


1999 Conference Agenda Report

World Service Conference of Narcotics Anonymous

Twelve Steps and Twelve Traditions of Narcotics Anonymous adapted by permission of AA World Services, Inc.

Twelve Concepts for NA Service copyright (c) 1989, 1990, 1991 by Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. All rights reserved. The Twelve Concepts for NA Service were modeled on AA's Twelve Concepts for World Service, published by Alcoholics Anonymous World Services, Inc., and have evolved specific to the needs of Narcotics Anonymous.



These marks, the name *Narcotics Anonymous*, and the periodical title *The NA Way Magazine* are registered trademarks of Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.

Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc.

PO Box 9999

Van Nuys, CA 91409

USA

ISBN 1-55776-383-6

WSO Catalog Item No. EN-9140

English

INTRODUCTION

A copy of this report is being distributed at conference expense to every World Service Conference participant and every registered regional service committee. This fulfills the responsibility to notify the fellowship of items being considered at the 1999 annual meeting of the World Service Conference. This year the *Conference Agenda Report* is being translated into five languages—French, Spanish, German, Portuguese, and Swedish. Additional copies of the 1999 *Conference Agenda Report* can be purchased from the World Service Office by any NA member, group, service board, or committee.

Following the abbreviated list of motions, we have included a list of the routine conference business sessions (not listed in any specific order). A more specific outline for the agenda will be provided in the pre-conference mailing. It is important to note that the conference proceedings will **begin on Sunday, April 25, 1999** and continue through the evening of **Friday, April 30, 1999**.

The next item is an overview of the conference sessions from the World Board followed by the motion for issue discussion topics for the 1999-2000 conference year. The third section is regional motions published at the request of regional service committees. Following each motion are recommendations for action from the World Board and the Human Resource Panel. These recommendations are usually given on the floor of the WSC as the motions are considered. They are provided here to give you additional information for your discussions. This year we have also included all of the WSC policies that the regional motions would amend, if adopted, along with each motion rather than in a separate appendix. This information is presented to comply with conference policy that states that any motion placed in the *Conference Agenda Report* must include any conference policies that would be amended by adoption of the motion. A financial impact statement is provided for each motion. Two general assumptions are made: the cost of changes to *A Temporary Working Guide to our World Service Structure* is a given and an assumed administrative expense; and the existing inventory levels of literature and service materials will be monitored to allow for a minimum of obsolete items to be destroyed. Costs are *not* included with each motion providing for an alteration of the *TWGWSS* and/or changes in inventory for service materials or literature items. When developing financial impact statements, staff time, production and storage costs, and trusted servant expenses were factored in as appropriate. Amounts are annualized for consistency, even though in some situations the amount may not be entirely applicable to the next conference year. All figures are in US dollars.

The fourth section of the *CAR* contains issue discussion papers on two topics determined at WSC '98: Resolution A and Improving Fellowship Communications.

The final section in this year's *Conference Agenda Report* is a glossary of service terms often used in discussing world service issues, including those appearing in the 1999 *CAR*.

The March issue of the *Conference Report* will contain a report from the World Board, a report from the Human Resource Panel, annual reports from regional service committees, and letters of intent from regions planning to request seating at WSC 1999. The deadline for the March 1999 *Conference Report* is Monday, February 15, 1999, no later than 5:00PM PST. Final orientation materials for this year's conference will be mailed to conference participants approximately 30 days before the WSC 1999 annual meeting begins.

All items submitted for publication in the *CAR* 1999 have been reviewed by the World Board. If you have any questions about this report or any subject pertaining to it, please call, write, or fax us through the WSO.

World Board

PO Box 9999

Van Nuys, CA 91409 USA

Telephone: (818) 773-9999

Fax: (818) 700-0700

Email: world_board@na.org

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	i
ABBREVIATED MOTION LIST.....	v
SESSIONS FOR WSC 1999.....	vii
WORLD SERVICE CONFERENCE 1999 AGENDA OVERVIEW	1
WORLD SERVICE MOTIONS	3
REGIONAL MOTIONS.....	5
ISSUE DISCUSSION PAPER SECTION.....	15
RESOLUTION A DISCUSSION PAPERS.....	17
IMPROVING FELLOWSHIP COMMUNICATION DISCUSSION PAPERS.....	36
NOMINATION FORM	54
WORLD POOL RESUMÉ	58
GLOSSARY	62

WSC '99 ABBREVIATED MOTIONS LIST

For reference only

Motion 1: To select two issue discussion topics from the following list for discussion at the 2000 World Service Conference:

Presented according to conference policy, page 3

Motion 2: That Narcotics Anonymous World Services add the following Identity Statement as part of the Group Readings inventory item offered by the World Service Office.

Maker: Carolina and North East Atlantic Regions, page 5

Motion 3: To publish an illustrative pamphlet about "different types of formats for recovery meetings" through which the groups can be stimulated to establish an important time/space in their regular meetings for sharing and informing about service and other issues that affect NA as a whole.

Maker: Colombia Region, page 7

Motion 4: To allow the sale of alternate merchandise from registered NA groups, service boards, or committees during the World Convention in conjunction with the sale of World Convention Merchandise.

Maker: Mid-Atlantic Region, page 7

Motion 5: To change in the *Narcotics Anonymous White Booklet* under the section "What is the Narcotics Anonymous Program?" on page 2, second to last sentence, the language "and are under no surveillance at any time" to "and participate in no surveillance at any time."

Maker: Lone Star Region, page 8

Motion 6: That NA World Services publish the *Conference Agenda Report* a minimum of 180 days prior to the World Service Conference. Further, that translations as currently done to German, Spanish, French, Portuguese, and Swedish be completed prior to the release on that date. This policy to take effect in conjunction with the 2 year conference cycle.

Maker: New Jersey Region, page 8

Motion 7: That the price of literature sold by NAWS to registered groups, areas, or regions outside of the United States be indexed or formulated to ensure a fixed maximum currency exchange rate.

Maker: North East Atlantic Region, page 9

Motion 8: That regions be allowed up to 150 words to describe the reasoning behind and consequences of their regional motions in the *Conference Agenda Report*.

Maker: San Diego/Imperial Region, page 10

Motion 9: To create a new bullet, which would be included in the *Temporary Working Guide to our World Service Structure*, page 18, Guidelines for the Unified Budget for NA World Services between existing bullets 7 and 8. Bullet shall read, "All proposed projects pertaining to the creation of new recovery literature and service material as defined in The Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust (FIPT) on page 13, will be presented through the *Conference Agenda Report*."

Maker: South Florida Region, page 10

Motion 10: To revise the NA World Services Vision Statement to: "That no addict seeking recovery need ever die."

Maker: Chesapeake/Potomac Region, page 11

Motion 11: That the World Board have one vote collectively during new business and elections at the World Service Conference, as expressed by the World Board Chair or Vice Chair in the absence of the Chair. This would be accomplished by amending the *Temporary Working Guide to Our World Service Structure*, 1998 edition, as follows:

Maker: Chesapeake/Potomac Region, page 12

Motion 12: That during the 1999 World Service Conference the Human Resource Panel (HRP) will interview the nominees presented by the conference participants for the world board elections, by asking them the following questions listed below. This information will be

distributed to conference participants along with the resums. Any nominee not present will be interviewed by phone if available. The HRP can ask any other questions they feel pertinent.

Maker: Region of the Virginians, page 13

WSC '99 ABBREVIATED MOTIONS LIST
For reference only

BLANK PAGE

Sessions for WSC '99
Woodland Hills, California, USA
Sunday, 25 April—Friday, 30 April 1999

Please note that these sessions are not listed in any particular order

- Narcotics Anonymous recovery meeting(s)
- Agenda overview, general orientation
- Introductions
- Approval of WSC '98 minutes
- Seating of new regions
- Adoption of procedures
- World Board Report
- Human Resource Panel Report
- 1998-1999 Issue-discussion topics: Resolution A and Improving Fellowship Communication
- Zonal Forum Reports
- Elections
- Report on Unified Budget process and 1999-2000 Budget presentation and adoption
- Discussion of issues related to Fellowship Development
- Zonal forum meetings, as requested
- New business
- Old business
- World Board Meetings

BLANK PAGE

WORLD SERVICE CONFERENCE 1999 AGENDA OVERVIEW

WSC '98 was the longest annual meeting in our history. What a difference a year makes. The 1999 annual meeting will be almost two and one-half days shorter with more time devoted to issues and discussion than ever before. This is a direct reflection of the changes made to the world service structure in 1998.

Change can oftentimes be characterized as messy. Just as we, as your new World Board, have had to learn to do things differently, we as the World Service Conference, will have to learn to do things differently as well. This year's agenda, with only twelve motions for the Old Business session, will allow the conference to spend its time discussing issues rather than debating motions.

One of the most notable changes for this year's conference is the development and facilitation of the agenda. What used to be the sole purview of the WSC Administrative Committee is now shared between the World Board, responsible for agenda development, and the WSC Facilitator, responsible for agenda facilitation. During the coming months we will work closely together to successfully meet the needs of conference week.

The primary discussion issues for this year, *Resolution A* and *Improving Fellowship Communication*, were determined by the action of WSC '98. During the year many regions held workshops and forums to discuss *Resolution A* using the outline of four models developed by the former Transition Group. Several regions and conference participants including the World Board have developed discussion papers on both topics. These will serve as the basis of our examination of the issues during conference week. *Improving Fellowship Communication* and *Resolution A* are very general topics and could be broken down to components to focus our efforts. Right now we are looking at several different methods of forming conference action groups with a smaller number of participants who could then bring ideas and recommendations to the full conference for further discussion. There will be more on this in the pre-conference package.

We are looking at ways to improve the way the conference holds discussion of issues that affect our development as a fellowship. The conference has tried many different formats in the past; panels, small groups, and the conference as a whole. We are reviewing the participant surveys from the Development Forum for the last nine years for ideas. We expect that the WSC '99 Agenda will include several sessions dedicated to discussions about fellowship development.

Zonal Forum Reports is a new agenda item. WSC '98 asked for these reports to be included as part of the WSC agenda. In addition, time and space will be made available for zonal forum meetings, as requested, on a space-available basis. We ask that all Zonal Forums that plan to present a report at WSC 1999 and/or who wish to meet during the conference week contact the WB Executive Committee by March 15, 1999, so the board may finalize the agenda for the conference week.

There will also be a session for elections for the World Board, the WSC Co-Facilitator, and the Human Resource Panel. Since this is a year of transition, the election procedures may differ from position to position. A resumé form is included in the back of this agenda for all nominees. More details about this year's process will be sent out to you before the conference by the Human Resource Panel.

The New Business Session will actually be quite new for all of us, as we are scheduled to deliberate and approve the first unified World Services Budget in our history and initiate a new fiscal year. Although the concept is simple, the new project planning process is not yet generally understood. Therefore, we are planning a session where we can discuss this new process, ask questions, and come to a common understanding before we actually enter the budget session.

The World Board Report Session will be an opportunity for conference participants to hear a report about all world service activities over the last year and to ask questions. Since the scope of this activity is so broad, we will plan our report in sections by topic.

We hope this information gives you a sense of how the annual meeting will go this year. Your pre-conference package will contain more information about the actual agenda. We thank you in advance for your cooperation in making this a successful conference and should you have any questions or wish to provide any input please contact the World Board in care of the WSO.

World Board

WORLD SERVICE MOTIONS

At WSC '97 Motion 48 "That the World Service Conference place issue discussion topics into the *Conference Agenda Report* and the final two topics be selected by the fellowship. Topics are to be submitted by RSR's at the 1997 World Service Conference and placed in the 1998 *Conference Agenda Report*" was passed. The motion in 1997 did not specify action beyond 1998. At WSC '98 Motion 91 "That selection by the groups of issue discussion topics in the *Conference Agenda Report* become an ongoing procedure of the World Service Conference" was passed. So in all future *Conference Agenda Reports* the following motion will appear. This motion is the policy of the conference and any conference participant may rise to the microphone and present for the conference to consider.

Motion 1: To select two issue discussion topics from the following list for discussion at the 2000 World Service Conference:

- A. What do we perceive is the groups' role in the world service structure?**
- B. What does 'consensus-based decision-making' mean to us *and* how would we utilize this process during the WSC?**
- C. How are Unity and Autonomy integrated and vital to our efforts to carry the message of recovery?**
- D. What does 'common needs' imply? How is the intent of 'special interest' synonymous with common needs?**
- E. How is being of service to the fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous a spiritual component of a program of recovery?**
- F. What are the benefits for NA, as a whole, to decentralize our service structure? How may the fulfillment of our primary purpose be actualized with a worldwide fellowship?**
- G. What can the Traditions do to foster growth for groups and service structure? How do the Concepts complement the Traditions and promote freedom for continued growth?**
- H. What is our experience with creating an atmosphere of recovery with disruptive members in our meetings?**
- I. What action do we, as a fellowship, need to take to retain our experienced members with substantial clean time?**
- J. What is NA's definition of abstinence? How does this definition apply to our members who need medication in recovery?**

Intent: To allow the fellowship to choose the issue discussion topics for the conference year 1999-2000.

Financial Impact: None

Policy Affected: This motion would not amend any WSC policies.

Presented according to conference policy

BLANK PAGE

REGIONAL MOTIONS

The following motions have been considered by the World Board or the Human Resource Panel. A *Temporary Working Guide to our World Service Structure*, on pages 12 and 13, contains the following points about input to the World Service Conference:

- Regions are strongly encouraged to work through the World Board with their input. Experience has shown that the utilization of the broader base and experience of the conference committees allows for more adequate discussion and consideration of fellowship concerns. It should be stressed that two-way communication between the World Board and the fellowship is essential.”
- Input for consideration at the conference must be submitted to the World Board one hundred fifty (150) days prior to the conference, and distributed to the fellowship for review ninety (90) days prior to the conference.

New project proposals can also be made to the WSC, and a process for these is described in the Unified Budget Section on pages 17-19. Recommendations on each of these motions by the World Board or the Human Resource Panel are listed following each motion.

Motion 2: That Narcotics Anonymous World Services add the following Identity Statement as part of the Group Readings inventory item offered by the World Service Office.

IDENTITY STATEMENT

In Narcotics Anonymous, we are presented with a dilemma. When NA members identify themselves as “addicts and alcoholics,” “cross-addicted,” or talk about living “clean and sober,” the clarity of the NA message is blurred. To speak in this manner suggests that there are two diseases; that one drug is separate from the rest. Narcotics Anonymous makes no distinction between drugs. Our identification as addicts is all-inclusive, allowing us to concentrate on our similarities, not our differences.

The above statement is offered in the spirit of NA unity. Please remember this request is not made to rule, censor, or dictate behavior. We make this request in order to provide an atmosphere of recovery, where we can hear the simple, non-confusing, and life-saving message of Narcotics Anonymous.

Maker: Carolina Region and North East Atlantic Region

Intent by Carolina Region: To provide NA groups with an approved piece of literature to use as a tool to foster unity of purpose in their meetings.

Intent by North East Atlantic Region: To help promote unity through a clear NA message.

Financial Impact: The typesetting of the changes to the new reading cards, the *Guide to Local Services in Narcotics Anonymous*, and the *Group Booklet*.

Policy Affected: This motion would amend the following WSC policies:

A Guide to Local Services in Narcotics Anonymous

The reading "Identity Statement" would be added to the following list of readings:

Page 43, Sample Meeting Format, 2nd section, Leader:

Select people before the meeting to read one or more of the following short pieces. These readings can be found in our White Booklet, the Basic Text, IP No. 1, or the group reading cards.

- Who Is An Addict?
- What Is The NA Program?
- Why Are We Here?
- How It Works
- The Twelve Traditions
- Just For Today

The Group Booklet

The reading "Identity Statement" would be added to the following list of readings:

Page 25, Sample Meeting Format, 3rd section, Leader:

Select people before the meeting to read one or more of the following short pieces. These readings can be found in our White Booklet, the Basic Text, IP No. 1, or the group reading cards.

- Who Is An Addict?
- What Is The NA Program?
- Why Are We Here?
- How It Works
- The Twelve Traditions
- Just For Today

World Board Recommendation: no consensus

The World Board could not reach consensus to oppose or support this motion, or what recommendation to make although a majority were in favor to oppose. Some of the points made during our discussion included: a) that the motion could help clarify our program for the newcomer and support our unity, b) that the motion could infringe upon our groups' autonomy and should not become world services policy, c) that all of our current group readings come from approved recovery literature which has received extensive review, input, and approval by the fellowship, and d) that this is only one of many versions of this type of statement that are currently being used by our groups around the world. The World Board did agree that regardless of the action by the WSC that groups who choose to use this type of statement in their meetings should exercise their group autonomy and continue to do so. The board also believes that if the conference wants to pursue this idea, the statement should go through the input and review process used for recovery literature and be developed and approved as a piece of recovery literature.

Motion 3: To publish an illustrative pamphlet about “different types of formats for recovery meetings” through which the groups can be stimulated to establish an important time/space in their regular meetings for sharing and informing about service and other issues that affect NA as a whole.

Maker: Colombia Region

Intent: “To get” to more members, with matters of common interest, since most of them, do not attend the groups’ service meetings, nor workshops, nor service forums.

Financial Impact: It is not possible to project a financial impact without having more information about the development of this piece.

Policy Affected: This motion would not amend any WSC policies.

World Board Recommendation: To not adopt.

The World Board believes that each group should determine their meeting format and those groups who choose to discuss service information and issues during their meeting should do so. Since *A Guide to Local Services in Narcotics Anonymous* already includes many descriptions of meeting formats, we believe world services already provides ideas and that specific formats should be left to each groups discretion.

Motion 4: To allow the sale of alternate merchandise from registered NA groups, service boards, or committees during the World Convention in conjunction with the sale of World Convention Merchandise.

Maker: Mid-Atlantic Region

Intent: To have alternate merchandise available for sale throughout the World Convention instead of just on Sunday.

Financial Impact: No specific financial impact can be projected. The cost would vary from event to event and would involve significant administrative and logistical support.

Policy Affected: This motion would not amend any WSC policies.

World Board Recommendation: To not adopt

This issue has become so difficult for world services to manage that the former World Convention Corporation devoted much of its 1997 Annual Report to presenting the challenges associated with this activity to conference participants. Our world convention has grown to the point that we are now primarily dealing with convention centers with specific requirements for union labor to move material and for charging and paying sales tax for all material sold. We have been able to avoid the typical requirement for paying a percentage of sales to a convention center by limiting ourselves to merchandise that commemorates the specific event. The alternate merchandise store at the world convention has far exceeded its original intent of providing a space for regions, areas, and groups to dispose of remaining merchandise from their events and has turned into a reason to create merchandise to sell at the world convention for fundraising. We cannot support the expansion of this activity for administrative and logistical reasons, as well, as for philosophical reasons. The conference has had lengthy discussions over several years that supports our refocusing our financial efforts from relying on conventions and the sale of merchandise to being supported by group contributions.

Motion 5: To change in the *Narcotics Anonymous White Booklet* under the section “What is the Narcotics Anonymous Program?” on page 2, second to last sentence, the language “and are under no surveillance at any time” to “and participate in no surveillance at any time.”

Maker: Lone Star Region

Intent: To clarify a misleading statement in our literature.

Financial Impact: Typesetting and administrative expense of coordinating changes into all languages currently in inventory (29 items) or development

Policy Affected: This motion would amend the following WSC policies:

Narcotics Anonymous Basic Text

The following sentence would be revised:

Chapter Two, What is the Narcotics Anonymous Program?, page 9, second paragraph, the sentence: We are not connected with any political, religious, or law enforcement group, and are under no surveillance at any time.

IP #1, Who, What, How, and Why

The following sentence would be revised:

Under heading, What is the Narcotics Anonymous Program?, second paragraph, the sentence: We are not connected with any political, religious, or law enforcement group, and are under no surveillance at any time.

World Board Recommendation: To commit to the World Board

Last year the WSC adopted Motion #21: “That all motions, amendments, and any other input regarding revisions or additions to the Basic Text or the booklet *Narcotics Anonymous* (The Little White Book), be committed to the World Board who will compile and forward to the conference, in two years, a detailed proposal including options, budgets, and timelines for those options.” We believe that this material should be committed to the Motion #21 process, since it seeks to change the Little White Book, along with any other input the fellowship may have.

Motion 6: That NA World Services publish the *Conference Agenda Report* a minimum of 180 days prior to the World Service Conference. Further, that translations as currently done to German, Spanish, French, Portuguese, and Swedish be completed prior to the release on that date. This policy to take effect in conjunction with the 2 year conference cycle.

Maker: New Jersey Region

Intent: To increase the available workshop time for the *Conference Agenda Report* from 90 to 180 days. Further, to provide regions whose primary language is other than English the same amount of workshop time.

Financial Impact: There is no way to reasonably project a financial impact for this motion since we do not know all of the parameters required in a two-year system.

Policy Affected: This motion would amend the following policies:

Temporary Working Guide to our World Service Structure

The following sentences would be revised:

Page 12, Guidelines of the World Service Conference, Item C., Last sentence, "The actual agenda is then prepared and sent out to all WSC participants ninety (90) days in advance of the meeting."

Page 13, Guidelines of the World Service Conference, Item K., "Input for consideration at the conference must be submitted to the World Board 150 days prior to the conference, and distributed to the fellowship for review ninety (90) days prior to the conference."

Page 15, V. WSC Recovery-Literature Process, B. Approval form literature Item 1., "Approval-form literature is prepared by the World Board and is distributed for a period of time, considering translations, determined by the World Board of not less than ninety (90) days."

Page 25, Addendum 2: The *Conference Agenda Report*, First sentence, "The *Conference Agenda Report* is distributed ninety (90) days prior to the opening day of the conference."

FIPT

The following sentences would be revised:

Page 15, Section 3, Item 1. "Proposals must be distributed to the NA groups via their regional delegates no less than ninety (90) days prior to the annual meeting of the World Service Conference at which the proposals will be considered."

Page 18, Section 8, First sentence. "The Trustee must notify the Trustor at least ninety (90) days prior to any given annual World Service Conference meeting of the Trustee's intent to publish or otherwise manufacture a product based on an alteration of any trust property."

World Board Recommendation: To commit to the World Board

All of the specifics for the two-year conference cycle will be included in the 2000 *Conference Agenda Report*. This motion should be committed to the World Board who is already mandated to present this information next year. This will allow the conference to consider all of the changes to the entire system at the same time.

Motion 7: That the price of literature sold by NAWS to registered groups, areas, or regions outside of the United States be indexed or formulated to ensure a fixed maximum currency exchange rate.

Maker: North East Atlantic Region

Intent: To ensure that addicts around the world are not burdened by increasing literature prices due to a strong US currency.

Financial Impact: It is not possible to determine the financial impact to world services or local communities until a specific index is established.

Policy Affected: This motion would not amend any WSC policies.

World Board Recommendation: To not adopt

The former WSO board did extensive research into the possibility of developing an index for pricing literature worldwide. Often the country by country indexes reflected only general economic conditions not necessarily the conditions of the NA communities in those countries which could be strikingly different. (Most economic indexes would raise

pricing for some as well as lowering pricing for others.) The WSO board eventually developed continental policies that were designed to handle divergent economic conditions through discount schedules, exchange rates, shipping rates, etc. The WSO board also recognized that economic conditions change and empowered WSO Executive Management to make exceptions to the policy on a case by case basis when necessary. Because the pricing issue is so complex the conference has always left these types of issues to its responsible boards and/or committees. The sales policy is scheduled to be revisited in January 2000.

Motion 8: That regions be allowed up to 150 words to describe the reasoning behind and consequences of their regional motions in the *Conference Agenda Report*.

Maker: San Diego Imperial Region

Intent: To improve fellowship communication by allowing regions to more fully and clearly describe the reasons for making the motion and the consequences the motion entails.

Financial Impact: The financial impact would be the additional typesetting, production, and translations costs for the extra pages in the CAR that this motion would create.

Policy Affected: This motion would not amend any WSC policies.

World Board Recommendation: To adopt

We are recommending adoption of this motion to allow the conference to determine if this information is helpful in making decisions regarding motions in the CAR. However, our discussions were that this issue would best be part of the discussion about a two-year conference cycle to be considered next year, so that all policies concerning the World Service Conference and the *Conference Agenda Report* can be discussed at the same time. The conference system and the unified budget process are both predicated on the assumption that ideas will be sent to the World Service Conference for consideration and development before being sent to the fellowship for a decision. We would encourage all regions to continue to use the system as it was designed in order to make world services as effective as possible. Our hope is that the motions that regions choose to place in the CAR have gone through this process. If a region does not agree with the recommendation from world services they have the right to ask the fellowship, through the CAR, to consider their idea. Once this has occurred, we believe regions should also have the ability to explain the intent, background, and desired outcome of motions that they are offering.

Motion 9: To create a new bullet, which would be included in the *Temporary Working Guide to our World Service Structure*, page 18, Guidelines for the Unified Budget for NA World Services between existing bullets 7 and 8. Bullet shall read, "All proposed projects pertaining to the creation of new recovery literature and service material as defined in The Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust (FIPT) on page 13, will be presented through the *Conference Agenda Report*."

Maker: South Florida Region

Intent: This will guarantee that proposal of new recovery literature and service material coincides with the FIPT on page 12, which explains how these decisions are made by the

Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous as given voice by its groups through their regional delegates at the World Service Conference.

Financial Impact: No specific financial impact can be determined at this time.

Policy Affected: This motion would amend the following WSC policies:

Temporary Working Guide to our World Service Structure

The following sentence would be revised:

Page 18, 6th bullet, 5th sentence: These will be forwarded to conference participants prior to the WSC for eventual prioritization at the conference.

World Board Recommendation: To not adopt

We have no experience with project planning or with a two-year conference cycle yet. The conference needs to allow the process for new projects adopted at WSC '98, to be implemented before making revisions. The unified budget process is not even scheduled to be fully implemented until after WSC 2000. We believe that this amendment could delay projects from two to five years. The conference always has the ability in this process to require that a project proposal be sent out in the next CAR.

Motion 10: To revise the NA World Services Vision Statement to: "That no addict seeking recovery need ever die."

Maker: Chesapeake & Potomac Region

Intent: To simplify and clarify our vision statement.

Financial Impact: Typesetting of the changes.

Policy Affected: This motion would amend the following WSC policies:

Temporary Working Guide to our World Service Structure

The following language would be replaced:

Page 1, NA World Services Vision Statement:

All of the efforts of Narcotics Anonymous World Services are inspired by the primary purpose of the groups we serve. Upon this common ground we stand committed.

Our vision is that one day:

- Every addict in the world has the chance to experience our message in his or her own language and culture and find the opportunity for a new way of life;
- NA communities worldwide and NA world services work together in a spirit of unity and cooperation to carry our message of recovery;
- Narcotics Anonymous has universal recognition and respect as a viable program of recovery.

As our commonly held sense of the highest aspirations that set our course, our vision is our touchstone, our reference point, inspiring all that we do. Honesty, trust, and goodwill are the foundation of these ideals. In all our service efforts, we rely upon the guidance of a loving Higher Power.

World Board Recommendation: To not adopt

The conference adopted its vision statement in 1996. We have barely had the opportunity to try to live up to the wording of the statement as it is currently written. This statement is only a portion of what is written in the introduction to our Basic Text

and is incomplete as it is presented. This change would eliminate the vision statement as it is written and replace it with only a portion of a quote from our literature. We believe that this is too limited a statement for the vision statement for NA World Services and is impossible to fulfill as written.

Motion 11: That the World Board have one vote collectively during new business and elections at the World Service Conference, as expressed by the World Board Chair or Vice Chair in the absence of the Chair. This would be accomplished by amending the *Temporary Working Guide to Our World Service Structure*, 1998 edition, as follows:

Page 4, Membership, by deleting the second and third sentence and replacing it with the following: “These conference-elected members will have equal participation rights during board meetings. During the World Service Conference they will have one (1) vote collectively as expressed through their chairperson. The chairperson may not, however, vote on items that have been submitted to the groups in the *Conference Agenda Report*, or on any other items of Old Business at the World Service Conference.”

Page 13, Guidelines of the World Service Conference, Section 1, by deleting Item F. 2. and replacing it with: “Chairperson of the World Board.”

Page 13, Guidelines of the World Service Conference, Section 1, by adding a new item as F. 4. which would read as follows: “In the absence of the World Board Chair, the conference will recognize the World Board Vice Chair.”

Page 13, Guidelines of the World Service Conference, Section 1, Item G, 2nd sentence by adding: “/WB chairperson” after “RDs” and “/WB vice chairperson” after “alternates”.

Page 13, Guidelines of the World Service Conference, by adding a new item to be included after 2. H. which would read as follows: “All members of the World Board are allowed a seat on the floor of the WSC. Except for voting, all other conference participation privileges are granted to these members.”

Maker: Chesapeake & Potomac Region

Intent: To change voting participation in new business and elections at the WSC.

Financial Impact: No direct financial impact other than typesetting the changes.

Policy Affected: This motion would amend the following WSC Policies:

Temporary Working Guide to our World Service Structure

The following sections would be revised:

Page 4, Membership, 2nd and 3rd sentence: These conference-elected members will have equal participation rights, including voting on the board and at the World Services Conference. Board members may not, however, vote on items that have been submitted to the groups in the *Conference Agenda Report*, or on any other items of Old Business at the World Service Conference.

Page 13, Guidelines of the World Service Conference, Section 1, Item F. 2.: Members of the World Board.

Page 13, Guidelines of the World Service Conference, Section 1, Item G, 2nd sentence: When RDs are not on the floor of the conference, duly elected alternates may vote, make motions, or address the conference.

World Board Recommendation: To not adopt

The new business and election sessions at the WSC concern motions which have not been previously presented to the fellowship for consideration. During these sessions all conference participants, including delegates and board members alike, share identical responsibilities for the decisions and actions taken at this point in the conference. Board members do not vote at all during old business sessions when issues contained in the *Conference Agenda Report* are presented.

We support the Seventh Concept which states that, "All members of a service body bear substantial responsibility for that body's decisions and should be allowed to fully participate in its decision making processes." World Board members are conference participants and should fully participate in new ideas and discussions during the conference week. To eliminate that ability or to try to assign one vote to World Board members limits the boards responsibility and participation. This motion would eliminate all members of the World Board, except the chairperson, as conference participants. The conference adopted a new system in 1998 that will not be fully implemented until 2000. We encourage the conference to allow this system to be implemented before we attempt to change it.

Motion 12: That during the 1999 World Service Conference the Human Resource Panel (HRP) will interview the nominees presented by the conference participants for the world board elections, by asking them the following questions listed below. This information will be distributed to conference participants along with the resumés. Any nominee not present will be interviewed by phone if available. The HRP can ask any other questions they feel pertinent.

Questions:

- 1. Do you go anywhere other than NA for your recovery? If so, why?**
- 2. Do you believe that working the 12 steps is the way to recover in NA?**
- 3. Do you have a relationship with a sponsor?**
- 4. Do you sponsor?**
- 5. Have you worked all 12 Steps with a sponsor?**
- 6. Have you ever had an NA service commitment that you did not finish? If so, why?**
- 7. Do you have the time and resources to fulfill the responsibilities of the position on the WB?**

Maker: Region of the Virginians

Intent: To provide more information to conference participants on nominees standing for election to the World Board.

Financial Impact: The direct financial impact would be the expense of phone calls to nominees not present.

Policy Affected: This motion would amend the following WSC policies:

1999 WSC Election Procedures

HRP Recommendation: To not adopt.

The Human Resource Panel has been working on internal guidelines and procedures to handle the interview and reference checking process. These will be tested this year for the

nomination and election of the WSC Co-Facilitators. After the election is done, we hope to get feedback from the regional delegates to improve the process. In this way, we can methodically create the processes necessary to ensure that the delegates have all the information that they need to make an informed decision. This motion's proposal, interviewing of candidates at the conference or by phone, is not part of our plans. We intend to have all of the interviewing and nominations complete well before the conference is scheduled to meet.

The HRP has several other concerns with this motion:

1. It requires the HRP to make subjective judgements about a person's personal recovery and spiritual condition.
2. It includes several questions that are not pertinent to an individual's ability to serve or to meet the basic requirements of service.
3. It contains a cultural bias that implies addicts all around the world recover in the same way.
4. The HRP does not have any procedure to do last minute interviews at the conference.
5. The HRP does not have a vehicle to report its findings in these types of interviews.
6. Telephone interviews are not the same as face to face interviews and would introduce an unfair bias.
7. The HRP prefers to have all of its information gathering and standard candidate profile reports completed before the conference is scheduled to begin.

WSC 1999 ISSUE DISCUSSION PAPERS SECTION

BLANK PAGE

RESOLUTION A DISCUSSION PAPERS

The following papers have been developed by conference participants for discussion at WSC '99. The topics were prioritized by conference participants at WSC '98.

Resolution A: To approve *in principle* a change in participation at a new WSC to achieve the following objectives:

1. to reduce the total number of representatives;
2. to provide for equal representation from all geographic entities; and,
3. to encourage a consensus-based decision-making process.

Note: All issue discussion papers have been typed into this document exactly as they were received at the World Service Office.

BLANK PAGE

Australian Region

One of the problems with Resolution A is that it seems almost overwhelming when viewed as a whole. But if each of the sub-categories is looked at separately, it doesn't seem anywhere near as daunting. We believe that a Resolution A group needs to be formed to collect input into each of these areas and to formulate proposals as to how these changes could be implemented.

Attendance. We agree that the conference cannot continue to grow in number of representatives. Every year a couple more regions want to be seated. We say that the conference is getting too big but we don't have the heart to say no to them. A common response to requests from zonal forums when they ask to be seated is that we are wanting to reduce the number of participants, not seat more.

We all accept that NA will continue to grow. US regions will continue to grow and split. Developing countries with huge populations like India and Brazil will have multiple regions and then there are all Asian countries, Russia and Africa where meetings are springing up. It is obvious that we need to look at a different kind of representation, even a different kind of conference.

Equal representation. Equitable is a better word than equal. Equal is too hard to define, we will just get bogged down searching for this impossible perfect thing called "equal" But there are many ways to make representation more equitable.

Cost. Established Non US regions like Ireland and New Zealand to name two, just can't afford to attend the conference every year. This is not only their loss, it is ours as well.

The cost to the Australian region for attendance at the WSC is completely disproportionate to that of mainland US regions. Add to that, the cost of our own internal travel in our large continent, and our participation in the Asia Pacific Forum, and we end up spending a huge proportion of our available funds on travel. Like other regions, we too have members who grumble about why we are spending all this money on travel. Sometimes it is difficult to assure members of our fellowship that we are getting value for our money.

In spite of this we have managed to attend the WSC every year since we started coming 12 years ago, except for one year when the region was suffering negative fund flow (we were in debt). Ironically that year we put up a motion on cost equalization and we were not at the WSC to speak to it.

Cost equalization. Because of our large continent Australia has cost equalized travel to our RSC. We have done this successfully for many years. The options for cost equalization for the WSC need to be looked at thoroughly, and models of options provided. There should also be a model for having participant travel to the WSC as a line item in the world services budget, that is, a model of how much it would cost world services to fund all the participants, in respect to the different Resolution A models.

Whatever model we adopt, it is likely that certain communities will still need extra funding assistance from the worldwide fellowship. Geographically the APF covers a large area (almost half the planet). We have many developing communities and very high potential for growth, but only the resources of Hawaii and Australia. Japan recently announced that they will be able to self-fund to the annual APF meeting, but we still have a long way to go.

Representation. Zonal forums are here for the long term. With the support of their Regions, Zonal forums are setting up structures, resources, bank accounts, websites, newsletters, and support participant travel to meetings. In the case of the APF we have jointly funded an international PI presentation in one of our communities in conjunction with World services. World services spend a lot of money travelling to and attending Zonal forum meetings within the US, as well as to the EDM, the Latin American Forum and the APF and also contribute to the funding of participants from developing countries. A lot of people believe that the forums come from a new and different perspective and have a lot to offer the WSC.

Zones outside the US are much more developed, because there has been more need to reach out to emerging communities. We understand that some of the US zones have only been dealing with local issues like insurance for events etc, never world issues. They are faced with a major shift, but in some cases this is starting to happen. *(The geographic entities originally referred to in The Resolution Group report are up and running, or at least up and walking).*

Looking at the input from participants in the small group discussions at WSC97, when asked, "What model would best serve the fellowships needs in the future?" 83% of the conference preferred either model 3, 4, 3 1/2 or some similar variation. These models are a major departure from what we have now. This must give an indication of where we want to go. *(Where we actually end up may be different, but we need to have an idea of where we think we are going, in order to take the first step.)*

Consensus. There are many ideas about what exactly this is, but we thought the best definition at WSC98 was from the RD France. "Consensus is a process where after lengthy discussion no one has strong opposition." Whether we end up with this consensus based decision making process or not, the desire is to move away from the parliamentary, adversarial method of debate. The Resolution A group should gather input about alternatives, i.e., the experience of the EDM with their consensus method, how it works in Japan, what are the best size groups for the alternatives to work best. How to foster an environment of cooperation.

Fear. There was concern that RD's would be reluctant to vote them-selves out of existence. RD's will still exist, they will just meet in a different way.

(This paper is not about providing answers, there is no simple answer The conference has been discussing this now for a number of years. It is time to hand it over to a work group who's sole purpose will be to look thoroughly into all aspects of resolution A. This group should be prepared to give guidance and present ideas to the conference on how this all might work.)

Yours in Service,
Australian Region

Hawaii Region

Aloha NA members.

The question is, now that we are here, where do we go from here?

Here we are, a world wide multicultural Fellowship. With language and legal Systems as diverse as it gets, yet we all want to be together. In the spirit of our first tradition we want and must have unity. So how do we do it? How do we make our fellowship work in a way that works for everyone?

The inventory process arose much out of the frustration of the members outside of the continental United States as any thing else. It had long been obvious that the WSC was bogged down in the issues surrounding those of U.S. Regions. It was a World Service Conference by name, but not in practice. Its Representation was totally lopsided. At first most new Regions from outside the U.S. were not that concerned, they were so excited to feel part of NA as a whole and they were getting so much support and shared experience. That generally didn't last that long, especially as they began working on their own issues at home and found that the conference was not touch with their problems. They quickly became aware that most of the projects that the conference works on relate to the Western culture. Very little was being done for other cultures. This is not to say there was apathy on behalf of the conference, the conference is very passionate about other cultures in our fellowship, and the problem is in understanding their isolation and their difficulty in accessing our resources.

The Inventory process provided us with three suggestions regarding the Zonal Forums and the Transition committee gave us a rough draft on where our fellowship stands regarding Resolution A. They offered four models for our entertainment but basically told us that this was some thing that in their opinion had to evolve on its own. They seen some vision with the formation of the zonal forums but recognized the forums still had a long way to go. It is easy to understand their reluctance to move on Resolution A. I believe the question they were faced with was are we ready for a Resolution A? The question here is when will we ever be ready? The question is what constitutes "being ready?" Several years ago a large number of delegates from Regions outside the U.S. walked off the conference floor in protest and frustration over the inequity of time spent on issues that had no relevance to them. They were "ready" at that point to do something. I don't believe it will be long until we see that kind of demonstration again. The Hawaii Region was one of the loudest proponents of this resolution, we had demonstrated a year prior by not attending tin WSC and instead pooling our resources towards the development of the Asian Pacific Forum, some members within the Hawaii Region seen this as a breakaway from our conference and were not in support of this, yet in hind site it appears that by lending our full support to the APF we were actually taking an action (right or wrong) that moves us closer to some definition of Resolution A. As in all our service work, the bottom line is carrying the message.

Right now nothing seems to make more sense than the zonal forums and assemblies in moving us towards a meeting process that focuses on tile needs and concerns of all cultural and geographical areas. They are autonomous entities of Narcotics Anonymous, I think unless someone comes up with a concept that is beyond brilliant this will be the direction we are headed for regardless of what model comes of it.

But how do we make them functional now? Most of the forums are in developmental stages, some have a little more experience than others but from what information I have been able to gather it appears that every one is “winging it.” There is no guidance at this point. One thing we can do as a world body (putting aside our regional concerns) is to give support to a concept that is beginning to take shape. Give it guidance by recognizing its validity.

The Conference will entertain reports from the zonal forums and assemblies this coming Conference, this is a good beginning and one that I hope will open the door to the possible seating of a representative from each of these bodies in the near future. I believe it should be a priority of the world board to offer some vision in regards to this. I am sure we all would like to know where the World Bond stands in regards to the seating of forums and assemblies.

I would like to request that the World Board places on its agenda at their next meeting a discussion on Resolution A and the role they envision the assemblies and forums will have in creating a true World Service Conference.

I would also like to add one more element to Model Three. Should this Model be adopted I believe it would be impertinent to have one meeting during the year attended by one delegate from each Zone. The purpose is simple to have five voices represent the world in as equal a forum as we can have.

As a reminder of the results of our inventory I have included the three areas empathized by the inventory we took concerning the Zonal Forums

1. Lack of communication between zones. No time set aside at WSC for zonal communication

There is no organized form of communication for zones. *Solutions offered:*

- Create a forum for zonal communication.
- Make time at WSC for zonal communication.

2. Lack of clarity regarding purpose of zonal forums.

Each zone operates independently regarding purpose and function. *Solution offered:*

- Empower zonal forums.
- Have the WSC define and give purpose to zonal forums.

3. Lack of financial and human resources dedicated to zonal forums.

The WSC does not provide any means for world trusted servants to participate in zonal forums. *Solutions offered:*

- Make conference funds available for zonal forums.
- Create a cost equalization plan for participation at zonal forums.

Yours in loving service

Tom Mc, Delegate, Hawaii Region

Midwest Zonal Forum

MIDWEST ZONAL FORUM's (MZF) understanding of issues related to Resolution A.

We have worked with a consensus based decision process for all of our decisions for some time. If even one member is not comfortable with the decision we don't move forward. We also know the nature of our fellowship is one of constant change. Working together we have developed our own sense of purpose and have all learned from the experience. Thus, we have not been in complete agreement with all issues related to Resolution A and yet we have found some common ground to move forward.

We feel there are many questions that need to be discussed Fellowship-wide to implement a smaller representation from regions at the World Service Conference (WSC). It is our view that we need to reach a consensus as a fellowship on the following issues prior to our regions not sending reps directly. We are each at different levels of readiness for the next step, knowing full well it may be a bumpy road. After #1 they have no particular order.

#1) Job Description of World Board (WB) and WSC. Direct services or support services?

The key to downsizing the WSC is to downsize what we do there and what the New World Board actually does. If we need to approve everything worldwide to the Fellowship, everyone will need to be a part of that process (micromanage). Do we feel the NA message has to be Universal, not allowing for individual views of recovery? Will we have to get all of the things we do in every Home Group "approved" at WSC? If we have a WSC that shares ES&H and very little "direct services", people will be more likely to let go of the control issues. With more "support services," people will be more willing to have a sense of ownership if they do it themselves...with help from others.

We do allow for group autonomy now; how much?... Service providing -- we seem to go with "this has worked for us" AND "you may do what works for you," "guidelines not directives." Looking at our process of approving guidelines we all have our own way of doing things. So everyone wants their two cents of input. Then there seems to be two camps of thought after that; one, "we can't do that, it isn't in the guidelines?" two, "here is a need, let's find a way to fill it" this creates a lot of disunity.

Lit production?... ONLY APPROVED lit. Bought from the Service office. Here we all want input because it's the official approved NA material allowed in a meeting. Some groups do read different lit in their formats, clarity statement, etc. If we can have some universal truths defined that need to go before everyone/CAR and leave the rest to the locals we would have internal and external guidelines. For example, everyone would determine a segment of our lit, say the Book One of our text and leave it alone. Then local fellowships could each have their own version of the stories, even in English. This would also give us more product to sell at the WSO.

In C.A.R!!!!!!

Any and all changes need to "go out to the fellowship" and this will help with SOME of the dissenting opinions. We need to get permission and give notice... Give all a chance to input and we can feel better about the final decision. We have seen how decisions made on the floor of the WSC, without going out to the groups, can divide us. We need a consensus decision on most of what we do from now on at the group level.

Get WB working.

Now that we have a WB, get their internal guidelines done. Let us see how they are going to work so we can feel comfortable letting go of the need to control everything. They will have the best sense of what they can accomplish. If they create a system of checks and balances we can input along the way. Members who wish to may remain involved, will. We have changed the way we do business and now we need to look at our expectations. We also seem to work better with "drafts"... It brings out the squeaky wheels to work with.

Smaller W.B./World services team.

How much will they need to use members to do the work? Not being able to "Do it all" we will delegate the job to members closer to the issue. I always heard "the chair should not DO the work, rather they should DIRECT the work BEING done." At the WSC we generally feel we need to do the work there because we have the whole fellowship represented. We spent the money to show up, let's DANCE. The WE will have to direct more than they do. This will get more people closer to group level involved, which will give us accountability, visibility, and lead to greater trust.

How to make decisions

Consensus voting? What does that mean exactly? . . .Veto power by individual"all in favor or it doesn't pass" or "Without objection" we can allow for enough discussion and understanding to let even one member to stop the process. one member feels the action should not be taken we shouldn't move forward yet. No WB vote under model #3

EQUAL Del-WB representatives at WSC

We would want an equal representation from W.B. and Delegates to allow for FULL participation.

How elected? From Zone/Geographic local conferences? We need to develop service bodies that are comparable to each other. This will be difficult if we are going for numerical representation in a developing service body. Look at our SEATING process at the WSC now. How do we determine Cultural divisions? As always, we let them develop randomly by themselves. All we can do structurally is create temporary boundaries/limits in participation at WSC.

Cultural Diversity?

Just where is the line of autonomy and universal fellowship approval? It seems fairly arrogant to believe we know how to APPLY our message to all cultures. We know what works for us and even what has worked for many. Whenever a direction is imposed on addicts, they generally get defensive and uncooperative. We already allow all forms of diversity in our message. Within institutions around the world, HI has many different rules they need to utilize. The public views us in many lights also. For example, it is still dangerous and often against the law to have meetings in some countries.

Role of Zone/Geographic entity

Job Description: What do the above have the authority to do on there own.

Can they create, produce, and distribute Lit, service manuals, posters.. (?) that applies to them locally? The more we find we can do for ourselves... use ES&H of more local members... the more we will want to. How do they fit into the WSC? (see above)

A working relationship, or sense of community, is needed internally. We can only develop this with time being together. This will get us sending more qualified trusted servants to have more trust in them.

FIPT

Here we need to protect the copyrights and delineate Roles and responsibilities.

Our View of the Models:

Models	How many liked	
3	0	Still World fellowship business meeting
3.5	4	Some Universal methods i.e.;...Book 1, "approved lit" only some cultural diverse Book 2, Service application. Full meeting of WSC for some business of FELLOWSHIP approved items. AND sharing session. Less Direct services more Support, to those in need.
4	2	Not World Fellowship only sharing session

So as you can see we seem to fall on the model between 3&4. We like some business to be approved for the world fellowship. Most likely to give direction to the W.B. on projects. Then some sharing sessions to share ES&H. Get new ideas on how to carry message. We always work better with "suggestions" over "directives". NAWS is better served when we share ES&H of trusted servants over paper shuffling. We heard all of the DF members wanting visits over correspondences.

Closing/where do we go from here?

As you can see we see the need to move forward even with regions within MZF at different levels of acceptance. Although we have been meeting together as a group for over 7 years there has been a lot of new faces participating. The MWZ was fortunate to see the need for communication with their neighbors. We feel there is a lot WE can do for each other if we know the Experience Strength and Hope is available locally. We just need to know what we may do and how we fit in with the World fellowship. Our collective Higher Powers will guide us further to better help the still suffering addict.

In Service, MWZF

submitted by John H (WI)

Northern New England Region

From the RSR Working Group Policy Plan B “Zonal Representation” at the 92 WSC through the inventory leading to the passage of Resolution A and the four “geographic entities” models of the 97 WSC we've added to the number of seated Regions. At the 98 WSC we seated Regions both within and outside the United States. After identifying a concern have we done anything but theorize?

Resolution A talks of two primary parts-equitable representation and consensus based decision making. We feel the process may proceed like this- define the terms, help the Groups since it has been left to them to move on to the next step, come to consensus, and implement the new system

Northern New England (NNE) focused discussion on three topics. 1. Resolution A implementation given that it has passed. 2. Consensus- what does that mean? And 3. What is equitable representation? This paper is a result of those discussions. We also discussed the new service resumé “no one can lose by doing NA service” and that the relationship of the changes at the World level be the vehicle to Resolution A solutions. That now all addicts have a greater chance to serve directly at the World level instead of the old system of Group to Area to Region to World.

We (NNE) voted for Resolution A because it would allow the WSC to be more manageable; we support equal representation so the WSC is not so USA oriented. We would be comfortable giving up our seat knowing that the new system would still allow our voice.

A new system of decision making would encourage more discussion. These discussions of the issues allow for exchange of ideas without the acrimony that choosing sides on voting brings.

The above stance is only of those involved with the continuing process. How do we get more Groups and the addicts in those Groups to realize the-importance of being a Worldwide Fellowship? As much as has been written and shown in reports from RSRs, RDs, ASRs (we as yet have no RCMs) and GSRs, the Groups have a tough time to understand that they can LEAD on this. Also how does all this affect keeping the door open for the meeting, for the newcomer? They are asking for leadership from the Areas (and the Co-op in our Region), the Region, and the World levels of service.

We came up with some ideas for discussion which we feel, could lead to solutions. Equitable Representation - Group based and Region based conferences. There would be two types of conferences- The first would be made up of representatives with an equal number of Groups for each one and would meet every two years. The other would be based on geography, meet less often and give direction to the first on broad-based issues. (This is similar to 3. 5). Another idea would be just the second type with the suggestion of delegates from the US and one each from Canada, Mexico, America, Europe, Africa, and Asia Pacific. These numbers would be revisited and if needed changed every 10 years or so as the number of Groups change.

Consensus Based Decision Making- Does that mean no voting (we came to no consensus)? Our experience is Southern Maine Area, which uses unanimity to make decisions. If one Group disagrees a motion doesn't pass. Motions are discussed to improve them and passed when there is no rebuttal. As to Resolution A we feel we need to focus on practicality and efficiency (not hand cuff us so no decisions are made)

Finally we believe we all should work toward a goal not just talk about hypothetical implementation. NNE doesn't agree with the decision that no work group was charged with defining anything about where to go next and how to get there. And we have a question- Do we need a motion to have no motions?

Our goal is to focus on not just what is best for our Region but what is best for the Worldwide Fellowship as a whole and for those yet to come.

Show-Me Region

“Does anybody care?”

That was the question I had to ask the Regional Committee Members of my region after bringing up the topic for the third time and still getting no response. So I'll give you mine.

After attending my first World Service Conference, I must say I loved it. Being around so much clean time, so many people who care about NA as I do and so many different cultures. I can understand how some people would like to keep things the way they are. I must say as much as I enjoyed the World Service Conference, I had a feeling that there was so much more we could do. I at times felt somewhat guilty that my region had spent so much money and yet I still had to focus inordinate amounts of time on understanding parliamentary procedure. The purpose of this issue discussion is not to determine whether Resolution A is necessary, that has already been decided for us by the Composite Group and WSC '96.

I have focused on the idea presented by the Transition Group. That is that any action taken by the fellowship must be a grassroots effort. Under this ideal have asked myself “Is our region ready to turn over our vote to another service body?” When broached with that concept we have had mixed response. Some members feel that our voice will be heard, whether it be directly or indirectly. Other members feel that our region gains something by having a direct link to the World Service Conference. By being able to meet the person who was actually at the Conference and hear directly from them what took place, they feel more connected to World Services.

Of the four models being discussed I must say I like them all, because they all offer change and I know if nothing changes... nothing changes. While some members feel that because North America has the most members, it should control the issues discussed at the conference, I feel that our World Services Vision Statement offers some guidance in this area. That Vision Statement says among other things “Our vision is that one day every addict in the world has the chance to experience our message in his or her own language and culture and find opportunity for a new way of life.” One could argue that since NA started in North America, has the majority of groups in North America and has had the most number of representatives at the World Service Conference since its inception, that addicts in North America have a much better chance of experiencing our message, than addicts in one of the most populated countries in the world....India. By the line of thinking of our vision statement and the amount of resources currently available to the North American, shouldn't the countries with the greater population and smaller memberships being given more representation at the WSC?

I feel one possible way of implementing Resolution A is to start with Model One and work our way to Model Four. Model Four could be the answer, but we may never know unless we try to move in that direction. By implementing Model One, we are allowed the opportunity to keep conference from growing much more in the geographic entity where the most addicts already have the opportunity to hear the message of Narcotics Anonymous. Model One allows us the opportunity to get our feet wet and try something new and to hopefully realize that we can change. If the idea of these models sound scary, remember how scary the proposal passed at last year's conference sounded.

One of the arguments against models three and four are that they add another layer of service, but if you look at a lot of regions and their participation in zonal forums,

that layer has already been added. One reason this layer has been added is because regions weren't getting their needs met at the WSC. Perhaps if the WSC becomes what we want it to be, those layers would no longer be necessary. As for the regions that are afraid of losing the connection to the VVSC, perhaps we could still send representatives to observe and take part in discussion groups and provide some connection.

In closing, I would just like to ask, "How can we act spiritually in regards to Resolution A?" I think by surrendering, we practice faith, acceptance and hope, as well as promote unity. By holding onto meaningless votes we hold ourselves back and addicts suffer.

From the World Board

Overview

At the 1996 World Service Conference, participants adopted Resolution A, which states:

Resolution A: To approve *in principle* a change in participation at a new WSC to achieve the following objectives:

- 1. to reduce the total number of representatives;**
- 2. to provide for equal representation from all geographic entities; and**
- 3. to encourage a consensus-based decision-making process.**

Prior to the 1998 WSC, the Transition Group released a comprehensive report that described the history of world service actions leading up to, and following the adoption of Resolution A. That report included the conference's response to working group surveys at the 1997 WSC, which indicated that WSC participants were not prepared to provide definitive direction as to how to proceed with this issue.

After a lot of discussion within the full board and also within smaller action groups of its own, the World Board decided to offer some questions for participants at the 1999 World Service Conference regarding Resolution A to consider. In this sense, we don't really hope to offer answers or solutions to this ongoing dilemma. We only hope to perhaps redirect the conference's focus upon the original reasons for the creation of Resolution A.

Asking the right questions...?

The final *Resolution Group Report* that accompanied the resolutions in the 1996 *Conference Agenda Report* indicated three primary areas of change for the new WSC: (1) the creation of "geographic entities" that would be represented at the new WSC; (2) the need for re-focusing the present World Service Conference's micromanaging "business" orientation to one of more "conceptual" orientation, addressing "matters of strategic direction and long-range planning"; and (3) the issue of fellowship representatives and their changing role within a new WSC, as well as the need for a more "global" representation of NA members worldwide. One can see these ideas reflected in the wording of Resolution A itself that was adopted in 1996.

In response to the RG's actions, the Transition Group developed four models for a new WSC which the conference considered during WSC '97. In essence, we believe that the conference has been stuck at comparing models, and in the process we all may have forgotten the initial reasons for the Resolution A proposal. We need to put the TG's models aside for the time being, and take a step back to examine the original problems with the conference that became the purpose of proposing Resolution A in the first place. Another difficulty with simply comparing the TG's models may be that doing so does not allow us the opportunity to really brainstorm about and develop a vision of what we hope our future world services and World Service Conference to be.

This situation is further complicated by the fact that the RG's final report did not clearly identify the problems or issues which Resolution A was formulated to specifically address. Yet a quick review of the Composite Group's final report helps to shed some light on this matter. Briefly, the identified problems can be divided into three categories: (1) lengthy and contentious business sessions which overshadowed any other concerns during the conference week; (2) a lack of truly "worldwide" representation; and (3) the need for the conference to be more uniformly focused upon common goals and long-

range planning instead of micromanaging individual projects and conference boards' and committees' work.

These three categories themselves, however, beg a series of questions, both about Resolution A, as well as about the Transition Group's models. Is the way in which we do business one of our biggest problems? If so, how do any of the proposed solutions address that issue? With the adoption of the World Services Vision Statement and the WSC Mission Statement, do we still feel that we lack a common purpose for the WSC and World Services? How might the new Unified Budget process help us to plan more effectively and have longer range discussions? What changes to our conference could we implement right now without a full-scale adoption of Resolution A's three mandates and/or any of the TG's models? Is the idea of an "evolution" process for the WSC one that we might subscribe to?

One of the board's first questions, then, is this: "Does Resolution A really address the original problems surrounding the World Service Conference identified in the world services inventory project?" We believe that there are more options to be explored on this issue, and we would like to pose some questions that may assist us all in getting a little further down the road to creating a system that will service us now and in the future.

Are Fewer Participants Better?

In retrospect, it is also clear that one of the underlying assumptions that supported the RG's original creation of Resolution A was that a WSC with fewer participants would be preferable to our present WSC, because fewer people could more reasonably hold discussions without requiring a more formalized "business session" to maintain control and decorum. Yet it may also be true that a decrease in numbers is not necessarily the answer to our troublesome business sessions. Instead, it could be that emphasizing the "consensus-based" decision-making aspect of Resolution A might potentially reduce the "parliamentary gymnastics" that has characterized our WSC business sessions in the past, and therefore might cause us fewer worries about the actual number of participants present at the conference.

Another of the World Board's questions is this: Is it true that a smaller number of participants is necessarily better for discussion? Given that the history of our conference is one primarily of business sessions, how would we know whether conceptual discussion is impossible in a larger body without having tried it first?

Form Follows Function

During previous WSCs, a former trusted servant often said, "form follows function." So we believe that another crucial question that must be addressed is this: "What function or series of functions do we anticipate for the new WSC?" One of the real difficulties here is that the models (One through Four) that the Transition Group offered to the conference in 1997 seem to have become our sole focus, even though they were never meant to have been prescriptive. Rather, the TG offered those models in order to provide the conference with some choices of general direction toward which we might steer the WSC in the future. It may be that we have become too focused upon those models and their accompanying details.

The adoption of Resolution A seemed to clearly indicate that we believe a substantial change is desirable for our present World Service Conference. Yet until we have defined the scope and nature of our new conference, as well as its new operational principles and guidelines, how can we really know if the conference needs to be business

or discussion oriented, how numerous its participants will be, where they will be elected from, and how they (or we) will fund their participation? Let's not become so focused upon the merits or liabilities of each of the TG's models that we forget the very real difficulties facing the WSC, and that those models were offered simply to provide a direction for the future in order to address some of those difficulties.

Zonal Representation at the WSC?

Zonal forums have become productive service bodies in parts of the world, as a number of regional delegates indicated during WSC '98. Yet there are really two separate issues to consider here regarding zones. On the one hand, the WSC itself has formally recognized the value of zones in helping to connect addicts in various parts of the world in ways that our present regions have been unable to accomplish.

On the other hand, with regard to Resolution A, zones have become connected with the resolution's declaration of the need for more "equal representation" at the conference. In fact, the TG's Model Three recommended zonal representation for the conference. The World Board neither endorses nor opposes zonal representation—we believe that decision is for our members to affirm or deny. The WSC has already acknowledged zonal forums as bona fide and valuable entities with regard to fellowship development—yet there is a dilemma facing some NA communities who are separated by large distances and have limited resources.

These communities would like to see zonal representation and cost equalization become a reality at the World Service Conference in order to ease the burden placed upon their available resources associated with attending the WSC. They still wish to be able to fully participate in the conference, but feel the pinch of their limited resources. In any decision that we eventually make regarding representation at the conference, we would do well to remember that not all NA communities around the world enjoy abundant human and financial resources, but we all wish desperately to belong and to participate.

Two questions we might want to consider regarding zones are (1) how can we further support what our zones are accomplishing in furthering our primary purpose and fellowship development, and (2) how this support may or may not relate to representation issues at the WSC. It doesn't seem as though we have really taken the time to discuss this issue among our fellowship. And that, we think, is of serious concern if we ever hope to move forward deliberately and with some sureness of purpose on this issue.

The other question that accompanies zonal representation is of course the much-talked-about issue of adding another tier to a service structure which has already been characterized at the world services meetings in both Manhattan Beach, California and Providence, Rhode Island, as well as at the 1997 and 1998 World Service Conferences, as being too far removed from our membership already. Here are some more questions that we might ask ourselves: Are we as a fellowship prepared to send fewer representatives to the WSC and still fund the services provided by world services? Will we be even harder pressed to support our local services if there were a new level of service added to our service structure? We may indeed be ready for these changes, but we may want to ask our members first if they think it's a good idea.

Cost Equalization

Another issue that has received some attention in the Resolution A discussions has been the idea of cost equalization funding for conference participants—the idea being that with fewer of us, we can more readily distribute the overall cost and help offset some of the

more costly travel expenses of certain participants to the WSC. Again, this sounds like a great idea—but is it? And how would we accomplish it? These and similar questions are in fact overshadowed by the larger question of “What do we hope to achieve by utilizing cost equalization?” A smaller WSC? More “equitable” representation? We have so many unanswered questions, it’s little wonder that we may feel overwhelmed by, and seemingly deadlocked at, proceeding further with Resolution A.

Conclusion

We have a lot to talk about, and it looks like it’s going to take some time to really get at the issues wrapped up in Resolution A. But here, we think, are some really important questions that we’re going to have to discuss together if we desire to make progress on this issue:

- 1. How does Resolution A really address the original problems regarding the World Service Conference identified in the world services inventory project?**
- 2. What function or series of functions do we anticipate for the new WSC?**
- 3. Do we believe that a discussion-based WSC is preferable to a business-oriented WSC?**
- 4. What will we accomplish if we eliminated business sessions altogether from the conference?**
- 5. Is it true that a smaller number of participants is necessarily better for discussion?**
- 6. What does “equal” representation actually mean to conference participants?**
- 7. How does Resolution A address the issue of dysfunctional business sessions, as identified in the inventory?**
- 8. Does Resolution A address the issue of the lack of long-range conference vision and the need for global strategic planning identified in the inventory?**
- 9. What can we accomplish with zones and with zonal representation in furthering our primary purpose that we cannot accomplish with our present system?**
- 10. Are zones and the WSC’s regionally based representation necessarily in conflict?**
- 11. Might we not have both zones *and* our present system, just as we do now, and keep the issue of representation at the WSC separate from the obvious good that zones are already accomplishing?**
- 12. Are we as a fellowship prepared to send fewer representatives to the WSC and still fund the services provided by world services?**
- 13. What do we hope to achieve by utilizing cost equalization?**
- 14. Is Resolution A the best way to implement cost equalization?**
- 15. What are the benefits of our WSC remaining “globally” oriented and unified? Are there other benefits to our fellowship subdividing into smaller (perhaps continental) conferences?**
- 16. Do we all have the same understanding of the phrase “consensus-based decision-making?”**

These are tough questions, and we hope they’ll steer us toward productive discussion at this year’s WSC. We offer them simply in the spirit of helping us all at least begin this discussion process regarding Resolution A in April. While we may not be able to answer all of these questions at the conference, the input from our groups, areas, and

regions will help us to begin to frame the most important questions regarding Resolution A for the future.

<p>IMPROVING FELLOWSHIP COMMUNICATION DISCUSSION PAPERS</p>
--

The following papers have been developed by conference participants for discussion at WSC '99. The topics were prioritized by conference participants at WSC '98.

Note: All issue discussion papers have been typed into this document exactly as they were received at the World Service Office. The paper from the Colombia Region has been translated to English.

BLANK PAGE

Mauricio A, Colombia RSC Chair

At the beginning of the current period, after our 9th Regional Service Conference (April 1998 to March 1999), we wrote to all the groups and areas in the region, informing them about the new structure of the regional committee and of the initial plans for development, and requested for updates of their groups, meeting times, trusted servants, membership, and the contact information of their contact, with the purpose of initiating a dialog and exchange of experiences and resources. Of the 58 groups we tried contacting, only 16 responded with their information.

It has been a painful and ominous custom of ours, specifically of our groups, to not maintain communications that are active nor consistent, amongst ourselves, much less with other areas or regions. We don't even communicate when some level of service solicits a response from the groups for something required by the fellowship, for example, motions for the regional or world service conferences, or written articles for our publications (magazine), or ideas or opinions about some specific theme. We don't even have the custom of preparing issues or topics in a timely or meticulous manner to better serve (the) speakers of our regional conventions.

It has generally been individual members, almost always trusted servants, or "strong personalities" who carry out these needs, which almost never result in a collective conscience of the groups, since our meeting formats, most of the time do not allow for time to discuss common interest issues if they do not have to do with one's personal experience oriented towards the newcomer and about the way we stay clean on a daily basis outside of NA.

Also, when it comes to the groups' service meetings, workshops, and forums, very few persons attend, usually it's the same "personalities" that end up doing all the service work. It's almost as if the traditions (the 5th one) and the suggested meeting formats in the Group Booklet hinder our being able to "create" a way of speaking and exchanging ideas regarding other issues, different from the experience of having used drugs, having found NA and how it is that we stay clean.

I do not ignore that the newcomer needs the empathy that such sharing offers, and that our only and primary purpose is precisely that. Nonetheless, if we do not establish in our groups, the only place where we are all together every day, an open and varied dialog in which along with the priority of sharing recovery, we can deal with issues of general interest to NA as a whole, not as "announcements" at the end of every meeting, when we are all getting ready to abandon the room, but rather as an "important time" in the middle of our regular recovery meetings or even at the beginning of these, then we should resign ourselves to continuing our slow and isolated growth. We should resign ourselves to a continued loss of interest and continuity of our members, even that of so many newcomers that we cannot seem to "keep" as regular members, since rarely are they informed of or kept current with other issues or topics that undoubtedly are also a part of one's personal recovery and that would probably interest and involve them in simple tasks of service, study, and keeping notes/writing. We should resign ourselves to continue (making/creating/shaping) mediocre trusted servants, who are only willing to carry out their duties according to the path of least resistance, solely willing to open "their group" in a monotonous manner, every day, without any concern for studying the principles, practicing them, and "communicating" these to their group and to the rest of

the levels of service, and incapable due to “1000 reasons and justifications” to involve themselves in tasks that support NA as a whole, or tolerate or stimulate others to learn about service (sponsorship). We will continue having “famous and powerful personalities” and know it all like the GSR’s of our groups, who are not strong branches of the great NA service tree, through whom the sap of (willingness/good will) and communication can run through. We will continue not writing, nor exchanging letters, nor articles nor participation efforts, nor (publishing) the points of views that arise from our collective conscience.

Today, on unity day, and hopefully all the days to come, let us all reflect, even those arriving for the first time to NA, and remember the simple principle that our symbol (the pyramid) illustrates: “The greater the base (goodwill/willingness) as we grow in unity in numbers and in fellowship, the broader the sides of the pyramid, (Self, God, Society, Service) and the higher the point of freedom.”

Freestate Region

I believe that we have already begun to take some significant steps to improve fellowship communication. Some of the ideas in the guide to local service, such as direct delegate contact with GSRs, and downsizing the regional level of service, will help improve communications with the GSRs and groups. The trend toward issue discussion at the WSC should also foster greater input and discussion throughout the fellowship. In addition to these areas of potential future growth the action taken at WSC 98 to simplify the world service structure and reduce the number of projects will make it much easier for delegates to explain world service issues to GSRs with limited experience.

Our region has begun to hold regional assemblies this year, and I believe this has been an effective way to get information directly to GSRs instead of filtering it through two or three levels of structure. At one assembly GSRs were asked if they were aware of world service information that had been passed on at the RSC and most were not. GSRs seem to be much more receptive to world service communications at an assembly focused on this rather than getting information mixed in with many other local and regional issues, and put out during the flurry of activity and business at area service committees. Direct access to the regional delegate also allows for more thorough explanation of unclear issues and answers to specific questions. Direct GSR participation in *CAR* workshops and voting gives those who participate a greater sense of ownership, belonging, and belief that their voice, and the voice of their group is heard and has an influence. The biggest down side of our regional assemblies is lack of attendance. We have been getting 20-30 GSRs out of approximately 700 groups. This is in comparison with about 100 groups who vote on the *CAR* and send in tally sheets. My goal is to get at least the 100 groups who care enough to vote to show up for the regional assemblies. Our assemblies have been established and scheduled, and the challenge now is to build attendance.

I also believe that one of the most effective tools for improving fellowship communication is issue discussion. We had a time of issue discussion at our august regional assembly and it went surprisingly well. GSRs were very receptive to the idea of thorough discussion instead of simply motions, pros cons, and voting. GSRs actively participated in the discussion of world service issues and had solid input. I believe everybody who attended felt heard and as though what they shared was important and would influence NA worldwide. I look forward to more issue discussion oriented cars. I believe GSRs will be much more interested in participating in workshops on one or two well defined, well thought-out, and prepared topics, rather than our current workshops on 50-60 scattered, confused, and sometimes poorly explained motions, going in several different directions at once.

We have opened the door to this kind of *CAR* by passing the transition groups proposals at WSC 98. As a result of downsizing to one board all the motions from that board should be linear and headed in the same direction towards the same goal (our vision statement). If the regions will cooperate and not deluge the WSC with motions we should have the most user friendly *CAR* ever this year. The new structure will also be much easier to explain to new GSRs than the old system. We can't communicate with GSRs if we can't get them to workshops and if we can't explain the structure in a way that they can understand. Shorter more focused, and less divisive *Conference Agenda Reports* should result in more pleasant workshops that GSRs can understand and want to

attend service at all levels should be pleasant, encouraging and help people feel a part of, not divide them into opposing pros and cons over micro-managing motions. However, if this is the direction we are headed we need to be constantly mindful of and respectful towards the verbal input we receive. If we, in the service structure, do not want to be bound by specific. Restrictive guidelines and motions we need to be extremely vigilant about hearing, responding to, and heeding the general verbal direction we receive. This calls for tremendous integrity on the part of those who serve in positions of trust and leadership.

I believe we are headed in the right direction and look forward to more issue discussion and fewer motions. The day when I attend a *CAR* workshop with 2 or 3 motions on long term projects with adequate, informed, and thorough explanation and discussion will be a vast improvement over the years of endless, contradictory, repetitive, and frustrating motions that have led many a GSR to not participate in the conference agenda. My vision is that one-day we will get adequate attendance at a regional assembly where GSRs will feel supported and encouraged enough to participate in the discussions. As a result of feeling heard and a part of hopefully GSRs will be able to encourage their groups to be supportive of the consensus we arrive at. Hopefully these assemblies will lead to a fellowship that can solidly support a structure that they have clearly set the general direction for.

In service to NA and a loving God

Eric H., Delegate, Freestate Region

The Minnesota Region

The Internet:

Introduction: The Problems

Staying in touch with “the issues” has always been a large problem within our fellowship. When it comes to world services, historically our communication method through the year has been one way, from boards and committees to the regional delegates. The communication vehicle typically has been paper reports sent through the mail. The only way for the delegates to effectively communicate with world services has been to gather all of the regional delegates together at the WSC for a week, once a year to give feedback, direction, and make decisions on key issues. This has caused several process and procedural problems that are not easily overcome without increased dialogue through the year.

The communication process looks like this:

1. World services guesses at the level of detail the fellowship needs to be reported on issues and activities. (This is difficult since each individual wants a different level of detail.)
2. The delegates are barraged with information, minutes and reports throughout the year.
3. The delegates have little opportunity to interact with world services or each other during the year.
4. The delegates discuss the issues presented in the *Conference Agenda Report* in the vacuum of their individual regions without the perspective of any other region.
5. At the WSC, the delegates come together, not knowing each other or what anyone else thinks about the specific issues.
6. In one week, the delegates must meet each other, form a “community”, grasp the issues, understand the perspectives of other regions, factor all this into what is best for NA, and vote.

WSC Timeframe

Conference participants have consistently reaffirmed a desire to move to a more discussion based WSC meeting. However, in the current system, there is simply not enough time to have effective dialogue during the WSC. The meeting only lasts for a week and there is so much to get done within this limitation that we always seem to fall into the hurry up, limited discussion, 3 pro/3 con, motion-based debate.

The pace of the discussion also makes translations difficult. Translating materials in real-time during the conference itself is problematic at best. Currently, Spanish is the only language for which translation is provided, and that is for solely spoken words. Written documents provided at the conference cannot be translated due to their sheer volume.

Lack of Trust

There is a lack of trust built into our current system. After all, we don't know each other. And those of us who happen to know each other are perceived as being in a clique. This lack of trust makes processes and procedures difficult at the conference itself, because several delegates act in an obstructionist fashion out of perceived fear. One of those fears

is that they don't have any idea of how the conference as a whole feels about the issue at hand.

For example, motion A. is moved and seconded. Three delegates speak pro and three delegates speak con. Everyone speaks passionately and several individuals start jumping through parliamentary hoops. They amend the motion. They object to consideration. They move to table. They ask inappropriate questions, manipulating an extension of debate. They move to split the question, and then amend it again. They call the question. All of this takes a frustrating hour or so and when we finally get to the vote, it is something like 7-yes, and 85-no,

What a colossal waste of time and money. All of this occurred because the delegates didn't have any idea of what the "sense" of the conference was. The reason that they didn't have this "sense" is that no effective dialogue occurred before the formal business session. Everyone walked into the conference essentially blind, and the majority were unprepared. If the delegates had a clear indication of what the decision would be, they could have dispensed with the motion easily. A couple of delegates would have spoken to the pros and cons of the motion, they would have voted and moved on. This would have saved time for the really difficult issues where a clear majority isn't present. If the conference is split, or the majority of delegates don't have a clear conscience on an issue, that is a motion that needs to be discussed at length. We should save our time for the "big" and complex issues,

Possible Solutions:

More Interim Meetings

We have tried to increase the opportunity for discussion and feedback by holding "quarterly" meetings midway through the conference cycle. This helps, but the problem with mid-year meetings, is that they are typically held in the United States, and the fellowship outside the U.S. generally can't come. It is just too expensive and cost-prohibitive. Since only North American delegates are able to meet at these long working weekends, the conference tends to retain its United States focus. The delegates from outside the U.S. often feel like visitors at the WSC, and it takes a great deal of time and energy for them to understand the issues which they are being asked to decide.

Conference Calls

If all the delegates could have a weekly conference call to discuss the issues and propose new initiatives that would go along way toward getting to know each other, getting to trust each other, and getting a "sense" of how the delegates as a whole feel on the issues. Obviously, this is impractical, as it would be too expensive. Besides getting 100 people on a conference call from 24 different time zones would be chaos.

E-mail Discussion

There is a communication method that works much like a conference call. It is called an e-mail discussion forum. This is how it works: Forum members send "letters" to an address. Then a computer copies the "letters" and sends them to all forum members. Since all this happens with computers and e-mail over the internet, the messages are sent and received within hours, usually within minutes. It doesn't matter if the sender and receiver live in the same town or are half way around the world. E-mail arrives in about the same amount of time. Since the mail arrives so quickly and it is sent to all members simultaneously, it creates the feeling of being in a large room with everyone talking, and

yet each member can clearly understand and review the input of every other member who is talking.

NA-Admin: An Online Discussion Forum

NA has been on-line since the middle eighties. In the last five years several of these discussion forums have been created. A Spanish NA on-line discussion in South America was started in the last year, and in Minnesota a local discussion list, NA-MN came on-line in November of 1998.

The lists that have had the greatest impact are NA-L and NA-Admin. NA-L is a forum or "list server" for discussion of personal recovery in Narcotics Anonymous. The subscribers of NA-Admin discuss service-related issues within NA. The membership to these forums has grown over the years, and members have come and gone. There are currently about 150 subscribers to NA-L and around 200 subscribers to NA-Admin.

NA-Admin is the forum related to service, so that is the forum we are using as a model in this paper. This communication tool has kept the delegates from Minnesota connected to the other delegates in the forum and well informed regarding different aspects and perspectives of the issues. It has been helpful during the Inventory/Resolution/Transition process to get feedback throughout the year from individuals with a lot of varied service experience. It has been beneficial to hear the perspective of those who disagree. Ongoing discussion makes the complexity of some of these issues much more understandable.

This e-mail discussion forum is totally open. The structure is based on anarchy, "a utopian society made up of individuals who have no government and who enjoy complete freedom."¹ Anyone may subscribe and anyone may "post." Posting means sending a message to all of the other members of the forum. The discussion is completely uncensored. This is important, because it is directly related to the integrity of the debate. It doesn't matter how "extreme" a position is, in NA-Admin we all must defend everyone's right to speak. There are no rules for content. All topics are fair game. Everyone can "talk," and everyone may "listen," but no one is forced to "listen." If individuals are not interested in reading about a particular subject, they may delete the message without reading it if they wish.

This method of conversation is remarkably creative. Members post questions or descriptions of problems and get immediate feedback from all over the world. Some of the topics have been:

Theft of fellowship funds, PI radio interviews, Violence in meetings, the FIPT, History of the Basic Text, H&I issues, Local literature development, GSR Assemblies, Motions in the *CAR*, etc. The discussion is often quite productive and helpful. That makes all the effort worthwhile.

NA-Admin's Shortcomings

Having an unmoderated forum does not come without a price however. Sometimes the discussion turns into a free for all. Personal attacks can happen and often do. Unsubstantiated rumors and allegations are easily suggested. Unfortunately, when there is no personal accountability, it is easy for personalities to come before principles. NA-Admin continuously struggles with this balance. The individual members often call on

¹ Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary

each other to get back to “principles before personalities.” Amends are made when necessary, and the long-term members have grown to love and respect one another even though they have basic fundamental differences on many issues. Friendships have grown despite the fact that the individuals have never met face to face.

In Summary:

- Communication is almost immediate.
- Information is distributed quickly and easily.
- It is a totally open forum.
- The structure is based on anarchy.
- There are no rules for content.
- It is creative.
- The forum is informal and unofficial.
- Everyone can talk at the same time.
- Everyone may “talk.”
- Everyone may can listen.
- Nobody is forced to listen.
- Sometimes personalities come before principles.

Proposal: A New E-mail Discussion Forum for WSC Participants

We are proposing that the conference begin an “official” e-mail forum for WSC participants. Ideally, it would include all participants of the WSC including: Delegates, Alternates, World Board Members, Human Resource Panel Members, and WSC Co-Facilitators. These would be all of the discussion participants who could “post”, or send e-mail to the list recipients. Other NA members could be part of the “gallery” by receiving the postings, but would not be allowed to contribute directly. They could express their thoughts by asking their regional delegate to post an e-mail in the forum.

We are not proposing this as a replacement for any meetings, conference calls or communication mechanisms that currently exist, but only as an addition, an amplification of delegate interaction.

Ongoing Discussion

This type of forum would continue the valuable discussions that begin at the WSC meeting, extending it through the months between conference meetings. Essentially, it would duplicate the current WSC meeting with the participants being able to “speak at the microphone” or “post” in the forum and the gallery being allowed to listen quietly in the back or “receive e-mail.” This medium would be used for discussion only. Decisions would not be made. Motions would not be passed or failed. However, preliminary motions that might be made at an upcoming WSC meeting could be discussed quite effectively.

Minimal Cost

The cost to NA world services for a communication vehicle like this is minimal. Actually, it is close to zero. The software is free and available to the public. Many internet service providers offer e-mail discussion list-servers as a standard feature, included in their

subscription rates. The forum administrator could be pulled from the world pool. The functions required for such a job are almost purely technical and clerical.

Increased international Participation

We believe that participation from regions outside the U.S. would increase since the cost of a basic computer and Internet access is much less than travel costs. There would also be more access to regular dialogue throughout the year, making everyone more prepared to discuss the issues efficiently at the conference itself. The language barrier will be there of course. It always is when the issue is international communication. Translations in this forum would be the responsibility of each participant. Since the translations won't have to be done immediately, they will be a little easier to accomplish. In addition, given the time, many participants can read a foreign language much better than they can speak it.

This forum would also provide a better connection to the NA service structure for geographically isolated regions. It is difficult for some regions to attend the WSC because it is too expensive and their population is so sparse that they even have problems getting together for an RSC. In 1998, Montana, Alaska, etc. were not present. The importance of their voices is not diminished however, they would be able to be heard more easily in a discussion like this.

Not For Everyone

When the forum is first implemented, there will not be 100% participation. We estimate from the WSC list of e-mail addresses that approximately 35% of conference participants currently have internet access. That will increase in the future, and as the value of this discussion forum becomes more evident, it will probably increase at a dramatic rate.

This forum is exclusionary. Each participant must have access to a computer and the skills to access the internet. The good news is that you don't have to own a computer to get on the internet. E-mail accounts can be acquired for free and internet access is available in libraries, cafes and kiosks all over the world. During this last year John C., an NA member, has been traveling around Europe, Africa, and India. Every week or so he would send an email out to several members just to keep everyone informed about his journey. Istanbul, Nairobi, Bombay, John found ways to send email from almost everywhere.

Using the Internet isn't nearly as difficult or expensive as it once was. Although everyone won't be involved at first, we don't think it is necessary to wait until every delegate can participate before we start. We believe that any step that we can take to increase interaction and close the feeling of separation is a step in the right direction.

Dialogue Between Regional Delegates

Rather than merely receiving information one-way from the World Board, its committees, the Human Resources Panel and the Co-Facilitators, this discussion mechanism would encourage dynamic dialogue on the issues. Regular interaction creates trust. This type of forum will allow conference participants to get to know each other and develop relationships. It will also provide a broader perspective of what NA is like in other parts of the world. What works in Minnesota might not have any value at all in Columbia or Singapore. On the other hand, an idea from Japan might very well make a lot of sense in our local communities, we just haven't heard of it yet. This forum would make it much easier to get that kind of experience, strength and hope.

Dialogue With NA World Services

Regular interaction between the regional delegates and world service trusted servants is also a possibility in this medium. This could go a long way toward increasing the trust level between the regional delegates and world services leadership. We believe that much of the mistrust is created because we have little or no free, frank, open and honest discussion from the World Service trusted servants. Without the rest of the Fellowship being brought into the decision making process, it appears a cabal, an elite few, is making decisions behind closed doors, ruling by fiat. But the lack of trust flows in both directions.

Increased Trust in World Services Leadership

Because there are individuals who appear to be out to “score points” at the expense of the world service leadership, trusted servants are naturally reluctant to be open and vulnerable to criticism. To be open requires a high degree of maturity and recovery as well as an extremely thick skin. It's extraordinarily difficult for one to be the recipient of a constant barrage of personal, venomous attacks without having one's ego react. Since lashing back is futile, it seems that trusted servants choose to protect themselves by avoiding candid expression of positions with all but those they clearly identify as their allies.

For this proposal to have real meaning, the individual members of the World Board, would need to be active, vocal participants in the deliberations. The evolution of opinion on the myriad of issues could take place in front of the entire online Fellowship. Trust can be earned as we watch first hand the way World Board members respond to input from the regional delegates. By discussing the concepts and issues before motions are even crafted, we may be able to dispense with a lot of the “choosing up of sides” that we seem to have gotten used to.

We think this unprecedented level of openness is certainly in line with the direction our fellowship needs to go. With the downsizing of NA world services, enhanced access to leadership would increase everyone's comfort level and improve fellowship trust. This access would definitely need to be balanced with the amount of time required by world service trusted servants to respond in this forum. World Board members are volunteers after all.

Varied Discussion Topics

The topics of discussion will be varied. The content will be determined by what is important to the participants. Rather than simply submitting discussion papers in the *CAR*, like we do now, topics can also be discussed in a dynamic fashion throughout the conference cycle. A delegate might bring up an idea for a possible WS project. That project could then be discussed and a clear proposal developed. A region might be having a particular problem they need help with, or another region might have a success story to share.

Regional motions could be posted in the forum and discussed informally. The maker could get experience, strength and hope as well as a “sense” of what the other delegates think about the motion. If there are particular problems with the motion, they could be fixed before it is submitted to the *CAR*. The participants can also help each other research policies that may be affected by particular motions. This would save a great deal of time at the conference because fewer motions would need to be amended. If there is not much support for the idea, it could be discussed at length and the region could decide whether it should even be submitted in the *CAR*. This would also better prepare

the regional delegates by providing background information to the NA members in their local regions to make their regional assemblies more effective.

A Kinder Gentler E-mail Forum

The participants will naturally be polite to each other, because they will need to work together for a week face to face. In theory, the forum would be self-policing. What we mean by that is that if individuals become abusive for some reason, the other members would point that out to him or her. Assuming we bring our recovery to service, members would make immediate amends when they are faced with their own short-comings and character defects. Of course, if by chance a debate got out of hand, one of the WSC Co-Facilitators could step in to mediate. Further, it is a lot easier to send an e-mail than it is to stand at the microphone and speak in a room of more than 300 people. Many delegates who would never speak at the conference might participate actively in a discussion via e-mail.

Conference Participants Only

Only conference participants would be allowed to post, so we might suggest that they sign their e-mail with their name, position and region or world service position. This would be necessary in order to maintain some semblance of order in the discussion. Just as members of the fellowship can sit quietly in the gallery and listen at the world service conference meeting, anyone may observe online while the conference participants discuss the issues that they are facing in their individual regions and the world as a whole.

Training

An interesting by-product of this forum could be training. It is scary for delegates and alternates when they come to their first world service conference. It is intimidating by its sheer size and they don't know what to expect. Some of the issues are complex and it is difficult to keep up with the discussion. Rather than approaching the WSC with nervous foreboding, new delegates and alternates will feel more "a part of." With the increased familiarity they have received during the discussions, they can look forward to meeting their new friends face to face. As NA members follow the e-mail discussion from the "gallery," they could get good background to help prepare them for service as a regional delegate. Hopefully, more NA members will want to get involved and the result will be more qualified and better prepared representatives.

In Summary:

- Communication, almost immediate.
- Information distributed quickly and easily.
- Relatively inexpensive.
- Only conference participants can "talk."
- The gallery can still listen.
- Participants can get to know each other.
- Participants can get a broader perspective.
- Content determined by participants.
- Creative
- Self-policing.
- A "sense" of WSC conscience.

- Straw polling could be an option.
- Better, clearer and more effective motions.
- The participants can research WS policies.

Conclusion

There are those who will say that this forum excludes some members of the fellowship. That is true. A delegate requires a computer or at least internet access in order to participate. There was a time however when the majority of the fellowship did not even have a telephone. Now it is almost impossible to be an effective trusted servant without one (although it can be done). Computers and the Internet are just like the telephone used to be. We must begin sometime and we believe that time has arrived.

Technology and the Internet are making the world a smaller place. We look forward to the time when access to information is more equal. The answers to questions can be a mere click away on a web page by anyone in the fellowship. Addicts from all around the world can share their experience, strength and hope and get immediate feedback. Our hope is that as a fellowship we can use this technology to come together in more effective ways, that some day we can finish old discussions, that we won't have to go over the same ground over and over. We believe that we can heal old wounds, that we can unite as a spiritual fellowship and move forward into the next century as one. There are too many addicts who need our message of recovery.

From the World Board

Overview

The world services inventory process showed us all that the way we communicate in our fellowship needs improving. For example, perhaps one of the greatest ironies of this particular discussion paper is that, although we are talking about the important issue of improving fellowship communications here and trying to reach “the fellowship” with this information, the reality is that only about 10% of our members will even be aware that this paper exists! The ways in which we are able to get information out to all our members is one area that can use improvement.

Even though the inventory revealed the importance of fellowship communications, their workloads prevented both the Resolution Group and the Transition Group from ever making any substantial recommendations on this issue. Yet, as our Eighth Concept makes very clear, “Our service structure depends upon the integrity and effectiveness of our communications.” The World Services Fellowship Development Plan has as one of its goals to improve world services communication. When the World Board looked at all of the challenges facing us, we all agreed that improving communications was our number one priority over the coming year. In order to accomplish this, we recently formed a Communications Task Force that will examine ways in which we can improve our communications throughout the fellowship.

Providing Information and Services

A basic understanding of why we communicate in the first place seems essential to our discussions about such a crucial issue as fellowship communications. One way to break this complicated subject down into a manageable discussion is to think of why we have created and maintained a service structure in the first place. The answer to that question can be reduced, in the end, to a simple idea: the purpose of the service structure of NA is simply to provide information and services so that we can better carry the message of recovery to the addict who still suffers.

Thinking of communication in light of this purpose takes much of the confusion away from the whys and hows of our communication, and places emphasis upon what we need to be communicating about most of the time. On the one hand, we need to communicate what information and materials we need to help us carry the message and to recover, at all levels of service. For example, groups seek literature and service support from their areas, and areas seek various kinds of support from their regions. At these levels, we seem collectively to communicate our needs to the service structure more or less successfully.

What do we hope to accomplish through fellowship communications? The answer is pretty simple: developing the necessary materials, information, and services necessary to carry our message as effectively as possible, and then delivering them to where they are needed in order to better fulfill our primary purpose.

Please Help Us Do A Better Job

There is a perceived breakdown in the communication chain when we begin to discuss world services’ response to our growing fellowship’s needs. Perhaps one of the things we need to discuss is our groups’, areas’, and regions’ ability to communicate their needs to world services: are there effective means for such communication? Are our members

utilizing those means? How can we better improve our members' ability and opportunity to make their needs known to world services? Perhaps most importantly, how can we improve our services so that our members' faith in world services can be heightened? How can we do a better job so that our members will be better assured that they are being heard and that their needs will be responded to?

Once again, the keyword here is dialogue. As we told you earlier, we have created a Communications Task Force that will begin to explore a number of ways to improve our communications over the coming months. Yet, in the meantime, we do have some questions that we hope all our members can discuss in CAR workshops, and send their input to us at the conference in April. Here are some of those questions: What kinds of communications in the past (for example, reports, periodicals, letters, and so forth) have been effective in getting information to our members? Is there consistency in world services reporting? Have there been any working groups, boards, or committees whose reporting was memorably successful? Does your group feel as though it has an open and reliable channel to world services? Are world services communications reaching you in a timely fashion? Should world services translate all of our reports and periodicals? How many languages (given our resource constraints) are appropriate for such translations?

Fellowship Communications: A Two-Way Street

One of the things you will continue to hear the World Board emphasize in our reports is the ongoing need to foster and maintain an honest and open dialogue between world services and the fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous. We are unanimously committed to responding to your needs for information and services so that we can best ensure the ongoing fulfillment of our programs' primary directive—to carry the message of recovery to the addict who still suffers.

Yet, in the end, any discussion that we have about fellowship communications must examine both sides of this dialogue—world services' duty to respond to our fellowship's needs is one half of this equation, but it may be that we also need to examine our members' duty to let our service structure know their needs. As our First Tradition tells us, our common welfare is what we must emphasize. Perhaps the discussion of our Eight Concept in the booklet *Twelve Concepts for NA Service* best reinforces this emphasis: "Our fellowship's service structure is founded on the unity of our groups; to maintain that union, we must have regular communications throughout Narcotics Anonymous. Together, our groups have created a service structure to meet their common needs and to help them fulfill their common purpose. The effectiveness of the service structure depends on the continued unity of the NA groups, and on their continued support and direction. These things can only be maintained in an atmosphere of honest, open, and straightforward communications among all parties concerned".

Questions For Review

Here are some of the questions raised in this issue discussion paper that you may wish to discuss in your home group, CAR workshops, Issue Discussion workshops, areas, and regions:

- 1. Are there effective means for our groups', areas', and regions' ability to communicate their needs to world services? Are our members utilizing those means?**
- 2. How can we better improve our members' ability and opportunity to make their needs known to world services?**

3. **How can we improve our services so that our members' faith in world services can be heightened?**
4. **How can we better get the message out that we need our members' to let us know their needs for more information, materials, and services?**
5. **What kinds of communications in the past (for example, reports, periodicals, letters, and so forth) have been effective in getting information out to our members?**
6. **Is there consistency in world services reporting?**
7. **Have there been any working groups, boards, or committees whose reporting was memorably successful?**
8. **Does your group feel as though it has an open and reliable channel to world services?**
9. **Are world services communications reaching you in a timely fashion?**
10. **Should world services translate all of our reports and periodicals?**
11. **How many languages (given our resource constraints) are appropriate for such translations?**

BLANK PAGE

NOMINATION FORM

Dear NA Member,

Before you complete your service resumé form, we would like to let you know a little more about service at the world level.

The position for which you may be nominated will require that you make a commitment of at least one year, with the possibility that your commitment could last for up to six years. This means that you may be asked to make a considerable investment of your time. You may be asked to travel and spend time away from your family, your job, and your home. This can mean as much as one weekend a month away from home and the week of the conference. You may also be required to spend some of your personal funds in order to fulfill your responsibilities. Certainly you will have work to do at home in your spare time, such as reading or writing reports and discussing the plans and objectives of your work with other members. In addition, you may be asked to participate in conference telephone calls that may last several hours.

In order to provide our fellowship with the very best level of service possible, we ask that you carefully consider the responsibilities that go with the elected position for which you may be nominated. You may wish to consult your employer, your family, and/or your sponsor. Talking with members who have served at the world level may give you additional insights into the commitment involved. Service on this level has many rewards and may have a profound effect on your life and personal recovery. However, it does not come without hard work, long hours, dedication, and personal sacrifice.

This is a year of transition for the conference. We are still dealing with some of the carryovers from the old system as we transition to the new. After this conference, the Human Resource Panel will be dealing with nominations for all positions except the Human Resource Panel itself. At this conference, nominations for all positions will come from conference participants. Additionally, the HRP will offer nominations for WSC Co-Facilitators.

The World Pool Resumé Form is for all nominations. The positions that are available at WSC '99 for nomination and election are: four positions on the Human Resource Panel, two positions for the WSC Co-Facilitator, and six positions for the World Board. More information about these positions and the process to be used this year will be available prior to the conference.

Resumés are reproduced and distributed to all conference participants prior to elections. In order to facilitate this process, please ensure that you use the form provided and do not substitute it for another format. This is the only format that will be included in the package that is distributed to conference participants. The World Pool Resumé Form is in the *Conference Agenda Report*, posted on world services website, www.na.org, or available upon request from the WSO.

BLANK PAGE

NOMINATION FORM

NOMINEE: (print) _____

NOMINATED FOR (position): _____

NOMINATED BY: (print) _____

SECONDED BY: (print) _____

SIGNATURE OF MAKER: _____

SIGNATURE OF SECOND: _____

SIGNATURE OF NOMINEE: _____

**(SIGNATURE OF NOMINEE SIGNALS ACCEPTANCE OF THE
NOMINATION)**

BLANK PAGE

WORLD POOL RESUMÉ

*Please type or print legibly and return to:
Human Resource Panel, NA World Services, Inc.,
P O Box 9999, Van Nuys, CA 91409*

Personal

Name _____

Address _____ City _____

State _____ Postal Code _____ Country _____

Home Phone (_____) _____ Fax (_____) _____

Email Address _____

Clean Date _____ Your Region _____

Nominated by _____

(Recommended but not required)

**Professional and/or Community
Organization Memberships**

Activities/Hobbies

Experience

Fellowship Service Experience

Dates	Length of Service	Position	Group/Area/ Region/World Service	Personal Satisfaction Rating 1-5 (5 being best)

--	--	--	--	--

List three (3) references of people you have served with

Name	Address	Telephone	Email Address

Work Experience

What do you like to do the most in your job, in service and throughout your life in general?

What do you like to do the least in your job, in service and throughout your life in general?

What accomplishment(s) in your job, in service, and/or throughout your life are you most proud of?

What do you believe you can bring to World Services?

Why is service fun?

Education

High School/College Attended

Degree Awarded

Seminars/Technical Training

Professional Licenses or Certificates

GLOSSARY

Also known as special or select committees, they are set up to perform specific tasks and generally dissolve once those tasks are done. Means of selecting members for ad hoc committees are specified in the motions creating them. See

for more detail.

Area service committee.

See

The working body created to facilitate the two-year world services inventory project being conducted from WSC'93 through WSC'95. The Composite Group coordinates work being done during the world services inventory, including fellowship surveys, world service board and committee self-assessment tools, and inventory sessions at WSC'94. Had twelve voting members—six WSC committee liaisons, three former RSRs, two trustees, and one WSO director—and one nonvoting member, a WSO senior staffer.

Yearly publication of business and issues to be considered during the WSC annual meeting. Released at least ninety days prior to the opening of the conference.

The full report of all world-service activities sent to WSC participants; RSCs may also have reports published. Typically issued three times a year. Mailed to conference participants and subscribers. March issue customarily contains annual reports, regional reports. Called the until 1991.

A long-term strategy for world services to plan and provide services and support which facilitate the continuation and growth of Narcotics Anonymous worldwide.

A document describing how NA's literature and logos are managed and protected for the greatest benefit of the fellowship as a whole. Contains its own glossary of terms. Approved by the fellowship in April 1993.

Group service representative.

A service handbook, approved in 1997, as a resource for NA Groups, Areas, Regions and their subcommittees in establishing and providing local services.

Hospitals and institutions: A field of NA service concerned with carrying the NA message to addicts incarcerated in correctional or penal facilities, hospitals, mental health facilities, and addiction treatment centers.

See

Provides the World Service Conference with a list of qualified candidates for election to the World Board and the Co-Facilitator positions. Consist of four individuals elected by the World Service Conference.

Published quarterly, currently offers articles about service, recovery-oriented stories, and entertainment as well as a calendar of international NA events. Available by request in English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, and German.

Refers to Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc., the legal name for the World Board. (See World Board description.)

See

A newsletter sent out by the world board after each board meeting reporting on their current activities. Published in English, French, German, Portuguese, and Spanish. Sent to all conference participants, registered areas and regions.

Public information: A field of NA service concerned with communicating NA's nature and purpose to government agencies, community organizations, health and addiction treatment workers, the clergy, the public media, and the community at large.

See

See

A gathering of GSRs and RCMs, conducted by the RSC, to discuss issues

affecting NA worldwide, usually in preparation for the annual WSC meeting. The regional delegate is elected at the assembly.

Elected by an ASC to participate on the area's behalf on the regional service committee.

Voting delegate from an NA region (or equivalent service body) to the WSC. Responsible to help communicate between region and world services throughout the year.

A body that draws together the combined service experience of a number of adjoining areas for those areas' mutual support. Composed of RCMs, the regional delegate and alternate delegate, and others as needed.

A working body created for conference year 1995-96 to formulate resolutions for the priority problems identified after the two-year world services inventory project. Had six members ratified by the conference.

See

A compilation of policy decisions approved by the World Service Conference, including WSC guidelines. First published in 1983 as the temporary successor to the a.k.a. which in turn was first published in 1976.

. A working body created for conference years 1996-98 to develop and present for conference approval a structural model based on resolutions approved by WSC'96. Had nine members and two alternates ratified by the conference.

Fundamental NA principles guiding our groups, boards, and committees in their service affairs. WSC-approved 1992; published with essays as a self-titled booklet.

The consolidated financial plan for all of NA World Services

See

World Convention of Narcotics Anonymous, a bi-annual recovery celebration held in different world zones on a rotating basis.

Makes necessary decisions affecting NA world services when the World Board is not in session, always mindful of the priorities previously established by the board. Consists of the chairperson, vice-chairperson, treasurer, and secretary of the World Board and the executive director(s) of the WSO-in a non-voting capacity.

The World Board is the service board of the World Service Conference. It provides support to the Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous in their efforts to provide the opportunity to recover from addiction; and oversees the activities of NA world services, including our primary service center, the World Service Office. The board also holds in trust for the NA Fellowship the rights for all their physical and intellectual properties (which includes literature, logos, trademarks, and copyrights) in accordance with the will of the WSC.

A pool of members' service resumés demonstrating a variety of recovery- and service-related experience as well as any skills necessary for the successful completion of world level assignments.

Primary world-level service body. Meets annually to conduct business. Voting members: RDs, World Board members: WSO executive codirector has microphone privileges; others may be granted microphone privileges at conference's discretion. Official working language is English.

NA's primary worldwide service center headquarters (Los Angeles) and branch facilities (Canada, Europe). Prints, stocks, sells NA conference-approved literature, service handbooks, other materials. Provides support for new NA groups and developing NA communities. Serves as clearinghouse for information about NA.

A two-year project begun at the 1993 World Service Conference. Guided by a detailed plan approved at WSC'93 and revised at WSC'94. New plan approved for the resolution phase at WSC'95 and a two-year transition plan approved at WSC '97.

An informal meeting held between conferences for the purpose of communication, discussion, and input.

Presides over the business meeting of the World Service Conference. Consists of two individuals elected by the World Service Conference.

Portion of the WSC annual meeting set aside for discussion of issues relevant to fellowship development, especially international development. First held in 1991. Previously known as International Development Forum (1991), Multinational Development Forum (1992).

See

See

See

Locally organized, service-oriented sharing sessions that provide means by which NA communities can communicate, cooperate, and grow with one another. Involves participants from neighboring regions.

