

2025 Interim World Service Conference



28 February &
1 March 2025



Draft Interim WSC 2025 Minutes

CONTENTS

ORIENTATION / BUSINESS: INTERIM REPORT MOTIONS	3
BUSINESS: INTERIM REPORT MOTIONS SESSION TWO	6
BUSINESS: INTERIM REPORT MOTIONS CONCLUDING SESSION	11
PLANNING SESSION ONE.....	13
PLANNING SESSION TWO	14
APPENDIX A: CONFERENCE FIRSTS AND STATISTICS ON PARTICIPANTS.....	15
APPENDIX B: INTERIM WSC 2025 ATTENDANCE	16
APPENDIX C: DRAFT NAWS STRATEGIC PLAN	20
APPENDIX D: COMPILED SMALL GROUP PLANNING NOTES	22

A Vision for NA Service

All of the efforts of Narcotics Anonymous are inspired by the primary purpose of our groups. Upon this common ground we stand committed.

Our vision is that one day:



Every addict in the world has the chance to experience our message in their own language and culture and find the opportunity for a new way of life;



Every member, inspired by the gift of recovery, experiences spiritual growth and fulfillment through service;



NA service bodies worldwide work together in a spirit of unity and cooperation to support the groups in carrying our message of recovery;



Narcotics Anonymous has universal recognition and respect as a viable program of recovery.

Honesty, trust, and goodwill are the foundation of our service efforts, all of which rely upon the guidance of a loving Higher Power.



CREATING OUR FUTURE

Friday 28 February 2025

ORIENTATION / BUSINESS: INTERIM REPORT MOTIONS

11:00 am–1:12 pm Led by Irene C (WB Chair), Mario T and Louis H (WSC Cofacilitators)

Once the interpretation feeds for Farsi, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish had been established, Irene C (WB Chair) opened the 2025 Interim World Service Conference (WSC) with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer. After reminders about participants' display names, A Vision for NA Service was read. Irene then reviewed the agenda before turning the meeting over to Mario T and Louis H (WSC Cofacilitators).

Mario reviewed the decision-making process while the chart from *A Guide to World Services in NA (GWSNA)* and the WSC Orientation Handout was shown on the screen. He explained how the process would change if Motion 1 was approved, and how amendments would be dispensed with.

Louis then reviewed the order of business for the day:

- Attendance
- Motion 2 to approve the WSC 2023 minutes
- Motion 1
- Motions 3 through 12

Taking attendance took over an hour as several participants struggled to use the polling software and had mistakenly joined the session as guests rather than signing in using the email and password provided. After multiple attempts to take attendance, a roll call was finally taken, participant-by-participant, to isolate any anomalies in the process. This showed that:

- 121 RDs were present
- 6 ZDs were present
- 14 World Board members were present

[Note: Two more regional delegates joined the session after the roll call]

(See [Appendix B](#) for the attendance record.)

Louis then introduced Motion 2.

Motion 2 World Board

To approve the 2023 World Service Conference minutes.

***Initial Straw Poll: 116 yes – 0 no – 5 abstentions – 5 present not voting
95% Consensus Support***

Louis asked if anyone not part of the consensus wished to speak, and hearing none, asked for a poll to be opened.

***Decision (Second straw poll): 114-1-1-7
98% Motion carried with consensus support***

Mario reminded conference participants that, as stated in the Interim Report, to simplify business for the Interim WSC 2025, the World Board had decided they would not be voting on any motions in the Interim WSC Report or the related amendments for this interim meeting only. This would not set a precedent or policy for future meetings. The board deliberately only offered motions that were carried over from WSC 2023's Moving Forward session, or those that were legally necessary, like the budget, minutes, or reimbursement policy. The board avoided any motions that might be considered CAR motions.

Motion 1 World Board

To adopt for the 2025 Interim WSC and the 2026 WSC only: If a motion has consensus in an initial straw poll (that's 80% or more in support or not in support), the Cofacilitators will announce the results as a final decision.

Intent: To minimize time spent addressing items the conference already has agreement on.

***Initial Straw Poll: 88-28-7-3
71% Strong Support***

Mario then introduced Motion 1-a1

Motion 1-a1 Florida Region

To amend Motion 1 by adding:

As many as 2 conference participants with dissenting votes (for or against), as chosen by the co-facilitators, will be able to submit comments for inclusion in the minutes after the conference.

Motion 1 would read as:

To adopt for the 2025 Interim WSC and the 2026 WSC only:

If a motion has consensus in an initial straw poll (that's 80% or more in support or not in support), the Cofacilitators will announce the results as a final decision. As many as 2 conference participants with dissenting votes (for or against), as chosen by the co-facilitators, will be able to submit comments for inclusion in the minutes after the conference.

Intent: To be in line with Concept 9 so the minority voice will be heard according to consensus-based decision making.

***Initial Straw Poll: 62-47-8-9
52% Lack of Strong Support***

Mario asked if the World Board had any recommendations on the amendment.

Irene responded that they did not.

Ramon R (RD Florida) spoke to the amendment submitted by his region, explaining that his region felt this could be a compromise more in line with a consensus-based process.

Sandy M (RD ABCD) stated that no amendment could fix the issue with ABCD because the Ninth Concept reminds us that we must listen to dissenting voices.

Fabio P (RD Brazil Sul) said that his community believes it's essential to hear the minority voices during the voting process; simply reading their opinions later doesn't allow us to reconsider our decisions or truly understand their perspective.

Leandro G (RD Argentina) opposed the motion because it ignores the unique social and cultural perspectives of smaller or single-region countries, meaning the voices of minority regions would not truly be heard or reflected in the decisions made.

John L [RD Northern California] was in favor of the amendment because it's important to have a record of the dissenting voices.

***Decision (Second straw poll): Motion #1-a1: 52-62-5-8
43% Amendment failed with lack of strong support
No objection was voiced to taking the second straw poll as a final decision***

Motion 1-a2 Louisiana Region

To amend Motion 1 by adding:

of all conference participants with rights to vote on that motion or amendment.

Motion 1 would read as:

To adopt for the 2025 Interim WSC and the 2026 WSC only:

If a motion has consensus in an initial straw poll (that's 80% or more of all conference participants with rights to vote on that motion or amendment, in support or not support), the Cofacilitators will announce the results as a final decision.

Initial Straw Poll: 44-60-10-12

38% Lack of Strong Support

Robert S (RD Louisiana) said that his region offered the amendment because of concerns that pre-conference straw polls may not reflect true consensus if many regions lack enough information to form a group conscience. They warn that excluding "present, not voting" participants can artificially inflate consensus percentages, making results misleading.

Mario asked if the World Board had any recommendations on the amendment?

Irene explained that the board didn't support this amendment because its wording could cause unintended consequences. It would count everyone with voting rights, including those not present or choosing not to vote, as part of the total, effectively turning their non-participation into "no" votes. She conveyed the board's belief that voting should only reflect those actively choosing to participate, and that the change would remove the "present not voting" option and create confusion in the decision-making process.

Decision (Second straw poll): Motion #1-a2: 15-95-5-6

13% Amendment failed with consensus not in support

No objection was voiced to taking the second straw poll as a final decision

Motion 1-a3 Rio de Janeiro Region

To amend Motion 1 to read:

To adopt for the 2025 Interim WSC and the 2026 WSC only:

If a motion has consensus 95% or more support or lack of support in an initial straw poll (~~that's 80% or more in support or not in support~~), the Cofacilitators will announce the results as a final decision.

Initial Straw Poll: 33-73-8-12

28% Lack of Strong Support

Joao D (RD Rio de Janeiro) said the motion was mainly administrative, and while Motion 1 received 71% support, many members feel that's not strong enough for true consensus. We suggest raising the approval threshold to 95%, or possibly 90% or 85%, depending on the situation, to ensure broader agreement before passing motions without debate. Since this is an experimental process over two conference cycles, adjusting the percentage would help make it more balanced and acceptable to participants.

Mario asked if the World Board had a recommendation.

Irene appreciated the input but stated that the board did not support changing the voting percentages, adding that it has taken years to refine the World Service Conference's consensus-based decision-making process, reducing it from eight to six clear levels of support. Adding new percentage thresholds would only reintroduce confusion and make the process more complicated.

Decision (Second straw poll): Motion #1-a3: 22-93-3-5
18% Amendment failed with Consensus not in support
No objection was voiced to taking the second straw poll as a final decision

Motion 1-a4 Rio de Janeiro Region

To amend Motion 1 to read:

If a motion has consensus 90% or more support or lack of support in an initial straw poll (~~that's 80% or more in support or not in support~~), the Cofacilitators will announce the results as a final decision.

Initial Straw Poll: 34-72-9-11
29% Lack of Strong Support

No further information was provided by the maker of the motion, and no further recommendations were provided by the World Board.

Decision (Second straw poll): Motion #1-a4: 23-88-4-5
20% Amendment failed with Consensus not in support
No objection was voiced to taking the second straw poll as a final decision

Motion 1-a5 Rio de Janeiro Region

To amend Motion 1 to read:

If a motion has consensus 85% or more support or lack of support in an initial straw poll (~~that's 80% or more in support or not in support~~), the Cofacilitators will announce the results as a final decision.

Initial Straw Poll: 32-73-10-11
27% Lack of Strong Support

No further information was provided by the maker of the motion, and no further recommendations were provided by the World Board.

Decision (Second straw poll): Motion #1-a5: 29-84-3-4
25% Amendment failed with Lack of strong support
No objection was voiced to taking the second straw poll as a final decision

Mario announced a break until 2:00 pm and requested that no one log off.

BUSINESS: INTERIM REPORT MOTIONS SESSION TWO

2:00 pm–4:12 pm

Louis H and Mario T (WSC Cofacilitators)

Mario (WSC CF) opened the session after the break and introduced Motion 1 without amendments.

Motion 1 World Board

To adopt for the 2025 Interim WSC and the 2026 WSC only: If a motion has consensus in an initial straw poll (that's 80% or more in support or not in support), the Cofacilitators will announce the results as a final decision.

Intent: To minimize time spent addressing items the conference already has agreement on.

Initial Straw Poll: 88 yes – 28 no – 7 abstentions – 3 present not voting
71% Strong Support

Mario opened the queue for discussion.

Jonas D (ZD Brazilian) expressed the concern that the motion affected not only the Ninth Concept about hearing minority voices but also the Sixth Concept, which values unanimous consensus over simple majority vote. Many regions don't have enough time to discuss motions before the conference, so this is

often their only opportunity to be heard. Excluding minority voices undermines the goal of collective conscience and unity.

Sam J (RD UK) spoke against the motion, stating that he understood the desire for efficiency, but that the reasoning behind the motion was weak and based on limited data. Expecting participants to hold discussions outside the conference isn't practical and risks silencing minority voices. This motion prioritizes expediency over key principles like hearing all voices and following the spirit of Concept Nine.

Danny G (WB) stated Motion 1 aligns with the Ninth Concept by making the World Service Conference more efficient and globally inclusive. Too much time is currently spent repeating points that don't change outcomes. Recognizing consensus earlier could allow the body to focus on hearing new and diverse perspectives from regions and zones that are often overlooked. The motion strengthens the group conscience process by promoting meaningful global dialogue instead of repetitive procedural debate.

Matthias (40 RD German-Speaking Region) said he agreed with Sam and that things in NA take time.

Jon A (83 Northern New York) expressed that he believed the motion violated the Second Tradition.

Decision (Second straw poll): Motion #1: 84-35-2-3

69% Motion carried with strong support

No objection was voiced to taking the second straw poll as a final decision

After the vote several exchanges took place between conference participants and the cofacilitators. Sandy M (RD ABCD) questioned whether delegates marked with yellow boxes should be counted as "present not voting," but Mario clarified they were considered absent since participants frequently drop in and out of the session. Alon (RD Israel) and Ana (RD Peru) requested a roll call due to uncertainty about who was still present, but Mario declined, citing time constraints and the fluid nature of attendance. Sam (RD UK) expressed disappointment that some delegates attended without participating, while others discussed discrepancies in vote counts for various motions. After clarifying these procedural issues, the facilitators decided to move forward with the agenda, noting that attendance fluctuates and some reported numbers might be inaccurate.

Motion 3 World Board

**To approve the 2025-2026 Narcotics Anonymous World Services, Inc. Budget.
(See Addendum A).**

Intent: to have an approved NAWS Budget through WSC 2026.

Initial Straw Poll: 119-1-4-2

95% Consensus Support

Louis (WSC CF) announced that the initial straw poll resulted in a final decision.

Motion 4 World Board

To extend the 2023-2025 Reimbursement Policy through the 2026 fiscal year.

Intent: to keep the 2023 WSC approved policy in place through the next WSC.

Initial Straw Poll: 118-2-4-2

95% Consensus Support

Louis announced that the initial straw poll resulted in a final decision.

In response to a question, Mario stated that the results of all motions needed to be read into the record for the official minutes.

Chris (AD AL/NW FL) wished to record his concern that because Motion 1 took effect immediately, the remaining motions would automatically pass as each one had consensus support, leaving the body unable to vote on the upcoming motions.

Motion 5 World Board

To adopt for the current conference cycle only: The 2026 WSC will take a new step in strategic planning by using a revised process (described below) for the CAR survey to consider ideas for recovery literature, service material, and Issue Discussion Topics. Instead of submitting motions for project plans to create specific pieces of service material, recovery literature or IDTs for the 2026 Conference Agenda Report, conference participants will submit those ideas for possible inclusion in the 2026 CAR survey.

Intent: to implement a process for all conference participants to collaboratively create a CAR survey with all ideas for Fellowship consideration of literature, service materials, and Issue Discussion Topics.

**Initial Straw Poll: 112-6-6-2
90% Consensus Support**

Louis announced that the initial straw poll resulted in a final decision.

Cesar C (RD Grande SP) questioned the validity of the initial straw poll since it wasn't conducted in an official conference setting, and wanted his concern with the procedure noted.

In response to questions from a couple of participants about whether regions could still offer motions for literature, service material, and IDTs, Irene explained that the new process replaced motions with a collaborative global survey system where anyone can submit ideas. She outlined that ideas collected from March to May will be reviewed and prioritized by all conference participants, leading to a shared list for the 2026 CAR survey.

Irene said that the process is explained in the conference reports. The new process doesn't limit voices; it's meant to expand them and let the entire Fellowship contribute ideas that reflect worldwide interests. It's a collaborative experiment designed to include more voices, not fewer.

Sandy M (RD ABCD) and Allison (RD Northern New England) offered that the survey should be renamed. CAR Survey is a confusing name, and it should be called a literature survey.

Motion 6 World Board

To update GWSNA amendment deadline policy to include first draft due forty-five (45) days in advance of WSC and final amendment deadline thirty (30) days in advance of WSC.

Intent: To establish deadlines for the submission of amendments that allow for time to get a draft amendment conference ready and to be translated and straw polled in advance of the WSC meeting.

**Initial Straw Poll: 95-22-6-3
77% Strong Support**

Louis then introduced Motion 6-a1

Motion 6-a1 ABCD

To update GWSNA amendment deadline policy include first draft due sixty (60) days in advance of WSC and final amendment deadline 30 days in advance of WSC. [NOTE: The amendment was revised as follows on the floor of the WSC.]

Intent: To give Conference Participants more time to review amendments with their Regions and Zones.

**Initial Straw Poll: 83-26-8-9
70% Strong Support**

Louis asked if the World Board had a recommendation.

Irene replied that the board did not necessarily have a recommendation but wanted to note that it extends the review period for amendments from 45 to 60 days. However, the motion list still would not be finalized until 30 days before the conference with the amendment as it is currently written.

Sandy M (RD ABCD) stated that participants should have more time to discuss motions within their regions, especially now that there is a three-year cycle. Many delegates didn't have enough time to review amendments before the conference, as they could only hold limited assemblies. The amendment was intended to ensure that there is adequate time for discussion.

Pam (RD OK) agreed with the need for more time for discussion.

Bob (RD Michigan) spoke against the amendment because it would reduce the amount of time available to craft amendments and not increase the amount of time to discuss amendments in their final form.

Alicia A (RD Arkansas) asked the maker of the amendment if both the deadlines should be adjusted by 15 days to match the changes proposed in Motion 7-a1?

Sandy agreed to the friendly amendment, stating that her intention had been to change both deadlines. With no objections, Motion 6-a1 was amended to read:

Motion 6-a1 ABCD

To update GWSNA amendment deadline policy include first draft due sixty (60) days in advance of WSC and final amendment deadline forty-five (45) days in advance of WSC.

Ramon (RD Florida) supported the amendment as revised because it would give regions more time to collect a conscience on amendments. Natalya (RD NW Russia) added that extra time is needed to translate and review English drafts. Ryan (RD Indiana) asked for clarification on how the new deadlines would translate to actual calendar dates, and facilitators explained the proposed 60- and 45-day timelines relative to the conference schedule, with Irene noting that exact dates would appear in official documents. Michael H (AD Colorado) added that GWSNA states the initial straw poll is taken as soon as possible after the deadline, so earlier deadlines mean regions will need to gather their consciences much sooner. After confirming details, facilitators opened a poll. Several participants raised questions and concerns, but the cofacilitators asked to complete the poll before further discussion.

**Second Straw Poll: 87-29-5-4
71% Strong Support**

Louis opened for further discussion and asked to please keep it brief and limited it to people who haven't spoken yet.

Patty (RD Minnesota) supported the amendment but raised concerns that the quick timing of the initial straw poll, as described in GWSNA, could limit discussion despite the intent to allow more preparation time. Irene said the board would need to discuss it, but agreed that it was reasonable to adjust the dates of the initial straw poll in light of the earlier amendment deadline.

Katherine (AD APF) emphasized that non-English-speaking regions still struggle with translation deadlines and worry the changes might actually shorten their preparation time if the straw poll remains too soon after the amendment deadline. Saymon S (RD Brazil) stressed the need for extra time due to translation and communication challenges, while Alison (RD Northern New England) pointed out confusion about how to reconcile the straw poll timing with Motion 1. Facilitators acknowledged these concerns and confirmed the World Board would consider adjusting the straw poll timeline to give regions more time.

Louis opened a poll.

Motion 6-a1 ABCD

To update GWSNA amendment deadline policy include first draft due **sixty (60) days** in advance of WSC and final amendment deadline **forty-five (45) days** in advance of WSC.

Intent: To give Conference Participants more time to review amendments with their Regions and Zones.

Decision (third straw poll): 92-19-4-4

80% Consensus Support

No objection was voiced to taking the third straw poll as a final decision

After further clarification regarding the decision-making processes and the deadlines contained in the amended motion, Louis opened a poll on the amended Motion 6.

Motion 6 as amended by Motion 6-a1 World Board

To update GWSNA amendment deadline policy include first draft due **sixty (60) days** in advance of WSC and final amendment deadline **forty-five (45) days** in advance of WSC.

Intent: To establish deadlines for the submission of amendments that allow for time to get a draft amendment conference ready and to be translated and straw polled in advance of the WSC meeting.

Decision (as amended by Motion 6-a1) (Second straw poll): 111-8-0-1

93% Motion carried with consensus support

Motion 7 World Board

To add to GWSNA amendment deadline policy include first draft due **thirty (30) days** in advance of interim WSC and final amendment deadline **fifteen (15) days** in advance of interim WSC.

Intent: To establish deadlines for the submission of amendments that allow for time to get a draft amendment conference ready and to be translated and straw polled in advance of the interim WSC meeting.

Initial Straw Poll: 91-25-7-3

73% Strong Support

Mario suggested combining Motion 7 with its amendment, Motion 7-a1, and treating them as a single motion, since the previous related motion already had strong consensus support. Louis agreed with the idea, explaining to the body that the amendment would effectively become the new motion. He then invited any objections from delegates to the proposed process.

Marcus (AD Grande SP) voiced an objection so discussion was opened on the amendment.

Motion 7-a1 ABCD Region

To amend Motion 7 to read:

To add to GWSNA amendment deadline policy include first draft due **forty-five (45) days** in advance of interim WSC and final amendment deadline **thirty (30) days** in advance of interim WSC.

Intent: To give Conference Participants more time to review amendments with their Regions and Zones.

Initial Straw Poll: 82-26-8-10

70% Strong Support

Marcus expressed the concern that a 45-day deadline would actually reduce the ability to discuss and gather community input and offer possible amendments. He said he believed that the original motion already gave more time and struck a better balance. He therefore opposed the deadline change.

Grant (RD Thailand) expressed opposition to the motion, explaining that it doesn't truly provide more time for discussion since GWSNA still requires straw polls to occur quickly after deadlines, leaving uncertainty and possibly repeating the rushed 48-hour timeline seen previously. Greg (RD Volunteer) asked for clarification about whether there would be another Interim World Service Conference, and Louis confirmed one is planned for 2028. Katherine (AD APF) agreed with Thailand's concerns, noting that without a guaranteed extension for the straw poll, the new timelines could actually shorten the time regions have to collect votes and input.

Louis called for final straw poll on the amendment.

**Decision (Second straw poll): 86-24-2-4
76% Amendment carried with strong support**

Several participants asked that the polls be open longer and that some time be taken to digest the motion before opening the poll.

Motion 7 as Amended by Motion 7-a1 World Board

To add to GWSNA amendment deadline policy include first draft due forty-five (45) days in advance of interim WSC and final amendment deadline thirty (30) days in advance of interim WSC.

Intent: To establish deadlines for the submission of amendments that allow for time to get a draft amendment conference ready and to be translated and straw polled in advance of the interim WSC meeting.

Louis opened a poll.

**Decision (Second straw poll): 106-8-2-2
91% Motion carried with consensus support**

Irene (WB Chair) closed the session by thanking everyone for their time and participation, noting it was after midnight in Ireland and even later for others. She expressed appreciation to the co-facilitators, staff, translators, and all participants for their dedication, acknowledging that despite a few challenges, significant progress was made. They reminded everyone that the next day's session would focus on planning and encouraged delegates to review the planning report beforehand and log in 30 minutes early to confirm room assignments.

Saturday 1 March 2025

BUSINESS: INTERIM REPORT MOTIONS CONCLUDING SESSION

11:00 am–11:06 am

Irene C (WB Chair), Mario T (WSC Cofacilitator)

Day 2 of the Interim World Service Conference 2025 opened with Irene (WB Chair) welcoming participants and reminding them to activate interpretation services, which were available in Farsi, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish. Zeynep (ZD EDM) then read the Serenity Prayer in Turkish. Following the prayer, Irene reviewed administrative protocols, reminding participants to display their voting number, service position, region or zone, and first name, even though no voting was scheduled for the day. She noted that all conference materials were available in the participants' Dropbox folders, then handed the meeting over to Mario T (WSC CF) to complete unfinished business from the previous day.

Mario read the motion number, percentage support, and disposition for each of the remaining motions, all of which carried due to having reached consensus support in the initial straw poll. While Mario announced the dispositions, the text of the motions displayed on the screen.

Motion 8 World Board

To add the following language defining amendments to the CAR & CAT-related paragraphs in GWSNA (pages 13 & 14):

An amendment to a motion is a change or addition designed to improve the motion. The purpose of an amendment is to refine a motion to move the Fellowship closer toward consensus. An amendment should clarify, add, or subtract language that keeps the motion consistent with its intent. An amendment shall not replace a motion or introduce a substitute or contrary motion. A motion to split or divide a motion is an amendment to the motion.

Intent: To clearly define the purpose of an amendment and its relation to a motion.

**Initial Straw Poll: 119 yes – 1 no – 4 abstentions – 2 present not voting
95% Motion carried with consensus support**

Motion 9 World Board

To make the following changes regarding amendments and replacements of motions during the decision-making process to Addendum F in GWSNA:

8. The Conference may decide to replace or amend motions that have been presented based on prior discussions. When the motion is presented, the WSC Co-facilitator may ~~recognize any participant~~ offering a replacement or amendment, or offer a suggestion to the Conference during the discussion of a motion. If supported by two-thirds of the Conference, the replacement/amendment will be accepted. The WSC Co-facilitator may interrupt this simplified process at any time they believe such action is warranted.

Intent: To revise GWSNA to reflect the current practices of the WSC on how amendments or replacements to motions based on discussion are handled during business sessions.

**Initial Straw Poll: 103-11-9-3
83% Motion carried with consensus support**

Motion 10 World Board

All candidates for World Service positions are forwarded to the HRP from regions, zonal forums, or the World Board (RBZ).

Intent: To ensure that all potential nominees for WSC election are forwarded through the HRP's RBZ process.

**Initial Straw Poll: 113-5-5-3
91% Motion carried with consensus support**

Motion 11 World Board

If Motion 10 is adopted, to redefine the purpose of the World Pool to be used to retain information on candidates forwarded for consideration by regions, zones, and the World Board as a part of the Human Resource Panel's nomination process.

Intent: To revise WSC policy to reflect current practices.

Initial Straw Poll: 111-6-7-2
89% Motion carried with consensus support

Motion 12 World Board

To not utilize a seating workgroup for the 2023–2026 cycle.

Intent: To attempt a simpler process for compiling seating information and recommendations.

Initial Straw Poll: 105-7-11-3
85% Motion carried with consensus support

PLANNING SESSION ONE

11:06 am–1:00 pm

Irene C (WB Chair)

This session began with Irene (WB Chair) reviewing some of the basics of the NAWS Strategic Plan, reminding participants about the process so far, and explaining the structure of the session.

The WSC is in the middle of the planning process, said Irene. It began at the 2023 World Service Conference. The whole conference spent a day developing a list of the most important issues affecting NA. After the conference was over, participants prioritized those issues by poll. Then there was a series of zonal workshops—some online and some in person—where zonal members discussed the challenges these issues present, and some of the ways we might begin to address those challenges. Then the board had discussions to draft issues and objectives for the World Service Structure and Operation key result area, because that is the board’s area of responsibility. The board took all of the discussion notes from the zonal meetings and the survey results and compiled them into the draft plan participants will discuss today.

The content of the plan is the result of our collective work together as a conference in the service of NA as a whole, said Irene. We’ve never had a process before to co-create something like this, she explained, so it’s challenging, but it’s exciting. Today we have a conference population of possibly 283 and we’re now going to go on and take the next steps.

In this session, participants separated into 20 small groups to discuss the draft Objectives for the first two Key Result Areas (KRAs) for the Strategic Plan. The small groups were each facilitated by former world trusted servants and Human Resource Panel members so that World Board members could fully participate. Each of the virtual breakout rooms was asked to address the following:

- I. Read Key Result Areas and Issues. Are there any adjustments to or disagreements with the 6 issues represented in these two Key Result Areas? Does anyone not agree that these are still important challenges the Fellowship faces that should be addressed in the next planning cycle?**
- II. Read each Issue and Objective(s) and then answer the discussion questions for each issue:**
 - a. Do these objectives focus us on the primary challenge or opportunity we need to address related to this issue?**
 - b. Do these objectives capture the result or change that we seek related to this issue?**
- III. In just one minute, what are one or two areas of activity in the coming planning cycle your group is most excited about – where the positive impact could be significant on the Fellowship?**

The small groups met for 85 minutes before reconvening in the main room. In the time remaining before the scheduled break, five of the twenty groups were able to share what they were excited about. There was general agreement that all six issues remain relevant. Some CPs felt that overall prioritization would be helpful. Multiple groups reported that they were excited about internal PR material to better educate the Fellowship about the importance of PR. Many found the wording of the objectives too vague and

suggested that more concrete, precise language be used, particularly in the fund flow objective. A group noted how many of the objectives were interlinked with one another across issues and KRAs. It was mentioned that words like “tools” may be too suggestive of outdated older ways of doing things, and participants were excited about a more innovative approach. It was suggested that the list of audiences for PR in Objective 1 be expanded to include educational institutions, and that Objective 8 possibly be divided into two objectives.

The draft plan can be found in Appendix C, and the compiled small group notes from both planning sessions can be found in Appendix D.

The conference then took a one-hour break.

PLANNING SESSION TWO

2:00 pm–4:00 pm

Irene C (WB Chair)

In this session, participants reconvened into the same small groups to discuss the draft Objectives for the second two Key Result Areas of the Strategic Plan. Each of the virtual breakout rooms was asked to address the following:

- I. **Read Key Result Areas and Issues. Are there any adjustments to or disagreements with the 5 issues represented in these two Key Result Areas? Does anyone not agree that these are still important challenges the Fellowship faces that should be addressed in the next planning cycle?**
- II. **Read each Issue and Objective(s) and then answer the discussion questions for each issue:**
 - a. **Do these objectives focus us on the primary challenge or opportunity we need to address related to this issue?**
 - b. **Do these objectives capture the result or change that we seek related to this issue?**
- III. **In just one minute, what are one or two areas of activity in the coming planning cycle your group is most excited about – where the positive impact could be significant on the Fellowship?**

The small groups met for 85 minutes before reconvening in the main room. Irene called on a different set of groups to share their ideas. There was much agreement that all five issues remain relevant; however, some input pointed to revision of two of the issues. As with the first set of objectives, many found the language to be too vague, particularly around the term “harm reduction”—with some wondering why we don’t label this DRT/MAT if that’s what we mean, and others saying that “harm reduction” is not related to NA recovery. Some CPs felt that “Generational and Cultural Differences” were two separate issues that should each have corresponding Objectives, especially since Objective 10 only addresses younger members. Also, there was confusion about whether “younger members” referred to biological age or clean time. Some participants felt the 3-year cycle shouldn’t be part of the strategic plan unless and until it’s adopted on an ongoing basis. CPs also shared excitement about the idea of diversifying revenue and creating a more sustainable NAWS.

The draft plan can be found in Appendix C, and the compiled small group notes from both planning sessions can be found in Appendix D.

APPENDIX A: CONFERENCE FIRSTS AND STATISTICS ON PARTICIPANTS

CONFERENCE FIRSTS

Interim WSC 2025 was the first . . .

- intentional virtual Interim WSC meeting.
- WSC meeting to review an interim strategic plan draft. Conference participants reviewed the key result areas, issues, and objectives. The solutions have not been drafted yet.
- WSC meeting with a majority of seated participants from outside the US (although 5 non-US participants were not present.)

STATISTICS ON PARTICIPANTS ATTENDING INTERIM WSC 2025

- There were 144 voting members participating at this WSC—129 delegates and 15 World Board members. In addition, there were 89 alternate delegates, plus 4 HRP members, 2 cofacilitators, and 8 translators.
- We also enlisted 15 volunteers, most former world level trusted servants, to help facilitate and take notes in the breakout rooms on day two of the conference.
- Of 128 seated regions, there were 123 RDs participating. Of 6 seated zones, 6 ZDs were participating.
- This was the first WSC that Brazil Central Region, Iran Region #1, Nordeste Brazil Region, Rio Grande do Sul Region, and Thailand Region participated as seated members.
- Baja Son, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Quebec, and Venezuela were not in attendance.
- Of the 129 delegates from seated regions and zones participating, 66 were from the US, 4 from Canada, and 59 from outside the US and Canada.
- We had 89 alternate delegates from seated regions or zones participating, 45 from the US, 3 from Canada, and 41 from outside of the US or Canada.
- This year's conference participants were from 44 countries.

APPENDIX B: INTERIM WSC 2025 ATTENDANCE

Participant		28 Feb 11am	28 Feb 2pm	1 Mar 11am	1 Mar 2pm
1	ABCD	1	1	0	0
2	Alabama/NW Florida	1	1	1	1
3	Alaska	1	1	1	1
4	AL-SASK	1	1	1	1
5	Aotearoa New Zealand	1	1	1	1
6	Argentina	1	1	1	1
7	Arizona	1	1	1	1
8	Arkansas	1	1	1	1
9	Australian	1	1	1	1
10	Baja Son	0	0	0	0
11	Best Little	1	1	1	1
12	Brazil	1	1	1	1
13	Brazil Central	1	1	1	1
14	Brazil Sul	1	1	1	1
15	British Columbia	1	1	1	1
16	Buckeye	1	0	1	1
17	California Inland	1	1	1	1
18	California Mid-State	1	1	1	1
19	Canada Atlantic	1	1	1	1
20	Carolina	1	1	1	1
21	Central Atlantic	1	1	1	1
22	Central California	1	1	1	1
23	Chesapeake & Potomac	1	1	1	1
24	Chicagoland	1	1	1	1
25	Chile	1	1	1	0
26	Colombia	1	1	1	1
27	Colorado	1	1	1	1
28	Connecticut	1	1	1	1
29	Costa Rica	1	1	1	1
30	Denmark	1	1	1	1
31	Eastern New York	1	1	1	1
32	Ecuador	1	1	1	1
33	Egypt	1	1	1	1
34	El Salvador	0	0	0	0
35	Finland	1	1	1	1
36	Florida	1	1	1	1

37	France	1	1	1	1
38	Freestate	1	1	1	1
39	Georgia	1	1	1	1
40	German Speaking	1	1	1	1
41	Grande Sao Paulo	1	1	1	1
42	Greater Illinois	1	1	1	1
43	Greater New York	1	1	1	1
44	Greater Philadelphia	1	1	1	1
45	Greece	1	1	1	1
46	Guatemala	1	1	1	1
47	Hawaii	1	1	1	1
48	HOW Brazil	1	1	1	1
49	Indiana	1	1	1	1
50	Iowa	1	1	1	1
51	Iran	1	1	0	0
52	Iran 1	1	0	1	1
53	Irish	1	1	1	1
54	Israel	1	1	1	1
55	Italy	1	1	1	1
56	Japan	1	1	1	1
57	Kentuckiana	1	1	1	1
58	Lithuania	1	1	1	0
59	Lone Star	1	1	1	1
60	Louisiana	1	1	1	1
61	Metro Detroit	1	0	1	1
62	Mexico	1	1	1	1
63	Michigan	1	1	1	1
64	Mid-America	1	1	1	1
65	Mid-Atlantic	1	1	1	1
66	Minas	1	1	1	1
67	Minnesota	1	1	1	1
68	Mississippi	1	1	1	1
69	Montana	1	1	1	1
70	Mountaineer	1	1	1	1
71	Nebraska	1	1	1	1
72	Nepal	1	1	1	1
73	NERF	1	1	1	0
74	Netherlands	1	1	1	1
75	New England	1	1	1	1

76	New Jersey	1	1	1	1
77	Nicaragua	0	0	0	0
78	Nordeste Brazil	1	1	1	1
79	North Carolina	1	1	1	1
80	Northern California	1	1	1	1
81	Northern New England	1	1	1	1
82	Northern New Jersey	1	1	1	1
83	Northern New York	1	1	1	1
84	Northwestern Russia	1	1	1	1
85	Norway	1	1	1	1
86	Occidente-Mexico	1	1	1	1
87	Ohio	1	1	1	1
88	OK	1	1	1	1
89	Ontario	1	1	1	0
90	Pacific Cascade	1	1	1	1
91	Panama	1	1	1	1
92	Peru	1	1	1	1
93	Philippines	0	1	0	0
94	Poland	1	1	1	1
95	Portugal	1	1	1	1
96	Quebec	0	0	0	0
97	Quisqueyana	1	1	1	1
98	Region 51	1	1	1	1
99	Region Del Coqui	1	1	1	1
100	Rio de Janeiro	1	1	1	1
101	Rio Grande	1	1	1	1
102	Rio Grande DS	1	1	1	1
103	San Diego/Imperial	1	1	1	1
104	Show-Me	1	1	1	1
105	Sierra Sage	1	1	1	1
106	SOSONA - Indian	1	1	1	1
107	South Africa	1	1	1	1
108	South Dakota	1	1	1	1
109	South Florida	1	1	1	1
110	Southern California	1	1	1	1
111	Southern Idaho	1	1	1	1
112	Spain	1	1	1	1
113	Sweden	1	1	1	1
114	Tejas Bluebonnet	1	1	1	1

116	Tri-State	1	1	1	0
117	UK	1	1	1	1
118	Ukraine	1	1	1	1
119	Upper Midwest	1	1	1	1
120	Upper Rocky Mountain	1	1	1	1
121	Uruguay	1	1	1	1
122	Utah	1	1	1	1
123	Venezuela	0	0	0	0
124	Volunteer	1	1	1	1
125	Washington/N Idaho	1	1	1	1
126	Western New York	1	1	1	1
127	Western Russia	1	1	1	1
128	Wisconsin	1	1	1	1
129	Afri-can Zone	1	1	1	1
130	Asia-Pacific Forum	1	1	1	1
131	Brazilian Zonal Forum	1	1	1	1
132	EDM	1	1	1	1
133	Latin American ZF	1	1	1	1
134	Russian Speaking ZF	1	1	1	1
135	Carla W - WB	1	1	1	1
136	Danny G - WB	1	1	1	1
137	Eduardo G - WB	1	1	1	1
138	Hammed A - WB	1	1	1	1
139	Irene C - WB	1	1	1	1
140	Jack H - WB	1	1	1	1
141	Jorge M - WB	1	1	1	1
142	Jose Luis A - WB	1	1	1	1
143	Lib E - WB	1	1	1	1
144	Michael B - WB	1	1	1	1
145	Paul F - WB	1	1	1	1
146	Tana A - WB	1	1	1	1
147	Tim S - WB	1	1	1	1
148	Veronica B - WB	0	0	1	1
149	Yoel G - WB	1	1	1	1
	Total participants	142	140	141	136
	Regions	122	120	120	115
	Zones	6	6	6	6
	World Board	14	14	15	15

APPENDIX C: DRAFT NAWs STRATEGIC PLAN

DRAFT 2026-2029 Strategic Plan Key Result Areas, Issues, and Objectives

Key Result Area: Public Relations

Issue: Credibility of NA

Objectives

1. Create PR training tools for four target audiences and raise awareness of their importance in the Fellowship.
 - a. General public (including families)
 - b. Government (including criminal justice, policy)
 - c. Addiction treatment
 - d. Medical profession
2. Raise addiction treatment professionals' awareness of NA and confidence in sending their clients to NA as a viable program of recovery.

Key Result Area: Service System Support

Issue: Safety and Belonging

Objectives

3. Raise the level of consciousness regarding diversity and inclusion, and develop tools to support groups in ensuring that all members and potential members feel safe, welcomed, and included at in-person and virtual meetings.

Issue: Impact of the Rise of Virtual NA

Objectives

4. Enhance the ability of virtual groups to fully participate in the service system and for their voices to be heard as part of the NA Fellowship's conscience.

Issue: Lack of Cohesion in the Service System

Objectives

5. Further the concept of collaboration within the service system and the understanding and appreciation of complementary roles and contributions to A Vision for NA Service.

Issue: Development and Organization of Trusted Servants

Objectives

6. Increase the interest of younger members in service.
7. Through mentorship, training, and tools, increase continuity of service delivery.

Issue: Disruption in the Flow of Funds

Objectives

8. Create tools for groups to offer convenient ways for members to contribute, and to ease and encourage the flow of funds through all components of the service system.

Key Result Area: Fellowship Support

Issue: Harm Reduction

Objectives

9. In the spirit of our Third Tradition, achieve a common understanding across the Fellowship of what it means to be an NA member and how to create the space for addicts to choose membership, regardless of how they found NA.

Issue: Generational and Cultural Differences

Objectives

10. Continue to update communication methods to meet younger members' preferences for engagement.

Key Result Area: World Service Structure and Operations

Issue: Three-year Conference Cycle

Objectives

11. Further refine and describe the three-year conference cycle, including major meetings, policies, process deadlines and guidelines.
12. Evaluate and define the collaborative planning process for ongoing implementation.

Issue: Future of the World Convention

Objectives

13. Create a financially sustainable model for the World Convention, in harmony with our Eleventh Concept, that meets the needs and expectations of the Fellowship in a changing world.

Issue: NAWs Sustainability

Objectives

14. Enhance NAWs' stability by diversifying revenue sources.
15. Evaluate and adjust activities at NA World Services to best support its roles and functions in a changing world.
16. Raise understanding of the need for and importance of adequate financial resources in carrying the message of recovery.

APPENDIX D: COMPILED SMALL GROUP PLANNING NOTES

Interim WSC 2025 Planning Session One

I. Read Key Result Areas and Issues (2 KRAs in part one, 2 in part two)

Public Relations: Credibility of NA

Service System Support: Safety and Belonging, Impact of the Rise of Virtual NA, Lack of Cohesion in the Service System, Development and Organization of Trusted Servants, and Disruption in the Flow of Funds.

II. Are there any adjustments to or disagreements with the 6 issues represented in these two Key Result Areas? Does anyone not agree that these are still important challenges the Fellowship faces that should be addressed in the next planning cycle?

Summary for Question II

There is general agreement that all six issues remain relevant. Some CPs felt that overall prioritization would be helpful.

- General agreement that all six issues remain relevant. [x14]
- Consider prioritizing the order in which the issues are addressed. Some issues feel like higher priority than others. [x3]
 - Safety and Belonging are high priority [x2]
 - Development and Organization of Trusted Servants are high priority [x2]
 - Bringing in new people is a high priority
 - In some regions, fund flow has not been disrupted significantly, so this issue feels lower priority there [x2]

III. Read each Issue and Objective(s) and then answer the discussion questions for each issue:

Key Result Area: Public relations

Issue: Credibility of NA

Objectives

1. Create PR training tools for four target audiences and raise awareness of their importance in the Fellowship.
 - a. General public (including families)
 - b. Government (including criminal justice, policy)
 - c. Addiction treatment
 - d. Medical profession
2. Raise addiction treatment professionals' awareness of NA and confidence in sending their clients to NA as a viable program of recovery.

Do these objectives focus us on the primary challenge or opportunity we need to address related to this issue?

Do these objectives capture the result or change that we seek related to this issue?

Summary for Objectives 1 and 2

There is overall agreement that Objectives 1 and 2 address the Credibility of NA. Some suggestions for additional audiences: education system, first responders, private corporations/companies, mental health (including unhoused), and underserved/marginalized communities (including native populations). There was also one point that 'general public' and 'families' may be two different categories. And another point that the Fellowship should be an audience to educate about the importance of PR. Maybe

even breaking Objective 1 into two parts with the first part looking at Internal PR training tools and the second part being the existing Objective 1, as this would allow local service bodies to address their unique challenges and create targeted resources.

There were a few comments about the wording used in the objectives. Such as the word “their” in Objective 1. Is this referring to the audience or the tools? One participant wondered how the two objectives were different. Another suggestion was to alter the focus of Objective 2 with this rewording: *To train our members to be able to approach and address institutions or professionals in an appropriate way.*

Input on the wording of Objectives 1 and 2

- “Addiction treatment” should specify *drug* addiction treatment. Includes harm reduction professionals, “recovery for profit.” [x3]
- The word “tools” is too general and suggests old-school methods – it should specify we want modernized tools like videos rather than thick printed handbooks.
- The language is very unclear – “their” importance = the importance of the audience?
- Not clear how Objective 2 differs from Objective 1.
- Language feels like “how do we capture market share” – seems like we’re targeting audiences, and perhaps we’re chasing rather than educating.
- *Suggested rewording: Objective 2: To train our members to be able to approach and address in an appropriate way with institutions or professionals.*
- Suggest that the Credibility of NA issue be divided differently into two objectives:
 - The first objective would be broader, focusing on creating internal PR training tools.
 - The second objective would be more specific, aiming to diversify the first by separating topics and broadcasting them to the fellowship, general public, and government. This would involve directing attention to areas, regions, and institutions, addressing their unique challenges and creating targeted resources.
- The topics should remain broad to account for differences in audience needs in a global Fellowship

Expansion of the audience categories in Objective 1

- Agreement that the four audience categories (a-d) are all important.
- Additional audiences to include in this objective:
 - Include the education system, both public and private; professionals, students (psychology/medical), alternate school students. [x4]
 - The Fellowship itself is an audience (*see point below about “internal PR”*) [x4]
 - Include first responders [x2]
 - Include private corporations and companies [x2]
 - Expand “medical professionals” to include all health care workers
 - Include NGOs under the “government” category
 - Need to include mental health as an “audience” especially for the unhoused
 - Create PR training tool for working with underserved or marginalized communities e.g. native peoples
 - General public may be a different category from families – need for both?
- Need more “internal PR” tools/training to educate the Fellowship about the importance of PR. [x8] [Many of the solutions listed below address this need]
- Not clear from the objective whether we are discussing internal or external training, but both are needed. NA Fellowship is an additional audience to inform members better about PR and FD—what we do, what impacts we have, etc. How to communicate as PR trusted servants. [x3]

Solution-oriented ideas

- Implement more internal, Fellowship-facing PR training to highlight the importance of NA's public image and encourage greater participation in PR efforts. This will also help address the shortage of trusted servants. We should focus on finding ways to encourage our members to join PR committees, create more PR opportunities, and actively discuss these ongoing issues. By raising awareness and sharing our collective efforts, we can work more effectively toward our common goals. There is a lot of unevenness across the fellowship as to what PI/PR even means. Many members don't fully understand how crucial it is for these institutions to see us in a better light. [x8]
 - This could be addressed through group discussions.
 - We must address our own behaviors and sponsorship – PR training tools internally must come first. Hearsay and stigma have a strong impact on our reputation as a fellowship and issues such as harassment hurt our credibility if not addressed and handled well. Current PR tools deal with certain outside sources, but not as much internally.
 - We have gotten a little too far, like we think everybody knows how to carry our message. We are finding that a lot of our newer people have no idea what it means to carry our message versus their own message.
- Raise excitement and willingness, help people want to do PR. Make it fun (e.g. PR conventions) [x5]
- Mixed message between treatment and NA. There is a need to distinguish between treatment and NA, and to talk with treatment professionals about the need to not use NA symbols or imply an affiliation. A tool to guide these efforts to uphold NA's credibility and distinction is important. [x4]
- Training tools that include how to deal with social media as all of the target audiences already are on social media [x3]
- Important to dispel the belief that MAT and NA are at odds with each other. [x2]
 - What is taught in treatment industry is different than reality of NA. Clearly communicating with facilities who we are and what is NA. Dispel the idea that NA isn't welcoming to those on MAT.
 - Have a clear defined way we interact with treatment to aid in dispelling the misunderstandings – not our job to tell treatment what their job is but more what NA is.
- Find a way to show our results. The number of members we have in recovery must be reported. That increases confidence in the effectiveness of our fellowship. [x2]
- Focus on our clarity of language with the four target audiences. Keep up-to-date with current language in the professional fields we're dealing with. For instance, in professional language this is not a "program" of recovery because it is not that formal. It would be better when talking to these audiences to call it a "support system" so they have a better understanding. [x2]
- NAWS training videos looking at different levels like CBDM training; how you address the public, which is completely different than how you address a medical professional or a probation officer. Areas and regions can use videos and run their own training sessions.
- Training in how to reach and contact professionals, obtain an updated list of licensed treatment professionals.
- Review the way we receive those who come from medical referrals or treatment centers.
- Generate a basic guide for groups on how to welcome those who arrive referred by prosecutors or judges.
- Give more information to professionals about the nature of addiction.

- Update the PR Handbook. The four audiences (a-d) are already covered in our PR handbook – but we need new tools to allow for more flexibility to adapt to specific cultures.
- Expand and broaden existing literature, such as *NA: A Resource in Your Community*.
- Have a reserve of PR trusted servants ready to make presentations to relevant audiences.
- Review processes that affect NA's credibility in films, series, or documentaries that portray NA.
- Find opportunities to hold panel presentations, give new members things to do. Challenge may arise when old-timers are not willing to let newer members with new ideas to be of service
- Making sure that the 3rd Tradition is present and welcoming people with open arms.
- Help service bodies with issues like NA name often rejected when trying to place ads
- Solve problem of not being present at ASAM or similar conferences. Researching societies/groups to interact with them on larger scale
- NAWS working with governments in other countries to give more credibility to NA in those countries.
- Overcome negative connotation of an addict vs alcoholic.
- Put great emphasis on following up after presentations.
- Do PSA and post our symbol and promise on buses, trains, walls.
- Doing more surveys more often to provide data for recovery studies would help NA PR.
- In our state we've developed a good relationship with state and federal prisons; we're making an effort to contact the decision makers and that has made a difference in our PR efforts
- We are trying very hard to get into discussions with parliament re: drug abuse.
- H&I coordinating with PR allows great success -- radio channel in jails, meetings in every jail.
- Contact local professionals, hold Professional Awareness PR Meetings.
- Education on NA and its role within treatment centers
- Communication between other 12 step programs
- Russia is experiencing similar challenges. We carry our message using modern technologies, such as YouTube and other social media platforms. Due to the current situation in Russia, including legislative developments, we are also engaging with Ministers of Defense. In major cities, we have established strong relationships with universities, allowing us to openly discuss NA. However, outreach in smaller communities is more challenging. To bridge this gap, we conduct fellowship outreach missions every six months to a year to introduce NA to these communities.
- NA's reputation on social media or search engines needs to be improved. Include virtual tools to strengthen NA's credibility.
- It's good to work collaboratively with government officials but in some places, stigma is a bigger problem: maybe we should focus on eliminating stigma, and address the social atmosphere and families more.
- Credibility: making sure we're not hard to find when they're looking for us. The na.org meeting finder going away was a big loss for us. Accessibility = credibility; it feels cloak and dagger when they can't find us. We need to improve brand recognition. It shouldn't be hard to find and recognize us when looking for information or a meeting.
- Seems to be a misunderstanding on how NA is distinct from other 12 step fellowships. Important to make that clear in the training.

Additional comments and considerations

- Global PR tools may not specifically address local problems. [x2]
- Explore book-length pieces of literature on inmate tablets. This has been hugely helpful in AZ.

- Our credibility as a fellowship also relies on word of mouth from non-members. Important to work on inner-conflict resolutions such as harassment. Hurts our credibility if not addressed and handled well.
- Objective 2 really depends where you are. In some places getting medical referrals is very challenging. (Some of this is about financial motivations.) Developing tools that show that we do not compete with them is very important. Present ourselves as a partner.
- Facilities have been starting their own meetings “in-house.” Important to create these tools to work with outside organizations and to train them to remain in line with NA’s purpose.
- PR tools should show what happens to the funds. Increased opportunities for addicts to choose other alternatives and not Narcotics Anonymous.
- Treatment centers need to require attendance in 12-step programs
- Make sure we address the need for continuity, dependability, and reliability.
- Outreach to policy and government – there’s still animosity toward addicts and stigma re: illegal substances. So it’s important that we continue outreach to impact how addicts are treated.
 - (e.g. in Iran for many years addiction was against the law, and PR helped a lot to change the attitude of lawyers, solicitors, and police. So criminal justice would be an important audience in Iran.)
- Where does this fall in line with the production of NA literature? We just passed a motion about the literature survey. Where does this fall in the priority list in development?
- NA often operates in the shadow of AA, which has long-established relationships with the federal government, the general public, court systems, medical professionals, and other institutions. NA is sometimes viewed as the 'troubled child' in comparison and should focus on building a more positive perception, so these entities view us as a viable partner. Many people and organizations miss our message because we are not welcomed into these spaces.

Key Result Area: Service System Support

Issue: Safety and Belonging

Objectives

3. Raise the level of consciousness regarding diversity and inclusion, and develop tools to support groups in ensuring that *all* members and potential members feel safe, welcomed, and included at in-person and virtual meetings.

Does this objective focus us on the primary challenge or opportunity we need to address related to this issue?

Does this objective capture the result or change that we seek related to this issue?

Summary for Objective 3

There was broad agreement that this objective is very important. Some suggested to specify that *safety* is in reference to violence and sexual predation, but others felt *safety and belonging* is more current and positive terminology, and some even suggested breaking safety and belonging into two separate objectives. Another suggestion for an additional objective was *Carry the message to addicts who are socially excluded or in socially marginalized communities, whether due to geographic, economic, or other factors*. There were suggestions to simplify the language of the objective and to cut the phrase “regarding diversity and inclusion.” As with the PR objectives, it was suggested to define/specify what types of tools (videos, workshops, IPs?...)

Input on the wording of Objective 3

- "Raise the level of consciousness and develop tools to support groups in ensuring that all members and potential members feel safe, welcomed, and included at in-person and virtual meetings." [x2]
- Can we define "tools", would they be IPs? Workshops? IDTs? Videos? The objective might be purposefully broad because we will get to potential solutions later. [x2]
- It might be better to use different names for diversity and inclusion to align with the current US government policy.
- Language could be simplified. Objective could say "We want NA to be a safe environment where people feel like they belong"

Input on Objective 3

- Strong agreement that this goal is important and needs to be reviewed by NA. [x6]
 - One person suggested that this objective is so important it may require its own strategic plan.
- Inside thing that we need to overcome - being inclusive to the people who enter our rooms (diversity) [x6]
- The language of the objective needs to identify that safety is related specifically to sexually predatory and violent behavior [x6]
 - Counterpoint: The change of language from "disruptive & predatory behavior" to "safety & belonging" is a better look and more solution-forward.
- This objective raises the question of autonomy. Primary purpose should remain the priority. Focus on carrying the message. [x2]
- "Safety and Belonging" may actually need to be broken down into two objectives, as each goal has its own means of achievement

Additional Objective

- Carry the message to addicts who are socially excluded or in socially marginalized communities, whether due to geographic, economic, or other factors.

Solution-oriented ideas

- Many potential solutions came up from zonal workshops (e.g. "More understanding by hearing other people's experiences"). We have a lot of safety tools developed at the local, regional, & zonal levels, we should continue to develop these. [x2]
- Highlight the use of greeters in local meetings. Whether IRL or virtual, use a greeter in the parking lot/waiting room to welcome newcomers as they arrive and to be available after the meeting for questions, etc. [x2]
- Gender-neutral language is very important, converting literature to include that language. [x3]
 - This relates to credibility as well, because if people come to meetings and don't find NA credible, there's a problem. We talk about inclusiveness, but our language is not inclusive. We can't include people who are non-binary when our literature erases them. We say they're welcome, but then the language in our literature undermines that in the meeting itself.
 - As for Safety and Belonging, there are links there with the ongoing IDT discussions around inclusive language that have been out for a long time for groups, areas, and regions to access. Many people would like to know where we are heading with the Inclusive language discussions. For example: in one region, they have initiated a meeting primarily for LGBTQ members, and the language of the readings does not sit well with all of our members. The region is fine with these discussions, but ultimately a decision must be made about the language.

- Special interest groups, LGBT meetings, women’s meetings, young person meetings. Educating our fellowship that there is a place for that.
 - Counterpoint: “Special interest” meetings or committees may look more exclusive than inclusive and reduce diversity of fellowship. Emphasize what unites us and have an adequate recovery environment. May not be all encompassing for the newcomer. These meetings may impact the needs of the fellowship as a whole. [x3]
 - They may also reduce safety: in some areas there seems to be a vicious cycle of women and LGBTQ members moving away from regular groups and starting special interest groups; as a result, the regular meetings are all full of straight men. This makes those “regular” meetings less safe than they were when they were more diverse. So, in some ways, special interest groups are making the safety and belonging problem worse. And there are no documents or workshop materials that we can turn to try to ask, *how do we bring each other back to be a part of?*
- Fellowship resources should be invested in creating literature and service materials to inform our members and the public that we are an inclusive fellowship. Our literature is our most powerful vehicle for this. More literature on these challenges will help. [x2]
- It’s not just a tool that is needed, but a conversation about the culture within meetings to be more inclusive. Raise level of consciousness of racism in NA (consider adding to the objective), predation, especially sexual predation; important to help new members feel safe. We may want to have an objective about internal training about maturity issues in the Fellowship. [x2]
- Educating the Fellowship about diversity and inclusion. Workshops—what they might look like?
- Women’s safety needs to be addressed through steps, traditions, and through service: we need to separate service as one category and steps as another, not intertwined, so people have skills/tools/understanding to build safety and welcome.
- Better involve members in group service.
- What are the existing guidelines for disruptive behavior? Service pamphlets are not always popular in groups – add guidance from the pamphlet to The Group Booklet?
- Make sure that we are clear in the NA language and remind us that “any” addict can find us and recover.
- Sometimes seems there are now 2 Fellowships—virtual and in-person; important to set a good atmosphere of recovery in both to ensure inclusion. Virtual meetings are still bound by the same Traditions as we are in in person meetings.
- Virtual meeting groups also need to include a welcoming statement in the meeting format because in virtual meetings there’s not the option to approach someone 1:1
- Utilize all-inclusive Zoom account available to all regions within a zone or all areas within a region.
- Where multiple languages are spoken, offer translations to help newcomers feel more welcome.
- Updating the *GTLS* to include virtual service.
- Is it time for an amendment to The Group Booklet to add more stuff about the special interest meetings, or can our regions help develop pamphlets to help with the special interest meetings?
- The best tool we have at our disposal is our traditions. Diversity is dealt with in Tradition 3, including gender; unity is in Tradition 1. We work the traditions with our sponsees. Then you can talk about equality, inclusiveness, etc. Empowering people to work on their recovery empowers us all.
- One reason we are not getting a lot of referrals is because of our behavior, including physical violence. We need to be modeling ourselves so we can attract more addicts from all backgrounds to Narcotics Anonymous. At WCNA the survey said that only 50% of our members

have sponsors. That is something we might want to look at: Are we sponsoring people? Are we giving people the information they need to be acceptable and responsible members?

- Mentoring the ones who are creating an unsafe environment and modeling good behavior.

Additional comments and considerations:

- Something big that fits under here is medication, mental health and MAT. Not sure how many people have come in on MAT and gone back to their doctor and said they are not welcome in NA. People being shut down when they share, for instance. Given the movement towards harm reduction in medical professionals, it's important to meet today's newcomers where they are so they're comfortable in NA. A lot of demand for NA meetings to have literature on MAT and DRT on their literature tables. Definition of being clean—there are different interpretations. How are we attracting those newer members regardless of whether they are “clean” or not? [x9]
- Women are not present in meetings or in service. They feel unsafe. [x3]
 - In our region members are building relationships with women in the rooms who are at about a year or just under; there seems to be a divide where people are being targeted.
- Racism, homophobia, sexism, transphobia. Need to raise awareness of members. [x3]
- There seems to be a lot of groups of people that don't seem to be at our meetings because of their sexuality or their ethnicity. My zone approved a project plan to create a committee to figure out why those groups of people are not at our meetings.
- We have tried to get some Spanish speaking meetings going and those have failed. We know there are Spanish speaking addicts in our community, so how do we do that?
- Issue gets lost in the IDT workshops because we're spending too much time defining it and not enough time looking at the results of the behavior.
- We have to find a solution for secure online meetings besides just changing passwords. In Ukraine we use Zoom but sometimes we must close our meeting because we cannot continue. And we cannot meet in person because many people do not speak the language.
- A lot of treatment centers in their region and Addiction Farms that come to meetings handing out their business cards.
- Several regions have collaborated to create service literature about harassment in groups, up on our website and printed. We found that many people asked us about that in PR presentations, so now we have something we can refer them to show them that we do recognize the problem and have tools to respond to it.
- How do we welcome those who make it unsafe for others? And still keep the meeting safe?
- Accessibility concerns with respect to the BMLT — not everyone has smartphones. Also, region is not comfortable with the history of the BMLT and who developed it. More accountability instead of encouraging its use to help addicts find meetings given information might not always be accurate.
- APF: women's FD committee has put together a pamphlet. Donnie will forward to WB
- The issue of belonging—for instance people who come in off the streets (“acting weird, smelling bad”). Do we welcome them in the same way we welcome others? We may be too focused on keeping established members comfortable and not focused enough on welcoming those who are new and may not be “easy” to sit next to and talk to.
- Disruptive behavior. People who don't know the protocols of NA meetings. Fighting in service bodies. This becomes more of a hot issue after there are incidents.
- Ensure that long term members are also addressed. They can be left out.
- Price of events—how to make it more available to our community by not overcharging.
- Build on our diversity. We need to embrace our diversity.
- Discussion about how virtual fits into the existing structure.

- Anonymity at the level of social media concerns.
- Issues when many people at a time sent to the meeting on drug probation.
- This isn't just in the recovery meetings—it's all areas. Service meetings, before/after...
- How to make the groups stronger? Safety and inclusion rely on this. Groups with strong conscience tend to be more in-line with this objective.
- Losing members due to fears of safety
- Future small groups such as this could use more diversity, different countries.

Issue: Impact of the Rise of Virtual NA

Objective

4. Enhance the ability of virtual groups to fully participate in the service system and for their voices to be heard as part of the NA Fellowship's conscience.

Does this objective focus us on the primary challenge or opportunity we need to address related to this issue?

Does this objective capture the result or change that we seek related to this issue?

Summary for Objective 4

Some input expressed general agreement with the objective, but there was a lot of input on reframing or expanding this objective.

One idea that came up repeatedly was to expand the objective to include service bodies, H&I, tools, etc., or refocus it to be more about the service structure and less about groups. Some related input suggested the objective might be premature, and that we need more discussion and consideration first about how to adapt the service system, restructure, revise policies, take better advantage of virtuality in service delivery. The structure is geographical, and we need to figure out how to incorporate groups with no physical location.

Another idea for expanding the objective was to include something about more discussion and bridging the divide and addressing the fact that many members still do not see virtual meetings as legitimate.

Another idea for expanding the scope was to help/guide/mentor meetings—both in-person meetings that are losing members to virtual NA—and virtual groups, including the issue of online safety, (though this may be addressed in Objective 3).

There was also one piece of input to expand the objective to focus broadly on technology, and another idea to do more outreach to government and jails so that we can better leverage online NA to carry the message.

Input on the wording of Objective 4

- “Empower” is a better word than “enhance.” Does virtual include other forms of meetings than zoom? There are also phone meetings for example. Inclusive language is helpful in relaying that virtual meetings ARE meetings. There is dissent in some regions whether a virtual meeting is legitimate. Specifying “virtual” doesn't cover everything that is not in-person. Much agreement on this, that the wording is very important.

Input on Objective 4

- General agreement with the issue at hand.
- These objectives so far have been well-targeted — “the best plan they've seen.”

- Possibly shift the objective to include not just meetings but also service bodies, H&I, tools. Nothing is mentioned here about service bodies. The objective should be less focused on virtual groups and more on virtual service structure. [x3]
 - There is a need to figure out how to enfranchise and include these groups, but we need more discussion about how to ensure inclusion. More discussion about the service structure itself—how to adapt the system.
 - It's important to clarify processes in how to incorporate virtual NA meetings in our service structure and write policies.
- We need to foster a shared understanding within the Fellowship by providing education and guidance that virtual groups are a part of NA. These situations are common, highlighting the need for an objective that includes outreach to offline groups and coordination efforts to bring them into the service structure.
- Do not believe objective fully aligns. Efforts have been made to integrate virtual meetings that operate outside the service structure.
 - The focus should be on how to effectively communicate with these meetings and encourage their participation in the service structure.
 - It is important to emphasize that a Zoom meeting is not recovery unless it is connected to the broader service structure.
 - Rather than focusing solely on *enhancing* virtual groups' participation in the service system, the objective should emphasize *balancing* their participation while ensuring they remain an integral part of the fellowship's service structure and collective conscience. The rise of virtual NA is inevitable.
- Is the objective premature? Do we need more discussion first? More explanation?
- Merge/integrate in-person and virtual to be more descriptive of "fully participate."
- Need to help in-person groups who are losing members to virtual groups.
- Add guidance/mentorship of the virtual groups.
- Beyond enhancing the how, important to encourage their participation.
- If the issue is safety, there needs to be a solution for people to feel safe in online meetings.
- How do we include groups that do not have a geographical place?
- Shift in objective— while the focus is on virtual NA and the service system, it could be made even broader like the use of technology to taking meetings into prisons. Looking at the use of hybrid meetings, the BMLT, and how we are doing our online meeting lists. Besides talking about virtual meetings, I think there is a lot more with just technology that could be looked at.
- Hard for members to adapt to the new reality of the rise in Virtual NA due to unfamiliarity.

Solution-oriented ideas

- Many CPs shared examples of virtual meetings being successfully integrated into the service structure. [x8]
 - Russian Tranzit—virtual region that's part of the EDM.
 - UK rewrote regional guidelines to help with the barrier of geography, and now we have 2 fully online areas seated at the region.
 - In our area, all meetings are virtual, and they have GSRs.
 - In my region, all service meetings are virtual. Our geographical boundaries are expanding because of the virtual meeting, and I think it goes back to our need as a Fellowship to be more flexible. Virtual meetings are here to stay.
 - Area is hybrid; we have some online-only meetings and a couple hybrids; they can participate just online or in person. Our region meets bimonthly online and in person once a year. We get a lot of work done online for the region. So, at zone we're working on a

- document for groups to do electronic funds collection, links to NAWS, and stuff about whether the group wants to incorporate, get an EIN, etc.
- We have an online area in our area as well; region is hybrid so they can be included and so can others who can't attend face to face. Rise of online is a boost to the future of NA. Before covid we had 280 meetings. Now 360 meetings, 60 are online/virtual. Most of them are part of the online area.
 - Montana's virtual community is its own area
 - Lithuania began meeting online pre-pandemic (Skype!) - connected with Lithuanian speakers recovering in other countries that shared experience – resulted in growth
 - ASC/RSC/Committees service meetings must be hybrid to include virtual groups in the service structure. Guidance and resources to help service committees help set up hybrid meetings and purchase appropriate equipment. Need facilitator training for hybrid service bodies. [x7]
 - Focus on virtual groups to be part of virtual areas, virtual regions, virtual GSC. [x5]
 - It is essential for us to take the initiative in outreach efforts, actively creating opportunities to engage members, ensuring all feel connected and included—whether through virtual or in-person meetings—strengthens the fellowship unity. [x3]
 - Need to incorporate virtual service into manuals and *GTLS* [x2]
 - Helping virtual groups maintain their ability to carry the message of NA. Virtual is held to different standards than 3D meetings. [x2]
 - Also encourage members in virtual groups to participate in service structure. We see many older members with vast experience who are only in virtual meetings and we would like to include them in the service structure, and see them participate more fully – which probably means we need hybrid service meetings. [x2]
 - Find a way to enhance the availability of virtual groups in the service system.
 - Take advantage of virtuality for service, such as fellowship development, H&I, etc.
 - Internal PR to establish guidelines on how and by whom service is done, but with main goal being inclusion and not exclusion. Tension is caused when virtual service bodies do not respect geographical limitations or in-person structures.
 - Need for some sort of help or literature in dealing with zoom bombers.
 - Develop a short IP to initiate discussions within the Fellowship about the needs and opportunities presented by the virtual world and how in-person meetings have been greatly impacted.
 - Centrally located in-person RSC meeting
 - Email, WhatsApp threads to maintain communication
 - Foster personal relationships – web of communication
 - Where multiple languages are spoken, offer translations to help newcomers feel more welcome.
 - Find ways for rural virtual groups to be a part of the NA service structure.
 - Make it welcoming to “all” rural or not rural/hybrid meetings.
 - Utilize all-inclusive Zoom account available to all regions within a zone or all areas within a region.
 - Consider ways that virtual meetings can contribute financially to service system. (Could fall under disruption in fund flow).
 - Shortness of time to complete everything that we need to do - reinforce people to stay from prayer to prayer, even when the meeting is slated for an hour but extended to two hours.
 - Have a subcommittee at regional level running by people with virtual experience.
 - Develop services based on needs of virtual meetings/areas.

- Investing more resources to support online NA, particularly in regards to educating the government and the jail system so we can reach the addicts with less hassle via the virtual platform and sponsor our trusted servants on how to fulfil those service positions, particularly in remote areas. Take advantage of virtuality for FD service.
- Bridging the skill-set divide through education with additional resources.
- Further supporting Hybrid resources through literature on na.org. Best practices, facilitator training, tech tips, etc.

Additional comments and considerations:

- Lots of CPs citing pros to virtual meetings: During the pandemic, virtual meetings were the only option for many members, reinforcing their importance. Additionally, as many members age and face mobility challenges, virtual meetings provide an essential means of continued participation in the fellowship. Virtual meetings and service can be very practical in places that are large and not densely populated. The prevalence of virtual meetings has lessened the travel and in-person growth. Can also be an entry point or stepping stone to in person attendance. [x6]
- Some negatives: Harder for transparency; harder to track what is happening; members can get lost. Is the quality of virtual meetings on par with in-person? Can create some isolating behavior. In-person meeting attendance has declined significantly since the rise of virtual meetings, impacting local fellowship engagement. In one instance, a hybrid meeting was held, but no one attended in person—all participants joined virtually. [x4]
- There is a perceived difference between in-person and virtual meetings and service bodies. The interests of virtual groups may be different. There are needs unique to virtual groups. [x3]
- Some regions and areas have obviously had success with this, but in other places it is not clear how to map a non-geographically based group onto a service system that is geographic in nature. Historically we haven't done a great job in adapting the service structure to enfranchise communities that don't fit neatly within a delegation stream based on geographical borders. Address how borderless groups can be incorporated into the region, including how to incorporate voices into votes and how seating would work. [x2]
- This objective ties into Objective 3 as members often feel excluded when not participating in person
 - This issue also links with inclusivity or access as virtual groups enable more addicts to attend meetings (e.g. the physically impaired and those living in remote areas)
- Sometimes seems there are now 2 Fellowships—virtual and in-person; important to set a good atmosphere of recovery in both to ensure inclusion
 - Virtual meetings are still bound by the same Traditions as we are in in-person meetings
 - Keeping in mind that some virtual groups don't follow traditions. (e.g. virtual groups including all anonymous fellowships). The stronger the links to NA the better the message.
- In Russia, there is a structure called TRANZIT that primarily supports online groups. However, a few months ago, some online group created their own process outside of TRANZIT, resulting in a lack of coordination and collaboration. There was also a situation where a group split into two, both using the same name—one operating offline and outside the service structure.
- Both in-person and virtual meetings provide the same foundation for recovery. The key is to unite virtual and in-person meetings, as both contribute to the fellowship and align with our principles.
- Virtual service can get “siloed” and disconnected from the rest of the service system.
- Members less likely to be of service in person, creates apathy to do service in the virtual arena while it affords those that ordinarily wouldn't be able to serve, the opportunity to do so

- Motion at WSC 2023 identifying virtual groups as registered/recognized groups enhances the ability for virtual groups to become involved with/conduct their own services, like virtual PR, etc.
- How does the service system communicate to the member—many members only participate in virtual meetings and are unaware of the service system.
- Many members feel safer in online meetings...how to invite them into in-person meetings?
- Region has mixed feelings because they want to make this step forward, but there is a lack of volunteers to make it happen.

Issue: Lack of Cohesion in the Service System

Objectives

5. Further the concept of collaboration within the service system and the understanding and appreciation of complementary roles and contributions to A Vision for NA Service.

Does this objective focus us on the primary challenge or opportunity we need to address related to this issue?

Does this objective capture the result or change that we seek related to this issue?

Summary for Objective 5

Many responses included approval of this idea. There were suggestions to have more clarification of the scope of the objective for either having a focus on planning or removing the word “concept.” Also comments about the need to address any disconnects in the service structure.

Input on the wording of Objective 5

- Consider just “further the collaboration” vs the concept of collaboration. That makes it feel less abstract.
- [Some clearer language as our group understood it]: More collaboration and understanding of each level of service. Coordination and efficiency.
- If the focus is on planning, then should we say collaborative planning?
- Objective needs to include communication and education within the service system and how the various arms work.

Input on Objective 5

- Like the idea [x9]
- Considerable need for clarification on this objective. It may be too broad and abstract to understand. [x4]
- Good for World Services and for local service bodies [x3]
- Where is this lacking within our service structure?
 - Guide to Local Services is dated
 - The service structure is still a little bit of a mystery for the general member
 - Better communication
 - Where are committees overlapping? How to combine or become more efficient.
 - Example: Keeping a PR chair. A rural area may have a harder time staying in communication within and without the fellowship.
- Not just “further collaboration” but build connection and build bridges. Heal the disconnect. There is active disconnect in some places. This is about local Fellowship—there is a disconnect and disunity at the group, area, and regional level. It’s about where are our feet—not just the horizon. It’s a local problem. This objective needs to be revised to be more about local disconnect. Not just collaboration, but communication should be part of this objective. [x5]

- Concrete objective needed. The concept of “collaboration” is not strong enough for this objective
 - Create a document to help members better collaborate to reach this objective.
- What practical steps can we take together to make collaboration a reality?
- Are we talking information flow? Delegation?
- Service Structure
 - How do we streamline or make efficient our service structure to do “more with less”?
 - We have had this rigid service structure for a long time, and we look at the Guide to Local Services for what it is supposed to look like. We don’t have to do it like we have always done it. How do we bring our trusted servants together? More project-based service and less “this is the committee you have to go to do this.” Not just geographical collaboration but also subcommittees in our areas. Maybe don’t have them the same way anymore.
 - Lack of cohesion in areas, regions, and zones needs to be mentioned including overlap in services.
- What are the challenges (including the ones we create)? Facility/institution rules that impact our ability to collaborate to deliver services? (connects to PR KRA)

Solution-oriented ideas

- Enhance cohesion and collaboration between the different groups of people. Align our goals between service bodies. [x3]
- Update the *GTLS*. Need to incorporate virtual service into manuals and *GTLS*. [x2]
- Consider role of zones:
 - Look to what zones do or could do—FD/outreach, mentorship, info-sharing, with their member regions (comment noted that US growth is stagnant, but growing in other parts of the world where zones are more active and service-oriented)
 - Address potential of moving on to making zonal motions as a means of sharing ideas. A regional motion could grow amongst regions and become a zonal proposal.
 - Concern for unseated regions’ ability to have impact on motions.
 - Unseated regions can send motions to the WSC by ZD.
 - Create workshop to educate members as to what the zones can provide / challenging apathy
- Promote reading and interpretation of 12 Concepts. [x2]
 - Workshops on awareness re: Concepts and Traditions. We mistake them for law, and lack understanding/nuance.
 - What’s lacking is a comprehensive book on our 12 Concepts, similar to Traditions: *Spirit of Our Concepts*. Increased understanding of our roles and our principles would go a long way toward addressing these issues.
- Learn to work together and/or separately without the need to attack each other.
- Be clear about the roles of each part of the service structure.
- There is a direct connection between service and sponsorship.
- Internal PR to establish guidelines on how and by whom service is done, but with main goal being inclusion and not exclusion of NA. Tension is caused when virtual service bodies do not respect geographical limitations or in-person structures.
- Providing more best practices or tools or ideas about how service bodies can work collaboratively – area to area, area to region/zone, etc. What are some ways we might better cross-pollinate?
- Resurrect the old ways of working together – e.g. group assembly

- Regional PR umbrella: workgroup includes H&I, phonedlines, website, writing behind walls, meeting directories.
- Hybrid and in person meetings. Ideas can be shared across zones and regions through virtual workshops, discussions.
- A region has been trying to create opt-in distribution lists so delegates can communicate directly with the groups. This solves some of the communications breakdown between region and group; communication is key.

Additional comments and considerations:

- Many service bodies struggle with suspicion toward other service bodies, forums, and/or the WSO. They are concerned that other service bodies are not following traditions and not being responsible with NA funds. We need to encourage people to extend some grace toward other committees. [x3]
- What we are doing here today is perfect collaboration. Virtual gatherings are the perfect medium for us to all join together and become a truer collaborative service system. This is what we've been given, let's just continue to do it better, rather than complaining about technological issues or time zones etc. [x2]
- Hold our horses—we need to improve communication with and within local communities before moving forward with zonal or world-level projects. The communication pipeline breaks down from region to group. [x2]
- Spend more time building consensus rather than making internal service body decisions—this leads to projects that belong to members more.
- Pandemic “forced” collaboration between areas due to reduced number of trusted servants
- There is a collaboration of US Zones that have created a website which has received quite a bit push back in fear of losing their voice.
 - Are they going to have a vote at the conference?
 - Are they going to take money from NA?
- We can be too administrative.
- All for a better understanding on how everything will work together.

Issue: Development and Organization of Trusted Servants

Objectives

6. Increase the interest of younger members in service.
7. Through mentorship, training, and tools, increase continuity of service delivery.

Do these objectives focus us on the primary challenge or opportunity we need to address related to this issue?

Do these objectives capture the result or change that we seek related to this issue?

Summary of Objectives 6 and 7

Many ideas about incorporating something for retaining those with service experience to help in the mentorship of newer members to service. There is a possible need to distinguish between age and cleantime when referencing “younger” or if it needs to address both.

Input on the wording of Objectives 6 and 7

- Clarification needed. Does “younger” refer to a newcomer or age of member? We should be talking about newer members. Some young people have many years and are not new to service. Older members need to be included as well– not being age specific. [x8]

- Counterpoint: It's important to focus on newer AND younger members. Younger people have a different language. We need to figure out how to speak to them, keep them coming back, make sure they have sponsors, etc.
- Objective should be inclusive of younger members AND newer members, as well as older members who have stepped away from service – make service attractive.
- Not a strong enough objective, needs to be re-written. “Inspire” members rather than “encourage.”
- The wording “in service” does not translate well out of English...better wording would be “to be of service.
- Objective 6 & 7 can be combined. Ex: “Through mentorship, training, tools and rethinking how we do service (like task-based/project-based) service opportunities) increase the percentage of members doing service at the area/region/ and world level”
- The phrasing of Objective 7 sounds very professional

Additional Objectives

- Recoup the institutional knowledge of experienced members that was lost during the pandemic.
- Increase the interest of experienced members to return to service, possibly as a mentor. Find ways to involve experienced members and retain the ones who are still there.

Input on Objectives 6 and 7

- Strongly believe that these objectives will help the fellowship. The difficulties so many here have experienced, and the many solutions being proposed, highlight the need for this objective. [x6]
- Remember the IDT on revitalizing service: do these objectives cover that? Is this redundant to issues that have already been discussed?
- Connection between these objectives and Objective 5.
- This objective covers other issues, such as safety & belonging.

Comments related to mentorship

- Retention of experienced trusted servants.
- Encourage members with experience to come back and share their experience through mentorship of new members. Task-based service in relation to service position time frames. Project vs service.
- How to encourage and foster the “on-fire” phase of a member in service? Avoiding burnout.
- Maybe add an objective for older members that are phased out, that have a bad taste for service. How do we, the experienced members, approach and talk about service?
- The idea of stronger mentorship feels like a solution to many even larger problems.
- How to find a balance on mentorship without becoming dictators.
- Additionally, being willing to mentor older members how to use those tools and new people getting service mentorship. Two-way street.
- “Mentorship” may be too broad. Need to really clearly define mentorship and mentorship roles; consider incorporating position into service bodies; perhaps develop lit explaining it. [x2]
- Mentorship and encouragement of a new member is a great way to get them into service. Takes the fear and mystery out of a service position.

Solution-oriented ideas

- Being enthusiastic about being of service. Need to share how exciting it is to get into service and the spiritual rewards. Re-educate. [x4]
- What services are younger members interested in? Utilize this as a gateway into other areas of service. Consider the perspectives of younger members regarding the Traditions – listen and

engage. Adjust/revise service approach/system to attract newer/young members. “This is the way we’ve always done things” is the worst reason. [x4]

- Direct relationship between sponsorship and service. We don’t talk enough about sponsorship. [x4]
- Look for more attractive ways to do the mentoring/training. New strategies to attract service members using tools that younger members are familiar with (including technology and social media). Catering to shortened attention spans (doesn’t just apply to young people). [x4]
- Look for opportunities for veterans and new members to serve together. Being innovative to having fun in service with older and new members. [x3]
- Concept of leadership. “Shoulder-tapping”, Sponsorship, 1 on 1 conversations: “Hey you would be good for this position.” “Service sponsors.” Could use a tool or resource to create a system to encourage service through these methods. Train the trainers. [x3]
- More literature for young people – possibly something for the youth on NA service. [x2]
- Each one, teach one!
- Maintain firmness in principles (avoid relaxing our principles to accommodate for newcomers’ attitudes).
- There is an excess of information, look for how to give better more limited information.
- Group near a university receives many young members saying that all they need to do is stay in the rooms, not work steps, etc. Need for mentorship. They made a rule that open meetings were only allowed to have 3 non-member visitors – even though they had training, HI, PR, we need mentorship – it seems something is missing. When we see “revitalizing NA” it seems nothing really happens. This suffocates NA. We need more material that creates connections with the service that groups need to provide – which is recovery, especially to young people.
- Stepping aside to make room for younger members, instead of the same folks continually shifting seats.
- Policy should be vague and simple. Policy as control mechanism means new members come in and are told just to follow the lines on the road, don’t have creative freedom instead of just stepping into a role. If we’re trying to find a way around something, it’s because it’s in the way!
- Adding burdens to effective trusted servants punishes effectiveness; we’re treating people like they’re just showing up to work (re: the idea that one person/committee must take up the responsibilities of another when that position is unfilled)
- Service days/workshops to encourage newer members to be a part of and not just be a bystander. You can see it helps, but we can’t force members.
- Involve experienced members from other areas as a resource when help is needed
- Better inform area level trusted servants of “Basics” service tools – assemble a service handbook as a purchasable item – Collect them all!
- Models for possible regional committee structures for youth committees.
- Identify people missing from our service system.
- Combining events with service.
- Many members have interest in being of service, but may have fear of understanding because of language barriers. Service IPs are in English. Would like tools that give members more confidence in wanting to be of service.
- For many newcomers, NA = the meeting they’re in. Experienced members need to share how NA works and model how to be involved in NA
- This is an FD issue: e.g., locally developed lit w/stories from younger members in recovery.
- Young people’s groups are attractive, a way for younger members to interact, and potentially participate in the ASC as a common need/“identity”

- Listening, holding events to foster connection and communication.
- Use the IP for young people in recovery (IP 13) as a useful tool; how to provide support for young addicts and what support to provide—online meetings, social media use, translations for inclusivity where multiple languages are spoken
- “Job fair” to attract newer members into service and mitigate the anti-service sentiment.
- Use technology for trusted servants training.
- Four magic words: “will you help me?” Great way to get someone involved 1-on-1.
- Important to consider 12 Traditions and 12 Concepts when selecting members for service. Not selecting someone out of desperation, but because they are a good fit.

Additional comments and considerations:

- Small country; lack of support of members willing to do service
- Lack of rotation with old-timers due to lack of support
- Pandemic was a huge setback. Less hugs, less interpersonal aspects.
- Today, young newcomers are not taught right off the bat to be in service.
- Low response rate to things like CAR votes.
- Connects to issue of credibility within our membership. Lots of Us and Them. Need to reinforce NA literature.

Issue: Disruption in the Flow of Funds

Objectives

8. Create tools for groups to offer convenient ways for members to contribute, and to ease and encourage the flow of funds through all components of the service system.

Does this objective focus us on the primary challenge or opportunity we need to address related to this issue?

Does this objective capture the result or change that we seek related to this issue?

Summary of Objective 8

While it is not an issue in every region, there was agreement that fund flow is a needed focus. Some suggested adding in service bodies along with groups. There were questions about the target for this objective and possibly including language about virtual groups.

Input on the wording of Objective 8

- Add “groups and service bodies.” [x2]
- To recognize the importance of the flow of funds, not just the disruption of the flow of funds.
- Add follow the existing fund flow.
- “Ease the flow of funds” – what does that mean? Easier for certain people to donate, or easier to move money around? Does this mean things like groups using QR codes? Easier to avoid burden of taxes, etc? Certain tools are more common in different countries. Education is such an important concept and word regarding money matters. It’s not all about convenience. We have discussed this with IDTs and IPs but something still is not working, we need more solutions: videos, NA app, delegation stream.
- Mention something about “including avenues for virtual groups/areas to pass funds.”

Input on Objective 8

- General agreement, though not an issue in every region. [x8]

- Yes, this is an issue. Less cash being used overall. The difficulty of using electronic methods of contributions. Education and guidance of best practices. Money can sometimes lead to divisive situations.
- Is this mostly about fund flow to NAWS? Resistance of some areas to support NAWS. So, this objective doesn't seem to clearly address this.
- This might actually be two distinct objectives: tools and processes?

Comments related to trust and transparency

- There are already available tools for members and groups to contribute; a way to increase flow of funds would be more transparency – in a manner that a group member can actually understand where the money goes – through simple story boards, etc. Once the member understands effectively how funds are used, there will be a more consistent flow. I do not believe we need more tools as they are available, what we need is to help the member have a different mindset. [x2]
- Another objective would be focusing on the trust/lack of trust issue at the next level of service – need more education on the Vision and where this money is going and being used for
- Missing the idea of trust in the fund flow. One member has experienced a group holding onto a large amount of money. Why aren't they participating? They don't trust the fund flow. Is there a stigma of the NA fund flow causing issues?
- Communicate confidence that if you put money in the basket, it is going towards what it is supposed to be going to.
- Be clear about the costs at each service level.

Solution-oriented ideas

- Convey our responsibility to sustain NA. Re-educating (explain) our members that we are self-supporting. Bring the information about ways of contribution to the group level. Education about the need to contribute to all levels of service. Call attention to and use IPs 24 and 28. Education and awareness to minimize misinformation. [x5]
- Better communication on the flow of fund system at the group level with putting money in the basket. [x3]
- Theft of money could be eliminated now with the use of technology.
- Mentions of payment apps (CashApp, Venmo, Zelle) for 7th, providing QR code for contributions to ASC, RSC, NAWS. Use at groups, events, include in \$ IPs. There is a desire for guidance or recommendations on what apps to use, but this varies by country. [x2]
- Use new financial technologies like QR codes or digital wallets making contribution more convenient and accepting digital currency as a contribution.
- Look for ways to provide anonymity to the account holders for the contributions.
- Overcome a fear of taxation on electronic fund transfers [x2]
- Finding the next best thing to avoid having bank charges that take away from the basket
- Being enthusiastic about what our funds provide. [x2]
- Overcome negative reaction when we are talking about direct contribution. [x2]
- Stop telling newcomers not to contribute in their first meeting (Note: In many regions in Latin America, it is customary to tell the newcomers in their first meeting that because it is their first meeting they do not need to contribute.)
- Bring the workshop on the Seventh Tradition to the groups.
- Use simple texts or images.
- Service should be fun, but we highlight the fun rather than the service on social media and the messaging is awful. Example: Pictures/stories about the work rather than the food/sights. Train

servants to communicate effectively on socials as well as in reports. Show that we're actually working – not going on holiday w/NA funds. More explanation of what we do in these meetings on socials. (Could address this in a Concepts book?)

- Since few people carry cash, members might give a lump sum at an in-person meeting when they have cash, rather than a small amount every week
- Lithuania created workgroup to explain how to make an annual contribution to NA at tax time.
- Old school ways still work too – cash and checks.
- Donorbox for regional contributions.
- Divide fund-flow between area, region, and world – demonstrates that members can contribute to all levels of service.
- Tools for groups only may not support the overall objective. Tools need to be aimed at all levels of service.
- Highlight fund flow as a spiritual tool. Not always well-known, people aren't aware of how important fund flow is; e.g., the spiritual nature of NAWS providing subsidized literature distribution and how each member's contribution helps support that.
- One region reviews NAWS financial report to see how much regions of similar size contribute— not to "feel better," but to guide what the region is/could be doing.
- One homegroup did a motion to the regional service conference to direct RSC to establish a monthly donations campaign. Totally voluntary: each member, group, committee and area can set a recurring monthly donation to the RSC bank account. Motion was approved and campaign established few months ago. At the moment it collects just a few hundred euros a month, but we believe that it will grow. If it reaches a few thousand a month we'd be free from dependence on literature sales profits.
- Highlight the areas of service that NAWS could provide if our fellowship wasn't depending on lit sales.
- Focus more on basket vs. events.
- Earmarking funds from donations for specific focus areas.
- What can NAWS do to make it easier for foreign funds to be emailed?
- Privately developed NA online payment app, like Yap and BMLT.

Additional comments and considerations:

- Acknowledge that virtual fund flow tools can be complicated and that the rules can change. [x3]
- Frustration with the unavailability of tools for virtual fund flow.
- Through the beginning stages of the pandemic, NAWS could have gone bankrupt. The fellowship dug in to help in this area. NAWS is on a positive trajectory now. We need to keep changing tools.
- Covid created problems with funding and income but at the same time, we discovered that there are ways to contribute without going to a physical meeting, i.e. CashApp, Zelle, Venmo.
- Problem with groups and service bodies holding funds instead of moving them through the service system.

What are a couple of highlights from discussion we could report? One or two areas of activity in the coming planning cycle we are most excited about – where the positive impact could be significant on the Fellowship?

- Focus the PR message on the target audience.
- Security and belonging: focus on making NA a safe space for everyone.
- The importance of this process, which teaches us to work collaboratively, where all trusted servants are equal, regardless of the structure to which we belong.

- Collaboration inside our service system: we created a piece addressing predatory behavior among three regions. When we collaborate, we can do amazing things. Collaboration addresses cohesion, trusted servant development, other areas of need.
- Direct communication between RDs and groups. Handouts and information that can be distributed for interested groups.
- Co-Creation: More Service Basics handbooks please, and literature on the Concepts.
- We spend too much time trying to define “predatory” and not enough trying to address the results of the behavior.
- To frame the objectives using words that suggest future-looking and flexible approaches rather than historical ones.
- We agree the objectives focus & capture... Objective 8 add processes & follow the existing fund flow. Also, Objectives 6 & 7 be more collaborative between all ages, closing the gap between older and new members.
- Create PR training tools for four target audiences and raise awareness of their importance in the Fellowship—Medical professionals (Objective 1d)
- Find ways to involve and retain experienced members (Addition to Objective 6)
- Impact of virtual meetings on in-person meetings (addition to Objective 4)
- Objective 4: In-person regions are geographically determined, but virtual groups are not. Address how borderless groups can be incorporated into established service bodies, including how to incorporate voices into votes.
 - Or...develop virtual areas, regions, zones
 - How is a virtual region given a vote in our service structure so their voices can be heard?
- Objective 5: Look to what zones do or could do—FD/outreach, mentorship, info-sharing, with their member regions (comment noted that US growth is stagnant, but growing in other parts of the world where zones are more active and service-oriented)
- Objective 7: Need to really clearly define mentorship and mentorship roles; consider incorporating position into service bodies; perhaps develop lit explaining it
- Objective 8: Is this mostly about fund flow to NAWS? Resistance of some areas to support NAWS. So, this objective doesn’t seem to clearly address this.
- Add Objective 2a. Explore book-length pieces of literature on inmate tablets.
- Objectives 3 & 7 – mentorship.
- Language – softening it, making it translation-friendly.
- Virtual meetings and electronic funds are important issues to overcome and adapt to. Societal/technological advancement outpacing how we do things. Safety and harassment also very important.
- Collaboration between older and new members to grow the fellowship.
- “Catching up” to the outside world.
- These objectives feel very interconnected in purpose.

Interim WSC 2025 Planning Session Two

I. Read Key Result Areas and Issues (2 KRAs in part one, 2 in part two)

Fellowship Support: Harm Reduction, and Generational and Cultural Differences

World Services Structure and Operations: Three-Year Conference Cycle, Future of the World Convention, and NAWS Sustainability.

II. Are there any adjustments to or disagreements with the 5 issues represented in these two Key Result Areas? Does anyone not agree that these are still important challenges the Fellowship faces that should be addressed in the next planning cycle?

Summary for II

There is much agreement that all five issues remain relevant; however, some input pointed to revision of two of the issues.

- There was a lot of input on the term “harm reduction”—with some wondering why we don’t label this DRT/MAT if that’s what we mean, and others saying that “harm reduction” is not related to NA recovery.
- Some CPs felt that “Generational and Cultural Differences” were two separate issues that should each have corresponding Objectives. Also, there was confusion about whether “generational” referred to biological age or clean time.

Some participants felt the 3-year cycle shouldn’t be part of the strategic plan unless and until it’s adopted on an ongoing basis. Suggestions to reword the issue to “Effective and Sustainable WSC Cycle”

Suggestions to add issues

- Under Fellowship Support add “Reaching Out to Rural and Isolated Communities.”
- Under World Services Structure and Operations add something about How NAWS Can Better Support and Fulfill Our Vision and Revisiting the Role of the WB/ Role of Zones.

There was also a suggestion to combine issues or objectives that address the same challenges. For example, harm reduction, generational/cultural, and virtual NA all speak to inclusion, diversity, and belonging.

Comments on issues

- No disagreement with the issues. [x9]
- “Harm Reduction” language needs clarification/definition for many [x6]
 - Questions about defining “harm reduction.” Is the issue actually DRT/MAT? Then why not just say it? It’s very unclear
 - Rephrase to “harm reduction as it relates to NA” or “...as a pathway to recovery”?
 - The specific term “harm reduction” refers to active addiction. Once addicts get here, the crucial part is the question is about what it takes to be a member, who can be of service—not harm reduction itself.
- Generational and Cultural Differences: The issue itself is two different issues—cultural differences are not the same as generational differences. Also unclear whether “generational” refers to age or time in recovery. Oldtimers v Newcomers? Maybe could be either. [x5]
- The 3-year cycle was moved and carried for only two cycles, but by putting it in our planning we are moving toward institutionalizing it before we assess it. Rename the issue to something like 'Effective & Sustainable WSC Cycle'. It was supposed to be an experiment. We should have this

conversation in 2029 and not before. We can't put it in the strategic plan before the decision is made. [x5]

- Consider combining items or objectives that should be under the same topic in order to make our lists more objective (Note: coherent?) As it is, we have issues that speak to the same challenges that aren't grouped together. This makes it hard to work on. (e.g. harm reduction, generational/cultural, and virtual NA all speak to inclusion, diversity, and belonging)
- Add an issue under Fellowship Support KRA: Reaching out to Rural and Isolated Areas.
- For World Services Structure & Operations: a fourth issue is how NAWS can better fulfill and support our Vision.
- For NAWS structure and operations, it is difficult for a new delegate to understand without WB guidance.
- Has the WB ever revisited the role of the WB? Wondering if it has changed over the last decade, since so much has. They have a difficult job supporting and hearing the voice of a worldwide fellowship that clearly has different problems. I don't know how you listen to everybody.
- We can only develop debate after problem / issue identification – once identified it seems we face barriers – which is a lack of using service bodies or members that have experience in said areas. We need to use zones to enable this transfer of information, rather than just having the WB responsible for NAWS actions.

III. Read each Issue and Objective(s) and then answer the discussion questions for each issue:

Key Result Area: Fellowship Support

Issue: Harm Reduction

Objectives

9. In the spirit of our Third Tradition, achieve a common understanding across the Fellowship of what it means to be an NA member and how to create the space for addicts to choose membership, regardless of how they found NA.

Does this objective focus us on the primary challenge or opportunity we need to address related to this issue?

Does this objective capture the result or change that we seek related to this issue?

Summary for Objective 9

As stated above, there was a lot of reaction to the term "harm reduction"—some felt the term was inappropriate for us to use, while others mentioned the term positively. There was a lot of discussion about whether this issue and objective see harm reduction as competitive with or complementary to NA, with people making assumptions on both sides. There was also confusion about the objective itself, and whether it was meant to pertain specifically to DRT/MAT, with some feeling the objective needed to be made more specific and others feeling it should be moved to Objective 3 or to the PR KRA.

There was concern that this objective asks us to decide what qualifies someone for membership. What is "common understanding across the fellowship" and who defines it? On a related note, there was confusion about whether this was about membership or clean time/abstinence, with a suggestion to reword "regardless of how they found NA" to address whether or not they are clean/abstinent. Some felt that, given the lack of common understanding, this objective was too heavy a lift.

There was lots of input that the objective is too general. Some suggesting adding to the objective: something about service, abstinence/clean time, mental health, predatory behavior. (Group autonomy and Naloxone were also mentioned.)

Input on the wording of Objective 9

- Consider adding language to the objective like “a common understanding of what complete & total abstinence means.”
- The wording “how they found NA” is not clear. This objective is to define the definition of NA membership, not abstinence. Maybe reword “regardless of how they found NA” into “whether or not they are abstinent.” [x2]
- The objective, as written, does not specify clearly what the focus is. Clean-time or membership? The challenge is clean-time, not membership. NA has a clear statement of what it means to be a clean member of NA. Anyone is welcome in our meetings.

Input on Objective 9

- Topic (once clarified) is important [x10]
- Confusion about the term/title “Harm Reduction” as relates to this objective. [x5]
 - “Harm Reduction” as a title may not represent the purpose of the objective, and it was challenging to understand what really needed to be addressed. [x2]
 - We don’t encourage people to continue to use or tell them how to use. Troubled by terminology.
 - Harm Reduction mostly relates to limited programs in the US/ other communities – find another word?
 - 'Harm Reduction as it impacts NA membership' or 'Harm Reduction as it relates to NA' or 'Harm Reduction as a pathway to recovery' would be more specific to address this issue.
 - Everyone agrees that being welcoming is important, but the wording lacks specificity/clarity
 - Is this only a reference to DRT / MAT or something broader? Is it internal or external as it relates to the fellowship or the public perception/knowledge? Is it saying our fifth tradition, our third tradition need to be intact in the way that we navigate this issue? [x3]
 - I think the definition is continuously changing. More has been introduced as harm reduction. Like “I’m just going to drink on Friday.” Things that are being introduced are similar to what we put out about methadone years ago but doesn’t apply right now. The medical community is changing what they refer to as harm reduction. How do we make something that addresses that and the consistent shift in change?
- This topic should be under Objective 3. Inclusion is the primary factor. All are welcome. What we should talk about is not NA’s opinion, but how we welcome members on harm reduction treatments. And how we can welcome and be safe. [x3]
- Support for this objective: finding a common ground on being welcoming to prospective members that come to the rooms on MAT/DRT. It’s not important how someone came to NA, its important what caused them to stay [x3]
- Objective isn’t clear: Does this objective allow “us” to decide who is a member? What is “common understanding across the fellowship” and who defines it? How do we get there? [x2]
- Important to differentiate between membership and being of service. Many people on drug replacement say that they are told they can be a member but cannot serve the fellowship, so they are really not a full member. Being a member and being able to serve is important to address. We do not have two classes of membership. [x2]
- How do we judge a person’s desire? Too general an objective. Mental health needs to be considered, predatory behavior.

- It's already clear what the common understanding for membership is. This objective may be addressing that in some parts of the fellowship, that understanding is not consistent.
- The objective may need to be more specific about actions we need to take. [Note: that may come in the solutions phase of planning.]
- Harm Reduction segues into the whole issue again of how the Fellowship serves those in need and all the competing alternatives that are out there these days (e.g. MAT/DRT)
- Should we focus on an area where we have a better chance of success? Can we reach a common understanding when some are more welcoming than others?
- A common understanding within the Fellowship needs to be met before we carry it outside the Fellowship.
- Include harm reduction to the Fellowship in these discussions.
- Maybe tie with the PR objective.
- Bridging the divide between NA's stance and individuals.
- Thinking of NA as a part of harm reduction is a good thing. Not sure how common that is.
- Would like to see Naloxone addressed somewhere. Is it an outside issue, should it be commonplace for a group to have some at hand?
- Objective currently sees harm reduction as a threat to NA, maybe it shouldn't be?
- How do we better educate our members on the 3rd Tradition?
- Existing positions or literature issued by the WB:
 - Bulletin 29 is a real controversial one over here and needs to be revisited to see if it still represents who we are and what we say we are.
 - 3 pieces have come out since then, which are all very helpful but maybe did not come out with a unifying message about this. The other thing they need to talk about is group autonomy, they can do whatever they want about what clean means. Some groups have varying opinions about what clean means and how it fits into our fellowship and how do we treat them. In my region there is a wide array of opinions about how people identify clean time and how they get treated, because some of it is not very nice. How group autonomy bears on all of this. Some of our groups say they are clean if they are taking prescribed medication by a doctor and they are doing service work, and that is not going over well in some corners. How does that approach fit in with group autonomy and the overall opinion of our traditions?
- External understandings of how we achieve a common understanding and acceptance of each other and what it means to be an addict across the Fellowship.

Solution-oriented ideas:

- Having a stance on abstinence/clean time collectively. Should clarify what it means to be clean and pick up a medallion/key tag [x4]
- IP or other recovery literature defining what clean time means. FAQs like: Does someone need to be clean to be a member? What if I'm using when I arrive? What if I relapse? [x4]
- With newer members from treatment facilities using non-NA language, it is important to educate and guide them and not judge them for what they do not know. Regardless of how they found NA, we need to help them feel welcome by supporting each other. We need to be kind to each other and create a welcoming space at our meetings. [x4]
- Highlight existing literature. Keep it simple. Clean means total abstinence. Being a member = having desire to stop using. ITOI addresses treatment and relationship w/MDs. Bulletin #29 talks about not serving in service positions if you are on Drug Replacements, etc. and it is important that we be clear that we are still using this literature that is available to us. [x3]

- Counterpoint: Our region has come full circle on this issue; we now feel that being obtuse in order to be more attractive is actually harmful. We find the current literature unhelpful. Everything from ITOI to the DRT/MAT service pamphlet, have been overly cautious and unclear about what we are about. Maybe it's time to take a more direct stand of what this fellowship is and who it is for.
- Harm reduction is really complementary to our mission. I tried different strategies to continue using until I had to make a decision. Someone at the right time handed me a meeting list. Handing out supplies to help people survive helps get people to where they need to be – which is ultimately the rooms of NA. One of the most important things about this subject is that we are not alone. Harm Reduction is an ally not a rival. [x2]
- We don't have two classes of membership. Some of our members' intolerance leads to fewer referrals from professionals. Growth has flattened in some places, such as the US, and maybe that's because we are not as welcoming as we could be. [x2]
- We need to address who can serve, who can celebrate, who can sponsor. It shouldn't just be between a member and their sponsor. But does producing an IP indicate governance more so than the other materials we already have?
- Guidance for the groups on how to have this conversation – IDT specifically
- We did the DRT/MAT IDT, and members shared their journey for how they got clean after DRT. It was powerful.
- It's not our part to take a stand on MAT – new members figure it out.
- Define and educate the Fellowship first on harm reduction. Inventory of our services and what we're doing to welcome the newcomer.
- The Fellowship must face making NA distinctive, not just relative in a landscape that has a great many players.
- Trusted Servant position to identify members on harm reduction and make them feel welcome.
- We do a clean time countdown, and ask people to identify if they're on DRT, and ask those to identify if they are still using. By having those two different callouts, people can understand without being pointed at or shamed, that being clean is different than being on Drug Replacements or active addiction. It also gives the chairperson an opportunity to ask those members to share if they would like to. This gives a space for those members to be members and stay members when those circumstances change.
- It's not “get harm reduction and then come to NA when you're clean” – being clean is about my self-honesty. We do not change our spirit or our message, but it's up to the member to decide their clean date.
- When we are talking about harm reduction we are talking about this full topic, and remember we are not professionals or doctors—we are a twelve-step fellowship that has no opinion on any of the medications that are prescribed. The lines with some of the medications get blurred and as a Fellowship I don't think we need to be stepping on those boundaries. Unfortunately, that is part of the problem of being a complete abstinence Fellowship. We have to address this issue, but we have to tread lightly not to take a medical stance because we don't have the credentials to back it up.
- We're not going to be standing at the door, taking someone's inventory, determining who can be a member. Remember not just the Traditions but the spiritual principles behind them - love, kindness, respect. It puts us in a position where we're drawing a line on who can come into a meeting or be a member. The desire to stay clean is an individual thought. We cannot decide it and we cannot detect it. We know members who have been around for decades but not consistently clean and that's okay. Sometimes it takes 30 years to surrender. Even in this small

group there are many different experiences. Maybe that is why the need for vague wording. Our common understanding might not be that common based on interpretation of the literature, where you live, etc. It will be hard for us to come up with something black & white. Inclusion, support, and love are more important than whether the person who makes the coffee is on DRT.

Additional comments and considerations:

- This will be a long journey due to the divisiveness in the fellowship regarding this topic.
- These discussions can be complex, but feel like we are in a place to have these discussions now
- Hope that anything we develop will allow for cultural differences.
- How can we help pave the road to abstinence for our potential members? How can we increase their desire to stay?
- If NA is complementary to harm reduction programs, it's not a competition, just a different narrative until/unless those members come to an understanding of/decision about their membership and what "NA clean" means.
- This is a huge thing in some areas/regions. Lesser or greater impact around the world depending on the drugs and the treatments that are prevalent. Reminder that there was a past WSC motion to put out an IP and there were many conflicting opinions, so it never happened.
- With additional flow of money from the government there has been a real rise in recovery coaching, peer support or sponsorship, and harm reduction, and I am not sure how they affect our Fellowship and making sure that our message is clear.
- "You're a member when you say you are" and "the only requirement for membership is the desire to stop using." These are both simple and straightforward sayings. But what is seen in our Region is a variety of available philosophies—addicts coming from a recovery house, or a treatment center, etc. These places recognize the addict has a problem; however, there are mixed messages. All for making NA's message clearer and more attainable for those who are not necessarily familiar with our traditions.
- Internal understandings and how they are communicated beyond the rooms, and making it available to the professionals, etc. NA sometimes doesn't make professionals' lists when it comes to treating addictions. How do we bring this objective to the forefront that we are credible alternative for recovery?
- In our region, we've had addicts turned away on Drug Replacements by being told they are not clean. They can't share or be of service, but the groups in their Region can make that decision for them.
- There is a lot of talk in meetings about going to psychography sessions. It almost makes me feel like an outsider. Is that part of the trusted servants that should put some boundaries out about talking about prescribed medication? We don't want to know what you used or where you came from, yet we hear more and more talk about detoxes and medication and psychotherapy sessions in meetings. Need more of a clear addressing when this happens in the meetings.

Issue: Generational and Cultural Differences

Objectives

10. Continue to update communication methods to meet younger members' preferences for engagement.

Does this objective focus us on the primary challenge or opportunity we need to address related to this issue?

Does this objective capture the result or change that we seek related to this issue?

Summary for Objective 10

Many participants pointed out that the issue is both generational and cultural differences, but the objective just addresses generational differences. Some thought we should add an objective more clearly addressed to cultural differences.

There was confusion about whether younger means in recovery years or physical age. There was concern about who was excluded from this objective and suggestions to reword to address communication methods that meet *all* members' or *diverse* members' preferences for engagement. One suggested a rewording "...communications to stay current with emerging technologies" rather than calling out younger members as different (this rewording could also broaden the objective to include assistive technologies).

Input on the wording of Objective 10

- *Add* rather than *update* because the ones that we currently use are preferred by many experienced members. Include *technology* not just *communications*. Address not just *methods* but how we structure activities, length of videos, etc.
- The objective as written does not address the cultural part of the issue. Either these should be split, or there should be an additional objective addressing cultural differences. [x8]
 - Defining cultural differences – need clarity on if meaning youth or geographic, indigenous, language, etc. And important to understand that culture can include a lot of things (disabilities, LGBTQ, etc.) Reword the issue if we are focusing just on the cultural differences of generations.
- “Younger members” is confusing and also too exclusive. Some thought/assumed it must mean newer members in recovery, probably because younger made less sense to them. Others understood younger but felt it excluded older members who are less tech-savvy. Younger members may want to learn from older members. It should go both ways. [x9]
- Consider “continue to include communication methods that are accessible to ALL members”
- Consider *diverse* members rather than *younger* members in the objective
- Continue to update communication methods...for all members
- Generational gap/differences are more than just “younger members,” Also applies to people who don’t have tech experience, social media experience/access.
- We can also add “aging members” to be more specific. Alternatively, “all population demographics...” or “demographic preferences...” may cover cultural aspects as well.
- Softening the language for both of objectives 9 & 10 could help. Would rather say “bridging the gap” rather than pointing out differences. It implies a negative connotation. [x2]
- Change objective to add “communication and technology” methods. Newer technology is not just younger members; it’s also about people coming in with medical issues like ADHD etc. Instead of communication methods to meet younger members’ preferences, “communications to stay current with emerging technologies.” [x2]
 - Counterpoint: Don’t forget to consider non-digital communication methods. Consider regional and cultural differences – not everyone has the same level of access to technology, or technical ability.

Input on Objective 10

- Some had difficulty understanding the purpose of this objective. We should focus on our similarities and not on our differences. Generational differences and others have always existed and will always exist. Let's strengthen the vision of our similarities. [x4]
- What are the communication methods this speaks to? Too vague.

- It is not only about communication methods it should be a broader vision like how we do activities, producing video (length of video), etc.
- Not only communication but also about the language that we use, including not using gender specific language. Broaden the objective to encompass communication, technology, PR and how we are reaching out to newer and younger members and the language.
- It's really about how to reach those who aren't here. Who's missing in our membership? [x2]
- This is a major objective that we need to address. Our fellowship is growing older. We have to meet the people where they are coming in. Service structure communications get stuck and never make it to the member, especially younger or older members, those with cultural differences, or those who use different or no apps/social media.
- Does this include how zones cooperate/communicate with each other?
- Giving more space for them to be involved rather than us doing/updating communication methods.

Solution-oriented ideas

- Use a variety of communication channels and broaden how we communicate the information— not just email or social media. Adapt to a multi “layer” form of communication to include everyone, regardless of their technical ability/comfort. Meet members where they're at. [x8]
 - E.g. — mass texts, WhatsApp, email, Zoom, podcasts, social media (TikTok)
 - Example: Regional workgroup assesses all members' access to communications channels, then determines as a group the best means to include all workgroup members. Email? Okay to use other means?
- Inventory current youth in NA – to understand how they think, communicate, and with that use that to carry the message in a way that new addicts will understand. What attracts them? What technology do they use? Engage with younger members and find out why they're not getting involved in service – ask them what isn't working for younger members before we start trying to assume we know and solve the problem. This also speaks to people that may come to our meetings that are much older. [x5]
- Newer members in our area tell us that having a phone line is not enough. We bought a WhatsApp business account so you can go on the website click the WhatsApp link it is making a big difference, getting much more engagement with that. It's not just about social media but about technology in general, people are not talking on the phone like they used to. [x3]
- To take care of how we treat newcomers and young people without compromising our principles, putting love first. Value the contributions that young people can make. Welcome them first, and then involve them in service. [x3]
- Younger people often listen better to other younger members. Getting younger members in service will help. We can't speak to people like we are their parents. Recruiting younger members into service so they can serve as a connection with a younger generation. Getting the younger members on board in the meeting and voting asap. [x3]
- Communication needs to be efficient; information needs to be clear. Bullet points, quick and fast ways to communicate with young and older members that are under a minute. [x2]
- Rather than focusing on bringing new members into service, old NA members can find other ways to be of service. [x2]
- When we do update our communication methods we need to include the range of our younger members. Find a way to help some older members to adapt to how the youth communicate, and their communication styles. [x2]

- Engage members not only about events/what's going on but also PR. Also capture preferences for types of fellowship activities and entertainment.
- Creation of a workshop with "new talent" – making inventory of young service members, including how your community works with young people, how communities draw new people to service, etc.
- Us older members in our region have a fear or anxiety of losing what we created. That if we let go they'll destroy it. So us oldies need a workshop on adaptation to learn the new ways, how younger people are thinking.
- Moving from committee-based service to project-based service.
- NA Step-Working App, something small and convenient. Work steps and save progress
- Virtual meetings are a platform the younger generation has embraced. We have to include virtual meetings when trying to carry the message to younger members.
- Engaging different cultures without having the same cookie-cutter approach and expecting it to work for everyone as it worked for the previous culture/generation
- Better outreach to indigenous populations
- Not using anonymity and "regardless of" as a way to ignore the fact that there are cultural differences (including disabilities)
- Paying for content is a generational/cultural difference that creates a norm for people to not purchase
- Technology changes so fast, hard to keep up – find out what the newest thing is
- Look to the successful projects of different zones. EDM made a downloadable workgroup and booklet about young people in recovery. The Netherlands did a successful young persons' convention last year.

Additional comments and considerations

- We do a good job of welcoming new members at the group level. There is a gap with older members as well, we discussed this earlier – they stop being of service when they feel redundant or unappreciated. Longer reports and more reading – young people tune out easily.
- Young people's committees have been shot down at our region. We've had an influx of younger members stepping up to regional positions. Getting younger people involved by addict-to-addict communication.
- We want to keep continuity of service for newer members and make it easier to bring them up to speed. The cycles are long and new people get elected, come and go. There is often a lot of reading involved.
- Do you think that the older people, set in our ways, have an obligation/responsibility to be more willing to change and adjust our methods to meet the younger members where they're at? Is the obligation on the older members?
- We all start off young and misunderstood by our elders, and then we all get old. So it's an age-old question about how we continue to draw in the younger generation/keep it funky fresh.
- AA has a strong YP fellowship with a service structure, gatherings, etc. – that appear to be effective in attracting and retaining younger people.
- Things look different now from when we entered the rooms. Maintain the level of feelings instead of experiences and we will be OK.

Key Result Area: World Services Structure and Operations

Issue: Three-year Conference Cycle

Objectives

11. Further refine and describe the three-year conference cycle, including major meetings, policies, process deadlines and guidelines.
12. Evaluate and define the collaborative planning process for ongoing implementation.

Do these objectives focus us on the primary challenge or opportunity we need to address related to this issue?

Do these objectives capture the result or change that we seek related to this issue?

Summary for Objectives 11 and 12

General agreement with the objectives were expressed in many of the groups, although concerns were expressed. Some participants voiced the perspective that including the three-year conference cycle as an issue in this KRA was premature while it is still in a trial period. Others sought to increase the specificity to the objectives and include ways to measure the effectiveness of the three-year cycle and the planning process.

Input on the wording of Objective 11

- Dividing it into two parts: 11a – make a decision to adopt a 3-year cycle, and 11b – pros and cons of a 2-year versus 3-year cycle, including information and perspective for newer trusted servants
- Reword the objective so that it focuses on taking inventory of the 3-year cycle versus the 2-year cycle
- Add to the objective: Refine the cycle using the experience of current one to show the impact of this change.
- Add to the objective to include the “why” of the 3-year cycle
- Add to the objective to include timelines for translated motions and amendments; projects that are in progress, completed and pending initiation; and clearly documented minority opinions [x3]
- Maybe include an objective to “refine” our process; with motion 5 we have chosen to change our process for literature for example, and this process needs to be clearly shown to the fellowship.
- Add consideration of the impact of longer service terms, including the spirit of rotation and the challenge for newer communities with less clean time
- Add consideration of its impact on the non-English speaking part of the Fellowship to the objective
- Add consideration of resource sustainability to the objective
- Refine the cycle using the experience of current one to show the impact of this change.
- Development of the agenda, how CAR ideas must be prioritized, date and the length of the iWSC

Input on the wording of Objective 12

- KRAs should be worded so that the objectives are measurable and tangible so we can do a proper evaluation of the outcome of the planning process.

Additional Objectives

- Add an objective about mitigating the possible disconnect created by a 3-year cycle and virtual meetings at challenging times for some participants, or include this in with Objective 11

- Possible additional objective: Offer guidance for service bodies to align their local service structure with a three-year cycle, especially around gathering group conscience.
- Possible additional objective: describe and refine the purpose & function of the interim conference specifically.

Solution-oriented ideas

- How to mitigate the issues of a decreased talent pool based on the need for a longer commitment to being a conference participant.
- Doing service at this level requires so much time or talent that it can be off putting to some members
- A great example of NAWS/WB including experienced servants was using facilitators that have previously served world. This is something we should learn from and replicate. Utilize experience.
- Consider having more than one AD or an additional position of “delegate in training.”
- Zonal delegate or mentor role to help new CPs fill the gaps, provide info/background, figure out the whole process.
- We must look for how to best use the time, both at the face-to-face conference and between conferences. [x2] Example: if WB sends out all the information to read in advance, why spend another half hour doing a presentation going through the reading that we have all read already?
- Use the experience gained over the 2-cycle experiment to draft guidelines for a 3-year cycle for inclusion in *GWSNA*
- Refining of the actual conference week—less time in the risers and more small groups. More planning of what we need to do going forward. Not spending half a day taking attendance.

Additional comments and considerations

General Comments

- These are big objectives.
- Objectives seem practical. We need time to live in the three-year cycle and then evaluate.
- Interim WSC motions partially addressed Objective 11.
- Does defining the collaborative planning process address Objective 11?
- A lot of new NA members got clean online.
- The interim WSC only exists because of budget; if we had a three-year approved budget, we would not need to have an Interim WSC and focus more on actual CP meetings.
 - Counterpoint: Three-year cycle requires an “intermediary” WSC, as it’s too long. This Interim conference needs to be more focused on planning and less business. This should not be temporary.
- Some of the motions for the interim meeting shouldn’t have been *CAR* motions. They were *CAT*-issues, and it was not useful to send those to the groups.
- Address whether our processes are Concept-directed.

Comments related to the 3-year cycle

- How do we measure what it’s like to function on 3-yr vs. 2-yr cycle?
- Pro 3-year cycle:
 - The three-year cycle with the intermediate conference is working well, allows for more and better work (e.g. IDTs and regional assemblies), more time for completing projects, facilitates consensus building, and saves money.

- Interim WSC extremely productive, very helpful, and necessary. The discussions that we had permit more inter-relation between members because much more information is discussed and digested gradually – it’s not suddenly a CAR with 50 motions.
- Because of the pandemic, the three-year cycle got thrust upon us and we had to have what we called an interim conference. We had to adopt this way of meeting together or we would not have a WSC.
- Those that could not attend in person for whatever reason, are now able to attend iWSC in the three-year conference cycle. Travel costs are down and jet lag is not an issue.
- As technology evolves, we will still progress.
- Technology allows us to be of service effectively.
- Anti-3-year cycle
 - Using online tools has become convenient, but time zones make it difficult for the APF to participate, which creates division and causes stress.
 - Doesn’t address the issue that we’re not meeting face to face for so long.
 - Another point against the three-year cycle; adding to that Motion 1 and Motion 5, we are becoming non-participant delegates. We can’t freely converse, we don’t see each other face to face, we communicate by straw polls without discussion, and it will ultimately be very harmful in alienating members/regions from the world structure. Will make strained relationships worse by curtailing contact. Even very lengthy zooms don’t provide the chance to hear the kind of ideas that would actually change my perspective. It doesn’t give delegates the opportunity to come to a conscious conscience about issues through learning other perspectives.
 - *WB reply:* We would be doing more business through virtual meetings even if we hadn’t a 3-year cycle. Prior to the 3-year cycle we had virtual workgroups etc. Over the last decade we have implemented CP webinars to develop ideas, frame IDTS, and provide an orientation, even prior to the pandemic. The virtual meeting mid-cycle made sense at the time. And the next midcycle meeting might be the last one, but the longer cycle has given us opportunities to try things out and do things in a different way. In the time that we *are* committed to doing this – what can we try out?

Comments related to engagement

- The means by which we gather group conscience is changing. Instead of a list of motions, we are gathering conscience in the building of a plan. We are used to thinking of group conscience as “what’s your vote on these motions,” but that’s not what it’s going to look like anymore with the passing of Motion 5. To me it’s very exciting that we have made this leap. The gap between the RDs and the WB is closing; now the gap is between the RDs and the Fellowship and we need to close that gap to engage them in a process that does not look like the old one. Back in the day, what was exciting was the collaboration and creativity, and we need to get back to this.
- Keeping delegates engaged in a longer cycle. Impact on the local Fellowship of a 3-year cycle. Having longer term lengths and getting members to engage in the idea of a term-length that lasts multiple cycles
- Change is good, but we can’t always integrate our communities to all the constant changes. The level of commitment of RDs will have to be greater than ever due to the process changes. We need to have WB Mentorship in our zonal forum to speak to cycle etc.
- I would like to refine the way we do the processes where we could include the rest of the fellowship. I did not get into the Dropbox until late so I did not have any inclusion. Would it be available to the entire Fellowship? We have to do better about communicating what our needs

are. Hard to get the Fellowship to engage. Get the message out sooner so we can get more of a fellowship conscience.

- It feels like we do not have enough time to collect Region opinion before iWSC.
- Importance of reporting back to members re: ongoing work of CPs to keep them apprised of the broad range of work CPs do throughout cycle
- If we do implement the 3-year cycle permanently, perhaps we can do CP webinars at times not adjusted to the US but staggered; small-group sessions at different times on the same day/s? Facilitator/note taker in appropriate time zone, workshop at a civilized hour? [x3]
- Consider streamlining communications with/for CPs: RD in first term who never served as AD is blasted with fire hose of info.
- Need it to be more interactive—break it down and invite members to engage and be a little more active, rather than giving a presentation that is almost like a written script that does not come from the heart.

Issue: Future of the World Convention

Objective

13. Create a financially sustainable model for the World Convention, in harmony with our Eleventh Concept, that meets the needs and expectations of the Fellowship in a changing world.

Does this objective focus us on the primary challenge or opportunity we need to address related to this issue?

Does this objective capture the result or change that we seek related to this issue?

Summary for Objective 13

There was broad agreement that the issue needed to be addressed. Suggestions were made to clarify and revise the language of the objective. Comments were made relating to WCNA finances, location and scheduling, and the planning and logistics of the event.

Input on the wording of Objective 13

- Could be broken into three sub-objectives:
 - (1) The primary purpose of WCNA is a celebration of recovery and (2) a secondary purpose is to not lose money and (3) to make it affordable for recovering addicts
 - Or: (1) Create a sustainable model and (2) meet the needs & expectations and (3) increase attendance
- We've been using a model that expects to make money one place and lose money in another; that's not sustainable. We need to consider the convention as a large PR/FD event and expect to lose money. "Create a financially sustainable model" may not be a realistic objective. Sometimes factors beyond our control lead to an unexpected loss of money. "Minimize risk" may be a better way to phrase this
- Objective seems vague. Do we want to better use resources, consider making or not making a profit, knowing how much we "can" lose
- "Balance the needs and expectations" instead of "meets the needs"
- Challenge objective language in terms of "wants vs needs." Does an addict or our fellowship "need" a world convention?
- Add the word 'experience' in the objective and revise it to '....expectations, and experiences of the Fellowship....'
- Living up to "expectations" might not even be realistic. Is there a better word?

- What if we took out financially and just said sustainable? Eleventh Concept talks about all of our service resources, not just finance.

Solution-oriented ideas

- It costs too much money to pull this off. The convention should scale back and be simpler, where we can all simply gather. [x3]
- Should we charge for the livestream?
 - Not opposed to finding ways to bring in the revenue, but streams need to be available for free for those that cannot make it.
 - Balance the free option of virtual meetings with voluntary contributions to stream?
- Facilitate payment in installments.
- Hold prior events that help in fundraising.
- Seek agreements with hotel chains and airlines.
- Change the sales strategy of the merchandise.
 - Not a fan of endless merchandise being sold and not being able to see it having a meaningful outreach to the local NA communities.
 - Can we reduce risk by creating merchandise on demand/onsite?
- Instill a culture of savings to encourage attendance.
- Varying levels of participation:
 - Virtual registration that's more affordable, but not as much as attending in person
 - Partial passes-1 day, 2 days, Sat night, etc.
- Hold it less often (e.g. every 5 years) [x4]
- Have an interim convention that is online.
- Consider two simultaneous, concurrent events in two different locations like North America and Europe
- Consider a zonal convention supported by world.
- Plan convention as pre-registered attendees only with a cut-off date to register; no onsite registration; allows planning for a more exact number of people, space, and time
- Simple, sustainable, scaled back, non-US, decentralized. [x5]

Additional comments and considerations

Comments related to WCNA finances

- It's got to be financially sustainable but also affordable enough for the average addict to be able to attend. [x3]
- Sustainable and frugal are key words. Huge fan of the World Convention, but losing a million dollars is not responsible use of NA's funds. We can't go forward, we shouldn't go forward, without sustainability. It's hard to project and predict registrations, etc. [x3]
- Acknowledgement of the challenge: If we have it at a place the size of WCNA 38 the costs will be the same. But if we go to a smaller place and attract more people, we would overflow. We've gotten too big to be affordable and too small to scale. There are factors we absolutely can't control (Covid, economy) that impact attendance. Not sure we can sustain having a world convention every 3 years and that kind of expense.
- Is there an acceptable level of financial loss? A spiritual investment? Can the return be quantified?

Comments related to WCNA location and scheduling

- Important that it is not always in the USA [x3]

- Important to define cycle/frequency
- Additional options be made available, such as not having one [x3]
 - Counterpoint: A world convention is very important. We need a world convention. We must look forward, not to the past. Dwelling on the mistakes distracts us from the future. [x3]
- Concern about loss of continental rotation—very expensive/difficult for much of the world to travel to US. Half of the delegates are now not from the US. Need more opportunities for fellowships and communities that are non-US to be put forward.
- We need to be more careful looking at where to have the convention—affordability. 11th concept—we need to be more careful with Fellowship funds. Part of location scouting is about other resources around the site—food, safety/security, etc. We have skilled people / resources within the zones that can help minimize the risk. Perhaps that’s the start.
- If it is only US based and has 80% US attendees, then it is not a World Convention. [x3]
- Acknowledge that this is a difficult conversation and that there are challenges to hosting an event outside the USA

Comments related to WCNA logistics and planning

- WCNA is fully organized by NAWS, with full control, etc...and as a Fellowship we end up not being able to assist – we should use local NA communities for organization and depend less on NAWS. This could help bring cost down. [x4]
 - What if ZFs volunteered to do that and take the load off NAWS?
- Germany was really keen to host WCNA but because only NAWS can do it, they are powerless and frustrated. They worked out a plan but are thwarted. USA don’t travel as well as other regions (Iran is the exception); maybe the regions that travel more freely are in a better position to plan and create.
- Look to other models. Germany has come up with a sustainable model. Just came back from APF and a lot of members from Iran were there
- Important that this objective includes addressing the change in our fellowship and the ways that members attend (or don’t attend) in-person events now
- Appropriate planning is more important than attendance numbers. Eleventh Concept handles this – being prudent and having realistic expectations.
- We don’t need big entertainment events.
- Look into models used by local conventions, EDM, APF, etc.
- Delegates need to be more involved in the decision making.
- Reassess our goals for WCNA (why we conduct it).
- Change the way attendance forecasts are made.
- Thinking about how the decisions are made regarding convention might give us some answers. Is there a permanent committee? How do we arrive at location/date/site/etc? What is the first decision? What would the starting point have been – numbers, city, venue, budget? [x3]

General WCNA comments

- Acknowledge the benefits of WCNA – generates interest in service, offers encouragement to new members, shows the big picture of NA that inspires and informs members
- It’s not about lack of trust, but the fact that we don’t have information on the convention until now, six months later, makes it hard for us to address these issues.
- Talked about sustainability for many years, and we maybe now have a possibility for change as we have so many new trusted servants that aren’t necessarily “stuck” to old ways.
- Members choosing not to travel/comfort with attending online for free rather than investing in the experience.

- Increased discomfort with that many people.
- Did the message get carried to the addict still suffering? Is the message now more accessible?
- Expectations of not just having a good time, but having a spiritual experience.
- Excited to see what WCNA might look like in the future

Issue: NAWS Sustainability

Objectives

- 14. Enhance NAWS' stability by diversifying revenue sources.
- 15. Evaluate and adjust activities at NA World Services to best support its roles and functions in a changing world.
- 16. Raise understanding of the need for and importance of adequate financial resources in carrying the message of recovery.

Do these objectives focus us on the primary challenge or opportunity we need to address related to this issue?

Do these objectives capture the result or change that we seek related to this issue?

Summary for Objectives 14, 15, and 16

Although broad agreement was expressed for the objectives related to this issue, several suggestions were made related to the wording of the objectives, particularly Objective 14, with many seeing a conflict with the principle of self-support and the idea of diversifying revenue sources.

Input on the wording of Objective 14

- It sounds like finding revenue from outside sources. Too broad in language when the Traditions make the options narrow. We could add “such as direct contributions,” or “less reliance on lit sales, more focus on contributions”? Otherwise, what are other potential revenue streams— selling new stuff, providing some sort of service at a cost? Our money comes from within. [x7]
- The word “revenue” sounds like business-speak and commercializes NA - find another word.
- Objective 14 is not clear— it sounds like making more literature to make more money
- Diversifying revenue sources – talking about not just literature but also donations and other sources. Should say revenue “stream.”
- Objective 14, perhaps change wording: “...more transparency in language regarding financials that permit better understanding of the member...enhancing NAWS stability by diversifying...”- this speaks to clarity, and a consolidation of clear communication. Every time we talk about bringing cost down, we are talking about bringing it up somewhere else.... zonal forums need to be used to promote NAWS sustainability, rather than just WB.
- Objective 14 may actually be a “how” and not a “what” – not an objective but a solution

Input on the wording of Objective 15

- “Activities at NAWS” is unclear. Should be made clear to the fellowship what the activities at NAWS are, what are the roles and functions [x4]
- Objective 15: NAWS needs to carry the message and fulfill our Vision, not just to be sustainable. Maybe this needs its own issue or objective.

Input on the wording of Objective 16

- It is very important to become better self-supporting, objectives 14 and 16. Reducing the stigma and raising understanding on the importance of contributions. 16 needs to move to the top of the priority list
- 14 and 16 could be combined in some way. If we fulfill 16, then that in essence accomplishes 14
- Change to 16. "...helping the groups to carry the message of recovery."

Additional Objectives

- Explore options for cost-sharing with zones (e.g. free and subsidized lit expense)

Solution-oriented ideas

- Most members don't have a clear idea of World Services' roles and responsibilities. Our members would be more inclined to contribute if they had a better idea of this. Currently a lack of understanding among members of where member's direct contribution going. [x7]
- It is important to make the Fellowship aware of all the resources that NAWS has available for them. Delegates should improve the transmission of information about the need for and relevance of NAWS. Highlight the services NAWS could provide if not dependent on literature sales. Not fulfilling our primary purpose due to the impact of literature sales on being the sole/main resource for funds [x4]
- Do we have tools to explain where the money goes? If so make them more available/better known. More financial transparency. [x4]
- Make the financial report and budget easy and simple to understand by the members with and without financial knowledge.
- Make educational videos to spread transparency and understanding of finances and needs.
- The budget alone is not a good tool for explaining finances and the need for contributions. A brief summary of where the money goes and where the gaps are would be much more useful.
- Raise awareness and understanding within NA as a whole about the importance of adequate financial resources and what they go to (on all levels of service). Inventory what the money needs to be spent on. Encourage personal and group contributions and uphold our 7th Tradition. The dollar doesn't have the same value it used to. Every group has a cost. Putting in more than a dollar in the basket would go a long way to solving the problem. Communicate better (whether with a preamble, stopping the meeting, etc.) and sponsors should encourage sponsees to value themselves enough to be a contributing member. [x5]
- Evaluate expenses and cost saving measures while maintaining services we have. [x6]
- We need to analyze and identify areas where costs need to be reduced, but for this we need to have access to information. Supplier negotiations—are the people designated to do this able to do it in a way that makes sense? Do we use best tools market offers for quality service? Example: terrible audio choice for translations at WCNA. Why did we backtrack? / We saw financial loss also in the USA, we need to find a common denominator for the whole Fellowship. / Are financials based on realistic predictions? How can we evaluate this? How can we prioritize having emergency funds? / Other communities have experience, maybe can help NAWS?
- Cost-saving exercise should be done by someone with no spiritual or emotional connection with NAWS. No one with a stake in the organization is going to be ruthless enough.
 - Example: at EDM special worker attended + WB member. There was cost associated with that. There was no real benefit from having them in person; they could have done the whole thing by zoom just as well. If an organization is strapped for cash, should they indulge that benefit for employees?
- Being prudent with our predictions, such as aiming for a sell-out for WCNA
- Consider cost of office location, warehouse location – nothing should be off the table.

- Much of what is delegated to NAWS ends up staying 100% with NAWS. Reduce the workload of NAWS and involve Zones to do that work. Could learn from AA. [x4]
- Continue to explore local agreements for printing and distributing literature.
- Create a portal that allows virtual access to literature without being able to download it. The change towards virtual literature is inevitable, we must anticipate that.
- Try to educate our members to avoid the use of illegal literature and the purchase of illegal merchandise.
- Come up with ideas for literature items that would be big sellers (e.g. an updated 12 Concepts booklet for Iran)
- Individual donations. Put a button on the front page.
- Involve CPs in this process.
- More webinars with CPs throughout the cycle to share the most recent updates of the Fellowship and have discussion where the CPs are more involved in NA world service efforts.

Additional comments and considerations

- A lot of the opposition to NAWS has to do with finances and transparency.
- The more we beat the drum that we need money; the more people are disinclined to give.
- NAWS Sustainability needs to focus on our ability to deliver services efficiently.
- How does diversifying of revenues relate to the spirit of our Traditions?
 - Announce the money in meetings. Promotion of the QR code and announcing that you should contribute the amount of clean time you have is not ok with me. We need service structure we need a helpline and we need money to take care of them.
- Connects with fund-flow discussion and accommodating current ways to contribute (7th Tradition isn't just spare change you have in your pocket), recurrent contributions
- Objective 16 is an implicit statement to membership to fund NAWS
- Thinking must change. We have some outdated thinking. World Services used to be pretty much the US. Now many of the communities outside the US have grown and we must get rid of our parental attitude toward these communities. [x3]
 - Counterpoint: We may have grown up as a Fellowship, but we still have a 5th Concept with a single point of accountability. World Services is still where we hear from delegates how to provide services.
- We need to continue to look at what's going on in the world. Maybe look at the US Zones and offering more help for them with the situation statewide.
- Fewer people carry cash and even when the problem is solved with a laminated QR code for digital donation, a culture of not-giving is developing.
- How do we raise revenue? How do we account for losses such as losses due to Covid?
- 70% of AA's revenue comes from contributions, ours was 17% before Covid.
- How will tariffs affect NAWS ability to distribute and create literature?
- Global economy has people not spending money like they did before
- We need feedback from our members for change. No bad ideas.

What are a couple of highlights from discussion we could report? One or two areas of activity in the coming planning cycle we are most excited about – where the positive impact could be significant on the Fellowship?

- World Convention, including oversight and revision of programming and agenda. [x7]
 - Create a workgroup to discuss how to better project the WCNA
- Excited to learn what "diversifying our income revenue" will look like [x4]

- Excited to see what sustainability looks like. [x2]
- Look for opportunities for veterans and new members to serve together.
- Excited about PR efforts. Create and develop tools to further assist and train our members. How can virtuality further assist in developing these tools?
- NA's reputation needs to be improved in search engines. Currently if you search NA in any browser there is a lot of misleading information. Also in movies, films or documentaries NA's image sometimes is negative and that needs to be addressed. We are excited to see if NA credibility can be improved in the next cycles.
- Better tools and information about how to involve virtual meetings in the service system
- KRA's and objectives need to be worded in a way that they are measurable and easier to evaluate the impact or outcome of the planning process.
- Excited to hear more ideas about engaging young members
- Generational and Cultural Differences - NEW/AMENDED OBJECTIVE: Don't forget to consider non-digital communication methods
- NAWS Sustainability - NEW OBJECTIVE: Explore options for cost-sharing with zones (e.g. free lit expense)
- Harm reduction - The objective, as written, does not specify clearly what the focus is. Clean-time or membership?
- 3-year cycle - Not sure a three-year cycle is what we need. Too soon to decide if it's right. Poll the WSC at the end of WSC 2026 how they feel about the 3-year cycle.
- Us vs them stigma—Keep communications effective so that newer members know what NAWS is and what NAWS is doing.
- Objective 9 isn't clear: Does this objective allow "us" to decide who is a member?
- Objective 10: CHANGE OBJECTIVE: Continue to update communication methods...for all members
- Generational gap/differences are more than just "younger members"
- Objective 11: Consider streamlining communications with/for CPs: RD in first term who never served as AD is blasted with fire hose of info.
- Objective 12: The current planning work has been a completely collaborative process, well received, good process
- Objective 13 seems vague. Do we want to better use resources, consider making or not making a profit, know how much we "can" lose??
- Objective 14: to be more specific, should it say "less reliance on lit sales, more focus on contributions"? Otherwise, what are other potential revenue streams—selling new stuff, providing some sort of service at a cost...?
- Impact of having inmate tablets on not only PR but also the population of potential NA Members
- Culture/youth
- Cultural difference issue is missing from objective 10.
- Take out "financially" from the WCNA model objective. Clarify in bullet points.
- Include Vision Statement in NAWS' sustainability.
- Involving the CPs in the discussion of objectives 14-16.
- Generation/cultural differences issue was poorly defined.
- Overcoming negative reactions to request for fund flow.
- Language in many of the objectives too vague/broad. "Tiptoeing" around the topic. Specifically for Harm Reduction, it feels like it is about MAT/DRT without saying it.

- I think we need to keep politics out of our fellowship. NA is about love not about our differences.
- Given the issues in our world right now- is this encroaching in our fellowship? It's distracting from our atmosphere of recovery. They are encroaching from social media. Arguments coming into the meetings from social media.
- Social media is a big topic for me and my area especially when it comes to pictures at conventions and other events.

Additional General Notes on all Objectives

- If not prioritizing, consider bullet points for the objectives, rather than a numbered list, which gives the impression of prioritization.
- There are too many objectives. We must incorporate a way of prioritizing and measuring results that allows us to focus on no more than four or five and move on to the next ones only when the first ones have been met. [x2]
 - Consider combining objectives so that there are fewer.
 - Possible Solution: It was suggested that the 11 issues perhaps be divided amongst the regions in a given zone, and then have the delegates come together to share in a zonal forum, because a zone can only work on one issue at a time.
- Reading the ideas for solutions listed at the end of the planning report helps to clarify the objectives.
- Some of the Objectives are interconnected and impact one another [x2]
 - Safety and Belonging connects to Credibility, as well as to Rise of Virtual NA (inclusion)
 - Using virtual tools will help with Cohesion and Collaboration in our Service System as well as Fund Flow.

IV. Consider the plan as a whole and make sure nothing is missing:

To ensure our Plan reflects the changing world we are in and the changing needs of the Fellowship . . . is there another significant challenge that has risen to this level of priority that you believe the Strategic Plan for 2026-2029 needs to address?

Summary for Plan as a Whole

The small groups expressed a variety of ideas they felt deserved attention in the Strategic Plan. Suggestions ranged across the four KRAs, with the most feedback pertaining to the area of World Service Structure and Operations. Other groups felt the Plan seemed complete and is a tall order as it stands. In fact, several groups felt there were too many objectives, and that they would need to be prioritized, combined, or divided up between regions.

- As a group we feel it is very complete and all these challenges will take several conference cycles to be addressed. Continue what we have been doing and value what we have established as well as review the way we do things within the Fellowship [x3]

Input related to Public Relations

- Explore electronic literature opportunities in education, institutions and prisons. Considering book length pieces on inmate tablets – needs to be discussed and explored [x2]
- Problematic and bad behavior at the World Convention and its impact on our public image (Could possibly be included in the Credibility of NA issue)

Input related to Service System Support

- Develop service materials on how to write reports at all levels of service from RDs to GSRs. This helps to improve communication from world level to the Group. Especially a handbook for regional delegates. [x2]
- Develop technology advisory committee (to address how we use technology for doing service).
- More strategies to attract members to service.
- New objective: To better organize and solicit local resources for Fellowship use.
- Guidelines for WhatsApp chats as an extension of groups and service bodies.

Input related to Fellowship Support

- Break out “cultural differences” and develop an objective specific to that. [x3]
 - Embracing and responding to the increasing cultural diversity of our fellowship, including age and gender.
 - Accessibility for those with additional needs—We have some stuff but have not seen the availability of that and awareness that it exists.
 - Can we create a resource or tool that helps connect members of similar cultures? It can be difficult to reach across a cultural divide (e.g., language barriers). Another Look for FD. Conceptual fidelity—we are expressing the same thing but in different language.
 - Counterpoint: Some in the group feel that focusing on the differences rather than similarities in a written resource may undermine unity. Bridging potential gaps happens member to member and on a group level.
- NEW OBJECTIVE: Sustainability of the NA Fellowship at all levels of service.
- Addressing unresolved literature pieces that haven’t been completed/prioritized.

Input related to World Services Structure and Operations

- New Issue: Technical efficiency of the WSC. Objective—Create training and tools to help delegates be as efficient as possible. Using new technology to have the WSC meeting go smoothly. Solution: Making sure RDs mentor the ADs. Improving the time management during conference participant meetings to hear from more delegates [x2]
- Number of regions in the US may not accurately represent the voice of addicts worldwide, US has a larger number of voices at the conference compared to other regions around the world. May not accurately reflect the changing world we live in
- Inclusion of unseated regions in planning. Zones are the only place they have a voice or inclusion.
- We need to focus more on translation and navigating the ways to take messages to different cultural/language communities.
- Need to focus more on issues related to supply chain and tariffs regarding literature distribution.
- Educate the Fellowship on the importance of engaging World Services surveys. If these are the primary ways for members to be involved, they need to be engaged.
- Strategic plan needs to address financial losses, lack of consequence, lack of available information. With this, the fellowship can offer better solutions to NAWS/WB.
- Need for more transparency, solid discussion on convention and conference sustainability. Group maintains KRA / objectives but believe we need better communication up the service structure.
- Difficulty of obtaining visas to the countries where WCNA is held.