

## Quarterly Delegate Meeting Minutes

### December 7, 2024

[Optional time before start of meeting when ABC committee members were available to answer questions about the agenda or voting process].

#### Opening:

- Serenity Prayer – [Link-Delegate Binder \(DB\), p4](#)
- Diversity Statement – [Link-Delegate Binder, p12](#)
- Commitment to Service Reading – [Link-DB, p10](#)

*Notice: Meeting is Recorded*

#### Introductions

- WSO Co-Chair Introductions - Carmen and William
- Parliamentarian - Kaz
- Timekeeper(s) - Edmundas and Dalibor
- Points of Information - Charlie and Marcus
- Points of Order - Charlie H.
- Point of Safety - Denise and Erin
- Secretary - Karin O.

#### Technology Briefing - [Link-Introduction to Tech Information](#)

- Introduce tech team
- Raised hands/reactions
- Tech help questions
- Website page
- How to change language
- How to save chat transcript

#### Setting the tone

#### Zoom etiquette

- [Safety protocol](#)
- Zoom etiquette
  - o Minimize distractions
  - o Neutral Zoom background
  - o Renaming yourself

**Established Quorum - Quorum established at 53 Delegates** *(Note: there were 31 observers present too)*

#### Reviewed Agenda

**ABC Sustainability Study Group** – Presented report on Aug. 2024 information, progress, and overview of Dec. 2024 meeting (especially, how the December meeting relates to delegate input)

[Motion Establishing ABC Sustainability Study Group](#)

[Sustainability Study Group PowerPoint](#)

[Relevant Sections of August QDM Survey](#)

#### Questions/Comments

- Thank you for the hard work. It's inspiring to see what we have accomplished and as an adult child we just want to be heard.

#### Confirmation Process for Fellowship Group Voting (Name Study Motion)

[Link-Motions Passed Related to Fellowship Group Voting-Name Study](#)

- Reviewed plan for disseminating name change to fellowship—PowerPoint presentation by Ken R.- see: [Fellowship Group Voting Process Presentation & Motion](#) and [Link- OPPM procedures for a Conference Vote](#)

#### Discussion

- Q: Regarding the 67% approval from the fellowship, do we count the abstainers or non-respondents in the no vote?
- A: We are doing a vote with our registered groups, not individuals. We will strictly count the Yes and No votes
- Q: I think the process for having group votes is a great idea. For our IG in Denmark we are just really concerned about moving forward with the name change motion that was decided on in the 2024 ABC. We have concerns about how the surveys were conducted and we think the 2024 ABC motion was based on a false basis because of the mistakes that were made in the surveys. So we are a little concerned. (10:18)
- A: All the info is being uploaded in the fellowship-wide voting page so we can see it from all perspectives and there are others that have concerns about a different name. So you have the ability today as all the other delegates do to continue with this process. You can say no to the process if you feel strongly about it. All the information is in front of them and nothing is hidden. So if you have any questions that we don't have, like FAQs, please let us know and we will post them.
- A: Again, all that is in front of us today is the process of having a vote within the fellowship. If we have questions/concerns about an issue that will be voted on later that is part of that vote's process.
- Q: Questions about what the substantial majority includes. As noted earlier, only 5% of groups send delegates to ABC/QDM. We have no track record of previous fellowship-wide votes. Is the 5% really reflective of the substantive majority and how do we

ensure that we really have the voice of the full fellowship when only 5% is voting?

- A: The delegates at the 2024 ABC said we cannot authorize the change without going to the fellowship which is not unusual in other 12 step fellowships. For something significant, they will send it out to all of their groups, so I'm expecting a far greater percentage of the groups. We will be tracking and making sure we are communicating to the groups. I personally think people care about our name and will therefore be voting.
- A: We don't know and we can't know what is truly a substantial representation of the fellowship. This is why we are trying to develop a mechanism that will allow people to make their voices heard. But if they choose not to, then there is no way to force that to be done. So if we still have a minority of people making a choice, is that sufficient? This question might need to be addressed at a conference by the delegates since they are trusted servants of the fellowship as a whole.
- A: If this process is approved, all the data that we collect will go to the 2025 ABC and even if there's a significant majority vote for it, we're going to look at how many of our groups vote and the 2025 ABC delegates can determine if the process is valid.
- Q: Can we post the slides in the chat?
- A: They are on the QDM section of the website and the revision will also be there.
- Q: Will there be a separate voting process vote section on the website?
- A: Everything will be on the website. We are not hiding anything.
- Q: This should fall under the category of being a ballot proposal and should follow the ballot proposal process. Now we have this being thrust upon us in a tight timeline. This could be a ballot proposal and discussed at town halls and it feels like there is a better way to handle it.
- A: You are presenting another idea that could be explored and that is why we are doing this. We aren't going ahead, we are coming to the delegates. We are following the motion and you can vote no to the process and then we will look at what we're going to do moving forward.
- Q: I wish we had a more autocratic way of voting. We should separate the very volatile question of a name change from voting on voting.
- Q: My concern is we are sandwiching two votes and throwing them all in at a QDM that has never been used for voting. It seems like this should have been a ballot proposal and should be an ABC decision. More people attend the ABCs than the QDMs so I am concerned.
- A: The only issue on the table now is the process NOT the name change.
- A: Nothing, even after voting, will be done until the 2025 ABC where all the delegates will make their decision whether or not it was valid. They will be making their decision on validity with real data.
- Q: The implications of voting on this motion at this QDM. The materials linked on this topic refer to the voting procedures for the ABC and have never been applied to the QDM. If we even vote on the motion that is being presented here, we are establishing a precedent that allows WSO to present floor motions at the QDM. I think that would require a lot more concern and consideration by delegates, which should be done as current voting procedures would require at an ABC rather than QDM.
- A: If folks are uncomfortable with being asked to vote on this starting with the QDM, then vote against it. That doesn't say anything negative about the process itself, instead we don't think we're ready to vote to approve it.
- Q: How will we consider a fellowship-wide voting process, considering that there are many meetings that are not registered and therefore do not have a vote. Many of these unregistered meetings are BIPOC and how might they be considered within the fellowship as a whole? For example newer iGs and newer meetings starting up.
- A: I understand the concern. You register your group and you get a vote. We need to look at the future for voting sustainability. If we have some groups that aren't registering for safety reasons, that can be looked at in the future.
- Q: Are comments available before or after the voting and can they be made available before the voting? Are they available for us to read each other's thoughts before the vote?
- A: I don't think it's possible technically and it will be available after. We would have to study that more on how to do that.

VOTE TO MAKE DECISION TO SEND MOTION TO WORLDWIDE VOTING:

Draft Motion: To approve the new proposed process for Fellowship Group Voting (see below) starting with the approved ABC Motion 2024-06 (Name Study).

The Proposed Fellowship Group Vote Process

- The Conference (ABC) will direct the board when to conduct a Fellowship Group vote via approved motion.
- A dedicated webpage with information and instructions about a vote will be created and sent to all groups.
- Each Registered Group on the voting start date will have one vote.
- Groups will be given a minimum of four months to vote.
- Each vote will include a section for groups to state their reasons for why they voted one way or another.
- Substantial unanimity (>67%) is needed for a vote to pass.
- The results of the vote will be posted within two weeks after the voting closes and also emailed out to all groups.
- The voting results and next steps will be added to the next ABC agenda.
- Revisions to this process can only be made with Conference approval. ↑

- Motion was seconded

#### DISCUSSION:

- I see this process as following what the 2024 ABC voted on and its representative of the worldwide fellowship and offers an opportunity for each group to vote. I also believe it will be voted on again at the 2025 ABC.
- I don't believe this is an issue the QDM is set up to vote on. If we were following proper protocol and procedures established for ABC voting, we would have to wait for the 2025 ABC where delegates have sufficient time to consider it thoroughly. I will personally abstain and hope this is deferred to the 2025 ABC.
- I feel more time is needed and I am confused about how there will be a minority opinion if on Dec 10th there is an email going out and if it were to pass and then it starts to move forward. Where is the minority opinion in that?
- A: If this passes and a minority opinion needs to be recognized then it will go to the Feb 2025 QDM and we will learn a lot about this process together.
- It sounds like a sane way to increase group participation on important votes. It should say greater than or equal to 67% because if it was a close vote, the results could be questioned?
- As far as doing business as QDMs, it was to do the business we could not get done at the ABC and I feel this is what the QDMs are for and I feel that's what has been voted on. Voting on this is exactly why we are here and I feel we should make a decision at this QDM. If people feel differently they can raise an objection. Because of minority opinion, it won't be able to be implemented until next year as we have to do the minority opinion.
- A motion was passed at the ABC and WSO wasn't quite sure how to proceed and it is being presented to the conference as an attempt to carry out the will of the conference. It is being brought to the conference to see if it works for the fellowship. If it doesn't work, that's not a problem, it just means more discussion is needed and we won't be able to stick to the original timeline. It is just a proposed process for people to react to.
- Maybe amending the vote to take out the name change so we can just vote on the process on whatever proposals we are voting on group-wide and it is confusing and overwhelming. We need to vote on the process and then we can apply the process down the line and then we all know what to expect.
- The process of taking a vote at the QDM is my concern and the name change is a separate issue. I think they are separate issues that need to be separately addressed. The process has never been done by voting at the QDMs and until we have a worldwide vote on that from an ABC ballot proposal, I cannot see a way forward with this. We are not following our protocol and I don't even know why it's being brought up this way. I'm a former board member, so I really have concerns about this.
- Q: What are the other 12 step fellowships that are using this process?
- A: Marijuana anonymous, who gave us the most information and they are working with other 12 step programs. They have already documented the process and we are on uncharted territory. We added in the comment section which they regret not having.
- This is the process. The name change is very volatile and it will create interest. Instead of saying this is not a QDM issue, maybe we need to focus on increasing participation. Maybe a simple flyer or go to meetings letting people know how easy it is to become a delegate. We can increase our number of participants.
- In 2022 when QDMs were created, a key reason was to handle spill over business from ABCs. So there was at least one of these 4 meetings where voting is allowed. As a general principle and parliamentary stuff, you don't have to have everything stated before you can do it. Concept VI makes the conference the last word on policies and there is nothing that overrides that. If the conference feels comfortable doing a procedural vote to help carry out a motion first passed at the ABC, I see nothing wrong with it. I am finding myself troubled by the notion that we are all together and we can't do anything, which personally really violates Concept VI. I'm going to encourage people to just go ahead and vote on the motion that's put before them today.
- I'm a first time delegate and for me it seems simple to vote yes. I'm part of a smaller meeting and we are stretched thin and we don't have time to be in 4 hour meetings, so I think having a process where you can simply vote, like through Election buddy, feels so accessible. We don't have big representation or alternate delegates, so this seems equitable and accessible.

Motion to extend section by 10 minutes: 44 in favour, 10 not in favour

#### Minority opinion

- I feel like I have heard both sides of the motion as it's written.
- one (1) wanted to change their vote, Motion to extend the section by 10 minutes PASSED

#### Discussion Cont'd:

- It looks like a good proposal and I'm surprised to hear that historically people aren't voting much in the QDM which is surprising to me. I will vote for it. It's generating some interest and I think that's important.
- I love this motion because there are so many people that hesitate to come to ACoA because of the title. I believe it will really help the fellowship and increase the membership.

#### Questions about the vote:

- Q: How does friendly amendment happen here? I'm concerned that there's nothing in the proposed process that covers a quorum question, like how many meetings would need to vote on this thing for it even to be considered valid?
- A: You would select option B "I am in favour of this motion but would like minor changes"
- There appears to be a point of order being raised? The legitimacy of QDM voting?
- A: Parliamentarian: There was nothing in the original decision to have QDMs that precluded having business taken and a specific inclusion of business being sent from the ABC to the following QDM and since this is the normal process, unless

they’re going to go to the conference that decides to do it differently, is that if it’s not prohibited, then it is permitted. Business being conducted at the QDM is not prohibited. So I believe that this is valid and we will go ahead with the vote.

ELECTIONBUDDY VOTE:

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

EndedAdministrator Closed Early

65 ballots submitted

of 188 eligible voters (2 opened) — 35%

0 notices queued

[Voter Audit Report](#)

To approve the new proposed process for Fellowship Group Voting (see below) starting with the approved ABC Motion 2024-06 (Name Study).

PLURALITY62.0 votes tallied and 3 abstentions

I am in favor of this motion as presented and want it sent to Worldwide Online Voting	32.00 votes	51.61%
I am in favor of this motion but would like minor changes	10.00 votes	16.13%
I am in favor of deferring action to a future meeting	7.00 votes	11.29%
I am not in favor of this motion	13.00 votes	20.97%

I am in favor of this motion as presented and want it sent to Worldwide Online Voting wins with 51.61% of the votes which meets the requirement of the most votes.

Will go to a revote and drop “I am in favour of deferring to a future meeting”

Adult Children of Alcoholics and Dysfunctional Families

December 7, 2024 at 11:20am — December 7, 2024 at 11:24am

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

EndedAdministrator Closed Early

69 ballots submitted

of 188 eligible voters — 37%

0 notices queued

[Voter Audit Report](#)

To approve the new proposed process for Fellowship Group Voting (see below) starting with the approved ABC Motion 2024-06 (Name Study).

PLURALITY67.0 votes tallied and 2 abstentions

I am in favor of this motion as presented and want it sent to Worldwide Online Voting	40.00 votes	59.70%
I am in favor of this motion but would like minor changes	10.00 votes	14.93%
I am not in favor of this motion	17.00 votes	25.37%

I am in favor of this motion as presented and want it sent to Worldwide Online Voting wins with 59.70% of the votes which meets the requirement of the most votes.

Revote and drop “I am in favour of this motion and would like minor changes”

Adult Children of Alcoholics and Dysfunctional Families

December 7, 2024 at 11:26am — December 7, 2024 at 11:30am

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

EndedAdministrator Closed Early

65 ballots submitted

of 188 eligible voters (2 opened) — 35%

0 notices queued

[Voter Audit Report](#)

To approve the new proposed process for Fellowship Group Voting (see below) starting with the approved ABC Motion 2024-06 (Name Study).

PLURALITY63.0 votes tallied and 2 abstentions

I am in favor of this motion as presented and want it sent to Worldwide Online Voting	45.00 votes	71.43%
I am not in favor of this motion	18.00 votes	28.57%

I am in favor of this motion as presented and want it sent to Worldwide Online Voting wins with 71.43% of the votes which meets the requirement of the most votes.

- Motion PASSED and will go to worldwide online voting

Established Quorum- Quorum established at 52 delegates

Motion to extend the QDM by 20 minutes: 26 in favour, 19 opposed

- Minority Opinion:



- I believe the allotted time for voting was too long, the subsequent revotes after we knew how to do it the first time was too long
- I think we should be respectful of people's time

Would anyone like to change their vote/revote? 3 people voted in favour.

**Motion to extend QDM by 20 minutes PASSED.**

#### **Conference Policy & Procedure: Greater Exercise of Delegate Authority**

Introduction to Breakout Rooms (substance and procedure) (conference procedure context, plus review of breakout room)

[Link-Motions Related to Changes in the Conference](#)

[Conference Policy & Procedure PowerPoint](#)

[Link-Breakout Rooms Process](#)

*Assign delegates to individual breakout room discussions*

#### **Breakout room discussions with 3 common questions:**

- **Question 1:** Delegates have suggested that the Conference should be more delegate-driven, and the WSO Board is recommending that delegates should approve any changes to Conference procedure. Do you agree that the Conference should be consulted, and have the final say, before any changes are made to Conference policies and procedures?
- **Question 2:** One possibility is removing Conference procedures from WSO's policy manual and creating a separate Conference Policy & Procedures Manual. Do you agree with this idea? And if so, what role should delegates play in maintaining and updating such a manual?
- **Question 3:** Should any changes be implemented right away, or should the ABC/QDM Committee and/or board be given until the May 2025 ABC to work out details and report back to the Conference?

#### **Breakout room reports**

Christine B:

- For the first question, we had unanimous agreement and for the second question, 8 people voted Yes and 1 abstained. There were 9 people in the room.
- After a very difficult ABC regarding controversy between the WSO and the Conference, we think it would be a good thing for the delegates to have their own document and their own procedures. We did come to the realization that we weren't looking at the sections in the OPPM that deals with the delegates and so we are being asked to give opinions on things we really weren't looking at which is a problem. In order to have the delegates deal with the sections of the conference, we need volunteers and there may not be enough volunteers.

Bradford (Room #5):

- We all voted unanimously on question one that delegates should have control of conference policies and procedures.
- We voted unanimously on question two that the conference policies and procedures should be moved to a separate document.
- We thought question three wasn't worded very well and the idea was that should the policy and changes be implemented right away, which implies now at this QDM which doesn't seem feasible to us. The other option is to have an ABC committee where the WSO and ABC committee or the board do the detailed work and present it to the ABC. We think there should be a conference committee and not just WSO committees to work out details and present it to the ABC. I guess this is for the delegates to take back to their groups for further discussion, so we didn't see much point in answering Question 3.

Sharon:

- On the first question we agreed that the conference should be consulted and have final say before changes are made to the conference policies and procedures.
- Regarding the second question, one possibility is removing conference procedures from WSO's OPPM and creating a separate conference policy and procedures manual. We agree with that, but regarding what role should the delegates play in maintaining and updating such a manual, we came up with a few ideas. First, we could pull the conference information from the WSO book, making two separate books. We talked about creating a conference of delegates that would be the actual ones doing the work being the delegate conference committee. With the fact that finding volunteers is difficult, who is going to do the work?
- We did not get to the third question.

Marion:

- For question one, 5 out of 8 people voted Yes, 2 No, and 1 abstained. The concerns raised about not having the knowledge or understanding the implications or complexities in the delegates and it would be a challenge to get them up to speed and keep them up to speed.
- For question two, 3 people voted Yes, 3 voted No, 1 didn't abstain and was ambivalent. Again, there were concerns that there is too much to do and too much for delegates to learn and understand. There are also reservations about delegates being reliable enough to stick around long enough to become knowledgeable and educated considering how many first timers we have. There are some people who stick around and are consistent.
- For the last question, 6 people voted Yes and 2 voted No. It's a case of if we are going to do it, then get on with it and do it as quickly as possible. There are some concerns about delegate continuity and the ability to sustain the responsibility.

Denise (Room 3)

- We all agreed on question one. Education is key and the delegates are not informed properly and there needs to be more information and education for the delegates to understand that they are responsible for the conference and that a service manual should be developed as part of this. Perhaps there should also be a vote taken for delegates to see if they feel like they know enough to be part of the process to vote on these things.
- We were split on the second question. If there is no service manual, keep it in the OPPM and then once it's developed put it in a service manual. Some people felt that a separate document may be less intimidating for the delegates. But also staying in the OPPM would expose delegates to all of the matters.
- We didn't really have a chance to vote on the last question, but we thought to leave it as is with the WSO until the delegates know how they want to proceed and wait for the conference.

Marcus (Room 7):

- All agreed to question one. The conference should be consulted and have the final say before any changes to the conference procedures and policies.
- Regarding question two, 6 voted Yes that they should be separated from the OPPM issues. Yes, the delegates should decide on changes at QDMs and ABCs.
- We didn't get a chance to vote on question three, but generally people were saying that we should take our time implementing any changes. Two people felt that they wanted the conference procedures in a separate document immediately.

Carmen B:

- For the first question, 7 people voted Yes and 1 abstained and 1 voted No. Overall, most were in favour because it's almost like the essence of group conscience and the inverted pyramid. There were some concerns that we will need to increase the number of delegates attending meetings in order to implement this higher responsibility that the delegates would have. Overall, if more delegates are in control, then it would also increase participation.
- For the second question, 7 voted No and 3 abstained. Overall, there was some hesitation as they felt like it was reconstructing something that is already in place. They were concerned that this would create two separate entities and there are questions about how these two entities would communicate and how they would be responsible to each other. There was some question regarding if there is even a need to do this and are things moving too fast? Another delegate mentioned trust and there are some questions about trust issues and separating things out from the WSO.
- There was some confusion about the third question and we didn't really answer it.

#### Closing

- Reminder: optional board Q&A follows meeting
- Overnight voting on Fellowship Group Voting motion
- Announce Feb QDM on 02/01/2025.
- Next Agenda-Building session in Feb (still working on Aug QDM)
- Annual World Convention is on April 4th and 5th 2025
- Reminder to take delegate survey

#### OPTIONAL Board Q&A Session led by Jim R., Trustee

- It is not easy for new delegates who do not have English as their first language to follow.
- Q. Will there be an in-person ABC in the future?
  - A. When we had to go to online-only in the pandemic, the delegates voted that they wanted to be online for all future ABCs. They also voted that they wanted a working group to do an evaluation of hybrid, online only, and in person only. That study is underway.
- Q. It would save a lot of time if people would refrain from thanking the presenters for doing a great job. Ask that the person speaking go straight to their question.
- Q. Regarding Conference Committees, it is important for the Conference to have its own committees, and I've heard that some feel there should be a charter first. Can the board comment on how they see that process?
  - We're clear. We know that we're going in that direction as other 12 steps have gone. They also are clear in their 12 Step World service organizations that they have a Conference service manual that includes all of these things, and they have a charter, we have neither. Of not having one into the future, of having one and doing it in a way that concept 10 asks us to do and concept 10 asks us to be very clear about our service responsibilities and our authority with that. So let's keep working to that.
  - In my experience with the first conference in Russia, I thought it was organized well, but now I see here that there is a Parliamentary and other structure. I believe it would be better to have you know, some written foundation, because otherwise it can be very sensitive.
  - Its hard to edit a blank page, so if there is anyone out there who has a vision of how it might look in the end result, please share it and then we can work backwards to build the plan to get there.
- Q. Some of the meeting groups in South Africa felt like they were being talked at/to, instead of us talking to the board. The question came up, how do countries outside of North America become involved in a two-way conversation given that English is not most people's first language, and the time difference is substantial?
  - A. One of the things we've been looking at is our priorities. Fellowship and increased connection/engagement with the Fellowship is a top priority. We have the BMF on a quarterly basis, we've agreed to send two trustees and possibly a committee chair to the European meeting. We are also looking at priorities and defining them and we will be able to share that with the Fellowship at that time.
  - Q. The problem is they do not not know the structure or where to find everything - it feels like a big job for them to make sense of things at WSO, and so they just give up. It does not feel easy, was the message I got.
  - A. Member services is trying to reach out at a global level, and we on the committee are working toward bringing members services to the world.
- Q. There is a request to have a Slack channel where non-North America Fellowship can submit their questions.
  - A. There are open channels in Slack already where the fellowship can go for information. Also, all of the committees have a page where they share information. Those questions can also go to the board from there.
  - A. There is also a "contact us" form on the website where questions/comments can be submitted. These questions can be submitted in their own language, and it gets translated upon submission.
- Q. When it was determined to have online conferences, it was in order to make the meetings more accessible to more people including those who can't afford it, those who have disabilities and can't attend. I'd like to know how that has increased the participation.
  - A. We'll have to coordinate to find the numbers prior to the pandemic.
  - A. We have grown our meeting groups by 25% since COVID, but our intergroups have stalled or even declined a bit.
  - A. We hope to have an automated way to tally the information in the future.
- Q. I don't understand the answer about why a Conference Charter is necessary before a Conference Committee.

- A. I think Sue said, that she had heard people were raising the question as to whether there needs to be a charter before conference committees. I don't think she held that perspective herself.
- Q. The board has adopted a whistleblower policy but has not communicated it yet. I'm concerned why it's taking so long, because the gap affects those who might need the whistleblower policy, particularly volunteers or delegates.
  - It's in the board report and we're bringing it into the process of communication. It takes time and we prioritize among all of the requests we get, which is about 80 at any given time.
- Q. Have we also consulted AA and Alanon because they have a long history and a robust Service Manual for their Conferences, such as definitions, e.g., Right of Decision, which I didn't understand until I read it in another program.
  - A thought is just because a group has been around a long time doesn't mean they are necessarily better, they may be more entrenched.
  - We consulted Marijuana Anonymous, because they are in the middle of creating this now. We did also consult with AA and Alanon and we have received information from them, as well, our committees look for relevant information on the websites of other programs.
- Q. The agenda is very long, and the topics are difficult, and there isn't much time for the fellowship to respond. My experience with my Intergroup, which is struggling, we have tried to give a lot of information to get everyone on board, because if you don't, you can lose them, and I wonder if that is why volunteers from the fellowship has fallen off. It seems in this format, it becomes Q&A, rather than "discussion."
- Q. I would like to see some social & ice breaker activities included in future QDMs? (This was posted in chat and the participant had to leave before discussing to open their meeting.)
- Q. I also feel that the agenda is packed without time for people to participate. Many people were not able to say what they had to say, and its important to me to hear what they have to say, and its important that I get to share what I want to say. Maybe we're being too aggressive and if we had less tasks to do we could get to more discussion.
- Re: the question about unregistered groups that are bipoc, I think it is a good idea for them to go through an Intergroup of some sort to get their information communicated.
- I would like to see the analytics about participants in all the years and meetings to be stored in the archival information.
- I would like to see the names and meeting numbers of the delegates involved in each meeting listed somewhere in the ABC minutes. It's important to have the names listed, because when you need to vet people for future service positions, even up to the board level, to be able to see past experience.
  - Maybe the Data Analysis committee could be tasked with this.

**Results from online worldwide voting following the QDM:**

To approve the new proposed process for Fellowship Group Voting (see below) starting with the approved ABC Motion 2024-06 (Name Study).		
PLURALITY	53.0 votes tallied and 0 abstentions	
Yes	42.00 votes	79.25%
No	11.00 votes	20.75%
Yes wins with 79.25% of the votes which meets the requirement of the most votes.		

[NOTE: These minutes were approved at the 2025 ABC on May 17, 2025]