

OPENING	OPEN	Welcome to this Governance Meeting of the ____ Circle. The meeting will last until _____. The next meeting is scheduled for the _____. My name is ____ and will I'll be your facilitator today. Our Secretary (today) is _____.	
FRAME MEETING for newcomers	EXPLAIN MEETING PURPOSE	Is anyone new to a Holacracy Governance Meetings? Great! Let's have a little intro: Unlike the tactical meeting which is an operational meeting format for roles in the circle to collaborate, the Governance Meeting is a space for the core members of the Circle to work ON the Circle's organisational structure and amend current expectations, restrictions and authorities. It is also the meeting during which circle's RepLink, Secretary, and Facilitator are elected.	
	EXPLAIN MEETING PROCESS	<i>Explain on cheatsheet:</i> - After an opening check-in round and taking care of administrative concerns, we will directly build our agenda of tensions and then process them. - A closing round will provide us with the opportunity to shortly reflect on the meeting.	
	CARDS	Follow along the meeting steps thanks to the yellow (Governance) Meeting card.	
	FRAME FACILITATION	The Governance process can feel rather rigid at first, but my job as Facilitator is to keep us within process boundaries; so I shall interrupt you or redirect you if you're out of process.	
	FRAME Q&R	If there's a question about the process, just ask for a "timeout" and share your question. If you have a reaction to the process, save it for the closing round. <i>In the timeout space: don't rush; keep it informal; make sure they understand. Fac. has no authority.</i>	

CHECK-IN	CHECK-IN ROUND	<b>Check-in round.</b> It is your chance to get present, to notice what has your attention and call it out. Check-in one at a time. No discussion. <b>The round starts with _____, and continues with _____.</b> <i>If multi-locations meeting, note down rooms+participants order for yourself.</i>	NO: discussion, question, reaction, objection.
----------	----------------	--	--

ADMIN CONCERNS	OPEN	<b>Let us now address administrative concerns.</b>	
	POPUP	<b>Any administrative concerns we should be aware of?</b> Any deputies or guests around? <i>When guests, introduce:</i> _____ is invited by the Lead/Rep/Cross -Link as temporary Core Member of the circle to help process a specific tension.	OK: clarifying questions. NO: discussion, reaction, objection.

BUILD AGENDA	OPEN	<b>Let us now build the agenda.</b>	
	BUILD	You may add your tensions to the agenda, import or type them in, or ask the Secretary to do so for you, by saying 1-2 words to represent your tension, as a placeholder to help you remember it. Remember that you can add items to the agenda any time; ask for it in-between items.	NO: discussion, question, reaction, objection.
	INVITE MORE	<i>When no agenda item is brought, or when there's much time left in the meeting, invite:</i> Anything you would have observed, some unclarity about roles, ... I leave the space open a short moment for anything you would like to clarify in the way we organise.	

PROCESS AGENDA	OPEN	<b>Let us start processing the agenda.</b> Remember that you can add items to the agenda any time; ask the Secretary in-between items to do so for you.	
	EXPLAIN PROCESS	The process wants us to go through the following steps, one item at a time: presenting the proposal, understanding it, reacting to it, objecting to it, integrating objections and consequently validating it. This is known as the Integrative Decision-Making Process. Everyone participates when requested by the process. <i>Process elections first, if requested by any meeting participant.</i> <i>For the rest, optionally ask for pitch, yet freely decide with which item to start.</i> - Is there any item someone would like to start with? Why should it go first? <b>Secretary, please select election / random / pitched / first item.</b>	NO: discussion, question, reaction, objection.

Election Process	DESCRIBE ROLE	<b>We now elect our Facilitator / Secretary / RepLink, for ____ months / until the date of ____.</b> <b>Its purpose is ____ and its accountabilities are ____.</b>	
	FILLOUT BALLOTS	I invite everyone to nominate the candidate they see as the best fit for the role. Share your ballot with me. <i>When all present physically: ballot can be Post-It note with candidate name and elector's "signature".</i> <i>When remote meeting: ballot can be a direct message to facilitator.</i> You may nominate yourself. <i>When electing RepLink or Facilitator:</i> - <i>The Constitution forbids us to nominate the LeadLink in this role.</i>	NO: discussion, comment, reaction, objection.
	NOMINATION ROUND	<Elector> has nominated <Candidate>. <Elector>, share with us why you believe that candidate would be a good fit for the role. <i>When Elector speaks of other candidates:</i> - Please focus on your candidate.	NO: discussion, comment, reaction, objection. NO argumentation including others than candidate.
	NOMINATION CHANGE ROUND	You now have the opportunity to change your nomination to a different candidate. If you do so, you may optionally explain your reason for selecting this candidate. <Elector>, do you keep your nomination for <Candidate>? When all present physically: ask for post-its with updated nomination. When remote: use DMs.	
	MAKE PROPOSAL	The candidate with most nominations shall be proposed for election. <b>The number of nominations per candidates are the following: ____.</b> <i>When there is a tie, do one of the followings:</i> 1. <i>blindly select and propose one of the tied candidates randomly;</i> 2. <i>if the person currently filling the Role is among those tied, propose that person;</i> 3. <i>if only one of the tied candidates has nominated himself or herself, propose that person;</i> 4. <i>go back to the previous step and require each participant who nominated someone other than a tied candidate to change that nomination to one of the tied candidates, then count nominations, etc.</i>	

STEPS	GUIDE participation	FRAME participation
<b>PROCESS AGENDA (continued)</b>		
<b>Election Process (continued)</b>	<p><b>I now propose &lt;Candidate&gt; as &lt;Role&gt;, for ___ months / until the date of ___.</b></p> <p>Let us now directly do an Objection Round. Candidate comes last.</p> <p><b>"___, do you see any (other) reason why adopting this proposal causes harm; objection or no objection?"</b></p> <p><i>If any Objections are raised, you may choose to process test and integrate them normally (with Facilitator as Proposer), or to discard the Proposal either immediately after the Objection round or at any point during the integration step. If you opt to discard the Proposal, go back to the prior step in this process, discard all nominations for the prior candidate, and follow the rules of the prior step to select another candidate to propose instead.</i></p> <p>CLOSE <b>&lt;Candidate&gt; is thus elected as &lt;Role&gt;, for ___ months / until the date of ___.</b></p>	
<i>For each non-election item, process with the Integrative Decision Process:</i>		
<b>Present Proposal</b>	<p>OPEN Is there any item to add to the agenda, before we start processing the next item?</p> <p><b>Let us now process item ___, proposed by ___.</b></p> <p>Proposer, please state <b>your proposal and optionally share the underlying tension.</b></p> <p><b>Make sure the secretary</b> is keeping up and capturing at least in <i>scratchpad</i>.</p> <p>PROPOSAL <i>When the Proposer has issues shaping their initial proposition, suggest:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposer, can you finish the sentence "I propose that ..."</li> <li>- Proposer, just state whatever you believe would help solving your tension.</li> </ul> <p><i>When the Proposer has really no idea of a proposal:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposer, you may ask for suggestions from others to shape an initial proposition.</li> </ul> <p><i>When another participant starts suggesting something, clear out permission:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposer, would you like to hear the suggestion of ___?</li> </ul> <p><i>When suggestions start discussing the pertinence of the proposal or seeking consensus / to please everyone:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We have a proposal that solves your tension? Great! The rest of the process will give you a chance to hear others' ideas and amend your proposal if you'd like to integrate anything they say.</li> <li>- Let's continue with clarifying questions.</li> </ul> <p>REDIRECT RANTING <i>When Proposer just wants to hold the space with their tension yet has no proposal, refocus:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposer, we've heard your tension, what is your proposal?</li> </ul> <p>CLOSE <b>So, as a response to ___, you propose to ___. Correct?</b></p>	<p>NO: discussion, question, reaction, objection.</p> <p>OK: Proposer demanding help to express an initial proposal.</p>
<b>Clarifying Questions</b>	<p>OPEN <b>Now clarifying questions.</b></p> <p>EXPLAIN That step is there to allow everyone to seek clarity on the proposal before reacting to it.</p> <p>POP-UP <b>Any clarifying questions?</b> Popup-style. Anyone who has questions can bring them up.</p> <p>What else do you need to know about the proposal?</p> <p><i>Keep an energetic pace, always redirect to the space.</i></p> <p><i>When Proposer has a hard time answering, relieve:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposer, it is ok to answer with "not specified" if you don't know or don't have the information.</li> </ul> <p><i>When it conveys info more than it seeks info, or when you sense the person wants to be heard or tries to influence the Proposer, cut and redirect:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sounds like a reaction/suggestion/opinion more than question.</li> <li>- You'll have the opportunity to share any reaction in the next step.</li> <li>- Anymore clarifying question?</li> </ul> <p><i>When someone fires an inquisitive sequence of questions, redirect to the space:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Anyone has another clarifying question?</li> </ul>	<p>NO: discussion, reaction, objection.</p>
<b>Testing Proposal</b>	<p><i>A proposal is always valid if triggering election, or aiming at more clearly reflecting activity that is already happening.</i></p> <p><i>In all other cases, test and re-test the proposal at any time (except "Present Proposal", here being ideal for such testing):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What's the tension behind the proposal?</li> <li>- Which of your roles will that proposal help?</li> <li>- What would be an actual example situation from your role that the proposal would have helped resolve?</li> </ul> <p><i>If Proposer has failed to answer any of the above, discard proposal:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- By ___, you just told me that your proposal is not valid. The process wants us to discard it.</li> </ul>	<p>NO judging the quality / pertinence of the reasoning.</p>
<b>Reaction Round</b>	<p>OPEN &amp; EXPLAIN <b>Let us now move to the reaction round,</b></p> <p>This is your once chance to share your perspectives, opinions and suggestions to the proposition.</p> <p>Time to get things off your chest. One chance only, one person at a time.</p> <p>Proposer, you might want to take note of some of this, if it serves your tension or if you want to give share more infos in the next round.</p> <p><b>We start with ___ and will continue with ___.</b></p> <p>ROUND <i>When reaction makes the Proposer uncomfortable, remind:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposer, the process wants you to ignore any reaction that does not help solving your tension.</li> </ul> <p><i>When Reacter has a question:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- You may share your question or bring up something that you think the Proposer ought to consider. Yet the Proposer can only respond to what they hear in the next step.</li> </ul> <p><i>When the reaction is directed to / engaging the Proposer, frame:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reacter, do react to the space, not the Proposer, and use third-person language.</li> </ul> <p><i>As facilitator, use your reaction turn to coach on proposal structure.</i></p> <p><i>But don't confuse Proposer with high-level technicalities / NVGO / preference details.</i></p>	<p>NO: reaction from Proposer, reactions, questions or discussions.</p>
<b>Amend &amp; Clarify</b>	<p>OPEN <b>Proposer, is there anything you would like to clarify about your proposal or amend in it?</b></p> <p><i>When Proposer seeks to integrate others' reactions due to pressure, or asks for inputs / starts discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- You've just heard some stuff. You may just ignore it all. Stay laser-focused on your tension.</li> <li>- Proposer, stay focused on shaping a proposal that works for your tension only.</li> <li>- There's no need to incorporate everyone's ideas. The rest of the process will let others bring up tensions that your proposal may create for them.</li> </ul> <p><i>When Proposer wants to drop the proposal because "it's operational":</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Even if there's an operational decision, it sounds like there's something in governance that may not be clear or something you want to expect from a role on an ongoing basis. Give it a try here.</li> </ul> <p>CLOSE <i>When the proposal has changed significantly, repeat it:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- So your proposal is now to ___, Correct?</li> </ul>	<p>NO: discussion, suggestion, question, reaction, objection.</p>

PROCESS AGENDA (continued)

<p><b>Objection Round</b></p> <p>EXPLAIN PROCESS</p> <p>EXPLAIN OBJECTIONS</p>	<p><b>OPEN</b> <b>We now move to the objection round.</b></p> <p><b>We start with ___ and continue with ___.</b> Proposer comes last.</p> <p>I'll ask each of you, including the Proposer, 'Do you see any reason why this proposal will cause harm?' You can answer 'objection' or 'no objection'.</p> <p>If you have an objection, then my job as Facilitator is to ask you some questions, which will help you to test your objection, to see if is valid in the eyes of the Holacracy Constitution.</p> <p>Everyone in their different roles may sense different potential harms a proposition brings. Objections are simply requests for integrating a concern with the proposal. Raising an objection is a present to the proposal, it sheds new light on potential negative effects.</p>	
<p><b>Raise Objection</b></p> <p>FAC. RAISES NIVGO</p>	<p><b>ROUND</b> <b>___, do you see any (other) reason why adopting this proposal causes harm; objection or no objection?</b></p> <p><i>When the person hesitates, invite:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Would you like to try an objection? Throw it in and let the process decide whether it is valid.</li> </ul> <p><i>When the person states they have the same objection as an objection that was raised before, invite:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An objection is a personal thing. I invite you to raise your objection even it sounds the same.</li> </ul> <p><i>As Facilitator raise an "non-valid governance output" (NVGO) objection when it contains invalid outputs typically:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it contains actions, projects, operational decisions, or capability accountabilities like "knowing ..., being ..."</li> <li>- it deals with resource allocation (an authority of the LL, unless specified differently in the circle gov.)</li> <li>- references people, not roles</li> <li>- is a policy stating accountabilities</li> </ul>	<p>NO discussions, questions, reactions.</p>
<p><i>If objection raised ...</i></p>		
<p><b>Capture Objection</b></p> <p>CAPTURE</p>	<p><b>OPEN</b> Great! let us capture your objection.</p> <p><b>What is the harm?</b></p> <p><i>When objection is fuzzy or complex, ask for synthesis:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Can you finish the sentence: "my concern / the harm is that ..."</li> </ul> <p><i>When objection is very abstract, guide towards the expression of material harm:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concretely, can you give an example of how it will harm?</li> <li>- How does this hurt the circle's capacity to express its purpose?</li> </ul> <p><i>When objection is that the proposal brings confusion or reduces clarity, invite:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Everyone has their own interpretation of the governance; what concrete misinterpretation do you fear and what impact would it cause?</li> </ul> <p><i>When objection seems to have separate aspects:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Would you like to first focus on part of your objection? you can always object to the rest later.</li> </ul> <p><i>When the objection is about resources (time, money) or people (employeehip, skills), invalidate and guide:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> </ul> <p><i>Make sure Secretary has captured the essence of the objection, for everyone to see.</i></p>	
<p><b>Test Objection</b></p> <p>OPEN &amp; EXPLAIN</p> <p>TEST Q1</p> <p>TEST Q2</p> <p>TEST Q3</p> <p>TEST Q4</p> <p>CLOSE TEST</p> <p>CLOSE OBJECTION ROUND</p>	<p><b>OPEN</b> <b>I now invite you to reflect on the validity of your objection through a series of either-or questions.</b></p> <p>A valid objection must express how the proposal (Q2) would necessarily create (Q3) harm (Q1) to one of the objector's roles (Q4).</p> <p>Please share your reasoning with us every time.</p> <p><i>Walk the objector through the test questions, don't judge.</i></p> <p><i>Test in any order, skip test questions if it seems obvious to you the objection would pass.</i></p> <p><b>TEST Q1</b> <i>Test whether the proposal would hurt the circle's capacity to express its purpose or accountabilities:</i></p> <p><b>Is your objection a reason the proposal causes harm or is your objection the proposal is unneeded or incomplete?</b> =&gt; invalid, invite to add their own agenda item to complete the proposal.</p> <p><b>TEST Q2</b> <i>Test whether the proposal would introduce a new (i.e. currently non-existing) tension if adopted:</i></p> <p><b>Is the harm created by this proposal or is it already a concern, even if the proposal were dropped?</b> =&gt; invalid, invite to add their existing tension to agenda.</p> <p><b>TEST Q3</b> <i>Test whether the objection is based on presently known data, or is necessarily predictive because we can't adapt later:</i></p> <p><b>Would the proposal necessarily cause the impact if adopted or are you anticipating this impact will likely occur?</b></p> <p><b>=&gt; Could significant harm happen before we can adapt, or is it safe enough to try, knowing we can revisit it anytime?</b> =&gt; invalid</p> <p><b>TEST Q4</b> <i>Test whether the proposal would limit the objector role's purpose or accountabilities:</i></p> <p><b>Would the proposal limit one of your roles in this circle OR are you trying to help another role or the circle in general?</b> =&gt; invalid</p> <p><i>Skip a question if it's obvious to you that it would pass the test.</i></p> <p><i>Yet anyone can request that you re-test the objection any time in the process.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>When objection is that the proposal is a "non-valid governance output" or states that it "breaks the rules of the constitution":</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Secretary, please confirm that this proposal is indeed a "Non-Valid Governance Output".</li> </ul> <p><i>When Proposer objects to the proposal because it does not address the tension (anymore), the objection is per Const. valid.</i></p> <p><b>CLOSE TEST</b> <i>As soon as found invalid (or hearing it does not cause harm):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>By considering that ___, you just told us this objection is invalid.</b></li> </ul> <p><i>If found valid (= passes all test questions):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>You just validated this objection. It will be integrated in a later step.</b></li> </ul> <p><i>Ask same person for other objections, before continuing the round with the next person.</i></p> <p><b>CLOSE OBJECTION ROUND</b> <i>If no objection raised during the round:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>In the absence of objection, the circle consented to the proposal.</b></li> <li>- <b>The proposal will now be integrated to our governance structure:</b> from now on ...</li> </ul>	

PROCESS AGENDA (continued)

*If objections found valid ...*

**INTEGRATION** <sup>OPEN</sup> **X objection(s) were raised and found valid.**  
*If NVGO, start with integrating it.*

*For each valid objection ...*

**Integrate Objection** <sup>OPEN & FRAME</sup> We now will integrate the first (next) valid objection about \_\_\_\_, raised by \_\_\_\_.  
 The goal is an amended proposal that would not cause the objection and would still address the Proposer's tension.  
 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.  
*Don't let consensus dynamics emerge.*  
*Don't allow debate/consensus seeking emerge; brainstorm and check any idea that might surface and for which you no negative signals from both parties arise.*

<sup>START</sup> **Objector, what can be added or changed to the proposal in order to remove that issue?**  
*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 seems to have shifted away from said objection, refocus:*  
 - Are you still solving for your specific objection?  
*When Objector words hint at objection's invalidity, re-test objection (even partially):*  
 - Objector, let us quickly re-test the objection ...  
*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 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 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?  
*When objector drops objection or proposal sees no factual change, still proceed to a new round of objections.*

<sup>CLOSE</sup> *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.**  
<sup>CLOSE INTEGRATION</sup> **All objections have been integrated into a new proposal which now is \_\_\_\_ .**  
 I now launch a new objection round to test this new proposal.

**CLOSING ROUND**

<sup>CUT</sup> *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.  
<sup>REDIRECT</sup> 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.  
<sup>ROUND</sup> **Let us now step out of this meeting by sharing a last reflection on it.**  
**We start with \_\_\_\_ and will continue with \_\_\_\_.**  
<sup>CLOSE</sup> This Governance Meeting of the \_\_\_\_ Circle is now over.  
 Outcomes will be shared to all Circle Members by \_\_\_\_ .  
 Thank you for your participation today.

NO discussion, question, or reactions.

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, ...