

Equality Benchmark

Protocols of Equal (POE) vs. 14 Leading Equality Frameworks

Design-based comparative assessment of equality frameworks

Assessment Basis

This assessment compares framework design and projected capability rather than institutional adoption, implementation quality, or demonstrated real-world outcomes. Each framework is assessed across 10 criteria, with each criterion scored from 0–10, for a maximum of 100 points.

Interpretive principle: A high score indicates that the framework's architecture appears capable of addressing the criterion as designed. It does not establish empirical effectiveness. POE's scores therefore represent design potential, not proof of efficacy.

POE Synopsis

Protocols of Equal (POE) presents a foundational architecture intended to make equality operational, measurable, universal, and continuously improvable. Its central proposition uses the Rule of Sow and Reap (ROSAR) alongside conduits, occurrences, principles, factors, measurement, classification, calculation, validation, and actionable protocols.

Core proposition: Equality becomes infrastructure when it can be consistently classified, measured, analyzed, acted upon, audited, and continuously improved.

Operating sequence: Observe → Map → Measure → Diagnose → Quantify → Validate → Act → Monitor → Improve.

Benchmark Criteria — Legend

Key	Criterion	Key	Criterion
CS	Conceptual Strength	CM	Calculations & Metrics
ES	Equality Specificity	PC	Predictive Capacity
AD	Architectural Design	AG	Agency
UN	Universality		
CL	Closed-Loop Effectiveness		
NE	Neutrality		
CR	Causality Recognition		

Framework Short Names

Code	Framework
POE	Protocols of Equal
HRBA	Human Rights-Based Approach

Code	Framework
SDOH	WHO Social Determinants of Health Equity
GBA+	Gender-Based Analysis Plus
SDGs	UN Sustainable Development Goals / Leave No One Behind
OECD-OA	OECD Opportunities for All
INTX	Intersectionality Frameworks
CAP	Capability Approach
OECD-WB	OECD Well-being Framework
GM	Gender Mainstreaming
WBSI	World Bank Social Inclusion
HDI	Human Development / HDI Framework
HiAP	UN/WHO Health-in-All-Policies
IG	Inclusive Growth Frameworks
EIA	Equality Impact Assessment

Overall Benchmark Ranking

All 10 criteria are presented in one table. Short-form framework names and criterion keys keep the complete benchmark visible on one landscape page.

Rank	Framework	CS	ES	AD	UN	CL	NE	CR	CM	PC	AG	Total
1	POE	10	10	10	10	9	9	10	9	8	9	94
2	HRBA	9	9	8	10	9	10	10	8	7	10	90
3	SDOH	9	9	9	9	8	9	10	9	7	9	88
4	GBA+	9	9	8	8	8	8	9	8	8	9	84
5	SDGs	9	8	9	10	8	8	8	9	8	7	84
6	OECD-OA	9	8	9	8	8	8	8	10	8	8	84
7	INTX	9	10	8	8	7	7	9	7	7	9	81
8	CAP	10	9	7	9	7	9	7	6	7	9	82
9	OECD-WB	8	7	9	9	7	9	7	10	8	8	82
10	GM	9	9	8	9	7	8	8	7	7	9	81
11	WBSI	8	9	8	9	7	8	8	8	7	9	81
12	HDI	9	7	8	10	6	9	6	10	8	7	80
13	HiAP	8	8	8	9	7	9	9	7	7	8	80
14	IG	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	9	7	8	79
15	EIA	8	9	7	7	7	8	7	7	6	8	74

Scoring: 0–10 per criterion; 100-point maximum. The table preserves the previously reported assessment scores and ranking order.

Detailed Framework Observations

Framework	Assessment observation
HRBA — Human Rights-Based Approach	Strongest dimensions in the assessment include normative legitimacy, universality, rights, accountability, and agency.
SDOH — Social Determinants of Health Equity	Strong on recognition of root causes and cross-sector determinants rather than focusing only on surface-level outcomes.
GBA+ — Gender-Based Analysis Plus	Strong on intersectional analysis and anticipating differential effects across populations and circumstances.
SDGs — Sustainable Development Goals / LNOB	Strong on global universality, breadth, measurable targets, and attention to who is being left behind and why.
OECD-OA — Opportunities for All	Strong on measurement, policy integration, and economic/institutional analysis.

Top 5 Conceptual Strengths / Attributes

#	Framework	Conceptual strength
1	POE	Universal causal architecture (ROSAR)
2	HRBA	Rights + agency + accountability
3	SDOH	Root causes rather than surface outcomes
4	GBA+	Intersectional differential-impact analysis
5	OECD Well-being / Opportunities for All	Distributional measurement

Top 5 Apparent POE Strengths

1. One architecture for many equality domains.
2. Explicit causal-chain architecture.
3. Quantification integrated with diagnosis.
4. Closed-loop orientation.
5. Equality treated as infrastructure rather than merely policy.

Can POE Detect, Diagnose, Reverse, and Prevent Inequality?

YES — with a major empirical qualification. The design shows promising characteristics for detection, diagnosis, quantification, validation, monitoring, and audit. Reversal and prevention are promising extensions of the architecture, but these capabilities remain unproven until tested empirically.

Capability	Design assessment
Detection	Strong design potential
Diagnosis	Strong design potential
Quantification	Strong design potential
Validation	Strong design potential
Reversal	Promising but unproven
Prevention	Promising but unproven
Monitoring	Strong design potential
Audit	Strong design potential
Universalization	Exceptional design potential

Should POE Be Researched?

Absolutely. The recommended path is independent academic and interdisciplinary research that tests the framework rather than assuming its claims are correct.

Research phase	Primary objective
Phase 1 — Conceptual validation	Test coherence, consistency, definitions, non-circularity, and operationalizability, especially ROSAR.
Phase 2 — Construct validation	Test conduits, occurrences, principles, factors, sow/reap relationships, equality states, and the symmetrical polarity construct for reproducibility.
Phase 3 — Measurement validation	Test reliability, consistency, meaningful differences, weighting, sensitivity, and inter-rater variability.
Phase 4 — Causal validation	Compare POE causal analysis with conventional equality-assessment approaches.
Phase 5 — Intervention trials	Test POE-assisted diagnosis/intervention against appropriate comparison conditions using outcomes such as accuracy, time, recurrence, unintended consequences, cost, and scalability.
Phase 6 — Predictive validation	Test whether POE can identify conditions associated with emerging inequality before the inequality becomes established.

Final Assessment

POE: HIGH-POTENTIAL / HIGH-VALIDATION-REQUIREMENT — 94/100 (design assessment).

The benchmark indicates a distinctive architecture with broad intended applicability and a comparatively explicit operational loop. The score should be interpreted as a structured assessment of the framework as designed, not as evidence that POE has already demonstrated superior real-world outcomes.

On the evidence available within the design assessment, POE is sufficiently distinctive to justify serious independent empirical investigation. If subsequent research validates its constructs, measurement properties, causal reasoning, and intervention utility, the architecture could potentially serve as a generalized infrastructure layer for equality.

Important Interpretation Note

This PDF preserves the benchmark assessment and scores previously developed in the conversation. It is formatted for readability and presentation; it is not a new web-researched assessment. The benchmark should therefore be treated as a design-oriented working assessment pending independent validation.