



## **MARLCNA XXVII** February 11<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup>, 2011

Lancaster, PA

*Introductions of the presenters* (Shawn M., Jenna T., RD/RDA team, Mid-Atlantic Region)

### **PRESENTERS:**

**Steve Rausch:** Fellowship Services Team leader (California)

**Mukam:** WB (Vermont, New Jersey)

**Mark:** WB, Service systems workgroup member (Wisconsin)

Many Service systems workgroup members stood and were in attendance, including **Craig R.** (Pennsylvania)

### **Power Point of NAWS Updates**

- Vision Statement for NA Service
- Current service structure diagram
- NA World Services diagram
- WB is up to 18 seats... 15 in place now
- WB members: *pics and description of duties*
- 5 physical WSO locations: *Mississauga, Ontario, Canada/ Brussels, Belgium/ Tehran, Iran/ India*
- Over 18,000 groups per week in Iran!
- WSO: *Handles Day-to-day business:* data base updates, mailings, literature sales, answering service calls, etc.
- Slides: NAWS Expenses: 2008-2010  
NAWS Income: 2008-10
- E-Subscriptions update
- WCNA 34 San Diego, 1-4, September 2011
- Service System
- 4 year (2 cycle) **Living Clean: The Journey Continues**

**Q:** What about the Basic Test in Braille?

**A:** If you make the request, we'll print and send you one.

**Q:** What is the WSO in CA doing to cut costs?

**A:** We have updated shipping costs, reduced production costs, decreased the number of workers at office, implemented attrition, WB members are attending events on their own, sending fewer members to events, have reduced the cost of mailings by encouraging e-subscriptions, etc.

**Q:** Have you ever considered moving out of CA where the costs are so high? (*Like to Arkansas?*)

**A:** Before we make that decision, someone would have to research the options. It's something that is being considered.

**Q:** If and when the World goes bankrupt, will you give away all that's left?

**A:** According to the Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust (FIPT), we support our vision by selling things. In addition, we have been asking for contributions from our fellowship that we are a part of. Some members are under the impression that we're in need of money. We have a spiritual purpose, not a financial one.

**Q:** Why hasn't NAWS News mentioned the Traditions Guide?

**A:** It takes a lot of planning for a project. We have the literature surveys out there. NAWS News is a reporting device as to what we are doing right now.

**Q:** Why do we need any more literature and why do we continue to write literature that separates us??

**A:** We've gotten a lot of input from younger members who don't feel a part of.

**Q:** What is the WSO doing to cut cost?

**A:** We have cut human resources by 10%.

**Q:** In the spirit of unity, will a WB member attend Wichita (to the United States Fellowship Assembly)?

**A:** No; we haven't been asked. We have little to say and/or know about it.

**Q:** First, thanks for coming. You talked about a CFO (Chief Financial Officer) looking at the WSO; we get confused as a fellowship. We're coming up with new products to make money. What can we take back to our areas about the increase in literature projects and the projection of a decrease in literature sales?

**A:** We've been working on ways to cut. We don't want to tell your areas to come up with more literature to create.

**Q:** Are we at a point where we have taken on all we can take on?

**A:** We've had those discussions. Should we let those addicts over there (other parts of the world) be on their own because we can't afford to carry the vision to them? It's very possible that if I were in charge, (I've never been good at spending), I would keep throwing money at the vision to keep carrying the message. Until it's totally undoable, we're still about making sure the message is carried worldwide. If the U.S. is not able to afford it, we hope that the wealthier regions of the world can take up the slack. The gift of recovery is so precious and such a deep act of faith. If the U.S. can't do that, than we may have to ask others for help. I don't feel that we're doing enough.

**Q:** With fellowship development, can you give me a few other things to tell my groups and what the expenses of Fellowship Development entail?

**A:** It's the free and subsidized literature to NA groups, like to Kenya. We put it in a box and sent it to them; a big chunk of fellowship development money is in assisting these groups in isolated areas.

**Q:** I don't know (nothing) about a vision statement; I know about the 5<sup>th</sup> tradition. I've got people saying the sky is falling and I say "read the 9<sup>th</sup> tradition..." It's the home group that's important. All I know is, on Wednesday morning, I'll open my home group and all will be well, for now. I got an email a couple of days ago and we (NA) have 58 days of operating reserve??!! What's up with that?

**A:** Yes, that's right. We used to have 9 months, but we have an emergency action plan. There're other services that can be curtailed and we'll not stop the presses until we have to. I can't believe that my HP would let this fall apart.

**Q:** At the Freestate Service Office, our literature demands are more than we can get from you. Why are they not coming in on a timely basis?

**A:** There was a strike on the dock. After we get the stock, we have a number of orders we have to distribute immediately. It will take a while to work itself out. There've been some bottlenecks. We work in partnerships w/RSOs and they all have different requirements. We're doing online meetings with RSOs to talk about these issues. Beyond that, the details we can iron out later.

**Q:** About the WCNA, we had an excellent meeting planner and the conventions were not handled well in San Antonio and Barcelona. The larger the convention, the more issues we'll have; and now we're in the planning stages for San Diego and Philadelphia; managing the large crowd is a great task. Also, several of the hotels in San Diego are sold out already.

**A:** Kahlil was elected and he's an invaluable resource. Luckily we've been to San Diego before. We're talking about having everything in one spot. As reservations get cancelled; there may be opportunities to get in. There isn't a threat as of now to run out of hotel rooms.

## **Saturday, February 12, 2011**

### **>>>Town Hall Meeting**

- *Overview of agenda for the day*
- *Multi-language key tags on tables*
- *Theme of this conference cycle is Our Vision, Our Freedom*
- *Strong groups are key elements to our service system*

## **The three basic steps to planning**

**STEP ONE >>> Identify and prioritize issues**

**STEP TWO>>> Brainstorm and prioritize solutions**

**STEP THREE>> Take action on these solutions: the "who", the what", and the "when"**

- *(Have ground rules and guidelines)*

**Remember >>sometimes the quieter voice is the one we need to hear...**

- *Facilitator needs to be kind...*
- *Give each addict one minute ("one addict, one minute").*

## **TOPIC TO CONSIDER: How do we strengthen our groups?**

### **Step One: The brainstorming of the process; to identify and prioritize issues**

- Making service appear more attractive, finding trusted servants
  - Texting in meetings
  - Finding trusted servants
  - Sharing a mixed message
  - Use of outdated literature
  - Better honoring and adhering to time limits
  - A little NA, and little AA on drug replacement therapy... how to address members without a clear message and creating confusion
  - Addressing how to share
  - Signing sheets: managing how we deal with court card attendees, rehab sheets
  - Theft of funds
- (Treasurer should not be a signer on the account, statement goes to anyone but the treasurer)

### **Finding trusted servants...**

#### **>> Addressing members who may be creating confusion and sharing a mixed message...**

- *Sharing around Drug Replacement Therapy (DRT)*
- *Sharing about other fellowships*
- *Didn't we talk about this when we discussed the clarity statement? The problem with the announcement is that it's not clear or consistent between meetings. Sometimes it doesn't address the issue.*
- *Would texting be part of that? Does it from the floor?*

- Addressing someone (especially with a lot of time) about humiliating and belittling an attendee who is on DRT or who shares other fellowships' language
- We have a member who is detoxing off methadone, who claims clean time. How do we handle that?
- A number of addicts are mandated to attend. It has destroyed the atmosphere of recovery in several meetings. Many more experienced members are leaving these groups due to the lack of serenity in meetings.
- If we are supposed to be fanning the flame of desire, who are we to deter the blossoming of these members?
- We need to address these people with care and concern.

**Step Two: Brainstorm and prioritize SOLUTIONS and identify concrete actions, the “what” of the solution**

- There is a way to pull them aside that is loving and caring
- Individual group members can be assigned to address the disruptive/confused member in a loving and caring way...
- We need to practice tolerance; give them time to learn
- It's also when we talk about members with time who give a confused message, that is a real concern
- Tough love for those we should give “tough love” to
- People come from outside and don't understand the perimeters of OUR program. Introduce and educate the members of health care/DOC professionals with PR efforts
- Use a clarity statement where we can identify the differences between other fellowships and us
- In my home group, we came up with a scripted format and made sure it was a qualified (the right) person to be the chair/secretary
- Train the chairperson/secretary.

➤ **The chosen solution >>> “TRAIN THE CHAIRPERSON/SECRETARY”**

**Step Three: Taking action; what actions will we take to address the issue?**

1. Are the proposed actions reasonable?
2. What resources (human and financial) do they require?
3. Identify the “who” the “when” and the “how”

**>>Actions to take:**

- Have an hour service workshop before each area meeting.
- Use the group conscious. We agree on what's important and communicate it with the chair/secretary.
- The group creates a structured, easy to follow format
- Address the issue at the ASC during group concerns
- Implement mentoring/grooming/guiding new members into group trusted servant positions
- With new trusted servants, at the group conscience, go over the Revised Group Booklet and have the outgoing member sit with, mentor and guide the new chairperson/secretary
- Use the literature; use outgoing trusted servants

*This is the core of the planning process, a smaller version of the Area Planning Tool.  
At some point, we need to conduct the “Evaluation” part of the process.*

\*\*\*\*\*

# **MID ATLANTIC'S requested topic**

**>>>Building Consensus** Embodies the 2nd tradition, 6<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> concept. Used at the WSC and by the WB

## **Pros to Consensus vs. Robert's Rules:**

- Consensus considers ALL voices
- There can be agreement through compromise
- There can be many approaches to consensus unlike *Robert's*
- *Robert's* creates a win-lose situation + low-trust in outcomes >>> *someone always loses*

## **Consensus Process:**

1. Formulate and present clear proposals
2. Maker of proposal speaks first, then discussion
3. Questions, variations, concerns shared
4. Once all voices are heard, a "straw poll" is taken
  - a. Shows the amount of support for the idea and any variations. If no significant support, the proposal is dropped
5. Move to a decision-making session

**Decision making session:** *The following is a mock sample of a proposal and the process of Consensus Based Decision Making*

## **Session 1: Large group exercise using Consensus Based Decision Making**

**Mock Topic:** *Do we let people on medication have trusted servants' positions?*

**Mock Proposal** >>>>> Why shouldn't we allow members on medication to be trusted servants (TS) at our home group?

### **Gathering input and discussion:**

- First, we need to clarify "mind and mood" altering substances
- Give qualifications and it's up to the group to question the TS and be responsible for them.
- Need to define *what meds* directly in the proposal.
- As prescribed by a doctor? Should we add that wording?
- Doesn't the word "trusted servant" mean "trusted"... somebody trusting them is watching them.
- Would like to modify the motion to say, "*except Trusted Servants on prescribed medications*"
- It may be more dangerous to *NOT* take their medications. We have many members on necessary meds.
- Who are we to make the decision on how a medication is affecting a member?
- A member on a DRP can do some aspect of service; arrange literature, set up chairs, etc.
- We have no opinion on outside issues. If you want to come loaded, come.
- The more we talk about this issue, the more we judge different illnesses. We know people. We see how they act, how they behave. The judgment should not be differentiation between illnesses.
- If the individual doesn't get the vote, they could take the med at a different time to not affect their behavior while carrying out the position
- I'm a trusted servant and have Hep C. When I was on *Interferon* and when I was on pain killers after surgery, I held service positions. I've been serving this fellowship a long time and no one's questioned my ability to serve.
- I'm not on any medication. It sounds ridiculous. It's essential to know that when a member makes a proposal, it no longer belongs to them, it belongs to the group. If we put a member in a position, it's up to the group to address any behavioral issues if there's a problem.
- When someone wants a service commitment, we look at the member and watch their behavior. I'd like to modify the proposal... "to include except a drug replacement program"
- CBDM: usually the member making the proposal is NOT the facilitator. There were people serving in positions on DRT and we didn't know it. We are not the determiners of what's clean and what's not.

How many want in the proposal >>>

*"... as prescribed by a doctor"*

*"... except those on drug replacement therapy (DRT)"*

*"... except those on mind or mood altering substances"*

**Straw poll taken:** *"How many people in favor?" Not an overwhelming amount in favor...*

*"Were going to move on to other business and this can be brought up at another time."*

**This concludes the mock demonstration of CBDM**

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Session 2: Large Group Exercise using Robert's Rules of Order**

**"Mock" Motion:** *That we let people on medication have trusted servants' positions.*

>> Motions is made and seconded. Discussion as conducted following "Robert's":

➤ *"This is an outside issue..."*

➤ *"Can you define medication? The motion doesn't define medication..."*

*(Robert's does not allow changes without amendments.)*

>> Amendment made and seconded to add the wording, *"except people on DRT."*

➤ *"On a side note... I know people in our area that take narcotics for a root canal. Our commitment is to the newcomer therefore we have a responsibility to newcomers to address the member who is altered."*

➤ *"When you're asking the question about a mind or mood alternate substance does that include nicotine and caffeine?"*

➤ *"Methadone is prescribed; hearing aids and glasses are prescriptions. If you take someone's glasses or hearing aids away, you'll see their moods alter drastically!!"*

>> **CALL TO QUESTION** >> >> *the vote to vote* >> *Call to question passes*

➤ *"All those in favor of the amendment to add... DRT?"*

➤ *"Amendment fails; back on to original motion"*

➤ *"Now on the other amendment only to add >> mind or mood altering chemicals"*

➤ *"Motion to table to the jack; we have a fourth tradition that allows us to be autonomous..."*

➤ *"Now to vote on second amendment: To allow people who are on mind or mood altering chemicals to be TS."*

***At this time, the mock demonstration was concluded.***

***This is the short discussion/comments that followed:***

➤ *We have now had an opportunity to have a taste of both methods to conduct business. Now it's up to you all to decide which seems more efficient.*

➤ *In the conference we're still voting on motions. At the WSC, we conduct straw polls and if no support, the proposals can be dropped. If there's substantial support, then it comes up for vote. We really had some motions that were "out there" We discussed spending many dollars on giving web access to members around the planet WAY into the night. It could have been taken care of quickly with a motion, then no second, but it went on and on...*

➤ *What we have at the WSC is a system that is neither one nor the other and it is a mess! We have discussions where we start with CBDM, then end up in Robert's and we experience the worst of them both!*

- It was apparent that both methods had flaws and strengths however CBDM better upholds the spiritual principles in our traditions and concepts.

### Applying Principles

- **1<sup>st</sup> Tradition:** *Talking together about issues in CBDM better supports unity and our common welfare.*
- **2<sup>nd</sup> tradition:** *Trusting group conscious*
- **6<sup>th</sup> Concept:** *If we fully discuss inviting a HP's influence, it's much easier for us to give the go ahead*
- **7<sup>th</sup> Concept:** *Full participation in the decision-making process*
- **9<sup>th</sup> Concept:** *All viewpoints are considered responsibly*

**Q:** *Why did your region ask for this topic?*

**Shawn:** We were actually going to do a workshop on CBDM and felt it would be easier and more effective to have this presented and discussed at MARLCNA. A lot of people use this and we needed to talk about what it is and what it isn't. If we decide to do something and 59% want to and 41% don't, is that truly a spiritual solution... and a true representation of the majority??

\*\*\*\*\*

## Service System Project:

### Desired Outcomes:

*We hope to:*

- Help everyone to understand the proposals
- Receive input and feedback to help shape the future of the work
- Hear how these ideas might impact our local fellowships

**Project background:** *Commonly experienced, ongoing challenges in NA service:*

*These common challenges were identified through the past few years' Issue Discussion Topics (IDTs)*

- Ineffective communication
- Insufficient resources
- Frustrated trusted servants
- Poor atmosphere of recovery in service meetings

### Foundational Principles for a Revitalized Service System:

- Purpose Driven
- Group-focused
- Defined by geographic boundaries
- Flexible
- Collaborative

### A Summary of the WB's Service System Discussions    **January, 2011**

We spent much of our January meeting holding discussions about the next stage of the Service System workgroup. We spent two full days in discussions with the Service System workgroup members and staff and will be formulating a new, revised proposal in the upcoming weeks. We expect to have this next draft to you by March. We hope it will be the basis of further discussion that will help us to frame what proposals will be contained in the 2012 ***Conference Agenda Report***.

Much of our discussions were about how components of the system work as well as how they work together based on being Purpose Driven, Group-focused, Defined by Geographic Boundaries, Flexible, and Collaborative. Our discussions will be reflected in the revisions of the proposals, but this March e-blast should give you an overview of our ideas in the meantime. We are also working on developing material about processes that we believe can help us all be more effective in working toward our vision.

So many of you have held and are planning to hold workshops and discussions about these proposals that we wanted to let you know as soon as we could about our discussions of your input and the direction of our ideas for revision of the

proposals. We reviewed the more-than-100 pages of input you submitted, and we thank each of you for helping to shape the proposals and move this work forward.

## **Foundational Principles—Collaborative**

“Collaborative” has been added to the list of foundational principles. There are now five foundational principles: collaborative, group-focused, purpose driven, flexible, and geographically defined.

Successful service provision depends on all the elements of a service system working together toward our common primary purpose. This means that structure, processes, people, and resources must work together, and that components of the system must cooperate both “vertically” and “horizontally” throughout the structure.

### **❖ Group Support (Group Support Unit, GSU)**

A service body devoted most centrally to meeting groups’ needs will continue to be a central part of the proposals.

We do not feel it is necessary, or helpful, at this time to recommend a particular option—linear or two-track—for local services, but we will try to outline the different options and provide reasons why a community might prefer one or the other.

#### **Things that would happen at GSU meetings:**

- Informal training and mentoring
- Discussion of group issues, group sharing, NO business
- Welcoming and outreach to new groups and members
- Orientation and introduction to service (recovery literature & service literature, traditions, concepts, etc.)
- Informal information sharing (e.g., upcoming events, LSU activities, new merchandise, NAWA issues topics)
- In some instances or circumstances, GSUs may be involved in some service delivery (e.g., putting up flyers in the community or supporting a local H&I meeting).

***GSU attendance is open: Groups send a delegate and any interested member can come.***

### **❖ Local Services (Local Service Unit, LSU)**

We have spent quite a lot of time at our last two board meetings discussing how we believe an LSU actually works.

These discussions will result in better clarification of our vision of this component of the system rather than any real change to the structural model already offered. Revisions to the proposals will describe the local service unit as comprised of a local service board and a regular (three to four times a year) planning conference, including an annual planning assembly event.

#### **Functions of a Local Service Board:**

- Includes chair, vice chair, treasurer, secretary, delegate(s), and service coordinators for essential services
- Meets monthly or as needed
- Oversees workgroups and routine services; coordinates the planning assemblies; develops budget and strategic plan to be reviewed, input, and approved by the planning conference; maintains external relationships; sends a delegate to the next level of service.

#### **Planning Conference**

- Consists of group and/or GSU delegates, LSB members, project coordinators, and interested members
- Meets three to four times a year
- Starts with an annual assembly (see below) to gather input and set planning goals. Planning conferences follow the stages of the planning cycle. They are used to prioritize, approve workgroups and budget created by the LSB, monitor and report, change direction as necessary, evaluate service delivery, and elect the board.
- There may also be training sessions and a session for interfacing with the intermediate, state/national, and world services levels (like a CAR workshop).
- As throughout the system, decisions will be made by consensus where possible. Annual Assembly
- The annual assembly is a planning event that gathers input from everyone to set planning priorities (like our environmental scan).
- It consists of everyone who attends the quarterly/triennial planning conference... All interested members are encouraged to attend.

### ❖ **Intermediate Bodies**

Intermediate bodies are those service bodies created to meet needs of density or distance or language. In essence, they are intended to span a gap between one level of service and the next in places where the NA community is densely populated, such as New York, or where the distances are great, such as Texas, or in places where the population is bilingual, such as Montreal. They are “permanent” and they are within the delegation stream. While it may be tempting to rename an existing service body an “intermediate body” to minimize the impact of restructuring, that’s not the spirit of the proposals. A clear need must be established to create an intermediate body. As already stated in the proposal, they are not created to provide shared services outside of the delegation stream. We acknowledge the need to explain how shared services will function in the new system and are asking that some of you who have experience with shared services share your experience with us.

### ❖ **State/Nation/Province Approach**

The board needs to further discuss what we mean by “state,” “nation,” and “province.” In the revisions to the proposals we will more explicitly acknowledge that the terms “state” and “province” are more flexible than simply “U.S. states, Canadian provinces, and everyone else is a nation.” Some type of “state” approach may be applicable to countries such as Brazil, Russia, Mexico, and India with many meeting and multiple regions. Conversely, it may make sense to combine states in places like New England. The issue needs further discussion.

### ❖ **WSC Seating**

We will be recommending a seating model based on state/national/province service bodies. We recognize that this model may have a shelf life due to the size of the WSC, and we will continue to be interested in exploring something like a “zonal” seating model (with the understanding that the “zones” as we now know them might need to be revamped to make such a model workable). At this time, however, state/nation/province seating seems most practical. Further seating criteria need to be developed, including but not limited to better defining “state” and “nation” (see above).

### ❖ **Zonal Forums**

Zonal forums have only really been addressed in the proposals insofar as they do or don’t factor into seating. Their role in the system needs to be better defined in the proposals.

### ❖ **Processes**

Ultimately, we would like to see concrete material on processes, like the ideas on planning discussed above in the “Local Services” section. However, given our perennial struggles with leadership and communication processes, we just don’t feel like we are there yet. We will be offering fundamental principles related to leadership, communication, and planning (and possibly decision-making, and what we are currently calling information management and issue management) in the next drafts of proposals.

### ➤ **Issues for Further Discussion:**

The following items need further clarification and discussion. This is by no means an exhaustive list. These are simply the items that came up in our recent discussions that we didn’t have time to fully address:

- Fund flow, including how the GSU is funded
- Literature distribution—where will groups buy their literature?
- Legal issues: corporations, insurance, RSOs
- Synching planning cycles throughout the system
- Who creates intermediate bodies?
- Who determines LSU boundaries?
- How do shared services (committees) work?
- The state/nation issue—e.g., Brazil, Mexico, India, Russia
- Further seating criteria

\*\*\*\*\*

## Group support and local services (GSUs & LSUs):

### **Benefits and challenges:**

**Challenge:** We recently did a regional workshop. We can't fulfill our current positions, how can we fulfill another level of service?

**Comment:** I think there are other ways to address the local fellowship. If we don't try we don't learn...

**Question:** A GSR came to our group with this paper that was clearly a violation of our 9<sup>th</sup> Tradition. It seems that you're putting the cart before the horse. What I'm saying is **who asked for this?**

**Answer:** This was unanimously approved at 2008 and then again at 2010. The reason people are confused that this is BEFORE the CAR. The groups will have an opportunity to give them input and get involved. Over and over we have pulled this information from the fellowship. Do you want us to keep at it?

### **Challenges:**

- Not having enough human services as it is, adding this layer seems to be creating a gap. Lack of people is a problem; this does not solve the problem as stated.
- I'm reaching barriers, lots of closed doors. People don't want to hear it or they don't care. How do I overcome this?
- An Intermediate Body needs to be *needs* driven. If you can imagine a community with a multilingual fellowship you can imagine a community ... need to

**Benefit:** Spreading around and sharing best practices.

**Challenge:** I've heard a lot of resistance. There WAS some resistance at the conference and is there a way to spot this? In Orlando, it was asked, "*Is there any way to stop this train?*"

**Comment:** This has been discussed very well and **it will be out in 2011**. We've been working on this for 10 years now.

### **Existing and Proposed (Updated) Seating Option**

Currently we have 116 seated regions and their alternates. The board was asked to try to resolve this growth issue.

### **Timeline of work**

- Current 4 year project to end at WSC 2012. Begun in 2008.
- At WSC 2012, we're planning to offer a set of "agreements in principle"
- We are proposing a System rather than a pyramid structure.
- Both Vertical and Horizontal models have been discussed and straw polled. The new model will be one or the other >> Linear versus Two Track. The system could be both/neither. We don't know what it's going to look like yet.
- The models will be presented with rationales provided about why a local community may choose one or the other.

## ***Presented separate from the Power Point:***

### ➤ **What happens at the GSU:**

- Informal training and mentoring
- Discussion of group business, group sharing
- Welcome and outreach to new groups and members
- Orientation and intro to service
- Informal information sharing
- Some limited informal service
- Open attendance at least on designated from each group

### ➤ **What are Local Services?**

- **Local service board**
  - Meets monthly
  - Admin officers and delegates to the next level of service

- Oversees workgroups
- Coordinates and plans events

### ➤ Local Planning conference:

- A 3-4 times a year event >> Local Service Board elected here
- Consists of delegates from both GSUs and LSUs, Local Service Board members, Project and or workgroup leaders, any interested members
- One meeting a year is the Annual Planning Assembly
- May be some focused sessions, like a session for interfacing with another level (collaborative) like CAR Workshops or a training/orientation of new service members
- Primary focus: executing this quarter's step in the annual planning cycle
- Consensus decisions can be made here

### ➤ Annual Assembly

- One major check in and refocusing event in the cycle each year
- Scanning, reaffirming priorities, setting new priorities
- May complete some workgroups and begin others
- Group delegates, GSU delegates

## Benefits and Challenges to GSUs/LSUs:

**Benefit:** How would this look in our area? 4-6 areas formations in my region were based on resentments. The GSUs might be good for us in the city. And the local service unit could be based on our county. If we had this at the county level, we could provide services to the existing fellowship.

**Benefit:** This would be a nice way to utilize shared services where we were not able to before.

**Challenge:** If all these changes are going to come about, how are we going to implement these changes? I hope there's going to be some guidance.

**Benefit:** Consolidation of service resources

**Benefit:** Checking in w/fellowship to ensure we are on the right track

**Challenge:** When were the groups going to get this information?

**Benefit:** Anytime I hear anger, I hear fear. We're afraid of what we don't know. We HAVE been working on this for way more than 3 years through the IDTs. I come from an area where the demographic represented is under a year clean. How can a new member digest all this? How do I present? If you don't have a 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> Step or a 1<sup>st</sup> Tradition, how can you possibly take this all in?

**Challenge:** The structure as it is now is part of my energy. I was empowered. There was the thought of the inverted pyramid. Maybe we might need to go to a four year cycle for the WCNA. How can we be empowered to be a part of the voting process, getting our voice heard within this new system?

**Response:** Exactly like you do now. One of the challenges for me is if you believe the structure is working today, couldn't it be better? You can get your ideas heard the same way as you do now.

**Question:** I'm a newer member. I came in around 5 years ago, and what happened in the 90s doesn't mean much to me. The GSU is what most of the older members are in support of now. It's where the GSU discusses before the LSU the concerns of the groups. You proposed an Annual Planning Meeting; is that to discuss financial issues/budget problems/planning?

**Response:** The Town Hall Meeting is an example of what can happen at the Annual Planning Meeting. One of the problems that we kept coming up with was "one size just doesn't fit all."

**Comment:** In June, the RD came and gave a presentation on the Service System. Since then, I have conducted 3 workshops. Craig came to one. I get offended when people say that the groups don't know about it.

## ➤ Intermediate Bodies:

They would span a gap where needed. For example, it may not be practical for CA to be composed of delegates from all the LSUs.

### **An Intermediate Body may be:**

- Created when the need definitely exists, but that need would be decided by LSUs
- Dependent upon density, distance or language
- A petition to reform
- Be needs based/purpose driven
- **Not** a place holder to retain existing structure
- **Not** shared services in the sense that it creates competition

## ➤ State/Nation/Province

- The basic model going in: *US, Canadian Provinces, Nations elsewhere*
- We need to identify any anomalies.

## **Challenges/benefits to State/Nation/Province**

**Challenge:** How are the different states/nation/provinces going to have the appropriate amount of proportionate representation?

**Challenge:** The train exists. Most motions that the world supports, pass. The motions that the world doesn't support, don't pass. It's like the WB is the 800 lb. gorilla in the world.

**Challenge:** We got these updates and the work group meets in June so we have little time to prepare the input and review for our groups. It feels like were being steered rather than allow things to take its due course.

**Challenge:** The Freestate Region is dead against any state representation. The challenge is that if it is implemented, if Maryland becomes a unit, if Virginia becomes a unit, some members say they will pull out. I tried to ask for input. *"If you don't like it, why not?"* I got nothing but a lot pissing and moaning. *"We just don't want it."* How do we reach those people who don't want it?

**Response:** (from the point person for the workgroup): We want you to tell **US** what to do. We want your input. I've been a part of the process since it began. There's nothing wrong with having benefits and challenges. There's no challenge that we can't work through. In PA we would reverse the duplication of services if we became one. Challenges are an opportunity. If you look beyond the structure, you have people talking together about what we're going to do. If we all read what we're proposing, do some environmental scanning, look at the possibility of shared services, etc. We need to look at state/nation/province before we decide what to do with seating.

## **Summary compiled from notes taken at MARLCNA.**

### **In love with service:**

**Judi M. RCM, Recovery Is Possible**