

February 2013
Report from Southern California World Service
Conference Structure Thought Force

This is our charge:

**Is the current Area structure providing
the spiritual bridge we need to expand
into the future in order to meet the
needs of the Area?**

Area Structure

- **1963, Delegate Helen W. took California's request to split into two areas to the World Service Conference.**
- **1964 the World Service Conference approved the split into California North and California South**
- **Then: 69 meetings in CA(N) and 149 meetings in CA(S)**
- **Now: 900 meetings in CA(N) and 1,242 meetings in CA(S).**
- **No structure change is off limits provided it does not affect policy on pages 75-121 of the "Al-Anon Alateen Service Manual 2010-2013".**
- **Any changes that affect the WS Conference must be submitted by December 15 of any year. Area pays all additional costs.**

What do we know about our members' needs?

- **More participation and communication in the Area.**
- **Manageable assemblies with more time.**
- **Convenient location and less travel time**
- **Improve members' understanding of Assembly function**

What do we know about our resources?

- **Abundance of talent (undetermined amount of participation).**
- **Diverse population and sporadic density**
- **Large population (over 1200 Groups in CA(S))**
- **Transportation benefits and challenges in both metropolitan and rural areas (trains, congestion, gas prices, hotels).**

What do we know about our resources?

- **Financial resources**
- **A rich history in the form of members.**
- **Technological advancement potential to facilitate the flow of information.**

What do we know about our culture or environment?

- **We are culturally diverse with over 300 Spanish speaking Groups and other non-English speaking Groups**
- **Traffic and long commutes discourages participation .**
- **Area and Group Financial resources cover mileage reimbursement.**

What are the implications of our choices? Pros and Cons?

PROS:

- **Possibly less travel time.**
- **Possibly more manageable Assemblies**
- **Possibly an increase in GR participation.**
- **Spiritual representation is not about geography**
- **Avoids creating any new problems**
- **It currently works!**

What are the implications of our choices? Pros and Cons?

CONS:

- **There may be choices we have not explored**
- **“Good leadership cannot function well in a poorly designed structure.” Page 191 of “Al-Anon Alateen Service Manual 2010-2013”.**
- **Difficulty in redesigning the area geographically .**
- **Financial impacts and other challenges are unknown.**
- **Would require considerable work.**
- **Could cause disputes in the fellowship.**

What do we not know about this issue that we wish we did?

- **Is six years enough? Too much? What if the project fails after six years?**
- **Will it be worth the time, cost and effort to evaluate?**
- **Does the fellowship want a smaller service Area? Are they dissatisfied now?**
- **Does distance really affect participation?**
- **What are the Groups' wants and needs?**
- **What other Areas would be affected?**
- **What effect would a restructure have on CA(N)?**

A question to ask yourself:

Is your group being served?

Another question to ask yourself:

**What does a well served group
look like?**

Finally – Presume Good Will.