Service System 101 and Project Update (through Jan. 2013) Workshop

Session Overview: (90 minutes, 2 hours is better for more Q&A time)
Go through PowerPoint presentation (45-50 min)
Q&A (40-45min)

On workshop tables for this session: (from www.na.org/servicesystem) - Basics
tools: GSU, LSU, Facilitator, Planning, CBDM; Ongoing topics; Healthy Service System

Documents for facilitators: Copy of this session profile; a copy of "A Vision For NA
Service" (you will hand to someone and ask them to read aloud); copy of the documents
on the tables (for reference).

PowerPoint Presentation (45 min)
Open with prayer and facilitators introduce themselves. If workshop is small enough
(and time allows) ask participants to introduce themselves, where they are from, etc.
(FACILITATOR #1)
Briefly review the materials on the tables, and let everyone know the 3rd draft proposal
is online.

Workshop Objectives
(slide 1) Explain that this workshop is just intended to give a review and overview to the
ideas in the 3rd draft of the Service System Project (but not explain in detail-see
resources on the SSP page at www.na.org), go over updates since the WSC2012-
especially the new tools that are on the SSP webpage, and answer questions for the
last part of the workshop. We will go through all the information in the powerpoint first,
so if you have questions that come up during, please write them down and we'll get to
as many as possible during the 2nd half of the workshop. The proposals have lots of
detailed information and it would be impossible to cover all of it here, but you can read
the essay and addendum in the 2012 CAR or go online to the project webpage and find
out more. Also write to world services or contact your regional delegate.

(Ask for a show of hands to see who has been to a service system workshop session
already? Who is familiar with the 3rd draft proposal of the SSP? Who is not familiar at
all? Ask who is familiar with the current NA service structure?)

Project Background
(slide 2) Many members have asked "where did this project come from?" We've
"retrofitted" the structure as best we can over the years but we continue to hear about
the same problems with local services from different sources:
⊠   Open-ended sessions at Worldwide Workshops all around the fellowship for years
asked what were the most significant issues members faced; most pointed to
challenges with local services. Apathy is almost always the #1 challenge – people don't
want to be involved.

☒ At PR Roundtables with professionals from the treatment, medical, and judicial fields, we asked about their perceptions of NA and how we are to work with. They indicated significant challenges such as NA being hard to contact or having multiple service bodies to communicate with.

☒ We've had several IDTs focused on our service system (Infrastructure, Our Service System, Leadership, Communication) over the last decade. Members talked about very little training and mentorship, a lack of trusted servants, a negative atmosphere of recovery in our service meetings, and ineffective services (e.g., helplines with no one answering them), to name a few issues.

The Service System Project is taking a holistic look at the system to think of ways to resolve some of these problems.

Project was adopted at WSC 2008 and reaffirmed at WSC 2010.
In August 2010 we released "first draft" proposals, after getting input at the conference on the initial ideas from the project. We took input on those proposals until the end of 2010, published "second draft" proposals in March 2011, and then revised and rereleased the proposals as part of the 2012 CAR. The differences from the first draft to now are not major, for the most part— more of a refinement than rethinking. We have also added new material each time, offering thoughts on the processes we use in service, and some examples of how the ideas could look in different types of communities.

(slide 3) The "A Vision for NA Service" was developed by the 2008 SSP workgroup and approved at the WSC2010. It is for service bodies at all levels of service. Hand a copy to a workshop participant and ask them to read it out loud (they can keep it).

(slide 4) 8 Resolutions and 9 straw polls passed at the WSC2012. A transition plan will be presented in 2014.   Two main focuses to get there:
• Ongoing discussion topics—areas that the world board plans to talk about this cycle
• Field Testing—putting the proposals into practice

Additional background info is available on the webpage: www.na.org/servicesystem.

(FACILITATOR #2)
(slide 5) Fishbone diagram
This illustrates the different elements of any successful system: structure, process, people, and resources. Those elements must all work together to realize our vision. Our first draft proposals focused almost exclusively on structure—though it was a "process-driven" structure. What that means is that process issues (e.g., How to communicate more effectively with the public? How to better support the groups?) informed our ideas about how to structure service bodies.

The second and third draft proposals introduced more ideas about processes. As we continue to discuss ideas for how to more effectively deliver services and continue to

refine these proposals, we hope to further develop ideas about processes, people and resources.

This relates to Resolution 1.

(slide 6) Five foundational principles
The resolutions in the CAR attempt to capture some of the principles that are the foundation of our thinking about a revised system.

Purpose-driven: Each of the proposed service system units is designed to answer a specific need or group of needs, and the responsibilities of each unit should be clearly defined and understood. This relates to Resolution 4 and 5.

Group-focused: The group support unit (GSU) focuses on aiding the groups in their efforts to carry our message. This relates to Resolution 2.

Defined by geographic boundaries: Following established geographic boundaries for our service bodies where practical will make it easier for professionals and the general public to find and communicate with us. It will also allow us to interface better with professional and legislative bodies. This relates to Resolution 7 and 8.

Collaborative: Successful service provision depends on all the elements of a service system working together toward a common goal. Consensus-based decision making encourages collaborative efforts within service bodies. Communication and planning help service bodies cooperate and synchronize efforts both "vertically" and "horizontally" throughout the structure. This relates to Resolution 5 and 6.

Flexible: We feel strongly that form should follow function and that communities need to have the flexibility to adapt the system in ways that work best for them. Structurally, that may be accomplished through optional service bodies, or "intermediate bodies," which can answer specific needs if the general model of GSU-LSU-state/nation/province cannot accommodate distance, density, or language needs in a given community. This relates to Resolution 7.

(slide 7) Group and Local Services
Now we are going to talk about some of the ideas for delivering local services in the proposals.
Overview of the local portion of the proposals:
GSUs and LSUs replace ASCs
GSUs devoted to group support
LSUs devoted to service delivery

Explain how in our current system the ASC has responsibility for both group support and local service. That is how the ASC is described in GLS. In many cases, having this dual focus means the needs of the groups gets overlooked.

These proposals offer a division of these tasks between the GSU and LSU. The GSU is devoted to group support and the LSU to local service delivery. LSUs are larger and they are defined geographically where possible (e.g., city, town).

(slide 8)Group Support
The GSU is where local groups gather to discuss their issues apart from the "business" and policies of NA. Relate to Resolution 2.

The GSU offers both structural and process changes intended to better support groups:
- ☒ GSUs are discussion forums for group issues, not decision-making bodies
- ☒ Several GSUs will make up an LSU - this will vary depending on size and density
- ☒ GSUs are neighborhood based

What happens at the GSU?
- ☒ Welcome & outreach to new groups & members
- ☒ Informal information sharing – group to group
- ☒ Orientation & introduction to service
- ☒ Informal training & mentoring (Relate to Resolution 3)
- ☒ Some limited, informal service (putting up fliers, supporting outreach or H&I) if necessary
- ☒ Open attendance; at least one designated delegate from each group

GSU Options
- Neighborhood based
- Usually multiple GSU's for one LSU

There are two structural options for organizing the GSU: two-track and linear.

The more the board discussed the two options, the more the two-track option seemed to the most sense. In particular, the idea of a quarterly LSU meeting reduces the amount of service meetings a group delegate would have to attend, making it less burdensome to attend both the LSU and the GSU. Some communities may still prefer the linear, however.

(slide 9) Local Services
The local service unit:
- Delivers bulk of local services
- Uses planning
- Meets quarterly
- Conforms to a recognized geographic boundary
- Uses Consensus Based Decision Making (CBDM)

(slide 10) Annual Assembly
- Planning event to gather input, develop goals, and set service priorities
- This is one of the quarterly LSU meetings
- Wide attendance consisting of any other interested members

<u>(slide 11)</u> <u>Local Service Board</u>
- Meets monthly (or as needed)
- Consists of admin officers, delegates to next level of service, coordinators for essential services
- Oversees workgroups and essential services
- Coordinates planning assembly
- Develops budgets and plans
- Maintains external relationships

(slide 13) **Intermediate bodies** would be formed when density or distance (or language) indicates they would be needed. The intermediate body is like an "accordion" piece; they give the system flexibility to meet needs brought about by large distances or dense populations or minority language populations.

Explain the main features of an intermediate body, including:
- Occupies space between service bodies like an accordion, when needed due to density, distance or language
- Based upon need
- Could be useful in large countries or states
- Communication is main function

(slide 14) **State/National Service Bodies**
The proposals outline a system where most services will be delivered locally, but services would be coordinated on a state, national, or province level. So there would be service bodies for most US states and Canadian provinces as well as countries outside the US.
- Interact with statewide/national government and professionals
- Centralized service resources, coordinate training, etc among LSUs
- Communication link between WSC and local NA communities
- Assemblies and conventions

(slide 14) **Zonal Service Bodies**
- Possible roles of zones include:
- Fellowship development
- Leadership development
- Planning
- Fund-flow
- Sharing best practices
- Connecting regions
- Communication link
- Do zones need common standards or more collaboratively determined boundaries?

(FACILITATOR #1)
(slide 15) **Service System Discussions that Still Need to Take Place**
These are all topics the board plans to devote time to during the 2012–2014 conference cycle. We welcome your thoughts or any input from your community.

(slide 16) Large (NA population) SNPs
The idea of a single body to conduct state/nation/province PR activities and coordinate efforts among the LSUs seems potentially unrealistic for places such as California or Brazil where the size of the NA community is so large. We need to elaborate on these sorts of possible exceptions to the SNP model and offer an alternative for these states/nations.

(slide 17) Small SNPs (NA population)
On a related note, some small states or countries do not currently have their own region (e.g., the countries within the Adriatic Region or the states within the New England region), and it's not necessarily the intention of the Service System Proposals to break up these regions. We need to offer an option or options for states/nations/provinces with smaller NA populations.

(slide 18) Seating Criteria (WSC)
While the conference resolved that the primary seating criterion will be state/nation/province boundaries, there are still many questions related to seating that have yet to be answered. What are the other seating criteria? How should very large countries be treated? Very large states? Very small countries and states? What about places like Malta that, because of their geography, will never grow very large? What kind of consideration should be given to a country's position relative to other communities? (This was a consideration that weighed in favor of seating Lithuania, for example.) What other factors, if any, should be considered when making decisions about seating—age of a community, amount of literature translated, services being delivered, etc.?

(slide 19) Consensus Based Decision Making (CBDM)
There are many different ways to define "consensus" and "consensus-based decision making." Members want more tools about how to use CBDM locally. A first draft of a tool for this was released in November online.

(slide 20) Lit Distribution
If the local service body meets quarterly rather than monthly and the group forum is ideally a place where no business happens, how do groups receive their literature? The proposal draft included in the 2012 CAR has an appendix on this issue, but the contents of the appendix are more of a brainstorm than a formal part of a system plan. We need to develop a more concrete recommendation or set of recommendations for lit distribution and fund flow.

(slide 21) RSOs & Service Offices
How do RSOs and other service offices fit in the new system? To this point we have included nothing in the proposals about service offices.

Fund Flow....On a related note, most groups make monthly donations to an area service body after purchasing literature. If those groups are now affiliated with a local service

body that only meets quarterly, how are their donations to be handled? What is the flow of funds between group/GSU/LSU/statewide body...

Border Communities
Some ASCs span two states at present and some belong to a region in a neighboring state because that makes more sense geographically. We don't want to necessitate more travel or urge affiliation with a service body that doesn't make logical sense to a given community, but at the same time, border communities need to be able to be informed about and participate in statewide activities (such as H&I to state facilities). We need to offer ideas about how to practically accomplish this.

(slide 22) Ethnic/Language/Culture Considerations
Currently, there are many service bodies that have formed because members felt their ethnic or language or cultural needs were not being well met by their existing area or region. If we are proposing a single service body to cover the needs of a city or a county, for instance, we need to consider these ethnic, linguistic, or cultural needs and be able to include strategies to help meet those needs.

(slide 23) Role of Zones
What role do zones play in the new system? The proposal draft included in the 2012 CAR has an appendix on this issue, but the ideas in the appendix are more of a brainstorm than a description of how zones might function as a formal part of a system. We need to develop a more concrete recommendation or set of recommendations for the role of zones. We are encouraging zones to give their thoughts on the issue.

Incorporated Bodies/ Conventions
We need to provide some guidance on how regions and conventions and other incorporated bodies can handle the transition as easily as possible. There has been a fair amount of concern over the fate of specific regional and area conventions if the hosting region or area no longer exists. Communities need some sort of guidance on how they can retain their legacy conventions and events.

(slide 24) Field Testing
• November 2012- July 2013
• Testing GSUs and LSUs—all interested communities are welcome to help
• A small group of "core" communities plus a broad range of general field testers
• Core communities are adhering to rigid criteria. All field testers are important.
(slide 25)
• Want to provide as much support as possible to regions within SNPs that are reunifying or providing joint services
• Results will help us shape a transition plan & strengthen the proposals

(slide 26) Online Project Tools
Summaries, "cliff notes" on different topics in SSP
• Tools and information are posted regularly on www.na.org/servicesystem

- We have drafts of tools for GSUs, LSUs, and facilitation- (Basics tools: GSU, LSU, Facilitator, Planning, CBDM; Ongoing topics; Healthy Service System)
- Please send input about these tools to NA World Services! They are drafts.

(slide 27)
Facilitation Tools:
[Basic Facilitation Guide Nov 2012](#)
[CBDM Basics Dec 2012](#)

Group Support Unit (GSU) Tools:
[GSU Basics Nov 2012](#)
[Group Report Form Nov 2012](#)
[GSU Agenda Nov 2012](#)
[GSU Report Form Nov 2012](#)

(Slide 28)
Local Service Unit (LSU) Tools:
[LSU Basics Dec 2012](#)
[Planning Basics Handout Dec 2012](#)
[Planning Assembly Survey Dec 2012](#)
[LSB Task List Pre-planning Assembly Dec 2012](#)
[LSU Planning Assembly Session Dec 2012](#)
[LSB Project Plan Worksheet Dec 2012](#)

(Slide 29)
Related materials:
Ongoing Discussions Related to the Service System Proposals
A Vision for NA Service l Spanish
Healthy Service System Handout l Spanish

Field testing frame:
Field Testing Frame
Intro to Regions Sharing Services or Talking about Reunifying
Intro to Prospective Core Group Field Testers

(Slide 30)
Service System Webpage info
Input always welcome!

(Slide 31) Questions and Answers (45-75 min)
Spend the 2nd half of the workshop having people ask questions. Facilitators and/or other workshop participants can provide responses. If we run out of time before all questions have been addressed, ask people to see us afterward and/or submit questions to NAWS.

Close with hug/prayer

More information if need detail for questions and answers:

(not in PPT) Processes
As you've seen from the brief description of the LSU, this draft of the proposals does have more information about processes, for instance planning at the LSU. We have talked quite a bit about many of the other processes as well. For example, this draft of the proposals offers some ideas for fund-flow and literature distribution.

The bulk of the information on processes in the proposals is broad and oriented toward principles rather than concrete practices. We have listed principles for five main processes:

Communication: Sharing information & ideas with each other. Better using tools & tying communication to planning

Leadership: Identifying leadership potential, training, mentoring, making effective use of veteran leaders

Planning: Determining actual needs, setting specific goals, assessing and assigning resources, monitoring and making adjustments Decision Making: Working together to make decisions through consensus where possible, exercise delegation and accountability

Information Management: Capturing, preserving, and delivering information as needed

Cover as many questions as the remaining time allows, ensuring there are a few minutes left to wrap up before the session is over.

Don't go into detail of the GSU options here, but use for reference if people have questions about it
(Two-track Option:
☒   Two-track GSU has sole focus of group support, preserving the simplicity of the meeting
☒   Two-track option requires groups to send a delegate to the LSU & GSU
☒   Quarterly LSU meetings help make this option less demanding on a group's resources

Linear Option:
☒   The GSU is part of the delegation stream between the group and the LSU (explain the
term "delegation stream" if necessary) so group only needs to send a delegate to the GSU
☒   Linear GSU still has main purpose of group support, although link with LSU may make it

challenging to keep this focus)

More stuff on State/National/Province, not to detail in presentation, but refer here if people have questions:

☒ We know we need more definition about what constitutes a "state" versus a "nation."

☒ Some countries that are organized by state and that already have multiple regions, such
as Brazil, Mexico, Russia and India, may be organized by state rather than nation. And some places like New England or the Balkan nations may want to combine states or nations.

☒ Border communities may join neighboring states for service provision purposes if it is practical.

Some of the things a state/nation/province might do include:

☒ Interact with statewide government and professional bodies

☒ Organize assemblies and conventions

☒ Coordinate centralized resources like phonelines, websites, service offices, liability and
event insurance, training roll-outs

☒ Provide a communication link between the WSC and local NA communities

Zones in a System of Service

Some of the ideas for zones in a new service system are:

☒ Zones offer opportunities for communication between state/national bodies, and for communication between NAWS and state/national bodies.

☒ Zones may need some common standards for how are they structured and how they operate, e.g. do they have an administrative body, do they operate as decision-making bodies, do they use consensus?

☒ Viewing service systematically, it makes sense to collaboratively reexamine zonal boundaries

Possible roles of zones include:

☒ Fellowship development

☒ Leadership development

☒ Planning – collecting information and feeding it into the NAWS scanning process

☒ Fund-flow – how are zones a part of this?

☒ Share best practices

☒ A point of connection

☒ Communication link as described above

Make sure attendees are familiar with what the WSC is and briefly explain background of seating if required, including:

☒ Different methods for seating regions have been used over the years, from an informal process in the early days of the WSC to a formal application and voting process for regions that satisfied a set of seating criteria more recently

- The criteria passed at WSC 2000 have not always been successful in helping the conference to make decisions
- The WSC has continued to grow in size and is becoming unmanageable in size and cost
- WSC 2008 agreed to 2 cycle moratorium on seating regions resulting from regional splits

while the board worked on seating options

The World Board will be recommending a seating model based on state/national/province service bodies. This model may have a shelf life due to the size of the WSC, but seems most practical at this time.

There will need to be some other criteria for seating, such as previous service experience.

Some regions that consist of parts of states will have to unify. Hopefully this will also have the effect of enabling them to provide state-wide services that they are currently unable to do.

Arrangements for large states or countries that currently have more than one region are still being discussed.

Some smaller states or countries may group together for seating, and service provision, if it makes sense, e.g. New England or the Balkan countries.