

GOVERNANCE MEETING

1

CHECK-IN

One at a time.
No discussion.

2

ADMIN CONCERNS

Address any
logistical concerns.

3

BUILD AGENDA

One or two words
per item.

4

PROCESS AGENDA

Process items one
at a time.



PROPOSER

Present Proposal

Proposer states proposal, and optionally shares the tension. Others can help if proposer asks, but only to craft an initial proposal, not improve it or seek consensus.



ANYONE

Clarifying Questions

Anyone can ask the proposer a question to better understand, but not influence; no reactions or discussion allowed. Proposer can respond "not specified" to any question.



EVERYONE

Reaction Round

Everyone speaks, one at a time, except proposer. No discussion. Reactions are directed to the space, not to individuals.



PROPOSER

Amend & Clarify

Proposer may clarify intent or amend proposal, but has no obligation to do so. No one else may speak, not even to help.



EVERYONE

Objection Round

Facilitator asks each person in turn, "**Do you see any reason why adopting this proposal causes harm; objection or no objection?**" Each objection is stated and tested without discussion. *See back of card for objection testing guidance.*



MOSTLY
PROPOSER
& OBJECTOR

Integration (if valid objections)

The goal is an amended proposal that would not cause the objection and would still address the proposer's tension.

- Integrate one objection at a time.
- Start with objector, but allow contributions from anyone.
- Facilitator asks, "**What can be added or changed to remove that issue?**"
- Don't wait for consensus. Stop and check out each idea:
 - Ask objector: "**Would this resolve your objection?**"
 - Ask proposer: "**Would this still address your tension?**"

After all objections are integrated, repeat objection round.

(if no valid objections)

Accept Proposal

5

CLOSING ROUND

End the meeting by sharing reflections one at a time. No discussion.



HOLACRACY

©2019 HolacracyOne, LLC

HOLACRACY v.4.1

v.021319

TESTING OBJECTIONS

Do you see any reason why adopting this proposal causes harm; objection or no objection? If objection, What is the harm?

The following questions can be asked in any order.

CRITERIA: THE PROPOSAL WOULD HURT THE CIRCLE'S CAPACITY TO EXPRESS ITS PURPOSE OR ACCOUNTABILITIES

Is your objection a reason the proposal causes harm, or

Is your objection the proposal is unneeded or incomplete?

INVALID
⊗

CRITERIA: THE PROPOSAL WOULD INTRODUCE A NEW TENSION IF ADOPTED

Is the harm created by this proposal, or

Is it already a concern, even if the proposal were dropped?

INVALID
⊗

CRITERIA: THE OBJECTION IS EITHER BASED ON PRESENTLY-KNOWN DATA, OR IS NECESSARILY PREDICTIVE BECAUSE WE CAN'T ADAPT LATER

Would the proposal necessarily cause the impact if adopted, or . . .

Are you anticipating this impact will occur?

Could significant harm happen before we can adapt, or

Is it safe enough to try, knowing we can revisit it anytime?

INVALID
⊗

CRITERIA: THE PROPOSAL WOULD LIMIT YOUR ROLE'S PURPOSE OR ACCOUNTABILITIES

Would the proposal limit one of your roles, or

Are you trying to help another role or the circle in general?

INVALID
⊗



VALID OBJECTION

AN OBJECTION IS AUTOMATICALLY VALID IF THE PROPOSAL BREAKS THE RULES OF THE HOLACRACY CONSTITUTION

e.g. "Not valid governance output (NVGO);"
"Outside the circle's authority."

