

PHC Project Manifesto

Illustrative Kenya Community WASH and Livelihoods Project

This is an illustrative PHC Port project for exploring how PHC Service could support a community-owned WASH and livelihoods intervention in Kenya. The proposed delivery model combines physical WASH outputs with the governance and behaviour-change work required to sustain them. PHC would provide a shared structure for recording the project's intentions, concerns, actions, locations, people, events and deliverables, while its comment mechanism would enable community members, committee representatives, implementers, local administrators and funders to contribute observations and respond to emerging issues. Particular attention would be given to committee legitimacy, community understanding, participation, incentives, inclusion, fee collection, financial transparency, maintenance responsibilities, safeguarding, grievance handling and the relationship between customary practices and formal local administration. The project would begin as a neutral demonstration and 7-Day Review candidate. Its scope, location, beneficiaries, implementing organisation, funding arrangements and delivery claims would remain provisional until authorised stakeholders provide or approve suitable source materials.

1. MANIFESTO TITLE

Community Ownership That Keeps WASH Working

2. WHY THE PROJECT EXISTS

We exist to help communities secure lasting improvements in water, sanitation, hygiene and livelihoods by making local ownership real in practice. Safe infrastructure matters, but its value is realised only when people can use it reliably, understand how it is governed, influence the decisions affecting it and sustain it after initial implementation support reduces. This project will bring physical services, behaviour change, local capability and accountable governance together so that healthier and more resilient lives—not completed installations alone—become the measure of progress.

3. THE PROBLEM ADDRESSED

Too many WASH investments are judged by what was constructed, distributed or taught at a particular moment. Water systems may later fail; sanitation facilities may not be used or maintained; hygiene messages may not become daily practice; committees may exist without broad legitimacy; fees and expenditure may not be understood; and the poorest or least powerful residents may carry the greatest burden while having the weakest voice. Livelihood activities can likewise produce attractive launch stories without durable income or fair access. The underlying problem is not simply a shortage of infrastructure. It is the separation of infrastructure and programme outputs from the community relationships, incentives, responsibilities, evidence and governance needed to sustain them.

4. WHAT THE PROJECT DOES

We will begin by listening and establishing what is actually true in each participating location: how people obtain water, practise sanitation and hygiene, make decisions, experience exclusion, resolve disputes and respond to incentives. We will work with communities, implementers, technical specialists and local administration to define clear responsibilities for operation, water safety, maintenance, finance, behaviour change, safeguarding and complaints. Community governance structures will be treated as accountable working arrangements rather than ceremonial committees. Decisions, concerns, actions and significant feedback will be recorded and followed through. Livelihood support will be designed around evidenced local demand and household resilience, with safeguards against benefits being captured by a small group. The approach will remain adaptable because different communities may require different routes to the same standards of safety, dignity, inclusion and accountability.

5. WHAT SUCCESS LOOKS LIKE

Success means that people have equitable access to safe and dependable water; sanitation is dignified, accessible and used; hygiene practices are understood and sustained; and failures are detected and corrected quickly. It means community members know who is responsible, how representatives are selected, how funds are used and where concerns can be raised without retaliation. Governance structures include and respond to women, young people, people with disabilities, poorer households and others liable to be overlooked. Assets have capable custodians, realistic maintenance arrangements and transparent financial support. Livelihood activity produces evidenced value without compromising affordability or community cohesion. Above all, success is demonstrated over time through service continuity, trusted decisions, resolved concerns and lived experience—not asserted through infrastructure counts or publicity alone.

6. THE ROLE OF PHC

PHC will provide a shared governance and evidence structure through which the project's Schedule, Concerns, Actions, Locations, People, Events and Deliverables can be understood together. Comments will enable stakeholders to add observations, questions, evidence and responses directly to the relevant project records, creating a continuing feedback process rather than an occasional consultation exercise. PHC will help distinguish intention from delivery, output from outcome and unresolved concern from verified resolution. It will support progressive reporting to communities, implementers and prospective funders while protecting confidential or anonymous participation where appropriate. PHC will not replace community authority, technical WASH practice or the implementing organisation's formal responsibilities; its role is to make their interaction more visible, coherent and accountable.

7. THE ROLE OF ORDER EFFICIENCY

Order Efficiency will initially maintain this as an illustrative project built from public and high-level discussion, without claiming the identity, approval, data or achievements of any live organisation. If authorised stakeholders wish to proceed, Order Efficiency will propose a PHC 7-Day Review to establish the real project context, test the available evidence, open priority governance questions and prepare a Review report and six-month PHC Service proposal. During any subsequent service, Order Efficiency would facilitate the PHC structure, analyse feedback, help maintain project records and report what the evidence supports—including weaknesses and uncertainty. It would not present itself as the WASH implementer, funder or owner of community decisions.

8. LEGACY STAKEHOLDERS

Community members are the intended users, beneficiaries and co-governors of the services, not passive recipients of a completed asset. Community committees coordinate defined local responsibilities and remain answerable to the people they represent. Implementing organisations organise delivery, facilitation, safeguarding and evidence. Technical and public-health specialists protect water, sanitation and hygiene standards. Livelihood actors help translate local capability into viable and inclusive economic activity. County and local administration provide legitimate alignment, oversight and service connections without displacing community voice. Funders support proportionate, progressively evidenced work and remain open to inconvenient findings. Order Efficiency supports the PHC governance process. Every stakeholder should be able to see what is expected of them, what they may decide, what evidence they must provide and how their decisions may be challenged.

9. CORE PRINCIPLES

Community ownership must be demonstrated, not declared. Safe water, sanitation, hygiene and human dignity come before publicity or institutional convenience. Infrastructure and governance are one sustainability problem, not separate workstreams. Participation must include those who are easiest to exclude and must not depend solely on literacy, connectivity or confidence in public meetings. Decisions about charges, expenditure, maintenance and benefits should be understandable and traceable. Feedback is project work: questions, criticism and local knowledge should lead to visible consideration and action. Evidence must distinguish verified fact, stakeholder opinion, assumption and future intention. Personal information, safeguarding reports and complaints must be protected. Livelihood activity must be economically credible, locally appropriate and fairly accessible. Plans should change when community experience and evidence show that they should.

10. CLOSING STATEMENT

We will not call a WASH project sustainable merely because infrastructure has been delivered or a committee has been formed. We will work towards communities that can understand, question, govern, maintain and improve the services on which their health and livelihoods depend. Our promise is to keep the relationship between people, assets, behaviour, money and decisions visible—and to let continuing evidence, including difficult feedback, determine whether the project is genuinely succeeding. This illustrative manifesto is an invitation to authorised organisations and participating communities to correct, strengthen and ultimately own that commitment.
