<u>**EDRG Group Conscience**</u> **- Sept 5, 2024**
Chaired by Dustin

Opened with Serenity Prayer/157 in attendance

1. <u>Group Rep Report</u>– Laura (not present): Shared quarterly appeal letter (attached). From last month: Laura's term will end in December if another group member is interested in becoming Group Rep they should reach out to Laura to learn more about the commitment.

2. <u>Group Secretary Report</u>– Sammy: All service positions are filled and daily meetings are adjusting well to the addition of tech host.

 3. <u>Treasury Report</u>– Bill R: Provided Treasury Report for the month of August

As of September 1st, 2024, EDRG has the following
$250.00 in the Treasury. (including $250.00 kept in prudent reserve).
$432.00 was collected in August.
$216.00 disbursed to GEA on August 31st.
$216.00 disbursed to WSO-AFG on August 31st.
$181.95 is collected as of 11:00 AM Pacific Time on Wednesday September 4th.

Anticipated expenses are as follows:
NO MORE ANTICIPATED EXPENSES IN 2024
Zoom One Pro Annual $159.90 due March 22nd, 2025.
Zoom 500 Participants $600.00 due March 22nd, 2025.
Website Hosting (3 years) $396.00 due January 5th, 2026.
Domain Registration (10 years) $126.10 due January 1st, 2033.

See July GC Minutes for other means of making donations.

4. <u>Old Business</u>:

● **None**

5. <u>New Business</u>**:**

● **Suggestion to introduce a new "Timer" commitment**– The recommendation is due to the observation that there are many members available for service and so the meeting can meet this need with an additional service commitment. There have been comments that volunteer timers are frequently the same people and so may dominate the position or that variation between timing styles can be confusing.

Discussion:

IN FAVOR: Chairs have felt discomfort that the same individuals are always willing.

AGAINST: People find it to be a great entry point into service without making a larger commitment. It is a good opportunity for participation for people who can't always come to the meeting. The experience of volunteering in the moment ("feeling ready and responding to the feeling") can be positive.

Conclusion:
Secretary will add to minutes and vote at next GC

● **Creation of new Format Committee**–The recommendation is to create a format committee due to the observation that several recent format changes have addressed welcoming newcomers but differentiation between meeting and "parking lot"or "after-meeting" is still unclear and the transition still requires some "improvisation" on the part of chairs.

Discussion:
The Current format doesn't specify that everyone is invited to the after-meeting.
There is no consensus whether the meeting is "parking lot" or "after meeting."
The phrase "all the time we have for sharing" is not accurate.
The strength of the meeting is its "clean" 30 minute format. The overflow time is useful. Format changes should be quick given that the flow of the meeting is working.
Parking lot feels "vague:" is it extra time for sharing? Is it for newcomers? When a question comes up from a newcomer, it shifts focus to address the question.
The committee can address issues with the transition.
Could the same committee discuss creation of the timer as that might appear in script changes.

Conclusion:
GC will hold a vote on formation of a new format committee next month.

● **Extension of Daily Commitments to 6 month terms**–The recommendation is due to the observation that the transitions are effortful and then it takes a while for service holders (chair, chat host, tech host) to get used to the positions.

Discussion:
Specified that the change would only apply to current 4 month terms.
Recommendation to make sure any changes in term would remain staggered with longer term commitments (secretary, chair treasurer) to prevent too much shifting at once.

IN FAVOR: It would make the secretary's job easier.
AGAINST: Four month terms create a lower barrier and more opportunity to "try" service. Longer terms may lead to fewer people trying.

Conclusion:
Discussion will be put in the minutes for others to weigh in.

● **Proposal to require members to turn cameras ON for sharing when a bomber has disrupted the meeting**- In the context of a zoom bomber in yesterday's meeting the chair and tech host asked members to turn their cameras on when sharing for the remainder of that meeting to avoid further disruption. The proposal is to formalize this step so it doesn't feel unilateral should the issue come up again.

Discussion:
Clarified that camera's "on" requirement would only apply to individuals who are sharing for the duration of their share and only during the specific meeting that has experienced a disruption. (ie No plan to kick out the good apples who listen with camera's off.)

Others have experienced meetings with frequent bombing and comment that the best course of action is to stay calm. In meetings with frequent bombers it is often the same individual using different accounts. Some meetings require turning your camera on at time of entry then option to turn off.

Members appreciated how the issue was handled yesterday and the strategy seemed to work well.

The tech host should have the right of decision in these moments even if there is no policy.

Some members would prefer that cameras were always on during shares to make it easier to engage with and understand the shares.

It's a good idea to have a bomber policy. If we decide on the proposal we should put it on the website and in the format so people are aware.

Many individuals reached out in the moment feeling confused why they had to have their cameras on.

Many reiterate that having the option to have camera's "off" increases accessibility for those in a variety of institutional or distracting settings. The GC voted on this early on and recommended that having a camera on was not a requirement.

Without a recommendation in place the decision felt too unilateral for some yesterday.

It felt like a demonstrated response to the incident so that those who noticed or were bothered by the bomber could have it acknowledged without changing the focus of the group.

Does the policy need to be added to the script? Some think scripting is not necessary as chairs and tech hosts are trusted servants. The proposal is not a format change but would exist in the guidelines. Questions in a particular meeting could be addressed in the chat.

Chairs may benefit from having a scripted line available as they may be unsettled in

the moment eg "we had an incident and going forward shares will have to be on camera."

Does the policy actually do anything since once you are kicked out of a meeting you can't reenter? A: A bomber may use more than one account to sign in and it is not uncommon for bombers to repeatedly disrupt the same meeting.

A recommendation was made to vote today so there is no confusion.

A motion in the chat to accept the proposal and put forth the following suggested language: "Due to recent bombing of our meeting [incidents] today, we will ask everyone who wants to share to put their cameras on"

<u>Vote</u>:
FOR 22
AGAINST 2
ABSTAIN 4

● **By email: "How can we make certain the current chairs are using the updated script? Is that a question for the secretary?"** Member not present for discussion.

Secretary is open to suggestions. Currently she sends an email to everyone in service when updates are made. Web chair puts the latest script on the website. You can't make someone read the right script!

Discussion of whether to defer discussion when an individual offering the suggestion is not present.
Some suggestions are made to other service members rather than to the GC Chair.
Many discussion items are straightforward. It is up to the GC chair.
Past GC would gauge a personal reaction vs a real recommendation by suggesting the member bring it to group conscience.
Each group is autonomous and can decide but many groups have asked someone to be present if they have an item for discussion.
Someone else can bring an item or represent an idea on behalf of another as it shows the concern of more than one person.

● **After-meeting host script change**- Person making the proposal was not present today to share recommendations. Will bring item to October GC.

Close with Serenity prayer. (32 present)