



# NA World Services Conference Report

---

VOLUME 19

NUMBER 2

MARCH 2000

## The World Board

### Overview

This first year of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century includes a milestone for NA World Services: the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of our World Service Conference (WSC). We have been preparing for what we hope will be a successful WSC meeting. And as usual, this will continue in a frenzy of activity leading right up to the week of the conference itself, 30 April-6 May 2000.

This year's conference will be quite unlike last year's conference, due to the amount of business and decision-making that must be accomplished. Last year's agenda was relatively free of specific proposals and motions. Because the conference can always be stressful, we are doing everything possible in our planning to instill an atmosphere of personal recovery throughout the conference proceedings. One very special event that we hope will contribute to the uniqueness and productivity of this year's conference is the history workshop that will take place on Saturday (29 April) before the conference opens on Sunday. This workshop, part of the history project approved by WSC'99, will bring together a group of individuals who attended NA meetings in the 1950s and early 1960s. World services, such as it was at the time, actually began in the 1960s through the visionary efforts of several of these individuals. Imagine the far reaching vision these members had to have, and the faith that Narcotics Anonymous would work for any addict, that our predecessors imagined a worldwide fellowship when there were but a handful of groups in the world. Along with others who have passed on, some of these members helped create NA's first World Service Board of Trustees to help work toward that vision—a reality we have inherited and for which we are forever grateful. This workshop will enable us to gather what these folks know about the beginnings of NA itself. We will then preserve what we collect for NA's future use. We hope this event and others we have planned will build a sense of community among conference participants.

Our intention with this report is to update you on the activities of the board since January and to provide more information about the upcoming WSC meeting. This includes, of course, supplemental information about our proposals in the *CAR 2000*. Many of the details of our work this past year can be found in the *November Conference Report* and in each issue of *NAWS News*. These are all available online at [www.na.org](http://www.na.org) or upon request. We realize this is another in a series of long reports this year. We thank those of you who are interested in participating in NA world services. We appreciate your effort to inform yourselves about what is going on. Your effort to study the issues pays off in your ability to inform other members. And we will need direction from you on many of these issues at the WSC.

Our report is divided into three main parts. First, we look back at this past year, summarizing key activities of the board and NAWS operations. This includes a review of the 14 projects adopted by WSC'99. Second, we discuss the immediate future leading up to WSC'00. This includes a discussion of the still tentative layout for the conference week. We will summarize the important activities scheduled to occur and the issues for discussion. Third, we conclude with a

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 2

look beyond the 2000 WSC into the next two-year conference cycle. (Our report also contains one lengthy exhibit—a detailed status report relating to the Communications Task Force Project.) Following our report is a separate report from the Human Resource Panel, followed by regional and zonal annual reports. (Any regional or zonal reports that we receive after the deadline, we will make available at the WSC).

### George Hollahan Update

As we reported in the last issue of *NAWS News*, George Hollahan, one of the Executive Co-directors of the WSO, is recovering from a stroke he had 7 February as a result of endocarditis. (Endocarditis is an infection affecting one's heart valves). As of this writing, George is out of the hospital. He is receiving physical and occupational therapy and other nursing care at home to help him recover from the effects of his stroke. He has made progress every day. George will still need surgery to replace his heart valve. No date has been set for surgery so far. George asked that we convey his gratitude for all of the cards and letters expressing love and support and offering prayers for his recovery.

## WORLD BOARD REPORT AND WORLD SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Our fiscal year now runs from 1 July-30 June. Formerly, the fiscal year matched the calendar year. In the past, the WSO published the *Annual Report* around this time each year. With the changeover to a new fiscal year, the next *Annual Report* will come out near the end of September. It will cover the period from 1 July 1999 through 30 June 2000. Instead of pointing conference delegates to the *Annual Report* as we usually do, we're giving a very brief update here of NAWS operations and World Board activities. We hope this will help to avoid information overload at the conference. The board will provide a further report at the upcoming WSC meeting, as in past years. There will be opportunities to ask questions in board open forums we'll schedule during the week, as well as in full conference sessions.

### Financial Update—Good News Continues

For the eight months ending 29 February 2000, NAWS, Inc. (consolidated) had total income (net of discounts) of \$4,068,000, total expenses of \$3,567,074, resulting in a year-to-date (YTD) net gain of \$500,927. Much of this profit will be used to offset the heavy expenses that we will experience in the last quarter of the fiscal year, due to the WSC. As of the same date, we had put in reserve savings of approximately \$500,000. This exceeds our savings goal for the year. These results are clearly good news for which we are very grateful, particularly the continuing increase in contributions from members, groups, areas, and regions collectively. These were also ahead of projections, totaling \$414,598 as of 29 February.

At the same time, we are a long way from meeting the Fellowship Development Plan objective of increasing fellowship donations by \$1,000,000+ so that donations account for 25% of NAWS total income (currently about \$6,500,000 per year). The benefit of this objective comes not only from greater accountability of NAWS to the groups by increasing world services reliance on Seventh Tradition funds, but also by decreasing our reliance on income from literature and products. Balancing better the sources of NAWS income would add stability to our financial foundation. Historically we've had significant swings in NAWS income, forcing staff layoffs and service cutbacks on more than one occasion in the 1990s, and as recently as 1997. Moreover, fellowship growth and the demand for services has continually increased, not decreased. Routine services provided by WSO (including the world convention) have grown increasingly complex. The ratio of full time staff to total NA groups has increased, not decreased. This means there are fewer staff members per NA group worldwide. Staffing levels have not recovered to the high watermark levels that were insufficient even at that time of the layoffs. Even with better financial conditions, we face serious challenges recruiting and retaining the highly skilled staff that we need today, given the wages and benefits we can afford to offer to prospective employees,

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 3

particularly with the relatively high cost of living in the Los Angeles labor market. And given this combination of factors, every day we see services that we would contribute to the continuation and growth of Narcotics Anonymous, but that we do not have the resources to provide. Some of those stories are told in the report below, in the features about drug court relations and our public relations activities, but there are many other areas as well. Although financially we are continuing to do well, we do not have money to burn. There is much more we could help to do to bring to life the WSC Vision and Mission Statements, with your help.

### **Routine Services—New Product Update News**

In addition to the new products we reported in the February *NAWS News* (Basic Text on CD Rom, large print version of *It Works: How and Why*), we are thrilled to report that we began shipping copies of the Castilian (Spanish) version of the *Narcotics Anonymous Step Working Guides* on 21 March. It's been less than two years since the fellowship approved the English version at WSC'98. Demand for the English version continues to be strong. Many Spanish-speaking local translation committees (LTCs) in a wide variety of NA communities successfully collaborated to produce this newly approved book. We congratulate these LTCs on their accomplishment. Two years is a relatively short length of time for the translation of book-length recovery material.

### **Routine Services—Literature Production & Distribution**

#### **WSO-Canada Update**

The Canadian branch office of WSO continues to meet current expectations in terms of its financial performance. Sales are down from last year, but this was partially anticipated. Net gain YTD is still almost \$25,000 US, but that's under this time last year. (Of course, we are always working to increase sales through improved service and at the same time control expenses so that the bottom line pays larger dividends in our overall effort to support carrying the NA message.) We are pleased that smooth operations at WSO-Canada have continued over the course of the last year during a transition in personnel there. We appreciate the performance the sole special worker onsite there, Jackie S, who has contributed to this result.

We are continuing our efforts to create fully integrated access to the WSO accounting system from the WSO-Canada branch. This matters because it will have an important benefit to our Canadian customers. Currently, the Canadian office has no computer to check the level of inventory items directly, the status of orders in transit or in process, or to enter orders for processing. Canadian customers who send an order directly to the Canadian office experience delays, because those orders currently must be re-sent to WSO headquarters for processing. (Under our current system, Canadian members can avoid this delay if they send any orders to WSO headquarters directly, which are then processed here and shipped from the Ontario branch.) Once we complete the current computer system upgrades and install a new computer for Ontario, WSO-Canada will be able to enter, track, and process orders more quickly, resulting in better inventory management, faster order turnaround times, and better overall service for Canadian customers. It may take up to a year to achieve this result.

One other thing we wanted to mention. We offer Canadian members a fixed rate of exchange of \$1.00 Canadian to \$0.75 US. As our Canadian members know, this is currently a very favorable rate of exchange. Canadian members need not incur the expense and inconvenience of converting Canadian currency into US dollars in order to make payment. We gladly accept payment in Canadian dollars.

#### **WSO-Europe Update**

The story with the European branch of the WSO is not quite as smooth. Europe is the most complex territory we currently serve. Due to the size of the fellowship there and the many different languages and cultures, the WSO-Europe branch has always faced its own challenges providing a full range of services to the fellowship—beyond just literature production and

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 4

distribution. Financially, the office is showing a net gain YTD. This compares to a net loss at this point last year. This puts us on track to break even or even show a tiny net gain as we hoped for after a dozen years of investment in European fellowship development. Although it has not yet reached that point, we remain optimistic that income will continue to increase given the growth of the European fellowship and the ongoing progress in translating recovery literature for various European NA communities. (For example, the Turkish translation of the IP *Recovery and Relapse* has just recently become available!)

Operationally, there have been more service disruptions in recent months. We want to apologize to our European customers for any inconvenience they have experienced and express our appreciation for your patience while we are improving operations there. Part of the story here is the same effort to integrate the accounting and inventory systems of WSO-Europe with WSO headquarters, as described with WSO-Canada above. Ultimately, this will have the same customer service benefit. However, the computer upgrades for WSO-Europe are broader in scope. And, this has been a more complicated task to accomplish for WSO-Europe, in part because of Y2K computer glitches with the existing computer system at WSO-Europe. We are also working on integrating the European branch with the WSO's new, main database system.

To accomplish this goal, we brought the principal employee who staffs WSO-Europe, Paul Decock, to WSO headquarters for the first time for two weeks of training. He has also done a great job for us over the last year. This was exciting for Paul and those staff here who interact with Paul regularly by telephone to have the opportunity to work together face-to-face. However, this additional training necessitated the closure of the WSO-Europe branch for this period. Again, we are sorry for any difficulties this may have caused our members. If you will continue to bear with us, we believe you will soon see the results of our efforts to improve our service to our European customers and members.

### Routine Services—Fellowship Development Activity

#### Drug Court Relations

In the 1999 *Annual Report*, we wrote: "the impact of drug courts on our fellowship has the potential to be greater than that of treatment centers in the 1980s." What does this mean?

It is increasingly probable that several hundred thousand newcomers will be coming to NA meetings, primarily in the US, over the next couple of years because of referrals from the booming drug court movement.

Drug courts represent a new formalized system of courts designed to deal with addicts who commit crimes. Drug diversion programs have long been a mechanism by which addicts have been court-ordered to NA meetings. The systematic creation of an entirely separate system of specialized courts is a relatively new phenomenon, however. State and national governments view the model as highly successful. As a result, there is explosive growth in the number of these courts. Initially, these courts have dealt with criminal offenders on the front-end of the criminal justice system (pre-trial, plea-bargaining alternatives to incarceration). Recently we have become aware of a new type of drug court known as a "re-entry drug court." These are operating on the back-end of this system (post-sentencing). There appears to be two emerging types of re-entry drug courts: jail-based (original sentence) and prison-based. The prison-based model seems to be the most innovative. The drug court may initially sentence the offender to state prison. Then at the back-end the offender is required to fulfill a probationary period in the re-entry drug court. In essence, these types of re-entry courts may represent almost a new, separate parole system for managing addict offenders. If state and national governments also find this model successful and copy it widely, this is another reason we see the potential for a significant increase in the number of addicts court-ordered to NA meetings, beyond that number of addicts who have historically first attended NA meetings as a condition of parole. During the 1990s, the number of prison-based treatment programs has also increased (again, primarily in the US), and this societal development appears to be related to the criminal justice system's overall adaptation to

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 5

addict offenders. The growing number of prison-based treatment units are introducing more and more addicts to NA, increasing the demand for NA H&I meetings behind the walls, and increasing the number of NA institutional groups in these facilities. The link between these prison-based treatment units and these new prison-based re-entry drug courts is a logical one that is likely to continue to increase as criminal justice systems continue to change how they deal with addict offenders.

The other factor that is driving this growth is the dramatically increased awareness and acceptance of Narcotics Anonymous as a program of recovery for drug addicts, both among professionals and the public. This is a result of our fellowship's phenomenal growth and maturation over the last two decades. Professional and public respect and knowledge of Narcotics Anonymous is substantially greater than what it was in the 1980s. This is a result of the tireless efforts of thousands of members, groups, and service committees to make our message more available to addicts everywhere. Increasingly, for professionals involved in all aspects of criminal justice systems, Narcotics Anonymous is the first choice for these professionals when they decide to refer or mandate addicts' participation in community-based programs.

The board is aware that in local areas where many drug courts have sprung up—and large numbers of addicts have been court-ordered to meetings—that some NA groups have faced challenges responding. The board has had very preliminary discussions about the need for a possible bulletin or issue paper to address this challenge. Concern about responding within the bounds of our Twelve Traditions is always the focus of our attention. Our attendance at professional conferences where we can interact with drug court professionals is particularly useful.

Because of the importance of the drug court movement, we have attended three conferences since June of 1999 sponsored by the (US) National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP). We told you in the last *Annual Report* about one of these: the NADCP's Adult Court Conference held in Miami Beach, Florida in 1999. During the first week of January 2000, we sent two staff to the NADCP's First Annual Family & Juvenile Drug Court Conference held in Phoenix, Arizona. (The Adult Court and the Family and Juvenile Court divisions of the NADCP have just recently formed. This reflects the tremendous growth and increasing sophistication and specialization of the drug court movement.) The January conference had expected about 600 or 700 attendees. They eventually hosted over 1,300 people. We had a booming attendance at our exhibit booth most of the time. We made numerous contacts, learned more about drug court developments, and were invited to attend another one of the NADCP's smaller but very important conferences.

We then attended that conference in San Diego, California (5-6 March 2000). The US Justice Department's "Community Orientation Policing Services" held this conference jointly with NADCP. This conference focused on better relations with law enforcement. WSO staff members were able to sit in on several of their topic specific focus groups to gain more insight into the inner workings of the drug courts and their law enforcement counterparts. Staff had an opportunity to sit in with a panel of judges and listen to their successes, as well as their daily woes. Drug court professionals are gaining an increasing awareness of NA's Twelve Traditions and how Narcotics Anonymous groups function. Our attendance at these events helps to further this understanding. These conferences are opportunities to foster dialogue about problems we face and they face—from different perspectives—when it comes to various courts interfacing with our fellowship's meetings at the local level. We are planning to attend another NADCP conference in San Francisco this June.

Finally, it's worth saying that although this movement has originated in the US, the movement is expanding worldwide and will have fellowshipwide impact. There are at least five nations with existing drug courts. A dozen more are in the planning stages. Last summer, growing out of the (US) NADCP, the organization formed an International Association of Drug Court Professionals (IADCP). The IADCP's board includes directors from Canada, Scotland, Ireland, Australia,

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 6

England, Brazil, Austria, and the United States. The IADCP will participate in the NADCP training conference we are planning to attend in June in San Francisco.

### **Routine Services—Fellowship Development—More Public Relations Activity**

Here are a couple more examples of public relations activity during the past nine months. All of our public relations work takes place within the bounds of the Twelve Traditions. And, of course, as our Eleventh Tradition tells us: “Our public relations policy is based on attraction rather than promotion ....” The professional conferences we attend generally share a common purpose of informing the public as to what NA is, what NA is not, and how NA works. This is particularly applicable to professional associations in the treatment or correctional fields. At these events, guided by our traditions of non-affiliation with outside enterprises, and without expressing opinions on outside issues, we can provide information to key professional groups who have extensive contact with addicts—addicts who haven’t yet found the new way of life we offer in NA. (Members who are new to public information service work can learn more about how it’s done and how our traditions apply by reading the service handbook, *A Guide to Public Information*, and *It Works: How and Why*.)

#### **ICAA in Vienna, Austria, September 1999**

We attended another annual conference sponsored by the International Council on Alcohol and Addictions in September 1999 in Vienna, Austria. We have continued our follow-up efforts over the years with this important international organization that brings together professionals who work with addicts from countries all over the world. This venue offers particularly valuable opportunities to make contacts with professionals and governmental officials from countries where no Narcotics Anonymous meetings presently exist. One of the travelers was a representative of the Euro Public Information Committee (a function accountable to the European Delegates Meeting). This improved our relationship and accomplished training to expand future cooperative public relations efforts. Follow-up is all-important in public relations work, and increasing the pool of experienced members for these kinds of important international public information efforts is an important objective. We are considering attending the next ICAA conference in Bahrain, 3-8 September 2000.

#### **Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University (CASA)**

We sent three staff members on a relatively inexpensive trip in our own backyard to the Reagan Library in Simi Valley, California (less than 25 miles from the WSO). We attended a conference presented by the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University (CASA). This public policy conference focused on “Substance Abuse in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Positioning the Nation for Progress.” 275 people attended from 29 February–3 March 2000. CASA hosted a multitude of nationally prominent figures, including Nancy Reagan and a number of important past and present US government officials.

One goal of the trip was to contribute to a positive image of Narcotics Anonymous as a concerned and valuable source of help for drug addicts. Our objectives also were to contribute to NA’s public relations efforts and to educate ourselves about the role of other key segments of society in national policy about drug abuse. It was an excellent opportunity to meet and make contacts with individuals from local and national government agencies, as well as the entertainment industry.

This conference gave us the opportunity to see where the future of substance abuse lies and what we may need to do to prepare our public relations efforts by using the information we garnered at this event. We were also able to further NA’s visibility and gain valuable personal contacts from representatives of a broad range of substance abuse treatment and information gathering fields, which attended this event. We learned a lot about the CASA, their research, and their efforts toward an informed policy-making approach for the United States. General Barry McCaffrey, head of the US National Drug Control Policy Office, and several other prominent

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 7

panel members acknowledged NA's role and presence on the recovery scene—something we can all be proud of.

### Routine Services—World Convention Update (Events)

WCNA-28 promises to be a unique event as we prepare for our first bilingual world convention. Dealing with the cultural and economic issues in order to make this fellowshipwide gathering a success has challenged our ability to plan an event that all can enjoy and afford. As we continue our planning, excitement seems to be building around the fellowship. Members are beginning to register and purchase travel packages for the convention. We were able to negotiate special travel packages from the US, several major European cities, many locations in Latin America, and for members traveling from cities throughout Colombia. While we were not able to get large discounts from all locations, our work on these packages reaches 14 countries—more locations around the world than ever before in world convention history. Registration flyers have been mailed to the fellowship in English, Spanish, and Portuguese. Flyers are available through the WSO or on our website, [www.na.org](http://www.na.org).

Despite our previous reports in *NAWS News*, the *WCNA-28 Newsletter*, and in the November 1999 *Conference Report* about our work regarding the issue of safety and civil unrest in Colombia and the lack of these problems in Cartagena, we continue to get questions and inquiries, primarily from our US members. We understand the anxiety that some members feel based upon press coverage of the civil war in Colombia and the perceptions about that country's drug-trafficking history. We still hear well-intended criticism from members who ask, "How could they ever have been so *stupid* to pick that location?" As we have reported before, we believe we chose the best overall location in Latin America. Concerns about violence and the safety of members were an issue we had to consider with each of the locations we evaluated for WCNA-28. The quality of the convention facilities in Cartagena, the isolation of Cartagena from the political and civil unrest in other parts of Colombia, and the size and stability of the NA community in Colombia (the second largest in Latin America) were among the deciding factors.

Now, all we can do is again offer the assurance that we are continuing to monitor the atmosphere of the country and activities in and around the convention site. No civil unrest commonly reported in some parts of Colombia has occurred in Cartagena. While we are committed to this event, we will not expose members to unnecessary risks. We will continue to monitor events in and around Cartagena right up to the event and notify the fellowship if anything changes. Traveling anywhere in the world always involves some element of risk, and each member everywhere must make a personal decision about such matters. We can share with you that the fellowship in Latin America in particular, and throughout Colombia especially, is tremendously excited and hopeful about hosting the worldwide fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous. For NA in Colombia, it is a dream come true! On their behalf, we can only pass on their gratitude in advance to all those who journey to Cartagena to celebrate "Nuestra Esperanza de Vida" (Our Hope for Life).

We are working hard to create a memorable and special program of convention speakers and workshops. In achieving our goal for the convention program, minimally we must identify speakers in both English and Spanish. (This is what makes this world convention truly the first bilingual convention. While we have often provided translation of English-language speakers in past conventions, we have never had an entire block of non-English speakers and workshops.) To be successful in this effort we are working with a program group within the host committee and have identified two other sources for assistance with this effort. We have selected a group of five trusted servants from names chosen out of the World Pool by the Human Resource Panel (based on criteria supplied by us) to serve on one program work group. This group will assist us in developing the English-speaking portion of the program for the convention by listening to tapes and narrowing the choices for speakers. The members of this group are: Greg S (Show-Me Region), Clark L (Northern California), CJ (Florida), Rhonda R (Free State), and Eduardo M (Brazil). We are also working with an identified group of regional delegates who participate in the

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 8

Latin America Zonal Forum to assist us in identifying potential speakers. Together, with the help of these groups, we hope to identify a diverse group of speakers for the convention. We thank these members for their willingness to serve and look forward to working with them.

At our March meeting, we continued a discussion that began at last November's meeting regarding the number of board members to send to WCNA-28. From 1986 through 1998, a separate board, the World Convention Corporation (WCC), planned and managed each NA world convention. The entire board of directors for WCC traveled to each world convention to work and handle on-site responsibilities for each event. The reorganization of world services in 1998 resulted in the elimination of this separate board, with the responsibility reassigned to the new World Board. For WCNA-27 in San Jose, California, the entire outgoing WCC board traveled to work the convention, plus the new World Board. As board members, we staged a series of workshops on service-related topics in addition to performing other on-site work such as registration. For the first time, the WSO closed the office and sent the entire staff to San Jose to work and support the event. The logistical challenges of an event with well over 15,000 attendees required this level of support.

Against this backdrop, in March the board discussed sending the entire board again to the next world convention (including any new board members elected at WSC'00). Our decision-making considered the needs and benefits for this particular trip in comparison to its estimated costs (approximately \$48,000 based on a 24-member board or less than 1% of NAWS annual budget). However, we also discussed the way any decision about board travel might be perceived in the fellowship.

We know that perception can be reality, and that there are members who think some or all world service-related travel is unnecessary. In the worst case, some perceive an abuse of fellowship funds where members are traveling on worthless junket trips that amount to vacations to sunny California or other sightseeing destinations. Sending all or part of the World Board to world conventions certainly raises these ghosts from the past. The reality is that the business purpose and potential benefits of each trip are carefully weighed against the projected costs. And although there have been rare cases in the past where volunteer travelers have been sent to functions who did not work hard or accomplish the mission of a particular trip, we believe we have learned from those lessons and that there is greater accountability today. We carefully screen and decide who to send to accomplish the purposes of any particular trip and then also subsequently evaluate the performance of all travelers, as well as review the trip reports all travelers are required to prepare to report on and account for all trip activity.

There are a number of reasons and benefits for sending the entire board to Cartagena. First, every world convention represents the largest single opportunity for the board to interact with the general membership face-to-face. Goal Eight of the Fellowship Development Plan is to "improve world services written and face-to-face communication with the fellowship." The proposed, experimental worldwide workshop system is one part of the effort to improve face-to-face communication. But it is inconceivable that the size of these workshops would ever rival the opportunities to interact with the cross-section of the general membership that attends a world convention. Second, the entire board is now responsible for the world convention, just as the old WCC board was when it was standard practice to send all of the directors. Even though the smaller size of Cartagena will present different logistical issues than San Jose did, sending the entire board has important training benefits for the board's planning and management of future world conventions. Third, the location of WCNA-28 in the Latin American zone represents a special opportunity to further fellowship development in this part of the world, an opportunity that may not present itself again for a generation. And again, although the board sent representatives to the last Latin America Zonal Forum meeting in Ecuador, these types of meetings attract dramatically fewer members than the world convention will in Cartagena. Fourth, Narcotics Anonymous is growing faster in Latin America than anywhere else in the world. Just as most members of NA have had no exposure to these emerging NA communities, most members of the



## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 9

board have not had the experience of seeing what NA is like in this part of the world. Increasing the awareness of board members about the issues confronting NA in this part of the world would further enhance the board's perspective about the realities of NA's growth worldwide.

After discussing these pros and cons, we decided that we would budget for sending the entire board to this particular convention. After making this decision to propose full funding in the Unified Budget proposal for 2000-2002, we did not have enough time to continue our discussions to decide exactly how many board members we will send to WCNA-28. Our discussions revealed that some members are unable to attend. Furthermore, our discussions also revealed that some members are not willing to accept funding even if they do attend. This was the also case with WCNA-27 in San Jose. Although we funded the entire board to San Jose, a substantial portion of the board chose to go without accepting funding, for different reasons. We referred the issue of specific travelers to Cartagena back to the board's executive committee for further discussion and will consider the matter at a future board meeting.

Planning WCNA-29 and WCNA-30 will begin immediately following the completion of WCNA-28. WCNA-29 will be held in Atlanta, 4-7 July 2002. WCNA-30, our special celebration of NA's 50<sup>th</sup> birthday, will be held in San Diego, 36 July 2003. Preliminary planning with the respective convention bureaus and negotiations for overflow hotels are happening now. We expect to have to plan both of these events simultaneously to some extent because of the large attendance expected at each of these conventions and the tremendous amount of work associated with planning events of this size. You will be hearing more regarding the planning of these events in coming months.

As previously reported, WCNA-31 will be held 1-4 September 2005 in Honolulu, Hawaii. While there is no major work currently in progress on this event, we will continue to build our relationships with the convention industry there and sign contracts with additional overflow hotels over the next two years in preparation for this event.

We have initiated research and site selection for WCNA-32 to be held in Central North America in the summer of 2007. To date we are considering Dallas, Denver, Detroit, Memphis, Mexico City, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Nashville, New Orleans, San Antonio, and Toronto as potential sites for the event. We have eliminated the cities of Cleveland and Albuquerque, originally under consideration. The convention bureaus (CVBs) in these cities have informed us that they do not have adequate meeting facilities or hotel rooms to host our convention. We are working on bid proposals with the CVBs from the other cities. We will begin site visits throughout this year. We expect to choose a site sometime in 2001 or 2002.

### **Announcement: Open Positions at WSO**

Live your dreams! Current employment opportunities are now available at the WSO in sunny California! We offer a comprehensive compensation and benefits package and are an equal opportunity employer. The World Service Office is the publishing agency of the Narcotics Anonymous Fellowship. WSO serves as a clearinghouse for information about NA and is a standing resource for the fellowship. Our mission is to provide services and support which facilitate the continuation and growth of Narcotics Anonymous worldwide. The WSO is headquartered in a two-story, 35,000 square-foot office building in Chatsworth, California, located in the San Fernando Valley over one hour north of downtown Los Angeles. The World Service Office also operates branch offices outside Toronto, Canada, and in Brussels, Belgium. The NA Fellowship has designated the World Service Office as the corporate trustee for NA's trademarks and literary copyrights, as well as the production and distribution of fellowship-approved NA recovery literature, service handbooks, commemorative keytags and medallions, speaker tapes, and other NA-related products.

Openings generally fall into two categories. Some of these opportunities are for general support positions that we try to fill locally. Other times there are opportunities where we will conduct a broader search. We currently have four positions available at our California

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 10

headquarters for immediate hire to qualified personnel. For the first two positions below, we are conducting a broader search. Here are brief descriptions of the job requirements of the positions now open:

**Committee/Project Support Staff:** Under WSO executive management's direction, manages projects and provides support to the World Board and/or its committees as directed. Supports special events such as the biennial business conference and/or world convention, and works weekends and travels in support of assignments as required. Creates and produces NAWS publications; recommends editorial development for WSO; assists other staff in writing and drafting correspondence, special reports, etc., as directed or needed. This position requires interaction with the public and with the NA Fellowship at large and various elected world level trusted servants in their capacities on the World Board and/or its committees. Requires excellent computer skills. Must have thorough knowledge of the NA world service structure, *and* either (1) experience with coordinating or administering NA service committees or (2) direct experience as a member of regional leadership or NA world services. Qualified applicants must have the ability to work under pressure and effectively perform multiple tasks simultaneously.

**Executive Administrative Assistant:** Assists executive management in their responsibilities at WSO. Provides administrative support and coordination for the World Board, as well as general secretarial support. May be required to travel and work weekends as needed. This position requires interaction with the NA Fellowship at large and various elected world-level trusted servants in their capacities on various committees, as well as the public. Excellent computer skills required.

**Team Assistant, Fellowship Services:** Performs a variety of clerical, general office and/or technical tasks and is responsible for a wide range of responses to correspondence and phone calls, data entry, file maintenance, and mailings. Interacts directly with the NA Fellowship and at times with the public. May require occasional travel in support of business meetings and/or weekend work. Must speak Spanish fluently.

**Receptionist:** Acts as the primary receptionist for the WSO and as our initial greeter/screener. Routinely handles incoming faxes, email, and courier deliveries for distribution. Interacts with all staff on a daily basis, as well as all visitors who arrive at the facility. Requires excellent interpersonal skills.

If you are interested in applying for the above positions or would like to leave your resume on file with us, the WSO Human Resources Department is now accepting all resumes. You may either submit your resume by mailing it directly to the office, to the attention of the Human Resource Department, or by email to [roberta@na.org](mailto:roberta@na.org).

### Status of the Board's Efforts to Implement its Committee System

We walked into our March meeting faced with a dilemma about implementing the committee system before WSC'00. Building on our discussions from the January meeting about committee philosophy, we had geared all of our planning to implement the committees at our March meeting. We had promised at WSC'99 and again at the World Service Meeting in Florida, that we would walk into WSC'00 with the committee system in place. As we discussed where we were in our March meeting, however, we saw that we actually haven't finished all the work and had all of the discussions we need to have to create the committees in reality as we envision them. This left us with a dilemma, because the last thing we wanted to do was go back on our repeated commitments. It would have been much easier to create the committees on paper and walk into the conference and say, "here they are."

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 11

We saw more clearly in March because of our discussions that the committees would not be meeting until the beginning of the next budget cycle in July. We saw that the assignments to these committees, both of staff and board members, could and would change quite substantially, depending on the work approved at WSC'00 for the next conference cycle. Even if we assigned board members on paper to each committee and then presented paper committees to the WSC, what purpose would that really serve? We could protect our own credibility by doing what we said we would do, even though we realized at our March meeting that waiting until after the conference made more sense.

Our ultimate goal is an effective and practical committee structure. As we stated in the last issue of *NAWS News*, "we don't want to burn out or overwork one particular group." Part of creating a proactive, rather than reactive, approach to implementing the committees is to make every effort possible to review and closely examine the projects that the conference commits to us. It is imperative that we know what each project will require, both financially and physically, in order for us to initiate effective resource management, as well as the appropriate assignment of world pool members.

Most of us who were directly involved in the old world service system remember the problems with the old conference and trustee committees. The truth is not only did these two committee systems compete with each other and waste resources, overall much of the time the committees were unsustainable, expensive, and unproductive. Also, the capacity for real planning in any area of service did not exist. When committees did succeed, it was often in spite of great inefficiencies and because of exceptional elected committee leadership or exceptionally talented staff support. At the same time, we know that the perception from many outside world services was that the standing committees were a resource of support for the fellowship, particularly for areas and regions with standing committees in the areas of H&I, public information, literature, and so forth. The board is trying to avoid replicating those old problems with the new committee system. And in the meantime, the WSO has been there to serve as a stable resource to the fellowship, to share experience, strength, and hope with all elements of our fellowship regarding all areas of service delivery.

We also saw a number of practical problems with forming the committees in March. First, if we assigned existing board members to all of the committees and to positions of committee leadership, what impact would that have on the WSC elections for new board members? The last thing we wanted to do was take an action that would have any appearance of tampering with or manipulating the elections. For example, if we appointed a current board member to lead the publications committee or the guardians committee, and that member was up for re-election, what message would that send to the conference? On the other hand, if we did the opposite with a member standing for re-election, what message would that send? Additionally, under the board's by-laws, the board elects new leadership, its executive committee, at its annual meeting in June (or July) each year. These internal board elections will have a significant impact on who is available to serve as the lead person for each of the board committees. Members of the executive committee cannot serve on any of the other board committees. This is due to the scope of responsibility and workload of service on that committee, among other reasons. Those board members who have expressed an interest in serving on the incoming executive committee would be in a difficult position if assigned to leadership on one of the newly created committees. The current board executive committee did not want to put itself in the position of manipulating the election of the incoming executive committee. Moreover, the board fully expects that some number of new board members will be elected at WSC'00. Regardless of how many, the current board does not want to prejudice the elections for the incoming board. All board members after the conference, new and old, will have to join as equals with different levels and types of experience to carry the work forward into the new year.

And without belaboring these points, but to honestly show what's really involved—*it wasn't obvious to us until we had this discussion in March*—assigning current board members (and staff)

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 12

to committees without knowing what the mix of personalities is going to be on the new board is less than ideal. The hardest part of putting a committee together is getting the right balance of personalities, the right combination of skills and background and temperament. Making it all together is always a challenge. If certain board members aren't re-elected—or even if all are re-elected—in either case you have to fit all new board members into the mix in a way that is balanced.

We also saw that we don't know for sure what projects and work the conference is going to approve and prioritize for the next two years. Who the board chooses to lead certain committees may very well depend on which projects the conference approves or rejects. Moreover, until we know which projects the conference approves, we cannot decide which committees should have primary responsibility for certain projects. While some of the choices are obvious, other choices are much less obvious. The board is also still deciding how to divide responsibility for the routine services of WSO among the different committees. (Remember, 94% of our budget falls under routine services, not projects.) Some routine services could fit just as well under one committee as another. We have not had all of the discussions we need to have as a board to make all of these decisions. We will be in a much better position after the conference to know what makes the most sense.

Another challenge facing the system this year is recruiting, hiring, and orienting new staff members who will be needed to help support the board and its new committee system. We must do this without diverting existing staff from providing existing routine services to the ever-growing worldwide fellowship. There is often a very steep learning curve of more than one year for new staff members who are hired. New staff also must be oriented to WSO operations and must adjust to the role of functioning as a special worker in the system. Historically, this has been a difficult adjustment process for even the most skilled and experienced individuals.

As we reported in the last issue of the *NAWS News*, we have had considerable philosophical discussions about the structure of the committees. We've recorded the result of these difficult but ultimately successful discussions in our internal guidelines (see below). Having begun the difficult discussions about formation, structure, delegation, and accountability, we believe assigning people to the committees after we know what projects and people we have to work with will be, relatively speaking, the easier task.

Finally, from the board's point of view, we have successfully managed all WSO routine services and the highest priority projects approved by the 1999 conference through the executive committee, various workgroups, and through full board oversight and administration of these things. We decided to delay for a couple of months until after the WSC for these reasons. Although from the fellowship's perspective looking at the board from the outside, we know for some this has been a very urgent matter since the conference created the board at WSC 1998. But the WSO has met the fellowship's needs as the standing resource for the fellowship and the service structure, and we have done our job administering the WSO. The system is working! We ultimately decided at our March meeting that it was more important to implement the committee system the right way the first time, even though we know some of you will disagree with this decision. We are accountable to you, and this is our account for this decision.

### **Status of 14 Projects Approved at WSC'99**

The 1999 WSC approved the following 14 projects that the World Board proposed as part of the 1999-2000 Unified Budget Proposal. The board identified these projects because of both past conference actions mandating certain work and its own review of the Fellowship Development Plan (FDP). The FDP is a long-range strategic plan first developed by the former WSO Board of Directors and the World Service Board of Trustees. The FDP, which we updated and presented at WSC'99, articulates ten long-range goals. (A copy of the FDP is available on our website or upon request from the WSO.) Each of the 14 projects approved at WSC'99 relates to one of the FDP's long-range, strategic goals.

Our former world service boards and committees did an effective job of integrating into the FDP the work they passed along to the World Board. We have taken the FDP as our blueprint for world service activities, both over the past year and for the coming two years. As you may recall, two of the predominant problems identified repeatedly in the world services inventory were a lack of short- and long-term planning, as well as a lack of effective administrative oversight of projects and goals. For this reason, it is very significant that, for the first time in our history, world services has both a long-term comprehensive Fellowship Development Plan, a single point of decision and accountability by which to execute that plan, and a budget and financial planning process to support these efforts. This is our “big picture” blueprint by which we can plan for current and future projects, service delivery, and global development. For the first time, we can prioritize all world service activity based upon available resources and the importance of each project or activity to furthering our primary purpose.

We are happy to report here the status of all of the 14 projects. Although we proposed and the conference adopted 14 projects, we knew that the first three projects described below had to be accomplished, no matter what, because they were *CAR*-driven and the necessary result of past conference action. The bulk of the *CAR 2000* embodies the successful completion of these three projects. They represent the largest single portion of the board's work and activity this conference year. We've also completed, or substantially completed, most of the rest as of this writing. A couple are still very much in progress. A few have been delayed by the crunch of other work and business this year.

### **1. Motion 21/Literature Development Plan Project—Completed**

The Motion 21 Project is complete. The resulting proposals are in the *CAR 2000*. We completed this project on time and for substantially less than what we budgeted.

### **2. Process for Service Material Project—Completed**

The Process for Service Material Project is complete. The resulting proposal is in the *CAR 2000*. We completed this project on time and for substantially less than what we budgeted.

### **3. Two-Year Conference Cycle Project—Completed**

The Two-year Conference Project is complete. The resulting proposals are in the *CAR 2000*. We completed this project on time and for substantially less than what we budgeted.

### **4. 1999 World Service Meeting and Unity Day—Completed**

The 1999 World Service Meeting and Unity Day project is complete. We described the results in the *November Conference Report*. The bottom line is that there was invaluable discussion in Florida of all three *CAR*-driven projects described above. The World Board used the fellowship input we received at this meeting and in writing from those unable to attend. With this input, we finalized the proposals in the *CAR 2000*. We completed this project on time and for substantially less than what we budgeted.

### **5. Internal World Board Processes and Procedures Project—Completed**

We mailed these guidelines on 1 March to conference participants as promised. Internal guidelines are just that, they describe how the board will deal with issues and protocols *within* its own structure. A few have argued that perfecting these internal guidelines are so important that this is a prerequisite for the WSC to move forward. We disagree and feel this places far too much emphasis on them. For us, they are quality standards and a tool to help orient new board members. The external guidelines are much more important as they describe the board's relationship with the conference and thereby the fellowship. We hope that the internal processes and procedures will help the board be successful. For us, these guidelines are a working document that we will add to and revise as we continue to gain experience working as a board and with our committee system.

## 6. History Data Collection Project—Nearing Completion

The background on this project is as follows. The purpose of this project is to gather historical information from some of the longest-standing members in NA while they are still available. We will do this by gathering a group of longtime members in one location and recording their discussions and perspectives about the beginnings of NA. Prior conference action called for this type of activity by a motion adopted 26 April 1993. That motion read: "That the World Service Conference solicit oral or written histories from members with substantial clean time, regarding the history of NA, to be held at the World Service Office in the archives, until a history project is approved." Since this motion was adopted in 1993, nothing has really been done to try to access this information. This project simply proposed two meetings to begin to gather this information.

For those interested members who are unable to attend, audiotapes of the history workshop will be available for sale after the conference, as with other WSC proceedings. To maintain the personal anonymity of all members present at the conference, the videotape recordings will not be available.

After the WSC, but before the end of the fiscal year on 30 June 2000, how we will follow-up depends on the results of the first workshop. This may mean a second workshop. Or we may do a series of face-to-face interviews. A combination of these two follow-up approaches is also possible. We will determine the focus of the second workshop or interview activity based upon what we learn in the first workshop. The follow-up activity will concentrate on the people and areas that appear to have the greatest amount of information. This plan will accomplish the two meetings originally provided for in the WSC'99 approved plan. The board will then make a report to the fellowship about both workshops and the information gathered. We will preserve all the information we collect as a resource for future use. Accordingly, we expect that the WSC'99 project will be complete as of 30 June 2000.

We have decided to propose a new project plan to continue work during the next conference cycle. This work is an extension of WSO's basic responsibility to serve as the fellowship's archives. The scope of the new project would allow for follow-up meetings and interviews with the same focus (beginnings of NA in the 1950s and 1960s), as well as a shift in geographic focus to other critical early areas of interest. As with the 1999 project, nothing further would be done with this material until the board comes back to a future conference with plans and ideas to use the material and the conference authorizes a new project to develop something.

## 7. Evaluation of the Literature Distribution System Project—Substantially Completed

Goal 1.D. of the FDP calls for the maintenance of a sales and marketing plan that benefits the WSO and the end user. It calls for an annual review of product pricing, sales policies, the marketing plan, and an increase in the efficiency of our literature distribution system. When the changes were made to the WSO sales policy, a commitment was made to evaluate the effects of those changes on our literature distribution system. In addition to the review of those changes, further investigation was to be conducted to determine if future changes should be considered. The WSO board scheduled this evaluation to take place beginning in January 2000, two years after the first changes started. We planned to seek input from the fellowship on distribution, production, and pricing, and then to evaluate the effects of the changes already made on fellowship customers and the WSO. We promised that a report on this evaluation would be presented to the WSC'00.

We conducted a survey of North American customers, large and small, including those groups who purchase directly from WSO. The survey gave us more information about the availability of literature, the pricing levels, and some of the distribution practices of different types of WSO customers. Overall, we learned more about how well the literature distribution system is working. We received responses from RSOs, ASOs, RSCs, ASCs, and groups. We want to thank everyone who responded. Your feedback helps us serve all our customers better.

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 15

On 4-5 February 2000, we held a literature distribution workshop in Woodland Hills, California, primarily for US customers. Along with staff from the WSO, two board members also attended. Approximately 86 members attended this two-day workshop (which also focused on convention planning and management). Some of the topics covered included the current WSO sales policy, upcoming 5% price increase, and discussion of necessary legal compliance issues for RSOs, licensing vendors, and general issues of accountability. Other topics included how to address the theft of fellowship funds, establish a more efficient order processing and shipping interaction with our customers, and how to better manage product updates and improve record-keeping. By all accounts, the workshop helped the participants. The participants asked us to continue to offer this service on an ongoing basis. We will decide the frequency of future workshops and determine other topics to include later on.

We developed a separate literature distribution survey for non-North American customers. Distribution issues differ in other parts of the world. Non-North American communities generally have different needs and problems. We placed this survey on our website on 21 March 2000 and sent an email to non-US regional delegates several days later. We will factor the results of the non-US surveys into the evaluation report.

In the meantime, the board continues to discuss ways to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the literature distribution system for non-North American customers. When the WSO changed its discount/pricing policies, it also ended licensing agreements with certain communities who had been printing locally under assorted contractual arrangements. Certain non-North American communities then had to make different kinds of adjustments than US and Canadian customers. This second survey will give us an indication about how these communities have adapted and give us an opportunity to respond to any problems or unique needs.

For example, we are already aware of particular problems for various NA communities in the Latin American zone. We are also still exploring long-range solutions to address future needs in this area of the world where NA is growing so rapidly. This may include NAWS, Inc. arranging to print certain literature locally within certain communities where this makes economic sense based on the demand for literature and other circumstances. Our aim is, and always has been, to respond specifically to the needs of the fellowship in various parts of the world. We do what makes sense and what we can to carry the message.

We will deliver a report to WSC'00 as promised that will provide information on where we are in the evaluation process. Although there are still aspects for us to complete, we can let you know that we see nothing that would warrant further changes to the discount policy or the distribution system, at this time. The changes we've made to the system have been successful. After a difficult period of adjustment for some fellowship offices and area and regional distributors, overall the system has adapted to the changes in the discount policy and distribution system set in motion over two years ago. We will send a final report to conference participants sometime in June.

Also, we do not plan to re-evaluate the distribution system or changes to the discount policy structure for the next five years. We heard concerns about the stability of the system expressed at the literature distribution workshop in February. We share the fellowship's concern for stability, so we wanted to announce that no further changes are intended between now and 2005.

Finally, in 1996 we established the practice of adjusting our prices to offset the effect of cost increases once every three years. The first adjustment went into effect in January of 1996. We have delayed this increase twice in the last two years, but we will not delaying it again. *We will implement the scheduled 5% price increase across the board on 1 January 2001.* We wanted to let you know far in advance so that all communities can plan accordingly.

## **8. New Database Project—Major Progress—Significant Work Remains**

This project's purpose is to finalize a new database at the WSO, which will include an online meeting directory with the ability for designated service bodies to update the information. An online shopping cart component will also be included. Much of our ability to meet the challenges of an ever-growing fellowship and a changing world depends on our ability to use systems and technology to our benefit. We believe this project will provide more benefits than we can be aware of at the present time. It is also an integral part of developing an effective information management system. We will use the fellowship service committees to beta test the online registration functions before it is opened up for general access.

We have experienced some delays due to problems with the vendor customizing the software package we purchased. We negotiated concessions from this vendor to make up for some of these delays. Overall, we are pleased with the software package, and we expect ultimately to receive all of the functionality and benefit we originally planned and bargained for with the conversion to this new database system.

We will begin testing online committee and meeting registration in April and perform a demonstration at the WSC. This feature will benefit the entire fellowship worldwide, because once it is fully implemented, anyone with Internet access will be able to find an existing registered meeting anywhere in the world. This is an enormous benefit to NA members, newcomer addicts seeking recovery, and the public (family, professionals, others) who need to locate an existing NA meeting.

Another major new feature, the online shopping cart ordering capability, will be completed by December 2000.

## **9. Communications Task Force Project—Major Progress—Significant Work Remains**

Goal 8 of the FDP calls for the improvement of world services written and face-to-face communications with the fellowship. The world services inventory of the early 1990s identified communication throughout as a critical issue. None of the subsequent resolutions addressed this problem. We, as a board, believe that the work of this group is essential to creating an effective foundation for the new world service system. To this end, we created the Communications Task Force (CTF) at our December 1998 meeting. We identified improving communications as our number one priority. The CTF plan was to assess all current world service communications and implement a plan that will improve future communications. The objectives of this project were to: (1) establish a baseline of current operations, e.g., effectiveness and efficiency for world services communications by January/February 2000; (2) develop communication objectives, strategies, goals, and tasks for world services by March/May 2000; and (3) institute a comprehensive and deliberate communications strategy for all world services communications by June 2000. We've made major progress, but significant work remains. We are asking the conference to extend our timeline by approving a continuation project for the next budget cycle so we can finish our original scope of work.

During the past nine months, the Communication Task Force has been designing research tools and conducting research both within the WSO, as well as among the fellowship, in order to establish baselines for communications between NAWS and the fellowship. There were four primary areas of research. First, we conducted interviews with virtually all WSO staff members regarding their communication activities. (Examples include telephone, written correspondence, fax, and email.) Second, we developed staff tracking sheets for a variety of staff communication functions. We then had staff use these tracking sheets to provide sample data for us to analyze about existing communications, including random telephone follow-up with selected customers regarding customer satisfaction. We also interviewed the editorial staff regarding the development of a comprehensive periodicals program and philosophy for NAWS (and sought written input from staff about this). Third, we arranged eight communication focus groups



## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 17

conducted among NA members in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Rockford, Illinois; Spokane, Washington; Mumbai, India; Berlin, Germany; Montevideo, Uruguay; Calgary, Alberta, Canada; and Woodland Hills, California. At this point, we have completed the interviews with staff and conducted all eight focus groups. The fourth type of data was feedback about our participation at certain multiregional CAR workshops we attended. We created a simple survey for that purpose. (See CTF Exhibit One beginning on page 44 for more details.)

We have completed the research phase of the project successfully. We have collected a great deal of valuable information in the research phase, more than we initially expected. We are analyzing that data now. We will provide a preliminary report to WSC'00.

Now it has become clear to us that because of both the expanded research phase and the limited staff resources to devote to this project, we have not met the ambitious original timeline we created. The CTF has substantially cut back the schedule of meetings that it had originally planned between March 2000 and June 2000. We had planned three meetings, each three days in length—one in March, one in April, and one in May. Because of the conflict having these meetings would have on WSO staff and board preparations for WSC'00, the CTF changed its three-day meeting in March to a one-day meeting on 12 March, when it also decided to cancel its April and May meetings. At the 12 March meeting, the CTF decided to re-plan the remainder of the CTF project, and worked on the proposed change in the plan for the CTF's presentation at WSC'00 and the follow-up project the board will propose for the next budget cycle in order to accomplish the CTF's original scope of work. The CTF's next meeting will be in early June.

Essentially, four out of five phases of the original project stand in front of us to accomplish. These are: (1) analysis of the research; (2) identification of NAWS communication problems; (3) identification of solutions designed to remedy those problems; and (4) implementation of those solutions. By 30 June 2000, we still hope to complete the analysis and problem identification phases. This would mean the focus of activity during the next cycle would be coming to consensus about solutions to the identified problems, then implementing those solutions.

To accomplish what we originally set out to do, we are proposing a supplemental communications project for the next conference cycle. We are making this recommendation because we believe the quality and success of the project will benefit from a focus on long-term results, not short-term performance between now and 30 June 2000. We want to take additional time to analyze the research data we have collected. We do not wish to rush to judgment about the nature of the underlying problem or the solutions we should implement. We plan to use that valuable data in formulating a baseline of current communications activity, a problem profile report, and ultimately a set of recommendations (communication objectives, strategies, goals, and tasks).

To prepare you for our preliminary report to the conference, we have attached a detailed report of the CTF's progress this year. You will find that fourteen-page report beginning on page 44 (labeled "Communications Task Force Exhibit 1"). Exhibit 1 offers a more detailed account of the research phase of the project, including the eight focus groups conducted around the world. For WSC participants this exhibit is background that will help you to better understand the CTF's work this year and the work that remains in the new project we are proposing to you. Also, we have set aside one afternoon session of WSC'00 for small group discussions about NAWS communications.

### **10. Information Management System Project—Delayed**

Goal 3.A. of the Fellowship Development Plan calls for designing an effective information management system at the WSO by 2000. Due to the shortage of human and financial resources, it has been difficult for us to develop a system that is capable of cataloging, cross-referencing, and archiving all of the information managed by the WSO. The objective of this project is to hire a qualified professional to assess and evaluate the current system and to make recommendations for the future. Once this project is complete, we had planned to move into

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 18

Goal 3.B. of the FDP which calls for the creation of a procedure to gather fellowship information annually in order to measure growth, service delivery, and general conditions. (This last goal will now be accomplished through features built into the new database system we have acquired.)

Activity at the WSO and staffing levels precluded us from making progress on this important project this past year. We have proposed this project again for the next conference cycle.

### **11, 12, 13, 14. Four Handbook Evaluation Projects—Delayed**

The objective of the final four authorized projects was to evaluate the work already completed and that which remains on the four service handbooks. These are: the *Public Information Handbook*; an Events Handbook (a revision of the current *Convention Handbook*); new Training Workbooks; and the *Treasurer's Handbook*. As you may recall, we limited the proposed scope of these projects to an *evaluation* of the existing material. We would then report back to the conference what we thought it would take to complete development or revisions to each of these.

We reported to WSC'99 and in the *November Conference Report* that these projects had a lower priority than the foregoing ten projects. We said that we would not begin this work prior to the completion of the *Conference Agenda Report 2000* in January. The logic of our approach was to present first a proposal to the conference to examine the process for the approval of service material. We felt it would make no sense to begin a revision process until the conference puts an approval process in place. (We've accomplished this with Motion Five in the *CAR 2000* that we hope the conference will adopt.)

After finishing the *CAR* in January, we recognized the need to delay any work on these handbooks until after WSC'00. We saw that the remaining workload to prepare for a successful WSC 2000 meeting would not sanely and reasonably permit simultaneous work assessing these four handbooks. Moreover, we saw that if we did the evaluation this year, there would most likely be a duplication of effort in the next budget cycle. This did not seem like a prudent use of limited resources. Another advantage of delay is that we plan to workshop some of the ideas on this material in the proposed worldwide workshops to gather feedback, and then possibly begin work later in the conference cycle. The Process for Service Material project, if the conference adopts the board's proposal as outlined in *CAR* Motion Five, will also facilitate the future development and approval of service material of this type.

The continuation project we are proposing for the next conference cycle will wrap all four of these handbooks into one project, and add the *H&I Handbook*. The new project scope will authorize the release of material "pending conference approval," contingent on the approval of the passage of Motion Five. Our vision is that we will use the worldwide workshop system to gather conceptual input about new service material that is needed by the fellowship worldwide. We hope this process of face-to-face communication will help to evaluate existing unmet needs and problems not addressed in specific handbooks now.

### **The Unified Budget Proposal for the 2000-2002 Conference Cycle**

This year's Unified Budget proposal is the first two-year budget in our history!

The budget system that was adopted at the 1998 WSC has not yet been fully realized. Our inexperience with a twenty-four (24) month proposal, the continuing dilemma with the project process as adopted, and the sweeping changes that could result from conference action all impact the nature of the budget that we will present. Therefore, like last year, this year's proposal is also a hybrid. We have continually reported that we would not be able to implement the system fully until WSC 2002 at the earliest. We still believe that is true. We have also learned from our test drive experiences so far, that we will need to come back to the 2002 conference with a proposal to change aspects of the basic system that looked better on paper than they have worked in actual practice. We are particularly aware of the need for changes relating to the confusing description of the process for projects.

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 19

This is a general overview of the 2000-2002 Unified Budget proposal. We will send the detailed budget plan with more specific explanations under separate cover to conference delegates as soon as humanly possible. We know that many delegates were upset that we distributed last year's budget proposal only two weeks before WSC'99. We had hoped to do better this year. Unfortunately, we may not be able to complete this year's budget proposal any earlier. The separate budget mailing will also include other standard pre-conference information, including the current NAWS reimbursement policy for expenses, the WSC rules of order, revised election procedures for WSC'00, and so forth.

You will find that the budget proposal has several aspects to it that are contingent upon conference adoption or rejection of certain specific motions appearing in the *Conference Agenda Report 2000*. We have done everything we can to try to show the financial impact different conference choices would have on the budget and the bottom line for the next two years. Obviously, for example, it makes a significant difference to the budget whether or not the conference adopts delegate funding to the WSC, the worldwide workshop system, or a project to evaluate the Basic Text with a two-year, four-year, or six-year timeframe.

### **CAR 2000 Update**

We mailed the English-language version of the *CAR* to all conference participants on 20 January 2000, 101 days before the WSC. (90 days is the mandated minimum this conference year. Some members have been confused, as the new policy adopted at WSC'99 requiring 180 days does not take effect until 2002.) We mailed the *CAR* to conference delegates a week earlier than we posted it on the website or began general distribution (27 January), so that delegates would not be ambushed with questions from members before they had a chance to acquire and read a copy of the *CAR* themselves.

Distribution of the English-language *CAR 2000* began on 27 January, and we posted it to the website on that same date. Distribution of the Spanish-language *CAR 2000* began on 18 February, and we posted it to the website on 1 March. Distribution of the Portuguese-language *CAR 2000* began on 23 February, and we posted it to the website on 1 March. Distribution of the Swedish-language *CAR 2000* began on 25 February, and we posted it to the website on 1 March. Distribution of the French-language *CAR 2000* began on 1 March, and we posted it to the website on 20 March. Distribution of the German-language *CAR 2000* began on 13 March, and we posted it to the website on 17 March.

The translated versions of the *CAR* include the main body of the *CAR*, Addendum A (the Proposed Literature Development Plan—Motion 21 Project report) and Addendum D (the issue discussion papers). We did not translate Addendum B (the 1999 *TWGWSS* showing policies affected as a result of the two-year conference cycle motions) and Addendum C (the proposed *TWGWSS 2000*).

We print and distribute about 3,500 copies of the English-language version of the *CAR* each year. For the second year, we posted the *Conference Agenda Report* on our website—in two different formats (PDF and zip file formats). It's free to download. While the process of measuring the number of downloads from our website is not an exact science, it appears that more members are using the website this year rather than last year to obtain a free copy of the *CAR*. This makes sense because we would expect awareness and access to the website to be on the increase. For the month of February 2000, approximately 488 copies of the English-language *CAR* were downloaded and less than half that many copies of each addenda that provides supplemental information. This distribution of the *CAR* compares to over 18,392 NA groups in the world holding over 27,000 meetings in 104 countries.

### **Update on Motion One**

First, we must mention again that Motions One through Four are interrelated. Action on Motion One will determine if we offer Motion Two. Action on Motion Two will determine if we offer

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 20

Motion Three. Action on Motions One, Two, and Three will determine the scope of work in Motion Four.

Second, we have heard frustration from some parts of the fellowship: "Why are you asking us this again?" "How many times are you going to ask us if we want to do this?" We explained why we are asking again in the *CAR*, and some have accepted that answer and some have not. We can only add that it's always been part of the conference's history to reconsider the actions of past conferences or to ask for clarification. Each conference is a separate beast. No conference has the ability to bind all future conferences. Moreover, with over 27,000 meetings in over 104 countries at different stages of development with different priorities and needs, we believe that we should not go forward until we make sure we are all of the same page as much as possible. While some segments of our fellowship were and are still very passionate about changing the Basic Text, some are much less sure, and some are strongly opposed to any change or certain kinds of changes.

Nothing brings out more passion than changing the Basic Text or the Little White Booklet. And if the fellowship wants to change these, then we have a responsibility to look at everything that effects now and in the future. Adding chapters seemed to be a good and simple idea on the surface, but what would that actually entail? Do we keep with the same style of writing as the text? Or, do we simply add chapters and not care about consistency? Do we follow the style of the current text? Or do we accept the new style found in *It Works: How and Why*?

In 1998, the WSC did something it has never done before. We passed several motions, and then committed them (A-List, Sponsorship booklet) to a process known as Motion 21. It was definitely purposeful, but no one has ever defined what that means. It remains unclear to this day. Coupled with that decision of the WSC, the literature survey we did, if it tells us anything, at least suggests that the fellowship is a bit less sure that they want to make those specific changes to the Basic Text, or at least is less sure that this is the number one priority for literature development. If we have learned one thing over the years, it is that we need to collect as much information as possible before we go off to change our basic literature pieces. The Basic Text moratoriums were no coincidence.

Motions One to Four are complex and require a great deal of thought. The positive thing is that we are considering these issues ahead of time and not later in the process. The literature motions are designed to give us a series of choices. Tough choices they are, but they should be. Changes to our basic literature should not be easy, and we need to consider the devotion of considerable resources to accomplish our choices. Depending on your choices, a comprehensive evaluation puts everything on the table including sponsorship.

Also, we have heard the possibility that some delegates may wish to divide Motion One into separate questions when the conference considers this issue. The conference could separate the question of changing the Basic Text from changing the Little White Book. We did not ask the questions separately, because the Little White Book is part of the Basic Text. If you change one, logically you open the door to changing the other or at least resolving the differences. Some delegates may wish to consider separately the question of *revising* the Basic Text (i.e., changing the first ten chapters and/or the story section of the book). For some, this is a separate issue from *adding* new material in the form of new chapters. We asked the question together because we believed the issues are related, and that if the fellowship decides it does want to change the Basic Text, the evaluation about what to change and how to change it should be comprehensive so that we can thoroughly discuss and come to consensus about these changes as a fellowship. However, under the WSC rules of order, a motion to divide Motion One in any of these ways would be in order, and if such a motion were made, it would then be up to the conference to decide whether they want to consider these issues as separate questions. We believed in December that it was simpler to present these issues as one question in the *CAR*, hence the form of Motion One.

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 21

Finally, we have been asked if the board has an opinion on Motion One. We discussed at our March meeting whether we wanted to take the time to form a consensus and give an opinion at this late date. We decided that we did not at this time.

### Update on Motion Two

Again, because of the three different timeline scenarios under Motion Two, we have prepared three different prospective project plans to match the different timelines. These details will be in the Unified Budget proposal for 2000-2002.

We have heard some confusion about what it means if the conference chooses the 2002 timeline (option "a"). Some thought this meant that no work would start until after WSC'02. Actually, it means that very significant work would start immediately to plan the Basic Text evaluation and to prepare a project plan for this evaluation that WSC'02 could adopt, modify, or reject. Likewise, if the conference chooses the 2004 timeline (option "b"), some work, probably 33% to 50% of the work, would actually start in the next conference cycle. Again, the focus of this work would be planning the evaluation—preparing the detailed project plan for WSC'04 to adopt, modify, or reject. It would be irresponsible to do nothing for the next two years, and do all of the planning between 2002 and 2004. Because of its major significance, this project would demand the attention of the full board and the fellowship, with a status report to WSC'02 about the direction the board was going so that the board could seek fellowship input and reach fellowshipwide consensus. It would also be necessary to do some planning about the Basic Text because of Motion Three, if Motion Three passes.

### Update on Motion Three

We have been asked whether we will have an approval-form about sponsorship by WSC'02, if the conference adopts Motion Three. The answer is no. We are not even promising to have a review-form draft by WSC'02. We are saying work will start through area and regional literature committees, and the board will then begin to evaluate and assess what kind of material the fellowship wants to have about sponsorship and what form that material should take. That is, should we have a book chapter in the Basic Text, a new booklet, a new pamphlet, a revision of the existing pamphlet, or some combination of these options?

### Update on Motion Four

We have received some questions about the bulletins and discussion papers that we identified within the list of work specified in Motion Four for the next two years.

First, generally speaking, flexibility and timeliness are the great fellowship advantages that come from the board's ability to produce bulletins on any needed topic. Bulletins may be generated from time to time on any topic that relates to the board's fundamental mission: "to contribute to the continuation and growth of Narcotics Anonymous." The development of bulletins is part of routine services. Bulletins are not project-size tasks. The board has the capacity to use the human resources at its disposal, including the WSO staff, to create bulletins on specific topics without committing the substantial resources and expense that full-fledged projects require. Of course, when the subject matter of a bulletin is very complex and difficult, it may take substantially more discussion within the board (or its committees or its workgroups) to create a specific bulletin. We have used the term "discussion papers" to refer to topics that are more complex and that we anticipate will be the basis for extensive fellowshipwide discussions. With such discussions, the board would generally need to contribute to and help facilitate these in order to achieve some resolution (such as future conference discussion, action, or policy).

For this particular bulletin in Motion Four, item D, we deliberately narrowed the scope of this bulletin to the Internet and anonymity for a couple of reasons. First, although we realize that there are many issues relating to the Internet that keep surfacing, including the Internet/FIPT issues that a couple delegates have brought up, we described this bulletin in this narrow way because it was a response to a specific literature motion that was committed to the Motion 21

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 22

project. That motion sought to change the essays on the Eleventh Tradition in the Basic Text and *It Works: How and Why*, to add new material to those essays describing how this tradition applies to the Internet. We questioned the need for such dramatic and resource-intensive action with such far-reaching implications. Therefore, we recommended a simple bulletin as the first step toward addressing this limited problem.

We have had other limited discussions about the Internet, and the possible need to develop other bulletins or modify existing service material. In fact, we have reported about issues relating to the Internet and the FIPT in several periodicals this past year, including the *NAWS Annual Report*, the *November Conference Report*, and *NAWS News*. We have consistently reported about our Internet/FIPT concerns because these issues are important. We need the fellowship's help and cooperation to protect NA's copyrighted materials. The Internet-related issues confronting NA are multifaceted. There are too many issues to address effectively in a single bulletin. This is why we have taken the general approach of using separate bulletins to address separate and complicated topics.

More importantly, however, this issue is a good example of the need for the conference to have discussions this year about the real critical priorities for the next two years. Many things can seem urgent on any given day. But tasks that are the most urgent are not necessarily the most important. Every year the conference commits motions to the board like this last one on the Internet and anonymity. These committed motions create work—sometimes a great deal of work.

Most of our reporting this past year has been about the challenge of identifying priorities for the next conference cycle. We're committed to focusing on planning and achieving quality results that will have the greatest long-term benefit. We are going to have to have open and frank discussions at the conference about what can be accomplished with existing resources as a practical matter. We are going to need direction to reach an understanding about which important and urgent tasks "must be accomplished" and what is more flexible. This is important not because the current system is not working well. On the contrary, the new system with the new World Board is working better and more efficiently than our world service structure has ever worked before in our entire history. Making choices about priorities is necessary because resources are limited. Making choices is important because we believe that the *quality* of the work world services accomplishes must be balanced against the quantity of work we attempt in any given timeframe. We all must thoughtfully consider this delicate balance between urgent short-term needs and important long-range activities each conference cycle.

In addition to all of the bulletin/issue discussion topics listed in Motion Four, most of the following potential bulletin topics have been tossed around over the years in one form or another:

- What do we perceive is the groups' role in the world service structure?
- What does "consensus-based decision-making" mean to us *and* how would we utilize this process during the WSC?
- How are unity and autonomy integrated and vital to our efforts to carry the message of recovery?
- What does "common needs" imply? How is the intent of "special interest" synonymous with common needs?
- How is being of service to the Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous a spiritual component of a program of recovery?
- What are the benefits for NA, as a whole, to decentralize our service structure? How may the fulfillment of our primary purpose be actualized with a worldwide fellowship?
- What can the Twelve Traditions do to foster growth for groups and service structure? How do the Twelve Concepts complement the traditions and promote freedom for continued growth?

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 23

- What is our experience with creating an atmosphere of recovery with disruptive members in our meetings?
- Where is the line between cooperation and affiliation?
- How can we effectively carry our message electronically?
- How do we apply our principle of anonymity to the Internet?
- Is the statement in our literature “that we are under no surveillance at any time” a problem? If so, should it be resolved by changing our recovery literature or better explaining the intent of this statement?
- Does “child care” have a place in NA meetings?
- What action do we, as a fellowship, need to take to retain our experienced members with substantial clean time?
- What is NA's definition of abstinence? How does this definition apply to our members who need medication in recovery?
- Other past WSC issue discussion topics from previous years. (Some might not be appropriate for a bulletin, like “Resolution A.” Others might be, like “Improving Fellowship Communications” from WSC’99, or “Racial and Cultural Diversity in NA”/“Dealing with Prejudice” from earlier years)
- Updating any existing Trustee bulletin topics and/or FIPT bulletins

This is not necessarily an exhaustive list of all of the possible topics, but obviously, it is a long one. The board will be seeking input from the conference on what are the most pressing issues, including issues not listed above that are problems in your locale.

### Update on Motions 6-13

First, as we said in the last *NAWS News*, all of the two-year conference motions are part of an interdependent conference system. The specific information we want to add in response to discussions and questions we have heard is as follows.

#### On Motion Seven

There are three separate, logical issues relating to *CAR* Motion Seven: 150 days versus 180 days; specifying languages versus leaving that open; and, translating the entire *CAR* with any addenda versus only the body of the *CAR*. Breaking the motion down into its three component parts may help to facilitate consensus.

We have explained why we think 180 days is more reasonable than 150 days, so we won't belabor that point. We have also said why we believe not specifying the languages, but leaving that flexibility to our discretion, is a better policy. (We have consistently done more than what the conference mandated in the area of translations. The most crucial needs may change from time to time.)

However, the last area about translating addenda in the *CAR* is still clearly causing outright confusion. This is not surprising because we know that we have not really been successful in explaining how translation of recovery and service material actually works. We keep getting questions from members who do not understand why it is impossible to translate the entire *Conference Agenda Report*, particularly recovery literature that may be up for approval at a specific WSC (and included in the *CAR* as addenda).

As the example above about the successful translation of the *NA Step Working Guides* into Castilian Spanish indicates, it often takes two or more years to complete one successful translation. We would still be waiting to approve the English-language *NA Step Working Guides* if a requirement existed to complete translation of this book-length recovery item into specific multiple languages.

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 24

No amount of money can really solve this problem. Achieving conceptual fidelity in translations of recovery literature—where the accuracy of the message, its spirit, and identification are such crucial components of effective translations—cannot be accomplished solely with professional translators. There is a careful and indispensable process of review by local translation committees (LTCs). Often, LTCs must hammer out both regional differences rooted in not only various dialects associated with a given language, but also differences in understanding of particular recovery concepts that may be foreign to a specific culture.

Furthermore, when it comes to translating service material for approval that may appear in the *CAR* as addenda in a particular year, non-English-speaking communities often have no immediate need or desire to translate and adapt such unapproved service material. The resources to do so often would compete with the translation of either recovery material or other more time-sensitive periodical translations, such as *NAWS News* or the *Conference Report*. Why would we want to mandate the translation into specific languages of service material like *A Temporary Working Guide to Our World Service Structure*, when so many language groups still lack major book-length recovery pieces? Mandating translation of the entire *CAR*, including all addenda, is not only impossible and impractical—it is undesirable.

### **On Motion Nine**

Some have asked why a region would not be seated until the end of the conference at which the seating decision is made. We are not trying to lengthen the waiting time arbitrarily. We have carefully considered the reasons for this timeline. The primary reason is to eliminate emotional appeals for seating and make the process more rational. Under our proposal, the task of considering the seating request is based on principles and not the personality of the prospective region(s) or its delegate(s). Also, this equalizes the approach for a worldwide fellowship where all are not equally able to fund their own attendance to the WSC. The majority of US regions have brought themselves to seek seating. The majority of non-US regions have not.

Members have also asked us if the timeline's length is based only on the issue of seating new US regions. The answer is no. Each aspect of the criteria developed takes into account the historical experience of new non-US regions joining the conference for the first time. We believe many do not know that some regions have come to the WSC too early in their process of internal development and experienced significant harm. The lack of a solid local service structure with a history of delivering effective services has sometimes caused problems, diverting scarce resources from local development.

Motion Nine is about placing “principles before personalities.” The word “criteria” is just a fancy word for “principles,” and the real issue here is coming up with some set of principles the conference can fall back on when it is faced with the emotional issue of seating new individual regions.

### **On Motion Ten**

The language of the motion has mistakenly caused some to think that the intent may be to fund more than one delegate from each seated region. This is an error, as the intent is to fund one *and only one* delegate from each seated region. If the WSC feels it's necessary to clarify this intent, we'll amend the motion on the conference floor as required.

### **On Motion 13**

We wanted to mention three other housekeeping details related to this motion that would make the following changes to *TWGWSS 2000* (Addendum C in the *CAR 2000*) after the conference. First, the table of contents would be revised, as always. Second, we want to strike the language in the Operational Guidelines of the WSC, page 26, item four, about ad hoc committees. Third, the World Services Translation Policy on page 34 makes reference to “NA conference-approved literature;” this term should be changed to “NA fellowship-approved literature.”



### Update on Motion 20

We currently do have in place editorial practices that define important matters of style and standard grammatical usage, including all rules for proper capitalization and punctuation. These rules are applied uniformly, to the best of our ability, in the production of not only all recovery and service literature but also all NAWS periodicals (the *Conference Agenda Report*, the *Annual Report*, the *Conference Report*, *NAWS News*, *The NA Way Magazine*, *Reaching Out*, *Meeting by Mail*, etc.). With service material and the various NAWS periodicals, we apply the same uniform editorial standards wherever it is possible and practical to do so. However, the short and demanding timelines for certain periodicals sometimes results in less perfection and more inconsistency in these materials than we would ideally like if we had unlimited resources. Nonetheless, we are continuously seeking to improve our internal editorial practices to improve the quality and the consistency of everything we publish.

The uniform standards are applied with the greatest level of care and attention to the most important and durable material we produce: recovery literature. Any known inconsistency that exists now in the entire body of recovery literature we publish is limited to two sources. First, the Basic Text is inconsistent with the editorial standards we now have in place. The reason for this is the Basic Text moratorium in effect since the adoption of the Fifth Edition at the 1988 WSC twelve years ago. The current editorial standards were developed after 1988 and have been applied to all existing literature that has been created or revised since then. (The Fourth Edition contained disastrous errors when the WSO published that edition of the Basic Text in November of 1987. That was the beginning of a subsequent effort by the WSO to avoid the repetition of any such problems. That beginning effort to improve in the late 1980s has continued throughout the 1990s up to this day.) The only other items that we know are still inconsistent are the large-print versions of certain information pamphlets and booklets. The reason that we have not yet updated these large-print items is because the quantities we sell are so limited. In most cases, we haven't yet exhausted supplies that WSO printed a number of years ago before the current editorial standards. Also, certain service material that has never been updated, revised, reprinted, or re-typeset since the early 1990s may contain inconsistencies. However, so far as we are aware today, if there are any other inconsistencies, these would be attributable to errors made in the copy editing and proofreading process as these consistent, existing standards were applied. (We always welcome any input that brings such typographical errors to our attention and make every effort to correct any errors we find in future printings wherever possible.)

Finally, these current editorial standards do include rules for capitalizing the Twelve Steps, the Twelve Traditions, and the Twelve Concepts. For example, we always change "12 Steps" to "Twelve Steps." A reference to Step Five is always capitalized, and we avoid the usage "5<sup>th</sup> Step." However, Step Twelve states: "Having had a spiritual awakening as a result of these steps, we tried to carry this message to addicts, and to practice these principles in all our affairs." In this context, the word "steps" is not a proper noun, and it would be grammatically incorrect to capitalize this word in this context, just as it would be improper to capitalize the word "principles," even though this reference to our steps and our principles refers to the Twelve Steps of Narcotics Anonymous. The system of capitalization that Motion 20 suggests is simply grammatically incorrect. Changing the rules now would not "begin to provide consistency" as the intent of Motion 20 claims. On the contrary, this new rule, implemented on the piece-meal basis Motion 20 calls for, would create chaos and substantial inconsistency that we have spent years trying to eliminate in everything we publish.

### Update on Motions 22 and 23

As we indicated in our discussion of these motions in the *CAR*, these issues have surfaced with great regularity. We summarized the history from 1993 on. There is also an old Trustee bulletin that is available on our website (or upon request) that gives additional background on WSC conflict over the voting issue from 1982-1991. That bulletin summarizes the opposing points of view in a neutral and even-handed way.

## Elections at WSC'00

This next conference cycle represents a unique stage of the building process. We are trying to build a service structure free of the problems, politics, and conflicts that have sometimes diverted NA World Services from NA's primary purpose (or contributed to an unwarranted perception or fear that this was the case.) One aspect of the board's original dream developed at its first meeting was to serve as a catalyst to healing the fellowship. We regret that World Board elections at the WSC, and our part in them, have become a lightning rod for controversy again this year. Placing principles before personalities when the subject at hand is elections is many times difficult for NA groups and service committees at all levels, so perhaps it is not surprising that this is a hot spot. We wish it were not so.

We reported in the February *NAWS News* that there will be twelve available seats on the board at this WSC. Eight openings are six-year terms that the WSC should fill at WSC'00 in the normal board rotation. The other four are vacancies. These vacancies are a result of the conference electing only 18 of 24 members at WSC'98, leaving six vacant seats at that time. Two of those vacant seats were two-year terms that are now part of the eight seats open this year. (The other six represent the two year seats held these past two years by Floyd, Daniel, David, Mary Kay, Mario, and Bob—for a total of eight open seats with six-year terms at WSC'00.) The remaining four vacant seats represent two with two-year terms (open at WSC'02) and two with four-year terms (open at WSC'04, based on the normal board rotation established at WSC'98). This may sound confusing, but this is the way the terms were setup at WSC'98.

We also reported that we are recommending that the conference only fill the eight six-year terms. We believe that a balance between rotation and continuity is best, and that the conference should stick with the original plan of electing no more than eight board members at any single conference, creating a maximum rotation on the board of no more than 33% in any single conference cycle.

We realize that some have the perception that participating in world services is limited to some elite, "in crowd" or "good old boy" network. The board is not at odds with the conference or the fellowship on this issue. The board is not afraid of new blood or new people. The board sees itself as an agent for change, and is not afraid of change. The issue is balance.

No matter how many new board members the conference may elect, however, we want to assure you that we will accept the outcome, adapt, and adjust. The board knows there are many talented and skilled NA members who are well qualified to contribute to world services. Most of the current board participated in the design of the current system that created the Human Resource Panel and the World Pool as components of a new system designed to remedy past problems inherent in electing conference leadership without any nominations committee. Those problems go all the way back to the first conference in 1976, twenty-four years ago!

At the same time, the World Pool is not yet a fully functioning stable resource for the new world service system. This process will be getting its first real-world trial run at this conference. We look forward to the day when the thousands and thousands of NA members who have five years clean and a desire to contribute to world services will take the time to complete the World Pool resume form and make themselves willing and available to serve NA as a whole. *But as of today, the HRP has only 307 resumes.* Clearly, this is a very small number out of the hundreds of thousands of members clean in NA today who participate in recovery and service in over 27,000 meetings in 104+ countries worldwide. And only 234 of these 307 resumes represent current, active resumes in the World Pool. (73 are inactive resumes that the HRP has asked these members to update using the current resume form.)

We believe that the risk of a rotation greater than 33% is especially problematic this year because of where we are now in the transition. In future years, imagine how different this will be when there are stable, functioning committees with a proven record of accomplishment. Established committee members will be able to assist with the task of orienting both new board

members and new committee members to each committee's purpose, functions, objectives, and tasks. We can foresee that the board's committees and workgroups will actually become a training ground for members selected out of the world pool to become oriented to the entire world service delivery system. Through that experience, some (but not all) future board members may come up through those ranks and gain valuable experience.

Nonetheless, if the conference chooses to reject our recommendation and attempt to fill the four vacancies, we recommend only one election and, further, that the WSC allow the board to distribute the terms internally (as we did in 1998). This second recommendation is important because we do not want to create a hierarchy of board members with different status. Equally undesirable would be for the conference to directly elect members to different term lengths, perhaps applying different criteria to a board member elected to a seat with a shorter term. Nor would we want the highest vote getters to get the longest terms and vice versa. Any of these procedures would tend to create inequities, or the perception of inequities, among a board of members who have equal responsibilities.

## **WORLD SERVICE CONFERENCE 2000**

### **SUNDAY, 29 APRIL – SATURDAY, 6 MAY 2000**

We all look forward to this particular conference with a mixture of enthusiasm, excitement, and a bit of trepidation. It has been said—*ad nauseum*—in the past few fellowship reports (including this one!) that this is the beginning of a new era and service structure in Narcotics Anonymous, so we won't repeat this yet again. However, we do want to encourage everyone to stay open-minded and willing as we all move forward along this path. Just as we didn't become addicted in one day, we will not reach our goals in one conference cycle either. This conference commemorates our 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the WSC with a focus on community building. Some of the highlights of this particular theme include the history workshop, open house at the WSO, and a speaker panel meeting on Saturday 29 April that will include some long-time NA members and others.

As part of the ongoing pre-conference preparations, we brought the WSC Co-facilitators to the WSO to attend portions of the board and executive committee meetings held 8-11 March 2000. The meeting was productive and helpful for all. As a practical matter, this orientation is essential for the WSC Co-facilitators to perform their function during the conference. This is doubly true for John H, who will take on the job for the first time this year, assisted by Vinnie F, who is returning for a second term. We have learned one thing from working with two different WSC Co-facilitators over the past two years. It will be important to provide a clear orientation about the roles and responsibilities of this position to each newly elected co-facilitator at the beginning of each conference cycle.

Our longstanding non-addict parliamentarian, Don Cameron, recently advised us that he would be unable to perform this job at this year's WSC because he has moved to the Middle East. We are grateful to Don for his many years of faithful service (including his assistance to the HRP this year with the analysis of past conference elections). We have found a very well-qualified parliamentarian to take on this ever-challenging task this year. Ever prepared, we also have two (count 'em, two) well-qualified understudies to fall back on just in case we frighten the first one away!

Before our January meeting, we received a request to fund to the WSC a certain long-standing region. The region had experienced a substantial convention loss. For this reason, they fell substantially behind in payments to WSO for literature purchases. Given this combination of circumstances, the region made a special request to the board for funding to WSC'00. Before

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 28

making the special request, in spite of financial hardship, the region had used available funds to bring their past due WSO account current. As we pieced together these facts, we felt conflicted. More than once, we had already publicly announced and reported that we were freezing, as of WSC'99, any funding to the WSC to the prior list of development forum participants. We did that because of some of the agonizing emotional decisions we had faced in 1998-1999 about WSC'99 funding requests. However, this region has always funded itself to the conference and never been a development forum participant. Moreover, this request was so honest. And the behavior in paying the WSO bill demonstrated a commitment to principle. The region could have failed to pay and then funded themselves without humbly asking for help. So, bottom line, we decided to make an exception and grant the funding request. This represents an unbudgeted expense, contrary to what we said we would do. For that reason, we are reporting our decision here.

We hope you find the tentative outline of the week below has addressed some of the suggestions and concerns voiced in the WSC'99 Evaluation Survey. In spite of the *gigantic* agenda, we tried to schedule as much time as possible for discussion, including sessions with large panel formats and the ever-popular small group discussion sessions. We want to build a sense of community each day of the week and create an atmosphere of consensus-building when possible. We've designed a variety of sessions each day. We hope that using different settings will provide much of the information that is needed—but avoid information overload. We're also trying to maximize the time for delegate questions and answers and/or discussion. One of our objectives with WSC'00 is to ensure that all conference participants comprehend those issues that *are* important and come to a common understanding of what is going to happen over the next two years. It is our hope that this *Conference Report*, in conjunction with the agenda items and conference-week format, helps to bring that objective to fruition.

You will also notice a few physical changes to the General Session room. Again, this is based on input we received from the WSC'99 Evaluations. The dais and podium will be lower in the General Session room. The World Board meetings will also have a different setup to facilitate the open forum sessions we have planned. Board members plan to sit in a “user-friendly” arrangement that will be more inviting to conference participants and hopefully encourage dialogue. We also hope to avoid board meetings at 1:00 am in the morning like last year or other late night conference sessions. Of course, we never *plan* to meet until after midnight! But all those minutes at the microphone *do* add up! Once again this year, we are sure all conference participants have the best of intentions. We hope WSC'00 will receive historically high grades for “using time wisely!”

We have also tried to structure the conference week so that old business is considered earlier in the week than usual. Past conferences sometimes have had two or more days of opening and reporting sessions before delving into the old business from the *CAR*. Sometimes, in past years, uncertainty or controversy regarding motions in the *CAR* or other issues has clouded the conference proceedings until those issues could be aired, discussed, and resolved. Having a board meeting with an open forum on Sunday night, and then going right into old business Monday morning, are two ways we have sought to change the agenda this year. We hope this works for the better. We have also planned to break the conference up into small discussion groups for two different sessions on two different days, and into two large panels on another day, to maximize discussion opportunities.

For you early birds, an unofficial “poolside” recovery meeting is ordinarily held each day at 7:00 am for those of you who want to begin your daily WSC adventure with a special NA recovery meeting in the California sunshine! A room will also be available at the hotel each evening after the conference adjourns for the day for a recovery meeting. These will not be planned meetings, but simply space made available for anyone who wants to organize and hold a meeting. Members of the local host committee (sponsored by the West End Area Service Committee) will also make themselves available for rides to local meetings.

## DISCUSSION OF THE 2000 CONFERENCE WEEK

Here's a brief description of the still-evolving plan for the each day of the WSC. We hope everyone has a safe trip to California, and we look forward to seeing everyone at this event.

### **SATURDAY, 29 APRIL 2000 (PRE-CONFERENCE ACTIVITIES)**

The registration desk will open Friday afternoon and also Saturday at 9:00 am until about 4:00 pm. Once the conference begins, the registration desk will move into the general session room. The local fellowship will also have members present at the registration desk to direct participants to meetings and provide information about the surrounding area.

The history workshop scheduled for 10:00 am, will focus on "who, what, and how" to capture as much as possible about the beginnings of Narcotics Anonymous before it is lost forever. Most of the surviving addicts who attended meetings in the 1950s and early '60s are getting older, and some are in failing health. It is our hope to gather as much information as possible about the climate of those times. It's hard to imagine—especially for many of us who have the luxury of being able to pick and choose our meetings—what those early members endured. Let's not forget that in most places it was illegal for addicts to gather together in one place.

The WSO will have an open house starting at 5:00 pm. There will be three buses available for transporting conference participants from and back to the hotel. We will have more information about sign-up and other particulars in your WSC packet when you register. There will be lots of "finger-licking good" food and plenty of time for fellowship and fun. We hope that everyone will take advantage of this opportunity to see the WSO and experience a bit of Southern California hospitality!

Starting at 8:00 pm, there will be a speaker panel featuring, among others, several of our long-time members. We're sure this will prove to be not only an enlightening meeting, but one that will fill us all with hope, strength, and immeasurable gratitude. And to top the evening off—the alternative store will open at 10:30 pm. Any conference participant or service committee who would like to sell merchandise should check in at the registration desk as early as possible.

### **SUNDAY, 30 APRIL 2000**

Today is the official launch and opening of WSC'00. In the opening session at 9:00 am, we will celebrate with a cake to commemorate our 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary. This will be followed by an orientation session to discuss goals for the conference week, conducted in eight small groups. World Board members will facilitate each group. Each breakout group will have approximately 30 conference participants (including the alternate delegates). Our main objective in this session is to orient all members and reach a common understanding about the plan for the week. Each board member will share on what the conference will entail, as well as the board's vision for the WSC. Conference participants will be asked to share their vision for the conference. We will record points of consensus throughout the session. At the end of conference week, we plan to do a wrap-up session to review if we achieved our collective vision. We hope this will create some closure of the event.

After lunch, we will continue the opening session. This session will include introductions, an overview of the goals for each day of the week individually, an explanation of WSC procedures, and tips on how to "survive" the week for new and seasoned participants. In this session, the conference will consider the approval of minutes from WSC'99, the WSC Rules of Order, and the WSC'00 Election Procedures. The order and structure of these morning and afternoon sessions are still subject to change, like other parts of the layout for the week.

After a dinner break, the World Board meeting will begin with a portion of the meeting designated for an open forum. This open forum will be a place to bring up any questions or issues any participant has about anything: past, present, or future.

**MONDAY, 30 APRIL 2000**

The conference day will begin at 9:00 am with a discussion of Motions One to Four and any amendments or related motions turned in before the old business deadline. The purpose of the discussion will be to create an opportunity for participants to ask questions or discuss any amendments or issues related to the underlying motions without getting bogged down in a nightmare of parliamentary procedure. We will also use straw polling wherever it makes sense to allow the conference to assess support and interest about any amendment or procedural motion.

When the WSC has used this procedure in the past, it has sometimes saved time and minimized procedural complexities in formal business sessions. This is because some participants decide to refrain from making certain amendments or procedural motions based upon the degree of support or interest the straw polling or discussion indicated. At the same time, it gives participants an opportunity to express points of view in a less formal session and have ideas heard, considered, and evaluated. Overall, individual participants have generally felt a greater sense of being heard when the conference has used this procedure. Participants also have had a greater willingness to surrender and accept the result of conference decisions when we use this procedure wisely.

Of course, sometimes the debate is equally heated or lengthy when the motions or amendments are presented in the formal business session. Sometimes, some participants feel compelled to make the same arguments and try again to persuade the WSC as a whole to their point of view. So we realize that time is not always shortened by this procedure. But we believe it is better to have the discussion in a more informal session than under parliamentary rules limiting debate to three pros and three cons. The ultimate purpose is to make decisions with greater unity and harmony, and to do so without disadvantaging those who are not experts in using parliamentary procedure. In fact, although we believe this process, when used, does save time on average, the goal is not to save time. The goal is to help ensure that our decision-making processes reflect the principles of Concept Nine. ("All elements of our service structure have the responsibility to carefully consider all viewpoints in their decision-making processes".) The combination of both processes, working in tandem, helps to ensure this result. We hope the conference will accept this process of considering old business.

After discussing Motions One to Four (the interrelated motions about recovery literature), the conference will go into a formal old business session on these motions. After a short break, the conference will then go back into a discussion session on Motion Five, the service-material approval process. Following that discussion, the conference will go into an old business session to deal with Motion Five.

After lunch, we will go back into general session for a brief setup. Then we will break out into two panels to discuss the Communications Task Force Project. We're giving you a lengthy status report on this project here (see Exhibit One) to begin to prepare you for this discussion. We'll have an even more detailed report at the WSC. This session will focus on brainstorming about NAWS communication problems and potential solutions. The goal is to give feedback and informal input to the board about the CTF's direction. We anticipate this work will continue in the next conference cycle if the conference approves the new project we've proposed.

These will be large panel discussion sessions. World Board members will facilitate the breakout groups. Each panel will consist of approximately 120 conference participants (including alternates). We also plan to conduct a simple survey of the conference body regarding communication issues. The survey purpose is to gain additional input to factor into the CTF's work.

We will then have a full conference discussion session on Motions 16-18 from the Human Resource Panel. An old business session on these three motions will then conclude a long and full day.

## **TUESDAY, 2 MAY 2000**

On Tuesday, we will follow the same basic format as we did for Monday. We will start in a general session to discuss Motions 6-14, regarding the two-year conference cycle. After this discussion, we'll then go into a formal old business session, then break for lunch.

After lunch, we have planned a discussion about how to use more effectively the discussion topics that the conference chooses each year. We will head back to the breakout groups to review the 1999 issue discussion topics (NA's definition of abstinence and retaining experienced members). A report of these discussions will occur later in the week, most likely on Saturday.

After a break, we'll rejoin in the general session room to discuss Motion 15 (issue discussion topics for the next conference cycle). The conference has customarily made the decision on this motion using a written ballot.

The WSC will discuss Motions 19-23 in a general session beginning in the evening. A formal old business session will then follow to deal with these regional motions.

## **WEDNESDAY, 3 MAY 2000**

Beginning at 9:00 am there will be a presentation of the World Board's report. As we mentioned earlier, we will make every attempt to keep this as concise as possible to avoid the dreaded "information overload syndrome." The real challenge will be to report on one year of activity *and* our plans for next two years, while allowing appropriate time for questions. The Human Resource Panel's (HRP) report follows lunch with space provided for zonal meetings beginning at 4:00 pm. These zonal meetings will be held in the breakout rooms. These meetings are left up to each zone and are not a function of the conference. It would be helpful if each zone could let us know if they plan to meet and if they have any specific requests. This can be done before the WSC by contacting the World Board or by checking in at the registration desk on site.

## **THURSDAY, 4 MAY 2000**

The first order of business this morning will be elections. Zonal reports will begin as soon as the ballots are turned in, and then we will break for lunch. We will need an indication from all the zones as to who wishes to report. Each zone will have 15 minutes to present its report, although one zone may choose to yield its time to another. Those who were at WSC'99 will remember that the hour-plus report from the European Delegates Meeting was an emotional highlight of the conference, and that certain US zones yielded their time to make this longer report possible. Due to the even more stringent timeframe the WSC faces this year—we have tried to allow as much time as possible—it is important for this session to stay within the allotted time. Again, if you could let us know your plans for your report, as we have also requested you do for your meeting needs, we would appreciate it.

After lunch, we will go back in full conference session to present and discuss the budget and the project plan proposals for the next conference cycle. In the late afternoon, we've scheduled a board meeting to address matters pertaining to new business and have designated time for an open forum.

## **FRIDAY, 5 MAY 2000**

This will be a "business-intensive" day with budget decisions starting at 9:00 am followed by new business. The conference will re-convene after lunch. The evening is free time off for conference participants. (Go to a meeting! By Friday, you'll probably need one!) If the schedule permits, a room may be available for use by delegates who wish to meet to discuss a US assembly this evening. This is in response to a request that we received at the World Service Meeting last September. However, depending on the schedule of the conference week, we may have to make this room available during the same period as the zonal forum meetings on Thursday.

## **SATURDAY, 6 MAY 2000—(OFFICIAL CLOSE OF WSC'00)**

The closing day of WSC'00 starts at 9:00 am with a full conference discussion of Resolution A. This issue is on the agenda again this year at the request of regional delegates. The board will give a very brief recap of Resolution A. An open full-conference discussion will follow, subject to the desire of the participants. The board does not intend to direct this discussion in any particular direction. The only point we would note in advance is that there seems to continue to be widely divergent points of view among all conference participants about Resolution A. There appear to be some folks on opposite ends of the spectrum having very passionate opinions about the best course of action, and a large group of dispassionate folks in the middle apparently unsure. We hope that all conference participants would recognize at the outset that there are serious differences of opinion. With this fact in mind, we trust all participants will recognize those divisions and allow genuine dialogue to go forward in a way that promotes mutual understanding and mutual respect among those with different, conflicting points of view.

After lunch, we will return to a general session to discuss our direction for the next two years and beyond, as well as to examine and review the focus for world services. If time permits, we will revisit the goals that we discussed at the beginning of the week, as well as hear reports from the small groups on the issue discussion topics. Closing ceremonies for WSC'00 will begin in the late afternoon or early evening.

### **Putting the Hog Out to Pasture**

One of the customary activities on the last day of the conference is to vote for the recipient of the "mike hog award." The award for biggest microphone hog dates back to the 1989 WSC, when it was originally known as the "golden mike award." This is the twelfth year the conference will consider presenting this award, which has apparently become more and more popular and prestigious with each passing year! (More than one current board member is a past recipient or nominee!) The board discussed eliminating the award this year because we have exhausted the supply of honorary statuettes that the conference has traditionally bestowed upon the "winning" honoree!

*On a more serious note, there are good reasons to consider eliminating this custom.* One of the significant problems the conference has wrestled with year after year is the dominance of conference business by boisterous personalities who have spent so much time at the microphone so often, that the conference resembled a collection of kidnapped hostages held in parliamentary hell. The board would like to suggest that the conference consider the retirement of this award in the future, replacing it with something more positive. We welcome ideas and positive options that would make an interesting alternative to this infamous contest. Because of the popularity of the mike hog award and the fun of the contest, however, the board did decide to continue the award this year.

Whatever the conference decides to do about the award this year and in the future, we hope that all conference participants will be mindful and vigilant each day about the use of the conference's most precious resource: time. We hope the conference will make progress in its efforts to engage in effective dialogue among the diverse participants with divergent points of view. We hope those conference participants who are naturally most-inclined to speak at the microphone will pause and hesitate before making multiple trips to the mike (each day). And we hope that those participants who are most reluctant to speak at the microphone—whether because of shyness, fear, a language barrier, or another reason—will make the extra effort to overcome any such tendency to remain silent and let others do all the talking. As our discussion of the week's agenda illustrates, we will not have any extra time to spare or waste this year. We hope that all conference discussions will be open and frank, and that all participants strive to bring any simmering conflicts out of the hallways and into the open for any needed resolution. While we hope that the activities planned for the conference week will be personally rewarding for all participants, we believe that in the forum that is the World Service Conference, the principles



of Tradition One are paramount. We hope that the common effort to unite around the NAWS Vision Statement and WSC Mission Statement will help to make this conference one that successfully and productively furthers our common welfare.

## WRAP-UP AND THE NEXT TWO YEARS

Nothing we can put on paper now can anticipate every scenario about what decisions could be made at this year's conference. Nothing will eliminate the need for the conference to discuss priorities for the next two years. Discussion will have to sort out conflicts that may arise from the many different possible decisions that will result after the conference acts on all of the old business presented in the *CAR*. Reaching a mutual understanding between the board and the regional delegates at the conference about the priorities for the next two years will be helpful to the on-going process to improve the service delivery efforts that led us to create this new system designed to maximize quality and efficiency through better long-range planning and accountability to the fellowship. We hope that a conversation will unfold over the course of the conference week that will lead to this dialogue and understanding. We see this happening through a combination of the open forum sessions the board will hold, the conference's action on the old business in the *CAR*, the board's report to the conference, and the discussion and adoption of the 2000-2002 budget proposal. We hope that by the week's end on Saturday that all of these pieces will start to come together in the final discussion session we've tentatively called, "Moving Forward with a Common Understanding." In many ways, the conference's action on old business and the budget will illustrate the roadmap for the next two years, but we hope this final wrap-up session will be a unifying discussion that will help to clarify the priorities and goals for the next conference cycle. If we can all agree on what we want to accomplish, we believe that will provide the overall direction and flexibility for the conference to delegate those objectives to the board. In this way, we hope to have a common vision for what the board will deliver back to the conference at WSC'02 and what the conference will hold the board accountable for.

We look forward to seeing many of you at WSC'00, and we want to thank you again for the incredible privilege you have allowed us and the trust you have shown us.

*THE WORLD BOARD*

# The Human Resource Panel

## March 2000 Conference Report from the Human Resource Panel

We would like to thank the fellowship for the confidence that you have shown in us over the last year. In the end, we were humbled by the power and responsibility with which you have entrusted us.

We worked very hard in our task to present for you a slate of best-qualified candidates from which you will choose your next WSC Co-facilitators and World Board members. We have every confidence in the candidates that we are presenting to you. We are pleased to announce our nominations in alphabetical order.

### HRP nominations for WSC Co-facilitator

Vandy A	Washington/Northern Idaho Region
Gordon C	Northern California Region
Phillip C	Region of the Virginians Region
John H	Wisconsin Region
Steve R	Tri-State Region

### HRP nominations for World Board Member

Saul A	Panama Region
Jim B	Chicagoland Region
Pedro C	Sweden Region
Geri C	Pacific Cascade Region
Ivan F	Ohio Region
Giovanna G	Colombia Region
Claude G	Quebec Region
Mark H	Wisconsin Region
Ron H	Rio Grande Region
David J	United Kingdom Region
Laura J	Pacific Cascade Region
Bob J	Florida Region
Nick K	New England Region
Laura K	Region del Coqui Region
Brian L	Greater Illinois Region
Eduardo M	Brazil Region
Cindy M	California Mid State Region
Joanna M	Show Me Region
Tom McC	Hawaii Region
Oliver N	German-Speaking Region
Rhonda R	Free State Region
Daniel S	German-Speaking Region
Simon T	Australia Region

## Election Procedures

Basically, the election procedures have not changed significantly, although the format of the document has changed. We have removed meeting-specific information from the procedures and moved them to a separate page that informs participants about deadlines and available positions for the current conference cycle. Once the election procedures are stable, only the information page will need to be changed.

We have worked hard with the World Board Executive Committee to make the procedures as clear as possible. Most of the problems that occurred last year were the result of a lack of clarity. As you review these procedures, please make a note of statements that are not clear to you, and bring them up during orientation. If something is not clear to you, it is probably not clear to others.

## Changes to our Nominations Process

We all have absolute confidence in the slate of candidates that we have offered to you. Each is extremely qualified. Nevertheless, this is the first time that any Human Resource Panel has ever nominated individuals to stand for election to the World Board, and it would be naïve to think that we were perfect the first time. We tried some experiments this year and struggled while making some difficult choices. We stumbled along at times and made some mistakes along the way.

Every choice was made with the best interests of the fellowship of NA, the World Service Conference, and the World Board at heart. Each of us has heard loud and clear that the conference participants want fresh faces from whom to choose in elections. We believe that the conference has charged us with the task of finding those qualified individuals who would serve well on the World Board. That was our focus this year. Unfortunately, that focus led us to remove highly qualified individuals with extensive experience from consideration very early in the process. That was a mistake.

As we have reported to you often, the evaluation of potential nominees is subjective by its very nature. It is unrealistic to think that an objective process could sort out the best-qualified candidates. In the end, each conference participant makes his or her final choices based on personal subjective criteria. Each voter must evaluate the nominees based on individual values, morals, and goals. In fairness to potential nominees, the HRP must strive to be as objective as possible in the evaluation process for as long as possible.

We find it necessary to clear up some misconceptions that we have heard in the rumor mill. Some World Pool members may be asking themselves, "What does it mean if the HRP chooses not to nominate me this year?" The most important thing everyone needs to know is that it doesn't mean that you are not qualified. It doesn't mean that you will never be nominated in the future. It doesn't mean there is some secret fault that was uncovered. The HRP does not have access to anyone's Fourth Step.

A new Human Resource Panel will consider everyone who meets the minimum qualifications for World Board member or WSC Co-facilitator in the next conference cycle. Each individual will start fresh. The HRP will consider each candidate with as fair a process as they can muster.

Based on our experience this year, we have made some specific changes to our Internal Guidelines (attached) that we would like to bring to your attention.

*Problem:* World Pool members who feel they are qualified to run for a world services position were not contacted at all if the HRP eliminated them in the second phase (formerly first cut) of the nomination process. They were left only to wonder if a decision was made or if there was a clerical error or something else.

*Solution:* Send a letter to every member of the World Pool who meets the minimum requirements for each position. Describe the requirements and

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 36

expectations of the position. Describe the nomination process and ask them to send in a form confirming their willingness or lack of desire to be considered for nomination.

*Result:* This will create more goodwill with World Pool members. They will be assured that their resume is being considered. If they do not make it into the third phase (interviews and reference checks), they will be aware of it and know that they, at least, were considered.

*Problem:* A miscommunication can occur by sending a letter to potential nominees and assuming that if we do not receive a response by a certain deadline that the candidate(s) are not interested in continuing in our nomination process. Several scenarios exist, especially with international mail, where a letter could be delayed or lost entirely. The result, due only to outside influences, is the elimination of a well-qualified candidate who "wished" or "wanted" to continue in the nomination process.

*Solution:* Send all communication to candidates who we wish to continue in the process after phase two by both email and regular mail. Except for phase one, all communication with potential nominees that requires a response from them will be sent via DHL for better tracking of the letter. Except for phase one, any candidate who does not respond by the deadline will be contacted on the telephone to confirm his or her desire to continue or not continue in the nomination process.

*Result:* We will have more assurance that important letters will be received. If an individual does not meet a deadline, we will know why and not assume anything. Overall communication with the candidates will be improved.

*Problem:* Potential nominees were eliminated too early in the process for subjective reasons. This caused a lot of confusion and hurt feelings. More importantly, it minimized the number of well-qualified individuals that the HRP had to work with during the entire process.

*Solution:* In the second phase, we will not consider recovery experience, continuity versus rotation, maturity, character, integrity, or stability in decreasing the group to a manageable size. Rather, the HRP will strive for objectivity whenever possible during this phase.

*Result:* The HRP will have a smaller pool of candidates to work with in the second phase since several World Pool members have already eliminated themselves. The HRP will have a larger pool of candidates to work with in the third phase since fewer subjective judgments were made in phase two. The HRP will also have more candidates to work with in the fourth phase, making the March meeting before the conference longer and more difficult.

*Problem:* There is not a process to evaluate the performance of a World Board member who is seeking reelection. This creates the perception that if a World Board member wants to run again, it is an automatic nomination from the HRP.

*Solution:* We suggest that the EC choose one of its members to provide an evaluation of an individual seeking reelection to the World Board. If he or she is doing an excellent job, we would like to know that. If she or he is not up to par, we would like to know that as well.

*Result:* The HRP will be better prepared to make a decision to nominate or not nominate a World Board member seeking reelection.

## Amendments to Motion 16

We heard some valuable input at the CAR workshops this year. These guidelines are supposed to be used for both nominees and project members, so we removed the language that referred to nominees and elections, making the guidelines more general.

We got some significant questions about the statement; "Discussion will be based only on the information gathered and not on personal experience with the individual." This is a process-specific statement that is out of context here and causes many more problems than it was trying to solve, so we would like to remove it.

Based on that input, we would like to amend Motion 16 and present it at the conference as amended.

Motion 16 (as amended): To add to *A Temporary Working Guide to Our World Service Structure* (1999 edition) on page 15, under EXTERNAL GUIDELINES FOR THE WORLD POOL AND HUMAN RESOURCE PANEL, section "Guidelines for General Eligibility and Implementation," the following language:

### Guidelines for General Eligibility and Implementation

#### I. World Pool Eligibility Requirements

A. World Pool members must have a minimum of five years clean.

#### II. Criteria for selection: HRP members will note the requirements and needs for the position, and then evaluate the individuals being considered. The following circumstances and qualities will be considered in the discussion:

A. The need for balance between rotation (new people and fresh experience) and continuity (service experience) in NA World Service efforts.

B. Recovery experience.

C. Service interests.

D. Skills and talents applicable to the task/position.

E. Maturity level, character, integrity, stability.

F. History of commitment.

G. Geographical diversity will be an important factor only if all other considerations are equal.

#### III. Administrative Policy for the World Pool

A. The HRP administers the World Pool.

B. All information in the World Pool is kept in strictest confidence.

C. Increasing the membership of the World Pool is a high priority.

D. In order to maintain accurate information, each member of the World Pool whose information is three years old will be sent a request to renew their interest and update their resume.

E. Any World Pool member who does not respond to the renewal request within 60 days will be deemed inactive.

F. The HRP is responsible for creating and maintaining the World Pool resume.

G. The HRP provides a current list of all pool members and current region of residence to the World Board on a quarterly basis.

## **New Business Motion**

We heard concerns at one *CAR* workshop that in order for Motions 17 and 18 to work, it must be a requirement that HRP members are prohibited from nominating themselves to any other world service position. We agree, and that is why the prohibition has been in our Internal Guidelines from their inception. However, our Internal Guidelines can be changed by the HRP at anytime. It seems prudent that this decision be made by conference action.

We are preparing a motion for consideration during new business to amend the HRP External Guidelines by adding under Nominations at the end of 2<sup>d</sup> paragraph page 17: "The Human Resource Panel will not nominate current HRP members to any other world services position."

## **Removal of HRP Members and Vacancies**

We need to point out to you that there is no process in *TWGWSS* or in our Internal Guidelines for handling the removal of HRP members. Neither is there a process for filling vacancies. We attempted to use the World Board Internal Guidelines as a model for a possible solution, but they are not adaptable for our needs.

We have asked the board to address the issue at the next conference.

## **Heartfelt Thanks**

We can't thank you enough for the opportunity to serve you on the Human Resource Panel this year. It has been difficult, but always rewarding. Each of us has grown in our recovery, our relationship to our Higher Power, and our relationship to each other. The confidence that you have given us is such an honor. It is impossible to express.

Thank you.

*THE HUMAN RESOURCE PANEL*

Attachment: Internal Guidelines

## ***HUMAN RESOURCE PANEL***

### ***INTERNAL GUIDELINES***

- I. Purpose
  - A. The purpose of the Human Resource Panel (HRP), as defined in *A Temporary Working Guide to Our World Service Structure*, 1999 edition, is to:
    1. Facilitate an election/selection process that will allow the World Service Conference to base trusted servant choices upon the principles of ability and experience.
    2. Allow members to be nominated from around the world without having to be present at the conference to receive due consideration.
    3. Create a more open opportunity for world services to benefit from our collective resources by providing an established and recognized process by which to do so.
  
- II. Functions and Duties of the Human Resource Panel
  - A. The Human Resource Panel provides a list of qualified candidates to serve the fellowship. The following duties, as listed in *A Temporary Working Guide to Our World Service Structure*, 1999 edition, will guide the panel in accomplishing this function.
  - B. Developing a description of the desired skills and experience necessary to complete the upcoming conference cycle's projects and services based upon the World Board's formal request.
  - C. Utilizing all available resources for the purpose of soliciting candidates' service resumes worldwide.
  - D. Screening applicants' resumes for the purpose of identifying qualifications and skills.
  - E. Informing potential candidates as to the qualifications necessary to serve on the World Board, the terms of office, as well as the general duties of the World Board, its committees, and the World Service Office.
  - F. Informing potential candidates as to the qualifications necessary to serve as a WSC Co-facilitator or as a member of the Human Resource Panel.
  - G. Providing the World Service Conference with a list of individual nominees best qualified for election to the World Board and the WSC Co-facilitator position. These lists, for the purposes of elections at the WSC, will not be governed by any minimum ratio, though the HRP should strive to always offer the conference a choice in candidates. Further, the maximum candidate-to-open-position ratio should have a limit of no more than three (3) candidates for each open position.
  - H. Providing the World Board with a list of individuals' resumes (addicts and non-addicts) for appointment to serve on committee projects. (Clean time requirements are not applicable for non-addicts.)
  - I. Maintaining a pool of individuals' resumes for committee appointment in the event of a vacancy.
  - J. Having a face-to-face meeting or conference calls (when necessary) prior to the World Service Conference to review candidates' resumes for World Board and committee needs, determining the need for interviews of prospective candidates.
  - K. Being available during the conference election process to answer participants' questions. However, all information about the panel's internal discussion about specific candidates will be kept strictly confidential by members of the Human Resource Panel.

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 40

- III. Relationship to the World Board
  - A. The HRP is committed to an effective partnership with the World Board throughout the conference cycle.
    - 1. This partnership is based on open communication.
    - 2. Regular reports about progress will be provided to the World Board.
    - 3. The World Board will be asked to review and input all external communications, HRP actions that effect conference policy and procedure, and all non-budgeted expenditures.
  - B. The HRP is committed to mutual accountability with the World Board, each one having the opportunity to impact decisions and actions that affect them.
  
- IV. General Processes for Elections
  - A. First phase of nomination process
    - 1. When WSC elections are scheduled, all those who meet the minimum qualifications will be selected for the initial group of individuals to be considered.
      - a. Staff will notify each candidate by regular mail that they are being considered to stand for election.
      - b. Each candidate will receive a list of the duties and qualifications, and projected travel commitments.
    - 2. All members of the initial group who express willingness to serve will continue in the process.
  - B. Second phase of nomination process
    - 1. The HRP will decrease the group to a manageable size by an agreed upon process, utilizing the following criteria:
      - Service interests and experience.
      - Skills and talents applicable to the position.
      - History of commitment.
      - Geographical diversity will be an important factor only if all other considerations are equal.
    - a. No one HRP member has the ability to eliminate a prospective candidate in this part of the process.
    - b. Any HRP member can reintroduce for consideration a candidate who has been eliminated.
    - c. Rotation and continuity will not be considered in this part of the process.
    - d. HRP members will strive for objectivity whenever possible during this process.
    - 2. Those who are eliminated from the process will be notified by regular mail.
    - 3. Those candidates who continue to the third phase will be notified by letter and email.
    - 4. Each candidate will be informed that the references they provided on the World Pool resume may be checked, and that a telephone interview will be conducted.
      - a. For current World Board members seeking reelection, in addition to the references provided, the HRP will interview a member of the World Board Executive Committee.
  - C. Third phase of nominating process
    - 1. Checking references
      - a. A standard set of questions will be used to contact all references.



## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 41

- b. References will be contacted by telephone first, email second, or postal mail last.
- c. Only HRP members will conduct reference checking.
- d. All information gathered will be kept strictly confidential.
- 2. Telephone interviews
  - a. Each candidate will provide a telephone interview.
  - b. A standard set of questions will be used for the interview and asked of each candidate.
  - c. Only HRP members will conduct telephone interviews.
  - d. All information gathered will be kept strictly confidential.
- D. Phase Four of nomination process—reducing the size of the candidate group after interviews and reference checks
  - 1. A candidate will be removed from consideration if the person declines or does not meet all requirements.
  - 2. HRP members will attempt to resolve relevant conflicting information from references. The results of this attempt will be included in the ensuing discussion process.
  - 3. A discussion process will accomplish selecting the best-qualified potential nominees of the group under consideration. HRP members will note the requirements and needs for the elected position, and then evaluate the individuals being considered. The following circumstances and qualities will be considered in the discussions:
    - a. Recovery experience.
    - b. Service interest and experience.
    - c. Skills and talents applicable to the position.
    - d. Maturity level, character, integrity, stability.
    - e. History of commitment.
    - f. The need for balance between rotation (new people and fresh experience) and continuity (service experience) in NA World Service efforts.
    - g. Geographical diversity will be an important factor only if all other considerations are equal.
    - h. The HRP will not nominate current HRP members to any other position.
- E. Facilitating WSC Elections
  - 1. The HRP will ensure that all procedures are followed properly during WSC elections.
  - 2. Election procedures will be updated to correct problems or as moved by the WSC.
- F. Maintaining the World Pool
  - 1. Increasing the size of the World Pool is a high priority and the status of the World Pool will be reviewed at each meeting.
  - 2. In order to maintain accurate information, each member of the World Pool whose information is three years old will be sent a request to renew his or her interest and update his or her resume.
  - 3. Any World Pool member who does not respond to the renewal request within 60 days will be deemed inactive.
- V. Project Selection Process
  - A. Upon request, the HRP provides a list of candidates, along with candidate profile reports, to the World Board to meet specific qualifications for world service projects.

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 42

- VI. The Human Resource Panel will utilize the following operational ground rules:
  - A. Operating principles of HRP are the Twelve Concepts.
  - B. The beginning of each meeting will focus the panel in a way that establishes unity, common respect, and trust for each other.
  - C. One person speaks at a time.
  - D. Meetings and breaks will start and end on time.
  - E. HRP issues will be discussed. Extraneous subjects will not be discussed.
  - F. Each HRP member is responsible to utilize his/her personal recovery in discussions, keeping principles before personalities.
  - G. Discussions will be balanced—no one person dominates and everyone actively participates. Respect for each other's views will be given.
  - H. The panel will try to achieve consensus whenever possible. Personal views will be expressed, but panel members will not separate themselves from the consensus and will take responsibility for the decisions of the HRP.
  - I. Negatives are not allowed in panel discussions.
  - J. The HRP values self-respect, respect for others, communication, trust, dreams, empowerment, creativity, shared information, and collective responsibility in its work.
  - K. The panel will meet its objectives for each meeting.
  
- VII. Decision-making
  - A. Unanimity of all panel members is required for a decision to nominate an individual. If the panel members cannot achieve unanimity, the nomination will not be made.
  - B. All other decisions will be made by consensus of all panel members if possible. If consensus is not possible, majority sentiment is sufficient. If majority agreement cannot be reached, no action will be taken.
  
- VIII. Communication Protocol
  - A. The Human Resource Panel members recognize the importance of complete and thorough communication.
  - B. Each member will make every effort to keep other HRP members, as well as the assigned WSO staff person, fully informed of their work and activities. This includes always providing current copies of works in progress and letters to one another, and a file copy for the WSO.
  - C. The HRP recognizes the following points of communication as routine for the HRP: with one another, with the fellowship, with the World Board, with the World Service Conference, with candidates for nomination, and with candidates' references.
  - D. The World Board Executive Committee will be given copies of all HRP communication before it is distributed.
  - E. A final HRP meeting agenda will be supplied to the World Board before each meeting.
  
- IX. Panel Leader
  - A. One member of the HRP will be selected each conference cycle, by mutual agreement, to serve as Panel Leader when interacting with the World Board, WSO staff, speaking at the World Service Conference, drafting reports, or communicating on behalf of the panel in other situations as needed.
  - B. Duties of the Panel Leader will include preparing agenda items and facilitating the meetings.

## March 2000 NAWS Conference Report Page 43

- X. Strict Confidentiality of Information
  - A. All information from World Pool resumes, reference checks, or interviews will be for use only by members of the Human Resource Panel and by no other person or entity.
  - B. Profiles may be created and distributed to conference participants at the World Service Conference meeting, then collected and stored with the same confidentiality as World Pool resumes.
  
- XI. Resumes from non-addicts
  - A. The HRP will encourage NA members to solicit service resumes from non-addicts who are interested in serving the fellowship and who are qualified to do so.

*Q:\HRP\newfolder\guide899, Revised 9/2/99 rt, 2/8/00 ss  
Modified and renamed to HRPguides2000.doc 3-11-00, ss*

Communications Task Force (CTF)  
*March Conference Report*  
Exhibit One

OVERVIEW OF CTF WORK TO DATE

The purpose of this report is to set a foundation for the board's Communications Task Force report to WSC'00 and subsequent discussion session. This report first gives background information about communication problems in world services going back to 1992 and the history of the CTF project. A detailed account of the research phase of the CTF project then follows. Attachments to this report include: the NAWS Organizational Identity Statement we developed (Attachment A); the questionnaire used in each of the eight focus groups worldwide (Attachment B); a sample WSO correspondence tracking sheet (Attachment C); a sample WSO telephone tracking sheet (Attachment D); and the survey form we developed to obtain feedback about CAR workshop presentations (Attachment E). These last four attachments supply additional details about the research tools we developed and used in the initial research phase of the CTF project. The concluding section discusses the timeline and plan for the remaining work this conference year.

**Overview of the History of the CTF**

In keeping with Goal #8 of the Fellowship Development Plan, the World Board created the CTF workgroup for two reasons. The first reason was essentially to examine and evaluate the effectiveness of the communication between NAWS and the fellowship. The second reason was to report its findings to the World Board and make some recommendations for the board to review.

It is certainly *not* headline news that we have longstanding communication problems in NA. With the adoption of the Twelve Concepts for NA Service in 1992, effective communication was clearly identified as essential for the accomplishment of service. Concept Eight states: "The integrity of our service structure depends on the effectiveness of our communications." Certainly, the identification of our communication problems did not originate in 1992. However, tracing the problem from this point forward will help to explain the scope and origins of the CTF project.

Communication was one of the main problem areas identified by the World Service Inventory conducted by the Composite Group in 1993 through 1995. The conference then formed the Resolution Group (RG) to address the inventory problems, but the RG did not tackle the communications issue. The conference then adopted various resolutions in 1996 and formed the Transition Group (TG) to implement those resolutions. While the TG worked on mapping out some possibilities for the resolutions adopted in 1996, communication problems went largely untouched by all bodies except within the WSO.

As far back as 1992, WSO staff have been looking at various ways of improving world service communications, specifically within its periodicals program. One study, for example, helped to bring about the new *NA Way Magazine*, but did not address other concerns. As the WSO board of directors (WSO Board) looked at implementing its business plan and worked with the World Service Board of Trustees (WSB) on the Fellowship Development Plan, it became increasingly apparent that something needed to be done about communications. To that end, staff developed the first proposal to improve communications for the WSO Board. Staff recommended a specific approach to develop such a comprehensive communications strategy known as "Communication

by Objectives” or CBO. Although it was largely supported in theory, it was not fully addressed until 1998, after the implementation of the World Board.

At its third meeting in November of 1998, the World Board began to prioritize various issues/concerns that it would address within its next two years. The issue of communication (not the CTF itself, but the topic) was prioritized as the highest non-routine priority for work by the board. The board decided to put together a workgroup to look at the issue and report back to the board with some recommendations about how to tackle the issue. The workgroup became known as the Communications Task Force. The CTF reviewed the CBO model as part of its initial orientation. Discussions during its first two meetings included the following highlights:

- Our first order of business was to develop a NAWS Organizational Identity Statement (see Attachment A), which we have used as our touchstone during our work.
- All members agreed that the scope of the project would be limited to the communications between NAWS and the fellowship.
- All members agreed that the scope would also need to be limited to communication within those areas that could be readily dealt with in terms of having identifiable problems, lending themselves to generally agreed-to solutions, and for which standards could be set. The group agreed that there was a significant lack of an existing set of standards against which communications could be measured to evaluate effectiveness.
- One of the main reasons the group adopted the CBO model was the generally held belief that a problem clearly identified was halfway solved. The model laid out a system that called for four primary phases:
  - ❖ **Research:** gather as much data as was feasible, whether quantitative or qualitative. Quantitative data means information that can be analyzed statistically. Qualitative data is generally more subjective and does not lend itself readily to statistical analysis, but this does not mean that one form of data is superior to the other or necessarily more “true” or “objective.”
  - ❖ **Problem Identification:** develop a comprehensive problem statement for all issues identified in the research phase.
  - ❖ **Solutions/Recommendations:** develop a comprehensive set of recommendations based on the CBO model—broad objectives, general goals, and specific tasks to accomplish the goals and then, in turn, the objectives.
  - ❖ **Implementation/Followup:** Implement recommendations, which includes the establishment of set standards, followed by periodic evaluation to ensure standards are met.

Research was going to be primarily conducted by interviews and other qualitative means, allowing for exclusively qualitative data which could then be factored into a narrative report about the problems identified.

The CTF developed a plan, along with a proposed timeline, which included holding interviews with staff, looking at the various periodicals, etc. The CTF presented that very general plan to the World Board. The board went generally on faith that the group would do its work and report frequently. One problem immediately identified was the lack of experience within the board for working with subgroups and delegating work effectively. As a result, many times board members were not as clearly aware of the project and what it entailed in terms of needed resources, timeline, etc., as members of the group itself. A second problem was the lack of a standard reporting system for subgroups of the board. Consequently, there were lapses in communication between the CTF and the Executive Committee.

In the first few CTF meetings in 1999, the group decided to introduce staff tracking sheets as a way of getting additional data. However, we did not have any substantive discussions about how the insertion of quantitative data would impact the project timeline or its need for staff resources. Additionally, the group talked about the need for some feedback from the fellowship about NAWS communication efforts. The eventual results of this discussion became the eight focus groups. Again, as an oversight, the CTF did not adequately discuss how the introduction of additional streams of quantitative and qualitative data would impact the project's timeline and resource needs. The CTF discussed some of the impact, but not enough time was factored into the problem identification and solution-development phases of the project.

Another major impact occurred when the primary staff support member changed his employment status from full-time employee to part-time contract worker. While the CTF worked around this member's schedule, the reduced staff resource hampered the project, especially as we reached the successful conclusion of the research phase.

The CTF adjusted the project timeline twice in 1999: before WSC'99 to reflect the possible adoption by the conference, and again in July/August to reflect the focus groups. In each case, however, despite the expansion of the research phase, the project still called for completion within the '99-'00 fiscal year. This would soon prove to be a problem.

The CTF met in late January, two days after completing its final focus group and faced some realities it had not previously considered. The insertion of a large amount of quantitative data that would now need to be processed by assigned staff. The CTF faced a predicament: How could it maintain its project timeline—complete the research, problem identification, and solutions phases by or before the end of June 2000? After some discussion, the members asked for extra CTF meetings and for additional human resource support from the WSO. The CTF was made aware that, as always, WSO staff resources are utilized beyond limits during the three months before the annual WSC. Nonetheless, WSO Executive Management, as well as the Executive Committee of the World Board, agreed to look at the request and do what it could to fulfill it.

We identified two additional problems during this January meeting. First, the World Board itself had not received a comprehensive report from the CTF since before the 1999 World Service Meeting (WSM) in Florida. The group had been busy conducting its focus groups and interviewing staff teams about their responsibilities. More and more questions surfaced within the World Board about what the CTF findings were, along with a need for some glimpse into how the problems and recommendations might shape up. In response, the group developed a progress report within a very short time-frame, showing the full board the various tools it had developed to conduct its research, as well as a revised timeline that still called for the group to present its findings and recommendations to the board at its June 2000 meeting. Second, the group discussed doing a brief survey at some of the multiregional CAR workshops, to obtain some feedback about the effectiveness of these events. The CTF decided to develop a simple, short, one-page survey that 20-25 participants at certain workshops would be asked to fill out. Again, the group did not fully consider how this would influence the timeline of the project.

The board had assigned one of the two Executive Co-directors of the WSO, George Hollahan, to the project from its inception. When he became ill in February, it left the project without an administrator. The two other members of Executive Management then were brought more fully up to speed, and another WSO staff person began an evaluation of the research data.

We will use all of this research material to generate a problem statement—that is, a comprehensive statement of world services' major communications challenges. This problem profile report along with the underlying research and discussion about both by the board, the CTF and WSO staff will lead to the discussion and identification of recommended solutions. These solutions will include objectives, goals, and tasks for the World Board to consider. After further

discussion and possibly revision by the board, the project can proceed to implement the recommendations adopted by the board.

### **Focus Groups**

We developed a focus group questionnaire (see attachment D), which we used at the eight focus groups around the world, and have developed summaries (or profiles) of each of those groups (see attachment E). In addition to this summarized information, each focus group generated an average of 15-20 individual questionnaire responses from members who participated in the groups, as well as a written narrative summary from staff and trusted servants attending those groups. We are very enthusiastic about this data, and are utilizing staff expertise in data analysis to help us organize this information, thus adding another crucial fellowship component to our problem profile.

The setup for each focus group was as follows: Eight-hours, twenty participants total. Clean time: Designed to vary, from one to five, five to ten, over ten years. Regular members mixed with service folks. People who have (1) never been involved in service; (2) people who used to be involved in service but are not currently involved; and (3) people currently involved in service. Male and female, English-speaking and non-English-speaking, and racial diversity where appropriate. Other things to be considered: educational background and work experience.

The RD worked with the RCM to find a meeting place and select the focus group participants. Staff contacted the RDs by phone. The RDs and RCMs for each focus group area received a detailed letter with the above information. Service resumes were distributed to members who choose to submit one.

### **Staff Tracking Sheets**

Part of the internal research conducted at the WSO consisted of tracking various communication operations within the office (see Attachment C and D). The Fellowship Services Team, Customer Service, Conventions Staff, and other WSO staff completed tracking sheets for various kinds of communication activities for a designated period. CTF members subsequently made telephone callbacks to some WSO customers to check the quality of certain communication activities. Through this research, we hope we can begin to (1) establish a baseline of *purposes* of staff communications (i.e., service questions, literature orders, meeting information requests, etc.); (2) develop a breakdown of the *percentages* of these types of calls across WSO operations; and (3) assess areas of difficulty in terms of response times, difficulty of response, and customer satisfaction.

### **CAR Workshop Survey**

The CAR workshop tool was developed at the January meeting (see Attachment E). The CTF asked board members attending CAR workshops to pick 15 to 20 people—five of whom should be RDs and 10-15 general participants. The purpose of the survey was to gauge the effectiveness of the communication during the presentation at the workshop. This information will be used to begin a baseline on NAWS face-to-face communication effectiveness for the problem profile.

### **CTF Timeline for the Remainder of Our Work**

*April 2000:* Progress report to conference participants from the CTF, including a summary of the group's work to date. The CTF will hold at least one conference call in early April to prepare for the WSC'00.

*May 2000:* Analysis of the research data will continue. The board will incorporate any input from WSC'00 discussions and/or actions into the remaining work. The quantitative data analysis will supplement the initial draft of the problem profile report and add supporting detail to the problem statements.

*June 2000 meeting:* The CTF will meet face-to-face in early June to finalize the problem profile report, and to the extent possible, begin to provide specific direction on objectives, goals, and tasks for the solution phase of the CTF project.

*July 2000 board meeting:* The CTF will present their final report to the board, including the problem profile report and any recommendations for carrying out the remainder of the work during the next conference cycle, assuming WSC'00 accepts the board's proposal to authorize a new (follow-up) project for the 2000-2002 conference year.

We hope this report brings all interested members "up to speed" with the progress of the CTF. We have worked diligently to complete our research. We hope the fellowship and the conference will support the continuation of this work to its completion during the next conference cycle by adopting the follow-up project we are proposing to complete the scope of work begun this past year.



## **ATTACHMENT A**

### **NARCOTICS ANONYMOUS WORLD SERVICES’ ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTITY STATEMENT**

#### **WHO WE ARE:**

Narcotics Anonymous World Services is comprised of the World Board, the World Service Office, and the World Service Conference.

#### **WHAT WE DO:**

NA World Services provides services and support to ensure the unity of NA, and facilitates the continuation and growth of NA worldwide.

#### **WHY:**

So that every addict in the world has the chance to find the opportunity for a new way of life.

#### **HOW:**

NA World Services achieves its purpose by always acting in accordance with the principles of our program, emphasizing honesty, trust, goodwill, and integrity. We use fair, fiscally sound, efficient, and effective decision-making, policies, and practices.

#### **WHERE:**

Internally: among our fellowship, conference participants, board and committees, and WSO staff.  
Externally: among the general public, treatment and correctional personnel, medical professionals, governmental and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and families.

## ATTACHMENT B

# FOCUS GROUP MEMBER QUESTIONNAIRE (REVISED)

*To be filled out at beginning of focus group*

**Focus Group Location:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Member name (first name is ok):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Male/Female (circle one)**

**Age:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Race and/or Cultural Background (optional)** \_\_\_\_\_

**Clean Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Do You Speak English? Yes No (circle one)**

**Do You Read English? Yes No (circle one)**

**Are you currently involved in NA service? Yes No (circle one)**

**If so, in what capacity? (current service position)** \_\_\_\_\_

**If not, have you even been involved in NA service? Yes No (circle one)**

**If you have had past (but not current) service experience, what date(s) and positions describe your service to NA?**

**Dates:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Positions:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Highest Level of Education** \_\_\_\_\_

**Present Employment** \_\_\_\_\_

### A. Correspondence

**Do you know the functions/services at the WSO?**

---

**Direct WSO Interaction:**

**A. Have you had any previous experience in contacting the WSO? (If the answer is no, please move to question #E)**

---

**B. How did you locate the telephone number or address for world services?**

---

**C. Was that experience helpful?**

---

**D. How helpful are the voice mail options when you call the WSO?**

---

**E. How available do you find information regarding world conventions?**

---

**F. How easy is it to understand the communication that comes from world services?**

---

**G. Have you received world services surveys and, if so, did you understand what they were asking?**

---

**H. Rate your overall experience with world services? (1-10 - 1=poor; 10=excellent)**

---

**Suggestions for improvement:**

**A. Why do you think more members don't contact the WSO from the group level?**

---

**B. How can we better communicate from world services to your group?**

---

**C. How can world services improve its service reporting?**

---

**D. How can world services better gain access to information about local members' needs for products and services?**

---

1. Internet Access

**Accessibility to Internet**

**A. Do you have Internet access?**

---

**B. Are you aware of the website, [www.na.org](http://www.na.org)?**

---

**C. Do you use it?**

---

**D. What is it presently used for?**

---

**Suggestions for improvement**

**A. How can world services improve site navigation?**

---

**B. What information/services are still needed in this medium?**

---

2. Periodicals

**Accessibility of periodicals**

**A. Do you or your group receive the *NA Way*?**

---

**B. Are you aware of *Meeting By Mail?* *Reaching Out?* *NAWS News*?**

---

**C. How easy is it to understand the communication that comes from world services?**

---

**D. What is your overall perception of the periodicals?**

---

**Suggestions for Improvement**

**A. What can world services do to make it more convenient for members to contribute articles and input?**

---

**B. Is there some need that is not being met with the current periodicals? If so, what?**

---

**C. Do you believe your group would like to receive an Executive Summary of world services' activities from the World Board?**

---

**D. If so, what type of information would your group like to know?**

---

**E. How frequently should such a summary be distributed?**

---

**F. How could the *Conference Agenda Report* be more user-friendly?**

---

**G. Should it be used primarily for providing information for voting purposes?**

---

**H. Or should it be used more as a tool for fellowship-wide discussion?**

---

**I. What topics would you like to see addressed by the fellowship in the future?**

---

3. Products and Services (present and future)

**Questions:**

**A. Which would you say is most widely used by your group: book length literature, booklets, or informational pamphlets?**

---

**B. Are recovery key-tags and medallions an important product for your group?**

---

**C. Do current products and services meet yours and your group's needs?**

---

**D. Which products and services are most useful to you in your recovery?**

---

**E. Does your home group provide the White Booklet and IP's along with the key tags or chips to newcomers and members?**

---

**F. What types of literature study meetings occur locally?**

---

**Suggestions for Improvement:**

**A. What kinds of new literature would you like to have?**

---

**B. What new products and services do you want or need?**

---

**C. Are there "special needs" addicts in your area that need additional types of products and services than what they are currently receiving?**

---

**D. If there are such addicts, what services and products do they need?**

---

**E. Are any of our products and services outdated?**

---

**F. If so, what products/services and should be revised? Eliminated?**

---

4. Translations

**Questions:**

**A. How would you rate the need for additional translated service material in your locale? (1-10 - 1=low; 10=high)**

---

**B. How would you rate the need for additional translated recovery material? (1-10 - 1=low; 10=high)**

---

6. World Wide Workshop System

**Questions:**

**A. Do you see a need for a service workshop system worldwide? If so, what purposes could these workshops serve in your NA community?**

---

**B. How does your community presently discuss service issues?**

---

**C. Would it be helpful for world services to use these workshops to assist in the training of local members in service efforts such as PI, H&I, and conventions?**

---

**D. Do you see these workshops as opportunities to provide input to world services projects?**

---

**E. How often should a workshop occur in your area (in this case we are speaking of not your ASC but a multi-regional geographic area)?**

---

**F. How many workshops is it reasonable to expect of world services each conference year?**

---

### ATTACHMENT C

# CUSTOMER SERVICE CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING SHEET

## Original correspondence:

Date Received: \_\_\_\_\_

Correspondent:  
Treatment Centers    Corrections    Friends/Family  
Drug Courts    Book Stores    Hospitals    Libraries  
NA Group    NA Member    Service Committee  
RSO/ASO    ASC/RSC

Format:  
Regular Mail                      E-mail                      Fax

Nature of Correspondence:  
Literature Order                      Information request                      Order Follow up

Language  
English                      Spanish                      Other

Response: (if non-order correspondence)  
Turn Around Time: \_\_\_\_\_day(s)



**ATTACHMENT D**

**HUMAN RESOURCES  
TELEPHONE TRACKING SHEET**

Date of Call: \_\_\_\_\_ Duration of Call: \_\_\_\_\_ (minutes)  
Response time to return the call \_\_\_\_\_  
# of staff involved to complete the call \_\_\_\_\_  
Did it require a mailing? \_\_\_\_\_

Caller: World Pool      Human Resource Panel      Professional      Staff

**Nature of Call:**

Benefits      Personnel      Transfer      Health and Safety  
HRP      Professional Organizations      World Pool  
Employment      Agencies/solicitation

## ATTACHMENT E (CAR Workshop Survey)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Region: \_\_\_\_\_

Service position: \_\_\_\_\_

Clean date: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Have you attended a *Conference Agenda Report (CAR)* workshop in the past?

YES or NO

2. Did you read the *CAR* before the workshop?

YES or NO

3. Did the presentation improve your understanding of the *CAR*?

YES or NO

3.A. Please rate the level of improvement of your understanding on a scale of one to five.  
(1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest)

1—2—3—4—5

4. Please rate your level of satisfaction of the answers given during the Q&A session on a scale of one to five. (1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest)

1—2—3—4—5

5. Please rate the usefulness of this *CAR* workshop on a scale of one to five. (1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest)

1—2—3—4—5

6. What did you like MOST about this *CAR* workshop? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. What did you like LEAST about this *CAR* workshop? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_