WSC 2023

RD Report

The conference started at 9am Sunday April 30, with the usual welcomes a video of images from prior service and recovery events and readings. Just for Today read by a member from India, the Twelve Concepts read by a member from the UK, a member from Minnesota reads from A Guide to World Services describing the World Service Conference. Jorge from the World Board (Colombia) puts on full display those English skills he's been working so hard on in the last few years by reading A Vision for NA Service.

Tim from Australia, the World Board Chair continues with opening remarks, acknowledgement of NAWS staff (which as always gets a big applause from the room, to which Tim says they're probably actually too busy to have heard that). Going over the agenda for the day. 120 of the 123 seated regions are in attendance here, and 6 zones. 139 voting participants, 126 delegates and the rest board members. Translators, other trusted servants also mentioned. 28 languages represented here today. HRP, World Board, Facilitators and translators were introduced. The Zonal delegates were introduced next. This is there first face to face conference as voting delegates.

Newly seated Regions introduced themselves next.

The Netherlands introduced themselves with a Colorful introduction ("Netherlands In the House!" to big applause). He described the start of his region in the late 80s and its growth to hundreds of meetings now. They still have lots of challenges, but are working hard on translations and other service efforts. Much has been translated, and still a ways to go.

Ukraine delegate discussed his region. The current situation has caused a need to do more translations into Ukrainian rather than Russian, so lots going on. There are 158 meetings a week in that country. Trying everything they can do to bring new addicts to the meetings. So glad to be a part of this and bring our voice to this floor. So thank you.

Mexico Occidente delegate discussed his Region. They have 412 meetings a week in their region. Giving his report in Spanish and being translated. We're about to celebrate our 24th Regional convention. Day by day we're working on PR, H&I, and our main hope is to learn a lot from you all here. I'm very emotional, very happy to be here. This is my first time here and I appreciate you all.

Minas Region of Brazil discussed his Region next. Minas is a state in Brazil. Used to be part of the Brazil region, but created our own region and worked on fellowship development in parts of the state that had no meetings. In 2013 we created a region with 13 areas and 130 groups. Carrying the message through PR and H&I. We came here to an earlier in person conference to learn about what we needed to do to be seated. We came away with a list of things we needed to do to get stronger. We did those things, and are here seated today. Calls his region "The Best Little Region in Brazil" (a nod to a Texas region). Laughter and applause.

Northwest Russia Region delegate was next. See the size of our region in blue on the map. Geographically very huge. More than 250 meetings per week. Interesting fact: One of our regions is actually outside of Russia. The fellowship of NA has no borders. This year in May we celebrate 10 years since our founding, and 33 years since the founding of the St Petersburg area. We are celebrating with a free event, fully financed by members who donated to make this happen. I'm so happy to introduce my region here, and thanks so much to all for your service and your warmth.

This session wrapped up with announcements and then participants will in turn say the serenity prayer in their language. 33 languages. Emotions already flowing here as they begin this.

We had our first breakout session of the week. We will have small groups to create community and get to know one another. We were assigned to the same table and group for all breakout sessions to help with the community building. There were rooms for delegates, alternates, Spanish and Portuguese speakers, and our virtual participants.

After the lunch break we briefly reviewed the discussion and decision-making processes and then jump right into business. The WSC Co-facilitators determine the order of business, which were distributed and posted before the session begins. After attendance, we began business by adopting the 2020 and 2022 minutes, and then addressed Motions #33–36, which are related to new processes for WSC 2023 only. Straw poles were done for all the motions before the conference. To find the decision making-processes of the conference go to <https://worldna.org/general-resources> and then to WSC 2023 Orientation.

On all straw polls and votes I will put how we voted in parentheses after the vote.

Vote numbers are as follows: Yes-No-Abstain-Present not voting

Motion #38

Maker World Board

To approve the 2020 and 2022 World Service Conference minutes.

Initial Straw Poll: 100-0-6-7 94% Consensus Support (yes)

Final Vote: 116-1-1-5 98% Consensus Support (yes)

Motion Passed

Motion #33

Maker World Board

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

for WSC 2023 only:

Unanimous support

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

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

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

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

No supportInitial Straw Poll: 106-1-3-3 96% Consensus Support (yes)

Final Vote: 119-1-2-1 97% Consensus Support (yes)

Motion Passed

Motion #35

Maker World Board

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

Initial Straw Poll: 86-17-5-5 79% Strong Support (PNV)

Opened for discussion because did not get consensus support:

RD stands to speak in opposition. Says that this was not in the tally sheets that the groups had. They may have voted differently had the groups had this information. I can’t say yes to this motion for that reason.

Further discussion from a virtual participant. The inclusion of abstentions is not necessarily confusing.

Is present not voting still in there and does it count against the motion. Answer yes it’s still in there and no it doesn’t count against the motion.

Another: in my Region abstentions are part of the voting process. People may not have a conscious on this one and actually intend to abstain, not be removed from the total count.

Going to a second straw poll:

2nd Straw poll: 85-29-7-2 70% Strong support (yes)

There was more of the same kind of discussion then it went to questions.

Question: Why is the World Board not voting on these they were in the CAT not the CAR?

Answer: Because they are being handled in the CAR session of the conference. So we are going with the CAR rule, which means the Board does not vote.

 Final Vote: 67-51-3-2 55% Lack of Strong Support (yes)

Motion fails did not get 2/3s vote.

Motion #34

Maker World Board

For WSC 2023 only: If a participant appeals a decision of the Co-facilitator,

the Co-facilitator will explain why they ruled as they did, the participant making

the appeal will explain why they are appealing the ruling, and then the body

will vote. The voting threshold required to uphold a decision of the

Co-facilitator under appeal will be 50% plus 1 in favor of the Co-facilitator

Initial Straw Poll: 94-10-5-4 86% Consensus support (yes)

No discussion or questions

Final Vote: 102-17-1-3 85% Consensus Support (yes)

Motion Passed

Motion #36

Maker World Board

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

Discussions

[See page 6 of the CAT]

Initial Straw Poll: 94-1-7-11 92% (yes)

No discussion or questions

Final Vote: 106-3-10-5 89% Consensus Support (yes)

Motion Passed

Motion # 9

Maker World Board

To approve a three-year World Service Conference cycle on a trial basis

following WSC 2023 through WSC 2029. Following 2029, the WSC cycle

would return to two years, unless another decision is made.

Initial Straw Poll: 90-15-3-5 83% Consensus support (yes)

An amendment has been submitted for this motion. The facilitator explains that because this has consensus, the body can decide whether to go ahead without entertaining amendments. Asks the body whether they are ready to make that procedural decision (to go forward without hearing the amendment).

A participant rises to ask a clarifying question: shouldn’t we hear from the maker of the amendment? Answer no that would happen if you decide right now to go ahead and hear amendments. Voting on that procedural question now.

Do you want to forego hearing any amendments and go ahead and vote on the motion? This is not a vote on the motion or on the amendment, only on the question of whether to hear amendments.

Final vote: 81-41-0-2 (no)

We will hear the amendment:

Amendment Motion #9-a1

Maker New Jersey

To amend Motion 9 as follows:

To approve a three-year World Service Conference cycle on a trial basis following WSC 2023

2025 through WSC 2029 2031. Following 2029 2031, the WSC cycle would return to two

years, unless another decision is made.

The motion as amended would read

To approve a three-year World Service Conference cycle on a trial basis following WSC 2025

through WSC 2031. Following 2031, the WSC cycle would return to two years, unless

another decision is made.

Initial Straw Poll: 33-55-6-19 35% (yes)

Inviting the maker to speak to the amendment for up to 2 minutes.

Maker: we understand the rationale behind the main motion. On the other hand, we believe this change has a significant impact on the trusted servant cycle at a local level. We believe that moving to a 3 year cycle is unsustainable in terms of trusted servants being selected and fulfilling these lengthy terms and being properly prepared for the conference.

WB response. We think this sort of decision takes a leap of faith. Covid gave us a push to test drive this already, as we’re in a 3 year cycle now. I got a little fuzzy beyond that

A member rises to ask, how does this affect future amendments: answer, if the amendment has 2/3 support even if the main motion has consensus support, we will hear the amendment. Only when the main motion has consensus support and the amendment has less than 2/3 support will the body be given the option to not consider the motion.

Discussion: one rises to say their region supports the amendment, another to say they are in favor of the original motion.

Another: we believe that we shouldn’t procrastinate this decision given the financial considerations and the financial crunch. We should pass the main motion on financial grounds. If we are talking about being proactive, let’s finish what we have on our plate now before considering a lot of new stuff.

Another: my region supports this amendment for the same reasons mentioned earlier. Either it creates very long terms of service to be AD and then RD, or it creates a conference with a lot of inexperienced or unprepared participants.

Anthony of the WSO answers a question about whether we are financially stable enough to handle it if this doesn’t pass. He says we have no assurance of that. We are still building back to financial stability.

Another: how will the delegates at the time this expires — who have never seen a 2 year cycle — make an informed decision

2nd straw poll:

30-87-3-4 25% Lack of Strong Support (PNV)

Asked if there was any objection to considering that the final vote?

There was none motion Fails

Back to Motion #9

Because the original straw poll had consensus support two members can speak in opposition of the motion. One does. My region has discussed it at length and understand the concerns. But we believe this has the potential to further disadvantage women accessing service at this level.

Another: I understand the rationale, but regarding the leap of faith, I don’t think this motion comes from the place of abundance or leap of faith. People are moving away from trust in the World Board and NAWS, and meeting more often tends to restore that faith. Doing this on financial grounds moves away from faith, not toward it.

Polling now open on the main motion.

Final Vote: 98-22-1-3 80% Consensus Support (yes)

Motion passed

That was the end of day one.

Day 2

Opening

Jack WB: Anthony came to my region and spoke one time. One thing he said was the question, “Have I done enough?” I thought is that even possible given what NA has given me?

Counting board members as well to get a full count, but because today’s business is CAR business, only RDs will be voting on business. Having technical challenges so redoing the roll call. The tech difficulties relate to the remote participants not getting logged in properly, so they’re not yet showing up in the count. Working it out. Conference patiently hanging in there as everyone gets on board for the continuation of sessions on CAR Discussions and Decisions.

Motion #10

Maker World Board

If Motion 9 is adopted, to approve an interim virtual WSC in the middle of the

conference cycle for decisions that are legally necessary and those that

conference participants choose to address. As was done in the 2020-2023

cycle, material would be posted on na.org under the same deadline policies

as the CAT (ninety days prior) and all voting conference participants would be

polled to choose the items they wish to address.

Initial Straw Poll: 101-5-3-4 92% consensus support (yes)

This motion has an amendment. Asking the body if they wish to hear the amendment. Again, not a vote on the amendment or the main motion, just the question do we wish to discuss and decide on the amendment.

54-69-1-1 43% Lack of Strong Support (yes)

Decision not to consider the amendment. Moving on to the main motion.

Opportunity now to hear from two of the minority.

Japanese delegate speaks. Very hard to hear the translator. It was some kind of request for making things more equal in the virtual environment.

Final Vote: 114-7-2-2 92% Consensus Support (yes)

Motion Passed

Motion #11

Maker World Board

If Motion 9 is adopted, to approve a change to the release of the Conference

Agenda Report (CAR) to be thirty days earlier than the current policy of 150

days prior to the start of the World Service Conference. The new CAR

release day would be 180 days prior to the in-person WSC meeting for

English, 150 days for translated versions. The deadline for the finalization of

regional and zonal motions would be 270 days. The Conference Agenda

Report will be posted on na.org at no cost to members.

Initial Straw Poll: 109-1-0-3 99% (yes)

There’s some stir in the body. The cofacs are trying to defer taking questions at this moment and want to hear them at a later time. Some in the body have raised cards and want to be heard now. A little back and forth about this. They relent and some questions are coming up, but are hard to hear. Question about the roll call and what number is needed for consensus, etc. Daniel is trying to explain the thing about saving questions for question time and voting at voting time. The body seems appropriately chastened and is settling down. Mario reading the above motion and we move on.

The body is again being asked whether they wish to discuss and decide on the amendment. Same deal as before. Cards fly.

This decision, as before, takes 2/3 to pass.

There are actually two amendments. Does this decision apply to hearing both of them? Answer, if this procedural motion passes, we will hear them both. If it fails, we will hear neither.

Someone disagrees. This person wants to decide this procedural question for each. Co-fac says simply vote yes on this and the one you care about will come up.

More of this stirring. Audible rumbling. Some impatience to get on with it. One more request for clarity on what we’re doing. Answered as I’ve described it above. Opening the poll now.

63-61-0-0 50% Lack of Strong support (no)

No amendments will be heard because they didn’t have 2/3 in favor of hearing them.

Hearing from the minority on motion 11.

Comments: my region has difficulty taking these questions to the groups. It’s a concern from a Brazilian region about the time it takes to translate. This was why we offered an amendment. The point was heard, no more were raised, and the vote is being taken.

Final Vote: 117-7-0-1 94% Consensus Support (yes)

Motion passes

Motion #7

Maker World Board

To extend the six World Board members’ terms currently expiring in 2024

through the end of the upcoming World Service Conference cycle.

Initial Straw Poll: 102-6-2-3 92% (yes)

This one also has amendments. They are opening the poll now on the question of whether or not to consider amendments, given that the motion has consensus support as it is. That procedural question would require two thirds support. Not deciding on the motion or any amendments, just whether to consider amendments at all.

41-82-0-1 33% Lack of Strong Support (no)

Hearing anyone on the minority side of the main motion. No one speaks up. Any clarifying or procedural questions now? None. Polling is now open.

Final Vote: 119-5-0-0 95% Consensus Support (yes)

Motion Passed

Motion #12

Maker World Board

To change the current policy of NA World Services automatically funding

delegates from seated regions and zones to the WSC to funding available

upon request.

Initial Straw Poll: 101-9-0-3 91% (yes)

No proposed amendments. Asking for any speakers in opposition since the motion has consensus support.

Participant: my region is nearly unanimously opposed. First it will discourage RDs from attending the WSC, particularly if culturally they do not wish to accept charity. Secondly, we haven’t evaluated how the optional self-funding we have now is working. We should do that. My region is discouraged with the squeezing of NAWS for money.

Taking a second straw poll. If it passes, it would be a final decision. One more card goes up to speak in opposition.

Comment: someone asked a question and didn’t get an answer. This person objects to that. Facilitator says this is not a point in opposition to the motion, nor is this the time for procedural discussions, but answers that they did not consider the points made by the last speaker a question. They made their point and now we are seeing via the second poll whether the body’s position has changed.

Someone has a clarifying question about the motion. Point of clarification is that the process now is automatic funding with an opt-out option, and if the motion passes it will be no automatic funding but an opt-in option. All a region would have to do is request funding in order to receive it.

How many regions chose to totally or partially find their own participation here? Answer: 46.

Final Vote: 110-12-0-3 90% Consensus Support (yes)

Motion passed

Motion #22

Maker Southern California Region

If any Motion or Proposal, in Content or Intent, has been submitted and failed to achieve

consensus or adoption at two consecutive World Service Conferences, the previously

proposed Content and Intent may not be suggested to the Fellowship in the Conference

Agenda Report (CAR)/ Conference Approval Track (CAT) or at the WSC for one entire

conference cycle.

Initial Straw Poll: 76-29-4-4 69% Strong support (no)

No proposed amendments. In the initial straw poll this received strong support (>=2/3) but not consensus support (80%). Any discussion? This time the discussion could be pro or con, not just from the minority, because the support hasn’t reached the threshold of consensus support.

Danny from WB: this motion isn’t really in the spirit of consensus as it rules out considering things on which the body may have shifted.

A region rises to say essentially the same. What might seem absurd at one time could make sense later consider Covid as the example of conditions on the ground shifting.

An RD: we discussed it extensively at home and our confusion is if one region brings an impractical motion with a sound intent, would this motion preclude bringing later a more sound motion to match that sound intent? The content or intent language causes this confusion.

This was a question, not a pro or con, but there was no real answer for it. We are voting on the motion as written.

2nd straw poll: 76-40-4-1 61% Lack of strong support (no)

Discussion will continue.

A region stands in opposition and wonders if the maker would be willing to withdraw it based on further discussions that are on this week’s agenda.

Another region; our region opposes, and we debated this at length. We understand that we don’t want to waste time with repeated frivolous motions. But as the other region says, we don’t want to preclude acting on matters where the intent was good but the method was not supported.

Jack from WB: I believe this is well-intentioned, but I believe this is more likely to create challenges for co-facs in the future who will have to sort through and decide these questions of content and intent when deciding whether to call matters out of order.

Another region thanks Jack. That is much of what I wanted to say. This is likely to really pose challenges of enforcement of the resulting policy in future conferences.

Question: how would this motion affect FIPT inspection clause. If there were two requests in prior conferences, would this preclude a third. WB chair Tim says not necessarily. It would depend on factors at the time.

Procedural question about the consensus process. Answer, if the results of the next poll indicates that the body hasn’t moved and the percentage has stabilized, we will then see if the body is OK calling that the final decision or if another final vote is needed.

Final Vote: 58-64-2-1 46% Lack of Strong Support (no)

Is anyone apprised to calling that the final vote? No objections are raised.

Motion fails.

Motion #4

Maker World Board

To acknowledge that an NA meeting that meets regularly in person or virtually

can choose to be an NA group if they meet the criteria described in The

Group Booklet, including the six points for an NA group, and are consistent

with NA philosophy as expressed in our Traditions. (Footnotes will be added

to The Group Booklet and GLS, reflecting the decision of the WSC, if this

motion passes, and referencing Virtual Meeting Basics as a possible

resource.) Initial Straw Poll: 107-5-0-1 95% (yes)

Since this has consensus support on the first straw poll and there are no proposed amendments, they are inviting two participants on the minority side to speak.

Comment from a participant being made in Japanese and interpreted. In our region, we don’t have the group booklet translated, so many don’t know about the 6 points that define an NA group. If this motion passes, would those 6 points be applied to virtual groups as they are in-person groups? Answer yes.

Another region stands in opposition because it implies that an authority will decide whether a group meets these criteria, and that no such authority should be exercised over groups.

Debate is exhausted now per the rules. Entertaining clarifying or process-related questions.

Question from a region to the world board: if this passes, will adjustments be made to the current guide for virtual meetings? I’m asking because of the effect a virtual meeting may have on a service body. What about cases where someone not even part of the in-person region, but participated in it virtually? Will that sort of thing be left up to the local body, or will there be policy about this? Answer: this motion is simply to recognize virtual meetings as groups. Other decisions are not included or implied in the scope of this motion.

Question: what would the implications be for virtual regions and seating at the WSC. Answer by WB chair: this motion does not address that.

Question: what about when the zoom account belongs to a member and that member stops letting the group use it? Answer; once again, this question is not addressed by this motion. This is simply to recognize them as groups. All questions like that would then have to be addressed separately.

Question: in the beginning it mentions in person meetings as well. So are we talking about just virtual meetings or in person meetings as well? Tim: we don’t find this confusing. It seems clear to us. Can you clarify? Trying to ask this respectfully. The clarification is that in person meetings are only mentioned in the sense that virtual meetings would now be included with the same status as in person.

Question: outside the US, what percentages of them have the group booklet translated, and so they even know about these 6 points? Answer from Tim, WB chair. This is addressed in the CAR in detail. Should I recap it? No, I’m just wondering is it more than 50%? Tim says he believes it is.

Final Vote: 114-9-1-0 91% [92%] Consensus Support (yes)

Motion Passes

Going on break now.

When a motion does not have consensus support and has amendments. We hear the amendment first and if they do not pass we hear the original motion.

Amendment Motion 23-a1

Maker Brazil Sul Region

To amend Motion 23 by replacing the words “English audio” with the words “all languages

that are being simultaneously translated

The motion as amended would read:

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

Initial Straw Poll: 50-35-9-19 53% (no)

This is a proposed amendment to motion 23 the maker and the WB (who is not in support) have already spoke. To this and debate is now underway.

Western Russia speaking. We support the original motion. Of course if more translation is possible and practice we would support that as well.

Point being made that historical fellowship growth patterns have correlated with the translation of the Basic Text. Translations have had a profound effect on growth. Perhaps this will be the same in the service arena.

A point: we already do translate as needed and as we are able. We are doing it now.

A couple of members in regions speaking non-English languages have expressed that members in their regions would be eager to connect and serve if it were more accessible in their native tongues.

Comment: our region discussed this. We’ve seen that participation in service events are always low compared to recovery events. The resources this would take for smaller needs are hard to justify. Well-intentioned but probably not practical (this was a non-US, non-English speaking RD)

As a non-English speaker, it would be nice to have the conference in different languages other than English.

Second straw poll on the amendment now.

But more hands came up. What is the cost for Streaming in English, and what would the cost of this be. Answer from Tim, we haven’t priced out the equipment or execution of this. The cost to stream it is negligible. Anthony: this really isn’t about equipment t or streaming cost. The big deal is having adequate translation services who know our language and culture. This amendment shifts the burden from the local communities that help with this sort of thing now. NAWS would mandate that we do his a certain way. Please don’t try to tie our hands like that with CAR motions. We make these services available now where we can and how we can. We want to continue operating with flexibility to meet actual needs, not by mandate like this.

Question about which languages are now simultaneously translated by policy. Answer by Anthony: We expand these services based on need and availability of resources, not by policy. What we want is the ability to continue operating on that basis.

Point: our understanding is that this amendment is only saying that when there is simultaneous translation, that this be streamed. Not a question, so moving on.

2nd straw poll: 43-72-2-7 36% Lack of Strong Support (no)

No one opposed to calling this a final vote.

Motion Fails

Motion # 23

Maker Kentuckiana Bluegrass Appalachian Region

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

Initial Straw Poll: 76-26-4-7 71% Strong support (no)

Questions? Yes, if this fails, what is the impact? Would it be taken to mean we are not in favor of streaming? Tim WB chair: No.

In future conferences, would we stop asking whether the CPs are comfortable with audio stream as you did before this conference? Tim WB: we will very likely continuously consult the participants in that manner where we believe we need to. The questioner wants a clear yes or no for the record. Will we always consult the participants before streaming them? The answer is yes.

How many are listening to the stream right now. Answer 64.

2nd straw poll: 80-40-2-3 65% Lack of Strong Support (no)

No one opposed to calling this a final vote.

Motion Fails

Amendment Motion 24-a1

Maker Brazil Sul Region

Initial Straw Poll: 47-39-8-19 50% Lack of strong support (no)

Maker states that their region discussed this in terms of accessibility. Translations are already being done, so this is just to include streaming. We are streaming this for our members now in a way we have worked out. It’s about inclusion. We want everything that is being streamed in English to be streamed in the other languages. Answer: the same answer is the other similar motion that was just defeated. We currently put the audio in the Dropbox for those communities who wish to translate them and make them available.

Discussion: I understand the desire to make this available more broadly, but on the other hand it’s called a “Conference Participant” webinar. It’s our duty to communicate the important info to those we serve.

Co-maker of 25 initially supported the amendments to our motion because they see them in the same spirit. The info provided today has us with redraw our support for this amendment, however.

RD rises to say their region talked about how easy this would be with a 3 year cycle. Some regions have other TSs in the wings that weren’t allowed to attend. We support this amendment to broaden the scope of who is exposed to these webinars.

A Zoom participant makes a similar point. We want to expand who within our region can be exposed to these webinars.

Point: We are an unseated region, but we share a seat with a seated one. The only way we had access was through them. It was really helpful to us to see them.

Non-English speaking region: Practical issue with the main motion and the amendments: in the CP webinars, we often use break-out rooms. Translations in this small group arrangement would be very challenging. Neither the main motion nor this one seek practical to me.

Non English-speaking region: this is not practical. If it’s not practical, as this clearly isn’t, why is it even allowed to be an amendment?

Moving to questions now since there is no more debate. The question just above is repeated. Answer: the conference can ask for whatever it wants. As facilitators, we are not assessing practicality, just whether it is in order etc. It’s up to the board to respond to the practicality question.

Question: someone brought up time zones. How challenging would it be for the fellowship to deal with the timeline issue. Answer: Tim gives several examples of how various board members get up in the middle of the night for CP webinars. Not practical at all in a worldwide fellowship.

Final Vote: 32-87-0-5 26% Lack of Strong Support (no)

Motion fails

Motion # 24

Maker Kentuckiana Bluegrass Appalachian Region

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

English audio. Initial Straw Poll: 68-35-4-6 63% Lack of strong support (no)

Open for discussion:

An RD: we feel like this is really important to happen but trust this isn’t the right way to do it. Forcing their hand by a policy motion doesn’t seem like the way, but we all should do what we can to make the intent happen.

2nd straw poll: 68-53-3-1 54% Lack of strong support (no)

Anyone opposed to calling this a final decision. Someone does. Discussion opened back up.

Comment: during the pandemic we streamed everything or put things on Zoom, and this had a profoundly positive effect. We want to continue this via this motion

Comment: a zonal delegate. We represent 12 regions who have no ability to participate directly. They would like better access. CP webinars are less jargon and more participatory. I would like all these unseated regions to have more access to them in this way.

Final Vote: 64-53-3-3- 53% Lack of Strong Support (no)

Motion fails

Taking a break.

Someone challenging that decision. Wants to soldier on. Just spent 1.5 hours on two motions and their amendments. Let’s move on. Answer: my decision is based on 1-we have a virtual environment participating, and sitting in front of the zoom stream is tiring. Some have medical stuff. Some need bathroom breaks. We need regular breaks. polling the appeal to the decision of the chair now.

In a shocking action — who could have predicted it — the conference supports the chair and decides to take a break.

Motion # 25

Maker Kentuckiana Bluegrass Appalachian Region

All votes and straw polls on motions that were included in the Conference Agenda Report or

the Conference Approval Track, not to include election ballots, will be displayed in real time

for all Conference Participants to see, showing who voted and how they voted.

Initial Straw Poll: 31-74-5-3 28% Lack of strong support (no)

Open for discussion:

Comment: I’m not worried about anyone seeing how our region votes. Why don’t we do this?

Comment: We disagree with this motion because it is t in the spirit of anonymity. It may encourage judgements or resentments between regions. Just let the results speak for themselves. Go on the numbers.

Zonal delegate for Africa speaking. Really I just want to get on the minutes to prove I was here (laughter). What purpose does it serve to know how someone else voted. Unity and anonymity seem to be on the side of defeating this. How would knowing this help fellowship unity.

Question for Anthony. We were hold that the previous clickers didn’t have the capacity to hold this info. Is it possible now with the new equipment? Response from Tim: as stated in the CAR, the answer is that our current technology doesn’t support that.

2nd straw poll: 21-99-2-2 17% Consensus Not In Support (no)

No one opposed to calling this the final vote.

Motion fails.

Amendment Motion # 20-a1

Maker Wisconsin Region

 To amend Motion #20 by making the following changes:

To direct NAWS to provide at na.org the World Board to develop a project plan, to create a

workgroup to consider providing audio recordings of the worldwide webinars on the topics of Public Relations, Hospital &Institution, Step Writing for Inmates, Fellowship Development,

Phone Line, and others.

The motion as revised would read:

To direct the World Board to develop a project plan, to create a workgroup to consider

providing audio recordings of the worldwide webinars on the topics of Public Relations,

Hospital & Institutions, Step Writing for Inmates, Fellowship Development, Phone Line, and

others.

Initial Straw Poll: 55-31-9-18 57% Lack of strong support (no)

Maker: we made this amendment as a tweak to bring the original motion better into conformity with project procedures for NAWS.

Response from Tim WB. Our full rationale for opposing this is in the CAR. We currently put full reports of these on line, and get about 4 requests per year. We oppose putting resources into this.

Open discussion. There was no discussion.

2nd straw poll: 42-70-6-6 35% Lack of Strong Support (no)

Motion fails.

Amendment Motion #20-a2

Maker Brazil Sul Region

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

The motion as amended would read:

To direct NAWS to provide at na.org audio recordings of the worldwide webinars, including

the simultaneously translated audio feeds, on the topics of Public Relations, Hospital

& Institution, Step Writing for Inmates, Fellowship Development, Phone Line, and others.

Initial Straw Poll: 48-36-8-21 52% Lack of strong support (PNV)

Maker seeking to clarify intent. I am having a hard time hearing it. WB opposes this on level of effort needed vs other demands on NAWS resources.

2nd straw poll: 27-83-5-8 23% Lack of Strong Support (no)

No objections to making this the final vote. Motion fails

Motion # 20

Maker Wisconsin Region

To direct NAWS to provide at na.org audio recordings of the worldwide webinars on the

topics of Public Relations, Hospital &Institution, Step Writing for Inmates, Fellowship

Development, Phone Line, and others.

Initial Straw Poll: 66-35-5-7 62% Lack of strong support (no)

No discussion

Final Vote: 60-57-5-2 49% Lack of Strong Support (no)

Motion # 5

Maker World Board

To revise A Vision for NA Service, changing the phrase “his or her own

language and culture” to the phrase “their own language and culture.” (If this

motion passes, A Vision for NA Service will be revised in future printings,

including in Fellowship-approved recovery literature.)

Initial Straw Poll: RD: 93-12-1-2 87% Consensus support (ZD vote: 4-1-0-0) (yes)

This is an RD only vote. Zonal delegates and WB do not vote on this one. The reason for this exclusion of ZDs in the actual vote is that this affects a piece of literature covered under the FIPT. As of this conference, the FIPT is specific that only the RDs can vote on FIPT matters. We are mid-evolution on this one since there is a motion to include them on the future on this, but this is why this is happening now. ZDs votes taken to be on record but does not count for the final tally.

Consensus support. Are there two participants who wish to speak in opposition? No cards go up. Taking the second poll now. If consensus remains, this will be a decision. If support has fallen below consensus (80%), it will open discussion.

Final Vote: 101-13-0-1 88% [89%] Consensus Support (ZD vote: 5-1-0-0) (yes)

Motion passes

Motion # 14

Maker Sweden and Australia Regions

To direct the World Board to create a project plan for consideration at the next

WSC to investigate changes and/or additional wording to NA literature from

gender specific language to gender neutral and inclusive language.

Initial Straw Poll: 75-34-2-2 67% strong support (yes)

Open discussion:

Swedish Region speaks for the makers. This has been in the works for a long time, with interest picking up as we went. The motion doesn’t say that this change will be made now, but it is saying let’s start the process. The intended effect if the project is undertaken eventually is increased opportunity for all to find identification. That’s it.

Another region speaks in favor. The theme of this conference is creating our future. This is the future. Let us lead by example into the future now, today, and move into the future with inclusion.

Another: the issue for us is not yes or no, but how. Who decides these things? How would this be implemented?

Another: since we collected a conscience on this motion, the CAR survey placed this issue discussion topic in the top three. For me this strengthens our regional position to support this, and may be a tie-breaker for any region who is still on the fence.

Another: my region asked me to speak to this one. My region is a solid no. Our LGBTQ meetings all voted no on this. We have a fear that if this passes, we will end up with a bigger problem with illicit lit than we have now. We like our stuff the way it is, and we see no reason to pass this.

A Spanish-speaking region stands to speak against. They believe the literature is already inclusive and the culture of NA is already inclusive.

Queue is exhausted for now in preparation for another straw poll. Some are still in line should discussion continue afterwards.

2nd straw poll: 82-41-2-0 65% Lack of strong support (yes)

Discussion continues:

Region speaks: we waited a long time for this. Maybe you don’t see it, but there many members whom it directly affects who do see it. This is only talking about creating a project plan, so nothing changes if this passes except that we agree to investigate further. There are many examples I could point out that make some people in our literature that make us uncomfortable and do not include us

Facilitator allows it to go long today. Tomorrow the breaks will be 20 minutes rather than 30. We have a little time to make up.

Region stands in support. If this passes, it would create a plan for a project that may answer many of the questions that are causing resistance to this now.

Another in support. Language evolves. We should evolve too and become more inclusive

Another stands in favor: it is very important to start this discussion and to discuss these issues. My other points have already been made.

Another stands in favor. Very much in support. Some reasons have already been said here. One question came up about how do we distinguish survey results from our regional voting on motions. We would like to move forward to investigate changes and to do this the right way, as this motion does.

Another speaks in support. We would add that the beauty of the nature of our literature is that we see ourselves in it. This expands that possibility for some. we must be willing to investigate this further.

Another region in support. We need to investigate implications beyond just members gender, but gender related references to a higher power. It is time to look further at this.

Polling again now to see if the body has moved.

3rd straw poll: 84-38-1-0 Strong support (yes)

Discussion continues:

Lib from WB stands to speak in favor. Creating a project plan now without changing anything now is consistent with moving at a thoughtful pace. I am a member of the LGBTQI community. I trust you. I know you love me. I love you no matter what. But this is such an opportunity to take a closer look at an important issue for so many of us. I acknowledge the generosity of spirit of each one of you

Another RD speaks in favor of investigating this regardless of where you stand on the underlying issue. We should pass this.

Another: as I workshop this around my region, I want to acknowledge those members of the lgbt community who expressed real gratitude that this motion is here. I stand for them in asking you to support this.

Another: Consider the message we send if we defeat this. All we are asking is that we look at how we can be more inclusive.

Another: my region is known for a lot of things, including our culture of service. That includes advocating for those who need this to be fully included. We have an LGBT area that was excluded from participation in an area. We welcomed them. We strongly believe that all barriers to recovery put people’s life at risk. This is an opportunity to not do that.

Taking another straw poll now.

4th straw poll: 92-31-1-1 74% Strong Support (yes)

Body agreed to call this the final decision.

Motion passes to a big applause.

Motion # 15

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

Initial Straw Poll: 46-59-2-6 42% (PNV)

Facilitator asks the body for a motion to commit this to the world board for inclusion in the project plan.

Motion Alaska/British Columbia: To commit to the World Board for the project plan for Motion #14

Going to vote on this motion to commit now.

A request to explain what motion to commit means for the first-timers here. Daniel says we passed a decision to have a project plan that this is related to. To commit means to put it in their hands to see how this may be integrated into that.

One participant rose to see if that means this may not happen if that project doesn’t happen. Concern that committing it the board means it may disappear. Just wanting to state that they want to see the project plan in the CAT next year.

Question. 15 is on the screen, but now we’re talking about this. Are there to be two project plans? Daniel explains it as just described above.

Another question: why can’t we just vote on it like we just did on the previous motion? Daniel said I made that call to consider it this way.

Another: this one doesn’t have consensus. Wouldn’t it need consensus to be committed? Answer, no, because committing it only sends it to them as input.

What if we vote not to commit? Answer, we’ll consider the motion.

Voting on the motion to commit.

Motion to Commit passes: 84-34-3-2 69% Strong Support (yes)

Motion is committed.

Someone asks for a standing roll call. Answer, this is not any longer in the policy, and if we wanted to do it, that would require that we reconsider the motion and take a roll call vote when we vote again. Things have now devolved into old timey confusion and chaos. Cards go up, people getting riled up. Now they are reminding the body that if we are wandering out into Roberts rules territory, a motion to reconsider can only be made by a member of the prevailing side. It was called out of order and the decision to commit stands. Breaking for dinner and continuing at 8:30 am.

Usually a motion to commit goes pretty quickly, and it leaves this issue as something that the project group, if there is one, would recommend a solution to. Even if they recommend no action at all, unlike what was said from the floor today, anytime a motion is committed to the board, the board is obligated to report on what they did with it and their rationale. So they gave it a try and it just went south this time.

During the consensus process with motion 14, the votes changed significantly towards support. Motion 15 is similar to 14. although the original straw poll did not have support, it is not unreasonable for the co-fac to assume the following:

1. After an hour of discussion on 14, the minds of the conference may be significantly different than when the original poll (15) was taken.

2. Given the time constraint facing the conference, a motion to differ will get motion 15 done quickly.

However, we have a lot of new CPs and this is our first in-person conference in 5 years and it didn't go as smoothly as he thought.

Motion 15 did not get put on the junk heap of good ideas. The gender language project may become a very exciting project to be on!

Sometimes we think our primary purpose is to carry the message we already know to ourselves. We forget, often after being here for decades, that the language and culture of active addiction always changes and our language needs to change with it so that our message (which never changes) can be heard by the suffering addict.

Day 3

Motion # 1

Maker World Board

To approve adding zonal delegates from seated zones to the

Settlor and Trustor of the Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust (FIPT).

Initial straw poll: 99-6-2-1 92% consensus support (yes) (ZD 5-0-0-0)

Another reminder: For the motions related to the Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust (FIPT), the Zonal delegates and the board do not vote because the FIPT, a legal document, specifies that only RDs vote for FIPT-related matters. If that language is changed during this process, that change would go into effect at the close of this conference.

There is an amendment. Because there is consensus on the main motion, the body has the discretion to decide whether to consider any amendments. They are being asked to do that now. Do you want to consider any amendments to this motion? This is purely procedural. It is not a vote being taken on the substance of this motion or any potential amendments.

In the discussion, Jack from the world board rises to say that the board believes the amendment is a good one and would enhance the main motion.

Results 91- 22-1-2 71%. Strong support (yes)

Going now to the amendment.

Amendment Motion # 1-a1

Maker World Board

To add to the end of Motion 1 the following:

. . . in Article II and to clarify the description of Recovery Literature in Article

III of the FIPT as reflected in Addendum B.

Motion 1 would read as amended: Motion 1: To approve adding zonal

delegates from seated zones to the Settlor and Trustor of the Fellowship

Intellectual Property Trust (FIPT) in Article II and to clarify the description of

Recovery Literature in Article III of the FIPT as reflected in Addendum B.

Initial Straw poll: 82-8-7-11 consensus support (yes) (ZD 3-1-1-0)

Inviting two participants in opposition to this are invited to speak. Hearing none, going to a second straw poll. If consensus support remains, this will be considered a final decision.

A few RDs were not here during the roll call, so per the FIPT rules, they cannot vote at this time. The FIPT specifies that RDs present at the last roll call are the voting participants for these matters.

Results 107-6-3-1. 91% consensus support. (yes) (ZD 6-0-0-0)

This is a decision.

Motion passed.

No further discussion on the amendment. It is now part of the main motion.

Both the original straw poll and the amendment had consensus support, so this is being treated as a motion with consensus support.

Any opposition? None.

Taking second straw poll, which would be a final vote if consensus remains.

Results: 111-3-1-1. 94%, consensus support (yes). Zonal Delegates 6-0-0-0 100%

Motion passes.

Motion # 2

Maker World Board

To approve the revisions to the FIPT Operational Rules contained in

Addendum B.

Initial Straw Poll: RD: 92-8-4-4 88% consensus support. (yes) (ZD 4-1-0-0)

There are amendments. Per policy, because this motion has initial consensus, the RDs are being asked to decide whether to hear proposed amendments.

Results: 48-64-3-2 Lack of strong support. (no)

Motion fails.

No amendments will be considered. Moving on to motion 2.

The original motion had consensus support so two may speak in opposition.

One says region is unanimously opposed. Board wants to treat the most significant motion ever as an administrative change. Implores RDs to abstain or vote pnv if they have not read and do not understand the FIPT. This is a critical accountability measure that is being taken away.

Another: I can ditto the previous comments. We agree with it all. Our understanding of the inspection clause purpose is to ensure that the minority concerns are not overrun by the majority. To remove this is not practical nor spiritual. We believe the amendment also was critical.

Going to a second straw poll. If consensus remains, this will be decision.

2nd straw poll: 81-19-6-11 Strong support

More discussion:

To pass, this motion needs to retain at least 2/3 (66.7%) support throughout the discussion/polling to follow. PNV is still a part of the vote count calculations.

A nuance is coming up here: according to the FIPT, 2/3 of those RDs present, whether voting or not, is needed to pass this. So PNV and abstentions both function as “no” votes in calculating the percentages in this case only. That’s because the rules of the FIPT supersede any current rules of order for matters pertaining to changing the FIPT.

Discussion continues:

Another point stating that this removes protections for the minority.

Comment: some of the concerns being raised would have been addressed by amendment 1. I believe we should go back and consider it.

Comment: I wish the motion said 5 or 10 percent, but it doesn’t. Those who required an in inspection are ready to litigate again. In other words, rather than 50% support being required to require an inspection, 5% or 10% would have been better.

Comment: my region trusts the world Board and did not agree with the last inspection. We are in support of this. Also it would be helpful to direct us to the place in the FIPT that you say makes pnv equivalent to abs.

Peru was similar to what was said but more forceful. Emphasis on the rights of the minority. This is a fundamental change and is a bad idea. He also stated he is a corporate lawyer and had litigated these issues on both sides of the issue.

One RD points to the FIPT page 20 and notes that the FIPT calls for a roll call before each vote on this. This causes some beard stroking and funny blinking up at the facilitator table. They call for a break while they study this.

Returned from break and took another roll call.

Jack World Board speaks.

Jack: The FIPT has three components, the trust, the operational rules, and …

The FIPT works in concert with the Guide to World Services policy and role definitions. After review, we are reversing our interpretation of the pnv vote. For these motions, pnv will function as it does on any other vote (to reduce the total number of participants against which the yes votes are computed in order to arrive at percentages). As to the motions already dealt with, while the percentages will shift as a result of this, all results remain in the category they landed in but with a slightly different percentage. By category we mean “consensus support” or “strong support” etc. [I paraphrased and added some of those clarifications at the end]

There is an appeal of the facilitator’s decision to hold the earlier vote to not hear amendments.

Takes 50% plus one.

The appealer calls for more clarity on how this voting is working, and he also believes the amendment should come back for consideration.

The cofacilitator says straw polling now would show whether or how all that discussion just held may have moved the body.

Polling now on the appeal of the facilitator.

Result: 77-45-0-1 63% (yes)

Decision of the facilitator upheld.

Moving forward with the third straw poll:

Question: when I raise my card for a question and am called on, does that affect where I am put in the queue that is trying to hear from those who haven’t spoken. Answer no. Only when you participate in discussion.

3rd straw poll: 85-27-3-2 strong support (yes)

Open discussion again.

Comment: The current language allows for a single region to make the request. This motion doesn’t change that. A single region can still request an inspection, but the proposed change simply provides that the conference would be the one to consider that and decide whether an inspection is merited.

Comment: we are not like the corporate world. Protecting the minority voice should entail hearing them out, and then deciding the NA way.

Comment: we are against this motion not because we mistrust the board, but because we believe in the importance of providing transparency as a way to reduce paranoia or mistrust issues.

Comment: this is my first conference. What happened in the past is one thing, but we are a different body. This is really important issue for us. One issue is how many people can decide to require an inspection. This says 50% plus one. That is not a minority rule. It seems like what’s at issue is how many people would be required to trigger an inspection.

Comment: 51 % can allow for the minority voice. If a motion to inspect was asked for by a minority and it was spiritually based and not based on resentment, our region and many others would hear it and support it. This motion retains minority protections.

Question: when would be a time to request a strong poll? Not addressed because it was a yellow card raised and it was neither emergency or an appeal of the chair. Bring up under questions.

In terms of pnv, can we get clarity on that decision? Again, this should have been a purple card during the question time. But the questioner persists that his emergency is that the percentages on the screen for polls 1 and 2 are wrong and should be changed to reflect the way the pnv is now counting. The resolution is to put the revised percentages in brackets.

Question: did the inspection confirm that something was amiss? Jack: substantively, no. All this is available on na.org. Summary, no one thought there was a big smoking gun. As with any inspections, there were recommendations for improvement, but no malfeasance was found.

4th straw poll: 90-24-1-2 strong support (yes)

Strong support is holding over 4 straw polls. Facilitator asks for objections to calling that a final vote. One hand goes up. Instead, closing discussion and calling for a final vote. Is anyone not ready to vote?

Comment: is it true that the workgroup was recommending that the threshold be 15% and the CPs called for 50%? Jack, no consensus on the workgroup was reached on that.

Final vote: 93-20-0-3 79% strong support (yes)

Motion passes.

Motion # 3

Maker World Board

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

Addendum D.

Initial straw poll: RD: 97-6-4-1 90% Consensus support. (yes) (ZD 4-1-0-0)

Taking roll call before the vote.

120 RD’s 6ZD’s

Since it had consensus support, asking for up to two participants in opposition.

RD comment: Restricting our ability to reproduce our lit when we can’t get our hands on it reduces our ability to carry the message.

2nd RD comment: This one had opposition in our region. We believe the lit belongs to the groups and if they need to copy it to carry the message, they should be free to do it. The groups are the most important service we have. The groups own it and shouldn’t need to ask permission to copy it.

Taking a second straw poll. If consensus holds, this will be a decision.

Question: what will be the procedure if the motion passes. World Board, just send a request. Responses will be quick.

Question: how will this be enforced? By what procedure? Anthony ED of NAWS: this is solely to support our ability to protect your property. We have never said no to someone who needs this to carry the message and I don’t see that ever changing. We don’t allow the posting of our books online because when you do you legally erode your right to protect it. Not eroding our right to protect your intellectual property is our only motive here and the basis of our need for these guidelines.

2nd straw poll: 104-12-2-2 86% consensus support (yes) (ZD 5-1-0-0)

Motion passed.

Motion # 6

Maker World Board

To approve a change to World Services Translation Policy in GWSNA to

allow the possibility for up to six locally developed personal stories to be

included in translated Sixth Edition Basic Texts, if the stories have first been

published in the Little White Book of that language. These stories would be

placed in their own section in Our Members Share with the following language

preceding them:

Initial straw poll: RD: 107-0-0-1 100% unanimous support (yes) (ZD vote: 5-0-0-0)

Taking a second straw poll and if consensus support holds, it will be adopted.

Final Vote: 118-1-1-0 98% [98%] Consensus Support (yes) (ZD vote: 6-0-0-0)

Motion passes

Motion # 8

Maker World Board

As a result of the COVID pandemic, to suspend the World Convention of NA

(WCNA) rotation policy after 2024, to allow the World Board to determine

what is possible and practical moving forward and then seek approval from

conference participants

Initial Straw Poll: 89-15-3-6 83% consensus support (yes)

This motion has amendments.

By policy, since the motion has consensus, the body can decide whether or not to consider them.

Polling to consider amendments.

Results: 57-68-0-1 (pnv) No amendments will be considered.

Final vote on motion 8

107-13-2-4 87% consensus support (yes)

Motion passed

Motion # 19

Maker Wisconsin Region

To direct the WB to create a virtual Institutional Review Board (IRB) to review all researchers

and their research questions that request access to the Narcotics Anonymous population

through NAWS to conduct research.

Initial Straw Poll: 42-56-8-7 39% Lack of strong support (no)

This motion has amendments and lacks strong support, so considering the amendment is automatic.

Amendment motion 19-a1

Maker Wisconsin Region

To direct the WB to create develop a project plan to create a workgroup to investigate the

need for a virtual Institutional Review Board (IRB) to review all researchers and their research

questions that request access to the Narcotics Anonymous population through NAWS to

conduct research.

The motion as revised would read:

To direct the World Board to develop a project plan, to create a workgroup to investigate the

need for a virtual Institutional Review Board (IRB) to review all researchers and their research

questions that request access to the Narcotics Anonymous population through NAWS to

conduct research Maker speaking to the amendment: did this because we had newcomer addicts who were made very uncomfortable by being asked survey questions about their spiritual practices, etc. Whether this passes or not, we just want to see more care taken for newcomers in situations like this.

Initial Straw Poll: 40-48-7-18 42% Lack of strong support (no)

World Board: we have provided a detailed answer in the CAR so won’t repeat. We believe sufficient safeguards are in place and that this amendment wouldn’t benefit in any way.

Opened up for discussion

Comment: region negative about the amendment and split on the motion. Wonders if the maker may wish to have this committed to the WB. This could have been handled by an email exchange with the WB.

Another stands to say her region supports this and offers thoughts on how much and what kind of care we should take when vetting researchers.

Irene WB: NA isn’t a secret society. We need to make ourselves known. The researcher in question is highly respected and a great friend of NA. We think the newcomers benefit from the kinds of results these surveys produce.

Comment: What exactly are we afraid of? What do we think we are protecting ourselves from? I have no answers for these questions.

Second straw poll on the amendment: 34-85-2-5 28% Lack of strong support (no)

Motion fails

Back to original motion # 19

Final Vote: 41-78-4-2 33% Lack of Strong Support (no)

Motion fails

Motion # 13

Maker Argentina Region

To direct the World Board to create a project plan for the next World Service

Conference (WSC), for the development of a new IP for daily personal

Inventory of gratitude.

Initial Straw Poll: 76-29-5-3 69% Strong Support (yes)

Opening it up for discussion.

No discussion

2nd straw poll: : 88-29-3-2 73% Strong Support (yes)

No objection to making this the final vote.

Motion passes

Motion # 16

Maker Baja Son Region

To direct the World Board to develop a project plan, for consideration at the next World

Service Conference, to create a booklet of Step study questions where all answers relate to a

line in Chapter Four in the Basic Text

Initial Straw Poll: 54-49-6-4 49% Lack of strong support (no)

Opening up for discussion

Discussion: region does not support this or any regional motion to create literature. That process should be a result of the lit surveys and the strategic planning process.

Discussion: please support this motion because this sort of resource is needed.

Another: this was unanimously supported by our region. Anything that can help us in this way would be a good thing. Working the steps is the core of our program so we support tools that help with this.

Another: my region opposed. This is a popular piece of lit where I live. Many use it. We don’t need NAWS inc to support it to use it. We do understand that we don’t take it into jails etc, but we can use it. The source of this is in debate. There may be copyright issues here. We could get sued if we try to officially call it our own.

Another: a comaker on the motion, but our region voted against it. We do not support lit projects that come from anywhere but the survey/prioritization/planning process.

Another: calling attention to the conference report where this was the 7th highest project prioritized, not in the top few.

Another: confused. If not via motions, how do we get lit items onto the CAR survey. Answer:I will go over the info on this that we provided before you were elected. I’ll go over it during the break.

Another: can someone clarify what we are hearing, that this is a piece of lit already in existence and in use? Anthony ED of NAWS: the locally developed resources aren’t really what we are talking about in the motion. It would be a piece developed for conference approval.

Another: maker said they were not referring to an existing piece of lit. The discussion here confused me too. Is it or isn’t it about something already in existence. Tim refers back to their CAR response. That’s still our response. It does not refer to any existing material.

Another: in 2018 didn’t we commit a project to the WB that involved a different type of step working guide or material? I didn’t hear an answer. Crowd around me said “yes” from several people.

Request to have the maker clarify the bit about whether the motion refers to something existing. Not sure what happened to this either. Moved right on.

Another request for clarity. Is the booklet Scott has been distributing in various places the same book we are talking about here?

Maker now being asked to reply to the earlier request for clarification. We have been using some material just as an example. We are open to however this is handled

Question: this motion says develop a project plan to do something specified clearly. Just look at it literally. That clarifies the questions.

Another: 2018 minutes indicate to us that this has already passed. Are we wrong?

Answer: committed to the board doesn’t mean it passed, it puts it into the boards hands to decide what to do with it. What we did was include it in the survey, and it didn’t gain traction.

2nd straw poll: 57-63-3-1 46% Lack of Strong Support (no)

Motion reduced in support. Facilitator calls it the final vote.

Motion Fails

Motion # 17

Maker California Inland Region

To place an 8 year moratorium on the creation of new recovery literature after WSC 2023,

excluding all translations or literature projects currently in development.

Initial Straw Poll: 35-65-7-6 32% Lack of strong support (no)

There is an amendment.

Amendment Motion # 17-a1

Maker Northwest Russia Region

To place an 8 year a 6-year moratorium on the creation of new recovery literature after WSC

2023, excluding all translations or literature projects currently in development.

The motion as amended would read:

To place a 6-year moratorium on the creation of new recovery literature after WSC 2023,

excluding all translations or literature projects currently in development.

Initial Straw Poll: 33-53-10-17 34% Lack of strong support (no)

Invite the maker to speak to the amendment. (Speaking in Russian for translation)

Over the 6year period - 2 cycles - we believe this would be sufficient time to clear the projects currently on the pipeline.

Tom World Board: we do not believe this motion would produce its intent. Translation efforts involve a combination of contracted professionals and local members, not NAWS Human Resources so much.

Open up for discussion:

Comment: this motion is primarily about taking a break. We keep creating new projects, more than the board can keep up with. Let’s stop loading up the pipeline and instead finish what’s already in our plate.

Comment: we can’t put a moratorium on our personal recovery. We should never put a moratorium on the tools for that either.

Comment: against both the motion and the amendment. Bring on the literature, don’t hold it back.

Now Questions:

Question: to maker of the amendment: would this include lit passed at this conference? Facilitator directs the question to NAWS. Tim. Yes. Several CPs shout out no, and say “after”. Conferring going on up front about this slight disturbance. Tim repeats yes. The effect of this motion would take effect at the close of this conference, so any action on the new plans would violate the moratorium.

Tim: Any project plans submitted in next CAR would include the timeline saying no work commences until after the moratorium.

Question: region is split on the motion. This has come up before. I read and reread the boards response. Still need to know, what could you do if this passed that you otherwise couldn’t. Tim again refers back to the CAR response. We simply don’t believe this would accomplish its intent.

Question: If this motion passed, then motion 13 wouldn’t start for 6 years? Answer: that’s correct.

Question: what lit projects are currently in development now? Answer: Tim: currently lots of translations, none new in English. One revision of “The Loner”.

Question: in the lit survey there was an option to not develop any new literature. How did that poll? Answer: that answer is in the conference report. My memory is that it’s 11% we’re in support of that option.

Question: historically there are many examples of things approved but never taken up. The office’s response is always resource crunch. I don’t understand why the board is opposed to catching up with all of that. It seems to me this motion tries to help the board catch up and I don’t understand why they oppose it. Tim: see the CAR response.

Anthony: motions tend to be very prescriptive.

Question: what do we actually need? Money, people, processes, what?

Anthony: I believe in the CAR we laid out what the challenges are and what we see as a broken system of prioritization. I think what we need is one coherent system of prioritizing lit projects. There is no magic bullet. Lots of things are needed, but that is the main one. We have to start by recognizing what’s wrong with our planning and prioritizing process. Seems sort of like a second step issue at this point.

2nd straw poll: 30-86-3-4 25% Lack of Strong Support (no)

No opposition to calling this the final vote.

Motion fails

Back to motion # 17

Initial Straw Poll: 35-65-7-6 32% Lack of strong support (no)

Final Vote: 31-89-3-3 25% Lack of Strong Support (no)

Motion fails

Motion # 18

Maker Tejas Bluebonnet Region

To direct the World Board to create a project plan for the next WSC to study permitting

service committees of Narcotics Anonymous who are, or may be, willing to serve as literature printing/distribution and selling centers inside and outside the United States. Initial Straw Poll: 42-65-2-4 38% (no)

Open up for discussion

Maker: we have had lots of problems getting lit related to logistics, shipping costs, etc. this keeps happening. We think it would be beneficial to add distribution centers. That’s why we’re asking for this.

Comment: not an easy motion. Lit revenue the main source of income and those sales flattening, how are going to thrive and go. Not an emergency but it is something to think about. Thank the wb for consolidating motions into a single proposal. Thanks to them also for their response. They’ve pointed out hazards that could be encountered. Can other service committees get involved and relieve some of their logistical burden?

Comment: my region is opposed. We feel it’s in conflict with the vision of NA that our lit be available all over the world in our own languages. Our ability to do this is thanks to the lit being sold around the world. In addition, we have a lack of trusted servants locally as well. Shifting this burden to us wouldn’t be good for us. We have always found ways to get lit, and have done so very well with the help of NAWS.

Comment: first we deeply thank NAWS for all they do and have done to support us in getting our lit reasonably priced and sometimes free. We have a distribution center that is not directly NAWS affiliated. We have had mixed experiences with this. We have studied NAWS answer to this in the CAR and agree with their skepticism and the likelihood that shifting this burden Your local fellowships would do no harm than good. Our region currently would not support centralization of lit distribution, but we feel a project plan to examine this would be beneficial.

Comment: we have addressed this in our region and support it strongly because we have had so many customs issues trying to get lit to our island. One thing going on is that lots of treatment centers send people our way and our demand for lit is huge. So it takes a long time to order, receive, deal with customs, and get lit into our hands and the members hands.

Final Vote: 42-78-4-2 33% Lack of Strong Support (no)

Motion fails

Motion # 21

Free State Region

To direct NA World Services to remove the Hospitals and

Institutions Handbook from the inventory.

Initial Straw Poll: 24-82-2-5 22% (no)

Facilitator: there is an amendment that we would have considered a substitute motion.

Amendment motion # 21-a1

Maker South Florida Region

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

Create a project plan for the next WSC to update the Hospitals and

Institutions Handbook and remove outdated terms and references. Initial Straw Poll: 71-24-3-15 72% Strong support (pnv)

Amendment discussion:

Maker of the amendment: my region feels strongly that this material is still very widely in use including in H&I internationally, mostly in Spanish. We agree it is outdated, but we think updating it is a better option than removing it. We hope these materials could become things similar to the service toolbox, more ready to more nimbly updates. WB recommendation is to update H&I basics instead of this.

Comment: even if this passes, it might go into the CAR survey, not a project plan. We strongly object to this. The CAR survey is broken as well. It was a trial basis and is still in use but is broken. I don’t appreciate that projects from motions that were passed are still languishing. Hey should be followed through on.

Comment: my region is very attached to the handbook and needs it, though we agree it needs updating. An updated h&i basics wouldn’t be enough.

Question time:

Comment: Tim, are you supporting this motion? Deferred until question time. The questioner was not English-speaking. Needed clarification.

Question from before: Tim, are you recommending this motion! Answer, no, we are instead using the H&I tools in the CAR survey. We believe that is a more efficient method.

Question: we are talking as though this is an amendment but it is really a substitute motion. Answer: We told the maker no, this is a substitute. They said they were operating from a 2018 statement made by facilitators that substitute motions would be treated as amendments so we allowed it, but we want to discuss this later in the week and fix that. This one was the only exception so we didn’t want them to get caught in this confusion so we’re just dealing with it this way.

A little stirring about this. Daniel says let’s see what the straw poll looks like at this point. Opening the poll now, voting on the amendment.

Final Vote: 89-28-3-6 74% Strong Support (no) because board is updating H&I basics

Amendment passes

Motion 21 now will be substituted with the new language. So the passing of the amendment means the main motion was changed, not that the main motion was passed. Now going to poll the amended motion.

Clarifying discussion on what we’re voting on.

Answer, just the motion as amended.

Final Vote: 109-13-3-1 87% Consensus Support (abs)

Motion passes

Ending session for the night

May 3

Full session

Planning – Creating our Future

Jim DeLizia, a consultant World Services has used for many years, will lead us in an inventory activity designed to reboot the strategic planning process at World Services and across the service system.

Session 2

Moved to breakout rooms

Planning – Creating our Future (breakouts)

Small-group inventory activity. What are the external and internal factors that can impact our ability to achieve our vision?

Session 3

Planning Wrap Up

Back together in one large group, we’ll hear from each room and discuss next steps for the planning process.

Session 4

Starting with the Budget overview. This session should be a 30 minute presentation and another hour of Q&A

There was a lot of discussion on this. And lasted a little longer.

Session 5

Now the Human Resources Panel is reporting to the conference. This was the discussion on the election process.

Ended the night with zonal meeting.

May 4

Session 1

NAWS report

The NAWS Report covers lots of information and is divided into two sessions with a half-hour break between. Anthony, the executive director of World Services, will report on NAWS’ financial, legal, and operational matters during the first session, including a plan to change our approach to listing meeting information next cycle.

Session 2

NAWS Report (continued)

Tim, the chair of the World Board, will focus on board- and conference-related issues, including the literature survey results. Because we have not scheduled a Fellowship Development or PR session at this WSC, we will also touch on some highlights of FD and PR in the time of COVID, as well as translations and free and subsidized literature.

Went on to questions and answers.

Session 3

Budget Decisions and Discussion of CAR Survey Results

After yesterday’s budget overview, there shouldn’t be many outstanding questions about the budget. Most of this session will be devoted to a discussion of the CAR survey results and project plans. See the Conference Report for the survey results and the board’s recommendations.

Session 4

CAT-Related Discussion and Decisions

The CAT-Related Discussion and Decisions session addresses Motions #26–32 to approve project plans and the budget for the cycle ahead, if those were not decided on in the previous session. Participants will also discuss and decide on Motion #37 to adopt the reimbursement policy for the cycle. This session also includes motions to seat regions, which for this WSC are Motions #39–43. Altogether, there are 13 motions.

Becky takes the mic. We'll start each motion or issue by straw polling your level of support.

First question: That the focus of the Issue Discussion Topic Project Plans be the following for the 2023-2026 cycle:

Dealing with disruptive and predatory behavior

Gender-neutral and inclusive language in NA

Reimagining and revitalizing service committees

DRT/MAT as it relates to NA

Straw polling the question about the focus of the IDTs listed above for the current cycle.

Straw poll: 118-6-2-0 93% consensus support (yes)

This is just a straw poll, not an official decision at this point.

Second question: That the focus of the New and Revised service tools project plan be the following for the 2023-2026 cycle:

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

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

And if time permits:

Revise and update the service pamphlet Group Business Meetings, with a section on using a CBDM process, and the concept of delegation.

Revise and update H&I basics

Straw poll: 123-5-4-0 93% consensus support (yes)

Third question: That the focus of the Revising Existing Recovery IP’s Project Plan be the following for the 2023-2026 cycle:

Revise IP #21 The Loner

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

These are:

Step working guide aimed at members not new to working the steps.

Step working booklet focused mainly on steps 1-3 aimed primarily at new members and those in treatment and drug court.

Revise and simplify the step working Guides

Straw poll: 121-10-1-1 91% (yes)

Taking roll for the record as we move to CAT motions:

116 RD’s, 6ZD’s, 13WB

Motion #26

Maker World Board

To approve the project plan for New Recovery Informational Pamphlets.

Initial straw poll: : 108-5-3-10 93% consensus support (pnv)

Now inviting two in opposition to speak, since in the initial straw poll there was consensus support.

One comment: don't like that the women in recovery IP isn't on that list.

Comment: Voting no solely because we felt strongly that we still lack a process and a prioritization mythology that this body can participate in.

Taking another straw poll. If consensus holds, this will be a decision.

Question: Can you remind us of the list of projects we are voting on now?

Answer, the ones we just straw polled with Becky.

What happens if we don't approve this motion? Answer, if it fails, the items we just straw polled won't become a project plan.

Is it true that there are no new IPs involved in this list? In response, they are putting up the slide showing what this relates to one more time.

Note: Someone points out that the list says "SWG" lit, but could we just say "SW" lit so as not to confuse it with the current step working guide. This is accepted.

The straw poll we did a few minutes ago was inclusive of both motions 26 and 27, right? Answer, that's correct.

Opening the poll now.

2nd straw poll: 124-10-0-0 92% Consensus Support (yes)

Motion Passes

Motion # 27

Maker World Board

To approve the project plan for Revising Existing Recovery Informational

Pamphlets.

Initial Straw Poll: 112-3-3-8 94% consensus support (pnv)

Clarification: This motion is also part of the straw poll you just took. This is the official action to approve that project plan now.

Now inviting two in opposition to speak

No discussion, taking the second straw poll now.

2nd straw poll: 131-2-1-2 97% Consensus Support (yes)

Motion passes

Motion # 28

Maker World Board

To approve the project plan for Issue Discussion Topics.

Initial Straw Poll: 111-3-6-6 92% consensus support (pnv)

Now inviting two in opposition to speak

Comment: It's hard to vote on these because we didn't have any of these. They weren't run by my region. Hard to get group conscience.

Taking second straw poll.

2nd straw poll: 127-5-2-0 94% consensus support (yes)

Motion passes

Motion # 29

Maker World Board

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

Initial Straw Poll: 113-1-4-8 95% consensus support (pnv)

Now inviting two in opposition to speak.

Comment: One stands: We should be working on the handbook that we passed, and not the basics. My region is saying that's the lit they want and need. The basics is not sufficient to help a new committee get its start and direction.

Taking a second straw poll. If consensus holds, it will be a final decision.

Question: Is there a process for those that want the handbook that we can practice here to decide if that is acceptable to the body?

Answer. No, the project plan was not written for a handbook.

2nd straw poll: 122-11-1-0 91% consensus support (yes)

Motion passes

Motion # 30

Maker World Board

To approve the project plan for Future of the WSC.

Initial Straw Poll: 109-3-4-10 93% consensus support (pnv)

Inviting two in opposition to speak.

No comments or questions.

Final Vote: 130-4-1-0 96% consensus support (yes)

Motion passes

Motion # 31

Maker World Board

To approve the project plan for Invest in Our Vision.

Initial Straw Poll: 108-2-6-10 93% consensus support (pnv)

Inviting two in opposition to speak.

No comments or questions.

Final Vote: 127-6-2-0 94% Consensus Support (yes)

Motion passes

Motion # 32

Maker World Board

To approve the 2023–2025 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc., Budget

Initial Straw Poll: 109-3-7-7 91% (yes)

Inviting two in opposition to speak.

No comments or questions.

Reminder this was discussed at length earlier in the day.

Final Vote: 129-5-1-0 95% Consensus Support (yes)

Motion passes

Motion # 37

Maker World Board

To adopt the 2023–2025 Reimbursement Policy.

Initial Straw Poll: 112-1-5-8 94% consensus support (yes)

Inviting two in opposition to speak.

No comments

Question: Shouldn't that date range be 2023 to 2026 now?

Answer, that will be revised at the interim conference. (references to the interim conference: in the new 3-year cycle, there will be an interim virtual conference mid-cycle.

Final Vote: 132-1-2-0 97% Consensus Support (yes)

Motion passes

Done for the night

May 5, 2023

Session 1

Motion # 39

Maker France

To seat Iran Region #1 at the World Service Conference.

Initial Straw Poll: 102-5-7-12 89% consensus support (yes)

Inviting two in opposition to speak.

Comment: One says the elephant in this room is the growing number of regions causing the conference to continue growing beyond effectiveness and cost effectiveness. We are for inclusion, of course, but we don’t believe we should ignore this issue.

Questions: we have one seated region in Iran and this would add another one, right? And it is from a split, right?

Irene WB speaks: they met the criteria and they met the geographic boundaries. Iran contains about a third of our members worldwide in a single region. The emerging region sees itself as having some philosophical differences with the existing region, so they wish to establish themselves separately.

Final Vote: 116-12-4-3 87% Consensus Support (yes)

Motion passes Applause from the body to welcome the new region.

Motion # 40

Maker South Florida Region

To seat Brazil Central region

Initial Straw Poll: 76-18-12-20 71% Strong Support (yes)

Because of strong support open up for any discussion.

Comment: This is my first conference, and I came here with low expectations that have been greatly exceeded. In general we are in favor of seating regions. But in this case, if this region is seated, Brazil loses its Zonal Delegate, because they will have only one unseated region. I would not like any region to not have their voice heard here.

Open up for questions:

Question for WB: I've heard a lot about the size of conference and the lack of space even in this room. Would it be feasible to arrange this room differently to accommodate growth. Irene WB: That's something we would have to look into. Fire marshal issues etc that we would have to investigate before commenting on that.

Question: About the count - 135 present and voting, right? Daniel: yes, that's right.

Question: Does the Brazilian Zonal Forum recommend seating in this case?

Irene: We don't currently have a criteria to require zonal recommendation. We are looking at adding that to the seating criteria (established over 20 years ago), but it isn't required now. The criteria are vague and need more work.

Question: The board had no recommendation. What was their thinking to move forward anyway? South Florida speaks: My region was aware that one of these didn't receive a recommendation We, through the zone and other ways, do have quite a bit of interaction with Brazilian regions. We are a region who supports inclusivity and including all voices that desire to be here. We don't want to tell anyone you're not welcome here. We were aware that the Brazilian Zone would lose their seat if these regions were seated. What was that point about a plus two impact on the conference?

By adding three of the four Brazilian regions, is the impact of that that one region effectively loses its voice here? In other words, if the ZD is removed, you would have three directly represented and one not represented at all.

Daniel: sort of let the question speak for itself and didn't speak to it.

Question: If Brazil Central Region is seated, I was wondering if they would consider our model, where we have an unseated region traveling and collaborating with a seated region at the conference? Daniel: Brazilian ZD, could you answer this for us? Responding in Portuguese through a translator: I'm not the delegate of the Brazil Central Region, and they did not send any representation with the Brazilian delegation. However, one delegate here is in contact with them and would be better positioned to answer. Is he allowed to speak? Irene speaks: Just to be clear, the seating workgroup doesn't get into philosophical discussions around the future of the WSC or what to do with unseated regions. We look only at the criteria and do they meet it. Of course everyone wants a seat at the table and we want to welcome everyone, but we do have criteria and that's our focus.

Comment from the Brazilian Zonal Delegate: We are in support of seating these three regions. This region is 10 years old, and we seek to align our growth with our geographical reality. The non-recommendation was about geography we think, but part of this region is in a neighboring region based on the way our services are organized. This is the main reason why that region and the Zonal Forum favor seating this region.

2nd straw poll: 88-32-7-9 69% Strong Support (yes)

No one opposed to making this the final vote.

Motion passes

Motion # 41

Maker South Florida Region

To seat Nordeste Brazil Region

Initial Straw Poll: 89-9-12-16 80% consensus support (yes)

Inviting two in opposition to speak.

No comments or questions.

Final Vote: 112-13-3-9 87% Consensus Support (yes)

Motion passes

Motion # 42

Maker South Florida Region

To seat Rio Grande do Sul

Initial Straw Poll: 91-7-11-17 83% consensus support (yes)

Inviting two in opposition to speak.

No comments or questions.

Final Vote: 111-13-3-10 87% Consensus Support (yes)

Motion passes

Motion # 43

Maker South Florid Region

To seat Thailand Region

Initial Straw Poll: 91-12-9-14 81% consensus support (yes)

Inviting two in opposition to speak.

Comment: : I feel like we’re seating a lot of people and of course I want everyone at the table. But seating for cultural difference doesn’t seem like a valid criteria to me.

Lib from WB with a question: for Irene Re the seating process. We’re you in contact with the local Thai members during the seating process?

Answer: Yes, though most is the members involved in the Thai region are expats. However, our job was to ask if they met the criteria. They did. We did discuss a lot the relative lack of local Thai members, but the region has added a website in Thai, so we did see that as favorable.

Question: Historically after a region has been seated, has there been growth?

Anthony: sometimes. Depends on a variety of factors. It depends on whether lit is available in the language, the nature of the services, etc. variety of factors.

Question: are there restrictions on addicts gathering in Thailand, and how are they with the criminalization of addiction.

Answer: there was at one time a purge where addicts were rounded up, some even executed etc, but this condition have changed and are now more favorable for NA.

Response on Zoom from one who lives in Thailand. Lots of frustration expressed about seated people talking about not seating someone who has met the criteria and has requested seating multiple times.

Final Vote: 119-14-1-3 88% Consensus Support (yes)

Motion passes

Tim takes the mic to note that this is Daniel’s last motion as cofac, and the body gives a rousing standing ovation for his service.

Now we were given the election results:

World Board Carla W, Jack H, Jose Luis, Tim S, Veronica B.

Human Resource Panel Sam L, Ron M.

Co-Facilitator Louis H

Session 2

We went to breakout rooms for small group discussion.

Creating our Future

This small-group discussion is focused on identifying the top issues to be discussed by the Future of the WSC project and develop ideas about those topics or issues.

Session 3

New Idea Discussions

This session and the next feature small-group discussions about the New Idea topics prioritized by the conference. On Saturday we will talk about next steps for the topics.

Session 4

New Idea Discussions

This session and the previous feature small-group discussions about the New Idea topics prioritized by the conference. On Saturday we will talk about next steps for the topics.

May 6

Session 1

Wrap Up from New Idea discussions

Saturday morning, we all met together to talk about yesterday’s New Idea Discussions, including the points of agreement or disagreement from the breakouts. We never have the resources (time, money, people) to address every issue, so we will decide together as a conference what to act on or continue discussing between now and the next WSC.

Session 2

Moving Forward with a Common Vision

The Moving Forward sessions are where we summarize the week’s discussions and decisions. Typically, in this session we prioritize projects, list workgroups that will be formed, remind everyone of the IDTs for the cycle, and make decisions about any ongoing policy changes that the WSC wants to see after trying new processes during the conference.

Session 3

Moving Forward with a Common Vision (continued)

The goal of these Moving Forward sessions is to make sure we are all on the same page with next steps for the work ahead.

The moving forward, CAR survey and new ideas session should be in the RDA’s (Bob) report.

Session 4

Certificates and goodbyes

Certificates for participation were handed out. Also acknowledge World Service trusted servants whose terms conclude with this conference, Nathanael M. HRP, Craig R HRP and Daniel C. Co-facilitator.

I want to thank Ron H for giving me access to his blog, which allowed me to provide such a thorough report. If you have any questions please feel free to contact me.

This was a long emotional week for me, coming to a head with these final goodbyes. I want to thank the Michigan Region for allowing me the privilege serve this great fellowship.

Marty D