

IBL Decision Processes

V0.1 Adopted June 16, 2017

1. Consent process for governance & policy decisions by the GA

The consent decision process has the following general steps:

- 1.1. *Presentation* of the proposal
- 1.2. *Clarifying questions* (solely to elucidate the original proposal).
- 1.3. *Discussion* including generative questions ('why don't you do it this way'), concerns ('I think it may not work...'), and counter-proposals ('I'd like to see it done that way instead...')
- 1.4. *Vote* (consent, consent with concern, objection).
 - 1.4.1. An *objection* is a well-reasoned argument of why adopting the proposal will irreparably harm the goals of the organization. A valid objection by any member of the decision body blocks the adoption of a proposal. The facilitator (moderator) is responsible for arbitrating what is a valid objection.
 - 1.4.2. A *concern* is belief (perhaps not well reasoned) that the proposal might cause harm. Concerns do not block adoption of a proposal.
- 1.5. If there is no objection
 - 1.5.1. The proposal is adopted as policy and recorded
 - 1.5.2. The proposal is given a review date in the future
 - 1.5.3. Concerns are listed in order to help guide the review
- 1.6. If there is an objection
 - 1.6.1. The proposal is revised to try to address the objection and the process repeats (2.1)
 - 1.6.2. Or the proposal is abandoned

2. Online consent decision-making process

Decisions by the GA may be made through an online process, which is the same in form as the general process but with additional specifications:

- 2.1. A *proposal* for consideration is made by posting to the GA
 - 2.1.1. The proposal is uploaded to the IBL Governance Google drive folder.
 - 2.1.2. A link to the proposal on the IBL *Slack* General Assembly channel and *emailed* to the General Assembly.
- 2.2. The proposal is open for *clarifying questions*.
 - 2.2.1. Questions can be posted to the Slack GA channel or made as *comments* or *suggestions* to the proposal document.
 - 2.2.2. The proposer(s) should answer the questions if possible.
- 2.3. The proposal is open for *discussion* including concerns, possible alternatives, etc.
 - 2.3.1. Discussion may occur simultaneously with clarification (since in practice it is hard to prevent this)
 - 2.3.2. Discussion must of open for a minimum period of *1 week*. This period is to give the GA time to absorb the information.

- 2.3.3. The discussion period may be *extended or reduced* by the joint agreement of the Facilitator and the proposer(s).
- 2.3.4. Concerns and alternatives must not displace the original proposal until it has been considered for a vote or the original proposers have voluntarily withdrawn or modified the proposal. If the proposal is modified, then it must go back to step 1, with a new announcement and reset discussion period.
- 2.3.5. If either the proposer(s) or *any other member* of the GA wishes, a real time *online or physical discussion* of the proposal may be requested (see 4).
- 2.4. After the discussion period is over, the proposal is open for online *voting*.
 - 2.4.1. Votes take the form of *consent, consent with concerns or objection*
 - 2.4.2. Votes are collected online using an appropriate method, e.g. Google form.
 - 2.4.3. Concerns or objections must be supplied in written form at the time of voting and are recorded in the proposal.
 - 2.4.4. Votes are not disclosed or tallied until voting period has closed. [This is meant to reduce conformity to group norms.]
 - 2.4.5. Votes can be *anonymous* [This is also meant to reduce conformity and preference argumentation over social authority.]
 - 2.4.6. A period of *1 week* is allowed for voting. This period may be reduced or extended by the Facilitator for example due to a request by a member of the GA.
 - 2.4.7. *A quorum of 2/3 of the members of the GA* voting is required for a vote to be considered valid. The period of voting should be extended by the Facilitator as necessary to obtain a quorum. [In other words, approval is the default vote.]

3. Real-time online discussion

- 3.1. At the time of proposal or during the discussion period, a real time discussion may be requested by the proposer(s) or any other member of the GA in the case of a proposal that is particularly important, difficult to understand, or may have many concerns or objections.
- 3.2. The Facilitator is responsible for deciding whether a real-time meeting is necessary.
- 3.3. Online real-time meetings will take place on *Zoom* (or similar) and will be recorded and posted to the IBL google drive.
- 3.4. The scheduling of an online meeting will be done by *Doodle* (or similar) to ensure availability of the proposer(s), the person(s) calling for discussion, and the Facilitator (or his/her substitute) and also to maximize the availability of other members of the GA. The Facilitator (or his/her delegate is responsible for scheduling).
- 3.5. An online discussion will generally be conducted > 1 week's notice (although this can be reduced by the Facilitator).
- 3.6. There is no official quorum required for an online discussion, as quorum only applies to voting. However, the proposer(s) or another member of the GA may

object to an online meeting with too few attendees and this request must be considered by the Facilitator.

- 3.7. If the proposer(s) decide to modify the proposal then the process starts again from 3.1 with the new proposal.