



Subject: **Conference Agenda
Report Workshop**

**KENTUCK-IANA – TEJAS BLUEBONNETT
SHOW ME – LOUISIANA – VOLUNTEER
ARKANSAS – LONE STAR – MISSISSIPPI**

Compiled by: Travis F.
(217) 345-6558
[mailto: secretary@szfna.org](mailto:secretary@szfna.org)

Submitted: 02/09/04 2:59pm

Note: These minutes were compiled by John S. from the Show-me region. Thank you very much John for your unparalleled determination.

Travis F.
SZF Secretary

CONFERENCE AGENDA REPORT WORKSHOP

- World Board members here to field questions, not to support motions. Because of length of material to be covered, will take RD questions first and limit discussion on each motion (19 total) to 15 minutes maximum. Also, there are 4 discussion questions that will consume much time at WSC. Don't forget those in your regional CAR workshops. Will attempt to break into 4 small groups and discuss these as time permits.
- Motion 1. To approve the book Sponsorship. Since about 1992, the fellowship has brought up the idea of having this book. At 2000 WSC, motion was made to develop book on sponsorship. Group was put together to study information submitted from all over the world. Another work group was put together to discuss what the composition of the book should be. They created a detailed outline for chapter content, pulled together quotes and wrote the first chapter for fellowship review. Fellowship was asked if they wanted to participate in input and everyone who submitted their name was given the first chapter for input. The group reviewed the input and suggestions for the remaining chapters and the rest of the book was written for distribution in the CAR this year.

Question: in financial impact part it states actual production costs will be minimal. Final figures are not available yet, but they may be available at the conference. Suggestion to send email to worldboard@na.org. These emails go first to the office contact who facilitates that area and they may be able to quickly provide you an answer.

Question as to the process changing and some in the region not understanding. Confusion partly due to literature process being so much slower in the past and this project being different. How could this project have gone so quickly? Board understands this is a new process and is waiting for input on what the fellowship thinks. Old process wasn't working, with a ten year period going by with nothing produced by world services. Shifted to staff writer approach, where a writer on staff at WSO working with a work group. Also board members solicited input during worldwide workshops. The team working on this was drawn from the world pool, which is the way literature will be produced in the future.

Question as to where we are in translation process with this piece. Translations committees decide what they will translate and when. If approved, this will move into the body of work available for translation. Needs to be approved in English first.

- Motion 2. To replace IP #11 with revised draft. Very simply, if you have a new sponsorship book, you don't want other pieces of literature with old material.



Subject: **Conference Agenda
Report Workshop**

**KENTUCK-IANA – TEJAS BLUEBONNETT
SHOW ME – LOUISIANA – VOLUNTEER
ARKANSAS – LONE STAR – MISSISSIPPI**

Compiled by: Travis F.
(217) 345-6558
[mailto: secretary@szfna.org](mailto:secretary@szfna.org)

Submitted: 02/09/04 2:59pm

- Motion 3. Replace 3 quotes in Just For Today with new material from new sponsorship IP. Same principle as Motion 2. It would be possible to pass Motion 1 without passing 2 and 3. There has been discussion that board is trying to make these minimal changes just so a new edition will be created to generate more money in sales. Board has discussed creating stickers that can be placed over the old copy, so new edition wouldn't have to be purchased. Question as to why initial sponsorship pamphlet has to go away. In this case, the answer is it doesn't if you vote no to Motion 2. Discussion about things in the new sponsorship book not agreeing with the old sponsorship pamphlet, such as same gender sponsorship, but many learned to sponsor using the original pamphlet. Not a question of the new material not being good, but does the old version have to go away completely? Question regarding translation burden if these are approved. Board believes that if fellowship approves Motions 1-3 it will not created an undo burden on translations committees. Question as to whether this created a second edition of Just For Today. This was not really discussed by the board, but the intention was that this is just a revised edition, not that the entire existing work needed to be replaced.
- Motion 4. Approve process of exploring possible revisions to the Basic Text. Have had two moratoriums in the past and at last conference decided to do a survey to determine if the text is in the form we need. About 70% of respondents said to leave first 10 chapters alone. Board felt that to try and discuss changes to the first book would not be sensible, even though many people say changes need to be made, but 70% is a strong majority on no changes for now. About 60% said they wouldn't mind changes to book two. Board looked at the survey and other input from world convention and worldwide workshops. Board decided it made most sense to not propose any changes to book one. Also, if changes to stories were undertaken, what would that entail? Board decided to propose the process for examining book two and what the fellowship wants to change. Also looked at what AA has done in the past. When they make changes to their book, they create a new preface to that edition that describes the changes that have taken place in the fellowship since the last edition. This motion would launch a project that would define the changes that would be made; those changes and direction would be approved in 2006, with the draft of those changes up for approval in 2008. Proposed changes are a new preface to part one, begin the process of looking at book two, decide what changes the fellowship wants made, approving those changes and then implementing.

Discussion on review process for the text as many people were not happy with the process used for the Sponsorship book. Concern of only taking input from the fellowship for six months, which is the time frame proposed by the board. Explanation that review time is for looking at the preface and then the existing stories and deciding whether they would be kept or not. Then another cycle begins in which input would be received and drafted, adding new stories for a draft that then goes back to the fellowship. Solicitation of input and approval of that draft would each take about a year. If this passes, should we request stories from our local literature committees? Premature at this point, as we're only proposing that we look at the book, agree upon what changes need to be made. Part



Subject: **Conference Agenda
Report Workshop**

**KENTUCK-IANA – TEJAS BLUEBONNETT
SHOW ME – LOUISIANA – VOLUNTEER
ARKANSAS – LONE STAR – MISSISSIPPI**

Compiled by: Travis F.
(217) 345-6558
[mailto: secretary@szfna.org](mailto:secretary@szfna.org)

Submitted: 02/09/04 2:59pm

of the concern is that with the Sponsorship book, there was one process of development communicated that was later changed in the CAR and that created distrust. Question on the survey and how it was structured. In the past, surveys have been poorly constructed as we didn't seek outside professional help. For this survey, contracted with an outside company. Results were compiled and published back to the fellowship in NAWS. Once the process starts, the stories would be handed off to a work group and they would recommend back to the fellowship how to proceed with reviewing what to remove or keep and what new stories to add. Will have a conference cycle after this in which to provide direction to this work group, if the motion approves this year. Key will be to provide input, either individuals or groups to this work group before the process starts.

Has there been talk of having a separate book of just stories? Yes there has. Also, AA has just created a separate piece of literature that includes all the stories that have ever been published.

How many stories are we planning on having? Hope is that we'd keep it about the same size, but that would be for the work group to develop recommendations approved by the fellowship.

Who will comprise this work group? Will be world pool and at least one board member, as is currently done. All work groups are responsible to the board, so a board member is automatically a member of each group as a liaison.

Disgruntled members in another region, again with process for review and input for sponsorship book. Is there any reassurance to alleviate concerns with members feeling promises were not kept with process and a few making decisions for the whole fellowship. The board views itself as serving all people and those people who are unhappy with process. They seek to serve and understand as much as possible and that is mostly done with the RDs. The way to make sure these concerns are heard is to bring them up at WSC so we can discuss. That is where the fellowship gives input and direction to the board and work groups.

- Motion 5. Size of the World Board. Change maximum number of members to up to 18 instead of 24. Have had the opportunity to work within the new system for the past 5 years. Have never had all 24 positions filled. As move toward more strategic focus makes sense to reduce number.

Concern voiced about motion saying "up to" being confusing. Would it be clearer to say "as many as" 18? Concern also that board is getting smaller and gives perception fewer people are making decisions.

Discussion that having fewer people discussing issues also means fewer ideas and input. When you get the board size down you increase efficiency, but too few means limiting diversity of viewpoints. Important to have a variety of international viewpoints, gender



Subject: **Conference Agenda
Report Workshop**

**KENTUCK-IANA – TEJAS BLUEBONNETT
SHOW ME – LOUISIANA – VOLUNTEER
ARKANSAS – LONE STAR – MISSISSIPPI**

Compiled by: Travis F.
(217) 345-6558
[mailto: secretary@szfna.org](mailto:secretary@szfna.org)

Submitted: 02/09/04 2:59pm

viewpoints, etc. As the fellowship delegates some decisions to the board, we want to make sure that have a diverse membership on the board. With this motion, the board is saying they feel 18 is a good number for increasing efficiency but retaining diversity. They also feel that 12 is the bare minimum.

Does a lower number also tax the members too much? With the board being more strategic, they are moving away from “doing” and are more into planning. The WSO staff and the work groups, comprised of world pool members, are the doers. This allows the board to be smaller and involve more members of the fellowship to actually get the work done. The highest number of people on the board in the past 5 years is 18.

Question as to where number 24 came from in the first place. Thinking is that there were 12 members of the old Board of Trustees and 12 members of the Board of Directors which were then melded together. Also, they looked at the number of committees needed and that’s how it originally broke out.

Of those currently on the board, 6 terms are due to expire. 4 of these are not seeking re-election; all four of these are women and two are from outside the U.S.

- Motion 6. Eliminate specific language about standing committees in the board guidelines. In the old system there were specific board members assigned specific committee responsibilities. However, they tended to become turf oriented and more concerned about that specific duty rather than looking at the entire scope of the work the board was doing. In the current system, board members are assigned specific work groups or tasks, but they are not responsible for overseeing a particular function, like H&I, PI, etc. They shepherd the projects to which they’re assigned and are responsible for reporting back to the board as a whole, but they also have planning input for all board projects and work.

Question as to whether members of work groups are being drawn from the world pool or are they being directed by the board. In the past, the board has given qualifications required for project work to the Human Resource Panel and they would then return with a list of pool members qualified to work on that project. The board would also directly solicit people if they knew of someone who was qualified, but they had to submit a pool resume first.

The pool is a way for people throughout the fellowship to get involved. But you have to fill out and submit a world pool resume first. Currently, there are only 420 resumes on file. We need to encourage everyone with 5 years clean to submit resumes.

Question as to whether lack of resumes are affecting projects. Board feels not as of yet, but it’s more an issue that there are so many untapped resources of which we’re unaware in the fellowship. When the board identifies people and asks them to participate, it is perceived as the good old boy network or that they’re trying to end run around the



Subject: **Conference Agenda
Report Workshop**

**KENTUCK-IANA – TEJAS BLUEBONNETT
SHOW ME – LOUISIANA – VOLUNTEER
ARKANSAS – LONE STAR – MISSISSIPPI**

Compiled by: Travis F.
(217) 345-6558
[mailto: secretary@szfna.org](mailto:secretary@szfna.org)

Submitted: 02/09/04 2:59pm

Human Resource Panel. Discussion that world pool form is daunting and intimidates many people from filling it out.

Question as to what the issues are with the HRP and the board. If the system isn't working, where are the energies of the HRP directed? What are the issues that keep this from working? Show Me has requested an open forum during WSC to discuss the world pool and HRP and the problems making this system work. Board is planning this and it will be an open, frank discussion so we can decide what needs to be done. Board feels it's not about the HRP, but the system they've been trying to work under. We need to discuss the system and how to make it work.

- Motion 7. Moratorium be placed on book one of the Basic Text from the Show Me region. Motion 8 is pretty much the same, with differences in the length of the moratorium. This motion does not conflict the board's recommendations in earlier motions, but takes it further by placing a block on changes to book one for year's to come. Board doesn't feel it is necessary and would limit.
- Motion 9. Create book one version of Basic Text and make it available for sale on its own like is done with other translated versions. Board recommends against as the book was approved in total, not as book one and book two. Question as to whether this is partially motivated by finance. Answer is that, yes, although we would like it not to be this way, but it is realistic that we only fund 10% of services through donations. The majority is via literature sales, conventions, merchandise, etc. Discussion that AA has a separate version of its text without the stories. Explanation that AA has made a concerted effort to communicate to its members the reason and importance of direct donations. It has worked to the point that they no longer rely on sales of literature to fund services. We're not there. And to do this would endanger our ability to meet our world services vision.

Discussion as to how we explain to members who ask why we can't have book one available separately so it can be sold cheaper and more easily afforded by addicts. Explanation that if we asked members to give \$3 in the basket knowing that \$1 was going to China to reach addicts with our message. And members wouldn't hesitate. We need to let them know why those of us who have more need to help those who do not.

- Motion 10. Create workgroup to create, edit and submit for approval the Tradition Working Guide developed by the Lone Star Region. Discussion that regional motions are not the best way to create a strategic plan. The motions set aside that process and try to set priorities outside the strategic planning process. Discussion: this is better submitted as a project request or project idea that would then be considered and developed within the current process. By using a motion to set it into motion, it circumvents the process. Not only should it be a project request, but the materials should be turned over to world services to be reviewed and considered.



Subject: **Conference Agenda
Report Workshop**

**KENTUCK-IANA – TEJAS BLUEBONNETT
SHOW ME – LOUISIANA – VOLUNTEER
ARKANSAS – LONE STAR – MISSISSIPPI**

Compiled by: Travis F.
(217) 345-6558
[mailto: secretary@szfna.org](mailto:secretary@szfna.org)

Submitted: 02/09/04 2:59pm

Discussion that although this may take us away from our strategic planning process, the Lone Star Region has done a lot of work to get this piece to this point in development. Sometimes it seems unreasonable to just turn ideas over to the board and have them create the project from scratch and would it not be better to develop some projects completely before turning them over to the board.

Question as to whether board currently has a Tradition Working Guide in the process. Answer is no. But there could be a project idea submitted that could turn into a project in a future conference cycle. Board mentioned that while a couple of regions have voiced interest in a Tradition Working Guide, there has not been a huge groundswell requesting one. To submit a project idea, there is a project idea form that you fill out and submit to the board. They report and list all project ideas that have been submitted each year and disposition.

Discussion that the current process seems like the board is telling the fellowship what we're going to do. Ideas are submitted but sometimes it can seem condescending when they are pushed back or no action is taken. A solution is to bring that passion for direction and projects regions want done and communicate that to the board. At the conference, discussions with participants is what helps the board determine what its priorities are. We have to understand that there are regions all over the world submitting requests and we must prioritize them.

Discussion as to how we create a process in which the fellowship as a whole can understand or see all the ideas submitted and then the delegates give input as to what the priorities are.

The strategic planning document will be distributed to all delegates in the coming month. In that document, there is a list of projects that are prioritized, according to what it will take to move us toward our vision and the delegates will be able to review and discuss those priorities with their regions and give input at the conference.

Discussion that a large group of people have been involved in the development of this piece. A group was working on this in 1998 when the conference committee system was abolished. At that time, this group felt the direction given them was that things weren't changing and that they should keep working on what they had in process. So that group continued to develop the Tradition Working Guide for submission to the fellowship. Is there not a way to make compromise and make this piece fit into our strategic plan? The Lone Star feels very strongly about this motion and wants to pursue it.

- Motion 11. Allowing limited reprinting and quoting from NA literature on the internet. Board has moved very slowly in regards to having literature on its website to make sure they fully protect our intellectual properties. At present, certain pamphlets are available via na.org. We can do this because NAWs is the trustee for protecting our intellectual properties. Other websites may link to that original material on na.org, but it cannot be



Subject: **Conference Agenda
Report Workshop**

**KENTUCK-IANA – TEJAS BLUEBONNETT
SHOW ME – LOUISIANA – VOLUNTEER
ARKANSAS – LONE STAR – MISSISSIPPI**

Compiled by: Travis F.
(217) 345-6558
[mailto: secretary@szfna.org](mailto:secretary@szfna.org)

Submitted: 02/09/04 2:59pm

duplicated on other websites. Board has always taken a very conservative approach to protecting our copyrights. They agree with the spirit of Motion 11, but believe motions are not the way to manage our copyrights.

Question as to whether putting literature on the internet will significantly decrease revenues. Response that the materials available now would not divert that much in funds and that in reality, if we get to the point where more of our literature is available online, it may actually increase sales of the print versions.

Discussion that the board has given negative recommendations for most regional motions and why this happens. Seems as though the explanation is that the motions aren't the proper way to accomplish what the maker of the motion is trying to do. Is it a matter of the proper way not being explained well enough to the fellowship? Board feels that it's important that the regions feel that they always have the ability to make their voices heard. Is there not a better way to communicate with the board to prevent this from happening year after year?

Question as to how regions or other websites can access literature available on na.org. Other websites need to create links to the original material on na.org but should not reproduce it on their own website.

- Motion 12. To make key tags, medallions and chips conference approved materials. Board feels there is no need to do this as they are charged with managing our intellectual properties and licensing of merchandise and it's not necessary to dictate production of this type.
- Motion 13. Rescind voting rights of World Board members. Discussion that the conference is the place that the board receives its direction, so why would they also vote? Who do the board members represent? Regions argue that they represent an entire region, but the world board members are elected to represent the fellowship as a whole and the developing fellowship that can't always be represented at the conferences.
- Motion 14. Change percentage required for election to the board to 51%. This is rooted in the current election process. Having difficulty filling board positions, so this region is saying maybe if we lower the standards, we can fill the positions. Board feels that it's better to look at the process rather than lowering the standards. They feel it's important to have a high degree of support from the fellowship as evidenced by a vote. So we need to look at the whole system, not just the approval percentage.

Discussion on the voting process and confusion in voting. If we have 6 board positions coming open this year and the HRP presents a slate of 20 candidates qualified for the job. A region can vote yes for as many people as they feel are qualified to service, it doesn't need to be limited to 6 people. The ballots are such that a region checks every name they have confidence in. If you do not check a name, you are in essence voting against that



Subject: **Conference Agenda
Report Workshop**

**KENTUCK-IANA – TEJAS BLUEBONNETT
SHOW ME – LOUISIANA – VOLUNTEER
ARKANSAS – LONE STAR – MISSISSIPPI**

Compiled by: Travis F.
(217) 345-6558
[mailto: secretary@szfna.org](mailto:secretary@szfna.org)

Submitted: 02/09/04 2:59pm

person. If more than 6 get more than 60 percent, they look at who had the higher percentages and they would receive the position. We have to have confidence in the HRP for this to work. If the HRP feels the candidates are qualified, we have to feel comfortable in voting for those people, otherwise you vote only for people you know and we don't fill spots.

- Motion 15. Lowering cost by 25% for all participating regions. Worldwide workshops were never intended to drive participation by delegates, but rather are ways to reach out to local members. There is no cost to regions for delegates to attend WSC. Explanation from Lone Star that RDs are covered to WSC, but doesn't cover alternates. In our concepts we talk about leadership and continuity of service. Do we want fresh delegates attending WSC every time if only delegates and not alternates are funded? Question cost of hotel room nights for WSC and whether it's possible to negotiate lower room rates to make it more affordable. Intent behind the motion was to look at lowering the costs associated with conducting WSC even though the delegates are funded, are there not ways to reduce our costs?
- Motion 16. Move to consensus based decision making by 2006 WSC. Board agrees that this was not accomplished this cycle. There are fewer motions, but this CAR is a hybrid with discussion items and some motions. Goal is to move further toward that goal in the next cycle. Board in agreement with underlying spirit of this motion, but they are going to bring a project plan to the conference addressing this issue.
- Motion 17, 18, 19. Fellowship representation, Resolution A, from Minnesota. Board's response in general to set of motions regarding Resolution A is they are of the opinion that we are developing on a slightly different track than Resolution A. It seeks to downsize the conference and implies the creation of a U.S. conference as separate part of the service structure. Board no longer believes we need to downsize the conference as long as we can control its expansion and it truly represents a worldwide representation. If we move toward a consensus based model that we can create a dialogue that will work with the current structure. Board believes we can work in small steps to achieve the goal and that a large sweeping reformation isn't needed at this time. If we move toward consensus based discussions, it wouldn't make sense to reduce participation, but to expand our opportunities for dialogue as a fellowship.

Being that the transition group didn't implement resolution A and with the changes that have taken place and the knowledge we have gained since 1998, it doesn't make sense to implement a resolution developed years ago without taking these things into account. The spirit of the resolution was to gain more equal representation and interaction by worldwide communities at the conference. In the past few years, great strides have been made in involving non-U.S. communities and moving the conference away from motion-based decision making.



Subject: **Conference Agenda
Report Workshop**

**KENTUCK-IANA – TEJAS BLUEBONNETT
SHOW ME – LOUISIANA – VOLUNTEER
ARKANSAS – LONE STAR – MISSISSIPPI**

Compiled by: Travis F.
(217) 345-6558
[mailto: secretary@szfna.org](mailto:secretary@szfna.org)

Submitted: 02/09/04 2:59pm

Also board concern that areas like Asia Pacific aren't developed well enough to have fair representation at this point. It's unfair to put them in a position of having to represent a zone when they're trying to understand how groups work and how to get meetings started and deliver the message.

Discussion that if we would have one representative or a set number from our zone to the WSC, how would information get disseminated? Would it not be more difficult? The board is trying to move us toward more interaction between individual members, world board, RDs, etc. And that this would remove those people from that contact.

Discussion that if North America represents 80% of NA as a whole, shouldn't they have greater representation? Spirit of representation is that rural areas have needs that are just as valid as large urban areas. This also holds true for non-US participants. We don't want to drown out those voices from areas that are smaller. We don't want large urban areas to control and dominate the conference.

Question as to whether there is a project plan with the world board to address this issue? Board has discussed looking at service structure and representation, but not in this fashion.

In closing, may contact the World Board via na.org, select world board section. Or via snail mail at World Board at NAWS, PO 9999 Van Nuys, CA 91409.