

## **Motion #2:**

### **Amend Motion 23.3 to No Geographic Boundaries within Conference Area**

---

#### **Minutes from the April 2026 Quarterly**

#### **Background Information Provided at April Quarterly:**

##### ***Re: International Groups and Conference Boundaries***

To: District 25 groups

Regarding the idea that we are a global district has me wondering where that thought came from and what all this talk is about.

Since I was involved in the actual creation of District 25 from roundtable beginning; please allow me to share what our vision was and mission statement was for District 25.

When covid hit there were so many of use finding our way to virtual/online meetings. We found that our homegroups had GSRs and yet no way for us as groups to participate in the area 72 business and have a voice within our General Service Conference area of the United States and Canada.

2020 brought us to the Area Assembly in October with a floor motion to create a virtual district. The motion was sent on to the January 2021 quarterly as a discussion topic. We advanced through the quarterly process with a motion (21.3) to create District 25 within Area72 and our general service conference area of the United States and Canada.

District 25 was created and we started the journey of learning how to make this all work in the virtual world. Trial and errors abound, but we now had a working district just like the rest of Area 72.

There arose the question to whether District 25 was going to admit those folks from outside of the Area 72 geographical area. So, motion 23.2 came into being. This was always about groups within the United State and Canada General Service Conference area.

Understand that District 25 was created within Area 72, which resides within the General Service Conference area of the United States and Canada.

And now, all this global talk is disruptive and causing disunity, both within our district and at the Area. Thus an "us versus them" mentality over this fire wall.

So, in the spirit of unity for all of us, I am proposing District 25 bring forward a motion to the Area April Quarterly to amend Motion 23.2 to read:

["In the spirit of unity, we affirm that District 25 is an online district with no geographic boundaries within the General Service Conference area of the United States and Canada."](#)

I believe this will go a long way to ease any confusion and possible disunity that has arisen over the geofence and international groups.

Patty Smith  
D25 Third Legacy Chair

---

#### **Patty, District 25 Third Legacy Chair Presented the Discussion Topic:**

Presented a proposal to amend Motion 23.2 to clarify that District 25, as an online district, has no geographic boundaries within the General Service Conference structure of the United States and Canada.

## **Motion #2:**

### **Amend Motion 23.3 to No Geographic Boundaries within Conference Area**

---

#### **Minutes from the April 2026 Quarterly**

She provided background that District 25 was created in 2021 (following a 2020 floor motion) to serve online groups within Area 72.

Patty noted that growing international participation in online meetings has led to confusion and tension, including an “us vs. them” dynamic regarding global involvement.

She emphasized that while online groups themselves are not geographically bound, Area 72 remains part of the U.S./Canada General Service Conference structure, and the motion aims to clarify that relationship and reduce disunity.

The intent of the amendment is to provide clarity, maintain unity, and better define the scope of participation within District 25.

---

#### **Motion: John C., DCM, District 45:**

Move to amend Motion 23.2 to read: *“In the spirit of unity, we affirm that District 25 is an online district with no geographic boundaries within the General Service Conference area of the United States and Canada.”*

**Second by: Jim M., DCM District 28.**

---

#### **Discussion on the Motion:**

##### **John DCM, District 45:**

Raised concerns about Area 72’s identity and scope, questioning whether the Area is prepared to function as a global online entity and noting potential implications such as non-U.S./Canada delegates. He emphasized adherence to existing General Service Conference structure and principles, suggesting the original decision may have been made hastily during COVID.

##### **Pete P., DCM District 22:**

Shared that the issue is evolving, stating the amendment does not go far enough and suggesting that if broader participation is desired, it may point toward creating an online Area rather than expanding a district’s boundaries.

##### **Bud W., Accessibilities Chair:**

Supported the amendment, citing A.A. principles and noting that reducing rebellion or conflict is an indicator of a sound decision.

##### **Mike L., DCM District 36:**

Questioned enforceability and fairness, expressing concern that the motion could lead to excluding groups or members, and questioning the Area’s authority to determine inclusion.

##### **David J., DCM District 46:**

Supported the amendment, stating District 25 has sought a balanced, “middle path” solution, and viewed the amendment as a necessary refinement that may bring greater unity. Thanked District 25 for doing this.

## **Motion #2:**

### **Amend Motion 23.3 to No Geographic Boundaries within Conference Area**

---

#### **Minutes from the April 2026 Quarterly**

##### **Louise W., GSR District 25:**

Expressed strong support for maintaining openness, sharing that the online district has been vital to her group's survival, and encouraged continued exploration rather than limiting participation too early.

##### **Jana C., Alt-DCM District 9:**

Referenced Tradition Four, raising concern about how decisions may impact A.A. as a whole, and expressed unease about broader implications.

##### **Morgan S., Alt-DCM District 40:**

Noted that GSO requirements align with U.S./Canada participation, supported the amendment as totally reasonable ask, and this might create a need for an online area. For the Motion to Amend.

##### **David H., GSR Broadview Group, District 42:**

Supported the idea that the issue points toward developing an online Area, placing responsibility on online groups to help lead that effort.

##### **Mike D., DCM District 10:**

Sought clarification, suggesting the amendment might allow participation broadly but limit voting to U.S./Canada members.

##### **Chuy, Member, District 31:**

Asked whether GSO's International Desk had been consulted, referencing guidance on groups outside U.S./Canada.

##### **Jo G., DCM District 25:**

Clarified that no international groups are formally part of District 25, though some groups have members living abroad, and that those groups are registered with GSO.

##### **Dave H., GSR Morning Phoenix Group, District 19:**

Emphasized inclusivity and unity, cautioning against exclusion while the fellowship continues to evolve, and supporting continued participation during this transitional period.

##### **Lisa B., GSR Global Speakers Group District 25:**

Expressed concern about feeling excluded, noting her group includes international members who were previously assured full participation and voting rights, and shared disappointment with the direction of the discussion.

##### **Mary W., Alt-DCM District 45:**

Suggested the issue may stem from alignment with the U.S./Canada Conference structure, while expressing appreciation for online participation and a desire for clarity.

##### **Alan F., Past Delegate Panel 69:**

Really appreciated this amendment, makes me feel more settled about things, referencing GSO guidance and the new group form, and emphasized that conference boundaries are not determined at the Area level, but through the General Service Conference and legal structure and we as an area don't get to choose something different. So this amendment isn't about exclusion, its about alignment with the existing conference structure. Any changes to that structure need to be handled through the Conference, not through an Area who says we want to change the whole world.

## **Motion #2:**

### **Amend Motion 23.3 to No Geographic Boundaries within Conference Area**

---

#### **Minutes from the April 2026 Quarterly**

##### **Derek S., Area Chair:**

Acknowledged the discussion as difficult but valuable, encouraging continued respectful dialogue and noted that we are not trying to exclude anyone, this is about alignment with the Conference.

##### **Melissa, Member, District 27:**

Provided historical context, noting the rapid growth of District 25 and suggesting the situation reflects growing pains, with potential need for broader structural solutions.

##### **Courtney S., Area Delegate:**

Shared that she is seeking guidance from GSO and other delegates and will raise the issue at the General Service Conference to gather broader input.

##### **Rocky, Alt-GSR District 31:**

Emphasized Tradition Three and inclusivity, expressing concern about excluding members based on geography.

##### **Debbie B., DCM District 8:**

Expressed pride in Area 72's willingness to engage in this and have these conversations, supporting continued leadership and discussion at the conference level.

##### **Morgan S., Alt-DCM District 40:**

Called for the question.

##### **Point of Clarification by Dave H., GSR Morning Phoenix Group, District 19:**

Are we voting on the Motion itself or just to put it on the Assembly Agenda?

##### **Derek S., Area Chair:**

This is to put it on the Assembly Agenda. Its already a motion [Motion 23.2 from 2023], this motion proposes to amend that motion.

##### **Derek S., Area Chair:**

At this time he is not going to honor the call for the question.

##### **Motion to Table: by DCM District 36.**

Moved to table the Motion for further discussion.

##### **Seconded by DCM District 3.**

**Results:** The Chair called that the Motion to table was approved, and the topic was tabled until the July Area Quarterly.

##### **Derek, Area Chair:**

Reported that during the break, DCM District 15 requested a vote count, and after consulting with other elected trusted servants, it was determined the original vote was too close to confirm, prompting a re-vote on the motion to table.

##### **Heather, Area YP Chair:**

Requested clarification to ensure members understood that the vote was on tabling the motion (not the

## **Motion #2:**

### **Amend Motion 23.3 to No Geographic Boundaries within Conference Area**

---

#### **Minutes from the April 2026 Quarterly**

motion itself) and related to placing the item on the agenda.

#### **Derek, Area Chair:**

Clarified the procedure:

- A motion to table had been made and seconded prior to the break.
- The vote appeared to me to show a simple majority, but this was disputed.
- A formal counted vote will now be taken to determine whether the Motion was tabled.

A count of a revote by show of hands was conducted on Tabling the Motion:

- 27 in favor
- 30 opposed

**Derek, Area Chair:** Declared the Motion is not tabled, discussion remains open.

**Call for the Vote:** Seeing no one at the microphones or with raised hands online, the Chair called for the vote on the Motion.

**Result:** Motion passed by substantial unanimity and will be on the agenda for the October Assembly.