**Voting Entity Issue:**We are requesting explication of the “discussion” in the minutes emailed on December 23, 2016 as highlighted on page 9 and 16.

The sections for reference:

1) Under heading October 17, 2016 - Executive Session - 11:18am, it reads: After discussion, MOTION WITHDRAWN.

2) Under heading October 20, 2016 – New Board Meeting – 6pm- AGENDA - Section 4 - Events Issue, it reads: ***Chris seconded.***Discussion. Concerned about whether this sets a precedent. **Motion withdrawn.**

**Rationale:**The board minutes that were published and emailed included verbiage that does not clarify what happened during the board meeting discussion. It is not clear as to why the motion was not presented at CSC concerning a commemorative coin. Would like clarification regarding the decision-making process as to why the motion was not brought up for a vote.

**Conclusion:**

-The SoCal CoDA Board voted in favor of the voting entity issue concern regarding the transparency of the decision made by the CoDA World Board to not let the fellowship (delegates) use the group conscience process.  Our questions are made in the spirit of Traditions 2 and 9 with leaders being trusted servants, they do not govern and committees are directly responsible to those they serve. The SoCal assembly also recently ratified the motion mentioning Concept 12, specifically "Every member has the right to know what is happening within our organization". We, as the Voting Entity, would like more transparency concerning the decision that was made to not make the commemorative coin available to CSC/ICC.

-The issue was significant enough to be presented on multiple occasions; at least five times between October 15th and 21st. At the initial meeting on the 15th, the Legal Group recommendations state the Attorney suggested that it be presented at CSC with a ratified permission letter and any questions regarding legalities were also addressed.

-We request explication on the first motion that was for an agreement to distribute with conditions, it was seconded, followed by "discussion", followed by "Motion withdrawn", and then a motion to hand over ownership. Why the change? What happened?

-For the second, the minutes read favorably...IMC is involved and there's a motion for future consideration, the motion was seconded, then "discussion", followed by “Concerned about whether this sets a precedent”, and followed by “Motion withdrawn.” The SoCal CoDA Voting Entity requests clarification on the discussion that led to the motion being withdrawn.

Thank you for the opportunity to honor our FSM (Part 4) and share our voice as equal members of CoDA.

In the Spirit of Loving Service and Carrying the Message,

SoCal CoDA Regional Committee of Co-Dependents Anonymous

Athena A., SoCal Delegate

Darlene H., SoCal Delegate

Kirsten S., Alternate SoCal Delegate