



WORLD SERVICE OFFICE, INC.
NARCOTICS ANONYMOUS

P.O. Box 9999
Van Nuys, CA 91409
(818) 780-3951

TO: WSC Policy Committee
FROM: Steve Sigman
DATE: August 28, 1991
RE: Regional Seating Survey; RSR Participation Survey

Both surveys, Regional Seating and RSR Participation, have been updated and are enclosed for your examination. All reponses received after the deadline of July 31 have been included. Please discard the one you received earlier.

**SUMMARY OF MASTERLIST
INPUT ON REGIONAL SEATING SURVEY**

1. Is this procedure too restrictive? If so, please explain

Out of 34 responses 19 said yes and 15 said no. 20 people went on to explain themselves.

2. Do we need an admissions committee?

Out of 34 responses 20 said yes and 13 said no. 4 people had additional comments.

If so:

A. Would they compile information?

20 yes, 2 no, and 12 no comment.

B. Would they evaluate information?

18 yes, 4 no, and 12 no comment.

C. Would they recommend?

15 yes, 7 no, and 12 no comment.

3. Do the surveys give enough information to help conference participants to make an informed decision?

Out of 34 responses there were 25 yes, 4 no, and 5 no comment.

4. Are the survey questions too intrusive? If yes, which one(s)

Out of 34 responses there were 7 yes, 26 no, and 1 no comment. 8 people took the opportunity to elaborate on their answers.

5. Additional comments:

29 respondents provided additional comments.

**MASTER LIST OF INPUT
REGIONAL SEATING SURVEY**

1. Is this procedure too restrictive? YES _____, NO _____

Yes: - 19;

No: - 15;

No comment: - 0

If so, please explain _____

1. I think it would be difficult to legislate participation of new regions. This is primarily supported by the inability to fully express the subjective parameters of the situation. I think the policy committee has done well to revamp the procedures and provide some integral conditions to be referenced when considering seating new regions. I think the policy committee's procedures were too restrictive and idealistic, but I feel that the principles contained therein were appropriate. I feel that there should be less restriction on requiring the region to offer a greater amount of information to the policy committee, so they in turn can inform the fellowship.
2. No comment.
3. The requirement to have a new region require a second year to be voted in is wrong.
4. - 7.No comment.
8. It's got to beat the "come one come all" approach that we have at present.
9. During the first WSC, while not voting, new regions should be allowed to enter discussion on motions.
10. This procedure appears to be too restrictive for a variety of reasons. First of all we need to ask ourselves: Do we need an admissions committee? As Mitchell has pointed out to us, this years seating of 5 new regions went easily, without any guidelines in place. Of course just because it went well last year, doesn't mean it will continue to in the future. I have to ask myself why do we need to be concerned with who becomes a part of Narcotics Anonymous on the world level? Do we fear that those members who seek to be a part of WSC are unworthy of a seat. Will they be unprepared, non-trustworthy, do they have ulterior motives? They may be all of these things, but those regions who aren't suppose to be regions, will die a natural death.

If a region comes to the WSC seeking to be a part of world services and we allow them in, then in the course of a year, the region falls apart, will we feel poorly about ourselves for allowing them in, because they weren't very sound to begin with? No, we recognize that regions have the right to decide what's best for themselves. We welcome anyone to be free to decide if they want to be a part of our fellowship. Just as we say you're an addict when you say you are, a region is a region when they say they are.

The list of ideals are wonderful suggestions, as well as the survey questions to anyone seeking to become a new region. Unfortunately these questions should not be made available when a region is seeking to be seated at WSC. By this time they have already declared themselves a region to the surrounding areas. Now is not the time to tell them they can't be a part of WSC, because they don't have a sound service structure. The time to review these questions is when an area is thinking about becoming a new region.

In reviewing the proposal for seating of new regions, it seems that we will allow a regions trusted servants to travel all the way to the conference and not allow them to participate on the conference floor (no voting, no motion making). The only time we will allow them to participate on the conference floor is in defense of their soundness during the question and answer period. This does not seem to be proposal which fosters unity and love.

I believe that if an admissions committee is created, it will cause bitterness and resentment on the part of those regions not allowed a seat at WSC. Our fellowship does not need more resentment and anger, but more unity and love for one another. For these reasons I do not believe a proposal for seating of new regions should be created, nor an admissions committee. Thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts with the policy committee.

11. No comment.
12. I think its more bureaucratic than restrictive. I prefer flexible guidelines rather than policy that may "exclude" rather than "include."
13. I agree with the first step but in the first sentence the will should be a may No. II could be the policy committee (maybe a year to year ad hoc).
14. The proposal for seating new regions is ok until we get to V from there on it is too restrictive and Chicagoland hates the rest of the proposal.
15. Procedure should be somewhat restrictive to prevent improperly structured or poorly conceived regions from disrupting existing services.

16. Too restrictive only in excluding voting privileges to newly seated regions.
17. I believe a two year process is not needed. Therefore, Section V should be changed, removing from "except voting" to the end of the section and the elimination of Sections VI through IX.
18. The main reason this seating procedure seems too restrictive to me is that if a newly forming region sends a representative to the conference and has to wait another whole year before becoming a voting participant, the idea seems crazy.
19. No comment.
20. No comment.
21. A year is too long to wait--the new region could submit completed questionnaires to the WSC, who could compile the information either to be included in the *Conference Report* in January or March, the CAR, or in a package distributed to conference participants at the start of the conference. Participants could evaluate the information and vote for seating maybe Monday night.
22. The problem is with the admissions committee.
23. No comment.
24. No comment.
25. I personally don't think. . .but the conference didn't swallow the idea of waiting one year to be "seated."
26. No comment.
27. I believe the work to become a region is done prior to the conference and we shouldn't penalize a perspective region one year to prove themselves.
28. Is too onerous and complicated.
29. No comment.
30. It does not allow a new region if seated to speak in form of a motion or a voting privilege. Also it is a costly trip for them.
31. No comment.
32. No comment.

33. What other privileges are there under V other than talking and voting?
 Yes too restrictive for regions splitting with blessings or friendly splitting.
 No for totally new regions, i.e. Bahamas.

34. No comment.

2. Do we need an admissions committee? YES ____, NO ____

Yes: - 20;

No: - 13;

No comment: - 1

1. I would suggest the policy committee create a working committee called a "Sponsoring Committee." This committee would gather information, correspond with the mother region and the new region; this would help facilitate training of the delegates sent to WSC to become RSRs, the RSC itself, etc. plus give them an awareness of the WSC services. I would strongly suggest that after eliciting, compiling and evaluating information received, the policy committee would be the sponsor of the new region at the WSC. I have often had a problem with region sponsoring new region, I think it is time to shift this to having WSC sponsor the applying region. This seems novel, but in actuality, the policy committee can be the designated arm of WSC to deal with the work of facilitating regions being included in WSC. We have operated too long in an "oppositional" mentality; "join the club." We need to change this framework to reflect what works best in NA, attraction. We need to make it comprehensible and possible to include new regions, and the process needs to be established long before the region is admitted. The policy committees sponsoring committee would be charged with preparing the new region, so that when it presents the new region to WSC, the region itself is ready to contribute and receive.

2.- 11. No additional comment.

12. Rather than create yet another committee, it could be compiled by office staff to already formed committee to make recommendation.

13. - 17. No additional comment.

18. No, not in the sense that the procedure seems to give. However, if there was an admissions committee, I could sure see them COMPILING and EVALUATION information as well as making recommendations. See additional comments for more information.

19. - 32. No comment.

33. Or something like it.

34. No comment.

If so:

A. Would they compile information? YES _____, NO _____

Yes: - 20; No: - 2; No comment: - 12

B. Would they evaluate information? YES _____, NO _____

Yes: - 18; No: - 4; No comment: - 12

C. Would they recommend? YES _____, NO _____

Yes: - 15; No: - 7; No comment: - 12

1.- 13. No additional comment.

14. Give a balanced picture, if there is controversy.

15. - 30. No comment.

31. But not binding

32. - 34. No comment.

3. Do the surveys give enough information to help conference participants to make an informed decision? YES _____, NO _____

Yes: - 25; No: - 4; No comment: - 5;

1. Needs emphasis on how the applicant region expects to be served by representation and involvement with the WSC. This would be needed, as the WSC would be evaluating both fitness to participate and service needs. The surveys do fine to establish fitness to participate and fitness to serve within the region. But the region's service needs is also part of the picture. Presenting a survey that elicits a need-based response would prevent unnecessary embellishments of information (we have no vacancies in any of our ASCs), fictions, and the need to project an anticipated image of readiness, rather than an honest image of the region. Also, we at WSC should be aware that we are responsible to the region long before it is a member, and this would be implicit in how we solicit information.

2. - 11. No additional comment.

12. If adopted; Helpful inventory survey nevertheless.

13. - 17. No additional comment.

18. Do surveys...??? I'm not sure what this question is asking.

19. - 29. No comment.

30. No comment.

31. - 34. No comment.

4. Are the survey questions too intrusive? YES _____, NO _____

Yes: - 7; No: - 26; No comment: - 1

If yes, which one(s) _____

1. No comment.

2. Surrounding the question of personal interest even though it is sometimes true.

3. - 8. No additional comment.

9. R5, R6, R7, R9 and fail to ask number of meetings; A1, A3, A4

10. - 13. No comment.

14. See below (See #14 below on additional comments)

15. #3

16. No comment.

17. No comment.

18. No, I don't think so.

19. No comment.

20. No comment.

21. No comment.

22. Regional survey #6,8,9 and area survey #3 and 7

23. - 27. No additional comment.

28. Parent region comment form

- 29. Not needed.
- 30. VI, VIII, and IX.
- 31. - 34. No comment.

5. Additional comments:

- 1. No comment.
- 2. I have to agree with Mitch S. that it seems like none of this is necessary if at the conference there is no policy at all for the seating of new region's. I have heard rumblings hear on the Mid-Atlantic coast of a new region developing around metropolitan D.C. which I believe to be unnecessary at this time, so I pray we can see this put into policy at WSC '92. On Admission: The policy committee could make sure all paperwork is computed and the conference would be left to make the decision on recognizing the new region.
- 3. Just develop all information *prior* to the WSC. Have all data for the conference to vote on them. The proposed complicates the procedure and allows too much control in the hands of WSC Policy Committee.
- 4. Some communication as needed to assist regions (new) in development and entrance to conference, may be sensed in some places as an intrusion. Stronger cover letter could resolve this issue.
- 5. On question #2-C would like to see instead of "evaluate" insert "verify."
- 6. No comment.
- 7. I believe the parent region is the key. Many times I've seen areas split because of personalities. The result is poor area services in the new area. H&I, Phonelines, etc. suffer because the new area was more interested in leaving than in really putting in the work to start new services. Then the only people who suffer are the addicts who do not get proper services. The parent region *must* be ok with the split and be willing to *help the new*.
- 8. Question #2-B: let the WSC delegates evaluate the information.
- 9. These surveys were compiled at a time when the direction from the policy chair was to stifle formation of new regions. These questions beg for either mediocre or bullshit answers. The English-speaking world has been pretty well carved-up into regions. Most future new regions will be non-English speaking. It sure looks like your trying to stifle regional

growth in our international community. *Forget the surveys, forget the admissions committee. *Yes, on incremental participation.*

10. No comment.
11. Keep up the good work!
12. If this survey was applied to say France, Italy, Japan, Philippines, Spain, etc. would we have the right to say, "You don't pass the test, you can't come, or after the 2nd year, you didn't get 2/3 so see you later?" I think "MONEY" and funding to the WSC needs further discussion. Sponsorship to WSC for "poor" regions needs discussion. Does the principle of "self-supporting" apply to a region? For countries that appear that they will never be able to fund an RSR to a WSC, is that the end for them? Are they still a region? This probably will exist until the formation of the ESC, National U.S. conference and South Pacific Conference. Their delegates will go to WSC.
13. No. 7 in the regional survey is redundant. Again I do not like the idea of an RSC committee coming to the WSC and not being able to motion or vote. I believe after a 2/3 vote of the conference they should have those privileges. I also think No. VIII is off base.
14. The proposal serves to limit new regions in how they might participate; all regions should be given full privileges upon admission and seating at the conference.

Survey questions:

Beginning with the letter "To: New Region" most of the ideals would be to much to ask of a new region so we hope the admission committee would be flexible. Then with the "Regional Survey" question #5--Most regions currently have no working relation with the surrounding area or region. This lack of inter-regional communication is one of the needs of the fellowship; hopefully, it will be addressed soon

15. We are in desperate need of some basic minimum standards for forming a region. Current standard of "you're a region when you say you are" in a certain sense promotes disunity and has a great potential for disrupting and/or destroying existing services if anything, proposed region should show that they are structured to enhance these services
16. Although survey is very informative we feel strongly that the admissions committee give a recommendation. We both feel that this is thorough and helpful however, we strongly disagree with V. * IX. (Proposal for Seating of Regions from the 1990/1991 CAR). We feel that if the WSC seats the region then that region should be treated as a region with respect to voting privileges.

Our thought is that the committee should give a recommendation regarding seating the region or not and other than that we should not discourage newly active region full participation.

17. I believe the conference wants and needs a policy for the seating of new regions. If this proposal had been inserted in the CAR with the above changes as a completed agenda item in old business it most likely would have been approved.
18. Basically I've got a big problem with the way the seating proposal is written now. What I see is that there are three areas from which new regions will be formed in N.A. (and it is very obvious that N.A. is not thorough forming regions). These areas from which new regions will be formed are:
 1. U. S. locations with large populations that divide into new regions for the purpose of streamlining services. i.e. better able to serve the ASCs by splitting up huge numbers of ASCs from one large population into a couple of new regions.
 2. U.S. locations with sparse populations, but which are spread over huge geographical areas.
 3. Non-English speaking (or non U.S.) locations that are forming new regions regardless of population or geographical area covered (although both these may be considerations in the near future in some countries).

It is my feeling that all three of these kinds of newly forming regions need to be handled differently.

In the case of small geographical areas with large populations--like some East Coast locations--the seating proposal makes some sense. Although I think I would still be reluctant to tell a group of addicts that they had to wait another year before they could participate in the voting. I could see the seating proposal being used to compliment and assist both the host and the newly forming region in accomplishing their task. I could also see the proposal being used to better serve the WSC in a case such as this. The assumption I'm making here is that there would be a lot of experienced, well informed, and dedicated addicts in a location such as on the East Coast. There would not seem to be such a sense of or need for urgency in forming a new region.

In essence, what I get is a sense that the WSC has asked if a seating proposal is possible--perhaps this seating proposal could be useful in helping to keep the WSC from having to deal with frivolous or dilatory region formations. If such a region seating proposal was to save those

addicts who are still obsessed with looking over their shoulders in paranoia, I would suggest that this seating proposal will likely protect the WSC from that. However, if the addicts making up the WSC are not paranoid, I'm not sure that a seating proposal is even necessary and would like to see the idea scrapped.

In the second case of forming a new region in a sparsely populated area with huge geographical area, I speak from recent experience. We spend over a year in the process of forming a new region out of parts of two others. The basic reason we formed this new region was to better serve addicts within a smaller geographical area and to cut down on lengthy travel. In forming the new region, both parts talked at length with the host regions. There was no animosity, no hassles, and nothing negative. The splits and new formation was seen to be in the best interest as far as all aspects of better carrying the N.A. message to the addict who still suffers was concerned. Yet, if it hadn't been for some persistence on the part of our RSR and some very timely help on the part of the WSO, we probably would not have been seated this year (and due to a lack of knowledge of the process--maybe not for a long time).

In this case, I think someone--perhaps the policy committee--could be very helpful in spelling out the process by which new regions form and how they are to be seated at the WSC. We did communicate well with both host regions--yet we still did not get the correct information in a timely manner.

I foresee many more regions forming in this manner. We've got some really crazy regions in N.A. Some take up parts of up to 7 states. One RSR I share with on a regular basis puts well over 100,000 miles on his car each year in service related travel through the region. Basically, I doubt seriously that newly forming regions from situations such as this need a seating policy. What they need is assistance and guidance in the formation process. The needs of those newly forming regions in the large areas with sparse addict populations are much, much different than those in the first example.

It also probably goes without saying that the needs of the newly forming regions in countries outside the U.S. are quite different. If any newly forming regions needed help and guidance instead of policy and proposals, it would be these regions forming in countries outside the U.S.

In conclusion, I think the proposal is too restrictive. If this proposal is to protect the WSC from frivolous and dilatory regional formation or if this proposal has been dreamed up to satisfy some paranoid addicts, I would like to suggest that there is a Higher Power to take care of this kind of thing.

If the policy committee really needs to come up with some kind of seating policy for new regions--how about first helping the WSC to define what a region is and what a region needs to do. Is it possible to put forth some numbers in terms of geographical size, number of member ASCs, numbers of addicts served, and so forth. How about helping to clarify the procedure for forming and getting a region ready to go?

In short, don't suggest to the WSC how they adopt and seat a new region. There does not seem to be a problem with that (it stays in the realm of a WSC conscience). But, I do think the WSC (and newly forming regions) need some help in figuring out what they are, what they are to be doing, and what the relationship between the new region and WSC will be. Then the policy committee could present these new ideas to the WSC. The current seating proposal seem too restrictive in terms of getting new regions involved and there are likely to be some problems getting such a policy into place since most regions already seated with the WSC didn't have to go through such a restrictive policy.

Anyway, hope you all have fun sorting through the situation and manage to come up with something. Will the new *Guide To Service* (if adopted) have any impact on this issue?

19. No comment.
20. It seems quite thorough on all levels. Parent region, proposed region, and area. Good work!
21. Change the names of the "admissions committee," and possibly use an already-existing structure like the Interim Committee, or some WSO staff, to compile the information. Recommendation by a "committee" is not needed and probably will not be welcome. Conference participants can decide for or against seating based on the information received in the questionnaires.
22.
 - 1) I do not feel the admission committee should do anything more than compile information and make available to other conference participants upon request or in a report to all conference participants.
 - 2) More questions need to be asked of the parent region.
 - a. What repercussion has your region felt since the split.
 - b. What financial position is your region in now.
 - c. Have many of your trusted servant positions become vacant because of the split.
 - d. etc.
23. No comment.

24. It isn't the place of the WSC to decide who is a region and who isn't. To my knowledge, no harm has come yet from not giving an admissions committee, but much harm could come quickly if we did.
25. These questions are pertinent to establishing guidelines.
26. My only concerns are the cost involved in attending two consecutive WSC before being allowed to vote or move or speak to motions may be to restrictive.
27. As I stated above, we need not penalize a perspective region. We can make the conference responsible to get us the information about a perspective region to the RSRs and RSR-Altenates in enough time for an informed vote on the floor of the conference.
28. Is too much like government; too lengthy of a time period to get new regions seated; could discouraged and alienate new regions.
29. The whole thing is a crock. The idea of an admissions committee makes me ill. Where is God! Where is the unity? What happened to the *spirit* in the fellowship? You are a region when you say you are. No one has the right to tell you if you do or do not belong.
30. Is making requirements to become a region a violation of Tradition Three if we are a member when we say are, what is the difference between groups and individuals? Do we have a right at the conference to exclude anyone membership? I think not.
31. We need to nutre and support new regions and establish that they are able to unify the areas in that region. It does no good to perpetuate the formation of regions done in anger or resentment.
32. I believe the questionnaire could be included in the CAR and the info could be evaluated by the conference *participants* prior to WSC. I strongly support withholding voting privileges for one year. I am somewhat supportive of delaying the making of motions. I do not support preventing speaking to motions.
33. No comment.
34. If the intent of this questionnaire is to restrict the amount of incoming regions it will fail. It will however be very useful as 4th or 10th step material for the regions in question.

At best it will slow down by 1 year the process we have. Possibly discouraging the type of situation where the region is started out of resentment, etc.

If you wish to restrict the amount of new regions, set down limits for # of regions in state or # regulated by population etc. These restrictions could be eased under certain conditions by the will of the conference.

REGIONAL SEATING SURVEY

1. Cevin McGuire, RSR Iowa
2. Ted Logue, RSR Alt
Region of the Virginians
3. Anonymous
4. Alden Irish, Vice Chairperson
WSC Literature Committee
5. Jenny DeBerg, RSR Alt
Nebreska Region
6. Paul Butterbaugh, Jr.
RSR Alt Georgia Region
7. Rory S. Augustson, RSR Alt
Central California
8. Volunteer Region
9. Scott Allen, RSR
San Diego/Imperial
10. Susan Blauce, Vice Chairperson
WSC P.I. Committee
11. Walter Johnson,
Board of Directors
12. Garth Popple,
Board of Trustees
13. David Jones, RSR Alt
Tri-State Region
14. Jim Edgren, RSR
Chicagoland
15. Bob Feneran, RSR
Northern New Jersey
16. Carol Kenney, RSR Alt
Michigan Region
17. Tom McKee, RSR
Together We Can
18. Dan Kearns, RSR Alt
Southern Idaho
19. Richard Hill, RSR
Arizona Region
20. Daniel Bekins, RSR Alt
Arizona Region
21. Marjorie Kleiman, RSR
GNYRSC
22. Anonymous
23. Anonymous
24. John H., RSR
Arkansas Region
25. Chris Chambliss,
Board of Directors
26. RSR Australia
27. Stan Sanchez, RSR Alt
New England Region
28. Mountaineer Region
29. Billy Zimmerman RSR Alt
Chesapeake/Potomac
30. California Mid-State RSR
31. J. Scroggs
1926 S. Grant #E
Springfield, MO 65807
32. Joe Loyd, RSR
Flordia Region
33. Jimmy Harper, RSR and
Kelly Snell, RSR Alt.
Lone Star Region
34. Steve Bice, voting member
Board of Trustees