

The S.L.A.A. Fellowship-Services, Inc.
2006 Annual Business Meeting

Tuesday, July 25 – Friday, July 28, 2006
The Hilton San Antonio Airport, San Antonio, TX, USA

Minutes

Conference Theme: The 4th Tradition of S.L.A.A.:

“Each group should be autonomous except in matters affecting other groups or S.L.A.A. as a whole.”

Present were 40 voting members that included five members of the Board of Trustees (BOT), the F.W.S. Executive Director, the F.W.S. Office Coordinator, *the Journal* editor, and delegates from the U.S.A., Canada (French and English speaking), Australia, and Germany. Also in attendance were volunteers from the San Francisco/East Bay Intergroup and Austin, TX.

The F.W.S. Office, Board Committees, and Conference committees submitted 2005 – 2006 annual reports to the ABM. The following list of reports appeared in the Welcome packet:

- F.W.S. Office 2005 – 2006 Report
- 2005 – 2006 Board of Trustees Annual Report
- 2005 – 2006 Board Finance & Operating Committee (BF&OC) ABM Report
- 2006 Board Finance & Operating Committee Addendum to the Annual Report
- 2005 – 2006 Board Governance & Nominating (BG&NC) Committee ABM Report
- 2005 – 2006 Board Public Relations Committee (BPRC) ABM Report
- Frequently Asked Questions (BPRC)
- 2006 Restructuring and Relocation Committee Report
- Conference Anorexia Committee (CAC)
- Conference By-Laws Committee (CBC)
- Conference Charter Committee (CCC)
- CCC BMIS Review Subcommittee Annual Report
- Conference Diversity Committee (CDC)
- Conference Finance Committee (CFC)
- Conference Healthy Relationships Committee (HRC)
- Conference Internet Committee (CIC), referred to as the Conference Computer Committee on its report
- Conference Interfellowship Committee (CIFC)
- Conference Journal Committee (CJC)
- Conference Literature Committee (CLC)
- Member Relations to the BOT / F.W.S. Committee (MRBOTC)
- Conference Public Information Committee (CPiC)
- Conference Steps and Traditions Committee (CS&TC)
- Prison Outreach Committee (POC)

The following committees did not provide a report in the packet or at any time during the course of the ABM.

- Conference Membership Retention Committee (MRC)
- Conference Intergroup Communication Committee (ICC)
- Conference Service Committee (CSC)
- Conference Sponsorship Committee (CSPC)

Frequently Used Abbreviations:

BMIS: Business Meeting Items Summary

BOT: Board of Trustees

CCC: Conference Charter Committee

CSM: Conference Service Manual

HP: Higher Power

General Assembly – Tuesday, July 25, 2006, 1:00 – 4:45 p.m.

The General Assembly began with a moment of silence and the Serenity Prayer, reading of the 12 Steps in French, and the 12 Traditions in German. Rob K. (CCC Chair) as macro, Danielle P. (BOT Chair) as micro, and Karma K. (CFC Chair) as back-up, facilitated this session. This session's record keeper was Andrew H.

Time was taken to recognize the efforts of the local volunteers/delegates and observers for their participation in hosting this year's ABM and International Recovery Convention (IRC). Present BOT members were recognized. Three BOT members who were unable to attend this year's conference were also recognized. Recognition was given to the F.W.S. staff. First time attendees to the ABM were recognized. The theme of this ABM, the Fourth Tradition, was introduced. Attention was called to a new letter in the packet that endorsed the safety and well-being of all attendees by practicing good boundaries and self-care. Information regarding the availability of free internet access was given.

Time was taken to explain the General Assembly process, as well as the importance of the voting quorum. The quorum is a specific number of people (2/3 of the voting members) needed in the General Assembly room for doing business. Without this number of persons, the Conference cannot vote, nor can any business functions be performed. The importance of voting for the BOT and organizing each conference committee for work between ABMs (budget requests, projects, and committee rosters) were highlighted. Ribbon colors attached to participant name tags were also explained. It was also explained that all participants must use the microphone in order to facilitate clear communication between all participants and for recording of the ABM.

The schedule for the ABM and the rooms for breakout sessions were reviewed. It was noted that the deadline for submitting motions for consideration at this year's ABM was 7:00 p.m. Tuesday, July 25, 2006. Other events, such as the live and silent auctions, the raffle, meditation, and getting current meetings were highlighted. Delegates were reminded to bring their Conference Service Manual (CSM), the Business Meeting Items Summary (BMIS), and their Higher Power (HP) to each General Assembly. The seating configuration for the General Assemblies was explained as roughly a circle, assuring everyone is of equal significance. The roles of micro, macro, and backup were explained, along with other service roles: record keeper, spiritual reminder, vote counters, and timekeeper. The facilitators explained that anyone can act as spiritual reminder and call for 30 or 60 seconds of silence.

Two minutes were allotted for Board and Conference Committee Reports. They were as follows:

- F.W.S. Office 2005 – 2006 Report

- S.L.A.A./F.W.S. Job Ledger Report for the Period from Oct. 1, 2005 to Sept. 30, 2006
- 2005 – 2006 Board of Trustees Annual Report
- 2005 – 2006 Board Finance & Operating Committee (BF&OC) Annual Report: Additions to the report were as follows: A prudent reserve will be set up and is two months of operating expenses (\$69K). There is currently \$14K or 20% currently in the prudent reserve. There were brief reviews of the Individual Contribution Month (\$15K was contributed from six Intergroups) and relocation finances budget.
- 2005 – 2006 Board Governance & Nominating (BG&NC) Committee Annual Report: An addition to this report was the request for more diversity, specifically women, in service on the BOT.
- 2005 – 2006 Board Public Relations Committee (BPRC) Annual Report: Additions to this report were as follows: The Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) was available in the packet for groups and Intergroups. The FAQ and the San Antonio move articles are posted on the website.
- Conference Anorexia Committee (CAC): There was no additional information.
- Conference By-Laws Committee (CBC): There was no additional information.
- Conference Charter Committee (CCC): Additions to this report were to note the changes to the roster of the BMIS subcommittee and a reminder for the deadline form Motions and Issues for Discussion.
- CCC BMIS Review Subcommittee Activity Report: There was no additional information.
- Conference Diversity Committee (CDC): There was no additional information.
- Conference Finance Committee (CFC): Additions to this report were as follows: \$22K was requested for committee work last year, \$9K was allotted, and \$5K has been spent thus far.
- Conference Healthy Relationships Committee (HRC)
- Conference Interfellowship Committee (CIFC): There was no additional information.
- Conference Internet Committee (CIC): There was no additional information.
- Conference Journal Committee (CJC): Additions to this report were a request for additional Journal Reps and more help on the Journal Committee.
- Conference Literature Committee (CLC): Additions to this report were as follows: A note that there is a piece of literature on the agenda this year and a request for help on this committee.
- Member Relations to the BOT / F.W.S. Committee (MRBOTC): There was no additional information.
- Conference Members Retention Committee (CMRC): There was no report.
- Conference Public Information Committee (CPiC): There was no additional information.
- Conference Steps and Traditions Committee (CS&TC): The mission of this committee was highlighted, developing literature and assisting the F.W.S. office and the BOT with questions regarding Steps and Traditions.
- Prison Outreach Committee (POC): Additions to this report were as follows: Requests for help in writing prisoners letters and to have those areas who currently have prison outreach to contact the POC.
- Conference Service Committee (CSC): There was no report.
- Conference Sponsorship Committee (CSPC): There was no report.

Once the reports were given, the CCC facilitated a group activity session designed to assist delegates on group problem solving with a focus on the purpose of the ABM, “Who Are We—Why Are We Here?”

After time for announcements and a break, the General Assembly reconvened. An overview of Phase I and Phase II of the business method, voting, quorum, service roles, amendments and friendly amendments, and the BMIS was given. A practice session of the process was completed.

The General Assembly adjourned for the “Getting to Know the BOT & FWS” Meeting and dinner.

General Assembly Reconvenes, July 25, 2006 7:15 – 8:00 p.m.

This General Session was led by Andrew H. as the micro, Chris D. as the macro, and Deb W. as the back-up. The 12 Steps and 12 Traditions were read. There were 40 voting members in the room at the beginning of this session, so business was started. There was an explanation of the Phase I process. The assignment of roles was as follows: Melinda R. and Stephen D. -Vote Counters; Sam A. -Timekeeper; Leon C. - Spiritual Reminder; and Irv B. - Record Keeper. Phase I began with reference to the 2006 BMIS. It is noted that the macro served as the micro and the backup served as the macro when motions authored by this session’s micro was discussed.

06o01/04-14 Issue for Discussion:

Edit Preamble to change #2 “Sponsorship/Meetings” to “Support”, change item #5 “Spirituality” to #3 and bump #3 and #4 to #4 and #5. (*Steve S., Ardmore, PA*)

No motion was received by May 25th deadline, so this item was removed from the agenda and was not addressed.

06o02/04-15 Issue for Discussion:

Create a Conference Writing Teams Committee (CWTC). The CWTC will operate parallel to the CLC but will not replace it nor operate as a subcommittee of it. The CWTC will provide a framework for communication for both open and closed Writing Teams (WTs). Each WT may choose to be open or closed to additional members. (*Ron G., Los Angeles, CA*)

This was sent to Phase II.

06o03/04-16 Issue for Discussion:

Create a Conference Service Sponsorship (or Mentorship) Committee. This would have three members who would be elected by the conference much like BOT members are elected. (*Ron G., Los Angeles, CA*)

No motion was received by May 25th deadline, so this item was removed from the agenda and was not addressed.

06o04/04-17 Issue for Discussion:

Change the by-laws to reflect a recommendation that the terms of delegates be 3 years with 2 terms totaling 6 years. (*Ron G., Los Angeles, CA*)

No motion was received by May 25th deadline, so this item was removed from the agenda and was not addressed.

06o05/05-05 Issue for Discussion:

Discuss whether the topic of incest/sexual abuse should be addressed in S.L.A.A. literature, e.g. a pamphlet. (*Jeffrey M., San Francisco, CA*)

No motion was received by May 25th deadline, so this item was removed from the agenda and was not addressed.

06o06/05-07 Issue for Discussion:

Discuss possibilities of changing the international service structure to allow decisions to be made by representatives of a larger number of S.L.A.A. members in all countries where we have S.L.A.A. groups. *(2004-2005 Conference Diversity Committee)*

No motion was received by May 25th deadline, so this item was removed from the agenda and was not addressed.

06o07/05-09 Motion:

With regard to the Travel Equalization Fund (TEF) policy, to pay the same percentage travel allowance for international delegates and North American delegates. *(2004-2005 Conference Diversity Committee)*

This item was moved to Phase II.

06o08/05-10 Motion:

To create a scholarship fund to pay for the food, lodging, and other registration costs for one delegate to the ABC/M from each of the following countries/regions: Argentina/Uruguay, Australia/New Zealand/Singapore, Brazil, Denmark/Sweden, Germany/Netherlands, Ireland/England, Italy/Spain, and South Africa to the ABC/M 2007. *(Jason T., Montevideo, Uruguay)*

This item was moved to Phase II.

06o09/05-11 Issue for Discussion:

To adopt the following prayer:

Higher Power make me worthy to serve You through this Fellowship and the 12 steps.

Help me to be generous with my time and effort, to give without counting the cost, to give back wholly for what I have so freely received without looking for any reward other than that of knowing I have done Your will.

Through my service, may I give hope and peace to those that still suffer.

AMEN! *(Conference Service Committee)*

This item was moved to Phase II.

06o10/05-12 Issue For Discussion:

The Conference approve active participation with the IFF on a web site for concurrent listing of active S.L.A.A. meetings (by city and area). The IFF is starting a conjugate web site for all the S and CO-S fellowships listing. Will S.L.A.A. participate? *(Conference Interfellowship Committee)*

This item was moved to Phase II.

06o11/05-13 Issue For Discussion:

The Conference approve listing of our literature on a master list for distribution to other S-groups, general web posting, and for availability for therapists and professionals. This is an annotated list with a short description of the literature, its contents and where it is available.

The Interfellowship Forum (IFF) will be forging a Master list of all literature and pamphlets for distribution within all S-Fellowships. *(Conference Interfellowship Committee)*

This item was moved to Phase II.

06o12/05-14 Issue For Discussion:

The Conference approve co-fellowship participation within the IFF. At present this would mean co-fellowships would send a representative and would participate in phone teleconferencing. The IFF would encourage the co-fellowships to fund and support a web site of their own. S.L.A.A. has its own relationship with Co-S fellowships. We need to support the IFF level participation within this relationship. (*Conference Interfellowship Committee*).
This item was moved to Phase II.

06o13/05-15 Issue For Discussion:

The Conference consider a voting member or member from the on line meetings. We have an increasing penetration in the on line areas. We have no representation from these groups which are represented worldwide. There is no paradigm for representation. There is no connection to FWS. Other S-Fellowships have managed their roles with on line fellowships in areas of representation and contribution. (*Conference Interfellowship Committee*)
This item was moved to Phase II.

06o14/05-16 Issue For Discussion:

Discuss the issues of accountability and fiscal responsibility with regard to credit card use by FWS. (*Scott D., Costa Mesa, CA – Delegate*)
This item was moved to Phase II.

06o15/05-17 Issue for Discussion:

How do we nurture concepts of service as part of the spiritual path undertaken. (*Andrew H., Elizabethtown, KY – Editor, the Journal*)
This item was moved to Phase II.

06o16/05-18 Motion:

Revise recognition of contributions (both group and individual), to remove the tier structure as well as the donor's name and instead state “Anonymous”, location and amount. (*Andrew H., Elizabethtown, KY. – Editor, the Journal*)
This item was moved to Phase II.

06o17/05-19 Motion:

Publish contributions to endowment fund separately from contributions to FWS/S.L.A.A. (*Andrew H., Elizabethtown, KY – Editor –the Journal*)
This item was moved to Phase II.

06o18/05-20 Issue For Discussion:

In light of the special relationship between S.L.A.A. and Co-S.L.A.A. (ref Co-S.L.A.A. Tradition12) to what degree is it appropriate to honor this relationship and which entity/ies should be the steward(s) of the relationship between S.L.A.A. and Co-S.L.A.A.? (*Conference Interfellowship Committee*)
This item was moved to Phase II.

06n19/06-01 Motion:

Motion to amend the By-Law Article XIV. (*Conference Charter Committee*)

This item was moved to Phase II.

06n20/06-02 Motion:

Approve as Conference Approved Literature the “Setting Bottom Lines” pamphlet, as submitted. (*Conference Literature Committee*)

This item was moved to Phase II.

06n21/06-03 Motion:

For FWS to publish, distribute to all groups and Intergroups, and make available to the fellowship, in as many ways as possible, this statement, as follows, clarifying the 2002 Policy on Non-Conference Approved Literature: “This group uses the following non-conference approved literature (list the literature...). This literature is not approved by The S.L.A.A. Conference, but is suggested for this meeting through group conscience.” (*Conference Steps & Traditions Committee*)

This item was moved to Phase II.

After announcements and the Serenity Prayer, the General Assembly was adjourned for a special Speakers Meeting on Tradition Four. It was noted that no new motions or Issues for Discussion were submitted at the deadline.

General Assembly Reconvenes, July 26, 2006, 1:15 p.m. – 5:15 p.m.

Danielle, the micro for this session, opened the meeting with the Serenity Prayer read in Spanish. The 12 Steps were read in (Australian) English and the 12 Traditions were read in Portuguese. The macro for this session was Chris D. and the back-up was Dan A. The assignment of roles was as follows: Timekeeper: Sam A.; Spiritual Reminder: Leon C.; Record Keeper: Andrew H.; and Vote Counters: Stephen D. and Maria P. There was a voting quorum, so business was conducted.

There was a presentation by the Board Governance and Nominating Committee Chair explaining the voting process, term lengths and rotation for BOT members. It was clarified that Stephen S., Scott S., and Dan A. were appointed BOT members that were to be confirmed by the conference. There were two BOT nominees up for 3-year terms, Brian R. and Leon C. Nominations were taken from the floor at the next session. Delegates were reminded that all nominees must go through the same process as the others in filling out the BOT nomination forms and completing in-person interviews. Delegates were reminded that Friday was the BOT vote.

Phase II was initiated after this presentation.

06o02/04-15 Issue for Discussion:

Create a Conference Writing Teams Committee (CWTC). The CWTC will operate parallel to the CLC but will not replace it nor operate as a subcommittee of it. The CWTC will provide a framework for communication for both open and closed Writing Teams (WTs). Each WT may choose to be open or closed to additional members. (*Ron G., Los Angeles, CA*)

After committee feedback, ten minutes were allotted for discussion on this item. Comments were as follows:

- Requirements note there is no cost, yet reference also made to minimal costs. Speaker identified a need for clarification.
- Participants in WTs might have minimal costs to participate in WT, e.g., telephone toll charges.
- Are there writers grouped geographically waiting for guidance, or will this create effort to create WTs?
- The question posed is not addressed in the idea.
- A speaker knows the maker of this, noting WTs currently exist.
- There is a need for a system to generate ideas and this will cost money. The money issue is not clear.
- The CLC would make motions re: the creation of literature. We need the creators of literature. If you want a writing team, then create a writing team.
- Would this lighten the job of the CLC Chair?
- This is not intended to circumvent the CLC. Literature needs to go through the CLC.
- There was volatile activity at a previous ABC/M around CLC activity. It is believed that this IFD came out of that series of events. I don't see a need for this idea now. We need to simplify, rather than make things complex.

The facilitator noted this information was recorded and this item will remain on the agenda until next year. If a motion is submitted relative to the item, it will take this place on the agenda. If no motion is submitted, the item will be removed from BMIS.

06o07/05-09 Motion:

With regard to the Travel Equalization Fund (TEF) policy, to pay the same percentage travel allowance for international delegates and North American delegates. *(2004-2005 Conference Diversity Committee)*

After committee feedback, comments by the BMIS Subcommittee, and clarification on the motion, pros and cons were heard:

- The BOT has voted unanimously in favor of this motion. It is a fundamental policy to establish the principle of equality. The BOT and the Conference are committed to working together to establish a well thought out service structure that will make this a non-issue
- This breaks the TEF mechanically. Not every North American group may be able to afford the costs
- We need to look at new solutions and to encourage committees work directly with the BOT without asking the conference to address this
- This seems to be a political thing. International Intergroups pay much more than North American Intergroups to get delegates here. I view this as discrimination and want to see this pass without any cap
- I only see this motion as asking to remove the cap. It appears nothing else changes
- If this motion passes, it does not increase money available for TEF. It redistributes the money available. I suggest increasing the money available for travel, for example, groups can have more fundraisers

The first vote was: 33-3-4. There was no minority opinion. The motion passed.

06o08/05-10 Motion:

To create a scholarship fund to pay for the food, lodging, and other registration costs for one delegate to the ABC/M from each of the following countries/regions: Argentina/Uruguay, Australia/New Zealand/Singapore, Brazil, Denmark/Sweden. Germany/Netherlands, Ireland/England, Italy/Spain, and South Africa to the ABC/M 2007. (*Jason T., Montevideo, Uruguay*)

After committee feedback, comments by the BMIS Subcommittee, and clarification on the motion, an amended motion was entertained: “The BOT shall, as promptly as practicable, establish an International Delegates Fund (IDF) to supplement the total registration, travel and lodging expenses of international delegates attending Annual Business Meetings (ABM). The IDF shall supplement, not replace, the Travel Equalization Fund (TEF). The IDF may receive financial contributions from S.L.A.A. individual members, Intergroups, lone groups and F.W.S. general fund. After consultation with the F.W.S. ED and interested Conference members, the BOT shall make all final decisions on the policies, guidelines and implementation of the IDF.” After additional clarification, pros and cons were heard:

- The message is the same, the replacement speaks to how this will be done
- The BOT liaison worked with the Diversity Committee to craft the replacement motion. It Addresses how the Diversity Committee, the BOT, and the ED can work together to implement the policy. The BFOC will have difficulty implementing the original motion and will have clarity for policy implementation with the amended motion.
- The new motion talks about funding where the old motion talks about setting up a scholarship fund. This may be a good thing, but the two amendments are substantially different. I would like the originator to agree with the amended version.
- The Diversity Committee chair is the originator and worked on the amended version.

The first vote was: 34-4-2. Minority opinion was heard. Minority opinion included the following comments: I would like a less specific motion and allow BOT members the flexibility to address this situation and work out the details; Our Intergroup did not vote on the amended motion, so I would rather table this motion. A second vote was: 31-4-5. The motion was passed to insert the amended motion in place of the original motion. The motion is numbered 06o08/05-10. Pros and cons were heard regarding this motion:

- This motion gives the BOT the flexibility it needs to. It has perfect flexibility. It is a good idea to do something in the short term to encourage international participation. IN the long term, there will a much better international service structure. The word “may” is an important word. The BOT takes unrestricted funds and allocates them to specific functions. Interested people will go out and “shake the tress.”
- There is no mention how much money will go into the fund, and we need to think about that in our current financial position. I think ideas should be developed for new funds, rather than taking from existing funds.
- S.L.A.A. put previous efforts into German participation. This had a positive effect on the growth of the Fellowship in Germany. Germany has two delegates this year. To create this fund does not ask just North Americans to contribute; it asks other groups to raise money.
- I agree with encouraging international participation. We already have an existing scholarship fund without prejudice to any group with financial need. I am concerned this motion asks for inequality, whereas previous discussion asked for equality. What happens with the ABM outside of North America? North American delegates won’t have access to the scholarship fund.

- It is noted that the Diversity Committee chair is not here because he is in Uruguay and unable to afford costs to send a delegate. This is a 1st Tradition issue, In Australia, weaker groups are supported by stronger groups. The Sydney Intergroup handles outreach costs for the entire county, because other intergroups are unable to afford outreach costs. The motion should not be seen as taking away from North Americans, but helping other groups make their best efforts to get delegates here.

The first vote was: 29-5-6. Minority opinion was heard. Minority opinion included the following comment: In my Intergroup, we talked about this and overwhelmingly voted against it because of 7th Tradition – each group should be self-supporting.

A second vote was taken. It was: 27-7-6. The motion passed.

06o09/05-11 **Issue for Discussion:**

To adopt the following prayer:

Higher Power make me worthy to serve You through this Fellowship and the 12 steps.

Help me to be generous with my time and effort, to give without counting the cost, to give back wholly for what I have so freely received without looking for any reward other than that of knowing I have done Your will.

Through my service, may I give hope and peace to those that still suffer.

AMEN! (*Conference Service Committee*)

After committee feedback and comments by the BMIS Subcommittee, ten minutes were allotted for discussion on this item. Comments were as follows:

- Replace word “worthy” with “willing.” Take out first sentence out altogether, with exception of HP.
- Why another prayer? With reference to intent, members don’t have big picture about need of service work involved. There is a need to develop intent.
- “Amen” is really Christian. It needs to be open to a God of our understanding.
- Tradition 4 states that if a group likes the prayer, it can adopt it. There is no need for a motion to adopt a prayer.
- For me, it could be misunderstood as a prayer of codependency. Doing service is for my own recovery. I remain vigilant to maintain boundaries. I don’t like this prayer.
- The BOT, as an autonomous group, chose to use this at end of BOT meetings.
- I entered this program as atheist. I have an issue with prayer. I am against all mention of prayer.
- Resistance to wording “...through God’s will...”. It was God’s will that brought me to the program with lots of pain. God’s will does not include just good things.
- If this is intended to get people to participate in service, this is blackmail. Service attracts people when you see people grow in service. I am not sure if this prayer works to attract members.
- The prayer wording is inappropriate. We are not just religious based. There is a shame base – if you don’t do this, you are being selfish. With reference to the St. Francis prayer in the 12x12, it speaks of giving of self. Service is natural to gaining sobriety. Prayer makes me uncomfortable.
- I will offer another prayer that is service based. An alternate prayer was read:
Prayer for a Trusted Servant

“Higher Power: I ask for your guidance in carrying out this work in service to the Fellowship. Relieve me of the burdens of my ego and perfectionism. Grant me the Grace of Humility. Remind me to put principles before personalities. Help me to focus only on the greater good of the Fellowship. Let me know that I am responsible only for doing the leg work, not the outcome. Give me the Faith to Trust in You and our Group Conscience and, Grant me the Serenity to accept the things I cannot change, courage to change the things I can, and the wisdom to know the difference.” We use this other prayer in our German intergroup.

The facilitator noted this information was recorded and this item will remain on the agenda until next year. If a motion is submitted relative to the item, it will take this place on the agenda. If no motion is submitted, the item will be removed from BMIS.

After announcements and a short break, the “Fireside Chat” BOT was held: Main points from the “chat” are summarized as follows:

- The BOT is thinking about trying to effectively determine or come up with ideas for structure that more adequately addresses international organization. 90% of our representation is from North America at ABC/Ms. This is not necessarily the most effective way to address international concerns. The BOT looking at an international service structure and in what way can the organization be changed to more adequately address the international community. The BOT is requesting feedback and ideas on how to make representation more balanced. This may include travel of BOT members to other regions. It may also include conversation with other 12-Step groups. The end result might be regionalization with other areas having their own ABM and FWS office.
- A brief history of the financial struggles of the Fellowship was shared. There is more effort put into fundraising by past and present BOT members as they see the importance of getting appropriate funding for the FWS office to operate. The Board Finance and Operating Committee (BFOC) has developed a strategy that included a service structure framework with two fundraising coordinators (BOT Chair, FWS ED), that would be empowered to delegate responsibilities. There would be a Group Service Development Coordinator and an Individual Service Develop Coordinator who would be responsible for developing strategies for fundraising. Fundraising strategy would include raising money but also in fundraising as service in actions and efforts by: 1.) Fundraising involving working one-on-one with specific individuals in addition to current practices. Some of this was done for getting money for FWS office move; 2.) Size of contributions accepted. Contributions to general fund capped at 12k per person per year. Contributions to the endowment fund are not capped. We may consider raising or eliminating cap on general fund, or putting cap on endowment fund; and 3.) Question of existence and/or size of endowment fund. Currently, the endowment fund is \$250K with a mix of stocks and bonds. That money is withdrawn at 5% per annum in four installments to the general fund. There was a great effort to include a discussion about the Traditions (5,7,2,9,1) as it relates to fundraising.

The conference had 30 minutes for a question and answer period.

Once this session ended, the floor was open to nominations for the BOT. Alice D. and Brian R. self nominated (Brian R later withdrew his nomination). Additional clarification questions about the election were answered, after which the conference continued with the Business Meeting Item Summary, Phase II.

06o10/05-12 Issue For Discussion:

The Conference approve active participation with the IFF on a web site for concurrent listing of active S.L.A.A. meetings (by city and area). The IFF is starting a conjugate web site for all the S and CO-S fellowships listing. Will S.L.A.A. participate? (*Conference Interfellowship Committee*)

After committee feedback and comments from the BMIS Subcommittee, ten minutes were allotted for discussion on this item. Comments were as follows:

- I've worked with the IFF for almost 5 years. It is daunting task as an individual. There is a lot to be gained. The cooperation between S.A.A. and S.L.A.A. is the kind of cooperation that we are looking for. This is the "not reinventing the wheel" effort we're looking for. There are about 11 "S" groups and 6 "Co-S" groups. In comparison, there is only 1 AA.
- Isn't the website (IFF) up now? If this does become a motion, it would be nice to identify the web address.
- Our Traditions allow cooperation with other organizations. There is a concern for the focus on "S" Fellowships. We are based on AA. We can gain much from AA. AA literature is only recommended literature. If we're putting out energy, we need to cooperate with all 12 Step Fellowships, rather than just the "S" groups. We need to focus on the solution, rather than the problem.
- There has been reference to intergroups in several areas (e.g., Denver, Atlanta) that act as clearinghouse for other "S" fellowships. There is an opportunity to carry the message and spread the word. It's our responsibility to get it out there, as long as we are mindful of Traditions.
- I am concerned about an S.L.A.A. description being developed by someone other than S.L.A.A. members.

The facilitator noted this information was recorded and this item will remain on the agenda until next year. If a motion is submitted relative to the item, it will take this place on the agenda. If no motion is submitted, the item will be removed from BMIS.

06o11/05-13 Issue For Discussion:

The Conference approve listing of our literature on a master list for distribution to other S-groups, general web posting, and for availability for therapists and professionals. This is an annotated list with a short description of the literature, its contents and where it is available.

The Interfellowship Forum (IFF) will be forging a Master list of all literature and pamphlets for distribution within all S-Fellowships. (*Conference Interfellowship Committee*)

After committee feedback and comments from the BMIS Subcommittee, ten minutes were allotted for discussion on this item. Comments were as follows:

- This seems like a carrying the message issue. In Toronto, the AA office gives out S.L.A.A. information to those who speak of such problems. Likewise, S.L.A.A. Toronto tells people of AA.
- I'm wondering why this is limited to "S" Fellowships, rather than to "Co-Fellowships."
- It would be nice to have annotated list accessible on our website.
- This would help someone that is like me. The DC area is moving to cooperation with other 12 Step Fellowships.
- There was reference to www.coloradoservice.org for "S" group references in Colorado.

The facilitator noted this information was recorded and this item will remain on the agenda until next year. If a motion is submitted relative to the item, it will take this place on the agenda. If no motion is submitted, the item will be removed from BMIS.

06o12/05-14 Issue For Discussion:

The Conference approve co-fellowship participation within the IFF. At present, this would mean co-fellowships would send a representative and would participate in phone teleconferencing. The IFF would encourage the co-fellowships to fund and support a web site of their own.

S.L.A.A. has its own relationship with Co-S fellowships. We need to support the IFF level participation within this relationship. (*Conference Interfellowship Committee*).

After committee feedback and comments from the BMIS Subcommittee, ten minutes were allotted for discussion on this item. Comments were as follows:

- The Omaha area Intergroup has expressed concern about a “Co-S” Fellowship that is not part of this Fellowship. This is not our business.
- In Germany, we do not support Co-S.L.A.A. meetings. However, partners are invited to open S.L.A.A. meetings.
- The CT Intergroup has supported Co-S.L.A.A. for many years and coordinated with Co-S.L.A.A. for recovery conventions.
- I’ve experienced confusion when we put Co-S.L.A.A. themes in meetings. I’d be glad to focus only on S.L.A.A.
- It sounds like they would encourage Co-S fellowships to fund a common website.
- Co-S.L.A.A. is not part of this conference. I don’t know who made this IFD. I think it is out of place; we are stepping over a boundary.
- I’m interpreting this as that “S” fellowships participating in the IFF are encouraging Co-S to participate in the IFF. Are we OK with Co-S.L.A.A. participating in IFF?

The facilitator noted this information was recorded and this item will remain on the agenda until next year. If a motion is submitted relative to the item, it will take this place on the agenda. If no motion is submitted, the item will be removed from BMIS.

This meeting was adjourned after announcements, a moment of silence, and the Serenity Prayer.

General Assembly Reconvenes, July 27, 2006, 8:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

The meeting started with a moment of silence and the Serenity Prayer in Italian. The 12 Steps and 12 Traditions were read. Rob K. was the micro for this session, Karma K., the macro, and Scott S. as the back-up. Assignment of roles was as follows: Timekeeper- Jack S. and Kim B.; Spiritual Reminder- Zoe M.; Record Keeper- Andrew H. & Deb W.; Vote Counters- Juanita J. and Terri B. Phase II continued. There were 36 voting members at start of session.

06o13/05-15 Issue For Discussion:

The Conference consider a voting member or member from the on line meetings. We have an increasing penetration in the on line areas. We have no representation from these groups which are represented worldwide. There is no paradigm for representation. There is no connection to FWS. Other S-Fellowships have managed their roles with on line fellowships in areas of representation and contribution. (*Conference Interfellowship Committee*) After committee

feedback and comments from the BMIS Subcommittee, ten minutes were allotted for discussion on this item. The CCC offered the following comment: “Provided any group, online or otherwise, is registered with F.W.S. as an S.L.A.A. group, they may send a delegate as a lone group (which acts as its own intergroup). Should two or more online groups form an online intergroup, they would fall under that same structure as any other intergroup per the By-laws Article IV, Section 1a, and Article V, Section 5a. For the purpose of representation at the ABM, they are no different than any other groups or intergroups beyond their method of meeting (online vs. face-to-face.)” Other comments were as follows:

- I agree with CCC response that there should be representation for these meetings. The question is about funding.
- Online meetings have been struggling with Tradition 7 collections.
- I recognize Tradition 7 problems. I encourage direct contributions to go directly to FWS. This is difficult situation for voting because of mixed 12 Step group participation.
- Online groups are valuable resource. We need, as a Conference to acknowledge that they are S.L.A.A. Some are trying to figure out how many people out there and how many reps can be sent. Other “S” fellowships have same challenge. This is an enormous outreach opportunity that includes international representation, diversity, and 15 languages used.
- Having misused the internet, online meetings are a valuable resource, as strict guidelines are enforced by the moderator. In small communities with no meetings, this is important resource.
- I think the issue of revenue and Tradition7 is about carrying the message.
- My suggestion is to state Tradition 7 at the start of the meeting and to suggest a donation being \$xx.xx.
- A suggestion for the next Conference is to dovetail with international outreach and new members. I suggest the BOT proactively contact one of the online meetings to invite them to the Conference for better Conference knowledge.

The facilitator noted this information was recorded and this item will remain on the agenda until next year. If a motion is submitted relative to the item, it will take this place on the agenda. If no motion is submitted, the item will be removed from BMIS.

06o14/05-16 **Issue For Discussion:**

Discuss the issues of accountability and fiscal responsibility with regard to credit card use by FWS. (*Scott D., Costa Mesa, CA – Delegate*)

After committee feedback and comments from the BMIS Subcommittee, ten minutes were allotted for discussion on this item. Comments were as follows:

- The ED clarified use of the FWS credit card and current policies. The FWS office has one credit card, an American Express, which is only used to pay for large expense items such as the down payment for the ABM or travel expenses for the BOT to the ABM. The office then pays that balance at the end of the month in order to avoid costly interest and fees. Additionally, by using the card for these purposes, we gain mileage and receive free travel for the BOT and thus savings for the fellowship at large. The controls on this card are as follows: the ED can use the card for expenses up to \$1000 without asking for BOT approval. Expenses higher than \$1000 need to go through the BF&OC and/or full BOT.

Delegates asked additional questions of clarification regarding what had been stated by the ED which were satisfactorily answered by the ED and the BOT. Q&A included the following:

- Who is Richard C.? A current BOT member and chair of the BFOC.
- Why do we need an American Express card? An American Express card is vendor friendly and can be used for online purchases and for hotel reservations. There are many controls in place to insure it is not abused.

We appreciate people keeping tabs on the BOT and FWS. There were no other comments. The facilitator noted this information was recorded and this item will remain on the agenda until next year. If a motion is submitted relative to the item, it will take this place on the agenda. If no motion is submitted, the item will be removed from BMIS.

06o15/05-17 **Issue for Discussion:**

How do we nurture concepts of service as part of the spiritual path undertaken. (*Andrew H., Elizabethtown, KY*)

After committee feedback and comments from the BMIS Subcommittee, ten minutes were allotted for discussion on this item. Comments were as follows:

- Owner stated that the humility and anonymity seems to be missing at the ABM and Conference level.
- The motion that follows is a good example of this.
- I am concerned about anonymity. This can create resentment and hold back service.
- Anonymity is talked about as “confidentiality” and placing principles above personalities. Anonymity is a way to achieve humility and is a right size existence of power. The way anonymity achieves that is to take the ego and the personality out.
- I have seen committees self-destruct due to personalities and I have to leave the ego at home. We are here to serve the Fellowship.
- I was not comfortable with others sharing their acting out stories.
- The purple list has my name on it and I was not asked.
- Anonymity does not mean using my last name. But when we are involved in service, we are surrounded by society. Anonymity goes beyond the last name and privacy, anonymity is not secrecy.
- In another fellowship, we use both last and first names.
- In planning the LPC, I had to visit this issue. Does the hotel know who we are?
- I have gratitude for everybody here. It is important to know that I am a part of the greater whole.
- Tradition 12 refers to confidentiality and humility. Bill introduced this by the word of “Sacrifice.” We need to make the sacrifices and take an honest assessment of strengths and weaknesses. The challenge of this is that I am vastly able to be of service more than what my ego can carry.
- I was asked for all this information. I had to start to let go and trust that HP will watch over me. Every time I step through the doors to do service, there is humility and grace to make contact and trust that contact. There is unsaid trust.
- Anonymity is meant to strike a balance between privacy and getting the word out.

There was a suggestion to move 06o18/05-20 Issue for Discussion here. There was an objection to this.

The facilitator noted this information was recorded and this item will remain on the agenda until next year. If a motion is submitted relative to the item, it will take this place on the agenda. If no motion is submitted, the item will be removed from BMIS.

06o16/05-18 Motion:

Revise recognition of contributions (both group and individual), to remove the tier structure as well as the donor's name and instead state “Anonymous”, location and amount. (*Andrew H., Elizabethtown, KY*)

After committee feedback, comments by the BMIS Subcommittee, and clarification on the motion, pros and cons were heard:

- Let's streamline the process and save some trees. There needs to be anonymity and humility when donating.
- If we do not use names and contributions and how we thank people for their service, wording is confusing. The intent is thanking people for their service.
- We need to take special care in Tradition 12 and this supports anonymity.
- Using a first name and initial is not a violation of Tradition 12. The Fellowship needs to be recognized and an option to remain anonymous is in place. There is evidence that listed contributions helps to increase contributions.
- We use the Traditions to get we want to happen and I think that this is the case here. We want to increase our membership for good spiritual reasons. The tier system perpetuates a misuse of power. For example, we don't publish a document with the names of the BOT and the hours of service (a tier system). Humility is not supported. We can give people thanks and acknowledgement another way.
- We are not anonymous from each other and I do not mind seeing my name next to a contribution.

A first vote was taken: 11-20-8. Minority opinion was heard. It included the following comments: There is no humility in a tiered structure, only power and prestige and it is fine in other institutions, but not here; I don't want to see my name here, I am horrified to see my name in print here; I get a letter of thanks from the office and that is enough, I did not know I had the option of remaining anonymous; There are other methods of fundraising that we do not use that could better get greater financial support and embrace unity, humility and funding; It is a slight to those that can only put coins in the basket when contributions are listed; Large donations should remain quiet, a contribution is between me and God; This attaches a person to the value of a contribution and this needs to stay out of our community.

A second vote was taken: 15-18-5. There was a challenge to group conscience. The facilitator called for a single vote to determine group conscience. The vote was 24-13. It was determined that the vote was group conscience. The motion failed.

06o17/05-19 Motion:

Publish contributions to endowment fund separately from contributions to FWS/S.L.A.A. (*Andrew H., Elizabethtown, KY*)

After committee feedback, comments by the BMIS Subcommittee, and clarification on the motion, pros and cons were heard:

- There is confusion about the endowment fund and how monies relate to the Fellowship and how it used
- Anything that encourages existence of endowment fund is good and so is a separate list.

A first vote was taken: 29-1-8. There was no minority opinion offered. The motion passed.

06o18/05-20 Issue For Discussion:

In light of the special relationship between S.L.A.A. and Co-S.L.A.A. (ref. Co-S.L.A.A. Tradition 12) to what degree is it appropriate to honor this relationship and which entity/ies should be the steward(s) of the relationship between S.L.A.A. and Co-S.L.A.A.? (*Conference Interfellowship Committee*)

After committee feedback and comments from the BMIS Subcommittee, ten minutes were allotted for discussion on this item. Comments are as follows:

- We have an active Co-S.L.A.A. Whenever we have a recovery event, we ask for their participation. We have spouses speak at events. It is important to offer hope to the spouses of the addict.
- What is Co-S.L.A.A.? Where is it, what do they do, and what is the relationship with S.L.A.A.?
- We need representation here for more information.
- There is a relationship with AA and Alanon. We could have the same.
- S.L.A.A. does not have the responsibility to have a relationship with Co-S.L.A.A.. We should remain two separate groups. We have two separate 12 and 12s.
- We have special relationship with other 12 Step groups and they are supportive of those relationships. We could have that same relationship at the level of the FWS office for information purposes.
- Co-S.L.A.A. is not the same as COSA.
- Our local newsletter publishes contact info of Co-S.L.A.A. and invites them to the S.L.A.A. Intergroup meetings.
- AA and Alanon are separated by a hallway. This is recognition that there are similarities and not differences.
- We should give out the same help to a co-sex addict.

The facilitator noted this information was recorded and this item will remain on the agenda until next year. If a motion is submitted relative to the item, it will take this place on the agenda. If no motion is submitted, the item will be removed from BMIS.

06n19/06-01 Motion:

Motion to amend the By-Law Article XIV. (*Conference Charter Committee*)

New: The Conference may make, amend or repeal these By-Laws, in whole or in part, by a two-thirds vote of all authorized voters who have checked in at the Annual Business Conference. In event of a legal emergency, the Trustees may make, amend, or repeal these By-Laws, in whole or in part, at any regular or special meeting if at least five days written notice is given of the intention to alter, amend, or repeal, or to adopt new By-Laws at such meeting. Any emergency By-Law change adopted by the Trustees must be confirmed by a two-thirds vote of all authorized voters who have checked in at the Annual Business Conference.

Andrew H. served as micro and Scott S. as macro for this motion.

After committee feedback and comments from the BMIS Subcommittee, pros and cons were heard:

- The wording in a bylaw change was changed to reflect a more legally confident position, but not another part.
- This raises the bar for any motion either made by the BOT or the conference in a vote that binds the BOT.

A first vote was taken: 36-0-2. The motion passed.

After announcements, the General Assembly was adjourned for lunch.

General Assembly Reconvenes, July 27, 2006, 1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

This session started with a moment of silence and the Serenity Prayer. Rob K. was the micro for this session, Danielle P., the macro, and Karma K. as the back-up. Assignment of roles was as follows: Timekeeper- Jack S.; Spiritual Reminder- Zoe M.; Record Keeper- Andrew H. & Deb W.; Vote Counters- Juanita J. and Terri B. There was a presentation by the CCC about the responsibilities of a Conference Committee Chair, after which, business was continued.

06n20/06-02 Motion:

Approve as Conference Approved Literature the “Setting Bottom Lines” pamphlet, as submitted. (*Conference Literature Committee*)

After committee feedback and comments from the BMIS Subcommittee, pros and cons were heard:

- This doesn't need to be perfect. It is just a good tool. I want to see it published tomorrow. I would love that our perfectionism would not make this take longer.
- I agree that I don't want it to be hung up. One issue is the reading comprehension level and the use of basic language. It doesn't flow well, It is halting. This may result in a poor view of the material. I do hope grammatical errors can be fixed prior to printing. I hope the reading comprehension problems can be addressed for English use and translation. I know it is meant to be basic. It isn't a difficult concept, but the material is difficult.
- The CLC took this into consideration, using Plain language. It is directed at a 4th or 5th grade level. Also, it is important to consider the patterns referenced and important to understand the patterns in order to get to understanding bottom lines.
- When it comes to the readability level, it behooves us to set it high rather than low.
- I have seen snippets of this pamphlet for years, and watched as it helped many women set bottom lines. I have not had something so beautiful that could help with setting bottom lines. I feel strongly about this pamphlet. Some people have trouble, may slip, and not make it back.

A first vote was taken: 35-0-3. The motion passed.

06n21/06-03 Motion:

For FWS to publish, distribute to all groups and Intergroups, and make available to the fellowship, in as many ways as possible, this statement, as follows, clarifying the 2002 Policy on Non-Conference Approved Literature: “This group uses the following non-conference approved literature (list the literature...). This literature is not approved by The S.L.A.A. Conference, but is suggested for this meeting through group conscience.” (*Conference Steps & Traditions Committee*)

After committee feedback and comments from the BMIS Subcommittee, pros and cons were heard:

- There were several inquiries about what to do about conference approved literature. This is only offered to those who are asking. There are those that do not have strong feelings about this. The motion does not express judgment on non-conference approved literature, just that it exists.
- There was concern this would give approval because it was written.

- This ties well with an earlier Conference decision regarding non-Conference approved literature and subsequent BOT action. This will help reinforce the earlier message.
- We continue to need literature. However, we still need lots more literature until we can honestly say no use at all. The BOT supports this motion.

A first vote was taken: 31-7-0. Minority opinion was heard: It included the following comments: This feels redundant; By group conscience, we have non-conference approved literature, I don't want this read at the beginning of the meeting, we already know it, I have to accept my meeting's group conscience; Tampa Bay Intergroup was against this motion; We have no Conference approved literature in our meeting, I think this statement prioritizes non Conference approved literature over Conference approved literature; it is confusing to the newcomer. A second vote was taken. 24-9-4. The motion passed.

After a moment of silence and the Serenity Prayer, the General Assembly was adjourned.

General Assembly Reconvenes, July 27, 2006, 7:15 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

The micro for this session was Danielle P. and the macro was Chris D., members of the Board Governance and Nominating Committee (BG&NC). Recognition of outgoing BOT members was held. BOT nominees were interviewed by the Conference in preparation for BOT elections on 7-28-06. The silent and live auctions were held afterward as F.W.S. fundraisers.

General Assembly, July 28, 2005, 8:30 a.m. – 9:40 a.m.

The meeting opened with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer. There were readings of the 12 Steps, in Canadian English, and 12 Traditions. The facilitators of the meeting were: Rob K. (micro), Karma K. (macro), and Roger R. (back-up). Role assignments were as follows: Time Keeper-Sam A.; Spiritual Reminder- Irv B.; Record Keeper- Deb W. The BG&NC stepped in for the purpose of conducting the vote for the BOT. The voting options were described; for three three-year term seats were Leon C., Alice D, and Brian D., and confirmation of the appointed BOT were Dan A., Stephen S. to complete 2-year terms and Scott S. to a 1-year term. The ballots were distributed. After the delegates cast their ballots, the BG&NC collected the ballots and departed the room with the observer to count the votes. Jack S. volunteered to be the impartial vote observer.

After their departure, the facilitators continued with the agenda. The Conference was informed as to the expectations of committees in regards to committee budgets, committee expenses, and committee accountability. It was strongly suggested to the Conference to set the first meeting in order to maintain the "energy" created at the ABM. Information regarding conference calls was discussed. A list of all committees and their pass codes was distributed. Phone etiquette on conference calls was reviewed. The fiscal year (October 1, 2006-September 30, 2007) was outlined for the committees. The CFC chair discussed the importance of collecting the committee budgets from each committee. Committees were encouraged to spend the money that is allotted to them. The CCC chair also stated that each committee needs to create a roster and turn copies of those rosters to the F.W.S. office. The CCC Chair discussed the vote that will take place to confirm all Conference committees. The CCC chair reminded committees of the

Adopt-A-Committee program. All committees were informed about the CCC committee chairs calls and each chair was encouraged to attend.

The BG&NC announced the election results, Brian D., Dan A., Scott S., and Stephen S. as the BOT members voted in at this conference.

Questions were entertained from the conference members about conference work. Members were encouraged to sign up as a volunteer by using the volunteer sheet, located in the packet. The *Journal* editor reminded members to turn in articles. The Conference recognized the CCC for their facilitation of this event. This session was adjourned for final committee meetings and lunch with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer.

General Assembly, July 28, 2006, 1:00 p.m. – 2:15 p.m.

This session was opened with a moment of silence and the Serenity Prayer in Spanish. This session was facilitated by Jack S. (CCC Chair), Danielle P. (BOT Chair), and Karma K. (CFC Chair). Roles were assigned: Andreas D. - Timekeeper; Bruce H.- Spiritual Reminder; Deb W.- Record Keeper. Vote counters were Katharina V. and Leon G. The Conference Committee BOT Liaisons were announced as being:

- CAC:
- CBC: Scott S.
- CCC: Danielle P.
- CFC: Richard C.
- CIC: Brian D.
- CLC: Scott S.
- CPiC: Chris D.
- CSC: Brian D.
- CSPC:
- CSTC: Dan A.
- CDC: Richard C.
- CJC: Chris D.
- HRC: Stephen S.
- ICC: Dan A.
- IFC: Chris D.
- MRBOTC: Scott S.
- MRC: Stephen S.
- POC: Stephen S.

Committees were asked to identify the following: Chair / co-chair(s); Budget requests; First scheduled meeting; Projects; and Goals. They are summarized in the following table:

Committee	Chair/Co-chairs	Budget Request	1 st Scheduled Mtg.	Projects/Goals
CAC	Michael J./Karma K.	\$1200	8-27-06 9pmE	Pamphlets on the solutions; updating website
CCC	Jack S.	\$3500	8-20-06 10:30amE	BMIS; ABM scheduling; process
CFC	Karma K.	\$200	TBA	Create 2007 budget; update charter; update 2006 budget
CIC	Robin S.		TBA	Research other sites; design guidelines for safe surfing; review and update committee site; podcasting in text and language; <i>Journal</i> online
CLC	Tom D./Alice D.	\$3860	8-20-06 10:30amE Pc 121138	
CPiC	Bruce H.	\$400	9-9-06	Intergroup Public Information Kit

			12noonE	
CSTC	Liz D.	\$400	3 rd Sunday of the month at 8pmE	Crystalize process of S&T; ongoing support to S&T inquiries; mechanism for storage of documents; develop 12 & 12; create outline of Steps and Traditions 1-6
CDC	Jacinthe L.	\$1845	8-19-06 5:30pE	Catalog of mtg. formats; POC pamphlet; international service structure; fantasy addiction
CJC	Kim B.	\$1000	8-20-06 6pmE	Who we are?; develop functional areas and processes in Journal preparation; feedback from survey; outreach for submissions
HRC	Stephen D./Alice D.	\$1200	8-20-06 12noonP	E-newsletter; healthy dating and relationships literature
ICC	Michael J.	\$2000	8-12-06 7pmE	Intergroup newsletter; internet newsletter on a webpage; intergroup web forum; correspond with intergroups
IFC	Juanita J./mentor-Tom D.		8-06-06 8pmE	Representative to IFF; phone contacts
MRBOTC	Rita H./Dee G.		TBA	Improve communication between BOT and Conference
MRC	Brian R./Carey C.	\$1000	8-27-06 12noonE	Sponsorship workbook; Step chips 2-12
POC	Dave McM.	\$385	8-4-06 8pmE	Pen pals

The facilitators asked the following question in order to vote whether we confirm the list of Conference Committees: Do we confirm the following committees?

- CAC:
- CBC:
- CCC
- CFC
- CIC:
- CLC:
- CPiC:
- CSC
- CSPC
- CSTC:
- DC
- JC
- HRC
- ICC
- IFC
- MRBOTC
- MRC
- POC

The result of the vote: 36 yes, 0 no.

Announcements were made. \$2195 was raised by fundraisers held during the ABM.

After time for announcements, the Conference was closed with a moment of silence and the Serenity Prayer.

The CCC would like to address and/or note the following items as footnotes to the 2006 ABM minutes:

- Motion 05o09/04-15 was tabled by the originator of that Motion in 2005 to be addressed in 2006. This was a Motion in 2005, yet was reflected in the 2006 BMIS as an IFD, and so was treated as such in the course of business. This error in translation from 2005 to 2006 explains why this ‘IFD’ went to Phase II when other IFD’s from 2005 were removed from the agenda during Phase I in 2006.