

**To:** The World Service Conference

**From:** Ed Duquette, Chairperson  
WSC Policy Committee

Greetings from the dynamic, innovative and relentless WSC Policy Committee. This has been a productive year for us. The new Committee Guidelines have served us well. Our strongest attribute was continuity of membership, eleven of our eighteen members having served the previous year. The new members on the committee added a vital (and sometimes interesting) perspective to our accomplishments. It was a good mix. We had exceptional attendance at both workshops; at Newark seventeen out of eighteen present, at Denver sixteen out of eighteen present.

In Newark we did get off to a slow start. There were a few committee members who seemed to take some exception to the committee's agenda for the year, primarily in developing any type of process for aiding and recognizing new regions. We were, though, able to start work on some of our projects. We discussed most of the input we had received from RSR's during the annual Conference. However, we were unable to make what I would consider substantial progress that weekend on any of our agenda items. I left Newark feeling responsible for the committee's ambiguity and vowed to be more prepared in Denver. The pressure was on, it was now imperative that the homework got done.

In Denver, we were able to step up the pace. There was a large amount of communication and correspondence between Newark and Denver, and it must have paid off. We had an entirely different attitude at that meeting. It was strangely familiar to me. The workshop had an atmosphere very near that of the Minneapolis workshop the year before. There was a lot of excitement in the air. Everyone was fresh and eager to work. It was like watching "Broadcast News," energy was high, emotions were at their peak, everything clicked, we were in rhythm... It was like GREAT SEX! I guess we needed Newark to feel each other out (so to speak).

Although I came out of Denver with a renewed sense of accomplishment, it was apparent that we would be unable to complete our entire agenda for the year. We left three items unfinished; a proposal for an annual work schedule for the Conference and its committees, a proposal for election procedures to be used at the Conference (these two items would complete the proposed guidelines for the operation of the WSC), and a proposal for aiding and recognizing newly forming regions. These three items will be carried over to next year's committee agenda and hopefully completed. provided that the committee isn't deluged with committed motions as we were this year.

I regret to inform the Conference that during the course of this year we experienced an attrition of about ten percent. One member of the committee had not attended either workshop and another hasn't been heard from since Newark. I have not been able to contact either member despite repeated attempts. Both were RSR's elected by the Conference. During the Denver workshop I brought to the attention of the committee that we should consider an involuntary resignation of one committee member due to non-participation and elect a replacement. The committee concurred. We accepted two nominations, heard qualifications and then put it to a vote. We elected Tim Banner from Dallas to fill the vacancy. Tim served well throughout the weekend and has been a productive addition to the committee.

I sincerely hope that both of these people are safe and well. We have often found ourselves in difficult times when the best we could do was make our lives less complicated. I offer both of these people my friendship and love, there are no hard feelings, there is nothing to fear.

### **COMMITTED MOTIONS**

The majority of our work this year was spent dispensing with six motions that were committed to this committee during last years annual Conference. Of these committed motions there were two that we decided to take no further action on other than to convey our feelings to the Conference. The first of these suggested that two members of the WSC Policy Committee be from outside the continental United States:

"To include amongst all the above, two (2) members from outside the continental United States"

The Policy Committee does not support this suggested change to our Committee Guidelines. Our concerns are stated in the following response:

"All members of our Conference Committees and Boards are elected, selected or appointed according to what they may have to offer in the areas of expertise that these Committees and Boards are responsible for. In the past the WSC has only been able to finance the participation of certain members of the Conference; the Administrative Committee, the WSB, and Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson of the Conference Standing Committees.

Recently, some Conference Committees have included in their annual budget funds for their committee members to attend specific functions or meetings of that committee. At this time though, the WSC is simply unable to assume the financial obligation for travel and lodging of all committee members to participate in all committee functions. Quite often RSC's have provided for members of their region to participate on Conference Committees. This practice has helped take the focus of participation away from only those who are willing, capable and financially able, and more importantly placing it on those who are willing and capable.

Until such time that the WSC is financially prepared to fund all participation we must stand on the principle that if a member of the Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous is willing, capable and able to fulfill their responsibilities on a Committee or Board of our World Service Conference, then he/she should be considered in the same respect as all other nominees.

To give special attention or preference to members simply because of where they happen to live, or not live, is a precedent we are not willing to support. If we are truly the same, regardless of the things that have divided us in the past, then we need to approach the membership of our Conference Committees and Boards with equality."

The second motion committed to Policy that the committee chose to respond to rather than present motions to stated;

"To remove the word 'temporary' from the Working Guide".

We have prepared the following response;

"After consideration of this motion, it is the feeling of the committee that there will be significant and eminent changes to the *Temporary Working Guide to Our Service Structure*. Therefore, it is the unanimous recommendation of the Policy Committee to retain the word 'Temporary' in the title of this service guide".

Our next committed motion has to do with the concept of redress, to remedy or rectify. The motion stated:

"That this Conference establish a policy of redress of any item of approval that has not followed the correct or proper approval process."

The motion itself sounds clear enough. It became quite apparent though, that the concern of the maker of the motion was deeper than what the motion suggests. When we discussed this motion our discussion centered around three options.

First was to utilize the tools within parliamentary procedure that presently exist for redress; Motion to Rescind, Repeal or Annul, and the Motion to Amend Something Previously Adopted, along with specific education of the responsibilities of the participants with respect to these tools.

The second option we discussed was to develop a comprehensive process for redress. This process would need to include an appeal board, or an appeal session of the annual Conference, to evaluate the merit of any grievance brought forth, before further action could be taken. This type of buffer provision might spend its entire session hearing grievances from participants who might have a problem with a previous decision by the Conference.

The third option we discussed was more of a plan of prevention and assurance than a remedy. This proposal suggested redefining the Conference committee system to adopt a standard operational format for handling input received from our Fellowship. For example, each piece of input received at the Conference would be sent to the appropriate committee and/or board to be considered on its merit. The committee or board may choose to take action or not, but in any event it should be the responsibility of the Chairperson of each committee or board to respond to the author of the input explaining the discussions and any decisions they had reached.

In our deliberations we understood that a process for redress alone wouldn't satisfy everything concerned, although a process is surely needed. The greater portion of our concern is that the WSC Committees and Boards of the Conference need to strive for a more responsible way of conducting business. Many times when input is received by the Conference it goes to the proper place, gets discussed, and is never heard of again. This tends to foster a lesser degree of confidence in our WSC Committee system.

Our decision was to pursue two directions with this committed motion. We believe that there exists adequate tools for redress within our parliamentary procedures. We have included these tools into our WSC Rules of Order. The second portion of our concern has to do with the work schedule of the Conference Committees and Boards. We have not completed this part of the task. In the upcoming year the Policy Committee will hopefully complete a proposal for an annual work schedule for the Conference. We will be embodying resolutions within the proposal.

The remaining discussion on motions committed to Policy will be taken up when we present our action items later in this report.

### ***FORMATION OF NEW REGIONS***

We were able to make marginal progress in developing a process for aiding and recognizing new regions. Between the close of last years Conference and the Newark workshop, members of the committee initiated workshops of their own to get a jump start on this. There were two documents presented in Newark that came about as a result of these small workshops. Each one discussed guidelines for receiving initial information from newly forming regions. Both of these documents were easily factored together and are enclosed at the end of this report for your review.

The down side of all this is that we have only begun the work of a much larger process. This is a start, and it's in its primary stage of review by the committee.

The up side is that we have acquired a good amount of historical documentation of regional formations. The committee involved in the formation of the Central California Region has sent a substantial log of their progress to the WSO which we have on file. In addition, I had the opportunity to attend a meeting of a committee involved in forming a region in Northern Central California. I brought back additional information of their formation efforts.

We have a great deal more information to work with now. I foresee some major work completed on this in the upcoming year.

### ***INPUT FROM RSR'S***

During last years annual session I received a number of items of input from RSR's. We have discussed all of them and sent responses to the RSC's from which they came. I have included copies of the responses at the end of this report for your general information.

*edduquet.doc/policy.dirtxerox.printer*

## INPUT ITEM "B"

*To:* Chesapeake/Potomac RSC  
*From:* Ed Duquette, Chairperson  
WSC Policy Committee

This letter is in response to two items of input submitted to the WSC Policy Committee during last years annual Conference. These items were submitted by your Alt-RSR (Stan A.). Your Alt-RSR opted to submit this input to the Policy Committee for consideration rather than presenting it on the Conference floor. This process of submitting input to Conference Committees so that these committees may make recommendations to the Conference, is stated in the TWGSS;

(Page 38, Section IV, 1987 Edition TWGSS)

"IV. In order to minimize the time spent discussing and debating within the Conference as a whole, a subcommittee system is used by the World Service Conference. All input to the Conference including questions, ideas, motions, suggestions, etc., is directed to a specialized committee."

I would like to thank your Committee for utilizing this process. For our Conference Committee-System to work properly we must first utilize it fairly. You have shown your faith in the system and I would hope that this letter will the Policy Committees responsibility to you with respect to the process.

The first item of input states;

"We feel a strong need for this committee (WSC Policy Committee) to work on establishing functional guidelines for the operation of the WSC. We also see a need for these (guidelines) to have full circulation throughout the Fellowship to insure adherence to the principle of 'direct responsibility to those they serve'."

As you may know by now, the WSC Policy Committee is presenting motions this year concerning guidelines for the operation of the WSC. Some of these motions are designed to bring non-functional or out-dated Conference procedures in line with what is presently done at the WSC. Additional motions will provide other guidelines for the Conference, in areas that have not been addressed to date. Of these motions most will be included in the Conference Agenda Report for "full circulation throughout the Fellowship".

There are though, two motions that the Policy Committee will be presenting that are not included in the Conference Agenda Report. These motions will be for the WSC to adopt two documents as Conference Approved procedures. These documents are; a draft of WSC Rules of Order, and Budget Reimbursement Policies at the WSC. Both of these documents



have been mailed to each Conference participant in a separate mailing from the CAR. This mailing had a cover letter explaining that these documents should be reviewed for adoption at the WSC "88".

The reason for this separate mailing came as a result of committee discussion that took place during the Denver Workshop. The Policy Committee was concerned with the appropriateness of expecting every Group throughout our Fellowship to consider materials that are large, complicated and will most probably never have any effect on them. Although this may be a precedent some may find disagreement with, many others have supported this procedure.

In any event, this mailing will allow the same ninety day review period as motions in the Conference Agenda Report. Regions who feel that these documents require review by their Group Members will be able to do just that. Other Regions that feel these documents do not need the Groups consideration may choose their own options.

To sum it all up, the WSC Policy Committee is presenting what we believe to be functional guidelines for the WSC. These guidelines are in the process of full circulation throughout the Fellowship, although through different methods, that can easily be combined into one document for consideration.

The second piece of input stated;

"On a separate point, we would (like) to see the subject of new business at the Conference sent to the appropriate committee to appear in the next years' Agenda Report."

The WSC Policy Committee agrees that new business at the Conference should be directed to the appropriate committee. As mentioned earlier in this letter, the TWGSS outlines that that is the process. Where it gets sticky though is what happens to it from there. There is presently no assurance that once a piece of input is directed to a Conference Committee or Board that anything will come of it. Nor is there any process that would require a Conference Committee or Board to respond to the originator of the input and explain what was done with their input.

The Policy Committee is receptive to this situation and we have some plans of our own in the fire. During this next year the Policy Committee will be undertaking a project that will finalize our work on the Operational Guidelines For The WSC. This project concerns the annual work schedule for the Committees and Boards of the WSC. We hope to resolve many of these problems of accountability. We believe that there needs to exist mutual responsibility between the Conference Committees and Boards, and those who utilize them; the Fellowship.

This concept of mutual responsibility, coupled with the Fellowships right to have an issue addressed is our operational goal. First, the Fellowship will need to utilize the Conference Committee-system as it is outlined in the TWGSS. That is, that all ideas, motions, suggestions, etc., be directed to a specialized committee. From that point the responsibility needs to rest on that committee. The committee should be required to

respond to all input received, whether they have chosen to take action or not. What is also required is that the input becomes property of the committee it was given to, to pursue whatever course of action it feels most reasonable and appropriate. This is the strength of our Conference Committees and Boards. They are representative of a wider experience than any single member, group, area or region.

What binds it all together is the Fellowships right to address an issue and that the Conference give fair consideration to that issue. If the originator of a piece of input is not satisfied with a committees recommendation of the input, the originator should have the right to be heard fairly.

To sum this all up, the Policy Committee feels that the process of simply requiring each piece of input, sent to a specialized committee, be included in the Conference Agenda Report the following year, is not a comprehensive enough process. It doesn't address accountability fairly, nor does it consider situations that require more time to complete.

I hope that this letter helps answer your concerns, in fact this letter is a form of that mutual responsibility I have shared with you all. Please call on me if I can be of further service.



## INPUT ITEM "A"

*To:* New Jersey RSC  
*From:* Ed Duquette, Chairperson  
WSC Policy Committee

This letter is in response to an item of input submitted to the WSC Policy Committee during last year's annual Conference. This item was submitted by your RSR (Bobby E.). Although this input was written in the form of a motion, your RSR opted to submit it to the Policy Committee for the Committee's consideration rather than present it on the Conference floor. This process is stated in the TWGSS;

(Page 38, Section IV, 1987 Edition TWGSS)

"IV. In order to minimize the time spent discussing and debating within the Conference as a whole, a subcommittee system is used by the World Service Conference. All input to the Conference including questions, ideas, motions, suggestions, etc., is directed to a specialized committee."

I would like to thank your Committee for utilizing this process. For our Conference Committee-System to work properly we must first utilize it fairly. You have shown your faith in the system and I would hope that this letter will reflect the Policy Committee's responsibility to you with respect to the process.

The item of input was presented by Bobby E. (RSR New Jersey Region), seconded by Mary V. (RSR Lone Star Region), and stated;

"The third purpose of this committee (WSC Policy Committee) is to provide guidance for the understanding and application of group conscience and the relationship of the trusted servant to group conscience as expressed by the Twelve Traditions.

Change 'two fold' to 'three fold'."

During the Newark quarterly workshop the Policy Committee considered this motion. Many questions about the application of group conscience and the role of the trusted servant came from this discussion. Should the WSC Policy Committee now, or has it ever in the past, provided guidance for the application of the Traditions or group conscience? Shouldn't that be the responsibility of the Trustees? Have we as a Fellowship established a unified understanding of the application of these principals?

There were no members of the Policy Committee that felt that this motion was absurd or unreasonable. In fact the discussions within the Policy Committee stimulated discussions on these principles within the Select Committee. The general feeling in the Policy Committee was that

until some basic questions about group conscience throughout our service structure, and the relationship of the trusted servant to the application of group conscience are answered, it would not be appropriate to include the concept of the submitted motion into the Purpose of the WSC Policy Committee.

At the close of the discussions a motion was presented by bobby E. (WSC Policy Committee/RSR New Jersey), seconded by Jay V. (WSC Policy Committee/RSR Florida), that stated;

"To add this language (as stated in the submitted motion) back to the Policy guidelines."

The motion failed (1 - in favor, 4 - opposed, 2 -abstentions).

If you are not satisfied with the decision of the Policy Committee, than it would be within your right to present this item directly to the Conference for consideration. Before your Committee makes a decision though, I would urge you all to consider this item carefully. The motion that your RSR submitted to the committee is not complicated, the concepts within are. There exists some rather diverse interpretations of how our Second Tradition should be applied throughout our service structure. Each one believes theirs is the "right" one. It is difficult to choose one over another, someone will always feel left out.

Until we agree, as a Fellowship, on a unified foundation of service we will never get past the "amend the guidelines" stage. Creating and re-creating guidelines is like treating symptoms when we should really be treating the illness. As we work together to overcome our common problems, not simply limit their influence, I believe we will come of age and do more good than ever before possible. Keep up the good work!

## INPUT ITEMS "C-1, C-Z, G"

*To:* Greater Philadelphia RSC  
*From:* Ed Duquette, Chairperson  
WSC Policy Committee

This letter is in response to three items of input submitted to the WSC Policy Committee during last years annual Conference. These items were submitted by your RSR (J.R. Friel). Your RSR opted to submit this input to the Policy Committee for the Committees consideration rather than presenting it on the Conference floor. This process of submitting input to Conference Committees so that these committees may make recommendations to the Conference, is stated in the TWGSS;

(Page 38, Section IV, 1987 Edition TWGSS)

"IV. In order to minimize the time spent discussing and debating within the Conference as a whole, a subcommittee system is used by the World Service Conference. All input to the Conference including questions, ideas, motions, suggestions, etc., is directed to a specialized committee."

I would like to thank your Committee for utilizing this process. For our Conference Committee-System to work properly we must first utilize it fairly. You have shown your faith in the system and I would hope that this letter will reflect the Policy Committee's responsibility to you with respect to the process.

The first two items are of a similar concept. They state;

- (1) "Policy Committee to study and report in the next (88) Conference Agenda Report the feasibility to issue the Conference Agenda Report more than 90 days prior to WSC."
- (2) "To have the Policy Committee study the effectiveness of our review process for the Fellowship Report expanding the time from 90 days up to 180 days and bring a motion to the 87/88 Agenda Report to be voted on by the Fellowship."

The WSC Policy Committee considered both of these motions, along with a similar motion submitted by the RSR from the Greater New York Region, during the Newark Workshop. Our decision was not to support any changes to the present ninety day review period.

The problem is in the timetable. At present we require a ninety day review period of the Conference Agenda Report, that brings us from May 1 back to the first week in February as the distribution date. The WSO needs two weeks, at the bare minimum, to produce the Conference Agenda Report

after all final changes are made, which brings us to the second week in February. The WSO also needs at least one week to correct all changes made during the JAC meeting during the first or second weekends in January, that brings us to the first week in January. (The joint-Administrative Committee meets to review all motions to be included in the Conference Agenda Report and may recommend changes to the Administrative Committee prior to the completion of the Conference Agenda Report).

This means that all the Conference Committees and Boards must complete their work by December 31. Since the annual Conference closes during the first week of May that leaves only seven months for the Committees to work each year. If we were to extend the review period the only place we could make up the time would be to shorten the period that the Committees have to complete their projects.

A more reasonable solution would be to make better use of the ninety day review period. One of the first things you could do is mail in your order for the Conference Agenda Report in January. That way as soon as the Reports are completed your order will be shipped, that should save you about two weeks. Another consideration is to shorten the amount of time needed to inform your Groups of the Agenda items. This could be done in a variety of ways. Many regions hold centralized Conference Agenda learning weekends and invite members of the WSC Committees to come and explain their agenda items. Other regions create a committee to compile shortened versions of the Agenda Report and include pros and cons, which make it easier for the Groups to review.

Probably the most important thing you could do is follow the progress of the WSC Committees during the year as reported in the Fellowship Report, the Newline, the NA Way and other mailings from the Conference. Find a way of disbursing this information throughout your region in an on-going fashion. It is easier to understand an item for consideration if you already have some general knowledge of it's nature.

The third piece of input received stated;

"That all WSC subcommittee meeting minutes be sent out to either the appropriate RSC subcommittee and/or the RSR to give to appropriate person."

This is a wonderful idea, unfortunately we cannot give J.R. the credit for its adoption. We are presently sending all approved minutes of all WSC Committees and Boards to all WSC participants. This is another source of information from which you can use to stay up-to-date on the items to be included in the Conference Agenda Report. Sorry J.R.!

I hope this letter has been of value to you all. Please call on me if I may be of any help.

To: Mid Atlantic RSC  
From: Ed Duquette, Chairperson  
WSC Policy Committee

This letter is in response to an item of input submitted to the WSC Policy Committee during last year's annual Conference. This item was submitted by your RSR (Bill A.). Your RSR opted to submit this input to the Policy Committee for the Committees consideration rather than presenting it on the Conference floor. This process of submitting input to Conference Committees so that these committees may make recommendations to the Conference, is stated in the TWGSS;

(Page 38, Section IV, 1987 Edition TWGSS)

"IV. In order to minimize the time spent discussing and debating within the Conference as a whole, a subcommittee system is used by the World Service Conference. All input to the Conference including questions, ideas, motions, suggestions, etc., is directed to a specialized committee."

I would like to thank your Committee for utilizing this process. For our Conference Committee-System to work properly we must first utilize it fairly. You have shown your faith in the system and I would hope that this letter will reflect the Policy Committee's responsibility to you with respect to the process.

This item was presented in the form of a motion made by Bill A. (RSR Mid Atlantic Region), seconded by Leo S. (RSR Oklahoma Region) and stated;

"At WSC '88' and at subsequent WSC's regional reports be submitted to WSC prior to the opening of the WSC for printing and distribution at the WSC, this is to be in lieu of oral reports currently on the Conference Agenda.

Further; in order to allow for discussions of regional problems and the introduction of new regions we allow a two hour open forum, and that discussions at this forum be limited to problems identified in the regional report and presented by RSR's only."

Intent; is to allow more Conference time to conduct the business of the Conference Agenda Report."

The WSC Policy Committee discussed this item during the Newark Workshop. Most all the members present in Newark agreed with the input and decided to factor it into the Guidelines for the Operation of the WSC. In addition I was directed to submit these concepts to the WSC Administrative Committee to consider for WSC '88'. Unfortunately, The Committee was not able to complete the section of the Conference and it's Committees and Boards. This section will be a primary agenda item for the Policy Committee to complete in this upcoming year.

The WSC Administrative Committee has chosen to initiate some of the concepts that this input suggests for this upcoming annual Conference. The written regional reports will this year be published in the Fellowship Report prior to the opening of the Conference. There will be a portion of the WSC Agenda devoted to recognizing new regions. Although there has not yet been any time allocated for RSR's to present problems they are facing to the Conference, I understand that that will be corrected by the opening of the WSC '88'.

This has been one of the more comprehensive pieces of input we have received this past year. I thank you all for your insight and cooperation. Please call on me if I can be of any further help.

*edsresp1.doc/policy.dir/xerox.printer*

## INPUT ITEM "C-3"

To: Greater New York RSC  
From: Ed Duquette, Chairperson  
WSC Policy Committee

This letter is in response to an item of input submitted to the WSC Policy Committee during last year's annual Conference. This item was submitted by your RSR (Joy K.). Your RSR opted to submit this input to the Policy Committee for the Committees consideration rather than presenting it on the Conference floor. The process of submitting input to Conference Committees so that these committees may make recommendations to the Conference, is stated in the TWGSS;

(Page 38, Section IV, 1987 Edition TWGSS)

"IV. In order to minimize the time spent discussing and debating within the Conference as a whole, a subcommittee system is used by the World Service Conference. All input to the Conference including questions, ideas, motions, suggestions, etc., is directed to a specialized committee."

I would like to thank your Committee for utilizing this process. For our Conference Committee-System to work properly we must first utilize it fairly. You have shown your faith in the system and I would hope that this letter will reflect the Policy Committee's responsibility to you with respect to the process.

This item was presented in the form of a motion made by Joy K. (RSR Greater New York Region), seconded by William A. (RSR Mid Atlantic Region) and stated;

"That the WSC direct a December distribution of the Conference Agenda."

The WSC Policy Committee considered this motion, along with two similar motions submitted by the RSR from the Greater Philadelphia Region, during the Newark Workshop. Our decision was not to support any changes to the present ninety day review period.

The problem is in the timetable. Presently we require a ninety day review period of the Conference Agenda Report, that brings us from May 1 back to the first week in February as the distribution date. The WSO needs two weeks, at the bare minimum, to produce the Conference Agenda Report after all final changes are made, when brings us to the second week in January. The WSO also needs at least one week to correct all changes made during the JAC meeting during the first or second weekends in February, that brings us to the first week in January. (The Joint-Administrative Committee meets prior to the completion of the Conference Agenda Report).

This means that all the Conference Committee and Boards must complete their work by December 31. Since the annual Conference closes



during the first week of May that leaves only seven months for the Committees to work each year. If we were to extend the review period the only place we could make up the time would be to shorten the period that the Committees have to complete their projects.

A more reasonable solution would be to make better use of the ninety day review period. One of the first things you could do is mail in your order for the Conference Agenda Report in January. That way as soon as the reports are completed your order will be shipped, that should save you about two weeks. Another consideration is to shorten the amount of time needed to inform your Groups of the Agenda items. This could be done in a variety of ways. Many regions hold centralized Conference Agenda learning weekends and invite members of the WSC Committee to come and explain their agenda items. Other regions create a committee to compile shortened versions of the Agenda Report and include pros and cons, which make it easier for the Groups to review.

Probably the most important thing you could do is follow the progress of the WSC Committee's during the year as reported in the Fellowship Report, the Newslite, the NA Way, minutes of WSC Committee meetings and other mailings from the Conference. Find a way of disbursing this information throughout your region in an on-going fashion. It is easier to understand an item for consideration if you already have some general knowledge of it's nature.

I hope this letter has been of value to you all. Please call on me if I may be of any help.

TO: The WSC Policy Committee

FROM: The Ad-hoc Subcommittee to Gather Input on the  
Formation of New Regions

RE: Subcommittee Meetings in June of 1987

On the weekend of June 26-28, several members of the WSC Policy Committee met in southeastern Pennsylvania while others were meeting in Los Angeles. The purpose of these meetings was to gather what experience we could on the formation of new regions. WSC Policy Committee members present at those meetings were Bob Edwards, Bob Mc Kendrick, Stan Atkins and Deb Ott on the east coast, with Bob Grier, Rueben Farris and Bob Barrett on the west coast. The following is a summary of the conclusions reached by the two workshops.

1. On the east coast, we decided to preface this report with a strong statement in keeping with the Second Tradition, stating that the WSC's role is to support the declaring region's emergence, and not to attempt to control, dictate to or limit in any way the emerging region. Further reflection brings more traditional posture against the attempting in any way to stifle the new region. It appears that the new region is one when it says it is, and should that region express a desire to become a member of the World Service Conference of Narcotics Anonymous, our function would be to assist it in any way we can. **WE WOULD DEFINITELY NEED** to inquire of the representatives of the new region if it intends to operate within the Twelve Traditions and espouse the Twelve Steps of Narcotics Anonymous.
2. We feel that prior to attendance at the WSC that any new region intending to become a supporting part of the WSC as a voting member should declare their intentions to the WSC Administrative Chair in writing in time for the information to be included in the WSC Agenda Report. There should be a section of the Agenda which lists the voting participants of the current body, for regional update before the Conference, and a listing of the new regions with the names and addresses of their representatives and elected trusted servants for the purpose of contact by other regional representatives and committee chairs.
3. We also felt that it would serve us all well for the WSC Administrative Chair to introduce the new region and invite their RSR to read a brief report on the condition of the region.
4. Successful regional transitions have taken place only with adequate planning. It is felt in general that at least the following ingredients are essential to a smooth transitional process:

- a. Consistent RSC representation by ASR's.
  - b. Strong committees with active memberships.
  - c. Trusted servants with necessary recovery time and experience at the area level who are willing to make AND KEEP a commitment to serve the region.
  - d. The support of the neighboring regions and the member areas.
  - e. Consistent fund flow, with a prudent reserve at least defined, if not in place.
  - f. A realistic timetable for the transition. Enough time must be allowed for all interested parties to submit input that is heard. The input should be workshopped to give all those with input a chance to be heard.
5. An information packet might be made available by the WSC Admin. Chair, its intent being to help them determine if they are ready yet to become a new region, or if perhaps their needs could be met in some other way. Included in the packet might be the following:

**Part I:**

A good statement on regional purpose, listing some (valid) reasons for forming a region.

**Part II:**

A questionnaire which would help to clarify some of the reasons for forming a region. Some suggested questions are:

- a. What are the needs you feel that suggest to you that the formation of a new region is necessary?
- b. How long has the planning committee for this formation been in existence and are both the parent and new regions represented on the committee?
- c. How many areas would be represented by this region?
- d. What are your proposed geographical boundaries?
- e. How are the existing meetings dispersed within these boundaries?
- f. Do you have the cooperation of the surrounding regions, as well as the support of the ASC's and groups within your proposed boundaries?
- g. How many active meetings do you have now and what has your growth been like over the last two to three years?
- h. How many groups are regularly represented at the ASC's?
- i. How many members are involved in area service?
- j. Do you have any former regional trusted servants?
- k. Have you adopted guidelines or proposed operating procedures?
- l. Are you presently self-supporting through you members contributions?
- m. Do you feel that you can meet the demands of increased services?
- n. Do you have a region-wide helpline?
- o. How has your fund flow within your Areas been in the past?
- p. Will you be able to afford to send an RSR and RSR Alt. to the WSC meeting and WSC committee workshops?

- q. Are you able to provide for the literature needs of your groups and do you have a separate literature prudent reserve?
- r. Do you have an existing service office, or do you plan to start one soon?
- s. Where is the nearest N.A. service office?

**Part III:**

A list of the necessary steps for the new region to complete if, after reviewing all of the above, the new region should elect to proceed. Perhaps some lessons learned by other RSC's could be added at the end. A wealth of experience exists, and a list of suggested DO and DON'T information would be useful.

newreg.doc/policy.dir