

MOVING FORWARD PART I	59
MOVING FORWARD PART II	61
GOODBYES	63
APPENDIX A: CONFERENCE FIRSTS AND STATISTICS ON PARTICIPANTS	64
APPENDIX B: WSC 2023 ATTENDANCE.....	65
APPENDIX C: COLLABORATIVE PLANNING – COMPILED NOTES.....	69
APPENDIX D: CREATING OUR FUTURE – COMPILED NOTES	76
APPENDIX E: NEW IDEA SURVEY RESULTS	84
APPENDIX F: NEW IDEAS DISCUSSIONS - COMPILED NOTES	93
APPENDIX G: CAR SURVEY RESULTS	108
APPENDIX H: AMENDMENTS WSC DECIDED NOT TO CONSIDER	111
APPENDIX I: REGIONAL MAP	114

A Vision for NA Service

All of the efforts of Narcotics Anonymous are inspired by the primary purpose of our groups. 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 their own language and culture and find the opportunity for a new way of life;



Every member, inspired by the gift of recovery, experiences spiritual growth and fulfillment through service;



NA service bodies worldwide work together in a spirit of unity and cooperation to support the groups in carrying our message of recovery;



Narcotics Anonymous has universal recognition and respect as a viable program of recovery.

Honesty, trust, and goodwill are the foundation of our service efforts, all of which rely upon the guidance of a loving Higher Power.



CREATING OUR FUTURE

Sunday 30 April 2023

FIRST THINGS FIRST

9:00 am–10:45 am

Tim S (WB Chair), Anthony E (NAWS ED)

Tim S (WB Chair) opened the session by welcoming everyone to the 36th World Service Conference and asking for a one-minute moment of silence. After a video showing highlights of the 2018 WSC, Tim introduced readings of *A Spiritual Principle a Day*, the *12 Concepts for NA Service*, the WSC description from *A Guide to World Services in NA*, and *A Vision for NA Service*.

Tim then reviewed some logistical information regarding the conference, including the provision of Wi-Fi for in-person conference participants, and the arrangements for those delegates attending virtually. After an announcement regarding the LGBTQi recovery meeting taking place that evening by Lib E (World Board), Tim highlighted some of the material available on the WSC Portal and offered some statistics about attendance at the conference:

- There were 139 voting members participating at this WSC—126 delegates and 13 World Board members. In addition, there were 103 alternate delegates, plus 4 HRP members, 2 cofacilitators, 5 in-person translators and additional virtual translations.
- Of 123 seated regions, there were 120 RDs participating. Of 6 seated zones, 6 ZDs were participating.
- This year's conference participants were from 45 countries and we spoke 28 languages.

Tim then introduced the members of the HRP, the conference cofacilitators, the World Board, the translators, and the zonal delegates who were participating in an in-person WSC for the first time.

Each of the delegates from the regions seated since the 2018 WSC was then invited to share briefly: Mexico-Occidente, Netherlands, Ukraine, Minas, and Northwest Russia.

After more logistical information regarding the room set-up, breakout sessions, and some of the processes used during the conference, Tim then conducted a countdown of the number of conferences served at by attendees.

The Serenity Prayer was then said in the following languages:

- | | | |
|------------|--------------|--------------|
| • Arabic | • German | • Norwegian |
| • Cherokee | • Greek | • Polish |
| • Danish | • Hawaiian | • Portuguese |
| • Dutch | • Hebrew | • Punjabi |
| • Farsi | • Italian | • Russian |
| • Filipino | • Japanese | • Spanish |
| • Finnish | • Lithuanian | • Swedish |
| • French | • Manipuri | • Turkish |
| • Gaelic | • Māori | • Ukrainian |

The session was then ended with the Serenity Prayer in English, followed by a reminder that the next session would be a community building session in the breakout rooms.

COMMUNITY BUILDING

11:05 am–12:35 pm

Breakout Rooms

For this session, participants were divided into four in-person rooms, and three virtual rooms. Each room was facilitated by one or more board members.

Participants were asked to separate into smaller groups and find three things they have in common and three things that represented differences among them (two related to service, and one personal). Each small group combined with another small group, and again compared lists. The results of the discussions were reviewed to close the session, with a focus on how commonalities can strengthen the WSC community, how the differences discovered can help the work of the conference, and what it would require from participants to leverage their differences to be successful in the week ahead.

Due to the nature of this session, a summary of the discussions was not created, but some of the most frequently mentioned commonalities were:

- Fidelity to our primary purpose and spiritual principles
- Inclusivity and approachability
- Shared service histories, although many were at their first WSC
- Being sponsored, and sponsoring others
- The use of CBDM

Frequently mentioned differences included:

- Geography
- Language
- Culture
- Sexual identity
- Life experiences

Many of the groups shared the conclusion that diversity and differences strengthen the conference body if it makes the effort to listen to each member's experience, remain teachable, and find the ties that bind us.

The conference then broke for lunch until 2:00 pm.

CAR-RELATED DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS

2:00 pm–3:30 pm

Daniel C and Mario T (WSC Cofacilitators)

Tim S (WB Chair) welcomed everyone to the first CAR Discussion and Decision-Making session and handed it over to the conference cofacilitators.

Daniel C (WSC CF) began by welcoming Mario T (WSC CF), who was able to obtain a visa at the last minute, and Laura B (HRP), who, as conference participants had previously been informed, was prepared to assist Daniel in the room during the business sessions when it seemed as though Mario would be unable to attend, and now would assist the two of them as needed. Daniel highlighted the amount of work there was to get through, and then handed it over to Mario for a brief overview of the process used during business sessions. Mario reviewed the decision-making chart from *A Guide to World Services in NA (GWSNA)*, and then offered a few words about amendments. He clarified that the maker of each amendment would have two minutes to speak to it, followed by a two-minute recommendation from the World Board. He also reminded the body that the process of submitting amendments prior to the WSC is new and still being refined. In their discussions before the WSC, Daniel and Mario agreed that an amendment should attempt to improve, clarify, or refine a motion while staying true to the original intent. Mario offered the thought that this was not the case for several of the amendments on the motion list, and suggested that it might be more accurate

to consider them as either substitute motions or amendments that contradict the initial intent of the motion. He said that if amendments were better defined in GWSNA they would not have accepted those amendments, but did so because during WSC 2018, a former cofacilitator said that substitute motions would be subject to the same vetting process as other amendments. He closed by saying that the cofacilitators would draw the body's attention to those amendments when they were introduced, and expressed the hope that the issue would be discussed further during the Moving Forward session.

Mario then introduced Laura, who clarified where the motions, amendments, and initial straw poll results could be found, and which participants could vote on which motions. She also reviewed the process for being added to the discussion pool and the discussion queue, the use of the yellow card, and the appropriate time for asking questions.

Daniel then reviewed the use of the remotes for voting and participating in polls, the voting app for virtual conference participants (VCPs), and the on-screen voting grid that indicates when a participant's vote has been received. He continued by reviewing the order of business, and by taking attendance.

113 regional delegates, 6 zonal delegates, and 13 board members were present.

Daniel then introduced Motion 38.

Motion #38 World Board

To approve the 2020 and 2022 World Service Conference minutes.

Initial straw poll Motion 38: 100 yes – 0 no – 6 abstain – 7 present not voting

94% Consensus support

No participants in the minority wished to speak, so a second poll was taken. Daniel reminded everyone that if consensus remained, this would be a decision.

Decision Motion 38: 116-1-1-5

98% Motion carried with consensus support

In response to questions, Daniel clarified the appropriate time for asking questions, and that abstentions affect the vote count.

Motion #33 World Board

To use the following terminology to describe straw poll and vote outcomes, for WSC 2023 only:

Unanimous support

Consensus support (meaning 80% or greater support) 80%–<100%

Strong support (meaning 2/3 majority support) 66.66%–<80%

Lack of strong support (meaning less than 2/3 support) >20%–<66.66%

Consensus not in support (meaning 20% or fewer support) >0%–20%

No support

Intent: To simplify the terminology to describe voting and polling outcomes and make it less potentially confusing.

Initial straw poll Motion #33: 106-1-3-3

96% Consensus support

In response to a question, Daniel explained that the motion referenced “2023 only” because the change in terminology was being offered on a trial basis, and if successful, a motion to make the change permanent would be offered in the Moving Forward session on Saturday. Daniel then conducted a second straw poll.

Decision Motion #33: 119-1-2-1

97% Motion carried with consensus support

Motion #35 World Board

To eliminate abstentions when voting or taking straw polls, for WSC 2023 only.

Intent: To simplify the voting and polling process and eliminate an option that has the same effect as a no vote.

Initial straw poll Motion #35: 86-17-5-5

79% Strong support

During discussion of the motion the following points were raised:

- *Abstain* was listed as an option on the CAR tally sheet and *present not voting* was not listed, so removing abstain as an option would not reflect the conscience of the participant's region.
- Members were not necessarily confused about abstentions.
- Present not voting would remain as an option if abstentions were removed.
- Abstentions and present not voting are viewed as different options in some communities.

Daniel then clarified that the World Board was not voting on these motions even though they were CAT motions, not CAR motions, because GWSNA specifies that the board does not vote during CAR-Related Discussion and Decision-Making sessions.

Second straw poll Motion #35: 85-29-7-2

70% Strong support

Discussion continued, with further points raised including:

- Delegates should be prepared to vote either yes or no on motions.
- Abstaining creates the option for discussion of a motion.

Daniel moved to a final vote on the motion.

Decision Motion #35: 67-51-3-2

55% Motion failed with lack of strong support

The conference then took a break until 4:00 pm.

CAR-RELATED DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS

4:00 pm–5:30 pm

Daniel C and Mario T (WSC Cofacilitators)

After some announcements, Mario T (WSC CF) introduced Motion 34.

Motion #34 World Board

For WSC 2023 only: If a participant appeals a decision of the Cofacilitator, the Cofacilitator will explain why they ruled as they did, the participant making the appeal will explain why they are appealing the ruling, and then the body will vote. The voting threshold required to uphold a decision of the Cofacilitator under appeal will be 50% plus 1 in favor of the Cofacilitator.

Intent: To clearly define the process for a participant to appeal the chair, thus maintaining checks and balances.

Initial straw poll Motion #34: 94-10-5-4

86% Consensus support

In response to a question, Mario read the existing policy in GWSNA:

“A participant can challenge any decision of the Cofacilitator, and if so, the body will vote on whether to uphold the Cofacilitators’ decision. Strong support (at least two-thirds) in favor of the Cofacilitators must exist for the Cofacilitators’ decision to stand.”

If the motion didn’t pass then this policy would still stand. He then conducted a second straw poll.

Decision Motion #34 102-17-1-3

85% Motion carried with consensus support

Motion #36 World Board

To adopt, for WSC 2023 only, the following approaches for New Idea Discussions

[See page 6 of the CAT]

Initial straw poll Motion #36: 94-1-7-11

92% Consensus support

Decision Motion #36: 106-3-10-5

89% Motion carried with consensus support

Motion #9 World Board

To approve a three-year World Service Conference cycle on a trial basis following WSC 2023 through WSC 2029. Following 2029, the WSC cycle would return to two years, unless another decision is made.

Intent: To put into practice some of what we’ve learned during the pandemic so that we can shift more resources to work that more directly carries the message. This would bring the WSC resource allocation in line with other changes that have been made in World Services—cuts in staff levels and a 50% reduction in in-person board meetings.

Initial straw poll Motion #9: 90-15-3-5

83% Consensus support

Daniel C (WSC CF) reminded the body that WSC policy states that when there is consensus in the initial straw poll, the conference can decide on a motion without entertaining any amendments, if participants wish to. He then polled participants about whether they wished to consider Motion #9 without entertaining any amendments. This was not a decision about the amendment or the motion itself.

Do you wish to consider Motion #9 without entertaining any amendments?

Decision Motion #9: 81-41-0-2

66% Motion failed with lack of strong support

The amendment was then introduced.

Motion #9-a1: (Amend, CAR Motion 9) New Jersey Region

To amend Motion 9 as follows:

To approve a three-year World Service Conference cycle on a trial basis following WSC 2023 2025 through WSC 2029 2031. Following ~~2029~~ 2031, the WSC cycle would return to two years, unless another decision is made.

The motion as amended would read

To approve a three-year World Service Conference cycle on a trial basis following WSC 2025 through WSC 2031. Following 2031, the WSC cycle would return to two years, unless another decision is made.

Initial straw poll Motion #9-a1: 33-55-6-19

35% Lack of strong support

Nancy C (RD Northern New Jersey) spoke to the amendment, suggesting that the implications of changing the length of the conference cycle needed more time to be workshopped locally, and that members seemed only willing to do this after a motion had passed rather than before.

Tim S (WB Chair) responded that the board believed that it was important to continue with the trial of a three-year cycle.

Daniel then opened discussion on the amendment.

Kathleen M (RD Mid-Atlantic) supported the amendment, saying that time was needed to adjust.

Bill W (RD British Columbia) expressed support for the original motion and the belief that his region was ready to move to a three-year cycle.

Simon M (RD Colombia) also supported moving to a three-year cycle and felt that the body shouldn't procrastinate, citing limited resources as a factor.

Dean H (RD California Mid-State) supported the amendment and asked if the reductions in staff levels and in-person board meetings would continue if a three-year cycle were implemented.

Anthony E (NAWS Executive Director) responded that the financial picture was still unclear, but a longer cycle would allow time to rebuild staff resources and determine if NAWS was on a more stable financial footing.

Joel B (RD Florida) supported the original motion, and offered the thought that if the conference delayed the change there would be fewer delegates with the necessary experience to make an informed decision.

Decision (Second straw poll) Motion #9-a1: 30-87-3-4

25% Amendment failed with lack of strong support

No objection was voiced to considering the second straw poll as a final decision

Daniel then asked if anyone in the minority wished to speak to Motion #9.

Elliot N (RD Australia) said that moving to a three-year cycle might disadvantage women accessing service at this level.

Alon S (AD Israel) shared his belief that the motion came from a lack of trust rather than a place of abundance, and that a longer cycle would decrease connection and trust in NA World Services.

Decision Motion #9: 98-22-1-3

80% Motion carried with consensus support.

The conference then recessed until 9:00 am the next day.

Monday 1 May 2023

CAR-RELATED DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS

9:00 am–10:23 am Tim S (WB Chair), Daniel C and Mario T (WSC Cofacilitators)

Tim S (WB Chair) opened the meeting and invited Jack (WB) to celebrate both Service Day and his 33 years clean by reading the *Spiritual Principle A Day* entry. Jack invited Vincent B (RD Volunteer) to share the reading with him. Jack then shared some personal thoughts on the topic of “Why do I serve?” and suggested that the essence of service is to make people feel loved and welcomed. “People don't always remember what we say to them: They remember how we make them feel.”

Tim then reminded participants to complete the “Why I Serve” cards on their tables, and handed the meeting over to Daniel C and Mario T (WSC Cofacilitators).

Mario then conducted a roll call. There were 119 regional delegates, 6 zones, and 12 World Board members present. (See [Appendix B](#))

Motion #10 World Board

If Motion 9 is adopted, to approve an interim virtual WSC in the middle of the conference cycle for decisions that are legally necessary and those that conference participants choose to address. As was done in the 2020-2023 cycle, material would be posted on na.org under the same deadline policies as the CAT (ninety days prior) and all voting conference participants would be polled to choose the items they wish to address.

Intent: To allow conference participants to address some WSC business between in-person conference meetings.

Initial straw poll Motion #10: 101-5-3-4

92% Consensus support

Mario then conducted a poll to determine if the body wished to consider the amendment to Motion #10.

Do you want to discuss and decide on the amendment to Motion #10?

Decision: 54-69-1-1

43% Lack of strong support – amendment was not considered (See [Appendix H](#))

Mario then re-introduced Motion #10 and asked if anyone in the minority wished to speak. Shigeto O (RD Japan) said he was in favor of having a virtual interim conference, but wanted the time zone challenges for some participants considered.

Decision Motion #10: 114-7-2-2

92% Motion carried with consensus support

In response to a question, Daniel clarified that a two-thirds majority was required to hear an amendment to a motion that had consensus support in the initial straw poll.

Motion #11 World Board

If Motion 9 is adopted, to approve a change to the release of the *Conference Agenda Report (CAR)* to be thirty days earlier than the current policy of 150 days prior to the start of the World Service Conference. The new *CAR* release day would be 180 days prior to the in-person WSC meeting for English, 150 days for translated versions. The deadline for the finalization of regional and zonal motions would be 270 days. The *Conference Agenda Report* will be posted on na.org at no cost to members.

Intent: To release the *CAR* earlier to allow more time for its review.

Initial straw poll Motion #11: 109-1-0-3

99% Consensus support

Do you want to discuss and decide on the amendments to Motion #11?

Decision: 63-61-0-0

50% Lack of strong support – amendments were not considered (See [Appendix H](#))

Mario then asked if anyone in the minority wished to speak on Motion #11.

Raphael V (RD Minas) explained that his region was against the motion because they wanted more time to allow for translation of the material.

Decision Motion #11 d: 117-7-0-1

94% Motion carried with consensus support

The conference then took a short break.

CAR-RELATED DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS

10:53 am–12:30 pm

Daniel C and Mario T (WSC Cofacilitators)

After acknowledging Laura M's (AD Chicagoland) 31-year clean date, Daniel C (WSC CF) then introduced Motion #7.

Motion #7 World Board

To extend the six World Board members' terms currently expiring in 2024 through the end of the upcoming World Service Conference cycle.

Intent: To accommodate the change to the WSC cycle that has already occurred and avoid World Board terms ending in the middle of a conference cycle.

Initial straw poll Motion #7: 102-6-2-3

92% Consensus support

Daniel then conducted a straw poll to determine if the amendment to Motion #7 would be discussed.

Do you want to discuss and decide on the amendment to Motion #7?

Decision: 41-82-0-1

33% Lack of strong support – amendments were not considered (See [Appendix H](#))

No-one in the minority wished to speak to the motion, so Daniel then moved to a second straw poll on Motion #7.

Decision Motion #7: 119-5-0-0

95% Motion carried with consensus support

Daniel then introduced Motion #12.

Motion #12 World Board

To change the current policy of NA World Services automatically funding delegates from seated regions and zones to the WSC to funding available upon request.

Intent: To encourage service bodies to fund their delegates, but ensure that regions and zones that need the funding are able to have it.

Initial straw poll Motion #12: 101-9-0-3

91% Consensus support

Daniel invited anyone in the minority to speak to the motion.

Sandy M (RD ABCD) explained that her region was against the motion because it felt it would discourage delegates from attending the WSC, particularly those from overseas who may have cultural differences and be uncomfortable with requesting money. She added that

many regions had decided to opt out from being funded to attend the WSC and time should be given to see if that process worked before changing to a system where regions had to opt in. She stated that she had asked for a percentage of the number of regions that had opted out of being funded, but had not yet received an answer.

Marcelo G (RD HOW Brazil) requested an answer to the question referred to by Sandy.

Daniel explained that this was not the time for questions, and that he did not believe that Sandy had asked the question when speaking, but rather had referenced that it had been asked.

Daniel then asked if there were any questions before the second straw poll.

Yuval (RD Israel) asked about the process of requesting funding.

Tim S (WB Chair) explained that it would simply be a request.

Dezzz G (RD Wisconsin) asked if there were cultural differences in some communities when it came to asking for money.

Tim replied that it was not consistent in the board's experience.

Emilio R (RD Peru) asked how many delegates had self-funded or been partially or wholly funded to this WSC?

Anthony E (NAWS Executive Director) responded that at the last count, 46 communities had either totally or partially funded their delegates.

Decision Motion #12: 110-12-0-3

90% Motion carried with consensus support

Motion #22 Southern California Region

If any Motion or Proposal, in Content or Intent, has been submitted and failed to achieve consensus or adoption at two consecutive World Service Conferences, the previously proposed Content and Intent may not be suggested to the Fellowship in the Conference Agenda Report (CAR)/ Conference Approval Track (CAT) or at the WSC for one entire conference cycle.

Intent: To use the Fellowship's decision-making processes and time responsibly and effectively.

Initial straw poll Motion #22: 76-29-4-4

69% Strong support

Danny G (WB) expressed concern that passing this motion would stifle discussion on the process of vetting motions.

Jadwiga B (RD Poland) said she believed that the time frame in the motion was too long.

Charles B (AD Region 51) asked for clarity on how the motion would be interpreted.

Daniel responded that any confusion about the wording of the motion should have been addressed during the process of CAR workshops, and that the body was now voting on the motion as it had been written.

Second straw poll Motion #22: 76-44-4-1

61% Lack of strong support

Bill W (RD British Columbia) had concerns about how the motion could affect motions in the future that were different but had similar intents, and asked if the maker would be willing to withdraw it.

Sadala A (RD Brazil Sul) said he supported the intention of the motion to avoid discussing the same motions repeatedly, but was not in favor of the method offered by the motion.

James K (RD Utah) questioned the practicality of enforcing the motion.

Daniel then asked if there were any questions before the next straw poll.

Mike C (RD California Inland) asked if the motion could have some effect on *FIPT* inspection requests if they were made at subsequent WSCs, and if *CAR* motions that were not voted on would be affected.

Tim responded that it was a possibility that *FIPT* inspection motions could be impacted, but motions that were not presented would not be.

After explaining that straw polls are taken periodically during discussion to gauge if the body was moving, Daniel opened another poll.

Decision (Third straw poll) Motion #22: 58-64-2-1

46% Motion failed with lack of strong support

No objection was voiced to taking the third straw poll as a final decision

Motion #4 World Board

To acknowledge that an NA meeting that meets regularly in person or virtually can choose to be an NA group if they meet the criteria described in *The Group Booklet*, including the six points for an NA group, and are consistent with NA philosophy as expressed in our Traditions. (Footnotes will be added to *The Group Booklet* and GLS, reflecting the decision of the WSC, if this motion passes, and referencing *Virtual Meeting Basics* as a possible resource.)

Intent: To recognize NA groups that meet virtually, including online and by phone.

Initial straw poll Motion #4 107-5-0-1

95% Consensus support

Shigeto O (RD Japan) requested clarity as *The Group Booklet* was not translated into Japanese.

Daniel confirmed that any meeting that met the criteria in the booklet could be acknowledged as an NA meeting, regardless of whether they met in person or virtually.

Dean H (RD California Mid-State) stated her region's opposition to the motion because it perceived it as a mandate, and groups are not directed by service bodies.

Daniel then asked for questions before conducting another poll.

Several participants asked if the motion would affect the status of virtual groups in the service system.

Tim responded that the motion was simply about recognizing virtual meetings as groups. Other decisions weren't addressed by the motion.

Other questions were raised about the intent of the motion not mentioning in person groups, and the number of languages *The Group Booklet* is translated into. Tim responded to these by referencing the essay in the *CAR*.

Decision Motion #4: 114-9-1-0

91% Motion carried with consensus support

The conference then recessed for lunch.

CAR-RELATED DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS

2:00 pm–3:45 pm

Daniel C and Mario T (WSC Cofacilitators)

Daniel began the session by introducing Motion #23.

Motion #23 Kentuckiana Bluegrass Appalachian Region; Co-makers: Upper Rocky Mountain Region, Russian-Speaking Zone, Western Russia Region, North-West Russia Region

All in-person and virtual World Service Conferences will be streamed to provide access to NA members in English audio.

Intent: To allow the entire NA membership a better understanding of what takes place at the World Service Conference.

Initial straw poll Motion #23: 76-26-4-7

71% Strong support

Daniel reminded the body that because the motion did not have consensus there was not the option to decide not to consider amendments. He then introduced the amendment.

Motion #23-a1 Brazil Sul Region

To amend Motion 23 by replacing the words “English audio” with the words “all languages that are being simultaneously translated”

The motion as amended would read:

All in-person and virtual World Service Conferences will be streamed to provide access to NA members in all languages that are being simultaneously translated.

Initial straw poll Motion #23-a1: 50-35-9-19

53% Lack of strong support

Sadala A (RD Brazil Sul) was asked to speak to the amendment. He explained that the purpose of the amendment was to create equal access to the conference for all the translated languages.

Tim S (WB Chair) responded that the technology currently employed would not support this amendment, but all ideas were being collected as input for the Future of the WSC project.

Daniel then opened debate on the amendment.

Saymon S (RD Brazil), Pavel I (RD North-West Russia), and Vincent D (RD Quebec) all spoke in favor of the amendment as it would promote involvement and understanding.

Sam K (RD UK) offered the thought that just as translated recovery literature helps a community to grow, providing translated audio feeds might encourage members to participate in service.

Jose M (RD Portugal) suggested that it would be technically possible.

Sasha P (RD Ukraine) questioned whether the potential number of members that would listen would be worth the investment in resources.

Daniel then asked if there were any questions before conducting another poll.

Caitlin F (RD Kentuckiana) asked if it was possible to estimate the cost of providing additional language feeds.

Tim and Anthony E (NAWS ED) responded that a skilled translator was the main challenge, and referred the body to the relevant essay in the CAR. Mandating something like this through policy is a challenge given how much the conference changes every cycle.

Kelly S (RD Alabama/NW Florida) asked if the stream would be provided at the next WSC in three years if it was technically possible.

Tim responded by saying that it had not been discussed.

Maurice S (RD Greater New York) asked if only Japanese, Portuguese, and Spanish simultaneous translations were currently being provided.

Anthony responded that Spanish, Portuguese, and Farsi were being provided via the translation booths, and Russian and Japanese were being provided by translators sitting alongside those delegates. Anthony also reminded the body NAWS takes every opportunity that it can to expand accessibility to translations.

In response to another question, Anthony again explained that the technology being used did not currently allow the translated feeds to be streamed.

Decision (Second straw poll) Motion #23-a1: 43-72-2-7

36% Amendment failed with lack of strong support

No objection was voiced to taking the second straw poll as a final decision

The body then returned to discussion of Motion #23. No cards were raised, so Daniel called for questions before opening the poll.

Mat S (RD South Florida) asked if the motion failed, would the board discontinue the English stream?

Tim replied that they would not discontinue the stream.

Alon S (AD Israel) asked if the board would continue to ask participants about streaming the conference if the motion failed.

Tim confirmed that the board would continue to consult delegates about streaming the conference in the future.

James K (RD Utah) asked how many participants were listening to the stream.

Tim replied that there were 64 at that time.

Decision (Second straw poll) Motion #23: 80-40-2-3

65% Motion failed with lack of strong support

No objection was voiced to taking the second straw poll as a final decision

Motion #24 Kentuckiana Bluegrass Appalachian Region; Co-makers: Upper Rocky Mountain Region, Russian-Speaking Zone, Western Russia Region, North-West Russia Region

All Conference Participant webinars will be streamed to provide access to NA members in English audio.

Intent: To allow the entire NA membership a better understanding of what takes place during CP Webinars.

Initial straw poll Motion #24: 68-35-4-6

63% Lack of strong support

Daniel then introduced amendment #24-a1

Motion #24-a1 Brazil Sul Region

To amend Motion 24 by replacing the words “English audio” with the words “all languages that are being simultaneously translated.”

The motion as amended would read:

All Conference Participant webinars will be streamed to provide access to NA members in all languages that are being simultaneously translated.

Initial straw poll Motion #24-a1: 47-39-8-19

50% Lack of strong support

Sadala A (RD Brazil Sul) spoke to the amendment and stressed it was about inclusion.

Tim responded that currently the capability to stream the translated feeds did not exist.

Daniel then opened the floor for discussion of the amendment.

Matthias V (RD German Speaking) offered that the webinars were for conference participants, who in turn had the responsibility to bring the information to their communities. He also suggested that the timing on the webinars would not make them accessible for attendees in some time zones.

Gail W (RD Upper Rocky Mountain) asked if the maker of the amendment would consider withdrawing it until such time as it was technically feasible.

Brenda D (RD Nebraska) suggested streaming the audio would be helpful in communities that elect a second-alternate delegate, and could attract members to service.

Rajiv S (RD NERF) pointed out that there are many languages spoken in his region and streaming in them would make a big difference to his community.

Caitlin F (RD Kentuckiana) suggested it would be helpful for unseated regions to view the stream in order to gain a greater understanding of what was involved with being seated at the WSC.

Remco G (RD Netherlands) pointed out the challenge with being unable to stream discussions in breakout rooms, and suggested that attendance would be lower than at the WSC.

Daniel then asked for questions before moving to a final vote.

Rossella R (RD Italy) asked why was the amendment accepted if it wasn't practical?

Daniel explained that the cofacs were not concerned with the practicality of an amendment, but rather with whether or not it was worded correctly.

Troy B (RD Connecticut) asked how challenging it would be to participate in other parts of the world.

Tim replied that he personally got up 3:30 am for conference participant webinars, while for others it was even earlier.

Decision Motion #24-a1: 32-87-0-5

26% Amendment failed with lack of strong support

The body then returned to discussion of Motion #24.

Jacob S (RD North Carolina) suggested that participants should decide to stream the web meetings themselves, rather than being directed to do so by the Fellowship.

Second straw poll Motion #24: 68-53-3-1

54% Lack of strong support

An objection was raised to this being the final vote.

Patrick D (AD Quebec) shared that during the pandemic all the service bodies in the region, as well as the regional convention, were streamed, and it had great value for them.

Matthew J (ZD EDM) said that the unseated regions in the EDM had expressed clearly that in order for them to better understand how World Services functions they would like better access to it.

Decision Motion #24: 64-53-3-3

53% Motion failed with lack of strong support

Bill W (RD British Columbia) appealed Daniel's decision to take a break.

Daniel responded by saying that virtual participants in particular needed a break, as did some of the in-person participants.

Mario conducted the appeal.

Do you support the decision of the facilitator?

Decision: 106-14-1-2

87% Decision of facilitator upheld

Daniel then called for a 20-minute break.

CAR-RELATED DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS

4:05 pm–6:19 pm

Daniel C and Mario T (WSC Cofacilitators)

After opening with the Serenity Prayer, Tim S (WB Chair) reminded participants not to share the WSC Zoom link. Daniel C (WSC CF) then introduced Motion #25.

Motion #25 *Kentuckiana Bluegrass Appalachian Region, Co-makers: Russian-Speaking Zone, Western Russia Region, North-West Russia Region*

All votes and straw polls on motions that were included in the Conference Agenda Report or the Conference Approval Track, not to include election ballots, will be displayed in real time for all Conference Participants to see, showing who voted and how they voted.

Intent: To see how each Conference Participant votes on each motion.

Initial straw poll Motion #25: 31-74-5-3

28% Lack of strong support

Pavel I (RD North-West Russia) spoke in favor of the motion because it would enable support to be offered to regions that did not vote due to a lack of understanding of the motion.

Joe Y (RD Greater Illinois) spoke in favor of the motion because it would allow for greater transparency.

Kirby M (AD Ohio) said his region disagreed with the motion because of anonymity and the belief that seeing how everyone voted could create resentments.

Gogs T (ZD Afri-Can ZF) questioned what purpose it served to see how others voted and whether it would foster unity.

Daniel asked if there were questions before the next straw poll, and Jacob S (RD North Carolina) asked if the clickers used by participants to register their votes had the capability to provide voting information in real time.

Tim replied that they did not, and in response to a further question, clarified that the clickers were not set to provide that information.

Decision (Second straw poll) Motion #25: 21-99-2-2

17% Motion failed with consensus not in support

No objection was voiced to taking the second straw poll as a final decision

Motion #20 *Wisconsin Region*

To direct NAWS to provide at na.org audio recordings of the worldwide webinars on the topics of Public Relations, Hospital & Institution, Step Writing for Inmates, Fellowship Development, Phone Line, and others.

Intent: To provide access to any interested member of Narcotics Anonymous throughout the world so they can hear the Experience, Strength, and Hope (ESH) of members from other geographic parts of the world.

Initial straw poll Motion #20: 66-35-5-7

62% Lack of strong support

Daniel then introduced the amendments to the motion.

Motion #20-a1 *Wisconsin Region*

To amend Motion #20 by making the following changes:

To direct NAWS to provide at na.org the World Board to develop a project plan, to create a workgroup to consider providing audio recordings of the worldwide webinars on the topics of Public Relations, Hospital & Institution, Step Writing for Inmates, Fellowship Development, Phone Line, and others.

The motion as revised would read:

To direct the World Board to develop a project plan, to create a workgroup to consider providing audio recordings of the worldwide webinars on the topics of Public Relations, Hospital & Institutions, Step Writing for Inmates, Fellowship Development, Phone Line, and others.

Intent: Wisconsin Region had no intent to tell the body what it should do and now knows that this is the proper procedure for having the body look at new ideas.

Initial straw poll Motion #20-a1: 55-31-9-18

57% Lack of strong support

Dezzz G (RD Wisconsin) said that the amendment was intended to ensure the motion followed the proper procedure.

Tim responded that the board's response to the amendment was the same as their response to the original motion: Written reports are provided for each webinar and are rarely requested.

No cards were raised to discuss the amendment, and in response to a question, Tim clarified that recordings of the Fellowship webinars were already posted.

Decision (Second straw poll) Motion #20-a1: 42-70-6-6

35% Amendment failed with lack of strong support

No objection was voiced to taking the second straw poll as a final decision

Motion #20a-2 Brazil Sul Region

To amend Motion 20 by adding "including the simultaneously translated audio feeds" after the word "webinars."

The motion as amended would read:

To direct NAWS to provide at na.org audio recordings of the worldwide webinars, including the simultaneously translated audio feeds, on the topics of Public Relations, Hospital & Institution, Step Writing for Inmates, Fellowship Development, Phone Line, and others.

Initial straw poll Motion #20a-2: 48-36-8-21

52% Lack of strong support

Sadala A (RD Brazil Region) shared that the amendment was intended to ensure that all recordings of the languages that the webinar was translated into were posted.

Tim responded that the board did not object to the spirit of the amendment but current technology and resources did not make it feasible to provide the recordings.

Decision (Second straw poll) Motion #20a-2: 27-83-5-8

23% Amendment failed with lack of strong support

No objection was voiced to taking the second straw poll as a final decision

The body then voted on Motion #20.

Decision Motion #20: 60-57-5-2

49% Motion failed with lack of strong support

Daniel then introduced Motion #5 related to the *FIPT*. Only regional delegates were able to vote on this motion, but separate counts for the zonal delegates were taken after each *FIPT*-related motion.

Motion #5 World Board

To revise A Vision for NA Service, changing the phrase “his or her own language and culture” to the phrase “their own language and culture.” (If this motion passes, A Vision for NA Service will be revised in future printings, including in Fellowship-approved recovery literature.)

Intent: To revise the Vision Statement to be more inclusive.

Initial straw poll Motion #5: 93-12-1-2

87% Consensus support

(ZD vote: 4-1-0-0)

Decision Motion #5: 101-13-0-1

88% Motion carried with consensus support

(ZD vote: 5-1-0-0) 89% with ZD vote

Motion #14 Sweden and Australia Regions, Co-makers: Northern California Region, Wisconsin Region, Ontario Region

To direct the World Board to create a project plan for consideration at the next WSC to investigate changes and/or additional wording to NA literature from gender specific language to gender neutral and inclusive language.

Intent: This motion will give the conference and the Fellowship the ability to meaningfully discuss changes to our literature to be more inclusive of all our members.

Initial straw poll Motion #14: 75-34-2-2

67% Strong support

Tomas K (RD Sweden) explained that the motion was about starting the process to consider and investigate NA language, and was about inclusivity.

Pavel I (RD North-West Russia) said his region directed him to vote against the motion as they felt that it would distract from the Fellowship’s primary purpose.

Berit A (RD Denmark) supported the motion based on the commonalities of diversity and principles identified in the community building session on Sunday.

Matthias V (RD German Speaking) highlighted the challenge with deciding who would determine what changes were needed, but was supportive of the direction offered in the motion.

Sam L (RD Northern New England) pointed out that the topic of the motion was also supported in the CAR survey.

John H (RD Montana) said his region voted no on the motion because all the LGBTQ meetings in Montana voted no on the motion, there were concerns that changing the literature would create a bigger problem with illicit literature, and because they liked the literature the way that it is.

Emilio R (RD Peru) expressed the belief that the Fellowship was already inclusive, shown by the presence of LGBTQ+ and atheist members, and that the motion would take the Fellowship away from its main purpose of recovery from addiction and towards involvement in gender politics.

Second straw poll Motion #14: 82-41-2-0

65% Lack of strong support

Robson N (RD Grande Sao Paulo) supported investigating the subject as there are many terms in NA literature that are not inclusive.

Mandy H (RD Alaska) supported the idea of a discussion on the topic.

Patrick J (RD Carolina) suggested that the Fellowship should try to evolve in the same way that the language used in society had evolved. Atro L (RD Finland) supported this perspective.

James P (RD New England) said the LGBTQ groups in his region were in support of the motion, and some were already altering the literature in their meetings.

Patty K (RD Minnesota) encouraged the body to dedicate the time and resources to investigate the possibilities and what was practical, possible and feasible.

Jade T (RD Southern California) suggested that changes could potentially benefit more members than just those in the LGBTQ community.

Third straw poll Motion #14: 84-38-1-0

68% Strong support

Lib E (WB) identified as a member of the queer community and presented the motion as an opportunity to create a space for a conversation and to build a group conscience.

Michael F (RD Northern California) said that a project plan could include several of the other issues raised by other motions in the CAR.

Krista L (RD Best Little) represented the support that her region offered for this motion as a miracle as it was not an easy place to be a member of the LGBTQ community.

Kia K (RD Washington/Northern Idaho) referenced the previous discussion topic of who's missing from our meetings, and questioned what message it would send if the motion wasn't supported.

Mat S (RD South Florida) talked about the efforts in his region to involve and welcome everyone.

Decision (Fourth straw poll) Motion #14: 92-31-1-1

74% Motion carried with strong support

No objection was voiced to taking the fourth straw poll as a final decision

Motion #15 Southern California Region

To direct the World Board to create a project plan for the next WSC to initiate the process for the Fellowship to approve adding "gender" to "What is the NA Program?" to read: "Anyone may join us regardless of age, race, gender, sexual identity, creed, religion or lack of religion."

Intent: To change 'What is the NA Program' to be more gender-neutral and inclusive.

Initial straw poll Motion #15: 46-59-2-6

42% Lack of strong support

Daniel then asked for a motion to commit Motion #15 to the board for the project plan called for in Motion #14. Nine regions supported his request. Alaska Region was recorded as the maker and British Columbia as the seconder

Danny G (WB) requested an explanation of the term "commit to the World Board" for the participants who were at their first WSC and may not understand it.

Daniel explained that the body just made a decision to create a project plan with a similar topic. Committing motion #15 would require the board to consider its content when creating that project plan.

Several participants expressed confusion about the process. Daniel clarified that a two-thirds majority would be required to commit the content of Motion #15 to the board as input for the creation of the project plan referenced in Motion #14. He also explained that a cofacilitator had the ability to suggest committing a motion when it seemed appropriate to

do so, but that the body would make the decision and could vote “no” if they did not think the motion should be committed.

Alaska Region / British Columbia Region: To commit Motion #15 to the project plan for Motion #14

Decision: 84-34-3-2

69% Motion carried with strong support

A roll-call vote was requested and ruled out of order as it was not made before the vote. A motion to reconsider was also ruled out of order as the maker was not in the majority.

The body recessed until 8:30 am the next day.

Tuesday 2 May 2023

CAR-RELATED DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS

8:30 am–10:20 am

Daniel C and Mario T (WSC Cofacilitators)

Tim S (WB Chair) opened the session with the Serenity Prayer and invited Irene C (WB) to make announcements about the women's luncheon and the onsite games room.

Mario T (WSC CF) conducted a roll call. 132 voting participants were present: 116 regions, 4 zones, and 12 board members. Mario explained that as the first motions would be related to the *FIPT*, only regional delegates who were present for the roll call were eligible to vote. Following a request from a participant, the roll call was conducted again to account for any late arrivals: There were 117 regional delegates, 6 zones, and 12 World Board members present. Were present. (See [Appendix B](#))

After reviewing the disposition of Motion #15 from the previous day, Daniel C (WSC CF) introduced Motion #1.

Motion #1 *World Board*

To approve adding zonal delegates from seated zones to the Settlor and Trustor of the Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust (FIPT).

Intent: To reflect the decision at WSC 2018 to make delegates from seated zones voting WSC participants and honor the six-month Fellowship review of this proposal that occurred from December 2020 through May 2021.

Initial straw poll Motion #1: 99-6-2-1

92% Consensus support

(ZD only initial straw poll: 5-0-0-0)

Daniel asked if the body wanted to discuss and decide on the amendment to Motion #1.

James K (RD Utah) asked if the motion would be sufficient without the amendment.

Jack H (WB) responded that it would be. However, the board has offered the amendment to clarify the motion.

Do you want to discuss and decide on the amendments to Motion #1?

Decision: 91-22-1-2

77% Strong support – amendment was considered

Daniel then introduced Motion #1-a1

Motion #1-a1 *World Board*

To add to the end of Motion 1 the following:

... in Article II and to clarify the description of Recovery Literature in Article III of the FIPT as reflected in Addendum B.

Motion 1 would read as amended: Motion 1: To approve adding zonal delegates from seated zones to the Settlor and Trustor of the Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust (FIPT) in Article II and to clarify the description of Recovery Literature in Article III of the FIPT as reflected in Addendum B.

Initial straw poll Motion #1-a1: 82-8-7-11

84% Consensus support

(ZD only initial straw poll: 3-1-1-0)

Jack H (WB) restated the board's belief that the amendment would further clarify the original motion.

Decision Motion #1-a1: 107-6-3-1

91% Amendment carried with consensus support

(ZD only straw poll: 6-0-0-0)

Motion #1 (as amended) World Board

To approve adding zonal delegates from seated zones to the Settlor and Trustor of the Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust (FIPT) in Article II and to clarify the description of Recovery Literature in Article III of the FIPT as reflected in Addendum B.

Intent: To reflect the decision at WSC 2018 to make delegates from seated zones voting WSC participants and honor the six-month Fellowship review of this proposal that occurred from December 2020 through May 2021.

Decision Motion #1 (as amended): 111-3-1-1

94% Motion carried with consensus support

(ZD only straw poll: 6-0-0-0)

Motion #2 World Board

To approve the revisions to the FIPT Operational Rules contained in Addendum B.

Intent: To revise the Operational Rules to reflect discussions at WSC 2018 about the Inspection of Trustee Activities and to reflect current practices, terms, and language.

Initial straw poll Motion #2: 92-8-4-4

88% Consensus support

(ZD only initial straw poll: 4-1-0-0)

Do you want to discuss and decide on the amendments to Motion #2?

Decision: 48-64-3-2

41% Lack of strong support – amendments were not considered (See [Appendix H](#))

Daniel then reintroduced Motion #2 and asked if anyone in the minority wished to speak.

Sandy M (RD ABCD) stated her opposition to the motion and her concern that it would remove the Fellowship’s oversight of its intellectual property.

Nancy C (RD New Jersey) echoed Sandy’s concerns and expressed the belief that the purpose of the inspection clause was to ensure that the concerns of the minority were heard.

Second straw poll Motion #2: 81-19-6-11

69% Strong support (Percentage if those registering as present not were taken out of the vote count – 76%)

In response to a question, Daniel explained that for votes on FIPT motions, percentages were calculated on the number of delegates present in the most recent roll call, which was 117, so for those motions “present not voting” responses would effectively still be part of the vote count.

Consensus was not maintained, so discussion ensued.

Patricia J (RD Chesapeake and Potomac) voiced her region’s concern that the changes to the inspection clause failed to adequately protect the rights of the minority.

Emilio R (RD Peru) said that a smaller percentage of regions should be required to initiate an inspection.

Doug W (RD Pacific Cascade) suggested that the amendment to the motion would resolve some of the issues being discussed.

Tom K (RD Rio Grande) said that a lower percentage in the future would be preferable, but in the meantime the Fellowship needed to be protected from litigious inspection requests.

Gail W (RD Upper Rocky Mountain) expressed support for the motion and for the idea that the conference should oversee the spending of NA funds that would be required for an inspection.

Kelly S (RD Alabama/Northwest Florida) reviewed the decisions the body had already made regarding the percentage threshold required, and reminded the body that it had an opportunity to review the percentage required and the majority did not vote for 33%. He also stated that the motion had been out for a long time and no evidence had been provided to support any of the concerns being expressed.

Jacob S (RD North Carolina) requested a roll call and referred to a page of the *FIPT* that he said required it prior to every vote.

Daniel responded that that only applied to votes on the trust itself, but that he would look into it while the body took a short break.

CAR-RELATED DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS

10:40 am–12:22 pm

Daniel C and Mario T (WSC Cofacilitators)

Daniel C (WSC CF) opened the session with the Serenity Prayer and an explanation of the compromise reached with Jacob S (RD North Carolina) to begin with a roll call. 117 regional delegates, 6 zonal delegates, and 12 World Board members were present. (See [Appendix B](#))

Jack H (WB) then offered a clarification regarding the last straw poll on Motion #2. He explained that the *FIPT* Operational Rules could be revised by a yes vote of two-thirds of regional delegates recorded as present in the WSC roll call immediately prior to a vote. The *FIPT* works in concert with *GWSNA*, which states that delegates can be present not voting, even when approving literature that is then added to the trust, so it was decided that it would be appropriate to do the same when calculating the percentages for polls and votes on Motion #2. The percentage with PNV included as a yes vote was added to the record, which had no effect on the level of support.

Vince P (RD Sierra Sage) requested to go back to the amendment for Motion #2 in light of the information offered during discussion of the motion. Daniel ruled this out of order and Vince appealed that decision. Mario conducted the appeal and asked Vince to speak to it.

Vince shared that he thought that the confusion with the voting process, and the information raised during discussion, meant that the body should have the option to reconsider the amendment. He cautioned against making a decision based on reaction, rather one based on discussion.

Daniel replied that his intention was to hold another straw poll to see if the previous discussions had moved the body.

Mario conducted the appeal.

Do you support the decision of the facilitator?

Decision: 77-45-0-1

63% Decision of facilitator upheld

Dezzz G (RD Wisconsin) raised a concern that one of the virtual conference participants was unable to log on to the voting software and wasn't being helped.

Daniel responded that they had participated in the last poll, and were being directly assisted by staff.

Kathleen M (RD Mid-Atlantic) asked if being recognized to ask a question prior to a poll or vote would affect being recognized to speak during discussion.

Daniel confirmed that it would not and then conducted the third straw poll on Motion #2.

Third straw poll Motion #2: 85-27-3-2

72% Strong support (73% with PNV taken out of vote count)

Troy B (RD Connecticut) clarified that the *FIPT* says that a single region can request an inspection, and the motion was not changing this. The revision would change the process by requiring the request to be in the form of a *CAR* motion, which would give the conference the ability to decide on the merit of the request, rather than a letter to the World Board.

Ahmed E (RD Egypt) shared that minority voices should be heard, but decisions in NA should be made by at least a simple majority.

Dana S (RD Mountaineer) stated her region's opposition to the motion, based not on a lack of trust of the board, but on the need for transparency, and her region's perspective that the motion was an over-reaction.

Meg M (RD Arizona) suggested that the issue was how many people would be required to initiate an inspection.

Pam T (RD OK) shared her perspective that the proposed requirement of 51% in favor of an inspection would still allow the minority to be heard, and an inspection request with merit would be supported by the body.

Daniel then asked if there were any questions before the next poll.

Mike H (RD Central California) asked if the 2018 inspection revealed anything amiss.

Jack responded that it did not, and referred Mike to the report of the inspection posted on na.org.

Fourth straw poll Motion #2: 90-24-1-2

76% Strong support (78% with PNV taken out of vote count)

Daniel noted that discussion was not moving the body and asked if this could be considered as a decision.

Caitlin F (RD Kentuckiana) asked if the workgroup had recommended 15% as the threshold for an inspection request.

Jack responded that it had not, and that the workgroup had not reached consensus on a percentage. The board's recommendation of 51% followed consultation with conference participants.

Decision Motion #2: 93-20-0-3

79% Motion carried with strong support (81% with PNV taken out of count-Consensus support)

(ZD only straw poll: 5-1-0-0)

Following a request, Daniel then conducted another roll call. 120 regional delegates, 6 zonal delegates, and 13 World Board members were present. (See [Appendix B](#))

Motion #3 World Board

To approve the revisions to NA Intellectual Property Bulletin #1 contained in Addendum D.

Intent: To revise this bulletin so that it provides more direct and clear guidance, and so that it reflects current practices, terms, and language.

Initial straw poll Motion #3: 97-6-4-1

90% Consensus support

(ZD only initial straw poll: 4-1-0-0)

Jan G (AD Poland) shared the challenges his region had with obtaining literature from NAWS, and asked for time to discuss these concerns.

Joe Y (RD Greater Illinois) stated his region's belief that because groups own the literature they should have the right to copy it when needed. He added that he believed that permission would be granted if a request was made.

Before the next straw poll, Yuval B (RD Israel) asked for details of the process for a request to reprint literature.

Jack responded that any requests would be responded to promptly.

Jon A (RD Northern New York) asked how the process would be enforced.

Anthony E (NAWS Executive Director) responded that a request to help make literature available to addicts had never been denied. The purpose of requesting permission was to better protect the Fellowship's intellectual property.

Sandy M (RD ABCD) asked if NAWS would grant permission to post the Basic Text online.

Anthony responded it would not, and that it had been tried. Over a hundred thousand copies of the PDF were distributed. Allowing the unbridled distribution of a piece of intellectual property erodes the owner's right to protect it.

Decision Motion #3: 104-12-2-2

86% Motion carried with consensus support

(ZD only straw poll: 5-1-0-0)

In response to a question, Anthony confirmed that permission had been granted previously for a group to print literature for its meetings.

The body then broke for lunch.

CAR-RELATED DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS

2:00 pm–3:30 pm

Daniel C and Mario T (WSC Cofacilitators)

Mario T (WSC CF) opened the session with a roll call. 120 regional delegates, 6 zonal delegates, and 12 World Board members were present. (See [Appendix B](#))

Daniel C (WSC CF) then introduced Motion #6.

Motion #6 World Board

To approve a change to World Services Translation Policy in GWSNA to allow the possibility for up to six locally developed personal stories to be included in translated Sixth Edition Basic Texts, if the stories have first been published in the Little White Book of that language. These stories would be placed in their own section in Our Members Share with the following language preceding them:

A Vision for NA Service looks forward to a day when addicts around the world have the opportunity to experience our message in their own language and culture. In pursuit of that vision, communities or language groups that have published local stories in the Little White Book may include up to six of those stories in the Basic Text if they choose. These [fill in the number] stories were originally published in the [fill in the language] Little White Book in [fill in the year].

Intent: To better reflect our Vision that “every addict in the world has the chance to experience our message in [their] own language and culture...” in our primary text.

Initial straw poll Motion #6: 107-0-0-1

100% Unanimous support

(ZD only initial straw poll: 5-0-0-0)

Decision Motion #6: 118-1-1-0

98% Motion carried with consensus support

(ZD only straw poll: 6-0-0-0)

Motion #8 World Board

As a result of the COVID pandemic, to suspend the World Convention of NA (WCNA) rotation policy after 2024, to allow the World Board to determine what is possible and practical moving forward and then seek approval from conference participants.

Intent: Given the disruption in the rotation of WSC and WCNA that has already occurred, the increases in event costs, and the other changes brought about by the pandemic, to allow an evaluation by the World Board and approval by conference participants for what is possible and practical in the future.

Initial straw poll Motion #8: 89-15-3-6

83% Consensus support

Do you want to discuss and decide on the amendments to Motion #8?

Decision: 57-68-0-1

45% Lack of strong support – amendments were not considered (See [Appendix H](#))

Daniel then reintroduced Motion #8

Decision Motion #8: 107-13-2-4

87% Motion carried with consensus support

Motion #19 Wisconsin Region

To direct the WB to create a virtual Institutional Review Board (IRB) to review all researchers and their research questions that request access to the Narcotics Anonymous population through NAWS to conduct research.

Intent: To avoid the misuse of Narcotics Anonymous member information.

Initial straw poll Motion #8: 42-56-8-7

39% Lack of strong support

Daniel then introduced the amendment to the motion.

Motion #19-a1 Wisconsin Region

To direct the WB to create develop a project plan to create a workgroup to investigate the need for a virtual Institutional Review Board (IRB) to review all researchers and their research questions that request access to the Narcotics Anonymous population through NAWS to conduct research.

The motion as revised would read:

To direct the World Board to develop a project plan, to create a workgroup to investigate the need for a virtual Institutional Review Board (IRB) to review all researchers and their research questions that request access to the Narcotics Anonymous population through NAWS to conduct research.

Intent: Wisconsin Region had no intent to tell the body what it should do and now knows that this is the proper procedure for having the body look at new ideas.

Initial straw poll Motion #19-a1: 40-48-7-18

42% Lack of strong support

Dezzz G (RD Wisconsin) spoke to the motion and the amendment, saying that they were made because some newcomers were made uncomfortable by the survey that asked about their spiritual beliefs and practices and believed that it was required. The motion requested an additional safety process.

Tim S (WB Chair) referred the body to the response in the CAR, and expressed the board's belief that additional safeguards were not needed.

Don S (RD Dan Diego/Imperial) said his region was divided on the motion, didn't find the amendment helpful, and suggested the motion should be committed to the board.

Dean H (RD California Mid-State) expressed her region's concerns about the researcher who conducted the survey, and their position on harm reduction programs.

Jacob S (RD North Carolina) stated his belief that the philosophy of the researcher was irrelevant, and the concerns raised were unnecessary.

Irene C (WB) reminded the body that the survey was voluntary, and a reminder could have been added if concerns had been sent to the board at the time. She also mentioned the guidance in the *PR Handbook* that NA is not a secret society and needs to make itself known through cooperative efforts with respected researchers.

Vaios Z (RD Greece) questioned the nature of the concern with a voluntary and anonymous survey.

Decision Motion #19-a1: 34-85-2-5

28% Amendment failed with lack of strong support

Daniel then reintroduced Motion #19.

Decision (Second straw poll) Motion #19: 41-78-4-2

33% Motion failed with lack of strong support

No objection was voiced to taking the second straw poll as a final decision

Motion #13 Argentina Region

To direct the World Board to create a project plan for the next World Service Conference (WSC), for the development of a new IP for daily personal inventory of gratitude.

Intent: To create a new resource for the fellowship members, through a new IP for the daily personal inventory of gratitude.

Initial straw poll Motion #13: 76-29-5-3

69% Strong support

Decision Motion #13: 88-29-3-2

73% Motion carried with strong support

In response to a question from Kathleen M (RD Mid-Atlantic), Tim reminded the body that there is already a backlog of projects that have not been completed due to a lack of resources, and that the CAR survey is the mechanism for prioritizing those projects.

Motion #16 Baja Son Region, Co-makers: South Florida Region, México Occidente Región, Northern California Region, Southern California Region, San Diego Imperial Counties Region & Región de México

To direct the World Board to develop a project plan, for consideration at the next World Service Conference, to create a booklet of Step study questions where all answers relate to a line in Chapter Four in the Basic Text.

Intent: To create a fellowship approved, inexpensive, NA Step study questions booklet that relates directly back to the Basic Text.

Initial straw poll Motion #16: 54-49-6-4

49% Lack of strong support

Bill W (RD British Colombia) said his region believed that ideas for literature projects should come from the Fellowship through the use of surveys, and not through regional motions.

Ernesto M (AD Occidente Mexico) shared his personal experience of being helped by the booklet.

Joe Y (RD Illinois) expressed support for basic tools that could be easily translated.

Sandy M (RD ABCD) opposed the motion, even though the literature was widely used in her region, as it did not need the support of NAWS to be used by addicts. She added that it would need to be Fellowship-approved if it were to be used in prisons and jails, and that there could be problems with the creator of the piece claiming copyright if it was reproduced locally.

Michael F (RD Northern California) said his region opposed the motion as it sought to subvert the existing literature creation process.

Sam L (RD Northern New England) drew the body's attention to the results of the CAR survey, and in particular, where the idea was in the list of priorities.

Before the second straw poll, Atro L (RD Finland) expressed confusion about the process for getting items into the CAR survey other than by a CAR motion.

Tim reminded the body that the CAR survey was sent to delegates for input prior to it being published.

Several delegates expressed confusion about whether the piece already existed and its history. In response, the record was checked, and Tim confirmed that a similar motion had been committed to the board at the 2018 WSC. The booklet was included in CAR surveys as a result of that action, but it had not gained any traction. Tim also referred the body to the board's response to the motion in the current CAR.

Liliana M (AD Baja Son) explained that the booklet used in her region was just an example of what could be produced, and that they were open to ideas and input.

Daniel then called for another straw poll.

Decision (Second straw poll) Motion #16: 57-63-3-1

46% Motion failed with lack of strong support

No objection was voiced to taking the second straw poll as a final decision

The body then took a break.

CAR-RELATED DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS

4:00 pm–5:52 pm

Daniel C and Mario T (WSC Cofacilitators)

The session opened with Motion #17.

Motion #17 California Inland Region

To place an 8 year moratorium on the creation of new recovery literature after WSC 2023, excluding all translations or literature projects currently in development.

Intent: To suspend the creation of new literature for an 8-year period and free up NA resources to better focus on carrying the message rather than continual literature development.

Initial straw poll Motion #17: 35-65-7-6

32% Lack of strong support

Daniel C (WSC CF) then introduced the amendment to the motion.

Motion #17-a1 North-West Russia Region

To make the following changes to Motion 17:

To place an ~~8-year~~ 6-year moratorium on the creation of new recovery literature after WSC 2023, excluding all translations or literature projects currently in development.

The motion as amended would read:

To place a 6-year moratorium on the creation of new recovery literature after WSC 2023, excluding all translations or literature projects currently in development.

Initial straw poll Motion #17-a1: 33-53-10-17

34% Lack of strong support

Pavel I (RD North-West Russia) spoke briefly to the amendment, noting that it was intended to coordinate with a three-year conference cycle and that two cycles would be enough to finish any outstanding projects.

Tim S (WB Chair) stated the board's belief that the motion would not assist the translations process.

Mike (RD California Inland) said that his region would accept the amendment, and that the motion was not intended to focus on translations, but instead to allow some time to catch up on projects.

Two participants spoke against the amendment and the original motion, stating their desire for more literature.

In response to several questions before the next straw poll, Tim confirmed that any plans for new literature projects would include a delayed start date if this motion passed, but that revisions to existing literature would not be affected.

Decision (Second straw poll) Motion #17-a1: 30-86-3-4

25% Amendment failed with lack of strong support

No objection was voiced to taking the second straw poll as a final decision

Daniel then reintroduced Motion #17 and asked for a decision-making poll.

Decision Motion #17: 31-89-3-3

25% Motion failed with lack of strong support

Motion #18

Tejas Bluebonnet Region

To direct the World Board to create a project plan for the next WSC to study permitting service committees of Narcotics Anonymous who are, or may be, willing to serve as literature printing/distribution and selling centers inside and outside the United States.

Intent: The intention is to study the impacts of permitting service committees of Narcotics Anonymous inside and outside the United States to print and distribute NA literature.

Initial straw poll Motion #18: 42-65-2-4

38% Lack of strong support

Ash D (ZD APF) shared about the challenges experienced in some of the APF communities to obtain literature and suggested that discussion about potential solutions should continue.

John J (AD Colombia) suggested that his region would not have the resources to undertake this type of service, and that the region had found ways to obtain literature with the help of NAWS.

Sadala A (RD Brazil Sul) supported the idea of continuing to discuss multiple distribution centers, but acknowledged the complexity of the issue.

Rafael P (RD Quisqueyana) shared some of the challenges with obtaining literature in his region.

Alexander M (RD Western Russia) shared about the challenges with finding local members to maintain the literature distribution center in Russia, and the damage caused by the printing and distribution of illicit literature in his region.

Decision Motion #18: 42-78-4-2

33% Motion failed with lack of strong support

Motion #21 Free State Region

To direct NA World Services to remove the Hospitals and Institutions Handbook from the inventory.

Intent: To remove an outdated service manual from WSO inventory

Initial straw poll Motion #21: 24-82-2-5

22% Lack of strong support

Daniel then introduced the amendment to Motion #21. He explained that the cofacilitators would have considered this a substitute motion and not allowed it if the guidance about amendments in GWSNA had been clearer.

Motion #21-a1 South Florida Region, Co-maker: New Jersey Region

To substitute the wording of Motion #21 with the following:

Create a project plan for the next WSC to update the Hospitals and Institutions Handbook and remove outdated terms and references.

Initial Straw Poll Motion #21-a1: 71-24-3-15

72% Strong support

Mat S (RD South Florida) spoke to the amendment, stating that while parts of the handbook were outdated, other parts still had value and were widely used. He also expressed the hope that materials like this could be more easily updated in the future.

Tim stated the board's recommendation to update *H&I Basics* and to continue posting the *H&I Handbook* in its current form.

Kathleen M (RD Mid-Atlantic) voiced her concern about the challenges with the literature prioritization system.

Jadwiga B (RD Poland) shared that the handbook was widely used in her region, but acknowledged that it needed updating.

Daniel then asked whether there were any questions before the next straw poll.

Marcelo G (RD HOW Brazil) asked if the board was recommending the motion.

Tim replied that they were not, but were instead recommending updating *H&I Basics*.

In response to a question, Daniel explained again that the cofacilitators would not have allowed a substitute motion but for the statement made by the WSC cofacilitator in 2018 that substitute motions would be treated as amendments. Mario T (WSC CF) expressed the hope that there would be some discussion before the end of the WSC about possible revisions to GWSNA to better clarify the position on amendments and substitute motions.

Decision (Second straw poll) Motion #21-a1: 89-28-3-6

74% Amendment carried with strong support

No objection was voiced to taking the second straw poll as a final decision

Daniel then called for a final vote on Motion #21 as amended.

Motion 21 as amended: Create a project plan for the next WSC to update the Hospitals and Institutions Handbook and remove outdated terms and references.

Decision Motion #21 (as amended): 109-13-3-1

87% Motion carried with consensus support

This concluded the CAR Discussion and Decision sessions. Tim ended the day with a round of applause for the cofacilitators and staff, and a reminder that tomorrow's session would begin at 9:00 am sharp.

Wednesday 3 May 2023

COLLABORATIVE PLANNING

9:00 am–9:45 am

Jim DeLizia (NAWS Consultant)

*** How to Plan ***

Essential Planning Steps

- ❶ **INVENTORY.** Gather information and input and identify issues that need to be addressed.
- ❷ **PLAN.** Set challenging, yet achievable goals. Brainstorm various ways you could achieve each goal, including current activities that work well.
- ❸ **PRIORITIZE.** Focus resources on those ideas that will help you address the most critical needs or opportunities.
- ❹ **DELEGATE.** Empower others to use their skills, experience and passion for NA to get involved and collaborate to achieve great things.
- ❺ **MONITOR.** Track progress and provide support where needed.
- ❻ **EVALUATE.** Assess progress, celebrate success and change what didn't work.
- ❼ **UPDATE!** Keep the plan fresh each year as needs change and new issues arise.

Qualities of Effective Planning

- **Driven by a common vision.** We plan so that we can better carry the message of hope.
- **A process, not an event.** Planning is an ongoing process we use to track our progress and find new and better ways to meet the needs of the fellowship as those needs change.
- **Information-based.** Gathering information and input before and during the planning process gives us insight and helps us make better decisions.
- **Inclusive.** When we involve others in the planning process we build ownership in the plan, and we benefit from different perspectives, experiences and ideas.

Jim DeLizia (NAWS Consultant) began by reviewing the purpose and format of the session, and then engaged participants in a warm-up exercise. Each person was asked to write the name of an everyday object on an index card, pair up with the person next to them, and then imagine how both objects could be combined to form something new. Jim explained that the exercise was intended to show the power of imagination and intelligence, and what can be achieved when we work together.

Jim moved on to highlight the main purpose of the session: to launch a new collaborative planning process that will involve the entire NA service system. Jim explained that this hadn't been done before with such a complex and multi-layered organization, and that adjustments might be needed along the way. The Planning Tips card was then reviewed. Jim continued by discussing how the process begins with an inventory that is intended to eventually encompass the entire service system. The purpose of the inventory is to gather information,

identify trends, and assess the impact of those trends on achieving the Vision. The next steps in the process will be to gather input locally and set goals in the upcoming cycle, and then prioritize what action to take during the interim WSC.

Jim concluded this part of the session by reviewing the remaining planning steps, explaining that some tasks may be delegated to zones or regions, and reminding everyone that monitoring and adjusting where needed are important parts of the process.

Before participants moved to their breakout rooms for the next part of the session, Jim asked for some examples of external and internal factors that could impact the ability of the Fellowship to fulfill A Vision for NA Service. Examples included:

- External:
 - The economic/financial situation
 - Restrictions in accessing jails and treatment centers due to the pandemic
 - Technology creating new ways to communicate
 - Increase in the use of medication in treatment programs
- Internal:
 - Workshops on predatory behavior (influenced by the external factor of the “Me Too” movement)

*** Why Plan ***

Planning . . .

- Unites us around a common vision
- Ignites our passion, energy and excitement to achieve more
- Builds consensus around goals and priorities we believe will make a difference
- Keeps us accountable to the Fellowship we serve
- Focuses us and helps us get the most from limited resources
- Gives members a meaningful way to contribute to service
- Helps develop future leaders with a global perspective

Other Ways You and Your Service Bodies Can Benefit from Planning

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

- Resistance to change and to engaging with new technology
- Virtual meetings and services

Jim then asked participants to move to their breakout rooms and be ready to start work at 10:00 am.

COLLABORATIVE PLANNING BREAKOUT ROOMS

10:00 am–12:00 am

Breakout Rooms

The conference separated into three rooms: one for delegates, one for alternates, and one for Spanish and Portuguese speakers, and into three breakout rooms on Zoom for virtual participants.

Once in the breakout rooms, each table and each virtual breakout room discussed the following questions:

EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT (outside of NA)

What factors (trends, issues, etc.) are shaping the environment in which NA strives to achieve its vision? (Consider factors in such areas as social/demographic/cultural, technological, economic, legislative/regulatory/political, legal, environmental, etc.)

INTERNAL ENVIRONMENT (within NA)

What factors (trends, issues, etc.) are shaping the environment within NA that will impact the ability to achieve our vision? (Consider factors in such areas the effectiveness of service bodies, the atmosphere of recovery, funding, unity, illicit literature, etc.)

Each table in the separate rooms then prioritized the top three external and internal factors they believed would most impact NA's ability to achieve the Vision for NA Service over the next three years. Similar ideas offered by the tables were combined and the entire room again prioritized the top three factors to report back to the entire body. The virtual participants in each of the breakout rooms also chose their top three and each room reported these to the body.

(See [Appendix C](#) for the compiled notes from these discussions.)

COLLABORATIVE PLANNING FEEDBACK AND WRAP-UP

12:15 am–1:20 pm

Jim DeLizia

Jim DeLizia opened the session and welcomed everyone back from the breakout rooms. He invited each facilitator to share highlights of their prioritized external and internal factor lists and any interesting information that arose from the breakout discussions.

RD Room: Hammed A (WB)

Hammed shared that many of the external factors his group discussed fed into the internal factors.

External Factors

- Harm reduction models such as DRT/MAT
- Evolution of technology—pros and cons
- Geopolitical dynamics
- Legalization of drugs
- Financial crisis due to COVID

Internal Factors

- Resource bottlenecks— human and financial— affecting some of the development of trusted servants

- Safety:
 - Racial discrimination
 - Sexual predators
 - Discrimination against members on DRT/MAT
- Redundant service models and lack of cohesive service efforts
- Literature availability and illicit literature

AD Room: Irene C (WB)

Irene noted that their group discussed many similar points to the RD room. In their discussion of external factors, the ADs developed some common themes, but they were all over the place with internal factors.

External Factors

- Global financial crisis, including effect on Seventh Tradition
- DRT/MAT— more of a US and Europe problem
- Geo-political
 - Legalization of drugs
 - War
 - National disasters
 - Inability to get visas
 - Government policies— people court-ordered to meetings
 - Technology

Internal Factors

- Disruption caused by court-ordered members
- Members getting clean virtually

Spanish and Portuguese speaking Room: Jose Luis L (WB) and Jorge M (WB)

Jose Luis and Jorge reported from the Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking room.

External Factors

- Technology
 - Con: Accessibility to virtual resources in some countries
 - Pro: Also more opportunities for unity, access to meetings
- Geo-political
 - Can't get literature into countries— customs, taxes, etc.
 - Court-ordered addicts in meetings creates larger groups than Seventh Tradition can support
- Cultural
 - Gender issues
 - Class issues
 - Stigma, especially because of bad behavior at meetings

Internal Factors

- Lack of trusted servants— need to sponsor new members into service
- Generational differences in how to approach and carry out service (paperless, etc.)
- Seventh Tradition: foster culture of giving

- Strong personality issues— control of groups, members, “we’ve always done it this way” attitude

Virtual Room #3: Tana O (WB)

Tana reported that members in this globally diverse room shared many commonalities.

External Factors

- DRT/MAT— multiple impacts
 - Positive: decrease in stigma around addiction
 - Negative: non-NA language, confusion about cleantime, taking service positions
- New and different approaches to recovery: harm reduction, sober companions
- Governmental policies: can make it difficult for NA to operate—anti LGBTQ, making it difficult to meet, requiring groups to reapply for government permission to meet (every two years in some places)
- Rise of a virtual society and virtual access— positive and negative impact
 - New opportunities for PR, H&I, and FD
 - Access to resources and experience related to recovery and service from other communities for isolated members

Internal Factors

- Virtual environment— positive and negative impact
 - Increased options for members to attend meetings
 - Decrease in in-person attendance
 - New opportunities for service
 - Increased global awareness of NA, and increase of NA’s global reach among members
- Increased group independence post-pandemic— services may need to be reimagined
- Resistance of older members to change— new literature, language, technology

Virtual Room #1: Yoel G (WB)

Yoel also mentioned the diversity of the group before sharing the external and internal factors they prioritized.

External Factors

- DRT/MAT
- Legalization of marijuana
- Meeting space availability after the pandemic
- NGO status required in some countries

Internal Factors

- Atmosphere of recovery in service bodies and ways to enhance it— sharing sessions and step work
- Zonal forums being more involved
- Getting younger people involved and using their ability with technology

Virtual Room #2: Lib E (WB)

Lib listed the participants, their locations, and their time zones.

External Factors

- Prescription medications, over-the-counter psychiatric medications, and DRT
- Cultural dynamics: women not being seen, access to meetings
- Societal discrimination: racism, sexism, homophobia, gender-related issues
- Lack of PR
- NA members owning rehabs, treatment centers using NA For financial gain

Internal Factors

- Blurring of NA message
- Groups splitting due to resentments
- Make sure to keep welcoming old-timers
- Religion and government not supporting NA or making it difficult to develop
- Predatory and disruptive behavior
- Lack of trusted servants
- Cultural and societal dynamics
- Prescription medications
- Virtual meetings’ impact on in-person meeting attendance
- Availability and accessibility of our approved literature, allowing development and distribution of illicit literature. Example: book that looks like Basic Text, but content is grey form.

Jim thanked everyone and stressed how important it was to review the responses together to see the richness of the discussions, both in diversity and commonality. He said it was important to probe the ideas and find the common threads that can be acted on together as a body, while also still allowing people their unique individual voices. Jim explained that he and the board and staff members processed all of the points from the breakout room discussions and created two polls—one for external and one for internal factors. Each participant was asked to use their clickers to choose the three factors they believe will most affect NA’s ability to fulfill the NA Vision.

Participants (on-site and virtual) were first asked to choose THREE of the External Factors summarized from the breakout discussions. In response to questions, Jim explained that the purpose of the poll was to get a feel for what the most important issues might be, but that none of the other ideas would be lost.

POLL 1 – External Factors

1. Evolution of Technology—pros and cons	76
2. Geo-political dynamics	46
3. Generational/cultural differences	61
4. Harm reduction model/approach	58
5. Increasing financial constraints/crisis	41
6. Legalization of drugs	33
7. Alternative programs for addicts	29
8. Recovery for profit	26

The top three choices for external factors were:

- Evolution of Technology— pros and cons
- Generational/cultural differences
- Harm reduction model/approach

Jim then asked for the second poll:

POLL 2 – Internal Factors

1. Development and organization of trusted servants	90
2. Redundancy and lack of cohesion in the service system	42
3. Sense of safety, welcome-ness, and inclusion	58
4. Generational differences/gaps	21
5. Impact of illicit literature	21
6. Disruption and bottle-necks in the flow of funds	41
7. Impact of the rise of virtual NA	20
8. Resistance to change	46

The top three choices for internal factors were:

- Development and organization of trusted servants
- Sense of safety, welcome-ness, and inclusion
- Resistance to change

Redundancy and lack of cohesion in the service system was close behind “resistance to change.” Jim suggested that this would be an interesting topic to talk and think about, stepping back and looking at who’s doing what, where and what are we delivering, and where we can be more efficient. Jim also noted that disruption and bottlenecks in the flow of funds got a fair amount of attention.

Jim then reviewed the next steps in the planning process, and reminded the body that notes, polls, and other information from the session would be provided to everyone, along with a summary of the inventory. Tools for participants to gather insight from their service bodies to feed into the strategic plan, will then be sent to delegates in late 2023 or early 2024 for discussion and vetting at regional meetings. The interim WSC will offer an opportunity to review the results, prioritize where the body wants to take action, and to start creating plans.

Jim closed the session by noting that collaboration leads to innovation, and offered a quote from Ralph Waldo Emerson: “Do not follow where the path may lead. Go instead where there is no path and leave a trail.” He said he saw the conference body as pioneers creating a future and a system for the people who will sit in the room five or ten years from now: The legacy for WSC 2023 will be to have created and implemented new ideas and systems to engage, unify, and ignite the service system to fulfill the NA Vision. Jim thanked all participants for their time and energy.

Tim S (WB Chair) ended the session by thanking Jim and by reminding everyone to be back at 3:00 pm.

BUDGET OVERVIEW

3:00 pm–4:30 pm

Anthony E (NAWS Executive Director)

Anthony E (NAWS Executive Director) opened the session with an explanation that it would provide a review of the NAWS budget contained in the Conference Approval Track (CAT) material. Before beginning the review, he discussed the length of some of the new idea proposals submitted for discussion in the sessions scheduled for Friday afternoon. The length of some of them made translation impossible, so in future, there will have to be a character limit for the submissions. For this conference, the material was distributed in its entirety, but the ideas were summarized in the survey created to prioritize which ideas would be discussed.

Anthony then reviewed the arrangements for transport to the airport after the close of the conference, explaining that travel on the vans hired for the event would be prioritized for non-US participants who were less able to make travel arrangements by themselves.

Anthony then continued the session by explaining that he would be focusing on highlights from the CAT material, rather than repeating it all, and that there would be time for questions. He asked participants to wait until the session tomorrow to ask any questions about project plans. He then reviewed the structure of the NAWS budget, including the percentages of fixed costs allocated to each of the four activity areas.. Anthony explained what fixed costs included, and mentioned that the technology budget had been significantly increased from previous cycles to allow for upgrades to the data and accounting systems. Anthony referred participants to the Proposed Budget Memo beginning on page 14 of the CAT for a detailed description of the budget, which follows the memo.


He then explained that the graph of overhead and personnel expenses on page 18 showed a considerable decrease in costs caused by the necessary staff reductions during the financial emergency in the early stages of the pandemic, but he referenced the need to increase staffing levels in the upcoming cycle, particularly in the translation team.

Anthony then reviewed the continuing decrease in sales of IPs and booklets, caused in part by their availability on na.org, and partly by the decrease in the number of in-person groups to distribute them. The distribution of free and subsidized literature also decreased for the same reason, but Anthony expected that to increase over time.

Anthony then discussed how trends over longer periods of time are the tool he uses to determine where the organization is financially, and that they show that slow progress is being made in the number and size of orders received. He stated that the primary concerns are stability and sustainability, and that the loss in sales of IPs and booklets had fortunately been offset by a dramatic increase in member contributions. Anthony then mentioned the

\$500,000 in legal costs incurred defending the recent lawsuits, the \$600,000 cost of the conference, and the expenses for the upcoming World Convention to explain that the cash balance in the bank account wasn't a good indicator of long-term stability. A more accurate measure of sustainability is determined by the figures designated as "accounts receivable" in the budget that show the value of the orders being received together with contributions, balanced against the monthly expenses of the organization.

Anthony then referenced the bubble graph on page 24 of the CAT that provided more detail about each expense area, and explained that the percentages may vary from cycle to cycle depending on what priorities were established and the need to continue providing literature at discounted or



subsidized levels. He explained that literature costs were set globally in an effort to make it affordable in all communities. He stressed that the real issue was making literature available to the addict who still suffers, even if this meant spending money far in excess of what could ever be recouped.

Anthony then responded to questions from participants, confirming details of where in the budget specific items could be found and offering the following information and thoughts:

- Collaborative global discussions on the needs of the entire Fellowship are needed to effectively increase resources and determine how they are allocated. Earmarking funds for specific purposes has been proven not to work.
- The NAWS budget is deliberately conservative—normally expenses are overestimated and income is underestimated.
- NAWS does not publish information about individual employees' salaries beyond what is legally required annually.
- The *NAWS Annual Report*, and other publications, provide detailed information about NAWS' activities. Members with additional questions or requests are encouraged to email the World Board: wb@na.org.
- It's expected that the resources allocated to Fellowship development and direct interactions with some of the zonal forums, as well as collaborative efforts with local members for PR events, will increase.
- Transferring funds to NAWS from outside the US is a problem in many communities. Finding solutions to this is an ongoing effort.
- Rebuilding staff capacity will take time.

The session ended with Gogs T (ZD Afri-Can Zone) expressing thanks for the immeasurable efforts undertaken by NA World Services and members around the world to promote the growth of NA in Africa.

The conference then took a 30-minute break.

HUMAN RESOURCE PANEL REPORT

5:00 pm–6:30 pm

Nathanael M (HRP Panel Leader)

Nathanael M (HRP Panel Leader) began the session by introducing the rest of the Human Resource Panel (HRP): Craig R, Arne H-G, and Laura B.

Nathanael thanked the candidates who participated in the nomination process, and acknowledged the efforts of the zones, regions, and the board in forwarding nominations. He shared that the session would focus on providing information about the nominations and election processes, and on the ideas the HRP has for the upcoming cycle. Time was allotted at the end of the session for questions and answers.

Nathanael explained that the HRP focuses primarily on evaluating candidates. The process this cycle began after the 2020 WSC with nominations from regions, the board, and zones. This is commonly known as the RBZ process, and has been used since 2006. Each candidate is asked a range of questions, created by the HRP, that provide the opportunity for them to show their skills, talents, and qualifications for the available service positions. The candidates' answers are used to create Candidate Profile Reports (CPRs) that are distributed to voting conference participants.

Each HRP member evaluates each candidate's responses and individually scores it, approximately based on the following percentages: recovery questions – 10%, service and leadership – 30%, general questions – 50%, life experience – 10%. The next phase is to interview each candidate virtually, before finally creating a slate of candidates the panel believes are best suited to fulfill the tasks outlined in *GWSNA*. Nathanael stressed the

importance of regular communication with the candidates. He then presented a video of each candidate introducing themselves.

Craig R (HRP) then provided additional information, including:

- Experience has shown that the strongest candidates possess some familiarity with World Service; have either been a delegate, or on a workgroup; provide succinct responses to all questions; and have been evaluated by regions, zones, or the board.
- There were five World Board positions available at the 2023 WSC, and any nominee receiving 60% or more of the votes would be elected.
- Conference cofacilitators are elected by a simple majority, and one position was available.
- Participants can vote for all of the nominees. Historical data has shown that only voting for the number of candidates equal to the number of open seats results in those seats not being filled.
- Since the start of the RBZ process in 2006, 41 of the 43 elected board members have had at least one RBZ nomination. Since 2002, only one nomination from the floor has resulted in a WSC election.
- Only 20 of the 74 members elected since 2006 have come directly from the World Pool rather than an RBZ. That's 20 from a 5,500-member World Pool .

Craig then spoke about the software used for the elections process and asked participants to complete their ballots as soon as possible, reminding everyone that the deadline was 4 May at 6:30 pm.

Craig then offered three ideas from the HRP about changes to the elections process that they hoped would be discussed in the Moving Forward session on Saturday:

1. To require at least one RBZ nomination for each candidate and to work together to strengthen the leadership identification process
2. Repurpose the World Pool
3. Remove the policy allowing nominations from conference participants

Nathanael then invited questions from the floor. In response to these, the following information was offered:

- The number of nominees on the ballot exceeds the number of open positions.
- Panel members made every effort to be objective when evaluating candidates.
- Diversity on the ballot could be improved by RBZ recommendations of diverse candidates.
- Only one woman received an RBZ recommendation for election to the HRP, and none for cofac.
- The ability to speak English is a requirement for candidates.
- Participants do not have the ability to question candidates at the WSC, but can do so at their region or zone.
- NA World Service experience is a criterion for nomination, which was established as such by the body, and reflects the fact that an effective trusted servant at the world level requires prior experience.
- The World Pool hasn't been an effective means of identifying candidates, but could serve as a database of information about candidates submitted via the RBZ process.
- There is no process for notifying a region or zone about the disposition of recommendations submitted by them.

- Term limits for World Board members are calculated from the formation of the board in 1998 and do not include service terms completed before that date on service boards and committees that no longer exist.
- The HRP provided sample questions to aid with the RBZ process and is considering ways to increase engagement with regions, zones, and the board in future.

The session closed with thanks to the HRP support staff and the two outgoing panel members.

Thursday 4 May 2023

NAWS REPORT – PART I

9:00 am–10:30 am

Anthony E (NAWS Executive Director)

The session began with Nathanael M (HRP Panel Leader) explaining that there had been a technical issue with the elections ballot software, and all votes cast up to that point were null and void. New ballots would be issued by noon, and all participants were asked to cast their votes again.

Anthony E (NAWS ED) then asked all participants to check the information posted on the conference room door about travel arrangements to the airport. Anthony passed around copies of the special edition of *A Spiritual Principle a Day (SPAD)*. He then continued with some highlights of NAWS operations.

Translations

There are approximately 1,300 translated literature items in 58 active languages, and approximately 200 active translations projects. The demand continues to increase, and rebuilding translations resources will continue to be a focus.

Meeting Data

The World Service Office began maintaining a current list of all NA meetings in 1975, following a decision by the Board of Trustees. The first WSC in 1976 reported that there were 151 NA meetings in the entire world. Today that figure is over 72,000. This presents a significant challenge in maintaining an up-to-date list. Anthony acknowledged that it has proved impossible to achieve any degree of accuracy, and he proposed a more effective approach to the board. As of 31 December 2023, the current system will be discontinued.. Search results will still be driven by geography, but instead of reflecting World Services' meeting data, they will contain links to websites and phonedlines with meeting information near your search location.

Virtual Meetings

Anthony explained that not every virtual meeting is attached to a geographic service body, and many have no wish to, so the NAWS website will continue to provide information about virtual meetings.

Staff

Anthony said that typically he would introduce the staff at this point in the NAWS Report, and he wasn't going to do that this time, but he wanted to acknowledge the sacrifices that staff have made to make this WSC possible. In order to ensure the survivability of the organization, many staff were furloughed or laid off, and many of them are volunteering to make the WSC possible.

Virtual Services

NAWS will continue to utilize virtual platforms to provide services, including topic-specific webinars of interest to members in general, and interactions with area, regional, and zonal trusted servants. Anthony mentioned the creation of a Farsi-language website to improve communication in Iran <https://nairan.org/>, the transition from Dropbox to the WSC Portal, the approval of *SPAD*, and the creation of *Virtual Meeting Basics* as notable achievements. He stated his belief that virtual services will continue to play a significant role in continuing to carry the message around the world.

Fellowship Development

Anthony mentioned China and Cuba as two places where the government has very recently stated that there are no addicts needing help in their countries. He offered these as indicators of the work that still needs to be done to make the NA message available, and

shared how members visiting Cuba have been able to carry literature with them. The hope is to work with the Latin-American Zonal Forum to identify countries that can legitimately transport goods into Cuba to try and make literature available on a consistent basis.

Infrastructure

Anthony reviewed the decision to move out of the warehouse space next to the WSO, and told the body that so far it has worked out well and has come in under budget.

Much of the antiquated IT infrastructure, including file servers and the database, will be replaced after the WSC. Some parts are over twenty years old and have become unreliable.

Production

Anthony shared some of the challenges with the supply chain, including the individual plastic bags that keytags are being supplied in (which will hopefully soon be discontinued), slight changes in keytag colors, and inconsistent colors for IPs. He gave the 300% increase in paper prices in Iran in the last few days as an example of the challenges, and said he expected them to continue for the next couple of years.

Questions and Answers

Anthony then invited questions from the floor.

Patrick J (RD Carolina) asked if there could be a way for members with IT experience to assist NAWS.

Anthony responded by mentioning the focus groups and beta-testing NAWS undertakes, and invited any members with those skills to contact NAWS.

Jon A (RD Northern New York) asked if there were plans to move to digital versions of NA literature.

Anthony responded that this had been looked at for seven years, but because of licensing fees, it was prohibitively expensive. He added that alternatives were being sought.

Scott M (RD Show-Me) asked if there were plans to host a webinar for trusted servants involved in sponsorship behind the walls service, which he said were growing robustly in his region.

Anthony replied that it was on the list.

Jacob K (RD Mid-America) asked if there was a point where the increase in the technology budget would result in decreased staffing costs, and whether the 10% increase in the technology was Anthony's preference, or the bare minimum.

Anthony answered by saying that he did not foresee a time when technology would replace many of the staff functions, and that because many of the capital costs of the IT upgrades had already been incurred, he believed that the 10% budget increase would be sufficient.

Wil M (RD Buckeye) asked if NAWS received any income from the sales of eLit.

Anthony responded that NAWS receives approximately 58–63% of the revenue from literature sales. He also mentioned that there has not been a rapid increase in eLit sales, and that paper appeared to still be the preferred literature medium for many members.

Sam K (UK RD) explained the challenge the UK website was having with listing Polish-speaking meetings in the UK that were already listed on the Poland Region's site because it would result in duplicate listings on the NAWS site when the meeting data was uploaded from the UK site. She asked if the new database would alleviate this problem.

Anthony replied that the solution could be to provide a link on the UK site to the meeting information on the Polish site, and issues like this would probably arise given the complex nature of the global Fellowship and would have to be dealt with on an as-needed basis.

Jorge M (RD Argentina) asked if there were any plans to sell virtual literature.

Anthony responded that subscriptions to digital material, and creating a digital content delivery system had been considered but an approach had not been settled on. He referenced the lack of staff resources as the main challenge with moving forward with these types of ideas at this time.

Jadwiga B (RD Poland) asked in Motion #3 would affect the ability to post daily meditations from NA literature online, and whether it was possible to make eLit available in other languages.

Anthony replied that it was possible to post meditations in other languages, but those communities needed to contact NAWS first. In response to the second question, Anthony said that the intention was to make all translated literature available digitally, but that it would take time, and that the Basic Text was being prioritized.

Jadwiga asked a follow-up question about the availability of hard-copy literature from the European Service Office, particularly when it was ordered in larger quantities.

Anthony responded that books are produced in quantities based upon the monthly averages of sales, so advance notice of larger orders would be helpful.

Saymon S (RD Brazil) asked which titles would be prioritized next when creating digital versions.

Anthony replied that all the books were available digitally, with the exception of *SPAD*.

The conference then took a thirty-minute break.

NAWS REPORT – PART II

11:00 am–12:30 pm

Tim S (WB Chair)

The session began with a clarification from Nathanael M (HRP Panel Leader) that the election ballots would all arrive in a single email, rather than in three separate ones.

Tim S (WB Chair) also clarified that the deadline for responding to the New Ideas Prioritization survey was 5:00 pm that day.

Tim then continued the session with some remarks about succession planning at the WSO. He explained that Anthony E's (NAWS Executive Director) employment contract was due to expire at the end of 2024, and that he had asked Anthony during one of their weekly calls if he would be willing to extend that date. After discussing the request with his family, Anthony stated his willingness to extend his contract by one year. The board approved the extension, meaning that WSC 2023 would be Anthony's last in-person WSC. Following extended applause, Anthony shared his feeling that underneath all the challenges encountered in his time at NA World Services there has been an undying love for Narcotics Anonymous. He reflected that working at NAWS has been his life's privilege, and thanked the people that had mentored and supported him through the years. He closed with some thoughts about the role that WSC participants play in the future of NA, and expressed his love and thanks to the body.

After further applause, Tim then informed the body that Becky M (NAWS Assistant ED) had been offered, and accepted, the position of executive director after Anthony's retirement.

Tim then continued the session by reviewing the difficult decisions made in 2020 that an in-person WSC was not possible, and that cuts to staffing levels had to be made, and that travel for World Services was suspended. Tim then talked about the regular online meetings that the board had established, both amongst themselves and at Fellowship events, and invited Nancy C (RD New Jersey) to share about one of the positive outcomes of this change.

Nancy shared about the idea in her region to introduce the World Board to the members in New Jersey, outside of the usual framework of CAR discussions and motions, to create a sense of the "we" in NA service. The resulting CAR workshop involved no discussion of budgets and business, but instead, several board members shared their stories. Nancy

thanked all those involved in helping realize her “random idea” that helped her membership gain a new understanding of the “we” element of World Service.

Tim then talked about the decision to cancel the World Convention scheduled to be held in Australia, and how the sadness of this was compounded by the loss of the former World Board member from Australia, Ron B, after a long illness.

Tim then offered some statistics about the current WSC:

- 139 voting participants
- 101 alternate delegates [This number was revised to 103 post-WSC]
- 4 HRP members
- 2 cofacilitators
- 5 in-person translators, and several additional virtual translators
- 120 regional delegates from a total of 123 seated regions
- 6 zonal delegates
- 11 RDs, 2 ZDs, 1 board member, and 25 ADs joined the conference virtually
- Minas and Northwest Russia participated at their first WSC
- 64 of the 126 delegates were from the US, 5 were from Canada, and 57 were from outside the US and Canada [These numbers were revised post-WSC to 66 US, 5 Canada, 55 outside US and Canada]
- 65 of the 107 alternate delegates were from the US, 5 were from Canada, and 37 were from outside the US and Canada [These numbers were revised post-WSC to 103 alternate delegates – 56 US, 5 Canada, 42 outside US and Canada]
- The conference consisted of 182 men and 65 women, were from 44 countries, and spoke 28 languages. [These numbers were revised post-WSC to 179 men, 63 women, 45 countries, 28 languages]

Tim then referenced *The Loner* revision survey results and the results of the survey on DRT/MAT as it relates to NA, both of which are in the *Conference Report*. The challenge of DRT/MAT as it relates to NA is we don't yet have a Fellowship consensus. Obviously, we all believe in complete abstinence, said Tim, but the Fellowship hasn't agreed on what to say about this issue yet. We need to have an ongoing conversation.

Tim then discussed the development of service and recovery literature. Shorter service material has been our focus lately, he said. *A Guide to Local Service* has been translated into three languages, and *CBDM Basics* is already available in six, which gives some indication of the usefulness of The Basics. Since the WSC requested a statement be added to the front of service pamphlets that they are not intended to be read at recovery meetings, the number of downloads and distribution has dropped. The development of recovery literature is deliberately slow.

Tim then provided more detail about the board's process for recommending candidates for the World Board. He explained that the board put a lot of effort into evaluating the current and future needs of the board and the Fellowship when considering possible candidates, giving the example that three women were recommended because there is a shortage of women on the board. The board has not offered recommendations for the HRP or cofac positions.

Tim then offered further detail about WCNA 38, the theme of which will be “The Power of Love”, which will go on sale sometime in October or November 2023. He reminded everyone to keep an eye on the WCNA webpage for service opportunities.

Tim then reviewed some of the work for the upcoming cycle:

- The Future of the WSC

- People selected by their zones to be workgroup members were asked to email worldboard@na.org
- Issue Discussion Topics
 - Dealing with disruptive and predatory behavior
 - Gender-neutral and inclusive language in NA literature
 - Re-imagining and revitalizing services
 - The board is recommending adding DRT/MAT as it relates to NA as an additional topic this cycle
- Revising *The Loner* IP

Tim then invited Jack H (WB) to talk about the Invest in Our Vision (IIOV) project. Jack began by clarifying that the vision in the project was a vision for all of NA. He continued by explaining that for a long time, many members have believed that service efforts should not be funded by revenue from the sale of merchandise, a belief that was supported by the collapse in revenue in the early days of the pandemic. The board has established a goal that 70% of all costs to provide services, outside of literature production costs, come from Fellowship contributions. During the pandemic, the percentage of income from contribution grew from 9 to 12% for a couple of decades to as high as 25% ish. But the budget itself was lower. That's a significant increase, but a long way from achieving that goal, said Jack.. Jack stated that the goal of the project was as simple as raising consciousness of the need to invest funds to better carry the message.

Tim then showed the results of the CAR survey ([Appendix G](#)) and explained that they would be discussed later in the day. Anthony also offered an overview of the efforts in multiple regions to get NA literature placed onto tablets given to incarcerated members, and expressed his thanks to the members involved. He added that NA World Services will not agree to making NA material available to any corporation that charges a fee to inmates to access the material.

Tim then invited questions from the floor.

Kelly S (RD Alabama/Northwest Florida) asked if there was any awareness or discussion about the potential cultural divide in NA between those who support and encourage online meetings, and those who do not.

Anthony replied that he was aware of the issue in some places, and suggested that the decision taken during the WSC may encourage a broader conversation about the role of virtual groups in the service system. He also highlighted the problem of virtual gatherings that were presenting themselves as NA meetings, but were in fact predatory environments that had nothing to do with carrying the message of Narcotics Anonymous.

Andrea F (ZD LAZF) asked if there was a plan to make a version of the literature available for sale that can be posted and shared in virtual meetings.

Anthony replied that there was not.

In response to other questions, the following information was provided:

- The world pool database is currently offline; the date for opening it up is dependent on the decisions about the HRP recommendations.
- The cost for regions to purchase tablets to send into correctional institutions is prohibitive. World Services forging agreements with correctional systems who provide the tablets themselves seems be a more effective approach.
- Methods of sending contributions to NAWS from overseas are being investigated.
- Conference participants were notified via email when candidate profile reports were posted in Dropbox.

- Registered service bodies have the ability to use registered NA trademarks on merchandise.
- NAWS translations team staff can offer guidance regarding the distribution of drafts of translated literature.
- The new idea prioritization survey was intended to be completed by voting participants.

Tim then ended the session with a reminder to look for the election ballot email.

BUDGET DISCUSSION AND DECISION-MAKING/CAR SURVEY

2:00 pm–3:15 pm

Becky M (NAWS Assistant ED)

After some announcements regarding the availability of the gift edition of *A Spiritual Principle a Day*, and the location of the New Idea Prioritization Survey on the WSC portal, Becky M (NAWS Assistant ED) reviewed the project plans being offered for approval. With the aim to ensure that participants had a clear understanding of what was in each project plan before voting on them in the next session, she made the following points:

- Currently only four or five names from a possible 15 have been submitted by zones for the Future of the WSC project.
- The Creating Our Future session on Friday would provide the opportunity to give input on the most important topics for the Future of the WSC project to discuss.
- Conference participants help the board to frame the IDTs during conference sessions and CP web meetings.
- The IDT about disruptive and predatory behavior is intended to begin by framing and fostering discussions, and will hopefully result in revised service tools.
- The board is proposing to start the IDT about reimagining and revitalizing service committees with Fellowship-wide webinars and focus groups to try to gather some of our experience rather than just making it a broad, open Issue Discussion Topic.
- The IDT focused on DRT/MAT as it relates to NA is an ongoing conversation, as there doesn't appear to be a common vision in the Fellowship for what to capture in NA materials at this point. There is still a conversation to be had about how to make people feel welcome in NA.
- The New and Revised Service Tools project has a number of items being proposed for development:
 - The PR Video explaining what NA is, how it works, and how to contact NA has been discussed during PR webinars so should be ready to start.
 - Virtual Service Basics is a subject the Fellowship is still learning about. Information will be gathered in a combination of webinars and open discussions, and bringing people in to help frame what it is we most need to talk about.
 - The other two items will be undertaken if time permits. Revising H&I Basics is also an area of service where there is a wealth of Fellowship experience. H&I committees, conference participants, and zones will all be asked for assistance in helping to gather information.
- The input gathered in the last cycle for revisions to *The Loner* IP (the focus for the project to revise existing recovery IPs) asked for it to reflect the current ways members connect with each other. The board believes this revision can be achieved pretty quickly.
- The input on recovery material related to the Steps was diverse and appeared in different places in the CAR survey. It includes:

- Revising *The NA Step Working Guides*
- Create a new step working guide
- Create something short and simple for newcomers in treatment
- So far, the board’s discussion has consisted of how to frame questions to ask the Fellowship about what they want regarding new step-working material.

Becky suggested that all of the projects should be viewed in concert with the planning discussions from Wednesday, and with creating a more collaborative approach in a three-year conference cycle. She then offered the following additional information in response to questions from the floor:

DRT/MAT

It was suggested that a new piece of literature might state that there are a variety of opinions within NA about DRT/MAT, and that it could have a broader focus of welcoming everybody to NA, not just those on medication.

Becky shared her experience of attending professional events and hearing that potential members are not sent to NA because of the perception that they are not welcome. She suggested that this could be one of the reasons that NA is not growing in the US. Obtaining government or insurance funding to provide treatment in the US is dependent on providing medically assisted treatment. Without a clear Fellowship position on DRT/MAT, it is challenging to make any broad public statements on the topic. Becky added that, in her opinion, the best pieces of NA literature are created by framing a discussion and then packaging the Fellowship’s ideas on a topic.

Literature Prioritization Process

Becky made the distinction between the motions passed at previous conferences to create project plans, and the approval of project plans by the conference. The pieces of literature mentioned in the previous motions were included in the *CAR* survey (See [Appendix G](#)), but were not prioritized, so the board did not offer project plans to create them. Becky explained that the ideas have not gone away, and could be worked on in the future. She reminded the body that general project plans for creating new and revised recovery literature and service material have been offered for approval since 2016, and that the conference decides which specific pieces will be created by those projects using the *CAR* survey results as a guide.

She also explained that the regional responses to the *CAR* survey come too late to influence the board’s discussions for what should be prioritized in the new and revised literature project plans, and suggested again that a new strategic planning system was needed to integrate regional motions, board ideas, conference ideas, and the *CAR* survey results, and then set priorities based on the Fellowship’s current needs and available resources. All topics that were the subject of motions passed to create project plans at previous conferences were color-coded as such in the *CAR* survey.

Both Becky and Tim S (WB Chair) referenced the relevant essays in the 2023 *CAR* and the *Conference Report* while responding to questions on this topic.

Projects in the Upcoming Cycle

Becky explained that committing a motion to the board requires them to report back to the body about it, but does not require them to take the same action as approving a project plan would. She shared that the number of projects being proposed for the upcoming cycle might be a little ambitious, but suggested that the interim WSC could provide the opportunity to review progress mid-cycle.

Executing project plans involves indirect costs such as staff time that are not typically listed in the same way as direct costs are listed in project plans. In the past, there were more direct costs, primarily workgroup travel. Currently, projects involve World Services’ time and

energy but fewer direct costs. There is a considerable backlog of ideas from previous cycles, and it was not possible to offer a dollar amount for completing them all.

Becky referenced the challenge of creating an IP on a topic such as social media that quickly becomes outdated. As a piece of recovery literature, rather than a service tool, it would likely take decades to be prioritized to revise it when needed.

The session closed with a reminder from Becky that communication to the board about ideas for future projects was always welcome and encouraged, and with an acknowledgment from Anthony E (NAWS Executive Director) of the hard work done by the volunteer microphone-runners during the conference.

CAT DISCUSSION AND DECISION-MAKING

3:45 pm–5:30 pm

Becky M (NAWS Assistant ED), Mario T (WSC Cofac)

Becky M (NAWS Assistant ED) began the session by explaining that the content of each of the project plans would be straw-pollled before the plans were voted on later in the session.

Becky then introduced the list of topics for the Issue Discussion Topics (IDTs) Project Plan.

Mario T (WSC CF) asked whether there were any questions before the straw poll was taken.

Brenda D (RD Nebraska) requested clarity on what is being voted on and how we are voting.

Becky replied that the body was voting to accept the board's recommendations of all four topics as IDTs, by responding with yes, no, abstain, or present not voting.

Ash D (ZD APF) asked if a roll call was needed.

Mario replied that it wasn't as the body was taking polls and not making decisions.

Straw Poll: Do you agree that the focus of the Issue Discussion Topic project plan for the 2023-26 cycle be:

Dealing with disruptive and predatory behavior

Gender-neutral and inclusive language in NA literature

Reimagining and revitalizing service committees (to further the reach of the NA message, improve communication, provide mentorship and training, and make service more attractive and accessible, learning from our experience the past few years)

DRT/MAT as it relates to NA

Results: 118 yes, 6 no, 2 abstain, 0 present not voting

93% consensus support.

Becky introduced the focus list for the project plan for New and Revised Service Tools.

Mario asked whether there were any questions before taking the straw poll.

Don S (RD San Diego/Imperial) asked what the chances were of getting two projects done now that we have added an additional year in the conference cycle.

Becky responded that it was very good, and that it would probably be possible to pretty quickly frame *H&I Basics*.

Straw Poll: Do you agree that the focus of the New and Revised Service Tools project plan for the 2023–26 cycle should be:

Virtual Service Basics (including virtual service meetings, virtual meetings and areas participating in the service system, virtual workshops and trainings, etc.)

PR video explaining what NA is, how it works, and how to contact us

Revise and update *H&I Basics*

And if time permits:

Revise and update the service pamphlet *Group Business Meetings* to include CBDM and delegation

Results: 123-5-4-0

93% consensus support.

Becky introduced the focus for the New and Revised Recovery Literature: to complete revision on *The Loner* and start asking questions about what people want to see about working the Steps that includes all of the ideas: for people who are new and not new, whether we revise existing material or create new material, whether we create shorter pieces for people in treatment. There are a number of ideas that the Fellowship has that would all be under this one topic, Becky explained.

Mario then opened the poll.

Straw Poll - Do you agree that the focus of the New and Revised Recovery Literature project plan for the 2023-26 cycle be:

Revise IP #21, *The Loner*

Step Working Guide Literature

- **If the SWG was edited and simplified, it could satisfy three of the prioritized ideas.**

These are:

- **Step working guide aimed at members not new to working the Steps**
- **Step working booklet focused mainly on Steps 1–3, aimed primarily at new members and those in treatment and drug courts**
- **Revise and simplify the Step Working Guides**

Results: 121-10-1-1

91% consensus support.

Mario then opened a roll call before moving to decision making on the CAT motions. There were 135 total participants: 116 regional delegates, 6 zonal delegates, and 13 World Board members. (See [Appendix B](#))

Motion #26 World Board

To approve the project plan for New Recovery Informational Pamphlets.

Initial straw poll Motion #26: 108-5-3-10

93% Consensus support

Mario asked if anyone in the minority wished to speak.

Nancy C (RD New Jersey) stated that her region voted no because they felt strongly that the body still lacks a process and prioritization methodology, and thought it was inappropriate to continue to perpetuate that by making new decisions when there's so much left unresolved.

Mario asked if there were any questions before taking a second straw poll.

Questions were asked regarding what was to fall under the project plan. Tim S (WB Chair) stated that the project plan would cover the items that were just straw polled in the survey results part of the session.

Emilio R (RD Peru) asked what would happen if the body didn't approve the motion.

Tim responded that if it failed, the board would not undertake the project.

Pam T (RD OK) stated that we didn't discuss any new recovery IPs, just revising *The Loner* and something regarding working the Steps.

Becky clarified that the CAR survey results contained four different ideas about working the steps. All of those would be considered as part of the new recovery literature project. The project plan title referred to Pamphlets because the board knew we wouldn't be able to undertake a book-length piece this cycle. If the plan passes, questions would be framed for the Fellowship, and the conference would decide what piece could be created from the responses.

Stuart L (RD Metro Detroit) asked to eliminate confusion by not using the word "guide" so as to understand that a piece on Step writing would be new and not revising the *NA Step Working Guides*.

Danny G (WB) asked to clarify that new recovery information pamphlets and the revisions are two separate projects. He also wondered if it would be helpful to just change information pamphlets to literature just for the sake of confusion.

Mario stated that motion was already on the floor.

Sashua P (RD Rio Grande Region) wanted clarity that the previous straw poll was inclusive of both Motions #26 and #27.

Tim stated that was true.

Mario asked if there were any further questions. Seeing none, he opened the poll.

Decision Motion #26: 124-10-0-0

92% Motion carried with consensus support

Jacob K (AD Mid-America) stated that he saw a pattern with the confusion and asked for clarity on what is being considered under each of the project plan motions to eliminate it.

Tim replied that he would give a recap prior to the motions.

Becky clarified that Motion #27 was only about finishing the revision to IP #21, *The Loner*.

Motion #27 World Board

To approve the project plan for Revising Existing Recovery Informational Pamphlets.

Initial straw poll Motion #27: 112-3-3-8

94% Consensus support

Mario asked if anyone in the minority would like to speak. Seeing no cards, Mario moved to questions. Seeing no questions, Mario opened the poll.

Decision Motion #27: 131-2-1-2

97% Motion carried with consensus support

Mario asked Tim to give clarity on the next motion before proceeding.

Tim stated that passing Motion #28 would approve the four IDTs that are: dealing with disruptive and predatory behavior, gender-neutral inclusive language in NA literature, reimagining and revitalizing service committees, and DRT/MAT as it relates to NA.

Sashua P (RD Rio Grande) asked about the count for the recent vote showing more participants than the roll call.

Mario explained that the vote could vary each time based on members coming into the room or leaving, and dropping or adding virtual participants.

Motion #28 World Board

To approve the project plan for Issue Discussion Topics.

Initial straw poll Motion #28: 111-3-6-6

92% Consensus support

Mario asked if anyone in the minority would like to speak.

Sandy M (RD ABCD) stated that her region voted against these motions because when they discussed the CAT in her region they didn't have any of the topics available.

Decision Motion #28: 127-5-2-0

94% Motion carried with consensus support

Motion #29 World Board

To approve the project plan for New and Revised Service Tools.

Initial straw poll Motion #29: 113-1-4-8

95% Consensus support

Tim elaborated that Virtual Service Basics could include virtual service meetings, virtual meetings and areas participating in the service system, virtual workshops, and training etc. The PR video would explain what NA is, how it works, and how to contact us. Revising and updating the service pamphlet, *Group Business Meetings*, would add sections on using CBDM and the concept of delegation. The final focus was to revise and update *H&I Basics*.

Mario asked if anyone in the minority would like to speak.

Brenda D (RD Nebraska) stated that Nebraska wanted Motion #21 regarding revisions to the *H&I Handbook* to be done, not revisions to *H&I Basics*. Nebraska is starting from scratch in many rural areas, and the *H&I Handbook* addresses how to start H&I services, whereas *H&I Basics* does not help with that.

Mat S (RD South Florida) asked if there was a process for those that wanted the project to focus on the handbook instead of the basics.

Tim stated the answer is no. The project plan was written for the basics not the handbook.

Mario opened the poll.

Decision Motion #29: 122-11-1-0

91% Motion carried with consensus support

Motion #30 World Board

To approve the project plan for Future of the WSC.

Initial straw poll Motion #30: 109-3-4-10

93% Consensus support

Tim stated that he didn't believe that there was a need to elaborate on the project.

Dezzz G (RD Wisconsin) asked when updates on the project would be provided in conference participant webinars.

Tim replied that reports would be provided when relevant information is available.

Decision Motion #30: 130-4-1-0

96% Motion carried with consensus support

Motion #31 World Board

To approve the project plan for Invest in Our Vision.

Initial straw poll Motion #31: 108-2-6-10

93% Consensus support

Decision Motion #31: 127-6-2-0

94% Motion carried with consensus support

Motion #32 World Board

To approve the 2023-2025 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc., budget.

Initial straw poll Motion #32: 109-3-7-7

91% Consensus support

Mike C (RD California Inland) asked about the two-year budget in regard to passing a three-year cycle, and whether the practice would be to extend the budget for an additional year.

Tim replied that a revised budget would be presented at the interim WSC to complete the cycle.

Decision Motion #32: 129-5-1-0

95% Motion carried with consensus support

Motion #37 World Board

To adopt the 2023-2025 Reimbursement Policy.

Initial straw poll Motion #37: 112-1-5-8

94% Consensus support

Tim explained that the proposed change was an increase to a \$70 per day per diem. This would most likely be revised at the interim conference to extend the rest of the cycle.

Emilio R (RD Peru) asked if it should be 2023-2026 Reimbursement Policy.

Tim again explained that a revised policy would be offered at the interim conference.

Decision Motion #37: 132-1-2-0

97% Motion carried with consensus support

The conference then recessed until 9:00 am the next day.

Friday 5 May 2023

CAT DISCUSSION AND DECISION-MAKING (CONTINUED)

9:00 am–10:30 am

Daniel C and Mario T (WSC Cofacs)

Tim S (WB Chair) opened the session with the Serenity Prayer and turned the meeting over to the cofacilitators.

Daniel C (WSC CF) then introduced Motion #39.

Motion #39 *France Region, Co-makers: South Florida Region, Israel Region, Netherlands Region*

To seat Iran Region #1 at the World Service Conference

Initial straw poll Motion #39: 102 yes, 5 no, 7 abstentions, 12 present not voting
89% Consensus support

Daniel asked if anyone in the minority wished to speak, and seeing none, asked if there were any questions before opening a poll.

There were questions concerning the recent issues in Iran with illicit literature. It was reported that this region was not a part of that situation.

Daniel opened the poll.

Decision Motion #39: 116-12-4-3

87% Motion carried with consensus support

Motion #40 *South Florida Region*

To seat Brazil Central Region

Initial straw poll Motion #40: 76-18-12-20

71% Strong support

Daniel opened discussion.

There was some discussion regarding the growth of NA in Brazil, and the need for multiple regions in the country. There was also discussion regarding the growth and size of the WSC.

Daniel called for questions, and seeing none, opened the poll.

Decision (Second straw poll) Motion #40: 88-32-7-9

69% Motion carried with strong support

No objection was voiced to taking the second straw poll as a final decision

Motion #41 *South Florida Region*

To seat Nordeste Brazil Region

Initial straw poll Motion #41: 89-9-12-16

80% Consensus support

No-one in the minority wished to speak, and no questions were asked.

Daniel then opened the poll.

Decision Motion #41: 112-13-3-9

87% Motion carried with consensus support

Motion #42 *South Florida Region*

To seat Rio Grande do Sul

Initial straw poll Motion #42: 91-7-11-17

83% Consensus support

No-one in opposition spoke and no questions were asked.

Daniel then opened the poll.

Decision Motion #42: 111-13-3-10

87% Motion carried with consensus support

*Motion #43 South Florida Region, Co-maker: Asia Pacific Forum
To seat Thailand Region*

Initial straw poll Motion #43: 91-12-9-14

81% Consensus support

Daniel asked whether anyone in the minority wished to speak.

Jon A (RD Northern New York) spoke in opposition, expressing his concern that cultural differences are a reason for seating, but only in some parts of the world. He also expressed support in general for seating new regions.

Daniel asked for questions.

Lib (WB) asked Irene C (WB), as a person who was on the seating workgroup, to talk about the involvement and participation of the local Thai members in the application to be seated.

Irene (WB) replied that they found that most of the people doing service in Thailand appear to be from the expat community. She went on to say that there was a great deal of discussion of this within the seating workgroup. She mentioned there were also concerns about the lack of detail, low level of information about services provided, and the lack of native Thai members being involved in service. She stated that Thailand met the criteria for seating despite those concerns.

Marty D (RD Michigan) asked if there was any history of growth in regions after being seated at the conference.

Anthony (NAWS Executive Director) reported that the answer to that depends on a variety of factors, including whether there are treatment centers that encourage addicts to attend NA meetings, literature available in the language of the people who are native to that community, or government restrictions that prohibit addicts from gathering. He stated that there is no uniform set of circumstances.

Jacob S (RD North Carolina) asked if there were any restrictions on addicts gathering in Thailand, and referenced the heavy-handed approach of recent Thai governments.

Anthony responded that he was not aware of any current restrictions.

Doug W (RD Pacific Cascade) asked if seating a region might further legitimize it in the eyes of the government in its country.

Anthony replied that it could.

Ash D (ZD APF) provided further information on some of the questions raised, highlighting the local Fellowship's good relations with the Thai government and his perception that Thailand would bring a unique perspective to the conference.

Paul F (WB) asked if there was NA literature available in Thai.

Irene responded that the Basic Text was translated into Thai, and that there was a small local translation committee.

Daniel then opened the poll.

Decision Motion #43: 119-14-1-3

88% Motion carried with consensus support

Daniel stated that this concluded the seating motions and CAT business. Tim acknowledged Daniel and his role as cofacilitator, and expressed appreciation for his contributions. After a few announcements the session was closed and a break was taken.

CREATING OUR FUTURE BREAKOUT ROOMS

11:00 am–12:30 pm

Breakout Rooms

The conference separated into two rooms for delegates, one for alternates, and one for Spanish and Portuguese speakers, and into two breakout rooms on Zoom for virtual participants. Each table in the in-person rooms, and each of the virtual breakout rooms, brainstormed ideas in response to this question:

What are the most important issues you would like to see discussed and addressed by the WSC of the Future project in the upcoming conference cycle to improve the functioning of the WSC?

Each table in the in-person rooms chose the top two ideas and shared them with the whole room, which then prioritized which ones would be discussed in greater depth by each table. Each virtual breakout room simply chose at least two ideas from the initial list they created to discuss further.

The most common topics focused on creating more collaborative processes to develop motions and determine priorities for new literature. The full notes from the discussions can be found in [Appendix D](#).

NEW IDEAS DISCUSSION BREAKOUT ROOMS – PART I

2:00 pm–3:30 pm

Breakout Rooms

Participants were asked to submit new ideas for discussion before Wednesday lunchtime. All the ideas were compiled into a survey that was posted on Wednesday evening. Participants were then asked to complete the survey before 5:00 pm the next day by indicating whether or not they wished to discuss each of the topics. The list of ideas, and the prioritization results, can be found in [Appendix E](#).

Participants gathered after lunch in the same rooms as the previous session to discuss the first two of the four prioritized topics, using the following questions:

Topic #1: How we can respond to predatory behavior in NA?

1. How can groups take responsibility to keep members safe?
2. What have we learned about keeping our members safe in the virtual NA environment?

Topic #2: Fellowship Development: Reimagining/revitalizing services and service committees especially post-pandemic.

1. How can we (groups, areas, regions, zones, and world services) help meetings and services rebuild after the pandemic, including virtual?
2. What can we do to help grow NA, especially in places where growth is flat?

NEW IDEAS DISCUSSION BREAKOUT ROOMS – PART II

ELECTION RESULTS ANNOUNCED

4:00 pm–5:30 pm

Breakout Rooms

Discussions continued with the next two prioritized topics.

Topic #3: Literature and Service Material Development Process: How to develop a single, well-understood process for prioritizing future literature project plans?

1. How do we pull ideas from regions, zones, the Fellowship, and NA World Services together and then vet and prioritize them?

2. How to create new revenue streams to supplement existing sources of revenue (literature sales, member contributions)?

Topic #4: Drug Replacement Therapy/Medically Assisted Treatment:

1. How can we best welcome members on DRT/MAT lovingly and kindly and how can we be cooperative with the current treatment approach without compromising our principles or expressing an opinion on an outside issue?
2. How do we reframe this discussion to focus on our primary purpose and help members understand how vital this issue is to the future of NA?

The complete notes from the discussions of all four topics can be found in [Appendix F](#). The HRP joined each of the in-person and virtual breakout rooms during the first of the afternoon sessions to announce the results of the elections.

WORLD BOARD

Carla W – Upper Rocky Mountain Region
Jack H – Washington-Northern Idaho Region
Jose Luis A – Region Del Coqui
Tim S – Australia Region
Veronica B – Sweden Region

HRP

Ron M – Florida Region
Sam L – Northern New England Region

COFACILITATOR

Louis H – Chicagoland Region

Saturday 6 May 2023

NEW IDEAS WRAP-UP

9:00 am–10:50 am

Tim S (WB Chair)

Tim S (WB Chair) opened the session and asked for World Board members from each breakout room to present some of the content from their New Idea discussions.

Irene C (WB) summarized the discussion of the predatory behavior topic from the first of the RD rooms. The top two ideas were developing a new pamphlet for predatory behavior, defining it and helping people navigate it. The second idea was workshops to raise members' awareness of predatory behavior. Other ideas raised included: strong sponsorship, strong homegroups, having greeters of all genders, groups themselves doing workshops on the topic, and strong members to reach out to people displaying predatory behavior to make sure they understand they had a place to recover. For virtual meetings, suggestions included not having the chat feature open or allowing it to only be used by people serving the meeting, using a waiting room, having newcomer greeters or reps of all genders, and not displaying identifying information for members including last names and locations so as to avoid unwanted advances via social media.

Michael B (WB) added that one conversation included that predatory behavior can be sexual, emotional, economic, or even involve illicit literature, and that the most powerful vehicle we have for dealing with it is the member. He also stated that there was consensus at all the tables that we are responsible to confront predatory behavior and stop it.

Danny G (WB) and Jack H (WB) shared ideas from the other RD room about the literature and service material development topic. Their first idea was to have a process where regional and zonal motions can be further developed at zones and service symposiums, then workshoped during the conference cycle and prioritized. Their second main idea was to survey the Fellowship for the most important literature ideas and prioritize them among conference participants, possibly during the interim WSC. Those priorities would result in project plans in the CAT. He said that there was hope that regional and zonal motions could be eliminated by placing a moratorium on literature project plans.

Tana S (WB) and Yoel G (WB) shared about their virtual group's discussion of the DRT/MAT topic. The group reached a consensus that we are a program focused on abstinence while welcoming and accepting everyone who seeks help. Two new ideas emerged from their discussions. The first was to include personal experiences in a piece of literature from individuals who have experience coming in on DRT/MAT, and members who have successfully gotten clean off it. The second idea was that the literature should address not only the person on DRT/MAT but also members who are not on DRT/MAT, and professionals who may refer someone to NA. This could convey that our program offers more than just abstinence, it provides a new way of living and support from a global Fellowship.

Jorge M (WB) and Jose Luis L (WB) shared that their room focused on discussing literature surveys, and surveys done at every level of service to enable all members to be involved. They also discussed the possibility of a workgroup to work on the results of surveys.

Paul F (WB) reported that the virtual group he was a part of discussed the reimagining and revitalizing services and service committees topic. He stated they had many ideas and the one they chose to share with everyone was hybrid service meetings and recovery meetings to encourage participation, especially from those who are physically far away from the service body. He shared their second idea, which was having project-based service rather than committee-based service. Another idea he shared was to identify younger members with talents, getting them involved and having personal interaction with other members. He

also mentioned that having criteria for service commitments was better than just placing someone in a service position.

Lib E (WB) and Hammed T (WB) reported back from the AD room on the DRT/MAT topic. One of their key takeaways was creating an IP about transitioning from treatment into recovery and into the meetings, including success stories from people that made it through and into recovery.

Tim opened up discussion for members that have not spoken over the last several days to offer any more input from their breakout sessions.

Several participants shared their experiences of being a part of the WSC, along with takeaways from the breakout sessions.

Amongst many expressions of gratitude and expanded perspectives, Andrea (RD Aotearoa New Zealand) read out the preamble used in meetings in her community: “The conscience of this group encourages and promotes a safe and secure environment for everyone, especially newcomers. We appeal to members to refrain from entering intimate relations with newcomers. Sexual harassment, harmful, or inappropriate behavior is not tolerated in this group. If you need support, approach a member of this group, your sponsor, or a member of NA that you trust.”

After a few announcements the conference took a break until 11:25 am.

MOVING FORWARD PART I

11:25 am–12:30 pm

Mario T (WSC Cofac)

Tim (WB Chair) opened the session and turned the meeting over to cofacilitators.

Mario (WSC CF) stated that three motions that were process changes in the CAT were a trial for WSC 2023, and that the body would now be voting to make those permanent WSC policy.

Mario introduced Motion #44 as the follow-up to Motion #33 that was approved with 89% consensus support at the beginning of the conference.

Motion #44 World Board

To use the following terminology to describe straw poll and vote outcomes:

Unanimous support

Consensus support (meaning 80% or greater support) 80%–<100%

Strong support (meaning 2/3 majority support) 66.66%–<80%

Lack of strong support (meaning less than 2/3 support) >20%–<66.66%

Consensus not in support (meaning 20% or fewer support) >0%–20%

No support

Intent: To simplify the terminology to describe voting and polling outcomes and make it less potentially confusing.

Mario asked if anyone was not ready to vote.

Paul (WB) asked for clarification on who was allowed to vote.

Mario stated that this was for everyone. There were no other questions and the poll was opened.

Decision Motion #44: 131-1-0-0

99% Motion carried with consensus support

Motion #45 World Board

If a participant appeals a decision of the Cofacilitator, the participant making the appeal will explain why they are appealing the ruling, the Cofacilitator will explain why

they ruled as they did, and then the body will vote. The voting threshold required to uphold a decision of the Cofacilitator under appeal will be 50% plus 1 in favor of the Cofacilitator.

Mario introduced Motion #45 and stated that this was the follow-up to Motion #34 that was approved with 85% consensus support at the beginning of the conference. He then asked whether there were any questions.

Mike (RD California Inland) asked what the reasoning was for changing from 2/3rds to 50% plus 1.

Mario replied that Robert's Rules uses 50% plus one and that two-thirds in favor of the appeal felt like a high threshold. There was not really a formal appeal mechanism in consensus-based decision making so they reverted to parliamentary procedure.

Danny (WB) posed a question about how the Moving Forward session worked to help clarify what we are doing in this process.

Mario clarified that ideas contained in the motions approved on a trial basis at the beginning of the WSC would be offered for approval as permanent WSC policy during this session.

Daniel (WSC CF) elaborated on the response and said that only the ideas that conference participants approved on a trial basis were being offered in Moving Forward as changes to policy. Things that seemed to work well during the week were being offered now to see if participants want to carry those processes forward on an ongoing basis. He explained that these decisions would come out as changes to GWSNA which would be sent out for 90-day delegate review. If delegates think something needs to be changed in the GWSNA draft, they can respond; otherwise, silence equals assent.

Mario asked whether there were further questions, and seeing none, opened a poll.

Decision Motion #45: 123-10-1-0

91% Motion carried with consensus support

Straw Poll World Board

To make first draft amendment deadline policy one month, 30 days in advance of the WSC.

Mario asked whether there were any questions.

Several participants posed questions relating to extending the timeframe based on translations, gathering input and a conscience, the future of the WSC, and collaboration. There were multiple questions about procedure, discussion about how the Moving Forward session worked, and about straw polls. There was also discussion on the review and input period for GWSNA and how that process works. Clarity was offered from the cofacilitators and the WB chair.

Straw poll results: 65-65-4-2

48% lack of strong support

After the straw poll results were announced, there was more discussion and questions. After much discussion and ideas about amending the timeframe, it was decided to remove the straw poll from the table.

The conference then recessed for lunch.

MOVING FORWARD PART II

2:00 pm–3:30 pm

Tim S (WB Chair), Becky M (NAWS Assistant ED)

Tim (WB Chair) opened the session with a moment of silence and then addressed the issues from the previous session. He explained that in previous conferences the Moving Forward sessions were conducted with straw polls and that had worked well, but it hadn't at this WSC. He then turned the session over to the cofacilitators.

Mario (WSC CF) introduced the next motion, stating that Motion #36 that offered the new idea discussion process on a trial basis for the duration of the WSC had carried with 89% consensus support.

Motion #47 World Board

To make the new idea discussion process used at WSC 2023 standing policy in GWSNA. [see page 6 of the CAT]

Mario asked whether there were any questions.

Remco (RD Netherlands) asked about the disposition of the item polled before lunch.

Mario responded that an answer would be offered later in the session, and clarified that the current motion is the one up for questions.

There was more discussion on the processes of moving forward, with some confusion about the motion referencing material in the CAT and conference participants not having the information in front of them. After dealing with questions, Mario called for the poll to be opened.

Decision Motion #47: 107-15-4-2

84% Motion carried with consensus support

Mario then stated that there were other items that were on the agenda for discussion that there would not be time to address:

- Amendment deadline
- Explaining the timing and purpose of the initial straw poll
- Better definition of amendments
- Roll calls and roll call votes
- Third person to assist the cofacs at in-person WSCs
- Future conference participant webinars about GWSNA policies

Mario then turned the session over to Tim.

Tim stated that other items not being addressed today included the future of seating and the Future of the WSC workgroup. He then turned the session over to Becky M (NAWS Assistant ED) to discuss project prioritization.

Becky reported on meeting growth in different geographic parts of the world from 2008 to 2023.

She stated that this information was based on the regional meeting map. She explained that the information will be used to update all of the PR pamphlets that quote meeting numbers, as well as the Basic Text. She requested that any updates be submitted by the end of May, and reminded the body that the meeting count number won't get revised again until 2026.

NA Meeting Counts

	2008	2010	2012	2014	2016	2018	2020	2023	Average Growth	Current percentage of Fellowship
Western Europe	2,557	2,664	2,820	3,038	3,282	3,591	3,918	4,487		6%
		4%	6%	8%	8%	9%	9%	15%	8%	
Iran	11,256	16,793	18,195	18,200	20,598	21,974	26,075	23,734		33%
		49%	8%	0%	13%	7%	19%	-9%	12%	
Middle-East	399	435	448	411	510	606	672	843		1%
		9%	3%	-8%	24%	19%	11%	25%	12%	
Africa	228	240	249	335	384	405	499	340		0.5%
		5%	4%	35%	15%	5%	23%	-32%	8%	
USA	25,613	26,881	27,804	27,317	27,375	27,677	27,005	23,511		33%
		5%	3%	-2%	0%	1%	-2%	-13%	-1%	
Canada	1,166	1,243	1,369	1,360	1,263	1,323	1,369	1,346		2%
		7%	10%	-1%	-7%	5%	3%	-2%	2%	
Central America	3,299	3,903	3,312	3,379	3,167	3,097	3,326	3,084		4%
		18%	-15%	2%	-6%	-2%	7%	-7%	0%	
South America	1,272	1,251	1,524	2,250	1,932	2,189	2,857	2,924		4%
		-2%	22%	48%	-14%	13%	31%	2%	14%	
Brazil	1,998	1,995	3,153	3,581	4,427	4,374	4,633	4,795		7%
		0%	58%	14%	24%	-1%	6%	3%	15%	
Eastern Europe	256	308	345	440	564	646	734	865		1%
		20%	12%	28%	28%	15%	14%	18%	19%	
Russia	340	523	909	1,042	1,657	2,072	2,726	3,904		5%
		54%	74%	15%	59%	25%	32%	43%	43%	
Asia Pacific	1,458	1,533	1,639	1,649	1,747	2,061	2,261	2,382		3%
		5%	7%	1%	6%	18%	10%	5%	7%	
Total Meetings	49,842	57,769	61,767	63,002	66,906	70,015	76,075	72,215		
		16%	7%	2%	6%	5%	9%	-5%	6%	

Becky then reported on project prioritization. She stated that there has been a lot of discussion this week on the backlog of work, and that this has always been so at NA World Services. She added that the last three years have not been normal times and that the board was asking for permission not to go through the process of prioritizing the approved project plans called for in *GWSNA*. The board had only offered an amount of projects that they believed could be accomplished in the cycle, and had the option of using the interim WSC to approve more projects if needed. She asked for any opposition and there was none.

Tim then turned the meeting over to the HRP.

Nathanael M (HRP) reported that due to time constraints they are going to hold over their items for business until the interim WSC and will present a set of proposals to consider at that time.

Items that were not considered from the HRP included:

- Require RBZs from all candidates
- Repurpose the World Pool
- No nominations “from the floor”

Anthony (NAWS Executive Director) then addressed the body. He asked for acknowledgement and thanks for all the virtual participants for their participation in the WSC. He also acknowledged the volunteers who had been of service throughout the week, as well as the translators, and again thanked the staff for all their hard work.

The conference then took a short break.

GOODBYES

4:00 pm–5:30 pm Tim S (WB Chair), Anthony E (NAWS Executive Director)

Tim (WB Chair) opened the session with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer.

The World Board handed out certificates to all the conference participants.

Tim then acknowledged the outgoing WSC trusted servants who were completing their terms in their respective roles. A video was played.

Anthony (NAWS Executive Director) then acknowledged two long-term staff that were retiring. He first talked about Steve L (NAWS staff) and introduced a short video with pictures from his time at NA World Services.

Steve offered some remarks about his time at the WSC and working for NAWS. He reflected on attending the WSC for the first time in 1986, meeting members from around the world, and realizing that NA was a global Fellowship. He said that he believed that the debt he owed to NA could never be repaid, and that working for NA was the privilege of a lifetime. He shared his perspective that service at the WSC was primarily about stewardship, and that the Fellowship was in good hands.

Anthony then acknowledged Jane N (NAWS Staff) and introduced a short video tribute to her.

Jane gave a short speech about her time at the WSC and working for NAWS, reflecting on her many years of service and the work that remains so that no addict need ever die from the horrors of addiction.

Becky (NAWS Assistant ED) then offered heartfelt thanks to Anthony E (NAWS ED) and acknowledged his qualities as a leader and his contribution to making NA literature available to addicts around the world. A video tribute to him was played.

Anthony addressed the body, reflecting on his personal journey as the executive director. He offered the perspective that this WSC was the best tempered, behaved, functional, and effective World Service Conference he had ever been to.

Tim then thanked the staff and translators again for their hard work. He also thanked conference participants on behalf of the World Board.

After a motion to close, and with no objection, the conference was adjourned with a moment of silence and the Serenity Prayer.

APPENDIX A: CONFERENCE FIRSTS AND STATISTICS ON PARTICIPANTS

CONFERENCE FIRSTS

WSC 2023 was the first . . .

- truly hybrid WSC, with 14 voting participants and 25 alternates joining via Zoom. (At WSC 2018, a few participants joined remotely—one delegate and two alternates.)
- WSC with no conference sessions scheduled after dinner.
- WSC with all motions and amendments submitted in advance.
- in-person (hybrid) WSC with zonal delegates voting.
- in-person (hybrid) WSC with no parliamentarian.
- in-person (hybrid) WSC with an eballot for elections.
- WSC with only RBZ candidates on the ballot.
- WSC with a dedicated online portal (www.worldna.org)

STATISTICS ON PARTICIPANTS ATTENDING WSC 2023

- There were 139 voting members participating at this WSC—126 delegates and 13 World Board members. In addition, there were 103 alternate delegates, plus 4 HRP members, 2 cofacilitators, 5 in-person translators and additional virtual translations.
- Of 123 seated regions, there were 120 RDs participating. Of 6 seated zones, 6 ZDs were participating.
- Eleven RDs, 2 ZDs, 1 World Board member, and 25 alternates joined the conference as virtual participants.
- This was the first WSC that Minas and Northwest Russia participated as seated members.
- Chile, El Salvador, and Spain were not in attendance.
- Of the 126 delegates from seated regions and zones participating, 66 were from the US, 5 from Canada, and 55 from outside the US and Canada.
- We had 103 alternate delegates from seated regions or zones participating, 56 from the US, 5 from Canada, and 42 from outside of the US or Canada.
- There were 179 men and 63 women among the conference participants—delegates, alternates, World Board members, and zonal delegates.
- This year’s conference participants were from 45 countries and we spoke 28 languages (based on Serenity Prayer languages at the close of the First Things First session).
- This conference made the decision to seat five regions: Brazil Central, Iran Region #1, Nordeste Brazil, Rio Grande do Sul, and Thailand.

APPENDIX B: WSC 2023 ATTENDANCE

Participant		1 May 9am	2 May 9am	2 May 11am	2 May Noon	2 May 2pm	4 May 4pm
1	ABCD	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	Alabama/NW Florida	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	Alaska	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	AL-SASK	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	Aotearoa New Zealand	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	Argentina	1	1	1	1	1	1
7	Arizona	1	1	1	1	1	1
8	Arkansas	1	1	1	1	1	1
9	Australian	1	1	1	1	1	1
10	Baja Son	1	1	1	1	1	1
11	Best Little	1	1	1	1	1	1
12	Brazil	1	1	1	1	1	1
13	Brazil Sul	1	1	1	1	1	1
14	British Columbia	1	1	1	1	1	1
15	Buckeye	1	0	1	1	1	0
16	California Inland	1	1	1	1	1	1
17	California Mid-State	1	1	1	1	1	1
18	Canada Atlantic	1	1	1	1	1	1
19	Carolina	1	1	1	1	1	1
20	Central Atlantic	1	1	1	1	1	1
21	Central California	1	1	1	1	1	1
22	Chesapeake & Potomac	1	1	1	1	1	1
23	Chicagoland	1	1	1	1	1	1
24	Chile	0	0	0	0	0	0
25	Colombia	1	1	1	1	1	1
26	Colorado	1	1	1	1	1	1
27	Connecticut	1	1	1	1	1	1
28	Costa Rica	1	1	1	1	1	1
29	Denmark	1	1	1	1	1	1
30	Eastern New York	1	1	1	1	1	1
31	Ecuador	1	1	1	1	1	1
32	Egypt	1	1	1	1	1	1
33	El Salvador	0	0	0	0	0	0
34	Finland	1	1	1	1	1	1
35	Florida	1	1	1	1	1	1
36	France	1	1	1	1	1	1

37	Free State	1	1	1	1	1	1
38	Georgia	1	1	1	1	1	1
39	German Speaking	1	1	1	1	1	1
40	Grande Sao Paulo	1	1	1	1	1	1
41	Greater Illinois	1	1	1	1	1	1
42	Greater New York	1	1	1	1	1	1
43	Greater Philadelphia	1	1	1	1	1	1
44	Greece	1	1	1	1	1	1
45	Guatemala	1	1	1	1	1	1
46	Hawaii	1	1	1	1	1	1
47	HOW Brazil	1	1	1	1	1	1
48	Indiana	1	1	1	1	1	1
49	Iowa	1	1	1	1	1	1
50	Iran	1	1	1	1	1	1
51	Irish	1	1	1	1	1	1
52	Israel	1	1	1	1	1	1
53	Italy	1	1	1	1	1	1
54	Japan	1	1	1	1	1	1
55	Kentuckiana	1	1	1	1	1	1
56	Lithuania	1	1	1	1	1	1
57	Lone Star	1	1	1	1	1	1
58	Louisiana	1	1	1	1	1	1
59	Metro Detroit	1	1	1	1	1	1
60	Mexico	1	1	1	1	1	1
61	Michigan	1	1	1	1	1	1
62	Mid-America	1	1	1	1	1	1
63	Mid-Atlantic	1	1	1	1	1	1
64	Minas	1	1	1	1	1	1
65	Minnesota	1	1	1	1	1	1
66	Mississippi	1	1	1	1	1	1
67	Montana	1	1	1	1	1	1
68	Mountaineer	1	1	1	1	1	1
69	Nebraska	1	1	1	1	1	1
70	Nepal	1	1	1	1	1	1
71	NERF	1	1	1	1	1	1
72	Netherlands	1	1	1	1	1	1
73	New England	1	1	1	1	1	1
74	New Jersey	1	1	1	1	1	1
75	Nicaragua	1	1	1	1	1	1

76	North Carolina	1	1	1	1	1	1
77	Northern California	1	1	1	1	1	1
78	Northern New England	1	1	1	1	1	1
79	Northern New Jersey	1	1	1	1	1	1
80	Northern New York	1	1	1	1	1	1
81	Northwestern Russia	1	1	1	1	1	1
82	Norway	1	1	1	1	1	1
83	Occidente-Mexico	1	1	1	1	1	1
84	Ohio	1	1	1	1	1	1
85	OK	1	1	1	1	1	1
86	Ontario	1	1	1	1	1	0
87	Pacific Cascade	1	1	1	1	1	1
88	Panama	1	1	1	1	1	1
89	Peru	1	1	1	1	1	1
90	Philippines	1	0	0	1	1	0
91	Poland	1	1	1	1	1	1
92	Portugal	1	1	1	1	1	1
93	Quebec	1	1	1	1	1	1
94	Quisqueyana	1	1	1	1	1	1
95	Region 51	1	1	1	1	1	1
96	Region Del Coqui	1	1	1	1	1	1
97	Rio de Janeiro	1	1	1	1	1	1
98	Rio Grande	1	1	1	1	1	1
99	San Diego/Imperial	1	1	1	1	1	1
100	Show-Me	1	1	1	1	1	1
101	Sierra Sage	1	1	1	1	1	1
102	SOSONA - Indian	1	1	1	1	1	0
103	South Africa	0	1	0	1	1	1
104	South Dakota	1	1	1	1	1	1
105	South Florida	1	1	1	1	1	1
106	Southern California	1	1	1	1	1	1
107	Southern Idaho	1	1	1	1	1	1
108	Spain	0	0	0	0	0	0
109	Sweden	1	1	1	1	1	1
110	Tejas Bluebonnet	1	1	1	1	1	1
111	Tri-State	1	1	1	1	1	1
112	UK	1	1	1	1	1	1
113	Ukraine	1	1	1	1	1	1
114	Upper Midwest	1	1	1	1	1	1

115	Upper Rocky Mountain	1	1	1	1	1	1
116	Uruguay	1	1	1	1	1	1
117	Utah	1	1	1	1	1	1
118	Venezuela	1	0	0	1	1	1
119	Volunteer	1	1	1	1	1	1
120	Washington/N Idaho	1	1	1	1	1	1
121	Western New York	1	1	1	1	1	1
122	Western Russia	1	1	1	1	1	1
123	Wisconsin	1	1	1	1	1	1
124	Afri-can Zone	1	1	1	1	1	1
125	Asia-Pacific Forum	1	1	1	1	1	1
126	Brazilian Zonal Forum	1	1	1	1	1	1
127	EDM	1	1	1	1	1	1
128	Latin American ZF	1	1	1	1	1	1
129	Russian Speaking ZF	1	1	1	1	1	1
130	Tim S - WB	1	1	1	1	1	1
131	Danny G - WB	1	1	1	1	1	1
132	Eduardo G - WB	1	1	1	1	1	1
133	Hammed A - WB	1	1	1	1	1	1
134	Irene C - WB	1	1	1	1	1	1
135	Jack H - WB	1	1	1	1	1	1
136	Jorge M - WB	1	1	1	1	1	1
137	Jose Luis A - WB	0	1	1	1	1	1
138	Lib E - WB	1	1	1	1	1	1
139	Michael B - WB	1	1	1	1	1	1
140	Paul F - WB	1	1	1	1	0	1
141	Tana A - WB	1	1	1	1	1	1
142	Yoel G - WB	1	0	0	1	1	1
	Total participants	137	135	135	139	138	135
	Regions	119	117	117	120	120	116
	Zones	6	6	6	6	6	6
	World Board	12	12	12	13	12	13

APPENDIX C: COLLABORATIVE PLANNING – COMPILED NOTES ORGANIZING TO LAUNCH A COMPREHENSIVE INVENTORY (PLANNING STEP 1)

EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT (outside of NA)

What factors (trends, issues, etc.) are shaping the environment in which NA strives to achieve its vision? (Consider factors in such areas as social/demographic/cultural, technological, economic, legislative/regulatory/political, legal, environmental, etc.)

Delegates

[Main ideas only – no table notes available]

Evolution of technology (+/-)

Generational/Cultural Differences (preferences, expectations, engagement, communication, etc.)

Financial Constraints (Cost, resources, inflation)

Harm Reduction Model /Approach (DRT/MAT)

Legalization of Drugs

Alternative programs for addicts (competitive/cooperative)

Political Polarization (geo and gender)

Alternates

[No table notes available]

Spanish/Portuguese

[No table notes available]

Virtual Room 1

Ability to work online

Incorporating online meetings into the service structure

Harm reduction (Drug Replacement Therapy/Medical Assisted Treatment) need to be welcomed while also letting them know about abstinence

Legalization of marijuana in Thailand had members leaving the Philippines. Also coming into meetings using marijuana arguing that they are clean because it's legal.

Political unrest—ability to do PR and FD, ability to carry the message to other countries and other parts of the world

Meeting space availability post-pandemic

Nongovernmental Organization—need this recognition to perform PR and H&I. Unable to register due to corruption in government.

Get information about NA into governmental agencies—To impact laws and agency creation about the viability of NA as a program of recovery.

Philippines police were responsible for killing addicts under presidential law. PR efforts were necessary to stop it.

Treatment facilities starting their own meetings. No accountability. Not within service structure.

Virtual Room 2

Prescription medication, DRT, over-the-counter meds (psychiatric)

Members owning rehabs, diluting the NA message and rehabs exploiting the NA message, financial gain

Social media, anonymity

Technology

Dating sites

Gambling

Porn

Religion – not supporting NA

Cultural dynamics

not all support complete abstinence

women not being seen

Political cooperation, societal discrimination

Racism

Sexism

Homophobia

Gender, etc.

Lack of good PR

Virtual Room 3

Decreased stigma around addiction

Laws in Russia causing challenges – e.g. Anti-LGBT propaganda law might mean changes to Basic Text stories

Increase in Treatment “business”

Russian “foreign agent” law makes inclusion of NAWS address in literature a problem

Other options for long-term recovery – other fellowships, religion-based programs

Local government permission given for NA meetings, but they don’t have a clear understanding of what NA is

Electronic access to jails and institutions brings greater bureaucracy

Harm-reduction philosophy and DRT/MAT, lack of belief in abstinence-based program by government etc.

Growth of “sober-companion” industry

Rotation in staff at jail means relationships are lost

“Peer support” person assigned by drug court

Private DRT clinics with no motivation to stop clients using – difficult for NA to get access to these

Schools and mother’s groups and clubs are providing meeting space (Nepal)

Invention of Narcan saving addicts’ lives and giving them the chance to find NA

Treatment centers taking clients to meetings (Nepal)

Lack of meeting venues – NA has outgrown the supply! (Iran)

Treatment centers requesting H&I services (Nepal)

Pandemic created different rules for renting meeting space
Need to renew registration with Iranian Government every two years

Choose the THREE (3) External factors that your table believes will most impact our ability to achieve the NA Vision over the next three years

Delegates

Evolution of technology – pros and cons
Geo-political dynamics
Generational/cultural differences
Harm reduction models/approach
Increasing financial constraints/crises
Legalization of drugs
Alternate programs for addicts
Recovery for profit

Alternates

Global economic crisis
Post Covid situations
Geopolitics
 Local/national politics
Harm reduction
 Pharma/policy
Technology
 Tablets
 Social media
 Hybrid
 Zoom
 7th tradition
Legal issues
 Mandatory attendance
Medication

Spanish/Portuguese

Technology
Government and Politics
Social and gender discrimination

Virtual Room 1

Harm reduction (DRT/MAT)
Needing NGO designation in order to be recognized

Meeting space availability

Virtual Room 2

Prescription medication, DRT, over-the-counter meds (psychiatric)

Cultural dynamics:

not all support complete abstinence
women not being seen

Political cooperation, societal discrimination:

Racism
Sexism
Homophobia
Gender, etc.

Virtual Room 3

Rise of DRT/MAT industry and treatment industry – creates multiple impacts

Rise of authoritarian governments globally making it harder for NA to operate

Virtual society creates PR and H&I and FD opportunities

INTERNAL ENVIRONMENT (within NA)

What factors (trends, issues, etc.) are shaping the environment within NA that will impact the ability to achieve our vision? (Consider factors in such areas the effectiveness of service bodies, the atmosphere of recovery, funding, unity, illicit literature, etc.)

Delegates

[Main ideas only – no table notes available]

Disruption of and bottlenecks in flow of resources (“pocket to basket”)

Development of trusted servants (identifying, recruiting, training, supportive atmosphere, organizing onboarding)

Pro/con of virtual engagement

Sense of safety, “welcomeness,” belonging - Inclusivity vs internal discrimination (DRT/MAT) and racial separation

Literature (availability, access, affordability)

Redundancy and lack of consistency in the service system

Impact of illicit literature

Alternates

[No table notes available]

Spanish/Portuguese

- Lack of trusted servants
- Lack of sponsorship
- Lack of human and financial services due to lack of conscience on 7th tradition
- Strong personalities

Virtual Room 1

Zones getting more involved in the service structure
Zones bring diversity of regions
Variety of effectiveness of leadership
Nonspiritual members in leadership roles
Lack of trusted servants due to the nonspiritual members
Good environment of recovery in service body. Inviting environment in service bod,
Personal recovery affects the service body and the message
Generational change and motive—Younger generation more connected to their phones. Communication is texts and social media. How do we use this to get younger members more involved in service?
Resistance to change. Biases.
Need approval from oldtimer to do service work even after being elected RD.

Virtual Room 2

Addict/alcoholic
Welcoming to all
Groups splitting, unity compromised
Welcoming/keeping oldtimers
Religion/government – not supporting NA
Blurry message of recovery
Lack of trusted servants
Predatory/disruptive behavior
Cultural & societal dynamics
Medication/Prescriptions
In-person vs virtual impact on attendance
Availability/accessibility of literature
Impact of illicit literature

Virtual Room 3

Influx of new addicts from treatment and use of language like “sober” in meetings creating tensions
Lack of local H&I /PR to explain what NA is to Government
Inconsistent approach from groups and members to new members on DRT/MAT
Local growth has created a broad and diverse membership – is this a cyclical factor, and how can it be nurtured
Post-pandemic NA may not look the same as it used to – some service positions are outdated or need to be reimagined
Post pandemic - NA groups are more independent from service bodies – e.g. literature supply
Regional divisions created internal tensions - Lack of personal NA principles in NA service on both sides
Very large and complex service structure

Missing women in the fellowship

Virtual NA changes who is in the meetings

Virtual NA has changed how the 7th tradition functions

Resistance of older members to adapt to new conditions

“conservative” vs “liberal” approaches to providing recovery

Virtual NA makes it easier to translate NA literature – Nepal has 80% of literature

Rumors and disinformation spread very quickly on the internet and via virtual NA

Great deal of responsibility put on the shoulders of trusted servants – lots of questions from members

Virtual NA meetings have made NA more accessible, but have also withdrawn support from in-person meetings

Choose the THREE (3) Internal factors that your table believes will most impact our ability to achieve the NA Vision over the next three years

Delegates

Development and organization of trusted servants

Redundancy and lack of cohesion in the service system

Sense of safety, welcoming, and inclusivity

Generational differences / gaps

Impact of illicit literature

Disruption and bottlenecks in the flow of funds

Impact of the rise of virtual NA

Resistance to change

Alternates

Apathy in service

Mentorship

Resistance to change

Atmosphere of attraction

Spanish/Portuguese

Lack of trusted servants

Lack of sponsorship

Lack of human and financial services due to lack of conscience on 7th tradition

Strong personalities

Virtual Room 1

Good environment of recovery in service body.

Zonal Forums being more involved in the service structure

Getting younger members involved in service

Virtual Room 2

Lack of trusted servants

Predatory/disruptive behavior

Availability/accessibility of literature

Virtual Room 3

Rise of virtual NA – multiple impacts: membership, 7th Tradition

Post-pandemic NA means less dependence by groups on service bodies and a need to change how services are provided

Resistance of older members to new conditions

APPENDIX D: CREATING OUR FUTURE – COMPILED NOTES

(Numbers in parentheses indicate votes to prioritize issues)

What are the most important issues you would like to see discussed and addressed by the WSC of the Future project in the upcoming conference cycle to improve the functioning of the WSC.

Salon G–H

Literature prioritization process (24)

More CBDM, more unity (decreased motions), vetting *CAR* motions, planning, and a more collaborative process for the *CAR* (21)

Accommodate delegates from time zones...how? (2)

Update seating requirements with goal: to combine seating regions (3)

Amendments timelines to increase clarity (7)

Predatory behavior global (2)

Print and distribute literature within regions, increase access (5)

Face-to-face WSC priority to increase trust and connection for global perspective (12)

Literature Prioritization Process

Make sure CP's input is weighted

Create a literature workgroup to fix prioritization and process

Define how motions for lit that have been passed will be completed with timelines

Define the difference between each approval type and communicate best practices to the fellowship

Suspend the survey until currently approved projects are cleared from the queue

Have a CP weighted (greater importance) survey, including only currently approved projects

A clear process to update outdated service and fellowship lit with regular review

Separate prioritization processes

Recovery literature

Service literature

Approved by the Conference

The idea should be on either the survey or motion (not both)

Input from the fellowship for what ideas make it into the literature survey

Constant updates on ongoing process

Clearer motions related to literature project plans

Clear system is a must

Finish old before starting new

Unity/CBDM/Motions

Combine questions and discussion to create more and smoother dialogue

Distribute *CAR* amendments as soon as possible after release of *CAR*

If a motion has consensus, ask if objection to final vote

Flexibility on CBDM on the floor for adding or changing amendments

Make proposals at interim WSC and vet them for the next face-to-face Conference

For amendments brought in on the floor: vote on it another day so that people can discuss and

contemplate/meditate on those new amendments
Move toward more true CBDM (less Robert's Rules)
Now winners and losers; move away from "us and them" mentality (less applause and booing)
More unity—building through taking spiritual principles beyond the words

Salon I–J

Table 6

Bringing ideas to develop motions to the ICC

Table 7

Engage WSC – CP participants

“Ensure that the priorities that hit the floor are the ACTUAL priorities of the CP participants”

Strategic Planning

Tools

Mentorship

Training and support

Engaging CPs

Looking at creating a LARGE SCALE – Strategic Planning Process

Table 8

Opportunity to workshop the motions and/or information to provide “better shit” in the process of utilizing the information ahead of time

Pre-vetting Motions – workshopping the regional motions before they come to WSC

Global Planning

Providing assistance and offer support and mentorship

Global collaboration for those who are struggling obtaining assistance and information for the WSC

Not everyone has the same ability to reach the “top officials”

Support from and to – need more assistance and have the ability to provide the knowledge and support the recognition to countries that do not have support currently

Table 9

Diversity Ideas

Delegate the work BACK TO THE worldwide fellowship – WORLD WIDE FELLOWSHIP vs. the Board (rather than to the board)

Include the WW Fellowship and the Zones in all the discussions

Allow the fellowship to be a part of the conversations

Ex. Finland – they have to translate the CAR – which increases the limitations.

It's like “Greek” (not “fair”- in the additional time limitations imposed)

Table 10

Global coordination and best practices

Fellowship Development is the OVERALL Concern

Encourage Fellowship/support service sponsorship (a service body helps another) through global coordination/sharing best practices

Encourage FD by providing assistance and collaboration opportunities

➤ Development by providing assistance and collaborative opportunities

- iii. Encourage proactive and forward-thinking FD
- iv. Invite service bodies (including zones) to synchronize planning cycles
- v. Identifying the diverse Fellowship Needs through Zonal Collaboration/Cooperation

Hidden Hills

- Unify our PR efforts (10)
- Improving communication within service body & membership (4)
- Survey protection and integrity
- DRT/MAT opinion as a fellowship (14)
- Rethinking WSC process including CAR/CAT/Survey (21)
- Mentorship prior to WSC for delegates (12)
- Make greater use of strategic planning & collaboration (2)
- Better process for literature and project plan selection (19)
- Amendments published 60 days in advance
- More inclusive voting, location and language (1)
- Completion of project from prior conference (4)
- Illicit literature (4)
- Understanding global nature & problems that go along with it (14)
- Turn the WSC cycle into an ongoing conversation (7)
- Repurpose into fellowship development reports training and more (9)

Issue #1 – Rethinking the WSC process for the CAR/CAT Survey

- More concise motion essay due to language translation issues. Shorter more concise summaries.
- Less tied to a rigid conference cycle
- Release amendments earlier
- Eliminate overlap between CAR/CAT/Survey and once prioritized keep it prioritized
- Eliminate procedural motions from the CAR
- Have the ZD/RD teams more involved in workgroups
- Getting info out sooner to effectively inform the fellowship – 6 months
- Each member registering to vote on literature (don't see a lot of buy-in from newcomers)
- Motions only come from collaborative workgroups
- No literature motions
- Process for combining similar motions
- Develop portal for continued use throughout conference cycle
- Survey only open to delegates (literature)
- Vote (final) on CAR motions before coming to WSC
- Meeting with World Board members
- More collaboration & strategic planning & training to take back to groups

Issue # 2 – Better Process for Literature & Project Plan Selection

Motions feed from regions regarding literature into survey not to floor

Once prioritized follow through allowing for some flexibility

Ideas must be well understood & easy to explain/communicate

No regional motions for literature

Accountability from Board for approved plans; follow through

Get it done

Survey main driving force for literature

A) Regional votes weighted more than individual votes

B) More discussion prior to prioritization of lit projects via webinars, CP meetings, zones, regions etc.

Call survey “Literature Survey” instead of CAR survey

Build more consensus for projects (eliminate low scoring items & re-prioritize)

Issue # 3 – DRT/MAT Opinion as a Fellowship

Reframe the topic: How can we welcome Everyone? How members live by choice (ex. Spirituality)

We believe in complete abstinence

We don't have an opinion (ex. Sponsorship IP)

Collection of experience

Member problem not newcomer (prescription, service, tags, judgement)

Gather group input on policies about DRT/MAT in services

Develop an IP of “one addicts experience” with DRT/MAT (many addicts input)

Develop a way for members on DRT/MAT to share with each other

Data gathering for sponsoring “issues” when sponsoring members on DRT/MAT

Defer decisions to local communities

Drop notion of having a “global opinion” because each country/zone may have different laws, treatments, etc.

IP separates into categories of topics:

Meeting attendance

Service

Sponsorship

Path to abstinence

Issue #4 – Understanding Global Nature & Problems that Go Along with it

Zonal collaboration globally to better understand issues

Communications and translations giving more time for translations

Take into consideration cultural and economic differences, overcoming boundaries

Translation of service manuals

Building trust and rapport in local communities

Economic struggles (natural disaster, value of money, recession)

Cultural differences (different languages within own country)

Government/Politics

Unable to provide meeting space

War

Supply chain, control over import/export

H&I/PR within US (prisons, background checks)

NAWS become official facilitator for refugees to start new meetings in non-English speaking countries

Better visibility/marketing in other non-US countries (multiple languages, buses, signs, helpline)

Ventura Room

A meeting between 2 Zonal Forums at the WSC

Create a service body that can train RDs (13)

Access to all service materials, audio, video, written, online in all languages (2)

Create workgroups to deal with specific topics: planning, finances, HRP, CAR amendments, admission criteria (12)

Uniform literature creation process (6)

Translate all the addendums of the CAR (1)

Topics to work on during interim conference: 6th Tradition, finances, WCNA, PR, enquiries (4)

Create a service body that can train RDs

Conference procedures manual

Institutionalize the functions of zonal delegates

Focus on training incoming RDs with information from outgoing RDs

Mock training presentations

Create workgroups to deal with specific topics: planning, finances, HRP, CAR amendments, admission criteria

Rotation and structured continuity of the work

Participation of all members in all languages in workgroups

Permanent workgroups to continuously provide ideas and work projects

Timelines for specific workgroups

Regional members to participate in WSC workgroups, CAR amendments, virtual literature

Virtual Room 1

How much room do we have – possibility of larger venue?

Location of the WSC – outside the US? (3)

Why do all regions need to be represented when zones are present? (4)

Implications to the WSC of seating new regions (1)

How can the WSC help to mentor and train trusted servants (3)

What is the role of technology in future WSCs – is it accessible for all participants? (2)

Can we get concrete recommendations from the workgroup this cycle?

Accessibility of the WSC – particularly for distant time zones and for communities without reliable infrastructure (7)

How can we make better use of CPs as a human resource to help achieve the tasks determined by the WSC? (1)

How can we better share best practices?

Increasing direct communication with NAWS at the area and group level and increase awareness and knowledge of what the WSC does in the local fellowships (1)

What could be the role of the WSC be in literature development and translations (2)

Accessibility of the WSC – particularly for distant time zones and for communities without reliable infrastructure

Shorten the WSC day – what do we stop doing?

- No lunch break and a shorter day

- Online discussion sessions before the WSC

Provide better information about the limitations of time zones and infrastructure to aid WSC decisions about accessibility

Provide hotel rooms locally for VCPs – this was discussed for 2020 in Australia – how can we help VCPs to have stable and accessible access?

Could we utilize local offices as WSC “hubs”

Could zonal conferences that connect virtually be organized?

The last 3 years have shown us that we can reimagine how the WSC happens – what can open-mindedness help us to achieve?

What does representation look like, given our limitations?

Evidence of zonal collaboration demonstrates that zonal representation is possible

The creation of zonal delegates was intended to be adjunct to regional delegation

Zones are very diverse in what they do and in terms of size and what their member regions need

Zones create connection and the possibility for one region to help another - Connections based on language can be made

Reducing the size of the WSC has been discussed since the 90's

Zones are evolving

There is fear in some regions about losing their “voice” but we are moving in that direction

Looking at regional boundaries (mainly in the US): What will it take and when will it happen? Focus on what we would gain, rather than what we would lose

Virtual Room 2

Encourage mentoring and training in service

Mentoring with role playing. Get familiar with the *GWSNA* and the *CAR* and procedures before arriving

How workshops are addressed.

Delegate teams can provide the best training.

Time becomes an issue with all else that a delegate team needs to do. Maybe a workshop on how to do it would help.

Familiarity sessions *FIPT* and *GWSNA*. Tap into the knowledge of our more experienced CPs.

Giving accurate information about processes and procedures on the floor of the conference.

More CP webinars—*FIPT*, *GWSNA*, meet the maker, workshopping styles, reports, how to mentor (breakout rooms with training sessions—maybe with someone who served at the last WSC).

The spirit of rotation. Information gap between representatives. Continuity of service.

When one region conducts a *CAR* workshop (for example) invite other regions to attend virtually—there may be language barriers.

Invite other regional delegates to present workshops to another region.

Workshops: How create project plans, how to vote on motions

Collect information about how to be a good delegate. Best Practices.

Cheat Sheet what is expected of you. About bringing conscience, report back to regions (let CPs know there will be summaries provided after the conference), let your region know there are virtual *CAR/CAT* workshops in other regions they can attend, how to submit a regional motion.

Cofacilitators—former cofacs for new participants, Decision Making for Dummies, yellow card, purple card, explaining some of the practicalities.

Page 53-54 CR printed out for CPs—that way they will know there are two ways to vote but a roll call vote has to happen before the actual vote. Key information as handouts.

Connect with your World Board contact—they are your service navigator. WB can connect a CP with someone with who has the information. World Board members need to be within the CP time zone.

More investigation on zones needs to reach unseated communities

Meet the maker sessions—to hear from the makers of motions.

Support World Services global PR (including government relations)

NAWS help in PR. Provide information about abstinence.

Greatest need in developing countries

FD teams in zones and regions could provide support (table at events and answer questions)

WB members conducted workshops for local fellowship and interviewed with a TV station. Maybe zones could do this?

Documents of cooperation or NGO in some countries in order for NA to grow.

Seek to improve the WSC by continuing to evaluate and make revisions to decision-making sessions

Put more responsibility on the zones. In a way to cut down time in decision making sessions

Invite service bodies (including zones) to synchronize planning cycles

If service bodies had more synchronized calendars it would helpful

Maintain the clarity of our message

This is an irritating statement

Review and approve NAWS budget

Simplify the budget for understanding. More of a summary.

Difficult to explain to regions. Culture differences with regard to \$\$ amounts.

Provide oversight of NA literature

Where are translations in their stage development

APPENDIX E: NEW IDEA SURVEY RESULTS

New Idea Prioritization Results	I want to discuss Friday	
	Yes	No
<p>Maker: World Board</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Predatory Behavior</p> <p>Proposal: How we can respond to predatory behavior in NA</p>	83	18
<p>Maker: World Board</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Fellowship Development</p> <p>Proposal: Reimagining/revitalizing services and service committees, especially post-pandemic</p>	81	19
<p>Maker: N New England</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Literature and Service Material: Development process</p> <p>Proposal: We propose that we discuss how to develop a single, well-understood process for prioritizing future literature project plans</p>	78	23
<p>Maker: World Board</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: DRT/MAT</p> <p>Proposal: DRT/MAT as it relates to NA how we can best welcome members on DRT/MAT lovingly and kindly and how we can cooperate with the current treatment approach without compromising our principles or expressing an opinion on an outside issue.</p>	72	35
<p>Maker: World Board</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Fellowship Development: Virtual Meetings and Services</p> <p>Proposal: Virtual meetings and services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What kinds of resources would help (or are helping) your virtual meetings and service bodies? • What else do you think would help create connection to the service structure? 	66	32

<p>Maker: Upper Rocky Mountain</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust (<i>FIPT</i>)</p> <p>Proposal: How can we deal with members who continuously promote, utilize and share illicit material?</p>	63	34
<p>Maker: World Board</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Gender terminology</p> <p>Proposal: Gender specific language in NA literature and creating language that is welcoming to new members</p>	62	37
<p>Maker: World Board</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Literature and Service Material: Development Process</p> <p>Proposal: How can we better create usable tools for members and groups outside of the recovery literature process? How do we get them to groups and meetings?</p>	62	32
<p>Maker: EDM</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Literature Printing and Distribution</p> <p>Proposal: To explore the potential and feasibility for WSO Europe to expand operations to printing non-English language literature to meet the growing demands and overcome some of the supply chain issues, including high customs fees and shipping problems.</p>	61	33
<p>Maker: World Board</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: WSC Seating</p> <p>Proposal: WSC Seating – How does seating zonal delegates at the WSC impact how we look at regional seating? What should the criteria be for a body to be seated at the WSC?</p>	60	40

<p>Maker: Utah</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Financial</p> <p>Proposal: Publish a request to all Zones, Regions, Areas, Meetings, and members to donate \$10MM to NAWs each year as a goal. This would cover all expenses and allow us to not depend on literature sales and be FULLY self-supporting. This is \$3/week per meeting worldwide... or ... \$8/week per US meeting. We are a large fellowship, with a lot of members, and the math is simple.</p>	56	40
<p>Maker: British Colombia</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: WSC-related matters: Other</p> <p>Proposal: to begin discussion and planning to move away from a CAR driven WSC to a Project based WSC</p>	55	46
<p>Maker: N New England</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Financial</p> <p>Proposal: We propose that we discuss how to create new revenue streams to supplement existing sources of revenue (literature sales, member contributions)?</p>	53	38
<p>Maker: Greater Illinois</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Fellowship Development Communication</p> <p>Proposal: Provide a medium to help with this to make things more clear and more transparent to help share information better.</p>	52	34
<p>Maker: Brazil</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Fellowship Development: Virtual Meetings and Services</p> <p>Proposal: Embracing virtual service structures</p>	52	38

<p>Maker: Mid Atlantic</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Literature and Service Material: Development process</p> <p>Proposal: Create two effective vehicles. One for creating and updating recovery literature. Another for updating and creating Service literature. Stop using the CAR survey for prioritizing literature projects because it does not work, except for using it solely to priorities already approved projects in the meantime until a new process that is approved by the WSC is developed.</p>	51	44
<p>Maker: Greater Illinois</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Fellowship Development: Volunteer Coordination</p> <p>Proposal: Make better use of experience and volunteer resources around the world.</p>	49	42
<p>Maker: British Colombia</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: WSC Seating</p> <p>Proposal: to begin discussions on what zonal representation would look like as opposed to Regional Representation</p>	46	52
<p>Maker: New Jersey</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Literature and Service Material: Development Process</p> <p>Proposal: How do we challenge the WSC body to take ownership and devote the time/energy to debate/discuss and come to a definitive decision on what will be the clearly defined method for literature creation/development decisions?</p>	45	47
<p>Maker: Carolina</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Fellowship Development: Volunteer Coordination</p> <p>Proposal: How could NAWS better leverage the fellowship's IT and Software Engineering expertise to assist with the WSO's IT projects?</p>	43	49

<p>Maker: Minas</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Fellowship Development: Virtual Meetings and Services</p> <p>Proposal: Establishment of clear criteria for the functioning of a virtual CSA and a virtual Region.</p>	41	46
<p>Maker: How Brazil</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Literature: Translations</p> <p>Proposal: The How region proposes that we discuss how it is possible for us to have agility in translating literature into more languages, considering that the first item of NA's vision is that: All addicts in the world can experience our message in their own language and culture, and find a new way of living; WE KNOW THAT MANY WORKS DEPEND ON THE COMMUNITY AND REGION BUT CAN NAWs COLLABORATE AND HOW CAN THE CONFERENCE HELP?</p>	36	51
<p>Maker: Minas</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: WSC Processes</p> <p>Proposal: That the publication of the 90-day advance virtual WSC interim material be made available simultaneously in all languages.</p>	36	54
<p>Maker: Central Atlantic</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Service Material: Create or revise service material</p> <p>Proposal: Discuss a proposal to change all service material over a ten or some determined time that is in need of updating be changed if needed to conference approval or world board approved to allow an easier process to update our service literature.</p>	34	55

<p>Maker: How Brazil</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Literature and Service Material: Development process</p> <p>Proposal: In view of the information we had during the conference regarding topics related to projects that are in progress and have not been completed, all of them, whether new literature, translations, the proposal of the How Brazil Region is that the conference discuss and take a decision together with WB and NAWS so that all these projects and translations that are stopped can continue and be finalized. Our concern is that more and more new projects are approved and those that exist are stopped or under development, but we think that the priority is to finish what is already in progress before starting new projects.</p>	33	54
<p>Maker: Venezuela</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Special Days</p> <p>Proposal: Annually, it is very important For NA worldwide to commemorate World Newcomer Day, since as our literature mentions "It is the most important person". We propone February 2 which is Jimmy K.'s clean time date, OR a day in August or October 5 which is when NA started in the world.</p>	33	59
<p>Maker: Nebraska</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Literature: Create or revise literature</p> <p>Proposal: To utilize Informational pamphlets instead of changing all of our literature with motions 14 &15</p>	32	56
<p>Maker: Kentuckiana</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: WSC Processes</p> <p>Proposal: I would like to create a tool of some sort to better prepare conference participants by familiarizing them with concepts and the flow of business that is not a written document. It could have a written document as a portion of it but the main idea would be to create a tool for people who learn in different ways. Whether it's a skit the Saturday before the conference to roll play the process of voting on a motion or a yearly virtual meetings held by members in friendly time zones to help familiarize CPs with procedure and concepts before the conference to help the flow of business go more smoothly.</p>	32	59

<p>Maker: British Colombia</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: WSC-related matters: Other</p> <p>Proposal: to have a group travel insurance policy for WSC participants</p>	32	61
<p>Maker: Baja Son</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Literature and Service Material: Development process</p> <p>Proposal: 1. We the Baja Son Region have seen that one of the items the World Board likes to emphasize is the use of the Literature/Project Survey as a tool in prioritizing projects for consideration at the World Service Conference. The Survey technique is touted as a way to avoid regions making motions for specific literature projects. There are issues with the Literature Survey as a mechanism to aid in fellowship decisions. To begin with, the Literature Survey only has items sent to the fellowship and placed there by the World Board. There is no published mechanism to nominate literature projects to be in the next survey. The Survey itself does not give any context or perspective on what the item would be, or the unmet need or the reason it is being requested. Therefore the fellowship has no background information to make an informed judgement on what is needed. In order for the Literature Survey to be an effective tool in determining the value of given submissions there needs to be an explanation of what is being proposed and how this fills an unmet need.</p>	30	58
<p>Maker: LAZF</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Special Days</p> <p>Proposal: Delegate to the World Board to set an exact date for the existing World Unity Day, when it is not celebrated, at our World Conventions, and then incorporate it into the annual calendar of the days already established by the WSC, of events NA and NAWS. Example: September 1, or first Saturday in September. When this activity is not done, every 3 years, through the respective event of our World Conventions, currently, there is confusion regarding this issue, and it is good that we all know when is the official date of said event, so that members We, groups, committees, bodies or local service agencies, regions and zones, celebrate it together, and in parallel or simultaneously, as it happens every year, and precisely, with the World Service Day, the 1st May, World PR Week, the first week of June, and World Sponsorship Day, December 1.</p>	30	57

<p>Maker: LAZF</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: WSC Processes</p> <p>Proposal: THE MOTIONS INCLUDED IN THE CAR CANNOT BE AMENDED BY RDs less than 3 months in advance of WSCNA Delegate to the World Board, to review in detail, the processes and procedures of the GSMNA and the WSC, regarding the non-acceptance of further amendments to the ideas or proposals of the IAC or VAC, before each WSC, with less than 3 MONTHS prior to said event, so that the DRs or the regions arrive at the WSCs with their well-represented voice about each one of them, stating what they want to be done with each amendment of a corresponding IAC or VAC theme or matter.</p>	30	60
<p>Maker: Nebraska</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Other: New material</p> <p>Proposal: To create a token to commemorate working each of the 12 steps</p>	27	69
<p>Maker: LAZF</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Special Days</p> <p>Proposal: Submit to the decision of the Delegates an exact date for the founding of NA of the world, and incorporate it into the annual calendar of days already established by WSC, world NA events, and NAWS. Choosing between: 1) July 15 or , 2) October 5.</p>	27	60
<p>Maker: Israel</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Literature Printing and Distribution</p> <p>Proposal: Exploring the feasibility of NAWS printing literature locally in regions and zones where literature deliveries are consistently delayed by more than 45 days</p>	26	54
<p>Maker: Grande Sao Paulo</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Public Relations</p> <p>Proposal: Our proposal to discuss the possibility of having a unique visual identity that identifies us in all the world</p>	26	67

<p>Maker: Greater Philadelphia</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Service Material: Create or revise service material</p> <p>Proposal: To direct the World Board to create a project plan for the next World Service Conference(WSC) for the development of a new Workbook for the group entitled "Our Fair Share."</p>	25	67
<p>Maker: Baja Son</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: Literature and Service Material: Development process</p> <p>Proposal: Establish resource materials and study guides literature category. To direct the World Board to describe and propose a new NA Literature Category that encompasses reference materials and study guides.</p>	22	67
<p>Maker: Greater Illinois</p> <p>Main Topic/Issue: WSC Processes</p> <p>Proposal: Why doesn't the WSC disclose the votes of all regions/conference participants?</p>	6	84

APPENDIX F: NEW IDEAS DISCUSSIONS - COMPILED NOTES

(Numbers in parentheses' indicate votes to prioritize ideas)

Topic #1: How we can respond to predatory behavior in NA?

How can groups take responsibility to keep members safe?

Salon G–H

Resource pamphlet/workshop (26)

- Educate members about it
- Training by FD
- Locally developed resource made available to local fellowship e.g. Inappropriate & disruptive behavior in NA meetings – UK regional approved lit (2005)
- Workshop service pamphlet
- Educate group members about service pamphlets

Best practicing (25)

- Updating format/ script
- Confront as group
- Security Statement
- Announcement at the meeting as part of the preamble

Helping groups (10)

- Having multi-members having side/ direct talk
- Update script with...
- “if you feel unsafe..”
 - “if you see something, say something”
 - “what is predatory behavior”

Core group workshoping (7)

Salon I–J

Include harassment statement in meeting format/recurring item in group business meeting (11)

Educating homegroup members and attending (11)

Use definition (create pamphlet) (10)

Training for how to confront predatory behavior (9)

Establishing guidelines: Group – Area – Region (5)

Consequences

Preamble

Make members aware there are more than one type of predatory behavior (4)

Create Workshop (5th Tradition) discuss and address issues

Channel for people to report predatory behavior discreetly

Hidden Hills

Workshops to groups & addicts (27)

Fellowship approved list or description (6)

Adding language to the format (23)
Advance plan how to handle (3)
Challenge the behavior (4)
Form committee and create guidelines (2)
ASC workgroups (2)
Group inventory – define what safe likes like (7)
Safe squad (6)
Develop toolbox to get to groups (35)
Mentoring our group members (2)
Personal behavior; being examples (1)
Keep in mind same sex behaviors are affected the same (4)

Ventura Room

To be an example - Our 5th Tradition goes further than our words, our behavior is also the message
Utilize IP 29 in the format of our meetings (8)
Strengthen group structure with business meetings (9)
More experienced members in business meetings must participate in home group meetings
Autonomy information - gather it
Create a new IP on predatory behavior (2)
Workshops for members about behavior (6)
Orientation for members about what we understand about predatory behavior (5)
Atmosphere of recovery workshops

Virtual Room 1

Ultimate solution is legal action – requests to the member didn't work
Role-playing the solutions in the Disruptive and Violent Behavior service pamphlet helped to put them into action
There was push-back from some members, but a workshop at the ASC helped to dispel their concerns and empower other members
The 3rd Tradition doesn't trump the group's safety
Intimidating behavior stemming from one member – no way forward yet – area service is being disrupted
Consider online behavior in with in-person – clarity statement created that NA is a free program to counteract rise of people charging for sponsorship
Predatory behavior happened after the meeting – home group members let female members know that they were available to help
Encourage sharing in the meeting about the issue to raise awareness
Experienced and prepared male home group members talk to male predators – you are welcome but your behavior isn't

Pay attention to what is happening – e.g. move the coffee pot away from an isolated part of the room
Add to the statement from IP 29 to tell members that the group is available to help and let members know what to do if something happens.

Participant has had the experience of being bullied and abused in service because of his age and where he's from – needs solutions

Virtual Room 2

This needs to be addressed. The addict performing the behavior is also an addict and needs the rooms. But it's about making it a safe place without driving away the person acting out, and protect the person being preyed upon. (1)

Predatory may be a strong word.

Something in the format of the meeting, if it's happening see someone after the meeting.

Members exhibiting predatory behavior might be perceived but not might be the case. It might be just their way. Or they may have a past trauma or low self-esteem.

Through the Sponsorship group, they may talk to an individual about how their behavior may be inappropriate.

In the homegroup, a group of members of the same sex as the person that is exhibiting behavior may talk to them.

Within service bodies, 2 individuals speak the member about behavior. If there is denial of the behavior, a service body may vote to have member removed. (1)

Asking member to only go men's meetings only or the meeting of the gender that they identify with. All women's meetings help with connection and empowerment. (1)

Make guidelines for the meetings. Read the rules before the meeting. (3)

If there are behaviors happening in a service body, they are referred to the guidelines to follow them.

Ask a friend to discuss the behavior with them.

Group business meeting should discuss this on how to be more effective.

Taking a newcomer aside and explain what might be in their best interest. (4)

Conversations before the meeting or after.

The more people that approach a person may help enforce the need to stop.

Person with predatory behavior may have other behaviors that are attractive and then cosign his bad behavior. They all need to be confronted. (1)

Tolerance for dysfunction is a lot higher so we tolerate a lot more.

Be super direct, confront, and make their bad behavior known. Not one-on-one behind closed doors.

Letting someone form their own opinion but being verbal with your confrontation.

Suggestion: Maybe will be good idea to conduct some service event, or make part of service event as speaker sessions from people who were involved in predatory behavior. And also take a time for brainstorming how we can act with this after.

What have we learned about keeping our members safe in the virtual NA environment?

Salon G–H

Keep chat closed (host only)

Host will rename to names only, no area info

Waiting room

Follow best practices:

- Waiting room before entry

- Be aware of local school calendar

- Mute on entry

- Change password periodically

- Check for suspicious names

- Have a “wrangler”

- Camera off reminder

- Monitor the chat

Salon I–J

Eliminate direct messaging feature in virtual meetings

Monitor the group and if you need to, place them in a waiting room (3)

Chat off

Ventura Room

Not recording meetings

Have knowledge of the platform that is being used

Virtual meetings tool box (3)

Informed meetings, clear autonomy

Train meeting hosts (1)

Strengthen the structure

Knowledge of technology

Guidelines for virtual groups (1)

Predatory behavior reading card

Procedures guide

Being inclusive and sharing experience, strength and hope

Virtual Room 1

Disruptive members can be removed quickly online

Check the chat for inappropriate messages

Virtual Room 2

Make a position for the meeting that monitors behaviors.

Topic #2: Fellowship Development: Reimagining/revitalizing services and service committees especially post-pandemic.

How can we (groups, areas, regions, zones, and world services) help meetings and services rebuild after the pandemic, including virtual?

Salon G–H

Keep meeting/e-list updated (2)
Make service meetings hybrid/ hybrid service structures (1)
More PR outreach - EXPOs, festivals (9)
Identify the needs (2)
 Ask- don't tell them
 Ask – don't wait for them to share
 Communication- better
Remove Barriers (1)
 Loner clean-time req.
 Proper budget for funding
Area funded - homegroup event (11)
 Social events that address/include a service component
RSC trusted servants offer more support to ASCs
Service sponsorship
Share all hard-won experience
Fun events with food (3)
Develop guidelines for new technology (6)
 Electronic payments
 Social media
 Virtual event announcements
PR/PI efforts- treatment centers, halfway houses, drug court (7)
Update/keep current meeting list (1)
Encourage new meetings
H&I + PR collaboration
Home group commitments
Pot luck/speaker meeting
Clean & concise website
Outreach Committee

Salon I–J

Advanced Zoom presence - virtual; share service responsibility
Creating unity – 3rd Tradition – event – fellowship (3)
Provide service workshops and other events for struggling communities. Consider having outside workshop presenters. (15)

Let members know they are necessary and important in service (3)

Hold events in smaller areas

Hidden Hills

Utilize more service structure & project outreach (7)

More public relations (18)

Make ourselves more attractive (2)

To include hybrid to be more inclusive (4)

Newcomer meetings (1)

Identify who is missing through inventory process (10)

Collaborative activities (1)

National PR & Helpline (3)

Utilize social media & QR codes (13)

Reframe how to get others involved (1)

Collaborate with other areas & groups (38)

More events & gatherings

Open service days to whole fellowship (15)

Area outreach committee (2)

Fun planning days (3)

Ventura Room

Open minded to change (5)

Support groups that have fewer members

Rotate ASC meetings to different group locations

Awareness of 7th Tradition (time, commitment, money)

Promote our vision

Support RSCs (5)

Engage member attendance in-person and virtual

Strategic planning to enhance growth and support to develop the fellowship (9)

Strengthen H&I and PR for newcomers

Service forums to attract members (5)

Virtual Room 1

Updated outreach committee to an FD committee in a similar way that PI became PR

Use local service resource area

Capture the flag game to encourage members to visit new groups

APF doubled FD budget and encouraged communities to ask for help

Focus on translation

Make it exciting and create buy-in from members – travel to newer communities showed others that they could receive help too

Met online with correctional professionals (educational officers) and H&I trusted servants to workshop how to be more effective in H&I and reintroduce the basic idea and principles of H&I – the do's and don'ts etc.

Provide workshops locally

Better connect groups and areas with world service level

Pay attention to scheduling of regional meetings to reduce costs by only needing one hotel night

Created FD ad-hoc to deliver PR and H&I focused on reviving meetings and updating meeting information. Convention and Brai (BBQ) also helped to rebuild the community.

Communicated directly with groups and members to offer help

Visiting new communities is inspiring for trusted servants

Use what worked at the APF locally – loving and caring attitude to everyone

Start with: Who is missing, and how can we reach them?

Back to basics – NA info booth at local events, e.g. at university

PI at West Coast Symposium – professional event for treatment professional – help as much as we can

Virtual Room 2

Project based service. Improves the lack of trusted servants. (4)

One Area sponsors another Area, which improves trusted servant's growth.

Regions make a celebration of anniversary of the region. Speakers at the regional level.

Not involved because they don't know about the service. Use technology to reach out—maybe personal experience in little snippets with photos. Jokes and stories work too.

To focus on FD with the help of NAWS and Zonal forums at events, etc. Focus on translations. (1)

Using technology—like Facebook groups, current information on website.

Finding meeting spaces for service bodies that are easy to get to and have adequate time for all subcommittees to meet.

Hybrid recovery meetings—extend the Area into the rural places. (2)

Mailing literature or have someone willing to deliver.

Long distance sponsorship—is better than not doing it at all. Groups can ask for emails and pass on to people looking for sponsor.

Mentorship—members bring a newcomer to an in-person or virtual meeting. Lead by example. Always entice with food. (1)

Hybrid service meetings and recovery meetings encourage participation. Especially those that are physically far away from the service body. (9)

Identify younger members with talents. Get them involved. Personal interaction with members gets them involved. (2)

Tell them they can't do it and they will step up!

What can we do to help grow NA, especially in places where growth is flat?

Salon G–H

Do a group/area/region inventory (5)
More PR outreach in rural areas (4)
Visit outlying areas
Zonal task teams (1)
Members take time to support group + areas that are struggling (2)
Attract new trusted servants by doing things new ways to get new ideas (5)
Utilizing principle of sponsorship for groups, areas, regions, and zones (6)
PR efforts - direct contact, professional days, ongoing contact
Visiting with indigenous communities travelers (1)
Relationships with government officials (1)
Webinars, PSA, billboards
Handing out free literature to libraries, treatment centers, behavioral health centers

Salon I–J

Training & supporting to make strong meetings. Commit to bringing one member into service in home group (13)
Perform proactive outreach to struggling communities to listen and understand how we can best support them. (2)
Fellowship development scans—strategic plans (5)
Activities committee going to groups to see how they can help (2)
Fellowship development from more experience region to help less experience regions (19)

Ventura Room

Create strategic projects for growth and to support FD (9)
Do an inventory to identify problems and generate solutions (9)
Utilize virtuality and in person to do external and internal PR
PR efforts
Research new meeting formats to make meetings more attractive
Access to PR
Group activities and workshops

Topic #3: Literature and Service Material Development Process: How to develop a single, well-understood process for prioritizing future literature project plans? How do we pull ideas from regions, zones, the fellowship, and NA World Services together and then vet and prioritize them?

Salon G–H

- Service literature - only conference approved (2)
- Recovery literature – only fellowship approved
- Service vs. recovery literature separate process (*CAR* vs. *CAT*) (Fellowship vs. *WSC*) (3)
- New ideas for literature should come from regions/zones (1)
- Expand survey timelines across conference cycle (2)
- Recovery literature voted on by individuals (1)
- Cycle focus: i.e. revisions in 2026
- Raise awareness of literature survey and make process more attractive + stop literature motions in *CAR* (Create short video) (10)
- Create workgroup to better prioritize literature (1)
- Prioritize what's already passed and work plan to complete or not (23)
- Form a lit workgroup that would prioritize so that we can have proposals by interim conference with full discussion (10)
- Local literature development committees (6)
- Engage outside company to develop survey
- Materials to solicit needs from local communities (1)
- One methodology to determine the project with a deadline (Either motion or survey) (18)
- NAWS creates a fellowship webinar to gather all ideas
- Slim down the process/shorten the time between prioritization and taking action

Salon I–J

- Survey the fellowship for most important literature ideas. Prioritize them among CPs (possibly during interim *WSC*). Those priorities result in project plans in the *CAT*. Eliminate regional/zonal *CAR* motion process (moratorium) for lit project plans. (16)
 - Note: This is a problem not an idea. In non-English speaking NA communities new literature project plans are less important because they are still working on translating existing literature.
- PowerPoint with brief description about literature voting on. Post before we vote. (5)
- Polling the fellowship once a year to see what addicts want (3)
- Communication at all levels (2)
- Workshops, surveys, + get zones involved (3)
- Have a process where regional motions can be developed further at zones and service symposiums, then workshopped during cycle and prioritized (28)
- Use IDT workshops as a method to develop literature motions during interim then voted on during *WSC*, live.

Member > group > ASC > RSC > zone > CP > WSC. Top to bottom idea/brainstorm flow (9)

After [process outlined above] create project plan, implement & create (5)

Hidden Hills

Using zonal voice as a way to prioritize (2)

Finding better ways to use the tools (1)

Scan first year of cycle then prioritize before interim WSC involving CP's to ensure voices are heard and to do the work to safeguard the whole fellowship is heard (28)

Send survey to zones for translations to ensure all members of that language group have an opportunity to input survey before deadline (17)

Use zone to prioritize the needs (1)

Info on cost, resources and time to produce IP versus Book length literature (2)

Keep priority on approved items until completed (4)

Portal for members to submit ideas then filter to regions & zones (18)

Separate *CAR* motions & survey (8)

Literature survey instead of *CAR*

Solicit, meet, survey, delegate then present; Tim's flowchart (1)

App with open ended questions to get all voices to form a single direction * create the way to decouple the literature process from conference process (26)

Ventura Room

Surveys for groups and other levels of service structure (4)

Create a workgroup to process survey data

Understand the importance of the 12 Concepts

Periodical surveys for the fellowship as a whole through the regions (10)

Translate all existing literature to all languages

Prioritize between survey or motion as a single channel for decision making (2)

Virtual Room 1

CAR motion to not make *CAR* motions to create literature projects – use surveys, IDTS, and WSC discussions to determine priorities

Updating old literature may be more important than creating new pieces

CAR survey system is broken – doesn't allow for regions to say why something is important to them. Acknowledges that *CAR* motions aren't the answer. Survey may work well for revision priorities, but minority needs may always be overlooked

Different pieces of literature are more important in some parts of the world than others. Would reducing the number of choices help? What is most important to individual regions?

Revisions could take a really long time

Zonal collaboration – local surveys to determine needs

APF is at capacity, but 3 year cycle gives us more time to talk about the “why” of literature priorities. Restrict input to regions to filter results and prevent individuals influencing the results by submitting multiple responses

Blend the *CAR* process and the *CAR* survey

How do we get less-developed parts of NA involved, and those who don’t speak English? How can we help the LTCs to bear the burden and maintain morale?

Do we need to decide how to remove items from the list and create a shorter list?

If the fellowship is going to let go of making *CAR* literature motions, it will need something that works to replace it

How can we acknowledge the very different needs of NA communities around the world – e.g. Women in Recovery IP plan from Iran is focused on a very different need than one for women in other communities

Try a new process and see if it works

Create a review date for all literature and a workgroup to review everything based on that timeline, then gather input and offer recommendations

Virtual Room 2

[Note: This breakout room discussed a different topic]

How to create new revenue streams to supplement existing sources of revenue (literature sales, member contributions)?

Design and conduct an event like a recovery meeting and collect 7th Tradition.

Sell books at events.

Difficult to rely on funds that come from conventions due to acts of God.

Group level events—Chili cook-off, Group anniversary, some kind of contest with Speaker Jam.

Could vendors make an agreement with service bodies to give back a percentage of sales to the service body and a percentage to NAWS. (1)

Promote that more members give \$1 for each year clean monthly. (1)

Need to consider that just breaking even on events may not be enough.

Maybe we need to look into the World Pool to help on projects. Use human resources to free up financial resources.

Merchandise at the world level with a third-party to drop ship (Canva). Members could provide designs. Include vendors. (6)

Have a learning day to teach areas and home groups about what a prudent reserve is and how they should donate over a prudent reserve.

Sponsors suggest contributing to the 7th Tradition. Maybe with more clean time it can be more than \$1.

Groups purchase books to give to newcomers. (1)

Put on a free event and all proceeds are donated to World Services. (3)

Contributing proceeds of an event once costs are covered.

Using trusted servants that are well versed in negotiation of hotels.

Splitting costs between regions and areas (like 70%/30% which is built in the guidelines)

Connect with other countries to get another perspective. Can you make the same amount of contribution by spending less at an event? (1)

Look at resources that members can provide (venue for event) while also being self-supporting.

Changing the culture of the dollar in the basket to maybe putting a fiver in the basket. (2)

Topic #4: Drug Replacement Therapy/Medically Assisted Treatment: How can we best welcome members on DRT/MAT lovingly and kindly and how can we be cooperative with the current treatment approach without compromising our principles or expressing an opinion on an outside issue? How do we reframe this discussion to focus on our primary purpose and help members understand how vital this issue is to the future of NA?

Salon G–H

Lovingly support/encourage members on DRT/MAT to keep coming back practice Tradition 3 (4)
Revise “Welcome to NA” IP #29 to include topic DRT/MAT and let all members know they are welcome (14)
“Welcoming all members” workshop (4)
Personal stories (E/S/H) (IP) of success with DRT/MAT transition (16)
Fellowship involvement on DRT/MAT: service, home group, sponsorship, etc. (Stories)
Focus on: traditions 3 abstinence, open vs closed meetings (4)
Discuss issue with more experienced members
Direct these members to those with experience with DRT/MAT (1)
Create IDT called “Welcoming and retaining members on DRT/MAT” (7)
Welcome no matter what (4)
Focus on experience rather than opinion (3)

Salon I–J

Rephrase the discussion to “welcoming DRT/MAT members”, and invite DRT/MAT members that are now abstinent to share their experience, hope, and love. (4)
Make sure members understand the need to be welcoming and that DRT/MAT does not conflict with the NA message of complete abstinence. (14)
Sponsorship (1)
Make being drug-free aspirational (6)
We drop it (1)
Welcoming all members (DRT/MAT member) are NA members (20)

Hidden Hills

NA has no opinion on outside issues (11)
We are not doctors we are all addicts; 3rd Tradition (2)
Treat all addicts the same (28)
Loving hugs, all are welcome
We don’t care how you get here, just get here (16)
Workshop transitioning out of treatment, success stories IPs (12)
Focus on primary purpose, no rules just suggestions (10)
Change language when welcoming newcomers (4)

Tradition 3 & 10 (15)

Ventura Room

Create an atmosphere of recovery for people who believe they have a drug addiction problem (6)

We need more information about this topic (7)

Separate DRT and MAT and deal with them individually

Facilitate workshops on these topics

Professional orientation and information to educate us on this topic (1)

3rd Tradition (4)

We welcome them; we do not have an opinion (1)

Love and respect for them.

IP that raises awareness of spiritual principles, 1st, 3rd and 5th traditions (9)

Virtual Room 1

We know that we need to welcome every addict, connect them with members, and have a clear statement about NA's position on abstinence - Do we have a clear position that the whole fellowship believes in, and follows?

There is a broad spectrum of opinion, and we don't do well with grey areas. Marking a clear line in the sand is a challenge. Should we do that and deal with the push-back from some parts of the fellowship?

A clear message would help the medical community.

Not a hot topic in the region, but is at the GSF. Upon taking inventory and hearing from members on DRT, it turned out that groups weren't acknowledging the efforts of members on DRT to move towards abstinence in as enthusiastic way as they were towards members that relapse. Changes in meeting structure came from this to better focus on welcoming all members.

12 Steps are part of the process – the 2nd step talks about losing the desire to use – abstinence isn't the only part of the message. We offer much more than just being clean. If you want what WE have to offer, then this is what WE do.

Ask the question: Do you want to be on this forever? Do you have a plan? Do professionals have the same idea of achieving abstinence? Can we have this conversation with professionals?

Conflation of the 3rd tradition and the right to participation in a meeting. Can we make people welcome without allowing them to fully participate?

We need to be direct – we have been going around it. Ireland is lucky that this isn't an issue.

Regions need specific information to explain to members why we are still talking about this topic – what is it we need to know?

Be direct about our message regarding our principles and what this program is, rather addressing DRT specifically.

Some doctors still won't send clients to NA

It's up to PR to say that regardless of our position on DRT, we welcome everyone.

Virtual Room 2

Talk to the member on a personal level. Follow the doctor's prescriptions.

The effective treatment plans taper down to 0. Whatever the method, give them a hug and tell them to keep coming back.

Third Tradition...it's all that matters. (3)

Encourage the DRT/MAT members to find a sponsor.

As a member try not to have an opinion. Try to give them a reason to keep coming back. (4)

Best thing I can do is love them. (1)

Reframe this discussion. Need to interact with the professional community—talk to them about what they can expect in NA. (1)



There is no difference between DRT/MAT members and members who come high. They are there because they have a desire.

Sponsors will help the DRT/MAT members come to the realization through the working of steps. (2)


Maybe find a doctor who is equipped to work with addicts and aware of NA.

APPENDIX G: CAR SURVEY RESULTS

The board's recommendations for project plans are bracketed in green.




3. New Service Material—choose up to 3 (percentage)



4. Revisions to Existing Service Material—choose up to 2 (percentage)



5. Issue Discussion Topics—choose up to 3 (percentage)



APPENDIX H: AMENDMENTS WSC DECIDED NOT TO CONSIDER

When there is consensus in an initial straw poll for a motion, according to GWSNA the body has the option to discuss and decide on the motion without any changes (amendments). The following amendments were submitted and had an initial straw poll taken before the WSC, but the body decided to discuss and decide on the main motion without any changes.

Do you want to discuss and decide on the amendment to Motion #2:

48-64-3-2 41% Lack of Strong Support

Motion #2-a1	ABCD Region
Amend, CAR Motion 2	To divide Motion 2 to consider separately the changes to Article V, Section 3 of the Operational Rules (the inspection clause). The motion, as amended would be divided into the following two motions: Motion 2a To approve the revisions to Article V, Section 3 of the <i>FIPT</i> Operational Rules contained in Addendum B. Motion 2b To approve the revisions to the <i>FIPT</i> Operational Rules, contained in Addendum B, with the exception of the revisions to Article V, Section 3

Initial Straw Poll: RD: 50-32-8-18 55% (ZD vote: 3-1-1-0)

Do you want to discuss and decide on the amendment to Motion #7:

41-82-0-1 33% Lack of Strong Support

Motion #7-a1	Australia Region Co-maker: Wisconsin Region
Amend, CAR Motion 7	To substitute the wording of Motion #7 with the following Motion: To lessen the six World Board members' terms currently expiring in 2024 to end at the close of the WSC 2023. Intent: To avoid World Board terms ending in the middle of a conference cycle and to practice the spiritual principle of rotation

Initial Straw Poll 46-44-6-17 47%

Do you want to discuss and decide on the amendments to Motion #8:

57-68-0-1 45% Lack of Strong Support

Motion #8-a1	Alaska Region
Amend, CAR Motion 8	To add to the end of Motion 8 the following:no later than at the convening of the next WSC. Motion 8 would read as amended: Motion 8: As a result of the COVID pandemic, to suspend the World Convention of NA (WCNA) rotation policy after 2024, to allow the World Board to determine what is possible and practical moving forward and then seek approval from conference participants no later than at the convening of the next WSC.

Initial Straw Poll: 63-24-8-18 66%

Motion #8-a2	Australia Region Co-maker: Wisconsin Region
Amend, CAR Motion 8	To substitute the wording of Motion #8 with the following Motion: To push back the World Convention of NA (WCNA) rotation policy by 6 years. This would mean that the rotation would be as follows. 2027 – Asia, Middle East and Africa (with Melbourne first choice if still feasible) 2030 – North America 2033 – Europe 2036 – North America 2039 – Central and South America Intent: Given the disruption in the rotation of WSC and WCNA that has already occurred, the increases in event costs, and the other changes brought about by the pandemic, to allow each zone to still get their turn just 6 years later than originally planned.

Initial Straw Poll: 40-46-7-20 43%

Motion #8-a3	Arizona Region
Amend, CAR Motion 8	To add at the end of Motion #8 “regardless of where the geographic location of the WCNA (world convention NA) is determined, that it be held in 2028 to celebrate the 75-year Diamond anniversary” The motion as amended would read As a result of the COVID pandemic, to suspend the World Convention of NA (WCNA) rotation policy after 2024, to allow the World Board to determine what is possible and practical moving forward and then seek approval from conference participants. Regardless of where the geographic location of the WCNA (world convention NA) is determined, that it be held in 2028 to celebrate the 75-year Diamond anniversary.

Initial Straw Poll: 50-32-11-20 53%

Do you want to discuss and decide on the amendment to Motion #10:

54-69-1-1 43% Lack of Strong Support

Motion #10-a1	California Inland Region of NA (CIRNA)
Amend, CAR Motion 10	To amend motion #10 by making the following changes If Motion 9 is adopted, to approve an interim virtual WSC <u>every non-conference year in the middle of the conference cycle</u> for decisions that are legally necessary and those that conference participants choose to address. As was done in the 2020–2023 cycle, material would be posted on na.org under the same deadline policies as the CAT (ninety days prior) and all voting conference participants would be polled to choose the items they wish to address. The motion as amended would read: To approve an interim virtual WSC every non-conference year for decisions that are legally necessary and those that conference participants choose to address. As was done in the 2020–2023 cycle, material would be posted on na.org under the same deadline policies as the CAT (ninety days prior) and all

	voting conference participants would be polled to choose the items they wish to address.
--	--

Initial Straw Poll: 55-36-8-14 55%

Do you want to discuss and decide on the amendments to Motion #11:

63-61-0-0 50% Lack of Strong Support

Motion #11-a1	California Inland Region of NA (CIRNA)
Amend CAR Motion 11	<p>To amend Motion 11 by making the following changes If Motion 9 is adopted, to approve a change to the release of the <i>Conference Agenda Report (CAR)</i> to be thirty <u>ninety (90)</u> days earlier than the current policy of 150 days prior to the start of the World Service Conference. The new <i>CAR</i> release day would be 180 <u>240</u> days prior to the in-person WSC meeting for English, 150 <u>210</u> days for translated versions. The deadline for the finalization of regional and zonal motions would be 270 <u>330</u> days. The <i>Conference Agenda Report</i> will be posted on na.org at no cost to members.</p> <p>The motion as revised would read:</p> <p>If Motion 9 is adopted, to approve a change to the release of the Conference Agenda Report (CAR) to be ninety (90) days earlier than the current policy of 150 days prior to the start of the World Service Conference. The new CAR release day would be 240 days prior to the in-person WSC meeting for English, 210 days for translated versions. The deadline for the finalization of regional and zonal motions would be 330 days. The Conference Agenda Report will be posted on na.org at no cost to members.</p>

Initial Straw Poll: 54-33-9-17 56%

Motion #11-a2	Brazilian Zonal Forum
Amend CAR Motion 11	<p>To amend Motion #11 by making the following changes</p> <p>If Motion 9 is adopted, to approve a change to the release of the Conference Agenda Report (CAR) to be thirty days earlier than the current policy of 150 days prior to the start of the World Service Conference. The new CAR release day would be 180 days prior to the in-person WSC meeting for English, 150 days and for translated versions. The deadline for the finalization of regional and zonal motions would be 270 days. The <i>Conference Agenda Report</i> will be posted on na.org at no cost to members.</p> <p>The motion as amended would read:</p> <p>If Motion 9 is adopted, to approve a change to the release of the <i>Conference Agenda Report (CAR)</i> to be thirty days earlier than the current policy of 150 days prior to the start of the World Service Conference. The new <i>CAR</i> release day would be 180 days prior to the in-person WSC meeting for English and for translated versions. The deadline for the finalization of regional and zonal motions would be 270 days. The <i>Conference Agenda Report</i> will be posted on na.org at no cost to members.</p>

Initial Straw Poll: 46-41-9-17 47%

APPENDIX I: REGIONAL MAP

