

## **Resolution A Discussion Questions: Panels 2 & 3**

**Overall purpose:** If the WSC could reach consensus about a general direction with these issues, work could be incorporated into the two year conference cycle project and discussed further at the September 1999 World Service Meeting.

Panels One and Two will discuss the following two related questions (and the underlying subject areas):

**Question One: How can the WSC best equalize the costs for all regional delegates to attend the WSC? Consider the options below and give input.**

Options include:

- ◆ Average the cost for all participants so that each pays that amount (estimated cost: \$1,526 per participant);
- ◆ Average the costs for all participants and at the same time also maintain a development forum system for those who still cannot afford the averaged cost (estimated cost: \$40,000);
- ◆ Fully fund the attendance of one RD for each Region as an item included in the Unified Budget; partially fund each RD at a certain flat rate (e.g., \$88,000 cost to the WSC with the Region responsible for making up the difference of \$600 per participant);
- ◆ Maintain a status quo development forum system with more concrete and uniformly applicable criteria to be created by the World Board (estimated cost: \$40,000);
- ◆ Other ideas.

Discussion of this question assumes the WSC believes that cost equalisation is an issue which we need to resolve and that the two year conference cycle project will be where the details will be worked out.

**Question Two: If the WSC creates some form of cost equalisation, will the WSC be faced with a proliferation of new Regions? Should the World Board form an Admissions/Seating Committee that makes recommendations to the WSC based upon agreed criteria? Would it be a helpful compromise to experiment with the Transition Group's "Model One" and establish a five year moratorium on seating new U.S. regions at the WSC?**

Would this solve the underlying historical problem of the relevance of the WSC to N.A. communities outside of North America (because of U.S. issues and U.S. participants predominating at the WSC)? Would the WSC be willing to limit every region to two seats on the WSC floor in the future? <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> (Additional RDAs/mentors could be seated in the gallery, but there are practical space limitations for space on the floor of the WSC itself that the body is running into.)

## **Resolution A Discussion Questions: Panels 1 & 4**

**Overall purpose:** If the WSC could reach consensus about a general direction with these issues, work could be incorporated into the two year conference cycle project and discussed further at the September 1999 World Service Meeting.

Panels Three and Four will discuss the following two questions about zones.

Question Three: **What is the purpose and function of the zonal forums? How can the WSC further assist the zonal forums with those functions?**

Discussion of this question is based on the premise that zones are already helpful and productive and can continue to exist and serve a useful function alongside the present WSC without necessarily changing the system of representation of the WSC itself. We do not need to implement Resolution A for Zonal Forums to exist and be useful. Before considering advantages and disadvantages of changing the system of representation, let's reexamine the purpose and function of zones. What can we accomplish with zones and with zonal representation in furthering our primary purpose that we cannot accomplish with our present system (if anything)? The WSC has already created time and space for the zonal forums to meet, and has encouraged zonal forum reports to the Fellowship at the WSC and throughout the year in the Conference Report. Although there are differences between the functions of the North American and non-North American zones, at a minimum, all are successfully helping RDs to function as better WSC participants and all zones are clearinghouses for locally relevant sharing of basic service information.

Question Four: **What system of representation will best help us to accomplish the functions we envision for the new WSC?**

The following related questions are intended to stimulate discussion and approach the issue from different angles. Do we need to make any change in the system of representation at the WSC in order to (1) make participation more equitable, (2) solve the problem of dysfunctional business sessions or (3) achieve a greater consensus in our decision-making processes? What additional structural changes, if any, need to be made to develop our vision of what we hope our future world services and World Service Conference will become? What problem(s) could be solved by changing from the current system of regional representation to some new system based on larger geographic divisions, and what are the pros and cons of attempting such a reorganization?

Are other changes in structure or in policy still needed to help make representation or participation at the WSC "more equitable" ? Do we:

- ◆ Encourage more of a discussion based format for the WSC?
- ◆ Strive for more consensus-based decision-making?
- ◆ Not change?