

Responses to Cotyledon Foundation Questions

1. **How did you use the grant from the Cotyledon Fund? Please give a general description of which portion of the grant covered which activities. If the funds have not been spent but are allocated, let us know approximately when they will be spent.**

The entire amount was used in the way originally requested in the budget:

- \$3,500 were used for administrative purposes within BayNVC
- \$25,500 were put into NGL's general Financial Gift Hub (FGH) and distributed, through a collective decision-making process, to individuals within NGL based on their needs for sustainability. To support capacity increase, the funds were allocated unevenly in the three distributions that occurred during the life of the grant: \$13,150, \$8,150, and \$4,200.
- \$6,000 were given to Jihan McDonald as a consultant to the project

Activities within NGL

It is inherently impossible to assign any amount of money to any specific activity; only to the totality of what we did within NGL. This is because our FGH functions, on purpose, by uncoupling need from contribution. The bulk of the evaluation of what the funding made possible is in the next question.

Activities related to work with Jihan

- Conversations with me to co-hold the project
- Setting up an advisory board for BayNVC
- Engaging with the Power, Access, Diversity, and Inclusion team within NGL
- Aiming to synthesize lessons about the liberation-based approach to questions of power and privilege

Jihan's mother became very ill for most of the duration of the grant, eventually dying just as the grant period ended. This compromised Jihan's capacity to initiate and carry out the fullness of what she envisioned with me at the beginning of the period.

2. **What were your expectations and assumptions about the project? How did the results compare to your expectations? If applicable, please also explain whether and how the project advanced broader strategic goals.**

In a gathering of some of the people within teams whose work was mentioned in the proposal, what we discovered as an overall assessment of the funds was surprising to all of us: almost none of what we had imagined would happen with the access to the funds happened

and, simultaneously, in all the areas that we took on doing work, larger lessons and movement happened which were not anticipated by any of us at the start.

The same thing happened when I last connected with Jihan: a discovery that we didn't bring to fruition the many ideas we had at the beginning of the year and, instead, several other things happened.

Within NGL

This part of the response relates to activities done within NGL, both by those who benefited from the additional funds coming in and the many who didn't submit requests and still participated in the work.

Resource Flow

Our biggest hope was that the access to a small reprieve from constantly struggling to figure out how to attend to the aggregate sustainability needs would result in releasing energy for some people to step in and take on the function of fundraising. That didn't happen. At the end of the year, and with the funds now fully distributed, we haven't found pathways to create ongoing fundraising efforts. Given that one of our core principles or operation is that only that which can be done with wholehearted willingness get done, that we made two distinct efforts to try to seed a fundraising team and neither generated the result we were looking for, it's clear that having a fundraising team is not something we can make happen now. We decided to let this goal go, from within the principles we hold dear.

Simultaneously, and quite spontaneously, we have begun to map potential pathways to resource generation through gifting the results of our extensive experiments in all areas of human functioning, systems, and relationships. We have so far mapped about twenty distinct tools in about eight areas. About five of these tools are sufficiently codified and have enough people sufficiently trained that we are now already offering them to the world. This includes options of courses available on a gift basis and options of direct consulting, facilitation, and coaching available in other areas. We are also in this way expanding the range of people we ask resources from, continuing to uncouple giving from receiving. We anticipate completing this mapping in the coming months and continuing the gradual capacity increase in terms of training, endorsing, and promoting the work of those within the NGL community who are choosing to dedicate their life energy to this work and to bringing it to the world. Some of these activities include:

- A course we offered this summer about the Vision Mobilization framework: <https://nvctraining.com/live-nvc-courses/video-conference/vision-mobilization-2021>
- A growing body of VM facilitators accompanying individuals, groups, communities, and organizations in creating and using their own Vision Mobilization structures and building their systems to align within it.

- A small group of people offering coaching support for people in support of identifying and making requests in relation to their sustainability needs
- Accompanying one of the more established alternative communities in the world in their own process of identifying and aligning with purpose
- Beginning to implement a collaborative form of working with organizations and communities whereby those who are apprenticing within NGL do the bulk of the work with support from more experienced practitioners within NGL. This is a model of stacking functions of learning for individuals, contribution to groups beyond NGL within their capacity, and increasing our collective capacity to offer our tools with more precision in the future.

In the course of this year we also have done a tremendous amount of thinking about our processes for asking for and distributing money within our FGHs. Our thinking has evolved and become more refined and has led to new presentations, interviews, and writings. Here are some of the insights we have developed this year:

- Maintaining the uncoupling of giving and receiving, so that we only orient to sustainability needs and not to contribution when distributing money doesn't mean letting go of discerning and offering each other feedback on our choices with regard to purpose and specific goals. We are now in the early phases of building pathways for such discernment, ideally as far from distribution times as possible, so that we can course correct discernment about where we put our attention and energy independently of whether or not we are going to submit a request to the FGH. This will support us both in directing the resources we receive from others as well as letting others know what they are being asked to support when they give money. This has been a weak link, and we are excited to plug this hole.
- We realized that we didn't have agreements for when people offer coaching, consultations, or workshops outside NGL, which meant a resource leak for NGL. We are in the process of creating agreements about it that are intended to be fully within the flow of capacity and willingness rather than set amounts or percentages as is commonly used elsewhere.
- We have come to believe that one of the reasons why we don't have more people step forward to generate resources for NGL is that we are still operating more as individuals than we anticipate happening in the world that our vision points to. We are beginning to tighten this by creating liberation pods and other ways for increased interdependence in terms of resources.

Conflict Engagement

When we wrote the proposal, none of us anticipated that a year later the conflict running through the community would be just as intense as it was then and that the core divergences within it would still be an open loop to the degree that they are. We mourn these results and are actively aiming to learn from them.

In the weeks leading up to the end of the year, a small and significant shift began to happen in the direction of community co-holding of the conflict. We now have a fledgling team that is aiming to develop a pathway for how to attend to the conflict.

That said, we have learned a lot about conflict, especially conflict within visionary organizations that involves core leaders. We include some of our preliminary insights and questions emerging from this protracted difficulty in the next question.

Power, Access, Diversity, and Inclusion (PADI)

The PADI team is one of the teams whose capacity has been significantly impacted by the conflict running through NGL.

At the same time, during this year, the team made incremental progress on projects that address deeper and larger questions related to power and leadership that could strengthen the community's collective capacity to integrate a liberation-based approach to power and privilege into all it does. Ultimately, we believe that this could support the movement of the conflict as well as learning for the whole and beyond NGL.

PADI has been working on cultivating a vision for its work within NGL and its relationships with other parts of the organization and community, specifically wanting to anchor the concept of power dynamics as a flow of resources that is happening implicitly and therefore relevant in every interaction and scenario. It has been focusing on community responses to leadership and on making visible and finding alternatives to mutually-reinforcing patriarchal "habits" done across power that generate or perpetuate impacts related to generic everyday uses of power. Some initiatives include:

- Identifying common assumptions about leadership and leaders as well as common patriarchal patterns of engaging with leaders, including separation and demand
- Creating a role for and group-process for supporting leaders in moments when they are challenged and many of the above assumptions are active
- Designing a community space/event for cultivating power literacy and for leadership development by looking at interactions and identifying the range of leadership responses from within various roles in the scenario
- Designing a community space/event for sharing stories and learning about individual liberation and linking that more specifically and explicitly to flows and access to resources (including internal resources)
- Drafting community agreements that support power literacy

Several more projects related to PADI and to Purpose and Values remain on the backburner while team capacity is low. This includes development of a variety of charts and diagrams: discerning considerations and contexts for common organizational strategies to attend to

power and privilege; a systemic view of the ripple-effect impacts of conflicts when narratives about power and privilege are a core part of the conflict; a systemic view of loss of trust and trust building in relation to forms of trust; template worksheets for doing conflict analysis and feedback integration or agreement-making specifically related to conflicts about power and privilege; a transparent and collective process for discerning collective capacity in relation to values expression; draft principles for discerning how much to attend to impacts related to power and privilege, and more.

Purpose and Values

This team is one of the core places where the conflict field exists, and hasn't met for the entire duration of the grant. This, in itself, has continued to be a pain point within NGL, with divergent views about the nature of the challenge within the team and about how to attend to this difficulty.

Direct work with Jihan McDonald

At the start of the project, Jihan and I laid out a plan for how to move this project forward. Our shared expectation at the start of the year was that engaging with Jihan as an outside person who is not part of NGL and therefore not *within* the conflict would contribute to forward movement and unsticking of energy.

This expectation didn't come to fruition. Jihan's work didn't end up supporting movement within the conflict and may have contributed to confusion and frustration within the conflict field. Between this complexity, Jihan's family situation, and transitions within BayNVC, we have collectively decided to end Jihan's involvement and retire the advisory council.

At the same time, as with the work within NGL, several other outcomes unfolded that we didn't anticipate and yet find valuable:

- Jihan found more clarity about what her strongest capacity to contribute is, which is working 1:1 with people for capacity increase. As soon as her grief period is over, we anticipate she will make herself available to support people within NGL on a 1:1 basis, inviting them through a "pay what you can scenario" to engage with her as support for increasing capacity in the areas of relating to power and privilege.
- Jihan and I decided to continue meeting monthly for mutual nurturing and continued engagement given our affinity and longing for companionship in places of depth and liberation.
- Based on the conversations between us over this year, as well as engaging with others, I have synthesized my own learning about various topics that are interwoven with the conflict, fulfilling in a different way the overall longing we had, as we applied for the funding, to share what we learn with others. The article is posted on Medium: <https://medium.com/@MikiKashtan/grappling-with-our-own-power-abfbf37b5b5f>.

- In part based on these conversations, in part based on a large estate donation we received this year at BayNVC, some of us are in the early phases of designing a new program. More on this below.
- A conceptual breakthrough happened within the conflict field at some point as a new possibility that had not been in view before: that the conflict may seed multiple paths of experimentation within NGL, instead of all of us having to agree on one path of experimentation. This could be a way of attending to the core divergences, if we proceed in this way through a collaborative agreement. This would mean that we would learn about how to move towards our vision in part through seeing what different experiments, different ways of prioritizing purpose, values, and care for impacts, and different ways of framing the NGL approach may lead to.

New Projects Initiated This Year

In addition to many changes and insights in the specific areas that we had already intended to work in, we also ended up initiating significant new projects this year that we would like to mention in this report.

Vision Mobilization

This year saw a massive leap in capacity as the Vision Mobilization work came to flourish within NGL as a pathway of liberation to align with vision and engage differently with internal limitations and external obstacles through leaning on strengths, openings, and agreements to hold it all together. This framework is now applied in more and more areas within NGL, and many of us experience an enormous amount of capacity increase from leaning on this framework.

Power and Privilege

Two new initiatives have started within this year in this area.

- As already mentioned earlier, some of us are beginning to experiment with a new approach to shifting access and widening the scope of who partakes of what NGL has to offer, as well as who eventually brings NGL tools to the world. We are in the early design phase of a new program offering which is intended to serve women from marginalized communities, equipping them with knowledge, practice, and support to be the part of what we anticipate will be a growing community of practitioners bringing NGL tools to the world.
- During the VM courses that we offered this summer, we began to create a Vision Mobilization structure for those of us committed to and working with a liberation-based approach to power and privilege. Initially emerging as part of attending to, learning from, and integrating feedback from the field in this area, we are now in an early process of putting together a project team to complete, expand, and work with and within this approach in the hopes of contributing to the larger questions humanity is facing in this area. In addition, some of us are hopeful that this may also become a pathway for engaging with the very divergences that are within the conflict field.

Live-in Communities

This year saw the emergence of the first physical NGL community, currently consisting of four people vagabonding and engaging with communities in Europe. During this year we engaged in a particularly active 3-month experiment in Portugal, for which we received a 30,000 Euro grant from an individual funder. That period was a particularly intensive learning time for us.

We are currently intending to identify and land in a permanent location by January 2023. This group is fully committed to experimenting more and more deeply in sharing all material and resource risks and making all life decisions together; deepening intimacy; and coalescing deeply around a shared purpose in applying the NGL framework in living with people and in bringing it to the world. Specific developments for NGL as a whole that emerged from those experiences:

- A new approach to conflict, looking at it through the lens of capacity, which has had minor pilot experiments so far
- A deeper understanding and nuance to the practice of impact sharing which is central to our vision of relationship and community
- A fuller appreciation of what it takes to onboard people into a visionary community and steps towards anchoring that in agreements

Much of what we have done is documented in [blog posts](#) on and my [newsletter](#).

Values Discernment

As the Vision Mobilization work grew and deepened, it became clear within those of us developing that work that the original set of values that NGL was founded with were more in the realm of principles than values. The absence of a clear set of values to align with appeared to us to be a significant void, especially in a time of conflict and lack of deeper clarity of what being an NGL member entails. Given the impasse within the Purpose and Values team, the Agreements Team took it upon itself to begin a values discernment process as a way to create movement within NGL in this critical area, even knowing doing so is within the conflict and has complex positive and negative consequences for different parties within the conflict. While there continues to be loss of capacity in parts of the system because of divergence about the existence and scope of this team as well as about access to its process, we also see this as a painful and solid example of how work can continue even when a major conflict is in existence.

3. What are the most important lessons? How will you apply them? Are there barriers to applying your learning?

As we were preparing for writing this report, we learned from an observer at the meeting what cotyledon means, which gave us a whole new appreciation for the vision of the foundation. Perhaps this reference to life and growing is what brought about the image that

came to me at the meeting. It is of water, flowing towards a particular direction, and then encountering obstacles. The flow of water doesn't stop. It finds pathways around the edges of the obstacles, and continues. Life, water, liberation, and movement towards vision are similar in that way. A magnificent and large vision gave rise to NGL coming into existence, attracting many people towards it. We encountered painful and unexpected obstacles. Like water, we are finding our ways around the obstacles. Like water, as we are moving in that way, the edges of the obstacles soften, ever so slightly, creating unexpected shapes, some beauty within the anguish of conflict.

One of the principles of our current major area of development, the Vision Mobilization work, is "nothing goes to waste." Although we didn't reach the goals we set out to do, that was all a plan. We come to this with utter humility, willing to not know and to discover. Nothing went to waste, though the pathways and the learning have been entirely different from what we wished. Here is a summary of where we see the deeper goal of increasing our capacity to do the visionary work we took upon ourselves both as liberation from patriarchal conditioning and as bringing the results to the world.

We are aiming to walk in humility, one of the soft qualities that we see as antidoting patriarchy. Humility is one of the values emerging in the current values discernment process, where we refer to it "as surrendering to the limitations of our individual and collective capacity, opening to the unknown without forcing anything." This is the spirit we want to bring to our work in these areas, so that we find willing to face, in addition to not knowing, the impacts of our actions. This report, itself, is written with the willingness to express what feels like truth about our situation without hiding or dressing up anything, proclaiming the vastness of what we have accomplished and mourning the gap still remaining, including, in particular, that even the writing of the report -- what does or doesn't go into it and how it's framed -- remains in part within the conflict.

The conflict has been going on for two years, with aspects of it predating even the establishment of NGL. It has been taking a major toll, as continuing impacts within the conflict have reduced both individual and collective capacity. How to continue to function while a major conflict is taking such a toll has been an enduring question for all of us involved or affected by the conflict. As anguished as we all are from not finding a path forward yet, we also experience awe at how much we have created and the togetherness and care that remain despite deep mistrust.

Resource flow

1. Functioning within a gift paradigm where everything is done based on willingness creates specific and unique challenges in relation to receiving grants. The experience of working with this grant was in that way instrumental to understand how different what we are doing is, and how much we need to learn different ways of doing things. Whereas in a conventional organization receiving a grant would mean that someone is

put in charge of overseeing it and attending to all the specifics within it. It's a deep lesson that without the familiar structures of subtle coercion that exist in the world, we need a clear and wholehearted co-holding of a clear purpose focus to mobilize a concerted effort to make things happen. Just putting money into the flow won't by itself result in flow of human resources toward difficult tasks. Once incentive-style containers are released open, we need other active purpose-related mechanisms to replace them within a gift flow environment. In particular, this applies both to holding the project as a whole and to holding the movement of the conflict forward.

2. Over the course of this year the conflict, at times, "spilled" into our financial gift hub processes. However painful the experience, it provided a deep motivation for upgrading the mechanisms used in the collective decision making process that is the heart of the distribution and moved us forward in our design and visioning of making the flow of gifting practical and doable even within a world that is systemically still steeped in patriarchal ways of functioning such as exchange, incentive, and deserve thinking.

Attending to conflict

There was no linear and obvious movement in the conflict field, despite multiple strategies being attempted over the year. Nonetheless, several of us have noticed a shift in the conflict field. Here are a few elements that have emerged as we reflect on this year and the conflict:

1. It appears that the more a conflict involves leaders within a community, the more significant it becomes to access collective capacity rather than relying on individuals, either parties to the conflict or others who facilitate processes, for movement. This may be due, in part, to the greater impacts that conflicts amongst leaders can have on a community. It also has a lot to do, we believe, with the reality that it is more difficult to offer support to leaders than to peers. In our case in particular, this is compounded by the leaders also being the main teachers and coaches in the community, creating two barriers to overcome. Learning how to shift our relationship with our own and each other's power is key to creating more robust conflict systems that care for everyone, regardless of power.
2. Just as the year was coming to an end, one of those initiatives coalesced into a new team forming to hold decision-making about how to move the conflict forward, since even how to attend to the conflict has divergence within it.
3. One of the biggest areas of learning we have been with here is the reality that, within visionary organizations, the gap between vision and the patriarchal reality within which we live is large enough that conflicts are likely to be a common feature. Rather than focusing only on how to "resolve" conflicts, we are seeing now that learning to find ways to work together amidst intense conflict may well be a key capacity.
4. Although we still have little by way of concrete results, we are beginning to see that attending to conflict within a visionary organization would by necessity need to rely on visionary measures beyond many already existing conflict resolution processes. We

continue to aim to take seriously and lean into our commitment to nonviolence, interdependence, and liberation, along with our faith in our experiments to yield something transformative. We all wish for more togetherness and co-holding, and we've not lost care.

5. At least some of us are investigating the potential of attending to conflict completely from a systemic perspective and without a relational component, including implementing processes, aimed to care for the whole, without specific consultation with or active endorsement of some parties of the conflict. So far, the results are mixed, sometimes reducing drain in capacity and sometimes increasing the cost of the conflict.
6. We are seeing beginning signs of the potential energy and capacity released by shifting from relying on individual capacity to community co-holding. This invites some amount of transparency and visibility into the conflict, and we are still investigating how to navigate differences in how much transparency is tolerable, when, and how, within this particular conflict.

Power and privilege

Naming learning in an area that is *within* the conflict field is particularly difficult. There is humility and surrender that particularly go into this section of the report, knowing the insights may not be shared by all.

1. We believe that the move from advocacy for the powerless to liberation for all means that everyone within a visionary community would need to have access to support from any team that takes on caring for these challenges. While the capacity may still not be there to actually do it, that leaders, too, need support -- especially in relation to how they are perceived and how much capacity for stretching is implicitly expected of them -- is now consciously held within NGL.
2. We have growing awareness that liberation for all requires integrating the soft qualities, and this has been influencing our values discernment work.
3. Many of the patterns that are painfully present in many organizations and communities would need much more complex and nuanced analysis and practical agreements to shift. For example, while it is common to talk about leaders and people in positions of privilege have blind spots about their power and the impacts of their actions, it is rare that the blind spots of those who are not in positions of explicit leadership in relation to the tendency to make ourselves small. We have become much more aware of how much internalized powerlessness operates within our community even in the absence of any power hierarchy; even in an explicit field of distributed leadership with an explicit invitation to people to take initiative, to set limits to how much they will stretch, and to speak their truth. The gap is extreme, still, even within our community, between the vision we hold and people's actual capacity to step towards it. We are in mourning about what has been done to the overwhelming majority of people on the planet to bring us to this state.

4. We see early signs that the vision mobilization work, both for individuals and for teams, supports shifting these patterns. When we do honest capacity assessment, we can build on our strengths and lean on each other through explicit agreements that are fully within capacity. This allows us to access collective capacity to work with our limitations and face external obstacles.

4. **Please provide whatever quantitative data you track that is meaningful to you.**

This year, as before, we tracked the flow of money through NGL. The table below summarizes the results. The total received includes the \$25,500 that were allocated to the FGH from the grant, along with other contributions. “Total offered” refers to people and other entities who have supported NGL in various ways and to whom we have offered money without their request.

	January	April	August	Total
Total requested (\$)	44,175	31,651	36,390	112,216
Total offered by NGL to others (\$)	2,450	650	650	3,750
Total needed (\$)	46,625	32,301	37,040	115,966
Number of people requesting (including 0)	12	9	19	
Number of people receiving offers	3	2	2	
Number of all entities	15	11	21	
Total received and distributed (\$)	32,602	30,757	30,472	93,831

In preparation for writing this report, we also did something that we had never done before: we took on coming up with an educated estimate of what it actually takes to sustain NGL for an average month in its current level of activity.

There are 20 teams working within NGL; no one is working outside a team. This culture is so deeply ingrained in us that anyone who starts any project is most likely to first look for co-holders and then do the work. Between regular meetings and the ongoing work that is done between meetings, our current estimate is that teams are putting in an average of 15-20 person hours per week. That’s the equivalent of between 7 to 10 full time employees. If we imagined an average cost of \$40,000 per person -- which is relatively low in most of the US and very high in other parts of the world -- this amounts to a budget of \$400,000 a year to sustain the people working within NGL. This is three and half times what was requested this past year, and more than four times what we collectively distributed amongst us.

We have never tracked this before because we don’t distribute resources based on contribution; only based on need, and so it wasn’t necessary to have this information. We are

deeply grateful for the opportunity that being asked to write this report gave us, as it created the conditions for us to deepen our understanding of the power of gifting and flow to increase capacity.

5. **Where would you like the work to go from here?**

Our purpose remains what it was when we started the grant year: “To integrate nonviolence into the fabric of human life through ongoing live experiments with truth focused on individual and collective liberation.”

Much of the work continues and will continue, taking on new and unexpected initiatives, responding to what emerges from our work and from the impacts of global crises on all of us. All of that we don’t and can’t anticipate well.

All we know is what we are committed to continuing to ask about and experiment with.

Foundational work within NGL

We have reconfigured our understanding of our work this year to be centrally focused on the Vision Mobilization framework, from which all other parts of the NGL approach hang. With that, we have been in an ongoing process of working on our own Vision Mobilization structure. Prior to the grant, we completed a purpose discernment process, and are nearing the completion of values discernment. We have also been working on bringing clarity to our agreements and aligning them with capacity. As part of this work, we are in exploration about which of our agreements are foundational in support of greater capacity for accurate self-selection in individual relationships with NGL, especially as it relates to criteria for membership. We have closed our process for new members to join until this work is complete, which also includes revamping our four-year old mission elements and our theory of change, and engaging in deep capacity assessment.

While the presence of the conflict within key NGL teams is slowing us down and complicating the work, we are persisting with it and are together in the clarity that completing our own Vision Mobilization (VM) structure will increase capacity.

In January, we are planning what we are calling a “VM party” to support all teams to have clearer purpose, capacity assessments, mission points, and agreements within capacity. We anticipate this vastly increasing our collective capacity. Overall, working explicitly on increasing collective capacity through practices we have already experimented with in smaller pockets is a significant goal for the coming year.

Attending to the conflict

With the willingness and creativity we are experiencing within NGL about the attempt to bring community co-holding to the conflict, many of us experience a surge of hope that a path

forward will emerge. We remain deeply humbled by the degree to which, despite clear goodwill and care towards everyone in the conflict field, we remain unable to untie the knot.

Resource flow

This year we anticipate experimenting with having multiple interrelated FGHS as we explore the following questions as well as others:

- How can we organically increase the degree of shared risk within NGL, so that responsibility and care are widespread within the community? For example, when work in the Vision Mobilization area begins to flow into NGL and financial resources come with it, how do we keep the distribution of work opportunities based on capacity fit and, simultaneously, separate from the distribution of resources, so that competition for work becomes a non-issue when everyone's sustainability needs are cared for independently of how much work they have done?
- Do multiple FGHS assist or hinder this possibility? In what ways can multiple FGHS support greater distribution of leadership and empowerment within NGL? What models can we create to support others in the world to engage in larger scale experiments in gifting?
- How do we anchor more deeply the understanding of the maternal roots of gifting and support the deeper shifts that this brings to liberation?
- How do we introduce purpose discernment and evaluation into the resource flow work while still maintaining the uncoupling of sustainability needs from how much each of us contribute?
- In working with others outside NGL, how do we support individuals and groups in grappling with the legacy of scarcity, separation, and powerlessness that is mutually reinforced with exchange patterns so that active flow of resources in the direction of needs can become progressively more visible and available within the world?

Power and privilege

In the coming year we are hoping to release publicly ongoing iterations of the insights gained from integrating the Vision Mobilization work with the liberation-based approach to questions of power and privilege, including about how power differences influence our relationships, collaboration, and conflicts. One of the fundamental features of the emerging framework is the leaning on tenderness and humility, absent any shaming and blaming, in attending to pervasive internal limitations and external obstacles within doing this work. We anticipate publishing a few learning packets and articles during 2022.

6. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Most of the learning that has arisen in the course of this year has found its way to my writing. In particular, I have produced about 15 [learning packets](#) in the past year, each about 20-35 pages long. At least half of them, along with several newsletters and a number of blog posts,

have been directly influenced by what has happened and what this grant has made possible: to give us a bit of a reprieve from the ceaseless effort to generate immediate resources to support people's sustainability and thereby increase our capacity to increase our capacity.