


Implementing Resolution A

If Nothing Changes . . . Then
Nothing Changes



Resolution A

To approve in principle a change in participation at a new WSC to achieve the following objectives


1. To reduce the total number of representatives;
2. To provide for equal representation from all geographic entities; and,
3. To encourage a consensus-based decision-making process.

(WSC 5/28/1996: Motion Carried Yes-66; No-17)

When considering the implementation of Resolution A, one can't help but ask, "Why hasn't it been implemented yet?" After all, Res. A was the first resolution brought to the floor of the WSC in 1996 and had it not passed, no other resolutions would have even been presented. Res. A was the first step in creating a world service structure with a world-wide perspective, focusing on the global growth of Narcotics Anonymous. It provides the necessary balance in participation at the WSC for the WSC Mission Statement to be accomplished and so the World Services Vision Statement can be realized.

The Resolution Group was clear. They stated strongly that the resolutions were a whole. Although they were presented one at a time, each resolution was part of a cohesive plan to design a new World Service structure that would effectively fulfill the WSC Mission and move toward the World Services Vision that the fellowship approved at the same conference. Resolution A was the cornerstone of all the resolutions. Its passage was the prerequisite for the rest. It was passed by 4 to 1 majority. Its implementation is long past due.

Motions 17 & 18 in the 2004 CAR propose an implementation of Resolution A that is consistent with the Resolution Group's intent to reduce the total number of participants and to provide a more equal representation from all geographic entities.



NA has Grown and Changed

- ✚ 1975 First WSC: 200 Groups in the US
- ✚ 1982 WSC attended by 22 U.S. Regions
- ✚ 1993-1994 Inventory of World Services
- ✚ 1996 WSC passes Resolutions A-G
- ✚ 1998 Resolutions B-G are implemented

When the WSC first met it was clear that NA had grown outside Southern California. Several experienced trusted servants got together for a few hours at a World Convention and discussed how to best carry our message to suffering addicts all over the country. Regions didn't even exist. They were arbitrarily carved out of a map of the United States.


By 1982 the WSC was becoming more structured. It was attended by 22 regions. All of them were from the United States. With the approval of our Basic Text, the fellowship began to grow by leaps and bounds.

By 1993, several regions were attending the WSC from outside the US. The needs of NA world services had outgrown its structure, but it wasn't clear exactly how. So we stopped all new projects and did an inventory for two years to identify what our problems were. It was kind of our collective 4th Step.

In 1995, the Resolution Group was formed to take what we had learned about ourselves in the inventory and create a plan to solve our problems. The Resolution Group created a plan in the form of several resolutions and presented them for approval *in principle* in 1996.

Over the next two years, the Transition Group then created detailed implementation plans for each of the resolutions, which were approved and phased-in beginning in 1998. Unfortunately, the Transition Group failed the fellowship by not creating a single viable plan to implement Resolution A. This failure haunts us today, but it need not continue to do so.


In 1999 the world board directed the fellowship to finish what the Transition Group could not. After four years of world wide discussion motions 17 & 18 have evolved as the consensus plan.



Why Did Resolution A Pass by a 4 to 1 Margin?


- ✚ Yesterday's structure can't meet Tomorrow's needs
- ✚ A *truly* world-wide fellowship requires a *truly* world-wide conference
- ✚ A *truly* world-wide conference requires equal geographic representation
- ✚ A change in participation at a new WSC will meet Tomorrow's needs

When growing the fellowship in the US, we consulted US participants because we believed THEY had the experience, strength and hope to succeed. Likewise, to gain the full benefit of the wisdom we need to grow the fellowship outside North America, we need equal representation from all geographic districts as we carry our message of hope to diverse peoples around the world.




1982 Focus: U.S. Growth

Participation: 100% U.S.




In 1982, we were concerned about furthering our primary purpose nation-wide. At that time it was perfectly reasonable for all of the conference participants to come from regions in the United States. There were a few NA meetings outside of the US, but not enough to form a region. The explosive international growth of our fellowship was just getting ready to occur.




1992 Focus: Structural Change

Participation: 81% North America




Ten years later, the fellowship had grown substantially outside of the US. Translators began to appear at the WSC. The structure of world services had evolved into three boards with three budgets and conference committees on top of that. Turf wars and duplication of efforts were rampant. Communication was ineffective. 80% of the regional delegates were still from North America.



2002 Focus: World Growth

Participation: 69% North America



By the last conference a lot had changed. We had implemented almost all of the resolutions.

- Resolution B, the consolidation of three boards into one.
- Resolution C1, the reorganization of WSC conference committees
- Resolution E, the consolidation of three budgets into one
- Resolution F, the creation of the world pool
- Resolution G, The creation of the Human Resource Panel

We had moved to a two-year conference cycle. We changed the representative's job description from RSR (Regional Service Representative) to RD (Regional Delegate) and they became world service trusted servants. We began to encourage consensus based decision-making processes.


These were all good and necessary changes, however they were not sufficient. Resolution A still had not been implemented. Although the focus was supposed to be world growth, 70% of the participants still came from North America and brought a North American perspective.

We have yet to see a change in participation at a new World Service Conference.



2008 Focus: World Growth

Participation: 25% North America



Motions 17 & 18 seek to implement Resolution A. This would provide the needed balance in geographic representation that we require in order to carry out our primary purpose on a global scale.

It combines the experience of the fellowship in North America with the cultures of fellowships experiencing explosive growth world-wide.


We'll begin to see Narcotics Anonymous through a wider angle lens. We'll understand that we truly are a world-wide fellowship and are acting like one.

The World Service Conference will focus on carrying our message to places in the world where Narcotics Anonymous is emerging or does not even exist like Russia, China, Korea, Turkey, Africa.

We'll be able to focus on translations and how our message is best understood and communicated in cultures that are decidedly different from North America.

We'll consider how best to educate and interact with governments who are hostile to Narcotics Anonymous, and even the concept that addiction is a disease or that addicts can recover.

We'll solve global problems globally and we'll solve local problems locally. We'll help each other in the best way we know how, by sharing our experience, strength and hope into this still new millennium.



Motions 17 & 18

- ✦ Defines the structure for new participation
- ✦ Defines geographic districts
- ✦ Opens discussion for two years
- ✦ With fellowship approval in 2006, the changes will be implemented in 2008
- ✦ Ensures conference participants control our intellectual property


Although they may seem kind of complicated and intimidating when you look at them, motions 17 & 18 are really quite simple. Motion 17 defines the change in participation for the WSC. It replaces regional delegates, with fellowship representatives. An equal number of fellowship representatives will come from each large geographic district.

Motion 18 defines the districts.

The reason that motion 17 “seeks to change the Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust” is that regional delegates are the trustors of the copyrights on our literature like the Basic Text and It Works: How and Why. If we replace regional delegates with fellowship representatives, then we have to change the FIPT to reflect that.

The neat thing is that because it takes two years to change the FIPT, that means that we have to discuss this proposal for two years before a decision is even made. Passing motion 17 doesn’t implement anything. Passing motion 17 only means that we want to discuss this proposal for two years.

Upon approval in 2006, the changes would go into affect at the 2008 conference.



Equal Geographic Representation

✚ North America	18
✚ Europe	18
✚ Asia Pacific	18
✚ Latin America	18
✚ Maximum Representatives	72


Motion 17 calls for equal geographic representation from each of the four current geographic districts.

Up to 18 from North America
Up to 18 from Europe
Up to 18 from Asia Pacific, and
Up to 18 from Latin America

Motion 17 also sets the maximum number of fellowship representatives at 72 so the WSC will stop growing without limit. The number of representatives on the floor of the conference will be lowered dramatically from almost 200 and the meeting will immediately become more effective.

As additional districts emerge, the fellowship representative seats would be reallocated equally to include all districts while maintaining the 72 representative maximum.

As an added benefit, this plan corrects an inequity in our current system. Today, as new U.S. regions emerge, they are routinely denied a seat at the WSC. This proposal restores the voice of all regions through their fellowship representatives.




Who Chooses the Participants?

- ✚ Asia Pacific: Asia Pacific Forum
- ✚ Europe: European Delegates Meeting
- ✚ Latin America: Latin American Zonal Forum
- ✚ North America: two from each zonal forum in North America

Regional Delegates won't disappear. They'll still exist, and they'll attend their zonal forums. The zonal forums are where the fellowship representatives will be chosen to attend the WSC.

There is one zonal forum for each of the large geographic districts other than North America. There are nine zonal forums in North America so each one chooses two fellowship representatives for a total of 18.



Let's not use Fear as our Higher Power

What could possibly be wrong with talking
about diversity . . . about equality . . . and
the future of Narcotics Anonymous?

In their October 1995 report, the Resolution Group suggested a future solution for the world board "Address the fear of changing the service structure. This fear is rampant within world services (it is less of an issue within the fellowship itself). Once this fear is dealt with, the transition plans—both strategic and tactical—will be much less difficult to develop and execute." By setting aside their own fears, we invite the world board to help us all set aside our own. Don't stop just because it's difficult. Don't stop just because it's complex. Don't stop five minutes before the miracle. Resolution A is too important to just leave undone. Let's finish it.