

Old Business:

"That CNCA establish a standing committee on Technology." – *presented by Dennis H.*

Discussion:

Our District was not in favor. Not that there isn't a need, but the scope of the Web committee could be expanded. // It is needed. Groups have issues and could use an Area resource to reach more people and stay connected. // Was initially opposed because our various committees are responsible for their own needs and pandemic has not changed opinion—our committees are exploring on their own. // We don't know what we don't know. Role of Tech committee could be to look at options to carry the message. Right now, we scramble to solve problems as they arise and people are working individually. // "Web Committee" name doesn't mean we aren't available to help. We could rename the committee so people know to ask for help. // In the 1.5 years we've been talking about this, I started off being in favor but changed mind. We are mostly non-tech people on Web, I don't know if we have people to fill another committee. Is the scope of this new Tech committee policy or hands-on? We could change the name and add members. // Virtual Ad Hoc Assembly committee will disband at the end of the panel. We can put another one in place if needed next panel. Absolutely a need to fill, but not sure if a dedicated committee is the way to do it. // Committees are formed based on needs. This panel we have people to solve our problems and it's important to make it permanent. // We need a lot of help. Our District thought we would be back to normal soon but the pandemic continued and we thought we might shut down. GSRs are scared and feeling inhibited. We need all the help we can get—standing or ad hoc. // I am opposed and I work in tech. We should make changes in structure and function of Web committee instead. It's unclear how this affects our budget. We have to ask if we would be served by adding or expanding. // What would have happened if our Area Officers had not had the skills? Would we have this assembly? In favor of adding Tech or expanding Web. Help needs to be permanent. // Was on Web and the ad hoc that looked at technology needs and have mixed feelings. Purpose of managing our technology—licenses, etc.—could offset costs of having committee. Web should have a singular purpose. Good structure would be for Tech committee to have Web as a subcommittee and to also add a Tech Officer. // I'm opposed. We can incorporate this into our existing committee. We need to keep the big picture in mind of how to serve and who we have available. // Our group was not in favor. The motion was not explicit enough. Minority opinion was that we need to keep up with technology. // The ambiguous nature of responsibilities may make for difficulty in getting people to join. No guarantee skills will be available. // As a Spanish-speaking woman, I feel it is important to have the committee and understand how we can be supported as a District. The pandemic taught us that. // Is a committee the right format? The Technology in AA forum exists—could something like that serve our Area? It doesn't seem like there is anything like the TIAA forum for the Spanish-speaking community. Is a committee the best way to solve that problem? // We just heard members of a remote community say they need this support. We can't wait to fine-tune when the need is now. // If I vote no on this, how can we create a combined Tech/Web committee instead? We agree on need but differ on how to create a solution. // Not in favor, but like idea of expanding Web to support. Infrastructure is there. // At the time the motion (which came out of an ad hoc) was made, that panel's Web committee didn't think they could add to their scope. This panel says they can. May not be right approach. // I am hearing the need but concern about volunteers. Maybe we can find a different solution. // At a Spanish-speaking event, it was hard to find volunteers in our Area and people from other states helped with technology. We need a committee to train more people. // We should redirect the resources we have rather than adding a committee. Will the Web committee continue next panel? // In AA, we do things with the least possible organization. // Important motion. We need an over-arching Tech committee, like in business, and roll Web into the bigger committee. Lack of people is not a reason not to form it. // We do have needs that are being pinpointed more. This is a solution, but not the best solution, and in AA we look for the best solution. // Hit in solar plexus by the need expressed by Spanish-speaking members. How can we better serve? Purpose of Web committee is on our website and not fully defined. Awesome if we could combine. // Too much organization. We have an active Web committee. Can they help us connect with tech people for immediate needs? // What is the cost to set up a committee? // Chair clarified that Standing committee members are appointed by Area Officers from a pool of volunteers and elect their own chair, etc. Cost is nothing to start, but expense reimbursement for chair travel can be nominal to hundreds of dollars, depending on where they live. Web is a standing committee that will continue next panel. The current Virtual Assembly Ad Hoc has members from Web and I&T committees and two Area Officers.

The Assembly was asked if they were ready to vote, and members were ready to vote. Substantial unanimity (2/3) was required for the motion to pass. Tech explained Zoom voting protocols.

Vote: 79 in favor, 48 opposed, 9 abstentions. Motion fails.

Minority Opinion:

Need should be met with creative solution. // Tech is a different skill set from website management. // Accessibility issue. // Today's format is proof of need and we have needs in other areas. A standing "Tech" committee would attract more people. // We need help to do a hybrid meeting. // We have a national technology forum, but communication would be helped if we had more locally. We could disband later if we don't need it anymore. // AA will find a way to support this. // I served on the ad hoc that looked at Area technology needs and many of us were not tech people.

Putting people in a room just to talk about technology creates answers. // Having fire extinguishers before the fire, retaining info and ongoing knowledge so we can respond more quickly. // We send people to NAATW each year. That costs money. Virtual Assembly Ad Hoc expires and we need that in place. // I used to think there were no emergencies in AA and then the world shut down. Business cycles mean we won't do business again until the Pre-Conference next year. Web could take a while to restructure and make proposals at ACM. // We need to create the committee and it could try to get diversity in the fellowship. People are scrambling and this committee could focus. // We have no way forward without this. Tech committee could start by meeting with Web. // Try to live one day at a time, but today and tomorrow we have COVID and technology has forced AA into a new world. Hope we use more, not less, technology in the future. // We have a new Communications department at GSO that works closely with other committees. There is an example there. // Berkeley Fellowship has a lot of Zoombombing, so strategies to help support hosts would help people feel safe in meetings and feel comfortable on Zoom. // Older people and Spanish speakers need our help now and many who need our help aren't here today.

Motion to reconsider; seconded.

Vote on motion to reconsider: 100 in favor, 24 opposed.

Motion to reconsider passes.

Chair announced motion would remain Old Business at the Pre-Conference Assembly.

After the break, a motion was made and seconded from the floor to fast-track the motion (and not wait until the next Assembly).

Discussion:

Important to my Sub-district to have this help.

Vote on motion to fast-track: 69 in favor, 13 opposed

Discussion on original motion resumed:

Nothing to stop committee from forming now and then a motion to combine if desired. There is a need now. AA is self-correcting. We can disband later if not needed. // Grateful for opportunity to fast-track. I voted against because of my District conscience, but see the need. // Excited to reopen this and support it. // It's an accessibility issue; glad we are talking again. // Good is the enemy of the best. Virtual Ad Hoc could be reformed next panel and meet our needs. We owe it to take our time. // Discouraging to see us act in an urgent way. Faulty premise that we can't meet the need without a committee. No emergencies in AA. // It takes time to form a new committee. Let Web expand its scope. I am available to help. Let's not let a name/title stop us from doing the work. // I abstained the first round because I didn't understand what it would mean if it didn't pass. In favor now. Many don't have access to technology. // Still not in favor. More bureaucracy doesn't solve the problem. // It took 1.5 panels for Web to redo guidelines. It will take time to get running. // Disturbed that fear is being used to talk us into a new committee. Name of "Web" doesn't prevent people from helping. // Tech committee is also about helping people who are not here. Web is specialized. I think we have interested members here to serve. // New Accessibilities committee is dedicated to collecting and sharing info to decrease barriers. So maybe Accessibilities plus Web. I'm a hard no. // What can we do in our Districts. It's inspiring for groups to hop on platforms and share experience. Dedicated to solving a problem might not be scope of a new committee. // Motion made before pandemic. I was opposed but listening changed my vote. Fast-tracking and Chair's rules are there for a reason. // In favor because I don't understand and I need to help others as part of service. // I want someone to help me set up and train people on computers in my District. // If people aren't here, why aren't we reaching out at District level? Or group level? I don't see Area doing what we should do locally. // Concerns about committee structure. There is a need that would not be solved at Area level. They would not be going to individual groups. Tech committee would support Officers and Area needs. // Motion is to start committee without scope. All your expectations, fears and dreams—it can't meet everything, so you'll be disappointed. // Could be amazing. What else besides Zoom could help us? Why are people in my meeting opposed to digital basket? If it doesn't work out, disband it. // I do frontline work at local service center and 90% of calls are tech questions. Great need, but Area is not completely responsible. // Was afraid of technology and the Delegate report showed how Area was trying to give us info and that's why I am here today. Need more structure. // SF/Marin Central Office already has lots of information regarding questions and needs expressed here: 7th tradition, Zoom settings, safety, etc. // I would want more time to develop scope of an idea that sounds great on the surface, rather than fast-tracking. // Important to have permanent committee; tech advances daily. // Need to have a clear problem statement and we don't have that.

Second Vote: 88 in favor, 41 opposed, 7 abstentions. Motion passes.