

## MEMORANDUM

From: Lee Manchester, WSO Senior Editor  
Date: September 8, 1992  
Re.: WSC Ad Hoc Committee on NA Service  
questionnaire on national and world services

On the following pages appear summary results, response percentages, limited quantitative analysis, and comments of individual respondents to a questionnaire on various issues related to the development of material on national and world services for inclusion in *A Guide to Service in Narcotics Anonymous*. The questionnaire was mailed on or about July 1, 1992 to the nearly two hundred individuals whose addresses are included in the WSO database for World Service Conference participants. The posted response deadline was September 1, 1992; all responses received at our post office box on or before September 8, 1992 were included in the final analysis.

For your reference, the actual questionnaire appears on pages 3 and 4.

On page 5 is a very brief summary of responses and their sources. We received a total of 193 responses; 130 were from local-level trusted servants and sixty-three were from world service participants (RSRs, alternates, WSC officers, etc.). Because it was the intent of the WSC Ad Hoc Committee on NA Service to survey trends in the thinking of WSC participants, in particular, I have broken out responses to specific key questions from that group of respondents only.

At the bottom of page 5, we show the number of responses from ten world locales and the number of regions from which we received responses in each of those locales. We received responses from a total of forty-seven regions worldwide. As you can see, five of those forty-seven regions sent us ten or more responses apiece; the average for the other regions was two responses each.

On pages 6 through 9, you will find response percentages for each question included in the questionnaire. For each question, we show the overall response percentages, percentages for local-level trusted servants, and world service participant figures. Then, we break down the world-level responses into eight subgroups: RSRs and non-RSRs, participants from the USA and outside the USA,

participants who said "yes" or "no" to the USA conference idea, and those who said "yes" or "no" to the idea of consolidating world-level service committees.

Response lines displayed in italics indicate that one or more of the response percentages for that group differ by 15% or more from the *mean*. (In statistics, a "mean" is a base figure or overall average against which other figures are compared.) The mean for local and world responses is the overall response. The mean for world-level subgroups is the total world-level response.

On pages 10 through 13, these deviations from the mean are examined further. Staff has examined them because they are quantifiable and, therefore, relatively easy to analyze, while other aspects of the response figures are not so readily quantifiable and require substantial exercise of judgment to analyze.

Finally, on pages 14 through 25, you will find all of the individual comments included with the questionnaire responses.

I hope you find this package useful in analyzing the results of questionnaire on national and world services developed by the WSC Ad Hoc Committee on NA Service.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>QUESTIONNAIRE:</b> <b>NATIONAL AND WORLD SERVICES</b></p>
---

1. Would you like the World Service Conference to serve temporarily (for perhaps five or ten years) as both the American and world service body, with an American service meeting every year combined with a world service meeting every other year?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes  
\_\_\_\_\_ No

2. Do you want to see Narcotics Anonymous in the USA form a service structure separate from the World Service Conference?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes  
\_\_\_\_\_ No

3. If NA-USA formed its own service structure, would you like to see:

\_\_\_\_\_ All the American RSRs continue to attend World Service Conference meetings  
\_\_\_\_\_ A smaller body of American delegates (perhaps a dozen members) represent NA-USA at the the World Service Conference

4. In the future, new NA literature:

\_\_\_\_\_ Must be approved by the World Service Conference  
\_\_\_\_\_ May be approved for use by NA communities in various countries by the service structures in those countries

5. In the future, all NA recovery literature:

\_\_\_\_\_ Must continue to be published through the World Service Office or one of its branches  
\_\_\_\_\_ May be published locally by license from the World Service Office  
\_\_\_\_\_ May be published locally without charge, royalties, or other restriction from world services

6. If NA literature is approved on a local rather than world basis in the future, should it first be approved conceptually by a world service body created specifically for that purpose?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes  
\_\_\_\_\_ No

7. How frequently should the World Service Conference meet?

\_\_\_\_\_ Every year  
\_\_\_\_\_ Every two years  
\_\_\_\_\_ Every three years

**8. What should be the basis for representation at the World Service Conference?**

- ☐ Regional--e.g., Germanspeaking Region, Mid-America Region, Show-Me Region
- ☐ National--e.g., Canada, US, France, Spain, Brazil
- ☐ Zonal--e.g., Northeastern US, Southern Europe, Pacific Rim
- ☐ Continental--e.g., Europe, North America, South America, Asia

**9. New NA communities in countries that have not had NA often ask for direction, translated materials, and NA literature either at a reduced price or free of charge. Should the NA service structure provide such assistance?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**10. If you answered yes to #9, who should provide such assistance?**

- ☐ NA in neighboring countries
- ☐ NA's world services
- ☐ Both of the above

**11. Do you want the world trustee committees and world conference committees consolidated under a single world services board?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**12. If a consolidated world services board were to be created, how should its working members be elected?**

- ☐ All by the World Service Conference
- ☐ All by local, zonal, or continental assemblies
- ☐ A mix of the above

**13. How should its officers be elected?**

- ☐ Directly to those specific jobs by the World Service Conference
- ☐ By the board from among its own members

**14. How should its committee chairpersons be elected?**

- ☐ Directly to those specific jobs by the World Service Conference
- ☐ By the board from among its own members

# **FINAL RESPONSE SUMMARY, SOURCES** **SEPTEMBER 8, 1992**

**Overall..... 193**

**Local-level trusted servants..... 130**

**World service participants..... 63**

RSRs, alternates..... 44

WSC officers, chairs, VCs..... 5

NAS members..... 5

Directors..... 4

Trustees..... 3

WSC PolCom members ..... 2

**USA, non-USA world service participants**

USA participants..... 50

Non-USA participants..... 13

**Yes/no USA conference (world service participants)**

Yes..... 44

No..... 18

No response..... 1

**Yes/no consolidation (world service participants)**

Yes..... 28

No..... 27

No response..... 8

LOCALE	REGIONS RESPONDING	NO. OF RESPONSES
Canada .....	4 .....	5
Europe .....	4 .....	10
Latin America .....	2 .....	2
North Central USA .....	5 .....	20
<i>Including:</i>		
Michigan, 13 responses		
Northeastern USA .....	9 .....	86
<i>Including:</i>		
Tri-State, 45 responses		
Free State, 19 responses		
Northwestern USA .....	3 .....	4
Pacific .....	3 .....	7
South Central USA .....	4 .....	6
Southeastern USA .....	5 .....	37
<i>Including:</i>		
Carolinas, 20 responses		
Virginia, 10 responses		
Southwestern USA .....	8 .....	16
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>47 REGIONS</b>	<b>193 RESPONSES</b>

**FINAL RESPONSE PERCENTAGES**  
**SEPTEMBER 8, 1992**

<b>1. Temporary WSM/ASM conference</b>	<b>no response</b>	<b>yes</b>	<b>no</b>
Overall .....	4%	62%	34%
Local .....	2%	65%	33%
All world service participants .....	8%	59%	33%
RSRs .....	9%	58%	33%
Non-RSR participants .....	5%	60%	35%
USA participants .....	8%	62%	30%
Non-USA participants .....	8%	46%	46%
"Yes" to USA conference .....	7%	66%	27%
"No" to USA conference .....	11%	44%	44%
"Yes" to consolidation .....	4%	68%	29%
"No" to consolidation .....	15%	44%	41%

<b>2. USA conference</b>	<b>no response</b>	<b>yes</b>	<b>no</b>
Overall .....	4%	55%	41%
Local .....	5%	48%	48%
All world service participants .....	2%	70%	29%
RSRs .....	2%	67%	30%
Non-RSR participants .....	0%	75%	25%
USA participants .....	0%	66%	34%
Non-USA participants .....	8%	85%	8%
"Yes" to consolidation .....	0%	89%	11%
"No" to consolidation .....	4%	52%	44%

<b>3. All USA RSRs, or small delegation</b>	<b>no response</b>	<b>all</b>	<b>small</b>
Overall .....	2%	37%	61%
Local .....	2%	42%	56%
All world service participants .....	2%	29%	70%
RSRs .....	0%	35%	65%
Non-RSR participants .....	5%	15%	80%
USA participants .....	0%	30%	70%
Non-USA participants .....	8%	23%	69%
"Yes" to USA conference .....	2%	11%	86%
"No" to USA conference .....	0%	67%	33%
"Yes" to consolidation .....	4%	18%	79%
"No" to consolidation .....	0%	44%	56%

4. Literature approval by...	no response	WSC	locals
Overall .....	3%	58%	39%
Local .....	2%	63%	35%
All world service participants .....	3%	48%	49%
RSRs .....	5%	51%	44%
Non-RSR participants .....	0%	40%	60%
USA participants .....	2%	46%	52%
Non-USA participants .....	8%	54%	38%
"Yes" to USA conference .....	2%	39%	59%
"No" to USA conference .....	6%	67%	28%
"Yes" to consolidation .....	4%	36%	61%
"No" to consolidation .....	0%	56%	44%

5. Publish NA literature by...	no response	WSO	license	anyone
Overall .....	2%	37%	51%	10%
Local .....	2%	47%	38%	14%
All world service participants .....	3%	16%	78%	3%
RSRs .....	2%	23%	72%	2%
Non-RSR participants .....	5%	0%	90%	5%
USA participants .....	2%	14%	80%	4%
Non-USA participants .....	8%	23%	69%	0%
"Yes" to USA conference .....	5%	9%	86%	0%
"No" to USA conference .....	0%	28%	61%	11%
"Yes" to consolidation .....	0%	7%	93%	0%
"No" to consolidation .....	4%	22%	67%	7%

6. Conceptual world approval of local literature	no response	yes	no
Overall .....	3%	85%	12%
Local .....	4%	83%	13%
All world service participants .....	2%	87%	11%
RSRs .....	2%	93%	5%
Non-RSR participants .....	0%	75%	25%
USA participants .....	2%	86%	12%
Non-USA participants .....	0%	92%	8%
"Yes" to USA conference .....	0%	91%	9%
"No" to USA conference .....	6%	78%	17%
"Yes" to consolidation .....	0%	93%	7%
"No" to consolidation .....	4%	81%	15%

7. WSC meeting every...	no response	1 yr	2 yrs	3 yrs
Overall .....	3%	58%	38%	2%
Local.....	2%	65%	32%	2%
<i>All world service participants</i> .....	5%	43%	51%	2%
RSRs.....	7%	44%	49%	0%
Non-RSR participants.....	0%	40%	55%	5%
USA participants.....	4%	40%	54%	2%
Non-USA participants.....	8%	54%	38%	0%
"Yes" to USA conference.....	7%	36%	55%	2%
"No" to USA conference.....	0%	56%	44%	0%
"Yes" to consolidation.....	4%	39%	54%	4%
"No" to consolidation.....	4%	52%	44%	0%

8. Representation	no response	region	nation	zone	continent
Overall .....	8%	30%	22%	27%	13%
Local.....	6%	31%	26%	18%	19%
<i>All world service</i> .....	13%	29%	13%	44%	2%
RSRs.....	14%	33%	9%	44%	0%
Non-RSRs.....	10%	20%	20%	45%	5%
USA.....	10%	30%	12%	46%	2%
Non-USA.....	23%	23%	15%	38%	0%
"Yes," USA conference.....	14%	9%	18%	59%	0%
"No," USA conference.....	11%	72%	0%	11%	6%
"Yes," consolidation.....	14%	14%	14%	57%	0%
"No," consolidation.....	15%	41%	11%	30%	4%

9. Material development assistance OK?	yes	no
Overall .....	97%	3%
Local.....	95%	5%
World service participants.....	100%	

10. Who should provide such help?	no response	neighbors	world	both
Overall .....	2%	1%	14%	83%
Local.....	3%	1%	17%	79%
<i>All world service participants</i> .....	0%	0%	10%	90%
RSRs.....			2%	98%
Non-RSR participants.....			25%	75%
USA participants.....			10%	90%
Non-USA participants.....			8%	92%
"Yes" to USA conference.....			11%	89%
"No" to USA conference.....			6%	94%
"Yes" to consolidation.....			14%	86%
"No" to consolidation.....			7%	93%



<b>11. Consolidate WSB, WSC committees</b>	<b>no response</b>	<b>yes</b>	<b>no</b>
Overall .....	6%	58%	36%
Local.....	3%	64%	33%
<i>All world service participants</i> .....	13%	44%	43%
RSRs.....	16%	40%	44%
Non-RSR participants .....	5%	55%	40%
USA participants .....	12%	42%	46%
Non-USA participants .....	15%	54%	31%
"Yes" to USA conference .....	11%	57%	32%
"No" to USA conference.....	17%	17%	67%

<b>12. Elect uniboard members by...</b>	<b>no response</b>	<b>WSC</b>	<b>locals</b>	<b>mix</b>
Overall .....	9%	23%	13%	54%
Local.....	8%	22%	15%	55%
<i>All world service participants</i> .....	13%	27%	10%	51%
RSRs.....	16%	23%	9%	51%
Non-RSR participants .....	5%	35%	10%	50%
USA participants .....	10%	24%	8%	58%
<i>Non-USA participants</i> .....	23%	38%	15%	23%
"Yes" to USA conference .....	11%	23%	7%	59%
"No" to USA conference.....	11%	39%	17%	33%
"Yes" to consolidation.....	4%	29%	7%	61%
"No" to consolidation .....	19%	30%	11%	41%

<b>13. Elect uniboard officers by...</b>	<b>no response</b>	<b>WSC</b>	<b>board</b>
Overall .....	10%	51%	39%
Local.....	9%	49%	42%
<i>All world service participants</i> .....	13%	52%	35%
RSRs.....	16%	53%	30%
Non-RSR participants .....	5%	50%	45%
USA participants .....	10%	58%	32%
<i>Non-USA participants</i> .....	23%	31%	46%
"Yes" to USA conference .....	14%	48%	39%
"No" to USA conference .....	6%	67%	28%
"Yes" to consolidation .....	0%	46%	54%
"No" to consolidation .....	19%	67%	15%

<b>14. Elect uniboard committee chairs by...</b>	<b>no response</b>	<b>WSC</b>	<b>board</b>
Overall .....	9%	44%	47%
Local.....	8%	44%	48%
<i>All world service participants</i> .....	10%	44%	46%
RSRs.....	12%	53%	35%
<i>Non-RSR participants</i> .....	5%	25%	70%
USA participants .....	6%	48%	46%
Non-USA participants .....	23%	31%	46%
"Yes" to USA conference .....	9%	39%	52%
"No" to USA conference.....	6%	61%	33%
"Yes" to consolidation .....	0%	29%	71%
"No" to consolidation .....	15%	67%	19%

**FINAL RESPONSE ANALYSIS: DEVIATIONS  
FROM MEAN AMONG SUBGROUPS  
SEPTEMBER 8, 1992**

Two major respondent groups (local and world) and eight subgroups among world respondents (RSRs, non-RSRs, USA participants, non-USA participants, those in favor of and opposed to a USA conference, and those in favor of and opposed to consolidation) were analyzed separately. Below, we have noted deviations from the mean exceeding fifteen percentage points. The mean for local trusted servants and world service participants was the overall response. For the eight world subgroups, the mean was the total world service response.

**World service participants**

1. As a group, they were far more strongly in favor of a USA conference, local NA literature publication licensing, biennial WSC meetings, and zonal WSC representation than the overall response.
2. Though the overall response to the idea of world service committee consolidation was favorable--and the local response was *overwhelmingly* positive--world service participants were evenly divided over the question.

**Non-RSR world service participants**

Including conference officers, trustees, directors, WSC committee chairs and vice chairs, NAS members, and two WSC Policy Committee members.

1. Were 90% in favor of publication licensing, while world service participants in general were 78% in favor of licensing and the overall response was just 51% for licenses.
2. Non-RSRs also gave more credence (25%) to exclusive world service responsibility for development support than either the overall response (14%) or the total world service response (10%).
3. While both the overall response and the total world service response were pretty evenly split over the question of who should elect world service committee chairs under a consolidated system, non-RSR world service participants leaned pretty heavily (70%) toward allowing the unified board to select committee chairs from among its own members rather than asking the WSC to elect people to specific committee leadership slots.

**World service participants (RSRs, trustees, NAS members) from outside the USA**

1. Were much more strongly in favor of creating a USA conference (85%) than either the overall response (55%) or the total world service response (70%).
2. They lined up with those responding "no" to the USA conference idea in supporting WSC election of all unified board members (38%) as opposed to either zonal board reps or a mixture of the two; mixed composition was the choice of both the overall response (54%) and the total world service response (51%).
3. Non-USA participants gave a 46% plurality in favor of allowing the unified board to elect its own officers from among its own members, while most respondents favored WSC election of board officers (51% overall, 52% total world service--and 67% of those saying "no" to a USA conference).
4. Non-USA world service participants favored an annual WSC meeting by 54%, more in line with the overall 58% support for an annual conference than the 51% support for an every-other-year WSC given by the total body of world service participants.

**World service participants who said "yes" to a USA conference**

1. Were much more strongly in favor of a small USA delegation to the WSC (86%) and zonal WSC representation (59%) than either the overall norm (61% small USA delegation; 30% regional, 27% zonal representation) or the total world service response (70% small USA delegation; 29% regional, 44% zonal representation).

**World service participants who said "no" to a USA conference**

This group had a greater number of views deviating significantly from the norms than any other respondent group.

1. They were evenly divided on the world meeting/American meeting WSC idea, while both the overall (62%) and the total world service (59%) responses were in favor of the idea.
2. They were 67% in favor of all USA RSRs attending the conference, while a smaller USA delegation was favored in the overall (61%) and total world service (70%) response.
3. They favored WSC approval of all NA literature by 67%, while the body of all world service participants was evenly divided and the overall response was 58% for WSC approval.

4. They were less strongly in favor of literature licensing (61%) than the total world service response (78%), but more favorable than the overall response (51%).
5. Their 56% support for an annual WSC meeting fell more in line with the overall response (58%) than the total world service response (43%; 51% favored biennial WSC meetings).
6. Aside from those who said "yes" to both the USA conference idea and the committee consolidation proposal, participants saying "no" to the USA conference were the only respondents with a clear majority in favor of any one of the four options offered for WSC representation, choosing regional reps by 72% (USA-yes chose zonal reps by 59%; consolidation-yes chose zonal by 57%).
7. Those participants against a USA conference also tended strongly to oppose consolidation (67%), while overall response was favorable (58%) and world service response was evenly divided.
8. If a unified board were to be created, those opposed to a USA conference would lean somewhat more toward direct WSC election of the board's members (39%) than mixed composition (33%), though the overall and world service responses gave slim majorities to the mix (51% and 54%, respectively).
9. And they would tend to favor direct election of committee chairs (61%), while both the overall and world service responses on that subject were nearly evenly divided.

#### **Participants saying "yes" to consolidating world-level committees**

1. Were much more strongly in favor of a USA conference (89%) than either the overall response (55%) or the total world service response (70%).
2. They gave stronger support to the idea of local literature publishing licenses (93%) than any other segment, topping the total world service response of 78% and far exceeding the overall response of 51%.
3. They were decidedly in favor of zonal representation at the WSC (57%), while both the overall response and the total world service response were mixed.
4. Those saying "yes" to consolidation were much more comfortable with the unified board selecting its own officers (54%) and its own committee chairs (71%) from among its own members than were either the overall responses (39% and 47%) or the total world service responses (35% and 46%).

**Participants saying "no" to consolidation**

1. Were split on the world/American WSC meetings idea, while the overall and total world responses were favorable (62% and 59%).
2. They were less strongly in favor of a USA conference (52%) and a smaller USA delegation (56%) than the total world service response (70% for both), but about the same as the overall response (55% and 61%).
3. If a consolidation were to be affected, those opposing consolidation would, at minimum, want direct WSC election of board officers and committee chairs (67% for both); direct officer election was supported by bare majorities of both the overall and total world service responses, while both were split on election of committee chairs.

**COMMENTS FROM INDIVIDUAL RESPONDENTS  
SEPTEMBER 8, 1992**

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

- 6. Thanks for the chance to input this.
- 8. When will NA's world services leave all the structural, policy, procedural, and other political activities behind and begin supporting the needs of regions (i.e. public image, phonedlines, H&I, Twelfth Step work, work with professionals, etc.)?
- 12. Just remember, "On a clean day, you can see forever."
- 20. *Re. specific comments below:* I offer these points with the knowledge that they probably have already been taken into consideration.
- 31. We discussed these questions at the regional service committee meeting. (Panama)
- 40. Personal response; will ask area later. (Belgium)
- 80. I strongly recommend we discuss some of these concerns with AA, Al-Anon, and other large twelve-step fellowships to learn from their experience.
- 84. Do addicts a favor: Go back to the TWGSS and stop messing with our unity. Our world service structure is sacrificing our traditions in favor of more complicated and convoluted mechanics. [Respondent notes that has been clean] since November 1983 when life was simple.
- 87. In Question #3, a smaller body of USA delegates is suggested as an option. How would this fit with representation in Question #8? Wouldn't each national or quasi-national service committee elect its national service representative (i.e., just one representative!).
- 105. Interesting choice of wording for questions--"should."
- 126. Change the word "American" where it appears in the questions to "USA."
- 181. This survey is responded to by myself on a personal level, not as the RSR.

**QUESTION ONE**

**Temporary ASM/WSM conference**

- 2. Yes, although the purpose of each would need to be differentiated and clear to all participants.
- 3. *No response: ?*

6. *No.* I believe the WSC should continue with regional representation (worldwide); if the American fellowship wants to meet, OK.
7. *No.* It is time to separate now; delay can only lead to further confusion.  
*Spec. re. "for perhaps five or ten years": get real!*
20. *Yes.* I felt that the five or ten year time span should be paraphrased to reflect a period of preparedness rather than set dates. The WSC should continue in its current yearly mode for an unspecified period of time. Non-USA NA communities that are prepared could attend on an every-other-year basis, if they choose. This would continue until such time as those unprepared communities reached the level of maturity that they could host separate conferences.
24. *No.* Really consists of two questions [break at "with an American..."]. I can't imagine many non-US reps voting yes to this question, thus I rule it bias.
33. *No response.* Continue as is.
41. *No.* We would like it to serve the world, not just America. We believe it is important that the WSC should be responsible to those it serves: the world fellowship, not just the American fellowship. To this end we would separate out the American service element.
42. *No response marked.* Maybe.
80. *Yes.* Good idea. We may want to consider having an American conference every other year and a world service conference once every four years.
87. *No.* This is sitting on the fence, isn't it? Unless there is a national service structure capable of supporting a world service structure, then the choice is to leave things as they are at present or let national structures evolve and curtail world services to the level at which the various national structures support them.
88. *Yes, as revised:* "Would you like the World Service Conference to serve... both the American and world service body... meeting every other year?"
105. *Yes.* Not for five to ten years, though; shorten time frames.
149. *No.* I believe that the WSC should stay as it is, with all the USA regions meeting with all the non-USA meetings every year until the non-USA fellowship tells the US that the world meeting needs to become a world meeting not focused on USA issues. By that time, the zones will have been established in some form and maybe zonal representatives can meet in a true world service conference focused on worldwide issues.
152. *No response.* Group did not understand implications of this question.
156. *Yes.* Ten years is unnecessarily long.

175. *No*. WSC every year still. Either we are a WSC or not.
181. Yes, [but change world service meeting from every other year to every year].

## QUESTION TWO

### NA-USA

2. Yes, to incorporate into WSC.
6. *No*. With the increased international participation, the ratio of fellowship growth is beginning to be reflected at WSC.
8. *No response*. Do you believe that world services will still have adequate funding for international development, translations, etc.? If no, then no is my answer.
12. Yes, absolutely!
14. Yes. Added "and Canada" to USA.
18. Yes. I'm not sure, need more info.
24. Yes. But no different from other communities. *Zonal*, not national.
40. Yes, but should meet together in order to keep the worldwide NA unity.  
[Answered "no" to Question #1.]
56. *No*. Should have been first question.
80. *No*. We need consistency in our services.
82. Yes, but still participate in WSC activity.
84. *No*. Violates the First Tradition. *One* fellowship, *one* service structure.
87. *No response*. I would like to see a WSC distinct from a USA service structure. However, living outside the USA, it is not for me to say what the USA membership should do. However, it would not be "separate," would it? We would expect each national service structure to support and be part of the WSC.
101. Yes. It will be important to separate US problems and dominance from world problems.
138. *No*, not if its cost is significant.
149. Yes, just as Canada, Europe, and South America have taken the lead in forming service structures for service zones, the USA needs to form its own service structure. The need is overdue. This is one issue we should move forward on.
183. *No response*. Yes and no--zonal forums, not necessarily "USA."
190. *No response*. Why? Need more information.



### QUESTION THREE

#### **All USA RSRs at WSC, or smaller delegation**

2. *Smaller delegation:* country representation vs. RSRs (since most RSRs represent USA, need larger "world" representation).
6. *All USA RSRs.* I believe regional representation for everyone is appropriate at WSC.
7. *Smaller delegation:* one from each zonal conference.
12. *Smaller delegation.* They need to be elected by the national.
18. *Smaller delegation.* At least work toward this ASAP.
20. *Smaller delegation.* The USA number should reflect the need of the experience it has to offer for the good of the fellowship. I think we should continue to act as sponsor to those inexperienced service committees within NA. The number twelve does not appear to consider future growth. The presented international zones do not seem to take into consideration the expansion of the fellowship. In example Africa, Central America, and Asia.
24. *Checked both.* [All USA RSRs] short term. [Smaller delegation] long term. [Underlined "perhaps a dozen members"] zonal reps: eastern, western, midwest, southern, etc.
41. *A smaller body* in the event that all the American RSRs would swamp the WSC and create an almost entirely American body.
44. *A smaller body.* Wouldn't want it to become another NA-USA because of our overwhelming attendance. [Marked "yes" to ASM/WSM conference, "no" to USA conference.]
80. *A smaller body.* Cost effective, and we would not overrun the WSC when we arrived.
82. *All USA RSRs* until formation of zones and elected zonal representatives.
84. *No response.* Neither. Addicts are addicts unless you rewrite the traditions!
88. *A smaller body.* Why?
101. *All USA RSRs.* The combined experience and input of RSRs, even if only used in RSR working groups, is invaluable.
149. *A smaller body.* If we establish a structure of zones for the USA, we could send one rep from each zone and send several delegates elected at large at the USA National Service Conference.
170. *No response.* Whoever chooses.
175. *A smaller body.* Maybe more than "a dozen members."
183. *A smaller body.* Zonal reps.

190. *No response.* Why?  
 191. *A smaller body.* Zonal representation.

#### QUESTION FOUR

##### Literature approval by WSC or locally

12. *By WSC.* Feel strongly about this.  
 19. *Locally,* with input of trustees. Keep as conceptually intact as possible within their language/cultural barriers.  
 40. *Locally* by those who use literature in a particular language.  
 41. *Locally.* Local communities to publish and approve their own literature. However, literature that is to be published and distributed by the WSO should be approved at the world level.  
 48. *Locally,* after fellowship has been well established. And world protection of copyrights.  
 52. *Locally.* Due to cultural differences, this may be a good idea!  
 69. *Locally.* Because of differences in culture and language, this is a must.  
 80. *WSC.* We need to maintain the integrity of our message (as well as our copyright).  
 84. *WSC.* Need better translation support through *one* service structure.  
 88. *WSC.* [Revised question with strikethrough:] "Must be approved by a literature approval and review body of some sort."  
 92. *No response.* Not enough information.  
 149. *Locally.* NA literature for distribution throughout all NA communities should be approved by the World Service Conference. NA literature intended for local distribution may be approved by the local service structure. NA literature intended for a language group should be approved by the recognized service bodies of that language, e.g. English-speaking lit would be approved currently by USA, Canada, UK, Ireland, Australia, and Aotearoa [New Zealand] with input from India.

#### QUESTION FIVE

##### Literature publication by WSO, locally by license, locally w/out license

2. *Publish locally by license* if more cost effective (which I assume it is).  
 3. *No response:* don't have enough information to answer this question.  
 12. *Locally by license.* Perhaps we need to look at more branches, especially in foreign countries.

- 18. WSO, [but] locally by license for countries other than USA.
- 19. *Locally by license*. What do we need legally for copyright? What is functional for WSO; for developing countries?
- 41. *Mixed response*: May be published locally without charge or restriction but under license. Such licence to ensure that the traditions and NA unity are adhered to. Such licence may be withdrawn by vote of WSC in the case of breaches.
- 42. *Locally by license*, maintaining our copyright.
- 48. *Locally by license*; [but] depends on what the license consists of.
- 80. *Locally by license*, but must maintain our copyright.
- 84. *Locally by license* when this makes literature more available.
- 92. *No response*. Not enough information.
- 149. *Locally by license*. All of the answers look good, but the second and third look best. In order to maintain fidelity of concept and copyright we should probably allow local fellowships to publish under license with the WSO if they choose to. For some communities where the restrictions or legal problems are too complex, we should allow them to publish without restrictions, but I feel that should be decided on a case-by-case basis by the WSC, not just the WSO.

## QUESTION SIX

### Conceptual world approval of literature

- 2. Yes. A knowledgeable review board may be helpful. With recommendation responsibilities, not necessarily "approval."
- 55. *No response marked*. This needs more discussion, but I think yes.
- 80. Yes, to keep the message consistent with NA philosophy.
- 84. *No response*. Neither! NA literature is for the entire fellowship, not "local" groups!
- 149. Yes, again, to keep up NA standards so that the principles of NA never get lost due to misunderstanding.

## QUESTION SEVEN

### How frequent WSC

- 12. *Every year*. I think every year. Not sure. Need some input why not. Maybe money? I think there is a lot of work to be done. Two years may be too far apart.

- 14. *Every two years*, and possibly three later.
- 19. *Every two years*. Depends on if this meets our needs.
- 24. *Every year*. Also World Service Meeting (a nonvoting meeting) every three years.
- 27. *Every year*. First ten years, then every two years after.
- 41. *Every two years*, and in various places around the world.
- 43. *Marked every year or every two years*. [Recorded as no response because of ambiguity.]
- 44. *Every year*, and eventually every two years.
- 49. *Every year*. [Underlined "world." Marked "no" to ASM/WSM conference, "yes" to USA conference.]
- 69. *Every year*, and work even harder.
- 88. *Every two years*. [Revised question as follows:] "How frequently should the World Service Conference--and the NA-USA that is being *pushed* forward--meet?" [Then remark:] Maybe alternate years.
- 92. *No response*. Not specific.
- 101. *Every two years*, with national and zonal forums in off-years.
- 105. *Every two years*, perhaps for five to seven years, then every three years.
- 149. *Every year* for the near future (1-5 years). When we separate the WSC from the USASC, the WSC can determine itself how often it wants to meet, whether every year or two years. Three years is just a horrible idea, nothing is kept track of by three-year periods that I know of. If it meets every year, then people know that next year there is always a WSC. If it meets every two years, then that is easy to keep track of; "if WSC met this year, it will meet again in two years. If WSC did not meet this year, this it meets next year." Also, you can keep track of it by odd- or even-numbered years, no matter what calendar you use (Georgian, Moslem, Hebrew, Hindu, Buddhist, etc.).
- 150. *Every two years* initially, and revisit the issue of frequency at a later date after information can be gathered on the feasibility of biyearly conferences.
- 156. *Every three years*. Every two years for six years, then every three.
- 170. *Every year*, but leave open to change.

## QUESTION EIGHT

### Regional, national, zonal, continental reps

- 5. *National*, with modification to account for size of USA fellowship.
- 12. *National*. Regional--definitely not. Zonal--possibly.

18. *Zonal*. Regional now, and work toward zonal.
19. *Only blank not checked was regional--recorded as no response*. We will have to see what works best--to get like cultures together--just a zonal swath could encompass so many different countries--i.e. in Europe--all so different.
20. *Zonal*. A combination of national and zonal would seem to better accomplish what we desire. Canada and Mexico, for example, possibly should be considered on a national basis, whereas the USA and Europe would be better suited under a zonal system.
24. *Checked both regional and zonal*. Regional now, zonal future.
28. *Zonal*. [Added following mark at bottom:] Possible combination.
36. *Checked both regional and zonal*. Zonal in future.
40. *Checked all four*. Whatever the service structure in the country represents.
41. *Regional*, except for those countries where there are only areas (or indeed groups), where representation may be made by the area or group.
42. *Marked both regional and zonal representation*. [Recorded as no response because of ambiguity.]
43. *Marked regional or zonal representation*. [Recorded as no response because of ambiguity.]
56. *No response*. Don't make sense.
80. *Regional* for now, subject to change if needed. [Marked "yes" to ASM/WSM conference, "no" to USA conference, "yes" to smaller USA delegation at WSC.]
82. *Regional* now, zonal future.
88. *Continental*. [Respondent circled "representation" in question.] This is probably diverse enough to *not* be *representative*. Where are other suggestions on "members," "MCMs," "RCMs"? Now we are back to "*representation*."
101. *Zonal*. The most reasonable and equitable solution to fair representation is zonal representation.
105. *No response*. [Respondent bracketed national, zonal, continental.] A configuration from these categories.
149. *Regional* for the near future (1-5 years). Once the zones are up and functioning it should become zonal. National and continental representation would allow for misbalanced representation and could cause serious problems among some local fellowships.

156. *Zonal*. I assume we're not considering zonally elected trustees as "representatives." If one of the goals of representation is to get a cross-section of NA experience, then in some cases national, regional, or some other kind of representation may be appropriate temporarily (non-US and Canada), considered on a case-by-case basis. Representatives should outnumber non-representatives by at least a two-thirds majority.
170. *Continental*, with regional branches and open for addition.
194. *Checked both national and zonal; recorded as no response*. Where is Show-Me Region? Seems as though someone is being excluded! If these are examples, please use better examples.

## QUESTION NINE

### Material development assistance OK

6. Yes. I'm amazed we have to ask these questions!
24. Yes. Primary purpose.
41. Yes, but in doing so to remember our tradition of self-support.
42. Yes, where possible.
48. Yes, definitely.
84. Yes, absolutely!
92. Yes, short time.
105. Yes, for a period of time (i.e. six months to a year) depending on resources of emerging NA community.
138. No. Not free of charge. We should help in accordance with our means.
149. Yes, without question.
170. Yes. Broken down to area levels. Help each other.

## QUESTION TEN

### Who provides assistance

2. *In neighboring countries*: translation will be easier here than WSO/WSC.  
*NA's world services*: support services in terms of literature, guidance, etc.
6. *Both*. I'm amazed we have to ask these questions!
19. *Both*. NA world services should continue to target strong newly developing NA communities and help them grow so they can then be a resource for those around them.
42. *Both*. All of us.
48. *Both*, everybody.

87. *World services.* The national service structures would support the world service structure.

## QUESTION ELEVEN

### Trustee, conference committee consolidation

2. *Yes:* one board; accountability; trustees can be a subcommittee like others.
6. *No response.* Ultimately--probably--we all know what administration, communication, task completion is like now.
12. *No.* (Question mark in left margin.) I am not sure here and would like to hear some pros and cons, more input.
19. *No.* I'm not sure how I feel--might be better.
24. *Yes.* Including WSO Board of Directors.
27. *No.* [Circled response; assume for emphasis.]
41. *Yes.* The WSO should be a subcommittee of the WSC. The USA service office should be split out of this and should answer separately to the USA fellowship.
44. *No response.* If their purposes are the same, they should consolidate.
80. *No,* unless their purpose becomes the same, then we should consolidate.
88. *No.* [Respondent underlined "world."] When did we establish "world" trustee committees? I thought they were board committees. Is there an assumption that we are divided into national assemblies? [Respondent underlined "single world services board."] Is this the same board?
98. *No response.* Unsure.
105. *Yes,* consolidated membership w/working ad hoc committees.
149. *Yes.* Eventually we need to come to have just one service body and all committees part of that one body. this applies to both world services and to national USA services. There should be only one literature committee, one policy, one PI, etc., but the members of the committee should come from both the representatives and from the trustees or service board.
156. *Yes.* Is there anything analogous to delegate review panels at the world level being considered? Also, why no question about consolidating BOT and BOD?
170. *No.* Not enough data.
175. *No response.* Not sure; there is a lot to this question.
183. *No response.* Yes and no. Perhaps the BOT could be world and conference committees could be zonal in nature.

## QUESTION TWELVE

### **Elect board members from WSC, local, mix**

84. *No response.* [Underlined "were to be created" in question.] It should not be done!
101. *No response.* Does not apply. [Respondent said "no" to Question #11, and answered both Questions #13 and #14.]
105. *Mix*, i.e., "elected nominees" from local/zonal/continental assemblies, submitted from WSC nominating board and elected by WSC.
149. *Mix.* If the board is small (10-20 members), most should be selected at the conference. If the board is larger (20 or more), most should be selected by the zones or assemblies. Most here means at least 51%.
170. *No response.* Not enough data.
180. *No response.* Objection, that since we did not approve of a consolidated world board, we thought that this was a leading question that should not be asked.

## QUESTION THIRTEEN

### **Elect board officers from WSC, board**

6. *By the board.* I'm not positive on this one. I think leadership abilities would be recognized best by the total board.
19. *By the board.* They know better who is qualified.
61. *Neither option checked; remark:* Both.
62. *Both options checked.* [Recorded as no response because of ambiguity.]
126. *By WSC.* An additional choice should be by resume a year prior to elections; to be published so groups can make informed decisions.
149. *By WSC.* The officers could be nominated by the board itself, but should be elected to those positions by the conference. In the far future, it could be possible for the board to select its own officers, but in the beginning (the next 5 to 15 years), the fellowship would be more accepting of conference elections.
156. *By the board* from among those members elected by the WSC.  
[Respondent said earlier that board membership should come from a mix.]
170. *No response.* Not enough data.
175. *No response.* I want to answer "by WSC," but only under the condition that the election procedures be revamped totally.



180. *No response.* Objection, that since we did not approve of a consolidated world board, we thought that this was a leading question that should not be asked.

#### QUESTION FOURTEEN

##### **Elect board committee chairs from WSC, board**

6. *By the board.* I'm not positive on this one. I think leadership abilities would be recognized best by the total board.
19. *From WSC,* only because I don't think people will ever give up this much control.
61. *Neither option checked; remark:* Both.
62. *Both options checked.* [Recorded as no response because of ambiguity.]
88. *By the board.* I am having a difficult time visualizing the structure being manipulated. However, why is there a board being created? What is wrong with a simple administrative or steering committee? Does this have something to do with the Charter?
149. *By WSC.* The committee chairs could be nominated by the board itself, but should be elected to those positions by the conference. In the far future, it could be possible for the board to select its own committee chairs, but in the beginning (the next 5 to 15 years), the fellowship would be more accepting of conference elections.
170. *No response.* Not enough data.
175. *By the board.* I want to answer this way, but only under the condition that the election procedures be revamped totally.
180. *No response.* Objection, that since we did not approve of a consolidated world board, we thought that this was a leading question that should not be asked.