Update on World Service Motions from the 2002 *CAR*

Group Treasurer's Workbook

As already reported, we received input for this workbook that resulted in changes to the *Treasurers Handbook* that was sent to you in the Conference Approval Track packet. We will be seeking the conference's concurrence to amend the material in the *Group Treasurers Workbook* so that it is consistent with the handbook. We have tried to keep our service material as consistent as possible to avoid confusion. The proposed changes to both the *Treasurer's Handbook* and the *Group Treasurer's Workbook* will leave us with an inconsistency in the fund flow diagram contained in the IP, *Self Support: Principle and Practice*. This inconsistency is the difference of an arrow in the fund flow diagram. We will be asking you what you would like us to do with these types of items: place motions in the *CAR* or seek your concurrence. We have also received additional input for format and copy edit changes that we do not believe require an amendment or a motion in order to be made.

Issue Discussion Topics—selection and discussion

We placed Motion #2 in *CAR* 2002 for a variety of reasons that we described in the introduction to the motion: the fellowship didn't seem to be embracing the selection process, there has been minimal participation in the development of issue discussion papers, choices were not interesting to many of our members, and many groups do not want to be asked to make these choices. At the same time that we placed the motion in the *CAR*, we made a commitment to actively work on ways to further issue-based discussions in the fellowship and make these discussions more effective. In our March meeting, we discussed potential workable approaches for selecting topics, discussing them in the fellowship, and providing feedback to the fellowship.

Initiation and Choosing Topics: It makes sense to us that the WSC meeting is the best place to initiate fellowship discussions. Without the efforts of all conference participants when they leave the conference, the fellowship would not be aware of what these issues are or why they are important. If Motion #2 passes, we see three ways that issue discussion topics could be selected. We believe that any combination of these three possibilities could work, and we propose an experiment for this conference that uses two different selection methods, one issue being generated by the World Board and brought to the conference and one issue being selected by conference participants, using ideas generated during the conference week, as well as the ideas contained in Motion #3 in the 2002 *CAR*. We would like to leave the selection process open to all of the following ideas to give us the opportunity to see what seems to work best. Limiting ourselves to only one selection process at this point could put us into the same constraints we are currently experiencing. Our proposed selection options are:

1. The World Board can come to WSC with a variety of topics, derived from many sources, for participants to either rank or choose from. The sources for topics would include reports from the Worldwide Workshops, WSO Fellowship Services' correspondence, topics submitted from regions or members, world convention workshops, etc.

2. The World Board can come to WSC with one or two topics already chosen for the next conference cycle. These topics would come from the same sources mentioned above.

3. Conference participants can generate topics throughout the week and choose one or two from a compiled list near the end of the week.

Conference Participant and Fellowship Involvement: The general steps below provide for wide participation of conference participants and members of the fellowship.

Conference participants, in small groups, can generate points to help establish the type of information in the *News Flash* for each topic.

The WB can finalize the *News Flashes* after the WSC meeting and distribute them widely.

The WB will invite input from the fellowship discussions. It will be important to actively encourage members and committees to share their experience, strength, and hope instead of asking for their opinion or "position" on the topic. Our recovery is built on this kind of sharing of experience rather than taking a position.

Finalization: We do not believe that the WSC meeting should be involved in finalizing the discussion of any topic, but it is clear that some type of conclusion or outcome is required to make the process complete.

Before the two-year conference cycle is over, we would provide feedback to the fellowship in the form of a synopsis or report on the input received. This could be in the *NA Way*, *NAWS News*, a special report, on the website, etc. The input might or might not be usable as input for a bulletin or even for a new project plan.

The approach outlined above delivers what was discussed at WSC 2000—an inclusive process that has a definable outcome. It outlines the selection of issue discussion topics and the initiation and finalization of discussions. It allows the board to draw from staff, Worldwide Workshops, convention workshops, member ideas, regional submissions, and board correspondence. The *News Flash* idea that was so well received during the last conference cycle is utilized, the selection process is taken out of the *CAR*, and "position papers" are discouraged in favor of shared experience.

This approach also preserves the value of holding fellowship discussions in many different settings while building community among the discussion participants.

Update on Basic Text Evaluation and Sponsorship Projects

Basic Text Evaluation: We are proposing a fellowshipwide survey to get a better sense of whether the fellowship would like to see revisions/additions/changes to the Basic Text or Little White Booklet. We developed the survey vehicle with assistance from a consultant, who has worked with us since November 2001. We also used two focus groups to get feedback on the survey instrument itself. We have discussed this project at length and approved a final version of the survey at our March meeting.

We will be distributing the survey to conference participants at the conference, so that the delegates can have a first-hand experience filling out the survey and can share that experience with others and approve the survey as a part of the Basic Text Evaluation project. If approved, the survey will be distributed until December 2002, through all world service publications, the July *NA Way*, and at WCNA-29.

The back cover of the survey solicits input on future literature development. This is a step toward assessing what the fellowship may need and want in the future in terms of recovery literature.

Sponsorship Project: As mentioned in the *Conference Agenda Report*, we have received a vast amount of input on sponsorship from the fellowship. In addition to all of the material we've received via email and the post, we have had the chance to talk to members and facilitate sponsorship input sessions at *CAR* workshops; the World Service Meeting in Vienna, Virginia; the Worldwide Workshops in British Colombia, New Zealand, Chicago, and Sao Paulo; the Asia