Naming of Coordinators, the International Focusing Institute

A study by Solange St-Pierre for Diffusion Focusing Quebec

Part 1: Some starting points

The 250 Certifying Coordinators (CCs) and Coordinators-In-Training (CNTs) of the Institute received a proposal from the International Leadership Council (ILC[1]) entitled: **A New Process for Naming Coordinators of the International Focusing Institute**. A more comprehensive review of the roles and responsibilities of the CCs is under preparation. These studies concern the 1500 members of the Institute and the future of the global organization of Focusing.

Reference documents

Guidelines for Coordinators-In-Training to Become Certifying Coordinators (in force)[2]
1. Identify an active CC to work with.
2. Develop a full training program that takes people all the way through from beginning to Certification.
3. In conjunction with the CC, take at least two people all the way through the program.
4. Be recommended by the CC mentor as a CC.
5. The CNT needs to want to work actively with the International Focusing Institute, e.g.: by connecting their Trainees with the Institute, attending Coordinator meetings periodically, keeping up-to-date with the Institute's online resources, staying in touch, reading posts on the Coordinator's email list, developing new Focusing resources and outreach projects, and helping to think about the overall situation of Focusing in the world, in their interest area, and in their geographic location.

New proposal from ILC for naming CC[3]
1. The CNT chooses a CC to be their Mentoring Coordinator (MC).
2. The MC notifies the ILC that the person is now a CNT.
3. The ILC announces to the community of Coordinators that the person is a new CNT.
4. The MC works with the ILC to form a Support Team who may refer the CNT to available resources, based on its assessment of the needs and interests of the CNT.
5. The Support Team consists of at least one member of the ILC, one member of the Board of Trustees, the MC, and two other CCs.
6. A portion of the Support Team should work in the same field as the CNT and another portion of the Support Team is appointed from other areas of specialization.
7. At least 6 months prior to the assumed naming of the CNT as a CC, the MC presents to the Support Team the file which will allow them to recommend the nomination.

---

[1] ILC (International Leadership Council) Members: Heinz-Joachim (Hejo) Feuerstein (CC, FOT; Germany), Ruth Hirsch (CC, FOT; Israel and USA), Akira Ikemi (CC, FOT; Japan), Sergio Lara Cisternas (CC, FOT; Chile), Roberto Larios (CNT, FOT; Mexico), Donata Schoeller (CNT; Switzerland).
[2] http://www.focusing.org/coordinators/Guidelines-to-Become-a-Certifying-Coordinator-2013.pdf
[3] http://www.focusing.org/ILC/docs/ILC_Coordinator_Certification-2017-03.pdf

Summary of results from the CC Open Space Assembly in May, 2014[4]

Our purpose: The fundamental criteria for the actions that we take would be "Is carrying forward happening?" (In how we interact with each other, the structures that we build, the guidelines that we form, and the bylaws that we create). If carrying forward is not happening, then further attention, sensing, and forming would need to happen before action could be taken.

Participation mode: Clearness comes when all aspects of the whole are heard. Disturbances need to be heard. A stopped process is a step not yet found. The larger process carries the stopped process forward, implying ongoing attention. With TIFI, there have been stopped processes since before and after the transition of 2014. Acknowledging that we are part of a greater whole means we *are* interaction, and TIFI must learn to interact with other independent Focusing organizations. The way we interact can create safety around discomfort, so the discomfort can inform our process. Lack of safety can shut down our process. The Institute, as a new sort of organization, needs to restore just enough structure to be safe enough to carry forward its creative, growing edge.

Roles of CCs: (1) Spreading Focusing in the world; speaking for Focusing; representing Focusing; modeling Focusing (2) Having a voice and taking a leadership role inside and outside of the Focusing community (3) Working collaboratively with other CCs, with the Institute, the Board, and other Focusing trainers (4) Staying informed and connected, and passing information to our trainers and communities (5) Training people to certification and continuing to support them (6) Maintaining excellence in training during and after certification in Focusing and experiential listening (7) Organizing events (e.g.: international conferences).

Responsibility of CCs: What behaviors might arise out of the sense of personal responsibility of the CCs? Concrete ideas: to volunteer for a project, to serve as a translator, to plan a conference, to work on a functional whole, etc[5].

New Organizational Structure: There is, as of May 2014, no formal right for CCs and trainers to be part of the decision-making and voting processes of TIFI. The Focusing community is growing with individuals from different cultures, local Focusing centers, national Focusing organizations, and continental networks. A new organizational structure would enable TIFI to expand its reach within this community, organizing mutual support on the local, national, and continental levels to spread Focusing, and to facilitate communication and exchange, developing and sharing concepts and applications. A kind of self-organization with elected people is suggested.[6]

Communication: (A point raised by Catherine Torpey). We're talking about internal communication (between CCs, Executive Director, ILC, and the Board). We're talking about communication between CCs and the larger Focusing community, to honor diversity of language and culture and finding ways to communicate. We want the website to be a home for Focusers,

---

[4] Results from the Open Space groups at the Certifying Coordinators' Assembly in May 2014 are published in English, French, German and Japanese on ILC page: http://www.focusing.org/ILC/. The "we" used here represents CCs in the subcommittees. However, these CCs form only part of all CCs.

[5] For a CNT, such ideas might be a part of their training process.

[6] Example: The World Association for Person Centered & Experiential Psychotherapy & Counseling WAPCEPC, a world association for PCA (Person Centered Approach).

starting by translating the homepage into many languages with links to websites in different languages and different parts of the world. Documents from TIFI should be sent out in several languages at the same time.

The vision of Eugene T. Gendlin

In a letter to the CCs in 2012,[7] Eugene T. Gendlin said that "*We need not lose our Large Official Focusing Free Space.*" Gene said that he was writing and speaking mainly in this Large Focusing Free Space, and rarely took any action within the Institute except to preserve this space when it seemed threatened and where the new type of organization represented by the Institute had to be preserved. When the coordinators wanted to define how to teach Focusing and establish quality control measures, he intervened. He did not want a small group that said it was "representative" to implement a plan that would have restricted us all by over-defining everything. For him, the Institute should not become a type of pyramid organization where everything is defined by a single group and where any action contrary to the views of this group would be stopped. "*In the usual organization there would be no Large Open Focusing Space where what each of us does is the official Focusing. There would only be the little Institute, as if our lives with Focusing and our very different creative ways and contributions must fit within the little Institute and be approved by whoever runs it. In that case people will have to fight about their understanding of Focusing and how to teach it. This will force people to fight in the little Institute, since they would have to leave if they cannot make their contribution within it.*"

Gendlin says that the Focusing organization has already grown far beyond what any person or committee can control, or even keep track of. He says also that: "*We need to be careful not to fall into the usual battles about who controls us, as if we accept the old assumption that some small group must control us, as if we are only concerned with how a controlling group is selected. Then organizational struggles take up all the space and time, rather than our mission.*"

In a letter published on the Institute's discussion list in May 2017 at the time of Gendlin's death, Rob Foxcroft takes up these themes. Speaking to Gene he said: "*I am glad I was able to be there for a while, as the Institute passed into the hands of the focusing community; and that you and Mary finally felt able to let go of the sensitive and paradoxical anti-control by which you sought to prevent any kind of top-down control from growing up to limit the freedom of individual focusers to carry forward focusing in their own independent ways.*"

---

[7] From Gene, October 16, 2012, published on the CC list.

Part 2: A vision for the future of Focusing

A few steps have been taken in our environment to come to a better understanding of how the Focusing practice, the Focusing certification process, and the CC nomination process are perceived. We had an initial *circle* on that subject at Diffusion Focusing Quebec in July 2016 (see below for a description of our organization and circles). We had invited all members of the organization and 19 people were present. When Bernadette Lamboy came to Quebec in April 2017, we had a second circle with four francophone CCs and three Focusing Trainers interested in these issues. Subsequently, we continued our process by reviewing the topics discussed during the meetings proposed by ILC and by reading the comments published on the CC discussion list.

Circle at Diffusion Focusing Quebec in July 2016[8]

Founded in 2006, Diffusion Focusing Quebec aims to promote Focusing, Experiential Listening, Thinking at the Edge (TAE), and the Philosophy of Implicit (POI) to a wide audience. The organization currently has 80 members. Anyone interested in the practice of Focusing can be part of our community and membership fees are minimal ($10.00 for 2 years). In Quebec, we try to organize ourselves as a local, francophone community. Our [website](#) and documentation are all in French. However, we also want to keep our connection with the global community. We feel concerned about what is going on in the world of Focusing and we want to contribute. In 2014, during the transition of the Institute from the founder to the community, we sent a paper[9] to the Institute on behalf of Diffusion Focusing Quebec, which was very well received.

The meeting of July 2016 was held in a circle without distinction of role. Some of us were at the very beginning of our Focusing learning process, while others had been practicing since the 1980s. The themes of the meeting were: (1) what brought us to Focusing, (2) developing a better understanding of the learning process and of the certification process, (3) our interest in the transmission of Focusing, and (4) our commitment and our connection to the global community. Many of us emphasized the importance of the first steps in learning: moments when a connection is made between what one speaks and what one feels, the listening quality in a Focusing experience, a felt benevolence, and the memory of a transformative experience like "Ha! Ha!"

In the course of learning Focusing we may discover that one can be good at listening to others but be less good at listening to oneself; that the Focusing partnership offers us the pleasure of being accompanied; that offering a simple reflection to a close person can induce a profound change; that to be heard is a fundamental need of human beings; and that an open-minded listening in our families and in our respective circles is of prime importance.

Thus, several stressed the importance of democratizing the transmission. They want to offer to others what nourishes them. They want to help people become self-reliant in their practice of listening and other Focusing processes. They do it spontaneously. They also do so by being supported collectively at the local level. Many, but not all, will walk towards certification after

---

[8] Attendees: Marine de Fréminville (CC), Solange St-Pierre (CC), Danielle Grégoire (Focusing Trainer), Diane Couture (Focusing Trainer), Madeleine Lepage (Focusing Trainer), Michèle Jodoin (Focusing Trainer), Henry Chen (Trainer in Training), Marie Pedneault (Trainer in Training) and other members of DFQ who were not members of the Institute.
[9] [Thinking on the Process of TIFI Restructuring, being carried forward](#)

many years of practice. Those who achieved certification lived the experience of meeting the local and the global as a second wind. Certification allows them to enter into a larger community whose strength they feel. They come back with an enduring momentum. For some, the process continues with a commitment to support the collective, by writing or translating texts on Focusing, or by contributing to the organization of workshops or events. A small minority will go abroad more regularly to meet passionate people and share their passion.

Those currently engaged locally and/or participating in international meetings may well become the future coordinators who will represent our francophone community.

Meeting of French speaking CCs in Montreal on April 23, 2017[10]

At this meeting, held in a convivial and relaxed atmosphere in a vegetarian restaurant on St-Denis Street, we first wondered why the ILC proposed this new structure. The explanation given by the ILC was: *"We are working together to move as smoothly as possible from a "mom and pop" model, to a more mature organization where the wisdom of the community is tapped."* It seemed to us that one part of the history had been forgotten. We had some doubts. Some assumptions came to us: there could be problems with some coordinators; some may have more power than others or be in conflict with one another; others might want to favor someone. In order to avoid such drifts, perhaps a more inclusive structure could overcome some of the issues regarding the role of Mentor of the CNTs. Some of us believed that the criteria have been tightened because the Institute wants fewer CCs. Others did not see such an intention. What is the reason for having fewer CCs? And how should we address the weakness of some mentors?

History

How have CCs been named so far? Marine was certified in 1991 in Chicago after a long process with Mary McGuire, who asked to train 3 or 4 people. Then there was a time when Gene and Mary could simply name CCs in an "organic and natural" way. When there were no CCs in a region, someone was named. Bernadette was named this way. To have published, to have a university title or to have a Rogerian base could play a role. This organic and natural method then evolved. Solange and Patricia have been certified according to a structured process with criteria and an approach that still exists and is accessible to everyone via the Institute's website (see footnote 3 on page 1). This process included the concept of coaching by a mentor. We had to train people, develop a certification program, and submit it to the Institute (a short version in English was enough). It was very good. Certain circumstantial elements were also taken into account. There have been appointments of people who have not completed this process. There seemed to be a multitude of parallel paths. It's hard to know today who did what to become CC. But we know that Gene and Mary wanted to trust the CCs to be the mentors of the CNTs.

We are now seeking to formalize a nomination system that will facilitate and enrich our understanding of the process. We would like to clarify the process without burdening the system. It would be a good idea to have a better understanding of the reasons for the parallel systems by

---

[10] Attendees: Bernadette Lamboy (CC), Marine de Fréminville (CC), Patricia Manessy (CC), Solange St-Pierre (CC), Francine Bergeron (Focusing Trainer), Henry Chen (TNT) et François-Charles Jullien (TNT).

asking who has followed the path of the current structured process, who has not done so, and why. We know that the process has not been followed in recent years. Sometimes, a simple message sent to the CC list showed a new CC.

The work we are doing is positive. It is important to review the process of naming CCs and, for the CCs, to ask ourselves what we want to do and what a CC mentor has to do. But it seems difficult, if not impossible, to study the process of naming CCs without first having a look at the role of the CCs.

What the CCs do

For some CCs and CNTs, the certification programs and the support of people towards certification seem to be the essential part of what makes the role of a CC. For others it seems more complex. CCs do a lot of things. And they do not all do the same thing. Some are at a conceptual level. They write articles. They do some research. Many have a doctorate. It is possible that those who have a specialization as a Focusing Oriented Therapist (FOT) teach only to therapists. At the local level, there are sometimes CCs who do the transmission and who do not like to write. Their main skill is to teach Focusing to people who will pass it on. Often, the CCs who work at the local level do not speak English and have little connection with the Institute. Conversely, there are CCs that work internationally and do not have much anchoring in a local community. They travel, they are seen everywhere, but they do not develop in their region or in their territory. The organization of workshops and seminars and participation in international conferences are also tasks fulfilled by CCs. Some CCs do not attend CC meetings because of the language barrier or the travel costs that are too high for their budgets, but they can get involved otherwise. In Japan, South America, and other parts of the world, there are CCs who do not speak English. They do not come to the CC meetings. But their communities are quite powerful and advanced locally, with their own organizations offering meetings in their language.

We agree that there is no single model of what a CC should do. It seems that the goal of the CC is to get involved and to make Focusing known in one way or another. We suggest three important functions: (1) The conceptual and research function, (2) The function of certifying and organizing at the local or regional level, and (3) The function of liaison with the Institute and with the global community and the tasks that this entails.

Our view on the process proposed by the ILC

We like the idea of the dyad formed by the mentor and the future CC receiving support. But we do not see a reason for the involvement of the Board. The naming of a CC is not an administrative process. Moreover, the presence of an ILC member in the support teams seems to go towards a top-down type of centralization process, which does not fit Gendlin's vision. We would like to propose something that draws on both the current process and the new process proposed by the ILC while adopting a more systemic vision. We also believe that the newer model does not take into account the language issue. If, in order to appoint a francophone CC, it is necessary to translate everything for the ILC and Board support members, the exchanges within the support team will be quite difficult. Some realities could make the ILC proposal not easy to apply and not transparent at all.

Transparency

Transparency begins with accessibility to studies submitted to the Institute regarding the ILC proposal. We are drafting this current study and we are offering it first to the francophone community for comments. The joint proposal that will be sent to the Institute will be for those who are interested in working on it. The francophone CCs and the members of Diffusion Focusing Quebec will be invited to contribute. This consultation seems to us to be consistent with Gendlin's vision. We also believe that if a group elsewhere in the world proposes a study or briefing, it would be appropriate to publish it so that the outcome of the consultation is not only available to the ILC and Board members. We ask that information be made available to all members of the Institute. It would be a good start to transparency. Our concern for transparency touches on all of the stages that we propose for the process of naming CCs.

Forming a support team

We would like to see the support team built on the needs of the person undertaking the process of being named as a CC, and also on the needs of the community in which the CC will act. The CCs are at the service of their community. They work with people. And these people can tell if what CCs do for them is adequate or not. Thus, it seems appropriate to have a support team mostly created from the community in which the future CC will work. With the eight francophone CCs offering services in French in Quebec, France and Belgium, we already have good resources and skills to accompany a future francophone CC. It seems logical to accompany a CNT in the language, region and the environment in which they will perform their function. This would allow us to avoid holding meetings and producing documents in a language that is not ours. On the other hand, if the dyad formed by the mentor and the CNT considers it important to assemble a bilingual team, or if the two members of the dyad agree to have only English meetings, this would be at their discretion.

Another great principle is to trust the CCs who will take the role of mentor. Thus, the dyad mentor/future CC will enlist a team composed of 2 to 4 persons at its discretion. The mentor is the primary reference person. Other members of the support team can be consulted in different ways and at different points in the process. We do not see the need for having members of the Institute (ILC and Board) in the support teams. We do not understand the role they could play. In practice, ILC and Board members cannot control what is being done in the process because it is impossible to translate everything. Recognizing CCs as fully responsible and qualified for the roles they occupy seems to us to be an essential first step in the new process. The collective path we propose reinforces and supports this approach and allows us: (1) to validate the quality and competences of the CNT, (2) to avoid drifts, and (3) to promote transparency and balance across the system.

Steps Towards a CC Certification Process

The CC/CNT dyad assembles its support team first. The CNT with the help of the CC mentor prepares a draft of the certification process, which they then submit to the team for comments and approval. Once validated and accepted by the team, the project is forwarded to the ILC in the form of a short document (2 pages). The current nomination policy (see footnote 1 on page 1) already provides guidelines that are relevant to this process. But it is possible to propose

something else. Since these guidelines have not been followed by everyone, there is room in our future projects to adjust the approach according to our needs. The proposed path can be in line with what the future CC wants to offer to the community, the CC roles the CNT wishes to work towards during their training, and the qualities needed in order to embody those roles. The project may include a certification program, research, writing, conferences, or a commitment to the local/global development of the community. What seems essential to us is to indicate, first of all, the reasons why a specific way is proposed. In addition, all CNT certification projects could remain accessible to the entire community at all times. It would be appropriate, for example, to put in the database of members, in the profile page of the future CC, a description of the certification project and the name of the CC who is mentoring the CNT. Otherwise, there will be a need to ensure that all CCs have a way to access to this information.

Quality Control

From the moment a team is formed and a certification project is sent to the Institute and approved (by ILC or an ILC subcommittee), quality control will be needed to ensure that the submitted project is indeed carried out. The entire support team is concerned with the result. It is also important to consider the climate of the team in which the process takes place. The future mentor must be able to benefit from the strengths of each member of the team. Members must be able to get along and work together, even if the primary relationship is with the mentor and the other CCs are only for support. When the conditions outlined in the initial draft are met, a report of the process is prepared by the CNT and submitted first to the mentor and then to the support team members. Once this is done, the entire team will then recommend the certification of the new CC. The report is then sent to the Institute (ILC or an ILC subcommittee) in the form of a brief document (2 pages). The ILC ratifies (or not) the naming of the new CC. If the ILC does not endorse the naming of the CNT, a generative dialogue begins with the team in order to reach an agreement.

An evolving model

We propose a model in development. We could ask our future CCs to agree to the creation of a support team that will be part of their process. We want clarity and transparency. When we have to indicate who could support the evolution of the person who wants to be a CC, we will indicate what motivates our choice. Our intention will be to create the best conditions around the person who wishes to join the CC community. In the French community, we have resources in France, Belgium and Quebec. We can communicate through Skype, Zoom or by other means.

We believe that the approach that we advocate would promote greater cohesion at the community level, without, however, imposing such cohesion. The mentor and the future CC remain entirely free in choosing their team. Inviting a CC to assemble a team is to recognize their qualities and skills. We will highlight the positive attributes the guest CC brings to the team. The person invited to the support group can accept or refuse, and that is OK.

Summary of the [minutes](#) of the Zoom meeting of April 11, 2017

18 people were present on 11 April 2017 at the meeting proposed by ILC to the CCs.[11] Subjects covered included: payment of support team members; the possibility for the CNT to change their mentor partway through the process; the criteria required to be a mentor; the possibility of revoking the title of CC. One topic concerned a single title for all CCs. Another topic was the possible presentation of an annual activity report. Consultation will take place within the framework of the [strategic plan](#) so that the CCs can create their own rules.

Key elements of our proposal

The key elements of our proposal are:
1. CNT chooses a CC as his mentor. The Mentor/CNT dyad is created.
2. The Mentor/CNT dyad assembles a support team consisting of 2 to 4 members who will be consulted in different ways and at different points in the process.
3. The Mentor/CNT dyad prepares a <u>project for the certification process</u> and submits it to the support team for comments and approval.
4. The certification project[12] is forwarded to the Institute. It is a short document (2 pages) indicating the motivations, intentions, and strengths of the CNT and the reasons for choosing the Mentor and support team members.
5. In dialogue with the Institute (ILC or a subcommittee), the certification project is validated and made available to the entire CC community.
6. When the conditions set out in the initial project are met, a <u>report of the certification process</u> is prepared by the CNT, submitted to the Mentor and then to the support team members. The whole team recommends the certification of the CNT.
7. The report of the completed certification process is forwarded to the Institute. It is a short document (2 pages) indicating the steps taken. If the process involved the creation of a Trainer certification program, it is published (as a link) on the profile page of the CNT. On the profile page there are also links to other publications available, including the report of the CNT certification process.
8. If the ILC (or a subcommittee) does not endorse the naming of the CNT, a generative dialogue begins with the team in order to reach an agreement.

One of the important elements of Gendlin's philosophy was freedom of thought for groups and individuals. He emphasized the importance of an organization in which no one can be a "representative" of another person or group. By not being directed from the outside, each step of the approach proposed in this study can emerge from the bodily sense of the people involved and be linked to their context of life and their relational environment. The key elements underlying this model are:

---

[11] ILC: Akira Ikemi, Hejo Feuerstein and Roberto Larios. Others: Catherine Torpey, Heidrun Essler, Jim Iberg, Jane Quayle, Nada Lou, Sherry McDonald, Ria van Hage, Aukje Strandstra, Beatrice Blake, Suzanne Noel, Heather Rogers, Tine Swyngedouw, Christel Kraft, Monica Perez Iturraspe, Derek McDonnell.

[12] The guidelines to become CC currently in force (see footnote 3 on page 1) already provide a grid that may be relevant to the process.

- Freedom of thought and action for groups and individuals;
- The responsibility of all CCs, which manifests itself in a concrete commitment, ideally visible to all at the local level, at the global level, or in a specific field;
- Transparency of CCs among themselves and possibly also transparency towards the entire community;
- A systemic vision with feedback loops that will make the system visible and possibly improve it.

Representation of the three systems studied

In order to better understand the elements involved in each of the three systems studied, we have represented each of them graphically (see the diagrams on the last page). If a person or a group does not find a place in the overall systemic vision that we propose, it is always possible to add a process that could fit for them into the whole system and be suitable for that person or that group, without requiring anyone else to join.

The first drawing, System 1, shows the current system. This system requires the creation of a Mentor/CNT dyad. It proposes a path where the CNT must prepare a Trainer certification program and lead two learners through the stages of the program. The strengths of this system are: (1) it gives a great deal of autonomy to the Mentor/CNT dyad, (2) when the path is respected, it ensures the continuity of the Institute by adding new members. The weaknesses of this system are: (1) it can be circumvented for a variety of non-explicit reasons; (2) it is not explicitly linked to groups and organizations that sometimes have their own certification criteria.

The second drawing, System 2, shows the system proposed by the ILC. This system also requires the creation of a Mentor/CNT dyad. In addition, it proposes the creation of a five-member support team (including the CC Mentor) in a multi-national collaboration project, and automatically includes the presence of two representatives of the Institute. The strengths of this system are: (1) the creation of a support team is definitely a major step forward; (2) the support team will facilitate exchanges between CCs on several levels and will diminish the silo effect of the different approaches. The weaknesses of this system are: (1) it does not contain any explicit documents or conditions visible to the CC community; (2) the composition of the support team, placed under the aegis of the representatives of the Institute, entails a bias towards the centralization of powers and that of the conditions for the naming of the CCs. There is a risk to drift the community toward the type of top-down model that Gendlin has always sought to avoid; (3) the focus is more on international development than on local or regional development, which may weaken the rooting and the richness of the different cultural contexts in which the transmission takes shape.

The third and fourth drawings, System 3 V1 and System 3 V2, show the proposed system following our study. Similar to systems 1 and 2, the basis is always creating a Mentor/CNT dyad. The system also proposes the creation of a support team. However, the composition of the team is initiated by the Mentor/CNT dyad according to the actual conditions of the environment in which the CNT wishes to develop their expertise. If the CNT wishes to position themself internationally, the team will be created according to the aim of system V2. If the CNT wishes rather to develop within a

solid and established local or regional community, the CNT will choose those who know their surroundings well. Together they will be able to collaborate, to advance with the CNT and to allow the CNT to flourish in their own environment and in their own culture. The aim of system V1 might be suitable. The advantages of this system are: (1) it transcends and includes systems 1 and 2; (2) it always contains two reference documents visible to the CC community; (3) it favors the local as well as the global. Weaknesses of this system are: (1) it involves a paradigm shift through its anchoring in a systemic vision still little known and little explored in our community, thus inviting resistance.

System 1: No explicit link with groups or organizations, conditions and document required OR any other possible decision.

System 2: Without explicit links to groups or organizations, without explicit conditions or explicitly required documents

System 3: (V1) In relation to groups or organizations, conditions and documents explicitly required and published

System 3: (V2) With or without links to groups or organizations, conditions and documents explicitly required and published

Delegate of TIFI

CC

Future CC

Trainer or Trainer in Training

Local group or organization

Project for the certification process to be published (2 pages)

Report of the certification process to be published (2 pages)