



World Services

Transition Group Proposals

*For Discussion at the World Services Meeting:
Providence, Rhode Island*

August 1997

NARCOTICS ANONYMOUS

WORLD SERVICES VISION STATEMENT

All of the efforts of Narcotics Anonymous World Services are inspired by the primary purpose of the groups we serve. Upon this common ground we stand committed.

Our vision is that one day:

- Every addict in the world has the chance to experience our message in his or her own language and culture and find the opportunity for a new way of life;
- NA communities worldwide and NA world services work together in a spirit of unity and cooperation to carry our message of recovery;
- Narcotics Anonymous has universal recognition and respect as a viable program of recovery.

As our commonly held sense of the highest aspirations that set our course, our vision is our touchstone, our reference point, inspiring all that we do. Honesty, trust, and goodwill are the foundation of these ideals. In all our service efforts, we rely upon the guidance of a loving higher power.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TRANSITION GROUP PROPOSALS	1
BACKGROUND TO THE INVENTORY/RESOLUTION PROCESS	1
INTRODUCTION: NEW CONFERENCE PROCESS AND A TWO-YEAR CONFERENCE CYCLE.....	2
<i>The Procedure for New Projects</i>	2
<i>Proposal: Two-Year Conference Cycle</i>	2
<i>Lengthening the work cycle</i>	3
<i>Lengthened review/input and translations processes</i>	3
<i>Proactive fellowship development and the world-wide workshop system</i>	3
<i>Cost-equalization and full-funding</i>	3
<i>Reducing overall expenses and activities until the implementation of Resolution A</i>	4
<i>Con: Communication Value of the Annual Meeting</i>	4
RESOLUTION B—THE WORLD BOARD	5
MISSION, MEMBERSHIP, AND DUTIES	5
<i>World Board's Mission:</i>	5
<i>Accountability Statement:</i>	5
<i>Membership:</i>	5
<i>Membership Qualifications:</i>	5
<i>Clean Time Requirement:</i>	6
<i>General Duties:</i>	6
<i>Quorum and decision-making:</i>	6
WORLD BOARD DUTIES: DISCUSSION	6
<i>The board is greater than the sum of its parts</i>	7
<i>The World Board directs and administers WSO staff</i> . . .	8
IMPLEMENTATION	8
<i>Time to move on</i>	9
<i>Let the board design its own processes</i>	9
ELECTIONS	9
RESOLUTION C2—STANDING COMMITTEES.....	10
BACKGROUND	10
STANDING COMMITTEE PROPOSAL.....	10
<i>Accountability:</i>	10
<i>Role of the standing committees:</i>	10
<i>Committee Makeup:</i>	10
<i>Responsibilities:</i>	11
I. The Executive Committee:	11
II. The Events Committee:.....	11
III. The External Committee:.....	11
IV. The Internal Committee:.....	12
V. The Publications Committee:.....	12
VI. The Guardians:	12
C2 PROPOSAL: DISCUSSION	12
<i>On the Size and Composition of the New Standing Committees</i>	14

RESOLUTION E—THE UNIFIED BUDGET	16
FOUNDATION OF THE UNIFIED BUDGET	16
PRIMARY IMPROVEMENTS UPON THE EXISTING BUDGETING SYSTEM	17
<i>One Group Responsible</i>	17
<i>Better Financial Management/Utilization of Resources</i>	17
<i>New System Less Forgiving</i>	18
<i>Friendlier, More Comprehensive Financial Reporting</i>	18
RESOLUTION F—THE WORLD POOL: RESOLUTION G—THE HUMAN RESOURCES PANEL.....	19
PROPOSAL	19
<i>Purpose of the World Pool:</i>	19
<i>Clean Time Requirement for the World Pool:</i>	19
HUMAN RESOURCES PANEL	19
<i>Purpose of the Human Resources Panel:</i>	19
<i>Duties of the HRP:</i>	19
<i>Accountability:</i>	20
<i>Composition:</i>	20
<i>Term:</i>	20
<i>Membership Requirements:</i>	20
<i>Clean Time:</i>	21
<i>Meetings:</i>	21
<i>Participation by WSO Staff:</i>	21
FUNCTION OF THE WORLD POOL: DISCUSSION.....	21
<i>Principles Before Personalities</i>	22
<i>Open Access</i>	22
<i>Untapped Fellowship Resources</i>	22
<i>Communication problem?</i>	22
<i>Another HRP-related topic for discussion</i>	22

Transition Group Proposals

World Services Meeting—Providence, Rhode Island

Background to the Inventory/Resolution Process

This report represents the latest progress in a process that began in 1992 at the world services meeting in Cincinnati, Ohio. At that meeting, the Interim Committee first suggested the need for a slowdown in world services activities for the purpose of inventorying world services' processes, structure, and project development. The 1993 World Service Conference saw the creation of the *Composite Group*, who, from May 1993 to March 1995, facilitated a comprehensive inventory of world services. The results of the Composite Group's research were eventually summarized in Book One of the group's 1995 report. They had also requested the hiring of an independent consultant to evaluate the world services system (including the office), and presented the results of his analysis in Book Two of their 1995 report. Faced by the fact that the information-gathering phase of the inventory had been completed, but that there was no group in line to carry on with the work, the WSC leadership proposed the adoption of the second plan to the 1995 World Service Conference participants who endorsed the plan and ratified a second group of six trusted servants known as the *Resolution Group*.

Utilizing a number of resources including the *Temporary Working Guide*, the *Guide to Service*, the Composite Group's Report (Books One and Two), as well as the participation of additional members invited from across the fellowship and a significant amount of written input from the fellowship at large, the Resolution Group eventually offered a series of Resolutions to the 1996 WSC: Resolutions A (a change in participants at a new WSC), B (the adoption of a single board), C2 (a significantly downsized standing committee), E (a unified budget), F (a world pool of trusted servants) and G (the creation of a Human Resources Panel) were all adopted in principle. At that same WSC, the World Services Vision Statement and the World Service Conference Mission Statement were also adopted, providing a mandate to all world services to measure all world service activities against the reference point of our fellowship's core principles and primary purpose.

Also at that conference, the Transition Group was formed and charged with the responsibility of developing the specific proposals that would assist the conference in the development of the new structure proposed by the Resolutions. The Transition Group members ratified at the 1996 WSC were Saul Alvarado from Panama City, Panama; Susan Blaue from Chicago, Illinois; Rose Crawford from Tampa, Florida; Bob Jordan from Tampa, Florida; Tim Banner from Dallas, Texas; Pete Cole from Greensboro, North Carolina; David James from Altrincham-Cheshire, England; Shannon Lynagh from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and Jane Nickels, from Poquonock, Connecticut. The First Alternate to the core group was Matt Schmeck from San Francisco, California, and the Second Alternate was Adam Wasserman from Montreal, Quebec. The Transition Group has been given the responsibility of developing definitive and specific proposals that will allow the realization in fact of what the Resolutions have thus far outlined only in principle. The following proposals are therefore presented for your discussion at the world services meeting in Providence, Rhode Island.

Introduction: New Conference Process and a Two-Year Conference Cycle

The following proposals for structural change to the world service system are predicated upon two fundamental changes to our conference processes: (1) a new process for the development of new world service projects, and (2) a two-year conference cycle. In order for our proposals regarding Resolutions B, C2, E, F and G to make sense, we must first discuss our proposals for the new project process and the two-year conference cycle.

The Procedure for New Projects

According to our proposal, all prospective projects in the new budgeting system will follow this procedure: The items that will be included in the *Conference Agenda Report* will be chosen by conference participants at the WSC meeting. A maximum of five project-oriented items will be identified and prioritized at the conference. Conference participants will also identify a "theme" for each conference cycle—for example, a principle-based issue, or a topical problem confronting our membership—that will be the subject of fellowship discussion for the following conference cycle. In keeping with the World Services' Vision Statement, the identified items must help to further the growth of NA worldwide and work to improve the unity of the fellowship for our members.

Delegates' ideas and suggestions for both the project items and the conference cycle's theme would be forwarded to the World Board during each cycle for possible inclusion in the next cycle's *Conference Agenda Report*. One of the reasons for the World Board's review at this point in the process is that, under this new system, no projects will be prioritized or considered by the World Service Conference unless they are accompanied by a project budget and timeline. One of the duties of the World Board is to develop project budgets and timelines for all prospective world service projects. The World Board will report to the conference on *all* ideas that they receive and may choose to propose some or all of those ideas to the conference for further discussion. To help avoid surprises at the World Service Conference, any initiatives brought directly to the conference by a delegate must be submitted for the World Board's consideration over the following conference cycle. Only after that consideration may such an initiative be presented to the conference for prioritization. For the purposes of proper planning, budgeting, and fellowship consideration, no project proposal would be considered for prioritization or action during the same WSC as it had been originally proposed.

Proposal: Two-Year Conference Cycle

The Transition Group is also proposing a change from our current one-year conference cycle to a two-year cycle. *We should clarify that all of the following proposals for the World Board, the standing committee system, the unified budget, and the Human Resources Panel are based upon a two-year conference cycle, though they can be altered to fit a one-year cycle should conference participants desire the continuation of our present annual meeting.* We have five major reasons for this proposal: (1) a two-year cycle will lengthen the actual work cycle, making world services more productive overall; (2) the two-year cycle will allow for lengthened review/ input and translations processes; (3) the two-year cycle will allow world services to be more proactive, particularly with regard to fellowship development and the Fellowship Development Plan's proposed world-wide workshop system; (4) the two-year cycle can make the principles of cost-equalization and full-funding a potential reality for world services; and (5) the two-year conference cycle will allow world services to reduce its overall expenses and activities until such time as the fellowship is ready to initiate the sweeping changes described in Resolution A.

Lengthening the work cycle

Our present “one-year” conference cycle is, for all practical purposes, actually a six-month work cycle. Each year in April, we hold our annual WSC. Office staff and trusted servants alike then scramble afterwards to shift priorities to accommodate the recent conference’s actions, as well as to report on the proceedings. For all intents and purposes, the actual work mandated by conference actions starts up in June. The *Conference Agenda Report* deadline is December 1. The result? A six-month window, from the middle of June until the middle of December, to complete all board and committee work assigned by the conference so that the CAR can be distributed in January in time for CAR workshops across the fellowship.

The two-year cycle will lengthen the actual work cycle to approximately eighteen months – a far more realistic time frame in which to complete conference-prioritized work.

Lengthened review/input and translations processes

Two commonly held complaints about our current system are that (1) our membership rarely has adequate time to review and input world service projects, and (2) our translations are either not timely or, when they are produced within a timely fashion, prohibitively expensive.

The two-year conference-cycle will allow for far greater fellowship review and input, especially in light of the new project development and prioritization process (as described under Resolution E): in essence, there should be no surprises at any WSC from world services, because the fellowship will have had ample time to consider all world service projects and initiatives. Additionally, the two-year cycle will allow for longer translation windows, thus reducing translations expenses for service-related communications and reporting. The other advantage offered by the lengthening of the review/input time-frame is the fact that our membership will have had communication from world services during the life of all world service projects, and so they’ll be better prepared to deal with those projects prior to the World Service Conference every two years.

Proactive fellowship development and the world-wide workshop system

Moving to a two-year conference cycle will also allow for the creation of a fellowship-wide interactive workshop system as described in the Fellowship Development Plan by (1) freeing up resources¹ that might have otherwise gone toward conducting the annual meeting; and (2) by making possible increased face-to-face interaction between world services and our membership beyond the limitations of the current annual meeting-based interaction – a new kind of interaction that is made possible by the lengthened work cycle.

Cost-equalization and full-funding

Moving to a two-year cycle will significantly reduce the overall expense associated with the World Service Conference, thus making it possible for the first time to consider funding all board and standing committee members, as well as all regional delegates, either through cost

¹ These resources include not only the financial impact associated with the annual meeting, but also the staff’s logistical and administrative support, which represents a substantial commitment of WSO resources in our present system. In the two-year cycle, both financial and human resources usually associated with the successful convening of our annual meeting could then become available for world service projects and for supporting the worldwide workshops.

equalization, full funding, or a combination of the two. This advantage of a two-year cycle would also make the playing field far more level for international participants, as well all members who might not otherwise have the personal resources to serve at this level.

Reducing overall expenses and activities until the implementation of Resolution A.

Conference participants at the 1997 WSC indicated during the small group meetings that they wished to see an eventual change in representation at the conference resulting in a downsized, more efficient WSC. However, they also indicated that such a transition should be gradual. Moving to a two-year conference cycle would allow world services to reduce its overall expenses and activities pending such changes in the conference as discussed last year. In essence, the two-year conference cycle could be seen as the first stage of the conference-recommended transition process.

Con: Communication Value of the Annual Meeting

The one argument that was raised in our discussion against moving to a two-year conference cycle was the loss of communication value that an annual meeting affords our fellowship. We recognized that the annual face-to-face gathering of regional delegates from around the world is of considerable value to our members in terms of maintaining communications between world services and our membership at large, as well as between the regions themselves. This could be affected by the move to a two-year cycle. We believe that the proposed worldwide workshop system could alleviate this potential "con," but we have nevertheless put it forward for the purpose of further discussion and input in Rhode Island.

- *Administrative skills*
- *Experience with plan development and financial forecasting*
- *Organizational and communication skills*
- *Personal resources to make the necessary commitment*
- *A working knowledge of the Twelve Steps, Traditions, and Concepts.*

Clean Time Requirement:

We propose that the clean time requirement for board members be a minimum of ten (10) years clean.

General Duties:

So that it can fulfill its mission and the will of the WSC, the duties of the World Board are to:

- *Communicate all world service activity to our membership in accordance with the principles embodied in our Eighth Concept.*
- *Oversee the operations of the fellowship's primary service center, the World Service Office.*
- *Administer the activities necessary for the successful operation of the World Convention.*
- *Hold our fellowship's intellectual properties in trust in accordance with the Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust.*
- *Provide support and administration of world service meetings.*
- *Plan and budget for basic service provision and project development.*
- *Be accountable for all world service budget responsibilities.*
- *Select committee members for project development and completion.*
- *Oversee activities associated with how our fellowship and service structure interact with society.*
- *Oversee development of new literature, periodicals, and translations.*
- *Address philosophical issues and questions about our traditions and concepts, developing position papers when necessary.*
- *Make necessary decisions affecting NA world services when the World Service Conference is not in session, mindful of the priorities previously established by the World Service Conference.*

Quorum and decision-making:

The proposed quorum for the World Board equals one half of all seated members plus one (e.g., were there twenty-six seated members, quorum would equal fourteen: one half the seated members – thirteen – plus one). While the board should strive for consensus, its process can allow for majority decision-making when necessary.

World Board Duties: Discussion

The above list of duties is comprehensive, encompassing in a general way all of the duties and responsibilities of the entire world service system, including those of the board's standing committees. The rationale for this all-encompassing list is clearly based in the results of the inventory process itself. For example, the Resolution Group, in addressing the need for a single board with clear lines of accountability, wrote that

The Consultant's Report states very clearly that our current system is not working. In that report, the consultant affirmed that "The complex NA organizational structure of two boards and a large number of committees was not supportive of good communication or focusing on the primary NA mission to support the suffering addict through recovery" (CR 6). That report continues: "Additionally, the organization is so intertwined in committees that two results have occurred: 1. Not exercising its full potential of leadership. 2. A lack of clear objectives that must be identified and accomplished. Because of the overabundance of projects, directives and committee involvements, a series of objectives aligned with the vision are often not properly prioritized" (CR 102). (RG 35)

Thus the inventory process up to this point indicates the need for a board and its accompanying committee system to be the single point of decision and accountability in the new structure, with clear lines of delegation and responsibility. We are proposing that the World Board, as the single point of responsibility and authority acting on behalf of our fellowship, must necessarily be held accountable for *all* of the activities occurring in world services. To divide that accountability among other world service entities, including the standing committees themselves, would be to compromise the principle of a single point of decision and accountability embodied in our Fifth Concept, and worse, to re-create a splintered and conflicting world service system that the inventory process has revealed to be at odds with itself and therefore largely unworkable.

However, such a change in our system necessarily implies at least two ideas that should be carefully considered. In order for this change to be feasible, the following two premises of the new board's operations are at the heart of this proposal: (1) the board is greater than the sum of its parts; and, (2) the World Board directs and administers the progress of WSO staff, who are responsible for fulfilling work as outlined by the World Board.

The board is greater than the sum of its parts

This premise assumes that, just as the World Service Conference delegates the necessary authority to the World Board in order to carry out the will of the conference, so the board itself delegates specific responsibilities to its own standing committees to better expedite the board's work throughout the conference cycle. In this sense, the committees can under no circumstances seek to act autonomously beyond the general scope of responsibilities and activities assigned them by the World Board. The committees serve to undertake and complete specific projects that the board needs to delegate so that the board may fulfill its duties successfully. This is the sole reason for separate standing committees within the board.

Given these clear lines of accountability and authority, the board, when it meets in full session, can and does direct the activities of each of its standing committees. The board is greater than the sum of its parts, for only the full board may make decisions that might initiate, change, or eliminate specific committee duties and activities. It is only by this means that the board can be held accountable for the activities of the committees, and therefore the board's oversight of committee activities on behalf of the WSC is without exception. Similarly, the board is in turn held solely accountable for all world service activities by the World Service Conference, from whom the board's authority and responsibility derive.

The corollary to this delineation of accountability and authority is that in truth the committees *are* the board. Given the overriding principle that the board is greater than the sum of its parts,

it should therefore be structurally impossible for the committees to ever be in competition with one another. The committees exist only in *service* to the full board, allowing them to accomplish those tasks which the board finds more expediently completed by a smaller group of individuals working on the board's behalf.

Therefore, whether the board's duties and responsibilities are accomplished by the full board while it is in session, or they are accomplished by separate committees for full board review and approval, all of the activities associated with the above list of duties remain the purview of the World Board, who are in turn legally and spiritually bound to act in accordance with the will of the World Service Conference.

The World Board directs and administers WSO staff. . . .

This second premise is that WSO staff is responsible for doing the actual work that furthers the board's duties and activities. While board members, acting either as full board participants or committee members, must direct and oversee the work that is to be accomplished, the work itself will be undertaken by special workers at the direction of the board and its standing committees.

The board, as the above list of duties demonstrates, is responsible for literally all of the activities associated with providing world level services. It would be impossible for them to undertake the actual writing, editing, and communicating about this volume of work while working as volunteers from around the world, serving a growing worldwide fellowship. Therefore, in order for the new board to be accountable for these activities, its members must direct and oversee the work carried out by staff at the board's initiation and under the board's supervision rather than attempt to carry out the work themselves. By assuming the responsibility for world level activity, the board is therefore the body which provides direction to the staff so that the work which has been prioritized and approved by the World Service Conference can be accomplished.

In reality, this scenario is already in practice and standard operating procedure for world service projects, as well as in basic service provision at the world level. In many, perhaps most cases, the WSO staff carry out the day-to-day functions on behalf of the existing boards and committees by administering conference calls, undertaking research, developing minutes and reports, organizing travel arrangements, and providing a host of other services that help keep world services functioning. The Transition Group desires to state explicitly what is already an every day occurrence in many areas of world service responsibilities and activities so that there can be no confusion as to the direct lines of accountability and responsibility within the new world service system. The TG therefore acknowledges what is already working well within our present system, and wants to incorporate those processes into the new system.

Implementation

We will make a motion in the 1998 *Conference Agenda Report* seeking to form the World Board during the 1998 WSC, with the board assuming responsibilities on 1 June 1998. Part of the new board's responsibilities during the 1998-1999 conference year will be to further refine its operating procedures and its various committees' responsibilities. The new board would then be required to submit those procedures and responsibilities for conference review in 1999. We believe that the seating of the new board should take place in 1998 for at least two reasons: (1) The inventory/resolution process is now into its fifth year: it's time for world services to move on to their primary responsibility of helping better carry the message; and (2) Rather than

create another group to flesh out the new board's duties and operational procedures, the new board can achieve these objectives with the added benefit of not having to spend its first year re-interpreting the previous group's efforts.

Time to move on.

By inventorying ourselves and moving toward solutions, world services has made an implicit promise to our membership: we have said "We're trying to change to serve you better." It's now time for us to make good on that promise. The fellowship has been very supportive and understanding regarding the inventory/resolution process in world services. In point of fact, our membership has seen considerable expense and resources devoted to the improvement of the world service system. We have inventoried ourselves, identified some of our major problems, and developed solutions to address them: it's time now to move on, and to return to focusing upon our primary purpose, helping the groups to better carry the message throughout our fellowship.

Let the board design its own processes

No matter how thorough the Transition Group's work, there is simply no way for any group to have all the answers up front as to what the new board will be faced with in developing their processes and procedures. Rather than creating yet another "Implementation Group" to further develop the new board's responsibilities, let's allow the new board to discover the best way to proceed as they begin to get up to speed with their duties and responsibilities. The added benefit here is that, unlike the Resolution Group and the Transition Group, the new board, in developing its own processes, won't have to spend the first year of its existence trying to re-interpret the previous group's work and its relevancy and /or meaning to the work before them.

Elections

With regard to the initial election of World Board members, we will recommend that the World Board be initially formed by an election at the conference that is open to all nominations. We believe that with a board this large the conference will keep enough experienced members for continuity of service. To establish one-third of board seats rotating every two years, the first board will have one-third serving a three year term, one-third serving a five year term and one-third serving a seven year term initially.² The standard length of term for all subsequently elected board members will be six years. The length of term for the initial board members should be chosen by lot. Board members may stand for a second term. We believe that it should be left to the conference to decide by their vote if an individual should serve a second term. This is an example of the checks and balances available to the conference.

² The reason for these numbers is that, if the two-year conference cycle were adopted, there would be no conference in 2000. Thus the initially elected board members elected in 1998 would, depending upon their initial term of election, roll off in 2001, 2003 and 2005, while subsequently elected board members (elected in 2001 and each serving a six year term) would begin to roll off in 2007. In this way, the board would maintain its continuity of rotation while preserving experienced members on the board during its initial years of operation. In the initial election, candidates must receive a vote of 60% or greater to be elected, while all subsequent elections will require a 2/3 conference majority to be seated on the board.

Resolution C2—Standing Committees

Resolution C-2:

To approve in principle a significantly downsized standing committee structure responsible to the World Board.

Background

In developing the following proposals, we reviewed a comprehensive list of all duties and responsibilities of the current world services system. We agreed that, to simply reproduce that list in its totality would be to risk re-inventing the same system that world services has spent so much time, effort, and resources to move toward improving upon. However, we have also striven, in creating the following committee structure, to ensure that all of our fellowship's service *functions* remain vital components of the new standing committee system. We therefore are making general recommendations (rather than very specific recommendations) as to the duties and responsibilities of the new system in order to allow the new board and its committees some latitude in defining their processes. In other words, we have identified general areas of responsibility for each new standing committee, but as to how they accomplish their work, we need to allow the board the latitude to develop their own protocols based upon what actually works within the new and as-yet unfamiliar system. To do otherwise would be to attempt to write guidelines for a committee based purely on theory, and not on experience—probably not the best way to proceed. At the same time, we hope to convey that those vital functions such as H&I, PI, literature development, and translations will remain world level resources within the standing committee structure, maintaining a point of information and guidance, continuity, and consistency that all local committees will continue to be able to contact and rely upon.

Standing Committee Proposal

The Transition Group proposes that there be five committees of the board: an executive committee; an events committee; an external committee; an internal committee; and a publications committee. There shall also be a group within the board to be known as the "guardians." All members serving in a leadership capacity for each committee shall be board members in order to provide for clear lines of communication and for adequate committee representation at board meetings.

Accountability:

Committees are continuous standing committees of the World Board and are thus answerable and responsible to the World Board. In keeping with Concept Five, the World Board, in turn, is directly accountable to the World Service Conference, thus ensuring definite and direct lines of accountability across all world service operations.

Role of the standing committees:

The committees provide a resource to the World Board and to the fellowship in specific areas of operations.

Committee Makeup:

A minimum of four World Board members will be assigned by the full board to each committee. The number and experience of non-board committee members chosen from the world pool

depends upon the projects assigned and prioritized by the WSC. Thus, each committee's size in a given year can vary, though each will always continue to exist.

Responsibilities:

The following will be the committees' and guardians' responsibilities:

I. The Executive Committee:

The Executive Committee will consist of the following members:

- 1. The Chairperson of the World Board*
- 2. The Vice-chairperson of the World Board*
- 3. The Treasurer of the World Board*
- 4. The Secretary of the World Board*
- 5. The Executive Director(s) of the WSO*

Participation: *All members shall have the right to full participation, except in the matter of the annual evaluation of the executive director's performance. All officers of the board will be elected by the board. Election to any position will require a simple majority vote. Officers can be removed from office by the board with a two-thirds majority vote.*

General Duties: *The Executive Committee will uphold the duties of the corporation and its officers in accordance with all applicable laws; direct the activities and the annual performance review of the Executive Director(s) of the WSO;³ retain responsibility for interacting with the executive director(s) between board meetings; remain responsible for the general administrative duties of world services; and make necessary decisions affecting NA world services when the World Board is not in session, mindful of the priorities previously established by the board.*

II. The Events Committee:

The Events Committee will consist of four (4) board members, with any additional committee members being selected as necessary from the World Pool.

General Duties: *The Events Committee will be responsible for the logistical planning for WSC meetings (agenda items are actually set by the full board) the World Convention, and other world service meetings, while serving as a resource for regional/area convention committees.*

III. The External Committee:

The External Committee will consist of four (4) board members, with additional committee members being selected as necessary from the World Pool.

General Duties: *The External Committee will be responsible for activities associated with how our fellowship and service structure interface with society, while serving as a resource on H&I matters outside of the fellowship. The committee will also guide the*

³ The corporation's by-laws will of course reflect that, in such instances where the executive director's participation in the executive committee constitutes a conflict of interest (as for example, in conducting the process of his or her own performance evaluation), then his or her participation will be disallowed.

way we inform the public about NA, covering all public relations with the medical profession, the criminal justice system, and the media.

IV. The Internal Committee:

The Internal Committee will consist of four (4) board members, with additional committee members being selected as necessary from the World Pool.

General Duties: The Internal Committee will be responsible for activities associated with our fellowship and service structure, conference policy and procedures, proposed changes to our service structure, and activities associated with institutional meetings throughout the fellowship.

V. The Publications Committee:

The Publications Committee will consist of four (4) board members, with additional committee members being selected as necessary from the World Pool.

General Duties: The Publications Committee will be responsible for overseeing the development of our fellowship's new literature, while coordinating and prioritizing the translations of existing literature, mindful of the need for conceptual fidelity of translations and literature. The committee will also be responsible for the revisions of existing literature, while serving as a resource for area and regional literature committees and local translations committees.

VI. The Guardians:

The Guardians will consist of four (4) members appointed by the full board from the board's conference-elected membership.

General Duties: These members will serve as a resource to the fellowship, the World Board, and to the World Service Conference. Acting as a kind of "bellwether"⁴ for our fellowship and for the World Board, the guardians shall address principle-related issues confronting our membership. A group whose responsibilities involve the very core principles of our program, the guardians are charged with the responsibility of moving proactively on such issues by developing position papers and so forth, though they also may provide guidance to our membership on issues as identified by the fellowship as problematic, controversial and/or topical. Remaining the "guardians" of NA's Traditions and Concepts, this group will also guide the World Board in philosophical discussions that affect the continuation and growth of NA.

C2 Proposal: Discussion

The world services inventory identified three major areas of concern surrounding our present standing committee system: (1) lack of long-range planning and project oversight; (2) "turf wars" and duplication of services; and (3) funding and budgetary concerns (dealt with under the Resolution E section of this report). With regard to lack of long-range planning and project oversight, the Resolution Group wrote that

⁴ Bellwether: Refers to the practice of "belling" a member of a flock: indicates "one that takes the lead or initiative."

Virtually every standing board and committee identified as serious problems a lack of long-range planning—either within their board or committee, with world services as a whole, or both. For example, the Board of [Trustees] identified a lack of long-range planning, and the one-year conference cycle, as serious problems in the accomplishment of world service goals (CG 88). They also identified the “acceptance of unplanned projects” within world services as a serious problem which produces inferior results in service projects as a serious problem (CG 89). Similarly, WSC H&I said “inconsistent planning” was a problem (CG 124). WSC PI (CG 128), WSC Literature Committee (CG 136), and the Board of Directors (CG 144) all recognized a lack of planning and long-term goals as serious problems in world services. The BOD also identified conflicting goals and policies as a serious problem, which points to the necessity for more organized and centralized project oversight (CG 144). The 1994 World Service Conference, in its self-assessment, also recognized a lack of project planning and oversight as a significant problem: “There is no long-term focus either for WSC or for NA as a whole. We live from year to year. Leadership does not encourage long-range planning. [. . .] WSC is task-oriented vs. long-range. WSC doesn’t look at the ‘big picture’ — it is reactionary, crisis- and dollar-driven, all short-term” (CG 67).

We believe that this new standing committee structure of the board addresses the identified problems as stated above. With regard to long-range planning and project oversight, the new system is designed to eliminate unplanned projects. We have outlined a process (explained in the Introduction) according to which all projects that come before the World Service Conference must have received prior consideration by the board, must be prioritized by the WSC, and must be accompanied by a timeline and budget. Moreover, because the standing committees are committees of the board, the board will maintain administrative control over the committees’ operations, thus ensuring clear lines of responsibility and accountability regarding project oversight.

Regarding “turf wars” and duplication of services, the RG stated:

Long recognized as a serious problem in world services, “turf wars” received significant mention in board and committee self-assessments. The Board of Trustees stated that “World service boards and committees do not communicate openly or frankly when communicating their positions on issues or projects to other boards and committees. Most of the time, boards and committees design their communications so as to protect their territory or limit the disclosure of useful information” (CG 101). Similarly, the Interim Committee identified “turfism” as a significant problem, stating that “pet projects continue to be championed by individuals” (CG 107). The World Service Conference itself recognizes “turf wars” as a significant problem, stating that “Leaders compete for tasks and projects to perpetuate their jobs” (CG 65).

Duplication of services, a corollary to “turfism,” was also identified as a serious problem. The World Service Conference stated that duplication of services, undefined boundaries, and a general lack of direction were all serious problems, resulting in: “Overlap of services (H&I, PI, Outreach). Blurred lines between WSB and committees when assigning tasks. Top-heavy structure (too many boards). Inconsistent criteria for establishing priorities. Committees become specialized, create turf wars” (CG 68). Similarly, WSC Policy stated that “Policy work is duplicated by other boards and committees. Policy work is overlapped (for instance, WSB Internal Affairs worked on

nominations while Policy worked on elections). There is no single point of accountability between conferences" (CG 120). The Board of Directors also stated that duplication of services in world services is a problem, springing from "conflicting policies and jurisdictions" (CG 145).

We believe that the new system also addresses the problems of turfism and duplication of services. Because the standing committees are committees of the board, they should never be in conflict or competition with each other. The conference decides project priorities, and the board outlines basic service priorities. Given the clear lines of delegation in the new system, committees should have clear assignments, definite budgets and priorities, and timetables within which to accomplish their work. Turfism, duplication of services, and vying for limited world service resources should be virtually eliminated.

On the Size and Composition of the New Standing Committees

We held considerable discussion during our June meeting regarding the constituency and duties of the standing committee structure. We heard the conference's concerns quite clearly that two board members do not constitute a committee, and so we decided to expand each committee to four board members along with additional committee members selected from the World Pool when necessary. We arrived at this configuration for at least four reasons.

First, the group believes that this configuration will allow for the continuity and experience-base necessary to the ongoing vitality and viability of the standing committees. At the 1997 WSC, conference participants stated very clearly their concern that standing committees need to develop and maintain an experience base to ensure continuity and quality of service provision at the world level. Creating a standing committee system in which each committee always consists of at least four persons, and whose terms will be staggered according to the board's proposed election procedures, will do just that. This dynamic configuration of committee membership also allows for the principle of rotation as described in our Fourth Concept.

Second, the board's ability to assign World Pool-screened members to designated committees in order to accomplish specific tasks further ensures that the system will remain open to new blood by allowing for the development of a pool of individuals who will acquire world-level experience themselves. In this way, members need not be present at the World Service Conference, nor even involved in regional service, in order to be considered for committee appointment. Under this new system, many more members than merely those presently involved in regional or world services will be eligible (and, most importantly, realistically considered on a level playing field) for committee assignment. We believe, in fact, that this system is far more accessible, in this respect, than our present system could ever be.

Third, the proposed system will maintain the efficiency of a "significantly downsized standing committee structure" as called for in the inventory materials and mandated by Resolution C2. By expanding the standing committees only when a specific project assigned to the board by the WSC calls for such expansion, the proposed system ensures that NA funds are being spent frugally in a well-planned and conference-approved manner.

Fourth, this system, as proposed, guarantees the board's role as the single point of authority and responsibility within the world service system as described in our Fifth Concept, while at the same time eliminates the turfism and competition for resources present in our current

system. Because standing committees are responsible to the World Board (as mandated in Resolution B), committees can never act autonomously, and thus can never be in competition with one another. In the new system, committees exist to serve the board only by furthering all initiatives that have been duly prioritized and approved by the World Service Conference, thus ensuring the direct accountability of all world service activities to the WSC through a single point—the World Board. This system therefore also helps ensure that duties and responsibilities will not be duplicated among the committees, thus eliminating the turf wars and competition for limited resources that characterize our present patchwork of board and committee duties and responsibilities.

As outlined in the original *NA Tree* service manual, we are also recommending that the standing committees meet with conference delegates at each World Service Conference. This opportunity to interact with our membership's representatives will allow the committee members to hear our members' concerns, suggestions, and input as given voice by their elected delegates.

Resolution E—The Unified Budget

Resolution E:

To approve in principle the adoption of a unified budget encompassing all world service funds.

Foundation of the Unified Budget

Under our current budgeting practices, world services develops three separate budgets each year: one for the World Service Conference and its related activities, one for the World Service Office, and one for the World Convention Corporation. The unified budget proposal, to perhaps oversimplify somewhat, is actually a proposal to coordinate all of this separated financial information into a single, comprehensive financial plan encompassing all of world service.

World Services has contracted an accountancy consultant to assist the Transition Group in developing a unified budget proposal for consideration at the 1998 World Service Conference. In order for us to maximize the use of the consultant, we realized that we would need to be able to develop the underlying operating principles upon which the proposal should be developed. We must emphasize that the consultant will be developing the structural details of the actual budget, based on the premise of the adopted resolutions (Resolution B&E) and on what we wish to specifically improve from our existing system.

The group's discussion of the unified budget proposal has thus far allowed us to come to some general consensus about the fundamental concepts upon which the unified budget proposal will be based. Those fundamental concepts consist of the following:

- 1. Any unified budget proposal should be designed so as to eliminate the possibility for any new world service projects that have not been thoroughly thought-out, planned with an accompanying budget, and finally prioritized and approved by the World Service Conference.*
- 2. In order to reflect the realities of our service delivery system, all items submitted for budget consideration should be accompanied by an expense estimate that includes a staff-time component.*
- 3. The unified budget proposal should make provisions for the maintenance of a world services operational reserve fund.*
- 4. The unified budget proposal should be predicated upon the creation of a three-tiered process in which funds shall be designated as "operational funds," "capital funds," and "reserve funds."⁵*

⁵ These terms are defined as follows:

- Fixed Operational Funds—refers to the funds allocated toward world service activities which are recurring in nature and have little to no functional change from budget year to budget year.
- Variable Operational Funds—refers to the funds allocated toward world service projects and/or activities which vary from budget year to budget year.
- Capital Funds—refers to the funds allocated toward the planned use of cash to offset the effect of depreciation, improve asset value, provide financial resources necessary to effectively address the intellectual property management called for in the FIPT, or to acquire any fixed asset that has a depreciable value. (cont. page 17)

Primary Improvements Upon the Existing Budgeting System

In their report, the Resolution Group made reference to the reasons indicated in the world services inventory as to why a unified budget was advisable for world services. In that report, the RG wrote:

Regarding budget management, the Board of Trustees stated that, "Budget management [under the current system is] not conducive to fulfillment of goals, long-range planning" (CG 95). WSC Policy Committee recognized "inadequate funding and inadequate budgeting" as a problem, stating that, "Inadequate funding results in undue personal expenditures and limits participation in world services. There is no standing criteria for funding" (CG 212). The WSC Literature Committee also recognized a, "lack of funding and WSC criteria for funding allocation" as a serious problem (CG 137). And the Board of Directors stated that, "World services are not cost-effective, specifically in areas of world services where services are duplicated" (CG 147).

The primary problems identified in the inventory were, therefore: (1) poor budget management resulting in poor long-range planning and resource utilization, and (2) a lack of cost-effectiveness, due to competition for limited resources and duplication of services among world service entities.

The proposed unified budget system should greatly reduce, if not eliminate, these problems for four reasons: (1) The totality of world service budget responsibilities will finally be viewed by *one group* responsible for the dispensation of that entire budget—the World Board, resulting in the potential elimination of the need for trusted servant oversight committees such as the Interim Committee to deal with competing demands for human and financial resources from the various arms of service; (2) the comprehensive overview of all world service resources will force the World Board into better strategic planning overall—both long-term and short-term, for the new budgeting process will be much less forgiving than our present process; (3) because of the more definite planning and budgetary processes and protocols in the new system, world service resources should be increasingly better-managed and more efficiently utilized; and (4) because the unified budget system will allow world services to move to activity-based accounting practices, budgetary reporting mechanisms will be much friendlier to our membership, and also much more comprehensive in terms of being able to report specific activity-related expenditures by including administrative, material, and staff-related expenses for each activity in the world service system.

One Group Responsible

For the first time in our collective history, all of the monies associated with the world service system will be the purview of a single group within the system—the World Board, as directed by the WSC. The advantages to this are many, but the most obvious one is that the World Board will be forced into more efficient, comprehensive planning of world service resource allocations, and they will be able to do so without the need for a committee such as Interim to deal with the competing demands for resources among world service entities. Conference participants will benefit here too—they'll finally have one place to look at the financial plan for all of world services without having to scramble through three different budgets to get answers to their questions.

-
- Reserve Funds—identifies those allocations which are set aside to meet current and/or future financial

Better Financial Management/Utilization of Resources

Providing the World Board with this "panoramic" view of all world service resources will allow them to make more informed recommendations and decisions based upon all available resource information within the system. Because of this increased efficiency in our accounting and reporting mechanisms, the board can avoid needless duplication of services and allocation of resources, thus improving the overall management and efficiency of resource allocations across world service operations. Additionally, this better vantage point regarding the allocation of world service resources will also allow for greater accuracy in strategic planning, both short- and long-term, because the new project process will increase the entire system's ability to forecast upcoming projects and their prioritization.

New System Less Forgiving

Given the better accounting mechanisms and the improved ability for strategic planning within the new system, so-called "emergency" funding allocations should be dramatically reduced. Because world services' resource allocations should be far more predictable and exact, our membership can expect more accurate cost-projections and reporting. The overall system, therefore, will be far less forgiving than our present system in terms of budget "forecasts," project costs, and financial reporting.

Friendlier, More Comprehensive Financial Reporting

Finally, a unified budget will enhance world services opportunity to eventually move into an activity-based accounting system, because the financial reporting mechanisms will allow much more accurate assessments of activity-related resource allocations. The unified budget will eventually help us to have a much more accurate representation of world service resource allocations based upon the enhanced resource analyses and reporting mechanisms, particularly when it comes to project-related costing.

Resolution F—The World Pool: Resolution G—the Human Resources Panel

Resolution F:

To approve in principle the adoption of a World Pool of experienced trusted servants as a resource to world service projects and initiatives.

Resolution G:

To approve in principle the adoption of a Human Resources Panel as a means by which the WSC may choose trusted servants based on the willingness to serve, experience, and knowledge.

Proposal

Resolutions F and G go hand-in hand. These proposals are being made given that understanding. The following represents the Transition Group's proposal for the purpose and function of the World Pool and the purpose, duties, and membership of the Human Resources Panel, forwarded for discussion at the world services meeting.

Purpose of the World Pool:

The purpose of the World Pool is to constitute a pool of trusted servants willing and qualified to serve on the World Board and the board's committee projects. The pool will consist of a compilation of members' service resumes demonstrating a variety of recovery- and service-related experience as well as any skills necessary for the successful completion of world level projects.

Clean Time Requirement for the World Pool:

Eligibility for World Pool inclusion requires all prospective pool candidates to have a minimum of five (5) years clean.⁶

Human Resources Panel

Purpose of the Human Resources Panel:

The purpose of the Human Resources Panel is to provide world services with a list of qualified candidates to serve the NA fellowship by administering the World Pool.

Duties of the HRP:

The Human Resources panel provides a list of qualified candidates to serve the fellowship by:

- 1. Developing a description of the desired skills and experience necessary to complete the present conference cycle's projects and services based upon the World Board's formal request.*
- 2. Utilizing all available resources for the purpose of soliciting candidates' service resumes worldwide.*

⁶ The Transition Group agreed further that there should be a list of general requirements for all prospective pool candidates, but that such a list of eligibility requirements should be developed by the Human Resources Panel itself.

3. *Informing potential candidates as to the qualifications necessary to serve on the World Board or any of its committees, the terms of office, as well as of the general duties of the World Board, its committees, and the World Service Office.*
4. *Screening applicants' resumes for the purpose of identifying qualifications and skills.*
5. *Providing the World Service Conference with a list of individuals (addicts and non-addicts)⁷ qualified for election to the World Board.⁸*
6. *Providing the World Board with a list of individuals (addicts and non-addicts) qualified for appointment to serve on committee projects.*
7. *Maintaining a pool of individuals' resumes for committee appointment in the event of a vacancy between conferences.*

Accountability:

The Human Resources Panel is accountable to the World Service Conference.

Composition:

The Human Resources Panel will consist of six(6) individuals – four (4) conference-elected⁹ and two (2) World Board members appointed by the board.

Term:

For the purpose of continuity, the term of office for the Human Resources Panel member will be two conference cycles. Once a member of the panel has rotated off, he/she is ineligible for reelection for two conference cycles.

Membership Requirements:

All prospective Human Resource Panel members should demonstrate the following characteristics:

- *Trustworthiness – possessing integrity and the ability to provide leadership (as discussed in our Fourth Concept).*

⁷ The Transition Group held significant discussion about the use of non-addict members on the board and committee system. The group agreed that no essential distinction should be made, in principle, between both addicts' and non-addicts' ability to serve on the board, its committees, or any world service projects. However, the group also clearly recognized that, up to this point, the world service system has not been especially effective in its use of non-addict servants. The TG believed that world services needs to hold serious discussions regarding its potential benefit from the involvement of non-addict volunteers. World services also needs, perhaps, to recognize that, in the past, it has demonstrated some prejudice against non-addict volunteers. Until such time as world services is willing and able to hold such discussions, it will probably have difficulty in the area of electing or appointing non-addict volunteers to the world board and its committees.

⁸ We discussed at length whether the HRP would simply forward all of the qualified candidates for the conference's consideration, or whether they would be more selective, proposing only the *most qualified* to the conference. We have decided to propose that the HRP forward a list of the most qualified candidates for each board position, at a ratio *not to exceed two-to-one* – up to two nominees presented for every open position on the board.

⁹ There are no limits placed on who is eligible for these elections to the HRP, provided each candidate demonstrates the necessary qualifications and holds no other world-level service commitment.

- *Discretion – possessing the ability to fulfill their responsibilities with the conference’s confidence that service resumes’ confidentiality will be protected.*
- *Experienced – members should possess previous world service experience, and should demonstrate some personnel/human resources experience.*
- *Ability to read English.*

Clean Time:

Human Resource Panel members must have a minimum of eight (8) years clean.

Meetings:

The Human Resources Panel would begin their work prior to any conference cycle by notifying the fellowship of the need for World Board members and/or committee members. Prior to the World Service Conference, the panel could have a face-to-face meeting or conference call (when necessary) to review candidates’ resumes for World Board and committee needs, determining the need for interviews of prospective candidates. The Human Resource Panel, or some of its members, are to be available during the conference election process to answer questions and, when necessary, to provide their rationale for forwarding specific candidates.

Participation by WSO Staff:

WSO staff will be responsible for ensuring that communication is forwarded through all available channels regarding the needs of the World Board. The communication will identify the types of skills and experience needed for participation on the board and its committees. The staff will also have administrative and clerical responsibilities for the HRP as well as facilitate the meetings of the HRP.

Function of the World Pool: Discussion

In the Resolution Group’s report, significant reference was made to the problems identified surrounding world services’ processes and procedures in selecting trusted servants. In that report, the RG wrote that

... the inventory material clearly suggests that less than careful attention is often given in world services when electing or appointing trusted servants to positions in world services. For example, the WSC has stated that “Political correctness [is sometimes] being used to determine nominations to committees, boards.” The statement continues: “WSC elections are competitive. ‘The squeaky wheel gets oiled,’ or in this case, elected. The election process the WSC uses makes informed choices difficult. The conference elects according to the ‘flavor of the day’” (CG 66). Similarly, the WSO Board recognized that “Insufficient care [is] taken in selection of trusted servants” (CG 150).

The Resolution Group therefore agrees with the Board of Trustees’ recommendation to formulate a “nominations panel that the WSC has faith in” (CG 97). This nominations panel (or, as we’re calling it, the Human Resources Panel), will have the responsibility to identify members’ skills and qualifications for election or appointment to service positions within world services, thereby instituting principles into the process of electing or appointing members to positions.

Given these problems revealed by the inventory process, we believe that world services’ focus in the development and implementation of a Human Resources component to the new world service system should be predicated upon three essential goals: (1) eliminating the “squeaky wheel”-oriented, personality-driven elections process at the conference, replacing it with a

process that is based on principles and ability rather than personality; (2) opening up access to our members, providing everyone with the equal opportunity to serve the fellowship by creating an open, equitable, and principled election/selection process; and (3) ensuring that world services can utilize the now largely untapped resources that exist in our growing fellowship.

Principles Before Personalities

The creation of a Human Resource Panel and World Pool will institute an election/selection process that will help to allow the World Service Conference to base trusted servant choices upon the principles of ability and experience, rather than simply familiarity and personality.

Open Access

Perhaps the most significant change that the HRP and World Pool make possible is that individuals who otherwise would not wish to participate in the regional or world level environments, but who nevertheless have excellent skills that they would be willing to bring to world service projects (or board operations), will, in the new system, enter into the election/selection process on a level playing field. Additionally, this new procedure also allows for members to be forwarded from around the world without having to be present at the conference to receive due consideration. While current conference procedure certainly allows for such nominations, the new process makes this kind of worldwide participation a much more viable, principle-based possibility.

Untapped Fellowship Resources

Currently, there is no effective way for our talented members to offer their talents to the fellowship that is viable and productive. A long-held recognition about our present system is that world services is not tapping even a fraction of the available resources that exists among our maturing fellowship. This process creates a far more open opportunity for world services to benefit from our collective resources by providing an established and recognized process by which to do so.

Communication problem?

One of the serious challenges to this new system relates to the difficulties associated with communication within our fellowship. The Transition Group recognizes that it seems to take about two years for our membership at the grassroots level to become truly aware of world service activities. We hope the creation of the new *NA Way* will help, however we believe communication difficulties will serve to somewhat limit at least the initial effectiveness of the new system.

Another HRP-related topic for discussion

In our discussions, we also identified an additional topic for discussion relevant to the Human Resources Panel, but were unable to arrive at consensus about this issue. The issue is whether or not nominations could be made from the floor of the WSC. On the one hand, we recognized that the process should be fair, open, and democratic, thus favoring the open nominations policy such as the conference now enjoys. However, we also recognized that, to leave the process this open, world services is in danger of rendering the HRP effectively useless. Because anyone could still be nominated and considered in an entirely open system, why bother then having a Human Resources Panel? There may be other pros and cons to this issue. We are therefore requesting input to help us formulate our final report after the world services meeting.