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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Service System Proposals / USSC

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

State/National

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

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

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

- Chose the State National as matter of coherency.

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

The meeting adjourned for the day at 5:20pm

Saturday 22 January
Our Service System

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

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

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

Service System Foundational Principles:

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

First question on page 1 of the agenda

Local 1. A. 1

Linear vs. Two Track option

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

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

How many prefer the:

Linear – 0   Two Track

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

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

Preference

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

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

Didn't vote/No preference

Thursday 16 June

Strategic Planning Session I

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

Full group discussion on trends:

Common Trends

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

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

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

Potential Implications

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

6

- High school H&I

Potential Responses

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

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

Potential Implications

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

Potential Responses

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

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

Potential Implications

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

Potential Responses

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

Friday 17 June
Service System

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

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

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

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

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

10.   USSC and how NAWS response

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

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

Board discussion:

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

Response Ideas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Straw Poll regarding attending Tulsa

Unanimous support to not attend Tulsa

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

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

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

Friday 21 October
Strategic Planning

The day spent with Jim DeLizia for the second planning session

Step or session 2 of this process, the connector piece of looking at environment, data and issues and figuring out what it all means

Will go back and review key trends and hammer out what to do. Today we will need to finalize the objectives, and then look at 2014 outcomes, tackling the approaches for 2012-2014.We will also discuss all the approaches to see what needs to stay on and what doesn't.

The trends and issue in the scan are putting more strain on us a causing us to rethink how we do our work.

2012 – 2014 NAWS Strategic Planning Draft Issues and Objectives – Version 2

We are to validate the objectives, have discussion on some of the issues, then deal with outcomes.

KRA COMMUNICATION

Issue: Relevance of Communication
Objective 1: No change

Issue: Communication Infrastructure
Objective 2: No change

Issue: PR/Outreach
Objective 3: For this cycle we could be more sensitive to the PR area, split the KRA and make internal and external communication. But next cycle, we will need to take a deeper dive of the actual plan.
One change is to take communication and take a further look at this. Decision: restructure the plan as it develops.

KRA FELLOWSHIP SUPPORT

Issue: Service System Revitalization
Objective 4: No change

Issue Support to Developing Communities
Objective 5: No change

Issue NA Group Support
Objective 6: No change

KRA RECOVERY LITERATURE

Issue Diversity
Objective 7: No change

Issue: Literature Development Process and Delivery Methods
Objective 8: No change

KRA: LEADERSHIP

Issue: Leadership Development
Objective 9: No change