



Assessing Project-Level Grievance Redress Mechanisms Using a Human-Rights-Based Approach

Tips and Tools



Acknowledgments

This report was part of an effort to strengthen the right to remedy in World Bank operations and beyond by building the capacity of World Bank staff, clients, and project-affected people, especially the vulnerable and marginalized, to implement effective grievance mechanisms so that they can improve service delivery, risk management, and development outcomes. The core team, led by Sanjay Agarwal and Saki Kumagai, comprised Harika Masud and H el ene Pfeil at the World Bank.

The lead authors of the report are Harika Masud and H el ene Pfeil, with invaluable contributions from Sanjay Agarwal and Saki Kumagai. Valuable inputs, comments, and guidance were

provided by Sophia Georgieva, Camilla Marie Lindstrom, Luiza Nora, G. Srihari, and Tatiana Tassoni.

The authors would also like to thank Laura Johnson for her excellent editorial support.

Finally, the authors are grateful to the Human Rights, Inclusion and Empowerment Trust Fund (HRIETF) for supporting the activities under this initiative. The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this report are entirely those of the authors and should not be attributed in any manner to the World Bank, to its affiliated organizations, or to members of its Board of Executive Directors or the countries they represent.



Introduction

This note is a resource for World Bank task teams providing technical assistance to Borrowers on grievance redress mechanisms (GRMs). The first step in strengthening a project-level GRM, after discussing it within the task team and informing the Country Management Unit (CMU), is to organize a technical assistance mission to conduct a detailed GRM diagnostic for the project or group of projects selected. This helps the project implementation unit (PIU) and task team understand the PIU's capacity for grievance management, learn about grievance resolution experiences of PIU staff and potential complainants and project beneficiaries through field visits, share international experiences with grievance redress while building the capacity of relevant staff, and facilitate the preparation of a GRM strengthening action plan by relevant PIU counterparts. The guidance and tools provided here, including templates and worksheets, can help social development specialists and other relevant task team members systematically plan and organize such missions.

While the documents presented here are primarily geared toward dedicated technical assistance missions focused on GRMs, a GRM assessment using the approach outlined in this note could also be conducted by a task team or social specialist as a part of project supervision, although this would require a significant amount of time, which the supervision mission would need to account for.

What characterizes an effective project-level GRM?

A GRM is a system through which queries, suggestions, positive feedback, concerns, and complaints about a project can be submitted and responded to; implementation issues resolved; and complaints efficiently and effectively addressed (Post and Agarwal 2011). Effective GRMs are widely accessible with multiple uptake channels and provide beneficiaries with a fair and predictable process and timeline for receiving a response.

What is the GRM value chain?

The GRM value chain is a useful framework for analyzing project-level GRMs. As depicted in figure 1, it outlines the six steps that are necessary for a GRM to be functional and effective: (1) uptake; (2) sort and process; (3) acknowledge and follow up; (4) verify, investigate, and act; (5) monitor and evaluate; and (6) provide feedback to the complainant.

What is the added value of assessing existing project-level GRMs?

GRMs play a crucial role in strengthening environmental and social risk management, notably under the following Environmental and Social Framework standards: ESS2: Labor and Working Conditions; ESS5: Land Acquisition, Restrictions

FIGURE 1. GRM VALUE CHAIN





1. INTRODUCTION

on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; ESS7: Indigenous Peoples/Sub-Saharan African Historically Underserved Traditional Local Communities; and ESS10: Stakeholder Engagement and Information Disclosure. Moreover, information compiled through an effective GRM can provide valuable insights on implementation progress and challenges, serve as a performance management tool for implementing agencies; and increase citizens' trust. A project-level GRM can serve as an effective tool for engaging citizens, in line with the Independent Evaluation Group's recommendation to harness synergies between citizen engagement and the Environmental and Social Framework. A GRM that is accessible and available to vulnerable groups also promotes social inclusion. However, evidence from the Inspection Panel, the World Bank's [Grievance Redress System](#),¹ regional GRM portfolio reviews, implementation status and results reports, and supervision missions indicates that the vast majority of GRMs in World Bank-financed lending operations are in need of considerable improvement, particularly in terms of their accessibility and the availability of evidence of complaints being received and processed.

Accordingly, it makes sense trying to improve the functioning and effectiveness of GRMs for Bank-financed operations through technical assistance and to do so, using a standardized approach that is replicable across the World Bank portfolio.² This note proposes such a standardized approach.³ The benefits to Borrowers of this type of technical assistance include: sensitization of PIUs to the intrinsic and operational value of GRMs, just-in-time technical support and capacity-building through GRM orientation sessions for PIUs, participatory GRM diagnostics, and client-led identification of corrective measures through a GRM strengthening action plan with clear accountability and deliverables.

For World Bank task teams, strengthening GRMs will improve social and environmental risk management. PIUs and projects that benefited from such technical assistance can then serve as good practice examples of how to receive and resolve a significant number of grievances in a satisfactory and timely manner—lessons that other operations can emulate.

What Is a human-rights-based approach to grievance resolution?

A human-rights-based approach to grievance resolution means paying attention to the principles of equal access, nondiscrimination, participation, inclusion, transparency, and accountability in the design and operation of a GRM. GRMs are a means of fulfilling an individual's right to effective remedy. In the context of project-level GRMs, these principles translate into pragmatic considerations, including:⁴

- ✓ Providing a variety of grievance uptake channels, adapting channels to local culture and language, and considering whether additional steps are needed to ensure that vulnerable groups can access the mechanism;
- ✓ Tailoring communication methods to the needs of vulnerable groups, such as those unable to read or write;
- ✓ Upholding transparent procedures and guaranteeing fairness of outcomes; and
- ✓ Regularly assessing trends related to grievances and disaggregating information about complainants while respecting the need for confidentiality.

1. Managed by the Operations Policy and Country Services (OPCS), the World Bank's Grievance Redress System is an avenue for people and communities to submit complaints directly to the World Bank if they believe a Bank-funded project has or is likely to adversely affect them. The Grievance Redress System ensures that complaints received at the corporate level are promptly and proactively addressed by fostering dialogue and problem solving as well as applying relevant dispute resolution tools. Its activities and complaint-handling processes are guided by the [Grievance Redress System Bank Procedure](#).

2. While the emphasis here is on IPFs, some of the elements presented in the note will also be relevant for the institutional approach required for PforRs.

3 The approach presented in this note has been tried in various projects in several countries such as the Philippines, Uganda, West Bank and Gaza, Egypt, and Georgia.

4. For more on how to encourage the participation of vulnerable groups in a GRM, see Pfeil and Agarwal. 2021.



Overview of Activities Before, During, and After a Technical Assistance Mission

The guidance provided in this note is organized as three sets of activities: (1) those conducted prior to the technical assistance mission; (2) those conducted during the mission; and (3) those conducted after the mission.

Activity	✓
BEFORE THE MISSION	
Reach out to the country management unit/regional GRM coordinator and the project’s social development specialist; engage the task team leader.	
Carry out a desk review of the project-level GRM (see worksheet in appendix A).	
Organize and hold a videoconference with relevant PIU officials to appraise them of the objectives of the initiative, the first mission, and the preparations required; identify the PIU GRM counterpart.	
Share the blank GRM self-assessment checklist (see appendix B) with each PIU and request their grievance logs; share the completed checklist with the project’s social development specialist and task team leader.	
As part of mission schedule preparation (see appendix C for sample agendas), request field trips to organize discussions with local PIU members and focus groups with project-affected parties from multiple categories, including women, youth, elderly, disabled, urban/rural, as well as potential and actual complainants.	
DURING THE MISSION	
Days 1 and 2	
Meet with the GRM counterpart and other relevant heads of departments from the PIU; try to schedule a briefing on the mission with the PIU’s project or executive director.	
Finalize field visit schedule a (see following section on <i>field visits and meetings</i>).	
Organize GRM kick-off workshop with PIU(s) to complete the GRM self-assessment and conduct a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis; share international best practices on grievance redress.	
Field visits and meetings	
Meet with representatives from all administrative and community levels who play a role in the GRM, such as district/field administration and community-level grievance committees. (See appendix D for list of suggested questions.)	
Meet with other relevant PIU teams, such as the information technology team in charge of the management information system, the monitoring and evaluation team, and the communications team (see appendix D); review available and relevant GRM logs.	
Meet with actual and potential complainants (see appendix E for list of indicative questions); collect examples of actual cases.	
Encourage the PIU GRM counterpart to begin developing possible activities for inclusion in the GRM action plan.	
Ask the GRM counterpart to submit project-level grievance data in reporting format (see appendix G).	
Consolidate findings and observations from meetings and field visits into a presentation for sharing in wrap-up workshop; identify existing gaps in GRM implementation and summarize them in the presentation.	



2. OVERVIEW OF ACTIVITIES BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER A TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE MISSION

Final day

Organize a wrap-up workshop with PIUs to validate the preliminary GRM assessment findings, and invite PIUs to generate and present a GRM strengthening action plan. (See appendix F for an action plan template.)	
Encourage the PIU GRM counterpart to present the GRM strengthening action plan to PIU management.	
Hold wrap-up meetings to debrief relevant World Bank team members on the GRM assessment mission.	
Agree on follow-up dates and a potential follow-up mission, as needed.	

After the mission

Immediately

Finalize the GRM assessment.	
Provide inputs and recommendations based on the assessment's findings for inclusion in aide-mémoire, implementation status and results reports, mid-term reviews, and project restructuring papers.	
Organize a follow-up videoconference with the social development specialist, as needed.	

Every two to three months

Organize follow-up videoconferences with PIUs, as needed.	
Request regular reporting on GRMs.	
Request spot checking to evaluate the functionality of the GRM.	

a. If, due to external circumstances such as the COVID-19 pandemic, field visits are not possible, teams may consider conducting some meetings and interviews with GRM actors remotely using online communication tools or organizing in-person interactions in settings that guarantee the safety of participants (e.g., small group meetings in open spaces with protective personal equipment, respecting all sanitary and epidemiological safety guidelines).

GRM = grievance redress mechanism; MIS = management information system; PIU = project implementation unit.

Appendixes



The appendixes presented in this section comprise a set of easy-to-use tools for assessing a project-level grievance redress mechanism (GRM) using a human-rights-based approach. Appendix A provides guidance on how to conduct a desk review of a given project-level GRM. Appendix B is a suggested self-assessment checklist that can be filled out by relevant Project Implementation Unit (PIU) staff. Appendix C proposes sample agendas for GRM mission launches and

validation/action planning workshops with PIUs. Appendixes D and E list indicative questions that can be used during GRM assessment field visits, whether with stakeholders from national and subnational PIUs or actual and potential GRM users. Appendix F is a template of a GRM strengthening action plan. Finally, Appendix G proposes a standardized way to report project-level grievance data.

Appendix A. Grievance Redress Mechanism Desk Review Worksheet

Objective

A pre-mission grievance redress mechanism (GRM) desk review compiles information on the project-level GRM, first to determine if one has in fact been established, and then to assess its functionality and effectiveness. This exercise can identify information gaps to address during the mission; inform discussions with project implementation unit (PIU) staff; and generate ideas for improving the GRM that can be discussed in detail with PIU staff.

Methodology

The GRM desk review should be prepared by the project's social development specialist. A worksheet (see below) can aid in compiling information from the following documents: project appraisal document (and project restructuring paper if applicable), project operations manual, implementation status and results reports, aide-mémoires, and mid-term reviews. For projects applying World Bank Safeguards Policies or Environmental and Social Standards, the following additional documents should be reviewed: Environmental and Social Management Framework, Environmental and Social Management Plans, Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, Resettlement Policy Framework, Resettlement Action Plan, Indigenous Peoples Development Framework, Indigenous Peoples Development Plan, Environmental and Social Commitment Plan, and Stakeholder Engagement Plan.



Desk Review Sample Worksheet

I. Project information

Name of project, including any additional financing (and project number)	Example: Project name (P000000)
Country	
Project implementation unit	
Task team leader(s)	
Lead global practice(s)	
Social development specialist/consultant(s)	
Effectiveness	
Closing date/revised closing date	
Project development objective	
Summary of project components (\$)	<i>Example:</i> Component 1: Description (Cost \$xx M). Component 2: Description (Cost \$xx M). Component 3: Description (Cost \$xx M).
Relevant safeguard policies and Environmental and Social Framework standards	

II. References to GRM in safeguard instruments, plans, and other project documents

(e.g., project appraisal document, project operations manual, implementation status and results reports, aide-mémoires, and mid-term reports)

Instruments/plans (date or sequence)	Description

Note: Since 2018, World Bank task teams have been required to answer three questions in internal semiannual project implementation status reports: (1) Is there a GM in place? (2) Is the GM accessible? (3) Is there evidence that the GM is receiving and resolving complaints? Reviewing the answers to these questions can serve as a useful starting point.

III. References to GRM in project documentation

(in chronological order)

Name of document (date)	Description

IV. Information gaps and questions about the GRM

V. Initial recommendations to improve the GRM

(based on desk review findings)



Appendix B. Checklist for Self-Assessment of Grievance Redress Mechanism

Prior to or on the first day of a mission, the World Bank team should ask relevant project implementation unit (PIU) staff to complete and return the following checklist, which should then be shared with the project's task team leader and social development specialist.*

A. Systems issues

1. Does the project invite feedback and grievances?
 Yes No
2. Does the organization have a written grievance redress policy?
 Yes No
(If yes, please provide.)
3. Does the grievance redress mechanism have the following features:
 - a. A comprehensive definition of all types of feedback that can be received?
 Yes No
 - b. A clear and understandable procedure for providing feedback and/or submitting a grievance?
 Yes No
 - c. A statement about who is responsible for dealing with feedback and grievances?
 Yes No
 - d. Procedures for investigating and resolving grievances depending on their seriousness and complexity?
 Yes No
 - e. A system for keeping complainants informed through status updates?
 Yes No
 - f. A system for recording feedback, grievances, and outcomes?
 Yes No
 - g. Procedures for protecting the confidentiality of complainants?
 Yes No

- h. Procedures for handling anonymous complaints?
 Yes No
- i. Procedures for handling allegations of gender-based violence, sexual exploitation and abuse, and sexual harassment?
 Yes No

B. System and staff management

4. Is effective grievance redress supported by statements from project leadership?
 Yes No
5. Is a senior manager responsible for the operation of the grievance mechanism?
 Yes No
6. Is there a grievance manual for staff?
 Yes No
7. Are the grievance policy and procedures communicated to all staff?
 Yes No
8. Are financial resources allocated to the grievance mechanism adequate for its effective functioning?
 Yes No
9. Is there adequate staff—in terms of numbers and competence—with assigned roles for grievance resolution?
 Yes No
10. Do frontline staff have specific instructions on how to handle or refer grievances?
 Yes No
11. Does the organization provide staff training on grievance management?
 Yes No

*This checklist closely follows the Environmental and Social Framework GRM checklist with a few adaptations.



- 12. Is an internal review conducted when a complainant is dissatisfied with the organization's initial response?
 Yes No
- 13. Are reviews carried out by an officer who is more senior than the original case officer?
 Yes No

C. Communication to grievance mechanism users

- 14. Are users informed about how to submit feedback or a grievance?
 Yes No
- 15. Is an informational brochure on the grievance mechanism available to users?
 Yes No
- 16. Are feedback/grievance forms available to users?
 Yes No
- 17. Are grievance forms or signs prominently displayed and readily accessible?
 Yes No
- 18. Is there an available and advertised feedback/grievance hotline or toll-free number?
 Yes No
- 19. Are the contact details of staff who receive feedback and grievances published and publicly displayed?
 Yes No
- 20. Does the organization's website include information on grievance management?
 Yes No
- 21. Is information on grievance management available in local languages?
 Yes No
- 22. Is information on grievance management available to people who are unable to read and write?
 Yes No

- 23. Are users able to submit feedback/grievances:
 - a. Verbally/in-person, such as to a grievance redress mechanism focal point at a physical facility?
 Yes No
 - b. By letter (mail)
 Yes No
 - c. By telephone/hotline?
 Yes No
 - d. By email?
 Yes No
 - e. Via an online form on a website?
 Yes No
 - f. Through a tablet/smartphone application?
 Yes No
 - g. Via social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter)?
 Yes No
 - h. By SMS/text, including WhatsApp?
 Yes No
 - i. Via a grievance box
 Yes No
- 24. Is assistance available to users who need help submitting feedback/grievances?
 Yes No
- 25. Can the grievance mechanism be accessed free of charge?
 Yes No
- 26. Do users have to create a profile or register before submitting an online complaint?
 Yes No
- 27. Are users promised confidentiality?
 Yes No
- 28. Are users informed about whether complaints can be submitted anonymously?
 Yes No
- 29. Are users informed about the appeals process?
 Yes No



D. Recording of feedback and grievances

30. Are all feedback/grievance submissions recorded?
 Yes No
31. Are feedback/grievances submissions logged into a case management system?
 Yes No
32. Are inquiries, suggestions, and recommendations recorded?
 Yes No
33. Are all outcomes and responses to feedback and grievances recorded?
 Yes No

E. Performance standards

34. Are performance standards in place for dealing with feedback/grievances?
 Yes No
35. Is the receipt acknowledged within a stipulated time frame?
 Yes No
36. Are the grievances supposed to be resolved within a stipulated time frame?
 Yes No
37. Are interim or progress reports submitted within a stipulated time frame?
 Yes No
38. Is there a quality control system in place to:
- Check if all grievances have been handled or addressed?
 Yes No
 - Check if all aspects of a grievance have been addressed?
 Yes No
 - Check if all necessary follow-up actions have been taken?
 Yes No
 - Check that underlying problems have been identified and addressed?
 Yes No

F. Analysis and feedback

39. Is someone responsible for identifying grievance trends and underlying causes?
 Yes No
40. Are regular internal reports produced for senior management on feedback and grievances?
 Yes No
41. Is one of the organization's key performance indicators (or project-level results framework) related to grievance resolution?
 Yes No
42. Is there a procedure or mechanism for collecting satisfaction levels and other feedback from complainants upon closure of their cases?
 Yes No
43. Do feedback and grievance reports include data on:
- Number of feedback or grievance submissions received?
 Yes No
 - Compliance with performance standards?
 Yes No
 - Issues raised in feedback and grievances?
 Yes No
 - Trends in feedback and grievances over time?
 Yes No
 - Profiles of complainants (e.g., gender, age, and disability)?
 Yes No
 - Whether or not remedial action was warranted?
 Yes No
 - The actual redress that was provided?
 Yes No
 - Recommendations/strategies to prevent or limit future recurrences?
 Yes No
44. Are reports about feedback and grievances made public periodically?
 Yes No



Appendix C. Sample Agendas for Grievance Redress Mechanism Launch and Validation Workshops with Project Implementation Units

Strengthening the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) for [Project Name]

Example: Draft agenda for Launch Meeting with Project Implementation Units (PIUs)

(half day—Mission Day 1 or 2)

Time	Description
8:00 a.m.–8:30 a.m.	Welcome and Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductory Remarks and Presentation of Context (GRM initiative, program, and mission objectives) • Introduction of Participants
8:30 a.m.–9:30 a.m.	Session 1: What Makes a GRM Effective? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing a Project-level GRM: What, Why, and How? • Guaranteeing the Human Right to Remedy Through Effective GRMs • Q&A
9:30 a.m.–9:45 a.m.	Coffee Break
9:45 a.m.–10:45 a.m.	Session 2: Best Practices for GRMs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best Practice Examples (global and regional) • Dos and Don'ts
10:45 a.m.–12:00 p.m.	Session 3: Group Activity: Assessing the Strengths and Weaknesses of a Project GRM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis of GRMs (building on self-assessment survey filled out prior to the mission) • Report to the Plenary

Strengthening the GRM for [Project Name]

Example: Draft agenda for Validation Workshop and Action Planning

(one day, at the close of the mission)

Note: The following sample agenda assumes that the GRM assessment mission worked with several PIUs to strengthen GRMs across several projects.

Time	Description
9:00 a.m. –09:30 a.m.	Meeting with PIU #1: Presentation of Mission Findings, Gaps, and Good Practices
09:30a.m.–10:00 a.m.	Meeting with PIU #2: Presentation of Mission Findings, Gaps, and Good Practices
10:00 a.m.–10:30 a.m.	Meeting with PIU #3: Presentation of Mission Findings, Gaps, and Good Practices
10:30 a.m.–11:00 a.m.	Coffee Break
11:00 a.m.–11:30 a.m.	Meeting with PIU #4: Presentation of Mission Findings, Gaps, and Good Practices
11:30 a.m.–12:00 p.m.	Meeting with PIU #5: Presentation of Mission Findings, Gaps, and Good Practices
12:00 p.m.–1:00 p.m.	Lunch Break
1:00 p.m.–2:40 p.m.	Plenary Meeting with all PIUs Group Activity: Enhancing GRMs and Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of Action Plan Template (15 minutes) • Development of GRM Action Plans in Small Groups (60 minutes) • Report back to the plenary (5 minutes per group = 25 minutes)
2:40 p.m.–3:00 p.m.	Wrap-Up <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key Takeaways and Next Steps • Closing



Appendix D. List of Indicative Questions for National and Subnational Project Implementation Units and Other Stakeholders During Field Visits

Note: Task teams should select the relevant questions from the following list. Not all questions are applicable or relevant to every project-level grievance redress mechanism (GRM) or context.

Country	
Relevant project(s)	
Name of project implementation unit (PIU)/institution	
Location	
Name, designation, and contact information of respondent	
Date	

Indicative Questions	Findings and Observations	
	National Level	Subnational Level

CROSS-CUTTING

	PIU ^a	Other Stakeholders ^b	PIU ^a	Other Stakeholders ^d
Organizational structure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a GRM manual that specifies systems, processes, procedures, and roles/responsibilities? • Are there clear principles of GRM (e.g., fairness, objectiveness, independence, confidentiality, accessibility, responsiveness, efficiency, proportionality, social inclusion)?^e • Does the GRM have multiple levels/tiers that allow for an escalation or appeal? • Does the GRM have an advisory body/group to ensure that grievance redress outcomes are satisfactory and that the GRM is performing well? • Is there a GRM focal point at the PIU level and/or at each relevant office? If so, how many? • How are grievances about the World Bank-financed project treated if they are channeled through the in-country systems or as a plea to the prime minister's office, to a minister, or to elected officials? • Is there a stipulated resolution timeline? What is the current practice? • How are allegations of gender-based violence, sexual exploitation and abuse, and sexual harassment being handled? 				



	PIU ^a	Other Stakeholders ^b	PIU ^a	Other Stakeholders ^d
<p>Communications and awareness raising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any communication materials (e.g., booklets or posters) available to PIU and frontline GRM staff on grievance resolution processes and procedures? • Are there any communication materials available for the public? What are they? How are they disseminated? Are they provided in local languages? Do they reach people who are unable to read or write? • Are clear timeframes/standards for the various steps of the GRM process (acknowledgment, update, and response) publicly available? • Do nongovernmental organizations and civil society organizations play a role in grievance collection and/or resolution? Do they play a role in communications and awareness raising? • Were there any consultations with project-affected parties/beneficiaries during the GRM design stage on preferred channels for submitting feedback and/or receiving updates on the GRM? Did the consultations involve a variety of groups, such as women, youth, and rural/urban populations? 				
<p>Training and peer-to-peer learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is any training available on grievance collection and resolution for staff at all levels? If so, is it mandatory for all PIU members? • Is there a way for PIU GRM focal points and frontline GRM staff to communicate and share information with one another, such as WhatsApp or Facebook? 				
GRM VALUE CHAIN				
<p>Uptake</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the uptake channels for grievances (e.g., website, social media, grievance box, email, telephone, mail, in person, smart phone app)? • How many uptake channel locations are there? If the mechanism is a grievance box, where is it located, who opens it, and how frequently? • How many and what types of grievances are collected? Are grievance data disaggregated by location, gender, age, beneficiary/citizen, and other indicators? • Can a GRM user submit an anonymous complaint? 				
<p>Sorting and processing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is feedback categorized, logged, and prioritized? • To what department are feedback cases referred when they are categorized and prioritized? 				
<p>Acknowledgement and follow up</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do GRM users receive an acknowledgment of their feedback or grievance submission? If so, how? Are users given a case number and information on how to receive updates? • How are GRM users provided progress updates? Do they need to proactively seek them or does the PIU periodically update feedback providers and complainants? • Are GRM users informed of the timeline and process for addressing their feedback? 				



	PIU ^a	Other Stakeholders ^b	PIU ^a	Other Stakeholders ^d
Verification, investigation, and actions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the PIU gather additional information or insights that may be necessary to resolve the issue? • How is feedback resolved? • How is feedback escalated to higher levels at the backend, absent an appeal by a complainant? • Is there a mechanism to verify the resolution and actions taken within the PIU/ agency? 				
Monitoring and evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are grievances documented? Is there a GRM module in the Management Information System or a standalone GRM Management Information System? Is the grievance database paper-, book- or Excel-based? • How are grievances received through various uptake channels and/or collated and reported on at multiple levels? • Does the grievance log accurately reflect the entirety of project-related GRM submissions by affected people, including grievances received verbally or submitted at the local level? • How is feedback tracked by the PIU management? • Are feedback data analyzed and reported? How? How are they used? • Does the PIU management and ministry/agency receive regular reports on trends in feedback receipt and resolution? What indicators are used to report on the GRM's performance and trends? • Is the GRM and citizen feedback part of the PIU meeting agenda? • Is resolution of grievances a key performance indicator for the PIU or agency? 				
Providing responses to GRM users <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are GRM users informed of the action(s) taken in response to their feedback? How? • When responses are provided to GRM users, is there a mechanism for those users to rate or comment on their experiences with the resolution service (i.e., to evaluate the satisfaction of GRM users)? How is this feedback collected? How are these data and information being used? • Is information about the feedback and the action(s) taken in response made available to the public (e.g., in an annual report)? • If anonymous complaints are accepted, how does the PIU/agency communicate about the outcomes and action(s) taken in response to them? • Does the GRM administer a satisfaction survey of complainants to close the feedback loop? 				

GRM = grievance redress mechanism; PIU = project implementation unit.

a. National-level PIU: GRM specialist, social and environmental safeguards specialists, monitoring and evaluation specialist, communications specialist, management information system specialist, procurement specialist

b. Other national stakeholders: Relevant staff from the same agency/ministry, relevant staff from other agencies/ministries, third-party monitors, ombudsman, anticorruption commission, NGOs, gender-based violence service providers, media

c. Subnational-level PIU: Field coordinators, GRM specialists, monitoring and evaluation focal points, management information system specialists, community liaisons, grievance committee members

d. Other subnational stakeholders: Laborers, contractors, community monitors, NGOs, gender-based violence service providers, media

e. For a more specific breakdown of the implications of each of these principles for the functioning of a GRM, see Post and Agarwal 2011.



Appendix E. List of Indicative Questions for Actual and Potential GRM Users for Field Visits

Note: Task teams should select the relevant questions from the following list. Not all questions are applicable or relevant to every project-level grievance redress mechanism (GRM) or context. Ideally, different categories of users should be consulted to investigate whether the GRM matches the preferences of the various segments of project-affected parties (such as women, youth, and people with disabilities).

Country	
Relevant project(s)	
Name of respondent	
Name of locality	
Visitation date	

Areas	Indicative Questions	
	Actual GRM Users	Potential GRM Users
Cross-cutting		
Communications and awareness raising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did you learn about the project-level GRM? • When you submitted your feedback to the project's GRM, did you use any other GRM in parallel? <p>If yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you share information on the other GRM? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are you aware of the project/program GRM? <p>If yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did you learn about it? • If you had a question, complaint, or suggestion for the project, would you use: (1) the project's GRM; (2) another GRM (please specify); (3) both; or (4) none? <p>If yes to (2) or (4):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are your concerns about this GRM? <p>If no:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What would have been a useful source of information for you to know about this GRM?
GRM value chain		
Uptake	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did you provide feedback? Was it easy for you to access the GRM? Did you need to pay for something to submit feedback? (e.g., cost of call, transportation to travel) Or ask someone to facilitate the process? • In case you used a complaint/grievance/feedback form, was it easy to fill it out? Did someone help you prepare the form? • If you submitted a complaint in person or over the telephone, did you feel that you are treated with respect? • What is your preferred method of grievance submission? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you know what channels you can use to provide feedback through this GRM? • Do you know what type of feedback you can provide?



Areas	Indicative Questions	
	Actual GRM Users	Potential GRM Users
Verification, investigation, and action	<p>Were you asked to submit additional information and documents?</p> <p>Were you provided with an explanation of why additional information and documents are needed? Was it easy to submit them?</p> <p>How did you submit them?</p> <p>Did you need to travel to submit documents or pay for a service (e.g., fax, scanning, the internet connection)?</p>	
Monitoring and evaluation	<p>Were you asked to provide feedback on your experience using the project-level GRM? How?</p> <p>As a result of your feedback, have there been any changes in the project team's actions or policies so that similar experience would be less likely to occur? Can you share examples?</p>	
Responding to the GRM user	<p>Were you informed of the result(s) and any actions taken? How did you learn about it?</p> <p>How long did it take for the feedback to be resolved?</p> <p>Were you informed about the appeal process in case you were not satisfied with the outcome of the resolution?</p> <p>Did you decide to appeal? If not, why (Were you satisfied with the resolution outcomes and/or processes, or was there something else)? If you decided to appeal, how was your experience?</p> <p>Are you aware of any retaliation against people who have complained before?</p>	<p>Are you aware of how GRM users are informed about the resolution? Do you talk about feedback at community meetings?</p> <p>Are you aware of how many feedback cases have been collected and resolved?</p> <p>Are you aware that there is an appeals process for those dissatisfied with the outcome or the process of grievance resolution?</p> <p>Are you aware of any retaliation against people who have previously complained?</p>



Appendix F. Worksheet/Template for GRM Strengthening Action Plan (with Illustrative Activities)

Country	
Project Implementation Unit (PIU)/project name	
Project effectiveness and closing dates	
Name and contact of PIU head	
Name and contact of PIU grievance redress mechanism (GRM) focal person	

GRM Area	Proposed Actions	Responsible Person and Contact Details (name, position, email)	Additional Human Resources Required (if any)	Allocated Budget	Budget Required (if any)	Timeframe (Completion Date)	Status ✓ completed → in progress X not completed	Comments
----------	------------------	--	--	------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------	---	----------

Cross-cutting

Organizational structure	1. Appoint GRM focal point at headquarters.							
	2. Appoint committee at municipal level per the Resettlement Action Plan or GRM operations manual.							
	3. Develop a GRM manual (standalone or as part of the operations manual) with clear processes and procedures.							
	4. Generate resolution processes and stipulate resolution timelines for various types of complaints.							
	5. Institute an additional level of appeal for dissatisfied complainants.							
	6. Coordinate with the public relations/communications department and utilize their outreach channels.							
	7. Other (specify):							



GRM Area	Proposed Actions	Responsible Person and Contact Details (name, position, email)	Additional Human Resources Required (if any)	Allocated Budget	Budget Required (if any)	Timeframe (Completion Date)	Status ✓ completed → in progress x not completed	Comments
Communication and awareness raising	1. Produce GRM communication materials in line with project-affected people's preferred communication channels.							
	2. Disseminate GRM communication materials (specify location and frequency).							
	3. Integrate information about GRM in training materials for project staff.							
	4. Integrate GRM information into project communication materials intended to raise awareness in communities as well as on the website.							
	5. Circulate hard copies of GRM communication materials, including the grievance receipt form (along with the Resettlement Action Plan and Environmental and Social Management Plan) during consultations.							
	6. Arrange for periodic awareness-raising sessions for senior management and other headquarters staff (legal and operations), as needed.							
	7. Other (specify):							
Training and peer-to-peer learning	1. Develop easy-to-understand GRM communication materials (e.g., handbook, booklet, posters) for GRM staff.							
	2. Carry out onboarding and refresher trainings for all GRM focal points at headquarters and at other relevant local levels (e.g., regional and municipal).							
	3. Integrate an information session on GRM into the PIU/project staff training and into a management meeting.							
	4. Other (specify):							



APPENDIXES

GRM Area	Proposed Actions	Responsible Person and Contact Details (name, position, email)	Additional Human Resources Required (if any)	Allocated Budget	Budget Required (if any)	Timeframe (Completion Date)	Status ✓ completed → in progress x not completed	Comments
Gender-based violence, sexual exploitation and abuse, and sexual harassment	1. Assign a GBV focal person in the PIU.							
	2. Develop a clear policy on how to handle allegations of GBV and SEA/SH; refer survivors to relevant service providers and notify the World Bank.							
	3. Conduct GBV training and/or information session for relevant PIU staff.							
	4. Include a GBV module in worker trainings on the code of conduct and in awareness-raising campaigns in communities.							
	5. Other (specify):							
Labor and staff-related issues	1. Clarify how the project addresses staff grievances in the operations manual or other document.							
	2. Specify how the contractor will address grievances received from workers.							
	3. Other (specify):							
GRM value chain								
Uptake	1. Identify complaint uptake locations that project-affected people would feel most comfortable using.							
	2. Widen the range of complaint uptake channels (e.g., create dedicated hotline and email address).							
	3. Design or improve complaint-receipt forms.							
	4. Other (specify):							



GRM Area	Proposed Actions	Responsible Person and Contact Details (name, position, email)	Additional Human Resources Required (if any)	Allocated Budget	Budget Required (if any)	Timeframe (Completion Date)	Status ✓ completed → in progress ✗ not completed	Comments
Sort and process	1. Create clear sorting and processing procedures from complaint uptake to resolution.							
	2. Develop an escalation mechanism.							
	3. Establish a simple filing/catalog system for complaints.							
	4. Other (specify):							
Acknowledgement and follow up	1. Generate a complaint number and provide it to complainant.							
	2. Issue an acknowledgment of received complaint.							
	3. Inform complainant on the stipulated resolution timeframe and next steps.							
	4. Issue final response to complainant.							
	5. Other (specify):							
Verify, investigate and act	1. Establish an investigation and resolution process at the PIU and local levels with clear procedures and assignments.							
	2. Ensure that the PIU verifies all actions taken.							
	3. Assign a point person (preferably from management) to conduct periodic spot checks on grievances.							
	4. Other (specify):							



APPENDIXES

GRM Area	Proposed Actions	Responsible Person and Contact Details (name, position, email)	Additional Human Resources Required (if any)	Allocated Budget	Budget Required (if any)	Timeframe (Completion Date)	Status ✓ completed → in progress ✗ not completed	Comments
Monitor and evaluate	1. Create, design, or improve the complaints registration database.							
	2. Analyze grievance data (e.g., disaggregated by gender, province/district, vulnerable group, type of complaint, and uptake channel).							
	3. Regularly produce reports on grievance resolution for the PIU and the public (specify frequency and type of report).							
	4. Start discussing the grievance resolution performance and monitoring data at the PIU grievance management committee meetings.							
	5. Other (specify):							
Provide feedback	1. Collect feedback from complainants on their experiences and levels of satisfaction.							
	2. Disclose findings in annual report on grievance redress or include information on progress and challenges related to grievance redress in the organization's annual report to the public.							
	3. Other (specify):							

GBV = gender-based violence; GRM = grievance redress mechanism; PIU = project implementation unit; SEA/SH = sexual exploitation and abuse/sexual harassment.
 Note: This table compiles the most common activities of various action plans. If any of the listed activities do not relate to a given project, they should be omitted.



Appendix G. Suggested Reporting Format for Collecting Project-Level Grievance Data

Key project information	Project Name				
	P Number				
	Lead Sector				
	Additional Sector(s), if applicable				
	Country Name				
	Task Team Leader				
	Name(s) of person(s) filling out form				
	Contact details for person filling out form				
	Date of project effectiveness				
	Date of GRM Action Plan Development				
	Date at which this form was filled out				
	Number of months between project effectiveness and GRM Action Plan Dvt <small>(calculated automatically)</small>	#VALUE!			
	Number of months between GRM Action Plan Dvt and today <small>(calculated automatically)</small>	#VALUE!			
		Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	
	Reporting indicators	From project effectiveness to AP development	3 months after AP development (+ 90 days)	6 months after AP development (+ 120 days)	Notes or Comments from individual(s) completing worksheet
Volume of grievances					
1	Number of grievances brought forward/carried over from previous period	0	0	0	
2	Number of grievances received during reporting phase				
3	Number of grievances resolved				
4	Number of grievances pending for more than 30 days				
5	Average number of grievances received per month	#VALUE!	0.0	0.0	
6	Percentage of grievances resolved	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	
Responsiveness of GRM					
7	Average number of days between complaint receipt and complaint acknowledgment				
8	Average number of days between complaint receipt and complaint resolution				
Data analysis about complaints					
9	Data about complainants can be analyzed by: gender				
10	Data about complainants can be analyzed by: location; urban/rural				
11	Data about complainants can be analyzed by: age				
12	Data about complainants can be analyzed by: employment				
13	Data about complainants can be analyzed by: disability				
Closing the feedback loop					
14	Is a satisfaction survey being administered with complainants?				
15	Percentage of complainants satisfied with resolution				

Legend:
Cells with a yellow background color need to be filled out. Kindly indicate the data requested.
Cells with an orange background color have a drop-down menu option: please select "yes" or "no".
Cells with a grey background color are pre-populated and automatically calculated. You don't need to fill these out.

Note: This table provides an example of how grievance data can be reported. An excel-based reporting format is also available. Kindly send an email to Sanjay Agarwal (sagarwal2@worldbank.org) to request it, if needed.



© 2022 International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank
1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433
202-473-1000 | www.worldbank.org

Some rights reserved.

The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this work do not necessarily reflect the views of The World Bank, its Board of Executive Directors, or the governments they represent. The World Bank does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this work. Nothing herein shall constitute or be considered to be a limitation upon or waiver of the privileges and immunities of The World Bank, all of which are specifically reserved.

Rights and Permissions

The material in this work is subject to copyright. Because the World Bank encourages dissemination of its knowledge, this work may be reproduced, in whole or in part, for noncommercial purposes as long as full attribution to this work is given. Any queries on rights and licenses, including subsidiary rights, should be addressed to World Bank Publications, World Bank Group, 1818 H Street, Washington, DC 20433, USA; fax 202-522-2625; email: pubrights@worldbank.org.