

Motions for CAR 2004

Motion: For the World Board to develop a project plan, timeline, and budget, which includes the appointment of a workgroup made up of Regional Delegates in attendance at WSC 2004, for implementing the following sections from Resolution A:

1. To reduce the total number of representatives
2. To provide for equal representation from all geographic entities; and,
3. To encourage a consensus-based decision-making process.

Reduction and equalization of representation, will be based on the following model:

Regions will participate in geographically based conferences. These conferences will send representatives to the World Service Conference. The districts and the number of representatives these districts shall include:

United States Eastern Conference- 3 representatives
United States Central Conference – 3 representatives
United States Western Conference - 3 representatives
European Conference - 3 representatives
Latin America Conference - 3 representatives
Central America Conference – 3 representatives
Asia Pacific Conference - 3 representatives
Canadian Conference - 3 representatives

The World Service Conference shall meet biannually, as it does now. The world board will retain the same participation as is currently required by the Guide to World Services.

The encouragement of consensus-based decision-making shall be based on the definition of consensus that the World Board was directed to develop at WSC 2002.

This plan and all it's components shall be ready for consideration at WSC 2006

Intent: To complete the process of implementing Resolution A.

Policy Affected: This motion would affect the section in the Guide to World Services entitled The Work Cycle between Conferences, on pages 8-9 by asking the World Board to develop this plan before of any other project. This motion also seeks to set aside the "Ideas for World Service Projects Submission Form" found in Addendum B, page 49.

Rationale: In 1996 this resolution was adopted by the WSC, and has been the subject of much debate throughout the Fellowship. The wording of this resolution, "to approve in principle," lent itself to a great deal of debate, and much confusion. After almost eight years of discussion and debate, it is time to put into "practice" the "principle" that is Resolution A. In practice, implementation should include all elements of this resolution. The districts mentioned in this motion could allow for the realization of the first two items in Resolution A. Consensus Based Decision Making is more effective with less people making the decision, and it seems to make sense to incorporate the work from the World Board that has already been directed. A workgroup consisting of members familiar with this Resolution will simplify the process by putting this issue into a controlled environment that can deliver results.

Motion: To change the percentage required for election to the World Board from 60% to 51%.

Intent: To get a realistic percentage requirement for electing World Board members.

Policy affected: This motion affects the following sections of the Guide to World Services:

Page 14 in the section "Membership," "World Board External Guidelines." The first sentence of this section will change to reflect a change in percentage from 60% to 51%.
Page 23 under the section entitled "Elections" in the "Voting" Subsection item 5B.

Rationale: Since the advent of the new service structure, we have not been able to elect what the fellowship views as a sufficient number of World Board Members. The current system has proven itself flawed in four consecutive World Service Conferences. The wording, "up to 24 members elected by at least 60%," created, and continues to create confusion. Given the current misconception that many in the fellowship have about elections, it might be prudent to simplify the process. A 60% margin has prevented us from electing members to the World Board, and will continue to restrict our ability to maintain enough members to accomplish the duties we need them to do. At WSC 2002 we had enough nominees to fill the World board, if they had been elected. Our World Board is getting smaller as terms expire, and this ineffective election process is not serving the fellowship as a whole.

Motion: For the World Board to develop a project plan, timeline, and budget, which includes the appointment of a workgroup to review, edit, and submit for approval the Tradition Working Guide developed by the Lone Star Regional Literature Committee. The workgroup shall be made up of individuals drawn from the Human Resource Pool who have demonstrated experience at Review and Input on Narcotics Anonymous literature. This project will be placed at the top of the current "A" list of recovery material, with the project to begin, dependent on Conference approval of the project plan, timeline and budget, after WSC 2006, and sent to the fellowship for approval no later than 2008.

Intent: To add another piece of recovery literature to our literature inventory that will make it easier for our members to learn the principles in the Twelve Traditions

Policy Affected: This motion would affect the section in the Guide to World Services entitled The Work Cycle between Conferences, on pages 8-9 by asking the World Board to develop this plan before of any other project. This motion also seeks to set aside the "Ideas for World Service Projects Submission Form" found in Addendum B, page 49. This also seeks to set aside the section on page 33 entitled "Approval Process for Recovery Literature" by having the fellowship consider a piece of literature not directly developed by the World Board.

Rationale: After the demise of the World level subcommittee system (H&I, Public Information, Literature R&I) there has been little or nothing for established Review and Input committees to do. This is a long, and well respected function in the Fellowship that has been all but denied the right to serve NA as a whole with the newer method of

developing literature. This document has been several years in the making by Narcotics Anonymous Trusted Servants serving on a service committee that was appointed in keeping with our 9th Tradition. The basis for this document is our book, *It Works How and Why*. The bulk of the work has been completed, and with careful attention there should be no reason this document could not be put out for Conference Approval in 2008. This allows more time than the Sponsorship book and less of a financial impact given the completeness of the document.

Motion: For the World Board to develop a project plan, timeline, and budget, which includes the appointment of a workgroup charged with developing a method of lowering the cost to all participating regions by 25% for all World Service events. The workgroup shall be made up of individuals drawn from the Human Resource Pool who have demonstrated experience with planning large events, and contract negotiation for fellowship events. These events shall include: the World Service Conference, World Service Meetings, and the Worldwide Workshops. This motion shall not include any World Convention being planned by NAWS.

Intent: To accomplish a more effective use of Narcotics Anonymous funds as directed by the 11th Concept.

Policy Affected: This motion would affect the section in the Guide to World Services entitled *The Work Cycle between Conferences*, on pages 8-9 by asking the World Board to develop this plan before of any other project. This motion also seeks to set aside the "Ideas for World Service Projects Submission Form" found in Addendum B, page 49.

Rationale: The 11th Concept clearly states in our booklet "Twelve Concepts for NA Service" (pg.24), "Narcotics Anonymous funds should always be used to further our primary purpose." The cost for participation at NAWS is prohibitive, and excessive. Donations in the service structure are already inadequate to fund our services, and this is not just at the World level. It is not realistic to expect the funding of Delegates by NAWS to continue. We should not have to suffer the financial burden of travel when there is work that can be done in our local communities with the funds we spend for travel. While it is necessary to attend World Service events, in order to maintain unity, it should cost less. "When NA members contribute service funds, they expect their funds to be used carefully, and to be used for the sole purpose of furthering our primary purpose." (Pg. 27)

Motion: For the World Board to develop a project plan, timeline, and budget, which includes the appointment of a workgroup made up of Regional Delegates in attendance at WSC 2004, and charged with the duty of writing new WSC Rules of Order based on Consensus Based Decision Making. The foundation for these rules shall be the definition of consensus that the World Board was directed to develop at WSC 2002. These new rules will replace the current rules found on pages 53-66 of *A Guide to World Services in Narcotics Anonymous*. This shall include the deletion of all references to Roberts Rules of Order, or Parliamentary procedure. The plan, timeline, and budget will be presented at WSC 2006. The project shall begin, dependent on Conference approval of the project plan, timeline and budget, after WSC 2006, and sent to the fellowship for approval no later than WSC 2008.

Intent: To bring a new level of efficiency, and communication to the World Service Conference.

Policy Affected: This motion would affect the section in the Guide to World Services entitled The Work Cycle between Conferences, on pages 8-9 by asking the World Board to develop this plan before of any other project. This motion also seeks to set aside the "Ideas for World Service Projects Submission Form" found in Addendum B, page 49.

Rationale: Parliamentary Procedure is by nature confrontational, much in the same way our service structure has been for many years. The fellowship has grown to the point where we can no longer afford to take sides on issues, or simply represent our local NA constituencies. We belong to a global fellowship, with a global vision and strategic framework to aid in this rapid development. Roberts Rules were written with an inherent need at the time for order with a firm hand, as it applied to meetings and conferences... over one hundred and twenty years ago. Narcotics Anonymous did not exist at the time, nor did the needs of our fellowship even become apparent until decades after the first printing of these rules. Consensus implies a common ideal, and allows for the betterment of those participating. Roberts Rules concern itself with votes, and numbers... oftentimes to the exclusion of true purpose and need.