

2025 ABC FINAL BALLOT RESULTS

A. Ballot Proposal Process

Each year all ACA Meetings, Intergroups, and Regions (Groups) are invited to submit Ballot Proposals that are meant to be of global importance to the Fellowship. Once received and vetted by the Ballot Prep Committee for viability, and after clarifying any unclear information, the remaining Proposals become part of the ABC Ballot.

This year's Ballot included 13 proposals. Groups were invited to vote on the Proposals after taking a Group Conscience to determine their vote on each one.

Their selected trusted servant then entered their votes on the online Ballot. This trusted servant might have been the group's secretary, their ABC Delegate, or any other designated group member. The group's vote on each Proposal indicated whether or not they wanted to see that Proposal added to the agenda for discussion at the ABC. If they could not reach a decision, there was a No Opinion option available for each Proposal.

This year, Ballot voting closed on April 7th. The Ballot Prep Committee then tallied and published the results. All Proposals that received at least 66.7% Yes votes are added to the ABC agenda.

B. 2025 Ballot Results

Of the 13 Proposals on the Ballot this year, Proposals 1, 9 and 13 will be on the 2025 ABC Agenda.

183 valid Ballots were received from 11 Countries, 155 Meeting Groups, 15 Intergroups, and 2 Regions. Note: One Ballot was incomplete, but was counted because over half of the Proposals had responses.

The following chart shows a summary of the results. 'No Opinion' votes are not counted in the total results.

Proposal #	Y/N Votes	Yes	No	% Yes	% No	No Opinion
1 - Group Contacts	160	130	30	81	19	23
2 - Liability Insurance	152	92	60	61	39	31
3 - Sponsor Database	164	45	119	27	73	19
4 - Social Media Committee	161	97	64	60	40	22
5 - Literature Conference Approved	159	75	84	47	53	24
6 - Literature Policy and Priorities	152	70	82	46	54	31
7 - Approval of Changes	154	86	68	56	44	29
8 - Name Change	167	78	89	47	53	16
9 - Changes to the Ballot Process	146	114	32	78	22	36
10 - Conference Committee	142	55	87	39	61	40
11 - IG Ad-hoc Committee	154	91	63	59	41	28
12 - Region Reps	152	71	81	47	53	30
13 - Committee Minutes or Reports	158	107	51	68	32	24

Proposals 1, 9, and 13 are on the ABC Agenda and are shown first:

Yes	81%	130	Proposal 2025-1 Submitted by Region 2 (Greater Western USA), WEB381 (Arroyo Grande, CA, USA), CA915 (Arroyo Grande, CA, USA), TEL0341	1
No	19%	30		
No Opinion		23		
			Issue: We propose that the meeting listing guidelines be changed to allow a single individual only to be the Public or one of the Primary Private Contacts for no more than four meeting registration numbers. We believe that implementing this system will help ensure that meetings are autonomous in accordance with the Traditions of ACA.	

Background: We are proposing to set a policy limiting meeting registration by one person as a Public and/or one of the Primary Private contacts to a maximum of four groups (meetings, Intergroups or Regions). Such a limit can help ensure that meetings are autonomous and rely on group conscience principles.

The meeting registration and update forms now have a checkbox that asks the submitter to affirm they attend the meeting they are registering. Because the checkbox cannot guarantee this is true, we feel this proposal is a step toward better ensuring that meetings are represented by ACAs who attend those meetings.

Giving service for a meeting is fundamental to our recovery in ACA. Our choice was to propose limiting one individual to register a maximum of four meetings. While many ACAs attend more than four meetings each week, we believe that other ACAs in those groups would benefit from fulfilling this service role and should be encouraged to do so. Registering meetings thus becomes a great opportunity for encouraging service.

Resources/Implementation: We have spoken with the WSO IT team. A developer has already been hired to create a new meeting-registration software "plugin" -- a piece of code that adds new functionality to the existing software program. If this proposal becomes a motion that is passed by the Delegates, the WSO IT staff sees no indication that this will require many additional work hours to implement.

WSO Analysis:

Factors to consider: The submitters of this proposal met with the Information Technology (IT) Committee to determine whether their proposal could be implemented.

As noted in the Resources/Implementation section, IT said this feature could be added. Although there will be an unbudgeted cost for the additional hours of work required, that cost appears to be manageable as part of the new "plugin" that's referenced.

Resources (for more background information)

<https://adultchildren.org/meeting/meeting-register/>

Optional Comments: (Those that were greater than 50 words, per Ballot instructions, were truncated. Comments that only referred to a group's internal voting percentages were not included.)

- a) Seems like a good idea; maybe four is even too many?
- b) This seems like a good idea to keep meetings autonomous, in keeping with Tradition 4.
- c) Doesn't address or take into account de facto 'intergroups' consisting of several meetings that have a safety protocol.
- d) Fellowships have one general secretary which is frequently the contact for more than four meetings
- e) It is necessary to limit the number of times a person can represent various meetings
- f) This will reduce the risk for the newcomer of unsuccessfully contacting a meeting, upon finally having mustered the courage to reach out for help.
- g) Could complicate things for fellowships with more than 4 meetings.
- h) This was not unanimous: we had 5 yes, 4 no, and 2 abstentions
- i) This issue and other problems with the current meeting list and its guidelines need to be studied by a Conference Committee and recommendations for change presented to a future meeting of Delegates.
- j) 4 might be too many
- k) Not because of the first issue - whether the person is participating in the group or not is too hard to keep track of without a rigid security system, but because of the second - it is important to us that no single person becomes too powerful within the program.
- l) See the wisdom of this proposal, but motion shouldn't be brought to Conference. Yes to Best Practice video that service body/meeting watches. Should be a registrar. Make a policy about meeting registration guidelines. Members concerned if meetings would disappear because of this requirement.
- m) 40% approve, 40% disapprove, 20% no opinion

Yes	78%	114	Proposal 2025-9 Submitted by The Ballot Preparation Committee of ACA World Services	9
No	22%	32		
No Opinion		36		
Issue: We propose that any future changes to the Ballot process must be approved by the Delegates at the ABC. By adopting this proposal, the ABC will be directing the WSO to make sure the changes are reflected in any procedural documentation, such as the ACAWSO Operating Policy and Procedures Manual (OPPM).				

Background: The ballot process allows ACA member groups (meetings, Intergroups, and Regions) to bring business items of global importance to the ABC for consideration by the entire fellowship. In its report to the 2024 ABC, the Ballot Prep Committee (BPC) stated as one of its goals that it will "explore recommendations for process changes to the current ballot process." Currently, decisions about the ballot process are made within the BPC, and resulting changes to the OPPM are implemented by the WSO Board of Trustees. NOTE: The OPPM contains the day to day operating guidelines by which the Board and Annual Business Conference functions.

Implementation of this proposal will ensure that decisions about the future of the ballot process will be made only with approval of the ABC, which represents the "actual voice, the effective conscience" for the whole ACA fellowship (Concept 2). This change may

slow down the decision-making process. However, it ensures that decisions about how the fellowship brings agenda items to the ABC are made by the ABC itself, representing the informed group conscience of the ACA fellowship.

This proposal lays the foundation for future changes, which may be presented by the BPC via a ballot proposal or a committee motion, or by other member groups and service bodies of the ACA fellowship in accordance with ACAWSO procedural documentation.

Resources/Implementation: Under this proposal, decisions about the future of the ballot process will reflect the informed group conscience of the ACA fellowship. The ballot process remains unaffected for the 2024-25 and 2025-26 seasons.

The fellowship is encouraged to present ideas for changes to the ballot process as future Ballot Proposals. Suggestions for changes may also come from Town Hall meetings and surveys initiated by any registered group (such as meetings, Intergroups, Regions, or WSO service bodies). The BPC and other committees can also use these forums to gather feedback from the fellowship.

The BPC relies on dedicated volunteers to carry out the ballot process as currently designed and amended in the future. ACA members interested in serving are encouraged to participate as trusted servants on behalf of the fellowship. Please refer to <https://acawso.org/bpc/> for more information about the current ballot process and how to participate in the Ballot Prep Committee.

WSO Analysis:

Factors to consider: As written, the proposal suggests that any significant changes to the Ballot process “must be approved” annually at the ABC. The Ballot Prep. Committee wants to clarify that the proposal does not require the Delegates to approve routine adjustments to the timing of deadlines, “town hall-style” discussions, or other procedural details. The proposal is for the delegates to approve process changes to the ballot proposal process.

If the fellowship votes to add this proposal to the ABC agenda and it is approved, the BPC Committee will need to develop an implementation plan for process changes with delegate participation.

Reference Info/Links:

The WSO Ballot Preparation Committee (BPC), re-established in 2017, is open to all ACA members and is composed of volunteers, including Delegates and Trustees. Its purpose is to oversee the proposal process by:

- Educating the fellowship,
- Calling for and assisting in the development of proposals,
- Encouraging translations,
- Compiling the Ballot,
- Promoting participation in voting, and
- Tallying and announcing results
- [Ballot Prep Committee webpage](#)
- [Location & Authority for Conference Policies/Procedures](#)
- [OPPM](#)

Optional Comments: (Those that were greater than 50 words, per Ballot instructions, were truncated. Comments that only referred to a group's internal voting percentages were not included.)

- a) This seems common sense to our group.
- b) This is a well thought out proposal.
- c) The selection of incoming items to be placed on the agenda should follow the group conscience in all parts of the process. Not just the Ballot Process Committee or the WSO Board's wishes for changes.
- d) Group thought proposal was unclear
- e) Our group appreciates the BPC's willingness to ask for more input from the entire fellowship
- f) Our group trusts the opinion of the Ballot Preparation Committee.
- g) The WSO Board and its OPPM should not be setting the policy and procedures for proposals being added to the Conference agenda without the approval of the delegates.
- h) Glad to see the exact opposite of hoarding control. Hopeful it will increase trust between the fellowship and its service organization.
- i) Anything that can help diminish the distance between ballots and ABC towards groups and members is good at this point.
- j) Some members are trying to create a conference. This is an excellent process to have a "test" conference to see if it will work.
- k) 60% approve, 20% disapprove, 20% no opinion
- l) But should refer to major changes to the process, not issues of holding town halls or time deadlines.

Yes	68%	107	Proposal 2025-13	13
No	32%	51		
No Opinion		24		
			Submitted by Region 2 (Greater Western USA), CA 915 (Arroyo Grande, CA, USA), WEB 381 (Arroyo Grande, CA, USA)	
Issue: We propose that all WSO committees (Collaboration Committees, Committees, and sub-committees) submit meeting minutes or reports for posting on the ACAWSO.org website within one month of each meeting.				

Background: WSO replaced 12 monthly teleconferences with 4. Very few of the 43 WSO committees listed (Collaboration Committees, Committees, and sub-committees) on the website diagram (ACAWSO.org) are given agenda time to make reports at any teleconference. This is also the case in the 4 Quarterly Delegate Meetings.

At recent Annual Business Conferences, only selected committees have made reports. Delegates are, instead, referred to the annually posted Delegate Binder to research committee information.

As of September 30, 2024, no reports or minutes were located from any of the four Collaboration Committees that has WSO's decision-making power. Some committees making quarterly reports are 6 months behind. Literature committee reports were last posted September 2022. The last reports of some committees meeting weekly were posted 3 to 9 months ago.

Committees of the WSO Board, such as the Finance Committee, Executive Committee, and Distribution Center, are posting their reports regularly.

Entries on SLACK channels and WSO Zoom committee meetings indicate meeting work is occurring. Reports are not, however, being posted in a timely way on the ACAWSO.org website that is accessible to the ACA worldwide fellowship.

While the OPPM (p. 36) already states that reports are to be submitted and posted, committees are not complying with this policy. This is a matter of large concern to the fellowship. We cannot make informed decisions about policy or projects without up-to-date information. We cannot discern the best fit for our skills as volunteers on committees or lend support to committee efforts without information.

Resources/Implementation: IT staff and volunteers post available WSO committee reports. With compliance by all committees to the existing OPPM policy, posting any additional committee reports may increase the IT workload by two to four hours each month. Since it is an expectation that IT posts all available committee reports to adhere to ACA transparency, this is a budgetary item that should be inherent in normal operation.

WSO Analysis:

Factors to consider: Transparency and periodic reporting are vital to the fellowship's ability to stay informed and engaged. According to the Operating Policies and Procedures Manual (OPPM), committees are currently required to submit monthly and annual reports for posting on the WSO service website, rather than reports for each meeting.

Some committees face challenges in meeting this monthly reporting requirement due to limited resources. Committees with the support of paid special workers, such as the Finance Committee and the WSO Office/Distribution Center, are better able to fulfill this obligation.

The proposal to require that all committees “submit meeting minutes or reports for posting on the ACAWSO.org website within one month of each meeting” may significantly increase the workload for committee volunteers. Addressing this issue could include exploring ways to recruit additional volunteers or other methods to support committees in meeting reporting expectations. Implementing such changes would also require a revision to the OPPM.

Note: the Literature Committee submitted its annual report to the 2024 ABC, demonstrating efforts to fulfill this requirement.

Reference Links:

- Committee reports are posted on the Committee webpage on the [ACA WSO website](#)
- [Chair/Board Forum Formation Summary](#)

Optional Comments: (Those that were greater than 50 words, per Ballot instructions, were truncated. Comments that only referred to a group’s internal voting percentages were not included.)

- a) Consolidate Committees to about 10 with perhaps sub-committees whose Chairs meet monthly with the Umbrella committee; minutes taken in all sub-committees and presented

- at Umbrella committee meetings; umbrella committee chair REPORTS IN WRITING (no paid staff needed to do their job) to Board summarizing all work of sub-committees
- b) The group felt that it was important that minutes be posted in a timely manner. If individual committees had difficulty submitting minutes in a timely manner it was a problem of not enough volunteers, of the committee leadership needing more support or training about how motivate members to take action, etc., not a reason to lessen or eliminate timely submission.
 - c) In this day and age posting minutes can happen almost immediately.
 - d) An additional requirement for this will not change the current situation. It is more about getting more people interested in service. Which is a general challenge in all layers of the ACA Community.
 - e) Reports need to be made in a timely manner.
 - f) We are satisfied with the current level of reporting. Asking all committees to report monthly would put unnecessary pressure on those committee members.
 - g) This is already a requirement. It seems better to just remind the committees about it.
 - h) They are already supposed to do this. So why discuss.
 - i) We agree that this is important and yet also understand that there are likely only a few volunteers out of all those in ACA who are doing the work on the committees
 - j) Our group sees the benefit in having defined deadlines for posting meeting minutes and reports to ensure compliance with the OPPM.
 - k) This proposal is an inappropriate attempt to micro-manage the WSO, which should be enforcing its own rules for its committee reports. The conference's responsibility is to set policy; not to dictate procedures.
 - l) Reports in the binder are real reports too. Violations of policy can't be fixed by making "follow policy" a policy. Don't pull up the flowers to see if the roots are growing. Reports aren't the only way to do transparency anymore.
 - m) Volunteers are an issue and this will make it even more difficult to get people to get in service.
 - n) All in our group who have tried to find information on the webpage find it both difficult to find and when found almost always difficult to see if it's current. But we are not a disciplining requiring community, so recommendations are fine. Perhaps we can clarify the need a bit...
 - o) Our group would like an accurate count of all WSO committees, ad hoc committees, sub committees, sub sub committees , study groups, advisory groups, task forces, and all other groups related and created by WSO . Including ones that WSO feel do not need to report. We would still like a list of all in existence.
 - p) Maybe change from 1 month to something more doable for dedicated servants
 - q) For a committee to be considered viable and a true committee, monthly reports need to be reported or the committee put on pause.
 - r) This is already being done by some committees and will help to keep everyone informed of work being done
 - s) in favor of transparency
 - t) 60% approve, 20% disapprove, 20% no opinion
 - u) Thank-you for your service!

Proposals that will not be on the 2025 ABC Agenda

Yes	61%	92	Proposal 2025-2 Submitted by Region 2 (Greater Western USA), CA1123 (Pacifica, CA, USA), CA1628 (South San Francisco, CA, USA), CA915 (Arroyo Grande, CA, USA), WEB0381 (Arroyo Grande, CA, USA)	2
No	39%	60		
No Opinion		31		

Issue: We propose that delegate volunteers write a trifold on how to provide liability insurance for meetings where venues require it. Delegates will form a committee, research the topic, organize their findings, and create the trifold by the 2026 Annual Business Conference (ABC) for current, newly forming and displaced ACA meetings, Intergrroups, and Regions.

Background: Our primary purpose in ACA is to carry the message of recovery to those who still suffer from growing up in alcoholic and dysfunctional homes. If prospective, displaced, and continuing meetings cannot get or keep meeting space, we cannot carry our message. Intergrroups and Regions need to help by supplying information.

Since the 1980s, meetings have asked ACA service boards for help. Recent concerns come from meetings in California, Massachusetts, and Washington State. 12-Step program websites in the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada address liability concerns.

Two problems seem to come up. Start-up, in-person meetings and small meetings do not receive enough 7th Tradition to pay for monthly costs of liability policies to cover damage to buildings and property in them. The other problem is that Insurance Companies need to know the number of meetings they would be covering and how many people attend them each week to calculate a price. It is difficult to provide these numbers for displaced meetings that often lose participants due to a new location as well as prospective meetings that do not yet exist.

Preliminary outreach to other 12-Step programs reveals that some of their regional areas do provide umbrella liability for their meetings. These are the larger programs with more attendees and larger 7th Tradition contributions. The insurance agents we have contacted have put out our request for coverage to underwriters for non-profit organizations; so far, we have received no offers.

Resources/Implementation: The committee of volunteer delegates of the Conference would determine when to meet, how often to meet, who their leaders will be, what their operational rules will be, develop a mission statement, list tasks to explore, collect data and analyze research.

By the 2026 ABC, the committee would develop and present a resource trifold on how meetings can individually get liability insurance, and how Intergrroups, and Regions can provide umbrella liability insurance for meetings, wherever possible.

With volunteers from our worldwide delegates, we will have a far wider outreach for information, personal contacts in 12-Step programs already providing meetings with

umbrella liability insurance policies, and established relationships with insurance agents.

No costs would be incurred by Intergroups, Regions, or WSO for development or electronic distribution of the trifold.

WSO would need to provide a regularly occurring Zoom slot for the committee of volunteers that step up to draft the trifold.

WSO Analysis:

Factors to consider:

- We know this has been an issue since 2015. The Member Services Committee, in its 2015 ABC report listed "How do we get meeting insurance?" in its top ten requests from the membership.
- Internet searches reveal a number of current insurance companies and brokers potentially providing various forms of insurance for not-for-profit groups. Due to the potential for insurers to enter and withdraw from this insurance sector, a trifold may yield dated [inaccurate] information.
- Keeping current information concerning insurance options may pose a challenge, unless there is either a consistent effort to assure correct information or merely recommending an internet search on the topic.

Reference Links:

[2015 Member Services Committee Report](#)

Optional Comments: (Those that were greater than 50 words, per Ballot instructions, were truncated. Comments that only referred to a group's internal voting percentages were not included.)

- a. This is an important subject to be dealt with. We suggest a webpage on the WSO website with general information.
- b. Liability is between venue to registrant. We signed a \$150,000 insurance contract with the church and this is not considered the responsibility of ACA or the WSO. If the delegates within the organization have language to defend us in a court of law then we would gladly review it.
- c. Insurance is a unique entity and changes by state. If the committee develops an umbrella liability policy in the future, the issue can be reintroduced later.
- d. However, a note in the "Guidelines for New Meetings" could be included mentioning Liability Insurance may be needed, depending on meeting location requirements.
- e. Suggestion: IG's could provide this information to their groups, as they would have more local information. This could be the subject of a future article in the Comline.
- f. This is better handled at the local level. A trifold could end up being out of date within months because things like insurance change.
- g. A trifold would have to be updated too often.
- h. Not unanimous: 6 yes, 3 no, 1 abstention
- i. Insurance is regulated by state, and expressing an opinion on an outside issue that is subject to changes throughout the country and over time may spread false or inaccurate details.

- j. If anything, this should be on the website for ease of updating.
- k. Our group feels a printed trifold would be difficult to keep current and relevant for all meetings.
- l. We don't believe this to be a common ACA-matter, but think it might be worth the time to lift this as a matter for the regions. And perhaps some new regions in the world might need some more central help while establishing their own.
- m. Most facilities allow meetings for free or donation. They have insurance. This is not a valid expense for all ACA members or groups
- n. We do think the issue of liability insurance is important and hope the WSO is addressing.
- o. Member services has already done it. States & countries have different requirements Liability Insurance. Groups should do their own research since information can differ.
- p. Could see this benefit ACA as a whole, workshops too. Meetings should seek from intergroups. This is a Frequent Asked Q. There is a service need. This is a Region issue due to vast differences in laws/requirements. Set general guidelines, common considerations for obtaining.
- q. different states have different requirements. handle at Intergroup/local level
- r. There was concern over how useful it would be since it may fall out of date quickly.
- s. 60% approve, 40% no opinion
- t. We feel a trifold may be out of date and information differ for each country, but perhaps there's a way of offering information online?

Yes	27%	45	Proposal 2025-3 Submitted by ZAF0004 (Johannesburg, South Africa)	3
No	73%	119		
No Opinion		19		

Issue: We propose that one or more consolidated databases of available sponsors be maintained at an organisational level above the group level (possibly Intergroup or Region level), to be a resource for groups lacking suitable sponsors within their own membership.

Background: A key aspect of the recovery journey for an ACA member is to establish effective relationships with one or more sponsors. Some groups may be too small or too new to offer a cadre of suitable sponsors within their membership. Members of these marginal groups can struggle to establish a connection with a qualified sponsor, which can impact negatively on their recovery. This proposal is intended to address this shortcoming by providing a formal database or databases of available sponsors who are part of the wider ACA organisation and who are willing to be sponsors to adult children reaching out from these marginal groups. This proposal foresees that ACA members worldwide can nominate themselves for inclusion in the database. They can also qualify their availability according to various criteria which would assist group members in selecting candidates. These criteria could include such attributes as age, period of ACA membership, level of availability, language, cultural background, religion, time zone, etc. (These attributes are offered as suggestions only, and would need to be developed more carefully.)

Resources/Implementation: Not included in Proposal

WSO Analysis:

Factors to consider: WSO does not currently maintain a sponsor database. IT indicates that the technology for maintaining a sponsor database is feasible.

Most other 12-Step programs do not maintain sponsor databases due to the challenges of upkeep. One 12-Step WSO shared that they previously maintained a database but discontinued it because demand for sponsors exceeded availability, and maintaining the database was time-consuming. Instead, they now offer sponsorship workshops and newcomer-focused meetings.

This proposal raises the question about whether it is appropriate for this to be managed by WSO, or if it is better handled by Groups, Intergroups or Regions.

If the fellowship would like WSO to move forward on this, there are several key items that may need to be considered:

1. A cost analysis is required, as the database is not included in the 2025 budget.
2. The question of who will manage the database—whether volunteers or staff—must be resolved, including responsibilities for periodic updates, member support, and troubleshooting.
3. Protecting the anonymity of both sponsors and sponsees is essential and must be prioritized.
4. Liability concerns must be addressed, as ACA WSO does not vet or certify sponsors. This creates potential risks if a negative sponsorship experience occurs.
5. A clear process for handling complaints should be established, along with specific guidelines for removing sponsors from the database, if necessary.

Reference Links: None

Optional Comments: (Those that were greater than 50 words, per Ballot instructions, were truncated. Comments that only referred to a group's internal voting percentages were not included.)

- a) This would be impossible to maintain. And difficult to keep current as Sponsors availability changes frequently
- b) Sponsorship must be sought out by individuals. Databases are not confidential nor are they in coordination with the ACA traditions
- c) A codependent suggestion. Seeking out a sponsor is part of the growth process in ACA. If a local physical meeting can't provide, there are several online meetings to attend,
- d) We suggest this could be achieved at the end of ACA events at the local level. Attendees could provide their contact information and if they are willing to sponsor.
- e) To recommend sponsors at the WSO or organization level creates liability
- f) Could be helpful, is it a WSO issue?
- g) We understand the issues, but there are problems with confidentiality for those who would add their names as sponsors.
- h) This can be a matter discussed at any intergroup or regional level. Those entities are autonomous.
- i) Our group feels there are too many challenges and potential risks in maintaining centralized sponsor databases.

- j) Selection of a sponsor needs to be based on personal relations and not on a list of phone numbers from a database. Creating and maintaining such a database would require excessive resources for a questionable outcome.
- k) Our meeting believes this task would be a burden to the already overloaded and under-volunteered WSO.
- l) Sponsors are in short supply here too, in a metropolitan area with 14 meetings a week. We make do with small closed Step groups.
- m) Not sure about this format but people do need sponsors or fellow travellers
- n) It's beyond the administrative capability of WSO to manage a database & the WSO response. Go to online meetings and state they're looking.
- o) Difficulty in maintaining and vetting a list of people
- p) Useful tool for the Fellowship monitored by WSO. We want you to hire a special worker for this work.
- q) seems impractical matching strangers. Keeping the list up to date would be difficult too.
- r) Concerns about all kinds of confidentiality as well as keeping the list up to date, problems with 'matching' a sponsor-sponsee pair, and sponsors getting quickly overloaded.
- s) 60% disapprove, 40% approve

Yes	60%	97	Proposal 2025-4 Submitted by BEL0011 (Brussels, Belgium)	4
No	40%	64		
No Opinion		22		
Issue: Motion for the creation of a committee to explore how to carry the ACA message forward through social media platforms.				

Background: The proposed committee, constituted of trusted servants who ideally possess experience in digital communication and social media activation. The proposed committee would be responsible for developing strategies and content to carry the ACA message forward in a manner which is mindful of ACA Traditions and rooted in a participatory, collaborative and community-driven approach.

Resources/Implementation: During last ABC, presentation was made of the Traffic on these posts nevertheless traffic does not necessary mean impact. We have contacted WSO on this matter. Our feeling is that by creating this committee, this procedure and decisions would become more open to the fellowship and therefore more representative of our diversity and more participatory. Some of our ACA members might be professionals in this field, be community manager and have interesting input.

WSO Analysis:

Factors to consider:

At the 2024 ABC, the conference approved the following motion: To approve the use of social media as a public awareness and outreach tool by ACA WSO while adhering to the Traditions in its use. (ABC_2024_09). This motion was approved based on a report that the General Manager presented at the 2024 ABC, following a trial period of using social media to carry the ACA message.

The general manager is currently overseeing ACA social media efforts with the support of a paid social media consultant, who is also an ACA member with a strong understanding of the Traditions. They are consulting and collaborating with the Public Services Committee. Both the WSO trustees and staff recognize the importance of maintaining a consistent flow of

content for an effective social media presence to carry the ACA message and have found that utilizing a paid professional has provided a reliable and consistent implementation.

For examples of social media content, please refer to the links below.

Reference Links:

[Social Media Report at May 2024 ABC](#)

<https://www.instagram.com/acaworldservice>

<https://www.tiktok.com/@acawso>

<https://youtube.com/@acaworldservice>

Optional Comments: (Those that were greater than 50 words, per Ballot instructions, were truncated. Comments that only referred to a group's internal voting percentages were not included.)

- a) The proposed committee who ideally possess experience in digital communication would be responsible for developing strategies and content to carry the ACA message forward in a manner which is mindful of ACA Traditions and rooted in a participatory, collaborative and community-driven approach.
- b) Involving social media is against Tradition 11
- c) This work is already performed by a consultant providing updates on a regular basis. Which is best for the newcomer.
- d) There is a larger digital strategy being developed by WSO and other consultant, of which social media is only a part. We suggest this be discussed at the ABC, with a presentation given about the digital strategy being developed.
- e) Social media is today's bulletin board
- f) There is already a group working on social media. The proposing groups can join the existing effort, including the public services committee.
- g) Already being worked on.
- h) Our group believes this work is already being done by the general manager, paid consultant, and public services committee
- i) ACA WSO has already enlisted the talents of a paid social media consultant, also an ACA member, who is collaborating with the Public Services Committee.
- j) WSO is already employing the services of a professional to do this.
- k) There is already a committee where the interested members are happily welcome to join.
- l) We were split on this. The main concern is that social media breaks Tradition 11 and moves into promotion rather than attraction.
- m) NO, already collaborating with the Public Services Committee, join that committee if you want involved.
- n) There's not enough people serving on committees as it is.
- o) Already done
- p) What kind of content would be on the Social Media? It is a distraction. As a parent it is better for me to get off social media and act as a parent with integrity. Focus on governance of the policy. These are the [4] social media/aka billboards ACA WSO uses.
- q) Tradition 11
- r) concerns about anonymity and promotion

- s) Anonymity is always a concern; also want to be sure that this is just for awareness rather than promotion.
- t) Quite a few people in ACA wish they'd known about it sooner.
- u) 60% approve, 40% disapprove

Yes	47%	75	Proposal 2025-5 Submitted by Region 2 (Greater Western USA), CA1267 (San Diego, CA, USA), WEB0381 (Arroyo Grande, CA, USA), CA915 (Arroyo Grande, CA, USA)	5
No	53%	84		
No Opinion		24		
Issue: We propose that all ACA literature is to be “Conference Approved” by the ACA fellowship before it is published and offered for sale. This change is expected to save thousands of dollars associated with the current practice of distributing unapproved ACA literature that may require substantial revision.				

<p>Background: WSO’s OPPM (pp. 37-47) outlines the process for ACA literature. Currently, the Literature committee evaluates submitted literature and may recommend it to the WSO Board. If WSO approves it, the book is typeset, printed, and sold without Conference Approval. Once published in English, the manuscript is distributed for fellowship review for one to three years for comments and suggested changes. The books are translated into multiple languages, published, and sold without Conference approval.</p> <p>The Literature Committee assesses fellowship input such as: comments, ways to reorganize, reword, delete, or replace material, or concerns, for example, plagiarizing works of others or authoritarian statements without therapist credentials. The committee then asks the authors to revise and resubmit the book.</p> <p>Matters of large concern for our fellowship are threefold. Published ACA literature is now decided upon by a very small number of people on the evaluation team and WSO service board. When manuscripts are revised and receive Conference approval, additional costs are incurred for typesetting revisions in approximately 28 languages. Finally, another cost, unsold books without Conference approval, would be deeply discounted or discarded.</p> <p>Typically, the price to typeset and print or reprint the same book is about the same, perhaps changing only the date of publication. Artificial Intelligence (AI) translations are fine-tuned by volunteers. Small revisions cost, according to WSO staff, about \$700 per workbook, about \$1300 for books with more pages, including the BRB, multiplied by the cost of each translation.</p>
<p>Resources/Implementation: To implement this proposal, if passed, requires a simple change in sequence of producing literature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Annual Business Conference delegates and/or Intergroups and Regions to review complete manuscripts for a period of six months to one year, the WSO IT staff would e-mail them the initial draft, or a link to it. • The delegates and groups will submit suggested changes to the WSO Literature Committee. • Suggestions will be sent to the authors to consider for their final draft. • Authors would resubmit this final draft to the WSO Literature Committee. • If the WSO Literature Committee and then the WSO Board approve any changes, the IT staff will then distribute to the fellowship the final draft or publish the links on the website for fellowship consideration for at least six months before balloting.

- The WSO Literature Committee would submit a proposal to approve the final draft through the ABC ballot process.
- If the proposal is passed, this will be discussed at the next ABC.
- Delegates at the ABC would vote as to whether to confer “Conference Approval” of the final document.

This process of getting Conference approval of literature before publishing incurs no costs and would save thousands of dollars. No originally published books would have to be sold at discounted prices or thrown away. Substantial time and money would be saved when translations would not have to be redone.

WSO Analysis:

Factors to consider:

Simplified Clarification on the Fellowship Review Process and Costs

The Fellowship Review process is designed to be inclusive and cost-effective. Members can read and provide feedback on a book through a controlled online feedback form during this three-year process. This allows:

- Firsthand Use: Members gain direct experience with the content.
- Meaningful Feedback: Suggestions and insights from members are gathered for consideration.

Skipping the Fellowship Review and bringing a book directly to the Annual Business Conference (ABC) for approval could result in a decision without most members having read the material. This limits thorough evaluation and broad member participation.

Currently, only 5% of groups send delegates to the ABC, highlighting the importance of Fellowship Review for inclusivity.

Role of Translation Teams in the Fellowship Review

Translation teams play an important role during Fellowship Review. Translating materials at this stage gives them early access to recovery resources and aligns their work with ACA principles. For example, during the Loving Parent Guidebook (LPG) review, translation teams worked closely with the draft content. After Conference approval, a summary of changes is shared, enabling translators to update their versions for consistency and accuracy.

Handling Outdated Literature and Reducing Waste

The office carefully times book orders to minimize waste. When literature becomes outdated, the ACA WSO repurposes it by donating to institutions, shelters, or groups in need. This ensures the materials continue to support recovery efforts while reflecting ACA WSO’s commitment to resourcefulness and inclusivity.

Reference Links:

[Literature Committee webpage](#)

[Publishing Committee webpage](#)

[Translation Subcommittee webpage](#)

[OPPM](#) - see Section XI. ACA WSO Literature/Subsection E. Literature Evaluation and Approval

Optional Comments: (Those that were greater than 50 words, per Ballot instructions, were truncated. Comments that only referred to a group's internal voting percentages were not included.)

- a) Townhall info indicates this proposal may have inaccurate costs and factors that need more work before taking up ABC time.
- b) Conference approval should precede the sale of ACA literature. Revisional material should be marked as such.
- c) Allready happens through the workflows described in the OPPM.
- d) Suggestion: any printed non-approved/in-review lit be clearly marked as such.
Suggestion: non-approved/in-review material be available only online (printable & downloadable). Group concerned that non-approved lit easily mistaken as approved, potentially misrepresenting ACA especially to the public as well as newcomers & members
- e) Our vote was unanimous.
- f) It is not fair for a handful of delegates to approve literature (there are less than 200 delegates at the ABC, and we have over 2000 meetings. The current system allows a 3 year process for members to provide feedback. Also, expecting delegates to read a whole book, for example, before the ABC, is not realistic ...
- g) We vote no - we would have to wait years to see anything that we can benefit from seeing now during the review time. And there is no money wasted. Leftover stock when the final copy is printed is used for our outreach mission - instead of sending new books.
- h) This issue and other problems with the current literature development and approval process need to be studied by a Conference Committee and recommendations for change presented to a future meeting of Delegates.
- i) ACAs do struggle with the urge to control.
- j) As literature is the backbone of any 12-stepprogramme this is more important than many other issues that it is passed by as many adult children as possible.
- k) Don't print as many of new literature. Requests of new literature can be informed of the need for written feedback as the book is proofread for further publication.
- l) We believe this is already addressed by existing structures
- m) No, seldom more than 5% of groups respond to fellowship review. Note sure how we would same money, as we charge full price for the FR copies. The proposal simply changes the order of the steps and would not save any money.
- n) Publishing committee does fine job already
- o) already a Publishing Committee
- p) We think this would slow things down rather than speed them up.
- q) 60% no opinion, 40% approve
- r) This substitutes review and comment by the delegates for the current review/comment by the full membership in fellowship review. Fellowship review permits members and groups to work with the printed copy before making comments. Delegates would not have this option as they would receive only an electronic copy.

Yes	46%	70	Proposal 2025-6 Submitted by Region 2 (Greater Western USA), CA915 (Arroyo Grande, CA, USA), WEB381 (Arroyo Grande, CA, USA)	6
No	54%	82		
No Opinion		31		

Issue: We propose that a Conference Literature Committee of delegates to the 2025 ABC be formed. This committee will initially be charged with determining fellowship literature needs, wants, priorities, and development process.

At the 2026 ABC, that Conference Committee will present its findings and recommendations. If approved, those policies and procedures will be guidelines for that Committee's development of future ACA literature. Translation and publication of literature will remain with WSO in its fiduciary capacity.

Background: Currently, ACA literature is drafted by individuals, groups, and WSO committees. The WSO sequence for literature development is documented in WSO's Operating Policy and Procedures Manual (OPPM pp.37-47). The OPPM is a document developed and changed by the WSO Board rather than by the ACA Conference.

ACA Literature is a matter of great concern to the entire fellowship. It defines our fellowship. It provides all of us with tools and avenues for recovery. No input, however, has been gathered from our worldwide fellowship as to our wants, needs, and priorities for ACA Literature.

The report from the last WSO Literature Committee meeting posted on the ACA WSO website was dated October 11, 2022. A project-development chart was last updated on September 19, 2022. No other reports from the main Literature committee or its sub-committees have been posted. If the WSO Literature Committee exists, it is unknown what is being done or who is doing it.

It's time for the Conference to define our own policies, procedures, and priorities in literature development. WSO no longer needs to be independently in charge of accepting or creating ACA Literature.

Resources/Implementation: Delegates at the 2025 ABC, who wish to volunteer to serve on this committee, will be invited to submit their e-mail addresses in the Zoom chat. Region 2, the group submitting this proposal, will contact those delegates to meet online at a mutually agreeable time and date to organize the committee. Delegate volunteers will choose their leaders and create a mission statement and committee rules, including when to meet and on what platform (for example, Zoom).

The Committee will devise a method to gather input as to what ACAs want and need in terms of future ACA literature. They then will collect it from group delegates and group contacts throughout the ACA service structure. They will also devise a way to determine fellowship priorities, get that input, and analyze the data.

At the 2026 Annual Business Conference, the Conference Literature Committee will present a report of their research and recommendations. If approved by the Conference, the

Committee's recommendations will be guidelines for the Conference's Literature Committee to develop future ACA literature. The OPPM will no longer need to address these matters.

This would cost nothing to implement. We need to have a conference approved approach to developing the literature that will help ACAs, currently and in the future, recover from the effects of growing up in alcoholic and dysfunctional homes.

Translation, publication, and distribution of literature will remain with WSO in its fiduciary capacity.

WSO Analysis:

Factors to Consider:

Conference Committees: The WSO Literature Committee is open to all members, ensuring the fellowship has a voice in ACA-produced literature. New ACA literature can be proposed through four channels:

- A delegate motion at the ABC.
- Development by an ACA group.
- Direction from the Board of Trustees.
- Creation by the Literature Committee.

ACA literature is conference-approved, reflecting the fellowship's collective input. WSO does not independently control literature decisions but remains committed to honoring the fellowship's voice.

Policies for Conference Committees have yet to be developed and are not documented in the Operating Policy and Procedures Manual (OPPM) or By-Laws. Other 12-Step WSOs with Conference Committees operate under a charter and a Conference Service Manual, providing structured frameworks that can serve as inspiration for future development.

Literature Assessment Update: The Board, in collaboration with literature volunteers, is actively reviewing literature priorities and development processes to better align with Fellowship needs, as directed by motions passed at previous Annual Business Conferences (ABCs). Progress and findings are detailed in the Literature Assessment Executive Report, available for review.

Currently, there are three books in the Fellowship review process: Loving Parent Guidebook (LPG), A New Hope, and Connections. Five books are in development, initiated by ABC motions.

Current Literature Report: An annual report of the WSO Literature Committee was included in the 2024 ABC binder.

Invitation to Join the WSO Literature Committee: We encourage proposers and all ACA members to consider volunteering with the WSO Literature Committee. Currently, we are seeking project coordinators to support our ongoing work.

Reference Links:

<https://acawso.org/literature/>

<https://acawso.org/2024/05/07/2024-abc-guidebook-literature-committee-report/>

Optional Comments: (Those that were greater than 50 words, per Ballot instructions, were truncated. Comments that only referred to a group's internal voting percentages were not included.)

- a) We need to reconsider more factors than just what this proposal covers and how materials will be broadly shared if we decide, not just screened by a small group/committee
- b) We do not have enough Member support for the committees we already have
- c) This is a regional/intergroup issue more than a WSO level issue. Every region has unique language, culture and programmatic needs.
- d) There already is a lot of input regarding fellowship literature via the existing Literature Committee, and ballot proposals from the fellowship.
- e) There are already many opportunities to volunteer on committees. More committees only create more complicated chains.
- f) Is already taken care of by the WSO Literature Committee.
- g) Absolutely unnecessary.
- h) Is this or something similar already in place?
- i) Our group thought this proposal was too broad and would be difficult to put into practice
- j) A WSO Literature Committee already exists and is open to all members. There are already multiple channels for the proposal of new ACA literature.
- k) there is already a wso commity
- l) Risk of literature development becoming more centralized, plus risk of world service structure becoming more fragmented -- worst of both worlds. Would rather interested members help WSO Literature Committee function better.
- m) There is already a committee where the interested members are happily welcome to join.
- n) Translations should be charged to those needing translations. English participants do not need to forgo the expense as we are moving g forward in our recovery needs.
- o) we believe this is already addressed by existing structures
- p) The Lit Com reports to the content collaboration com, which is responsible for providing the literature report as part of it's report. There's already procedures that are open to anyone.
- q) Publishing committee already found a fine job
- r) no process to form a committee
- s) There's already a literature committee, and delegates can serve if they like.
- t) 40% approve, 40% no opinion, 20% disapprove

Yes	56%	86	Proposal 2025-7 Submitted by IG630 (SoCal Intergroup, CA, USA)	7
No	44%	68		
No Opinion		29		
Issue: 75% of registered ACA (ACoA) meetings are needed to approve changes to traditions and concepts.				

Background: Although ACA is a 12-step based group it's the traditions and concepts that are the bedrock foundation on which we stand. Throughout the years our program has seen many changes and growth, we have recognized how big our tent is. From children of alcoholics to children of addiction to children of every dysfunction. We have grown to embrace varying spiritualities and none at all. We have grown to embrace the teaching and understanding of many scholars and educators the source of our issues and have recognized the solution, although similar can vary in practice. We can attend meetings where the ACA steps are read, or Tony A, or Atheist, Native American, Buddhist. We are able to be open to all aspects of recovery because we have a solid bedrock foundation.

Resources/Implementation: Not included in Proposal

WSO Analysis:

Factors to consider: Currently, there are no established percentage thresholds specifically for making changes to the ACA Traditions and Concepts. The general rule for significant unanimity in the "Big Red Book" is two thirds (2/3) (English BRB page 596).

As per the Operating Policy and Procedures Manual (OPPM), Section XIV Ballot Preparation Committee, sub-section G. "Validate and Publish the Results", proposals are added to the ABC agenda with a 66.7% which is 2/3rd affirmative vote (excluding 'no opinion' votes) from registered ACA groups that choose to participate.

The number of registered ACA meetings fluctuates, and as of late 2024, there were over 2,700 registered meetings. A 75% participation threshold would require over 2,000 groups to vote.

Other 12 Step programs, such as AA, use a 75% threshold for changing foundational documents.

Reference Links:

[OPPM | ACA WSO](#)

[Meeting Search - Adult Children of Alcoholics & Dysfunctional Families](#)

Optional Comments: (Those that were greater than 50 words, per Ballot instructions, were truncated. Comments that only referred to a group's internal voting percentages were not included.)

- a) More clarity needed

- b) We are concerned about the calculation of a 75% threshold for the traditions 2000 groups of 2700 groups and we believe It should be 75% of groups responding.
- c) This seemed a very high approval rating to achieve and the response of the group's representative in the Town Hall indicated that the group itself had misunderstood the existing requirements of 66.7% approval for passage of proposals.
- d) The Traditions are the foundation of the ACA program as written and do not merit interpretation.
- e) Could be interesting to hear the opinion of the ACA Fellowship on this one.
- f) We support a minimum 75% approval for changes to any core material.
- g) Discuss - but maybe decide on a lower number.
- h) Our group thought it would be unlikely to get 75% of registered meetings to participate
- i) Fear of change fuels a lot of decisions like this. I trust that the representatives in the future shall make choices with the best interest of ACA involved. Having 75% of the meetings required is something that will never happen. Its likely that ACA has never had 75% of groups ever vote on any one issue, much less carry a 75% majority.
- j) Our group feels it should not be easy to change the ACA Traditions or Concepts. Any changes should be supported by a large majority of members.
- k) This proposal does not describe a problem that would be solved by this solution. The existing 12 Concepts need major revisions and a requirement for approval by 75% of registered groups would be virtually impossible to achieve.
- l) Concept 2 current wording is obscure or meaningless, not ready to be locked down. We're skeptical about ever getting 75% of all registered meetings to even vote at all, but let's see what happens with the "ACAD" vote process.
- m) Votingsystems ca be used in various ways. AA has used this as a way to make the steps, traditions and concept 12 unchangeable, while the other concepts are difficult but not impossible to change. We see an interesting discussion regarding what parts we want to protect.
- n) 90% of ACA members should agree.
- o) AA, use a 75% threshold for changing foundational documents. Too important to allow changes at a 66%.
- p) It would be almost impossible to reach this threshold when only about 5% of meetings now participate in the fellowship ABC
- q) Yes it should be discussed. The problem is in wording, must add "representative."
- r) 40% approve, 40% disapprove, 20% no opinion

Yes	47%	78	Proposal 2025-8 Submitted by CA1608 (Thousand Oaks, CA, USA)	8
No	53%	89		
No Opinion		16		
Issue: We propose that the descriptive name for ACA be simplified to ADULT CHILDREN ANONYMOUS.				

Background: By leaving our acronym the same (ACA), yet simplifying the descriptive title to "ADULT CHILDREN ANONYMOUS " we would accomplish several objectives:

1.) PRIMARILY - It would allow for a more INCLUSIVE program offering to the community of suffering individuals whom we serve - many of whom might otherwise tune-out with the exclusionary name of "Adult Children of Alcoholics and Dysfunctional Families". (We've all experienced this when we begin to describe ACA to others - "Well, there are no alcoholics in my family." Or "I had a good childhood..." 2.) It's concise - easy to say and remember. 3.) Welcomes every potential newcomer, ALL Adult Children - coming from ANY 12-Step group; including those with zero Program participation. 4.) Invites curiosity and interest: A prospective newcomer hears the term Adult Children and asks "What is an adult child?" To which we respond: An adult child is someone whose actions and decisions as an adult are guided by childhood experiences grounded in self-doubt or fear." (BRB p.302, paragraph 3) 5.) More EFFICIENT and COST EFFECTIVE - Does not require the re-reprinting of myriad collateral materials (new logo, workbooks, brochures, coins and medallions, stationary, answering-machine trees, etc.) - Seamlessly integrates with our existing website.

Resources/Implementation: We've reached out to the name-study committee, <https://acawso.org/name-study/> - and received the following reply from the Chair of that study: "We have gone through two fellowship surveys with more than 11,000 responses and two town halls. The most popular name from the surveys was Adult Children of Alcoholics and Dysfunctional Families (ACAD). The 2024 Annual Business Conference (ABC) has approved sending this out to the groups for voting." Further communications with the Ballot Prep Committee encouraged us to submit our group's Ballot Proposal if our group strongly supported its inclusion - which was unanimous. Hence, this proposal. We feel that it better supports the Stated name-study purpose: "to develop a name for the fellowship that communicates inclusion for any adult child from a dysfunctional family regardless of the presence of alcohol in the home."

WSO Analysis:

Factors to consider: The Name Study Committee explored the name "Adult Children Anonymous" and reported their findings at the 2024 ABC.

Regarding domain ownership:

- The web domain adultchildrenanonymous.org is owned by a private individual.
- The web domain adultchildrenanonymous.com is owned by the ACA World Service Organization (WSO).

This proposal conflicts with what the 2024 ABC delegates have decided to date regarding a possible ACA name change. At the 2024 Annual Business Conference (ABC), delegates approved a motion (#2024-6) to submit to all ACA registered groups the proposal to change the fellowship's functional name to "Adult Children of Alcoholics and Dysfunctional Families (ACAD)," which was the top choice from the Name Study Committee's surveys.

To implement this decision, the Board developed a Fellowship Group Voting process that was approved by the delegates following the Quarterly Delegate Meeting on December 7, 2024. The minority opinion on the "voting process" will be heard at the Quarterly Delegate Meeting on February 1st, 2025.

If the delegates approve the process, we will move forward with the "Fellowship Wide Group Vote" on the ABC 2024-6 Motion on "Name Change." An update will be added to the 2025 ABC agenda. More information is available on the links below.

Reference Links:

[Name Study webpage](#)

[Name Study Presentation at the 2024 ABC](#)

[Proposed Fellowship Group Voting Process](#)

Optional Comments: (Those that were greater than 50 words, per Ballot instructions, were truncated. Comments that only referred to a group's internal voting percentages were not included.)

- a) This is a good name!
- b) We agree that the new name will retain the existing acronym AND invite all Adult Children into the healing conversation.
- c) This proposal appears to be an attempt at an end run around the choices made by previous surveys of the fellowship regarding the proposed new name for the fellowship, that would require the fellowship to have to go back to restart the name change process from the beginning, thereby requiring additional resources.
- d) Although the membership has spoken and Adult Children Anonymous is too obscure to be effective, it is always prudent to make sure all members have spoken.
- e) Awful idea. The average person coming to a program would have no idea what an adult child is, as opposed to say an alcoholic or an addict. If that were the name, I would not have come to a meeting (in ACA 4 yrs now)
- f) All of the arguments for this proposal make sense. Keep it simple - ie. don't complicate things unnecessarily.
- g) If the name MUST be changed, this is the best. It was not included in the previous polls!
- h) This ballot is trying to impose an opinion that overrides 2 years work and studies of the name change committee
- i) Spreading the message is the key concept.
- j) The name is already taken.
- k) We defer to the work of the name change committee and applaud their efforts
- l) Me, and too many other people question whether their parent was alcoholic. It seems to be a barrier to membership for far too many people. Having Adult Children Anonymous maintains our fellowships initials and opens membership up to anyone.
- m) This name is more inclusive of all adult children, regardless of whether there was alcohol in the home.
- n) This proposal is rendered moot by the name change that has already been approved by the delegates and will soon be voted on by all registered groups.
- o) Some of us think the solo reference to "Adult Children" would confuse the public. Some of us like the proposed name, but think rebranding when we don't own the .org domain would confuse the public.
- p) We believe this is such a big issue for so many that it would be peaceful for everybody that the issue had been lifted even if it is turned down later.
- q) Adult children anonymous is perfect
- r) We want to honor the multiyear process already taking place.

- s) YES- Keeps the acronym the same!! & if Proposal 7 passes, it should require 75%. It is foundational!
- t) alcoholics makes you think it is for alcoholics only the BRB has the name correct on the cover - dysfunctional made a lot of group members to join
- u) Names project has already invested so much effort into this
- v) Most members saw no need to discuss this again. A step back, not progress. Disconnected submitting group. Like idea of not having 'alcoholism' in name.
- w) Name change process already in place
- x) didn't we vote on this already?
- y) We've discussed and voted on this already.
- z) Adult Children Anonymous
- aa) 80% approve, 20% disapprove
- bb) The present name clearly conveys what the group is about, while the proposed name doesn't (newcomers may be unfamiliar w/ the term "adult children"). Without a clearly understood name, less people will come to their first meeting because they don't realize it may apply to them.

Yes	39%	55	Proposal 2025-10 Submitted by OK0058 (Oklahoma City, OK, USA)	10
No	61%	87		
No Opinion		40		
Issue: The Conference adopt a policy for ACA World Services that all future proposals from any source for consideration at a meeting of Conference delegates must be reviewed by a Committee of the Conference for analysis and recommendations, and then by the entire Conference delegation for a final decision on proposals to be placed on an agenda. Members of the Conference Committee will be a reasonable number of randomly selected delegates willing and able to serve.				

Background: Current ballot proposal and delegate meeting agenda development processes are driven by WSO Board Committees with little involvement by the Conference of Delegates. This is not in alignment with the Twelve Concepts and is inconsistent with the proper role of the Conference as the voice and conscience of the ACA Fellowship. Under this proposed policy, the Conference will decide which proposals to consider and act upon. WSO will have input, but not control, over the processes by which proposals are selected for the Conference agenda.

This Conference Committee will:

- organize itself, elect officers, adopt procedures and guidelines;
- collect additional information about each proposal;
- accurately summarize and describe the issue to be addressed; and,
- identify alternatives the Conference may consider as solutions or actions.

The Conference will:

- consider all information and the recommendations of the Committee,
- select the proposals to be considered on its agenda,

- discuss and decide on a solution or action on each issue, and
- send a recommendation to the WSO Board on each proposal.

Resources/Implementation: The WSO Board of Trustees will take appropriate measures to implement this policy.

WSO Analysis:

Factors to consider: As stated above in #9, the WSO Ballot Proposal Committee—composed of volunteers, including Delegates and Trustees—facilitates the process of managing proposals.

Today proposals are voted on directly by registered ACA groups worldwide to determine their inclusion on the Annual Business Conference (ABC) agenda. This proposal seems to eliminate the requirement to circulate the Ballot to all registered ACA groups for voting on what is to be placed on the ABC Agenda.

At present, guidelines defining the role, responsibilities, and authority levels of Conference Committees have not yet been established by the delegates.

Reference Links:

- [BPC Page | ACA WSO](#)
- See also: Proposal 2025-9 (above) - Future Changes to the Ballot Process
- Concept X states: “Every service responsibility should be matched by an equal service authority and should always be well-defined.” - see: [Twelve Concepts of ACA](#)

Optional Comments: (Those that were greater than 50 words, per Ballot instructions, were truncated. Comments that only referred to a group’s internal voting percentages were not included.)

- a) Membership still is our ultimate authority.
- b) Already happens as described in the OPPM page 62.
- c) Lots of groups are interested in submitting a ballot to stay informed, but have no one willing or able to be a delegate. We're not nearly ready for anything like this.
- d) What is the structure of how a conference committee would work? Doesn't make sense at this time.
- e) We agree that more input from the groups, intergroup, and regions is important and that the conference should be directing WSO
- f) Decisions about which issues are placed on the agenda for delegate meetings should be made by the delegates, and not by a WSO-led process that leaves the delegates out of decisions on which proposals they are permitted to consider.
- g) Concerned about no guidelines for responsibility of a committee with that much authority. Even with such guidelines, would prefer to leave the agenda under broader Fellowship control.
- h) This ballot is too unclear and needs to be rewritten.
- i) They are trying to remove the fellowship from the decision process.
- j) Would delay the process too long
- k) no process in place

- l) would allow a smaller group to decide the agenda rather than all the groups that want to
- m) So groups wouldn't be able to vote on them. Seems less inclusive.
- n) 40% approve, 20% disapprove, 40% no opinion

Yes	59%	91	Proposal 2025-11	Submitted by IG70 (West Great Lakes Intergroup, USA)	11
No	41%	63			
No Opinion		28			
Issue: To allow the creation of Intergroup(s) defined by a shared set of needs among its member meetings, including but not limited to geographic proximity; to allow meetings to register with any Intergroup, provided the Intergroup votes at a regular business meeting to accept their registration; and to convene an ad-hoc committee to study the role of Intergroups within the ACA service structure to highlight the opportunities offered by participation in Intergroups.					
Background: The Big Red Book generally describes the scope of an intergroup’s reach as bounded by a geographical area (e.g. BRB pp 603-604); the Big Red Book further directs groups that have no Intergroup in their area to elect a Group Representative to attend the Annual Business Conference (page 604). With the dramatic increase in virtual meetings that both identify with no explicit geographic area and include members who live in a wide, in some cases international, array of geographical areas, there are virtual groups who are desirous of the representation and information that registration with an intergroup can provide.					
Resources/Implementation: As a functioning intergroup for 13 years, the West Great Lakes ACA Intergroup (WGLACA) will provide leadership and support to carry out this activity. WGLACA is offering to collaborate with the appropriate WSO committees as well as with other Intergroups and Regions that are interested in participating in this project.					
WSO Analysis: Factors to consider: Removing Geographic Boundaries: Published in 2006, the ACA Fellowship Text “Big Red Book” is nearly 20 years old. Since its release, significant changes have occurred, including advancements in technology and the global growth of ACA. Groups have evolved from being primarily geographic-based to also including virtual groups without geographic boundaries. Therefore, the geographic policy for forming Intergroups has already been informally amended to allow virtual Intergroups to register on the ACA website. The first part of this proposal seeks to formalize this informal policy.					

Creation of an ad-hoc Committee:

- The ACA WSO Member Services Committee has an existing subcommittee for Intergroups and Regions - see reference to webpage below. This subcommittee is open to all.
- The ACA WSO Intergroup subcommittee currently supports an "Intergroup Roundtable" to discuss the role of Intergroups.
- This proposal suggests creating an ad hoc committee which may be duplicating efforts.
- We welcome the involvement of West Great Lakes ACA Intergroup (WGLACA) as well as all Intergroups in the established Intergroup subcommittee and roundtable discussions.

Reference Links:

- [Intergroups-Regions Info. webpage](#)
- [Member Services Committee webpage](#)
- [Intergroups Subcommittee webpage](#)
- [ACA WSO Bylaws.pdf](#)

Optional Comments: (Those that were greater than 50 words, per Ballot instructions, were truncated. Comments that only referred to a group's internal voting percentages were not included.)

- a) Reorganizing intergroups to give broader support and representation is a positive thing.
- b) This change has already happened informally. It would be a good idea to make the informal change from purely geographically oriented intergroups to intergroups without geographical boundaries formal.
- c) 2 abstain
- d) The pyramid structure would seem to support the groups within the intergroup should designate what parameters their intergroup should have.
- e) We are already struggling geographically.
- f) Geographic boundaries are no longer an issue, so we don't see the need for this.
- g) Already ok to do.
- h) Our group is in favor of allowing ACA groups to register with a willing Intergroup not limited to geographical proximity.
- i) The ad hoc committee must be a conference committee and not another WSO committee.
- j) In favor of non-geographic Intergroups, not in favor of overlapping competing world service structures, and grateful to West Great Lakes Intergroup for service it renders to the fellowship beyond its own geographic area.
- k) There is already a committee where the interested members are happily welcome to join.
- l) We already have this guideline
- m) Unclear how intergroups work for telephone meetings
- n) No Duplication- Join the Member services committee!

- o) Our group was evenly split on this proposal. Some saw important to address, while others did not want it discussed at the ABC. No unanimity.
- p) some of this is already in progress
- q) There are already intergroups based on shared needs. Some of the other parts (like letting the Intergroup approve new members and studying their roles in service structure) might be worthwhile.
- r) 60% approve, 20% disapprove, 20% no opinion
- s) Although check if anything prohibits this type of intergroup currently.

Yes	47%	71	Proposal 2025-12	Submitted by Region 2 (Greater Western USA), WEB381 (Arroyo Grande, CA, USA), CA 915 (Arroyo Grande, CA, USA)	12
No	53%	81			
No Opinion		30			
Issue: We are proposing that ACA reestablish the practice of seating Representatives elected by a Region onto the WSO Board. As in prior ACA practice, each elected Region representative will be empowered to vote on all matters before the WSO Board, an ACA service body.					

Background: In the past, the WSO Board was comprised of elected Region and Intergroup Representatives, as well as “at large” trustees. In the late 1980s, elected representation on the service boards fragmented and disappeared. The very few remaining trusted servants provided leadership at meeting, intergroup, region, and world levels.

ACA meetings elect individuals to represent them on the Intergroup service boards. Intergroups elect representatives to represent them on the Region service boards. And, mirroring some other 12-Step programs, our Intergroups and Regions used to be able to elect their representatives to serve them on the World Service Board.

Today, the fellowship has sufficiently increased to reestablish the original service structure. Without having, at least, Region representatives on the Board, there are insufficient checks and balances, increased communication failures, as well as shortages of volunteers and 7th Tradition donations.

The policy for selecting “at large” trustees, as stated in the Operating Policy and Procedures Manual (pp.12-14), is exclusionary as it has been applied to elected Region Representatives. The policy as applied by the Nomination Committee violates the autonomy of the Regions (Tradition 4) and the Inverted Pyramid embodied in “service boards directly responsible to those they serve” (Tradition 9).

We need to restore our representative form of our service structure by automatically seating elected Region Representatives onto the WSO service board. To reiterate, this will facilitate improved trust and fellowship support. It will also improve communication and build in checks and balances.

Resources/Implementation: To implement this proposal WSO would remove the sections of their Operating Policy and Procedures Manual (OPPM) that stipulate elected Representatives of Regions need to apply for WSO Trustee positions. WSO may want to keep their internal application process for “at large” trustees.

WSO would welcome and seat elected representatives of the Regions as voting members of the WSO Board when presented with written documentation of that election from the Region.

There is no fiscal impact to seat elected Representatives of the Regions onto the WSO Board.

WSO Analysis:

Factors to consider: Regions are strongly encouraged and warmly invited to put forward trustee candidates to the Nominating Committee for review and approval as outlined in the Operating Policies and Procedures Manual (OPPM).

The Nominating Committee’s vetting process for board applicants, along with the qualifications for board membership, is clearly outlined in the OPPM under Section II, K. Nominating Committee; L. Qualification for Board Membership, and M. Regional Trustees (pages 13–15). All trustee candidates are thoroughly vetted for conflicts of interest and overall suitability by the Nominating Committee and are ratified by the delegates at the Annual Business Conference as per the bylaws.

This proposal bypasses the established application and vetting process by the Nominating Committee and introduces a dual track for trustee confirmation.

Since the inception of the Nominating Committee, WSO board candidates put forward by a Region have been accepted.

Nominating Committee members are vetted using the same qualifications and standards as board members.

Reference Links:

- [OPPM](#) (see pages 13 - 15 and Appendix IV)
- NOTE: A similar ballot proposal was submitted in 2022 see: Proposal 2023-06 in [2023-Proposals-Results-final.pdf](#)

Optional Comments: (Those that were greater than 50 words, per Ballot instructions, were truncated. Comments that only referred to a group’s internal voting percentages were not included.)

- a) This proposal needs to be refined to make sure it still vets those proposed for conflicts of interest somehow. That’s not clear and needs further work.
- b) We hope to gain more understanding of the current vetting process before voting to change the policy.

- c) This is the structure assured by the Inverted Pyramid on which 12-Step programs have been built; change happened AFTER 2017
- d) Our group felt that this proposal would allow individuals to be seated on the WSO Board without a review of their background and credentials in line with current practices of ACA. The group favored the continuation of the current review process for all candidates for the board.
- e) Because of proposal 11 it makes sense that further discussion is warranted to come up with solutions that address the needs of smaller unrepresented regions.
- f) All intergroups and regions are already free to propose representatives for admission to the Board. There is already a good procedure for final approval of these candidates at ABC. That is, the Community ultimately approves the candidates.
- g) We believe everyone should have to apply and submit to the same vetting process, no exceptions.
- h) Region trustees that could have a lot of influence in how things are run without some type of application process seems risky for the fellowship. The analysis seems to say no one has been turned away anyway.
- i) Not all intergroups and regions are well functioning. Just adding people to the board because these groups say so doesn't make any sense at all.
- j) We agree that this would be one way to gain more representation of groups, intergroup, and regions
- k) Regions seem to have no functional purpose in ACA in most areas. One regional meeting I attended seemed to have no function whatsoever and, given the size and population of said region, the meeting was remarkably small.
- l) New trustee candidate nominations by Regions to the WSO Board are already welcomed by the existing Nominating Committee, who use an established application and vetting process.
- m) would help people to get sponsored
- n) This proposal could return a critically needed degree of oversight of the WSO Board and the Nominating Committee does not have the authority to vet Trustees appointed by Regions. Regions are autonomous the same as the ACA groups.
- o) Proposal seems intended to seat a trustee who could not pass vetting for qualifications we consider essential. It buries this point in a grandiose sales pitch. The sales pitch contains elementary editing mistakes. None of this passed our sniff test.
- p) current structure was adopted for a reason
- q) "- Other 12 Step fellowshipss still have their Regional nominees vetted by a ""Nominating Committee"". They do not merely place them on the Board of Trustees. "
- r) not ready -- we don't have enough regions at this point to consider this
- s) 40% approve, 40% no opinion, 20% disapprove