

Since the last meeting of this body, there has been no formally required service commitments conducted and /or attended by this RD or RD Alternate. The following is a report on key issues and or items before the Fellowship of NA.

- **Service System Proposal (as workshopped @ MARLCNA XXVII on February 12,2011 and summarized by the secretary of the NEZF)**

## **Service System Project:**

### **Desired Outcomes:**

*We hope to:*

- Help everyone to understand the proposals
- Receive input and feedback to help shape the future of the work
- Hear how these ideas might impact our local fellowships

**Project background:** *Commonly experienced, ongoing challenges in NA service:*

*These common challenges were identified through the past few years' Issue Discussion Topics (IDTs)*

- Ineffective communication
- Insufficient resources
- Frustrated trusted servants
- Poor atmosphere of recovery in service meetings

## **Foundational Principles for a Revitalized Service**

### **System:**

- Purpose Driven
- Group-focused
- Defined by geographic boundaries
- Flexible
- Collaborative

## **A Summary of the WB's Service System Discussions** *January, 2011*

We spent much of our January meeting holding discussions about the next stage of the Service System workgroup. We spent two full days in discussions with the Service System workgroup members and staff and will be formulating a new, revised proposal in the upcoming weeks. We expect to have this next draft to you by March. We hope it will be the basis of further discussion that will help us to frame what proposals will be contained in the 2012 ***Conference Agenda Report.***

Much of our discussions were about how components of the system work as well as how they work together based on being Purpose Driven, Group-focused, Defined by Geographic Boundaries, Flexible, and Collaborative. Our discussions will be reflected in the revisions of the proposals, but this March e-blast should give you an overview of our ideas in the meantime. We

are also working on developing material about processes that we believe can help us all be more effective in working toward our vision.

So many of you have held and are planning to hold workshops and discussions about these proposals that we wanted to let you know as soon as we could about our discussions of your input and the direction of our ideas for revision of the proposals. We reviewed the more-than-100 pages of input you submitted, and we thank each of you for helping to shape the proposals and move this work forward.

## **Foundational Principles—Collaborative**

“Collaborative” has been added to the list of foundational principles. There are now five foundational principles: collaborative, group-focused, purpose driven, flexible, and geographically defined.

Successful service provision depends on all the elements of a service system working together toward our common primary purpose. This means that structure, processes, people, and resources must work together, and that components of the system must cooperate both “vertically” and “horizontally” throughout the structure.

### **❖ Group Support (Group Support Unit, GSU)**

A service body devoted most centrally to meeting groups’ needs will continue to be a central part of the proposals. We do not feel it is necessary, or helpful, at this time to recommend a particular option—linear or two-track—for local services, but we will try to outline the different options and provide reasons why a community might prefer one or the other.

#### **Things that would happen at GSU meetings:**

- Informal training and mentoring
- Discussion of group issues, group sharing, NO business
- Welcoming and outreach to new groups and members
- Orientation and introduction to service (recovery literature & service literature, traditions, concepts, etc.)
- Informal information sharing (e.g., upcoming events, LSU activities, new merchandise, NAWS issues topics)
- In some instances or circumstances, GSUs may be involved in some service delivery (e.g., putting up flyers in the community or supporting a local H&I meeting).

***GSU attendance is open: Groups send a delegate and any interested member can come.***

### **❖ Local Services (Local Service Unit, LSU)**

We have spent quite a lot of time at our last two board meetings discussing how we believe an LSU actually works. These discussions will result in better clarification of our vision of this component of the system rather than any real change to the structural model already offered. Revisions to the proposals will describe the local service unit as comprised of a local service board and a regular (three to four times a year) planning conference, including an annual planning assembly event.

#### **Functions of a Local Service Board:**

- Includes chair, vice chair, treasurer, secretary, delegate(s), and service coordinators for essential services
- Meets monthly or as needed
- Oversees workgroups and routine services; coordinates the planning assemblies; develops budget and strategic plan to be reviewed, input, and approved by the planning conference; maintains external relationships; sends a delegate to the next level of service.

## **Planning Conference**

- Consists of group and/or GSU delegates, LSB members, project coordinators, and interested members
- Meets three to four times a year
- Starts with an annual assembly (see below) to gather input and set planning goals. Planning conferences follow the stages of the planning cycle. They are used to prioritize, approve workgroups and budget created by the LSB, monitor and report, change direction as necessary, evaluate service delivery, and elect the board.
- There may also be training sessions and a session for interfacing with the intermediate, state/national, and world services levels (like a CAR workshop).
- As throughout the system, decisions will be made by consensus where possible. Annual Assembly
- The annual assembly is a planning event that gathers input from everyone to set planning priorities (like our environmental scan).
- It consists of everyone who attends the quarterly/triennial planning conference... All interested members are encouraged to attend.

## **❖ Intermediate Bodies**

Intermediate bodies are those service bodies created to meet needs of density or distance or language. In essence, they are intended to span a gap between one level of service and the next in places where the NA community is densely populated, such as New York, or where the distances are great, such as Texas, or in places where the population is bilingual, such as Montreal. They are “permanent” and they are within the delegation stream. While it may be tempting to rename an existing service body an “intermediate body” to minimize the impact of restructuring, that’s not the spirit of the proposals. A clear need must be established to create an intermediate body. As already stated in the proposal, they are not created to provide shared services outside of the delegation stream. We acknowledge the need to explain how shared services will function in the new system and are asking that some of you who have experience with shared services share your experience with us.

## **❖ State/Nation/Province Approach**

The board needs to further discuss what we mean by “state,” “nation,” and “province.” In the revisions to the proposals we will more explicitly acknowledge that the terms “state” and “province” are more flexible than simply “U.S. states, Canadian provinces, and everyone else is a nation.” Some type of “state” approach may be applicable to countries such as Brazil, Russia, Mexico, and India with many meeting and multiple regions. Conversely, it may make sense to combine states in places like New England. The issue needs further discussion.

## **❖ WSC Seating**

We will be recommending a seating model based on state/national/province service bodies. We recognize that this model may have a shelf life due to the size of the WSC, and we will continue to be interested in exploring something like a “zonal” seating model (with the understanding that the “zones” as we now know them might need to be revamped to make such a model workable). At this time, however, state/nation/province seating seems most practical. Further seating criteria need to be developed, including but not limited to better defining “state” and “nation” (see above).

## **❖ Zonal Forums**

Zonal forums have only really been addressed in the proposals insofar as they do or don’t factor into seating. Their role in the system needs to be better defined in the proposals.

## **❖ Processes**

Ultimately, we would like to see concrete material on processes, like the ideas on planning discussed above in the “Local Services” section. However, given our perennial struggles with leadership and communication processes, we just don’t feel like we are there yet. We will be offering fundamental principles related to leadership, communication, and planning (and possibly decision-making, and what we are currently calling information management and issue management) in the next drafts of proposals.

➤ **Issues for Further Discussion:**

The following items need further clarification and discussion. This is by no means an exhaustive list. These are simply the items that came up in our recent discussions that we didn’t have time to fully address:

- Fund flow, including how the GSU is funded
- Literature distribution—where will groups buy their literature?
- Legal issues: corporations, insurance, RSOs
- Synching planning cycles throughout the system
- Who creates intermediate bodies?
- Who determines LSU boundaries?
- How do shared services (committees) work?
- The state/nation issue—e.g., Brazil, Mexico, India, Russia
- Further seating criteria

\*\*\*\*\*

**Group support and local services (GSUs & LSUs):**

**Benefits and challenges:**

**Challenge:** We recently did a regional workshop. We can’t fulfill our current positions, how can we fulfill another level of service?

**Comment:** I think there are other ways to address the local fellowship. If we don’t try we don’t learn...

**Question:** A GSR came to our group with this paper that was clearly a violation of our 9<sup>th</sup> Tradition. It seems that you’re putting the cart before the horse. What I’m saying is *who asked for this?*

**Answer:** This was unanimously approved at 2008 and then again at 2010. The reason people are confused that this is BEFORE the CAR. The groups will have an opportunity to give them input and get involved. Over and over we have pulled this information from the fellowship. Do you want us to keep at it?

**Challenges:**

- Not having enough human services as it is, adding this layer seems to be creating a gap. Lack of people is a problem; this does not solve the problem as stated.
- I’m reaching barriers, lots of closed doors. People don’t want to hear it or they don’t care. How do I overcome this?
- An Intermediate Body needs to be *needs* driven. If you can imagine a community with a multilingual fellowship you can imagine a community ... need to

**Benefit:** Spreading around and sharing best practices.

**Challenge:** I've heard a lot of resistance. There WAS some resistance at the conference and is there a way to spot this? In Orlando, it was asked, "Is there any way to stop this train?"

**Comment:** This has been discussed very well and *it will be out in 2011*. We've been working on this for 10 years now.

### **Existing and Proposed (Updated) Seating Option**

Currently we have 116 seated regions and their alternates. The board was asked to try to resolve this growth issue.

### **Timeline of work**

- Current 4 year project to end at WSC 2012. Begun in 2008.
- At WSC 2012, we're planning to offer a set of "agreements in principle"
- We are proposing a System rather than a pyramid structure.
- Both Vertical and Horizontal models have been discussed and straw polled. The new model will be one or the other >>  
Linear versus Two Track. The system could be both/neither. We don't know what it's going to look like yet.
- The models will be presented with rationales provided about why a local community may choose one or the other.

## ***Presented separate from the Power Point:***

### ➤ **What happens at the GSU:**

- Informal training and mentoring
- Discussion of group business, group sharing
- Welcome and outreach to new groups and members
- Orientation and intro to service
- Informal information sharing
- Some limited informal service
- Open attendance at least on designated from each group

### ➤ **What are Local Services?**

- **Local service board**
  - Meets monthly
  - Admin officers and delegates to the next level of service
  - Oversees workgroups
  - Coordinates and plans events

### ➤ **Local Planning conference:**

- A 3-4 times a year event >> Local Service Board elected here
- Consists of delegates from both GSUs and LSUs, Local Service Board members, Project and or workgroup leaders, any interested members
- One meeting a year is the Annual Planning Assembly
- May be some focused sessions, like a session for interfacing with another level (collaborative) like CAR Workshops or a training/orientation of new service members
- Primary focus: executing this quarter's step in the annual planning cycle
- Consensus decisions can be made here

## ➤ Annual Assembly

- One major check in and refocusing event in the cycle each year
- Scanning, reaffirming priorities, setting new priorities
- May complete some workgroups and begin others
- Group delegates, GSU delegates

## **Benefits and Challenges to GSUs/LSUs:**

**Benefit:** How would this look in our area? 4-6 areas formations in my region were based on resentments. The GSUs might be good for us in the city. And the local service unit could be based on our county. If we had this at the county level, we could provide services to the existing fellowship.

**Benefit:** This would be a nice way to utilize shared services where we were not able to before.

**Challenge:** If all these changes are going to come about, how are we going to implement these changes? I hope there's going to be some guidance.

**Benefit:** Consolidation of service resources

**Benefit:** Checking in w/fellowship to ensure we are on the right track

**Challenge:** When were the groups going to get this information?

**Benefit:** Anytime I hear anger, I hear fear. We're afraid of what we don't know. We HAVE been working on this for way more than 3 years through the IDTs. I come from an area where the demographic represented is under a year clean. How can a new member digest all this? How do I present? If you don't have a 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> Step or a 1<sup>st</sup> Tradition, how can you possibly take this all in?

**Challenge:** The structure as it is now is part of my energy. I was empowered. There was the thought of the inverted pyramid. Maybe we might need to go to a four year cycle for the WCNA. How can we be empowered to be a part of the voting process, getting our voice heard within this new system?

**Response:** Exactly like you do now. One of the challenges for me is if you believe the structure is working today, couldn't it be better? You can get your ideas heard the same way as you do now.

**Question:** I'm a newer member. I came in around 5 years ago, and what happened in the 90s doesn't mean much to me. The GSU is what most of the older members are in support of now. It's where the GSU discusses before the LSU the concerns of the groups. You proposed an Annual Planning Meeting; is that to discuss financial issues/budget problems/planning?

**Response:** The Town Hall Meeting is an example of what can happen at the Annual Planning Meeting. One of the problems that we kept coming up with was "one size just doesn't fit all."

**Comment:** In June, the RD came and gave a presentation on the Service System. Since then, I have conducted 3 workshops. Craig came to one. I get offended when people say that the groups don't know about it.

## ➤ Intermediate Bodies:

They would span a gap where needed. For example, it may not be practical for CA to be composed of delegates from all the LSUs.

*An Intermediate Body may be:*

- Created when the need definitely exists, but that need would be decided by LSUs
- Dependent upon density, distance or language
- A petition to reform

- Be needs based/purpose driven
- **Not** a place holder to retain existing structure
- **Not** shared services in the sense that it creates competition

### ➤ **State/Nation/Province**

- The basic model going in: *US, Canadian Provinces, Nations elsewhere*
- We need to identify any anomalies.

### **Challenges/benefits to State/Nation/Province**

**Challenge:** How are the different states/nation/provinces going to have the appropriate amount of proportionate representation?

**Challenge:** The train exists. Most motions that the world supports, pass. The motions that the world doesn't support, don't pass. It's like the WB is the 800 lb. gorilla in the world.

**Challenge:** We got these updates and the work group meets in June so we have little time to prepare the input and review for our groups. It feels like were being steered rather than allow things to take its due course.

**Challenge:** The Freestate Region is dead against any state representation. The challenge is that if it is implemented, if Maryland becomes a unit, if Virginia becomes a unit, some members say they will pull out. I tried to ask for input. "*If you don't like it, why not?*" I got nothing but a lot pissing and moaning. "*We just don't want it.*" How do we reach those people who don't want it?

**Response:** (from the point person for the workgroup): We want you to tell *US* what to do. We want your input. I've been a part of the process since it began. There's nothing wrong with having benefits and challenges. There's no challenge that we can't work through. In PA we would reverse the duplication of services if we became one. Challenges are an opportunity. If you look beyond the structure, you have people talking together about what we're going to do. If we all read what we're proposing, do some environmental scanning, look at the possibility of shared services, etc. We need to look at state/nation/province before we decide what to do with seating.

**As previously stated the preceding summary was compiled from notes taken at MARLCNA by Judi M. secretary of the NEZF.**

The second draft of the Service System Proposals was developed after gathering input from members of the Fellowship who chose to be part of the process. The draft material titled *Service System Proposals March 2011* can be accessed on the NA's website at: [www.na.org/servicesystem](http://www.na.org/servicesystem). NA World Services has stated that this report will "...form the basis of conversation that will help shape the material in the *Conference Agenda Report*."

Included on this webpage is all the materials distributed since the conference, as well as the background reports and updates with shortened session profiles for local workshops. In addition to all the materials, there is a link to a bulletin board for the project. Any questions or concerns don't hesitate to contact the NA World Services at [worldboard@na.org](mailto:worldboard@na.org).

- In response to the new service system proposals the first *United States Fellowship Assembly* was hosted in Wichita, Kansas March 4-6, 2011. The purpose of this assembly was to establish a “United States Service Conference” to respond to the “... many changes that have created a ‘disconnect’ between our members and all levels of NA services.” For more information you can access the Assembly’s website at:

**[www.usfellowshipassembly.org](http://www.usfellowshipassembly.org)  
or email  
[contact@usscnaformingcommittee.org](mailto:contact@usscnaformingcommittee.org)**

The United States Fellowship Assembly presented to those in attendance the United States Service Conference Information Booklet copyrighted 2011. Included in the booklet are following topics as found in the booklet’s table of contents:

1. A Vision for the United States
2. What is a Service Conference
3. The Inverted Pyramid
4. Proposed Agenda & Topics for Discussion
5. Group Conscience
6. Core Group for the United States Service Conference
7. History of this Project
8. Why do we need a United States Service Conference?
9. Frequently Asked Questions

After reading through the booklet, one can conclude that there appears to be very clear differences of perspective regarding the development and growth of NA when considering the viewpoints of NA World Services and those of the United States Service Assembly. Many statements were made throughout the booklet that are broad generalizations lacking specific support. One may view the statements as opinions. For example, in the discussion regarding Group Conscience the following statement was made: “Many very wrong decisions made in the name of Group Conscience have been the result of manipulation in form of incomplete, inaccurate or biased information.” Although this may be true, a supporting example or two of significance would provide a stable foundation upon which to build an argument.

Another example of unsupported generalizations was clearly evident in the following statement: “Changes began to happen at world services such as disbanding the literature writing committee and hiring paid writers and taking our membership out of the process. True as it may be that paid writers are involved in the process, our membership has not been taken out of the process. This is especially clear for anyone who has been involved in the literature review and input process. The most recent examples of completed literature projects whose success was framed by membership participation are [In Times of Illness](#) and [Living Clean The Journey Continues](#) of which the WNY Fellowship actively contributed review and input.

United States Fellowship Assembly II for Narcotics Anonymous is scheduled for October 28 – 30, 2011 in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Assembly II is seeking to confirm group conscience regarding the establishment of a United States Service Conference. With all that is currently taking shape within the Fellowship, I strongly recommend that the WNY Region of NA travels to this event so that more can be revealed.

One last matter concerning the United States Fellowship Assembly needs mention. In a email from NA World Services dated May 2, 2011 there was reference to the “recent illicit publication of the Basic Text labeled Narcotics Anonymous Third Edition, Revised with original Fourth and Ninth Traditions, Fellowship Approved, United States Fellowship Assembly. The publication involves violation of Fellowship Copyrights. For those interested, World Services has posted a response that includes Narcotics Anonymous Copyrights and Literature and a brief factual history of the development of the Basic Text; as well as, related motions that passed at WSC in 1991 concerning the protection of NA’s Intellectual Property Rights. Any questions regarding this matter do not hesitate to email World at **Worldboard@na.org**.

Once again, we ask that the word be spread by the RCMs that each ASC ask their Area to schedule service structure workshops for the purpose of gaining input and conscience regarding the proposed changes to NA’s service structure. Changes to NA’s service structure have been proposed and are being revised in preparation for the upcoming World Conference. If we as a Region want to effectively participate “in matters affecting other groups or NA as a whole” (4<sup>th</sup> Tradition), then we need to be mindful of the 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, and 9<sup>th</sup> Concepts of NA.

- Concept 7 “All members of a service body bear substantial responsibility for that body’s decisions and should be allowed to fully participate in its decision-making processes.”
- Concept 8 “Our service structure depends on the integrity and effectiveness of our communications.”
- Concept 9 “All elements of our service structure have the responsibility to carefully consider all viewpoints in their decision-making processes.”

**Request for workshops can be scheduled by calling Jim L. at 716-834-9522.**

## WSC

Please note that proposals for the inclusion in the Conference Agenda Report have a deadline of August 1, 2011. Also, if we are interested in submitting proposals for discussion the deadline is the same. Please see the February 2011 issue of NAWS News for detailed explanation of what is being proposed for the 2012 Conference and submission of proposals.

## **N.E.Z.F.**

I wish to remind this body that the RD and RD Alternate are committed to service events in July 2011 and December 2011. Disbursements will be asked for at the meeting of Region prior to the service commitments. At this time the RD and RD Alternate are requesting a disbursement of \$1050.50 for the NEZF being hosted in Sturbridge, MA the weekend of July 22- 24, 2011.

Travel/Mileage (873 Approximated):	\$436.50
Tolls (Round Trip Approximated):	\$40.00
Hotel (2 nights @ \$107 – taxes ?):	\$214.00
Stipend for RD (food)	\$180.00
Stipend for RDAlt (food)	<u>+\$180.00</u>
	\$1050.50

More will be revealed ~ yours in service,

*Jim L.*

**PEACE BE THE JOURNEY**