship in 2000, with the board starting a preliminary evaluation of the issues relating to the sponsorship material in 2001. [CARRIED.]

Motion 4: To affirm the general direction of the proposed literature development plan as summarized below.

- ❖ Implement the Publications Committee; this includes developing evaluation tools to identify fellowship needs for the creation and revision of recovery literature and to achieve consensus about priorities.
- ❖ Depending on the outcome on motions 1 and 2 (see above), prepare a detailed project plan to

August 2001 Conference Report

evaluate revisions and/or additions to the Basic Text and the Little White Booklet.

- ❖ *Depending on the outcome on Motions 1, 2, and 3* (see above), begin evaluation of new sponsorship material and report to WSC 2002.
- ❖ Develop a bulletin on the Internet and the Eleventh Tradition.
- ❖ Develop a discussion paper re surveillance and the Little White Booklet.
- ❖ Gather fellowship input on Future Discussion Issue #1, “Process of Reviewing Fellowship–Approved Literature for Revision” and give update to WSC 2002.
- ❖ Gather fellowship input on Future Discussion Issue #2, “Recovery Literature Targeted for Specific Needs” and give update to WSC 2002.
- ❖ Gather fellowship input on Future Discussion Issue #3, and develop a discussion paper about translations.
- ❖ Prepare an updated five- to ten-year literature development plan for WSC 2002.”

[Motion 4 CARRIED.]

WHAT HAPPENED AT WSC 2000

The final session of the conference was planned to update the delegates as to what the board heard from the discussions and business sessions held during the week. The majority of this session focused on the general impressions from the delegates regarding their perceptions of the fellowship’s desire for a comprehensive

evaluation of revisions and additions to the entire Basic Text and the Little White Booklet. This discussion pointed out that Motions 1 and 2 were the only *CAR* motions that were carried by a simple majority, rather than the overwhelming support that the remaining motions received. Recovery literature requires a 2/3 majority for adoption, and there was concern that we, the board, would be beginning four years of major work on an item that lacked that majority, as well as any clear direction from the WSC. This is extremely important, and because of the enormity of this particular project, we sought help in clarifying the general fellowship’s response to the whole issue.

The questions asked during this session were taken from the report in the *2000 CAR* and were asked only to determine what the regional delegates heard in the *CAR* workshops, in order to provide additional information to the board for use in developing the evaluation process. Some of those responses were:

- ❖ The majority of conference participants did not believe that the Little White Booklet and the Basic Text were deficient in meeting our members’ needs;
- ❖ Most of the participants heard that the Little White Booklet and Basic Text contain material that is outdated;
- ❖ The majority of conference participants heard that the Basic Text and Little White Booklet would be improved with the addition of new material;
- ❖ Most heard comments about adding chapters to the Basic Text regarding sponsorship and service work;

August 2001 Conference Report

- ❖ Many members also heard to leave both the Basic Text and the Little White Booklet alone; and lastly,
- ❖ The majority of delegates heard that members understood that, “revisions” meant substantial deletions and/or changes in the Basic Text and stories.

These discussion also revealed the confusion about what language edition of the Basic Text was under discussion, how many versions don't have personal stories, and the lack of clear information provided about what a change to the English text means for existing and future translated versions.

WHERE WE ARE NOW

Based on the motions passed at WSC 2000, we face two major tasks to be done simultaneously (sponsorship and planning the process for the Basic Text evaluation).

We, as a board, took over a day at our four-day July meeting to discuss some of the larger issues surrounding this entire topic. Some of the issues include:

How important is new recovery literature to the fellowship? What level of support (resources) are we willing to dedicate to it?

What is the relative importance of the revision of existing literature versus the development of new literature?

Concerning the Basic Text: What is to be evaluated? Why? How? And by whom?

Some of these questions are not yet fully answered, but this report tries to outline how far we have gotten in our discussions.

THE SPONSORSHIP PROJECT

At WSC 2000, Motion 3 was adopted by an overwhelming margin. To move forward on this mandate, we sent out a *News Flash* in December 2000 requesting ideas and concepts about sponsorship. (Still available at www.na.org or upon request.) The response from the fellowship was incredible: we received an enormous amount of input from the fellowship. The deadline for that input passed on 1 June 2001. We're grateful to all the members, groups, and service committees who took the time to submit written input. The Sponsorship Evaluation Workgroup has done a great job in keeping up with the input received. Our thanks to them also.

In evaluating the stacks of material we received from members, we realized that we had sufficient ideas and information for a book-length piece. We are now in the process of making a detailed project plan. Our proposal is to develop a book of about 100 pages in length and to create a new IP from the book's material to replace the existing IP. In order to be responsive to the needs of the fellowship, the proposed plan will have an accelerated schedule allowing for adoption at WSC 2004.

The fellowship's desire for sponsorship literature seems urgent. Therefore, our goal is to include an approval form in the 2004 *Conference Agenda Report* for consideration at WSC 2004. To accomplish this, our proposal includes continued solicitation of source material through 31 December (at specific venues such as the worldwide workshops) and a development process similar to that used for *Just for Today*.

Our precedent is the development process used for *Just for Today*. What we have received to date is an unprecedented amount of raw source material. This source material contains your ideas and input for what you want, rather

August 2001 Conference Report

than reacting to a draft already developed. We believe this is an effective way for a global fellowship to truly impact the direction, scope, and content of a new piece of recovery literature. With the approval of the conference at WSC 2002, we propose to use this source material and the standard development process: a workgroup with a staff-team for writing and support.

In addition, there will be a voluntary—you must sign-up to participate—review and input in two stages. Stage one will consist of review and input for a detailed outline and chapter one, to be returned to us in 30-45 days. In stage two, the balance of the book will be sent to those who completed stage one. This stage will have a short turnaround as well. The project plan concludes with the book being sent out for an approval period of, minimally, 150 days, which is longer than the 90-day period in the past. The only alternative that we see is to have an approval-form at WSC 2006.

In order for the project plan to be successful, we must form a partnership. We are asking RD's to inform the area and regional literature review committees about our plan, encouraging them to register with the WSO to participate in the review-and-input process. Then, shortly after the conference, we will send out a letter to all who signed-up with the WSO, after which, drafts with specific instructions for the review and input will be mailed. More details will follow about this proposal in the 2002 *Conference Agenda Report*, following discussions at the World Service Meeting. We look forward to working together in a cohesive manner to create a piece about sponsorship that the fellowship will embrace.

BASIC TEXT EVALUATION PROJECT

Although the conference was not entirely clear about what changes, if any, the fellowship might want in the Basic Text, the WSC did favor a comprehensive evaluation process. Based on this, we plan on creating a workgroup to develop various instruments and strategies during the next conference cycle that we hope will lead to clearer direction from the fellowship about what, if anything, should be done.

If there is an evaluation, it will not start until after WSC 2004. This is what Motion 2 provides for. *We cannot overemphasize how much confusion there has been on this point.* No evaluation of the Basic Text can start unless and until the WSC in 2004 authorizes such a plan.

Let's say this another way. What we are doing now and next cycle is simply planning an evaluation. We are calling this project a "plan-to-plan" process. Everything between now and WSC 2004 is about planning how an evaluation might occur and outlining the scope of that possible evaluation, if WSC 2004 authorizes it to go forward.

What we are proposing is a survey that contains the questions and issues involved with the Basic Text and the Little White Booklet, as well as an attempt to gather other information about the fellowship's desires for future recovery literature. We realize the Little White Booklet is part of this process, but to keep things clear and simple, we will keep the Little White Booklet and the fellowship's desires for future recovery literature separate from the Basic Text in the survey instruments.

We hope that we will be able to feed back useful information to the fellowship and a clear proposal about the Basic Text evaluation that will be presented to and decided by WSC 2004.

August 2001 Conference Report

WHERE WE ARE GOING?

It is up to the fellowship to decide where we are going. Our report in the 2002 *Conference Agenda Report* will provide more information and setup a fellowshipwide dialogue. We look forward to face-to-face interaction with delegates at the World Service Meeting, and we would appreciate receiving written input on any aspect of this report, or the projects we have described, from those of you who are not attending the WSM in Virginia.

We have discussed the development of a vision statement for NA literature. This is now a low priority, given all of our other work. We see a discussion on the purpose and function of NA literature as a starting point for future literature development. If we can develop a common vision and philosophy, hopefully that can serve as a foundation for these two projects and future literature development policy and work.

As stated previously, we are planning to include a significant report in the 2002 *CAR about* literature issues. This report will not contain any motions. We believe that a portion of our report to the fellowship in the *CAR* should focus on the fact that we have an unparalleled opportunity to look at why and how we develop literature in NA. Our goal is to get members to begin to look at the bigger picture, and then talk about the specific tasks in front of us like the sponsorship project and the Basic Text evaluation issue.

Some parts of the report will include:

- ❖ Our proposed plans for the next conference cycle in terms of the sponsorship project.
- ❖ A discussion of some of the issues around the Basic Text evaluation project.

- ❖ The reality of NA in 2001 versus NA in the late 1970s early 1980s - x number of groups, in x number of countries, spoken in x number of languages, translations, etc., etc.
- ❖ The need for us to be focused on the needs of a global fellowship when developing new literature and possibly include a literature vision statement to help guide us.
- ❖ Introduction of the four stages in a development process and show how that could (and to what extent has been) done, in regard to the sponsorship project.
- ❖ Any development process, including NA's Literature Development Process, should have the following four components:
 - Needs Assessment
 - Dialogue
 - Consensus
 - Create piece

These basic ideas were also contained in the Proposed Literature Development Plan (*CAR 2000 Addendum A*), as basic principles. The adoption of Motion 4 reaffirmed this general direction, and our own continuing discussions as a board have continued to come back to these fundamentals.

NOW IS THE TIME TO PREPARE:

Because literature arouses so many passions and is so important to fellowship unity, we want an open process and discussion to give everyone who wishes to participate the chance to help in forming the most informed group conscience possible.

For those who want to know more, here are some of the additional resources that are

August 2001 Conference Report

available that help explain where we are now, how we got here, and where we might go.

1. The Proposed Literature Development Plan in the *2000 CAR* (Addendum A) contains a wealth of information about what we proposed to WSC 2000, why, and other background/history. (At www.na.org or upon request.)
2. *A Temporary Working Guide to Our World Service Structure* contains much basic information. (Available for sale from WSO.) Pages 1-22 explain the structure of NA World Services. The Process for New Projects (p. 27) explains how any project can come about (including any proposal for any new or revised literature). The translations policy is on pages 31-32. The current approval process for recovery literature is on page 33, as are the requirements to make “Changes to NA’s Twelve Steps, Twelve Traditions, Twelve Concepts or NA’s Name, Nature or Purpose.” How service literature approval differs from recovery literature is also covered on page 34.
3. Some information about the history of the Basic Text is in the *CAR 2000* Addendum A. You can also request a handout from the WSO entitled “A Brief History of the Basic Text.” This document describes the changes in the first five editions of the book and how these came about (free upon request).
4. Again, some information about the history of literature development process is in the *CAR 2000*. Additional information exists in a twenty-eight-page memo/report from the 1990 WSC Literature Chairperson. This memo (free upon request) chronicles the problems and history of the development of *It Works* and other

literature in the 1980s. This led to the adoption at WSC 1991 of the current staff-team literature development process. This process has allowed addict special workers to be used in the process of writing and editing all literature developed since then.

5. Confusion about how literature gets translated can complicate discussion about recovery literature development and approval. Certain information can be found in *Translation Basics* (free upon request).
6. The *NA World Service Office Product Catalog* describes all our literature and specialty products and the languages in which each item is available (free).
7. Guidelines for literature committees can be found in the *Handbook for NA Literature Committees* (for sale). Unfortunately, this material is mostly outdated, but some helpful material is there. *A Guide to Local Services in Narcotics Anonymous* (for sale) suggests keeping the literature supply function separate from literature review. Moreover, it suggests that literature review committees are often better structured as temporary “ad hoc” committees.

We hope that all efforts to determine and meet the literature needs of Narcotics Anonymous will exemplify the bullet point from the NA World Services Vision Statement which says:

❖ *NA communities worldwide and NA World Services work together in a spirit of unity and cooperation to carry our message of recovery.*

August 2001 Conference Report

FELLOWSHIP RELATIONS

Two principles, readiness and rotation, together explain why we made the site choices we did for worldwide workshops for this cycle.

First, on the readiness issue, we believe that local communities must be of a sufficient size and stage of development to take advantage of the commitment of scarce resources that a worldwide workshop represents. This principle alone accounts for our view that only two communities in Asia will benefit from a worldwide workshop now. Even in our chosen site in New Zealand, the fellowship is so small that it's unlikely we'll attract more than 150 members to the event.

Second, in Latin America, the rotation principle ruled out communities who benefited from proximity to Cartagena most directly, or LAZF last May was in Costa Rica. Taken together, this led us to focus on the southern most parts of South America. Chile, Bolivia, Paraguay are not "ready." The previous LAZF was in Ecuador. This left our "two serious choices:" Brazil and Argentina. We went through a similar process in looking at the Asia Pacific Zone this cycle. Similarly, we took into account the sites for this year's World Unity Day and the next world convention in Atlanta, Georgia (USA) in selecting the North American sites.

If the project continues next cycle, geographic rotation would again be part of the consideration, opening up countries not seriously considered this time, and growth could change our view of the readiness level of various communities in either zone.]

FACILITATION TRAINING UPDATE

The first day of the April board meeting, April 19th, we experienced a facilitation training

session. An outside consultant provided the training. The purpose was to improve our facilitation skills, with a special focus on the worldwide workshops. Selected staff went through a similar training in early April. Some staff participated in the second training session with us.

Of course, the worldwide workshops are not the only setting where we will benefit from improved skills. Facilitating discussions and presenting information is something we do in a variety of settings, including our own board and board committee meetings, the World Service Meeting, and the World Service Conference. We hope this short one-day training session will be an ongoing part of board and staff development. We believe this will have a positive and much needed impact on the quality and effectiveness of these types of NA World Services events. Ultimately, we hope it will further consensus-based decision-making processes.

WSC SEATING WORKGROUP STATUS

The board has formed its advisory workgroup to help form recommendations in response to requests from communities who apply for seating at the World Service Conference. This process is a new one that the board is putting in place this cycle in response to the new policy adopted by the conference at WSC 2000. (That policy can be found in the *Temporary Working Guide to Our World Service Structure (2000 Edition)*; see pages 24-25.) The workgroup consists of Michael McD, David J, and three RDs (Mukam H, New Jersey Region; Seth S, Rio Grande Region; and Michael C, Region of Spain). The board's Fellowship Relations Committee will coordinate this workgroup for the board. The workgroup had a preliminary meeting on 22-23 April. Lib E (World Board) also sat in

August 2001 Conference Report

on this first meeting to contribute her knowledge about the background relating to this policy. (Lib headed up the board's Two-Year Conference Cycle Workgroup that led to the policy.)

The conference-adopted policy provides that regions who meet certain definite criteria may initiate a "request to be recognized as a conference participant by submitting a letter of intent to the World Board not less than one year before a World Service Conference." That deadline passed on 27 April 2001. The following seven communities submitted timely requests by that date:

FOR CONSIDERATION AT WSC 2002	DATE RECEIVED
Alaska	29 Sep '00
Arabian Gulf	11 Apr '01
Dividing Carolinas Region	17 Apr '01
Greece	16 Nov '00
Pakistan	17 Apr '01
Poland	10 Apr '01
Turkey	1 Apr '01

The WSC policy creates "Criteria for Recognition of New Conference Participants." It does not create "Criteria for Regions." This is a difference of paramount importance. The policy expressly provides that "Due to the complex nature of regional development, each application is considered on a case-by-case basis, rather than through some arbitrary criteria that establishes minimum sizes and structure of regions in order to address local service issues."

However, in order to be eligible to apply, the policy does specify one absolute requirement. "A new region is eligible to apply for recognition as a conference participant after having

functioned as a service body for at least three years." The timeframe for a dividing region is the same. "For regions forming out of an already existing region, the newly formed region has to have functioned as a separate body for at least three years." The policy does not give the board any authority or discretion to waive this three-year timeframe.

We plan to engage in dialogue with each of these communities, whether they are eligible to apply for recognition as a conference participant or not. After all, one of the underlying goals of the policy was to foster fellowship development and communication with emerging communities.

Since the 27 April deadline, we have received three additional requests from the following communities:

FOR CONSIDERATION AT WSC 2004	DATE RECEIVED
Chile	29 May '01
Dividing Guatemala Region	2 Aug '01
Venezuela	29 May '01

Although these communities have missed the deadline to apply for seating at WSC 2002, we intend to engage in an ongoing dialogue with these communities as well. After all, each of these communities has asked for help in one form or another. New NA communities forming a service structure are looking for ways to be more effective in delivering local services. These communities want, need, and deserve experience, strength, and hope from world services and from other NA communities. With our limited resources, we are usually not able to respond as quickly as we would like; often, even if we had a magic wand, it is just not within our power to do for these newcomer regions what they ultimately

August 2001 Conference Report

must do and/or work out for themselves. We cannot magically ease the growing pains and struggles that are involved in setting up a new service structure anywhere, particularly when it's in a country where NA is young, small, and/or isolated. Each country, culture, or language-group faces unique challenges and must decide for itself what kind of structure and what types of local service delivery will do the most to help carry the message to the addict who still suffers in that corner of the world. What we can share is the knowledge that they are not alone and that most regions go through very similar growing pains and struggles.

In the meantime, once we receive formal notice of a new region's existence, our standard practice is to add that community's elected representative to the conference-participant mailing list. In this way, that representative can begin to receive the general flow of information from NA World Services. This includes all the periodicals from NA World Services, including things like this *Conference Report*, *NAWS News*, the *Annual Report*, and the *NA Way Magazine*.

This may not offer as much in the way of practical help to a struggling new community as we would like. However, it does start the process of informing new communities about what's going on in NA worldwide and in NA World Services. Sometimes this desire to be a part of something greater than ourselves—this desire to unite with other addicts and other NA communities—is what new communities who request seating are really looking for. We face many challenges to improving our communication so that we meet this basic need and offer practical assistance where we can. We are committed to improving in this area and believe that implementing this new policy will help us to pay more attention to our routine fellowship development mission.

Routine services are often like this. Routine services are not as sexy as a brand new conference project. The routine job doesn't always hold our interest and attention the way a new, deadline-driven project does.

We hope this practice will help us to communicate better with emerging communities from the start. Our goal is proactively building a solid relationship from the point of "first contact" all the way through to the day when a community matures to the point that it is ready to assume the responsibilities that go with participating in the World Service Conference and being of service to NA as a whole. This means giving back to the next new community who comes along, as we strive together to fulfill each of the ideals of the NA World Services Vision Statement and the World Service Conference Mission Statement.

<p>NEW PUBLIC RELATIONS STATEMENT IN THE WORKS</p>
--

One of the first public relations directives addressed was the creation of a draft public relations statement. We explored and discussed the philosophical issues confronting us as we strive to fulfill the WSC Mission and Vision statements.

The committee presented the full board with a draft statement that initiated a spirited discussion. Some of the issues raised are: who is the audience for this statement? Are we writing something that we can give to a professional, or are we writing something that explains why we do what we do? Is this a statement of our philosophy or a PR statement? With numerous questions like these, it is easy to see why the board decided against putting the statement into the *CAR* at this time. We will first clarify the philosophical issues. Then we'll tailor the statement to fit that foundation.

August 2001 Conference Report

We believe this statement will build on our current PR Statement of Purpose (see *A Temporary Working Guide to Our World Service Structure*, pages 34-35), so that it will address both the NA Fellowship and the public as a whole in a clear and concise manner. This current Statement of Purpose was adopted in part because world services lacked long-term strategies and goals regarding fellowship growth and development.

We believe by creating an *actual* public relations statement, we will help to establish a general understanding of what NA is about and what the NA program has to offer, not just within the NA Fellowship itself, but within society as a whole.

It is important to not only develop and improve the public's awareness of the NA program of recovery, but to also improve our fellowship's awareness of the necessary components that comprise public relations. The existing terminology in *TWGWSS* describes what NA is to the fellowship and does not adequately describe what NA is to the general public or to professionals who deal with addicts.

REACHING OUT UPDATE

We have changed the process for reviewing and approving articles for the periodical, *Reaching Out*. Instead of the quarterly conference calls, as utilized by the former workgroup, we will send the manuscript draft via email to pool members and to PR Committee members for review and input.

We want to thank David J (Pennsylvania) for his years of dedicated service to this periodical and welcome Susan S (Massachusetts) to this assignment.

GUARDIANS

PRIORITIZED TOPICS: ACCOUNTABILITY AND COURT CARDS

The Guardians have prioritized three subjects to work on. They plan to present bulletin drafts to the board on meeting attendance cards and accountability for funds in NA. Also, the committees will give input to the Executive Committee on Internet issues, such as anonymity and Tradition Eleven, and also some thoughts about online "groups" and meetings.

A session at the worldwide workshop in Vancouver discussed the subject of meeting attendance cards. It will also be a subject at the World Service Meeting. We believe that a substantial amount of information from the fellowship exists on this subject, as well as at WSO. We envision a helpful bulletin being produced by the Board. Accountability was also a subject at the Vancouver workshop and will be discussed at future workshops. The fellowship contacts the WSO about this topic frequently, so we believe that a new bulletin (or revision to the existing bulletin) will be a worthwhile tool.

ISSUE TOPIC DEVELOPMENT PROCESS/ISSUE TOPICS IN THE CAR

At the July WB meeting, the Guardians brought a discussion to the board about the current process for selection of issue discussion topics by conference participants. While the issue topic discussions themselves are clearly enjoyed and wanted by conference participants and many members of the fellowship, the process for selecting topics is not embraced by everyone. Very few topics have been submitted since the process began in the mid-1990s, and conference

August 2001 Conference Report

participants haven't been happy with all the choices. In addition, many groups don't feel they should be asked to discuss the selection of topics in their home groups. We believe that the process should be taken out of the CAR, but that the issue discussions themselves should continue. The worldwide workshops, regional workshop settings, world service meetings, and convention workshops all offer excellent opportunities for these discussions to occur, in addition to at the WSC meeting.

We will be proposing a motion that simply takes the selection of topics out of the conference agenda report process. The World Board will also present in the CAR 2002 the list of submitted topics, because the present policy requires that. We will include discussion about whether this should even continue at WSC 2002.

PROCESS FOR FRAMING PHILOSOPHICAL ISSUES DEVELOPED

The Guardians Committee presented a framework for discussing issues (see below). This was well received by the Board, and we recommend that other board and fellowship committees use it widely.

Framework for Issues

The board agreed to use a standard framework, developed by the Guardians, for evaluating any issue or topic discussions. That framework is:

Why is the project or topic before us?

- Identify the scope of the issue from the symptoms and manifestations of problems associated with it.
- Where does it come from?

Who is the audience that is involved with this issue?

- The majority of issues originate primarily from North American NA members. Sometimes this concern extends to other countries and sometimes it doesn't. Sometimes a project is developed specifically for a particular audience. Being aware of and clear about this audience is important when discussing the issue.
- Is the audience primarily service structure or general fellowship?

What is the nature of the work to be done?

- What already exists concerning this issue?
- What are the goals of discussing this – short-term and long-term? Possibly a feedback discussion with the board, providing input to another committee, a bulletin, a framework for discussing the issue, an article giving a range of experience, or a definite statement, etc?

How will the work be done?

- Are there solutions to the issue? What are the solutions?
- Is it possible to say something meaningful about the issue that the Guardians and the World Board believe in?
- What method(s) to use—a workgroup, collecting feedback, a board discussion (etc.)?

Once this evaluation takes place, the board decides if further work should be done.

EVENTS

Energy is starting to build towards WCNA 29, taking place in Atlanta, Georgia (USA),

August 2001 Conference Report

4-7 July 2002. That's only eleven months away! The theme selected is "Freedom to Live Our Dreams."

We held an informational session for members of the Georgia region in June to begin the work of selecting a local committee needed to support us over the next year in preparing for the event. Over 100 enthusiastic members of the Georgia fellowship turned out to meet board members Lib E and Tony W of our Events Committee, who along with staff members Mike Polin (Manager of Conventions, Meetings & Events) and Becky Meyer (Assistant Executive Director).

The next year will be extraordinarily busy. WCNA-29 will be held just 60 days after WSC 2002. Immediately, we will then have to make final plans for WCNA-30, a special world convention to commemorate our fellowship's 50th birthday. This event will take place 3-6 July 2003 in San Diego, California. We expect this to be the largest world convention in our history.

Planning for WCNA-32 in 2007 also continues. The board decided in July to narrow the possible sites to two cities: New Orleans and San Antonio. Final negotiations will continue over the next two months with a final decision probably in October. Regardless of which city is selected, WCNA 32 will be a sure winner with those two cities as the finalists.

The Events Committee has met twice to address specifically needed changes in two areas of convention planning: (1) how to effectively plan a diversified program for world conventions, and (2) how to restructure the role of the local committee. These issues have been an ongoing challenge for several years.

PROGRAM PLANNING FOR WORLD CONVENTIONS

After many years of trying a variety of different ways, and after assigning various combinations of groups the responsibility of planning the program for the world convention, we are ready to surrender to four truths. First, the process of listening to hundreds and hundreds of tapes, primarily from the US, neither gives us the diverse pool of potential speakers needed, nor provides us with a variety of potential new speakers not already known to us. It is a time and labor-intensive process with little return.

Second, the group of individuals with the most experience and qualifications to be able to create a diverse program of worldwide speakers are either currently on the board, or are past world service trusted servants with world convention experience.

Third, no matter what process is used, the group with the primary responsibility for speaker selection will never recommend a main speaker it has no familiarity with. By this, we mean that some members of the final decision-making group have always known enough about the speaker to give the rest of the group comfort that they were making a good decision.

Fourth, all of the factors involved in selecting speakers, assigning a local committee the task of completing work, and a different world-level committee with the decision-making power, will always create a collision course between the groups that undermines trust and the resulting work itself.

History Of Selecting Speakers

Planning the program for the world convention has always been a difficult task. In the past, many different methods and workgroups

August 2001 Conference Report

have tried to complete the work of program development and speaker selection.

Beginning in the 1980s, the World Convention Corporation, as the primary group responsible for the convention program, was repeatedly confronted with the same dilemma. Speaker selection and program development processes are flawed. Delegating this work to a local committee or any other group outside the board exacerbated the problems. To create a truer representation of our globally diverse fellowship, the speaker selection and program development process needed improvement.

Every year, the former WCC would review the process of program development and speaker selection only to expose the recurrence of two basic problems. First, the collective experience of local committees have never been afforded access to or experience in considering the broad perspectives required to pick speakers that represent a worldwide fellowship. But we continually asked them to perform this work, unintentionally setting them up for failure because local committees lack the necessary tools needed to create the desired outcome. Second, we have placed great reliance on a tape review process for speaker consideration that has been minimally helpful. That tape review process has given us primarily US male speakers to consider. The time-consuming tape review process has not given us a diverse selection and, therefore, does not work.

After reaching these conclusions over and over again, steps were implemented to try to adjust the process. Simple changes, such as asking areas and regions for written recommendations, netted the same result—very little change or improvement in the outcome.

Attempts At “Band-Aiding” The Problem

At every world convention from 1994 to the present, either today’s world board or the WCC

that preceded it, has changed the process of selection, or changed the actual speakers selected for workshops and main meetings in order to achieve the desired diversity.

Every effort has been made to try to make this system work and resolve these problems. Beginning in 1996, the local committee was asked to recommend a group of qualified main speakers, instead of recommending specific choices, in order to allow the WCC the opportunity to impact the work and better attain the desired diversity. While this helped a little, it did not resolve the problem because this system still relied on a tape review process that could never provide a diverse global variety of speakers.

The selection of workshop speakers had all the same problems, but was even worse (only speakers attending the convention could be considered) because, not only were tapes virtually useless in this process, selection was further complicated by having to wait until sixty days (or most times less) before the event to know who was registered to attend. This severely limited timetable dramatically further hampered any possibility for the board and a local committee to work in harmony on speaker selection. Efforts at improving this process, no matter how good, resulted in increased frustration, discontent, and at times, undermined the trust between the board and the local committee.

It is important to acknowledge that in spite of the identified flaws in our past formal selection procedures, we were able to achieve a final program that has reflected the desired diversity. However, what is needed now is to create a formal process that can best achieve this end from the start.

Board Solution Adopted

August 2001 Conference Report

We acknowledge what our experience has taught us. We concur with the goals previously established by the WCC, that the world convention, in all areas, but especially in the program speakers, should reflect the diversity of our membership. Elements that commonly express diversity—age, culture, ethnicity, gender, language, race, sexual identity, and message—should always be the primary considerations in the program planning for a world convention.

The sole responsibility of program development and speaker selection will rest with the World Board. We will no longer ask a local committee to form a program committee or choose and recommend speakers as a matter of course, with the exception of recommending some specific number of speakers from their home region. We also welcome any and all additional suggestions that they may have. The local committee may also be asked to suggest topics at the request of the board.

- Within the scope of the board, a workgroup called the Program Development Group (PDG) shall be made up of World Board members with vast world service, world convention, and/or extensive recovery experience, and knowledge of the NA fellowship. This group has the option to include other members from the fellowship (with vast fellowship and/or world convention experience) to participate in all, or some portion of its planning based on the board's needs and goals for the respective convention. For example, we may use these types of groups for specific program development aspects of WCNA-30 (NA's 50th birthday) because of our desire to plan a very special and unique program that reflects our history, as well as our future.

- The World Board, as a body, shall be the final decisionmaker on all main speakers. Main speakers shall be considered

those who are funded to the world convention. Workshop speakers are not funded, but planning to attend the event already.

- Speaker tapes may be used as a tool for considering potential speakers. However, we will not depend on tapes to select speakers, and we will no longer ask that tapes be submitted for consideration.

- If a member is interested in speaking at the world convention, they should send the PDG their name, contact information, what language they speak, clean date, and if they are currently planning to attend the world convention.

The PDG may use any number of means available to clarify the quality of the speaker's message, including dialogue with local members or listening to a tape if the committee so desires.

The PDG will develop the vision and focus of the overall program, theme, meeting topics, and speakers. Some parts of this process will be phased in over the next two conventions as planning for WCNA-29 has already begun. The PDG will reach out to the fellowship as a whole and through the service structure for input as a means of talking about the selection process, giving the fellowship timelines, and asking for their assistance.

The PDG has the ability to reach out to experienced members around the world for input and may decide to create a group to assist in the development of specific parts of the program. While this group would not have the level of formality as a normal work group, it would function as a resource to assist the PDG in identifying potential speakers or soliciting input on workshop topics for the world convention. After considering all the input received, the PDG will recommend main speakers for the world convention to the World Board for concurrence.

August 2001 Conference Report

In addition, the PDG will work closely with the Fellowship Relations Committee to develop the service delivery plan included in the program of the world convention. After receiving input from the world board and other members, the PDG will approve workshop speakers and finalize meeting topics. As stated earlier, the composition of this group may vary from convention to convention, based on the needs and goals of that particular event, and may also include experienced members who are not on the World Board.

These recommendations eliminate the host committee's responsibility for selecting speakers. Ultimate responsibility belongs to the World Board and for the purpose of WCNA-29, the program decisions will fall on: WB Events Committee; WB Executive Committee; WB Fellowship Relations Committee (for service delivery plan), and NAWS staff. The make-up of the WCNA-29 PDG may differ from the WCNA-30 PDG and future groups, as this system evolves over time and is tweaked to meet the needs of each respective convention. We have already asked the Georgia Region to submit ideas for the convention theme.

As the PDG evolves through the next few years, we hope that the group becomes less board-dependant and involves other members with relevant world convention and fellowship experience. We believe that this group should combine the most experienced board members and staff, plus include all of the current Events Committee members in order to expand the pool of experience by using this opportunity to train newer board participants for possible use in future convention planning.

RE-DEFINING THE ROLE OF THE LOCAL WCNA COMMITTEE

The structure of the host committee as currently stated in *TWGWSS* and as used in the past, is virtually unchanged from the 1980s when most of the bidding and planning work of the world convention was delegated to a local host committee. We no longer function that way, so we have worked to create a local committee structure that more truly reflects its role and responsibilities, can be clearly described to the local fellowship, and attains the desired results. We are proposing a revised description in *TWGWSS* to reflect current practice.

Over the past eight years, the role and scope of the local committee has been repeatedly examined, revised, and changed as world convention attendance has grown dramatically and planning has become increasingly complex. Though the local committee did much of the work in the bidding and planning processes through the early 1990s, today's role is much different and continues to be a work-in-progress. Some of the ideas described here may appear new but few of them really are. In fact, the world board used most of what follows in planning WCNA-28, as did the former WCC. The role of the world board, staff, and the local community may address different areas of planning, however all three bodies must work effectively together as a single unified entity in order for the convention to be successful.

Once called a host committee, we will now call the local committee the Support Committee in order to reflect their role more accurately in the overall planning and implementation of the event. In the past, the use of the word "host" has caused confusion because at the regional level a host committee for a convention typically is delegated responsibility as the primary planning body for a

August 2001 Conference Report

regional convention. For a world convention, the world board has this role so calling the local committee a “host committee” has been inadvertently misleading. We took a small step in this direction in 1996 when we renamed the individual sub-committees (i.e., registration, merchandise, etc.) because we wanted to try to clarify their role as supportive. This additional clarifying step simply applies that same logic to the whole local committee structure.

The purpose of the Support Committee is to provide support and assistance to NA World Services in planning and implementing the convention. The World Board acts as the single point of accountability and decisionmaking for the world convention. The Support Committee participation in this process is integral to our ability to have a successful event for our fellowship and affords members a unique and gratifying opportunity to experience service in recovery.

The primary role of this committee is volunteer recruitment. The committee creates the necessary volunteer base to support world services on-site at the convention. Volunteer recruitment and training is the single most important, most complex, and most time consuming job in the planning for a world convention. This can involve the coordination of up to one thousand volunteer slots, depending on the location and size of the event. Volunteer recruitment is essential to the success of the event for our fellowship.

Another important role of the Support Committee is, and should be, to work closely with the world board’s Program Development Group in providing a set number of suggested speakers out of the local community; input on workshop topics; and selecting chairs, readers, and leaders as requested.

Finally, ideas, thoughts, and input from the Support Committee is always welcome and will be considered as NA World Services makes decisions in the planning of the event. These ideas may include, but are not limited to, input on registration and merchandise items, local entertainment, and any ideas that might add some uniquely local flavor to the event. Additionally, the world board may ask the committee for input or to provide other services based on the needs of the specific event.

The Support Committee will typically consist of 13 people, but may be adjusted according to the needs of each specific convention. An administrative committee will be made up of three people: two co-chairs, and a secretary/treasurer. The remainder of the committee will eventually evolve into point people for each area of volunteer recruitment for the event.

The administrative arm of the Support Committee works in tandem with NA World Services in between meetings, communicates with the rest of the Support Committee, handles the disbursement of funds to cover any expenses incurred by the local committee, and keeps a record of Support Committee meetings.

The region (on behalf of NA World Services) shall elect the Support Committee, including all administrative positions. Once elected the Support Committee shall provide periodic reports to the region but are directly accountable to world services. Support Committee members must have five years clean time to qualify for election, to keep this position consistent with the requirements for the World Pool.

For purposes of brainstorming, providing input to the world board, and any functions other than volunteer recruitment, the Support Committee works together as a unit rather than splitting into sub-groups, based on their identified

August 2001 Conference Report

areas of work. At some appropriate pre-designated time, assigned Support Committee members will be point people responsible for coordinating the volunteer base for a specific area of the event.

Our old system of having sub-groups, or sub-committees, or the local committee itself “specialize” in any one area of planning (i.e., registration, entertainment, merchandise, etc.) has generally been problematic. These groups tend to focus too much attention on trying to provide specific ideas about their one area of the convention, rather than on implementing the overall convention plan. In our experience this does not happen intentionally, it is just the continuous outcome of this structure. Creating specific sub-committees for a regional convention works well in that setting. But we have found that the Support Committee for a world convention is more successful when functioning as a single unit.

Recognizing this problem, we used the Cartagena experience to try something different. We asked the region to select point people in various areas like merchandise, entertainment, etc. We encouraged the local committee not to create any sub-committee structure. The Support Committee would deliberate together on all areas and input ideas through committee consensus. The specific point people only divided into their respective parts for volunteer recruitment and on-site supervision, or if directed sooner for some reason by the world board. We had much better results. Committee members were able to participate in other areas of convention work if they had experience or access to the needed services or vendors. For example, the person appointed to convention information helped find entertainment. We were able to better utilize individual skills, knowledge, experience, and geographic location as needs arose instead of being limited to using people only in their assigned area of work.

The Support Committee should work as a unit as much as possible in the brainstorming and initial stages of planning. Listed below is a summary of typical tasks to be completed by the Support Committee:

- Recruiting and scheduling volunteers for all areas of the convention.
- Developing a handbook of restaurants outside of the hotels, tourist attractions, and other information of interest to members for use during the event.
- Providing input and assistance on local entertainers and disc jockeys.
- Submitting a set number of potential speakers from the region for consideration, and offering input on workshop topics.
- Choosing chair people, readers, and leaders for workshops.
- Providing input on specific types of items to be included in the registration packets.
- Providing input on specific types of merchandise items.

Input and ideas from the Support Committee will always be welcomed and encouraged. While all ideas may not be adopted, committee input is valued and will always be considered in light of NA World Services overall goals for each world convention.

August 2001 Conference Report

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

In accordance with the bylaws, the board held elections in July for its officers. The board unanimously re-elected the existing executive committee members for an additional one-year term. Jon T (Chair), Jane N (Vice Chair), Bob J (Secretary), and Cary S (Treasurer) will serve in these positions for another one-year term. There were no other nominations for this mid-term executive committee election. All four of the EC members stated their willingness to continue for another year.

In keeping with the two-year conference cycle, all other board members also stated their willingness to remain with their current board assignments.

FDP/BUSINESS PLAN WORKGROUP

The board still has on its agenda a review and updating of the Fellowship Development Plan (FDP). The purpose of the FDP is “to plan and provide services and support which facilitate the continuation and growth of Narcotics Anonymous worldwide.” We have formed a new Business Plan group primarily to focus on updating FDP Goal One (“To increase and improve world services available financial resources.”). Copies of the FDP are available on request or online at www.na.org/reports.htm.

The workgroup consists of two board members, Cary S and Bob J, two pool members, Mario T and Bob McD, and three members of the WSO Management, Anthony Edmondson, Becky Meyer, and Tom Rush.

At the April board meeting, we devoted several hours of discussion to provide input to the business plan workgroup. We discussed the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats

facing NA World Services and our ability to serve the fellowship.

The other sections of the plan (Goals Two through Ten) have been referred to the committees of the board that the goal or one of its objectives are applicable to. We expect that each committee will review, revise as necessary, or recommend new objectives or goals. This work will continue into early next year. The board will present a revised Fellowship Development Plan at WSC 2002.

STATUS OF PROJECT IDEAS

We have attached a report, as Addendum A, showing the status of all project ideas we’ve received since WSC 2000.

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM PROJECT

The Information Management System Project is running behind schedule. This was one of the seven projects approved at WSC 2000. The purpose is to initiate a comprehensive information management system for world services. The need for an improved records management system has been around for well over ten years. Phase one will make an initial assessment. This includes gathering standardized fellowship information as called for in the FDP.

The original timeline called for the hiring of a consultant in mid-2000. The beginning of the implementation of the recommendations received was to occur from 2001-2002. The good news is that a consultant has now provided an assessment for the management of our archives. It will likely be next year before any implementation phase can begin. An assessment and proposal still needs to be done for the management of current information.

RELATIONS WITH THE HUMAN
RESOURCE PANEL

We have been working together with the Human Resource Panel this conference cycle over some substantive issues that we felt had been resolved with the previous HRP panels. We are now into the third conference cycle of the existence of the board, the HRP, and the World Pool. We believe it will be helpful to review the history of our relationship and update you on the areas of past agreement and disagreement and where we are now after our last meeting together.

During the 1998-99 conference cycle, several issues began to emerge that needed to be resolved. Responsibility for election procedures and facilitating elections at the WSC meeting wasn't entirely clear. The HRP believed it to be their responsibility to develop and administer the procedures and the board believed that the service manual clearly says that the HRP will only facilitate the elections at the WSC meeting and the board is responsible for conference policy and procedures.

Another problem was that no process existed for how to utilize the world pool or how to formulate requests that were specific enough to result in a list of qualified people. We quickly saw that both specific and abstract information needed to be on the resume form and a reliable process for retrieving the information on the form was needed.

Additionally, the HRP and the board understood selection of people for projects, events, and travel differently. The HRP believed it had a role in each process because the world pool should be used. We saw the selection of people for projects as different than for events and travel. The board was just beginning to create its processes at that time, and it was obvious to us that the selection of

From the Nov.'99 Conference Report:
More Settling In: Developing Working Relationships Between and Among the World Board, the HRP, and the WSC Co-facilitators

We have come a long way from the complex turf wars of the old world service system. Those with their short-term memory intact may remember the infamous Interim Committee thanklessly trying to bridge the three headed monster that was world services, with its dueling standing committee systems and the WSO squarely in the middle fighting fires and taking shots from all sides. Reorganizing and simplifying that old system has brought immense benefits we already experience every day, but of course the new system has not eliminated every possibility for conflict. We have reported previously that we have had conflicts and differences with both the HRP and the WSC co-facilitators, this conference cycle and last year. We have worked hard with both the HRP and the co-facilitators to improve communication and engage in frank, open, and honest dialogue where differences have existed. This is an ongoing process. We believe that there has been a normal settling in adjustment process of clarifying our roles and responsibilities and coming to a common understanding about the scope of authority of each component of the new world service system, and the nature of the inter-relationships among elements. It takes time to build effective and trusting working relationships. We look forward to settling in to these relationships and solidifying the progress we have made so far.

people for events and travel needed a separate process clearly defined in the external guidelines. And the board was looking for a way to help the

August 2001 Conference Report

HRP build the world pool so that its usefulness could be maximized.

Many smaller questions came up too. The need for establishing effective communication between the HRP and the board became apparent.

The board and the HRP each made substantial progress on some of these issues independently, and we began meeting together to exchange information and views. At first, we had some personality conflicts because it seemed on the surface that members of each group were protecting turf. However, everyone involved recognized that progress had to be made so the WSC could be best served. Everyone drew on their personal recovery to overcome the personality clashes. We recognized that even more communication between the two groups was essential.

Then, in the 1999-2000 cycle, we continued meeting with the HRP and exchanging thoughts about the same basic issues. We met with the HRP two times during that cycle. We discovered that each time we were again talking about the same issues: accountability, responsibility for election procedures, selection processes, and utilization of the world pool.

A new development that occurred during the 2000-2002 cycle involves the implementation of the committee system. We now have six board committees trying to find the best-qualified people for selected projects and other tasks. The entire board now has firsthand experience with the limitations of the World Pool, the problems with the resume, the difficulties of defining the skills and experience needed for specific workgroups/projects/tasks.

The HRP had a 75% turnover in its membership at WSC 2000 and 20% of the World Board members are new. And with the resignation of Jim E in April, the committee has

been left with no continuity of experience from the past HRP or any past recollection of previous discussions with the board. So now, there are new members bringing a fresh perspective to the situation and the issues.

It is important to note that, even with new members and perspectives on both service bodies, the very same issues came up again as during the first cycle of the new world service system. For this reason, we believe that the issues are probably symptoms of systemic problems rather than people or personalities.

Meeting with the HRP in November and then again in July, we feel we have made great strides forward in establishing a foundation of agreements that we can build on with future HRP and board relationships. Some of the points that we have reached agreement on are as follows:

- ❖ We believe that travel to events is a routine function of NA World Services, not a WSC project. This is why we don't consider the world pool to be the primary resource for selecting travelers to events but we do occasionally use the pool to locate qualified members who might fit a particular need of a trip. With more long term planning, the more this process may be utilized. On the other hand, we do see the world pool as the exclusive resource for HRP nominations. In addition, it is the primary resource for WSC projects. Here we realize that WSC participants might believe that the pool is the exclusive resource for the board. We both realize that we are just not strategically where we need to be yet in order to utilize fully the process, and this hasn't been effectively clarified to the fellowship. In many cases, we know of people

August 2001 Conference Report

with valuable experience that could be very helpful to workgroups and when they are not in the pool, we always ask them to submit a resume.

- ❖ We believe that we've found common ground with the HRP on the election procedures and the challenge to nominations process. This year we've refined the procedures for presentation to the conference and the HRP has given us their input and approval. The challenge to nominations process, which had some lively discussions around it in the past, has been settled with a workable solution that is also being presented to the conference next year for approval.
- ❖ Both groups realize that getting unknown members elected to a world service position at the conference or selected to serve on a board's committee project or workgroup has not been successful. As possible remedies for this, the board is looking into the possibility of: interviewing potential workgroup members, random selection, and long-term planning. We feel we have worked hard at expanding our workforce within the fellowship by utilizing the pool but still feel we have further to go. The HRP is looking into ways that the conference will feel confident, in that any nominee presented is qualified to serve in the position nominated for.
- ❖ The HRP believes it was necessary to attend the World Service Meeting in Virginia. Our belief is that the HRP members should do everything possible to maintain objectivity for

their nominating process because most nominations seem to come from current or recently past conference participants. Most of the board believes that the fellowship is best served by an HRP who serves as a nominating committee that has some distance from those nominees, particularly around the time when the selection process is beginning. The HRP has developed an information form and an interview process to insure equality in the evaluation process, and it seem to us that the potential conflict of developing interpersonal relationships with those that will be evaluated should be avoided. This we feel is in line with the original TG proposal. There are a few of us who feel that interaction with the fellowship achieves an objective and informed slate of candidates, and may be beneficial to candidate presentation. We do recognize though that the HRP is in the same six-year transition period that we are in and understand their need to continue to present their works in progress. This is one of the areas that we will continue to discuss within the board and with the HRP. We have authorized funding for the HRP to attend the World Service Meeting. We are committed to working cooperatively with the HRP, and we did not want funding issues to become a distraction as we work to resolve the differing views that each body holds.

- ❖ We have tried to work together to improve the resume form (now information form) so that more useful

August 2001 Conference Report

and relevant information can be captured in the world pool database for later retrieval in response to specific needs that arise.

- ❖ Regarding accountability, we realize that in the HRP's external guidelines they are accountable to the WSC, who elected them. But *during* the conference cycle they fall under the NAWS umbrella, which is the responsibility of the world board. The HRP is accountable to the world board to report its status and progress, to provide ongoing communication about its work and its needs administratively and budget-wise during the conference cycle. The relationship is one of mutual respect not mutual accountability.

Our belief is that the issues we've been discussing with the HRP could continue to be unresolved issues each time that new HRP members are elected. This wouldn't serve the conference or the fellowship well. We both feel that currently the best solution is to work on changing practice rather than structure. Some ways of doing this will be to consider more shared meetings, using liaisons with particular projects, possible communications between point persons of committees before providing pool member list for workgroups, and more interaction in general regarding communication and interpretation. We also feel it is essential to record our agreements and discussions in writing for future board and HRP members to have as a resource. With all of this and more in place for the remainder of this transition phase we feel we will be able to reach a mutual conclusions at the end whether the system is flawed or not and needs to be changed.

As our dialogue with the HRP continues, and the board's discussions progress, we will definitely keep conference participants informed.

Establishing the World Pool as a Resource Will Take Time

We know that the Human Resource Panel is doing everything possible to build and develop the World Pool, and you will find a report on their activities at the end of this report. . . . The World Pool is a fundamental component of the new system, and a very important channel for fellowship participation. Yet it will take time to build. It is reasonable to expect that building the World Pool will be a focal point during the next phase of our transition. Again, your help with this task is crucial.

We have learned that there is no substitute for making a personal, direct appeal to qualified members we know personally and asking them to submit their service resumes to the World Pool. We can make a million announcements in every NAWS publication, post the resume form on the NAWS website, and stand up in every service meeting and forum and repeat the call for resumes— there is no substitute for approaching a qualified member one-on-one and putting a resume in his or her hand with a personal appeal. We are asking all delegates to help the HRP and us by taking on the task for which we are co-responsible: making the World Pool work!

—From the November 1999 Conference Report

August 2001 Conference Report

WHAT'S NOT GETTING DONE:

As we have previously indicated, there is an ever-growing need for services and a pretty much fixed level of resources. The result is that decisions must be made about what gets done, when, and what is not going to get done right now. Because of this constant reality, there will always be some number of things that are not getting done at all. Other lower priority things do not then receive as much time and attention as we would like or as they deserve. Many of our activities as a board are creating new foundations for things that have been neglected for years. This takes discussions by the full board and limits the number of items that we can do well at any one time.

This has also been severely impacted by the open positions for writer/committee support positions at the WSO. We hope to have one or more of these positions filled in the near future.

What are the immediate and longer-term priorities for NA World Services? We are again approaching the point where we want to begin a discussion to help build a consensus answer to this question.

COMMUNICATION STANDARDS PROJECT UPDATE

We wanted to give a brief update on the status of the Communication Standards Project. This is a follow-up to last cycle's Communication Task Force Project. The board delivered a final problem report last July. There has been insufficient time and resources to concentrate on this project this cycle. We have, however, made some limited progress. In a future report we will update you on how various problems identified by the CTF Project have been tackled by various aspects of work moving forward now.

Nonetheless, it is clear that the bulk of this project will have to be deferred until more staff resources are available to focus on this task.

HISTORICAL DATA COLLECTION PROJECT

The historical data collection project has received no attention since some minimal follow-up, which we did shortly after WSC 2000. Unfortunately, we do not have the time or resources to advance this work at this time. We are encouraged, however, by some of the activity in local NA communities. Some communities, as a result of the impetus at the last WSC, have begun projects to document their own local history.

SERVICE MATERIAL EVALUATION PROJECT

Two handbooks are getting limited attention. These are the *Treasurer's Handbook* and the *Guide to Public Information* handbook. The other service materials included in the scope of this project are receiving even less attention at this time. The defined task in this project is to identify the issues in each of these handbooks before development of improved tools goes forward at a later date in a follow-up project. Even with the limited scope of this first phase of the work, more pressing issues have required our time and attention first.

TREASURER'S HANDBOOK AND GROUP TREASURER'S WORKBOOK.

We inherited a draft revision of the *Treasurer's Handbook* that is a substantial improvement over the current material available now. It is not perfect. It is not everything we

August 2001 Conference Report

would like it to be. But we are seriously considering releasing this material using the conference approval-track for the approval of service material. The dilemma we are faced with is releasing something that does not contain information that should be covered but is nonetheless much better than what we currently have available. We reported earlier in the year about a non-traveling workgroup we formed to evaluate the draft and give input. We are in the process of having the draft edited now. Depending on how this turns out and when we have another draft to look at, we may have a draft for conference consideration before WSC 2002.

PI HANDBOOK EVALUATION INPUT TEAM

We are in the process of finalizing the selection of World Pool members to participate in a workgroup to evaluate the existing input from the fellowship for *A Guide to Public Information* and *A Guide to Phoneline Service*. We plan to divide the workgroup into two groups—one group to review and evaluate the input for *A Guide to Public Information* and one group to review and evaluate the input for *A Guide to Phoneline Service*. We are also planning to develop a simple and effective evaluation tool (e.g., a questionnaire or some such) to assist the workgroup members with their evaluations. In addition, we want to ensure that we provide this workgroup with all the necessary information available to complete the task.

Before making any decisions regarding the outcome of these handbooks, we will wait to receive the evaluations and recommendations from these workgroups. We will continue to keep you apprised of the progress being made in this area. We know this is an important priority, particularly for those involved in public

information service. Our limited resources impair our ability to progress with this as quickly as we all would like, and we are unsure how our ongoing resource crunch will affect the timetable for this going forward.

WCNA-29 CARTAGENA REPORT STILL NOT FINALIZED

It appears that the transition into the unified budget and job costing processes have created additional challenges in producing a final report for Cartagena. The expense entries stretch over multiple fiscal years, which means that the final reconciliation will have to cross-check the entries manually, and then input the entries into the new system. This is primarily a result of the accounting classifications changing mid-stream of implementing the event. Although, we are confident that the event ended up in the income and expense range anticipated by the board, in the revised budget we have not completed the final detail. As time permits, we will conduct a manual audit of the general ledger entries, while still working on the implementation of the Atlanta event.

August 2001 Conference Report

STATUS OF PROJECT IDEAS

The following chart lists the status of project ideas submitted since WSC 2000.

1.	Kevin H & Mukam D, RDA New Jersey	To amend the <i>Guide to Local Services</i> by providing clean time requirements guidelines for group trusted servants.	29 Apr 2000	Keep idea on hand for when and if the <i>Guide to Local Services</i> is revised.
2.	Mary Anne L, RDA Connecticut	To add to the WSO inventory book covers for the JFT*, BT*, ITW* with coin and/or medallion holder – plain, service symbol, Serenity Prayer printed or embossed on covers.	May 2000	Communicate decision about specialty items— not going to carry in regular inventory but possible limited runs around conventions.
3.	Peter H, RDA South Florida Region	To produce a pamphlet, booklet, or just update the stories of Book Two of the Basic Text.	2 May 2000	Will keep input for the Basic Text evaluation.
4.	Peter H, RDA South Florida Region	Create a booklet on Sponsorship.	2 May 2000	Will keep input for sponsorship project.
5.	Peter H, RDA South Florida Region	Add the Twelve Traditions to the end of the Little White Booklet (the 2 nd part of traditions).	2 May 2000	Will keep input for the Basic Text evaluation.
6.	Tim A, RDA Iowa Region	To print or check on the feasibility of printing key tags with year amounts, printed on them i.e. 1, 2, 3, ...	2 May 2000	Not planning to pursue— produced multiple year tag at direction of conference.
7.	Paul C	NA Online Handbook; use of NA on the Internet and how it affects members and committees relating to information and interaction through various online opportunities. (Most recent version of handbook.)	3 May 2000	Will keep on hand for future discussions about the Internet.

August 2001 Conference Report

8.	Greg I	WSC web page; to place information on na.org a web page about the WSC. Possible ideas include roll call, motion results, description of activities e.g. small groups discussion topics, and report from boards. At some, point perhaps – regional reports that follow a format.	3 May 2000	Not planning to pursue at this time.
9.	Gilbert W	Material or demonstration tape outlining facilitation of small groups and consensus based decision-making process to be used to educate our members on how to use these tools to do business.	3 May 2000	Will keep as input for discussions about tools needed by the fellowship.
10	Khalilah S	Laminate the vision and mission statements, and concepts like the group readings.	5 May 2000	Not planning to pursue at this time.
11	Jim M, RDA Chesapeake and Potomac	The WB or some part of the WB should research and develop a process for building consensus in large groups.	5 May 2000	Will discuss this later in the conference cycle.
12	Steve D, RDA	Create a Basic Text; instead of revising stories in BT, create a Book Three, which would be new book altogether. This book would include chapters on sponsorship, relationships, and parenting. This book could also include personal stories that reflect current times, different cultures of members, our members dealing with a variety of issues, HIV/AIDS in NA...	WSC 2000	Will keep input for the Basic Text evaluation.
13	Steve D, RDA	Loner group having a meeting by mail workshop during future WCNA.	WSC 2000	Not planning a workshop-bulletin board provided onsite for those who wish to plan offsite meetings.

August 2001 Conference Report

14	Steve D, RDA resubmitted idea	Creating a book regarding how to be a chairperson or leader for an NA meeting.	WSC 2000	Will keep as input for discussions about tools needed by the fellowship
15	Stacy C	Create an IP cautioning addicts of the possibilities of using the Internet as a means of transforming their addictions rather than enhancing the face-to-face meetings for those with access to face-to-face meetings.	25 May 2000	Not planning to pursue new ideas for literature at this time but will keep as input.
16	Mike F	Train the trainer pamphlet. Pamphlet on how to run a successful subcommittee and on how to be better subcommittee chairs.	8 June 2000	Will keep as input to discussions about tools needed by the fellowship.
17	B157BEAR@AOL.COM	Congratulation Anniversary Cards.	28 Mar 2000	Communicate decision about specialty items— not going to carry in regular inventory but possible limited runs around conventions.
18	Paul R	Establish and operate a nationwide NA meeting referral Phonenumber.	13 June 2000	Not planning to pursue- WSC 2000 indicated they did not support this idea.
19	Barry O	Discuss the First Tradition and how being of service in NA allows a member or and groups to be a bigger part of the whole as a fellowship and ideas to get members involved.	5 July 2000	Assigned to Guardians for consideration.
20	Mats-Einar J	Internet Guidelines: guidelines for the internet, due to anarchy, and violation of traditions/copyright, email groups already exists and are experiencing severe problems.	15 Aug 2000	Will keep as input for when the issues about the Internet are addressed.

August 2001 Conference Report

21	Bosmat N	Add language in TWGWSS to help clarify the roles and responsibilities for the RD and RDA, as well as specify a term for each position.	15 Aug 2000	Forwarded to FRC for possible idea when the <i>Guide to Local Services</i> is revised.
22	Erik R	Create a training guide to be used in a service workshop to teach facilitation skills to trusted servants for service meetings.	17 Aug 2000	Will keep as input for discussions about tools needed by the fellowship.
23	Wally I	Resolution A – Off table. Direct an implementation or transition group to move us in action on adopted Res. A. If the conference acts in the following WSC 2002, nothing will actually happen until after WSC 2004.	26 Oct 2000	Reiterate what was said at WSC 99; responsibility lies with fellowship if they wish to discuss this.
24	Connecticut Region	Step Working Guide audiotape.	2 Nov 2000	Rerecording of Basic Text now – will keep idea in stream for future
25	Thomas L	Step Working Guide audiotapes.	4 Dec 2000	See above.
26	Don E	Large print Just for Today.	11 Dec 2000	Redoing Basic Text now – will pursue but may take awhile.
27	Don E	Year specific clean time chips.	11 Dec 2000	Will produce two chips: 18 month and multiple years.
28	Jaime L & Pat	How It Works Preamble.	13 Dec 2000	Will keep idea on file for future “How It Works” literature ideas
29	Ken M	Email listserv(s).	3 Jan 2001	Not able to pursue.
30	Jim C	WSO Purchase web server.	16 Jan 2001	Interesting idea, however, would require at least one staff person – not prepared to pursue.

August 2001 Conference Report

31	Bruce M	New cover for the NA Basic Text "Spiraling Out" ~ New Millennia book cover.	31 Jan 2001	Will keep idea on file. Not planning to pursue at this time.
32	Upper Midwest Service Office	<i>Just for Today</i> Meditation software.	1 March 2001	Board approved production.
33	Carl P	Pamphlet: What is Spirituality.	12 Mar 2001	Will keep idea on file for future literature ideas.
34	Dave S	Pamphlet for the Agnostic and Atheist.	18 June 2001	Will keep idea on file for future literature ideas.
35	Dave S	Wireless Web.	18 June 2001	Not able to pursue currently.

From the Human Resource Panel

Part Three—August 2001 *Conference Report*

Update from the Human Resource Panel

Jim E resigned from the Human Resource Panel on 9 April 2001. Jim cited personal reasons for not being able to continue. He was elected to the Human Resource Panel at WSC'99, and has served as the panel leader since WSC 2000. We will miss his diligent approach to our work and his leadership, and we all wish him well.

Since Jim's resignation, we have regrouped and asked Charlotte S to serve as our temporary panel leader until our next meeting. We held a conference call on 12 April for the purposes of assessing the impact of losing Jim's leadership, reviewing the status of our work, and planning for the immediate future. We quickly realized that our nomination process beginning 1 September will be affected the most because Jim was the only panel member who actually had been through this process. Our plan is to ask two members from the previous HRP to join us for our July meeting so that they can share their valuable insights and experience with the nominating process. The World Board Executive Committee has expressed the board's support for this idea, and we are making arrangements for this to occur.

Our work on the new information form (formally known as the World Pool resume form) is progressing, although somewhat slower than we anticipated. We've put many hours into it, ran trials with several people, examined resumes and data collection forms from other organizations, and sought input from board members and former HRP members. We still plan to have the new form ready very soon, but it probably won't be finished by 1 June as we'd hoped. The form was included in a separate mailing, and we'd like your input within the next 30 days. Keep in mind that the form is nearly finished; however, it is not yet finalized. Some details and formatting will change as it is finalized, but we'd like your input now. We also reported in March that we'd like to change the name of the form to a simple generic name (World Pool information form) in the service manual, and we asked for your input. So far, we haven't received any input on this change.

The nomination process timeline begins 1 September 2001 by selecting people who are in the World Pool and who meet the initial criteria. The criteria is ten years clean for World Board members and eight years clean for WSC Cofacilitators and HRP members. A letter is sent to each one, listing the requirements of the position and inquiring about their willingness to be considered. The letter asks for a response within 30 days, and all those who are interested will be considered for the next phase. HRP members will examine the candidate profile reports for those willing to be considered and hold a conference call at the beginning of December for the purpose of reducing the number of people to be considered. Discussions are completely confidential, and it will take two votes out of the three remaining HRP members to eliminate someone from consideration. Telephone interviews and reference checks then begin and are conducted by HRP members through February 2002. Then, the HRP meets in March 2002 for the purpose of reducing the candidates to an acceptable number of nominations (a maximum of three for each open position), as specified in the HRP guidelines in *A Temporary Working Guide to Our World Service Structure*. Unanimity of HRP members is required to make an HRP nomination for WSC elections.

Revised interview and reference questions are finished. In our last report, we indicated our intention to include them in this report; however, these questions are not included here since it doesn't seem right to release them to potential candidates who we might interview soon. We do plan to ask for input on

From the Human Resource Panel

Part Three—August 2001 *Conference Report*

the specific questions from individuals who will not be potential candidates for any election. We'll also gladly accept input from anyone about the general subject of interview questions up until we need to utilize them beginning in October.

At this writing, the World Pool is composed of 513 members. For this conference cycle, World Pool utilization by the World Board has continued to increase. Sometimes, we found people in the pool who met the general criteria requested by the Board, and other times we found people in the pool who met only some of the criteria. Occasionally, the qualities desired by the board were simply things that were not specified on the original resume, so they couldn't be searched for. Learning this has helped us in designing the new information form, and we hope it will allow for a more defined search in the future. The World Pool was utilized by the World Board so far during this conference cycle as follows:

- In July 2000, we supplied 14 names of World Pool members to be considered for a Translation Evaluations Workgroup. Two people were selected from the list, and an additional person was selected who later submitted a resume form. One World Board member was also appointed to the workgroup. A second request was received from the World Board in November, but no additional names could be supplied from the pool.
- In November 2000, we supplied four names from the pool for consideration to be on a Literature Development Process Workgroup. None of the pool members met all of the board's criteria. Four other people who did meet the criteria were found in the World Pool and selected.
- In November 2000, we supplied 45 names from the World Pool to be considered for a Sponsorship Material Evaluation Workgroup. Seven people were chosen; four of these were from the list, and three others were chosen who later submitted resumes.
- In February 2001, we supplied 199 names from the pool to be considered for a workgroup on the Public Information Handbook. Eight additional names were supplied in May 2001. This group has not yet been formed.
- In February 2001, we supplied 197 names from the World Pool to be considered for a workgroup on the Treasurer's Handbook. This group has not yet been formed.
- In February 2001, we supplied 30 names from the pool to be considered for a workgroup on Internet issues. This group has not yet been formed.
- In March 2001, we supplied 16 names from the pool to be considered for a workgroup on the Fellowship Development Plan and Goal One. Two individuals were selected for the workgroup from this list.
- A world convention brainstorming group was formed for a single meeting in November 2000. Two people with previous world convention experience were selected, and one of them was in the pool. The other person was asked to submit a resume to the World Pool.
- A Regional Recognition Workgroup was formed to meet in April 2001. The board needed current RDs who would still be RDs at WSC 2002, so a contact list of RDs was utilized instead of the World Pool.
- In April 2001, two World Pool members were selected, from a list supplied in November 2000, to become non-board members of the Publications Committee.
- In May 2001, a list of 33 names was supplied to be considered for the *Reaching Out* Editorial Panel. No selection has been made yet.

From the Human Resource Panel
Part Three—August 2001 *Conference Report*

All members of the Human Resource Panel plan to attend the World Service Meeting in September. We will present a report on the status of all our work, distribute the new information form, and answer questions about the HRP.

Even though none of us were on the previous panel, we feel that we can achieve the work that lies ahead, and we are each dedicated to do the very best job we can. Our fellowship is built on sharing experience, strength, and hope with each other, and we are certain that the former HRP members will be an invaluable aid to us at our July 2001 meeting. In addition, the WSO staff has continuity with the HRP work which is a very important resource for us. Perhaps, most importantly, we are counting on your prayers and support in the months ahead.