PHC Project Manifesto

Ending Harassment

Ending Harassment – Evidence into Action is an international, independent Governance project addressing sexual harassment, sexual exploitation, acid violence, institutional abuse and abuse of authority. Its scope encompasses NGOs, educational institutions, public bodies, employers and other institutions globally.

The project brings evidence, institutional responsibilities and proposed improvements into a central framework for governance review and action. It aims to examine how organisations prevent harm, respond to concerns, protect survivors and demonstrate accountability across countries and institutional settings.

Through the PHC Service, the project intends to record concerns, assess the quality and limitations of evidence, distinguish allegations from substantiated findings, identify weaknesses in safeguards and track corrective actions against defined responsibilities and review dates.

The intended operating model is subscription-funded, supporting independent research, structured review, monitoring and reporting. Subscription arrangements will need transparent terms and safeguards for independence and conflicts of interest. Payment will not confer a favourable assessment or influence findings.

Survivor dignity, confidentiality, informed participation, safeguarding and procedural fairness will guide the work. The programme and subscription arrangements are in development; the project makes no claim of existing subscribers or verified outcomes.

1. MANIFESTO TITLE

Manifesto Title

Ending Harassment – Evidence into Action

2. WHY THE PROJECT EXISTS

Purpose

Everyone deserves safety, dignity and fair treatment. Sexual harassment, sexual exploitation, acid violence, institutional abuse and abuse of authority demand more than statements of concern: they demand responsible action that can be examined and improved.

Ending Harassment – Evidence into Action is an international, independent Governance project bringing these concerns into a central framework for evidence, responsibility and institutional improvement. Its scope encompasses NGOs, educational institutions, public bodies, employers and other institutions globally.

Our purpose is to help turn credible evidence into practical safeguards, fair responses and accountable follow-through. Our ambition is global; the scope of each review must reflect the permissions, expertise, resources and safe participation actually available.

3. THE PROBLEM ADDRESSED

Problem

A policy on paper cannot, by itself, show that people are protected. Governance must be tested through what happens when concerns are raised: whether people can speak safely, whether evidence is examined fairly, whether decisions are explained and whether promised changes are implemented.

Unequal power, fear of retaliation, inaccessible reporting routes and institutional self-interest can obstruct accountability. The same scrutiny must extend to organisations claiming to prevent harm, including NGOs and oversight initiatives themselves.

Public attention, organisational reputation and funding are not substitutes for evidence. An allegation must not be treated as a finding, and uncertainty must not be concealed. A credible response must protect people while preserving fairness for everyone involved.

4. WHAT THE PROJECT DOES

Approach

We propose a disciplined path from concern to action:

1. **Define the question:** agree the review's purpose, scope, criteria, permissions and limits of authority.
2. **Listen safely:** offer accessible ways for affected people and institutions to contribute, without requiring public testimony or unnecessary personal information.
3. **Examine the evidence:** record sources, assess reliability, distinguish allegations from substantiated findings and make gaps or disagreement visible.
4. **Agree responsibility:** connect identified weaknesses with practical remedies, named owners, deadlines and clear completion criteria.
5. **Check implementation:** review evidence, invite fair responses and keep unresolved risks visible rather than close actions on assurances alone.
6. **Report and learn:** publish appropriately protected accounts of progress and limitations, correct errors and improve the approach.

The intended subscription-funded model should sustain independent research, review and monitoring. Subscription terms must explain the offer and protect assessment and reporting from financial influence. Payment must never purchase a favourable conclusion, privileged control over findings or protection from scrutiny.

5. WHAT SUCCESS LOOKS LIKE

Success

Success means stronger practice that can be supported by evidence: safer and more accessible reporting, fairer handling of concerns, clearer institutional responsibility and corrective actions that are implemented and tested.

We will seek to distinguish preparation from delivery, delivery from implementation and implementation from longer-term outcomes. Assessment should use defined baselines, transparent indicators, appropriate independent challenge and voluntary feedback from affected people.

Subscriber numbers, publicity, adopted policies and completed activities may describe the programme, but they do not prove that harm has reduced. Fewer complaints alone may not indicate greater safety. Claims of impact must explain the evidence, its limitations and the basis for attributing change to the project.

These are intended outcomes. This manifesto does not claim an existing subscriber base, completed institutional reforms or verified reductions in harm.

6. THE ROLE OF PHC

PHC Role

The intended role of the PHC Service is to give governance work a structured, reviewable record: linking concerns and questions to evidence, institutional responses, decisions, responsibilities, actions and follow-up.

Subject to suitability and access checks, PHC should support a coherent action and decision register with clear evidence status, owners, deadlines and completion requirements. Sensitive source material should remain in appropriately restricted storage, linked by reference where suitable rather than exposed through public summaries.

A platform can organise scrutiny; it cannot replace competent judgment, fair process or independent challenge. Using PHC does not confer regulatory authority, establish that a claim is true or certify that an institution is safe. Operational arrangements and reporting capabilities must be confirmed before they are promised.

7. THE ROLE OF ORDER EFFICIENCY

Order Efficiency Role

Order Efficiency's proposed contribution is to help translate this purpose into an organised, workable programme: clarifying scope and responsibilities, coordinating planning, supporting PHC processes and connecting resources with reviewable actions.

Any engagement should define its authority, deliverables, time, fees or discounts, expenses and accountability explicitly. Organisational support must remain within agreed competence and must not imply an appointment, partnership or statutory mandate that has not been established.

Where Order Efficiency contributes to designing or delivering work, independent challenge of that work should come from a suitably competent, unconflicted reviewer. Commercial interests must not control evidence assessment, findings or publication.

8. LEGACY STAKEHOLDERS

Stakeholder Model

Credible governance requires affected people to be heard, institutions to answer fairly and reviewers to remain independent. The proposed stakeholder model brings together complementary contributions:

- **Affected people and communities:** inform priorities, accessibility and the practical meaning of protection through safe, voluntary participation.
- **NGOs and institutions:** explain their responsibilities and practices, respond to evidence and take ownership of agreed improvements.
- **Subscribers:** support a defined service offer and the continuity of the programme without purchasing influence over conclusions.
- **Specialists and independent reviewers:** contribute relevant expertise, local knowledge and challenge proportionate to the work.
- **Public and professional bodies:** contribute within their own mandates where appropriate, without transferring unconfirmed powers to the project.

Participation, appointments and partnerships require explicit agreement. No organisation or individual is represented as endorsing the project merely because their work is relevant. A subscription, personal disclosure or public appearance must not be a prerequisite for having a concern considered within the defined complaints process.

9. CORE PRINCIPLES

Principles

- **Dignity and choice:** respect people as participants with agency, never as publicity material or evidence to be extracted.
- **Safety and confidentiality:** minimise sensitive information, explain confidentiality limits and assess risks before collecting, sharing or publishing.
- **Evidence and honesty:** distinguish what is reported, what is substantiated and what remains unknown. Correct material errors openly.
- **Fair process:** give appropriate opportunities to respond, explain decisions and provide an unconflicted route for complaints and review.
- **Independence:** declare interests, manage conflicts and separate income generation from assessment and publication decisions.
- **Accountability:** apply scrutiny to the project itself, including its spending, conduct, commitments and handling of concerns.
- **Transparency with care:** explain methods, funding and limitations while protecting identities, security and justified confidentiality.
- **Proportionate authority:** state the limits of each review. Independent governance work must not be presented as statutory regulation, legal adjudication or guaranteed emergency support.
- **Global scope, contextual judgment:** use consistent principles while recognising different institutional settings, languages and local circumstances.
- **Responsible growth:** expand only when competence, safe systems, independent oversight and resources support the commitments being made.

These are commitments to guide the project's development. Their implementation must itself be documented and reviewed.

10. CLOSING STATEMENT

Closing Statement

People deserve institutions that respond to concerns with care, examine evidence fairly and follow through on their responsibilities.

Ending Harassment – Evidence into Action invites affected communities, NGOs, institutions, specialists and prospective subscribers to help build that discipline of accountability. Participation should strengthen the quality of evidence and action, while leaving independent judgment intact.

Our commitment is to ask clear questions, listen safely, record what is known, make responsibility visible and test whether agreed changes happen. We will describe progress honestly, acknowledge what remains unresolved and subject our own work to the standards we ask of others.

Evidence should lead to action. Action should be open to scrutiny. Dignity and fairness should guide both.