





## Sunday, 25 April 2004

### FIRST THINGS FIRST: CONFERENCE OPENING AND INTRODUCTIONS

*Session led by Jane N (WB Chair)*

As at WSC 2002, the room was set with one half formal risers and the other half informal rounds. The session opened at 9:10am on the informal side of the room with a “conference countdown” where participants let each other know how many conferences they have attended. Jane N (WB chair) explained that this opening was designed to allow those participants with experience and those who are new to see and connect with each other as a resource throughout the week. More than half of the room stood when asked if this was their first conference.

After the conference countdown, the first roll call was conducted by participants forming a closing circle as board members introduced themselves and delegates introduced themselves and their alternates table-by-table. After all participants were introduced, the circle was connected and participants from each language group present were invited, in turn, to say the Serenity Prayer in the thirteen different languages spoken by conference participants.

Roll call #1 (see Appendix A)  
 Conducted by Jane N (WB Chair)  
 112 participants are present  
 98 regions are present

### COMING TOGETHER: THE 27TH WORLD SERVICE CONFERENCE

*Session led by Bella B (WB) and Saul A (WB)*

Bella opened the session by expressing her hopes for the conference to continue evolving toward a discussion-based conference. She reminded everyone to turn in the WSC Evaluation Forms by the end of the week, and she reviewed some of the small group procedures that would be occurring throughout the week. Bella encouraged participants to share openly, as one idea can lead to another idea, which may be just what we are looking for. On tables was a form for conference participants to write a “Letter to the Home Group,” and Bella explained that everyone should write a letter home about the experiences, emotions, gifts, etc., that they anticipate at this conference. Bella explained that participants may get a chance to read their letters randomly when called upon throughout the week. We utilized the “idea tree” again this conference—and on tables were cards (leaves for the idea tree) for participants to use to submit ideas about how to make the new system work.

Because this session’s focus was to begin building a sense of community, small groups were asked to share with each other their greatest hopes and fears of the week. Some of the responses included

- applauding the efforts of the non-English speaking members;
- sharing deep, personal, intimate details about each other’s families;
- hopes that “us and them” can become an “us”;
- the fear of speaking at the microphone;
- members dying due to lack of translated literature;
- the fear of not being able to carry all the information back to regions;
- a reminder that we all have a soft, caring side; and
- the toughest-looking guy at the table missed his cat.

A report was then given from Tonia, the RD from Greece (the newest seated region). She shared about how Greece has eighty meetings, twenty-three groups, and committees such as H&I and PI, although they still have the greatest rates of deaths from drugs and few facilities to get clean. She shared that she was impressed by the way conference participants seem so confident with the different issues, and also that she was overwhelmed and grateful to be here. At 12:30pm Bella closed the session.

## NAVIGATING THE WSC: ORIENTATION

*Session led by Craig R (WB) / WSC Cofacilitators (CF) / Human Resource Panel (HRP)*

After a lunch break, Craig opened the orientation session at 2:00 pm. This session gave a general overview of the conference week. The cofacilitators were introduced, and participants were encouraged to be open-minded and open-hearted. Participants were told that risers (tiered seating) and rounds (seating at round tables) would be used again this year, and participants would be asked to vary their seating arrangements throughout the week. Craig also explained that this year there will be an off-site adventure to hopefully add some levity and variety to the week.

The cofacilitators explained that the purpose of the pre-business discussion sessions is to get familiar with the rules of order and to better understand the motions. Mark H (CF) and Tim S (CF) explained that during the pre-business session, motions have been grouped according to topic, and each will be discussed and then a straw poll will be taken. The hope is that ultimately this approach will be more time-efficient. The use of red and yellow cards was reviewed, and voting procedures were explained.

The HRP reviewed election procedures and criteria, deadlines, and HRP session times.

A question-and-answer session included clarification about

- procedural issues voting;
- nomination and elections processes;
- motion making;
- *Robert's Rules of Order*;
- alternate delegate functions; and
- translations issues.

## NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

*Session led by WB Executive Committee and the Human Resource Panel*

The Executive Committee (EC) and the Human Resource Panel jointly led a session about nominations and elections. The session opened at 7:00 pm. At the beginning of the session Susan C (WB) told conference participants that this session was scheduled in response to requests. Because of conference concern in 2002, when only one person was elected to the board, we were asked to look at this issue, Susan explained. She said that she personally has watched the conference wrestle with nominations and elections for more than twenty-three years. Were there a single change that could address the issues, we would have already found it, Susan said.

We have had many ideas for how to improve nominations and elections, Susan continued, but all we are planning to change for this conference is how we collect the ballots. Instead of a roll call to turn them in, you may turn in your ballots to the HRP, who will be seated in the front of the room.

Susan began with some background information. She explained that the ideals articulated in *A Guide to World Services in Narcotics Anonymous* have not been met:

Election/selection process that will allow the World Service Conference to:

1. Base trusted servant choices upon the principles of ability and experience.
2. Helps to allow members to be nominated from around the world without having to be present at the conference to receive due consideration.
3. And create a more open opportunity for world services to benefit from our collective resources by providing an established process by which to do so.

*GWSNA, p. 3*

### **HRP PRESENTATION**

Susan introduced Charlotte S (HRP), who opened by explaining that the HRP is committed to a thorough and unbiased nominations process.

Charlotte told the conference: "In a few minutes you will hear from the EC the issues that they believe 'we' as a conference face in regard to the nominations and elections process of the service structure that you put into place at the WSC 1998. In that same manner, we would like to begin this joint forum with what the HRP believes to be the issues that 'we' as a conference face in this process."

The HRP is responsible for maintaining the World Pool and nominating trusted servants to open positions at the WSC. The HRP guidelines in *GWSNA* state that "increasing the membership of the pool is a high priority." The HRP, Charlotte explained, feel that qualifications should be more important than the quantity of the trusted servants in the pool. We have also received a lot of input suggesting that the HRP, together with regions and areas, should function as "head-hunters" to look for the "shining stars" of the fellowship, Charlotte said.

As far as nominations go, despite the questions the EC may have, we stand behind our process, Charlotte explained. The HRP has no mechanism to make recommendations to the conference regarding elections procedures, Charlotte said; the process belongs to the delegates.

Charlotte reviewed some of the HRP's perceptions of the nominations/elections process. First, the HRP process doesn't seem to be used satisfactorily by the conference. (One could conclude that there was only one among the 300,000 addicts worldwide who was qualified to serve on the board in 2002.) Second, despite the fact that such voting behavior conflicts with the aims of the HRP process, people still seem to vote for who they know. Third, the HRP believes the nominations process is not flawed, but that a new election process could solve some of our problems.

Charlotte explained that the HRP is open to all input but will not implement every suggestion. For example, when the WB and EC wanted to provide the HRP with a list of candidates who would not go through the blind CPR process, the HRP did not accept that input. They do not feel they should treat WB input any differently from that of RDs. They feel that the HRP's accountability to the WSC has been compromised by the EC's insistence that they submit all communication to conference participants to the EC first, and by the EC first and the fact that they have been denied the resources needed to do their jobs at times.

The HRP had some concluding observations: They believe the HRP as a single, stand-alone committee is the best way to ensure the ideals outlined in *GWSNA* are met. They would like

clarification from the conference regarding the conflict between the leadership development and cultivation concept in the WB's strategic plan and the HRP process mandated by the conference. In conclusion, Charlotte said the HRP believes it has fulfilled its responsibilities and looks forward to more guidance from the conference.

### **EC PRESENTATION**

Susan C (WB) resumed the presentation and reviewed some of the questions from the *March Conference Report* on elections and nominations.

- What would allow us to base our choices on the ability and experience of the nominee?
- Do we need to personally know a nominee to vote for him or her?
- Can a resume or profile give us confidence in a nominee? Do you gain confidence in a nominee because of the current HRP process?
- What methods of nomination could be used in addition to self-nomination?
- Should being in the pool be a requirement to be considered for nomination, or should the pool simply function as a wider net to get people involved?

Susan explained that the EC has surveyed conference participants, analyzed election data, discussed the issues, and met with the HRP. They have tried to use the World Pool, but because of its limitations, they have reached out to members and asked them to serve on workgroups (the sponsorship and the business plan workgroups) and put their names in the pool at that time. Susan explained that the evaluations the board makes of workgroup members' ability and performance currently have no place in the nominations process.

Accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation, Susan summarized some of the board's thoughts about nominations and elections. The WB feels the HRP/World Pool has narrowed the field of potential nominees rather than expanded it because members must "self-nominate." The board wonders how to communicate ability and experience without seeing someone's work. Yet they know the possibility of input from the WB evokes a fear of the "old boy" network.

The voting of the conference has not changed, Susan explained. The average number of trustees elected by the conference before 1998 was 2.5 per conference. In 1999–2002 the conference elected 2.6 board members per conference. The "average of the conference (our collective behavior)" has been votes for far fewer candidates than there are open positions. Our tendency, Susan explains, has been to try to change elections procedures rather than improve the nominations process.

The board believes that leadership cultivation (as opposed to the "self-nomination" process in place) is a large part of the solution. In such a scenario, board members would keep their eyes open for members who they feel have the passion and ability to be good board members, and to actively cultivate them. Susan explained that, as addicts, we can tend to rebel against authority, but leadership is not a dirty word. As the Fourth Concept tells us, anyone in NA can be a leader through simple acts of service.

The board feels that leadership cultivation could provide people with experience in the system before they become board members. Just as we might not elect a member to a regional or area position if he or she did not have RSC or ASC experience, leadership cultivation could provide people with an opportunity to work with current board members and on world-level projects.

Were we to accept the principle of leadership cultivation, it seems fitting that the board would have a more active role in the nominations process. The board is the only body who has

worked directly with people in world services, and they have no voice or role in the nominations process, Susan explained.

The board feels that electing the most qualified candidates is more important than filling all of the vacant seats, Susan said. This is reflected in the board's desire to change the guidelines for the size of the board (to "up to twenty-four," and for this conference, to "up to eighteen"). The board believes they need between twelve and eighteen members, which would mean electing four to ten members at this conference (it seems that to elect four WB members, the conference participants would need to vote for six to seven candidates on average).

Susan told participants that we will be talking about leadership cultivation later in the week.

### **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

The HRP and EC presentations were followed by an extensive question and answer period. Among the topics covered were the following:

- the need for more communication among RDs;
- translations issues;
- potential modifications to nominations and elections processes, such as establishing a primary or changing the percentage required for election;
- issues related to blind CPRs;
- regional nominations versus nominations made by conference participants as individuals;
- regional references or endorsements of candidates;
- the relationship between the HRP and World Board;
- challenging nominations; and
- the need for more information than is contained on a resume.

Charlotte told conference participants that straw polls would be conducted on Tuesday and asked whether the body supports providing a room, a translator, and an HRP member to go over the forms for the Spanish-speaking participants. Much applause. Old business motions were passed out. The session closed at 10:15 pm with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer.

## **Monday, 26 April 2004**

### **WORLD BOARD CONFERENCE FORUM**

*The World Board Forums are not technically a conference session, but they have been increasingly used to discuss the business of the conference, so we are including a summary of them here.*

Jane N (WB chair) called the meeting to order at 9:00 am. First the board discussed amendments to motions that appeared in the *Conference Agenda Report* and formulated recommendations, and then there was a more general question-and-answer session.

### **MOTION #20**

**"To amend motion 4 by adding the language '(specifically for the English Edition)' to the end of the 3rd bullet paragraph**

**Add the language '(specifically for the English Edition)' to the end of the 4th bullet sentence.**

**Add the language 'if adopted, not including the revision of the personal stories section in languages editions other than English would allow the NA communities to freely adopt or not the most suitable personal stories section, including it's introduction, according to their needs.' to the last paragraph."**

Intent: To clarify the motion.

The board is recommending not to adopt Motion #20 because the personal stories policy already accounts for what the motion requests. Motion #4 as written does not need additional clarification.

#### **MOTION #21**

**“To amend motion 4 by replacing the language in the second to the last sentence to read, ‘The timeframe for this work will be three conference cycles, from 2004 to 2010, including an eighteen-month review and input period.’”**

Intent: The purpose is to allow multiple rounds of communication between the workgroup and literature review committees. This permits three rounds to take place and maximizes fellowship input in our Basic Text before it is placed in the *CAR* for final approval.

The board is recommending not to adopt Motion #21 as the eighteen-month time frame is not sufficient to accomplish the motion’s intent. Also, literature review has never been limited to a selected group; anyone wanting to participate is able to give input.

#### **MOTION #22**

**“To amend motion 4 by deleting the words ‘or all’ from bullet #3.”**

Intent: To remove the possibility of replacement of all current personal stories.

The board is recommending not to adopt Motion #22. They understand the passion involved with the stories, but this motion doesn’t allow the workgroup enough flexibility. It drives the workgroup or board to select “some,” and the board doesn’t want the workgroup to be handcuffed. One board member reminded participants that members can submit input that will be considered during the Basic Text process.

#### **MOTION #23**

**“To amend motion 1. To direct the World Board to add an index to the Sponsorship Book prior to publication.”**

Intent: To add an index to the Sponsorship book.

The board is recommending not to adopt Motion #23 because of the book’s experiential nature; the book is not a classic textbook. The board is not stating that an index cannot be created, but they are not sure what exactly creating an index would entail.

#### **MOTION #24**

**“To amend motion 13 by adding language to the WSC *Rules of Order*, item 9M ‘To rescind the voting rights of the World Board Members at the World Service Conference.’**

**By deleting language page 7, second paragraph of WSC *Rules of Order*.”**

Intent: To allow only delegates, representatives of the members of the fellowship, to have the conscience in the decision-making process.

Larry K (RD, Wisconsin) said he realized that the wording is not correct. It’s not the intent to remove the board’s ability to make motions or nominations, only to remove the ability to vote in elections and new business.

The board is recommending not to adopt Motion #24.

#### **MOTION #25**

**“To amend motion 12 by adding language ‘Entrust to NAWS to select color and design of chips, key tags, and medallions for non-English speaking regions or countries**



**whose culture or language find our present colors or designs unacceptable. Information will be provided at the following WSC.”**

Intent: To meet cultural and language requests of different areas of our world.

The maker of the motion, Allan J (RD, Carolina), explained that he was told that in some countries some could not have particular colors; however, he clarified that the region wants to leave these decisions to NAWS.

The board is recommending not to adopt Motion #25.

### **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

A question-and-answer period followed discussion of the motions. Among the topics discussed were

- the impact of a new Basic Text preface on translations;
- the review and input process—time frames and how to get the word out better;
- whether the board should have voting rights in old business;
- the use of regional motions as a way to communicate;
- the need to improve communication;
- using the electronic bulletin board at [www.na.org](http://www.na.org);
- nominations and elections—the suggestion to form a workgroup to come up with ideas on how to incorporate regional nominations;
- the process for addressing a project idea;
- listing online meetings in our meeting locator;
- whether or not to continue discussing implementation ideas for Resolution A;
- an index for the *Sponsorship* book; and
- stickers to replace the revised *Just for Today* quotes.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:03 pm.

### **HRP CONFERENCE FORUM**

The HRP conference forum ran concurrently with the WB conference forum. With over 100 participants in attendance, the session was opened at 10:15 am. After a moment of silence and the Serenity Prayer, the meeting began with introductions. Then Francine gave a general overview of the session. There was some discussion about the agenda, with one delegate wanting a question-and-answer period first, but the original agenda prevailed. The session was geared around a small-group exercise where each round table would be given information on two imaginary nominees (CPR packets and a synopsis of a mock-interview and reference checks). Tables were instructed to discuss each candidate in the hope that this would give them insight into the HRP's process. At the close of the session, there was a question-and-answer period.

The room was abuzz for about thirty minutes. After a break, each table reported their findings, voicing concerns and recommendations for the mock candidates they reviewed.

### **TABLE REPORTS**

Some of the issues tables reported on included

- how to weight the information on the form;
- the desire to contact the RD or AD from the nominee's region;
- the feeling that there wasn't enough information about some candidates;
- lack of current references;
- how to treat qualified candidates who did not follow directions on the WPIF; and
- how to handle inconsistencies in information for a given candidate.

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Questions and comments included the following concerns:

- How to include information from an RSC in the process. (The HRP said they are interested in including a regional endorsement in the process.)
- How to ensure geographic diversity. (The HRP explained that they use *A Guide to World Services in NA* as their guide to qualifications.)
- Is language ranked in the process? (HRP: No, that information is relevant for projects)
- How are members who do not make the final cut informed? (HRP: They are sent an email which tells which nominees were elected. A hard copy of the same letter is mailed to them. No details are given as to why.)
- What are some of the reasons to exclude someone from nomination? (HRP: Inability to complete service positions, and the reasons why, lack of support from references, not a team player, lack of respect for others.)
- Questions about the percentage benchmark the HRP uses (50 percent) and a request for a breakdown of the HRP's measuring tools. (The HRP declined to provide such a breakdown because to do so would unfairly advantage those in the room who heard the information.)
- An inquiry on how to expand the process so that the HRP can get more information. Should a motion be made by conference participants? (The HRP explained that they are open to input but request not to be dictated to by the conference.)
- Is there a reference to computer literacy on the form? (HRP: Yes.)
- The comment that the WPIF is very business-oriented and does not allow for the less educated members to accurately reflect what they have to contribute.
- How does the HRP feel about downsizing the World Board? (A member of the HRP agreed to answer the delegate later.)

Charlotte asked that any input be given to the HRP in writing by the end of the conference, and the session closed at 12:15 pm.

**OLD BUSINESS DISCUSSION**

*Session led by Mark H (CF) / Tim S (CF)*

Jane N (WB chair) called the meeting to order at 1:33 pm. Mark H (CF) described this session as an opportunity to discuss old business motions and take straw polls before actually voting. Motions were grouped by related topics. Don Cameron, WSC parliamentarian, was introduced. Tim S (CF) opened the forum for discussion. (The participant presenting the motion is listed in parentheses following the motion.)

**SPONSORSHIP (MOTIONS 1, 23, 2, 3)**

*Motion #1: "To approve the book, Sponsorship, contained in Addendum A." (World Board)*

Jane explained that the book is based on experiential fellowship input. No discussion on this motion.

*Motion #23: To amend Motion #1. "To direct the World Board to add an index to the Sponsorship Book prior to publication." (Eileen G, RD-San Diego/Imperial)*

Jane and Anthony (WSO, ED) said a table of contents would be added. Several participants spoke in favor of an index, but the board responded that creating an index would be complex and might delay publication. There was some concern expressed that an experiential book does not lend itself to an index like a "how-to" book does. *Straw poll on Motion #23: Very weak support from the body.*

*Motion #2: "To replace the existing IP #11, Sponsorship, with the revised draft*

**contained in Addendum B. This motion would also approve the replacement of the text from the entire Sponsorship IP that currently appears in An Introductory Guide to Narcotics Anonymous.”** (*World Board*)

A conference participant asked if the board will still present Motion #2 if Motion #1 fails. Jane said yes. *Straw poll on Motion #1: Very strong support from the body. Straw poll on Motion #2: Very strong support from the body.*

**Motion #3: “To replace the three quotes in *Just for Today* from the existing IP #11, *Sponsorship*, with material from the proposed IP as follows:**

- **February 8 would now read, ‘... an NA sponsor is a member of Narcotics Anonymous, living our program of recovery, who is willing to build a special, supportive, one-on-one relationship with us.’**
- **March 13 would now read, ‘A sponsor is not necessarily a friend, but may be someone in whom we confide. We can share things with our sponsor that we may not be comfortable sharing in a meeting.’**
- **March 26 would now read, ‘In seeking a sponsor, most members look for someone they feel they can learn to trust, someone who seems compassionate...’”** (*World Board*)

Jane explained that it is necessary to add these new quotes so the literature is consistent. The quotes are not being inserted for the purpose of creating a second edition (the book will be called “revised edition”). Stickers will be offered as soon as possible to insert the new quotes in existing books. Current inventory will be depleted before the revised edition is offered for sale, which is estimated to be in six months. Anthony acknowledged that NAWS will also address correction of the CD-ROM version of the book. *Straw poll on Motion #3: Very strong support from the body.*

#### **BASIC TEXT (MOTIONS 4, 20, 21, 22, 7, 8, 9)**

**Motion #4: “To approve work on revisions to the Basic Text, Narcotics Anonymous, that includes:**

- **no changes made to Chapters One through Ten,**
- **the addition of a new preface to the Sixth Edition preceding the current preface (the current preface will remain the same and be titled “Preface to the First Edition”),**
- **the replacement of some or all of the current personal stories, in order to better reflect the broad diversity of our fellowship, and**
- **a brief introduction to the revised personal stories section.**

**The timeframe for this work will be two conference cycles, from 2004 to 2008, including a six-month review and input period. The approval form of the Sixth Edition Basic Text will be distributed as an appendix to the 2008 Conference Agenda Report for a minimum of 150 days.”** (*World Board*)

Jane explained that surveys of the fellowship showed that most desire to revise personal stories. There was some concern among participants about the review and input period. Anthony explained that passing the project means the passing of a six-month period. Jane said there may be room for a few more months, and the body, when straw-polled, showed willingness to allow an amendment to extend the review period from six to nine months even though it was offered after the deadline. A new preface will clarify that the book is comprised of two sections. Jane explained that this motion has been discussed for many years and is not related to increasing literature sales or fund flow issues. *Straw poll on Motion #4: Very strong support from the body.*

**Motion #20: “To amend motion 4 by adding the language ‘(specifically for the English**

**Edition)' to the end of the 3rd bullet paragraph. Add the language '(specifically for the English Edition)' to the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet sentence. 'if adopted, not including the revision of the personal stories section in languages editions other than English would allow the NA communities to freely adopt or not the most suitable personal stories section, including its introduction, according to their needs'" to the last paragraph. (Pepe C, RD-Mexico)**

Pepe explained that the amendment is to clarify Motion #4 and ensure that other language groups' stories will not be revised. *Straw poll on Motion #20: Weak support from the body.*

**Motion #21: "To amend motion 4 by replacing the language in the second to the last sentence to read 'The timeframe for this work will be three conference cycles, from 2004 to 2010, including an eighteen-month review and input period.'" (Bryan W, RD-California Mid-State)**

Bryan explained that this motion rose out of his region's desire for more review and input time on the sponsorship project and feelings that six months wasn't enough time for the Basic Text review and input. *Straw poll on Motion #21: Weak support from the body.*

**Motion #22: "To amend motion 4 by deleting the words 'or all' from bullet #3." (Bobby S, RD-South Florida)**

Bobby explained that some in his region wanted to remove the possibility that all of the personal stories would be replaced. *Straw poll on Motion #22: Very weak support from the body.*

**Motion #7: "That a moratorium be placed on changes to Book One of the Basic Text beginning at WSC 2004 and ending at WSC 2010." (Mindy A, RD-Show-Me)**

Mindy said that this motion will not be presented in old business.

**Motion #8: "That no changes be considered or made to Book 1, Chapters 1 through 10 of the Basic Text from WSC 2004 until the start of WSC 2014." (Brian T, AD-Free State)**

Brian said that the survey revealed that most strongly want to leave Book One intact. Other participants said they were not in favor of a moratorium. *Straw poll on Motion #8: Very weak support from the body.*

**Motion 9: "To direct Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. to create a Book One version of the 5th Edition Basic Text (approved April 25, 1991) and make it available for sale at the same price as other language versions available in Book One only." (Manny, RD-Buckeye)**

Manny explained that he didn't feel strongly about the motion and could not speak to it; he was uncertain how the motion got into the CAR. Most discussion was financially oriented. Jane told participants that we depend upon literature sales to fund services. It was pointed out that the Little White Booklet and *An Introduction to Narcotics Anonymous* are available at no charge, and that the idea that addicts outside of the US have an unfair advantage because their texts are priced more cheaply may be wrong-headed. *Straw poll on Motion #9: Very weak support from the body.*

#### **OTHER LITERATURE (MOTION 10)**

**Motion #10: "To set aside WSC Policy, and a workgroup be created to review, edit, and submit for approval at WSC 2006 the Tradition Working Guide developed by the Lone Star Regional Literature Committee." (Tim R, RD-Lone Star)**

While several participants said that their regions are in favor of a traditions workbook, they are concerned that the document should go through the usual development, review, and approval process. *Straw poll on Motion #10: Very weak support from the body.*

#### **WORLD BOARD/WORLD SERVICE CONFERENCE (MOTIONS 5, 6, 13, 24, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19)**

**Motion #5: “To change the maximum number of members for the World Board from “up to twenty-four” to “up to eighteen” and to reflect that change in the World Board External Guidelines in A Guide to World Services in NA.” (World Board)**

Some participants were concerned that work is not getting done. Jane responded that the number of staff is more relevant to the amount of work that gets done; with a strategic board, work is accomplished through project workgroups. She also explained that the board always offers more potential work in project plans than they think can be accomplished. The board believes they have functioned well with fourteen as well as eighteen members, which is why the motion calls for “up to” eighteen. *Straw poll on Motion #5: Very strong support from the body.*

**Motion #6: “To eliminate specific language about standing committees, except the Executive Committee, from the section Committees of the Board in the World Board External Guidelines in A Guide to World Services in NA. These changes would also be reflected in the section on General Duties and in the chart representing the world service structure.” (World Board)**

Jane explained that standing committees were carried over from the original structure and don't fit the new system. One delegate brought up concerns that communication has decreased since the elimination of standing committees; a board member responded that communication issues aren't related to the committee structure. *Straw poll on Motion #6: Very strong support from the body.*

**Motion #13: “To rescind the voting rights of the World Board members at the World Service Conference.” (Larry K, RD-Wisconsin)**

The motion maker explained that concerns over potential implementation of Resolution A motivated the motion. Several delegates said that they felt part of the board's function is to speak for NA communities who are not represented at the conference. Several participants questioned why this motion was being brought up again after being made and rejected many times in the past. *Straw poll on Motion #13: Weak support from the body.*

**Motion #24: “To amend Motion 13 by adding language to the WSC Rules of Order, item 9M ‘To rescind the voting rights of the World Board Members at the World Service Conference’. By deleting language page 7, second paragraph of WSC Rules of Order.” (Larry K, RD-Wisconsin)**

The maker said that this motion will not be presented in old business.

**Motion #14: “To change the percentage required for election to the World Board from 60% to 51%.” (Tim R, RD-Lone Star)**

Tim explained that there is general agreement that the process is flawed and this motion attempts to fix the process. Some delegates brought up the board's past statements about the effects of lowering the percentage and questioned whether the information was accurate. The point was made that the motion would not inspire more confidence or trust, and that it might be a step toward mediocrity. *Straw poll on Motion #14: Very weak support from the body.*

**Motion #16: “To direct the World Board to develop a project plan, timeline, and budget, for WSC 2006 about the creation of new WSC Rules of Order based on Consensus Based Decision Making as it applies to the World Service Conference.” (Tim R, RD-Lone Star)**

Tim explained that his region uses CBDM, and others spoke to their experiences using it in service bodies. Some said they understood the board was working on this, but there was concern about the low priority of the CBDM project. Jane responded that we must improve the communication network to practice CBDM. *Straw poll on Motion #16: No support from the body.*

**Motion #17: “This proposal seeks to change the trustor of the *Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust*, and if adopted, would require that this proposal be sent out for a six-month review and input period which ends before June 2005 and then be presented to the fellowship in the 2006 *Conference Agenda Report*.”**

To reduce the total number of representatives and to provide for equal geographic representation at WSC 2008, the current regional delegate representation will be replaced by fellowship representatives. The World Service Conference shall be comprised of a maximum of 72 fellowship representatives:

- Up to 18 from North America
- Up to 18 from Europe
- Up to 18 from Asia/Pacific Rim
- Up to 18 from South/Central America” (John S, RD-Minnesota)

There was lengthy discussion about this motion. Some said Resolution A was passed years ago and it may not apply to our current situation. Others questioned the model of geographic representation included in this proposal. Some RDs stated that they could not afford the human or financial resources to function in the proposed system. Several said their region would like the opportunity to talk further about the representation issues in Resolution A or that their region is in favor of the principle involved, but they weren't sure whether this proposal would increase or decrease communication and representation of regions in zones such as the APF. *Straw poll on Motion #17: Weak support from the body.*

**Motion #18: “To create geographic districts and define the selection of fellowship representatives.”**

The following geographic districts shall be created:

- Asia and Pacific Rim District – all regions participating in the Asia/Pacific Forum.
- European District – all regions participating in the European Delegates Meeting.
- North American District – all regions participating in the Autonomy Zonal Forum, Canadian Assembly, Midwest Zonal Forum, Mountain States Zonal Forum, Northeast Zonal Forum, Plain States Zonal Forum, Southeast Zonal Forum, Southern Zonal Forum, Western States Zonal Forum.
- South and Central American District – all regions participating in the Latin America Zonal Forum

Fellowship representatives at the WSC shall be selected by the entities currently known as zonal forums. Each zonal forum shall select these fellowship representatives by a method of their own choosing and forward the names and contact information of their selected fellowship representatives to NA World Services. These fellowship representatives shall be recognized at the World Service Conference beginning at WSC 2008. The Zonal Forums shall each choose the following number of fellowship representatives:

- Asia/Pacific Forum: up to 18
- European Delegates Meeting: up to 18
- Latin America Zonal Forum: up to 18
- North America: up to 18 selected as follows
- Autonomy Zonal Forum: up to 2
- Canadian Assembly: up to 2
- Midwest Zonal Forum: up to 2
- Mountain States Zonal Forum: up to 2
- Northeast Zonal Forum: up to 2

- **Plain States Zonal Forum: up to 2**
- **Southeast Zonal Forum: up to 2**
- **Southern Zonal Forum: up to 2**
- **Western States Zonal Forum: up to 2”**

The maker said that this motion will not be presented in old business.

**Motion #19: “To direct the World Board to develop a project plan, timeline, and budget, for WSC 2006 for the implementation of the following sections from Resolution A:**

- **to reduce the total number of representatives;**
- **to provide for equal representation from all geographic entities; and**
- **to encourage a consensus-based decision-making process.”** (*Tim R, RD-Lone Star*)

Tim explained that this is an alternative to Motions #17 and #18. *Straw poll on Motion #19: Very weak support from the body.*

#### **OTHER TOPICS (MOTIONS 11, 12, 25, 15, 30)**

**Motion #11: “To allow the limited (fair use) reprinting and quoting of the NA Fellowship approved copyrighted literature by registered NA Service Boards and Committees that have a presence on the Internet.”** (*Ruben A, RD-Southern California*)

There was much discussion on this motion, including clarification of “fair use” according to copyright law. Ruben explained that the best way to describe our fellowship is through our literature and his region wants to be able to do so. Anthony said that NAWS has proceeded very conservatively to protect the fellowship’s intellectual property, and NAWS’ position and actions have changed over time and will continue to do so. The board is asking that the conference not manage the board’s administration of the FIPT. *Straw poll on Motion #11: Weak support from the body.*

**Motion #12: “To adopt the following as fellowship approved:**

- **All keytags, chips, and medallions in the colors and corresponding time frames currently available from NAWS. Presently available from NAWS are keytags and chips as follows; welcome white, 30 days orange, 60 days green, 90 days red, 6 months blue, 9 months yellow, 1 year moonglow (Luminance white), 18 months gray, multiple years black, and medallions in bronze, bi-plate, gold plate, silver and 14 K gold for 18 months, 1-45 years, and eternity in English and bronze 1-20 years in Spanish, French, Brazilian/Portuguese**
- **Furthermore, to delegate to NAWS the authority to produce non-English keytags, chips, and medallions corresponding to their English counterparts with the text appropriately translated as deemed practical by NAWS as conference-approved items**
- **As fellowship approved items, keytags, chips, and medallions would require that NAWS present proposals for any changes to these items in the Conference Agenda Report. Minor design and material changes would not require fellowship approval.”** (*Allan J, RD-Carolina*)

Allan explained that his region’s intent is simply to make the chips, keytags, and medallions fellowship-approved. Confusion was expressed over the phrase “minor design” and who would determine what is minor. Some argued that keytags and medallions are merchandise, not literature, and should not be subject to the literature review process. *Straw poll on Motion #12: Weak support from the body.*

**Motion #25: “To amend motion 12 by adding language ‘Entrust to NAWS to select color and design of chips, keytags, and medallions for non-English speaking regions or countries whose culture or language find our present colors or designs unacceptable.**

**Information will be provided at the following WSC.”** (Allan J, RD-Carolina)

Allan said this amendment was intended to satisfy the World Board's objection to Motion #12. *Straw poll on Motion #25: Very weak support from the body.*

**Motion #15: “To direct the World Board to develop a project plan, timeline, and budget, for WSC 2006 about lowering the cost to all participating regions by 25% for all World Service events. These events shall include: the World Service Conference, World Service Meetings, and the Worldwide Workshops. This plan will not include any World Convention.”** (Tim R, RD-Lone Star)

Tim explained that this motion rose from feelings in his region that it costs too much to send trusted servants to events, including the AD's travel to the WSC. Some were confused about where the money (savings) would come from, and while there were some thoughts that money could be saved on lodging and airfare, others felt that NAWs does a good job keeping costs down. *Straw poll on Motion #15: Very weak support from the body.*

**Motion #30: “To amend motion 4 by adding language to paragraph 2, bullet 4 ‘To allow an extension for motion 4, to increase by up to 90 days a input and review process timeframe. This motion will allow up to 9 months for fellowship input and review instead of 6 months for Basic Text amendments.’”** (Brian T, AD-Free State)

Walt (RD-Free State) explained that his region wished they had more time for review and input on the sponsorship project, and that motivated this motion to increase the length of R&I time for the Basic Text project. In response to questions, Jane explained that a longer review and input process would take time from somewhere else in the project—perhaps meaning the project could not be completed in two cycles. *Straw poll on Motion #30: Weak support from the body.*

The session broke at 10:40 pm and participants spontaneously began dancing in the middle of the conference floor.

## OLD BUSINESS

Following the lengthy pre-business discussion session, Mark H (CF) reconvened the conference at 11:00 pm with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer. Mark reminded participants that the rationale for having the pre-business discussion session was to have a more manageable business session.

Roll call #2 (see Appendix A)  
 Conducted by Mark H (CF)  
 103 participants are present  
 93 regions are present  
 For old business,  
 62 represents a 2/3 majority  
 47 represents a simple majority

Tim S (CF) began facilitating (See Appendix B for a list of motions carried and committed.)

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #1*

**“To approve the book, *Sponsorship*, contained in Addendum A.”**

*Amendment: It was M/S/F Eileen G (RD, San Diego/Imperial) / Seth S (RD, Rio Grande), Motion #23*

**“To direct the World Board to add an index to the Sponsorship book prior to publication.”**

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #2*

**“To replace the existing IP #11, *Sponsorship*, with the revised draft contained in Addendum B. This motion would also approve the replacement of the text from the**



entire *Sponsorship IP* that currently appears in *An Introductory Guide to Narcotics Anonymous*.”

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #3*

“To replace the three quotes in *Just for Today* from the existing IP #11, *Sponsorship*, with material from the proposed IP as follows:

- February 8 would now read, ‘... an NA sponsor is a member of Narcotics Anonymous, living our program of recovery, who is willing to build a special, supportive, one-on-one relationship with us.’
- March 13 would now read, ‘A sponsor is not necessarily a friend, but may be someone in whom we confide. We can share things with our sponsor that we may not be comfortable sharing in a meeting.’
- March 26 would now read, ‘In seeking a sponsor, most members look for someone they feel they can learn to trust, someone who seems compassionate...’”

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #4*

“To approve work on revisions to the Basic Text, *Narcotics Anonymous*, that includes:

- no changes made to Chapters One through Ten,
- the addition of a new preface to the Sixth Edition preceding the current preface (the current preface will remain the same and be titled ‘Preface to the First Edition’),
- the replacement of some or all of the current personal stories, in order to better reflect the broad diversity of our fellowship, and
- a brief introduction to the revised personal stories section.

The timeframe for this work will be two conference cycles, from 2004 to 2008, including a six-month review and input period. The approval form of the Sixth Edition Basic Text will be distributed as an appendix to the 2008 *Conference Agenda Report* for a minimum of 150 days.”

*Amendment: It was M/S/F Bobby S (RD, South Florida)/Donna C (RD, Georgia), Motion #22:*

“To amend Motion #4 by deleting the words ‘or all’ from bullet #3.”

*Amendment: It was M/S/F Bryan W (RD, California Mid-State)/Adam H (AD, Connecticut) Motion #21:*

“To amend motion 4 by replacing the language in the second to the last sentence to read *The timeframe for this work will be three conference cycles, from 2004 to 2010, including a eighteen-month review and input period.*”

*Amendment: It was M/S/F Walter B (RD, Free State)/Richie S (RD, Eastern New York), Motion #30:*

To amend motion 4 by adding language to paragraph 2, bullet 4 ‘To allow an extension for motion 4, to increase by up to 90 days an input and review process timeframe. This motion will allow up to 9 months for fellowship input and review instead of 6 months for Basic Text amendments.’

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #5:*

“To change the maximum number of members for the World Board from ‘up to twenty-four’ to ‘up to eighteen’ and to reflect that change in the *World Board External Guidelines* in *A Guide to World Services in NA*.”

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #6:*

“To eliminate specific language about standing committees, except the Executive Committee, from the section Committees of the Board in the *World Board External*

**Guidelines in A Guide to World Services in NA. These changes would also be reflected in the section on General Duties and in the chart representing the world service structure.”**

Mark H (CF) began facilitating the session.

*It was M/S/F (by roll call vote: 13/81/0—see Appendix A) John S (RD, Minnesota)/Rosie (RD, Australia) (maker requested a roll call vote), Motion #17:*

**“This proposal seeks to change the trustor of the Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust, and if adopted, would require that this proposal be sent out for a six-month review and input period which ends before June 2005 and then be presented to the fellowship in the 2006 Conference Agenda Report.**

**To reduce the total number of representatives and to provide for equal geographic representation at WSC 2008, the current regional delegate representation will be replaced by fellowship representatives. The World Service Conference shall be comprised of a maximum of 72 fellowship representatives:**

- **Up to 18 from North America**
- **Up to 18 from Europe**
- **Up to 18 from Asia/Pacific Rim**
- **Up to 18 from South/Central America”**

Bryan W (RD, California Mid-State) asked the facilitator if regional CAR motions required a second before being considered by the body. Mark H (CF) responded that CAR motions do not need a second. Bryan challenged the rule of the chair. After a brief discussion, Don C (parliamentarian) clarified that according to the *WSC Rules of Order*, all regional motions require a second to be considered.

*It was M/S/F Tim R (RD, Lone Star)/Doug F (RD, Louisiana), Motion #10:*

**“To set aside WSC Policy, and a workgroup be created to review, edit, and submit for approval at WSC 2006 the Tradition Working Guide developed by the Lone Star Regional Literature Committee.”**

*It was M/S/F Wes R (RD, Mountaineer)/Jim B (RD, Greater Illinois):*  
**“To commit Motion #10 to the WB.”**

Ron H (WB) speaks con to the motion by stating that when you commit something it requires the WB to spend energy and resources on this. If you want to send this out to pasture, simply defeat the motion.

Rex S (RD, Washington/N. Idaho) asked for clarification regarding what the body is considering committing to the WB.

Mark H (CF) responded that the body was considering committing Motion #10 to the WB.

*It was M/S/F Tim R (RD, Lone Star)/Doug F (RD, Louisiana), Motion #14*

**“To change the percentage required for election to the World Board from 60% to 51%.”**

*It was M/F Tim R (RD, Lone Star), Motion #15: Motion fails for lack of second.*

**“To direct the World Board to develop a project plan, timeline, and budget, for WSC 2006 about lowering the cost to all participating regions by 25% for all World Service events. These events shall include: the World Service Conference, World Service Meetings, and the Worldwide Workshops. This plan will not include any World Convention.”**

*It was M/S/F Allan J (RD, Carolina)/Willie B (RD, Alabama/NW Florida), Motion #12:*

**“To adopt the following as fellowship approved:**

- **All keytags, chips, and medallions in the colors and corresponding time frames currently available from NAWS. Presently available from NAWS are keytags and chips as follows; welcome white, 30 days orange, 60 days green, 90 days red, 6 months blue, 9 months yellow, 1 year moon glow (Luminance white), 18 months gray, multiple years black, and medallions in bronze, bi-plate, gold plate, silver and 14 K gold for 18 months, 1-45 years, and eternity in English and bronze 1-20 years in Spanish, French, Brazilian/Portuguese**
- **Furthermore, to delegate to NAWS the authority to produce non-English keytags, chips, and medallions corresponding to their English counterparts with the text appropriately translated as deemed practical by NAWS as conference-approved items**
- **As fellowship approved items, keytags, chips, and medallions would require that NAWS present proposals for any changes to these items in the Conference Agenda Report. Minor design and material changes would not require fellowship approval.”**

*It was M/S/F Walter B (RD, Free State)/Mindy A (RD, Show Me), Motion #8:*

**“That no changes be considered or made to Book 1, Chapters 1 thru 10 of the Basic Text from WSC 2004 until the start of WSC 2014.”**

*It was M/S/F Manny T (RD, Buckeye)/ Amanda K (RD, Ontario), Motion #9:*

**“To direct Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. to create a Book One version of the 5th Edition Basic Text (approved April 25, 1991) and make it available for sale at the same price as other language versions available in Book One only.”**

*It was M/S/F Manny T (RD, Buckeye)/ Amanda K (RD, Ontario):*

**“To commit Motion #9 to the WB.”**

*It was M/S/F Tim R (RD, Lone Star)/Mukam H-D (RD, New Jersey), Motion #19:*

**“To direct the World Board to develop a project plan, timeline, and budget, for WSC 2006 for the implementation of the following sections from Resolution A:**

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

*It was M/S/F Ruben A (RD, Southern California)/William H (RD, Northern NY), Motion #11:*

**“To allow the limited (fair use) reprinting and quoting of the NA Fellowship approved copyrighted literature by registered NA Service Boards and Committees that have a presence on the Internet.”**

*It was M/C Bob J (WB)*

**“To approve the WSC 2002 minutes.”**

*It was M/Ruled Out of Order Walter B (RD, Free State):*

**“To amend the minutes to show a minimum of 12 WB members.”**

Mark H (CF) closed the old business session at 12:04 am. Applause.

# Tuesday, 27 April 2004

## STRATEGIC PLAN OVERVIEW FOR WORLD SERVICES

Session led by Bob

The session opened at 9:00 am with a brief description of the principles underlying the strategic plan. The body was reminded that even though the plan directs a relatively small percentage of world services' work, the plan is important because it support us moving forward toward our vision.



The following points were made about the value of the strategic plan:

- The plan allows responsiveness and responsibility.
- It provides sound organizational management. *Just like when building a city we need to prioritize and organize work—we cannot do everything at once. We must build a sewer system before we can install toilets.*
- The Strategic Plan comes from several environmental scans, including conferences, zonal forums, and surveys.
- It provides continuity—a method to move from point A to point B with benchmarks along the way.
- The Strategic Plan has the perspective of an entire, collective body—it's not about what each of us as individual members "gets," but about furthering our collective vision.
- The plan has relevance to everyone regardless of what "side of the fence" we are on—there may not be something specifically for me, but I support it.
- The plan facilitates the RDs and WB working together—because together we make up world services and it can only work if we have a common goal. We are working to strengthen the partnership between WB and delegates.

The plan's contents were reviewed and the connection between how the strategic plan leads to the project plans was made. The conference was taken through a small group activity in which they envisioned the tools developed and the goals fulfilled in order to accomplish the goals in the five key result areas contained within the plan.

Some of the ideas reported by the small groups included the following: more use of technology; public information in all levels of the media; the Basic Text translated into all languages; the education of groups, areas, and regions on fund flow; effective sponsorship; an increased availability and accessibility of literature; better communication with the World Service Office through the use of branch offices worldwide; more outreach; the cultivation of leaders, mentoring, sponsorship; more project-driven workgroups. (For a complete list, see Appendix C.) Bob closed the session at 10:50 am.

## NAWS REPORT

*Session led by Jane N (WB chair) and Anthony E (WSO ED)*

This session, which opened at 11:05 am, focused on current reporting as opposed to reviewing past projects. Jane reviewed the seating recommendations, use of the business plan group, and the issue discussion topics.

Only three communities completed the application process (Venezuela, Chile, and Occidente Regions), and two regions (Venezuela and Chile) were recommended for seating at 2006 WSC. Greece was seated at this conference. The board reported that they will continue to be in contact with Occidente, although they are not recommending seating them at this point.

The business plan workgroup has been a valuable resource for office management in helping to frame and develop recommendations for business objectives for the WSO. The group is also evaluating shipping and handling costs and is working on updating current financial policies and business objectives, as well as providing input to the shopping cart and donations portal.

The issue discussion topics for the 2004–2006 conference cycle are *Infrastructure* and *Our Public Image*.



## WSO UPDATE

*This portion of the session was led by Anthony.*

Anthony told participants that NAWS has worked hard to provide this information to conference participants ahead of time. The March 2004 financial statements, which include donations received up to Monday, 26 April at 4:00 pm, were distributed. Anthony informed the conference about financial information and other topics, such as public relations and fellowship development which will be discussed in more depth at other designated sessions. This is an effort to give everyone a better opportunity to understand what we do [at the WSO] in a less compressed manner.

- The WSO staff was introduced by Anthony.
- There are 322 translated and published items as of today—thirty-eight newly translated items and sixty-five active translations projects in forty-one languages.

- Bulletin board utilization is increasing. Anthony explained that the bulletin boards are for participants to talk to each other, not to talk to NAWS. NAWS simply facilitates the conversation.
- Website statistics—see Appendix D for correct figures.
- Database: We have encouraged web servants at the local level to maintain the information about groups, areas, and regions, and we are working to make this more user-friendly. Other points covered about the database were:
  - There are approximately 990 registered areas and 107 registered regions (seated and unseated), equaling 1097 potential web contacts.
  - There are approximately eighty web contacts doing “something” – equaling 7 percent of the potential users.
  - There have been 3775 meeting updates and 2084 new meetings added by web contacts in the past conference cycle.
  - We have revised the online instructions in an attempt to make them more user-friendly
- Inmate Correspondence: NAWS has received a significant number of requests from incarcerated addicts wanting people to communicate with them in writing. We discovered that six regions and four areas have had inmate correspondence programs for a long time. We would like to ask participants to send us your guidelines and contact information so that we can make that information available to incarcerated addicts who request it. The WSO is *not* doing inmate correspondence—we are just trying to find out what communities are doing. Anthony asked that this information be sent to the Fellowship Services Team.
- New items were presented: a new design for our medallion, a group reading card, and the Third Step prayer. With “Many of us have said” added to the beginning and (“When at the end of the road..”).

A straw poll was taken for the medallion design. The smooth finish was chosen, and the pebbled finish was *not* chosen.

A question-and-answer session then followed which included the following points: a request for a list of active web servants and a list of the communities already doing inmate correspondence; a concern about Our Public Image as a issue discussion topic; a request about the nature of technology challenges; a request for follow-up on employee theft; the need for budget clarification; a question about the toll-free helpline that was committed to NAWS at the last conference; and there was a request for some education about technology, FIPT, and copyright laws. The session closed at 12:40 pm.

## HRP REPORT

The Human Resource Panel opened their report with an introduction of the panel members and support staff. This portion of the report included the status of the World Pool, the utilization of the World Pool during the past conference cycle, and the nomination timeline and procedures for the past cycle (ultimately leading to the ninety-five people being interviewed for nomination to the World Board, Human Resource Panel, and cofacilitator positions). See Appendix E for the statistics related to elections presented in this report.

The panel expressed that they believe the “blind” CPR review removes the bias and personality issues and helps the panel focus on the qualifications needed for world service positions. They felt more comfortable using the “blind” CPR review this conference cycle, and felt it helped them to assess all candidates in a fair and equal manner.

The panel reported on the questions used during candidate interviews and the interviews with the candidates’ references.

The panel then reported that they believe regional nominations should be handled differently because they do not go through the extensive interview and reference check process that the HRP nominations do.

Deadlines and mailing errors were mentioned, and the panel reported that they will use registered receipt mail to prospective nominees in the next cycle.

The statistics from the WSC 2002 Survey were reviewed, as well as a history of World Board elections and voting patterns.

A question-and-answer period followed which included some of the following points: a question about the accuracy of the voting patterns presented; a belief there is growing confidence in the process; a question about the nature of election criteria—conference experience, formal training in Robert’s Rules of Order, willingness, etc.; clarification about what constitutes world service experience; time and resources for serving on the world board; how people tend to vote for whom they know; clarification about who carries a regional nomination; a request to review candidate profile reports in advance to be able to make more informed decisions; questions about whether or not 50 percent of votes would produce more people elected to positions and whether the number of votes should depend on the number of open positions; a request to change the language to distinguish between a nomination made by a region and a nomination made by a conference participant; another question about nominees with no conference experience versus those with life and professional experience; a clerical question about candidates being notified about not being nominated; a question of whether regional endorsements could help; and questions about the principle of ability and experience versus confidence and the validity of regional nominations made during conference week.


The following *straw polls* were conducted:

Send blind CPR’s in advance?	yes: 80	no: 6	abs: 0
Regional endorsement:	yes: 80	no: 8	


**CULTIVATING LEADERSHIP SESSION**

*Session led by Daniel S (WB) and Ron H (WB)*

Jane N (WB chair) opened the session at 4:30 pm. After a moment of silence and the Serenity Prayer, she turned the session over to Ron H (WB) and Daniel S (WB). First Ron gave an overview of the session. Then Daniel talked about leadership qualities and the difficulty in identifying leaders. He talked first about leadership



in German history and his own personal experience with leadership (including the admission that he called his wife to ask what she thought about his talk on leadership).



Daniel went on to make the point (through a farm animal analogy) that it’s


challenging to identify leadership qualities. A cow slide appeared on the overhead, and Daniel said his grandmother used to tell him you can’t expect more from a cow than beef. Then a horse slide appeared on the overhead. Daniel explained that what we are looking for is a work-horse. We describe the kind of animal we want: four legs, hairy, big, a tail, two eyes, a mouth and a nose, two ears. And this is what we get—the cow slide reappears on

the overhead. And so we say, "The process is working." Daniel further explained that we need to trust our leaders. If he brings a plumber into his house and leaves the plumber there alone, he said, he needs to know the plumber or know someone who knows the plumber.

Ron reviewed the leadership questions from the CAR. He then engaged participants in small group mind-mapping exercise

Each table reported back one idea that they came up with. Some of the ideas were: trust, integrity, a leader who brings out my best, commitment to the vision, general commitment, experience, personal recovery, humility, empowerment, people skills, and communication skills.

Ron asked the conference participants to specifically mind-map *experience*, which produced the following points: variety of service, application, self-confidence, works well with others, open-minded, having experienced a good role model (mentor), facilitator/problem solver, knowledge and skills, sense of humor, learns from mistakes, accountability, practical, flexible, responsible, perseverance, patience, respectable, and compassionate. (For a complete list, see Appendix F)



In concluding, Ron explained that this exercise can be useful at an RSC or ASC; for example, a committee could mind-map "outreach." The session was closed at 5:52 pm.

## MAKING THE NEW SYSTEM WORK

Jane conducted a number of straw polls in the beginning of this session (see Appendix G).

After Isabel L, the AD from the Sierra Sage Region, read her home group letter, David began the session by talking about his own anxieties of feeling like a newcomer at the conference, and then gave a history of how we've arrived here. But first Mukam H-D (RD, New Jersey) read a letter about the future of the WSC written by Fred, the region's AD.

David resumed by discussing a brief history of the resolutions passed in 1997 and the restructuring in '98. He described the problems of a huge, organically grown service structure: political infighting, funding, duplication of work, voting on issues before considering



resources, the trouble of seating new conference participants. He shared how he was a part of creating the new system, and he summarized what the new components are—processes for seating, the change in language to reflect delegated authority, and an attempt to create a partnership. He shared his personal experience with the “us and them” mentality.

Jim then facilitated, gathering ideas about *Making the New System Work* which included some of the following: targeted literature; trusting the process; multi-zonal meetings between conferences; the need to reduce the time it takes to create literature; that a discussion-based conference needs a discussion-based CAR and discussion-based regional area service committees and group business meetings; and that the US regions need to be willing to listen to what the non-US regions are asking for. David closed the session at 10:21 pm.

## Wednesday, 28 April 2004

### BUDGET AND PROJECT PLAN PRESENTATION

*Session led by Jane N (WB chair), Becky M (WSO Asst ED), and Anthony E (WSO ED)*

The session opened at 9:00 am with a roll call followed by a budget presentation given by Anthony.

Roll call #4 (see Appendix A)  
 Conducted by Jane N (WB Chair)  
 110 participants are present  
 97 regions are present  
 For new business,  
 73 represents a 2/3 majority  
 56 represents a simple majority

Anthony discussed the difficulty in presenting a \$12 million budget to people with varying financial and accounting experience in such a limited time frame.

Anthony went on to explain a number of issues related to budgeting. Some of these issues included the following points: the challenge of a conceptual budget versus an actual budget; how we budget conservatively so it makes donations look higher; the way donations are affected by whether or not regions have good convention years; that San Diego did not set a financial precedent; NAWS' prudent reserve; discrepancies in how expenses are allocated; an embezzlement update; the need for new and updated financial policies; and an update on the new shopping cart and donations portal.

Becky presented the proposed project plans and discussed the difficulty of the prioritization process, the difficulty of not having enough staff resources, and the challenge of creating project timelines so far in advance. She explained that the biggest change in this conference cycle's priorities is a move away from projects being so conference-focused. The staff and board have collaborated on prioritization, Becky explained, and how the results hopefully convey the communication coming into world services.

A question-and-answer session followed which included some of the following points:

information about open staff positions and the possibility of working for NAWS outside of the physical office; clarification about financial documents; a question about the philosophical motivation for the world convention to financially break-even; clarification about the low prioritization of projects that seem to be routine; a question about whether or not the groups will approve the strategic plan; a number of questions about the worldwide workshops; support for the strategic plan; a suggestion to use a standardized method to capture older

members' experience; a request for more readable financial charts; and clarification about the type of event that occurred in St. Petersburg.

### WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON AND EVENING ACTIVITIES

In the afternoon conference participants went to Calamigos Ranch, where they ate lunch, fellowshiped, had a recovery meeting, and relaxed. In the evening, zonal forums that wished to meet did so.

## Thursday, 29 April 2004

### WORLD BOARD CONFERENCE FORUM

*The World Board Forums are not technically a conference session, but they have been increasingly used to discuss the business of the conference, so we are including a summary of them here.*

Bob J (WB) called the meeting to order at 9:00 am.

### BUDGET AND PROJECT PLAN PRESENTATION

The session began with calling the numbers left in yesterday's queue from the *NA World Service Budget and Project Plans* session.

#### Communications

One delegate expressed concerns regarding communication: world services communications only being delivered to one person, communications in English, the need for more literature (e.g., on HIV/AIDS in NA), and the desire for non-seated regions to participate in literature development and be recognized as part of the NA community.

Bob J (WB) explained that everyone was able to participate in the review and input of the sponsorship material, and local communities are able to translate after approval. The World Board tried to involve everyone in the sponsorship project, announcing it in publications, News Flashes, and workshop sessions. Also, *NAWS News* is distributed to all ASCs, RSCs, and conference participants and is available online, so if groups are not receiving it, they may need to check their contact address with the WSO.

Anthony (WSO ED) spoke to the targeted literature needs, stating that the World Board would not write something about this issue (HIV/AIDS) but it would be a part of the targeted literature discussion.

#### Public Relations

Another delegate said he would like to see more workshops like that on public relations in San Diego. He asked what the proper channels are to have something like an Internet discussion board that would allow the sharing of ideas, solutions, etc., all year. Anthony reiterated the fact that the board is trying to be responsive to the body's will. If there is conference participant interest, NAWS will try to create a board.

*A straw poll revealed support for the idea, and the board will research creating a PI/PR bulletin board area.*

#### Other Issues

Other topics discussed included

- Translations and the implementation of the Basic Text project (e.g., dealing with international input). Anthony said that we want to be as inclusive as possible, but the details have not been worked out so he cannot provide definite answers yet.

- Retaining the history of long-time members.
- Better use of technology (e.g., publishing more literature online, the bulletin board, guidelines for using the Internet in the fellowship).
- Where the figures for the WSO's reserves came from. Anthony responded that the reserves target came from research on how other corporations develop reserve policy.
- Publishing the Conference Approval Track material on the web. Anthony said the board may discuss the possibility.
- Appreciation for the off-site afternoon at Calamigos Ranch. Jane N (WB chair) said that a conference session had been planned, but because everyone was having such a good time, the board decided to not interrupt the fun by having the session.
- The priority of the worldwide workshops.

Having completed the questions on the budget and project plans, the session turned to a discussion of new business motions.

#### **MOTION #27**

**“To amend *A Guide to World Services*, page 22 by adding the following language:**

**To add a bullet #3 in Nominations that “all regional nominations for WB, HRP and Cofacilitators be submitted 60 days prior to the opening of WSC, and names of nominees to be included in the *March Conference Report*.”**

Intent: To allow for ample time for the HRP to complete their duties and responsibilities to validate nominations.

Jane N (WB chair) suggested to the motion maker that he speak with the HRP, as the board does not have the ability to affect their process. The board has no recommendation pending information from the HRP.

#### **MOTION #28**

**“To amend *A Guide to World Services*, page 23, paragraph 5 by adding the language ‘To create a 2-tiered election system for WSC World Board positions. The HRP will continue to nominate as many people as HRP determines are fit to serve. If there are at least three more nominees than open positions, then there will be a ‘Primary’ election reducing the number of nominees to two more than the number of openings. In this Primary the RDs and WB Members may each cast up to as many votes as there are openings, and nominees receiving the most votes will move on to the General election, regardless of what percent of the vote they received. The General election will be held at least one day later, and will follow the current election procedure.’”**

Intent: The current NAWS election formula is terminally flawed. It is statistically all but impossible to elect more than one or two nominees using a process that has a large number of nominees running for substantially fewer open positions. The HRP does an excellent job of nominating highly qualified men and women. Moreover, it is important, for many reasons, not to artificially limit the HRP's ability to nominate those who are qualified. However, the current result is that all nominees are relatively equally qualified and votes are therefore relatively equally distributed amongst them—with none or very few being able to gather 60%. The "solution" that RDs/WBM should vote for more candidates than there are open positions dilutes the mandate given to those we elect, lacks integrity, and in any case will not be followed by most RDs/WBM. The solution envisioned by this motion is commonly used throughout the world and has been proven to work very well.

Bob and Jane both said they wished that there could have been dialog between the board and the motion maker because it is difficult to draft policy on the floor. David J (WB) said he can see some flaws with the system but at the moment we have a board that achieves what we want to achieve. John (AD, Florida) explained that if we elect six people tomorrow the motion will be withdrawn. Jane said that elections and casting of ballots is not what's flawed.

**MOTION #29:**

**“To form a United States Delegate Assembly**

**Intent: To eliminate US-specific business at the WSC, and allow this type of business to be done at a venue where solutions can be fully discussed, and the human and financial resources can be better allocated.”**

This is similar to a previous motion and the board's recommendation was to not adopt Motion #29.

**MOTION #31**

**“To amend *A Guide to World Services in Narcotics Anonymous* page 3, end of paragraph 4 ‘A regionally designated Second Alternate may substitute for an Alternate Delegate at the discretion of the Regional Delegate.’”**

Intent: To encourage and cultivate leadership qualities within willing trusted servants who have worked throughout the year to learn more about our service format at the world level. This is not to increase the number of seated participants.

Some of the points the board brought up were the need to cultivate leaders, the fact that some regions cannot afford to send a second alternate, and whether switching delegates in and out of sessions really works to cultivate leadership.

This is similar to a previous motion and the board's recommendation was to not adopt Motion #31.

**MOTION #32**

**“That the World Service Conference agrees that the principle of Resolution A is being met by our current world service structure.”**

Intent: To allow the conference to move forward in unity.

A couple of board members expressed their thoughts that there is more to accomplish with Resolution A. There was some discussion about new business being an inappropriate place for such a motion. David brought up the idea that this could be placed in the CAR for discussion. Bob responded for that to occur the board would have to agree as a body.

The board is recommending not to adopt Motion #32.

**MOTION #33**

**“To include regional conscience and endorsement in the HRP Guidelines for the selection process for World Board, HRP and Cofacilitator positions.**

Intent: To acquire more information on individuals considered for world positions from those they have served.”

Tom McC (WB) was concerned about members who are not connected to a RSC body but could be highly qualified. He thought we would be cheating ourselves out of possible leaders with this motion. Craig R (WB) added that endorsement is required but optional, the motion is not to exclude but to provide additional information. Susan C (WB) expressed concern if this was to be a requirement.

The board is recommending not to adopt Motion #33.

**MOTION #34**

**“Take action to pursue recovery of actual damages, losses and costs incurred as a result of the WSO employee embezzlement.”**

Intent: We placed the recovery of the embezzled money as the highest priority in our response to the theft when we discussed this at the last conference. This will lead us towards completion of the task.

Anthony responded we intend to pursue this. What the maker is looking for is some assurance and we do intend to follow up.

Motions #35 through #53 are motions submitted by the board and will not be discussed.

**MOTION #54**

**“That a moratorium be placed on presenting any motions that rescind or limit the voting privileges of World Board members for 3 conference cycles ending 2010.”**

Intent: To encourage trust in the existing WSC policy regarding participants voting privileges and the principles of the Seventh Concept of service.

Among the ideas the board discussed are the desire to let the body make a decision on the issue at every conference to assure board members of participation rights, the need for motions in the *CAR* to be important to the fellowship, and the belief that policy will not create trust. Trust comes from RDs reporting the board’s integrity to other members.

The board is recommending not to adopt Motion #54.

**MOTION #55**

**“That all content of the literature in process of development be accessible to every region for input and review before the publication of the final draft for approval in the *Conference Agenda Report*.”**

Intent: Allow major fellowship participation in the literature development process.

Bella B (WB) said the board is trying to move toward a more inclusive literature development process but a motion is not the way to go. She supports increasing ways for fellowship involvement but feels this motion creates too many problems.

The board is recommending not to adopt Motion #55.

**MOTION #56**

**“To amend *A Guide to World Services in Narcotics Anonymous* by adding language on page 56, paragraph K ‘Any motion appearing in the *Conference Agenda Report* need no second at the World Service Conference during old business.’”**

Intent: To eliminate unnecessary parliamentary procedures.

Ron H (WB) said the motion works against its own intent because a motion that does not receive a second should not warrant discussion. David J further shared that the board always checks for a second prior to old business discussions.

The board is recommending not to adopt Motion #56.

**MOTION #57**

**“To amend *A Guide to World Services in Narcotics Anonymous* by deleting language on page 22, number 3 ‘make or.’”**

Intent: To help ensure that all nominations come from a seated region or the HRP.

Motion maker clarified that the motion intends to do away with the good old boy system, allowing only seated regions and the HRP to make nominations. Among the concerns expressed by board members were the fact that the candidate profiles don't help find individuals who may have no world service experience but many other talents and skills. Also qualified members from unseated regions are not identified in the process. Some attempts to eliminate the old boy system may just eliminate another opportunity to identify leadership.

The board is recommending not to adopt Motion #57.

#### **MOTION #58**

**“That the system for identifying candidates for Word Service positions include the opportunity for RSCs and/or the World Board to forward potential candidates to the HRP separately from and after the HRP’s initial blind screening process.”**

Intent: To expand the pool of qualified candidates and to allow the leadership development process to culminate in nominations at the WSC

Among the thoughts board members shared about this motion were support of the spirit of identifying potential leaders, agreement with the move towards a cooperative relationship, the fact that the motion seeks to state a principle that has been discussed without wading into details of implementation, and enthusiasm about opening up the system.

The board is recommending to adopt Motion #58.

#### **MOTION #59**

**“To add language to *A Guide to World Services in Narcotics Anonymous* page 22, nomination section #6 to read ‘All nominations for World Board members, Human Resource Panel members and World Service Conference Cofacilitator positions must be received by the Human Resource Panel no later the 30 calendar days prior to the opening day of the World Service Conference.’”**

Intent: To ensure the HRP can request, receive and review WPIFs and prepare candidate profile for conference participants before the WSC. Also to give RSCs the time and directions in making nominations with the HRP’s guidance “To help eliminate mistrust about WSC outside nominations”.

The board had some discussion of the timeframe and the expectations of the HRP.

The board has no recommendation on Motion #59.

#### **MOTION #60**

**“Reprioritize the worldwide workshop project plan to ‘initial priority.’”**

Intent: To ensure we continue to hold these highly valued workshops.

There was no objection from the World Board to move into a second-tier project.

The board has no recommendation on Motion #60.

#### **MOTION #61**

**“To establish a workgroup to evaluate our nomination and election process to help determine if either of these processes could benefit from either minor adjustments or a major overhaul.”**

Intent: To allow perhaps 8-10 RDs, 1-2 HRP members, 1-2 WB members, and any necessary NAWS staff to have a forum to cooperatively discuss and evaluate our current nominations and election process and offer the WSC areas to consider for future action.

Bob noted that this would require suspending budgetary rules, and Ron asked whether we want to be in the habit of making motions to create workgroups and circumvent the prioritization process.

The board is recommending not to adopt Motion #61 and suggesting that this be submitted as a project plan for the next cycle.

### **MOTION #62**

**“That the WB informs the floor before the election, of how many candidates we should vote for, to have a chance to see someone elected.”**

Intent: That all the regions have a clean picture of the effect of the number of candidates they choose.

Ron explained that this is possible, but what is less easy is to wait for confidence and popularity. Statistically if everyone voted for the same person, they would be elected and he doesn't think it appropriate for motion to try to do that.

The board is recommending not to adopt Motion #62.

### **MOTION #63**

**“The HRP work on a nomination process that results in a single avenue for nominations at the WSC.”**

Intent: That all the candidates get through the same interview process so there is no shortcut to be a nominee and all the candidates have the same fair opportunity.

The board has no recommendation on Motion #63.

The session ended at 12:05 pm.

## **ELECTIONS AND BUDGET AND PROJECT APPROVAL SESSION**

During this session, project plans were informally prioritized using a straw poll and elections were conducted. (See Appendix H for a copy of the ballot.)

Roll call #5 (see Appendix A)  
 Conducted by Mark H (CF)  
 112 participants are present  
 98 regions are present  
 For new business,  
 75 represents a 2/3 majority  
 57 represents a simple majority

### **DISTRIBUTION OF BALLOTS**

Tali (HRP) let participants know how many candidates they could vote for and how to turn in their ballots:

- up to 4 candidates for WSC Cofaciliators,
- up to 6 for the HRP, and
- up to 39 for the World Board members.

Participants could vote for any number of candidates below the maximum number as well. Tali told participants to bring their completed ballots along with candidate profile information to the front table where they would be collected. Tali explained that once ballots were collected the HRP would take them to a secure room for tabulation and would announce results as soon as they were available.

**BUDGET AND PROJECT APPROVAL PRIORITIZATION**

After a break, Jane opened the meeting and explained that delegates would now prioritize the project plans. Non-binding straw polls for each project plan will help the board get a sense of the conference's priorities. Following are the straw poll results:

<b>World Board</b>		<b>High</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Low</b>
<b>Routine</b>	<b>Business Plan Workgroup</b>	<b>Not Ranked</b>		
<b>High</b>	<b>Basic Text</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>Leadership Identification &amp; Development</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>NAWS Communications &amp; Publications</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>Public Relations Strategy</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>Service Handbooks</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>High</b>	<b>Service Material</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Medium</b>	<b>Worldwide Workshops</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Medium</b>	<b>Leadership Qualities in NA</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Medium</b>	<b>Self-Support IP</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Medium</b>	<b>Service Structure Relationship &amp; Definition</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Medium</b>	<b>Targeted Literature</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Low</b>	<b>Capturing Longtime Members' Experience</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Low</b>	<b>Consensus-Based Decision-Making at the WSC</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Low</b>	<b>Fellowship Issue Discussions</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Low</b>	<b>Literature Distribution &amp; Convention Workshop</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>51</b>

**ELECTION RESULTS**

After a break, Charlotte announced election results. The conference elected two cofacilitators, three HRP members (two of those three tied with the same number of votes), and seven World Board members.

Charlotte suggested a run-off election to break the tie for the second HRP seat. Lib E (WB) suggested a name be drawn from a hat, and David J (WB) asked whether there could be five members of the HRP. Mark H (CF) informed him that that was an option.

Don C (parliamentarian) explained to the conference that any of the above options were possible, and that the conference could decide how to proceed.



After much discussion, there was a straw poll to determine conference support for the three options

Straw poll for three options:

Run-off election: 43

Draw names: 28

Five-member HRP: 35

Mark announced that the top two options were having a run-off election and having a five-member HRP. The body decided to go back into a business session and conducted a roll call vote which resulted in a tie between the two options.

After more discussion, the results of the cofacilitator and board member elections were announced. Then a standing vote was taken to determine how to proceed with the HRP election. The total number for run-off election was 53; the total number for a five-person HRP was 56. Election results for the HRP were then announced.

#### **WSC Cofacilitators**

Mark H

Ubaldo "Roberto" J

#### **World Board**

Craig R

Mary B

Michael C

Mukam H-D

Piet De B

Ron B

Ron M

#### **Human Resource Panel**

Dylan J

Mindy A

Sergio R

### ZONAL FORUM REPORTING

The session was called to order by Jane N (WB chair). Each zone was given ten minutes for reporting. Jane explained that no zone could give time to another for reporting.

The following zones gave reports:

- **Plains States Zonal Forum**—six regions in zones. Working on several projects including creating a formal service structure, assisting members regions with PI and workshops, and exploring a US delegate assembly.
- **Autonomy Zonal Forum**—meets twice a year. Two topics were chosen for discussion: personal growth and service, and unity through diversity. WB member Craig R attended the forum.
- **Rocky Mountain Zonal Forum**—currently has three participating regions and is in contact with four. Met once a year.
- **Midwest Zonal Forum**—zone began in April 1987 and today is a consensus-based decision-making body. Inherited Mid-Coast Convention money and, along with regional donations, will be making a donation to WS. Hosted a PI multi-regional workshop. Financials are on website, mzfna.org.
- **Southern Zonal Forum**—eight regions in zone, formed in May 1992. All excess funds are donated to NAWS. Website: szfna.org.

- **EDM**—showed slide show. Reported on fellowship development issues and trips. Needs help with the Eastern European communities. Reported info on Russia and setting up bank account; talked about ECC; would like more communication between zones.
- **Canadian Assembly**—six regions in the zone. One area meets by teleconference in addition to face-to-face. Reported on convention. Provides services beyond the reach of the region. Sees the website as a good PI tool in helping to carry the message to rural communities and other language groups.
- **Western States Forum**—zone formed in December 1991; no elections or treasury in the zone.
- **APF**—started in 1992. Sixteen NA communities and regions. Had first meeting without financial help from NAWS. Discussion about making first donation to NAWS.
- **Northeast Zonal Forum**—no report given
- **LAZF**—meets once every two years. Thanked NAWS and C&P Region for support. Also thanked NAWS and WB for translators. Would like to have more interaction between zones. Reported on the difficulties with Cuba. Donated fifty pounds of literature to Cuba, which was confiscated at the airport.
- **Southeast Zonal Forum**—five regions in zone. Had inventory and workshops on consensus-based decision-making and self-support, and a PI event with NAWS.

## Friday, 30 April 2004

### NEW BUSINESS DISCUSSION

*Session led by Tim S and Mark H, cofacilitators*

Mark H (CF) opened the session at 9:00 am with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer. Conference participants were asked to read from *Just for Today*, the Seventh Tradition, and the Seventh Concept. Mark asked everyone to be responsible with time; we want everyone to be heard. However, at the same time we get a lot of repeated comments on a topic. Mark/Tim reintroduced themselves and Don Cameron, the WSC Parliamentarian. (The participant presenting the motion is listed in parentheses following the motion.)

Roll call #6 (see Appendix A)  
 Conducted by Mark H (CF)  
 112 participants are present  
 98 regions are present  
 For new business,  
 75 represents a 2/3 majority  
 57 represents a simple majority

Mark turned the meeting over to Tim, who facilitated this discussion segment. Presenters spoke to their motion first, and then discussion followed until the facilitator called for a straw poll on each motion.

### **WSC SEATING (MOTIONS 52, 53)**

***Motion #52: “To recognize Venezuela as a seated World Service Conference participant beginning at the close of WSC 2004.” (World Board)***

No discussion on this motion.

***Motion #53: “To recognize Chile as a seated World Service Conference participant beginning at the close of WSC 2004.” (World Board)***

No discussion on this motion.

**NOMINATIONS (MOTIONS 27, 33, 57, 58, 59, 61, 63)**

**Motion #27: “To amend A Guide to World Services, page 22 by adding the following language:**

**To add a bullet #3 in Nominations that ‘all regional nominations for WB, HRP and Cofacilitators be submitted 60 days prior to the opening of WSC, and names of nominees to be included in the March Conference Report.’” (Bobby S, RD-South Florida)**

Bobby asked to modify the motion so that it called for nominations to be submitted “up to” sixty days prior to the WSC opening. There was discussion about committing the motion including an HRP recommendation to commit (to the HRP), concerns that committing the motion might result in its not being brought to the floor of the conference in any form, and clarification of the definition of “commit.” Jane clarified that the earliest that committed motions could take effect would be 2008. After some discussion about the process for the new business discussion session in general, Tim took a straw poll to determine whether the conference wanted to deal with the nomination motions in a group, and the body showed weak support. One delegate stated that he felt the current nominations process was based on fairness and a regional nomination was not as legitimate because it did not go through the same process. Another delegate spoke in favor of the motion, as it helped facilitate multiple avenues for nominations. *Straw poll on Motion #27: Strong support from the body. Straw poll on committing Motion #27: Strong support.*

**Motion #33: “To include regional conscience and endorsement in the HRP Guidelines for the selection process for World Board, HRP and Cofacilitator positions.” (Walter B, RD-Free State)**

Walter said that he is okay with committing the motion to the World Board. Both the HRP and WB recommended not to adopt the motion. One participant expressed concern that a member may not be active in the region at the time of his or her nomination. Another delegate explained that a regional recommendation could reveal important information that the current process does not. Someone suggested adding the option for zonal or area endorsements, and another said that a regional recommendation should be optional. *Straw poll on Motion #33: Moderate support from the body. Straw poll on committing Motion #33: Strong support.*

**Motion #57: “To amend A Guide to World Services in Narcotics Anonymous by deleting language on page 22, number 3 ‘make or.’” (Larry R, RD-Nebraska)**

The motion maker explained that the motion intends to ensure that all nominees have had to go through some type of process. He said he is willing to commit the motion to the World Board. The board recommended not to adopt the motion, and the HRP made no recommendation, as policy is not their domain, Tali explained. Concern was expressed that the motion would narrow the field. *Straw poll on Motion #57: Very little support from the body.*

**Motion #61: “To establish a workgroup to evaluate our nomination and election process to help determine if either of these processes could benefit from either minor adjustments or a major overhaul.” (George L, RD-Central California)**

George said he was hoping to create an ad-hoc committee but feedback encouraged him to make a motion to create a funded workgroup. He envisioned workgroup members being conference participants with an interest in nominations and elections. There was a lot of discussion about the current workgroup and budget process, and Bob (WB) explained that creating a workgroup would require the body to override policy. Some participants spoke in favor of the idea of an overall evaluation of the process, but several were concerned about the vague nature of the motion—that the details of the project were not clear. *Straw poll on Motion #61: Little support from the body. Straw poll on committing Motion #61: Some support.*

**Motion #58: “That the system for identifying candidates for World Service positions include the opportunity for RSCs and/or the World Board to forward potential candidates to the HRP separately from and after the HRP’s initial blind screening process.”** (Arne H, RD-British Columbia)

Arne clarified that the motion was brought together by a number of regions. Leadership development seems to come from the RSC, Arne said. The board recommended to adopt the motion, and the HRP recommended not to adopt. One delegate explained that his region would be offering an amendment to include zonal forums. There was some discussion about how to implement the motion, including whether candidates should all be subject to a blind screening process, the advantage in knowing a candidate’s performance if they have a history in regional or world services, whether time frames should be specified, and whether the HRP could still reject such a nominee. Some participants felt that the motion could be committed so that details of the policy affected could be worked out. *Straw poll on Motion #58: Very strong support from the body.*

**Motion #59: “To add language to A Guide to World Services in Narcotics Anonymous page 22, nomination section #6 to read “All nominations for World Board members, Human Resource Panel members and World Service Conference Cofacilitator positions must be received by the Human Resource Panel no later the 30 calendar days prior to the opening day of the World Service Conference.”** (John S, R-Mid-America)

The maker said that this motion will not be presented in new business.

**Motion #63: “The HRP work on a nomination process that results in a single avenue for nominations at the WSC.”** (Jean-Pierre B, RD-Quebec)

The maker said that this motion will not be presented in new business.

Mark H (CF) continued facilitating new business discussion.

### **ELECTIONS (MOTIONS 28, 62)**

**Motion #28: “To amend A Guide to World Services, page 23 paragraph 5 by adding language ‘To create a 2-tiered election system for WSC World Board positions. The HRP will continue to nominate as many people as HRP determines are fit to serve. If there are at least three more nominees than open positions, then there will be a “Primary” election reducing the number of nominees to two more than the number of openings. In this Primary the RDs and WB Members may each cast up to as many votes as there are openings, and nominees receiving the most votes will move on to the General election, regardless of what percent of the vote they received. The General election will be held at least one day later, and will follow the current election procedure.”** (Ron M, RD-Florida)

The maker said that this motion will not be presented in new business.

**Motion #29: “To form a United States Delegate Assembly.”** (John S, RD-Mid-America)

John explained that the motion is motivated by the desire to include all delegates at the WSC. He says, however, that they will withdraw the motion because it’s out of order; but they are still looking for input.

**Motion #62: “That the WB inform the floor before the election, of how many candidates we should vote for, to have a chance to see someone elected.”** (Maxence G, RD-France)

The maker said that this motion will not be presented in new business.

### **RULES OF ORDER (MOTIONS 31, 54, 56, 34)**

**Motion #31: “To amend A Guide to World Services in Narcotics Anonymous page 3, end of paragraph 4 ‘A regionally designated Second Alternate may substitute for an**

**Alternate Delegate at the discretion of the Regional Delegate.”** (Tony C, RD-Region of the Virginias)

Tony told the conference that the second to the motion had been withdrawn but the motion would still be presented in new business if there was a second. The World Board recommended to not adopt. Free State was asked why they withdrew their second, and Walter B (RD, Free State) explained that he was uncomfortable with it being at the discretion of the delegate. *Straw poll on Motion #31: Very little support from the body.*

**Motion #54: “That a moratorium be placed on presenting any motions that rescind or limit the voting privileges of World Board members for 3 conference cycles ending 2010.”** (Pepe C, RD-Mexico)

The maker said that this motion will not be presented in new business.

**Motion #56: “To amend A Guide to World Services in Narcotics Anonymous by adding language on page 56, paragraph K ‘Any motion appearing in the Conference Agenda Report need no second at the World Service Conference during old business.’”** (John S, RD-Mid-America)

The maker said that this motion will not be presented in new business.

**Motion #60: “Reprioritize the worldwide workshop project plan to ‘initial priority.’”** (Bryan W, RD-California Mid-State)

The maker of the motion explained that he considers the worldwide workshops important and sees a need to support them more strongly. The World Board had no recommendation. There was some clarification regarding the non-binding nature of the straw polls about project prioritization. Several delegates spoke to the effectiveness of worldwide workshops, including their function as a model for regional workshops, their contribution to leadership development, the way they help get people involved in service, and the ways they help to better the relationship between world services and local NA communities. Other participants were concerned that other projects might suffer if worldwide workshops were made a top priority. Bella (WB) clarified that regardless of the disposition of this motion, fellowship development is an ongoing service. There was some discussion about locations and cost, and Bob (WB) said that the board understands that emotional value is difficult to connect to financial cost. *Straw poll on Motion #60: Moderate support from the body.*

#### **LITERATURE (MOTION 55)**

**Motion #55: “That all content of the literature in process of development be accessible to every region for input and review before the publication of the final draft for approval in the Conference Agenda Report.”** (Jose Luis A, RD-Region Del Coqui)

Jose Luis explained that his region would have liked to review the whole sponsorship book as a draft. The board recommended not to adopt. One participant said that his region’s experience using workgroups to evaluate the *Step Working Guides* has led them to oppose the motion. Jose Luis clarified that the motion is not intended to be about translation. Several board members spoke against the motion because it does not allow for flexibility from project to project and it may affect the speed of literature development. There was some debate over the ideal way for members to have an impact on literature development. *Straw poll on Motion #55: Very weak support from the body.*

#### **OTHER TOPICS (MOTIONS 26, 32, 34)**

**Motion #26: “Add a World Service Meeting Project Plan to the budget/project plans. Budget \$12,000 for meeting space, equipment rental, mailings, literature, etc. and \$3,000 for travel subsidies for non-US regions for a total budget of \$15,000. Hold the World Service Meeting in the off-conference year.”** (Bryan W, RD-California Mid-State)

Bryan explained that he sees a value in the opportunity to meet before the end of the CAR deadline. He believes a number of motions in the CAR could have been dealt with before we

did regional workshops. The motion's provision to fund some non-US participants could make this less of a US-exclusive event. He said that he will withdraw the motion, but he would like to see the body's interest in the concept. A couple of delegates spoke to their desire to see improved communication. Bryan said that the motion is out of order because it calls for a project. *Straw poll on Motion #26: Moderate support from the body.*

**Motion #32: "That the World Service Conference agrees that the principle of Resolution A is being met by our current world service structure."** (*Rex S, RD-Washington/N. Idaho*)

The maker said that this motion will not be presented in new business.

**Motion #34: "Take action to pursue recovery of actual damages, losses and costs incurred as a result of the WSO employee embezzlement."** (*Bryan W, RD-California Mid-State*)

The maker said that this motion will not be presented in new business.

Mark H (CF) stated that the meeting is adjourned and reminded participants that the new business session would begin at 3:00 pm after a brief break.

## NEW BUSINESS

*Session led by Tim S and Mark H, cofacilitators*

Tim (CF) called the new business session to order at 3:04 pm. He opened the meeting with a moment of silence to remember the still-suffering addict, followed by the Serenity Prayer.

Tim introduced Garth P (HRP) so that he could have an opportunity to say goodbye to the conference. Garth received a standing ovation from the conference. Garth presented a slide show to illustrate his gratitude. He left the conference with these few words: "Try not to take things so seriously here."

Roll call #7 (see Appendix A)  
 Conducted by Mark H (CF)  
 107 participants are present  
 93 regions are present  
 For new business,  
 72 represents a 2/3 majority  
 54 represents a simple majority

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #35*

**"To approve the Business Plan Workgroup project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."**

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #36*

**"To approve the Basic Text project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."**

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #37*

**"To approve the Leadership Identification & Development project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."**

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #38*

**"To approve the NAWS Communications & Publications project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."**

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #39*

**"To approve the Public Relations Strategy project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."**

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #40*

**“To approve the Service Handbooks project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.”**

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #41*

**“To approve the Service Material project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.”**

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #42*

**“To approve the Leadership Qualities in NA project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.”**

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #43*

**“To approve the Self Support IP project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.”**

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #44*

**“To approve the Service Structure Relationship & Definition project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.”**

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #45*

**“To approve the Targeted Literature project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.”**

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #46*

**“To approve the Capturing Long Time Members Experience project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.”**

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #47*

**“To approve the Consensus Based Decision Making at the WSC project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.”**

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #48*

**“To approve the Fellowship Issue Discussions project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.”**

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #49*

**“To approve the Literature Distribution & Convention Workshop project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.”**

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #50*

**“To approve the Worldwide Workshops project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.”**

*Amendment: It was M/S/F Bryan W (RD, California Mid-State)/ Peter H (RD, Greater New York), Motion #60:*

**“Reprioritize the worldwide workshop project plan to ‘initial priority’.”**

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #51*

**“To approve the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.”**

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #52*

**“To recognize Venezuela as a seated World Service Conference participant beginning at the close of WSC 2004.”**

*It was M/C World Board, Motion #53*

**“To recognize Chile as a seated World Service Conference participant beginning at the close of WSC 2004.”**

*It was M/S/F Bobby S (RD, South Florida)/ Donna C. (RD, Georgia), Motion #27*

**“To amend A Guide to World Services, page 22 by adding the following language: To add a bullet #3 in Nominations that “all regional nominations for WB, HRP and Cofacilitators be submitted up to 60 days prior to the opening of WSC, and names of nominees to be included in the March Conference Report.”**

*Conference participants accepted this friendly amendment offered by Bobby S (RD, South Florida) :*

**“To change the words ‘up to’ to ‘at least’”**

*It was M/S/Committed to the World Board Walter B (RD, Free State) / Peter H (RD, Greater New York), Motion #33*

**“To include regional conscience and endorsement in the HRP Guidelines for the selection process for World Board, HRP and Cofacilitator positions.”**

*Amendment: It was M/S/C Walter B (RD, Free State) / Peter H (RD, Greater New York)*

**“To include the word ‘optional’ between the words ‘include’ and ‘regional’ in Motion #33”**

*It was M/S/C Rex S (RD, Washington/N Idaho) / Seth S (RD, Rio Grande)*

**“To commit Motion #33 to the World Board”**

*It was M/S/C Arne H (RD, British Columbia)/ Roseann B-A (RD, Northern California), Motion #58 (Standing count, of 112 participants, 76 voted “Yes”)*

**“That the system for identifying candidates for World Service positions include the opportunity for RSCs and/or the World Board to forward potential candidates to the HRP separately from and after the HRP’s initial blind screening process.”**

*Amendment: It was M/S/C Luc C (RD, Quebec)/ Paul O (RD, Japan)*

**“To add the words ‘zonal forum’ just after the term ‘RSC’ in Motion #58.”**

*It was M/S/F Nick E (RD, UK) / Miko N (RD, Israel)*

**“Commit Motion #58 to the World Board”**

*It was M/S/F Jose Luis A (RD, Region Del Coqui) / Pedro M (RD, Panama), Motion #55*

**“That all content of the literature in process of development be accessible to every region for input and review before the publication of the final draft for approval in the Conference Agenda Report.”**

*Amendment: It was M/S/C Jose Luis A (RD, Region Del Coqui) / Richie S (RD, Eastern New York)*

**“To add the words ‘whenever feasible’ before the word ‘That’ in Motion #55”**

After the motion was dispensed with, the following occurred:

Jose Luis A (RD, Region Del Coqui) asked what policy the last motion affected such that it needed 2/3 majority to pass.

Bob J (WB) responded that it would affect the approval and input process in *A Guide to World Services in Narcotics Anonymous*.

Bob thanked the cofacilitators and Don C (parliamentarian) for their services. (Standing ovation.) Bob asked if we can get Don to come back in two years.

Don told the body that his first conference was in 1988. He reminded those who were here in 1988 to realize how far this group has come. He also commended the cofacilitators for their effort.

Bob pointed out that Don didn’t answer the question.



Don: I'll be here. (Applause.)

Bob stated that if Don is still here in 2008, we should give him a gold watch... or a purple heart for twenty years of service.

Mark H (CF) took a moment of personal privilege to thank all conference participants for a very successful business session. He stated that he is grateful to be here to witness this. Applause.


And with that Mark closed the new business session of WSC 2004.

## FELLOWSHIP DEVELOPMENT

*Session led by Ron and Tom*

This session opened with a clip of fellowship development from the NA History CD created for WCNA. Tom then talked about his personal passion for the subject and then gave some highlights of NAWS fellowship development efforts over the past cycle, including the APF in Bangladesh, Indonesia, and Nepal.

Anthony then talked about attending a professional event in Cuba for the first time. A member of the World Board went and made contact with local members and professionals while there. Anthony said that we all need to pray for our members in Cuba who are having a hard time. Sometimes we haven't reached a level of professional credibility in a community and "our brothers and sisters in Cuba right now are struggling" in trying to just go to meetings and recover. Anthony warned, however, that our efforts to help may cause harm. He cautioned Americans who have the desire to help to contact members of the LAZF because they know how to be helpful without making the situation in Cuba worse. Anthony also talked about trips to China and South Korea.



Tom shared about fellowship development connected to the fiftieth anniversary world convention, and Ron talked about the impact of the worldwide workshops. He then began a sharing portion of the session where he asked delegates the following questions: *What event occurred where you live and what do you see as its impact in moving forward? We know that worldwide workshops feel good but that has only a limited value—do they change the local fellowship? What are the long-term effects?*

- Luis (RD, Peru) shared that the experience in Peru made a mark on the region—they knew the meaning of the groups, added the workshop model to their step-working meetings, and took the model and started to do workshops in different areas in Peru.

- Piet (RD, Sweden) shared about Daniel's visit and how he shared in a way that really made the members back home feel a part of this body. Donations and contributions will increase, and the visit affected the unity of NA.
- Ron (WB) commented on how challenging it can be to carry this work to groups. He talked about how we often think of fellowship development only as small communities outside the US, and how these workshops can be thought of as "energizing the base" of members committed to service in NA.
- Bryan W (RD, California Mid-State) shared that they used the workshops as an opportunity for leadership development.
- Pritam D (RD, IRF) shared how the worldwide workshops allowed people who speak many different languages to talk and interact.
- Becky (WSO, Asst. ED) then talked about her experience in Russia. She described how they took workshop techniques and applied them a little differently. She shared about the diversity of language groups present and how what the members wanted to talk about most were basic translation and service structure issues. She also mentioned the recent trip to the Philippines in which an unprecedented decision was made to send only one member to attend a regional event.
- Anthony (WSO, ED) described recent trips to Latin America where there were immediate challenges with unity and women in local service. He emphasized that world services is trying make the NA message accessible to the global fellowship.
- Seth (RD, Rio Grande) shared about a region in Mexico that partnered with the Rio Grande region.

The session closed with a CD that was created for the most recent trip to Russia.

## OUR PUBLIC IMAGE: ISSUE DISCUSSION TOPIC

*Session led by: Lib E (WB) and Tony W (WB)*

Lib opened this session with some introductions and then shared how she feels privileged to be a part of the PR roundtables and how they connect to the strategic plan.

Tony then talked about how we tend to forget about our public image and how examining this connects to our Seventh Step. He pointed out that our reputation is changing, but follow up is important, and we need to address the issues of predators and prejudice in meetings. He then detailed some of the public relations events that occurred this last cycle and stated the importance of the WSO having a PR policy.

Lib gave an overview of the PR roundtables. She explained how the PR roundtables are like an inventory and how we can gather and exchange information, increase cooperation between NA and professionals who help addicts, and, identify/reduce real or perceived barriers between NA and the public or professionals. Following is a list of PR roundtables facilitated by NAWS.

Video clips then illustrated some negative feedback given during the PR roundtables. Tony asked conference participants to share some of their experience:

- Deb (RD, Aetoroa New Zealand) shared that there is much energy around our public image in her area. Regional assemblies did strategic planning; one idea was professional surveys.
- Luc C (AD, Quebec) said they had the opportunity to have a drug conference a year ago and they had NAWS support. NA is twenty-five years old in Quebec. Many of their professionals were not talking about NA but since the conference they have been doing so more. They are on TV and radio now. They asked NAWS for help and received it. If

you need their help, ask. He shared overwhelming feelings for the Russian workshop and involvement with the EDM.

- Jim (AD, Carolina) said they began notifying NAWS of professional events some time ago. They've become deeply involved in SECAD. This has evolved into a five-region effort to communicate the viability of NA. They talk about fellowship sorts of things as well as marketing issues. Jim has been involved with eight of these. We need to be mindful of our actions at our homegroup, not just at a professional booth.
- Jose Luis (RD, Region del Coqui) said that at LAZF two months ago they were approached by Dominican Republic government officials. He had the privilege of going down there and doing a PI panel for a group of physicians, treatment professionals, police, nurses, and religious people. They want to do one every year, and some of them had never even heard of NA.
- John (RD, Mid-America) shared about a facility with a mixed twelve-step message in the meetings and a PI presentation. Now there is a clear message at the facility for each twelve-step program. "All it took was us getting off our ass."
- Lucie P (RD, Le Nordet) spoke of two regions cooperating to get a TV ad together.

Lib ended the sharing session by acknowledging Anthony and by reminding the body that we have two years to discuss this topic. The session closed with positive clips from the PR roundtables.

## Saturday, 1 May 2004

### INFRASTRUCTURE ISSUE DISCUSSION SESSION

*Session led by Craig R (WB) and Giovanna G (WB)*

Craig began by talking about last night's session on public image and how it relates to infrastructure. He gave the body an overview of the session's flow and then asked conference participants what infrastructure means to them. Responses included the following: it's the structure inside an organization; it's the structure of an RSC, ASC, WSC; it's the structure of world services to the groups.

Craig then added to what was said by further detailing the components of infrastructure. He shared that the feedback from the PR roundtables provides an opportunity to affect those perceptions and that this session is about those challenges and solutions.

Giovanna then shared about efforts to strengthen infrastructure in relation to the LAZF's trip to Argentina and recent trips to El Salvador and Nicaragua. She then referenced the challenges outlined in the regional reports and drove home the premise that infrastructure is strong when people are willing to do things.

A small group activity then gave participants the opportunity to answer the following questions: 1. Where is your area/region today as far as providing services to your local NA community? 2. Is your area/region faced with any of the same challenges affecting infrastructure? If so, share some of the solutions and/or issues that are still present. 3. Imagine that the vision statement is already fulfilled; what is the structure already in place to help achieve that? What tools have been created in order to make that a reality? (See Appendix I for complete results.)

The small group reports included some of the following points:

problems of leadership and communication among the different levels of the service; use of the Internet; work in PI and H&I in developing in countries; members not understanding why we need service; lack of maturity and experience; resistance to change and apathy;

phonelines; filling service positions with qualified people; lack of consistency; problems with outreach to isolated groups; not using service material; developing better rules and using them; how to pull in geographically far-apart areas; rotating meetings to get people involved; giving service a positive attitude; prejudice concerning structure; business work taking the place of “real” work like H&I and PI; people making service look dull when they stay a long time; groups not communicating with each other; apathy from oldtimers; CBDM; conventions taking people away from service; service priorities; predators; metro cooperation; training and interactive workshops—not just a boring presentation; awareness newsletters—letting people know what we need; developing a problem-solving process; lack of literature; getting along with each other; limited funds and using those funds; groups not feeling connected—high-profile meetings; racial issues; downsizing subcommittees; mentoring; language and culture diversity; misuse of NA funds; lack of rotation; streamlining the service structure; regions trying to make money to buy literature and having to put all their energy into that; getting meeting lists updated; food attracting people; dysfunctional comfort zones—we keep doing the same thing over and over; more fluidity and cooperation. In Japanese, the character for crisis means opportunity—it seems that when there’s a crisis, people get involved.

Craig brought the session to a close by collecting the forms from each table, and he highlighted how our service structure is interrelated and interconnected.

## MOVING FORWARD WITH A COMMON VISION

*Session led by Bob J (WB) and Anthony E (WSO ED)*

Becky M (WSO Asst. ED) passed out the summary of decisions to conference participants and made a few announcements concerning expense reports, requests for pictures of the board, and WSC evaluation forms.

### **SET UP OF SESSION**

Bob explained that the purpose of the session is to talk about the upcoming cycle, 2004–2006.

Those with suggestions for the conference participants’ bulletin board were asked to talk to Paul C.

### **NEW PRODUCTS**

Anthony then talked some about new and forthcoming products including *NA Way* bundles, new literature racks (prototypes were displayed), and medallion journals.

Then Anthony told the room that “we made history this week,” but that the record doesn’t necessarily reflect what he saw in the room. The record will reflect that there was overwhelming conference support to accept the smooth-finish medallions, change the Third Step posters to add the words “many of us have said,” and to create a reading card from the third paragraph from the Basic Text’s “We Do Recover” beginning, “When at the end of the road.” The room assented through applause, and Anthony explained that “we’ve all made history together.”

### **BUILDING LEASE**

Anthony then talked some about the WSO building in response to the many questions he’s received. At the close of this session he informed participants that the numbers he’d given them about the leasehold improvements here were not accurate and that correct figures would be included with the conference summary (see Appendix J).

### **COMMUNICATION AND PROJECT PLANS**

Anthony turned the session back to Bob who said that the rest of the session would focus on communication and project plans. Bob explained that we will talk about communication in two

senses: communication within the fellowship (without WS necessarily involved) and the “input-feedback-reporting” loop—communication during the cycle about projects—from delegates to world services and from world services to delegates. “We want that to be a loop, instead of a tennis match, as it were.”

### **ISSUE DISCUSSION QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Bob asked some questions of participants, including: Did you use the issue discussion bulletin boards and *News Flashes*? Were they helpful? How could we improve them? Did you have discussions within regions? How did they go? What were the outcomes? How can we have more effective (deeper and wider) discussions?

Comments included

- difficulties using the bulletin boards;
- successful issue discussion workshop experiences;
- challenges in getting the information “upstream” to world services and other regions;
- suggestions on improving group-level self-support; and
- receiving more input on issues by distilling the CAT and CAR material by topic.

### **COMMUNICATIONS WITH DELEGATES AND SERVICE STRUCTURE**

Bob asked questions of the group, including: Where are our communications working best? What can we improve and how? How can we better solicit ideas and help you better communicate about issues and projects in your regions? We think standardized regional reports were a process improvement; what do you think needs improving?

Comments and suggestions included

- suggestion to send blanket emails to RDs reminding them to check the bulletin board;
- the idea that even if only one region suggests a change, more than one region may be in favor of it, and so the board may want to make the change;
- complaint about listing online meetings, even with a disclaimer;
- suggestion to put more downloadable, editable reports online;
- the idea that the board could work harder to get a sense of the body when making decisions, perhaps with phone calls or some other use of technology;
- the desire to have more of a summary of the PR roundtable results;
- comment about the issue discussion *News Flashes* being helpful, especially with a deadline; and
- kudos to NAWS for helping a new delegate, along with suggestions for more summaries of information.

### **ONLINE MEETINGS**

Jane brought up the desire for a straw poll for the board to consider Northern California’s concern about listing online meetings on the NAWS website. Roseann (RD, Northern California) explained that her region is conservative and they feel that there are complex issues that need to be further examined before meetings are listed on a “trial” basis. For example, in some of those meetings, there is no way for a group conscience to influence things. In some online groups you need to register personal information in order to share. Roseann said her region thinks the decision to list these meetings was premature.

Anthony (WSO ED) took a straw poll to determine who thought “it was premature for NAWS to proceed with listing online meetings”:

Yes: 39	No: 21	Not sure: 11
---------	--------	--------------

Do you want us to continue listing online meetings? Yes: 30    No: 22    Not sure: 21

### **PROJECT PLANS**

Then Bob solicited feedback on the project plans

Business Plan Workgroup: No feedback

Basic Text: The Show-Me delegate said her region had input on all of the projects and they would email it to the board. Several urged her to post it to the bulletin board as well.

Leadership Identification and Development: No feedback

NAWS Communications and Publications: No feedback

Public Relations Strategy: One delegate questioned whether a fifteen-member board would enable more of the projects to get addressed, and Bob explained that staff levels have more of an effect on how many projects get worked on.

Service Handbooks: Comments included issues about clothing and public image, review of and input for handbooks, whether work was being done to the draft PI Handbook (it is one of the materials that will be in the mix in creating a new handbook, but the board is looking at possibly creating a handbook that addresses the interrelation of committees), and a question about outreach (without wanting to create false expectations, Anthony said he imagined that we would look at all of our current materials to determine their relevance and whether they needed updating).

Service Materials: One delegate asked whether PSAs are still being distributed, and Bob said they are on the web and they are old but still available.

Leadership Qualities in NA: No feedback

Worldwide Workshops: Bob said, "You want more of them, is that what I heard?" and the room applauded.

Self-Support IP: One delegate talked about his home group's approach to self-support—each member pays for part of the meeting; all basket money goes to area.

Service Structure Relationship and Definition: One delegate suggested an emphasis on area and group service since most of our membership serves there.

Targeted Literature: There were several comments about this topic, including issues surrounding HIV/AIDS, literacy, and the need for faster literature development. A delegate asked about "IPs" he received in the mail, and Anthony said those are public information brochures—information about NA and compiled statistics from surveys distributed at world conventions—that are available from WSO.

Capturing Long-Term Members' Experience: A delegate asked how tapes and information can get to those working on the project. (Send them to the office.)

Consensus-Based Decision-Making at the WSC: Comments included the desire to stop just talking about CBDM and start incorporating it, the wish for more updates on the issue, the prompt for anyone with information to forward it to NAWS, and the desire for a standard definition.

Fellowship Issue Discussions: Bob reminded participants that the issues for discussion in this cycle are Our Public Image and Infrastructure.

Literature Distribution and Convention Workshop: No feedback

### **OFFSITE SESSION**

Bob asked whether participants liked the off-site session, and the room clapped and cheered. Bob asked if anyone didn't care for it, and one participant said the only thing wrong was that there wasn't enough time.

### **THE BASIC TEXT**

Bob invited the room to recognize that the decision to revise the Basic Text was history-making; it will affect many lives to come. World services will need a consistent stream of

communication. What's your wish list for the personal stories? Give us your ideas about the identities, experience, etc., you want to see. We will also need your stories. Send them along with a copyright release form. All project progress will be reported in *NAWS News*. You'll see more about the Basic Text project in *The NA Way* as well.

#### **MISCELLANEOUS**

Anthony then addressed Roseann and asked if she still had a sense of humor. He presented her with an annual report that he said he had prepared especially for her and then showed the room that it was completely blank on the inside. The whole room clapped.

#### **ANNOUNCEMENTS.**

The meeting closed with miscellaneous announcements (e.g., zonal forum website info will be posted on na.org, questions about the bulletin board can be directed to: [admin@wsoinc.org](mailto:admin@wsoinc.org), as well as a video of Hawaii, and a presentation of flowers to Jane from the Hawaii delegate team.

The meeting adjourned to lunch where the conference officially closed with food, goodbyes, and hugs.





## APPENDIX A: ROLL CALLS

Roll Call 1   Roll Call 2   Roll Call 3   Roll Call 4   Roll Call 5   Roll Call 6   Roll Call 7

Name	Here	Here	Here	Here	Here	Here	Here
WB - Bella A	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
WB - Bob J	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
WB - Craig R	1	0	0	1	1	1	1
WB - Daniel S	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
WB - David J	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
WB - Giovanna G	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
WB - Jane N	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
WB - Jim B	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
WB - Lib E	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
WB - Ron H	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
WB - Saul A	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
WB - Susan C	1	1	1	0	1	1	1
WB - Tom McC	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
WB - Tony W	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Region	Here	Here	Here	Here	Here	Here	Here
ABCD Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Alabama/NW Florida Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Alaska Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
AI-Sask Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Aotearoa New Zealand Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Argentina Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Arizona Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Arkansas Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Australian Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Baja Son Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Best Little Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Brazil Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
British Columbia Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Buckeye Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
California Inland Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
California Mid-State Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Carolina Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Central California Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Chesapeake/Potomac Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Chicagoland Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Colombia Region	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
Colorado Region	0	1	1	1	1	1	1

Connecticut Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Costa Rica Region	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
Eastern New York Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Ecuador Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Florida Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
France Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Freestate Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Georgia Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
German Speaking Region	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
Greater Illinois Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Greater New York Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Greater Philadelphia Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Greece Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Guatemala Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Hawaii Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Indiana Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Iowa Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Ireland Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
IRF Region	1	1	0	0	1	0	1
Israel Region	1	0	1	1	0	1	1
Italy Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Japan Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Kentuckiana Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Le Nordet Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lone Star Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Louisiana Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Metro Detroit Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mexico Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Michigan Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mid-America Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mid-Atlantic Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Minnesota Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mississippi Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Montana Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mountain Valley Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mountaineer Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Nebraska Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
New England Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
New Jersey Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
North East Atlantic Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Northern California Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Northern New England Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Northern New Jersey Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Northern New York Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Norway Region	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
Ohio Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
OK Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Ontario Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Pacific Cascade Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Panama Region	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
Peru Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Philippines Region	1	1	1	0	1	1	1
Portugal Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Quebec Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Region 51	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Region Del Coqui	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Region of the Virginians	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Rio Grande Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
San Diego/Imperial Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Show-Me Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Sierra Sage Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
South Florida Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Southern California Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Southern Idaho Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Spain Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Sweden Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Tejas Bluebonnet Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Tri-State Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
UK Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Upper Midwest Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Upper Rocky Mountain Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Uruguay Region	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
Utah Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Volunteer Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Washington/N. Idaho Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Western New York Region	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
Wisconsin Region	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<b>Total participants present</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>Number of regions present</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>2/3 majority</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Simple majority</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>54</b>

<b>Old Business--only RDs vote</b>							
<b>Number of regions present</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>2/3 majority</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Simple majority</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>47</b>

**Seated but not attending this conference**

Finland Region

NERF Region

South Dakota Region

**ROLL CALL VOTES**

<b>Roll Call Vote #1 (Motion #17)</b>				<b>Roll Call Vote #2 (Regarding Number of HRP Members)</b>		
<b>Name</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abs</b>	<b>Run Off</b>	<b>Seat 5</b>	<b>Abs</b>
WB - Bella A				1		
WB - Bob J				1		
WB - Craig R				1		
WB - Daniel S				1		
WB - David J					1	
WB - Giovanna G					1	
WB - Jane N					1	
WB - Jim B					1	
WB - Lib E					1	
WB - Ron H					1	
WB - Saul A					1	
WB - Susan C				1		
WB - Tom M				1		
WB - Tony W					1	
<b>Region</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abs</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abs</b>
ABCD Region		1		1		
Alabama/NW Florida Region		1			1	
Alaska Region				1		
Al-Sask Region	1			1		
Aotearoa New Zealand Region		1		1		
Argentina Region	1			1		
Arizona Region		1			1	
Arkansas Region		1			1	
Australian Region	1			1		
Baja Son Region		1		1		
Best Little Region				1		
Brazil Region		1		1		
British Columbia Region		1			1	
Buckeye Region		1			1	
California Inland Region		1		1		
California Mid-State Region		1				1
Carolina Region		1		1		
Central California Region		1			1	
Chesapeake/Potomac Region		1			1	
Chicagoland Region	1				1	
Colombia Region		1			1	
Colorado Region		1			1	

Connecticut Region		1		1		
Costa Rica Region	1				1	
Eastern New York Region		1		1		
Ecuador Region		1		1		
Florida Region		1		1		
France Region		1			1	
Freestate Region		1			1	
Georgia Region		1			1	
German Speaking Region		1		1		
Greater Illinois Region		1		1		
Greater New York Region	1				1	
Greater Philadelphia Region		1		1		
Greece Region		1			1	
Guatemala Region		1			1	
Hawaii Region		1		1		
Indiana Region		1			1	
Iowa Region		1		1		
Ireland Region	1				1	
IRF Region		1		1		
Israel Region					1	
Italy Region		1		1		
Japan Region		1			1	
Kentuckiana Region		1		1		
Le Nordet Region		1			1	
Lone Star Region		1			1	
Louisiana Region		1			1	
Metro Detroit Region		1			1	
Mexico Region		1		1		
Michigan Region		1		1		
Mid-America Region		1		1		
Mid-Atlantic Region		1			1	
Minnesota Region	1			1		
Mississippi Region		1		1		
Montana Region		1		1		
Mountain Valley Region		1			1	
Mountaineer Region		1			1	
Nebraska Region	1				1	
New England Region		1		1		
New Jersey Region		1			1	
North East Atlantic Region	1				1	
Northern California Region		1			1	
Northern New England Region		1		1		
Northern New Jersey Region		1		1		
Northern New York Region		1			1	

Norway Region					1	
Ohio Region		1		1		
OK Region		1		1		
Ontario Region	1			1		
Pacific Cascade Region		1		1		
Panama Region		1			1	
Peru Region		1			1	
Philippines Region	1				1	
Portugal Region	1			1		
Quebec Region		1		1		
Region 51		1		1		
Region Del Coqui		1		1		
Region of the Virginians		1			1	
Rio Grande Region		1		1		
San Diego/Imperial Region		1			1	
Show-Me Region		1		1		
Sierra Sage Region		1			1	
South Florida Region		1		1		
Southern California Region		1		1		
Southern Idaho Region		1		1		
Spain Region		1		1		
Sweden Region		1			1	
Tejas Bluebonnet Region		1			1	
Tri-State Region		1			1	
UK Region		1		1		
Upper Midwest Region		1			1	
Upper Rocky Mountain Region		1		1		
Uruguay Region				1		
Utah Region		1			1	
Volunteer Region		1			1	
Washington/N. Idaho Region		1			1	
Western New York Region		1		1		
Wisconsin Region		1			1	
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abs</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abs</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>1</b>

<b>Total participants present</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>Number of regions present</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2/3 majority</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Simple majority</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>Old Business--only RDs vote</b>		
<b>Number of regions present</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2/3 majority</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>Simple majority</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>51</b>

## APPENDIX B: MOTIONS CARRIED/COMMITTED

### Old Business Motions Carried:

- Motion 1: “To approve the book, *Sponsorship*, contained in Addendum A.”
- Motion 2: “To replace the existing IP #11, *Sponsorship*, with the revised draft contained in Addendum B. This motion would also approve the replacement of the text from the entire *Sponsorship* IP that currently appears in *An Introductory Guide to Narcotics Anonymous*.”
- Motion 3: “To replace the three quotes in *Just for Today* from the existing IP #11, *Sponsorship*, with material from the proposed IP as follows:
- February 8 would now read, ‘...an NA sponsor is a member of Narcotics Anonymous, living our program of recovery, who is willing to build a special, supportive, one-on-one relationship with us.’
  - March 13 would now read, ‘A sponsor is not necessarily a friend, but may be someone in whom we confide. We can share things with our sponsor that we may not be comfortable sharing in a meeting.’
  - March 26 would now read, ‘In seeking a sponsor, most members look for someone they feel they can learn to trust, someone who seems compassionate...’”
- Motion 4: “To approve work on revisions to the Basic Text, *Narcotics Anonymous*, that includes:
- no changes made to Chapters One through Ten;
  - the addition of a new preface to the Sixth Edition preceding the current preface (the current preface will remain the same and be titled “Preface to the First Edition”),
  - the replacement of some or all of the current personal stories, in order to better reflect the broad diversity of our fellowship; and
  - a brief introduction to the revised personal stories section.
- The time frame for this work will be two conference cycles, from 2004 to 2008, including a six-month review and input period. The approval form of the Sixth Edition Basic Text will be distributed as an appendix to the 2008 Conference Agenda Report for a minimum of 150 days.”
- Motion 5: “To change the maximum number of members for the World Board from ‘up to twenty-four’ to ‘up to eighteen’ and to reflect that change in the *World Board External Guidelines* in *A Guide to World Services in NA*.”
- Motion 6: “To eliminate specific language about standing committees, except the Executive Committee, from the section *Committees of the Board* in the *World Board External Guidelines* in *A Guide to World Services in NA*. These changes would also be reflected in the section on *General Duties* and in the chart representing the world service structure.”
- Admin motion: “To approve the WSC 2002 minutes.”

### New Business Motions Carried:

- Motion 35 “To approve the Business Plan Workgroup project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.”



- Motion 36: "To approve the Basic Text project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."
- Motion 37: "To approve the Leadership Identification & Development project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."
- Motion 38: "To approve the NAWS Communications & Publications project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."
- Motion 39: "To approve the Public Relations Strategy project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."
- Motion 40: "To approve the Service Handbooks project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."
- Motion 41: "To approve the Service Material project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."
- Motion 42: "To approve the Leadership Qualities in NA project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."
- Motion 43: "To approve the Self Support IP project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."
- Motion 44: "To approve the Service Structure Relationship & Definition project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."
- Motion 45: "To approve the Targeted Literature project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."
- Motion 46: To approve the Capturing Long Time Members Experience project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."
- Motion 47: "To approve the Consensus Based Decision Making at the WSC project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."
- Motion 48: "To approve the Fellowship Issue Discussions project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."
- Motion 49: "To approve the Literature Distribution & Convention Workshop project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."
- Motion 50: "To approve the Worldwide Workshops project plan for inclusion in the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."
- Motion 51: "To approve the 2004-2006 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget."
- Motion 52: "To recognize Venezuela as a seated World Service Conference participant beginning at the close of WSC 2004."
- Motion 53: "To recognize Chile as a seated World Service Conference participant beginning at the close of WSC 2004."
- Motion 58: "That the system for identifying candidates for World Service positions include the opportunity for RSCs, zonal forums, and/or the World Board to forward potential candidates to the HRP separately from and after the HRP's initial blind screening process."

**Motions committed:**

- Motion 33: "To include optional regional conscience and endorsement in the HRP Guidelines for the selection process for World Board, HRP and Cofacilitator positions."

**APPENDIX C: STRATEGIC PLAN SMALL GROUP RESULTS**  
**Tuesday, 27 April 2004 9:00 am**

Responses are as transcribed from group notes and not edited.

(Red or \*\* indicates top choices from tables)

**I. Communication**

- \*\*Ability for fellowship to interact with NAWS, i.e., monthly worldwide workshops
- \*\*Better PR/PI tools and processes
- \*\*Better WB/NAWS accessibility
- \*\* Public relations on a group level
- \*\*Decrease use of acronyms—state what they mean—simplicity
- \*\*Does not translate well
- \*\*Group communications with each other interculturally
- \*\*Internet x2
- \*\*PI/public relations training
- A WS book on how to do local service, to encourage all members to read *all* literature
- Ability to listen
- Apply principle of open-mindedness
- BT translated to all languages
- Better circulation of NA literature
- Better communication with legal and professional
- Better interaction between areas, groups, regions, etc.
- Better listening
- Better understand electronic access and capabilities
- Broadly distribute digest versions of all publications
- CAR, CPRs, etc.... WSC material needs to come in our own language
- Clarity of the NA message at the home group level
- Continue PR round tables
- Cultivate trust with each other in and out of the fellowship
- Defined communication channels (re: email)
- Development of the Internet
- Discussion on NAWS website for each topic, i.e., H&I, PI, CC (?), etc.
- Easier access to NAWS website to post
- Education
- Effective translations
- Email utilized to communicate needs
- Expand diversity—more languages in HRP
- External use technology—education with media
- Formal/specific updates at each area
- Format to create WSM on off-year of the WSC
- Full time translators on staff with \$\$ resources
- Greater and consistent contact with health professionals
- Greater knowledge and use of Internet
- Group registration and updates
- *Guide to Local Services in NA* workshops
- Have designated members of the WB for fellowship interaction

- Have WB members to make contact (phone) to RDs throughout the world—say kia ora bro! It is a personal touch. Build the links and break down the disconnect
- Have worldwide translation communication
- How can we lessen the disconnect with communication in the area of language [this was written in Spanish]
- Increase communication between WB and home groups; more face-to-face throughout fellowship
- Increase effectiveness of communications by the RDs and NAWS
- Increase liaison with RDs and NAWS and among RDs
- Increase usage of resources we have, i.e., Bulletin Board
- Increase use of power points within zonal areas
- Internet participation during area and regional meeting
- Inventory process within service structure (identify breakdowns)
- Lack of communication because of language
- Liaisons between committees
- Links between zonal forums
- Localized listening workshops
- Making concise version of the WSC minutes available to the groups [this suggestion from the gallery]
- Mass media advertisements and public announcements
- Meet we professionals
- More active participation with the WSO in NA public information forums
- More information (NAWS assertiveness) to internal information management system
- More involvement with schools/more NA literature available in schools
- More low-tech fellowship development trips
- More NAWS presence at regional conventions
- More PR efforts
- More support for zonal forums in terms of financing and attendance
- More use of technology
- More venues for conference participants to be together
- More WWW workshops—break down us/them
- Multimedia venues
- Multiple points of contact in native language
- Need to get more people in service
- One-fourth WS meetings done via Internet
- PI “speaking out” publication
- Principle of honesty
- PSAs
- Public relations communication needs to take into account cultural differences
- Public relations improvements
- Public relations—way to help members know how to present to public (public relations packet, PI info packet)
- Quarterly emails from NAWS—reminds us of bulletin board, etc.
- Reaching isolated groups
- Reports quarterly from regions every six month
- Service material translations separate
- Small groups with WB—interaction
- Specific WB contacts
- Speed up literature development process and follow with immediate translations

- Standardized reporting forms
- Steering committees
- Submitting monthly reports
- Survey our image
- Train public information servants to work with professionals
- Train the trainers
- Translations
- Trusted services not breaking chain of communication
- TV commercials (PI)
- Update events calendar/meeting lists updates
- Updated recent PI materials and public relations
- US regional assembly
- Use simple language
- Verify/shake down communications
- Video-teleconferencing x2
- WB has not been available for dialogue/more accessibility
- Wider distribution of *The NA Way Magazine*
- Work on mutual communication (this was written in Spanish)
- Worldwide helpline
- Worldwide workshops (internal)
- WSC at the UN so that all languages are translated in real time

## II. Leadership and Management

- \*\*ACE = accountability, communication, education
- \*\*Better development of HRP—proactive
- \*\*Continued/expanded use of workgroups
- \*\*Creative—exploit NA members for skills/talent via interviewing; use WSO; video conferencing
- \*\*Cultivate leaders/mentoring/sponsorship
- \*\*Cultivation of leadership—how can we identify our local shining stars? Solutions welcome!
- \*\*Developing/utilizing World Pool
- \*\*Es mejor un servicio basado en la recuperacion que una recuperacion basada en el servicio
- \*\*Fellowship mentors that pass on experience and knowledge
- \*\*Have a full WB
- \*\*Having system in place to develop, train, and assist WP participants
- \*\*More independent board involvement
- \*\*More project driven workgroups
- \*\*More worldwide workshops
- \*\*Recovery oriented literature directed toward service
- \*\*Service IP
- \$\$\$\$ and resources
- Active recruitment/principles before personalities
- Area and regional surveys (get women)
- Better communications between HRP and WB
- Better education of professionals of who we are and what we are about
- Better identify the point person for each service

- Better PR for the addicts who need to find us
- Better promotion of World Pool
- Better resumes
- Better use of the Traditions and the Concepts
- Bring sponsees to service commitments
- Buscar en las regiones en desarrollo nuevo liderazgo
- Change perception of leadership
- Combine HRP and WB
- Concept Four awareness—how to become
- Concept working guide
- Conference participants—proactive
- Continuing education outside the fellowship
- Conferences
- Define zonal forums
- Develop literature on leadership. Train the trainer guide (x2 entries)
- Do not fear confrontation
- Do not waive clean time
- Document program of leadership development
- Ejemplo y liderazgo
- Eliminate all types of racism and/or “us” versus “them”
- Encourage and support
- Ensure we resource and look after our members doing service—realistic expectations
- Evaluation by RDs of NAWS staff
- Formentar la rotacion programada
- Give current leaders more responsibility in selecting new leader
- Guidelines for service learning geared to leadership and management
- Head-hunting process
- Holding people accountable/performance appraisals
- How can we encourage addicts to see the benefits of participating in service—group, area, region, world
- How to elect our WB...improve process
- Humanize board—they are like us
- I have done my time...older members staying away from service.
- Identify people in fellowship with skills necessary
- Identify potential leaders
- Improve HRP
- Improvement of PSAs
- Improving meeting environments
- Improving understanding of the Seventh Tradition and concept
- In PI, no service can be better than poor service
- Increase our tradition/concept knowledge through exposure
- Increase PI presentations with the community
- Increase process of trust
- Job sharing
- Keep experience around
- Keep service meetings “insanity free”
- Lead by example
- Leadership mentors/pairing off x2
- Leadership suggestions handbook

- Less corporate language
- Make service fun and more attractive
- Mentoring
- Monthly board reports
- More addicts participating in workgroups utilize the World Pool
- More NAWS involvement in emerging areas
- More stringent criteria for WS positions
- Motivation by example in effective leadership
- News Flashes/info—simplify the info
- Nurturing our future leaders
- Opportunity for RDs to discuss among themselves the nominees to world level positions
- Personal invitations
- Personal involvement with each other
- Plan ahead on nominations
- Programs to support interaction between groups and areas
- Raise awareness in NA that leadership is highly desired
- RDs (etc.) should encourage members to fill out WP resumes
- Right person for right job
- Schedule regional leadership workshops supported by WS
- Service = we become responsible productive members of society
- Service-oriented (IP) leadership
- Service medallions/T-shirts
- Service structure filter down/local strategic plan/inventory on service
- Service workshops
- Simple and direct communication toward everyday members
- Single point of accountability in all service areas
- Skills audit—ask the questions
- sponsorship
- Start this process at ground level (through sponsorship)
- Strengthen the relationship between RDs and WB (unity)
- Structure
- Structured mentoring
- Talleres de servicio mundial en regions en desarrollo
- Technical systems that will help to improve the good management of the WSO
- Train the trainer x2
- Trust God!
- Trusting our leaders x2
- Update service manuals
- Use consultants
- Use our symbol—service, recovery, god, society, goodwill...our symbol is the strategy for life!
- Utilize resources of people already here (professionals)
- Where is it more important to have the leadership?
- Workgroups with diverse leadership experience
- Workshop at area/regional levels to communicate the need
- Workshop for training x2
- World pool better utilized through WWW
- World Pool driven by regional nominations

- WSC nominees to be surveyed by those they served with
- WSO in China/Africa

### III. Recovery Literature

- **\*\*Assign literature projects to regional/zonal forums**
- **\*\*Easy to read, understand, and get**
- **\*\*Increase availability and accessibility**
- **\*\*Increased availability of our literature**
- **\*\*Inexpensive**
- **\*\*Localized literature process—the freedom for it**
- **\*\*More translations x3**
- **\*\*Streamline approval process**
- **\*\*Translations**
- **\*\*Translations/NAWS multilingual support x2**
- 400 languages in India
- A living clean book
- A piece of literature on changing our image—being a responsible member
- Adapting literature as needed x2
- Addiction counselors
- Address cultural diversity
- Address professions/addicts and medication
- African literature
- All service and recovery literature translated
- Allow freedom for localized literature development to increase cultural diversity
- Aumento inversiones en trajuccionos
- Balance of cost/affordable
- Better communication and support of local and foreign translation committees
- Better relationships with outside world
- Better timelines for translations
- Book and/or IP on service
- Book and/or IP on spiritual principles
- Books in libraries
- Broaden the scope of topics (youth and recovery)—targeted literature
- Comic books
- Consider cultural diversity
- Cubiertas mas atractivas
- Cultural resistance to specific wording, i.e., God, Higher Power
- Culturally diverse literature x2
- Current translations of service materials x2
- Descentralizar la venta de literature x2
- Development of literature from different communities
- Easy to read, easy to understand, and easy to get = inexpensive
- Eighth-grade reading level
- Elderly literature
- Establish a translations process in each country's language
- Everything on CD-ROM
- Experienced translators from every region
- Extra staff

- Family oriented literature
- Fellowship input
- Focus on anonymity not diversity
- Free literature for all
- Graphics book on recovery—more tapes and Braille x2
- Have wish list workshops for literature
- How can we involve our targeted members to get involved—speaker jams
- Identifying needs
- Impression de lit en otros paises
- Improve input and review process
- Improve prioritization process
- Increase surveys in-between conferences to localized communities to speed up process
- Internet x2
- Keep literature simple
- Literature about finding recovery while in hiding from government (this was translated from Spanish)
- Literature for members 10+/-+ years
- Literatura hecha por minorias para minorios
- Local fellowship translation
- Look at Basic Text model of literature development
- Loosen up the literature development process
- Lots of IT
- Media utilization
- More (new) youth-related literature
- More centralized office that produces/distributes
- More credence for lit review committees
- More diverse distribution
- More emphasis on translations
- More literature for our senior members
- More literature geared to youth
- More study (???) into cultural literature (proactive)
- More translations
- More variety in literature topics
- Multiple lit projects simultaneously
- New version of JFT
- Newcomer stories
- Online purchasing
- Pain management/chronic disease
- Pamphlet on past achievements
- Parenting in recovery (how NOT to kill your kids!)
- Personal stories from culturally diverse
- Reduced cost for literature x2
- Refigure (reconfigure?) Basic Text
- Revise *In Times of Illness*
- Senior literature x2
- Service JFT
- Speed up approval process
- Stop changing what we have



- Streamline translations
- Strengthen translation process/indigenous literature
- Sucursales de la OSM en cada continente para agilizar servicios (traducciones, cononicacion)
- Better use of surveys to see what we need x3
- Target audience/expand literature content x4
- Targeted literature development as per conference approval and by WB workgroup with input and review by membership x2
- To have the Basic Text in every language
- To investigate licensing in different parts of the world
- Todo en DVD y tecnología
- Traditions work book x2
- Traditions working guide
- Untranslatable “God” and other verbiage
- Update all service manuals
- Use symbol as guide to how to live
- Vision statement in group readings
- Wallet-sized Basic Text and other literature
- Worldwide literature conferences
- Written by addicts

#### IV. Resources

- **\*\*Better use of the World Pool**
- **\*\*Contributions make clean time (when affordable)**
- **\*\*Effective leaders**
- **\*\*Experienced members**
- **\*\*Financial**
- **\*\*Group contribution (more direct)...less reliance on literature sales.**
- **\*\*IP on self-support**
- **\*\*Money funds/Seventh Tradition**
- **\*\*More support and unity for our leaders**
- **\*\*Share financial information**
- \$2.00 per week per group—all groups making direct donations
- A suggested donation (Seventh Tradition) amounts for members, groups, areas, and regions
- Aid in exchange money (emerging communities/restricted currencies)
- Area breakdown pie chart—be proud to show your donation
- Attraction
- Better understanding of convention and event revenues x2
- Better usage of those willing to service, and better teaching of why it’s a benefit to do so
- Bilingual members
- Celebration of recovery
- Creating local service pools
- Decentralize the WSO—offices in other parts of the world
- Develop literature
- Develop targeted literature on responsibility of membership—how to change the US culture of \$1.00 in the basket. How much is my recovery worth???

- Developing trusted servants
- Electronic transfer of resources
- Encouraging members to fill World Pool resumes (recruitment) x3
- Encourage metro utilization of services
- Equipment/computers/software/phones
- Experienced members as a resource
- Explain difference between trusted servant and special worker
- Fellowship directed work assignments at NAWS
- Financial resources = lead by example, fundraiser/fun-raiser, raise awareness x2
- Find better way to communicate importance of Tradition Seven
- Focus on efficiency
- Focus on regional self-support
- Good girls and boys
- Historical resources (learn from our mistakes)
- Identify and meet the training plans through performance appraisals of WSO staff
- Improve fund flow, people (trusted servants) flow—group, area, region, world
- Increase NAWS staff capacity with best qualified and with increased wages
- Info on how regions do not have to rely on conventions (share experiences)
- Initialing (?)/mentoring trusted servants
- Internet tools and utilization
- Inventory of our resources (financial and human), have better use of
- Invest more resources into translations
- Less dependence on literature sales
- Let members know costs of meetings, etc.
- Looking to other organizations on how they manage resources
- More booths/fairs to interact with community
- More teaching of “where does the money go?”
- More worldwide NAWS employees x2
- My home group is where I pay the rent
- Positive attitudes
- Promote/increase World Pool—US recovering addicts/experience time
- Regions that cannot contribute money, can provide other types of resources, such as human, etc.
- Resources outside of NA—UN
- Retention of members x2
- Satellite offices
- Seventh Tradition
- Simplify services
- Skills
- Specialized staff/professional conduct
- Sponsorship x4
- Stability/consistency
- Staff capacity—trust our servants to monitor
- Survey
- The people, the people, the people...one of our greatest assets!
- To sell literature in libraries and institutions
- Workshops to improve the functions of the regional trusted servants
- Translation database x2
- Translations/translators

- Try to get away from literature sale dependence
- Updated RD contact list
- Use most simple service—they touch everybody
- Very expensive NA birthday cards
- WB and NAWS contact and duties info
- Website—job description/function of staff and how they can assist our members
- Willingness
- WSM off-conference
- Zonal pools x2

## V. Fellowship Support

- **\*\*Area service**
- **\*\*Better communication between groups, areas, regions, zones, and NAWS**
- **\*\*Empower leaders and develop better communication between group, area, regions, zones, and NAWS**
- **\*\*NAWS to work toward social acceptance of recovery from addiction**
- **\*\*Physical participation**
- **\*\*Service oriented literature—international**
- **\*\*Translations current in ten years**
- **\*\*Workshops**
- Accurate meeting list
- Assessment and creation of leaders at the local level from WS
- Asian Service Office
- Assistance with web planning
- Be open and caring
- Call and get live person
- Choose proper leaders at group level, especially the secretary
- Communication with service structure
- Community development/outreach/two-way communication
- Compile statistics
- Complete set of service materials
- Develop literature for maturing membership
- Encouraging role of zonal forums
- Fellowship development using the World Pool
- Financial support
- Financing emerging communities (this was written in Spanish)
- Focused training at zones
- For WS to send and finance trusted servants to attend conventions and conferences close to their countries
- Greater PR efforts, i.e., jails, governments
- Greeters at groups
- Improved relationships with existing service offices
- Improved service handbooks
- International helpline
- Interregional communication through videos or web conferencing
- Inter-zonal cooperation and support system
- Literature developed outside US and translated into English
- Literature subsidies x2

- Local infrastructure
- Local pool for local problems
- Maturity of zonal forums
- Mentoring
- Minimize acronyms
- More fellowship development trips
- More regional responsibilities
- More staff at NAWS
- More www workshops
- More zonal support outside US
- Much greater involvement in service
- NAWS office for each zonal forum
- Old-timers involvement
- Online support
- Open branch offices in Latin America
- Outreach
- Picture phone like Japan has for face-to-face addict to addict
- Primary purpose because of fellowship support
- Prioritize communities based on level of needs
- Recovery systems—symposiums/forums
- Recovery teams
- Reduction in cost of literature
- Region service offices of NAWS
- Regional/service sponsorship x2
- Self support
- Service structure—define service structure; increase or improve fellowship development/outreach x2
- Streamline lit process
- Technological support
- Tell us about AA process
- To send members of WS to support regions on a consistent basis
- Totally funded by the basket
- To work in the communication area which is the weakest part of the process
- Using the web (NAWS.org) to share guidelines/experience among regions
- Utilize Ninth Tradition—committees/members to fulfill services—motivate members/mentorship and communicate/human presence
- Video conferencing
- View the future
- Worldwide workshops

## APPENDIX D: WEBSITE STATISTICS

<b>Statistics - Report Range: 04/19/2003 23:59:59 - 04/19/2004 23:59:59</b>		
<b>Hits</b>	Entire Site (Successful)	22,308,921
	Average Per Day	60,953
	Home Page	741,862
<b>Page Views</b>	Page Views (Impressions)	3,534,862
	Average Per Day	9,658
	Document Views	3,379,996
<b>Visitor Sessions</b>	Visitor Sessions	1,257,963
	Average Per Day	3,437
	Average Visitor Session Length	00:06:54
	International Visitor Sessions	4.37%
	Visitor Sessions of Unknown Origin	43.07%
	Visitor Sessions from United States	52.54%
<b>Visitors</b>	Unique Visitors	480,626
	Visitors Who Visited Once	391,173
	Visitors Who Visited More Than Once	89,453

## APPENDIX E: HRP ELECTION INFORMATION

Following is information from the overheads from the HRP Report given Tuesday 27 April. This information is exactly as presented by the HRP. It is clear that some of the columns do not total.

World Board Elections	2002	2000	1999	1998
Ballots distributed	111	110	110	104
Ballots turned in	107	110	110	104
<u>Blank</u> ballots turned in	-	-	11	-
Ballots <u>not</u> turned in	4	-	-	-
% voted all open positions	-	5.5%	-	-
Votes needed for 60% election requirement	65	66	66	63
No. open positions	11	12	6	24
No. of candidates offered	18	28	18	36
Number WB Elected	1	7	0	18

No. Votes per Nominee	2002	2000	1999	1998
Nominees received votes on <b>60% or more</b> of the ballots turned in	1	7	-	18
Nominees received votes on <b>50 to 59%</b> of the ballots turned in	5	7	1	8
Nominees received votes on <b>40 to 49%</b> of the ballots turned in	10	8	5	6
Nominees received votes on <b>30 to 39%</b> of the ballots turned in	2	3	4	4
Nominees received votes on <b>20 to 29%</b> of the ballots turned in	-	3	6	-
Nominees received votes on <b>10 to 19%</b> of the ballots turned in	-	-	2	-
Total Number Nominees	18	28	18	36
Number WB Elected	1	7	0	18

Voting Pattern	2002	2000	1999	1998
% of participants voted for 0–3 nominees	14	4	17	1
% of participants voted for 4–6 nominees	20	5	39	0
% of participants voted for 7–9 nominees	27	15	23	2
% of participants voted for 10–12 nominees	26	25	1	3
% of participants voted for 13–15 nominees	8	10	2	10
% of participants voted for 16–18 nominees	5	14	1	9
% of participants voted for 19–21 nominees		10		22
% of participants voted for 22–24 nominees		5		31
% of participants voted for 25–27 nominees		6		18
% of participants voted for 28–30 nominees		6		5
% of participants voted for 31–36 nominees				3
Number WB Elected	1	7	0	18

## APPENDIX F: CULTIVATING LEADERSHIP MINDMAP QUALITIES

**Tuesday, 27 April, 2004, 4:30 pm**

Small Groups were asked to write down their ideas related to the questions on leadership in the CAR:

- What do we expect from our leaders, and how do we communicate those expectations?
- What is the role of leadership in moving toward our vision?
- How do we get people involved in service and cultivate leadership in Narcotics Anonymous?
- How can we cultivate leadership without falling into the “old boy network” syndrome?
- Can we even cultivate leadership in our new system?

The concepts were then “mapped” by Ron H (WB). Following is a list of the text on the map.

Action \*

Affirmation

Accountable \*\*\*\*\*

Do their job

Policies in place to hold them accountable

Appreciation

Approachable

Accessibility of our leaders to the member

Assertiveness (without aggression) \*

Attraction \*\*\*\*\*

Drawing people towards them (charisma)

Rather than promotion

Balance

Behavior

Benevolence

Commitment \*\*\*\*\*

Communicate/Communication \*\*\*\*\*

Communicate realistic expectations

Verbally clear \*\*

Communicate follow through

Communication skills

Open communication

Be concrete

Direct communications through workshops

Clear thinking

Communicate that trusted servant's work is important

Confidence

Consensus based decision-making

Consistency

Continuity \*



Through utilizing our current leaders

Creativity \*\*\*

Criteria

Better selection

Cultivate \*\*\*

Look for the “sparkle” and cultivate those and pick them up and show them the way mentoring\*\*\*\*\*

Starts at the home group give everyone a position, not money, chairs, coffee, hugger, etc.\*

Seek out new people

Training /need a map

If more people would cultivate leaders 5% of our servants doing 90% of work would end

Bring in newer members

Walk them through it—bring them along

Cultivate with trust

Inclusion

Visible and available \*

Workgroups

Exposure

With direction and help of Higher power

Provide opportunity

Dependable

Direction (clear) \*

Good direction

Diversity

Education \*\*\*

Job description \*

Be teachable

Teach / educate people \*\*

Remove stigma that leadership is control

Remove the “us and them” starting at home group

Ask for help

Training \*

Empowerment

Empathy

Encourage \*\*\*

Invitation

Play off strengths and encourage

Identify by talents and encourage

Encourage participation/engage

Lead spiritually through encouragement

Ethical

Not just ethical but spiritual: what does loving service mean

Evolve

Growth and maturity

Evolve newcomers

Experience \*\*

Sharing experience

Invite people with experience

Experienced member support

Example \*\*\*\*\*

Ask people directly

Have somebody show you

Power of

Role model \*

Enthusiasm \*

Lead spiritually

Role of leadership should be strong and motivational

Faith \*

Feedback (2 ways)

Honest \*\*\*

Flexible

Focus \*\*\*

Able to keep focus

Forgiveness

Fresh blood

Fun \*\*\*

Positive attitude \*

Goals

Able to set goals \*\*

Goal identification

Stay on task

Guidance \*

Guidelines \*\*

Follow guidelines

Gratitude

Honesty \*\*\*\*\*

Honest sharing

Truthfulness

Humility \*\*\*\*

Humble \*

Able to accept shortfalls

Remove ego

- Being able to admit when you're wrong
- Incentives
- Infrastructure
  - Support
- Integrity \*\*\*\*\*
  - Communicate it—don't assume
- Interaction
- Involved
- Kindness\*
- Knowledge \*\*\*
  - Knowledgeable
- Leaders
  - Love and nurture \*
  - Create a sense of safety
  - Able to lead
- Listening\*
- Literature
  - IP on service
- Loyalty
- Mentor \*\*\*\*\*
  - Guide and fulfill
- Motivation
  - Be motivated-challenge people
  - Motivational skills
  - Stay motivated
  - Motivation to lead
- Open-minded \*\*\*\*\*
  - To ideas \*
  - Think outside the box \*
  - Be open to change
  - Teach change
- Performance
- Perseverance \*
- Personal recovery \*\*
  - Implementing the 2<sup>nd</sup> Tradition and 4<sup>th</sup> Concept
  - Upholding/Using Steps, Traditions, and Concepts \*\*\*\*\*
  - Takes time for newcomers
  - Reach out to newcomers
- Predictability
- Proactive/vision
  - Ability to develop plan \*
  - Being able to see the whole picture

- Strategic planning
- Stay focused on plan at hand/vision \*
- Set course
- Process of selection
  - For dialog
- Open-mindedness \*\*\*\*\*
  - Open-minded regarding gender discrimination (towards
- Reliable \*
  - Reliability
- Regular inventory
- Respect \*
- Responsible
  - Responsibility \*\*\*
  - Expect them to be here
- Risk taking \*\*
  - Step forward
  - Courage\*
- Rotation \*\*\*\*
- Serenity
- Service
  - Desire to
  - Being of \*
  - Service meetings
  - Introduce service business during meetings
  - Make/attend
  - Pick service as meeting topic
  - Love and compassion
  - Service workshops/Learning Days \*\*
  - Position description
  - Participate in the fellowship
  - Selfless service\*
    - Share gifts of selfless service
  - Raise awareness about giving back
  - Functions
  - Drop "work" from service
    - Service is not work it's a spiritual principle
  - Different meeting areas, etc.
  - Share of good experiences\*\*
  - Well mannered committees
  - End clichés-we are not twisted service or ASC circus
  - Respect service
  - Outreach

Principles before personality

By way of example create a chain of assorted service

Solution oriented \*\*\*\*

Sponsorship \*\*\*\*\*

Have a service Sponsor

Mentor sponsees

Encouragement and guidance through Sponsorship

Stability

Strength \*

Support

Non judgmental

Ask for people directly/help \*

Team Player \*\*\*

Tolerance \*\*

Trust/trustworthy \*\*\*\*\*

Trust process

Understanding \*

Validation

Vision \*\*\*

Accountable to vision

Direction

Innovative

Willingness \*\*\*

Worldwide Workshops

World Pool (use)

Miscellaneous

With current electoral restriction "no"

Stop setting people up for failure

Strive for excellence

Ability to delegate/impartial

Delegate authority

Accept other abilities/don't impose personal expectations

Key tags for service position sponsored into service

Ask new members for input

Yes nothing has changed

Assure them they don't have to do it alone

Identifying and using resources

Ignore good old boy network=nepotism, call people out on it and train to address it

Old boy

New roles with old boys

Fairness and equality

Patience

Try a new appearance

Railroading

Practice principles

Small group net

Anonymity

Simplicity

Atmosphere

Body language guides

Changeable old timers

The ability to represent the real sentiments of his representatives and expectations

The ability to carry the message to each region in his/her own language and culture

Support NAWS in their task following the traditions.

## APPENDIX G: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND HUMAN RESOURCE PANEL STRAW POLL RESULTS:

Following are the results of the straw polls taken before the Making the New System Work session Tuesday 27 April 2004.

1. Do we believe the system we have now allows the conference to elect people based on their ability and experience?  
 Yes: 49                      No: 39                      Not voting: 7
2. Does the current system expand the conference's opportunities and choices?  
 Yes: 22                      No: 32                      Not voting: 41
3. Does the conference support moving towards regional endorsements of candidates?  
 Optional endorsements: 57                      Mandated endorsements: 31  
 Not at all: 3                      Not voting: 8
4. Do you support the idea of leadership cultivation through WB workgroups?  
 Yes: 80                      No: 2                      Not voting: 13
5. For the purpose of this straw poll choose one:  
 The goal of the WSC nomination/election process should be to fill all vacant/available seats OR elect the most qualified candidate?  
 Vacant/available seats: 8                      Most qualified: 87                      Not voting: 11  
 (*Some people voted for more than one option*)
6. Does the conference support the blind Candidate Profile Report component of the nominations process?  
 Yes: 73                      No: 19                      Not voting: 9
7. Does the conference support the HRP being a separate and independent body as currently outlined?  
 Yes: 71                      No: 20                      Not voting: 10
8. Does the conference support zonal forums or language groups meeting to help their members understand the information in the CPRs?  
 Part A of question: Zonal forums:  
 Yes: 58                      No: 16                      Not voting: 13  
 Part B of question: Language groups including the EDM:  
 Yes: 92                      No: 0                      Not voting: 2
9. Does the conference wish to have the ability to meet to discuss candidates?  
 Yes: 30                      No: 55                      Not voting: 11

## APPENDIX H

**WSC 2004 BALLOT**

(Last names have been omitted for this record)

**WORLD BOARD** 16 positions open

Vote for up to 39 candidates by marking the box next to their name.

Antoinette S	John H	Rhonda R
Bobby S	Jose (Tata) M	Robert G
Brent C	Louis H	Robert L
Chas N	Mark H	Ron B
CJ A	Mary B	Ron M
Craig R	Michael C	Roseann B-A
Erik R	Mukam H-D	Rosie-Marie R
Gordon C	Nick C	Shawn R
Greg W	Nick K	Simon J
Ivan PT	Paul C	Sue S
J. Alan B	Piet De B	Sylvia B
Janet C	Ramesh AR	Tom M
Jeff B	Rex S	Willie B

**HUMAN RESOURCE PANEL** 2 positions open

Vote for up to 6 candidates by marking the box next to their name.

Bill L
Dylan J
Mindy A
Paul F
Randy K
Sergio R

**WSC CO-FACILITATOR** 2 positions open

Vote for up to 4 candidates by marking the box next to their name.

Mark H
Robert B
Ubaldo "Roberto" J
Walter B



**APPENDIX I: INFRASTRUCTURE SMALL GROUP RESULTS**  
**SATURDAY, 1 MAY 2004**

Responses are as transcribed from group notes and not edited.

**Where are the challenges in your area/region today as far as providing services to your local NA community?**

**Barriers**

- Different language groups \*\*\*\*\*
- Groups just don't feel connected
- Know how to reaching other cultures in our community \*\*\*
- Racism, cultural diversity issues \*\*\*\*\*
- Separated Geographically \*\*\*\*\*
- Difficult to coordinate efforts with space

**Communication \*\*\***

- Communication between RSC and ASC (RCM)
- Communication in the areas
- Large areas needs communication-bringing groups to ASC
- Lack communication and trust between local service structures \*
- Not effective

**Continuity / Commitment \***

- Not keeping experienced members
- Lack of consistency and continue to reinvent the wheel
- Lack of commitment especially at home group \*\*
- Small in numbers and clean time
- Strengthening groups

**Cultivating / Mentoring \***

- Creating quality people
- Old – timers not sharing knowledge
- Old-timers set bad example
- Training (on all levels) \*\*

**Deficiencies**

**Funds / Fund Flow \*\***

- Economic aspects
- Focus is on generating resources resulting in weak structures
- Lack of donation at group level
- Limited and don't know what to do with it

People not contributing /not self supporting \*\*

Theft / misappropriation \*\*\*

Using the convention to generate funds

#### Guides / Tools

Lack of infrastructure information (how it works)

Lack of use

#### Public Relations

Centralized PR

Danger of mafia (S Italy)

Image (activity in and outside meetings)

Lack of public recognition\*\*

Lack of Public Relations \*

NA has a poor image

Need to fix internal image first

Predators

#### Renegade groups

#### Service

Apathy towards service \*\*\*\*\*

Apathy from Old-timers who go away \*

Area lack of participation

Apathy because people refuse to rotate out \*\*

Business side taking precedence over H&I and PI work

List H&I commitment

Lack of H&I (facilitating and maintaining) \*\*

Can't keep up with H&I and PI demand

H&I can

Outreach and H&I in isolated areas

Fear of structure becoming governmental

Filling service positions with quality people \*\*

Involvement / participation \*\*\*\*\*

Keeping old-timers involved

Lazy

Lack of members with service experience

Lack of Outreach

Lack of support for RSC

Negative attitude about service \*\*\*\*

Nobody doing their job and no one doing anything about it \*

Service Sponsoring (need)

Old-timers and newcomers not interested

Updating group directories

#### Service Structure

Area and regions splitting

Development of PI, H&I and PR

Downsize structure

Duplicating services

Lack of organization \*

Lack of support \*\*

Lack service structure

Not coordinating efforts \*

Region controls areas, areas what Phonenumber responsibility

Rivalry between areas

Rural division

Struggling area / lack of maturity

Stagnant / no growth

Subcommittee (difficulty maintaining)

#### Sponsorship

Misinterpretation of what a sponsor is

#### Steps and Traditions

Lack of effort in step working area

#### Trusted Servants

Controlling \*\* / Strong personalities \*\*

Don't know what to do

Egos / Grandiosity (areas)

Intimidate newer members \*\*

Lack of rotation \*

Lack of trust amongst trusted servants

Lack of trusted servants

Members not understanding why service is needed

Not enough trusted servants \*\*

Not open-minded

Poor examples

Resistance to change \*\*

Trusted servants fighting amongst selves \*

Miscellaneous

Generating the beast

Struggling with transmission – not letting go

Lack of clean NA message at group level

Lack of community

Lack of information about the member's responsibility

**Share some of the solutions to those common challenges**

Communication

- Announce all events (including service) \*\*
- Bring information back to the local fellowship
- Email (utilize more) \*\*\*
- Increase communication levels
- Sharing at the home group
- Use newly learned techniques to expand communication

Collaborate

- More before decisions are made
- Service is not a suggestion. It's a compromise

Fund flow \*

- Convention is fiduciary
- Generate more events like Step Festivals, besides convention to raise funds.
- Prioritize
- Prosecute or negotiate payment plan

Guidelines / tools

- Create database of service information
- Create Internal Procedures Guides
- Develop better inventory tools and use
- GSR Handbook
- Infrastructure information (how it works)
- Literature \*\*
- More IP donations from the LAZF instead of books, an addict can buy a book.
- Pass on all notes / forms
- Train the trainer \*\*\*
- Utilize \*
- Simplify (make reports attractive)

Mentoring \*

- Create a Resource person
- Cultivate leadership \*\*
- Educate \*
  - Educate about NAWS
  - Educate via convention workshop techniques as opposed to speaker meetings
- Lead with love

- Include newcomers in solution processes
- Make service attractive
- Old-timer to share knowledge not necessarily takes position \*
- Orientation \*
- Personal commitment and integrity
- Positive example \*\*\*\*\*
- Support new members in service \*\*

#### Public Relations

- Need more positive PR / improve \*
- Yellow Pages Lawyers/Physicians/Professionals invite to luncheon and do presentation addicts sponsor professionals

#### Service

- Areas are the engine rooms of service
- ASC more streamline/effective
- Centralized
- Combine celebration and Learning Days (make service fun) \*\*\*
- Coordinate Area PI
- Create service key tags (recognition) \*\*
- Create consensus-based decision-making \*\*\*
- Down size service structure
- Duties (simplify and decrease)
- Emotional (get attached)
- Inventory \*
  - Inventory and share with others / comparison
- Involve more members
- Issue discussion prior to service meetings
- Make service attractive to newcomers and old-timers \*\*
- Outreach \*\*
- Positive Attitude \*\*
- Prioritize service needs \*
- Publish results of service efforts (recognition)
- Support new groups and areas
- Take someone with you to service meetings (kidnap)

#### Service Workshops (need more) \*

- Create workshops around special events
- Convenference (presentations by H&I, PI, banquet, speaker)

Create informative activities which consequently will help members to fellowship and to motivate themselves to serve.

Down sizing structure

Don't make it intimidating

GSR Orientation workshops

Learning Days \*\*\*

Promote service through example by having PI and H&I workshops

Recovery and service workshops

Unity Days

Worldwide Workshops (more)

#### Sponsorship

Create Service Sponsoring \*\*\*

Encourage sponsees

Teach service through sponsorship

Emphasize

#### Translations programs

Instant translations

#### Trusted Servants

Choose trusted servants carefully

Collaboration between trusted servants (create more)

Get involved in service

Not fighting for positions

Make sure work get done

Rotation of RSC location (more) \*

Rotation of members (more)

#### Miscellaneous

A spiritual awakening-no recovery without unity

Be open to new things

Break down the walls –equality – “the box”

Don't allow problems to continue, get involved, and keep informed

Guide to local service workshops

Have meetings and workshops via the Internet

No motions in the *CAR*

Targeted literature (contents about recovery linked with service)

Transmit the unity and love that is perceived in the conference

Working in project work groups

**Imagine that in ten years our vision statement is fulfilled... what is the structure in place today that helps us achieve our vision? What tools have been created in order to make our vision a reality?**

Communications

- Healthy areas with good / positive communication
- Providing information to all levels of the structure
- Training and communication \*\*
- Use "stop & time out" when service discussions get heated-serenity prayer

Funds / Fund flow

- Self support from groups only
- Eliminate prudent reserves
- Self-supporting

Global Fellowship \*

- Change in culture
- EDM participation
- Going to discussion based decision-making \*
- Mature
- No competition, but rather cooperation
- Support for isolated and far away areas.

Guidelines

- Fellowship development through guidelines
- Material that explain and teach a common view of structure-provide a map
- Procedures guides

Inventory process

Leaders / Leadership development \*

- Trusted servants
- Need more
- Cultivation

Roundtables

Spiritual principals

Service

- Area and Regional Service Structures
- Consistent and responsible trusted servants
- Development of PI, H&I and PR
- Keeping old-timers in service
- Outreach\*\*



Public Image

Regional Service Structure geared in a way that is strengthening PI and H&I

Reports (monitor and utilize)

Use as a recognition mechanism

Use as a way to monitor work accomplished, etc.

Rotation of trusted servants

That the term "area circus" is never heard

PI, literature translation, strategic plan are all tools that continue to give direction

Service workshops and PI and H&I presentations

WS / RD's

Technology

Support via the Internet

Traditions

Foundation built on the 5<sup>th</sup> Tradition

Carry the message (12 Steps and Traditions) \*

Translations\*\*

Willingness

Worldwide workshops

Miscellaneous

Continue action focused

Encourage the first language meetings

Find support from other regions with different languages and zonal forums

Free food

Have group adopt H&I meetings

Have more topic, concept meetings

I don't believe that NA's Vision for the future is a fixture that we will reach in 5,10,15 or 20 years.

If the vision for the future is our common objective we will always be ready to unite to do the necessary work.

Minimize fear in the "us" and "them" attitudes

No WSC except for specific issues

Opening an office to become a focus for the community

This community is not static. It's very dynamic; therefore we will always have new challenges and goals to accomplish.

This conference was more towards consensus based decision making

Time dilutes animosity

World Board entrusted to guide us

List the most unique, interesting, and/or  
controversial experience shared at your table

Carry the message without training

Childcare issues growing from group issue to regional committee

Commonly share the same issues

Communications

Contributions and donations

Effective leadership

Geographical challenges \*

General apathy – poor examples not making service attractive

Groups that don't meet any longer but still appear in the group directory

Internal personality conflicts

Members who do reply helpline calls

PI and H&I work

Regions doing the work that the areas should be doing

Service and recovery workshops

Sticking to assignment without training

To say whom the servants are

We discovered that we all the same difficulties.

**APPENDIX J: CORRECTED SUMMARY OF LEASEHOLD IMPROVEMENT INFORMATION**

Provided by Anthony on Saturday, 2 May 2004

Our operations were in three buildings in Van Nuys totaling approximately 13,500 square feet. For several years we had been considering relocating to a larger facility comprising only one building. Shortly following the Northridge earthquake we had an opportunity to lease the current building that has approximately 35,000 sq ft. Because of the earthquake the lease agreement was for significantly less than the lease market had been prior to the earthquake, and we were given eight months free rent as an incentive. We signed the lease in early 1995 and made that move in the middle of 1995.

The original term of the lease was for five years (with a five-year renewal option) at approximately \$ 0.43 /sq ft, or \$15,000/month. We had been paying approximately \$0.90/ sq ft in Van Nuys, or \$12,200/month. To make the new building usable for our needs we obtained a loan for \$150,000, combined that amount with the rent savings, and used part of our regular income, and made leasehold improvements totaling about \$485,560.

We renewed our lease in 2000 for ten (10) years. We have about 6.33 years remaining on our current lease. We needed more office space on the first floor for customer service and on the second floor for project coordinators or writers. We expanded the size of the downstairs conference room as well as one of the conference rooms on the second floor. We added a new air-conditioning unit that had been eliminated from the original leasehold improvement in 1995 for budget reasons. We've redesigned storage areas and general workspaces and created separate office areas in fellowship services so the staff members do not have to talk over each other when talking to members of the fellowship. The current leasehold improvement is expected to cost approximately \$160,000.

There is always some amount that a company spends on leasehold improvements each year, but that is usually some small amount to maintain the usability of facilities. In our case we would have spent an average of approximately \$9,600 per year. If you take the life of our lease and add that amount x 15 years, we would have probably spent an additional \$144,000 over the life of the lease.

Total Leasehold Improvement, Life of Lease

\$485,560 original improvements	
	\$160,000 current improvements
	\$144,000 average yearly improvements
Approx,	\$789,560

A comparable property in the same area as our current office, today, would lease for approximately \$0.94/ sq ft, or about \$32,900 per month. We are currently paying about \$18,800/month. If we had had to pay comparable lease costs for the area, we would have spent approximately \$14,100 more per month over the fifteen-year life of the lease, or an additional \$2,538,000. Even though by the end of this lease we will have spent approximately \$789,560 in leasehold improvements, we are still well below what our total lease costs may have been had we continued to get additional space in Van Nuys or a comparable space in our current area.

The board has had one discussion and will be in more discussion about whether or not to buy a building when this lease is up.