

13 April, 1994

Thank you for your willingness to assist the conference in the inventory process. You have been chosen for the role of recorder because we believe your personal skills lend themselves to helping the group to record all relevant discussions. The names of the members of your small group are contained in the attached material. In addition, your group will be facilitated by Ted Logue, who will be responsible for maintaining an open and balanced conversational flow during the meeting. Your group will meet at Wednesday, 4 May from 9:00 am to 12:30 pm, and again between 2:00 pm and 5:30 pm.

There will be a brief meeting following the panel presentations on Tuesday evening. This will provide an opportunity for any questions or assistance that you may need to accomplish your task. We are looking forward to seeing you all.

World Service Inventory Composite
Group

Encl: List of suggestions for recorders
List of small group members
Outline of conference inventory activity

OUTLINE FOR INVENTORY PANEL PRESENTATIONS AND SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS AT WSC'94

Tuesday 3 May - Panel presentations - four members for each panel. The panel members will be given approximately ten minutes each to present their topic. The main topics are:

- a. WSC history & purpose
- b. WSC relationship to fellowship
- c. WSC relationship to committees/boards/WSO
- d. WSC annual meeting and procedures

Each panel is 40 minutes long, followed by a one-hour Q&A session followed by a 15 minute break. At the end of panel D, material regarding the panels will be handed out.

Two panels in morning and early afternoon, followed by lunch then final panels ending in early evening.

Wednesday 4 May - Small groups

- a. Sixteen small groups composed of conference participants, committee members, and WSO coordinators and managers (10-25 participants each)
- b. Small groups will have two sessions, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. They will be asked to discuss different topics during each session.
- c. The small groups will have a recorder assigned to keep notes of the proceedings.
- d. Each small group session will have a facilitator (not moderator) who will be requested to facilitate both sessions.
- e. Each group will have to choose a representative at the beginning of each session to present the substance of his/her group's discussions regarding a particular topic.

Wednesday 4 May/Thursday 5 May - representative meetings

- a. Each of the main topics will be discussed by the representatives of the small groups which addressed that issue. This representative group will have two tasks: first, develop a list of points they wish the conference as a whole discuss and, second, develop presentations to the conference to engender lively discussion.
- b. The representative groups will choose a body of four to sit on a panel and present to the conference the results of the small-group discussions.

Thursday 5 May - Inventory meeting of the conference as a whole

- a. The representatives present their findings and the conference as a whole enters into a discussion mode.
- b. The conference will, hopefully by the end of this session, be able to identify those areas that it finds to be problematic and wants to address at a later date.

WORKING GROUP NUMBER 4

1) Is the history of the conference relevant to our current practices?

- 1) history is important because it lets us know what we have evolved from
- 2) we have too many chefs and not enough cooks, questions are "do we provide services and do we provide basic services"? and what are basic services?
- 3) We see a growth similar today as regards to international participants as we did domestically in the 70's when we first started the WSC. We wanted anyone.
- 4) Feeling of us versus them.
- 5) Risk vs. Trust
- 6) Funding is more and more complex with an increase of more and more projects.....the history of funding is important.
- 7) Is the history of the WSC relevant? Current practices effected by our history including the suspicions and mistrust. On a positive note Jimmy K. envisioned a global fellowship and we are there today, we are healthy today, we are healthy enough to take the time to plan for the future. More checks and balances.
- 8) Recognition of the international community is important. Example is that translation has emerged as very important maybe dominant force.
- 9) Does the US have too much control? We the US fellowship are trying to dictate to the non US community. The word Colonialism was used as a description. The word power was used in conjunction with control.
- 10) Is the US representative of the world fellowship?
- 11) Our current practices are convoluted due to our history.

12) We also have the impact of our social history as a culture which influences our relationships

13) We have gone from inviting attendance to expecting attendance and even paying for attendance. Our history showed us that invitation alone did not bring enough participation. A member said his region is contemplating not attending in the future. Past showed us the way we need to do it today not how to do it today. It shows us what worked and what didn't.

14) Funding is an issue. Members may aspire to positions based on funding potential. Inequity created by selective funding leads to a scrambling for funded positions and takes away from the spirit of anonymity and selfless service.

3. Does the purpose of the WSC contribute to our primary purpose?

15) The WSC purpose is not always reflected in our actions as regards our 5th Tradition.

16) Pros and Cons

PROS	/	CONS
*Development of Literature	/	*Lit Develop diverts resources
*Translation	/	*Locked into process at expense
*Resource of Information	/	of results
*Coordination	/	*Loose focus
*Provide guidance	/	*Conference is self-serving
*Committees provide fellowship	/	*Self-perpetuating agendas and
needed assistance to complete	/	projects
their primary purpose	/	*Nepotism in leadership

17) Does the Development forum contribute to fulfillment of our "primary purpose"? It is a significant use of our resources. It is a long lasting commitment. Will we know when to back off materially and spiritually in keeping with the spirit of the 7th Tradition?

4) Does the current structure of the conference contribute to our groups' efforts to carry the message?

18) WSC assumes too much. WSC needs to find out what groups need or do not need.

19) We need good effective communication laterally as well as vertically, i.e. between committees as well as between the WSC and the fellowship

20) Groups need to understand how to access information

21) We need to provide the why along with the how.

22) The WSC offers administration for projects that groups need.

23) Does the three headed structure of our conference lend to productivity or to gridlock? You have the WSB and it's committees, you have the Admin and it's committees, and you have the BOD. There is definite overlap, duplication, and bureacracy.

24) One view is that project or task oriented committees are the most productive relative to the needs of the fellowship at the area and group level.

[REDACTED]: A lot of the work seems to be in the hall. We can't agree on what different committees do. Outreach, instead of defining themselves, just started work. Would like to be more informed.

[REDACTED]: I think that the most unclear relationship would be the interim committee. Even though everyone has criticism, nobody seems to have any solutions to offer. Interim is damned if they do and damned if they don't. In the end we need one board. I really think that it is a lack of trust, we need to be vulnerable.

[REDACTED]: Having a dual member has been good and bad, good because the additional perspective helped, but bad because we lost a member some of the time. Without quorum we could not vote, and had to discuss. Why not a WSC committee learning day.

[REDACTED]: One solution was the International Ad-Hoc. since we did not have many contacts, we sat in on the PI Ad-Hoc international. They had a big book of contacts, and so we did not have to do that all over again. We need some way to have the committees interact.

[REDACTED]: The answer to a lot of these questions is Yes and No. Some roles are very clear (H&I, P.I.) the conference has learned to trust these two committees. The BOD seem to be focused. WSB and Admin however, what are the roles, are they really needed, and who defines them. I wonder if the amount of time that we demand of our volunteers is too high. At one time these decisions were made by Bob Stone. He was dedicated and strong. Now we do by committee, and it is not as successful. The one point of decision, seemed to help.

[REDACTED]: Translations is non-voting, it is composed of people coming from all of these other boards. I think that one of the reasons for the success of the translations committee is the fact that it is apolitical, and we have a very precise and clear-cut responsibility. There is sanity in the committee, and in its relationship to the WSC.

[REDACTED]: One of the differences between translation and the others, is that there is no counterpart to them in the WSB. No competition, so automatically there is a difference. I do not think that the WSC as a whole benefits from the feeling of competition. As soon as the open gun sounds, and the race for microphone starts, we can't break out of old habits.

[REDACTED]: As much as we try to deny it, we are very much the product of our environment, in so many ways. We have this ability to really look like Washington D.C., and one of the ways is the way in which we try to decide how to deal, and where to deal with problems of a philosophical nature. The roles of WSC committees are fairly clear, I've never been in a situation where committees have tripped over each other. I have also not personally experienced a lot of problems between the BOD and the WSC.

[REDACTED]: From the literature perspective, the committee roles are pretty clear. WSB is where the complications come in. Trustees did as much make work as subcommittees. WSB subcommittees activated as why of having something to do, an identity. Need to pass on more written material to help plan our roles. Instead of re-inventing the wheel.

█ Guardians of Traditions was just early 80's. Before that it was The Tree, the trustees were the yearlong body. Then the WSC developed new Trustee guidelines, and starting in '85 WSC started to assign projects. They were not even comfortable. There was an overlap in most areas except literature review, and that was just for tradition violations. Other than that we really tried to keep them out of the Lit process. We still elect the beard-combers and hair-pullers, guardians of the traditions. There is not a clear consensus in the WSB on role. Policy is the guardian of the TWGS, and they do not even like it! It is a mess, and could not be otherwise. The make work notwithstanding, the committees know their work real well, and do it real well.

Seems like the trustees are body snatchers. I've heard that we have to change. P.I. comes up with ideas, and then the ideas just get "disappeared" into the "trustee zone." Just when we get things like NA, a Resource in Your Community all done, and then it gets snatched away from us.

█ H&I sit around review a handbook. We know what the people want: workshops and learning days. We keep asking, and they keep saying the same thing. How come we can't ever get the funding to do this then.

█: Lack of communication, lack of trust. Duplication of work. Got to stop living in denial, and let go of the positions.

█: Problem trying to mix provision of service with philosophy. Collectively we tend to do the same things, and we have got to be aware of doing those things.

█: 3 main boards, how much \$ spent. Do we need all 3?

█: Not really full participant. Second class citizen. When Australia ask for H&I they don't want Garth. They asked for H&I.

█: So often when I hear a solution, I wonder where I have heard it before. Concepts seem to hold answers to all of the solutions we discussed today. I haven't been all that responsible for reading *and absorbing* them. All of this has come from NAS, something that is sitting on a shelf. How did we get existing structure? If you are cynic like me, you might say it was because the trustees selected amongst themselves, and with the conference structure, anyone has a shot at serving and getting work done.

█: First off, there is a reason why we have been all separated. It was thought that with all of the discussions, we form perspectives. If we go to unified board there will still be competition for resources. There will still be subcommittees, with chairs. The clearly defined things that subcommittees do need only one single point. Some stuff is so simple, that we don't need a complicated solution.

█: Note on duplicating of services. We have a trustee assigned to our committee. One has the spokes, one has the wheels. We should put the pieces together. We don't know what we want so how can we tell the board what to do. WSC is like a black hole.

█: The one board thing was a source of complete paranoia when I first hear of it. One of the reasons why I have been afraid of one board, I that I would not be on it. We want a

(3)

title. Always have chairs, but no members. No leaders. One board would provide the exchange of viewpoint that would help us to have a broader perspective. I now respond to H&I letters from people desperate for anything with NA on it. Answering this type of letter would be a spiritual awakening for anyone, but a P.I. member wouldn't have a chance to do this. I have had a lot of jealousy, and it came from the fear that I would never get to do be on one of those boards. Now one board is no longer a threat. I can accept that we all are the best at something, and that we should do what we are best at. We would all have some kind of place.

■ We need to be organized. Traditions talk about groups, not service structure. Have had the whole gamut of feelings about 1 board, 2 boards, 3 boards. The only way a single board would work is if it was so large that it was almost as if there were still 2. Single board servants would be 24 hr a day NA servants. An inherent part of the democratic process is that it is slow. This is ok, that way we can check. Most of the things that we do not affect whether or not we have a meeting tonight, and so I have no problem putting it on the slow track. We are reluctant to change.

■ Are we afraid to be like AA? They have already experienced most of the problems we have or will have. We should learn from both the good and the bad of their structure. we shouldn't let any BS about the "mother" fellowship stop us from looking at what is good.

■: Agrees that we have a lack of maturity as regards single board. Real differences between the way our services developed and AA's. They came from real centralized, and we came from total anarchy. In the past we had direct contact with AA. They extended lots of invitations. One of the big differences, is that AA has always counted on direct contributions from groups. They have a lot more \$. They have a unified budget. They have full participation from the folk with most experience. Not as dinosaur trustees, or chairs. The folks that provide the continuity is the staff.

■ I am extremely grateful for this meeting. Mostly because of being able to talk about things that I thought were taboo, only for the hallways. I am ready to learn from AA, even if I do not care to be an AA member. What we have is the dictatorship of the RSRs. With more trust, and less control, things could happen more naturally. I do not see democracy being worked on the floor.

■. I hope that one of the messages that we can get across is that we need the people to keep coming back at the service level, and that the ones with experience should not pack up and go home when they are done.

■: As a newcomer I could not understand beyond my wildest dreams, but now I do. I think that this applies to the conference as well. We could have the faith to believe that this too will shape up to beyond our wildest dreams.

■: Earlier I had a lot of gripes about the composite group. I was hoping that earlier in summer that they would just come with a whole new plan. But now, even though it is far from perfect, the process that we have embarked upon has made this one of the most valuable conferences I have ever intended.

Group Number 13

Afternoon Session

Questions chosen for discussion #2 & #8

#2: Are the roles of the WSC and the WSB as they relate to each other sufficiently clear? **NO!! NO!! NO!!**

?? Are the roles as they relate to each other the Interim Committee??

The roles we see in the TWGSS is sufficiently clear for the WSC and WSB as they relate to each other. But the action we see from conference year to conference year is not consistent with what is written. i.e. the motion to suspend the World Service Travel Guidelines which was made by a trustee

We want to quote Donna, "When we are not directly involved in the process, we don't trust the process or the results" We do have hope and we feel we are going in the right direction.

Lack of mutual respect between the WSC and WSB leads to a break down in trust.

#8: What is the criteria for establishing priorities at the WSC

Theoretical: money, time, trust, 12 Traditions, Concepts, fellowship need (real needs), specifics needs of emerging NA communities

Actual: Turf wars, lobbying, lack of trust, lack of money and fund flow, lack of time, lack of accompanying budgets with motion proposals, lack of human resources, RSR's with personal committee agenda's, fellowship need (hidden agenda), lack of utilization of willing & qualified trusted servants

We found ourselves in the Us and Them syndrome. Not feeling as though we were a part of the WSC. Talking about the WSC as them.

GROUP ONE — TOPIC A

Decided to focus on two of the questions (there were too many) chose Questions 2 & 4.

Question 2 :

Used the purpose as written in TWGGS and discussed during the panel presentation:

">>> To be supportive to the F. as a whole, and to define and implement the policies of N.A." and "To define and take action according to the group according to THE group consciousness of N.A.

Brainstormed what we all feel the WSC currently does and then rated those things by 1) whether or not it is a strength or weakness to be doing it and 2) is it reflected in TWGGS

BRAINSTORM RESULTS: S=Strength -- W=Weakness : Y or N= Yes or No reflected in TWGGS

Unify Fellowship	S	Y
Provide for Common Welfare	S	N
Encourage/support growth(development)	S	Y
Project oriented tasks	W	N
Coordination of regional counterparts	W- split	N
Not just an event; a moving, living organism	W	N
Forum for objection and complaining and political ambition	W	N
Long term planning	S	N
Direct response to Fellowship requests	S	Y
Forum for emotion-based decision-making	W	N
Conduit for decision-making for F.as whole	S	Y
Accomplish tasks as directed by F.	S	N
Provide formats for education-goes both ways	S	N
Provide direction to WSO (at the event)	S	N
Provide direction to all WS elements	S	N
Problem solving and creation forum	S	N
Conflict resolution	S	N
Worldwide communication	S	Y- split
Inter-regional/zonal forums	S	N
Establish/vote on policy for N.A.	S	Y
Implement policy	S	Y
Administer World Convention	W	N
Meeting place for networking	S	N

The topic of Carrying the Message was put on the list, then scratched because it needs much more discussion in a larger forum. There was a definite feeling on the part of some that the WSC needs to be part of carrying the message, directly indirectly and that it does, in fact, do so. Others interpret carrying the message in a pure form, meaning that ONLY a group and members can carry the message and the WSC does not and is not meant to do so. THIS PROBABLY NEEDS MORE DISCUSSION IN RELATION TO CHANGING THE STRUCTURE AND MAKING ALL PARTICIPANTS COMFORTABLE WITH A DIFFERENT DECISION MAKING PROCESS

WSC AS AN ENTITY OR EVENT and WHAT

IT SHOULD BE:

As an event ---

- Can be the beginning or end of the entity's work
- Could be separated from any task/work
- Would transform from task-oriented
- Would shorten # of days
- Would allow for broad based discussion that would guide the work in a general way
- Could discuss issues that affect F. as a whole
- Could assign work based on discussion to body best suited to handle it
- Consensus building
- Forum for WORLD F to build consensus NOT to come with answers

The WSC as an event is a strength, when it becomes an entity it turns into a weakness

Majority believe it is an entity AND THAT IT MUST CHANGE FORM Cannot simply be fixed, needs to change instead.

CURRENTLY:

Many of the individual points of our brainstorming above fall under the general purpose of Unifying and Carrying Message. Purpose must be simple with the other things as goals and objectives as how the purpose is carried out.

It currently is too vague and general, lacking explanation. However, if there was more explanation, discussion of WSC purpose it would suffice. As it stand now, almost noone knows what the purpose is.

There is no group conscience reflected

Procedure and motion making as an attempt to discuss is a weakness

Must stop and look and plan - We are currently so far behind we can't even get to the present much less the future - Conference every two years would provide for better planning.

Current structure is governmental in nature not service oriented

RSRs have been provided with no other way to do their perceived job.

CAR works against purpose - Need to have a year without it

Current leadership MUST propose and model a structural change AND lead RSRs in a different plant

U.S. F. needs to accept the idea of fewer reps - perhaps one per zone.

RSRs need to deal with more regional problems through zones , need to have more security in knowing where to go with their issues - right now WSC is the only place they know to go

ALL OF WORLD SERVICE MUST BE INVOLVED IN LENGTHY DISCUSSIONS REGARDING MAKING THE STRUCTURAL CHANGE OR IT WON'T FLY.

GO BACK TO THE TREE TO FIND THE BASICS - DON'T RE-INVENT THE WHEEL

"WE CAN'T SEE THE TREE FOR THE TWIGGS"

WORKING GROUP NUMBER 4

1) Do the current practices of the WSC reflect the principles contained in the Twelfth Tradition?

- 1) The idea of all of us being equal doesn't seem to be in effect because of the many requirements for positions. There are different requirements both real and perceived. Equity should be required within a committee. Due to the fact that the 12 Tradition is the spiritual foundation of all the Traditions then we question whether the 3rd, 6th, and 7th are followed.
- 2) Voting process is not perfectly reflective of a consensus.
- 3) Does selective funding reflect the 12th Tradition?
- 4) The group felt that there should be representatives from the WSB, Interim, and WSO on the small working groups and not have such homogenous groups.
- 5) A way to limit the differences is to form small diverse working groups to deal with the issues at the front end of the conference, for example workshop the conference agenda then vote on it or some process that allows interaction not possible on the floor and which will allow us to break down the perceived differences based on our respective positions and personalities.
- 6) Elections often based on personalities rather than qualifications. The changes in the procedures are not necessarily reflective of the 12th Tradition.

8) When is the conscience of the NA groups not essential to the decision-making processes used by the conference?

- 7) Elections, Amendments and Substitutions, Procedures, Budgets, Internal Problems, Additional Motions (such as new business)
- 8) Group conscience, as it is understood by each conference participant, should always be reflected in each decision.

9) It is essential that the group conscience be consulted any time that the decision can effect NA as a whole, e.g. changes to the steps and traditions, fundamental and philosophical changes to our literature (as defined by the Intellectual Property Trust)

10) In our decision making processes we need to strive for consensus.

11) Our process of majority rules is not inclusive of the concept of spirituality by its very essence. If we reach consensus we have reached group conscience to the best of our ability

Small Discussion Group #6

May 4, 1994

2:15 p.m.

We version of Serenity Prayer.

After much discussion, we decided to discuss #8 and #4

When is the conscience of the NA groups not essential to the decision-making processes used by the conference?

Fred: As I understand "group conscience", voting should be unnecessary. If we truly listen to each other (at any service level, from group to world), truly listen, and then empathize, unanimity would always be reached. From this standpoint, group conscience should always be invoked in any NA decision-making process. This question isn't completely clear to me--if it means, "Should everything go back to the groups?", the answer is, obviously, no. Certain things are irrelevant to them. But, in any NA decision-making process, a true group conscience must be reached, or an incorrect decision may have been made.

Joe: Everything obviously shouldn't go back to the groups, for we'd bog down. Our elected trusted servants should be able to represent a true group conscience. Major decisions (changing the steps, the service structure, etc.) should go back to the groups with alternatives, etc.

Mary: Sometimes it doesn't matter who you elect, for they can't really screw things up too badly. Gathering of conscience by trusted servants (not just votes) is beginning to evolve. Fear of reprisal (roll call votes) keeps the trusted servants ~~honest~~. When trusted servants fear they're not being heard, they push for everything to go back to the groups. Group conscience is always appropriate.

Willie: Need to distinguish housekeeping from important issues. Any group's conscience should be heard at WSC. Many groups don't show up for CAR workshops--they don't really care about these issues; they're more concerned with carrying the message at meetings, etc. Certain issues are simply not group problems, and the RSRs should be able to make these decisions by themselves.

Lori: Members of her home group, some of which work at the WSO, don't even care about the CAR. They trust their GSR will make appropriate decisions. Decision of one region to send literature to a foreign country offended its neighbors. However, we can't inform every single group about everything; many groups won't register. Groups don't want all the information we have to give them, and it's impossible to give it all to them anyway. Some people feel that it's only group conscience when it's unanimous. We here at the Conference have a responsibility to pass the spiritual attitudes we're evolving here (like at yesterday's discussion) back to the groups in our ~~areas~~ and regions.

Craig: What is group conscience when, out of ten people in a group, only two show up to vote? We use what we've got.

Wendy: In our Region we're going to separate out policy and procedure. This stuff is not of true importance to the groups. Crossing Ts and dotting Is not essential to the group conscience of the NA fellowship.

Carl: The wording of this statement is unfortunate. (1) Despite everything that goes on here, there is a loving God expressing Himself in our group conscience--I must believe that or I wouldn't be here. (2) If world services ceased to exist, my home group would still meet and I'd still stay clean. The group exists from the commitment of its members. It would be a terrible thing for the group to dedicate its time to study all the issues involved in world services. It needs to work at the grass roots level. (3) If world services gets off track, how would the groups exercise their authority anyway? (4) What about people who are informed sitting in a business meeting and not saying anything? Should we be resources for a group's conscience? (5) How can one have differences in the way a group responds (it cares, it doesn't care) to world service question? (6) What about slanted presentations in a business meeting? (7) Does tradition 2 only apply to the NA group; what about the service structure? Other than the issue of literature, what has the WSC actually done that effects my home group?

Teresa: nothing to add.

Ten minute break

So, WHEN is group conscience essential, when is it not essential?

Essential:

Recovery literature (conceptual framework)

Significant structural changes

Whenever they want it.

Conceptual guidance in service decisions

Non-essential:

Inner-committee guidelines

Procedure

Translations/Recovery literature (by non-English speaking groups)

Elections

Question #4:

Does the WSC consider the long-range outcomes of its decisions in its deliberations?

Carl: Boards try to predict the outcome before we commit ourselves. Elections, however, are often based on personalities. When it's on the floor, no, when it's in committee, yes.

Wendy: Sometimes yes, sometimes no. Often more information is needed. We need more discussion before the motion is voted upon. Financial impact is only one element. Long range impact isn't often considered.

Willie: We do, but we don't spend a lot of time on it. A group conscience should be able to handle this. Our Higher Power should help us. With limited information, we can't make good decisions. The result is a mess.

Mary: It's a piecemeal process--some we do, some we don't. Sometimes it gets too hard, and we just say f*** it, and make ^{an} the decision. It scares us. Even if there are 99 positives, one negative frequently causes us to vote no. It's a mixed bag.

Joe: Yes and no.

Fred: When in doubt, do as little as possible. If a decision is difficult to make, don't make it. It probably isn't ready to be made.

Teresa: Yes, let's take our time. Thirty motions in the CAR, and then sixty more which fall from the sky, and we have no time to decide upon them. We should have better planning on how to decide upon and discuss things.

ten minute break

Answer to the question: Yes and No!

Let's be more specific:

Mary: In elections, what are we electing someone to do? NA positions change over the years.

Translations: Yes.

Carl: When you start a project, you're focused. Over time, it's easy to lose focus. (Next year, there's a whole new agenda...) So the question is, how do you keep on focus?

Willie: Committees tend to look long range.

Mary: But my committee doesn't always get the long range impact data from other committees.

Craig: As committee membership changes, the thrust of the original discussions (when things were focused) is lost. We're constantly changing; our ideas are changing.

Mary: For elections, we don't know the long term direction of the committees (like the BOT), so we have trouble choosing trusted servants.

Budget: Short Term with a capital ST

Site plan for the WSC. Long range. Yes.

Public Relations Five "Year" Plan. Yes.

Motions not in the CAR - NO.

Inventory process: did we consider its long range implications?

Stop the insanity, right now. If the process is intended to gain a vision of world services' future, then it WAS considered, by definition. We did consider the long term implication of NOT doing the inventory. But we didn't consider the long term implications of the ramifications of doing the inventory.

WSO: yes, in principle. Fuzzy. Not until this year.

We'll finish up with 1'30" on the question of our choice.

#6. Diversity? Craig: No.

#7 Questions of significance to NA as a whole. Wendy: No, a lot of the time.

#5 Election process-well qualified trusted servants? Carl: It makes such a difference when we have good leaders. In tomorrow's elections, I don't feel we're going to be electing the best people for the jobs. Personalities, etc. Our current process inhibits careful consideration.

#1 12 Traditions? Willie: No.

#9 Planning for annual meeting. Joe: No.

#6 Diversity. Teresa: No.

#5 Election process. Fred: We need a written "vision statement" from Trustee candidates.

1

Rogan opened with a brief overview of the questions, and the group selected a few of the most important ones.

Uschi will represent.

Questions will be chosen:

Mike 5,7,8,9

Shanon 2


Uschi 3


Carol would like to make sure that our rep has something useful in hand this afternoon


Shanon says that it might be that we are not looking for expertise as much as an experience of the conference. since this is a group of spectators, the detachment of being in "the peanut gallery" might give us a special perspective.


Rogan would like to be sure that our exploration of each question is thorough.


Question 3/5/7

: A couple of things that come to mind are: the tendency to become self perpetuating. We dream up things that would be "good for the fellowship." Handbooks, international committee, etc. There is some communication that way, but these might not be generated by requests from the fellowship. As though we are telling them, not them telling us. I wonder if some of our projects are to keep us busy, then gets filed for posterity. Spending an inordinate amount of time on guidelines, our other under-utilization of talents. yesterday was one of the bet things I've ever seen hapen at the WSC. I would like to see us getting the information out to the service committees that need it. Too bad we couldn't have filmed yesterday, and just sent it out.


: Although so far big changes, and minds opening. We have to stop and determine just what it *really* is the fellowship needs at this point. It won't be the same thing in different places. All of the business interferes with real learning. More discussion, the only way I have learned in recovery is from listening to experience strength and hope, not motion. We tend become too focused, and our vision narrows, it becomes easy to forget, or lose touch with *group* needs. In business we forget why we are there.


: I know that a lot of what happens on the floor I stay out of. We call ourselves worldwide, so why can't we include them more in our presentations. How come it is us *telling* them, when it should be *them* telling us. We need to *learn* about others in order to do what's right. With all of the mail that we sent out, there doesn't seem to be any response, we don't even know why!


: Last night in all of the confusion one thing leapt out at me as being what is wrong. One person, after submitting an amendment for a second time, said at the mike, I lost again. This should not be "win or lose." What does a group needs: Space, Coffee; the WSC can't do anything. They need lit and exp. This we can provide, but then we have to focus on that. We should try and focus our discussion on what group members would actually be interested in. People need to be taking experience back to regions, areas, and groups. The US fellowship as so much to give, yet the WSC is not oriented around giving out to newer fellowship.


: Concepts say that the service structure is to take care of one set of business, so that the groups can focus on *another*. Maybe we should *not* be trying to be a group, or area. Things have to get done, and group or areas will not be able to do them. The primary purpose of this level of service is to ensure that other levels of service can function. Sure there is more that we can do, but we have started doing them, it is long and hard, and above all we need to learn new


situations before it can go at full speed. A tendency to stay in comfort zone of passing motions to be able to say that we did work. Some participants have different views of service.

: When I am here, I have yet to leave with something that is primary to my personal recovery. I feel to often that we are getting direction and government rather than service. Things move too fast or in unexpected directions for the participants who do not yet have their feet beneath them. We *think* that it working because we keep producing, but we are prisoners of our structure. I felt as though by making a committee into an ad-hoc, more work would get done. I don't care where the experience comes from, we need to hear it. If we stick to basics, we won't have to get back to them. Groups are not aware enough of the existence of other groups in the world. Too much focus on the leadership, not enough on the full fellowship. I feel better being able to bring back information new to my region than I do about making my regions point.

: I believe that the groups needs are being met as per lit in English, and meeting place etc. The WSO says we have to slow down, Translations needs to keep going they need time. Committee system perpetuates narrow view, and makes it hard to function in the best interests of the whole. In fact it's human nature. Why can't we just stop everything and do our inventory. When I was literature, I did not like a motion to stop work for three year, but know I can see a point to it. I do not know why, If it is because I am not on literature anymore, or if I have grown. We can't do it all at once, and it takes time to get up to speed.

: I really don't think that my participation absolutely necessary, because so much of what I feel is shared. However I did make decision to try and contribute to the best of my ability. I haven't spent very much time *off* the floor. It is beneficial to just be able to listen instead of *working*. I was resistant to discussion instead of business, but this is changing. Only discussion is hard with so many people, many of whom will only repeat. We can't be everything to everybody. We can't keep minorities, in my local fellowship. The fact that there is no racial or linguistic controversy is a bad sign because it means that we are just too homogenous. I feel that sometimes that the lack of translations is being used as some sort of excuse, and the conference is being drawn into emotionalism over the fact that there are addicts without literature. I know that there is a need for a step working guide, just as there is a need for a Russian White Book. But I do know what to do to help get a step guide going, but not the slightest on how to take care of the Russian stuff. So I can only do what I can. When the needs are different I don't know what to do. There is something that happen here that *is* positive. Tunnel vision is a problem, but what can I do.

: Conference is very confusing from the days of motion sickness, to the internationals walking out. But I am able to see definite signs, Once after giving a totally confused, and isolated H&I inmate a Spanish Basic Text, he became part of. We in Asia Pacific really feel the need to start working in a forum where the number of issue is more manageable. It s wonderful to be able to meet members from around the world, but I am not sure that this is the best forum. I really value my service time, and I feel that the time can be best put to use in an Asia-Pacific forum. The Conference is not helping us maintain contact wit other service bodies. other H&I committees, or other committees entirely, such as translation. Feel that WSC bureaucracy is taking to much WSC time. It could and should be done by a smaller group. Would like to see 30 delegates representing whole world. way to much time on policy issues, an internal business.

: In the hall, I started to focus on two aspects, one is myself, my territorialism, and the huge gaps of communication that I live with, that we are getting only the sketchiest information on what each other is doing. There is so much that needs to happen, that I feel that I do not spend enough time to it and consider. Again, a lot of direction and lecturing, and I can see it in myself. The second thing is that there is a clash between the format of the way the conference works, and

the way we say we would like it work. In the end we are left with assumptions, because we can't really know for sure. am very affected by Rich's ideas on zonal forums. Definite request for tools, not sure on how to deliver, but suspect that reducing the size of working groups is the direction.

[Redacted]: Sometime we are trying to do things the way we would in an ASC, because it is more boring here. The ASC is so fantastic because we really do hear directly from the Groups! If what we say about World Services is true, what do we do about the fact that most of the addicts on the planet do not have what we have, and are different from us in a lot of ways. In the old days it was more straightforward, and easier to do things. There are some things that ONLY world services can do, Translation, legal, some P.R. There is a whole lot of P.I. experience, but some of it, in an international context, is just plain wrong if you take it out of US. The same for other subcommittees. Even though US have access to everything, but how many addicts are informed? Can't dismiss the parts I don't like, because it must be important to somebody. Don't know how to reconcile need for smaller world services with the possible loss of experience that the larger WSC provides.


[Redacted]: Very happy for the forums. To me this is what it is all about. As much as business has to happen, this is the real stuff. We accept that with the vast majority of groups being US English, the agenda is centered in some way, but my dream is that we manage to separate out the US only issues into an American conference. Need to re-evaluate our structure, need to be able to question that which we take for granted, so that it can be changed if necessary.


[Redacted]: Conceptually fully agree that there has to be some place other than WSC for Americans to do business, but there is the fear of the financial impact. Most people seem to agree that there is a need, but I believe that perhaps the biggest impediment is the \$\$\$. As far as how to insure that the conference encourages intl. part. The development forum is the most important, at first symbolically, but then more concretely when we allocated DF budget as our second most important line item after the inventory. Unfortunately there are some other things that continue to negatively impact what we are doing. Normally the CAR is so large that it represents a two year process to translate the whole CAR. The other thing is the issue of travel and funding. We continue to get too worked up about the idea of traveling outside of the US. Even though the 3 visits of WCC are essential, it is negotiable the minute it represents a larger travel cost. Through funding, we limit access to service. The servant must do a lot of personal funding. This only gets worse when we are talking non-north american fellowship.


[Redacted]: All of this for me comes down to personal responsibility. The \$ spent on funding travel is wasted unless we are able to provide something of value to the people we bring here, and we are not in tune enough with what *they* consider of value.


[Redacted]: What came out of all of this for me is Mark's Law. There is enough \$ to supply all of the needs. It all depends on how we spend it. When we talk about funding participants, I strongly believe that there is enough \$ if spent wisely. Fellowship, means sharing with others. Mark's Law. Swing of the pendulum. But we never stop to find the need. We need to stop and uncover our needs. Now we are swinging back to the other extreme. Now we are ignoring the inventory. Question 5 is answered by what we are doing now. We are going in the right direction, we just need to be patient. Too much time on \$.

[Redacted]: Maybe the 105 people in the conference are not expert in budgets et al. But some do. If we spent the time to do these kinds of discussions, we could leave the details to trusted servants. The many levels of service provide a way to get distracted by the how of doing instead of the why or even if. There can be no competition for world resources because by definition they belong to the world.

: The All in question seven really caught my eye. For the last seven or eight years, mostly what I see is White middle-income men. I am no dummy, but I don't have a clue. I have way more questions than answers. There so many people that are not even participating in recovery let alone service. We are trying to take steps, but sometime it looks like tokenism, like we are bestowing this great gift, and then when they you don't understand, we think that we understand better than they do. It seem one-way. I was one of them I wonder if I wouldn't feel like I did not need this. I don't know how to make this accessible to people that can't afford to take a week off work like I can. I feel that we are starting to trust. I feel that in some ways we finally are starting to get the to things that we should be talking about, but in other ways we are missing the mark.

: I think that in some ways the opportunities are there, if I think of myself who gradually became more involved in service. I try to tell people that NA is special because it is open to anyone. In the last couple years it has started to turn around. Some of the things I read and hear, are disturbing, like the idea that we are losing touch with the grass roots, and losing touch with a largely uninterested fellowship. Changing our structure might attract more people. More people might be attracted to a consensus based conference than to what we have now. For a long time my area wondered what to do about opening up our fellowship, but then it just did. lust with time. Maybe that is how it will happen at the world level, it will just happen. I hope we do not repeat history by breaking down when we hit water, that we manage to remain a worldwide fellowship.

: I hate to get into \$ too, but no matter what goes on in this conference, I own part of it. When I first came in you wouldn't want to put me in a room like this. I would have wanted to kill someone. But you slowly started to pull me in. I do not have to apologize for having what I have. But I can't make someone feel less than for having to ask for something. I cant be a shotgun, just pull the trigger, and hit everything that is out there. Can't stop growth, but you follow, or be left behind.

: I also hate talking about \$. One of the things that we have looked at for a long time in AP is Budget and how much it costs to send a rep to WSC. It is almost all of the RSC budget of most of our regions just to send some one to WSC. It costs about 50,000 all told. I think that most of the AP would be perfectly happy just to have one good rep as long as he was good. We might even give up the vote, in order to have a zonal forum, and send just one rep. But that \$ could be so useful at home. A basic service would be basic literature, for non-English members, and 50,000 could go far. Level of funding provided by members in AP to serve is 400 @ month.

Morning session:

Questions chosen for discussion: # 5 & 7

#5: We are seeing a willingness to start the process, with still a long way to go with no easy solutions.

Hearing a lot of talk about being a world wide fellowship but not seeing the reality of that . The fact that English is our official language (per TWIGS) puts the international fellowship at a disadvantage. The key is "If you can't understand, than you can' t participate"

One concern about waiting until someone asks for help participating: If they are not already here , how do they know that assistance is available? Is there some one in charge of that already? Making sure they understand that assistance is available before they ask.

Producing a CAR at the conference with a minimal number of unamenable motions, with 3 or 4 issues for discussions only would ensure world wide participation affecting those issues through a year long discussion process. This would give ample time for translations and discussions in non English speaking communities.

Summary:

We need to define what is "World Wide", The complex language needs to be simplified. We need to remember that our English speaking participants as well as the non English speaking participants don't always understand. Yes , the DF and Translations is taking steps but the conference as a whole is taking steps backwards. in procedures, language and communication processes

We try but we get bogged down with procedure. The process is so new that it is not as affective as it could be.

The WSC expends a great deal of resources getting participants here and fails by throwing to much at them, to fast..

Morning session cont.

#7: Defined "Means" as meaning financial , language, physical challenges, educational, personal availability

Defined "All" as being all members, and groups.

Bringing the concept of development forums through the service structure, such as Regions , Areas and Groups

If someone is intent on being involved in a discussion and they are limited in means, as a body we should be able to make that available to them

To provide more effective leadership

The inability to participate sometimes comes from a lack of service experience.

Whoever does our presentation please ask the participant for a straw pole of those who have not come to the mike because they felt intimidated for whatever reasons.

Summary:

Informal discussions/forums, less structure, in a more comfortable environment

Additional discussion:

Question to RSR's: How valuable are your RSR A's ? Absolutely!!!!

We really need to consider funding for non-U.S. RSR Alt.s

Maybe we need to consider a workshop on the relationship between the RSR and the Alt. to be included in the orientation process.

Suggest a buddy system where experienced conference participants would be available to assist and guide new conference participants.