

TRANSITION GROUP REPORT TO WSC 1998

Background to the Inventory/Resolution Process

This work represents the culmination of a process that began in 1992 at the world services meeting in Cincinnati, Ohio. At that meeting, the Interim Committee first suggested the need for a slowdown in world services' activities for the purpose of inventorying world services' processes, structure, and project development. The 1993 World Service Conference saw the creation of the Composite Group, who, from May 1993 to March 1995, facilitated a comprehensive inventory of world services. The results of the Composite Group's research were eventually summarized in Book One of the group's 1995 report. They had also requested the hiring of an independent consultant to evaluate the world services system and presented the results of his analysis in Book Two of their 1995 report. Faced by the fact that the information-gathering phase of the inventory had been completed, but that there was no group in line to carry on with the work, the WSC leadership proposed the adoption of a second plan, known as the Resolution Plan, to the 1995 World Service Conference participants who endorsed the plan and ratified a second group of six trusted servants known as the Resolution Group.

Utilizing a number of resources including *A Temporary Working Guide*, *A Guide to Service*, the *Composite Group's Report* (Books One and Two), as well as the participation of additional members invited from across the fellowship and a significant amount of written input from the fellowship at large, the Resolution Group eventually offered a series of Resolutions to the 1996 WSC: Resolutions A (a change in participants and participation at a new WSC), B (the adoption of a single board), C2 (a significantly downsized standing committee structure), E (a unified budget), F (a world pool of trusted servants) and G (the creation of a Human Resources Panel) were all adopted in principle. At that same WSC, the World Services Vision Statement and the World Service Conference Mission Statement were also adopted, providing a mandate to measure all world service activities against the reference point of our fellowship's core principles and primary purpose.

The Transition Group's Work During the Past Two Years

Also at the 1996 conference, the Transition Group was formed and charged with the responsibility of developing the specific proposals that would assist the conference in the creation of the new structure proposed by the Resolutions. The Transition Group members ratified at the 1996 WSC were Saul Alvarado from Panama City, Panama; Susan Blau from Chicago, Illinois; Rose Crawford from Tampa, Florida; Bob Jordan from Tampa, Florida; Tim Banner from Dallas, Texas; Pete Cole from Greensboro, North Carolina; David James from Manchester, England; Shannon Lynagh from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and Jane Nickels, from Poquonock, Connecticut. The First Alternate to the core group was Matt Schmeck from San Francisco, California, and the Second Alternate was Adam Wasserman from Montreal, Quebec. Over the past year, however, Shannon Lynagh has had to resign from the group due to employment responsibilities.

The group first met during the weekend of 12-13 July 1996, where we oriented ourselves to the task before us, and made preliminary decisions regarding some internal participation and communication ground rules, as well as how to solicit input from our membership. After this meeting, we sent out questionnaires to all former Resolution Group members, to everyone in the Transition Group Resource Pool, and to all conference participants to help us clarify the direction of our work in our future meetings. We then met during the weekend of 24-25 August

1996, and developed our working timeline, in which we lined-out our various tasks, and set dates by which each should be accomplished if we were to finish our assigned work.

At this meeting, we also began to “break out” each resolution into its various component parts in order to get a better idea of the kinds of detail we would need to focus on to complete our work. For example, in examining Resolution B, which deals with the World Board, we knew we would need to identify the recommended number of board members, their qualifications, the functions of the board, the “spiritual guardian” component as mandated by the amendment to Resolution B, and so forth. We had to do similar “break outs” for each of the six resolutions at this meeting. Then, based on the workload that we saw before us, we divided our group into two smaller work units, one to deal with Resolutions A and G, and the other to deal with Resolutions B and C2.

We had a meeting during the weekend of 25-26 October 1996, and our work groups set about the task of further defining our work outline, which we then presented to conference participants. In the report from this October meeting, we also realized that we wanted to achieve as many face-to-face input settings as possible. With this in mind, we recommended that there be a world services meeting during the fall of 1997. We felt that this meeting, along with the 1997 WSC in April, would provide us with a minimum of two face-to-face input sessions with conference participants, along with the regular channel of ongoing written input from the fellowship at large. We felt that opening as many avenues of direct input to our membership as possible was essential to the success of this project.

We then met in January 1997, and began finalizing our report to the 1997 World Service conference participants. Our 1997 report (the mint green one) was finalized in March 1997, and sent to conference participants about thirty days prior to the 1997 WSC. We received a lot of input at the conference, and, in our June 1997 meeting, began to incorporate that input into our work. For example, the 1997 WSC participants told us to focus on Resolutions B through G. They felt that when these Resolutions have been implemented, then world services might better focus on Resolution A. In view of this input, we changed our work strategy, deciding not to forward specific proposals for Resolution A for action at WSC '98. WSC '97 conference participants' input indicated that about 70% of conference participants were in favor of change, but as to the direction of that change, the conference was split between the four models that we offered as a choice for Resolution A. As a result, we have decided to simply present a report on Resolution A to conference participants later this year.

We then met in July, in order to finalize our revised proposals for conference participants' input at the August world services meeting. We sent out our report (the red one) about thirty days prior to the world services meeting in Providence, Rhode Island, and received input at that meeting that has been incorporated into our work that is being presented in this year's *Conference Agenda Report*. Our October 1997 meeting report outlined the many changes to our work as the result of participants' input from the Providence world services meeting. A brief summary of those changes includes: the procedure for new world service projects, World Board membership, the role of the Executive Director(s) of the WSO, the World Board's voting at the WSC, the composition of the Human Resources Panel, the duties of the Human Resources Panel, and the use of non-addicts in world services. As we reported in November, our proposals reflect these changes as they were discussed in Rhode Island.

If Motion #1 doesn't pass – Or, back to the drawing board

During the course of our discussions over the past two years, it became very clear to us that it was difficult to consider any one of Resolutions B through G separately from the others. In

this sense, we re-discovered what the Resolution Group (RG) itself had discussed in their reporting during the 1995-96 conference year. We, like the RG, found it impossible to consider the form and function of the World Board without having to consider its committee structure, the World Pool and Human Resources Panel, the unified budget, and the length of the conference cycle. All of the Resolutions adopted in 1996 made artificial divisions between the various components of the new structure for convenience sake. But in reality, we found that the system had to be designed as an entire mechanism whose parts function interdependently, just like the parts of a clock or an engine.

Because of the necessity of thinking of this new World Board as a series of interdependent components, it is clear to us that we are *not* presenting a series of independent "engine parts" for the conference's consideration. Rather, with regard to Resolutions B through G, we are presenting a new "engine," an interdependent service delivery *system*. The artificial divisions between its "parts," necessitated by our motion-oriented *Conference Agenda Report* format, could be misunderstood to mean that one "part" might be adopted or accepted, while another "part" could be revised or even removed from the world service system. However, such an assumption would be mistaken. We have developed a new World Board *system* whose parts are interdependent, and therefore not changeable without going back to the drawing board and creating yet another complete "system" whose parts have been redesigned to function together.

We are therefore committed, by both practical necessity as well as legal counsel, to the following course: We shall present Motion #1 for the conference's consideration. If that motion is not adopted, we do not plan to present any further motions for consideration at the World Service Conference. We do not adopt this course of action to limit the conference's ability to change the world service structure. The conference always has the ability to direct another group to go back to the drawing board and develop a new system that will meet the practical and legal requirements of a new world service system, if conference participants do not agree with the structure being proposed.

We ask that all members please remember that the following system being proposed represents the culmination of the entire inventory/resolution process that has received widespread participation and direction from our membership. In this sense, this system being proposed reflects a collective effort that attempts to be most representative of the vast majority of both conference participants' and home group members' input for at least the past five years. All of their input and deliberation, along with all of our collective synthesis of this information, including the legal preparation that has been done to ready us for the change to the world service structure, have given us a clear mandate: We were given the task of making Resolutions B through G, which were adopted principle at the 1996 World Service Conference, a workable reality. To do so, we knew that we would need to design a viable legal and practical system that would be created within the spirit of the resolutions but that would also, most importantly, *work*. All of your input, and our deliberation, has been based upon the following four basic premises: 1) there will be one World Board; 2) the committees are committees of the World Board; 3) there will be a World Pool and a Human Resources Panel; and 4) there will be a Unified Budget.

We have designed this system according to these four premises. Thus, if either Resolution B or C2 was not adopted, for example, it would render the other resolutions inoperative within the structure that has been prepared based upon the work that we have completed. The system we are proposing has been legally researched, and has been built according to that research, as well as according to all of the fellowship input that has been forwarded during the inventory/resolution process. We have therefore concluded that the only practical way for us

to proceed at this point is to give you what we have designed according to all of your input, as well as that of our legal and financial consultants, as the new system to be adopted.

The World Service Inventory: “Steps Four Through Seven”

We have followed the conference’s lead in not presenting any proposals for conference action regarding Resolution A at this year’s WSC. Like conference participants, we believe that the changes to our World Service Conference, and to our membership’s representation there, implied by Resolution A will require (1) more time for the various geographical areas across our fellowship to evolve sufficiently to make a zonal or even continental representational format a practical reality, and (2) ample time for the fellowship as a whole to discuss, input, and help develop a new representational format. Because such maturation and input/development processes can’t be mandated by any service body’s action, we agree that the most practical thing to do today regarding Resolution A is for us to provide a report prior to the 1998 World Service Conference to help the conference frame the issue for future discussion and eventual action.

The changes implicit in Resolutions B through G, however, can be implemented today. We believe, in fact, that taking action to implement them now is in keeping with our principles and with both our individual and our collective experience. Both the Composite Group and the Resolution Group, at times, likened the world services inventory to our program’s process of working the steps. The Composite Group helped world services to do its Fourth and Fifth Steps. World Services--and that means *all* conference participants, including our regions’ representatives, as well as the entire 1994 WSC collectively--did a lengthy inventory of everything that was wrong with our system. Together, we identified confusing lines of authority and responsibility, inefficiency and duplication of similar services, “turf wars” between the various components of the system, a lack of short-term and long-term planning, a need for better budgeting practices, the need for a more principle-based elections process, and a number of other “defects” in our system. . . . We took our inventory and, like the Basic Text says, we “sorted through the confusion and contradictions” of our service system, in the hope of “trying to free ourselves of living in old, useless patterns” of behavior.

We identified our defects, as well as our assets, and then we published them for the world to see. We did our “Fifth Step” with the whole fellowship! We said, “here are all of the things wrong with the system. We admit that they’re wrong. And we do want to do better.” So the conference created the Resolution Group in order to help us work our “Sixth Step.” In forming our Resolutions for change, the RG helped us to see a new way to conduct our affairs—a way that pointed out the various shortcomings of our system and tried to address them comprehensively. They even gave us a “vision” of what we should be focusing on with the World Services Vision Statement. And the 1996 conference participants, in adopting the Resolutions, the World Services Vision Statement, and the World Service Conference Mission Statement, expressed our collective willingness to change. Together, once again, we said “These Resolutions appear to be a way, in principle, for us to move away from our old patterns, and into our new way of doing things. And we want to change. We want to improve the way we’re doing things, and to better serve our members.” We had developed a vision of what we could become as our goal to attain within *any* service structure, and we truly began working our “Sixth Step” when we expressed our willingness to move in the direction of the Resolutions

The Transition Group, in further developing the details of the Resolutions, has tried to increase that willingness to change. But, just as these steps work in our personal lives, no change is possible without action. We have done our Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Steps—but we won’t change until we step out in faith in our “Seventh Step.” Most of us know the pain and

the wreckage that results from putting off Step Seven in our personal lives. And there is no reason to believe that the world services "inventory" is governed by any different or lesser principles. *We knew in 1982 that we needed to change our service structure.* And world services has been attempting for the past fifteen years to find a way out of our "Temporary" service manual! Isn't it just like us to call something "temporary" and then hold onto it for fifteen years? We have edged up to the moment of change for over a decade, but when the time came – we backed away. Fear and lack of trust kept us time and again from stepping into faith, and into change. Isn't it time for world services to become more efficient, more productive, more responsive to our members, and more prepared to deal with the reality of the increasing challenges that face us as the result of our growing international membership? Isn't it time to take one step closer toward realizing the day when *no* addict, regardless of language, culture, or geographic location need die without having heard that there is a better way to live? To take one step closer to developing a world service system that can be more responsive to our members, so that NA communities and world services can truly work together in unity and cooperation to carry our message? To take one step closer to the day when world services' public relations efforts are more solidly unified than ever before to help ensure that NA really does have universal recognition and respect as a viable program of recovery?

We have much work to do! And the time to begin is now.

In a report regarding the possibility of a world services inventory that seems now to have begun so long ago, the Interim Committee asked a simple question in 1992--"If not now," they asked, "when?" "If not us," they questioned, "who?" We strongly believe that the time for world services to work "Step Seven" is today. Our program emphasizes "progress" over "perfection." We know that implementing the Transition Group's work won't "miraculously" solve all world services' problems, just as our first attempt at surrendering to the Seventh Step does not result in our becoming "perfect." In fact, we believe that to fully implement the ideas described in Motion #1 (the World Board), Motion #2 (the Unified Budget), Motion #3 (the World Pool and the Human Resources Panel), and Motion #4 (the WSC Co-Facilitators) will take about two years. We need to understand and support that this will be a process. Allowing this time necessary to fully implement these ideas is the biggest reason we are recommending the delay of implementing Motion #5 (the two-year conference cycle) until after WSC 2000.

Implementing these proposals will simply be the first step toward real, productive change. But even a journey of a thousand miles begins with that first step. Without that first leap of faith, no change is possible – either in our personal lives, or in the long history of developing the world's first internationally unified and globally responsive 12 step membership organization! Emphasizing "progress" rather than "perfection," we have an answer to the 1992 Interim committee's question: "If not us, who?" -- We believe that the 1998 World Service Conference participants should make history by implementing the new World Board and its accompanying service system. "If not now, when?" -- We believe that the time to begin the newest phase in our service structure's growth and development is at WSC '98.

RESOLUTION B AND C-2 – THE WORLD BOARD AND ITS COMMITTEES

Background to th World Board and its Committees

In developing the proposals for the World Board and its committees, we reviewed a comprehensive list of all duties and responsibilities of the current world services system. We agreed that, to simply reproduce that list in its totality would be to risk re-inventing the same system that world services has spent so much time, effort, and resources to move toward improving upon. However, we have also ensured, in creating the proposed board and committee structure, that all of our fellowship's service *functions* remain vital components of the new system. We therefore are making general recommendations (what our trusted servants have come to call "External Guidelines") as to the duties and responsibilities of the new system in order to allow the new board and its committees some latitude in defining their processes.

In other words, we have identified general areas of responsibility for the board and its committees, but as to how they accomplish their work (what we've come to call "Internal Guidelines"), we need to allow the board the latitude to develop their own protocols based upon what actually works within the new and as-yet unfamiliar system. To do otherwise would be to attempt to write "Internal" guidelines based purely on theory, and not on experience—probably not the best way to proceed. At the same time, those vital functions such as H&I, PI, literature development, and translations will remain world level resources within the new board's committee structure, maintaining a point of information and guidance, continuity, and consistency that all local committees will continue to be able to contact and rely upon.

We are recommending to form the World Board during the 1998 WSC, with the board assuming responsibilities on 12 June 1998. Part of the new board's responsibilities during the 1998-1999 conference year will be to further refine its operating procedures and its various committees' responsibilities. The new board would then be required to submit those procedures and responsibilities for conference review in 1999. We believe that the seating of the new board should take place in 1998 for at least two reasons: (1) The board needs to be allowed to develop its own "Internal Guidelines." Rather than create another group to flesh out the new board's duties and operational procedures, the new board can achieve these objectives with the added benefit of not having to spend its first year re-interpreting the previous group's efforts. No matter how thorough the Transition Group's work, there is simply no way for any group to have all the answers up front as to what the new board will be faced with in developing their processes and procedures.

And (2) The inventory/resolution process is now into its fifth year: it's time for world services to move forward, reassuming their primary responsibility of helping better carry the message and thereby developing projects and services more closely related to our core principles. It's time, we believe, for world services to work its "Seventh Step," and begin the long-awaited changes to our service structure.

For more in-depth background to Motion #1, please see Addendum #1.

Combining Two Corporations

Motion #1 also involves the combining of our two existing non-profit corporations (the World Convention Corporation and the World Service Office) into a single non-profit

corporation that will be known as “Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Incorporated.” Also, even though they’re not legal entities today, the World Service Board of Trustees, as well as the WSC committees, will also be combined into this new entity in order to best streamline the entire world services system. This name change thus reflects the larger scope of the new organization over the present way world services is organized, with its confusing lines of accountability, divided budgeting and budget reporting mechanisms, and sometimes overlapping duties and responsibilities. In streamlining our legal structure, we will also simplify our budget reporting, so this new corporation really reflects a legal entity that is more in line with the spirit of the resolutions for a downsized, more efficient and more responsive world service system adopted in principle during the 1996 World Service Conference.

In the new World Board, we have designated board members as simply “members,” rather than “trustees” or “directors.” This simple designation helps to allow for the considerable change in the board’s responsibilities which are greater than those of both the current “trustees” and the current “directors.” It also has the added benefit of reducing the kinds of expectations and “baggage” that prospective new board members may bring to their role as World Board members by not associating their new responsibilities with either of our present boards and their respective responsibilities.

In order to maintain a working administrative, decision-making body between the end of WSC ’98 and the legal commencement of the new board on 12 June 1998, Motion #1 outlines the way in which the Interim Committee will need to remain in existence immediately after the 1998 World Service Conference. In this way, we are ensuring that there will be a body in place to act on the conference’s behalf between the end of the 1998 WSC and the beginning of the new board’s implementation. Doing so also allows for the legal necessity of having a decision-making body in place through the combining of our legal entities into a single 501c3 non-profit corporation.

All motions relevant to the *Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust* and to the Internal Use document in this year’s *Conference Agenda Report* will be presented by the WSO Board of Directors and the World Service Board of Trustees. Since the WSO board planned to present other housekeeping motions to the *FIPT* and the Internal Use document, it seemed the easiest way for the fellowship to review and consider all possible changes at the same place in this year’s *CAR*.

Changing for the Future

We understand that some of the language here and that follows is legalistic and maybe even a little scary. But the fact is, we’re no longer a fledgling organization like we were when the legal entities of the WCC and the WSO were first formulated. Further, the laws governing non-profit organizations have changed pretty significantly since the early and mid-eighties. The Transition Group has worked with our attorneys and accounting consultants every step of the way to ensure that the World Service Conference remains in charge of the world service system. We believe as strongly as you do that our service boards and committees are “directly responsible to those they serve,” and that our leaders are trusted servants and do not govern. Nothing in any of our proposals contradicts these core principles of how our service structure will operate. Nevertheless, we are required by law to state many of the World Board’s responsibilities in a way that would be legally recognized by a court of law. We hope that you’ll bear with us through what might seem kind of threatening to many of our members — lawyer-speak! Please understand that, for our new system to be legal, and legally viable, and to protect our status as a non-profit corporation exempting us from for-profit tax laws, we need to

state things in a way that will stand the test of time and legal challenges, protecting our organization and our fellowship's properties for the future.

Motion #1: To implement Resolutions B and C-2 by adopting the following External Guidelines for the World Board. Further, that elections for the World Board be held at WSC 1998 with the new corporation taking effect 12 June 1998. The current Interim Committee, World Service Office Board of Directors, and the World Convention Corporation will continue to function until 11:59PM 11 June 1998. The Interim Committee will be responsible to make necessary decisions affecting NA world services and to assist in preparing the agenda for the first meeting of the new World Board.

Intent: To implement Resolutions B and C-2 previously adopted by WSC 1996 as follows: Resolution B: To approve in principle the adoption of a World Board, replacing the current World Service Board of Trustees, WSO Board of Directors, WCC Board of Directors and the WSC Administrative Committee and further that within the consolidated World Board, there be a specific group whose purpose fulfills the role and function as originally defined for the WSB who remain guardians of the traditions and ensure the spiritual nature of the checks and balances that they provide. Resolution C-2: To approve in principle a significantly downsized standing committee structure responsible to the World Board.

World Board External Guidelines

World Board's Mission

The mission of the World Board is to contribute to the continuation and growth of Narcotics Anonymous. The board serves as a primary resource for the NA fellowship by providing the support needed to carry our message while ensuring that the service and support provided are of the highest quality possible.

Accountability Statement

The World Board is the service board of the World Service Conference. As such, it is accountable to the final authority within our service structure as stated by our Second Concept – the groups, who retain the final responsibility and authority for all NA services. In accordance with the principle of delegation described in our Third Concept, the World Service Conference, on the fellowship's behalf, delegates to the World Board the authority to provide effective services.

Purpose of the World Board

The purpose of the World Board is to:

- *Carry the message of recovery to addicts who still suffer from addiction.*
- *Provide support to the Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous in their efforts to provide the opportunity to recover from addiction.*
- *Oversee all the activities of NA world services, including the fellowship's primary service center, the World Service Office.*
- *Provide service to individuals or groups of addicts seeking recovery from addiction and assist the public in understanding addiction and the Narcotics Anonymous program for recovery from addiction. Such assistance may include direct and indirect communication with addicts, organizations, agencies, governments and the public.*

- *Ensure that no resources generated from Trust Properties are utilized to engage in any activities or exercise any powers that do not further of the primary purpose of Narcotics Anonymous, which is to carry the message to the addict who still suffers.*
- *Hold and manage in a trust for the fellowship the income produced by any world service activities in a manner that is within the spirit of the Twelve Steps, Twelve Traditions, and Twelve Concepts of Narcotics Anonymous.*
- *Hold in trust for the Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous the rights to the exclusive control, use, printing, duplicating, sales and use of all the intellectual properties, logos, trademarks, copyrighted materials, emblems or other intellectual and physical properties of the WSC, or the Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous as a whole in accordance with the will of the WSC.*
- *Control and manage the exclusive production, printing, manufacture or reproduction of the properties or the licensing for production, printing, manufacture of the properties of the Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous and offer these properties for sale to the fellowship and the general public.*

General Duties

The duties of the World Board shall be understood to be administrative in nature. So that it can fulfill its mission and the will of the WSC, the general duties of the World Board are to:

- *Communicate all world service activity to our membership in accordance with the principles embodied in our Eighth Concept.*
- *Oversee the operations of the fellowship's primary service center, the World Service Office.*
- *Administer the activities necessary for the successful operation of the World Convention.*
- *Hold our fellowship's intellectual properties in trust in accordance with the Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust.*
- *Provide support and administration for all world service meetings.*
- *Plan and budget for basic service provision and project development.*
- *Be accountable for all world service budget responsibilities.*
- *Select committee members for project development and completion.*
- *Oversee activities associated with how our fellowship and service structure interact with society.*
- *Oversee development of new literature, periodicals, and translations.*
- *Address philosophical issues and questions about our traditions and concepts, developing position papers when necessary.*
- *Make necessary decisions affecting NA world services when the World Service Conference is not in session, always mindful of the priorities previously established by the World Service Conference.*

Membership

The World Board will consist of twenty-four members elected by the World Service Conference. These conference-elected members will have equal participation rights, including voting on the board and at the World Service Conference. Board members may not, however, vote on items that have been submitted to the groups in the Conference Agenda Report, or on any other items of Old Business at the World Service Conference. The Executive Director(s) of the World Service Office will be non-voting members of the board.

Membership Qualifications

In addition to the qualities expressed in Concept Four such as humility, integrity, trustworthiness, and strong commitment to open communication, the following qualifications for nomination and election to the World Board are written to express the variety of skills and experience necessary to the board's optimum operation. A single individual may not have all of the qualifications listed below. These qualifications should not be viewed as a list of absolute requirements, but rather as an expression of the qualities and experience that will help the board to best serve our fellowship:

- *History of both completing work independently and working well within a group*
- *Familiarity with and commitment to the World Service Conference vision of a global fellowship demonstrated through world service or personal life experience*
- *Familiarity with Narcotics Anonymous service structure*
- *Administrative skills*
- *Experience with plan development and financial forecasting*
- *Organizational and communication skills*
- *Ability to donate sufficient time to attend meetings, travel, and to fulfill the extended commitment of board membership*
- *A working knowledge of the Twelve Steps, Traditions, and Concepts.*

Clean Time Requirement

All board members must have a minimum of ten (10) years clean.

Terms

The length of term for board members shall be six years. All members of the board are eligible for election for two consecutive terms.

*[With regard to the initial election of World Board members, the World Board will be initially formed by an election at the conference that is open to all nominations. To establish one-third of board seats rotating every two years, the first board will have one-third serving a two-year term, one-third serving a four-year term and one-third serving a six-year term. The length of term for the initial board members should be chosen by volunteers and then by lot.]**

Quorum and decision-making, Internal Elections, and Removal of Members

Quorum and Decision making: *The proposed quorum for regularly scheduled meetings of the World Board equals one half of all seated members plus one (e.g., were there twenty-four seated members, quorum would equal thirteen: one half the seated members – twelve – plus one). While the board should strive for consensus, its process requires a minimum of a majority of seated board members to vote in the affirmative (i.e., a minimum of thirteen “yes” votes) to represent a decision of the World Board.*

Participation and Internal Elections: *All board members shall have the right to full participation. All voting members of the executive Committee of the board will be elected by the board. Election to any position on the board will require a simple majority vote.*

* All bracketed items [] indicate terms and conditions pertinent to the transition from the old world services system to the new system being proposed. They are presented as “guidelines,” but of course will expire or roll off as the implementation of each of the system’s components takes effect.

Removal of Members: Members *may* be removed from the board by a two-thirds majority vote for the following causes:

1. Failure to attend two meetings within a twelve month period.
2. Relapse as defined by the Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous
3. Conviction of a felony or equivalent offense during their term of office.
4. Declared to be of unsound mind by a final order of a court.
5. Misappropriation of Narcotics Anonymous World Services funds.
6. Breach of statutory duties relating to a board member's standard of conduct as defined by the law of the state of incorporation.

Once removed from the board, former members may only be reinstated by an action of the World Service Conference. Removed members retain no rights of attendance and/or participation until such time as they have been reinstated by the WSC.

In the event of vacancies on the World Board due to removal or any other cause, the World Board may not fill such vacancies. Only the World Service Conference can elect World Board members, and all vacancies will remain until the World Service Conference elections.

Committees of the Board

The World Board accomplishes much of its work through its five committees: an executive committee; an events committee; a public relations committee; a fellowship relations committee; and a publications committee. There shall also be a group within the board to be known as the "guardians." All members serving in a leadership capacity for each committee shall be board members in order to provide for clear lines of communication.

Accountability

Committees are answerable and responsible to the World Board. In keeping with Concept Five, the World Board, in turn, is directly accountable to the World Service Conference, thus ensuring definite and direct lines of accountability across all world service operations.

Role of the Committees

The committees provide a resource to the World Board and to the fellowship in specific areas of operations.

Committee Makeup

A minimum of four World Board members will be assigned by the full board to each committee. The number and experience of non-board committee members chosen by the board from the world pool depends upon the projects assigned and prioritized by the WSC. Thus, each committee's size in a given year can vary, though each will always continue to exist.

Responsibilities

The following will be the committees' and guardians' composition and responsibilities:

I. The Executive Committee

The Executive Committee will consist of the following members:

1. The Chairperson of the World Board
2. The Vice-chairperson of the World Board

3. *The Treasurer of the World Board*
4. *The Secretary of the World Board*
5. *The Executive Director(s) of the WSO – in a non-voting capacity*

General Duties: *The Executive Committee will uphold the duties of the corporation and its officers in accordance with all applicable laws; direct the activities and the annual performance review of the Executive Director(s) of the WSO; retain responsibility for interacting with the executive director(s) between board meetings; remain responsible for the general administrative duties of world services; and make necessary decisions affecting NA world services when the World Board is not in session, always mindful of the priorities previously established by the board.*

Election and Removal: *The Executive Committee, with the exception of the Executive Director(s) of the WSO, will be elected by a majority vote of the board. Officers of the board can be removed from office by the board with a two-thirds majority vote.*

II. The Events Committee

The Events Committee will consist of four (4) board members, with any additional committee members being selected as necessary from the World Pool.

General Duties: *The Events Committee will be responsible for the logistical planning for WSC meetings (agenda items are actually set by the full board), the World Convention, and other world service meetings, while serving as a resource for regional/area convention committees.*

III. The Public Relations Committee

The Public Relations Committee will consist of four (4) board members, with additional committee members being selected as necessary from the World Pool.

General Duties: *The Public Relations Committee will be responsible for activities associated with how our fellowship and service structure interface with society. The committee will also guide the way we inform the public about NA, covering all public relations with the medical profession, the criminal justice system, governmental and non-governmental organizations, and the media. The Public Relations Committee will also serve as the H&I and PI contact for our fellowship and its local service committees.*

IV. The Fellowship Relations Committee

The Fellowship Relations Committee will consist of four (4) board members, with additional committee members being selected as necessary from the World Pool.

General Duties: *The Fellowship Relations Committee will be responsible for activities associated within our fellowship and service structure, conference policy and procedures, proposed changes to our service structure.*

V. The Publications Committee

The Publications Committee will consist of four (4) board members, with additional committee members being selected as necessary from the World Pool.

General Duties: *The Publications Committee will be responsible for overseeing the development of our fellowship's new literature, while coordinating and prioritizing the translations of existing literature, mindful of the need for conceptual fidelity of translations and literature. The committee will also be*

responsible for the revisions of existing literature, while serving as a resource for area and regional literature committees and local translations committees.

VI. The Guardians

The Guardians will consist of four (4) members appointed by the full board from the board's conference-elected membership.

General Duties: *These members will serve as a resource to the fellowship, the World Board, and to the World Service Conference. Acting as a kind of "bellwether"¹ for our fellowship and for the World Board, the guardians shall address principle-related issues confronting our membership. A group whose responsibilities involve the very core principles of our program, the guardians are charged with the responsibility of moving proactively on such fellowship issues by developing position papers, though they also may provide guidance to our membership on issues as identified by the fellowship as problematic, controversial and/or topical. Remaining the "guardians" of NA's Traditions and Concepts, this group will also guide the World Board in philosophical discussions that affect the continuation and growth of NA.*

¹ Bellwether: Refers to the practice of "belling" a member of a flock: indicates "one that takes the lead or initiative."

RESOLUTION E – THE UNIFIED BUDGET

Background to the Unified Budget

Under our current budgeting practices, world services develops three separate budgets each year: one for the World Service Conference and its related activities, one for the World Service Office, and one for the World Convention Corporation. The unified budget proposal is actually a proposal to coordinate all of this separate financial information into a single, comprehensive financial plan encompassing all of world services' activities. The current budget year for the World Service Office and the World Convention is 1 January through 31 December. The current budget year for the World Service Conference begins on 1 June and ends 31 May.

For an examination of how the Unified Budget will address the major problems with our current system, please see Addendum #2.

Provided that Motion #1 is adopted, the following will be presented:

Motion #2: To implement Resolution E by adopting the following Guidelines for the Unified Budget for NA World Services.

Intent: To implement Resolution E previously adopted by WSC '96 as follows.

Resolution E: To approve in principle the adoption of a unified budget encompassing all world service funds.

Unified Budget Guidelines

1. *Any new world service projects will have been thoroughly planned with an accompanying budget and timeline, and be prioritized and approved by the World Service Conference. No prospective project may be prioritized by WSC participants unless it has been accompanied by a project timeline and budget.*
2. *In order to reflect the realities of our service delivery system, all items submitted for budget consideration will be accompanied by an expense estimate that includes a staff-time component.*
3. *In the unified budget, provisions will be made for the maintenance of a world services operational reserve fund.*
4. *A four-tiered accounting process will be used in which funds shall be designated as:*
 - **Fixed Operational Funds** – *funds allocated toward world service activities that are recurring in nature and have little to no functional change from budget year to budget year.*
 - **Variable Operational Funds** – *funds allocated toward world service projects and/or activities that vary from budget year to budget year. This includes those items prioritized by the World Service Conference.*
 - **Capital Funds** – *funds allocated toward the planned use of cash to offset the effect of depreciation, improve asset value, provide financial resources necessary to effectively address the intellectual property management called for in the FIPT, or to acquire any fixed asset that has a depreciable value.*

- **Reserve Funds** – those allocations that are set aside to meet current and/or future financial needs.
5. The fiscal year end for Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. will be 30 June.

[The new World Board will spend the remainder of 1998 consolidating world services' funds. The board will then develop a unified budget for the first six months of 1999 prior to presenting the first annual unified budget covering the period of 1 July 1999 through 30 June 2000 to WSC 1999. This allows the conference to impact the upcoming budget year.]
 6. Beginning with 1999, the world services annual report will include the decisions made at the conference as well as the annual audit, and will be issued within **90 days?** after the end of the fiscal year. In addition to the already established protocols for an annual report and an annual audit, the World Board will issue quarterly financial reports to all conference participants.
 7. New project proposals can be forwarded from the fellowship and from the board itself. One of the duties of the World Board is to develop project plans which include budgets and timelines for all prospective world service projects. The World Board will report to the conference on all ideas that they receive, and will choose to propose some of those ideas to the conference for further discussion and eventual prioritization. The board will decide which items they believe are desirable, practical, and achievable and develop project plans for these items. These will be forwarded to conference participants prior to the WSC for eventual prioritization at the conference. No project proposal would be considered for prioritization or action during the same WSC as it was originally proposed.
 8. All project ideas submitted to the board from the fellowship will be considered and all forwarded projects, along with the board's decisions as to which projects will be further developed, will be reported to conference participants. In the event that conference participants do not agree with the board's decision to not develop an item for prioritization, the conference may provide direction that a project plan be developed and presented to the next World Service Conference for prioritization.
 9. While there is no minimum or maximum number of projects that may be offered and/or prioritized, all project-related decisions will, of course, be limited by available resources, both human and financial. For the purposes of budget development and oversight, the World Board will be responsible for determining Basic Services, which will appear under Fixed Operational Funds in the budget proposal. The conference will then prioritize projects based on available resources that will appear under Variable Operational Funds in the budget proposal and finally review and adopt the budget for the upcoming conference cycle.

<p style="text-align:center">RESOLUTION F – THE WORLD POOL RESOLUTION G – THE HUMAN RESOURCES PANEL</p>

Background to the World Pool and the Human Resource Panel

The inventory process has revealed our elections process to be less principle-based than conference participants would like it to be. The WSC self-assessment from 1994 stated that elections were often “squeaky wheel”-oriented, meaning that elections seemed often to be personality-driven and not necessarily based upon skills and experience. Members have also stated that the elections process needs to be opened up, providing everyone with the equal opportunity to serve the fellowship by creating an open, equitable, and principled election/selection process. Lastly, the '94 WSC self-assessment stated that world services needs to better utilize the now largely untapped resources that exist in our growing fellowship.

We believe that the creation of a Human Resource Panel and World Pool needs to make possible an election/selection process that will allow the World Service Conference to base trusted servant choices upon the principles of ability and experience, rather than familiarity and personality. We hope too that the HRP and the World Pool will allow members to be forwarded from around the world without having to be present at the conference to receive due consideration. While current conference procedure certainly allows for such nominations, the new process can make this kind of worldwide participation a more viable, principle-based reality. Lastly, we also understand that there is no effective way for our members to offer their talents to the fellowship that is viable and productive. A long-held recognition about our present system is that world services is not tapping even a fraction of the available resources that exists among our maturing fellowship. This process may 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.

Of course, we must recognize that, even with the adoption of the world Pool and the Human Resources Panel, such a shift in our attitudes about conference elections can only be accomplished gradually. We believe that the Human Resources Panel and the World Pool are potential agents of that necessary shift in our collective thinking. But we also believe that the new system and process itself will have to evolve over time. It may take years for this new process to take firm hold. But we believe creating the Human Resources Panel and the World Pool are the first step toward creating the necessary changes toward eliminating the “squeaky-wheel” orientation of our elections, opening up our process, and tapping into the wealth of skills and experience left virtually untapped by our current system.

For more detailed background to the World Pool and the Human Resources Panel, please see Addendum #3.

Provided that Motions #1 and #2 are adopted, the following will be presented:

Motion #3: To implement Resolutions F & G by adopting the following External Guidelines for the World Pool and the Human Resource Panel. Further, that elections for the Human Resources Panel be held at WSC 1998.

Intent: *To implement Resolutions F and G previously adopted by WSC '96 as follows:*

Resolution F: To approve in principle the adoption of a World Pool of experienced trusted servants as a resource to world service projects and initiatives. Resolution G: To approve in principle the adoption of a Human Resources Panel as a means by which the WSC may choose trusted servants based on the willingness to serve, experience, and knowledge.

External Guidelines for thw World Pool and the Human Resource Panel

Guidelines for General Eligibility and Implementation

[Additional eligibility requirements for the World Pool, criteria for selection of nominees, and administrative policy for the World Pool will be developed by the Human Resource Panel for presentation to the 2000 World Service Conference.]

Purpose of the World Pool

The purpose of the World Pool is to constitute a pool of trusted servants willing and qualified to serve on the World Board, the WSC Co-Facilitator positions, the Human Resources Panel, and the World Board's committee projects. The pool will consist of a compilation of members' service resumés demonstrating a variety of recovery- and service-related experience as well as any skills necessary for the successful completion of world level assignments.

Clean Time Requirement for the World Pool

Eligibility for World Pool inclusion requires all prospective pool candidates to have a minimum of five (5) years clean.

Purpose of the Human Resources Panel

The purpose of the Human Resources Panel is to:

- facilitate an election/selection process that will allow the World Service Conference to base trusted servoant choices upon the principles of ability and experience*
- allow members to be nominated from around the world without having to be present at the conference to receive due consideration*
- 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*

Duties of the HRP

The Human Resources panel provides a list of qualified candidates to serve the fellowship by:

- 1. 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.*
- 2. Utilizing all available resources for the purpose of soliciting candidates' service resumés worldwide.*
- 3. Screening applicants' resumés for the purpose of identifying qualifications and skills.*
- 4. Informing potential candidates as to the qualifications necessary to serve on the World Board, the terms of office, as well as of the general duties of the World Board, its committees, and the World Service Office.*
- 5. Informing potential candidates as to the qualifications necessary to serve as the WSC Co-Facilitator or as a member of the Human Resource Panel..*

6. *Providing the World Service Conference with a list of individuals best qualified for election to the World Board, the WSC Co-Facilitator positions, and the Human Resources Panel. 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 also have a limit of no more than three (3) candidates for each open position up for election.*
7. *Providing the World Board with a list of individuals' resumés (addicts and non-addicts) for appointment to serve on committee projects. (Clean time requirements are not applicable for non-addicts.)*
8. *Maintaining a pool of individuals' resumés for committee appointment in the event of a vacancy.*
9. *Having a face-to-face meeting or conference calls (when necessary) prior to the World Service Conference to review candidates' resumés for World Board and committee needs, determining the need for interviews of prospective candidates.*
10. *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 Resources Panel.*

Nominations

"Nominations" to the World Pool consist of submitting a service resumé for consideration to the Human Resources Panel. All members who meet the minimum requirements will be included in the World Pool. While local service boards' and committees' nominations of candidates to the World Pool are recommended, they are not required for nomination to the pool.

The Human Resources Panel will make nominations to the World Service Conference for election to the positions of World Board member, Conference Co-facilitator, and the Human Resources Panel positions. Nominations may also be made for each of these positions by conference participants, but it is recommended that all prospective candidates go through the World Pool/Human Resources process.

Accountability

The Human Resources Panel is accountable to the World Service Conference.

Composition

The Human Resources Panel will consist of four(4) conference-elected individuals.

Term

The term of office for the Human Resources Panel member will be one conference cycle. All members of the panel are eligible for election for two consecutive terms.

Membership Requirements

As well as holding no other world-level service commitment by the time they assume their duties on the Human Resource Panel, all prospective Human Resource Panel members should demonstrate the following:

- *Trustworthiness – possessing integrity and the ability to provide leadership (as discussed in our Fourth Concept).*

- *Discretion – possessing the ability to fulfill their responsibilities with the conference's confidence that service resumé's confidentiality will be protected.*
- *Experienced – members should possess previous world service experience, and should demonstrate some personnel/human resources experience.*
- *Ability to read English.*
- *A working knowledge of the Twelve Steps, Traditions, and Concepts of Narcotics Anonymous*

Clean Time

Human Resource Panel members must have a minimum of eight (8) years clean.

Participation by WSO Staff

WSO staff will be responsible for ensuring that communication is forwarded through all available channels regarding the needs of the World Board. The communication will identify the types of skills and experience needed for participation on the board and its committees. The staff will also have administrative and clerical responsibilities for the HRP as well as facilitate the meetings of the HRP.

WSC CO-FACILITATORS

Background to the Co-Facilitators Positions

An issue that arose during our discussions of the input from conference participants at the world services meeting in Providence, Rhode Island was that of how the facilitator(s) of the World Service Conference should be selected. Initially, we had planned to recommend that the Events Committee simply select or appoint the conference facilitator. But, upon further reflection, we have decided to recommend that the conference directly elect two co-facilitators of the World Service Conference.

We have a two reasons for the decision to create these positions. First, we believe that the co-facilitators should not be current board members, nor currently seated Regional Delegates. The conference is made up of Regional Delegates and World Board members, and needs trusted servants elected from outside both of these constituencies to facilitate the meeting fairly and impartially.

In addition to the issue of impartiality, we also believe that the conference should have the right to elect its own co-facilitators, just as the board is given the right to elect its own "chair." It is crucial for the optimal operation of the World Service Conference that participants believe in their co-facilitators and trust their integrity and impartiality. The only means by which these elements can reasonably be ensured, we believe, is to allow the conference itself to choose its co-facilitators.

We are recommending co-facilitators because the hours at the podium become long and arduous, and each co-facilitator will need someone to "relieve" (or sit in for) him or her. Facilitating the conference is simply too big a job for only one person. The Human Resources Panel will make recommendations as to the list of nominees for the positions, and it must also be emphasized that neither of the co-facilitators may hold any other world service responsibilities aside from facilitating the World Service Conference.

Provided that Motions #1, #2, and #3 are adopted, the following will be presented:

Motion #4: To create and implement the conference positions of WSC Co-Facilitators by adopting the following Guidelines. Further, that the WSC Co-Facilitators be elected at WSC 1998.

Intent: To provide for the equitable facilitation of all World Service Conference meetings.

WSC Co-Facilitators Guidelines

Purpose of the WSC Co-Facilitators

The purpose of the WSC Co-facilitators is to preside over the business meeting of the World Service Conference.

Clean Time Requirement for the WSC Co-Facilitators

WSC Co-Facilitators must have a minimum of eight (8) years clean time.

Duties of the WSC Co-Facilitators

The duties of the WSC Co-Facilitators are to:

- 1. Preside over the business meeting of the World Service Conference.*
- 2. Communicate with the World Board as necessary in order to be prepared for the conference meeting.*

Qualifications for the WSC Co-Facilitators

The qualifications for the WSC Co-Facilitators are:

- 1. A demonstrated ability to preside over business meetings.*
- 2. A working knowledge of WSC conference policies and procedures.*
- 3. A working knowledge of Robert's Rules of Order and general parliamentary procedure.*
- 4. Demonstrated organizational skills.*
- 5. Holding no other world service positions or responsibilities at the time of assuming the co-facilitator's duties.*
- 6. A working knowledge of the Twelve Steps, Traditions, and Concepts of Narcotics Anonymous.*

Accountability

WSC Co-Facilitators are accountable to the World Service Conference.

Term

The term for each position will be one conference cycle. The Co-Facilitators may be elected to two consecutive terms.

TWO-YEAR CONFERENCE CYCLE

Background to the Two-year Cycle

The Transition Group is also proposing a change from our current one-year conference cycle to a two-year cycle. Our present “one-year” conference cycle is, for all practical purposes, actually a six-month work cycle. Each year in April, we hold our annual WSC. Office staff and trusted servants alike then scramble afterwards to shift priorities to accommodate the recent conference’s actions, as well as to report on the proceedings. For all intents and purposes, the actual work mandated by conference actions starts up in June. The *Conference Agenda Report* deadline is December 1. The result? A six-month window, from the middle of June until the middle of December, to complete all board and committee work assigned by the conference so that the CAR can be distributed in January in time for CAR workshops across the fellowship.

We believe that the two-year cycle will lengthen the actual work cycle to approximately fifteen months—a more realistic time frame in which to complete conference-prioritized work. Within the two-year cycle, projects can proceed from the June following the conference, through the first of September of the following year—a fifteen month work cycle.

Lengthened review/input and translations processes

Two commonly held complaints about our current system are that (1) our membership rarely has adequate time to review and input world service projects, and (2) our translations are either not timely or, when they are produced within a timely fashion, prohibitively expensive.

The two-year conference-cycle can allow for greater fellowship review and input, especially in light of the new project development and prioritization process. In fact, we believe that a two-year cycle could easily allow a 150-day CAR review period instead of the current 90-day review period. Additionally, the two-year cycle can allow for longer translation windows, thus reducing translations expenses for service-related communications and reporting. The other advantage offered by the lengthening of the review/input time-frame is the fact that our membership will have had communication from world services during the life of all world service projects, and so they’ll be better prepared to deal with those projects prior to the World Service Conference every two years.

The actual details of how these changes should be effected under the two-year cycle, we believe, should be left to the World Board to determine and then present to the conference. Current conference polices describe, in many places, an annual WSC, but most would be minimally affected (e.g., would require simple “housekeeping” revisions) by this change.

Proactive fellowship development and the world-wide workshop system

The TG believes that moving to a two-year conference cycle may also allow for the creation of a fellowship-wide interactive workshop system as described in the Fellowship Development Plan by potentially (1) freeing up resources² that might have otherwise gone toward conducting

² These resources include not only the financial impact associated with the annual meeting, but also the staff’s logistical and administrative support, which represents a substantial commitment of WSO resources in our present system. In the two-year cycle, both financial and human resources usually associated with the successful convening of our annual meeting could then become available for world service projects and for supporting the worldwide workshops.

the annual meeting; and (2) by creating the possibility for increased face-to-face interaction between world services and our membership by providing a new kind of interaction that could be made possible by the lengthened work cycle.

Cost-equalization and full-funding

We believe that moving to a two-year cycle may reduce the overall expense associated with the World Service Conference, thus making it possible for the first time to consider funding all board members, as well as all regional delegates, to the conference, either through cost equalization, full funding, or a combination of the two. This advantage of a two-year cycle could also make the playing field far more level for international participants, as well all members who might not otherwise have the personal resources to serve at this level.

Reducing overall expenses and activities until the implementation of Resolution A

Conference participants at the 1997 WSC indicated during the small group meetings that they wished to see an eventual change in representation at the conference resulting in a downsized, more efficient WSC. However, they also indicated that such a transition should be gradual. Moving to a two-year conference cycle could allow world services to reduce its overall expenses and activities pending such changes in the conference. In essence, the two-year conference cycle could be seen as the first stage of the conference's transition process.

Provided that Motions #1, #2, #3, and #4 are adopted, the following will be presented:

Motion #5: To implement a two-year conference cycle beginning at the end of WSC 2000.

Intent: To get the World Service Conference's approval to implement the two-year conference cycle at the end of WSC 2000, with the specific details to be presented to the World Service Conference by the World Board.

CHANGES TO POLICY RESULTING FROM THE TRANSITION GROUP'S MOTIONS

The task of attempting to identify and then describe all of the changes to existing world service policy as a result of the Transition Group's proposals for change has been monumental. Never before has the World Service Conference considered any motions that seek to reconfigure the entire world services structure. There has been no way, therefore, to anticipate what an enormously complex and difficult challenge it would be to describe in a reasonably comprehensible way all of the policies that will be affected by the sweeping changes implicit in the TG's motions this year.

After some initial attempts to give a motion-by-motion breakout of all of the policies that would be affected by the adoption of the first three Transition Group motions, the Transition Group soon decided that to provide any such line-by-line examination of policy changes would seriously jeopardize the conference's focus upon the significance of the proposed changes, and onto the nuts-and-bolts of the alterations to policy that are simply an after-effect of those changes. We believe that an overly detailed--and therefore extremely confusing--delineation of policy changes would certainly satisfy the policy fans among us, but it would not serve our delegates or our home group members in understanding what, exactly, they were voting to change.

In an effort to simplify this process, therefore, we have identified four major categories of policy that require review by our membership so that they can reasonably understand what will change as the result of the TG's motions in this year's *Conference Agenda Report*. Please keep in mind, however, that there was no way to simplify this process without concentrating on certain kinds of changes while passing over others that seemed to us less important to our membership. For example, we believe that our members will be quite concerned about how literature will continue to be produced and translated. But, we believe, they will be far less concerned with word changes such as replacing "World Service Office, Inc." (the name of the present non-profit 501c3 corporation) with "Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc." (the proposed name of the new non-profit 501c3 corporation). These kinds of "housekeeping" changes will not be included below. Also, please note that all existing WSO personnel and corporate management policies will remain in place and in effect before, during, and after the transition process to the new system unless and until such time as the World Board chooses to change those policies.

The four categories we have identified are: (1) **Unaffected Policies**—these will remain essentially unchanged in the transition from the old system to the new; (2) **Eliminated Policies**—these will be removed from world services' policy as a result of the changes to our structure; (3) **Partially Affected Policies**—these will change somewhat from our old system, based upon the recommended changes to our structure; and (4) **Brand New Policies**—these will be created as the result of our new service structure. Below is a complete list of every substantive change to the *TWGWSS* that will result from the adoption of the Transition Group's motions.

1. Unaffected Policies – these will remain unchanged in the transition from the old system to the new.

Policies relevant to the WSO:

1. The Purpose of the WSO remains unchanged.

2. Except that the office will be overseen by the World Board (rather than the WSO Board), the description of the WSO and its duties remain unchanged (with minor wording changes, i.e. The *NA Way* editorial board will no longer consist of conference and board officers, but instead of World Board members).

Policies relevant to the WSC:

1. The purpose of the WSC remains unchanged.
2. The NA World Services Vision Statement remains unchanged.
3. The WSC Mission Statement remains unchanged.
4. The Basic Format for the WSC remains unchanged.
5. The procedures for amending guidelines and conducting business stay the same
6. Most of the description, guidelines (with word changes to reflect old and new service positions and bodies) and duties of the WSC remain unchanged. (There are some exceptions, however: the committees' duties and the description of the RAP will be removed, but these guidelines will be forwarded to the WB. Also, the procedure for seating new regions remains in effect, but the deadline for input to the WB for the CAR would be changed to 150 days to reflect the current practice).
7. Consensus at the WSC will still be determined by a majority vote.
8. The WSO will still perform its duty as the WSC secretary.
9. With appropriate "housekeeping" wording changes, all literature review and approval guidelines will stay the same.
10. With appropriate "housekeeping" wording changes, the process for input to the conference stays the same.
11. All previously adopted motions, unless otherwise noted below, stay the same.
12. With appropriate "housekeeping" wording changes, the PI Contingency Plan stays the same.
13. With appropriate "housekeeping" wording changes, the guidelines for the Conference Report stay the same
14. The guidelines relevant to the CAR will remain same, but may change after the implementation of the two-year conference cycle.
15. The Public Relations Statement of Purpose stays the same.
16. With appropriate "housekeeping" wording changes, the World Service Translations Policy stays the same.
17. With appropriate "housekeeping" wording changes and some deletions based upon the elimination of the Interim Committee, the World Services Travel Guidelines stay essentially the same.
18. The World Convention Zone Rotation Plan, including procedures for bidding, site selection, and local host committee guidelines, stays the same.

2. Eliminated Policies – these will be removed from world services' policy as a result of the changes to our structure.

This category can be subdivided into two sorts of policy that will be eliminated: (1) Policies that are simply eliminated as the result of being superseded by new policies or are outdated even without the proposed changes to world services; and (2) Policies that will be eliminated from

the TWGWSS, but that will be forwarded to the new World Board as input to their process of creating new policies, procedures, and guidelines for the board and its committees.

Policies simply eliminated –

1. Reference to the **Conference Work Schedule** will be removed from the TWGWSS because it is currently inaccurate.
2. All references to the **Officers of the WSC** and the **Committee Chairpersons** will be removed from the TWGWSS.
3. The 1982 description of **“World Service”** from a source identified as the Green Service Manual (TWGWSS page 23) will be removed from the TWGWSS because it is duplicated language from another section of the manual.

Policies eliminated but forwarded as input to the World Board:

1. All references to the **WSO Board of Directors**, the **WSC Board of Trustees**, the **World Convention Corporation**, the **Administrative Committee**, the **Policy Committee**, the **Literature Committee**, the **Hospitals and Institutions Committee**, the **Public Information Committee**, the **Translations Committee**, the **Recognition Assistance Panel**, the **WSC Conference Officers**, the **Board of Trustees’ Additional Needs Advisory Panel** and will be removed from the TWGWSS. However, their guidelines and duties will be forwarded to the World Board as input to the new board’s creation of its internal processes and guidelines to ensure that their vital functions are retained within the new system.

3. Partially Affected Policies – these will change somewhat from our old system, based upon the recommended changes to our structure.

For the most part, policies that are partially changed will reflect simple wording changes to reflect the elimination of some world service entities and their replacement by new entities.

1. With appropriate “housekeeping” wording changes, WSC election procedures stay basically the same, except that world board nominees will require a 60% majority vote to be elected.
2. World Services’ description will be changed to consist of two specific bodies (the World Board and the World Service Conference), rather than the three specific bodies (the WSO, the WSC, and the Board of Trustees) that currently comprise the world service system.
3. Regions seeking seating will in the future be introduced by either the parent region or the World Board, rather than the parent region or the WSC Chairperson.
4. Input for consideration at the conference will be submitted to the World Board 150 days prior to the conference as is our current practice.
5. Nominations for any elective WSC position are accepted from conference participants, but it is recommended that nominations pass through the Human Resources Panel’s process.
6. For the purposes of all world level attendance at professional conferences and other activities, world services will be responsible for registration fees and transportation of the public information booth (as opposed, in the old policy, to these expenses being equally shared between the WSO and the WSC PI Committee).
7. The World Board (rather than the former WCC) is authorized to change the date of the World Convention.

8. The ownership of all NA's intellectual and physical properties will be held in trust by Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc., rather than the WSO, Inc., as the former policy stated. This name change is relevant wherever the WSO has been formerly named as the holder of these kinds of trust responsibilities.

4. Brand New Policies – these will be created as the result of our new service structure.

1. All External Guidelines described in Motion #1 for the World Board and its committees will be added to the TWGWSS.
2. All guidelines described in Motion #2 for the Unified Budget will be added to the TWGWSS.
3. All External Guidelines as described in Motion #3 for the World Pool and the Human Resources Panel will be added to the TWGWSS.
4. All guidelines as described in Motion #4 for the WSC Co-Facilitator positions will be added to the TWGWSS.

ADDENDUM #1: THE WORLD BOARD DISCUSSION

World Board Duties

The list of World Board duties is comprehensive, encompassing in a general, administrative way all of the duties and responsibilities of the entire world service system, including those of the board's committees. The rationale for this all-encompassing list is clearly based in the results of the inventory process itself. For example, the Resolution Group, in addressing the need for a single board with a clear single point of decision-making, wrote that

The Consultant's Report states very clearly that our current system is not working. In that report, the consultant affirmed that "The complex NA organizational structure of two boards and a large number of committees was not supportive of good communication or focusing on the primary NA mission to support the suffering addict through recovery" (CR 6). That report continues: "Additionally, the organization is so intertwined in committees that two results have occurred: 1. Not exercising its full potential of leadership. 2. A lack of clear objectives that must be identified and accomplished. Because of the overabundance of projects, directives and committee involvements, a series of objectives aligned with the vision are often not properly prioritized" (CR 102). (RG 35)

Thus the inventory process up to this point indicates the need for a board and its accompanying committee system to be the single point of decision and accountability in the new structure, with clear lines of delegation, and responsibility. We are proposing that the World Board, as the single point of responsibility and authority acting on behalf of our fellowship, must necessarily be held accountable for *all* of the activities occurring in world services. The foundation for this broad-based and wide-ranging accountability is based upon the general assumption that the board's primary role in fulfilling its respective duties will be administrative in nature. Therefore, while board members may be called upon to carry out specific tasks in the course of fulfilling their board membership responsibilities, the general description of board duties assumes that the hands-on work will, for the most part, be carried out by the committees of the board, and by WSO staff.

Regarding the board's accountability, it is essential that all committees, and their work, be the purview of the board as the sole administrator of those committees and their activities, carrying out the will of the World Service Conference. To divide the accountability held by the board on the conference's behalf among other world service entities, including the committees themselves, would be to compromise the principle of a single point of decision and accountability embodied in our Fifth Concept. Further, to create a separate set of committees not accountable to the World Board would be to re-create a splintered and conflicting world service system that the inventory process has revealed to be at odds with itself and therefore largely unworkable. Such a committee system, we believe, is also out of keeping with the spirit of the Resolutions for change adopted at WSC '96.

However, such a change in our system necessarily implies at least two ideas that should be carefully considered. In order for this change to be feasible, the following two premises of the new board's operations are at the heart of this proposal: (1) the board is greater than the sum of its parts; and, (2) the World Board directs and administers the progress of WSO staff, who are responsible for fulfilling work as outlined by the World Board.

The board is greater than the sum of its parts

This premise assumes that, just as the World Service Conference delegates the necessary authority to the World Board in order to carry out the will of the conference, so the board itself delegates specific responsibilities to its own committees to better expedite the board's work. In this sense, the committees can under no circumstances seek to act autonomously beyond the general scope of responsibilities and activities assigned them by the World Board.

Given these clear lines of accountability and authority, the board, when it meets in full session, can and does oversee and administer the activities of each of its committees. The board is greater than the sum of its parts, for only the full board may make decisions that might initiate, change, or eliminate specific committee duties and activities. It is only by this means that the board can be held accountable for the activities of the committees, and therefore the board's oversight of committee activities on behalf of the WSC is without exception. Similarly, the board is in turn held solely accountable for all world service activities by the World Service Conference, from whom the board's authority and responsibility derive.

The corollary to this delineation of accountability and authority is that in truth the committees *are* the board. Given the overriding principle that the board is greater than the sum of its parts, it should therefore be structurally impossible for the committees to ever be in competition with one another. The committees exist to accomplish those tasks which the board finds more expediently completed by a smaller group of individuals working on the board's behalf.

Therefore, whether the board's duties and responsibilities are accomplished by the full board while it is in session, or they are accomplished by separate committees for full board review and approval, all of the activities associated with the above list of duties remain the purview of the World Board, who are in turn legally and spiritually bound to act in accordance with the will of the World Service Conference.

The World Board directs and administers WSO staff. . . .

This second premise is that WSO staff is responsible for doing much of the actual hands-on work that furthers the board's duties and activities. While board members, acting either as full board participants or committee members, must direct and oversee the work that is to be accomplished, the work itself will, by and large, be undertaken by special workers at the direction of the board and its committees.

The board, as the above list of duties demonstrates, is responsible for literally all of the activities associated with providing world level services. It would be impossible for them to undertake all of the actual writing, editing, and communicating about this volume of work while working as volunteers from around the world, serving a growing worldwide fellowship. Of course, at the same time, it is necessary to qualify this statement by recognizing that board members will, from time to time, be directed to carry out specific tasks on behalf of the whole board. In order for the new board to be accountable for these activities, though, its members will direct and oversee the work carried out by staff at the board's initiation and under the board's supervision rather than attempt to carry out the majority of the work themselves. By assuming the responsibility for world level activity, the board is therefore the body which provides direction to the staff so that the work which has been prioritized and approved by the World Service Conference can be accomplished.

In reality, this scenario is already in practice and standard operating procedure for world service projects, as well as in basic service provision at the world level. In many, perhaps most

cases, the WSO staff carries out the day-to-day functions on behalf of the existing boards and committees by administering conference calls, undertaking research, developing minutes and reports, organizing travel arrangements, and providing a host of other services that help keep world services functioning. The Transition Group desires to state explicitly what is already an everyday occurrence in many areas of world service responsibilities and activities so that there can be no confusion as to the direct lines of accountability and responsibility within the new world service system. The TG therefore acknowledges what is already working well within our present system, and wants to incorporate those processes into the new system.

Elections

Another concern that was raised by some participants at the 1997 world services meeting in Providence, Rhode Island was that elections to the World Board should be delayed until 1999, after the Human Resources Panel had been in place for a year to make recommendations for the new board, and after the regions have had ample time to seek out nominees for the World Board.

The group has heard concerns about implementing the TG proposals at WSC 1998. Some participants believed that the '98 conference was too soon to begin implementation, and wanted to see the creation of the World Board delayed until 1999, even though more participants agreed that it is time to move forward. We do understand that there may be anxiety surrounding these changes to our world service structure, but, even after a lengthy discussion, we still believe that beginning implementation in 1998 is the most prudent and reasonable course of action, for the same reasons that we cite above.

We considered the input that having a Human Resources Panel (HRP) in place might smooth out the elections process for the World Board. Yet, upon practical reflection, we saw some difficulties with assuming that the HRP could reasonably function during its first year sufficiently to provide the conference with a list of candidates to comprise the full 24-member board. First of all, this new service body's processes and procedures have thus far only been minimally defined. A large part of their first year's duties will certainly include outlining such details and processes that will make this brand new entity functional and practical. If the World Board is implemented and elected in '98, the HRP would then largely be responsible for developing its own processes and procedures during its very first year of existence, which seems more practical for a brand new service body.

Second, we also saw that much of the language that we had used to describe the benefits of the HRP in our report was, in part, responsible for participants placing such lofty expectations upon this service body. In reality, what we hope for from the HRP is that, once its guidelines and procedures are in place, they will 1) provide a level playing field for members nominated for election who are otherwise unknown to conference participants; and 2) institute a practical means of "sorting" through the many service resumés to streamline the selection/election process of the WSC's board candidates, WSC Co-Facilitator, and HRP candidates.

The Human Resources Panel can serve to assist and improve the WSC election process in many ways, it is true. But we need to be careful not to place unrealistic expectations upon this new service entity. Neither, we believe, should we allow World Service Conference participants to hand-off the very significant responsibility of selecting candidates for our first World Board to a single group of individuals, namely the HRP. Perhaps more than ever before in our history, the WSC needs to be fully responsible and accountable for this first election of its World Board. And the responsibility for providing candidates for this one-time event (for the board will not

be elected in its entirety again) needs to fall upon no single group other than World Service Conference participants.

Regarding the second issue, that some delegates wanted ample time to gather nominees from their local NA community, we believe that a lead-time of several months is plenty of notice for local NA communities to provide the conference with a number of excellent candidates for the new World Board, the Co-Facilitators, and the Human Resources Panel positions. If the conference adopts the proposed changes, we are advising you now of the need to be prepared to conduct the World Board, the Co-Facilitators, and the Human Resources Panel elections. We will have released our proposed election criteria for these positions in December, 1997. We are sending out resumé forms with the requirements from our proposals for each position, and we are suggesting that this year's nominations be open to all, requiring no conference participant nomination. The WSC Administrative Committee will then develop the best way to proceed with the actual elections themselves, if the conference agrees with our proposal to implement these proposals at WSC '98. In this way, we are providing as much lead time as possible, and the most open access to WSC elections that has ever been offered, up to the time of the '98 WSC, for any member to forward their resumé for conference consideration.

So that there be no misunderstanding, we need to emphasize that we do not see the implementation of the World Board, the Co-Facilitator, and the Human Resources Panel in 1998 as anything like a "done deal." Only the World Service Conference participants can make that determination. What we *are* saying is that, if the majority of participants agree with our reasons for implementation in 1998, then we must all be responsibly prepared to move forward. Thus, regions, areas, or individuals who wish to provide nominations for candidates to these positions may want to begin seeking out members and securing their willingness to serve. In the meantime, the WSC Administrative Committee will prepare the standard election procedures as they have always done, in the event that the does not implement our proposal. Either way, we will all be prepared to carry out the will of the conference.

Voting

World Service participants at the 1997 world services meeting also raised a question about the voting rights of the World Board in Old Business. Our recommendation will be that the board members may vote only on those issues that have not been sent out for group review in the *Conference Agenda Report*, as well as on any other items that fall into the category of Old Business at the World Service Conference. Board members will then be permitted to vote only on "New Business" and elections, just as world level voting participants do today in similar numbers.

World Board Qualifications

At the world services meeting in Providence, some members raised the concern of the Executive Director(s) being members of the World Board, and others raised the question as to whether some seats on the World Board should be reserved for international members. Regarding the first issue, we heard participants loud and clear—you don't want paid staff voting on the board, but you do see the necessity of their providing information and guidance to the board. Our legal consultants inform us that it will remain necessary to continue to name the Executive Director(s) as an "officer" of the corporation, just as we now do in the WSO Board's by-laws. For our organization's purposes, naming the Executive Director(s) as a non-voting member of the board is sufficient to satisfy this legality, and will allow them to participate in the board's meetings, but they will hold no vote there or at the WSC.

We also discussed the issue of international members and decided, in the end, to recommend that we not set aside any designated number of seats for international members. We believe that electing people simply because they come from a country other than the United States is contrary to the principles we hope will govern all our elections: anonymity, qualifications, and experience. As one international member of the TG put it, "I wouldn't want to feel as though my election to any service position was merely the result of the citizenship designation on my passport. If I thought that's why I was there, I would really feel like a second-class citizen. I feel I am here because I'm fully qualified to serve." We agree, and believe that members should know that they've been elected on the basis of their qualifications. We also believe that designating a specific number of "international seats" could one day actually serve to limit international participation. For these reasons, we will not be recommending international seats on the board.

C2 Proposal: Discussion

The world services inventory identified three major areas of concern surrounding our present standing committee system: (1) lack of long-range planning and project oversight; (2) "turf wars" and duplication of services; and (3) funding and budgetary concerns (dealt with under the Resolution E section of this report). With regard to lack of long-range planning and project oversight, the Resolution Group wrote that

Virtually every standing board and committee identified as serious problems a lack of long-range planning—either within their board or committee, with world services as a whole, or both. For example, the Board of [Trustees] identified a lack of long-range planning, and the one-year conference cycle, as serious problems in the accomplishment of world service goals (CG 88). They also identified the "acceptance of unplanned projects" within world services as a serious problem which produces inferior results in service projects as a serious problem (CG 89). Similarly, WSC H&I said "inconsistent planning" was a problem (CG 124). WSC PI (CG 128), WSC Literature Committee (CG 136), and the Board of Directors (CG 144) all recognized a lack of planning and long-term goals as serious problems in world services. The BOD also identified conflicting goals and policies as a serious problem, which points to the necessity for more organized and centralized project oversight (CG 144). The 1994 World Service Conference, in its self-assessment, also recognized a lack of project planning and oversight as a significant problem: "There is no long-term focus either for WSC or for NA as a whole. We live from year to year. Leadership does not encourage long-range planning. [. . .] WSC is task-oriented vs. long-range. WSC doesn't look at the 'big picture' — it is reactionary, crisis- and dollar-driven, all short-term" (CG 67).

We believe that this new committee structure of the board addresses the identified problems as stated above. With regard to long-range planning and project oversight, the new system is designed to eliminate unplanned projects. We have outlined a process (explained in the Introduction) according to which all projects that come before the World Service Conference must have received prior consideration by the board, must be prioritized by the WSC, and must be accompanied by a timeline and budget. Moreover, because the committees are committees of the board, the board will maintain administrative control over the committees' operations, thus ensuring clear lines of responsibility and accountability regarding project oversight.

Regarding "turf wars" and duplication of services, the RG stated:

Long recognized as a serious problem in world services, "turf wars" received significant mention in board and committee self-assessments. The Board of Trustees stated that "World service boards and committees do not communicate openly or frankly when communicating their

positions on issues or projects to other boards and committees. Most of the time, boards and committees design their communications so as to protect their territory or limit the disclosure of useful information” (CG 101). Similarly, the Interim Committee identified “turfism” as a significant problem, stating that “pet projects continue to be championed by individuals” (CG 107). The World Service Conference itself recognizes “turf wars” as a significant problem, stating that “Leaders compete for tasks and projects to perpetuate their jobs” (CG 65). Duplication of services, a corollary to “turfism,” was also identified as a serious problem. The World Service Conference stated that duplication of services, undefined boundaries, and a general lack of direction were all serious problems, resulting in: “Overlap of services (H&I, PI, Outreach). Blurred lines between WSB and committees when assigning tasks. Top-heavy structure (too many boards). Inconsistent criteria for establishing priorities. Committees become specialized, create turf wars” (CG 68). Similarly, WSC Policy stated that “Policy work is duplicated by other boards and committees. Policy work is overlapped (for instance, WSB Internal Affairs worked on nominations while Policy worked on elections). There is no single point of accountability between conferences” (CG 120). The Board of Directors also stated that duplication of services in world services is a problem, springing from “conflicting policies and jurisdictions” (CG 145).

We believe that the new system also addresses the problems of turfism and duplication of services, because the board’s committees should never be in conflict or competition with each other. The conference decides project priorities, and the board outlines basic service priorities. Given the clear lines of delegation in the new system, committees should have clear assignments, definite budgets and priorities, and timetables within which to accomplish their work. Turfism, duplication of services, and vying for limited world service resources should be virtually eliminated.

On the Size and Composition of the New Committees

We have held considerable discussion regarding the constituency and duties of the committee structure. We heard the conference’s concerns quite clearly that two board members do not constitute a committee, and so we decided to expand each committee to four board members along with additional committee members selected from the World Pool when necessary. We arrived at this configuration for at least four reasons.

First, the group believes that this configuration will allow for the continuity and experience-base necessary to the ongoing vitality and viability of the committees. At the 1997 WSC, conference participants stated very clearly their concern that standing committees need to develop and maintain an experience base to ensure continuity and quality of service provision at the world level. Creating a committee system in which each committee always consists of at least four persons, and whose terms will be staggered according to the board’s proposed election procedures, will do just that. This dynamic configuration of committee membership also allows for the principle of rotation as described in our Fourth Concept.

Second, the board’s ability to assign World Pool-screened members to designated committees in order to accomplish specific tasks further ensures that the system will remain open to new blood by allowing for the development of a pool of individuals who will acquire world-level experience themselves. In this way, members need not be present at the World Service Conference, nor even involved in regional service, in order to be considered for committee appointment. Under this new system, many more members than merely those presently involved in regional or world services will be eligible (and, most importantly, realistically considered on a level playing field) for committee assignment. We believe, in fact, that this system is far more accessible, in this respect, than our present system could ever be.

Third, the proposed system will maintain the efficiency of a “significantly downsized standing committee structure” as called for in the inventory materials and mandated by Resolution C2. By expanding the committees only when a specific project assigned to the board by the WSC calls for such expansion, the proposed system ensures that NA funds are being spent frugally in a well-planned and conference-approved manner.

Fourth, this system, as proposed, guarantees the board’s role as the single point of authority and responsibility within the world service system as described in our Fifth Concept, while at the same time eliminates the turfism and competition for resources present in our current system. In the new system, committees exist to serve the board only by carrying out all projects that have been duly prioritized and approved by the World Service Conference, thus ensuring the direct accountability of all world service activities to the WSC through a single point—the World Board. This system therefore also helps ensure that duties and responsibilities will not be duplicated among the committees, thus eliminating the turf wars and competition for limited resources that characterize our present patchwork of board and committee duties and responsibilities.

As outlined in the original *NA Tree* service manual, we are also recommending that the committees meet with conference delegates at each World Service Conference. This opportunity to interact with our membership’s representatives will allow the committee members to hear our members’ concerns, suggestions, and input as given voice by their elected delegates.

ADDENDUM #2: THE UNIFIED BUDGET DISCUSSION

Reasons for Recommending the Unified Budget

In their report, the Resolution Group made reference to the reasons indicated in the world services inventory as to why a unified budget was advisable for world services. In that report, the RG wrote:

Regarding budget management, the Board of Trustees stated that, “Budget management [under the current system is] not conducive to fulfillment of goals, long-range planning” (CG 95). WSC Policy Committee recognized “inadequate funding and inadequate budgeting” as a problem, stating that, “Inadequate funding results in undue personal expenditures and limits participation in world services. There is no standing criteria for funding” (CG 212). The WSC Literature Committee also recognized a, “lack of funding and WSC criteria for funding allocation” as a serious problem (CG 137). And the Board of Directors stated that, “World services are not cost-effective, specifically in areas of world services where services are duplicated” (CG 147).

The primary problems identified in the inventory were (1) poor budget management resulting in poor long-range planning and resource utilization, and (2) a lack of cost-effectiveness, due to competition for limited resources and duplication of services among world service entities.

The proposed unified budget system should greatly reduce, if not eliminate, these problems for the following four reasons:

One Group Will Be Responsible

For the first time in our collective history, all of the monies associated with the world service system will be the purview of a single group within the system – the World Board, as directed by the WSC. The advantages to this are many, but the most obvious one is that the World Board will be forced into more efficient, comprehensive planning of world service resource allocations, and they will be able to do so without the need for a committee such as Interim to deal with the competing demands for resources among world service entities. Conference participants will benefit here too – they’ll finally have one place to look at the financial plan for all of world services without having to scramble through three different budgets to get answers to their questions.

Better Financial Management/Utilization of Resources

Providing the World Board with this “panoramic” view of all world service resources will allow them to make more informed recommendations and decisions based upon all available resource information within the system. Because of this increased efficiency in our accounting and reporting mechanisms, the board can avoid needless duplication of services and allocation of resources, thus improving the overall management and efficiency of resource allocations across world service operations. Additionally, this better vantage point regarding the allocation of world service resources will also allow for greater accuracy in strategic planning, both short- and long-term, because the new project process will increase the entire system’s ability to forecast upcoming projects and their prioritization.

New System Will Be Less Forgiving

Given the better accounting mechanisms and the improved ability for strategic planning within the new system, so-called “emergency” funding allocations should be dramatically reduced. Because world services’ resource allocations should be far more predictable and exact, our membership can expect more accurate cost-projections and reporting. The overall system, therefore, will be far less forgiving than our present system in terms of budget “forecasts,” project costs, and financial reporting.

Friendlier, More Comprehensive Financial Reporting

Finally, a unified budget will enhance world services opportunity to eventually move into an activity-based accounting system, because the financial reporting mechanisms will allow much more accurate assessments of activity-related resource allocations. The unified budget will eventually help us to have a much more accurate representation of world service resource allocations based upon the enhanced resource analyses and reporting mechanisms, particularly when it comes to project-related costing.

ADDENDUM #3: WORLD POOL AND HRP DISCUSSION

Background to Motion #3: Function of the World Pool

In the Resolution Group's report, significant reference was made to the problems identified surrounding world services' processes and procedures in selecting trusted servants. In that report, the RG wrote that

. . . the inventory material clearly suggests that less than careful attention is often given in world services when electing or appointing trusted servants to positions in world services. For example, the WSC has stated that "Political correctness [is sometimes] being used to determine nominations to committees, boards." The statement continues: "WSC elections are competitive. 'The squeaky wheel gets oiled,' or in this case, elected. The election process the WSC uses makes informed choices difficult. The conference elects according to the 'flavor of the day'" (CG 66). Similarly, the WSO Board recognized that "Insufficient care [is] taken in selection of trusted servants" (CG 150).

The Resolution Group therefore agrees with the Board of Trustees' recommendation to formulate a "nominations panel that the WSC has faith in" (CG 97). This nominations panel (or, as we're calling it, the Human Resources Panel), will have the responsibility to identify members' skills and qualifications for election or appointment to service positions within world services, thereby instituting principles into the process of electing or appointing members to positions.

Given these problems revealed by the inventory process, we believe that world services' focus in the development and implementation of a Human Resources component to the new world service system should be predicated upon three essential goals: (1) eliminating the "squeaky wheel"-oriented, personality-driven elections process at the conference, replacing it with a process that is based on principles and ability rather than personality; (2) opening up access to our members, providing everyone with the equal opportunity to serve the fellowship by creating an open, equitable, and principled election/selection process; and (3) ensuring that world services can utilize the now largely untapped resources that exist in our growing fellowship.

Best qualified Candidates

It has become clear that the responsibility for verifying service resumé information and making recommendations accordingly is a potentially enormous and staff-intensive task. In order to make this kind of expenditure of human and financial resources worthwhile, we believe that the HRP's work should result in a significant change from the way our elections process presently occurs. Thus, to provide a real change to elections, and to truly assist WSC participants in the elections process, we will be recommending that the HRP provide lists of only the *best qualified* Board, Co-Facilitator, and HRP candidates.

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 also have a limit of no more than three (3) candidates for each open position up for election. After lengthy discussion, we realized that, unless the purpose of the HRP is to winnow the significant numbers of service resúmes that the conference even now seems hard-pressed to deal with at times, then the panel isn't significantly improving the elections process over our present process. In order for the

allocation of resources associated with their duties to be a worthwhile expenditure for world services, and in order for the HRP to truly assist WSC participants during elections, we believe that the HRP must be charged with the responsibility of sorting through the many resumés on the conference's behalf, and then presenting the *best qualified* candidates for nomination to the respective positions.

Nominations from the floor of the World Service Conference

The issue of whether or not to propose the ability to make nominations from the floor of the WSC has been a difficult one for us. Believing that the conference's elections options should not be limited as a matter of policy, our recommendation is to leave the process open to nominations from the floor. However, the conference should always be encouraged to use the Human Resource Panel process in order to be assured of the best qualified candidates for election.

Administration of the World Pool

The Human Resources panel will have as part of its responsibilities the administration of the World Pool. However, the criteria for nomination to the pool, as well as the guidelines for maintaining the pool (for example, how long members' resumés are to be kept in the pool, and so on) should be determined by the first HRP during the first year after their election.

The use of Non-Addicts in World Services

The Transition Group has held significant discussion about the use of non-addict members on the board and committee system. Participants in Rhode Island were also very vocal about the concept of the use of non-addicts in world services. Foremost among your input was the objection to non-addicts sitting on the World Board. This input surprised us somewhat, as people seemed to believe that the Transition Group itself had opened up world services to non-addict participation. In reality, non-addicts are currently eligible for election to the Board of Trustees, though it has been some years since we have had any non-addicts serve in world services.

We are recommending that non-addicts may not be elected to a board position, but they may serve as committee appointees at the board's discretion. We believe that there still may be instances where non-addicts have much to offer us in the way of experience and expertise. We therefore believe that some avenue should be left open to the board to avail themselves of this potential benefit. Because the board has the authority to remove any committee appointees at any time, we feel that recommending that non-addicts could serve as committee appointees would alleviate members' concerns about non-addict involvement, but still allow an avenue for non-addict participation in world services.

The group agreed that no essential distinction should be made, in principle, between both addicts' and non-addicts' ability to serve on the committees. We clearly recognize that, up to this point, the world service system has not been especially effective in its use of non-addict servants. The TG believes that world services needs to hold serious discussions regarding its potential benefit from the involvement of non-addict volunteers. World services also needs, perhaps, to recognize that, in the past, it has demonstrated some prejudice against non-addict volunteers. Until such time as world services is willing to hold such discussions, it will probably have difficulty appointing non-addict volunteers to the committees.

Ability to Read English

Some of the input we received questioned why Human Resource Panel membership should have the ability to read English as one of their membership requirements. From a practical point of view, WSC service resumés will be written in English, and members of the HRP can also expect to have to deal with a great deal of written information to review within somewhat limited time frames. Therefore the members of the HRP will need the ability to read English to be able to perform the duties assigned to them.

Also, as a matter of policy, English has already been recognized by the World Service Conference as the official language of the WSC by a resolution adopted in 1992:

Be it resolved that, as Narcotics Anonymous is a worldwide fellowship whose primary purpose transcends national boundaries, cultural barriers, and linguistic differences:

- 1. For both the general purposes of NA world services and the specific purposes of the World Service Conference of Narcotics Anonymous, there are neither "foreign" languages nor "foreign" countries.*
- 2. The World Service Conference has elected to use English as the working language of its plenary and committee meetings, records, and primary reports.*