PHC Business Case

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. PROJECT CONTEXT

Project Context

Ending Harassment – Evidence into Action is PHC project P533, 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 proposed operating model uses subscriptions to sustain independent research, institutional governance review, corrective-action monitoring and appropriately protected reporting. The purpose is to connect evidence with responsibilities and practical action, rather than treat policies, public commitments or campaign attention as proof of effective protection.

This business case supports the revised Project Information, 60 Governance framing answers, Strategic Plan and Manifesto. It seeks a staged decision on readiness and a bounded initial programme; it does not establish funding, appointments, partnerships or service availability.

The legal operating or hosting body, accountable contact, participating institutions, subscription terms and actual costs remain to be confirmed. No statutory mandate, compulsory access or enforcement power is established. International scope describes the remit, not verified operational coverage or authority in every country.

2. CURRENT POSITION AND GAP TO TARGET

Current Position and Gap to Target

CURRENT POSITION

The supplied materials define the project direction, proposed principles and a phased twelve-month development approach. They do not provide a verified subscriber base, signed institutional participation agreements, adopted review criteria, operational service records, cost baseline or completed assessments. Missing records should remain unknown rather than be reported as zero activity.

GAP TO THE TARGET

- **Accountability:** an authorised operating body, named lead, oversight and documented decision rights.
- **Credible services:** a defined offer, assessment criteria, appropriate expertise, safe participation and fair complaints and correction processes.
- **Reliable systems:** suitable PHC configuration, controlled documents, restricted evidence storage and a reconciled subscription-finance ledger.
- **Financial readiness:** actual costs, transparent pricing, evidence of willingness to pay and resources sufficient for commitments and safe continuation or closure.
- **Demonstrable value:** baselines, reviewable action outcomes and independent challenge proportionate to the claims made.

Subject to readiness, the proposed Month 6 target is a manageable initial cohort with agreed scope and documented baselines. By Month 12, the aim is completed assessment and follow-up cycles, sampled independent challenge and a redacted account of progress, limitations and learning. Dates run from an agreed authorised and adequately resourced start; volumes remain capacity-dependent.

3. OPERATING OPPORTUNITY

Operating Opportunity

The operating opportunity to test is whether a central governance framework can help institutions and affected communities move from fragmented concerns and promises to clearer evidence, responsibilities and follow-through. Its usefulness and commercial viability remain hypotheses requiring consultation and a bounded trial.

The proposed offer combines scoped reviews of institutional safeguards, structured evidence and decision records, practical action plans, follow-up and transparent reporting. Institutions may value an organised improvement process; affected people may benefit from clearer accountability; oversight stakeholders may gain a more reviewable basis for challenge. These are anticipated uses, not demonstrated demand or benefits.

Subscription categories could reflect the defined services, support or access provided and the subscriber's capacity. Subscribers and institutions under review need not be the same group. Terms must make clear what is included, what requires separate commissioning and how confidentiality and independence are protected.

Before launch, test willingness to participate and pay through structured discussions, costed offers and explicit commitments. Compare the proposal with existing internal processes and independent review options, recognising that P533 need not replace specialist services. Record objections, affordability constraints and reasons not to proceed as well as expressions of interest. Growth should follow demonstrated usefulness, safe capacity and sustainable receipts.

4. PROBLEM BEING SOLVED

Problem Being Solved

The project is intended to address a governance problem: the difficulty of establishing whether institutional safeguards operate in practice, who is responsible when weaknesses are identified and whether corrective action is completed effectively.

Its review questions concern safe reporting, prevention, complaint handling, protection from retaliation, oversight and follow-up in relation to sexual harassment, acid violence and institutional abuse. Evidence must distinguish reported concerns from substantiated findings, and give institutions and individuals appropriate opportunities to respond.

The proposed framework would connect each material concern to sources, assessment criteria, limitations, responsible parties and reviewable actions. This offers a testable improvement over relying on unsupported assurances or action lists without completion evidence; comparative effectiveness has not yet been established.

The project cannot promise to eliminate harassment or violence, compel cooperation or determine legal liability. Governance review also cannot substitute for emergency protection, clinical care, legal representation or statutory investigation. Any specialist referral requires suitable arrangements.

The business case concerns a disciplined contribution to prevention and accountability within these boundaries, not a guaranteed solution to every form or consequence of harm.

5. PROPOSED INVESTMENT LOGIC

Proposed Investment Logic

OPTIONS TO CONSIDER

1. **Remain at planning stage:** avoid new delivery commitments while clarifying purpose and resources. This limits immediate expenditure but does not test the proposed service or establish operational benefits.
2. **Commission reviews individually:** test specific assessments through separately agreed engagements. This may suit limited demand, while ongoing follow-up and core governance costs would still need an explicit funding arrangement.
3. **Develop a staged subscription-funded programme:** combine a defined service offer with continuing review and action monitoring. This matches the intended direction but requires demonstrated demand, cost discipline and strong protection against financial influence.

PROPOSED INVESTMENT SEQUENCE

Prefer the third option conditionally, beginning with a limited, costed readiness phase. First establish accountability, criteria, competent people, safe systems and transparent subscription terms. Then authorise only a manageable programme supported by resources and explicit participation agreements. Release further expenditure as readiness and useful delivery are evidenced.

The intended chain is resources and expertise, followed by fair reviews, agreed actions, checked implementation and potentially stronger institutional practice. Each step needs evidence; a completed review alone cannot establish reduced harm.

No return on investment, revenue forecast or quantified social benefit is substantiated. Compare options using actual whole-programme costs, demand evidence, independence, safety and capacity before approving operational commitments. Do not count the same action, resource or anticipated benefit twice.

6. EXPECTED BENEFITS

Expected Benefits

INTENDED BENEFITS

- **For affected people:** clearer opportunities to inform priorities and raise concerns within a defined process that respects dignity, safety, confidentiality and choice.
- **For institutions:** a practical account of governance weaknesses, evidence gaps, responsibilities and corrective actions.
- **For oversight stakeholders:** more traceable decisions, implementation evidence and visibility of unresolved issues.
- **For subscribers:** a clearly defined, independently governed service offer with transparent scope, costs and reporting.
- **For the wider programme:** learning across institutions and countries without assuming that identical interventions suit every setting.

HOW BENEFITS WOULD BE TESTED

Establish baselines and definitions before setting numerical targets. Monitor review timeliness, evidence completeness, fair response opportunities, overdue actions, justified action closures and voluntary feedback. Examine implementation and durability, not simply policy adoption. Use sampled independent challenge and record alternative explanations for changes.

Assess possible adverse effects, including retaliation, exposure of identities, additional institutional workload, exclusion through cost and false reassurance from superficial reviews. Record mitigations and unresolved risks alongside intended benefits.

These benefits are prospective. Subscriber growth, publicity and activity counts do not prove safer institutions; fewer complaints do not alone establish less harm. No verified outcomes or quantified savings are claimed.

7. COST AND RESOURCE NEEDS

Cost and Resource Needs

RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

Cost a proportionate team covering coordination, evidence assessment, safeguarding, secure records, finance, subscription administration and reporting, with access to local expertise and independent challenge. Functions may be part-time or contracted where appropriate, while preserving essential separation of duties.

- **One-off readiness:** service and criteria design, operating arrangements, system configuration, essential equipment and induction.
- **Recurring essentials:** coordination, approved PHC and other system charges, secure storage, communications, finance oversight and minimum quality assurance.
- **Activity-dependent costs:** institutional reviews, authorised visits, translation, accessible consultation, specialist advice and independent review.
- **Continuity:** risk-based contingency, appropriate reserves and unavoidable closure or handover costs.

FINANCIAL MODEL TO PREPARE

Obtain rates and quotations, choose billing and reporting currencies, and prepare a twelve-month budget and cash forecast. Document PHC Consultant scope, hours, full or discounted rates, deliverables, expenses and third-party charges. Distinguish cash payments, in-kind contributions and concessions; remove duplicated cost items.

Test each subscription tier's price against its expected variable delivery cost and contribution to shared essentials. Model different tier mixes, renewal and collection delays, affordability concessions, capacity limits and loss of a major contributor. Invoices and expressions of interest are not cash receipts. No break-even subscriber count can be supported until these inputs are verified.

The proposed reserve starting point is at least three months of essential operating costs, with unavoidable commitments and wind-down needs assessed without double counting. This is an unapproved policy option, not a funded balance. Previous country-specific illustrative budgets are not carried forward. No cost total, price or funding commitment is approved by this business case.

8. WHY GOVERNANCE SUPPORT IS NEEDED

Why Governance Support is Needed

Independent scrutiny is central to the product, not an optional administrative addition. The project must be able to demonstrate that its own decisions, spending and claims meet the standards it asks institutions to apply.

Proposed governance support includes an accountable operating body and lead; unconflicted oversight; clear delegations and publication authority; evidence and document controls; safeguarding; a fair complaints and correction route; and separate financial approval and reconciliation. Anyone designing or delivering work should not independently assure that same work.

Use PHC for structured governance and action records only after confirming its suitability. Restricted sources, personal information and subscription-finance records require controlled handling appropriate to their purpose. A platform does not itself establish competence, independence or regulatory authority.

The main risks are subscriber influence, funding concentration, insufficient expertise, weak evidence, unsafe disclosure, retaliation and delivery beyond affordable capacity. Address them through transparent terms, conflict declarations and recusals, review-specific risk checks, realistic service limits, tested systems and independent challenge. Any proposed contribution from Order Efficiency or other providers requires an explicit engagement defining responsibilities, fees and authority.

Payment must never determine findings or suppress justified reporting. Non-payment is a contractual service issue, not a basis for altering evidence or erasing the historical record. Oversight should pause unsafe work and intervene when financial or independence risks make continuation unsound.

9. RECOMMENDATION

Recommendation

Approve this business case in principle as a basis for a limited, costed readiness phase for Ending Harassment – Evidence into Action. An authorised decision-maker should set its scope, expenditure ceiling, owner and review date after actual costs are established. This recommendation is not approval to spend, launch services or claim regulatory status.

GATE 1: READINESS

Confirm the operating body and accountable lead, review authority limits, independent oversight, criteria, competence, safeguards, complaints route, secure records and publication controls. Validate the proposed offer through consultation, pricing work and evidence of willingness to participate and pay.

GATE 2: BOUNDED OPERATIONS

Authorise a manageable initial cohort only when written participation and service terms, approved costs, adequate resources, capacity and safe continuation or wind-down arrangements are evidenced. Plan baselines by Month 6 and assessment and follow-up cycles through Month 12 from an agreed resourced start, adjusting to actual readiness.

GATE 3: CONTINUATION OR EXPANSION

Require evidence of useful delivery, fair process, checked implementation, manageable risks and sustainable receipts, supported by unconflicted challenge. Rephase, narrow or stop work where these conditions are not met. Do not make expansion depend on subscriber numbers alone.

For oversight approval, carry forward the draft financial triggers: below three months of essential-cost cover, prepare a recovery plan and review new commitments; below two months, rephase discretionary activity; insufficient cover for the next month's essential obligations, decide urgently on funded continuation or safe service reduction. Final thresholds depend on a verified budget.

The next decision should review a concrete readiness pack: named accountabilities, defined service scope, risk controls, costed budget, proposed subscription terms and demand evidence. Until those conditions are met, describe the project as in development and report only supported progress.