

Order of discussion (p.2 of handout)

Introduce & straw poll motion / proposal

Straw poll & discuss any proposed changes

If the conference supports the proposed changes, the motion /proposal is now revised

Discuss main motion. Proposal (as changed or not)

There is a 3 min cutoff for questions per region per question

After discussion, straw poll motion/proposal

Verbiage for judging straw polls will be:

Unanimous Support

Strong Support

Support

Opposition

Strong Opposition

Unanimous Opposed

Total= up to four straw polls

127 Participants

112 Regions

$2/3 = 75$

simple majority = 57

Motion #7 To Adopt for WSC 2012 only, the following Exceptions to the WSC Rules of Order.

Discussion Session:

Initial Straw Poll: Strong Support

Discussion:

17 Doug Cal Mid-State: Though we support this motion, however we have a concern that it will be used against us to move forward regardless if we change our minds later.

73 Kenny New Jersey: I think there are 2 different motions, I think we should separate old & new business as well my region is strongly opposed to not being able to make motions in new business. Straw Poll: weak support

Final Straw Poll: Strong Support

Motion #6 To approve the 2010 World Service Conference Minutes

Initial Straw Poll: Strong Support

Discussion Session:

Objections were heard to the validity of some of the specifics. The board listened to the tapes, and found that objection to be incorrect.

Final Straw Poll: Strong Support

Motion #1 To Approve "Living Clean - The Journey Continues"

Initial Straw Poll: Unanimous Support

Discussion Session:

Region 51: we had a meeting use this as the meeting topic, we read this cover to cover and the attendance in the meeting nearly tripled.

49: Production time, price, and hardcover or soft cover?

A: October-ish, yes hard cover, don't know about price yet.

Javad Iran: most of the members in my region liked this book and wanted to say thank you.

72: that members were excited about the process with this book. They felt more involved in the process.

107: The CAR says the cost has already been incurred. How much do we have invested into this?

A: I would have to go back & look at the initial project proposal, we will answer that on Wednesday.

25: Is it possible that in October we will have the book in Spanish in October?

A: No.

28: Is there timeline, or a prioritization for this book to translations?

A: It depends on the communities and their ability to take this project on, as well as the local communities' readiness to prioritize this above the other projects already on the list.

35: Is this book going to be a special & limited number project?

A: given our financial condition, it is highly probably.

43: if there is a unanimous support, do we need to have a final straw poll?

A: not necessarily

Final Straw Poll: Agreed it was not necessary

Motion # 2 To allow the WB to make non-substantive corrections to Fellowship Approved Literature which do not impact the original meaning of the Fellowship Approved text and which fix typographical errors, obsolete references, references to outdated literature and other similar corrections. The WB will announce such corrections in advance of publication.

Initial Straw Poll: Support

Amendment Proposal F: "To allow the WB to make non-substantive corrections to Fellowship Approved Literature which do not impact the original meaning of the Fellowship Approved text and which fix typographical errors, obsolete references, and references to outdated literature and other similar corrections. The WB will announce such corrections in advance of publication.

Intent: To limit the WB's ability to make corrections to Fellowship-approved Lit.

WB Recommendation: This is not the language that we were seeking,

Straw Poll: Opposition

Final Straw Poll: Strong Opposition

\*\*Request to discuss all related proposals together.

Straw Poll: Strong Support.

Amendment Proposal K: To amend motion 4 as follows: To allow the WB to make non-substantive corrections to Fellowship Approved Literature which do not impact the original meaning of the Fellowship Approved text and which fix typographical errors, obsolete references, references to outdated literature and other similar corrections. The WB will distribute the draft changes to RDs for approval 120 days announce such corrections in advance of publication.

Intent: To provide for WB accountability to the fellowship

WB Recommendation: We see no way to distribute this and would rather motion 2 fail and put this info in the CAR than do this.

Straw Poll: Opposition

Final Straw Poll: Strong Opposition

Amendment Proposal N: We would like to have a 90 day review and input time frame to have the possibility to look for major mistakes.

Intent: As a result of the experiences with Sponsorship book and the service pamphlet "Introduction to NA" we want to avoid a repetition.

WB Recommendation: This is like comparing the material in a book & SP with constrictive copyright. If this is the will of the body, we will always follow the world body.

Straw Poll: Opposition

Discussion:

76: though these have had opposition on their own, it seems there is a feeling of desire for definition and not so vague. As well, I'd like to see a definition of 90 specific notification to RDs and not so much the Review & Input.

115: We are international fellowship, we speak many languages, who will be responsible for translating all these announcements?

A: This relates to the FIPT. This motion relates to copy edits which regular publications would consider meaningless, they are not important. But because of the legalities of the FIPT document, this is the language we need. In the translations, this stuff is already done, it would not necessarily affect the translated documents.

\*\*Is there interest in having a timeframe in the wording of this motion?

Straw Poll: Support

90? Support

120? More support

30: What did you mean "Announce"? is that just to know, or to review & input?

A: currently the only way we have to Announce is in a publication. Which is NAWS News or NA Way. The Dilemma is that this is a legal document, and we have to define the process in the FIPT which we did not want to do, so we wrote Announce.

Final Straw Poll: Strong Opposition

Amendment Proposal P: To allow the WB to make non-substantive corrections to Fellowship Approved Literature which do not impact the original meaning of the Fellowship Approved text and which fix typographical errors, obsolete references, references to outdated literature, and other similar corrections. The WB will announce such corrections in advance of publication.

Intent: For clarity purposes and remove any potential doubt from fellowships understanding of the WB's abilities.

WB Recommendation: This seems to make our ability very specific.

Straw Poll: Opposition

Final Straw Poll: Strong Opposition

Motion # 2 To allow the WB to make non-substantive corrections to Fellowship Approved Literature which do not impact the original meaning of the Fellowship Approved text and which fix typographical errors, obsolete references, references to outdated literature and other similar corrections. The WB will announce such corrections not less than 120 days in advance of publication.

Initial Straw Poll as revised: Strong Support

\*\* Does anyone object to the verbiage "not less than 120 days"

No objection heard

Final Straw Poll: Strong Support

Motion # 3: To allow the WB to bundle, excerpt, and repackage Fellowship Approved literature without changes to the texts themselves. The WB will announce these actions not less than 120 days in advanced of publication.

Initial Straw Poll: Strong support

Discussion Session:

97: what does packaging mean?

A: Any form, paper, electronic, audio etc.

115: Again about translations, how would this work?

A: this would depend on the cooperation, willingness and ability of the local fellowship.

81: So does this mean that proposal L is out of order?

A: yes, because the Board has amended the timeframe proposal L has been resolved.

Final Straw Poll: Strong support

Motion # 4: To allow the WB the ability to create and approve enhanced electronic or digital versions of texts that include supplemental materials or connections to other NA Materials. The WB will announce such enhancements in advance of publication.

Initial Straw Poll: Strong Support

Amendment Proposal G: To allow the WB the ability to create and approve enhanced electronic or digital versions of texts that include supplemental materials or connections to other NA Materials. The WB will announce such enhancements in advance of publication.

Intent: An area did not like giving the board ultimate ability to approve.

WB Recommendation: we have already been given the authority to approve in prior conferences.

Straw Poll: Strong opposition

Discussion:

48: We request to rule this out of order. Who decides audio of people is fellowship approved and who isn't? We feel this is in opposition to the meaning of the FIPT.

Straw Poll: Strong Opposition

Amendment Proposal I:

Intent:

WB Recommendation: We are not sure what our limitations of fellowship material are at this point. We have no desire for our literature to be controversial so if this is the will of the body, we will follow that will.

Straw Poll: Strong Opposition

\*\*Maker withdraws proposal

Amendment Proposal Q:

Intent: We look at these motions and we looked at the FIPT. The FIPT is the actual governing document. I am requesting to add "copywritten literature" section to include fellowship approved so that it may be more enhanced.

WB Recommendation: We already have this ability through the process of the CAR. This is a legal document and it is our duty as Board members to protect the FIPT. We would rather this motion fail than have it pass and create a document that would jeopardize this document.

Straw Poll: Strong Opposition

Discussion: None seen, none heard

Straw Poll: Strong Opposition

#### Amendment Proposal S:

Intent: My intent was to introduce an idea rather than a motion, we were concerned about the enhancements not being fellowship approved.

WB Recommendation: We already have this ability through the process of the CAR. This is a legal document and it is our duty as Board members to protect the FIPT. We would rather this motion fail than have it pass and create a document that would jeopardize this document.

\*\*Example: the group logo designed by Jimmy K is not Fellowship approved, though widely accepted by the fellowship.

Straw Poll: Strong Opposition

\*\*Maker of Motion withdraws motion

#### Amendment Proposal U

Intent: With the amendment of time, I think the original motion would be fine. We understand that Jimmy K had a concern that there would be a picture of him hanging on a wall. Then when we read the intent that came to mind about the kind of enhancements, with glorifying pictures of people.

WB : we already have the ability through the CAR and the delegation of trusted servants. We do not have a history of publishing pictures of individual member.

\*\* With that explanation, we will withdraw our proposal.

Motion # 4: To allow the WB the ability to create and approve enhanced electronic or digital versions of texts that include supplemental materials or connections to other NA Materials. The WB will announce such enhancements not less than 120 days in advance of publication.

Discussion:

42: How does this affect the ability of RSOs to market & distribute these electronic items?

A: We are constantly reviewing our marketing, this has not been addressed yet and we will take that under advisement.

59: Does the enhancement then become fellowship approved material?

A: the item would be fellowship approved with a link that is labeled enhancement which will have documentation of where it came from and more info about it.

84: RE the timeline, if there is negative feedback, how much feedback is needed to decide not to do it? And will we get any kind of reporting on the input numbers?

A: if one area responds and 2 of the comments are negative we pay attention to it. But if we get repetitive responses we do pay attention and scrutinize what we are putting out.

Final Straw Poll: Strong Support

Motion # 5: To hold the World Convention of NA every three years, beginning 2018, attending North American and Non-North American locations, as follows and contained in Addendum C.

Initial Straw Poll: Strong support

Amendment Proposal H: To change motion 5 from “every three years” to every “2 ½ years” (with all else pertaining to the motion remaining the same – see example

Intent: Our region realized that with the convention moving to every 3 years, it would not fall on anniversary years, 60, 65, 75 etc... Also this would allow the convention to not fall on conference years. And it

WB Recommendation: we are already trying to plan the 2015 conference and this would exacerbate the planning, as well as changing months.

Straw poll: Strong opposition

Discussion: ??

\*\*Maker withdrew proposal

Amendment Proposal V: to amend motion 5. No change to frequency, keep every two years.

Intent: Every two years is what we want. We think that time may not be the problem but perhaps management and planning. Is there a way to review the mistakes made and change the process so they are not made again.

WB Recommendation: We say no, whether to keep the old rotation or the new, we think the time needs to change. We believe rather seriously that timing does have a lot to do with the problems seen at the World convention when we have to compete with 1000+ conventions world wide, this makes the World Convention less important.

Straw poll:

\*\*Maker withdrew the proposal

Motion # 5: To hold the World Convention of NA every three years, beginning 2018, attending North American and Non-North American locations, as follows and contained in Addendum C.

Discussion:

23: didn't we discuss a moratorium on conventions at 2010?

A: We discussed changes to the support committee and we said that the current rotation plan or a new rotation plan would be submitted in sufficient time for the 2029 convention. We are addressing the rotation AND the frequency of them...

Final Straw Poll: Strong Support

Resolution #1 Our Service efforts will be carried out through a system that includes structure, process, people and resources

Initial Straw Poll: support

Discussion Session:

101: we are opposed to this, not because of the principle, but that we believe this is already included in what we already are doing & believe that the lead specifically toward the end result and all other similar motions.

Final Straw Poll: Support

Resolution # 2: The service system is group-focused and includes a local-level body dedicated exclusively to addressing group concerns.

Initial Straw Poll: Support

Discussion Session: None seen, none heard

Final Straw Poll: Support

Resolution #3 Training and mentoring of trusted servants are essential functions of the service system.

Initial Straw Poll: Strong support

Discussion Session: none seen, none heard

Final Straw Poll: strong support

Resolution # 4 Service Bodies are purpose and vision driven.

Initial Straw Poll: Strong support

Discussion Session: none seen, none heard

Final Straw Poll: strong support

Resolution # 5 Service Bodies work together to utilize planning processes to organize and coordinate their efforts.

Initial Straw Poll: Strong support

Discussion Session: none seen, none heard

Final Straw Poll: Strong support

Resolution # 6 Service Bodies make decisions by consensus.

Initial Straw Poll: Support

Discussion Session:

101 Jodie southern Idaho: I request that the traditions and concepts be discussed. I'd like to know how this supports concept & tradition 2.

A: I don't see how this violates or conflicts with any, however if you are requesting specifics I am not prepared to do so at this time.

82: We've tried CBDM in our region and have not been successful. Will there be training material provided on this?

A: These are agreements of principles. The details of this process will come later. We are not at the implementation phase, but we will be considering tools for implementation.

81: The SSP information states that a new system be flexible, and the wording of this Resolution does not seem to allow that flexibility for those committees who are and are not comfortable with CBDM & Roberts Rules.

\*\*Co-Facs suggestion to amend the resolution to "Service bodies strive to make decisions by consensus" Straw Poll: Strong Support

Final Straw Poll: Support

Resolution # 7: The service structure included local service bodies, state/nation/province service bodies, and intermediate bodies if needed. Service bodies follow established geographic boundaries. They are not self-determined, but are formed, based on need, through a collaborative planning process and agreement at the next level of service.

Initial Straw Poll: evenly split

Amendment Proposal J: to amend resolution 7 as follows: Resolution 7. The service structure includes local service bodies, state/nation/province service bodies and intermediate bodies if needed. Service bodies willing to follow established geographic boundaries,. They are not self determined, but are formed, based on need, through a collaborative planning process and agreement at the next level of service with other affected service bodies.

Intent:

WB Recommendation: this seems to be doing what a lot of communities are currently doing, this imposes no resolution.

Straw poll: Strong opposition

Final Poll: Strong Opposition

Amendment Proposal R: To amend Resolution 7. To separate the global level from the local level when considering geographical borders for service bodies.

Intent: We understand there is a problem of too many regions seated at the conference. So the conference size is ...

WB Recommendation: This seems to be opposed to Res 7 rather than change anything.

Straw Poll: Strong Opposition

Discussion:

Q: what is the importance of stating geographical boundaries?

A: Navigating within NA is difficult with names like “sunshine region.” Also there are entities that are in control of addicts’ lives and this helps those entities.

Final Poll: Strong Opposition

Amendment Proposal W: To amend Resolution 7 as follows: Resolution 7. The service structure included local service bodies, state/nation/province service bodies, and intermediate bodies if needed. Service bodies follow established geographic boundaries. They are not self-determined, but are formed, based on need, through a collaborative planning process and agreement at the next level of service.

Intent: We believe that grouping is not really relevant with the exception of seating at the conference.

WB Recommendation: We recommend against this.

Straw Poll: Strong opposition

Final Poll: Strong Opposition

Resolution # 7 The service structure included local service bodies, state/nation/province service bodies, and intermediate bodies if needed. Service bodies follow established geographic boundaries. They are not self-determined, but are formed, based on need, through a collaborative planning process and agreement at the next level of service.

Interim Straw Poll: Opposition

Discussion Session:

17: we agree to many principles in this proposal, including collaboration. We are not in support of self-determination or next level of service.

10: There are 3 regions in Mexico which are very large. We are concerned that we will lose our region boundaries. There is no way that a national service body will know the needs of all our groups. We want to know what will happen with large countries like us.

101: How does this not violate traditions & Concepts?

A: The 4th Trad does have the caveat which states “except when to do so affects other members or groups as a whole.”

Q1.) Being told to follow established geographical boundaries, these are not self determined which we feel violates the Autonomy in Trad 4.

A: we believe the 2nd part of that tradition, that limitation on group autonomy applies.

Q2.) We believe that the second Tradition is violated in the same way.

Q3.) 9th Tradition: I believe there is a mention of the WSC doing this definition in the resolutions somewhere...

A: We don’t see any conflict... We’d like to see conversations with our peers and make sure that there are no gaps or double coverage in services.

76: From working with on the workgroup, one of the things we saw, was that bodies who set their boundaries along Geographic boundaries seem to have the best public relations.

Final Straw Poll: evenly split

Resolution # 8: State/national/province boundaries are the primary criterion for seating Consideration at the World Service Conference



Initial Straw Poll: evenly split

Discussion Session:

108: Primary means primary and not only correct?

A: Yes.

109: We are a small geographic region though we have had large growth in NA standards. We may end up being combined with another state/region and this would be very hard for the delegate to represent the different cultures. It would be hard to bring OUR diversity to the conference if we are not seated as a result of this motion.

A: Uruguay is a country, they will still be attending the conference. This does not apply to you guys.

78: We are divided down the middle and we felt it important to share why. The boundaries were an issue on 7, \* it is the thought in principle of losing the NA communities as we know it. At this point, this may be the primary criterion, but we don't know what the other criterion is.

A: We have to address seating no matter what happens with this motion.

28 Costa Rico: is there a possibility we could start this resolution in regards to future growth, future seating requests & not the currently seated regions?

Who defines the State/nation/province and who determines who gets seating?

A: this is agreement in principle, so the particulars have not been established. At that, the moratorium on seating expires at the end of this conference, so we have to further address this later.

10: We are 150 areas 5 states. Mexico has 500 areas in 32 states. We like some ideas of this project, and we understand that the conference needs to save money, but it would affect us in crisis of money because we would have to travel more to carry the service across all the states...

A: we have examples in the essays which address these concerns. The intermediate body may also help with your situation, however this resolution deals specifically to seating.

Final Straw Poll: Support

\*\*We are not covering the straw polls at this time. There is confusion and we will be discussing if they get covered at all.

Regional Proposal # A: For the Fellowship of NA and the WSC to consider a proposal for the creation of Written Service Material dedicated to assisting the members of NA as a whole on 1) how to actively participate in literature and publication projects as well as 2) to have resource material available in providing guidance for the development of Literature and Publication processes locally.

Initial Straw Poll: Opposition

Discussion Session:

\*\* The WB does not oppose the principles in this proposal, though we are not sure this wording is the correct way to go about it and that at this time we do not have the resources available

\*\*Maker of the motion requests removal of bullet #2 and to re-poll the Proposal

Straw Poll or revision: Opposition

Final Straw Poll: Opposition

We will conclude the business tonight, and resume at 9am. The NAWS report was scheduled for then, we will move that to after the business is concluded.

Regional Proposal # B To produce a book-length publication called "The NA Way: Celebration Edition" comprised of a compilation of articles published in the NA WAY 1982-2012.

\*\*Maker amended proposal to state "To submit to the WB as an idea for further study: to produce..."

WB Recommendation: We are prepared to put out an electronic version, though when we did the lit survey, there was no interest in this project. We are willing to introduce this into the environmental scan, though we are recommending a NO vote on this project.

Initial Straw Poll: Opposition

Discussion Session:

81: We like the idea of offering this in a limited edition, or commemorative gift edition and we also recognize that though the staff has done an excellent job sorting through the and selecting the submissions, none of it is NA approved literature.

49: We have a a similar publication in Iran, and every 12 issues we publish and make a book of it so that members who came after that magazine publication can enjoy it too.

Final Straw Poll: Opposition

Regional Proposal # C For Board Approved Literature be clearly marked on front "Service Related Material" and not intended to be read during recovery meetings.

\*\*Maker amended proposal to read "For Board Approved Service Pamphlets be clearly marked..."

WB Recommendation: We have no opinion other than what's in the CAR, though if this is the will of the body we will follow that will.

Initial Straw Poll: support

Discussion Session:

48: We feel that "Service Related Material" does not adequately explain that this is not to be read in Recovery Meetings.

\*\*48 requests amendment to proposal which would read... "Service Related Material not to be read during recovery meetings."

\*\*Anthony: We think this is an instance where proposals can work rather than crafting policies on the floor. We think we heard your intention and would like to bring this back to you on Saturday. Would the body be ok with this? -- YES.

Regional Proposal # D That members who wish to receive the NA WAY Magazine in hard copy format pay a subscription fee to cover the costs of printing and mailing.

Initial Straw Poll: Strong Opposition

Regional Amendment Proposal # O (Amends Prop D) To amend Proposal D:

That The members who wish to receive the NA WAY Magazine in hard copy format and who can or wish pay a subscription fee to cover the costs of printing and mailing., have a direct form of doing so (either by credit card or bank transaction) which will only serve for this publication.

Intent: For members who want to support this publication, they wanted to do so directly

WB Recommendation: We recommend members to donate directly to NAWS rather than require us to maintain subscription accounting and database.

Initial Straw Poll: Strong Opposition

Discussion Session for Prop O:

39: what are the estimated costs of NA Way?

A: Right now what we know is that the direct cost is approx. \$10 USD, and we would have to add 18-20% for other production costs. It cost us more when they were paid subscriptions. It's possible that we have 9,000 subscriptions, it would be better to use our current donation infrastructure for a few of those than to create a new one.

10: We order 200 magazines be sent to one address, and ask members make a donation when they pick it up, which we then forward to NAWS. This also helps to avoid magazines being sent to wrong addresses when people or meetings move.

Final Prop O Straw Poll: Strong Opposition

Regional Proposal # D That members who wish to receive the NA WAY Magazine in hard copy format pay a subscription fee to cover the costs of printing and mailing.

Prop D Discussion Session:

110: what I heard the maker say, is that it is difficult for the members of the region to donate to NAWS. Wouldn't it be easier to ask NAWS to work with that community to make it easier?

A: Yes. You have a specific idea on how to improve services please email us as we are constantly looking for ways to improve.

Final Straw Poll: Strong opposition.

Regional Proposal # E Our idea is to revisit the discussion of the WB Members no longer having voting status at the WSC.

Intent: If the Board members have a Homegroup, they vote their conscious their, then for them to vote here too, they are essentially voting twice.

WB Recommendation: It is offensive that a member would question if the board members have a homegroup. When we are here, we represent our position as the Board members and our global prospective. There are participants who represent their region, and there needs to be representation for the global fellowship.

Initial Straw Poll: Opposition

Discussion Session:

122: I'm struggling to figure out whether the statements for the intent of this motion is ingeniously misleading or misinformed. As a board member, I only vote in new business, not on old business. New business has never been discussed at the homegroups.

93: This motion was asking to revisit the discussion. Many didn't want to have this discussion and here we are having this discussion.

61: CBDM cannot properly function in line with concept 9 without the WB having a voice as well.

Final Straw Poll: Strong opposition

@@

FORMAL OLD BUSINESS VOTING

Total participants 127

Regions 112

Simple majority 57

2/3 majority 75

Motion 7: called to floor by Co-fac

\*\*the SSP Straw polls will be addressed following the decision on the resolution. The WB has asked us to wait to discuss after the formal business and will be handled in an informal business session. \*\*

73: Request to split the motion, to separate Old business & new business sections of this proposal. \*\*Request was seconded\*\* Voice vote: Request Failed

Discussion: none further seen

Motion Requires 2/3 majority.

Objection: yes

Voice vote: motion carries

Motion 6: called to floor by Co-fac

Discussion:

IOWA: was the objection from yesterday dealt with

A: yes.

Objection: None seen, motion passes by unanimous consent

Motion 1: at 12:09pm May 1, 2012 "Living Clean- The Journey Continues" is approved

Discussion: None seen

Objection: none seen, motion passes by unanimous consent

Motion 2: as revised in Old Bus Discussion

Requires 2/3 majority

Discussion: none seen

Objection: yes

Voice Vote: Motion Carries

\*Request for Roll Call Vote

Roll Call vote requires simple majority support for Roll Call Vote. Request does not require a second.

Vote for Roll Call: Motion defeated

\*\*Per pg. 25 of the FIPT, a 2/3 majority (75) of delegates present is needed to affect a change.

\*After reconsideration, Co-Facs Request a Standing vote to verify the 2/3 majority.

Standing Vote:

For: 90

Opposed: 19

Abstention: 1 \*\*2 delegate chose not to stand

Motion Passes

Motion 3: as revised in Old Bus Discussion

Requires 2/3 majority

Discussion: none seen

Objection: yes

Voice Vote: Motion Carries

\*Request for Roll Call Vote

Roll Call vote requires simple majority support for Roll Call Vote. Request does not require a second.

Vote for Roll Call: Defeated

\*Request for Standing vote to verify the 2/3 majority. Request requires simple majority. Request does not require a second

Vote for standing vote: defeated

\*\*Per pg. 25 of the FIPT, a 2/3 majority (75) of delegates present is needed to affect a change.

\*After reconsideration, Co-Facs Request a Standing vote to verify the 2/3 majority.

Standing Vote:

For: 89

Opposed: 22

Abstention: 1

Motion Passes

Motion 4: as revised in Old Bus Discussion

Requires 2/3 Majority

Discussion: none

Objection: yes

Voice Vote: Motion Carries

\*Request for Roll Call Vote

Roll Call vote requires simple majority support for Roll Call Vote. Request does not require a second.

Vote for Roll Call: Defeated

\*\*Per pg. 25 of the FIPT, a 2/3 majority (75) of delegates present is needed to affect a change.

\*After Reconsideration, Co-Facs Request a Standing vote to verify the 2/3 majority.

Standing Vote:

For: 87

Opposed: 23

Abstention: 1 \*\* 1 delegate chose not to stand

Motion Passes

\*\*RECESSED TILL 2:30PM

Motion 5

Discussion: none seen

Objection: yes

Voice Vote: Strong Support, Motion Carries

Resolution 1

Simple majority is needed

Discussion: none seen

Objection: yes

Voice Vote: Resolution Carries

Resolution 2

Simple Majority is needed

Discussion: none seen

Objection: yes

Voice Vote: Resolution Carries

Resolution 3

Simple Majority is needed

Discussion: None Seen

Objection: Yes

Voice Vote: Resolution Carries

Resolution 4

Simple Majority is needed

Discussion: none seen

Objection: yes

Voice Vote: Resolution Carries

Resolution 5

Simple Majority is needed

Discussion: none seen

Objection: Yes

Voice Vote: Resolution Carries

Resolution 6

Simple Majority is needed (56 is needed for simple majority as requested to be counted as 2 were presented but not voting)

Discussion:

101 Jodie Southern Idaho: Con- We are still not convinced that these agreements in principle do not violate concepts and traditions. We also believe these come from the wrong end of the service structure and are coming at the wrong time in the process.

Objection: Yes

Voice Vote: \*\*Standing Vote is requested by the co-facs.

Standing Vote:

For: 77

Opposed: 31

Abstention: 1

Present not voting: 2

Resolution Passes

Resolution 7

Simple Majority is needed. (4 requested to be counted as present and not voting, simple majority was 56)

Discussion:

Q: Please define Geographic Boundaries

A: for the purpose of this Resolution we consider city, state, nation, province. Not 'next to the stream'.

59: we voted no at the region for the purpose of the language "not self-determined." We believe that in the spirit of the 4h trad that self-determination is in the spirit of autonomy

127: it is clear that we will need to have a discussion on the autonomy of service bodies? Are they autonomous when they affect other bodies? How is the Area? Who is the Region? We are.... It shouldn't need to be scary.

Objection: Yes

Voice Vote: \*\*Standing Vote is requested by the co-facs.

Standing Vote:

For: 61

Opposed: 44

Abstention: 2

Present not voting: 4

Resolution Passes

Resolution 8

Simple Majority is needed

Discussion:

Q: How will this affect the regions currently seated?

A: This is an agreement in principle, and at this time we do not know.

23 Con: we don't believe N should have any boundaries. This will affect countries, Costa Rica said they have 7 provinces, this could affect them. What we don't know, we don't want to change.

39 Pro: in Europe we are working on this kind of seating for the EDM and other seating bodies. My perspective is that this is casting more fear than affect.

63 Con: There is a lot of people that think when our seat is taken so will our pride be. We'll have one seat in Pennsylvania, and there will be a lot disheartened people because of the loss of our historical seating here. We were one of the first regions to come to the conference and we don't want to loose that.

14 Pro: Read from GTWSA section on purpose of WSC.

23 Con: this has been a problem since WS restructured. Where do you place the priorities when you look at seating here? My state is the most densely populated state in the nation and it is a concern that the matter of population has not been considered during this projects. We believe that it should be part of this discussion.

Objection: Yes.

Voice Vote: \*\* Co-Facs request standing

Standing Vote: 112, 3 present. 55 is simple majority.

For: 60

Opposed: 46

Abstention: 1

Present not voting: 3