

PROCESS AGENDA (continued)

<p>Clarifying Questions</p>	<p>OPEN & EXPLAIN EXPLAIN STEP POP-UP</p>	<p>Now clarifying questions. That step is there to allow everyone to seek clarity on the proposal before reacting to it. Any clarifying questions? Popup-style. What else do you need to know about the proposal? <i>Keep an energetic pace, always redirect to the space.</i> <i>When it conveys info more than it seeks info, or when you sense the person wants to be heard, stop and redirect:</i> - Sounds like a reaction, just hold any reaction for the next step. <i>To the space:</i> Anymore clarifying question? <i>When a question pressures the Proposer, protect:</i> - Proposer, it is ok to answer with "not specified". <i>When someone fires an intense interrogation (sequence of questions), redirect to the space:</i> - Anymore clarifying question?</p>	<p>NO: discussion, question, reaction, objection.</p>
<p>Testing Proposal</p>		<p><i>A proposal is always valid if triggering election, or aiming at more clearly reflecting activity that is already happening.</i> <i>In all other cases, test and re-test the proposal at any time (except "Present Proposal", here being ideal for such testing):</i> - What's the tension behind the proposal? - Which of your roles will that proposal help? - What would be an actual example situation from your role that the proposal would have helped resolve? <i>If proposer has failed to answer any of the above, discard proposal:</i> - By ____, you just told me that your proposal is not valid. The process wants us to discard it.</p>	<p>NO judging the quality/pertinence of the reasoning.</p>
<p>Reaction Round</p>	<p>OPEN & EXPLAIN ROUND</p>	<p>Let us now move to the reaction round, This is a chance for every other member to get things off their chest and sense whether or not they'll have an objection. Proposer, you can leave the room if you want. One round only. We start with __ and will continue with __. <i>When reaction makes the proposer uncomfortable, remind:</i> - Proposer, the process wants you to ignore any reaction that does not help you solve your tension. <i>When the reaction is directed to / engaging the proposer, frame:</i> - Reacter, do react to the space, not the Proposer, and use third-person language. <i>When reactor kidnaps the space and time or moves off topic, timebox reaction:</i> - Reacter, you have one minute left for your reaction, focus on what you still haven't shared. <i>Use your reaction time to coach on proposal structure. Don't confuse proposer with high-level technicalities / NVGO here.</i></p>	<p>NO: reaction from Proposer, reactions to reactions, questions or discussions.</p>
<p>Amend & Clarify</p>	<p>OPEN EXPLAIN STEP CLOSE</p>	<p>Proposer, is there anything you would like to clarify about your proposal or amend within it? <i>Protect the proposer from reactions' pressure:</i> You've just heard some stuff. You may just ignore it all. Stay laser-focused on your tension. If the proposal still solves your tension, then just leave it as is and we will move on to the next step. <i>When proposer seeks to integrate the others reactions and asks for inputs / starts discussion:</i> - Proposer, stay grounded in your tension. Be selfish about it. <i>When the proposal has changed significantly, repeat it:</i> - So your proposal is now to ____, Correct?</p>	<p>NO: discussion, suggestion, question, reaction, objection.</p>

PROCESS AGENDA (continued)

Objection Round OPEN **We now move to the objection round. We start with ___ and continue with ___ . Proposer comes last.**
EXPLAIN OBJECTIONS Raising an objection is a present to the proposal, it sheds new light on its potential negative impacts.
 Everyone in their different roles can sense different potential harms a proposition brings.

Raise Objection ROUND **___, do you see any (other) reason why adopting this proposal causes harm; objection or no objection?** NO discussions, questions, reactions.
When the person hesitates on giving an answer, invite:
 - You seem to hesitate, would you like to try an objection?
When the person states they have the same objection as an objection that was raised before, invite:
 - An objection is a very personal thing. I invite you to raise your objection even it sounds the same.

If objection raised ...

Capture Objection OPEN **Let us capture your objection. What is the harm?**
CAPTURE *When objection is fuzzy or complex, ask for synthesis:*
 - Can you finish the sentence: "my concern / the harm is that ..."
When objection is very abstract, guide towards the expression of material harm:
 - Concretely, can you give an example of how it will harm?
 - How does this hurt the circle's capacity to express it purpose?
When objection is that the proposal brings confusion or reduces clarity, invite:
 - Everyone has their own interpretation of the governance; what concrete misinterpretation do you fear and what impact would it cause?
When objection seems to have separate aspects:
 - Would you like to first focus on part of your objection? you can always object to the rest later.
When the objection is about resources (time, money) or people (employeeship, skills), invalidate and guide:
 - Governance is about roles, not persons filling them nor the time or money it takes. You may share your concern about personal, capacity or resource issues to the Lead Link at any time.
 Make sure Secretary has captured the essence of the objection, for everyone to see.

Test Objection OPEN **I now invite you to reflect on the validity of your objection through a series of either-or questions.**
 A valid objection must express how the proposal (Q2) would necessarily create (Q3) harm (Q1) to one of the objector's roles (Q4).
 Please share your reasoning with us every time.
Walk the objector through the test questions, don't judge.
TEST Q1 *Test whether the proposal would hurt the circle's capacity to express its purpose or accoutabilities:*
Is your concern a reason the proposal causes harm
OR is your concern the proposal is unneeded or incomplete? => invalid
TEST Q2 *Test whether the proposal would limit the objector role's purpose or accoutabilities:*
Is your concern created by this proposal
OR is it already a concern, even if the proposal were dropped? => invalid, invite to add their existing tension to agenda
TEST Q3 *Test whether the objection is based on presently known data, or is necessarily predictive because we can't adapt later:*
Do you know this impact will occur
OR are you anticipating this impact will likely occur?
=> could significant harm happen before we can adapt,
OR is it safe enough to try, knowing we can revisit anytime? => invalid
TEST Q4 *Test whether the proposal would limit the objector role's purpose or accoutabilities:*
Would the proposal limit one of your roles in this circle
OR are you trying to help another role or the circle in general? => invalid

Skip a question if it's obvious to you that it would pass the test.
Yet anyone can request that you re-test the objection any time in the process.
When objection is that the proposal is a "non-valid governance output" or states that it "breaks the rules of the constitution":
 - Secretary, please confirm that this proposal is indeed a "Non-Valid Governance Output".
When the words of the objector hint at a specific test question, adapt the second half of the test question with their words on "the harm done", to make it more salient.

CLOSE TEST *As soon as found invalid (or hearing it does not cause harm):*
- By considering that ___, you just told us this objection is invalid.
If found valid (= passes all test questions):
- You just validated this objection. It will be integrated it in a later step.
 Ask same person for other objections, before continuing the round with the next person.

CLOSE OBJECTION ROUND *If no objection raised during the round:*
- In the absence of objection, we all consent to the proposal.
The proposal will now be integrated to our governance structure.

PROCESS AGENDA (continued)

If objections found valid ...

INTEGRATION ^{OPEN} **X objection(s) were raised and found valid.**

If NVGO, start with integrating it.

For each valid objection ...

Integrate Objection

^{OPEN & EXPLAIN}

We now will integrate the first (next) valid objection about ____, raised by ____.

All participants are welcome to help but I'll start first with the Objector, with the aim of finding them minimal change to the proposal accepted by Objector and Proposer.

Objector, what can be added or changed to the proposal in order to remove that issue?

How will that solve the tension for each case presented by the Proposer?

When Objector blocks the integration:

1. Objector, can you come up with an suggestion that would remove your objection while still addressing the Proposer tension?

2. Objector, you are currently making insufficient efforts towards integration. I shall drop your objection if you continue on this path.

When Objector words hint at objection's invalidity, re-test objection (even partially):

- Objector, let us quickly re-test the objection ...

When Objector seems to have shifted away from said objection, refocus:

- Are you still solving for your specific objection?

When Proposer does not provide specific examples of how the original tension was created when requested or refuses an amendment without sharing specific cases where it wouldn't work:

1. Proposer, can you give us a specific case in which the objector's suggestion would fail to address your tension?

2. Proposer, you are currently making insufficient efforts towards integration. I shall drop your proposal if you continue on this path.

When proposer words hint at proposal invalidity, re-test proposal:

- Proposer, can you share a concrete example situation for your role where the proposal would have helped?

When integration is stuck in circular considerations or system/process issues (hiring, firing, onboarding, ...), propose:

- What about a new role with an accountability for figuring all of this out?

^{CLOSE} *As soon as your hear a first/new idea, check:*

- **Objector, does this remove your objection?**

- **Proposer, does this still address your original tension?**

When double yes:

- **The objection has been successfully integrated into the proposal.**

^{CLOSE INTEGRATION}

All objections have been integrated into a new proposal which now is ____ .

Launch a new objection round on the new proposal.

Don't allow debate.

Don't wait for consensus.

Don't let the discussion escape the objector and the proposer.

Halt discussions to allow capture.

CLOSING ROUND

^{CUT}

When in the middle of processing a proposal / objection:

- Meeting time is up! I have to drop the processing of this item and any other remaining item in the agenda.

^{REDIRECT}

I invite you to process any remaining item during next scheduled Governance Meeting, or through Governance out of Meeting, or call for an extraordinary Governance Meeting.

^{ROUND}

Let us now step out of this meeting by sharing a last reflection on it. We start with ____ and will continue with ____.

NO discussion, question, or reactions.

^{CLOSE}

This Governance Meeting of the ____ Circle is now over.

Outcomes will be shared to all Circle Members by ____ .

Thank you for your participation today.

Sources

[Holacracy Constitution, v4.1](#)

[Holacracy Governance Meeting Cards v.061117](#)

[A better way to test objections in Holacracy](#)

[Discussion on reactions, Holacracy Community](#)

[On testing proposal, Github](#)

<https://blog.holacracy.org/a-better-way-to-facilitate-holacracy-governance-meetings-c0929f1ff90f>

<https://blog.holacracy.org/holacracy-basics-understanding-objections-d87b579d00d1>

<https://blog.holacracy.org/integration-in-holacracy-an-overview-358a3af0533f>

Trainings, ...