

## **ANNEX J**

Supplement to PHREVO Framework Paper, Version 1.0

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

# **PHREVO Participatory Research Network: Toward Transregional Validation of the Framework from Africa, Asia, and the Pacific**

*Research Network Proposal v1.0 — Open Call — South-South Collaboration*

## **Author**

**Andres Jimenez**

*Founder, PHREVO — Independent Research Initiative*

## **Date**

April 2026

## **Status**

*Open call — for discussion and co-design. This document is an invitation, not a finalized plan.*

## **Audience**

Global South researchers, communities, social movements, philanthropic funders

## **Key theoretical reference**

Santos, B. de S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South*. Paradigm Publishers.

## **License**

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

## **Abstract**

PHREVO was born in Colombia, from a Latin American experience. Its theoretical references draw on the epistemologies of the South, Boaventura de Sousa Santos, Zapatista governance, and Latin American social movements. But the Global South is not Latin America. It is West Africa's tontine economy and dense urban mutualisms. It is East Africa's mobile-money innovation and cooperative agriculture. It is Southeast Asia's resilient peasant economies and indigenous land struggles. It is the Pacific's marine commons governance and ceremonial reciprocity economies. Without engagement with these diverse experiences, PHREVO is a framework that claims universality it has not earned.

This annex is a formal open call for the co-creation of the PHREVO Participatory Research Network — a South-South collaboration structure designed to translate, challenge, and co-develop the PHREVO framework across four initial regions: West Africa, East Africa, Southeast Asia, and the Pacific. The network operates on five non-negotiable principles: horizontality (no central node controls the others); reciprocity (knowledge flows in both directions); non-extractivism (research benefits are shared with communities, not extracted); linguistic plurality (no imposition of English as the sole working language); and community ownership (data and findings belong to participating communities, not to researchers or PHREVO).

The proposal unfolds in four phases over 36 months: Phase 1 (mapping and contact establishment, \$10-20K); Phase 2 (translation and adaptation workshops, \$80-150K); Phase 3 (participatory research pilots in 8 communities across 4 regions, \$200-400K); Phase 4 (open-access publication and community dissemination, \$50-100K). Total estimated budget: \$340-670K, primarily sought from IDRC Canada, Ford Foundation, and Open Society Foundations.

The central argument of this annex is simple and serious: without this network, PHREVO is epistemic colonialism dressed in progressive language — a Latin American framework claiming to speak for the Global South without the legitimacy of co-creation. With this network, PHREVO becomes what it claims to be: an economic architecture built from the Global South's diverse experiences, for the Global South's diverse communities. The destiny of PHREVO is not decided in Bogota or New York. It is decided in Dakar, Nairobi, Manila, and Suva.

# Contents

## **J.1 Why PHREVO Needs a Participatory Research Network**

### **J.1.1 The Problem of Claimed Universality**

### **J.1.2 Global South Epistemologies are Not Monolithic**

### **J.1.3 PHREVO as Open Framework, Not Dogma**

## **J.2 Network Structure**

### **J.2.1 Five Non-Negotiable Principles**

### **J.2.2 Four Regional Nodes**

### **J.2.3 Network Governance**

## **J.3 Participatory Research Methodology**

### **J.3.1 Against Methodological Extractivism**

### **J.3.2 Translation and Adaptation of the PHREVO Framework**

### **J.3.3 Co-Design of Pilots**

### **J.3.4 Co-Authorship Publication Protocol**

## **J.4 Regions and Potential Partners**

### **J.4.1 West Africa (Senegal, Ghana, Nigeria)**

### **J.4.2 East Africa (Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda)**

### **J.4.3 Southeast Asia (Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand)**

### **J.4.4 Pacific (Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands)**

### **J.4.5 South Asia (India, Nepal) — Phase 2**

## **J.5 Four-Phase Work Plan**

## **J.6 Budget and Funding Strategy**

## **J.7 Conclusion: PHREVO as a Global South Common Good**

## J.1 Why PHREVO Needs a Participatory Research Network

### J.1.1 The Problem of Claimed Universality

PHREVO was born in Colombia. Its founder is Colombian. Its first operational deployment is in New York City, serving Colombian, Mexican, Venezuelan, and Central American immigrant communities. Its theoretical foundations draw on Latin American social movements — the Zapatistas, the Landless Workers Movement in Brazil, Andean concepts of Buen Vivir, and the long tradition of critical social science in the region.

This origin is a strength, not a weakness. PHREVO's grounding in Latin American experience — in the specific wounds and resistances of the Global South as lived from Colombia — gives it an authenticity and practical orientation that Northern frameworks lack. But it is also a limit. The Global South is not Latin America, and Latin America is not a single experience.


Without engagement with these experiences, PHREVO claiming universality is epistemic pretension. The participatory research network is the mechanism through which that pretension is replaced with earned legitimacy.

### J.1.2 Global South Epistemologies are Not Monolithic

Boaventura de Sousa Santos — one of PHREVO's key theoretical references — has consistently emphasized that there is no singular "epistemology of the South." There are epistemologies of the South in the plural: each region, each community, each tradition of struggle produces specific knowledges that cannot be reduced to a general formula. The act of recognizing the Global South as the epistemological center of PHREVO does not resolve the question of which Global South, whose knowledge, and on whose terms.

A concrete example: the PHREVO-Score currently includes Care and Wellbeing (CB) as one of its six dimensions. This dimension was developed primarily from a feminist political economy tradition (Fraser, Federici, Tronto — Annex C) rooted in North American and European academic contexts, applied to Latin American and immigrant community realities. But the concept of care in Wolof (Senegal), where *teranga* (hospitality/care for the stranger) is a central social value, may have dimensions that the current CB indicators do not capture. The concept of *harambee* (communal self-help work) in Kenya involves forms of community care that cross the boundary between CB and IC (Community Impact) in ways the current framework does not anticipate. The *kula* ring exchange in Papua New Guinea involves reciprocity relationships that resist classification under any of the six current dimensions.

These are not deficiencies to be corrected from the center. They are knowledge contributions to be incorporated through the network. PHREVO version 2.0 will be richer for what Dakar, Nairobi, Manila, and Suva teach it — not despite, but because of the differences.

### **J.1.3 PHREVO as Open Framework, Not Dogma**

PHREVO is not a religion. It does not have a sacred text. It does not have an infallible leader. While Andres Jimenez is the founder and the primary architect of the current framework, the framework must transcend him to be credible. The participatory research network is the institutional mechanism through which that transcendence is built.

Any community, researcher, or movement participating in the network can propose modifications to the framework: new instruments, new Score dimensions, new policy adaptations. Proposals are discussed in the network and adopted by consensus — not by majority vote, not by the founder's decree. The network is the epistemological parliament of PHREVO: it does not govern PHREVO's operations (that is for territorial assemblies) but it governs the evolution of PHREVO's conceptual tools.

## J.2 Network Structure

### J.2.1 Five Non-Negotiable Principles


### J.2.2 Four Regional Nodes


### J.2.3 Network Governance

*Network Assembly (annual rotating meeting)*

*The Network Assembly meets annually, hosted in rotation by each regional node.*

*Participants: all principal investigators plus community representatives elected by each node (minimum one community representative per node). Functions: evaluate progress, discuss framework adaptations, resolve disputes, plan the next year.*

*Decisions: by consensus (preferred) or 70% qualified majority if consensus fails.*

*Coordination Committee (monthly virtual meetings)*

*Composed of one representative per regional node plus one PHREVO representative (Andres Jimenez or a designated person). Functions: coordinate logistics, resolve urgent matters, prepare the annual assembly. PHREVO has no veto in the Coordination Committee.*

*PHREVO Node*

*PHREVO participates as one node among equals — with voice and vote, but without veto. PHREVO contributes: the initial framework, contacts, some funding (seeking external funds), technical accompaniment. PHREVO cannot impose decisions or close discussion on any question that the Network Assembly has jurisdiction over.*

## J.3 Participatory Research Methodology

### J.3.1 Against Methodological Extractivism


### J.3.2 Translation and Adaptation of the PHREVO Framework

The goal is not to "apply" PHREVO in Africa or Asia as it currently stands. The goal is to discover where PHREVO is generative, where it requires adaptation, and where it needs to be fundamentally revised.


Illustrative example (East Africa): The concept of harambee — communal voluntary work organized around a community need in Kenya — is a form of care and community coordination that the current PHREVO-Score does not explicitly capture. Should it be integrated into the CB (Care and Wellbeing) dimension? Into the IC (Community Impact) dimension? As a new instrument within the care policy family (PLAB)? Does it complicate the distinction between voluntary unwaged care (which PHREVO values through RIB) and community obligation (which has a different ethical status)? These questions are resolved by the East Africa node, in dialogue with Kenyan communities — not by the framework's founder in Bogota.

### J.3.3 Co-Design of Pilots

Once translated and adapted, each regional node co-designs research pilots with local communities. Pilot types vary by community readiness and research question:


### J.3.4 Co-Authorship Publication Protocol

Every academic publication resulting from the network must be co-authored between regional researchers and, where appropriate, community members — not as "informants" in the acknowledgments section, but as named authors with intellectual contribution credit.



## J.4 Regions and Potential Partners

### J.4.1 West Africa — Senegal, Ghana, Nigeria

Relevant context for PHREVO: the tradition of tontines and ROSCAs (rotating savings and credit associations) in Senegal, Ghana, and Nigeria represents one of the most sophisticated community mutual finance systems in the world — managing billions of dollars outside formal financial institutions through trust-based reciprocity. This tradition is directly relevant to the PHREVO-Exchange design (Annex E), the RIB (Annex C), and the Territorial Arbitration Mechanism (Annex A). High informality (above 80% in some countries) and rapid urbanization create dense popular economies that PHREVO's instruments should be able to serve.

#### **Priority Institutions**


*Starting recommendation: Senegal (UCAD or ENDA) as the first contact. France and Colombia share colonial language; CODESRIA has existing relationships with Latin American social science networks; and Senegal's tontine tradition is the most directly relevant to PHREVO's mutual finance architecture.*

### J.4.2 East Africa — Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda

Relevant context for PHREVO: Kenya's M-Pesa mobile money system is the world's most successful example of a community-scale financial system that operates outside formal banking — directly relevant to the PHREVO MEP currency design and the RIB distribution mechanism. Agricultural cooperatives in Tanzania and Kenya, combined with a growing technology innovation ecosystem in Nairobi, make East Africa the region most likely to produce technical co-developers for PHREVO's evaluation applications alongside community researchers.


### J.4.3 Southeast Asia — Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand

Relevant context for PHREVO: Southeast Asia has the world's most sophisticated indigenous land rights movements (Philippines Cordillera, Kalimantan) fighting against some of the most predatory extractivism (palm oil, nickel mining, coal). The Territorial Arbitration Mechanism (Annex A) and the PHREVO Legal White Paper (Annex D) were designed partly with these contexts in mind. Thailand's cooperative sector — with more than 10,000 registered cooperatives — offers the largest existing cooperative network outside Europe for potential PHREVO piloting.



Starting recommendation: Philippines (UP Diliman) — wide use of English; strong community-participatory research tradition; active indigenous rights movement that would immediately engage with PHREVO's land sovereignty instruments (PTIERRA policy family).

#### **J.4.4 Pacific — Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands**

Relevant context for PHREVO: The Pacific offers the most direct existing examples of what PHREVO calls Sustainable Depth (SP) in governance practice. Customary marine tenure systems in Melanesia and Polynesia — where communities have governed fishing grounds and coastal resources through traditional protocols for generations — represent exactly the kind of community ecological governance that the PHREVO framework theorizes but has not yet found in other regions. The climate adaptation urgency of Small Island Developing States (SIDS) also creates the strongest possible motivation for adopting a framework that puts ecological regeneration as the lexicographic priority (Annex A).


Starting recommendation: Fiji (USP) — it is the academic hub for the entire Pacific region; air connectivity to multiple island nations; established climate research capacity; English-language institution. USP has campuses in 12 Pacific island nations, making it the single highest-leverage institutional contact for Pacific engagement.

#### **J.4.5 South Asia (India, Nepal) — Phase 2**

South Asia — with 1.9 billion people across India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, and Bangladesh — is too large and diverse for a single regional node. Including it in the Phase 1 network would dilute resources without adequate representation. The recommendation is Phase 2 inclusion (Years 2-3 of the network) if funding and institutional partnerships are secured.

##### **Priority entry points for Phase 2:**

SEWA (Self-Employed Women's Association) — India. 2 million organized informal women workers; the world's most successful example of care economy organizing at scale. Directly relevant to Annex C (Care Framework) and the PLAB policy family. Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS) — Mumbai. Strong tradition of participatory action research; connections to social movements across South Asia.

Azim Premji University — Bangalore. Heterodox economics and social science; explicit commitment to Global South knowledge production.

## J.5 Four-Phase Work Plan

## J.6 Budget and Funding Strategy



### **Funding sequence strategy:**

Phase 1 (mapping): Self-funded by PHREVO. Low cost (\$10-20K), primarily founder time. No external funding sought — avoid creating expectations before results exist.

Phase 2 (workshops): Submit simultaneously to IDRC and Ford Foundation (\$150K each). IDRC has South-South collaborative research programs specifically designed for this type of proposal. Ford Foundation's Inequality strategy explicitly targets care economy and social movement knowledge exchange.

Phase 3 (pilots): Submit to Open Society Foundations and European Commission Horizon Europe (with one European institutional partner). Also consider Nippon Foundation for Pacific node separately.

Phase 4 (publication): Residual funds from earlier phases plus university in-kind contributions (researcher time, open-access publication fee waivers).

If external funding is not secured: reduce to 2 regions in Phase 1 (West Africa and Southeast Asia — lowest cost, highest partner readiness). The network logic remains intact with 2 nodes; it simply starts smaller.

## J.7 Conclusion: PHREVO as a Global South Common Good

The PHREVO Participatory Research Network is not a "knowledge transfer" initiative. It is not PHREVO going to Africa and Asia to teach alternative economics. It is PHREVO going to Africa and Asia to learn whether its framework is real — and what must change for it to become real in those contexts.

Without this network, PHREVO makes a claim it cannot support: that a framework built in Colombia by a Colombian founder, deployed first in New York, and theorized largely through Latin American and Northern academic references, speaks for the Global South. That claim is not humble. It is not honest. And it reproduces precisely the dynamic of epistemic colonialism that PHREVO names as one of capitalism's tools of domination.


*The destiny of PHREVO is not decided in Bogota or New York. It is decided in Dakar, Nairobi, Manila, and Suva. This network is the mechanism through which that decision is made — collectively, honestly, and with the rigor that the stakes require.*

Immediate next steps (next 3 months):

Present this document to priority funders — IDRC and Ford Foundation — as the basis for a Phase 1-2 grant proposal.

Contact priority institutions by region: UCAD (Senegal), University of Nairobi or iHub (Kenya), UP Diliman (Philippines), University of the South Pacific (Fiji).

Organize a virtual launch workshop with interested parties from all four regions — introduction to PHREVO, open Q&A, identification of mutual interests.

Constitute a provisional Coordination Committee (one representative per region + PHREVO) to govern Phase 1 activities and prepare for the first Network Assembly.

## References

**Escobar, A. (2018). *Designs for the Pluriverse: Radical Interdependence, Autonomy, and the Making of Worlds*. Duke University Press.**

**Federici, S. (2018). *Re-enchanting the World: Feminism and the Politics of the Commons*. PM Press.**

**Jimenez, A. (2026). PHREVO: A Post-Capitalist Economic Architecture for the Global South. SSRN Working Paper 6614438. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19666941.**

**Mbembe, A. (2021). The Universal Right to Breathe. *Critical Inquiry*, 47(S2), S58-S62.**

**Mignolo, W. (2011). *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Duke University Press.**

**Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge University Press.**

**Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of Power and Eurocentrism in Latin America. *International Sociology*, 15(2), 215-232.**

**Santos, B. de S. (2014). Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide. Paradigm Publishers.**

**Santos, B. de S. (2016). Epistemologies of the South and the Future. From the European South, 1, 17-29.**

**Shiva, V. (1988). Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Development. Zed Books.**

**WIEGO (Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing). (2024). Informal Economy Statistics. [wiego.org](http://wiego.org).**

*PHREVO Framework Paper — Annex J — Participatory Research Network v1.0 — April 2026*

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

**Andres Jimenez — [hello@phrevo.org](mailto:hello@phrevo.org) — [phrevo.org](http://phrevo.org)**

***Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)***