

MRLE December 5th, 2015

- Two World Board members are present, Junior and Mukam

9- Noon WB Facilitated CAR session W/ NAWS update

Started with an update on where we currently stand with the SSP and the Traditions workbook. All discussions and input is welcomed and can be accessed at www.NA.org/Traditions or www.NA.org/servicesystemproject

NAWS is currently using virtual work groups as well:

1. Decision Making Workgroup
 2. Planning Our Future
 3. Delegate Sharing Session
- WCNA 36: Brazil Was not a huge success financially but it was a huge success for the fellowship as a whole in regards to becoming connected worldwide. Public Relations did a great job connecting with the medical community as well.
 - N.A currently speaks 77 languages (45 published languages)
 - It is quite clear that the goal of the WB is to reduce the cost of the WSC and sell more literature. fellowship development will assist in producing literature and if we can offset the cost of the WSC we can make a profit (for lack of a better word) because the goal is our vision for NA service
 - Some Q&A followed regarding NAWS. Mostly in regards to money

C.A.R Formal Session

This session will focus on the WB motions:

- **Motion 1** To approve the tradition workbook (lay terms). Development started in 2010 with input gathering between 2012-2014 which concluded in 2015 with a rough draft
1. This whole project to me seems like it was made rather quickly (It was revealed to me that we asked for a four year turnaround on this project) which would make sense that selling more literature would help with our operating costs, lots of delegates are telling the WB that we have not had enough time to read this approval draft. It was suggested that the delegates could table the approval at the 2016 conference in order for the delegates and N.A members to take more time to digest this.
 2. we read a chapter (In Service from the approval draft page 82) each table answered a question in our particular chapter. ours was the first question and it focused on our common welfare being benefited by our common welfare (page 84) afterwards each table shared what we discovered

Motion 2: To approve the following changes to the WB External guidelines contained in a guide to world services in NA (GWSNA)

- To change the size of the board from 18 to 15 members
- To remove the obligation for staggered terms if more than 8 members are elected at one time
- To change the the limitation from two consecutive terms to two terms in a lifetime

This is a cost saving motion wrapped along with allowing many members to have the opportunity to serve on the WB in the future. It is my feeling that the conference will be moving to zone based representation in order to save money, this will be a concession by the WB to encourage regions to be Ok with smaller representation at the WSC.

1. Questions ensued in regards to this being a three part motion. Most delegates think this will be divided at the WSC (probably from a delegate from the U.S).
2. More Questions (due to time left over) ensued in regards to saving money (Junior coming from Brasil in regards to Tanna from NY coming here) Junior stated that this is a process and they are working on WB member assignment.

Literature Survey: on page 19 in the C.A.R and we were asked to pick two in each of the four categories which will coincide by number:

1. **Book Length Recovery Material:** *Revise current sponsorship book and Collection of stories from early N.A members*
2. **Booklet-or Pamphlet-Length Recovery Material:** *Revise PI(PR) and the N.A member and Revise H&I and the NA Member*
3. **Service Material:** *CBDM basics and Local/Area Service Tools*
4. **Ideas For Upcoming Fellowship Issue Discussions:** *Service in NA and Applying our principles to technology and social media*

These topics that i picked were strictly things that i would like to see personally. As we were filling this survey out many delegates were concerned that we were not given the option to say that we would not like anything added to the literature surveys. Delegates once again feel like the WB is pushing an agenda and i just don't see it.

Future Of The WSC

A brief Power Point presentation resumed in regards to the history of the WSC. again, it appears to me that we will be moving in a zone style representation. It also appears to me that zones just function better outside of the United States in regards to collaboration and services offered.

Questions ensued asking delegates what they think about the future of the WSC. it's quite obvious that as we as a fellowship continues to grow and most importantly develop we do need

to see what we can do about the conference becoming too big. The World Board is much more valued and better received outside of the United States especially in the regions and zones that are currently being developed. Many delegates including myself feel that we are being led to agree to zonal seating. Junior and the WB disagrees and these thoughts were based on the small group work that we did with the Mind Maps. All of these new ideas and changes will take some time

Regional Motions

In an effort to eliminate some of the motions being similar, the WB and Regions worked together to present it as one consolidated motion.

Motion 3: The WB develop a project plan which includes a budget and create an IP specifically about mental illness and recovery for consideration at the 2018 WSC

- If approved a project plan will be developed at WSC 2018
- definitely a good IP to help addicts that may not feel welcomed based on their diagnosis

Motion 4: That all future WB minutes be posted on NA.org for download

- This might make obtaining them easier as there are other ways to get them (NAWS News)

Motion 5: All financial reporting for the WCNA be provided in a detailed line item format and not in a summary as is currently available. This report will be posted on NA.org and be downloadable.

- This would provide delegates with a more detailed report of monies spent at the WSCNA. It would make the WSCNA more accountable and transparent but I feel it is a matter of trusting NAWS

Motion 6: That all face to face WB meetings be open to any NA member on a space available basis; unless the topic(s) being discussed are required by law to be confidential.

- Does not seem like an easy thing to make happen. proximity alone would make it tough. While i feel that every level of service should be as transparent as possible, this just seems difficult
- Every time we discuss transparency with the WB the (WB) members always seem to take these type of motions personal. Mukam addressed the body and told us why she could not be allowed to serve on the WB level anymore if this motion passed. It also happened in 2014 when Roger spoke to the motion about WB members sharing rooms; kind of like "well, i'm going to take my ball and go home if this motion passes attitude" I don't understand the separation members see with the WB on a spiritual level but i don't feel like the WB does itself any favors from a PR standpoint.

Motion 7: That if there continues to be a WSC Participants Discussion Board on NA.org that it be made accessible to non WSC participants; only for viewing, not posting.

- I personally do not see the need for this. People tend to discuss things with their support groups and sponsorship families etc. This information is quite easy to obtain, especially in regards to social media.

Motion 8: To direct NAWS to produce a low cost paperback *english* version of the Basic Text which contains only the first ten chapters called “Our Program”

- Making a “cheaper” Basic Text would affect our bottom line (NAWS)
- We already have introductory Literature.
- making it english only would open the door to producing this book in other languages

Motion 9: To direct the WB to post a PDF version of all approved English and translated Basic Texts on NA.org for free download

- I get it, but literature sales keep us going and to provide a PDF for no cost would destroy our fellowship unless we find another way to make a profit.

Motion 10: To hold every other WSC outside of the U.S to begin this rotation in 2020 to be held in Moscow, Russia

- To me, It does not seem like a great idea. having the WSO so close to the conference makes planning easier and keeps workers from the WSO close not to mention it would be expensive
- Russia (the creator of the motion) did not really outline a plan to make this fiscally achievable

Motion 11: To allow a delegate from any ZF who requests to be seated at the WSC as a non-voting participant. The expense will be the responsibility of the ZF, not the WSC

- A frivolous motion, we have a gallery that allows participants to attend. The idea i suppose would allow non seated zones (and we do not even seat zones at the WSC) to participate in discussion but i think it would be of no benefit to the business session

Motion 12: That NAWS add the following “what is NA service” card as part of the group readings offered by the WSO

- Adding another reading before the meeting kind of waters down our message, besides, some groups don't read all of the cards that we offer.

Motion 13: Each WB member votes only in elections and may make motions in all sessions.

The WB has one collective vote (made by the Chairperson of the WB) in new business sessions

- Again, it would behoove the WB to only have one vote; many times their individual votes have affected $\frac{2}{3}$ votes and it just doesn't look good for them, especially when they vote as a bloc which has happened quite often. If delegates can carry one vote for an entire region then they should only carry one vote for their service commitment.
- With the numbers that we have on the floor, the WB can block many motions that are on the floor. i think it is very important that they put out a better image of themselves. Consolidating their vote would be a fantastic idea.
- out of all the motions we are currently discussing and will ultimately be workshopping, this one is so very very important. Too many decisions have been made based on 15-18 member votes compared to 66,000 group votes.

Motion 14: That the WB or members of the WB no longer make motions or proposals for decision at the WSC. The WB may forward ideas or work that regional delegates may present as a motion or proposal to the WSC for a decision

- Definitely a good idea. There is no reason why the WB can not work with their region independently to introduce motions to the WSC
- This will also remove the governing ability of the WB and once again, it will help bridge the gap between the WB and the rest of the fellowship.
- They (the WB) definitely does not like this motion which also troubles me. they are not big on compromise unless they suggest it.

In Closing, todays business session, most of the same people jumped in the queue, said the same things, shared the same concerns and all in all i feel like we did not get much accomplished. It was nice to hear the WB members speak to the motions and some of the delegates whose regions had motions in the CAR were actually present to speak to the motions so that helped. It is the responsibility of the delegates to workshop these motions to their respective regions to get a complete consensus so that we may vote effectively and hopefully resolve some of the concerns we have been having for the past few cycles.

In Loving service,

Stephen R Dysert WNYRDA

