Proposal for PHC Service

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.

PHC Proposal

This proposal sets out a provisional six-month PHC development and initial delivery package for Ending Harassment – Evidence into Action. It translates the revised project information, Governance framing answers, Strategic Plan, Manifesto and Business Case into a costed working scenario.

All figures, hours, subscription prices, uptake assumptions, roles and funding arrangements are planning estimates for discussion, not quotations, appointments, contracts, secured income or verified results. GBP is used consistently. Refresh the model after each material development, supplier agreement or change in capacity.

PHC is intended to organise the Schedule, Concerns, Actions, Locations, People and Deliverables, linking evidence to decisions and corrective action. Access, sensitive evidence handling, financial visibility and reporting functions require suitability checks; public or subscriber access must not expose restricted records.

Project Summary

Develop a manageable, independently governed programme that examines whether institutional safeguards work in practice and records what should improve, who is responsible and what evidence will demonstrate implementation.

- Scope: a small initial cohort, provisionally one or two willing institutions, subject to safe access, complexity and available hours. Subscriptions do not each include an institutional review.
- Timing: Month 1 contains a proposed seven-working-day readiness review and the remaining approval period; Months 2-3 are setup; Months 4-6 are initial continuation. Further continuation and the wider twelve-month strategy require separate approval and rebasing of milestones.
- Six-month cost envelope: £14,975, including people, essential hardware, tooling, engagement and risk allowances.
- Illustrative subscription receipts: £17,500, assuming gated activation from Month 3 and a ramp to 60 paying subscriptions by Month 6. Demand is untested.
- Illustrative opening unrestricted working capital: £15,000, separate from subscription receipts and not claimed as available.

Retain fair response opportunities, a defined complaints route and independent challenge. No statutory powers, guaranteed certification, direct emergency response or proven reduction in harm is asserted.

Involved Parties

Proposed functions are an authorised operating or hosting body and accountable project lead; unconflicted oversight; PHC strategy and analysis; records and subscription administration; project coordination; safeguarding expertise; and an independent quality reviewer. All appointments and contractual responsibilities require confirmation. Names in the original template have not been treated as evidence of availability or appointment.

Any Order Efficiency or other PHC provider engagement should specify scope, authority, rates, deliverables, expenses and conflicts. The person designing or delivering work must not independently assure that same work. The limited paid-hour allowances do not constitute a staffed full-time service.

Willing NGOs and institutions, affected people and community representatives, relevant specialists and prospective subscribers may contribute through explicitly agreed roles. Participation and partnerships are not confirmed. Public bodies retain their own mandates; P533 does not acquire their authority.

Subscribers fund a defined offer, not favourable findings, privileged control over reporting or access to sensitive testimony. A concern may be considered within the defined complaints scope without a subscription. Specialist medical, legal, emergency or formal investigation services require separate competent providers and arrangements.

Operational Strategy

PHASED, GATED DELIVERY

Use a six-budget-month package: Month 1 for the seven-day review, approvals and readiness; Months 2-3 for setup; Months 4-6 for initial continuation, renewable only after review. This resolves the template's inconsistent three-month and twelve-month continuation descriptions. No additional nine months of continuation are included in these costs.

ILLUSTRATIVE MONTHLY SUBSCRIPTIONS

Tier	Monthly price	Proposed scope
Supporter	£25	Support pooled research and public-interest reporting; public summaries; no bespoke casework.
Institutional	£100	One seat in planned group orientation or governance briefings and general non-confidential guidance.
Enhanced institutional	£250	Up to two seats in the same group sessions and priority scheduling within published capacity; no preferential assessment or influence.

Prices and service entitlements are draft and subject to affordability, capacity and tax review. Reviews are separately scoped within the programme: none of these tiers promises a dedicated audit, emergency service or unlimited consultant time. Priority scheduling concerns available sessions only; it must not affect risk-based review priorities, complaints, findings or publication. Discounts, cancellations, refunds and non-payment terms need explicit approval.

Cash scenario: monthly billing, receipts in the service month, no annual prepayments, no assumed refunds or collection fees and no subscriber income in Months 1-2. Actual non-payment, charges, taxes or reduced receipts must be modelled when known. Subscriber counts are monthly active paying targets, not signed members or new additions; renewal and churn are not separately estimated.

CAPACITY AND INDEPENDENCE

Keep most subscriber engagement pooled and reserve separately scoped assessment time for the small initial cohort. The model supports only 215 paid hours across six months, not 60 individual institutional reviews. Cap onboarding or reprice and recost if actual demand exceeds the approved offer. Record conflicts and protect publication decisions from financial pressure.

Phase 1: 7-Day Review

Timing: a proposed seven-working-day diagnostic within Month 1; remaining Month 1 is reserved for decisions, costing and funding readiness. The cost model uses one budget month for this period, not seven days of full-time staffing.

People allowance: £1,450; total Month 1 budget including tooling and contingency: £1,700.

- Confirm the operating body, accountable lead, scope and authority limits.
- Assess stakeholder fit, evidence access, safeguarding, skills, conflicts and system suitability using the PHC structure.
- Test subscription interest and affordability; obtain supplier and consultant terms.
- Prepare a baseline risk register, service definition, cost model, funding options and go, revise or no-go recommendation.

Do not assume a green light. Authorise setup only when responsibilities, controls, initial resources and a safe continuation or closure plan are credible. Actual review duration depends on access and readiness; one week is a target, not a guarantee.

Phase 2: Setup Phase

Timing: Months 2-3, subject to the readiness decision. People allowance: £4,280; full setup-period cost: £5,490.

- Approve criteria, evidence labels, fair response procedures, safeguarding, complaints, publication and correction rules.
- Configure suitable PHC registers, controlled documents, restricted evidence storage and the subscription-finance ledger; test permissions and recovery.
- Appoint and induct competent personnel, with independent review and escalation arrangements.
- Agree the initial institutions, review scope, baselines, action owners and evidence requirements.
- Validate the proposed subscription offer, terms, capacity limits and collection arrangements before accepting paid subscriptions.

The base scenario starts subscription receipts in Month 3 only if the promised introductory services can be delivered. Delay activation and receipts together if readiness slips. A target of 25 active subscriptions in Month 3 is an unvalidated assumption. Reapprove the cash forecast before commitments if uptake or setup progress differs.

Phase 3: Continuation Phase

Timing: Months 4-6, an initial three-month continuation period. People allowance: £6,810; full continuation-period cost: £7,785.

- Conduct a limited number of scoped reviews and follow-up actions within the approved hours and expertise.
- Provide the agreed pooled subscriber briefings and general guidance, keeping sensitive information restricted.
- Record evidence status, institutional responses, action owners, deadlines and checked implementation.
- Review financial performance, workload, safeguarding and independence monthly; commission the budgeted unconflicted quality checks.
- Issue a redacted six-month learning and finance account and a continue, narrow, reprice or stop recommendation.

Renewal is not automatic. Further work, country expansion, extensive visits, specialist investigations or full-time case support require a revised scope and budget. Rebase later strategic milestones after evaluating the actual start and first delivery cycle.

Expected Outcomes

By the end of the initial package, intended outputs are an approved governance and operating framework; a tested records workflow; transparent subscription terms; a small set of institutional baselines and action plans where participation permits; monthly progress and finance summaries; and sampled independent challenge of assessments and action closure.

Test value through evidence completeness, timeliness, safe participation, fair responses, overdue actions, justified implementation and voluntary stakeholder feedback. The initial cohort is deliberately limited and actual review completion depends on complexity and evidence access.

Subscriber targets, billed amounts and cash receipts are financial indicators, not proof of safer institutions. A completed review or adopted policy does not establish reduced harm; fewer complaints alone do not demonstrate improved protection. Any outcome claim needs supporting evidence, stated limitations and a defensible basis for attribution. No existing subscribers, completed reforms or verified impact are claimed.

FINANCIALS & FORECAST

6-Month Forecast

Category	Month 1	Month 2	Month 3	Month 4	Month 5	Month 6	Total
People - 7-Day Review and Readiness Decision	1,450	0	0	0	0	0	**1,450**
People - Setup	0	2,080	2,200	0	0	0	**4,280**
People - Continuation	0	0	0	2,230	2,230	2,350	**6,810**
Hardware	0	560	0	0	0	0	**560**
PHC, secure storage and communications	100	100	100	100	100	100	**600**
Risk contingency allowance	150	150	150	150	150	150	**900**
Accessible engagement and translation	0	75	75	75	75	75	**375**
TOTAL	**1,700**	**2,965**	**2,525**	**2,555**	**2,555**	**2,675**	**14,975**
PHC Profit	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Agency Markup	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**

Cost Breakdown - Hardware

Category	Description	Total Cost
Secure coordination device allowance x1	One suitable protected computer if existing equipment cannot be approved; allowance, not a specification or quote	£500
Authentication hardware allowance x2	Two compatible security keys where supported; allowance subject to system assessment	£60
		£560

Cost Breakdown - People

Role	People	Hourly Rate	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	Total (GBP)
Independent Quality Reviewer	Unconflicted reviewer to agree	£60.00	**0** £240 (£240)	**0**	**4** £240 (£240)	**2** £120 (£120)	**2** £120 (£120)	**4** £240 (£240)	**12** £720 (£720)
PHC Admin	To appoint or confirm	£35.00	**2** £70 (£70)	**8** £280 (£280)	**8** £280 (£280)	**8** £280 (£280)	**8** £280 (£280)	**8** £280 (£280)	**42** £1,470 (£1,470)
PHC Analyst	To appoint or confirm	£60.00	**8** £480 (£480)	**12** £720 (£720)	**12** £720 (£720)	**12** £720 (£720)	**12** £720 (£720)	**12** £720 (£720)	**68** £4,080 (£4,080)
PHC Strategist	To confirm; proposed appointment	£90.00	**6** £540 (£540)	**4** £360 (£360)	**4** £360 (£360)	**3** £270 (£270)	**3** £270 (£270)	**3** £270 (£270)	**23** £2,070 (£2,070)
PHC Trainee - optional, not budgeted	No appointment or funded hours assumed	£12.00	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0** £0 (£0)
Project Coordination	To appoint or confirm	£60.00	**4** £240 (£240)	**8** £480 (£480)	**8** £480 (£480)	**12** £720 (£720)	**12** £720 (£720)	**12** £720 (£720)	**56** £3,360 (£3,360)
Safeguarding Specialist	Independent specialist to agree	£60.00	**2** £120 (£120)	**4** £240 (£240)	**2** £120 (£120)	**2** £120 (£120)	**2** £120 (£120)	**2** £120 (£120)	**14** £840 (£840)
PHC Provider Markup			£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Agent Markup			£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Total			**22** £1,450 (£1,450)	**36** £2,080 (£2,080)	**38** £2,200 (£2,200)	**39** £2,230 (£2,230)	**39** £2,230 (£2,230)	**41** £2,350 (£2,350)	**215 hrs** **£12,540** (£12,540)

APPENDICES & METHODOLOGY

Links & Documents

- The Story of PHC - https://phcport.com/media/profile/The_Story_of_PHC.pdf

PHC vs PICS vs Common Planet

The comparison below describes the proposed operating design, not evaluated superiority over other methods.

Approach	Potential use	Limit or trade-off
Internal policy and action tracking	Use existing institutional systems and local knowledge.	Requires a credible way to test implementation and manage internal conflicts.
Separately commissioned specialist review	Obtain defined expertise and an external opinion within an agreed scope.	Recurring follow-up and cost need separate arrangements; scope may be narrow.
Proposed PHC-supported Governance programme	Link concerns, evidence, responsibilities, decisions, actions and follow-up in one reviewable framework, funded by subscriptions.	Depends on competent people, safe evidence handling, willing participation and protected independence; not statutory regulation or guaranteed impact.

P533 can complement existing systems and specialists. Select tools and methods by the actual question, risk, cost and access rather than assume that a platform itself provides assurance. Independently check significant conclusions, state limitations and correct material errors.