Safety Management Manual

Version 5.0
15 September 2026
Supersedes Version 4.0 (26 August 2026)

This is Casa Kink's internal operational manual. It's written for Consent Monitors, Safety Committee Members, Safety Officers, Event Managers and the Owner, the people who have to take action when a concern is raised, not the general public.

It does two jobs at once:

- **Procedure**: what to do, in what order, when a concern comes in. This is the part you follow step by step.
- **Standard**: the level Casa Kink holds itself to, and what "doing it properly" looks like (Guiding Principles, Documentation Standards).

It is not the Consent & Violation Policy. That's a short, public document that states what Casa Kink believes and promises members and guests. This manual explains how those promises are carried out in practice. If there is any conflict between the two, the Consent & Violation Policy takes precedence and this manual should be corrected.

It is also not a quick-lookup reference. If you need something fast in the middle of an event, use the checklists in the Appendices: Consent Monitor Checklist, Safety Officer Investigation Checklist, Process Flow by role. The body of the manual is where those checklists come from and why they say what they say.

Key Terms
These terms get used loosely in conversation, this manual uses them precisely and every other section builds on these definitions.

Casa Kink
The business: the venue, its owner, its paid and volunteer team and the events it runs. Casa Kink has commercial interests, revenue, bookings, reputation, attendance, alongside its safety commitments. For an organisation who's key selling points are safety and community, those interests are usually aligned, but not always, and this manual doesn't pretend otherwise (see Conflict of Interest).

The (Cape Town) kink scene
The broader network of people, munches, other venues, educators and events that make up kink, BDSM, fetish and alternative relationship life in and around Cape Town. Casa Kink is part of this scene but doesn't own, govern or speak for it. Things that happen in the scene outside Casa Kink's events are outside this manual's authority, though they can still be relevant to a risk assessment (see Scope).

The Casa Kink Collective
Everyone this manual applies to: guests, volunteers, Consent Monitors, Safety Committee Members, Safety Officers, staff, presenters and facilitators, for as long as they're attending, working, or otherwise engaging with a Casa Kink event or space. There's no formal membership, you don't join the collective, you're part of it while you're here. "The collective" in this manual always means this, not the wider scene and not the business.

Volunteer vs. staff
Casa Kink runs on a mix of paid staff and volunteers. Consent Monitors and Tour Whores are a volunteer roles, as is that of Safety Committee Members and Safety Officers. Event Managers (Managers on Duty) typically take a profit share from an event they run. Our Door Whore is paid position.

Safety Management Manual

1. Guiding Principles

Everything in this manual is applied through these six principles. They're stated once, here, later sections point back to this list instead of restating it.

Collective Safety

The safety and wellbeing of the collective is the primary consideration when responding to incidents and managing risk.

Consent & Personal Responsibility

Consent is fundamental to every interaction at Casa Kink: informed, freely given, specific to the activity, and withdrawable at any time. Alongside this, Casa Kink adopts PRICK: Personal Responsibility, Risk Aware, Informed, Consensual Kink, as the shorthand version of the same commitment: **everyone understands their own boundaries and limits, communicates them clearly, stays honest about their experience level, and takes reasonable steps to reduce risk to themselves and others**.

Fairness

All parties are treated with dignity, respect and impartiality. Reports are assessed on the available evidence, not assumptions.

Accountability

This applies to everyone, not only to reported parties. Collective members are expected to take responsibility for their own behaviour and its impact, including where an action caused harm without intending to. Casa Kink and the people carrying out safety roles are accountable: for following this manual consistently, for explaining decisions, and for correcting course when a process fails someone. Accountability shows up concretely at three points later in this manual, in how findings are written (Stage Five), and in what an outcome requires of the person concerned (Stage Six).

Education

Casa Kink reduces future harm through continual community led education, guidance and skills development wherever that's a proportionate response. Education never replaces protective action where collective safety needs a stronger response.

Continuous Improvement

Every incident, and every piece of collective feedback, is an opportunity to strengthen Casa Kink's policies, training and safety systems. This is followed through concretely in Stage Nine.

Confidentiality is also a firm commitment of this manual, but it's an operating standard rather than a value to weigh against the others, it's covered in full in Information Management & Records, and applies throughout everything above.

Safety Management Manual

2. Roles & Responsibilities

Every person at Casa Kink, whatever their role, is expected to act in line with the Guiding Principles, respect others' autonomy and boundaries, raise concerns where someone's safety may be at risk, and cooperate honestly with Consent Monitors and Safety Officers when asked. What follows is what's additionally expected of each specific role.

Guests

- Understand and follow Casa Kink's policies.
- Communicate openly and negotiate honestly before, during and after play, disclosing information that may reasonably affect informed consent.
- Monitor their own wellbeing and seek assistance when needed
- Respect safewords, boundaries and the right to withdraw consent at any time.
- Report concerns promptly where possible and appropriate. How promptly you report does not have any impact on how the report is addressed.
- Negotiating a scene in writing beforehand is welcomed and can help, but it is not required, the absence of a written negotiation does not change how a report is taken or handled.
- If you do not follow the above perfectly it does not stop you from bringing a report and having that report handled fairly.

Volunteers (general)

Depending on the event, volunteers may help with décor and set-up, welcome guests, support venue operations, watch for emerging safety concerns and direct guests to a Consent Monitor or the Event Manager. Volunteers should not take on responsibilities beyond their training or authority and should escalate rather than handle a safety concern alone if unsure.

Tour Whores

A Tour Whore is a trained volunteer role and the first point of contact for guests on their first visit to the Dungeon. Responsibilities:

- Greeting new guests as they arrive and welcoming them into the space.
- Giving a tour of the space, orienting guests to the layout, exits, and facilities.
- Educating guests on consent, negotiation, and Dungeon etiquette as a standard part of every tour, not an optional add-on.
- Answering questions and helping new guests feel comfortable and oriented in unfamiliar surroundings.
- Flagging early to a Consent Monitor or Event Manager any guest who seems unsafe, confused about consent, or in need of more support than a tour can give.
- Maintaining confidentiality.

Tour Whores do not handle safety reports, investigate concerns, or make safety decisions, and cannot delegate their responsibilities to a guest or anyone outside the trained Tour Whore team. If a Tour Whore needs to step away, they hand off to another Tour Whore or the Event Manager, not to whoever's nearby.

Tour Whores volunteer for the role. Tour Whores go through the following developmental process:

- Vetted with the Safety Network which Casa is a part of, as well as against the Casa patterns and reports lists.
- Attend Tour Whore orientation, covering consent, negotiation, and Dungeon etiquette, prior to working a shift.
- Shadow experienced Tour Whores for a minimum of 2 shifts with a minimum of 3 different experienced Tour Whores.
- Take at least 2 shifts giving tours, whilst shadowed by experienced Tour Whores.
- When feedback from those shadow shifts is positive, appointed to the Tour Whore Team and take on shifts independently.

Some Tour Whores go on to progress to the Consent Monitor role, following the additional shadowing and feedback steps described under Consent Monitors.

Tour Whores and Consent Monitors receive the following to support their community volunteering:

- Tickets to attend every event they work a shift.
- Free access to Consent Monitor Training.
- Free access to specific workshops, e.g. newbies, culture, and some consent education.

- Free access to Wednesday Dungeon Days.
- Free access to sleepovers.

We do not consider this payment, it is simply enabling their volunteering.

Consent Monitors

A Consent Monitor is a trained community volunteer role and the first point of contact for safety concerns during an event. Responsibilities:

- Responding promptly to reports or requests for assistance and helping ensure immediate safety.
- Watching play spaces and intervening, or calling for help, where something looks unsafe, this is a core part of the role, not separate from it.
- Providing calm, impartial, compassionate support and recording factual observations.
- Explaining reporting options and escalating to the Safety Committee or the Owner where appropriate.
- Maintaining confidentiality.

Consent Monitors do not investigate, determine findings, or decide outcomes and cannot delegate their responsibilities to a guest or anyone outside the trained CM team, if a CM needs to step away, they hand off to another CM or the Event Manager, not to whoever's nearby.

Consent Monitors volunteer for the role. If nominated by members of the Collective, they still need to volunteer. Consent Monitors go through the following developmental process:

- Vetted with the Safety Network which Casa is a part of, as well as against the Casa patterns and reports lists
- Attend Tour Whore orientation, covering consent, negotiation, and Dungeon etiquette, prior to working a shift.
- Attend Consent Monitor training at any point in this process, but prior to working a solo CM shift
- Shadow experienced Tour Whores for a minimum of 2 shifts with a minimum of 3 different experienced Tour Whores
- Take at least 2 shifts giving tours, whilst shadowed by experienced tour whores
- When feeling confident to move over to the Consent Monitor role, begin by shadowing a minimum of three different experienced CMs
- When feeling confident and ready, feedback will be sought from the CMs that shadowed with the new CM
- If feedback is positive appointed to the CM Team and take on shifts

Tour Whores and Consent Monitors receive the following to support their community volunteering:

- tickets to attend every event they work a shift
- free access to Consent Monitor Training
- free access to specific workshops e.g. newbies, culture and some consent education
- free access to Wednesday Dungeon Days
- free access to sleepovers

We do not consider this payment, it is simply enabling their volunteering.

Safety Committee

The Safety committee members will be made up of one Consent Monitor, one Tour Whore, one guests who is NOT a volunteer and the Casa Kink Venue Manager (works customer facing as the Door Whore).

The safety committee will be responsible for:

- Receive reports (formal and informal) from Consent Monitors
- Establish whether an investigation is required or whether the incident was a serious one as identified in the exception section.
- Review for conflict of interest.
- Identify an Investigator from the Safety Committee to carry out an investigation, provide findings and recommendations on actions.
- Passing all reports, including informal reports to the owner for communication (where appropriate including to all Consent Monitors), training and pattern recognition.

Safety Committee Members will be selected from volunteers by the Owner with insight and feedback from outgoing Safety Committee. For the appointment of the first Safety Committee, feedback shall be sought from existing Consent Monitors.

Selection will include considering the volunteers level of experience in communities (both kink and other), handling reports and investigations. Relevant experience might include HR in the corporate world, harm reduction, risk management, psychology or counselling, especially in GBV and the breadth of kink experience, skill and/or insight held. The Venue Manager is a paid member of Casa Kink staff and as such will not take on any investigations, they are there to ensure venue safety changes are implemented as quickly as possible.

Safety Committee members will be provided with training on carrying out fair and impartial investigations, working with reporters (who may be survivors) empathically, documentation and any other elements deemed necessary to carry out this role.

Safety Committee roles will be rotated on an annual basis.

Safety Officers

Safety Officers manage the formal investigation process: receiving and assessing formal reports, conducting impartial investigations, gathering evidence, interviewing parties and witnesses, assessing risk, and preparing findings and recommendations. A Safety Officer must declare, or have raised about them, any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest, and should not investigate a matter where their independence could reasonably be questioned (see Conflict of Interest under Stage Three).

Please see the section on the Safety Committee above for information on how the Safety Officers are identified and trained.

Event Manager / Owner

Oversees the safe running of the venue at all times: coordinating the team, supporting Consent Monitors and volunteers, responding to significant safety concerns and authorising emergency decisions. They should not be involved in an investigation or producing recommending outcomes. Their role is to implement the changes they deem appropriate.

Owner

- Supports implementation of this manual and appoints a competent Safety Committee with competent Safety Officers.
- Reviews investigation recommendations and makes organisational decisions.
- Where the Owner or a Manager is themselves the subject of a report, the matter is handed to an independent person (see Conflict of Interest).

Who's who at a given event

At every event, a pre-event briefing will ensure everyone on crew that event knows who is the Event Manager and what other Consent Monitors and Tour Whores are present on that night.

Presenters and Facilitators

Deliver accurate information within their own experience, clearly communicate the risks of what they're teaching, model consent-focused behaviour and raise concerns where a participant's safety may be at risk.

Reporting Party

Has the right to be treated respectfully and heard, to receive information about the process and expected timeframes, to decline mediation, to provide additional evidence and identify witnesses, to request support and to raise a concern if they believe the process itself wasn't handled properly (see "Unhappy with how a report was handled" below).

Reported Party

Has the right to understand the nature of the allegation and respond to it, to provide evidence and identify witnesses, to be treated respectfully and heard, to receive information about the process and decline mediation, to request support and to receive procedural fairness, including the ability to raise a concern about how the process was run.

Witnesses

May be asked to provide factual observations and are expected to avoid speculation and maintain confidentiality if they choose to take part. Nobody can be compelled to act as a witness.

Unhappy with how a report was handled

Safety Management Manual

If a Reporting or Reported Party feels a Consent Monitor, Safety Officer or Owner handled their situation poorly, regardless of the outcome, they can raise this with the Safety Committee. This exists so that a bad experience of the process doesn't just go unheard because the finding itself wasn't in dispute.

Competency & Training

People in safety roles are expected to have the knowledge, judgement and training their responsibilities require, developed through induction, role-specific training, mentoring and refresher training covering consent, incident response, trauma-informed communication, investigation technique, risk assessment, documentation, confidentiality/POPIA, and emergency procedures. A role is earned through demonstrated competency and integrity, not by tenure or standing in the collective alone.

Training Minimums

- **No one works a Consent Monitor shift solo before completing initial training in full.** Shadowing an experienced CM is expected before that point. It's not a substitute for completing training.
- **Refresher training is required at minimum annually** for every active Consent Monitor and Safety Officer, covering at minimum: this manual's current version, the tiered reporting model, conflict-of-interest criteria, and any changes made since the last refresher.
- **Completion is tracked centrally** by the Owner or a designated training coordinator, not assumed from memory or tenure. Someone whose refresher has lapsed is not scheduled for a solo CM shift until it's current.

Separation of Functions

Where reasonably practicable, Casa Kink keeps receiving a report, investigating and deciding findings, and implementing outcomes as three separate functions, ideally held by at least three different people, wherever reasonably possible. One person may hold more than one function where circumstances require it, but conflicts of interest and independence must be actively considered whenever that happens.

Safety Management Manual

3. Venue & Event Safety

This section covers day-to-day and event-level safety, separate from what happens once a report is made, which is covered in Incident Management.

Before an Event

Risk Assessment & Classification

Before each event, the Owner or Event Manager assesses foreseeable risk based on the nature and purpose of the event, expected attendance and experience level, planned activities or demonstrations, venue layout, staffing and any known factors that raise risk. Public event, private hire, workshop, play party or social, and whether it combines several of these, all affect how much planning, staffing and oversight is proportionate. Where added risk is identified, put reasonable controls in place before the event opens.

Staffing

Confirm ahead of time: Event Manager/ Owner, Consent Monitor coverage, Door, Tour and other crew coverage and first aid capability. Every volunteer should know their responsibilities and who to go to if something comes up.

Pre-Event Briefing

Before doors open, the team gets a short briefing covering the schedule, individual responsibilities, any event-specific risks, emergency procedures, communication methods and who's acting as Event Manager for the night. Crew should arrive and be briefing-ready 15 minutes before doors open, so everyone has a shared picture before guests arrive. If crew arrive late they should check in with the Door Whore for this information. On week nights the briefing will take place once doors are open at 6.15pm in order to allow the crew on duty to arrive.

Venue Readiness

Before opening: play equipment inspected, emergency exits clear, fire safety equipment in place, first aid supplies stocked, sharps containers in place, lighting and ventilation adequate, bathrooms and communal areas clean, cleaning supplies available and signage current. Address any identified hazard before guests are admitted, wherever reasonably practicable.

During an Event

Active Monitoring & Play Space Safety

Consent Monitors and the Event Manager/Owner stay visible and approachable, observe play spaces for signs of distress or unsafe practice, watch for hazards, and escalate promptly where intervention is needed. Monitoring should be supportive rather than intrusive, respecting participants' privacy and autonomy while staying alert. Walkways and exits stay clear, mugs and glasses cleared to kitchen, occupancy is watched, and scenes are given privacy without losing the ability to step in if something looks unsafe. Participants remain responsible for the safe negotiation and conduct of their own scenes. Be aware that if you play in a private room, our consent monitors will not be able to monitor your play.

All participants are asked to take care of themselves and others and get help if they have any concerns.

All staff and volunteers are required to report any issues e.g. damaged equipment, cleanliness or other (non-confidential) issues to the Door Whore.

Equipment & Hygiene

Venue-owned equipment is routinely inspected, damaged equipment removed or fixed and cleaning/maintenance schedules kept. Casa Kink provides cleaning materials, disposal facilities for waste and medical waste as well as a shower and towel rental for guests. Guests are expected to clean equipment after use and keep any personal equipment they bring secure and appropriate for its use.

Welfare Support

Consent Monitors and volunteers check on guests who appear distressed, isolated or unwell, help people find quieter spaces or first aid and explain reporting options where something's disclosed. Always respecting the individual's autonomy and privacy.

Immediate Hazards & Emergencies

Where there's an immediate risk, a hazard, unsafe activity, medical emergency, fire, or threat to safety, isolate or address it, interrupt the activity, if necessary, call for the Event Manager and contact emergency services where required. The

immediate safety of everyone present always comes first. Volunteers should know where first aid and exits are and how to get help. A single person should be identified who is coordinating the response. It will be the Owner or Event Manager unless someone else is specifically delegated by them.

- STAR Alarms: 021 557 1455
- SAPS Milnerton: 021 528 3800
- SAPS Bothasig: 082 446 5590
- MediClinic Milnerton: 086 122 4555
- Netcare Blaauwberg: 021 554 9000

Escalation

Concerns that can't be resolved through routine intervention go to a Consent Monitor, the Event Manager, the Owner or emergency services, depending on severity. Once an immediate risk is managed, anything ongoing moves into the Incident Management process below.

After an Event

Event planning, staffing, briefing notes, equipment checks and any incident logs are documented in line with Information Management & Records. Organisers review whether anything from the night, safety concerns, operational issues, lessons learned, should change future planning, training or procedure.

Safety Management Manual

4. Incident Management

This is the process that runs once a concern reaches Casa Kink. From the moment something is disclosed through to investigation, decision, communication and review.

Serious Harm & Immediate Exclusion: the Exception, Read This First

The standard nine-stage process below applies to all other cases, assuming Casa Kink is in a position to assess evidence and reach a proportionate finding. That's not true for every report.

Where Casa Kink receives a report of **rape**, **sexual assault**, **serious physical assault** or other conduct presenting a significant **risk of serious harm**, the standard investigation process below does not apply. Casa Kink is not a police service, court or forensic body, and does not have the mandate or expertise to determine whether a crime occurred. Our responsibility is to protect the collective and manage risk.

In these serious cases, Casa Kink accepts the survivor's account as the basis for its risk assessment and safety decision. This is not a legal finding that an offence occurred, it means the survivor is not required to prove, defend or repeatedly recount their experience before Casa Kink acts. They will be believed and supported, treated with dignity, not required to take part in an investigation or to confront the reported party, and offered information about support and reporting options. Casa Kink will avoid unnecessary questioning, seeking only what's needed to understand immediate safety implications.

The reported party is immediately excluded from Casa Kink and its events. This is a safety and risk-management decision, not a finding of criminal guilt, and it doesn't replace any legal process. The exclusion stays in place under Casa Kink's exclusion procedures. No internal investigation into the underlying allegation is conducted. Casa Kink won't attempt to establish whether the conduct meets a legal definition. The reporting party may be offered information about external support, medical assistance or reporting to authorities, but pursuing any of that remains their choice unless Casa Kink has a separate legal obligation to report.

Very few incidents meet this exception. Where it's unclear whether a report falls here or should follow the standard process, that decision is escalated to the Safety Committee. The guiding principle: Casa Kink doesn't need to determine whether a crime occurred to determine that someone presents an unacceptable risk to the collective.

Threshold Criteria

Not every serious or upsetting incident meets the threshold for immediate exclusion. As a guide:

- **Immediate exclusion applies**: rape, sexual assault, serious physical assault, or conduct presenting a comparable, significant risk of serious harm. Where believing the account and acting on it is the only responsible response, regardless of what a fuller investigation might later show.
- **The standard process applies**: consent violations that don't rise to this level, boundary breaches, negotiation failures, disputes over what was agreed, incidents where there is an injury, where there is a need for further education and matters where the central question is genuinely what happened, rather than what to do given an account that's already clear.

Making the Call

Where it's genuinely unclear which applies, the decision goes to the Safety Committee, but:

- The decision is made within 2 hours during an active event, or next-business-day otherwise. This is not left to drift while the report sits with whoever received it.
- The reasoning is documented, not just the outcome, a short written note on why the matter was classified one way or the other, filed alongside the report itself.
- Where new information later suggests the classification was wrong, the matter can be re-routed, this isn't a one-way door, but re-routing itself is also documented, with reasoning.

The guiding principle remains:

Casa Kink does not need to determine whether a crime occurred to determine that someone presents an unacceptable risk to the collective.

Contacts

- Rape Crisis: 021 447 9762
- Thuthuzela Care Centre (TCC): 021 918 1321

Safety Management Manual

Karl Bremer Hospital
Operating Hours: Open 24 hours, 7 days a week

Acting Without Delay

Where an incident falls within this category, exclusion is actioned **before the event in question ends**, or, where the disclosure happens outside an event, within 24hrs of being received.

Who Can Act

Authority to action immediate exclusion is not held by the Owner alone. If the Owner is unreachable, the following delegate chain applies, in order:

1. A Safety Officer
2. The Event Manager
3. The most senior Casa Kink team member present
4. Whoever acts records that they did so and why the person above them in the chain wasn't reachable.

This is a safety decision made under time pressure, not something requiring sign-off from someone who isn't there.

Immediate, Not Provisional

Action taken under this delegate chain is not "provisional pending confirmation", it is the decision, effective immediately, exactly as if the Owner had actioned it directly. The Owner is notified as soon as practical afterward no more that 24hrs after the incident and reviews the decision as part of the normal Serious Harm process, but the exclusion itself does not wait on that review. The owner confirms exclusion to the reported party if doing so can be done without risk to the reporter. If there is a notable risk to the reporter, the reported party will be added to the banned list for access management.

Stage One: Immediate Response

Objective: Ensure the immediate physical and emotional safety of everyone involved. At this stage, the priority is not determining fault, it is preventing further harm and making sure the person is genuinely cared for before anything else happens.

This section is a mandatory checklist, not guidance. The order below is not a suggestion or a matter of individual style. Questioning someone about the incident before their safety and wellbeing has been actively checked is a failure of process, not a judgement call a Consent Monitor is free to make differently in the moment. Getting this order wrong is the single most damaging thing that can happen in the first few minutes, and it's very hard to undo afterward, however well the rest of the process is handled.

Step 1: Ensure Immediate Safety

- Stop the scene if necessary.
- Separate the parties involved, if appropriate.
- Call for additional assistance if required.
- Arrange medical assistance if needed.
- Provide a calm, private space.

Step 2: Confirm the Checklist: Before Anything Else

The first Consent Monitor on the scene must actively confirm each of the following, in order, before moving on to anything resembling a question about the incident itself:

☐ Physical safety checked. Is the person hurt, and do they need medical attention?
☐ Emotional safety checked. Are they safe from further contact with anyone involved, and do they feel able to stay where they are?
☐ Private space offered, have they been moved somewhere calm and away from onlookers, if they want that?

None of these are assumed from context or skipped because the situation seems minor or obvious. Each is actually asked and actually confirmed. Only once all three are genuinely in place does the conversation move toward anything about what happened.

Step 3: Provide Support

- Introduce yourself.

- Ask what they need immediately.
- Avoid questioning about the incident itself until the person is ready.
- Helpful: "Are you safe?" / "Would you like somewhere quieter?" / "Is there someone you'd like with you?"
- Good practice: Stay calm. Listen. Move slowly. Offer options rather than instructions. Maintain confidentiality.
- Avoid: Leading questions. Making promises. Taking sides. Trying to solve the situation immediately. Discussing it with anyone who doesn't need to know.

Step 4: Assign a Continuous Point of Contact

Once the checklist above is complete, the Consent Monitor providing support is, wherever possible, confirmed as this person's continuous point of contact through the rest of the process. The same person who takes the initial information carries forward into Stage Two and is the one the Safety Officer coordinates with in Stage Three, rather than the person being handed off to someone new at each stage. If this CM genuinely cannot continue in that role (end of shift, personal conflict, etc.), the handover is explicit and the person is told directly who their point of contact now is. They are never simply left to find out through a new person turning up.

Step 5: Record Immediate Information

- The Consent Monitor records on the Incident Report Form: who was involved, where and when it happened, and any immediate safety concerns. Witness statements are not taken at this stage.
- Documentation: Complete the Incident Report Form as fully as possible, including confirmation that the Step 2 checklist was completed and who has been assigned as continuous point of contact.

Step 6: Notify the Owner

- As soon as practical. This is NOT an optional step, it is essential for Casa to manage sfatey.
- If the Owner is not available, notify the Event Manager and the Owner directly via message.
- Notification to the Owner must be made by the Consent Monitor within 24hrs of the CM getting involved in the case.

Stage Two: Receiving a Report

Objective: every disclosure is acknowledged and handled at a level proportionate to what it actually is. Not everything needs a file, but nothing that could matter gets lost either. Every response tier below is documented at the level appropriate to it, and nothing that reaches a Consent Monitor disappears without a trace.

The Three Tiers

Not every concern needs the same response. Casa Kink uses three tiers, and a Consent Monitor should be able to identify which one applies:

- **Tier 1: On-the-Spot Coaching.** A brief, in-the-moment conversation about something minor. A first-time negotiation slip, a small miscommunication, something that's really a learning moment rather than a safety concern. This does **not** open a case file. A CM handling something at this tier still mentions it to the Safety Committee and the Owner, so it can be logged for pattern recognition. It isn't logged as a report/disclosure or investigation.
- **Tier 2: Informal Disclosure.** Something's shared without a request for formal action, but it's worth recording. This is recorded confidentially, in line with POPIA, noting any immediate safety concern. The person is told they can make a Formal Report later if they choose. The Owner and a Safety Officer are advised of any safety risk, with the reporter's identity protected. No investigation begins unless the reporter is aware and agrees, but the disclosure itself is kept, because it's often a run of Tier 2 disclosures, seen together, that reveals a pattern before anything reaches Tier 3.
- **Tier 3: Formal Report.** A report made with a request for investigation and/or action. This moves into the process below.

Use Tier 2 whenever there's genuine uncertainty about which applies, the lightweight tier exists so small things don't get inflated into case files, not so they can be waved off. If a CM isn't sure, that uncertainty is itself a reason to log it as a disclosure rather than treat it as a coaching moment.

Checking for a Pattern: Before Tier Is Decided

- A Consent Monitor does not have visibility into prior coaching moments or informal disclosures and shouldn't. Access to that record is deliberately limited (see Information Management & Records). The pattern check is not something a CM performs themselves. It's a quick query they're required to make before finalising which tier applies.

- Before a concern is handled, the CM contacts the Safety Committee / Owner with the Reported Party's name and asks a single, narrow question: **has this name come up before, at what tier?** If the response is a **yes**, the owner will provide the Tier on record e.g. Tier 1 or 2. No information will be provided on the content of any prior case. This keeps other reporters' confidentiality intact while still letting the check happen. This should be fast enough not to defeat the point of having a lightweight tier, a message or a quick call, not a formal escalation, but it happens every time, before the fact, not as an afterthought.
- Where a name has prior disclosures, the Consent Monitor should handle the report taking at Level 2, regardless of how minor each individual report seemed.
- If the Owner or Safety Committee member is unreachable in the moment, the concern defaults to Tier 2 rather than Tier 1. A coaching conversation can still happen on the spot for immediate purposes, but it gets logged as a disclosure and the pattern check is completed retroactively, as soon as possible.

Escalation Triggers

A Consent Monitor should escalate immediately, not just "when uncertain," where any of the following apply:

- The pattern check comes back as anything other than a clear "yes, Tier 1 is fine."
- The person involved is already subject to a restriction, condition, or watch-list entry.
- The concern involves a pattern across more than one event, even if no single incident was severe.
- The Consent Monitor is, for any reason, unsure which tier applies.

Formal Reports

Once a Formal Report is made:

- Report submitted to Safety Committee and Owner
- Owner, acknowledges receipt and explains the process and timeframes and explains confidentiality
- Safety Committee checks for conflict of interest and appoints a Safety Officer

Information to Collect

- Date the report was received, reporter's details, if not anonymous, reported person's details, date and location of the incident, summary of what occurred, any immediate risks, witnesses, supporting evidence.
- Documentation: Incident Report Form, acknowledgement email, investigation file, a record that the pattern check was requested and its outcome, whatever tier the report ends up at.

Stage Three: Investigation

Objective: establish what happened and whether it requires action to protect the collective. This is fact-finding, not advocacy for either side.

Before Anything Else: Confirm Continuity

- If a Consent Monitor was assigned as the Reporting Party's continuous point of contact in Stage One or Two, that assignment carries into this stage. The Safety Officer works alongside that CM rather than replacing them as the person's point of contact. Before conducting any interview, the Safety Officer reviews everything already on file: the Incident Report Form, any Stage Two notes, and prior correspondence with the Reporting Party. Interviews at this stage are for genuinely new information, not for re-covering ground the Reporting Party has already provided. Where something needs clarifying, the Safety Officer says plainly what's already understood and asks only about the gap, rather than opening with "tell me what happened."
- This same principle applies to the Reported Party once they're brought into the process: they should be told clearly what's already been recorded and given a fair, single opportunity to respond to it, not walked back through the same ground repeatedly across multiple conversations.

Conflict of Interest

Before beginning, the assigned Safety Officer, and anyone else involved, checks for:

- Direct involvement in the matter, or a previously expressed opinion about it.
- Personal or social familiarity with either party, including through a partner, metamour, close friendship or regular social contact within the community. Given the size of this collective, some degree of familiarity is often unavoidable, the test is not "do I know them at all" but "could my judgement reasonably be seen as compromised."
- Whether someone else, not just the investigator themselves, would reasonably perceive bias. This isn't a private gut-check: the Safety Officer asks the Consent Monitor who took the report, and where appropriate others close

to the case, whether they see a conflict. This doesn't require breaking confidentiality, it's a yes/no question about perceived independence, not a discussion of case detail.

- Commercial conflict: where a finding or outcome could affect the venue's bookings, reputation, or a paying relationship, that pressure is treated as a standing category of potential conflict, not ignored because it's uncomfortable to name (see Key Terms on the business/collective distinction).
- This check happens at intake and immediate response, not only once a formal investigation is confirmed (see Stage Two). Where it surfaces a conflict at any point, another investigator takes the case.

Pattern Check

- Before forming any view of the current report, the Safety Officer checks the Reported Party's name against the disclosure list described in Information Management & Records. This information will be available through the Safety Committee or Owner. Every prior Tier 2 disclosure and finding, not only prior Formal Reports. This is a required, documented step in every investigation, however minor the current report seems on its own, it's how a string of small concerns actually gets connected before something worse happens, rather than staying theoretical. The result of this check, what was found, or that nothing was found, is recorded in the investigation file.
- Previous informal disclosures are never treated as proof that the current allegation is true. But where a pattern exists, it's directly relevant to the risk assessment in Stage Four, and its existence shouldn't be something the Safety Officer only stumbles onto by chance.

Evidence Gathering & Interviewing

Evidence may include interviews, photographs, written communications, incident reports, venue records and witness statements, preserved in original form wherever possible. Interviews ask open questions, avoid assumptions, allow breaks, clarify inconsistencies without confrontation, and keep observations separate from opinions.

Investigation Output

The investigation record separates Agreed Facts, Disputed Facts, Corroborated Evidence, Findings, and Recommendations and records: the continuity-of-contact arrangement followed, the conflict-of-interest check completed (and by whom it was corroborated), and the pattern-check result.

Stage Four: Risk Assessment

Objective: assess risk to the Reporting Party, the Reported Party, the collective and Casa Kink, and identify what protective measures are needed. Not disciplinary, this stage is about reducing risk.

Consider the behaviour and its context, likelihood of recurrence, and severity of potential future harm. Whether it's isolated or part of a pattern and whether education or supervision could reduce risk as well as, or instead of, a punitive response. Relevant factors: immediate safety risk, physical safety (injury, force, competency, equipment, environment), consent and communication (negotiation, safewords, recognition of withdrawal), competency gaps (usually addressed through education first), behavioural pattern (previous findings are never used to decide whether a new allegation is true, but are relevant to assessing risk once findings exist) and wider collective impact.

Likelihood	Minimal Harm	Moderate Harm	Serious Harm
Low likelihood	Low Risk	Low Risk	Medium Risk
Possible likelihood	Low Risk	Medium Risk	High Risk
Likely	Medium Risk	High Risk	Critical

Risk Level	**Typical Response**
Low	Education, advice, monitoring.
Moderate	Education, supervision, temporary restrictions.
High	Immediate protective measures, significant restrictions, possible temporary or permanent ban.
Critical	Removal from the venue pending review, or permanent exclusion where justified.

Safety Management Manual

Stage Five: Findings and Decision-Making

Objective: reach fair, evidence-based findings and an appropriate response, with the reasoning explained clearly enough that someone unfamiliar with the case could follow it.

Standard Used to Decide What Happened

Casa Kink's findings are organisational safety decisions, not criminal or civil legal determinations, and a civil "balance of probabilities" standard doesn't map cleanly onto that. In practice: the Safety Officer/Investigator works out the most likely explanation for what occurred based on the evidence available and writes down that reasoning. Where evidence is genuinely unclear or contested, that uncertainty is acknowledged rather than resolved by guesswork, and the assessment errs toward the safety of the person who reported harm and of the collective rather than requiring certainty before acting. This means Casa Kink can take a protective measure, e.g. monitoring, restriction or exclusion, in a case where the evidence wouldn't support a formal finding, if the potential severity of harm justifies a precautionary response. Recognising genuine uncertainty is a sign of a thorough process, not a weakness in it.

Findings distinguish Established Facts, Disputed Evidence, and the Investigator's Findings, supported by evidence, free of speculation, with reasoning explained and corroboration referenced where it exists.

Accountability in Findings

Where a finding is made against someone, the investigator's report names not just what happened but the impact it had, on the person harmed and, where relevant, on the collective's trust. Even in cases where there was no intent to cause harm. This is what makes the Accountability principle operate in practice rather than sitting only in the principles list.

Decision-making considers the seriousness of the matter, likelihood of recurrence, insight shown, willingness to engage with education, impact on the Reporting Party and wider collective safety. No single factor decides the outcome alone.

Roles stay separated where practicable: the Consent Monitor takes the report, the Safety Officer investigates, the Owner or a delegated decision-maker determines the organisational action.

Stage Six: Outcomes and Protective Measures

Objective: a fair, proportionate, evidence-based response focused on reducing risk to the collective. Not punishment for its own sake, but not the absence of consequence either.

Outcomes should be fair, consistent, proportionate, clearly explained, focused on collective safety, and reviewed on a defined schedule. They should consider the seriousness of the matter, actual and potential harm, insight shown, willingness to engage with education, previous relevant findings (including anything surfaced by the pattern check in Stage Three), current risk and mitigating circumstances.

Outcome	When it applies
No Further Action	Evidence doesn't support a safety concern requiring intervention.
Education	A knowledge gap is the primary issue.
Informal Guidance	Minor or first-time concerns.
Watch List	Ongoing observation is a proportionate response.
Temporary Restrictions	Limiting access or participation for a defined period.
Suspension	Removing access for a period pending conditions being met.
Permanent Exclusion	Serious or deliberate misconduct, or unmanageable ongoing risk.

The guiding principle is the least restrictive intervention that adequately addresses the risk, professional judgement remains essential in every case. The table below is guidance, not a formula.

Situation	Typical Response
Knowledge Gap	Education
Developing Competency	Guidance and Monitoring
Poor Judgement	Restrictions & Education
Ongoing unsafe behaviour	Suspension or Exclusion
Serious, deliberate misconduct	Permanent Exclusion

Accountability in Outcomes

Safety Management Manual

Where a finding is made, the outcome should require something of the person concerned wherever possible, acknowledging what happened, completing education, or meeting a condition before a restriction is lifted. Protecting the collective and holding the person accountable for what they did both matter.

Review Schedule

- A review date is set at the time the outcome is decided. Where no shorter interval is specified, the default is every 12 months.
- The Safety Committee is responsible for tracking this specific case's review date.
- The owner will run a monthly review of all cases so an outstanding restriction can't simply go quiet.
- Reviews consider: completion of any required education, observed behavioural change, demonstrated insight, feedback from Safety Officers, and ongoing collective confidence. Possible review outcomes: restrictions lifted, restrictions extended, additional education required, or escalation where necessary.

Breach of a Restriction

Where someone under a Temporary Restriction, Suspension, or Monitoring/Watch List condition breaches their terms, e.g. attending an event they're barred from, or continuing behaviour they were told to change, this is not treated as a brand-new, unrelated report starting from zero. It triggers:

- Automatic escalation to the Safety Committee as soon as the breach is identified. It is not held for the next scheduled review.
- Treatment as an aggravating factor, connected to the original finding, rather than assessed as an isolated new incident that's lost the context of what came before.
- A standing presumption that a breach is evidence the original response was insufficient for the risk this person presents, meaning the next outcome should generally be more restrictive than the one breached, not a repeat of it.
- The breach itself, and the response to it, is documented in the same case file as the original finding, not opened as a separate record.

Documentation

- Summary of findings
- Risk assessment
- Reasons for the chosen outcome
- Review date and the person responsible for tracking it
- Date the outcome was communicated
- Any breach recorded against this outcome, and the response taken

Stage Seven: Communication

Objective: everyone understands the process, receives timely updates, and is treated with dignity throughout. This builds trust even where the outcome isn't what someone hoped for.

Communication is timely, respectful, factual, confidential and proportionate. It is shared only with those who have a legitimate need to know. The Reporting Party is acknowledged promptly, informed of the process and timeframes, updated if there's a delay, and told when the investigation concludes (with an explanation where confidentiality limits what can be shared). The Reported Party understands the concerns raised, gets a fair chance to respond, and is informed of findings and any organisational action affecting them. Where a delay happens, both parties get a periodic update explaining the reason, the stage reached, and a revised timeframe.

Investigations stay confidential, information isn't shared beyond those who need it, except where required by law or where there's an immediate risk to someone's safety. Parties are asked to respect that confidentiality themselves.

Handling Feedback About the Process Itself

Objective: make sure a concern about how a case is being handled is caught and addressed while the process is still live and make sure nobody's own words end up misrepresented in their own file.

Logging Process Feedback

Where a Reporting Party or Reported Party raises a concern about how their case is being handled, not about the underlying incident, but about the process itself (feeling unsupported, feeling rushed, feeling unheard) this is:

- **Logged verbatim**, in the person's own words, not paraphrased or summarised at the point of capture

- Kept as a **separate record from the incident file itself**, so a complaint about the process doesn't get folded into, or lost inside, the substantive investigation
- **Acknowledged in writing** to the person who raised it, confirming it's been received and logged
- This sits alongside, and works the same way as, the "Unhappy with how a report was handled" pathway already in Roles & Responsibilities. That's the route for raising a concern, this is what happens to it once raised.

The Right to Review Your Own Words

Before a case file is finalised, a Reporting or Reported Party may request to see how their own statements have been recorded and represented in the file, and may correct anything attributed to them that doesn't reflect what they actually said in that form. This doesn't extend to disputing someone else's account of events, or to rewriting findings, it's specifically about making sure their own words, as recorded, are actually their words.

Why This Sits Outside the Investigation

Feedback about the process is handled by someone other than the Safety Officer running the substantive investigation, wherever practicable, usually the Owner, or the independent contact named for process complaints, so that raising a concern about how things are going doesn't put someone in the position of criticising the very person deciding their case.

Post-Case Check-In with the Reporting Party

Objective: find out privately, while there's still time to act on it, how the process felt to the person who went through it. Not just whether the case was closed correctly on paper.

How This Works

- Once a case involving a Formal Report closes, the Reporting Party is offered a private, optional check-in, separate from the investigation itself and from the closing communication in Stage Seven.
- This is offered, never required. Declining has no bearing on the case or on how the person is treated going forward.
- It's conducted by someone who wasn't the investigating Safety Officer, ideally the same continuity-of-contact person from Stage One (typically a Consent Monitor), where that relationship still stands, or the Owner where that's more appropriate to the case.
- It happens close enough to case closure that the experience is still fresh, but with enough distance that the immediate stress of the process has settled. Roughly two to four weeks after closure is a reasonable window.

What's Actually Asked

Kept short and specific, not a general "how was it":

- Did you feel supported before you felt questioned?
- Did you have to repeat yourself to multiple people?
- Did you feel the people making decisions were impartial?
- Was there anything about how this was handled that you'd want done differently?

Where This Goes

Responses are logged the same way as process feedback raised during an open case, verbatim, kept separate from the incident file, and are a required input to Stage Nine, not an optional add-on. Where a check-in surfaces something that points to a real pattern (not just one person's individual experience), that's raised at the next scheduled continuous-improvement review, not held until enough similar feedback accumulates to seem significant.

Community Communication: When a Matter Becomes Visible

This can be triggered at any stage if the case becomes externally visible.

Objective: protect the people directly involved and the integrity of an ongoing process, while acknowledging that the collective's confidence in Casa Kink is a separate thing from the case file and needs its own response.

When This Applies

This section applies whenever a matter becomes known to the wider collective or community outside the formal reporting channel, through a public post, word of mouth, or any other route. Regardless of whether the internal process is still open, has concluded, or was never formally reported at all.

Who Owns the Response

The Owner is responsible for the community-facing response, unless the Owner is personally implicated in the matter, in which case an independent person is named to lead it, following the same conflict-of-interest logic as Stage Three.

This person is decided in advance where possible (see Roles & Responsibilities), not improvised once something has already gone public.

What Can Be Said

The instinct in this situation is often to say either everything or nothing. Neither serves the collective well. What can generally be shared, without breaching confidentiality:

- That a matter has been raised and is being taken seriously
- That it is being, or has been, reviewed through Casa Kink's formal process
- General information about how the process works (this manual is not confidential, it can be shared with any interested party).
- Any changes Casa Kink has made or is making as a result, once genuinely decided, not promised speculatively in the moment to manage the immediate reaction
- What is not shared, regardless of pressure to do so: names, identifying details or anything that would let the collective piece together who was involved beyond what they already know from outside the process. Where someone directly involved has chosen to speak publicly about their own experience, Casa Kink does not confirm, deny, or add detail to their account. It can acknowledge that the account exists and is known, without validating or disputing its specifics.

Responding, Not Reacting

A single named person drafts and approves any public or collective-facing statement. This is most typically the Owner who has ultimate responsibility for the safety of the Casa collective as well as final decision on actions being taken by Casa. No Casa crew member, whether staff or volunteer is allowed to speak on behalf of Casa Kink unless specifically authorised to do so.

Statements are reviewed for accuracy against the actual internal process before being shared, not written from memory or under pressure to respond quickly.

Where the collective's reaction includes real, specific criticism of how a matter was handled, that criticism is treated as input to Stage Nine (see below), not something to be managed away.

This Is Not the Same as Closing the Case

Restoring collective trust is a distinct task from concluding an investigation, and it doesn't end when the case file closes. It's picked up explicitly in Stage Nine.

Stage Eight: Continuous Improvement

Objective: every incident should improve the safety system. A post-case review isn't about revisiting the findings, it's about whether the procedures worked, timeframes were reasonable, communication was effective, people understood their roles, investigators had enough guidance, collective expectations were clear, and whether policy changes or further training are needed. Lessons learned are documented and reviewed periodically for recurring themes.

Public Reporting on Major Incidents

- As part of continuous improvement and transparency, Casa Kink publishes an anonymised summary of major incidents that take place at Casa, findings, outcomes, and agreed actions, for the collective.
- **Anonymised, defined:** removing names is not sufficient on its own. In a collective this size, a description built from event date, role, or a distinctive detail of what happened can still identify someone even without a name attached. Before publication, each summary is checked specifically for this, not just for names, but for whether the combination of details makes someone reasonably identifiable to people who were around at the time. Where a genuinely anonymised version would say too little to be useful, the safer choice is to say less, not to publish something identifiable. This is the same approval chain used for the anonymised major-incident reports described in Stage Nine. One named person, the Owner, is accountable for everything Casa Kink says publicly about a safety matter, not just live-crisis communication.
- **Sign-off:** the Owner is responsible for the community-facing response under Community Communication and approves anything published here, for the same reason. This is public-facing material about a safety matter, and it shouldn't go out without the person accountable for that decision reviewing it first.
- This will be published individually after every major incident that takes place at Casa Kink. It will be published on the Casa Kink Safety page.

Safety Management Manual

Restoring Collective Trust

Where a matter has become known beyond the formal process (see Community Communication above), the post-case review explicitly considers, alongside the procedural questions already in this stage:

- What did the collective's reaction reveal about where trust was lost, beyond whatever the internal review already found?
- Is there anything Casa Kink can share, consistent with the confidentiality limits above, that would help rebuild confidence, beyond what's already been said?
- Has enough time and consistent follow-through passed for trust to be genuinely rebuilding, or is this still an open wound that needs more than a statement?

This isn't a box to check once. Where trust has been significantly damaged, this question is revisited at a defined interval rather than considered resolved the first time it's asked.

Safety Management Manual

5. Information Management & Records

This section covers how investigations are documented, how personal information is handled under POPIA, and how long records are kept.

Documentation Standards

A record should be clear enough that another Safety Officer, or an independent reviewer, can understand what happened, how it was investigated, and how the conclusion was reached, without needing it explained verbally.

- Distinguish evidence from findings: evidence is what was gathered (statements, documents, photos, messages, observations); findings are the conclusions reached after weighing it.
- Attribute statements to their source, "The Reporting Party stated...", "The witness recalled...", "Photographs show...", rather than presenting disputed information as fact
- Separate observation from opinion and avoid speculative or emotive language
- Explain the reasoning behind every finding, not just the conclusion.
- Use neutral language unless the findings directly support a stronger characterisation
- Acknowledge genuine uncertainty rather than resolving it through guesswork
- Quote directly only where exact wording matters, where intent is disputed, terminology is specific, or context would otherwise be lost, and keep quotes brief.

Before an investigation is finalised: has every allegation been addressed, are findings supported by evidence, are recommendations proportionate, and has confidentiality been maintained throughout?

Information Handling & POPIA

Information is collected only where necessary, used only for legitimate safety purposes, shared only with authorised people or where required by law, stored securely and destroyed once no longer needed. Where information is used for training or policy development, identifying details are removed wherever reasonably practicable. Casa Kink manages personal information in accordance with the Protection of Personal Information Act, 2013 (POPIA), including how it responds to a request for someone's own information.

Secure Storage & Access

Physical records are stored off-site, away from the Dungeon, in a locked cabinet. Electronic records are password-protected and anonymised. Only the Owner has standing access, granting access to others only when they need it to perform their role, e.g. the assigned Safety Officer, or an appointed independent reviewer.

Retention Periods

Record Type	Retention Period
Informal disclosures	3 years from the last recorded activity for pattern recognition purposes.
Formal investigations	7 years after case closure.
Cases resulting in a ban	Duration of the ban, plus 7 years thereafter.
Anonymous reports	3 years, unless linked to an active investigation.
Investigation working notes	Destroyed once incorporated into the final report.

Where legal proceedings, a police investigation, or an insurance matter is ongoing, records are retained until that matter concludes, even beyond the periods above. At least once a year, retained records are reviewed and securely destroyed once their original purpose no longer applies. Electronic records permanently deleted, paper records shredded or burnt.

Statistical or historical learning may draw on anonymised records for training and policy development. An anonymised list of reports resulting in a ban or watch-listing is kept for vetting purposes.

Using Historical Records

Historical records may be reviewed to spot recurring safety concerns, evaluate whether past interventions worked and improve policy and training. Previous reports are never used to decide whether a new allegation is true, but once a finding has already been made, it's relevant to assessing an ongoing pattern or risk.

Safety Management Manual

Confidentiality

Everyone involved in an incident is expected to maintain confidentiality. Information is shared only with Casa Kink's knowledge and authority, where needed to fulfil an official role, where required by law, or where disclosure is necessary to prevent a serious, immediate risk of harm. Unauthorised disclosure may constitute a breach.

Reviewing This Manual

This manual is reviewed annually, after significant incidents, following legislative change, or wherever operational experience shows an improvement is needed. Casa Kink management maintains it, Safety Officers, Consent Monitors and volunteers are responsible for applying it consistently and flagging where it stops matching reality.

Safety Management Manual

6. Closing Statement

Casa Kink believes a safe collective is a shared responsibility, built on consent, respect and honest communication. These procedures exist so that when something goes wrong, everyone involved is treated fairly, the collective is protected and Casa Kink keeps learning and improving.

Safety Management Manual

7. Appendix A: Expected Timeframes

Stage	Responsibility	Target
Provide report to Safety Committee and Owner	Consent Monitor	Within 24hrs
Acknowledge receipt of report, advise of process	Owner	Within 48 hours.
Assign Safety Officer	Safety Committee	Within 72 hours where possible; update reporter daily.
Initial contact with Reporting Party	Consent Monitor with Safety Officer	Within 4 days.
Initial contact with Reported Party	Safety Officer	Within 4 days.
Progress updates	Safety Officer and Consent Monitor	Typically every 3 days.
Outcome communicated	Owner	As soon as reasonably practicable after the decision.
Internal lessons-learned review	Owner, Consent Monitor, Safety Officer and Safety Committee	Within 30 days of case closure.

These are targets, not guarantees, complex investigations may need more time.

8. Appendix B: Consent Monitor Checklist

- ☐ Made the scene safe.
- ☐ Checked whether anyone requires medical assistance.
- ☐ Provided a calm, private space.
- ☐ Listened without judgement.
- ☐ Recorded immediate, factual observations.
- ☐ Explained reporting options.
- ☐ Notified the Owner, a Safety Officer, or the Manager on Duty.
- ☐ Maintained confidentiality.

9. Appendix C: Safety Officer Investigation Checklist

- ☐ Completed a conflict of interest check, including asking others, not just self.
- ☐ Interviewed the Reporting Party.
- ☐ Interviewed the Reported Party
- ☐ Interviewed relevant witnesses
- ☐ Reviewed available evidence
- ☐ Prepared a timeline
- ☐ Distinguished agreed facts from disputed facts.
- ☐ Completed a risk assessment.
- ☐ Recorded findings, including impact
- ☐ Made recommendations
- ☐ Recorded the organisational decision
- ☐ Communicated the outcome
- ☐ Completed a lessons-learned review.

10. Appendix D: Investigation Report Structure

- Executive Summary
- Background

Safety Management Manual

- Scope of Investigation
- Methodology
- Timeline
- Summary of Evidence
- Agreed Facts / Disputed Facts
- Findings, with impact
- Risk Assessment
- Recommendations
- Organisational Outcome
- Lessons Learned

11. Appendix E: Definitions

- Reporting Party: the person raising a concern or making a report.
- Reported Party: the person a report concerns.
- Formal Report: a report made with a request for investigation and/or action.
- Informal Disclosure: information shared without a request for formal investigation.
- Risk Assessment: the structured process of evaluating risk to individuals and the collective.
- Finding: a conclusion reached by the investigator, based on the evidence.
- Recommendation: a suggested action arising from an investigation's findings.
- Protective Measure: an action taken to reduce risk to any person or the collective.

("Casa Kink", "the community" and "the collective" are defined in Key Terms, not repeated here.)

12. Appendix G: Process Flow by Role

Consent Monitor

Incident → Safety → Listen → Record → Escalate → Maintain Communication → Review

Safety Committee

Conflict Check → Appoint Safety Officer → Review.

Safety Officer

Evidence → Investigation → Risk → Findings → Recommendations → Review.

Owner

Support → Resources → Maintain Records → Protect Collective → Implement Decisions → Review.