

WSC 31

Opening Mtg. 4/29/12

First things First – The 31st World Service Conference

- I. Open mtg w/ MOS & SP
 - a. Slide show of worldwide fellowship events in NA
- II. Rdgs.
 - a. Included the Mission & Vision Statements
- III. Conference Stats
 - a. Make Up
 - i. 115 seated regions
 - ii. 112 present
 - iii. 112 Rds and 83 RDAs
 - iv. 39 countries
 - v. 24 languages
 - vi. Over 61,665 mtgs. wkly. worldwide
- IV. Regions around the World
 - a. Sharing – Iran, Tejas Bluebonnet, Brazil, Nepal, and Sweden
- V. WSC Attendance Countdown
 - a. More than ten , 5-10, 4th, 3rd, 2nd, 1st

Inspired by Our Primary Purpose

(Building Community)

How will one of these spiritual principles inspire my service at the conference this week?

Integrity Responsibility Unity Anonymity

Process – Small Group Discussion (meta) followed up by sharing and Large Group Interaction

- I. Table Introductions – 10 minute period
- II. Sharing One Hope One Fear while serving @ the Conference – 20 minute period
 - a. SSP doesn't pass/SSP will pass - Chesapeake
 - b. Re-energized/leave here a divisive fellowship
 - c. Remain open-minded/lack of willingness to accept the perspectives of others...
 - d. Divided fellowship/Open-minded and unity
 - e. Old-timers who don't seem to need mtgs-will I feel the same/pick up lots of new info to take back to Japan
 - f. To feel the same gratitude and excitement I felt 2 years ago – Step Working Guide published in Japan/ Due to my shyness I may not pick up what I need to bring back EXP to Japan
 - g. Interpret everything/any questions seek out the answers
 - h. Understand what is good for our group therefore the area... / getting stuck in one aspect
 - i. Develop the best solution for moving forward/bag weighing more than 50 lbs.

III. Spiritual Principles

- a. 5th Tradition “Each group has but one primary purpose – to carry the message to the addict who still suffers.”
 - i. Excerpts from It Works How and Why
 1. Spiritual Principals
 - a. Integrity – Groups demonstrate (integrity) when they offer vigorous, conscious support for addicts seeking to work the NA program
 - b. Responsibility – Each group is responsible to become as effective a vehicle for carrying the NA message as it can be. -and- Each member is responsible to help the group keep our primary purpose in focus.
 - c. Unity – Unity is one of our greatest strengths in carrying the message.
 - d. Anonymity – In anonymity, our personal differences are insignificant compared to our primary purpose. When we come together as a group, our first task is to carry the message; all else ought to be set aside.
 2. How do the spiritual principles of the 5th Tradition inspire our service? Each member shared on the principles in the 5th Tradition what it meant to them as they relate to their recovery and their experience in service.
 3. Select one of the 5th Tradition spiritual principles and respond to the following question: How will this spiritual principle inspire my service at the conference this week? (15 – 20 minute process/writings if so desired were signed over to WSO for possible use later)

AFTERNOON SESSION NAVIGATING the WSC: ORIENTATION

- Overview of week’s deadlines, conference resources, and the expense process
- Discussion of the nomination and election procedures
- General Questions
- HRP Questions
- Expense Questions

Note: The focus of the discussion and Q&A dealt primarily on HRP questions dealing with the RZBs and CPR.

AFTERNOON SESSION 2

WHO VOTES and WHEN TYPES of VOTES

ITEM	DETAIL
Motions	CAR & CAT material
Resolutions	A type of motion
Service System/Straw Polls	Vote on in pre-business
Proposals	

CARD USE

Gold Card – listed motions only – point of information/parliamentary item (not used for discussion)

Purple Card – all other business (used to gain the floor)

ITEM	DETAIL
Roll Calls	How not to affect the vote
Parliamentary Procedures	A Guide to World Services in NA
Proposed Process	Proposals rather than motions

Abstentions are considered no votes. Roll Call present and then no vote will not affect the vote.

BUSINESS SESSION PROCESS

Proposed Process

Brief History of CBDM at WSC

Resolution A 1996: focus discussion based conference

Changes to WSC Description 2000

Conference Actions & Improvements to Process: Almost every WSC since

GWSNA CBDM description 2008

Regional Proposal Straw Poll 2010

Summary of the Proposed Process

- WSC 2012 only Motion 7 either it passes or doesn't
- Applies to main motions and amendments
- Motions would be changed in discussions
- Old and New Business deadlines still apply
- Hope to use in pre-business to decide on other motions too – eg., commit, divide the questions...

Business sessions

Old Business Motions:

CAR Motions, including resolutions

Motion to approve WSC 2010 minutes

Motion "To adopt for WSC 2012 only , the following exceptions to WSC Rules of Order"
see motion list in CAR.

New Business:

Motions to pass projects

Motions to approve the 2014 budget

All other proposals are due by 6 pm Wed.

Note: Explanation of process of straw polling was provided. This process would then be followed by resolutions and motions as changed by the straw polling. Final straw poll determines the status of the proposal. (See HO in the binder Decision-Making Procedure Proposed for WSC 2012 under the Handouts Tab.)

Q&A

Why do regional proposals get straw polled, discussed, and then put in the next cycle? It depends on the type of idea – some things require this; for example, projects.

What about the proposals now – there are 5? Will these be tabled until Saturday? If these have overwhelming support they will just do it. It will not have to be presented as a motion.

Are abstentions no votes. Yes, under roll call votes. Not under voice.

How hard would it be to put together a flow chart – diagram of the process. Not sure. It will become more understandable as we move through the process.

When move into formal business session are we going to use motions as we have in the past? If the process is adopted, then no. This process is intended to bring about CBDM.

Question concerns Motion 4, can amendments be proposed? Not in new business if the process (Motion 7) passes. There is no requirement for seconds? Assuming 7 passes.

What if an idea for change comes up during the new business session? Since the list of proposals won't be seen until new business, it will be straw polled at that time.

Note: 1, 7 and FIPT must pass by 2/3. All others must pass by majority.

How will a standing straw poll be gauged? Only voting participants will stand for yes, then no.

Because the proposals (the ones in the CAR) are not motions do we amend them formally? Yes, the proposed changes must be written and submitted. If it takes place during the discussion the refinement can be made at that time and the revised version presented in new business.

What level of support is needed to move an idea forward? What is strong support and light opposition – weak support?

Will resolutions be determined by a simple majority? Yes.

Question pertains to quantifying – certain motions such as convention rotation need 2/3 vote. It is not so much a question as a statement. How is a percentage that is decisive going to be reached and who will decide that # for quantification? You are correct regarding the convention. We will address these issues as they arise.

April 30, 2012

Morning Session Delegate Survey and Our Service System

Focus here will be the report of the results of the delegate survey with some of the results of the infrastructure discussions in 2006 context followed by delegate discussion and Q&A about the service system project outside of the business session (and the business attached to the particular resolutions).

- I. Delegate Survey Review (126 respondents – 97 RDs and 29 RDAs)**
 - a. RSC/Effectively Functions
 - i. 17% Outstanding
 - ii. 52% Satisfactory
 - iii. 31% Needs Improvement
 - b. Defined role of RD/RDA
 - i. 87% yes
 - ii. 13% no
 - c. Areas/Effectively Functions
 - i. 7% Outstanding
 - ii. 51% Satisfactory
 - iii. 42% Needs Improvement
 - d. Mechanism for Training RCMs
 - i. Training
 - 1. 48% Yes
 - 2. 52% No
 - ii. Effectiveness
 - 1. 46% favorable
 - 2. 28% unfavorable
 - 3. 26% no response

- e. Application of Five Foundational Principles in service system
 - i. 13% collaboration
 - ii. 22% defined by geographic boundaries
 - iii. 17% flexible
 - iv. 21% group-focused
 - v. 27% purpose-driven
 - f. Needs Most Improvement
 - i. 21% collaboration
 - ii. 18% defined by geographic boundaries
 - iii. 15% flexible
 - iv. 21 group-focused
 - v. 26% purpose-driven
- II. 2006 Infrastructure Discussion
- a. Service System Discussion
 - i. Q&A FORMAT – the following points will be summarized conversations held on the floor.

Carolina Region – When we left 2010 these would be enhancements, but in mid-stream it seemed to be replacement of what we have now. What would the final outputs look like – enhancements or complete change? Enhancement of the services is the intention of the SSP, but in fairness to those systems developed 30 years ago will not see the change as an enhancement. This is not a whole sale replacement of what we now have, but yes change is going to be an integral part. We are not renaming things as many think that is what is going to be done.

New Zealand – Trying the SSP for over a year, we have found that we can take what we need and leave the rest. Now that we have a road map we are attempting to try the aspects of the SSP. Seating issues are not an issue for us – we are one country one region. It seems to be that we need to separate the seating issue from the rest of the SSP. No question.

Missouri – 840 something mtgs only 161 responded to the tally. This is a sad statement. I don't see this resolution – SSP as an answer for the apathy and lack of participation. I don't see this change affecting the lack of commitment... We can't fill positions now, where are going to get individuals to fill the new positions this new SS will create? **Response:** There are a lot of causes for lack of ... One thing I have observed, when there is something meaningful that can be measured often people will do it. Ownership/immediacy is what draws people. Confirmation of people's efforts by connecting people with a task that has a beginning, middle, and end will draw people in. Our current structure alienates people.

New Jersey – IDTs fuel behind the SSP. Why only 50 minutes for this discussion? This is huge. Huge! I understand that this is not and us and them thing now, but there are things that have been done to create this idea. It is the method (example CBDM). You say you want to know what the RDs think, but what about the groups? You guys seem to selling this project. This is the perception WSO has created and the fellowship is in conflict as a result. We don't need to be going forward with this especially regarding the transition process. Why are we being left out. Response: Leadership and what it is that leadership is intended to do.

Chicago – Going with the region of Sweden. We like to learn from trial and error. And, that is what we have been doing in NA. My areas didn't trust the RD and RDA to put on the CAR workshops. They put on their own workshops without the RD/RDA. To tell them that we want to recreate won't happen with these areas. This recreation is believed to be throwing out the baby with the bath water. To knock out seating is going to take away the opportunity to share ESH and create empathy. There are other ways to generate funds to maintain seating.

Montana – A lot of the SS has been implemented in my region. Service enhances recovery. Are we replacing the inverted pyramid? No. Not now and not with the SSP.

Southern Brazil – 13 areas 178 groups. We are dealing with apathy and lack of servants. GSU in the two track option is being applied, and it is working especially regarding training. It is working – it is getting more people involved.

Peru – In Peru 40 groups and 100 mtgs weekly. Having trouble with the new SS. It is very hard for the fellowship here to understand. Literacy is an issue. We need some examples to help us explain these things.

Northern New York – Before coming here there was difficulty with creaming the concepts out of this material and understanding the materials. I felt like I needed to be a Lean Six Sigma trainer... We are in the process of transitioning regarding the delivery of services in our 6 areas and the SS works especially regarding avoiding the duplication of services by creating coordinator positions for the areas subcommittees.

Ontario – We are here to comfort the disturbed and disturb the comfortable. My group wanted little from area. So when we went to area, we were disenchanted because we had to deal with the bureaucracy. We believe it is going to work. We don't how. We just have faith that it will eliminate bureaucracy as with the possibility of the GSU.

Central Atlantic – We are steeped in culture. We have already implemented this SS. How do you say yes to this but no to that? All this clearly reveals is that people don't understand what is being proposed. We don't get clarity. We get we don't know yet – we're not there yet. How can we get the information out there to help gather a conscience? **Response:** When the SS is implemented and it is a change in processes, then we have to do it one step at a time so as not to complicate. There is much we can't see yet, because we have not gotten there yet. It won't be as many fear letting go of our for examples conventions. These things will most probably continue.

Rio-Grande – We understand boundary problems. We are trying pieces of it – GSU/LSU model. We are answering questions as we go. We are just happy to get a chance to do it.

Idaho – How does this SSP resolve our underlying problems? How does the SSP continue to uphold the Traditions and Concepts? Response: We believe it does not violate the Traditions and that it truly introduces the Concepts across the board to service. The question that will need to be answered will be delegation and group conscience.

Sweden – Translation was a challenge. All the projects, to make them accessible to the groups, we need more time. There is no time at the area level to do these things. We have begun to adopt some of the SS. It is working for us and providing more time and making service more attractive and easy. There are not a lot of people against this SSP.

Norway – It was understood that the SSP was meant to respond to the growth of NA. In Norway, we like it, but it is getting very complicated. What happened to keep it simple? What is the problem – do others have problems with the SSP? Where did it come from? **Response:** The WSO made the proposals for the SSP. The question now is is it responsible for us to not make a proposal? We need to make some decisions on where this is going to take us.

OLD BUSINESS DISCUSSION

Focus old business motions, resolutions, and proposals followed by the Taking of the Service System Project straw polls. Generally, each issue was discussed and then straw polled to get a sense of the body before moving into formal business decisions sessions.

Process

- Intro & straw poll motion/proposal
- Straw poll & discuss any proposed changes
- If conference supports the proposed change, the motion/proposal is now revised.
- Discuss main motion/proposal is now revised.
- Discuss main motion /proposal (as changed or not).
- After discussion, straw poll motion/proposal
- Total = up to four straw polls

I. Roll Call

- a. Regions
- b. World Board
- c. 127 participants, 112 regions $2/3 = 75$ and simple majority = 57

- II. Motion #7 (not included in the CAR) To adopt for WSC 2012 only, the following exceptions to the WSC Rules of Order:**
- a. Formal Old Business Session
 - i. Main motions or amendments to main motions will be limited to the following:
 - 1. CAR motions, including resolutions
 - 2. A motion "To approve the minutes from WSC 2010"
 - 3. This motion "To adopt for WSC 2012 only, the following exceptions to the Rules of Order."
 - ii. Changes to motions, resolutions, and proposals will be handled in the discussion portion of the old business session.
 - 1. Proposed changes to motions, resolutions, and proposals should be submitted on a proposal form by the old business deadline at 6pm Sunday night.
 - 2. Changes that would previously have been addressed by making formal amendment will be submitted by the deadline as "an idea for changing a motion, resolution, or proposal."
 - b. Formal New Business Session
 - i. Main motions or amendments to main motions will be limited to the following:
 - 1. Motions to pass project plans
 - 2. A motion to approve the 2012-2014 NAWS budget
 - ii. Any other new business will be treated as a proposal rather than a motion:
 - 1. New business proposals, including proposed changes to motions, must be submitted on a proposal form by the new business deadline, 6pm Wednesday night.
 - c. Intent: To continue our evolution towards a consensus based conference.

Straw Poll: Strongly support for Motion #7

Discussion Queue: regarded the types of business.

Straw Poll: Divide Motion #7 so that it is used to separate Old Business from New Business.

Final Straw Poll: Strong support

- III. Motion #6 To approve 2010 World Service Conference Minutes.**
- a. Straw Poll: Strong Support
 - i. Discussion Queue
 - b. Straw Poll: Strong Poll
- IV. Motion #1 To approve the book Living Clean the Journey Continues contained in Addendum A.**
- a. Straw Poll: Unanimous
 - i. Discussion Queue
 - 1. Positive statements regarding process

2. Cost/Production: It will be a hardcover book and the price has not yet been determined. Production time is projected to October 2012.
3. What was the initial cost incurred and will there be any other cost? First and second question: We will get the information.
4. How long will it take to translate to Spanish and is there a priority list? That depends on the community. If the community prioritizes it and is ready that will move the process along.
5. Is this going to be a special limited edition book? Given our financial situation that is very probable.
6. Have a draft version in Spanish to help bring the conscious of Regions.
7. Will this book freely be provided to Nepal like the Basic Text? We do what we can to meet the needs of our NA communities. We will find a way to meet the needs – but we will need specifics to determine our response.
8. The multi-cultural perspective was enormous and how everybody’s input was treated with great consideration.
9. Procedure question: Why do we discuss this to death when we have unanimous support? We are in discussion

b. Final Straw Poll: Unrequired due to first unanimous poll.

AFTERNOON SESSION

I. Motion 2: To allow the World Board to make non-substantive corrections to Fellowship-approved literature which do not impact the original meaning of the Fellowship-approved text and which fix typographical errors, obsolete references, references to outdated literature, and other similar corrections. The World Board will announce such corrections in advance.

a. Discussion Session:

- i. Straw Poll: Support
- ii. Proposal F: to amend motion 2 as follows: To allow the World Board to make non-substantive corrections to Fellowship-approved literature ~~which do not impact the original meaning of the Fellowship-approved text and~~ which fix typographical errors, ~~obsolete references,~~ references to outdated literature, ~~and other similar corrections.~~ The World Board will announce such corrections in advance.

1. Straw Poll: Opposition

- a. Iowa – request the Motion 2,3, and 4 be ruled out of order due to vague language. Ruling of facilitators is that the motions are not out of order.
- b. Can all the similar motions to amend motion 2 (F, K, N and P) be joined under one discussion? Yes.
- c. Straw Poll: Strong Support

- iii. Proposal K: To amend motion 2 as follows: To allow the World Board to make non-substantive corrections to Fellowship-approved literature which do not impact the original meaning of the Fellowship-approved text and which fix typographical errors, obsolete references, references to outdated literature, and other similar corrections. The World Board will distribute the draft changes to RDs for approval 120 days ~~announce such corrections~~ in advance of such publication.
 - 1. Straw poll: Strong Support
- iv. Proposal N: To amend motion 2 as follows: We would like to have a 90 day review period and input time frame to have the possibility to look for major mistakes.
 - 1. Straw Poll: Opposition
- v. Proposal P: To amend motion 2 as follows: To allow the World Board to make non-substantive corrections to Fellowship-approved literature which do not impact the original meaning of the Fellowship-approved text and which fix typographical errors, obsolete references, references to outdated literature, ~~and other similar corrections~~. The World Board will announce such corrections in advance.
 - 1. Straw Poll: Opposition
- vi. Discussion of Proposals to Amend
 - 1. Proposals K and N want to affix time restraints and review periods
 - 2. There is a concern for vagueness of language. There seems to be support for some kind of review process as seen in K and N. Maybe the difficulty lies in the language of the amendments stating: “review and input” and “approval.”
 - 3. In translations it is common to have a lot of errors. You have taught me something that is practical is spiritual. The motions states that the original meaning will not be changed. What is the problem? Do we not trust the World Board?
 - 4. Who do we hold responsible for all these changes since there are over 30 languages? Since this is done in English how do the foreign speaking regions deal with this issue? How are you going to organize all these announcements when you wish to make changes? **Response:** This doesn’t affect the translations because the language will be translated after the corrections are made in English. This motion is really only about edits not involving service literature and is really about English literature. We could easily live with changes. We have a mechanism in place for that.

As for the rest of the language we need to understand the legality of IPT materials.

a. Straw Poll: For time frame inclusion has support.

i. Time Frame of 120 supported

5. What is meant that the World Board will announce?

6. What is meant by obsolete references? Example was given: “As long as the ties that bind us together are stronger than those that would tear us apart all will be well.” Now change it to read: “As long as the unity that binds us together is stronger than the disunity that tears us apart all will be well.” Would this be considered a non-substantive change to an obsolete reference?

Response: Not in NA! This would not happen.

7. 2008 World Board was given the option to create service pamphlets with a 90 day review period. This process was used and it worked. So what is the problem? Do we not trust the Board? We are past the 90s shit.

8. For “approval” might not be the correct word. The problem is the responsibility should be with the Fellowship not the Board. Who changes the motion if it is to be revised or amended? **Response:** It won’t be done in now it will be done in process for the business session when voted on.

vii. Second Straw Polls:

1. Proposal F,K,N, and P: Strong Opposition

viii. Discussion Queue: Final Straw Poll for original Motion 2 with the addition of 120 days to follow corrections and precede in advance of publication.

1. Straw Poll the rewrite: Strong Support

2. Final Straw Poll: Strong Support

II. Motion 3: To allow the World Board to bundle, excerpt, and repackage Fellowship-approved literature without changes to text themselves. The World Board will announce these actions in advance of publication.

a. Discussion Session:

i. Initial Straw Poll: Strong Support

ii. Inclusion of 120 days so that the motion reads: To allow the World Board to bundle, excerpt, and repackage Fellowship-approved literature without changes to text themselves. The World Board will announce these actions not less than 120 days in advance of publication.

1. Final Straw Poll: Strong Support

- III. Motion 4: To allow the World Board the ability to create and approve enhanced electronic or digital versions of texts that include supplemental materials or connections to other NA materials. The World Board will announce such enhancements in advance of publication.**
- a. Modified: III. Motion 4: To allow the World Board the ability to create and approve enhanced electronic or digital versions of texts that include supplemental materials or connections to other NA materials. The World Board will announce such enhancements not less than 120 days in advance of publication. Note: Motion M was withdrawn as a result of the 120 inclusion.
 - b. Discussion Session
 - i. Initial Straw Poll: Strong Support
 - c. Proposal G: To amend Motion 4 as follows: To allow the World Board the ability to create ~~and approve~~ enhanced electronic or digital versions of texts that include supplemental materials or connections to other NA materials. The World Board will announce such enhancements in advance of publication.
 - i. Straw Poll: Strong Opposition
 - d. Proposal I: To amend Motion 4 as follows: To allow the World Board the ability to create and approve enhanced electronic or digital versions of texts that include supplemental fellowship materials or connections to other NA materials. The World Board will announce such enhancements in advance of publication.
 - i. Straw Poll: Strong Opposition
 - e. Proposal Q: To amend Motion. To add to the end of the proposed new language for Article @, Section 5 of the *Fellowship Intellectual Property trust* “and obtains Fellowship approval.”
 - i. Intent: The language permitting the World Board to create and self-approve enhanced electronic or digital versions of the texts that include supplemental materials effectively limiting the current and future Board members from making unapproved new literature.
 - f. Straw Poll: Strong Opposition
 - g. Proposal S: To amend Motion 4 to not include that this non-fellowship approved literature (in the digital enhancement).
 - i. Straw Poll: Strong Opposition
 - ii. Amendment withdrawn resulting from discussion had regarding Proposal U
 - h. Proposal U: To amend Motion 4. Make a project for later approval.
 - i. Intent: To have all the ideas consolidated and reviewed before approval so the fellowship can give feedback.

- ii. Since pictures are not included in our literature the maker of the amendment withdraws the amendment.
- i. Discussion Queue:
 - i. Giving complete discretion to the World Board is a violation of the FIPT. It oversteps the bounds. This was noted as a No vote statement by the facilitators.
 - ii. We already have this in Miracles Happens. **Response:** That was conference approved.
- j. Proposal G withdrawn.
- k. Proposal Q Straw Poll: Strong Opposition
 - i. Discussion Queue
 - 1. How does this affect RSO financially? What about marketing?
Response: First, that has nothing to do with the motion. Secondly, we need to address marketing if the literature is to be produced.
 - 2. Does giving the World Board ability to approve literature result in that approval automatically making all approvals by the Board Fellowship approved literature?
 - 3. We need to give the Fellowship time to make decisions before you go into full production and then find out that the Fellowship does not like the product. Pulling the product back after a production would be costly.
 - 4. How do we/the Board determine what is supplemental materials?
Could these supplemental materials be things other than NA approved materials?
 - ii. **Final Straw Poll: Strong Opposition.**

IV. Motion 5: To hold the World Convention of NA every three years, beginning 2018, alternating North American and non-North American locations, as follows and contained in the revised World Convention Map contained in Addendum C of CAR.

- a. Initial Straw Poll: Strong Support
- b. Proposal H: To change motion 5 from every three years to every 2 ½ years (with all else pertaining to the motion remaining the same.
 - i. Straw Poll: Strong Opposition
- c. Proposal V: To amend motion 5. No change to frequency, keep every two years.
 - i. Straw Poll: Maker of the amendment withdraws the proposal to amend.
- d. Maker of Proposal H withdraws the proposal to amend.
- e. Discussion Queue
 - i. This issue was addressed previously; the establishment of rotation and time table, and was not to be revisited until a later established date. If

this is correct then is this not out of order? **Response:** We will have to check on this in the Guide to Local Services. See page 38 of Guide to World Services. The reading of the World Convention Guidelines is open to interpretation by both the RD and the Board. This discussion raised issue related to parliamentary procedure.

1. Straw Poll: Strong support.
2. **Final Straw Poll: Strong Support**

EVENING SESSION

- I. **Resolution 1: Our service efforts will be carried out through a system that includes structure, process, people, and resources.**
 - a. Initial Straw Poll: Support
 - i. Discussion Queue
 - b. **Final Straw Poll: Support**
- II. **Resolution 2: The service system is group-focused and includes a local- level body dedicated exclusively to addressing group concerns.**
 - a. Initial Straw Poll: Support
 - i. Discussion Queue
 - b. **Final Straw Poll: Support**
- III. **Resolution 3: Training and mentoring of trusted servants are essential functions of the service system.**
 - a. Initial Straw Poll: Strong Support
 - i. Discussion Queue
 - b. **Final Straw Poll: Strong Support**
- IV. **Resolution 4: Service bodies are purpose-and vision-driven.**
 - a. Initial Straw Poll: Strong Support
 - b. Final straw Poll: Strong Support
- V. **Resolution 5: Service bodies work together to utilize planning processes to organize and coordinate their efforts.**
 - a. Initial Straw Poll: Strong Support
 - b. **Final Straw Poll: Strong Support**
- VI. **Resolution 6: Service bodies make decisions by consensus.**
 - a. Initial Straw Poll: Support
 - i. Discussion Queue
 1. How does this not violate Traditions? **Response:** WB does not believe that this violates any Traditions or Concepts.

2. Is there any plan for training or mentoring if so what? **Response:** These are agreements in principle and we have not finalized the process.
 3. What is the definition of consensus? **Response:** Again these are agreements in principle. Details and specifics will come at a later date. See page 89 of the Guide to World Services for an essay on CBDM.
 4. We should make the opportunity available for both CBDM and RR of O. **Response:** Again this is an agreement in principle and therefore the opportunity exists.
 5. Based on my own experience and the dictionary, consensus means majority. When we used the combination of both last Conference things move along with fluidity. It doesn't seem to be happening this Conference.
 6. Can we go back to the question of Traditions violation? **Response:** If there is a conflict we ask that you show us the conflict for the purpose of further discussion.
 7. How is this not government? And if this can't be answered we are not in support regardless of it being an agreement in principle.
 8. The true definition of consensus reveals that one person can kill the agreement. Robert's Rules of Order takes 3 pros and 3 cons no one person can kill an attempt to reach an agreement.
 9. WB member strongly opposes the recommendation because it becomes binding and by doing this the Board is being required to give a model to be followed.
 10. Can we get an explanation of "agreement in principle"?
Response: It means that we all agree on the principle and that we are going to move forward in that direction. It gives us a direction that we want to move. See page 8 in the CAR. It means to set a general direction and in this case it is for the project.
 11. Our collective conscience is what we want to gather and every community will have their own opportunity to experience what we are discussing.
- ii. Facilitators Recommend: Service bodies **strive to** make decisions by consensus.
 1. Straw Poll: Strong Support
 - a. Discussion Queue: Return to original Discussion Queue.
- iii. **Final Straw Poll: Support**

- VII. Resolution 7: The service structure includes local service bodies, state/nation/province service bodies, and intermediate bodies if needed. Service bodies follow established geographic boundaries. They are not self-determined, but are formed, based on need, through a collaborative planning process and agreement with other affected service bodies at the next level of service.**
- a. Initial Straw Polls: too close to call/ relatively split
 - b. Proposal J: To amend Resolution 7 as follows: The service structure includes local service bodies, state/nation/province service bodies, and intermediate bodies if needed. Service bodies willing to follow established geographic boundaries. ~~They are not self-determined, but~~ are formed, based on need, through a collaborative planning process and agreement with other affected service bodies ~~at the next level of service.~~ with other affected service bodies.
 - i. Straw Poll: Strong opposition
 - c. Proposal R: To amend Resolution 7. To separate the global level from the local level when considering geographical borders for service bodies.
 - i. Straw Poll: Strong Opposition
 - d. Proposal W: To amend Resolution 7 as follows: The service structure includes local service bodies, state/nation/province service bodies, and intermediate bodies if needed. ~~Service bodies follow established geographic boundaries.~~ They are not self-determined, but are formed, based on need, through a collaborative planning process and agreement with other affected service bodies at the next level of service.
 - i. Straw Poll: Strong Opposition
 - e. Discussion Queue on Proposals
 - i. Concern is with the language reading “at the next level of service.” Does this mean that areas will tell groups, regions will tell areas, World will tell region? **Response:** In large measure the problem with J is that you might be unwilling to work together. The words were placed in order to identify an easy way collaboration would take place. Such as the formation of a new area and how the new area could affect other areas in the surrounding geography.
 - ii. What is the importance of stating the criteria for stating geographical boundaries? **Response:** The reason to include reference to it relates to the fact that NA does not exist independently of the communities we operate. Example of governmental agencies that control the lives of the people we want to save- we need to be able to work with these agencies. Also using a geographic boundary makes it easier for us to be located.

- iii. How can we slow this down so that we can work into the transition/change? We seem to have lost the consensus we were building.
- iv. We learned to two things: One – having worked these bodies into the our region. It has worked for some and not for others. The isolated areas needed much help like that of sponsorship, but having to be organized under geographical boundaries these groups would have to be left alone.
- v. My region has geographic boundaries. Obviously this is not geographic as much as it is political.
- vi. We noticed that the explanation said that boundaries are practical/logical. But this is not the case. These boundaries are geopolitical. The logic of the boundaries was based upon greed and lack of spiritual ideology.

f. Final Straw Poll: Proposal J, R , and W: Strong Opposition

- g. Interim Straw Poll on Resolution 7 as originally written: Opposition
 - i. Discussion Queue
 1. Lengthy discussion – huge sticking point is lack of self-determination and our region finds this unacceptable.
 2. Mexico has 3 regions and each is very big. Say that the limits of the region will not be the size of the region worries us. Having a national body would make it impossible for the national body to know the needs of such a big service body. In our region there is 450 groups. At the moment it is very hard to service these the groups and it would be even harder if we are united under one service body.
 3. If want to come across as professional to all the state agencies we need to unite and have single point of accountability.
 4. We were told that we will work it out. How does this resolution not violate Traditions 2 and 9.
 5. We are very familiar with getting calls because so many areas and regions do not have names that assist in helping people who are reaching out find us.
 6. Can 101 restate the questions? Tradition 4 autonomy, Tradition 2 and 9 authority are not these Traditions being violated?
Response: Except when affecting other groups or NA as a whole responds specifically here and stops the stretching of autonomy. We don't see any conflict with Tradition 2 or 9. You will have tell us the conflict you see?

7. We are just concerned that legal authorities reside in different states so this is problematic. There may be reasonable and logical exceptions. **Response:** Yes there are exceptions as in Ireland's case.

8. Our region has overwhelming opposition to this resolution.

ii. Straw Poll to end discussion: Strong Support

iii. **Final Straw Poll: evenly split**

VIII. Resolution 8: State/Nation/ Province boundaries are the primary criterion for seating consideration at the World Service Conference.

a. Initial Straw Poll: evenly split

i. Discussion Queue (limited to six)

1. Question for the maker of the resolution stating that "state/nation/province are the primary" does this mean that there are other criteria? **Response:** No, primary means primary.
2. Our location Cal Mid State is exceptionally large in population and has varied culture and splitting us up will not serve our fellowship. **Response:** Primary criteria leaves open flexibility to address this issue. Eventually, we will have to address the issue of conference seating.
3. In Uruguay we supported all resolutions up to 6, what worries us about 7&8 is the concept of the geographical boundaries and we are a very small region. It is pretty well defined and has a lot of growth in NA terms. Our case would be that we might join a country next to us since we are so small. What worries us is not being able to come to WSC to participate in the conversations taking place at the WSC. Also, it would be very hard for our servants to interact across borders. We would lose our diversity. After each conference we are strengthened and for this conference we have brought our RDA. We want to look for a solution but another kind of solution to conference seating. **Response:** This really doesn't apply to Uruguay because you are a country.
4. We have thoughts in principle that we are losing a vote. What are the other criteria for seating? **Response:** Regardless, we need to address seating and that is what primary means to me.
5. Most of the regions are worried about being able to keep their seats. Can we make this Resolution only applicable to new service bodies? We don't see how the resolution will fix that. **Response:**

This is an agreement in principle. At this point, there is no criterion. We don't have these specifics.

6. How is my region -150 groups 13 areas in 5 states in all Mexico there are 482 groups in 4 states. We have put in place some of the ideas and yes we like some of the ideas. And we understand that it is about saving money and that would affect us more because we would have to travel more to service commitments. We feel that our question has not been answered. We would like to take an answer back to our region. **Response:** We have some examples such as Brazil, Mexico, and Russia and how collaboratively your concerns could be worked out. The intermediate body may be your answer. This is strictly related to conference seating.
7. We have a responsibility here that we cannot sustain our own size and we need to reduce the number of seats to make room for those yet to come. We must make the room for growth. We need to start thinking in a global term not local term.

b. Final Straw Poll: Support

REGIONAL PROPOSALS

- I. **Proposal A: Carolina Region: For the Fellowship of NA and the WSC to consider a proposal for the creation of Written Service Material dedicated to assisting the members of NA as a whole on (1) how to actively participate in literature and publication projects as well as (2) to have resource material available in providing guidance for the development of Literature and Publication processes locally.**
 - a. Initial Straw Poll: Opposition
 - i. Discussion Queue
 - ii. Writer of Proposal A amends by removing bullet 2.
 1. Straw Poll: opposition
 - b. **Final Straw Poll: opposition**

**TUESDAY MORNING SESSION
(Regional Proposals Continued)**

- II. **Proposal B: Hawaii Region: To produce a book-length publication called ‘The NA Way: Celebration Edition’ comprised of a compilation of articles published in the NA Way 1998-2012.**
- a. **Writer of the proposal wishes to change the original proposal to read as: To submit to the World Board as an idea for further study: to produce a book-length publication called ‘The NA Way: Celebration Edition’ comprised of a compilation of articles published in the NA Way 1998-2012.**
 - b. Initial Straw Poll: Opposition
 - i. Discussion Queue
 1. We do have a process for things such as these and proposals such as this waste time.
 2. This would be a great opportunity for a FIPT project – electronically.
 3. The intent involving contributions by members from the past 30 years is of great interest and we support this based upon sharing ESH.
 - c. **Final Straw Poll: Opposition**
- III. **Proposal C: Tejas Bluebonnet Region: For Board Approved Literature be clearly marked on front “Service Related Material” and not intended to be read during recovery meetings.**
- a. Initial Straw Poll: Support
 - i. Discussion Queue
 1. Is there a way for this proposal to be amended at this time? Can it be written as follows: For Board Approved Service Pamphlets Literature be clearly marked on front “Service Related Material and not intended to be read during recovery meetings.”
 - a. Straw Poll on revision: Strong Support
 2. Is the maker of the proposal clear that this will affect a great deal of lit other than SPs?
 3. World Board states we believe we understand the request and that we could come back with the language crafted. At that time the delegates could move to accept or reject.
 - a. Straw Poll: Strong Support
 - ii. Straw Poll on maximum number in queue: Strong Opposition
 - b. **Final Straw Poll: Not taken due to World Board interpretation of the intent.**

- IV. Proposal D: South Brazil Region: That members who wish to receive the NA Way Magazine in hard copy format pay a subscription fee to cover the cost of printing and mailing.**
- a. Initial Straw Poll: Strong Opposition
 - b. Proposal O: To amend Proposal D: ~~That~~ The members who wish to receive the NA Way Magazine in hard copy format and who can or wish pay a subscription fee to cover the cost of printing and mailing, have a direct form of doing so (either by credit card or bank transaction) which will only serve for this publication.
 - i. Straw Poll for revision: Strong Opposition
 - ii. Discussion Queue
 1. WB is opposed because we have a mechanism to take donations from those who wish to offset the cost. It would be more costly to implement such a mechanism – history reveals we lose subscribers when such things are done.
 2. Perhaps a link on the website to identify donations for this publication over say \$10 could help.
 3. Final Straws Poll on revision: Strong Opposition
 - iii. Discussion Queue on original Proposal
 1. Can we revise the donation portal? Response: Please continue to send ideas for our consideration. Ideas often can be implemented without such a process as this.
 - c. **Final Straw Poll of Proposal D: Strong Opposition**
- V. Proposal E: Upper Midwest Region: Our idea is to revisit the discussion of the world board members no longer having a voting status at the world service conference.**
- a. Initial Straw Polls: Opposition
 - i. Discussion Queue
 1. WBM – Are the statements made about this motion ingenuously misleading or misinformed. We only vote on new business, not on items in old business. If we don't know what is in new business how can we vote twice.
 2. If the proposal intent is to revisit the discussion and there is strong opposition why are we having a discussion.
 3. We believe that the board should consolidate their conscience as the participants do in their regions.

4. The principle of voting and duly representing the fellowship is upturned. If we go to the new SS that would give the WB unfair #s in comparison to the #s from the seated delegates at the conference, especially considering zonal representation that may never be realized.
5. Are we envious or suspicious of the WB? What is the problem? They are trusted servants and should have a vote.
6. This proposal has a long history and it has been voted down every time. I believe this proposal has merit.
7. My region elects me to represent them, but when the need arises they recognize that there will be times that I must represent the Fellowship. The WB represents the worldwide fellowship and there perspective needs to be shared. Who will represent the 112 unseated regions of the Fellowship?
8. The WBM's ESH is critically important before, during, and after the Conference and it is with this in mind that when we as individuals speak to the importance of their shared perspective – we need to recognize that share perspective can be gained at many different times especially during discussion queues thereby having ample opportunity to influence the decision-making process. If they participate in the discussion leading up to voting they have shared their ESH – representing those that may not be seated or are seated and therefore affect the final result of the vote. Like many here and as my region of WNY's conscience requires me to act and as the 7 Concept states, why can their vote not be consolidated as we do at the home group, area , and regional levels. In essence giving us the board's group conscience and not having unfair numbers when voting – 1 vote one body – not 15 votes for 15 individuals.

b. Final Straw Poll: Strong Opposition

1. Note: There were many yellow cards question procedure that were inappropriate and wasted a great deal of time as there were many other points presented for discussion. The irony is that with the great number of points in favor out weighing the number of points in opposition that when the proposal was straw polled there was strong opposition.

FORMAL OLD BUSINESS SESSION **(Morning Session Continued)**

See Guide to World Services for WSC Rules of Order pages 55 – 59. WSC Rules take precedence over Robert’s Rules of Order.

Process

- Call to Question
- 3 pros/3 cons
- Vote (If you wish not to affect the vote state present not voting. Abstentions affect the vote base upon percent.)

Roll Call: Total participants: 127 Regions: 112 Simple Majority: 57 2/3rd majority: 75

I. Motion #7 (not included in the CAR) To adopt for WSC 2012 only, the following exceptions to the WSC Rules of Order:

- a. Formal Old Business Session
 - i. Main motions or amendments to main motions will be limited to the following:
 1. CAR motions, including resolutions
 2. A motion “To approve the minutes from WSC 2010”
 3. This motion “To adopt for WSC 2012 only, the following exceptions to the Rules of Order.”
 - ii. Changes to motions, resolutions, and proposals will be handled in the discussion portion of the old business session.
 1. Proposed changes to motions, resolutions, and proposals should be submitted on a proposal form by the old business deadline at 6pm Sunday night.
 2. Changes that would previously have been addressed by making formal amendment will be submitted by the deadline as “an idea for changing a motion, resolution, or proposal.”
- b. Formal New Business Session
 - i. Main motions or amendments to main motions will be limited to the following:
 1. Motions to pass project plans
 2. A motion to approve the 2012-2014 NAWS budget
 - ii. Any other new business will be treated as a proposal rather than a motion:
 1. New business proposals, including proposed changes to motions, must be submitted on a proposal form by the new business deadline, 6pm Wednesday night.
- c. Intent: To continue our evolution towards a consensus based conference.

Motion to Divide the Question: separate formal old business from new business sessions: **2nd by 107. Voice Vote: Defeated**

No Discussion to the Motion.

Motion carries by Voice vote even though it requires 2/3rd vote to pass. Note voice vote if strong will be considered will be determined as 2/3rd or lack of 2/3rds.

- II. **Motion #6 To approve 2010 World Service Conference Minutes.**
 - a. **Motion carries by unanimous decision.**
- III. **Motion #1 To approve the book Living Clean the Journey Continues contained in Addendum A.**
 - a. **Motion carries by unanimous decision**
- IV. **Motion 2: To allow the World Board to make non-substantive corrections to Fellowship-approved literature which do not impact the original meaning of the Fellowship-approved text and which fix typographical errors, obsolete references, references to outdated literature, and other similar corrections. The World Board will announce such corrections not less than 120 in advance.**
 - a. **Motion carries by 2/3rd voice vote motion carries**
 - b. **Roll Call Vote Defeated**
 - i. **Standing Vote: 90 For 19 Opposed 1 Abstained**
 - 1. **Motion Passes**
- V. **Motion 3: To allow the World Board to bundle, excerpt, and repackage Fellowship-approved literature without changes to text themselves. The World Board will announce these actions not less than 120 days in advance of publication.**
 - a. **Motion Carries by 2/3rd voice vote**
 - b. **Roll Call Vote Defeated**
 - i. **Standing Vote: 89 For 22 Against 1 Abstained**
 - 1. **Motion Passes**
- VI. **Motion 4: To allow the World Board the ability to create and approve enhanced electronic or digital versions of texts that include supplemental materials or connections to other NA materials. The World Board will announce such enhancements no less than 120 days in advance of publication.**
 - a. **Motion Carries by 2/3rd voice vote**
 - b. **Roll Call Vote Defeated**
 - i. **Standing Vote: 87 For 23 Opposed 1 Abstained**
 - 1. **Motion Passes**

LUNCH BREAK

AFTERNOON SESSION (Formal Old Business Continued)

Roll Call: Participants: 127 Regions: 112 Simple Majority: 57 2/3rd Majority: 75

Voting Procedure: Do to issue regarding voting this morning the co-facilitators are returning to Motion 4 to take a Standing Vote.

- I. **Motion 5: To hold the World Convention of NA every three years, beginning 2018, alternating North American and non-North American locations, as follows and contained in the revised World Convention Map contained in Addendum C of CAR.**
 - a. **Motion Carries with 2/3rd voice vote**
- II. **Resolution1: Our service efforts will be carried out through a system that includes structure, process, people, and resources.**
 - a. **Motion Carries with Simple Majority voice vote**
- III. **Resolution 2: The service system is group-focused and includes a local- level body dedicated exclusively to addressing group concerns.**
 - a. **Motion Carries with Simple Majority voice vote**
- IV. **Resolution 3: Training and mentoring of trusted servants are essential functions of the service system.**
 - a. **Motion Carries with Simple Majority voice vote**
- V. **Resolution 4: Service bodies are purpose-and vision-driven.**
 - a. **Motion Carries with Simple Majority voice vote**
- VI. **Resolution 5: Service bodies work together to utilize planning processes to organize and coordinate their efforts.**
 - a. **Motion Carries with simple Majority voice vote**
- VII. **Resolution 6: Service bodies make decisions by consensus.**
 - a. **Motion to carry undetermined**
 - i. **Standing Vote: 77 For 31 Against 1 Abstained 2 present not voting**
 - ii. **Motion Carries**

VIII. Resolution 7: The service structure includes local service bodies, state/nation/province service bodies, and intermediate bodies if needed. Service bodies follow established geographic boundaries. They are not self-determined, but are formed, based on need, through a collaborative planning process and agreement with other affected service bodies at the next level of service.

a. Pro/Cons

- i. Con – Self-determination is a form of autonomy and therefore this violate Tradition 4.
- ii. Pro – Each group should be autonomous except in matters affecting NA as a whole. How is any group autonomous in service?
- iii. Con – Our group tallies were 75 yes and 75 no therefore we must vote no.
- iv. Pro – I don't see any where that says we are not self-determined. To take 3 words out of the sentence is a dis-service.
- v. Con – It appears that the discussion did not address the concerns of the Fellowship.
- vi. Pro – Voting in favor is not a bad idea. An agreement in p... cut off due to move toward a con.
- vii. Pro – our biggest concern was that the pyramid would be inverted, but our area/region found that the groups are in fact in need of this resolution since we have 2 areas that have sprung up that are duplicating services and wasting NA funds.

b. Motion to carry undetermined

i. **Standing Vote: 61 For 44 Against 2 Abstained 4 Present but not Voting**

1. Resolution Carries

IX. Resolution 8: State/Nation/ Province boundaries are the primary criterion for seating consideration at the World Service Conference.

a. Pros/Cons

- i. Con – My region is not for this particular resolution. We don't believe regions should have any boundaries. Costa Rica is a good example.
- ii. Pro – In Europe in most regions/areas we are using this type of model. I believe we are casting more fear than fact.
- iii. Con – Mid Atlantic has a lot of history. Once our seat is taken from us there is a sense of loss. One state one seat is unacceptable. I wish there was something else we could do.

- iv. Pro – We are not stuck on history. See Guide to World Services – the purpose of the WSC is to be supportive of the Fellowship as a whole. We are accountable to NA and not solely as an advocate for their region.
- v. Con – This issue has been lingering around the Fellowship because it is difficult at best as to where the priorities are placed for seating. My region
- b. Points of Parliamentary Procedure were raised and resulted in an Appeal to the Facilitator. Vote requires a majority to adopt versus a 2/3 vote to adopt, Parliamentary Procedure was applied and the process resolved that the vote only required simple majority.
 - i. Previous Question/Close Debate – 2nd and strong support
- c. Motion to carry undetermined
 - i. **Standing Vote: 60 For 46 Against 1 Abstained 3 Present not voting**
 - 1. **Resolution Carries**

TUESDAY EVENING SESSION (The Human resource Panel)

- I. **Human Resource Panel**
 - a. **4 members, each 4-year term**
 - b. **Current HRP**
 - i. **Margaret and Val (2008 – 2012)**
 - ii. **Pat and Mark (2010 – 2014)**
- II. **This cycle**
 - a. **Replaced postal mail w/emails**
 - b. **Reduced cost by using skype**
 - c. **Strengthened nomination process**
 - i. **Refined RBZ rationale form**
 - ii. **Local committee questionnaire**
 - d. **Supported early release of CPRs**
 - e. **Evaluated WSC elections data last two cycle**
 - f. **Preparing additional recommendations**
 - g. **Blind scored 94 potential candidates**
 - h. **Interviewed 47 candidates**

III. Process

- a. World Pool – 8 yrs clean time invited to join the process**
 - i. Enter blind scoring process of CPRs – those w/highest score asked to move to next level**
 - 1. HRP Candidate Interviews & Reference Checks**
 - a. RBZ candidates enter here**
 - 2. Most qualified are considered for nomination**
 - b. Candidate's and References**
 - i. Interviews: team & Individually**
 - ii. All interviews use the same set of questions w/predetermined potential values**
 - iii. Blind Score**
 - 1. Individual scores are compared**
 - 2. All candidates are selected by consensus**
 - 3. Nominees**
 - 4. announced in Conference Report**

IV. What Makes a Good Candidate?

- a. World Service perspective**
- b. Focused and succinct**
- c. Response to questions**
- d. Supported references**
- e. Accurate WPIF – information is correctly entered on the form**

Note:

- **Tanya A. not a former Board member**
- **Dennis S. not a former Board or special worker , but was a volunteer**
- **Irene C. not former Board member**

Blank ballots count against the nominee

Do not return the ballot counts against the nominee

Voting is in the morning

May 3, 2012

**THURSDAY MORNING SESSION
(Communication)**

Workshop focused on the following: effective, reliable ways to reach those in the Fellowship that are/need to know what is happening in NA. Purpose: To develop collaborative strategies to communicate effectively.

Eighth Concept “Our service structure depends on the integrity and effectiveness of our communication.”

Objective #1: Relevance of communication

Objective #2: Communication infrastructure

Experiential Exercise – see slide 3 of PP handout pg. 3 Effective Communication. Analysis of message of same information but the manner in which each was delivered. Positive vs Negative.

I. Communication and the RD

- a. Primary contact in the service structure – one that provides information and perspective of agents of the messages
- b. Challenges: Unity and communication

II. Components of Effective Communication

- a. Content, Perspective, Words, Tone (Non-verbal Communication), Integrity (Character of the Communicator)
 - i. “What you are shouts so loudly in my ears, I cannot hear what you say.”

Ralph Waldo Emerson

III. Modalities (How we gather information)

- a. 75% See, 13% Hear, 12 Taste

IV. Delivery of Important Information

- a. Effective Conduit involves
 - i. Clear understanding of roles and responsibilities of the service system
 - ii. Knowledge of the information most important in delivery
 - iii. Knowledge of what is most important to be shared

- iv. Knowledge of what is the best way to deliver the information

V. Preparing an Effective Report

- a. See PP slides 1-3 on pg. 3 of PP Handout (This was a meta group discussion followed by large group sharing on delivering content at a Regional Assembly – this would be an excellent vehicle to use to deliver key aspects WSC)
 - i. First – focus on communication goal (this requires determining what it is you hope to accomplish)
 - 1. Delivery of data to the varied members in the audience – who gets what and when (understanding the value of the data will help determine what is delivered – use of analogies/examples in the language that the varied level of those in service can understand. Here is a good place to reinforce the reality that their voice/input is taking in and considered.)

VI. Sharing our Experience (RD Communication)

- a. RD success stories
 - i. Iowa – RD Team Handout (see HO RCMS/GSRS February 2012) – one page of bulleted points/highlight of the highlights handouts for RCMs and GSR – PDF for posting. Utilization of technology and collaborative efforts between committees such as H&I, PI, and others. Utilized na.org – NAWS communication tools and suggestions on use of color cards when in discussion – especially used when in skype meetings. Engage people face to face as often as possible.
 - ii. Egypt – We just reach out and try to make it simple through direct communication. Elect trusted servants that are best for the service positions. We provide training for trusted servant positions. Interact with other service entities example the EDM. Increased use of technology for purpose of communication.
 - iii. NAWS tools for Communication: email blasts, MAWS News (Critical for RDs – summarizes reports from the Board and what is going on in NA, NA Way, invested in face to face communication – attendance at the Zonal Forums, Webinars – interactive use of internet technology that allows everybody see, hear, and participate.
 - iv. Ideas for improving Communication
 - 1. Use of picture/like a travel log – visually engaging for the audience
 - 2. Human Interest Works – emotionally engaging

3. Use of Discussion Boards (Use of Social Media)
4. Use of technology should be user friendly and whether or not it works effectively (Our attempt at gathering Tallies in WNY)

VII. Communicating in times of Change

- a. Challenges: Fear/closed Mindedness – lack of unity
- b. Keys to Success
 - i. Timing
 - ii. Involvement (engagement/ownership – opportunity to reinforce that their voice I being heard)
 - iii. Sensitivity – (How does it involve me and affect me?)
 - iv. Clarity
 - v. Connection (Translate to goals and needs of the group – immediacy)
- c. Qualities that builds unity (First Tradition “Our common welfare should come first; personal recovery depends on NA unity.”)
 - i. Visual – use stories, analogies, real world examples
 - ii. Inclusive – avoid use of “I” statements and possessive pronouns “mine”
 - iii. Positive
 - iv. Sincerity – simple, clear, honest, transparent words that reveal the you
 1. Experiential Exercise: Rewriting Statements
 - a. What is violated in effectiveness? (see Yellow HO statement #3: violates Inclusivity/Sincerity/Visual. Keep it simple. Rewrite: We can achieve the goals outlined. We can provide tremendous value to our members. These goals are attainable. or What an exciting opportunity to achieve the goals we have identified. These may provide tremendous value to our members as we join together to accomplish... (Imagine the needs of an area or region and how they are reaching their goals. What would that look like?)

VIII. Communicating in the 2012-2014 Cycle

- a. Cycle Issue Discussion Topics (IDTs)
 - i. Principles before Personalities
 - ii. Collaboration
- b. IDT: PRINCIPLE BEFORE PERSONALITIES
 - i. Twelfth Tradition “Anonymity is the spiritual foundation of all our traditions, ever reminding us to place principles before personalities.”

- c. IDT: COLLABORATION
 - i. Foundation principle of a Healthy Service System: “Successful service provision depends on all the elements of a service system working together toward a common goal. CBDM encourages collaborative efforts within our service bodies. Communication and planning help service bodies cooperate and synchronize efforts both vertically and horizontally throughout the structure.”
 - d. Meta Group Activity – Side 2 Why Collaboration Reasons/Side 2 Improve (change) – What do we want to see different? (see pg 8 of PP HO)
- IX. Key Messages**
- a. Qualities of Effective Key Messages
 - i. Reflect understanding of the audience
 - ii. Stresses relevance and benefit to audience
 - iii. Clear, concise, and delivered consistently
 - iv. Can be adapted
 - v. Sets the stage for action
 - b. Key Message Activity (see pg. 9 of PP HO slide #3)
 - c. Developing Key Messages – The First Step (see pg. 10 of PP HO slides 1 -3)
 - i. Collaboration: Autonomy Doesn’t Mean We Don’t Collaborate
 - 1. What do we have to say to those that need to understand?

Note: The morning’s Meta discussions/small group activities will be available in WSC handout after the conference/also available on CD. This aspect of WSC needs to be shared and worked on at the regional and area level.

LUNCH BREAK

**AFTERNOON SESSION
(NAWS REPORT 2 PART SESSION)**

Session #1 focus: Introduction of NAWS staff Chatsworth, Canada, Europe, India, and Iran. Strategic Planning Process and how the planning process will help prioritize and carry out essential services and projects. Additional items will include: NAWS Communication and publications, including the idea of a NAWS Facebook page.

- I. Strategic planning – Communication
 - a. Key Result Areas (KRAs)
 - i. Internal Communication
 - ii. External Communication
 - iii. Fellowship Support
 - iv. Recovery Literature
 - v. Trusted Servant Support and development
 - vi. Resources
- II. NA Publications
 - a. Moving toward e-subscripts
 - i. NA Way
 - ii. Reaching Out
 - iii. Just for Today
 - iv. E-Blast
 - b. NAWS E-Meetings
 - i. Inmate Step-Writing
 - 1. 2 mtgs. Held so far
 - 2. Sharing ideas/experiences
 - ii. Regional Service Offices
 - 1. 4 mtgs. held so far
 - 2. Shared info about best practices, shipping issues, challenges, and communications
 - iii. Other possibilities
 - 1. Web contacts
 - 2. Conventions

- 3. H&I/PI
- iv. Contact Information
 - 1. Crucial to success
 - a. Very little RSO Information
 - b. For other e-meeting topics send us idea
- c. Social Media Service Pamphlet
 - i. Offers thoughts on upholding principles in online interactions
 - ii. WSC 2010 Straw Poll said no to facebook page
 - iii. Facebook pages changed – now possible to “Like” page and receive updates w/out compromising anonymity
 - iv. FB possible ways to reach largest # of NA members w/single communication
 - v. One way communication only – for now

III. Q & A

- a. Initially biggest concern security – now it seems to be comments. Can this be managed?
- b. What about the ability of governmental agencies accessing Facebook? There is the possibility for this to be done and the result could be possible denial to travel across international borders.
- c. Our focus is giving individuals options. This option involves individual responsibility.
- d. Are we going to link this page to other pages – opening more lines of communication? This is under review.
- e. Once our position as RDs is over are we removed from e-blast? (Just from the Conference Participant List.)
- f. Isn't this against our 6th Tradition? (WB believes that use of a disclaimer resolves this issue.)
- g. Trusted servant update form seems to have issues. (WB stated the issues were addressed but if there are continuing issues please contact us so we can have IT look into the issue.)
- h. Iran – we need to be mindful of social/cultural/governmental issue that might result in restrictive issues.)
- i. This is such a major issue and took up two sessions last conference. We don't believe that this is an issue that should be dealt with in straw poll fashion.
- j. I am not sure that everybody knows there are actually 6 different ways to set up a FB page. Comments can be blocked just for starters. May be we could create a

primer. (WB requests that those with significant knowledge and skills related to this contact us and get involved.)

- k. WB – Whatever we do will be done with a significant degree of conservatism. At this time there really is no significant body of research out there for or against. It will be our responsibility to make a well thought out reason for our action either way.

NAWS REPORT (Session Two)

- **Living Clean and Our Lit development**
 - **Website Redesign**
 - **Removal of PDFs from na.org**
 - **WSC Seating**
-
- I. **Living Clean/Lit Development**
 - a. **Lit input and Review Process very success/will continue**
 - II. **Website Redesign**
 - a. **Existing site stats**
 - i. **Ave 9-10 million hits per month**
 - b. **Home Page in redesign and more user friendly/easier to navigate**
 - c. **Google Maps integration – no branding**
 - d. **Designing a Mobi version**
 - i. **25% current visitors use mobile devices**
 - ii. **New site is html 5 compatible**
 - iii. **Still in design and development stage**
 - iv. **Apps included**
 - e. **Development timeline**
 - i. **May –beta testing**
 - ii. **June review and input**
 - iii. **July launch**
 - f. **Google search for site, no branding**
 - g. **New Meeting Tool**
 - III. **Other Achievements**
 - a. **50K+ emails nightly to JFT**
 - IV. **Looking Ahead**
 - a. **New Strategies are needed**
 - b. **Will use small group to help develop**
 - i. **Not just website issues, but all IT matters**
 - V. **Removal of PDFs**
 - a. **First posted 2002 – reported as an experimental basis only**
 - b. **Reasons for pulling down PDFs**

- i. Infringement of copyrights
 - 1. At one convention copy junk drives were given out with all NA lit
 - ii. 385 downloads of the Basic Text before removal since 2007
 - iii. 655,000 downloads of IT Works How and Why
 - iv. NAWS role as Trustee requires vigilance about protecting copyrights
 - v. Much of the lit is still available online –lps and Introductory Guide for example
 - vi. More secure electronic versions of booklength pieces forth coming
- VI. WSC Seating
 - a. Adopted in 2000 never really embraced
 - b. Proposed Moratorium on seating failed in 2010
 - c. Resolution 8
 - d. Recommend no new seating at WSC 2014
- VII. Q & A
 - a. Are we considering use of paypal?(Yes)
 - b. PDFs what is the problem? We are the biggest problem. (Yes it is about the money but it takes money to carry the message.)
 - c. Removal RDAs as an option to reduce Conference size was mentioned. (This is not an option at this time and such policy takes time.)
 - d. Are there other avenues to gain input from the unseated regions?
 - e. It's great to be but what's best for NA may be a zonal forum format.
 - f. Is the app for smart phones going to for iPhone and Android? (Yes, first Iphone and then Android.)
 - g. Regions reuniting do not cause a seating issue. It actually frees up more seats for others to attend.
 - h. Funding is an issue in this. WSO funded all regions expecting donations to increase. Why don't we go back to the old system where regions that could afford to pay pay and those that can't apply for assistance from the WSO? (No real comment to the question.)
 - i. What do we do with the large # of groups that are not represented here as in the case of Brazil? (The answer has already been given. No more seating til we get input to help resolve the issue.)
 - j. Why haven't you given us any kind of financial projection and why is this the only facility that can host the WSC? (We are looking at alternate facilities. It should be noted that our contract is up with this facility. If we move the expense difference is difficult to project based upon those in attendance.)
 - k. Columbia believes that seating should be by country and that those already seated should have their seats maintained. Only new seating should be by country. We apply the seventh Tradition.
 - l. How long will Living Clean be available online? (It would had been gone if we had been thinking about. It will be gone soon –thanks for the reminder.)
 - m. How can we solve the seating problem and remain inclusive? How can we stay positive? We invite all those to go back to the day when we were self-

supporting and those that were unable request assistance as was done in the past. (We are accepting donations, so if your regions feels so moved please do.)

BREAK
EVENING SESSION
(Think Globally, Plan Locally)

Delegate sharing on local issues. Focus: how to plan effectively and provide services in our local NA community. See implementing strategies outlined in *Planning Basics*.

Overview of Planning Basics

- Who Plans: all members
- Decide Planning is a Priority
- Choose a workgroup or coordinator
- Scanning
- Prioritize Issues
- Develop Goals to address the prioritized issues
- Consider all available resources
- Choose who is going to address and develop action plans
- Monitor and Evaluate

Stumbling Blocks to Proper Planning

- Failing to plan is planning to fail – planning is not a priority
- Absence of accountability
- Absence of SMART principles
- Apathy
- Failure to prioritize
- Denying the existence of available resources

Developing an Action Plan

- Identify issue – what needs to be done? State goal.
- Establish criteria used to determine goal attainment
- Determine action steps (Include here specific mode of contact and projected schedule of meetings).
- Establish a time lime – when tasks need to be accomplished (Prioritizing step)
- Assign roles/tasks to trusted servants – who will be responsible for what?

- Identify single point of accountability for tracking progress (monitoring progress toward bench marks) and report regularly
- **Determine available resources (time & money)**

Note: Once again Meta discussion – small group activity followed by large group sharing. See *Planning Basics* specifics.

May 4, 2012

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION (Fellowship Development/Role of Zones)

- **Focus Part One: Review of the opportunities to support and collaborate with NA communities worldwide – an overview of more than 100 fellowship interactions and workshops including the SSP.**
 - **Focus Part Two: NAWS due to limited funding this cycle didn't hold any workshops. Emphasis here was on discussing what kind of partnership opportunities might be possible between zones and world services for cooperative workshops in this cycle.**
- I. Fellowship Development**
- a. Approximately ¼ of NAWS budget
 - b. Vision Statement
 - i. Speaks to FD – specifically the bullet points
 - ii. Encourage that the VS be read and used
 - c. 74 Languages spoken in NA
 - i. 41 published languages based on IP#1
 - ii. See NA map
 - iii. Challenge
 1. 23 books in translation process
 2. # is increasing/translation
 - a. Requires understanding of culture and language to maintain meaning of NA language
 3. Free and subsidized literature
 4. Data available on the FTP site
 5. Mtgs. May 2010 58,076 – May 2012 61,650
 - a. Mtgs. in US remain somewhat unchanged
 - d. Development Worldwide (PP presentation)
 - e. Africa – FD can be seen in the PR and the interaction with officials in government who support the growth of NA and are the greatest asset to developing NA in the countries of Africa (example of Tanzania and Kenya translations –Tonga and Dodoma)
 - i. Regular Donations are made by NAWS to East Africa

- f. Latin America
 - i. Tremendous growth as revealed by the growth of LA delegates in attendance at the Conference and participation at the LAZF
- g. Asian-Pacific (predominantly made up of developing countries)
 - i. 2 Zones/5 service events...
 - 1. China – moving slide of addict interview
 - a. NA is not accepted by the “higher ups”
 - 2. India/NERF Malaysia, New Zealand, Indonesia
- h. Middle East
 - i. Egypt and other Arabic nations
 - 1. Approved one version of the Basic Text in Arabic
 - ii. Iran and Turkey
 - 1. Growth in Iran resulted in opening WSO in Iran
 - 2. 4 times as Iranians filled out Lit Survey as Americans
 - iii. Growth is evident and the challenges are specific especially due to the reality that these places are nations with strong religious leadership.
- i. Canada
 - i. 9 Zones, 6 Service Events, 3 Conventions 7 NAWs - 1 World Convention 6 WCNA
- j. U.S. too much to even begin
- k. Europe
 - i. 3 Zones, 4 Service Events, 1 Convention
 - ii. WSO attends EDM (helps with issues specific to NA in Europe and translation – efforts here reveal the positive results of collaboration example: Sweden – we worked with Sweden found out what they were doing assisted and then they were able to reach out to Poland and other surrounding nations
- l. Eastern Europe
 - i. Includes Russia
 - 1. 4 Russian speaking workshops
 - a. Common language in this geographic setting is Russian
 - 2. Birth in Moscow 20 yrs – 1992 103 mtgs.
 - a. 25 years Sweden and Finland
 - b. 2002 Russian Region founded/3 areas
 - c. 2004 first NAWS workshop
 - d. Growth 937 mtgs.
 - e. Siberia has seen significant growth
 - 3. Challenges
 - a. How to serve such a large territory – 5 day trip one from one side of country to other.
 - b. 9 time zones
 - c. 10 hours on plane from east to west (8 hour time difference)

BREAK

~FUN WOW~

PART TWO
Morning Session
NAWS & Zones Today

Current Collaboration (Zonal Sharing on interaction with NAWS: those chosen predominantly identified strategic planning workshops, FD, zonal workshops on such things as SSP)

- **What is NAWS role in your zone?**
- **What specifically has NAWS done when attending your zone?**

Small Group Discussion

- **What needs and objectives could NAWS workshop in your zone help to fill?**
- **What would your zone be willing to do to help this happen?**

Needs:

- Identifying global perspective
- Assist w/Collaboration between Regions
- Examples of how to operate
- Training /Mentoring
- Assist in establishing criteria for establishing geographic boundaries
- Recognizing zones as a level of service
- Implementing the NA Vision Statement
- Help w/identifying needs/ and using other Zonal Success
- Help Planning
- More practice with use of Planning Basics
 - **Shaded Background – shared by other Zones**
- Work with IDTs
- How can Zones work together to share resources
- Sync our planning with NAWS

- Help with PR
- Help with bringing the SSP to the local communities for better understanding
- Translation
- Help with discussing conference seating

What are we willing to do to help?

- Willing to discuss what is coming forward w/an open mind
- Include NAWS update in our agenda
- Communicate w/the local fellowship – include in the planning process
- Plan to spend more time on NAWS identified items
- Include regular zone wide workshops that are inclusive of the local community – if we are to act locally while thinking globally – what better way do we have to bring what is happening in the worldwide fellowship then inviting active participation of individual members
- Share expenses to NAWS attendance at Zones
- Willing to discuss Conference seating
- Willing to restructure our agendas, especially concerning Friday and Sundays
- Increase meeting space if necessary to address attendance of 100-200 participants

Note: Each zone shared on the above. This session will be available on the WSC disc provided to all service participants

AFTERNOON SESSION (New Business Decisions)

**Focus: Formal business session limited to motions to approve the budget and project plans.
7 motions form CAT, 8 Straw Polls, 16 Regional Proposals**

Changes to Discussion Session: 2 minutes, Conference Participants will be informed of # of times they have spoken, and cofacs will ask when they believe the queue should be closed if it can be closed. No use of the yellow card during discussion session.

- I. **Motion #8 To approve the Fellowship Issue Discussions project plan for inclusion in the 2012-2014 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.**
 - a. **Straw Poll: Strong Support**
 - b. **Discussion: None**
 - c. **Final Straw Poll: Strong Support**
- II. **Motion #9 To approve the Service System project plan for inclusion in the 2012-2014 Narcotics Anonymous Services, Inc. budget.**
 - a. **Straw Poll: Strong Support (took standing vote to confirm)**
 - i. **Discussion: Reminded the body that these straw polls and discussion consumed 46 minutes and at \$200 per minute we need to recognize the**

cost. Can those opposed keep in mind the strong opposition to their positions and withdraw their motions so as not to waste any further time or money.

- ii. Can we get a clearer budget proposal so as to help us make more effective decision. Response: We used to do that but the individual fellowship members began holding our feet to the fire when we went over projected budgets. No.

b. Final Straw Poll: Strong Support

The following two proposals were addressed simultaneously in the queue.

III. Proposal AC – The Service System Proposal be dropped from the budget of WSO

a. Straw Poll: No support

- i. Discussion: Given our goal for consensus... reminded us of the history of the TWIGS. It is obvious that it will take time and we need to adjust. If the SSP continues in this fashion the project could die and a great deal of money lost.
- ii. At any point during our discussion will we have a motion and a 2/3rd vote. Response: Yes – changes to policy require a 2/3rd vote.
- iii. Are these resolutions we voted on going to be in the GTWS? Response: These resolutions are to frame the work. No they will not be in the GTWS.
- iv. We are not anti board. Our perspective is related to the reality that we split back in 97. We have shared services. We did not spit because of resentment. We split because of need. Ran out of time.
- v. We haven't finished with the straw polls, so how do we know the direction we are going. What is the rush? Why not allow the fellowship the opportunity to try it out?
- vi. Last cycle, workshopping, and discussions our concern is that allowing more time and possible experimentation may not lend us what is needed to move forward.
- vii. If we move forward with this it may allow for us to develop tools to work with the proposed changes. But the problem is it doesn't give us anything definite to move forward with.
- viii. When we approve the budget what is it going to include considering the new SS could require different finances. Response: See Item A and B in the CAR related to the budget.
- ix. We support more time and that if we are not given the time the region will feel very much disenfranchised.
- x. My concern is that the fellowship is not fully informed and the evidence is we are here in Cali and by attending homegroups found that they are not even aware of the SSP or the Conference.
- xi. We believe this is flexible enough and find no problem with it.
- xii. What is it going to look like 10, 20, 30 years from now. There is concern that some will follow and some will not. There are currently 105

unseated regions. If we do not move forward with this how will we address our needs.

- b. **Final Straw Poll: Strong Opposition**

- IV. **Proposal AG – To give a full conference cycle to workshop, investigate, and trial implementation of the SSP. Results of efforts to be gathered at the WSC 2014 for further action.**
 - a. **Straw Poll: Strong Opposition**
 - b. **Final Straw Poll: Strong Opposition**
- V. **Proposal AL – That the elements of the SSP be offered as suggestions and options rather than instructions and mandates.**
 - a. **Straw Poll: Strong Opposition (standing count to confirm)**
 - i. **Discussion: group with AC,AL, and AH.**
 - b. **Final Straw Poll: Strong opposition**
- VI. **Proposal AH – That the decisions regarding the SSP be included in the 2014 CAR and require 2/3 vote pass.**
 - a. **Straw Poll: Strong Opposition**
 - b. **Final Straw Poll: Strong Opposition**
- VII. **All in favor of drastically reducing the SSP budget: Straw Poll:**
 - a. **Straw Poll: Strong Opposition.**
 - b. **Discussion: None**
 - c. **Final Straw Poll: Strong Support**
- VIII. **Motion #10 To approve the Traditions Book project plan for inclusion in the 2012-2014 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.**
 - a. **Straw Poll: Strong Support**
 - b. **Discussion: None**
 - c. **Final Straw Poll: Strong Support**
- IX. **Motion #11 To approve the Public Relations project plan for inclusion in the 2012-2014 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.**
 - a. **Straw Poll: Strong Support**
 - b. **Discussion: None**
 - c. **Straw Poll: Strong Support**
- X. **Motion #12 To approve the An Introduction to NA Meetings project plan for inclusion in the 2012-2014 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.**
 - a. **Straw Poll: Strong Support**
 - b. **Discussion: None**
 - c. **Straw Poll: Strong Support**
- XI. **Motion # 13 To approve the Trusted Servant Support and Development project plan for inclusion in the 2012-2014 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.**

- a. Straw Poll: Strong Support
 - b. Discussion: None
 - c. Straw Poll: Strong Support
- XII. Motion #14 To approve the 2012-2014 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.
- a. Straw Poll: Strong Support
 - b. Discussion: None
 - c. Straw Poll: Strong Support
- XIII. Proposal Z WSO no longer provide staff at the WCNA and the World Board not be provided any sort of assistance or reimbursement for them to attend WCNA as well
- a. Straw Poll: Strong Opposition
 - b. Discussion: None
 - c. Final Straw Poll: Strong Opposition
- XIV. Proposal AF To discuss alternate ways the WSC participants can relax and fellowship together on (Wednesday) afternoon, instead of spending \$22,000 to go to the ranch.
- a. Straw Poll: Strong Opposition
 - b. Discussion: Lengthy discussion from both sides
 - c. Final Straw Poll: Opposition
- XV. Proposal Y To recognize Siberia and Far East as a seated region at the end of WSC 2012. (Included in the CAT Tally for the purpose of obtaining the conscience of WNY.)
- a. Straw Poll: Strong Support
 - b. Discussion: Significant #s spoke to the support of this proposal. Few spoke against it and those that did referenced the moratorium and the SSP.
 - c. Final Straw Poll: Evenly split

The following two proposals were addressed simultaneously in the queue.

- XVI. Proposal X: Change the GTWS, pg. 3, line 31 and 33. (allowing the RD to stay while the RDA addresses the assembly)
- a. Initial Straw Poll: Strong Support
 - b. Discussion: Again significant discussion, but this time all but two in the queue spoke in opposition support
 - c. Final Straw Poll: Strong Support

- XVII. **Proposal AI: While we agree that a region be allowed to speak only once to an issue, we propose that if the RD and RDA agree, that the RD be allowed to remain on the floor while the AD speaks to the issue.**
 - a. **Initial Straw Poll: Strong Support**
 - c. **Final Straw Poll: Support**
- XVIII. **Proposal AJ: That the conference either adopt true consensus based decision making or return to parliamentary procedure rather than waffling between the two.**
 - a. **Straw Poll: Strong Opposition**
 - b. **Discussion: Involved the need to develop clear and concise criteria for determining what a consensus is or is not. Also reference was the TWIGS where it was moved that the criteria be established by the World Board and placed in the TWIGS. To date this has not been done. Finally, group conscience and decision making should not be confused; and that CBDM is a unique and meant to assist in discussion prior to the business session when voting. The Board believes it has addressed this issue in the TWIGS under CBDM pgs. 7 – 9.**
 - c. **Final Straw Poll: Strong Opposition**
- XIX. **Proposal AK: To improve the process of electing trusted servants to the WB, HRP, and Co-fac positions by providing either live (if at the conference) or recorded (if not present at the conference) interview early in the conference week.**
 - a. **Straw Poll: Strong Opposition**
 - b. **Discussion: This was very disappointing there was such little vocal support for this proposal but it was spoken to in great detail by those opposed. How much sense does that make?**
 - c. **Final Straw Poll: Strong Opposition**
- XX. **Proposal Y: readdressed to do a standing Straw Poll for official count since it was evenly split. Count: (126 Participants) 55 For 60 Against 6 Abstained**

**EVENING SESSION
(New Business Continued)**

- XXI. **Proposal AD: That the World Board consider and allocate time on the agenda of WSC for zonal reports if the zones wish to present a report.**
 - a. **Straw Poll: Support (Standing Straw Poll used to determine vote.)**
 - b. **Discussion: Emphasis was placed on time and sharing on development within the zones. This provides us a great opportunity to share our successes. What uploading files to a discussion board that is protected and can be used for sharing so that we don't take up valuable time. What about the time spent at the ranch? How about zones making video by a certain date and the video gets**

played throughout the Conference? EDM has a sharing section on its site for those of you who are interested.

- c. Straw Poll of idea of video be shown at the Conference
 - i. Straw Poll: Strong Support
- d. Final Straw Poll: Strong Opposition
- XXII. Proposal AE: B gives recommendations in regional proposals in the CAR. Our proposal is that the WB only gives important information about the proposal the more neutral as possible.
 - a. Straw Poll: Strong Opposition
 - b. Discussion: No discussion
 - c. Final Straw Poll: Strong Opposition
- XXIII. Proposal AA: The financial reporting by the WCNA be provided in detailed form and not in a summary way.
 - a. Straw Poll: Strong Opposition
 - b. Discussion Poll: None
 - c. Final Straw Poll: strong Opposition
- XXIV. Proposal AB: All previous and future WSC and World Board minutes be posted on na.org for all members to view at their leisure.
 - a. Straw Poll: Strong Opposition
 - b. Discussion Poll: None
 - c. Final Straw Poll: strong Opposition
- XXV. Proposal AM: That a transparent communication process be created where all regional input given to the World Board toward shaping of projects, proposals and CAR motions is viewable to all WSC participants.
 - a. Straw Poll: Strong Opposition
 - b. Discussion: limited input
 - c. Final Straw Poll: Strong Opposition

**CONCLUDES NEW BUSINESS PROPOSALS
START OF NEW BUSINESS MOTIONS**

Straw Poll 4 Questions: Do you like?

- 2minute time limit **Strong Support**
- No Yellow Cards **Strong Support**
- CO-fac suggesting closing of que **Unanimous Support**
- Rules used in New Business discussion **Strong Support**

Roll Call: 125 Participants 110 Regions
Simple Majority 63 Two-thirds Majority 84

- I. **Motion #8 To approve the Fellowship Issue Discussions project plan for inclusion in the 2012-2014 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc, budget.**
 - a. **Suspend the Rules: Failed (required 2/3rd vote)**
 - b. **Vote: Carries**
- II. **Motion #9 To approve the SS project plan for inclusion in the 2012-2014 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc, budget.**
- III. **Motion #10 To approve the Traditions Book project plan for inclusion in the 2012-2014 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.**
 - a. **Vote: carries**
- IV. **Motion #11 To approve the Public Relations project plan for inclusion in the 2012-2014 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.**
 - a. **Vote: Carries**
- V. **Motion #12 To approve the An Introduction to NA Meetings project plan for inclusion in the 2012-2014 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.**
 - a. **Vote: Carries**
- VI. **Motion #13 To approve the Trusted Servant Support and Development project plan for inclusion in the 2012-2014 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.**
 - a. **Vote: Carries**
- VII. **Motion #14 To approve the 2012-2014 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. budget.**
 - a. **Vote: Carries**

CONCLUDES NEW BUSINESS MOTIONS

**EVENING SESSION PART TWO
STRAW POLLS
(ALL STRAW POLLS WILL BE A STANDING COUNT)**

Straw Poll H: To amend Straw Poll H to use the “mentoring” opposed to “training” Passes

- I. A. There is a small, neighborhood sized body devoted to group needs. This group forum, which is typically not part of the delegate stream, is formal in nature and operates through conversation not formal decision making.
 - a. Straw Poll: 53 For 37 Against 9 Present Not Voting Abstention
- II. B. Groups send delegates quarterly to a local service planning meeting. One of these quarterly meetings is a general assembly where all interested members are encouraged to attend and input is given to help plan service activities for the cycle.
 - a. Straw Poll: 65 For 37 Against 6 Present Not Voting Abstention
- III. C. Services are coordinated by a local service board and carried out by members, committees, and project workgroups who report to the board.
 - a. Straw Poll: 76 For 31 Against 2 Present Not Voting Abstention
- IV. D. Local service bodies follow county, city, or town boundaries, where practical. (They are much larger than the group forums mentioned above and in many cases larger than the current ASCs.)
 - a. Straw Poll: 60 For 43 Against 5 Present Not Voting Abstention
- V. E. The boundaries are those local service bodies agreed to at the state or national level.
 - a. Straw Poll: 58 For 48 Against 5 Present Not Voting Abstention
- VI. F. Planning cycles are synchronized from level to level (local to state to global) as well as across each level.
 - a. Straw Poll: 71 For 34 Against 4 Present Not Voting Abstention
- VII. G. Where service needs cannot be accomplished effectively by local service bodies and state/national/province bodies, an intermediate level of service can be added.
 - a. Straw Poll: 71 For 36 Against 4 Present Not Voting Abstention

- VIII. H. Most state, provinces, or countries have one state-, or nationwide service body that is responsible for state- or national-level public relations and coordinating efforts such as training across local service bodies.
- a. Straw Poll: 67 For 39 Against 3 Present Not Voting Abstention
- IX. I. Zonal boundaries are decided through a collaborative process with neighboring NA communities, other zones, and the WSC.
- a. Straw Poll: 72 For 34 Against 6 Present Not Voting Abstention

SATURDAY MORNING SESSION

(Focus: WSC processes and new straw polls.)

- **Straw Poll Groundrules still in experiment: yes –strong support**
- **Continue CBDM at the WSC and use of straw polls: yes – strong support**
 - **Willing to limit initial discussion on old business: strong support**
 - **Willing to limit discussion on new business: strong support**
 - **2 minute limit: strong support**
 - **Closing of the queue by co-facs: strong support**
 - **Seek body’s concurrence for the specific limitations of debate/discussion: strong support**

(The focus here is not establishing specific rules as much as it is obtaining consent of the body. The language should include “only with the consent of the body.” The spirit of CBDM is hearing everybody’s voice especially those opposed.)

- **No use of Yellow Cards during discussion: Strong Support**
- **Have a filter (such as co-facilitators) for all proposals to ensure they are clear before they are accepted: No clear support**
- **Use the same rules of discussion in old business in new business: strong support**
- **Limit the # of times any one person or region can speak in a session so that thought is given before doing so: No clear support.** (This is already covered in TWIGS) Straw Poll revealed more discussion needed – no clear support. Issue /item is one thing the number of times in a session is another. A region may wish to speak on every item and that is covered in the TWIGS procedurally. This seems to be an attempt to set policy and if so then we need specific language: Limit the # of times a person can speak on any given proposal, motion, or resolution...” Support of specific language for the purpose of clarity is important. The problem is related to those that are not clear and only stir the pot so to speak. We need to give the co-facilitators the ability to end discussion when similar points are continuing to be made. WB recognizes that this is not an item

that is clearly supported by the body and is willing to move on without consensus. The WB will continue to work on recommendations that will be made prior to next Conference. Can regional delegates be part of this process? It is hoped that they would be involved. The more rules we about this the more trouble we will have. Does limiting discussion include WB members? Yes. May be we need to set the suggestions for the co-fscilitators.

- **Do you support the WB recommendations to not consider any region for seating at WSC 2014? Straw Poll: 57 opposed 41 In favor** (This poll revealed need for more discussion.) The WB wants to not seat any region as we move forward with the SSP. It states because we have no real criteria for seating new regions. It was in the TWIGS at one time and has been removed and now only states the WB will make recommendations. Offered up was the following: **Continue the moratorium for one cycle(do not consider regions resulting from a split).** The WB recognizes that this body does not support the WB recommendation for seating. The WB continues to state that CBDM actually should take us in a specific direction or provide specific action. The WB refuses that if the body doesn't wish to act that inn itself is an action providing direction. The body is asking for what the policy was prior to 2008. Knowledge of the policy would help us possibly make a more effective decision. My question is how can we consider it if we do not have it to reference? **One thing is clear we are split. Let us return to "Continue the spirit of the existing moratorium for cycle (Do not consider regions resulting from a split.). Straw Poll: Strong Support. Standing Count: 73 in favor 20 against. With this response the WB believes that they have enough information to move forward.**
 - **Discussion Queue continued: Does not Resolution #8 provide the criteria for seating in the future? This really isn't a question it is a point.**
 - **This is really only a US issue, especially regarding re-unification of regions. It is not a world issue. According to Resolution #8 no new US regions will be seated.**
 - **Geographic boundaries already exist therefore the criteria already exists.**
 - **If a region meets the criteria let them be part of this body.**
 - **Accepting the Resolution in there spirit and a state comes back that has re-united that would be a new seat. Does not this cause a problem?**
 - **Who gets to decide where a seat goes when existing regions give up their seat?**
 - **WB referenced re-unification as compression. This is actually downsizing the number of existing regions.**
 - **This session according to a WB is not for the purpose of writing policy but rather to check to see if we have consensus.**
 - **Where do we find the solution? We are a compassionate fellowship that just sat a new region because of their massive geographic size, but**

- what about the future when the fellowship grows there? What happens when they split due to the sheer size of their geography?
- The moratorium ends at 2012 conference it said nothing about the end of the conference. Here is an example of the need to have clear, concise language.
 - The problem is that the straw polls are putting out rather narrow perspectives for consideration.
- **WSC To add this language to WSC Rules: Each conference participant has only one vote. RD alternates are considered to be the same “member” as their respective RD when acting as a participant. Either the RD or RDA – but not both – may speak on any one topic.**
 - This is from Proposal X that had Strong Support.
 - It does change the TWIGS, so why is it not a policy change that requires 2/3rd vote. It will continue to require to 2/3rd vote when it comes back to the Conference next cycle.
 - **Continue to release the CPR’s early.**
 - There are problems inherent in releasing CPR’s early; such as, integrity of RDs that may discuss the profiles with people outside the Conference. Confidentiality is a problem. The release of confidential information can happen before and during the conference; therefore, early release is a non-issue. **Straw Poll: Overwhelming support**
 - **Do you support a push on NAWS Facebook page?** Originally discussed in previous discussion and demonstrated strong support despite having heard objections. RD wants to re-open discussion. The WB feels this is unnecessary since there has been strong support multiple times. This was unsupported by the body. **Straw Poll: Strong Support**
 - **Propose Language for cover of Service Pamphlets (Proposal C – Original straw poll: Strong Support) Straw Poll: Strong Support.** Currently, we have an existing inventory. This does not include the inventory we have on hand only new service literature produced.
 - **Zones be given a chance to provide a 5-10 minute video to be weaved into the Conference. Original straw poll: strong support – straw poll is unchanged.**
 - **Conference Participant Bulletin Board is mobile friendly. Original straw poll: strong support.** Discussion focused on the reality of this being a public forum and accessible to anyone. Also, discussion about specifics within a region results in less anonymity. What might be helpful at the conference would be a session that provides a primer. Knowing how to use it is the first step – user friendly or not. **This has already been implemented by our IT department; therefore no straw poll is necessary.**

END OF CONFERENCE BUSINESS

SEE WSC 2012 FTP ACCESS HANDOUT FOR MATERIALS SPECIFIC TO WSC 2012

PARTICIPANTS

IT HAS TRULY BEEN A SPIRITUAL EXPERIENCE

THANK YOU FOR LETTING ME BE OF SERVICE

JIM L. WNYRD