

Proposal 1

Short presentation given by a member of the proposing group: no one present.

Discussion Points

- I have a number of objections. This is not clear about how many documents are being referred to - I tried to obtain this information from the proposing group with no results. Fellowship review is an existing and defined process. It is a process documented in OPPM. This process would subvert the well defined process that is already underway for other documents. 3. We have an open literature policy. If people want to go to the archives to get these documents, they can get it readily. I don't agree that they need to go through fellowship review and conference approval.
- The literature review committee has a vigorous review process and to go back to a minimal process would be where I don't think we should go. Those who wrote the BRB did not use all the used the best materials that they had at the time.
- 3:22ET
- I do not support this. It is perfectly appropriate with the new archiving software to find this material.
- For the sake of unity and transparency, I think the literature process should be followed for all literature.
- I strongly oppose this. The existing process involves the entire fellowship and allows them to review for three years. It's one of the most inclusive procedures I know of. I think this would be a huge step backwards. Plus it is very vague and doesn't define exactly what they mean. Additionally, there is nothing preventing the proposers from submitting these pieces to the existing literature review process.
- There is a way for people to do this right now called "volunteering" so there is absolutely no need for this and that we keep things as simple as possible.
- I don't know what they mean by "pre-2006 anonymous program material" ... we have what was left after one store room was destroyed, and we did lose a lot of stuff. But if it is referring to anything else, it has not been given to us.
- When I spoke with proposer last night, it sounded like it was referring to her writings and when I asked what other literature this included, I did not receive a response. I have concerns about what kind of content it would be if we go forward with this proposal. It would need to be in compliance with the 12 Traditions and it may not be up to standards or style in terms of how we now refer to race and gender and ethnicity, etc.

Poll #1

Proposal 1 - 2022

Adult Children of Alcoholics and Dysfunctional Families

July 23, 2022 at 3:31pm — July 23, 2022 at 3:33pm

(GMT-05:00) EASTERN TIME (US & CANADA)

Completed Administrator Closed Early

47 ballots submitted of 136 eligible voters (2 opened) — 35%
0 notices queued

We propose that, upon signing WSO's 2020 revised copyright release, any (non-religious, non- treatment facility) pre-2006 anonymous ACA/ACoA Twelve-Step program materials may be put up for direct fellowship review on the ACA Literature page of adultchildren.org for a period of three years, subject only to Literature Committee vetting for compliance with the ACA Twelve Traditions. PLURALITY

I support the spirit of the Ballot Proposal and would like a Motion to be crafted for approval at the ABC	1 vote (2.1%)
More information is needed. I prefer a motion to be crafted to initiate an in-depth study that will report to a future ABC	3 votes (7.1%)
I would like a motion to be crafted to delegate this matter to the ACA World Service Board for assessment and possible action that could be taken before the next ABC	0 votes (0%)
I do not support the Ballot Proposal in any form	38 votes (90.5%)

I do not support the Ballot Proposal in any form wins with 90.5% of the vote.

42 votes tallied and 5 abstentions

Based on the above vote, this proposal will not move forward.