Proposal 7

Short presentation given by a member of the proposing group.
- This came up since WSO said they needed more income. The original is 60/30/10 so we proposed it change yet the numbers can be discussed.

Discussion Points
- A lot of us are functioning without a region, or an intergroup, so right now WSO gets 100% of our excess. I think this will shift as more IGs and regions form. Has that eventuality been considered?
- Our group thinks it is premature to change these with COVID over the past years and WSO should not change until 2023 at the next ABC.
- The current recommended formula is 60 to IGs and 40 to WSO, which is insufficient in two ways. Regions are being developed, and they need to be included. Second, this does not address groups that do not have an IG or Region. I think the formula should be 50/25/25 which is equitable and includes IGs and Regions.
- Point of Order: There is a provision if there is a region in place it is 30%. Historically it has been 60% to intergroups, 30% to regions and 10% to WSO.
- I’m concerned because (a) regions are just developing, and (b) there’s no reason that I can see that regions need the money. I haven’t seen any regional events advertised. Giving the region more than WSO is a misuse of funds.
- All of the meetings are autonomous and we can give any input we prefer. We are a region and have been giving to WSO since we have not had any events. We do hope to have events soon.
- I feel that regardless, WSO needs more money, and Regions don’t need more money than what they have or than WSO.
- The bigger issue is the 7th tradition is not being emphasized enough and we are having so many new people. I prefer to let things be and have the finance people come up with how we proceed. Also, I am doing research on online donations.
- My experience is that we tend to give in our own country, so it doesn’t flow to WSO. Other meetings that I attend throughout the world tend to keep a prudent reserve and send it to WSO. I think it should go to the treasurer of the groups to determine where to send it.
- The web meetings are exploding and so I would like to see the “brick and mortar” meetings be separated from the online meetings.
- In the original regions, money was not coming into regions so they had to have their own fundraisers, which took a lot of extra energy from those doing service in regions, which resulted in the regions dying due to lack of funding. The original 60/30/10 is my option.
- It was said the information I gave was incorrect about the percentages. I challenge this based on what it states on a current tri-fold.
My experience is that I get more benefit from the Intergroups, who do special meetings, so I’d be in favor of keeping 60% for IGs.

I don’t feel like I have any information about what the funds are needed for.

I’m not clear as a delegate what the current status is, or what the opportunities are. I’d like clarification re: current state vs. options. Also, the inverted flow of donations, so even if donations are given to IGs, they would also donate to regions and/or WSO.

Meetings are autonomous and many operate without any support from WSO so it should be up to them what they give. Also, there needs to be more transparency as to where the WSO money is going.

Treasurer: in a current sheet on the ACA website it states 60/30/10 percentages.

Parliamentarian: the percentages in the proposal can not be changed.
Based on the above vote, this proposal will not move forward.