Governance Meeting

Check-In Round
The Facilitator invites participants, one at a time, to share a check-in to call out distractions and get present. No discussion.

Build Agenda
Participants build the agenda of tensions to process, using one or two words per item as a reminder for the agenda-item-owner.

Process Agenda Items

1. Present Proposal
   The proposer states their proposal, optionally sharing their tension. Others can help if the proposer asks, but only to craft an initial proposal, not improve it or reach a consensus.

2. Clarifying Questions
   Anyone may ask the proposer questions to better understand the proposal, but not to try to influence. No discussion. No reactions. The proposer can respond “Not specified” to any question.

3. Reaction Round
   The Facilitator asks each participant (except for the proposer) for a reaction, one at a time. No discussion. Reactions are directed to the space, not to individuals.

4. Option to Clarify
   The proposer may clarify the intent or amend the proposal, but they have no obligation to do so. No one else may speak, not even to help.

5. Objection Round
   The Facilitator asks each participant (including the proposer), “Do you see any reason why adopting this proposal causes harm; objection or no objection?” Each objection is stated without discussion. The Facilitator may test objections. See back of card for objection testing questions.

   (If Valid Objections) Integration
   Integrate one objection at a time. The goal is an amended proposal that removes the objection and addresses the proposer’s tension. Anyone can participate, but the focus should be on the proposer and the objector. See back of card for details on facilitating this step.

Closing Round
The Facilitator invites each participant, one at a time, to share a closing reflection. No discussion.
To warrant integration, a concern must meet all of the following criteria. The questions can be asked in any order. Any participant may request testing.

**Criterion The proposal would hurt the circle’s capacity to express its purpose or accountabilities.**

- Is your concern a reason the proposal causes harm, or...?  
  - Is your concern that the proposal is unneeded or incomplete? ✗

**Criterion The proposal would limit the purpose or accountabilities of the objector’s role.**

- Would the proposal limit one of your roles, or...?  
  - Are you trying to help another role or the circle in general? ✗

**Criterion The proposal would introduce a new tension for the objector if adopted.**

- Is the harm created by this proposal, or...?  
  - Is it already a concern, even if the proposal were dropped? ✗

**Criterion The objection is either based on presently-known data or is necessarily predictive because the circle can’t adapt later.**

- Would the proposal necessarily cause the impact, or...?  
  - Are you anticipating that this impact will occur? (If "Yes," ask next question.)

- Could significant harm happen before we can adapt, or...?  
  - Is it safe enough to try, knowing we can revisit it at any time? ✗

**Special Objection Not Valid Governance Output (NVGO)**

- This concern is automatically valid if the proposal breaks the rules of the Holacracy Constitution. E.g., "This proposal is outside of the circle’s authority."

**Facilitating Integration**

Start with the objector, but allow contributions from anyone. Ask the objector, “What can be added or changed to remove that issue?”

Don’t wait for consensus. With each idea, ask the objector, “Would this resolve your objection?” If the answer is "Yes," then ask the proposer, “Would this still address your tension?”

After all objections are integrated, repeat the Objection Round.