

ANNEX B

Supplement to PHREVO Framework Paper, Version 1.0

SSRN Abstract ID: 6614438 — DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19666941

PHREVO Market Entry Strategy: Identification, Activation, and Scaling of First Adopters

Go-to-Market Strategy v1.0

Author

Andres Jimenez

Founder, PHREVO — Independent Research Initiative

Date

May 2026

Status

Operational proposal for implementation — not for public distribution without author approval

Audience

PHREVO team, territorial collaborators, potential funders

License

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

Executive Summary

PHREVO's theory of change identifies three phases of development: framework creation, territorial adoption, and systemic scaling. The first phase is complete — the framework is published, the Dignity Toolkit is operational, and three evaluation applications demonstrate the system reasoning in real time. The third phase is a consequence of the second. This annex addresses the second phase directly: how does PHREVO move from a framework to a territorial reality?

The answer is not a single path but three simultaneous entry strategies, each targeting a different type of first adopter with a different motivation, a different entry channel, and a different implementation rhythm:

Type 1 — Municipalities in Crisis: Where PHREVO is a survival tool. These are territories where the existing economic system can no longer sustain basic functions and where standard prescriptions have already failed.

Type 2 — Territories with Legal Autonomy: Where PHREVO is a sovereignty tool. These are territories with existing legal recognition for self-governance that lack technical and financial instruments to exercise that autonomy fully.

Type 3 — Diaspora and Displaced Communities: Where PHREVO is a coordination infrastructure that requires no state permission. The Dignity Toolkit in New York City is the proof of concept.

This annex provides: a maturity model for adopter readiness; detailed entry strategies, illustrative cases, and risk matrices for each adopter type; a 12-month implementation roadmap with specific metrics; and governance principles for productive failure documentation.

Contents

B.1 Foundational Principles of the Entry Strategy

B.2 Adopter Maturity Model

B.3 Type 1 — Municipalities in Crisis

B.3.1 Adopter Profile and Motivation

B.3.2 Priority Candidates

B.3.3 Three-Phase Entry Strategy

B.3.4 Illustrative Case: Buenaventura, Colombia

B.4 Type 2 — Territories with Legal Autonomy

B.4.1 Adopter Profile and Motivation

B.4.2 Priority Candidates

B.4.3 Entry Strategy: Collaborative Implementation

B.4.4 Illustrative Case: Guarani Territory, Bolivia

B.5 Type 3 — Diaspora and Displaced Communities

B.5.1 Adopter Profile and Motivation

B.5.2 Priority Candidates Beyond New York City

B.5.3 Entry Strategy: Dignity Toolkit Expansion

B.5.4 Illustrative Case: Los Angeles

B.6 12-Month Implementation Roadmap

B.7 Success Metrics and Evaluation Framework

B.8 Risk Management and Productive Failure

B.9 Immediate Next Steps

B.10 Conclusion

B.1 Foundational Principles of the Entry Strategy

Four principles govern every entry decision PHREVO makes, regardless of adopter type. They are not aspirational guidelines — they are operational constraints that determine how PHREVO approaches, engages, and sometimes withdraws from potential adoptions.

Principle 1 — Operate without unnecessary confrontation. PHREVO builds legitimacy through demonstrated results, not ideological confrontation. It operates where it can, documents what it learns, and does not provoke state or elite opposition before it has built the institutional resilience to withstand it.

Principle 2 — Begin where the existing system has already failed. First adopters are not territories that function adequately under existing arrangements. They are territories where capitalism, or its local variant, demonstrably cannot sustain life. The urgency of failure creates the openness to alternative architectures.

Principle 3 — Scale through demonstration, not proselytism. Each successful territory is the most credible argument for the next. PHREVO does not evangelize. It documents, publishes, and makes results available. The invitation is implicit in the evidence.

Principle 4 — Preserve local autonomy absolutely. PHREVO offers tools, not prescriptions. It adapts to the governance logic, cultural framework, and institutional reality of each territory. It does not impose its architecture — it makes the architecture available for communities to adopt, adapt, or reject.

B.2 Adopter Maturity Model

Territories move through five stages of engagement with PHREVO. Not all territories will reach consolidation. A pilot that runs for two years in a neighborhood of 20,000 people and then ends is not a failure — it is evidence. The maturity model exists to set realistic expectations and design appropriate interventions at each stage.

The maturity model applies to all three adopter types, though the pace and character of each stage varies significantly. Municipalities in crisis move faster through Interest and Diagnosis because urgency compresses deliberation. Territories with legal autonomy move more slowly through all stages because the governance logic requires deep consultation at every step. Diaspora communities move fastest through Pilot because the Dignity Toolkit already exists as a deployable prototype.

B.3 Type 1 — Municipalities in Crisis

B.3.1 Adopter Profile and Motivation

Type 1 adopters are municipalities, cities, or regions where the existing economic system can no longer sustain basic functions: public security, essential services, social cohesion, or viable livelihoods. The defining characteristic is not political ideology but systemic failure — these territories have already tried standard prescriptions (fiscal adjustment, investment attraction, targeted social programs) and the prescriptions have not worked.

The motivation for adoption is survival, not idealism. This distinction is operationally significant: idealism produces interest but rarely sustains implementation through difficulty. Survival produces urgency that can overcome institutional inertia, elite resistance, and bureaucratic friction.

Diagnostic indicators for Type 1 adopter readiness:

- Gini coefficient above 0.50 — structural inequality that standard redistribution mechanisms have not addressed.

- Fiscal crisis — declared inability to service debt or provide basic services.

- Service collapse — water, health, education, or security services operating below minimum standards.

- Informal labor above 60% — the formal economy does not absorb the working population.

- Presence of illegal economies or predatory extractivism — the most damaging productive activities are the most economically dominant.

- Forced displacement or significant out-migration — the population is voting with its feet.

Specific risks for Type 1 adoptions:

- State intervention if PHREVO is perceived as a political threat by national government.

- Elite capture by local landowners, criminal networks, or clientelist political structures.

- Weak institutional capacity — the municipality may not have the technical or administrative infrastructure to implement even a bounded pilot.

B.3.2 Priority Candidates

B.3.3 Three-Phase Entry Strategy

Phase 1 — Approach (Months 1-3)

The entry channel for Type 1 municipalities is never the political executive directly, unless that executive has already signaled openness and is demonstrably not captured by the interests that produced the crisis. The standard entry sequence is:

1. Local universities with active social economy, territorial development, or public policy research programs.
2. Civil society organizations with demonstrated community trust — foundations, community associations, solidarity economy networks, faith-based organizations.
3. Mid-level technical officials — not elected politicians — who see the systemic failure clearly and are looking for alternatives.

The initial offer is a free diagnostic, framed precisely as follows:

PHREVO offers a free evaluation of your municipality using the PHREVO-Score — a multidimensional assessment that shows where the existing system is failing and what a structurally different approach might look like. No commitment, no cost. We want to demonstrate that a different way of measuring produces a different way of governing.

The diagnostic report (10–15 pages) establishes: a territory baseline across the six PHREVO-Score dimensions; a comparison with a similar municipality as an implicit counterfactual; and identification of two to three pain points where PHREVO intervention would have the highest expected impact.

Phase 2 — Pilot (Months 6–12)

The pilot is deliberately bounded. PHREVO does not attempt to implement across an entire municipality in the first phase. The pilot scope options are:

- A specific neighborhood or commune (10,000–50,000 inhabitants).
- A specific policy domain — care economy, waste management, community energy, participatory budgeting.
- An existing failing public program that can be redesigned using PHREVO principles.

Resource division: PHREVO provides the technology platform (lightweight version), facilitator training, and weekly remote support. The territory provides a local counterpart team of two to three people, data access, and political will to experiment. Pilot cost: \$15,000–\$50,000, funded by PHREVO and partner foundations. The municipality in crisis does not pay.

Success criterion: The PHREVO-Score for the pilot area improves by more than 15% across the six dimensions within 12 months.

Phase 3 — Scaling or Documentation (Months 12–24)

If the pilot succeeds: document results with data, testimony, and cost-benefit analysis; present to the municipal government for expansion to additional neighborhoods; seek co-financing with the municipality contributing 20–30% of costs.

If the pilot does not reach its targets: document lessons with full transparency regarding the source of underperformance (framework design, contextual factors, implementation failure, or some combination). Publish openly. The documented failure is as valuable as the success for the science of implementation.

B.3.4 Illustrative Case: Buenaventura, Colombia

Buenaventura is the principal Pacific port of Colombia. The wealth that flows through its infrastructure does not remain in the territory. Its Gini coefficient is estimated above 0.55 — the highest in Colombia. The humanitarian crisis is characterized by forced displacement, illegal economies, and persistent violence. However, Buenaventura also has an extraordinarily resilient social fabric: the Consejo Comunitario de Comunidades Negras, active peace processes, and dense popular economies.

The entry sequence for Buenaventura:

1. Contact researchers at the Universidad del Pacifico (Buenaventura campus) or the Social Economy program at Universidad Javeriana (Cali) to establish academic legitimacy before any community contact.
2. Request introduction to the Consejo Comunitario de la Comunidad Negra de Buenaventura — the most legitimate and rooted community institution in the territory.
3. Offer a free PHREVO-Score diagnostic of a specific neighborhood with active popular economies (El Pinal or Juan XXIII are candidates).
4. If the Consejo is interested, propose a pilot in the care economy or waste management — both urgent needs with existing community infrastructure.
5. Document results and present to the Alcaldia as evidence that an alternative economic architecture is possible in Buenaventura, regardless of which political party governs.

Estimated time to visible results: 18-24 months from first contact.

B.4 Type 2 — Territories with Legal Autonomy

B.4.1 Adopter Profile and Motivation

Type 2 adopters already possess the most important resource for PHREVO implementation: recognized authority to govern themselves. These are territories with constitutionally or legally recognized autonomy — indigenous territories, Afro-descendant collective territories, autonomous municipalities, or cooperative-governed regions. Their governance authority is not in dispute; what they often lack are technical tools and financial instruments to exercise that authority fully.

The motivation is sovereignty, not survival. This distinction shapes the entire entry approach: PHREVO does not arrive as a solution to a crisis, but as a set of tools that a sovereign territory can choose to use, adapt, or reject. The offer is always conditional on the territory's own determination that PHREVO is compatible with its governance framework.

Specific risks for Type 2 adoptions:

- State intervention if PHREVO is perceived as separatist or as reinforcing political autonomy beyond what the national legal framework permits.

- Internal territorial conflicts — factional divisions, local elites, or governance disputes that could capture PHREVO for one side of a territorial political struggle.

- Scale limitations — some autonomous territories may be too small for certain PHREVO instruments (the MEP, for example, requires sufficient transaction volume to be meaningful).

B.4.2 Priority Candidates

B.4.3 Entry Strategy: Collaborative Implementation

The entry approach for Type 2 is fundamentally different from Type 1. There is no acute crisis that softens the institutional terrain. The entry requires deep respect for existing governance logic and must be framed accordingly.

The framing of the initial approach:

PHREVO does not come to teach you how to govern your territory. You already know. But you may find it useful to have technical tools — metrics, platforms, protocols — that facilitate what you already do. Can we explore together whether PHREVO is compatible with your governance framework?

The initial deliverable is a compatibility document (5-10 pages) that:

- Maps PHREVO instruments against the territory's existing norms and principles.

Explicitly identifies incompatibilities — what in PHREVO does not work here, and why.

Proposes adaptations — what PHREVO would change to fit the territory's governance logic.

There is no "pilot" in the Type 1 sense. Imposing a time-bounded experiment on a territory with its own governance rhythm would be disrespectful and would undermine the trust that makes the relationship possible. Implementation is collaborative: the territory decides which PHREVO instruments to try, if any. The pace is set by the territory. PHREVO provides technical support on demand.

B.4.4 Illustrative Case: Guarani Territory, Bolivia

Bolivia's 2009 Constitution (Articles 289–296) recognizes indigenous autonomies with legal personality and governance authority over defined territorial domains. The Guarani Indigenous Territory has this recognition and governs through the Asamblea del Pueblo Guarani (APG) and the Consejo de Capitanes.

The entry sequence for the Guarani Territory:

1. Contact the APG and the Consejo de Capitanes through a trusted intermediary — an academic or civil society actor with an established relationship with the Guarani governance structure.
2. Do not present PHREVO as a solution. Present it as a question: how does PHREVO relate to Nandereko — the Guarani concept of living well? Where are the alignments and the tensions?
3. If interest exists, co-design a PHREVO-Score adaptation that incorporates Guarani-specific indicators: territorial autonomy, linguistic vitality, traditional medicine access, land sovereignty.
4. Implement only if explicitly requested by the territorial governance structure. If the request does not come within 12 months of the dialogue, the dialogue ends respectfully.

Estimated time to establish trust before any implementation: 12 months. Total time to a functional adapted Score: 24–36 months.

B.5 Type 3 — Diaspora and Displaced Communities

B.5.1 Adopter Profile and Motivation

Type 3 adopters are communities that operate at the margins of or in active tension with state infrastructure — because the state is hostile, incompetent, or both. This includes international migrant communities with irregular status, internally displaced populations, and communities in territories where state absence is the defining governance reality.

The defining characteristic is not geography but the relationship to formal governance: these communities cannot rely on the state for basic coordination, and in many cases the state is an active threat rather than a source of protection. Their dense informal networks — community organizations, faith communities, mutual aid structures — are their primary governance institutions.

The motivation is survival infrastructure that requires no state permission. The Dignity Toolkit in New York City demonstrates that this is achievable: a coordination system that connects families to verified resources without collecting data that could expose them to state violence.

B.5.2 Priority Candidates Beyond New York City

B.5.3 Entry Strategy: Dignity Toolkit Expansion

The Dignity Toolkit in New York City has produced operational lessons that are directly transferable. The entry strategy for Type 3 builds on these lessons rather than starting from first principles.

The three-phase expansion process:

Phase 1 — Adaptation (Months 1-2)

Do not build from scratch. Adapt the existing Dignity Toolkit codebase to the new context: translate the interface and all documentation; adjust resource coordination flows (what types of assistance are coordinated — food, housing, health, legal support); map local community organizations as potential partners.

Phase 2 — Activation (Months 2-4)

Convene an initial meeting with three to five (not more) community organizations. Implement in a specific neighborhood or zone — not the entire city. Train

community facilitators who are not external technical staff. The facilitator is the person the community already trusts; PHREVO provides the tool they use.

Phase 3 — Optional Expansion (Months 6–12)

If the adaptation functions, expand to additional neighborhoods. Document and share with other cities. Do not scale too quickly — the Dignity Toolkit functions because it is lightweight and reliable. Complexity is the enemy of trust in high-surveillance contexts.

Cost per city: \$5,000–\$20,000 for adaptation; \$1,000–\$3,000 per month for operation (servers, support, facilitator training). Fundable through local foundations or small donor campaigns. The operational cost is deliberately low to enable sustainability without large institutional funders.

B.5.4 Illustrative Case: Los Angeles

Los Angeles has one of the largest Central American communities in the United States (Guatemalan, Salvadoran, Honduran). Community networks are dense and well-established, including CARECEN-LA (Central American Resource Center) and numerous neighborhood organizations in Pico-Union. The surveillance environment is intense, with active ICE operations and a history of immigration enforcement that has created justified institutional mistrust even of progressive city government.

The entry sequence for Los Angeles:

1. Contact CARECEN-LA and two to three additional neighborhood organizations — not the large national NGOs that have LA offices, but organizations whose primary relationships are in specific neighborhoods.
2. Present the Dignity Toolkit case from New York City with specific data: families served, resources coordinated, response time, and — critically — zero incidents of data exposure.
3. Offer a free technical adaptation (funded by a local or national foundation — the Ford Foundation has documented interest in technology supporting migrant communities).
4. Implement first in Pico-Union, where Central American community density is highest and existing organizational infrastructure is strongest.
5. Document results and share with the national network of migrant support organizations as a replicable model.

Estimated time from first contact to operational implementation: 6 months.

B.6 12-Month Implementation Roadmap

Twelve-month milestones:

- 1 Type 1 pilot in implementation (Buenaventura or La Matanza, Argentina).
 - 1 Type 2 formal dialogue established (Guarani Territory or Marinaleda).
 - 1 Type 3 expansion operational (Los Angeles or Miami).
- All results documented publicly — working paper update, blog posts, presentations.

B.7 Success Metrics and Evaluation Framework

B.7.1 Process Metrics

B.7.2 Outcome Metrics

B.7.3 Learning Metrics

The following are tracked not as performance indicators but as evidence of intellectual honesty and institutional learning capacity:

- Documented failures: number of pilots that did not reach targets, with root cause analysis.
- Framework adaptations: number of changes to PHREVO instruments or processes based on field learning.
- Respectful withdrawals: number of territories that initiated dialogue and then withdrew, with documented reasons.

B.8 Risk Management and Productive Failure

B.8.1 Risk Matrix by Adopter Type

B.8.2 Abort Criteria

A pilot must be terminated when any of the following conditions are met:

Documented community harm — PHREVO design or implementation causes verifiable damage to the community it serves (e.g., data exposure that endangers migrants).

Irremediable capture — violent actors or entrenched elites control the process and PHREVO cannot correct this without their cooperation.

Explicit community rejection — the community votes or clearly manifests that it does not want PHREVO to continue.

Unsustainable cost — the pilot costs more than twice the budget without proportional results.

Abortion is not failure. It is learning. Every terminated pilot is documented, analyzed, and published. The documented abortion of a PHREVO pilot is as scientifically valuable as a successful expansion — it defines the boundary conditions of the framework and prevents replication of unsuccessful approaches in similar contexts.

B.9 Immediate Next Steps

B.9.1 Actions for the Next 30 Days

B.9.2 Immediate Resource Requirements

B.9.3 Companion Documents Required

The following documents are needed to complete the partner-facing communication package. This annex is the strategic foundation; these are the operational instruments:

- One-page PHREVO presentation for municipal governments — technical tone, no ideological framing.
- One-page PHREVO presentation for autonomous territories — respectful tone, emphasis on compatibility and adaptability.
- Two-page Dignity Toolkit fact sheet for community organizations — practical tone, specific operational details.
- Foundation funding proposal (5-10 pages) — includes the three adopter types, the 12-month roadmap, and a detailed budget.

B.10 Conclusion

This annex is not a business plan. It is an operational theory of change. It answers the question: how does PHREVO move from a document to a territorial reality?

The answer is not a single path. It is three simultaneous entry strategies, each respecting the specific logic, rhythm, and risk profile of a different type of first adopter. Municipalities in crisis need survival tools, not ideological persuasion. Autonomous territories need compatible instruments, not external prescriptions. Diaspora communities need coordination infrastructure that operates without state permission — and the Dignity Toolkit proves this is possible.

What these three types share is more important than what differentiates them: in each case, PHREVO does not claim to bring what is missing. It offers to help territories use what they already have — community resilience, governance authority, mutual aid networks — more effectively, more transparently, and more sustainably. The framework provides the architecture. The territory provides the life.

Every territory that implements PHREVO — successfully or unsuccessfully — adds to the empirical base of post-capitalist economic governance. The accumulated evidence of what works, what does not work, and under what conditions constitutes the most valuable intellectual contribution PHREVO can make to the global conversation about economic alternatives. This is not a side effect of the strategy. It is its core purpose.

PHREVO Framework Paper — Annex B — Go-to-Market Strategy v1.0 — April 2026

Supplement to SSRN 6614438 — DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.19666941](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19666941)

Andres Jimenez — hello@phrevo.earth — phrevo.org

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)