

2012 CAR Workshop Outline

This outline offers three sessions that total about 4 hours and a 15 minute introduction. There is the option to include an IDT session if a day-long workshop is desired. It could also be possible to shorten the World Board motions session and the regional proposals session into a single 90 minute session and limit the time for service system to 90 minutes by restricting time for questions and discussion, thereby limiting the session to a presentation of the information only. This could make it possible to cover the essentials of the CAR in a short introduction and two 90 minute sessions.

Workshop Introduction – 15 minutes

Service System session – 2 hours

World Board Motions session – 1 hour

Regional Proposals session – 1 hour

Workshop Introduction – 15 minutes

Introduce workshop facilitators.

Review workshop agenda.

Review list of main contents of CAR, most of which will be covered in the workshop:

1. Service System – project background, resolutions, straw polls
2. *Living Clean: The Journey Continues* – creation process and contents
3. World Board motions – FIPT, WCNA
4. IDTs – no new IDTs proposed in this CAR, although we encourage everyone to review the three IDT sessions released in MAY 2011. Topics are A Vision for NA Service, *In Times of Illness*, Revised, and Self-Support
5. Regional proposals
6. Addenda, including the Service System Proposals Report, the approval draft of *Living Clean*, and the WCNA zone map

Explain the differences between motions, resolutions, straw polls, and regional proposals:

Two types of binding decisions will be made at this conference:

- **Motions:** These are decisions about actions to be taken now. And so, for instance, in this CAR, there are motions to approve a new book, *Living Clean*, to make changes to convention policy, and to revise parts of the *Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust*.
- **Resolutions:** These are intended to reach agreements in principle on broad-based ideas. These agreements will be binding for future work on the Service System Project & help create a conceptual foundation for future changes.

Two types of items in the CAR are designed to gauge preferences and support levels for ideas. will inform and guide future work. They may lead to future decisions, but are not decisions that will be made at this conference:

- Straw polls: Non-binding votes intended to gauge support for more specific aspects of the service system proposals. Results are intended to be used to guide future work.
- Regional Proposals: Ideas forwarded by regions for study and consideration in lieu of regional motions. They are not being presented for decision at this time. This is an experiment for this conference only. Once we see if this approach helps us better discuss ideas rather than debate motions, the conference will make a decision about the future.

Two types of proposals:

- Service System Proposal Report (CAR Addendum A) – This is a **background** resource to understand the resolutions and the straw polls. It will not be voted on at this conference.
- Regional Proposals – These are ideas from regions for study and consideration at this conference.

Why Regional Proposals not Motions:

- Proposals are more flexible than motions.
- Motions are inherently rigid. The process of changing motions is complex and intimidating to many.
- Our hope is that proposals rather than motions will allow delegates to bring ideas that can more easily be discussed.
- We talked about it in terms of a metaphor: delegates often feel like they are bringing trees to the conference and getting all the branches lopped off in the process of making motions CAR-ready. We are hoping that bringing proposals is more like bringing seeds.
- This is an experiment. We will discuss it further at the conference.
- The board presents motions rather than proposals because the policy hasn't changed in terms of how to pass a project or approve a book, for example. We don't feel it's responsible to experiment with things like approving literature, for instance. But in the future, it may be that we are able to conduct more business through proposals rather than motions.
- Also, the board's motions all stem from the strategic plan. Everything they propose is driven by the plan.

Service System Session - 120 minutes

Very briefly recap the background of the project. Our decision to propose changes to service delivery comes from an ongoing commitment to listen to what members are saying on a local level and try to meet their needs.:

- From the beginning of the worldwide workshops in 2001, we were asking people what were the most significant issues they were facing and they all pointed to challenges with local service, especially apathy. People don't want to get involved.

- Similarly, when we asked professionals during the PR roundtables, about NA, they pointed to challenges with local services.
- After several Issue Discussion Topics focused on things like “Infrastructure” and “Atmosphere of Recovery,” in 2008 we proposed a project to take a holistic look at how to improve local services. The conference passed the plan in 2008 and renewed it in 2010.

More background information is available on the service system website: www.na.org/servicesystem. There is a separate session profile and PPT for the Third Draft Proposal Report (Addendum A of this CAR) online for those who wish to hold a separate workshop session on the Proposal Report or those who are refamiliarizing themselves with the material.

Explain how this session will make more sense if those present have first read the proposals report in addendum “A,” although we hope that there will be enough information today to help those new to the project begin to catch up.

Resolutions

Explain that we are not voting on the proposals report in the addenda at the 2012 WSC. Instead the board is offering eight resolutions relating to the service system project. Each resolution covers one of the basic ideas of the project and the board is seeking agreement on these ideas before moving forward.

Offer a brief explanation of each resolution referencing the relevant proposals material, providing page references, and allow time for Q&A where possible.

Resolution 1: reference the section “What It Means to Be a Service System Not Just a Structure” on page 11 of the CAR, and the section “The Basic Elements of a System” on page.

Resolution 2: reference the section “The Group Support Unit – Carrying the Message” on page 57.

Resolution 3: reference the section “Leadership” on page 76.

Resolution 4: reference the section “Local Service Unit – Effective Service Delivery” on page 61.

Resolution 5: reference the section “Local Service Unit – Effective Service Delivery” on both page 61 and page 63, and the “Planning” section on page 77.

Resolution 6: reference the section “Local Service Unit – Effective Service Delivery” on page 61, and the section “Decision Making” on page 78.

Resolution 7: reference the sections “Size and Attendance” on page 61, “Intermediate Bodies” on page 64 and “Making Better Boundaries” on page 67. [Note: It may be helpful to read the second paragraph on page 13 of the CAR when explaining Resolution 7. This paragraph explains in some detail what the word “collaborative” means in the context on Res. 7.]

Resolution 8: reference the section “WSC Seating” on page 72.

Straw Polls

Explain the purpose of the straw polls and how they differ from the resolutions.

2012 *CAR* Workshop Outline – December 2011

To help us clarify what some of the agreements in principle contained in the resolutions might look like in practice we have formed a list of straw polls. These are being offered to gauge support for some of the specific ideas in the proposals and to guide the next steps in the process.

Review each straw poll and where necessary, briefly recap the relevant material from the proposals report, using the page references from page 14 of the *CAR*. Answer as many questions as time permits.

World Board Motions Session – 60 minutes

Living Clean: The Journey Continues

Review the methods used in the creation process for *Living Clean*, stressing the *CAR* essay goes into much greater depth:

- Overall the intent was to engage the wider fellowship as early in the creation process as possible
- Initial survey on turning points and challenges e-blasted
- Session profiles for workshops, online discussion board, and a project webpage created
- Initial fellowship input used to create an outline for the book
- Initial input, along with other sources such as speaker tapes, *NA Way* letters, and old drafts of literature used to begin creating the material
- Brainstorming software used to organize raw material under general topic headings
- Tape and scissors also used to further organize drafts of the material
- Review and input drafts released in three batches between June 2009 and December 2010
- Order of chapters changed as a result of fellowship input
- Approval form released April 2011

Review the contents of each chapter from page 18-19 of the *CAR*.

Review Motion 1 and allow time for questions as available.

Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust

Explain basically what the *FIPT* is: both a legal document and the conscience of the NA fellowship. It explains the rules governing the use of NA literature and trademarks, and protects our message from unauthorized use or change.

You may want to read some or part of the excerpt below from the Reader's Notes section of the *FIPT* and let people know it's on the NAWS website. There is a link from the service materials page: www.na.org/?ID=legal-bulletins-fipt.

The purpose of the *Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust* is to lay out the collective decisions the Narcotics Anonymous Fellowship has made over the years concerning its literature and logos. Anyone who has any questions about how NA literature is to be developed and approved, who "owns" it, how it may be changed and who may change it, who may print it, and what is to be done with the money resulting from its sale can easily refer to the *Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust*. In this one comprehensive document appear the policies our entire fellowship has created to preserve the integrity of its published message and the accountability of its publishing services.

These policies have been cast as a legal document, a "trust." This has been done, in part, because US law and international treaty regulate the way "intellectual property"--copyrights, trademarks, and other creations of the mind or spirit--should be administered. The legal "trust" framework has been used because it

fits the relationship established in Narcotics Anonymous between the fellowship and its service bodies where NA literature and logos are concerned.

The intent of the trust is to provide assurance to our present and future membership that NA's properties are duly protected from misuse by anyone, including our world services. Until the *Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust* is actually approved, Narcotics Anonymous World Services has only sketchy instructions on how it is to administer the fellowship's literature and logos. The trust clarifies and limits Narcotics Anonymous World Services' responsibility and authority in administering those properties on the fellowship's behalf. NA's literature and logos belong to no one individual, board, or committee, but are held in trust for the Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous as a whole. By casting the policies affecting this arrangement as a registered legal document, we ensure that those policies can be enforced, if need be, by the California state government.

Explain that Motions 2-4 would directly amend the operational rules of the *Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust* not the body of the *FIPT* itself. The *FIPT* does not allow changes to be made to Fellowship-approved literature without first putting a motion in the *CAR*, even if these are **corrections** of typographical errors – use examples from page 20 of the *CAR* to illustrate this point. Make it clear that the proposed change would not allow any changes to be made to the wording of the literature itself.

.Explain the idea of **bundling** pieces of existing literature, referring to page 20 of the *CAR* for details if needed. Stress that this does not involve changing any of the pieces of literature to be bundled.

Explain the idea of electronic **enhancements**, referring to page 21 of the *CAR*. One point to make clear is that the purpose of the motion is to enable the creation of **enhanced** texts. No motion would be required to simply create electronic versions of the texts.

Review Motions 2, 3, and 4 and allow time for questions as available. [A general note before reviewing the specific motions themselves: Motions 2-4 all seek to add language to the same article & section of the *FIPT* (among other changes). If more than one of the motions pass, therefore, the exact changes to the paragraphs involved may differ slightly from what is shown in the “Policy Affected.”

Online Literature

Posting literature online was an experiment by the board and was intended to increase access to our texts and help to carry the message. The book-length .pdfs from our site are being widely distributed and sold and that this was never the intent when they were posted online.

The board still wants to provide access to our message through publishing excerpts online but in the interests of protecting the fellowship's intellectual property the board intends to remove the online versions of the Basic Text and *It Works: How and Why*. These will be replaced with excerpts from the texts, either the table of contents or the first chapter. The board believes that this is the responsible

course of action. This is a related but separate issue from Motions 2, 3, and 4 so this will happen regardless of the outcome of those motions.

The board will be producing electronic or digital versions of the books for sale. All IPs and booklets will be left online in 41 languages in order to serve our members and potential members.

WCNA

Very briefly review the figures from past conventions from page 26 of the *CAR*, acknowledging that this has created a degree of discussion in the fellowship over the last few years.

Review the main points of the board rationale for altering the WCNA rotation plan, including:

- WCNA attendance has decreased in recent years
- WCNA is a awkwardly sized event – too large for hotels and too small for convention centers
- There are over 1000 other US fellowship events annually
- Registration at WCNA 34 was slightly less than the last time we were in San Diego 8 years ago
- Staging a world convention requires a tremendous amount of NAWS resources

Present the current plan and the revised plan and review Motion 5, allowing time for questions as available.

Issues for Discussion

The *CAR* always also contains issues to discuss on a local level some of which may be discussed at the conference. This *CAR* has

- A brief section on the 2010-2012 IDTs (pg. 30) and
- An explanation about the board's decision to remove .pdfs of full-length books from na.org (pg. 21-22)

Regional Proposals Session - 60 minutes

Recap the history of where this idea came from and explain why we are trying regional proposals at this conference rather than motions. Explain that this process will also cover new business at the conference. Refer to page 34 of the *CAR* if necessary and cover the following points:

- WSC has been moving towards a discussion based conference since the 1990s, and is less dominated by motions and parliamentary procedure than in previous years
- Majority of sessions at the WSC are discussion based
- Motions are discussed and straw polled before entering into formal business sessions
- Communications outside of the WSC at workshops, online discussion boards, articles in *NAWS News*, and from fellowship input are also part of the consensus building process
- WSC 2010 participants supported the idea of an experiment at WSC 2012 to replace motions with a process for discussing ideas from regions
- The experiment covers both regional motions in the *CAR* and in new business

Remind everyone that the last three issues of *NAWS News* reported on the regional proposals trial, and that the *CAR* contains a more detailed discussion as well.

Cover the main points of what will happen at WSC 2012 from the *CAR*:

- Proposals will be discussed, and possibly refined
- Proposals may be weighted to gauge the level of support for them
- Ideas with significant support could become part of the planning process
- The wrap-up session of the conference will be used to determine the next steps for any ideas that the conference supports
- Matters that require a change to conference policy will go through the appropriate *CAR* or *CAT* process
- WSC 2012 is the first step in the process and will lead to further refinements

Review each of the 5 regional proposals in turn, trying to both discuss the ideas contained in the proposals while capturing the main points of these discussions, and to gauge support for each proposal.

Ask the conference participants in the room to identify themselves before the proposals are discussed, illustrating that the experience and conscience expressed during the workshop will have the means of being carried to the WSC.