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The World Bank Group’s Ombuds Services (OMB) office has three major functions:

1. To help staff and managers resolve workplace problems
2. To alert management to trends and issues that should be addressed to improve the working environment and make recommendations for change in policy or practice
3. To administer the Respectful Workplace Advisors (RWA) Program

Key Characteristics

Confidential
Under Staff Rule 9.02 and the office’s professional standards, communications with Ombuds Services are private and absolutely confidential. An Ombudsman does not divulge any information told to him or her that might reveal a staff member’s identity, unless authorized by the staff member (except if there appears to be imminent risk of serious harm). It is a safe place for staff to discuss any conflict, concern or dispute outside formal communication channels, without fear of retaliation.

Impartial
An Ombudsman is impartial and does not serve as an advocate for a particular point of view or for any of the parties involved. The office strives for solutions that are consistent with fairness and respectful treatment.

Independent
Ombuds Services is not part of the formal organizational structure. Each Ombudsman is appointed by the President on the advice of staff selected by the Staff Association. An Ombudsman is not subject to annual performance reviews, receives a nominal salary increase, serves a five-year term which may be renewed one time and may not accept a position elsewhere in the World Bank Group for a period of two years after completing their term.

Informal
Ombuds Services is focused on problem-solving and encourages informal resolution of problems at the lowest level possible in a way that minimizes harm to relationships. Contacting Ombuds Services is not the same as reporting an issue to the organization and does not place the WBG “on notice”. The office does not register complaints, perform investigations, or keep formal records for the Bank Group, but an Ombudsman can provide advice about the Bank Group’s formal grievance system.

How Can We Help?
The office’s objective is to facilitate resolution to workplace issues. An Ombudsman does not make decisions or mandate actions, and the staff member remains in full control of any actions that would be specific to him/her.

An Ombudsman can:
• Hold confidential discussions to listen to staff’s concerns or inquiries
• Analyze the facts of a given situation and provide an impartial perspective on the issue(s)
• Help identify and evaluate options for the staff to consider
• Help staff decide which option makes the most sense
• Provide advice on how to implement the selected option(s)
• Coach staff on how to deal with the problem directly
• Provide informal intervention, only if requested by staff
• Provide information on policies and procedures
• Explain other available resources and refer staff to other units in the WBG that may help

Contacts:
Internal Web Page: http://ombudsman
Internal Email: Ombudsman@worldbank.org
External Email: wbombresearch@gmail.com
Appointments: Call 202-458-1056 (collect calls accepted)

An Ombudsman can call staff at home, at night or during the weekend, providing added assurance of confidentiality and privacy. Offsite visits are also possible.

Ombudsman: Thomas Zgambo 202-473-3043
Ombudsman: Constance Bernard 202-458-5175
Ombudsman: David Talbot 66-2-686-8338

All categories of current and former WBG staff and consultants—including those from International Finance Corporation (IFC), Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA), Global Environment Facility (GEF) and International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID)—are welcome to consult OMB regarding any work related issue.
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OMBUDS SERVICES

Trends in Caseload and Visitor Characteristics. The Ombuds Services (OMB) had the highest caseload in its history in FY12 with 608 new visitors to the office, a 26 percent increase over the previous year. Although the reasons for the increase are not obvious, it may reflect a growing awareness of the service through outreach efforts and word-of-mouth recommendations. As in the past, staff based outside of Washington, DC, men, short-term consultants and temporaries (STC/STT), GA-GD staff, and International Finance Corporation (IFC) staff continue to be more underrepresented groups. However, significant increases in usage can be seen for country-based staff and STC/STTs in FY12, probably reflecting the increased outreach efforts. The office has recruited a third ombudsman, David Talbot, who moved to Bangkok this year to increase availability to country-based staff. The increased caseload has presented challenges to maintaining high standards for responsiveness and service while being frequently present in World Bank Group (WBG) offices outside of HQ.

Frequently Raised Issues. In FY12, as in the past, the single most frequently raised issue by OMB visitors was related to human resources (HR) processes (not necessarily those managed by HR offices). Concerns around performance evaluation are consistently raised. This is not surprising, because performance evaluation is inherently sensitive. Nevertheless, there are some behaviors that lead staff to distrust the process. These include long gaps in communication from supervisors, lack of clear feedback, and lack of specific suggestions on how to improve performance. The current system of confidential feedback from higher ups and peers may create distrust and can undermine teams; it may be helpful for the institution to consider the pros and cons of confidential feedback for peers and more senior colleagues. The practice of using management team meetings to determine relative performance and salary review increases (SRIs), while well-intended, is also a source of distrust. There is the perception that they lack objectivity because of power differences within the group, the natural desire of managers to advocate for their own staff, differing levels of familiarity with individual performance, and unclear criteria for measuring contributions. Some visitors have also complained about decisions being made at management meetings regarding performance before the feedback process has been completed.

The second most frequently raised issue is problems with management skills and behavior. This category represents many different perceptions and conflicts that staff have with their managers but seems primarily to encompass the following broad areas: (1) career development, (2) communication/transparency, (3) equity of treatment, (4) respectful treatment, (5) supervisory effectiveness, and (6) trust/integrity.

The Changing Institution

HR Reform. The IFC has undertaken some major improvements in HR management, devoting greatly increased resources to management training, including for untagged managers, with increased focus on people skills and performance management. In the Bank, HR has initiated a radical reorganization with an ambitious set of time-bound commitments for FY13. These include review and modernization of the entire compensation system; development of a medium-term corporate mobility strategy and work planning process; and revision and streamlining of the recruitment process, among others. HR also plans to establish a Leadership Foundation with the aim of strengthening the skills of current and future
Bank leaders and improving managerial effectiveness. These developments in HR, if successful, will help address many of the common concerns raised by visitors to the OMB office.

**Mainstreaming Bank Values.** The WBG has a robust set of values that have been institutionalized through mandatory ethics training over the past years. Nevertheless, many staff are cynical about the WBG’s commitment to high standards for ethics and behavior. The cynicism may in part reflect that this training has been promoted primarily by the Office of Ethics and Business Conduct (EBC) but has not been strongly and visibly supported by the highest level of management. In addition, some senior managers have been perceived as acting inconsistently in terms of Bank values without repercussions. Finally, some Bank practices give the appearance of indifference to these values. Recently, the president has announced his support for reaffirming, clarifying, and integrating Bank values more fully into the institution’s culture—a critically important initiative for the institution.

**Some Areas for Attention**

**Short-term Consultants.** These are widely used in the institution. Some report being treated unfairly by supervisors: for example, being asked to work without pay. Some mention that others have taken credit for their intellectual contributions. Most of the STCs with such concerns are relatively new in the job market and feel vulnerable because of concerns about career development and future employment, which make them reluctant to complain. It would be helpful if current HR reform efforts could take a look at the role and treatment of STCs.

Increased budget pressures appear to have led to pressure on re-entry guarantees after country-based assignments, external service, or leave without pay. Some staff have had difficulty—the Bank needs to clarify in simple language exactly what commitment is implied when a re-entry guarantee is used.

**Reinstatement of Staff after Absence.** When staff return to work after sick or disability leave, they occasionally have difficulty being reintegrated. It may be helpful to track their situation to maximize their contribution to the institution and to minimize damage to their career.

**Staff Working in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States (FCS).** It may be worth considering special arrangements to maximize use of the Bank’s best international staff and to promote the development of locally recruited staff. Senior management has already had discussions with FCS staff and is looking at various proposals in this area. Some specific areas of focus include the following:

1. More active career path management for FCS staff
2. Use of hub locations to enable a diversified work program and to permit more family-friendly living arrangements
3. Training for Internationally Recruited Staff IRS on cultural and historical issues
4. Greater use of scholarship, training, and development assignments DAIS programs for promising Locally Recruited Staff LRS staff in FCS
5. Review resettlement and rehabilitation (R&R) benefits for IRS

**Visitor Evaluations of OMB services**

In order to monitor its performance and continue to improve the services it provides, OMB uses an anonymous exit survey to gather feedback from visitors. In FY12, OMB received 118 responses (out of 628 exit surveys sent) rating performance on process objectives (confidentiality, impartiality, knowledge, respectful treatment, and so forth) and the utility of consulting the office. Feedback on process objectives remains positive with a 92 percent average positive response rate. Positive response rates on the utility of the office and whether visitors would consult OMB again or recommend it to others were at 74 percent and 83 percent, respectively.
RESPECTFUL WORKPLACE ADVISORS (RWA) PROGRAM

The number of RWA contacts increased by about 9 percent in FY12 reaching 564. The majority of RWA contacts (82 percent) are country office staff. Women, Part II staff and grade GA-GD staff are overrepresented groups among RWA contacts. Forty-three percent of issues raised by staff who consulted RWAs in FY12 involved respectful workplace issues, while about one quarter of issues (23 percent) involved HR process issues. As per previous tendencies, for CO-based visitors the most frequently raised issue was interpersonal conflicts, while for Washington-based staff it was management skills and behavior.

Nominations for new RWAs were conducted in the Africa, East Asia and Pacific (EAP), and South Asia (SAR) regions in FY12, followed by six training sessions held in Dakar, Nairobi, Washington and Bangkok. The increase in number of RWAs in FY12 reflects a 9 percent increase—from 191 to 204. Fifty-six new RWAs attended the Basic training and 41 RWAs attended the required mid-term training. The RWA training team continues to receive a very positive overall rating of 4.88, compared to the Bank Group 2010’s training evaluation overall average rating of 4.22.

This year, the RWA Program achieved many objectives. One of them is the publication of the RWA News & Views, Volume 8 newsletter and book review. In addition, the Case of the Month retains popularity among RWAs and IJS Staff alike, and the RWAs are recording issues at a 12 percent increase rate partly due to a better system and systemic follow-ups from the RWA team. If FY12 alone, RWAs have made 529 referrals to IJS and other services strengthening their critical local resource status. In addition, 46 RWAs from 38 countries participated in the IJS Day global outreach with attendance by an estimated 1,140 local staff members. RWAs are also increasingly included in new staff orientation in their location.

The report also highlighted the value added of the program, including serving as an initial point of contact and gateway to the Internal Justice System (IJS) and the function of the RWA to meet with the Vice President/Country Director/Country Manager (VP/CD/CM) to discuss general issue trends in the office.

An independent evaluation of the RWA program was completed in FY12 and concluded positive findings and identified a number of recommendations to improve the program. The RWA Program was found most helpful in country offices as the program has particular local relevance for local staff. Some of the recommendations include more visibility for management support of the program and the need to increase the program’s engagement with HR staff to improve awareness for this group, as well as find a way of communicating the program’s benefits to staff and the organization.
SECTION 1: OMBUDS SERVICES
Ombuds Services (omb) operates according to the International Ombudsman Association (IOA) code of conduct and standards of practice.1

To promote consistency with other World Bank Group (WBG) reports, the Conflict Resolution System (CRS) made the decision in January 2012 to change from a calendar year (CY) to a fiscal year (FY) reporting cycle. This report therefore covers the 12-month period July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012. Data comparisons in this report refer to fiscal years unless otherwise indicated.2

OMB Caseload

In FY12, 608 new visitors reached out to OMB—the highest caseload in OMB3 history (see graph 1). This represents a 26 percent increase over FY11 and a 63 percent increase compared to an annual average of approximately 374 visitors between FY08 and FY11. Possible explanations for the increase include greater awareness of OMB’s role and increased accessibility and outreach with a third ombudsman on board. Total staff remained roughly constant during this period, making this challenging year with a decreasing real budget and increasing workload. While some categories of staff increased proportionately relative to the overall increase seen in OMB visitors, significant increases can be seen among country office (CO) staff and short-term consultants/short-term temporaries (STC/STTs) (see table 1).

With the third ombudsman, David Talbot, on board effective September 2011, OMB hopes to broaden its reach to country offices and to reduce the many challenges associated with global communication. Each ombudsman takes several trips each year to explain the role and services of the Internal Justice System (IJS) to WBG4 country office staff and to afford staff an opportunity to meet personally with an ombudsman. Currently, EAP has the highest percentage of Bank5 staff based in the country offices at 75 percent, followed by SAR at 70 percent and AFR at 66 percent. In FY12 approximately 25 percent of cases were the result of the ombudsman’s mission travel to 28 countries—a testament to the importance

1 Ombudsman is both a singular and plural term of Swedish origin. “Man” refers to the responsibility to serve “the people” and does not signify singular/plural or gender.
2 Previous reporting cycle refers to the last annual report produced by OMB on a calendar year basis, which was CY2010.
3 “Visitor” is the term used by organizational ombuds offices to describe those who consult the service.
4 WBG refers to the World Bank Group which includes IBRD, IDA, IFC, ICSID, and MIGA.
5 Bank refers to IBRD and IDA.
of having a physical presence in the field. Talbot relocated to Bangkok in August 2012 and will be conducting more frequent regional travel in the future.

An ombudsman may intervene when explicitly requested to do so by a visitor, if the ombudsman agrees that intervention is appropriate. The most frequent type of intervention is when an ombudsman speaks to a visitor’s manager, followed by ombudsman communication with HR. The number of ombudsman interventions decreased this year to 191 or about 31 percent of cases—compared to 201 interventions or about 42 percent of cases in FY11 (see table 2). It is not clear whether the decrease in interventions indicate a trend such as greater reliance on coaching of staff to resolve issues, and the office will continue to monitor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Change in OMB Utilization from FY11 to FY12 by Demographic Category*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Offices</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-GD</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE+</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa/Caribbean (SSA/CR)</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non SSA/CR</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-ended</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term**</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Term</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC/SIT [40+ days]</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regions</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks and Other Operational Units</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Administrative, and Corporate Units (FAC)***</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFC</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The 2011 and 2012 values represent the ratio of the percentage of OMB visitors in each category to the percentage of WBG staff. A ratio of 1 indicates that the percentage of OMB visitors in a particular group is equal to the percent that group represents among all WBG staff. Groups with a ratio greater than 1 are overrepresented; groups with a ratio of less than 1 are underrepresented.
** Includes coterminous staff.
*** Includes Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA) and Global Environment Facility (GEF) staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Ombudsman Interventions by Referring Entity, FY11–12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>FY12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity Vice Presidency (INT)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Services</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Conflict Resolution System (CRS) Services</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Involved</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and Work Stress Counseling Unit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Association</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Graph 2** Characteristics of New OMB Visitors Compared to WBG Staff, FY12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Ratio of OMB% to WBG%*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington-based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-GD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA/CR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SSA/CR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Shows the ratio of the percentage of OMB visitors in each category to the percentage of WBG staff in each group. A ratio of 1 indicates that the percentage of OMB visitors in a particular group is equal to the percentage that group represents among all WBG staff. Groups with a ratio greater than 1 are overrepresented; groups with a ratio of less than 1 are underrepresented.

**Visitor Characteristics**

The profile of OMB’s new visitors during FY12 (see graph 2) is quite similar to that in FY11. CO-based staff, men, Part II, and GA-GD staff remains underrepresented, though usage increased among each of these groups. A few possible explanations for the increased usage may be greater awareness of OMB services, increased outreach, and increase in WBG staff. Non-SSA/CR staff is another group that continues to be underrepresented, although representation improved slightly in FY12. Differences in usage among gender and grade levels remained about the same as in the previous fiscal year.

Utilization of OMB also varies among staff with different contractual arrangements (see graph 3). As in the past, open-ended/regular staff were significantly overrepresented in FY12. While the remaining appointment types are all underrepresented, STC/STTs usage increased by about half. This increase may reflect that STC/STTs are now better represented in IJS outreach platforms and are more aware of service eligibility. Utilization by all term-type appointments decreased this year. On the positive side, this may reflect that some 88 percent term contracts were renewed. On the negative, many staff with term contracts feel vulnerable and are reluctant to take actions which they perceive may harm their chances of renewal or conversion. Extended-term (ET) appointment types showed the largest decrease in usage compared to last fiscal year. This could be due to the 6 percent decrease in the number of staff holding this appointment type.

The unit type in which staff work in the World Bank Group may also affect the likelihood of consulting OMB (see graph 4). The percentage of region, network, and Finance, Administration and Corporate (FAC) units was more proportion-
ate this year. Region and FAC usage increased, while network usage decreased. IFC usage increased slightly this year but remains underrepresented overall. OMB usage by IFC CO-based staff accounted for 60 percent of IFC’s total usage (see graph 5), a 20 percent increase from FY11. A potential reason for this rise in country office usage may be a result of greater awareness due to the increased number of IFC RWAs in the country offices.
GRAPH 5  OMB Utilization by Unit Type and Location Compared to WBG Staff, FY12

*Includes Other Operational Units
**Includes MIGA and GEF visitors
OMB Visitor Issues

In line with the increase in visitors in FY12, the number of issues raised by visitors increased by about 32 percent. Similar to FY11, HR process issues were the most frequently raised by both CO-based and Washington-based visitors, accounting for 37 percent of the total. Within this group, performance evaluation stands out as a commonly raised concern. This is likely always to be the case, because performance evaluation is inherently sensitive. Nevertheless, there are some behaviors that lead staff to distrust the process. They include long gaps in communication, lack of feedback, lack of clarity, and lack of specific suggestions on how to improve performance. The current system of confidential feedback from higher-ups and peers creates an arena for distrust and can undermine teams; it may be helpful for the institution to consider the pros and cons of confidential feedback from peers or more senior staff. The practice of using management team meetings to determine relative performance and SRIs, while well-intended, can also be a source of distrust. There is the perception that the meetings lack objectivity because of power differences within the group, the natural desire of managers to advocate for their own staff, differing levels of familiarity with individual performance, and unclear criteria for measuring contributions. It has also been the case in some units that the management review makes determinations of ratings before the feedback process has been completed.

The second most frequently raised issue group was management skills and behaviors at 26 percent. In looking at the types of issues that come up most often in this category, OMB identified six subcategories that would help break up the category and provide a clearer sense of the types of behaviors that are problematic and/or skills that are lacking. The new subcategories are (1) career development, (2) communication/transparency, (3) equity of treatment, (4) respectful treatment, (5) supervisory effectiveness, and (6) trust/integrity. OMB began using these subcategories mid-year and will report next fiscal year when a full year of data is available.

Benefits were a frequently raised issue among CO-based visitors (see table 3). In particular, visitors raised concerns about compensation, loans and advances to staff, and problems with medical insurance.

Notable changes include an 80 percent increase in the overall issues raised by CO-based staff, with the majority of the increase reflecting concerns in management skills and behaviors. The most frequently raised issues for Washington-based staff was management skills and behaviors (25 percent), followed by performance evaluation (11 percent).

The Changing Institution

One of OMB’s mandates is to monitor emerging concerns that may need to be managed to
improve the working environment in the WBG. The three ombudsman periodically meet with the president, IFC’s executive vice president, managing directors, Bank and IFC HR management teams, and other senior managers to discuss such concerns.

This section highlights a few patterns and developments that have been apparent in OMB casework between January 2011 and June 2012 18 months and provides updates on the progress made on past concerns. OMB is not the unique identifier of these issues; the Staff Association, HR, and/or management are working on a number of them.

### Mainstreaming WBG Values

The WBG has a robust set of values, which have been the subject of thorough ethics training for a
number of years. Nevertheless, some staff are cynical about the WBG’s commitment to high standards for ethics and behavior. The cynicism arises in part because in the past training in values and ethics has largely been sponsored by EBC (now vice presidency) but has not been strongly and visibly supported by the highest levels of management. In addition, some senior managers have been perceived as acting inconsistently with WBG values without repercussions. Finally, some WBG practices give the appearance of indifference to these values. Recently, President Kim has announced his support for reaffirming, clarifying, and integrating WBG values more fully into the institution’s culture. This is a critically important initiative for the health of the institution.

Development in HR Management

In IFC, the Human Resources Vice Presidency has taken a number of steps to better link HR management with institutional objectives. Worth mentioning in particular is an expanded and strengthened management training program, which includes untagged managers, and has increased focus on people skills and performance management. The performance management system has been updated to integrate individual objectives with the institution’s business goals, and a mandatory mid-term performance review has been initiated. With the elimination of coterminous contracts and the adoption of a “one IFC” philosophy, earlier tensions between advisory and investment staff seem to have improved.

In the Bank, the HR Vice Presidency has instituted a radical reorganization with an ambitious set of time-bound commitments for FY13. These include, among other things, review and modernization of the Bank’s total compensation system; development of a corporate mobility strategy and work-planning process (which goes beyond the budget year); redesign and streamlining of recruitment process; establishment of a new performance management system that links individual results agreements with the organization’s strategic objectives; and revision of policy and guidelines on the range of Bank appointment types, including term contracts. HR also plans to establish a Leadership Foundation with the aim of strengthening the skills of current and future Bank leaders and improving managerial effectiveness.

These developments in HR management, if successful, will be helpful in addressing some of the common concerns raised by visitors to the OMB office, especially those around performance management, general managerial effectiveness, fairness of compensation, and consistent approaches to contracting. An important area to address which does not seem to be covered by current plans is to make selection and promotion processes within the institution more streamlined and transparent.

Special Issues of Short-Term Consultants (STCs)

The WBG continues to rely heavily on short-term consultants to get its work done. STCs with contracts for over 40 days amounted to 13 percent of total WBG employees in FY12. Current budget practices have contributed to the heavy reliance on STCs; pressure to keep fixed costs at targeted ratios incentivize managers to keep staff as STCs even when they have worked for many years solely for the WBG.

Short-term consultants are underrepresented relative to their numbers among RWA and OMB visitors. This appears to reflect lack of information about the IJS system and reluctance to use it because of the insecure nature of their contracts. Nevertheless, they have raised several persistent concerns over the years. First, many have mentioned situations in which they were pressured to work without compensation. This typically occurs when an STC has maxed out his/her 150 days, but also occurs when a particular funding source has been exhausted. Sometimes an STC is encouraged to continue working after he/she has billed all his contracted days with the understanding that addi-
tional days will be added, only to find that they are not. The practice of pressing STCs for unpaid work unfortunately seems relatively widespread. Many STCs accept this practice in order to maintain good relations with task team leaders (TTLs) and in hopes that their cooperation will increase chances of a more secure contract.

Second, STCs have been the primary source of a few complaints each year about TTLs taking inappropriate credit for their work. In almost every case, the STC has been reluctant to raise an issue because he/she feared that damaging the relationship with the TTL would harm his/her career prospects. A WBG task force looked into the larger issues around authorship and attribution and produced a set of proposed guidelines in FY12; these are attached in annex 3.

Third, many STCs (excluding retirees) do not have access to institutionally supported health insurance. The individual purchase of health insurance for young consultants is prohibitively expensive on a typical salary. OMB wonders whether a basic health insurance program for WBG STCs could be established at a reasonable cost.

Re-entry Guarantees No Longer Guarantee Re-entry

There has been a number of cases in the past fiscal year in which managers have chosen not to honor previously agreed unconditional re-entry guarantees associated with developmental assignments, leave without pay, and external service. Despite the apparently clear meaning of “unconditional re-entry guarantee,” the interpretation of the exact commitment implied is murky, as a number of staff have discovered to their dismay. It would be helpful if HR and management could focus on this issue and clarify the intended use, good practice, and exact commitment implied by re-entry guarantees. Under current processes, staff often feel deceived about the security of their position, which generates mistrust in the institution.

Reinstatement of Staff after Absence on Disability

Usually, staff who have been absent or working on a reduced work schedule because of illness or disability are reabsorbed without difficulty. The OMB office, however, has seen several cases when staff have returned to work after some months of illness only to confront pressure to exit. Flexibility and understanding from managers are needed, especially when workplace accommodations may be required. Staff rules are silent on these situations; it would be helpful if more guidance could be provided to managers and HR staff. It may also be helpful to use a multidisciplinary team (HR, management, and legal) to consider optimal solutions and to monitor an individual’s situation after reinstatement.

Staff Working in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States

In FY12, 33 states were on the WBG fragile and conflict-affected states list. Only 3 percent of WBG staff are physically located in these states; only about 6 percent of WBG staff have residential FCS experience. The working conditions in these states are difficult, and several issues have been raised to OMB regarding treatment and recruitment of local and international staff.

Recruiting the Best International and Local Staff

Many internationally recruited staff share a perception that taking a position in a fragile or conflict-affected state will be damaging to one’s career. Due to the working conditions in these states (corruption, safety concerns, weak institutions, difficult travel, and so forth), it is often hard to get work done. Additionally, the level of the work that is required may appear less sophisticated compared to projects and economic work being done in other country offices. Highly trained staff often find it undesirable to
sacrifice several years in these states because one may have very little to show for the time spent there. They may also fear losing their edge while away from more sophisticated developments in their profession. There may also be other hardships involved that affect an individual and his/her family. Because of these concerns, countries with the greatest need for our best staff sometimes go wanting. A hub approach or more generous R&R policies, which would permit a more diverse work program and a better situation for families, may help address some of these concerns. FCS experience might also be more consistently applied as a criterion for selection to leadership roles.

For locally recruited staff, the competition for the limited supply of educated, well-qualified individuals in FCS is often tough, with international organizations and the private sector competing for the same small group. Greater flexibility in compensation approaches may be required in these situations. In many cases, staff with appropriate education or experience can’t be found. There are a few examples of country managers who have invested in training and mentoring of such staff with positive results in staff performance and office effectiveness. Such investment appears to be the exception rather than the rule. It may be helpful to be as flexible as possible with regard to education and training programs, DAIS opportunities, and so on.

Senior management has already engaged with FCS staff to hear their concerns and to consider proposals in response. In addition, the Bank modernization paper commits Management to take steps to strengthen the FCS model. The Board has also approved measures to enhance LRS staff mobility across country offices, including FCS, through the new benefits package for third country nationals. The OPS office in Nairobi is working to build a stronger community of practice on FCS and to sponsor training and learning events to link FCS staff to global knowledge and experience on how to work effectively in FCS.

In summary, several ideas worth exploring or expanding with regard to staff working in FCS:

1. Create more active career path management for FCS staff
2. Use hub locations to enable a diversified work program and to permit more family-friendly living arrangements
3. Train IRS on cultural and historical issues
4. Make greater use of scholarship, training, and DAIS programs for promising LRS staff in FCS
5. Review R&R benefits for IRS

**Past Issues**

There has been mixed progress on issues raised in previous reports. The status of some of these issues is highlighted in annex 2.
VISITOR EVALUATIONS OF OMB’S SERVICES

Exit Survey Responses

As part of OMB’s efforts to assess and enhance its performance, visitors are asked to provide feedback by anonymously completing a hard-copy or online exit survey once their case is resolved or when they have not come back to the office for some time. To protect visitors’ confidentiality, the survey with the web address is mailed to the individual’s home and not sent through the WBG’s interoffice mail.

In FY12, 628 exit surveys were mailed, with 118 replies received by August 3, 2012—a response rate of 19 percent, down from the previous reporting cycle’s 23 percent. OMB hoped to have received a better percentage of respondents as a result of requesting feedback in a timelier manner. OMB also anticipated that a higher portion of respondents would utilize the web-based survey, in particular, visitors from country offices who in the past would have had to mail the questionnaire at their own expense. While only 18 percent of total respondents provided feedback online, 25 percent of CO respondents used the online survey compared to 17 percent of Washington-based respondents.

To improve response rate, OMB will need to make further adjustments to its exit survey process. Three areas identified to address this issue include enhancing current systems to provide more rigorous and standardized follow-up and case closing monitoring features, refining the design of the survey, and implementing an electronic-based feedback request system to replace the current mail-based format. OMB recently modified the order, language, and length of the questionnaire. This moderately revised version will be used next fiscal year. The remaining two areas are pending additional discussion.

The profile of respondents is more or less consistent with the profile of OMB visitors with one exception—the percentage of OMB visitors with one exception—the percentage of country offices respondents (10 percent) continues to be low compared to the percentage of OMB visitors from country offices (42 percent).

Dimensions of Evaluation and Analysis of Responses

The questionnaire targets two key areas of OMB’s performance: process objectives (confidentiality, impartiality, respectful treatment, and so forth) and the meeting of visitors’ needs. It also gathers data on whether visitors would consult OMB again and whether they would recommend the office to colleagues.

Process Objectives. OMB continues to receive positive responses about its processes, in particular in the areas of treating visitors respectfully, maintaining confidentiality, and being accessible (see table 4). The average percentage of positive responses for FY12 was 92 percent,9 a 6 percent increase compared to the previous reporting period.

One exception to this positive trend was a drop in positive perceptions of ombudsman impartiality from 87 percent to 78 percent. According to the write-in comments, some visitors perceived OMB

9 Most of the exit survey questions use a 5-point scale for responses. Responses of 4 or 5 are considered positive.
to favor management. Some explanations for this perception could be due to a lack of clarity of the ombudsman role by the visitor, unrealistic expectations by the visitor, and partial resolution for the visitor or decisions that are optimal for units but may be less desirable for the visitor at that time. Although the reasons for this change are not evident in the data, it may reflect expectations that the ombudsman will advocate for staff rather than play a neutral role. There are also some commonly held misconceptions that may feed into unrealistic expectations; for example, many staff believe that good performance should automatically be rewarded with promotion. In other cases, a visitor may not be informed of the steps taken to raise their concerns in order to protect the confidentiality of others. These are speculations; OMB will monitor these statistics carefully and also discuss strategies to ensure that OMB staff behave as impartially as possible. While OMB is unable to guarantee any visitor (staff or managers) a desired outcome, OMB can improve its communication in helping visitors better understand its role and how OMB can help.

Meeting Visitors’ Needs. Exit survey respondents were asked about the utility of consulting OMB. The percentage of positive responses increased for both areas: fulfilling the reasons for using OMB increased by 14 percent and providing helpful information or advice increased by 6 percent (see table 5). The ombudsman will continue to explain and educate staff and visitors about the services and how the office operates. OMB hopes that with continuous clarification to visitors on the role of the office it can manage visitors’ expectations and maintain this upward trend.

Respondents were also asked if they experienced any additional benefits from using OMB’s services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Quality of Services Provided by Ombuds Services, FY12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Questions</td>
<td>Percentages of Positive Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the administrative staff in Ombuds Services treat you with respect?</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the ombudsman treat you with respect?</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel that the ombudsman was impartial in the handling of your case?</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the ombudsman maintain appropriate confidentiality?</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the ombudsman appear to be knowledgeable about the issues involved in your situation?</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the advice/information provided to you clear?</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was access to Ombuds Services easy and convenient?</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Ombuds Services clearly explain its role and guiding principles?</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Utility of Consulting Ombuds Services, FY12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Questions</td>
<td>Percentages of Positive Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, did you feel your reasons for going to Ombuds Services were fulfilled?</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the information or advice provided help you decide what you wanted to do about your issue?</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
other than addressing their issues as well as “what worked best in OMB?” Forty-two percent indicated that there were other benefits. Some of the write in comments included:

- Peace of mind
- Feeling supported and understood
- Helped to put issue in perspective
- Gaining insight into WB procedures/policies

Seventy-five percent of respondents provided written feedback on “what worked best”, and the top four responses were as follows:

- Having a safe, impartial place to turn for advice and knowledge on Bank polices
- The confidentiality
- The character of the ombudsman
- The accessibility of the service

This year, 6 percent of the respondents indicated that consulting OMB had negative repercussions for them, a slight decrease from the previous reporting cycle. The most frequent write-in comments providing an explanation of these repercussions included the following:

- Feeling retaliated against
- Feeling that managers expressed displeasure that OMB had been consulted
- Feelings of being alienated

Whether a visitor is likely to consult OMB again or recommend it to others provides a final indication of satisfaction with its services. Visitors continue to be largely positive about using OMB again as well as recommending OMB to others. Table 6 shows that the percentage of positive responses increased this year.

Survey Design

The survey design remained the same as last year’s report. Responses were analyzed by year in which cases closed as well as, separately, according to the year in which they were opened (initial contact with the office). OMB hopes that with more regular feedback responses it will be able to monitor trends more effectively.

Table 6: Likelihood of Consulting Ombuds Services Again or Recommending it to Others – FY12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Percentages of Positive Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last reporting cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you consider using Ombuds Services again?</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you recommend Ombuds Services to others?</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Ombuds Services provided good information on options available, on Bank procedures, and on contacts.”

Staff Member
FY12 OMB Feedback Survey

“Ombudsman is very knowledgeable about conflict issues and available policies and procedures to address issues. That has won my trust and given me confidence to recommend Ombuds Services to others.”

Staff Member
FY12 OMB Feedback Survey
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SECTION 2: THE RESPECTFUL WORKPLACE ADVISORS (RWA) PROGRAM
The Respectful Workplace Advisors (RWA) Program is one of a range of informal services available to staff within the Internal Justice System (IJS) of the World Bank Group (WBG). This program supports the WBG’s commitment to fostering a positive workplace in which all staff can work together with openness and trust, in ways that demonstrate respect and value differences.

The role of the RWA is to provide an informal, confidential, trustworthy, and readily accessible source of early assistance for staff with questions or concerns regarding a respectful workplace or who want information about where to seek assistance. Issues might include interpersonal conflicts, unfair treatment, harassment, disrespectful and unethical behaviors, performance, misconduct, and other workplace stresses. RWAs are expected to brief management on general respectful workplace trends while maintaining strict confidentiality as per Staff Rule 9.02 (see Respectful Workplace Advisors (RWA) Program Terms of Reference, annex 4).

The RWA Program, administered by the Ombuds Services Office (OMB), is an important source of support for staff who face workplace issues, especially in offices outside Washington, DC. RWAs are peer volunteers nominated to a four-year term by their colleagues (see the RWA Program objectives in annex 5).

RWAs do not intervene directly to help resolve issues, as this could affect others’ perceptions of their neutrality as well as working relationships with colleagues and managers (see the RWA Program Standards of Practice in annex 6).

The RWA Program is required in Bank and IFC offices outside Washington, DC, with more than 15 staff members, but participation for Bank vice-presidential units (VPUs) in Washington, DC, is optional. Washington, DC–based IFC units, ICSID, MIGA, and GEF are not currently participating in the program.

*The goal of the RWA is to help staff help themselves by listening and providing problem-solving guidance.*
RWA CASELOAD, VISITOR DEMOGRAPHICS, AND ISSUES

Characteristics of Staff Who Consult RWAs

The number of RWA contacts has continued to increase steadily over the years, with the total number of contacts reaching 564 for FY12: a 9 percent increase over the previous year (see graph 6), and a 142 percent increase over the past four years. One of the reasons for this increase is a concerted effort by the RWA administrative team to reach out to RWAs regularly and more frequently. This also creates stronger support for the RWAs and links their contribution to the organization’s commitment to a respectful workplace. Other explanations for the increase include more outreach by the IJS and the RWAs, the program becoming more established and well known, an increase in the number of RWAs and scope of the program, more support from management and Human Resources for staff to use CRS services, and greater challenges for staff in the institution.

Given that approximately 88 percent of RWAs are located in the country offices, the majority of contacts with RWAs continue to be by staff located in those locations (see graph 7). The number of country office contacts increased for both RWA and OMB, but the percentage of country office visitors remains much higher for RWA (82 percent) than for OMB (38 percent). As in previous years, women were proportionately overrepresented among those who consulted RWAs, consisting of 73 percent of RWA contacts, which is higher than OMB’s contacts of 57 percent. In contrast to the OMB visitor profile, Part II staff and GA-GD staff also continue to be overrepresented groups for RWA contacts. The overrepresentation among Part II is likely due to the fact that 82 percent of country office staff are from Part II countries.

Issue Types Reported to RWAs

Respectful workplace issues—which include issues of interpersonal conflicts, alleged discrimination, alleged harassment, alleged retaliation, and other misconduct—continue to be the most prominent among RWA visitors, with interpersonal conflicts being the single most frequently raised issue for CO-based staff. For Washington, DC-based staff, “management skills and behaviors” is the most frequently cited issue (see table 7). Although there are similarities across the distribution of types of issues compared to last year’s report, there is a significant increase in the Washington, DC–based issue distribution resulting in 30 more issues of managerial skills and behaviors (a 250 percent increase). In addi-

---

GRAPH 6  
RWA Contacts, FY06–12

2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012

97 230 233 325 408 517 564

80 RWAs are asked to record contacts with colleagues about issues brought to their attention. No names or information that could identify a staff member and/or any involved parties is collected, only basic issue and demographic characteristics. See annex 7.
tion, for CO-based staff, a greater number of interpersonal conflicts (a 46 percent increase) are reported this year, as well as concerns about ending employment (a 170 percent increase). It is also interesting to note that number of domestic issues jumped from 6 to 21 in country offices last year, a 250 percent increase. Compared to OMB, the distribution of issues between HR and respectful workplace is vastly different—RWAs were contacted much more frequently (43 percent) about respectful workplace issues than OMB (20 percent) and less frequently about HR process issues (23 percent compared to 37 percent).

A possible explanation for this is that RWAs are seen as being more helpful as a sounding board for relationship-type issues that fall in the respectful workplace category, while OMB may be seen as being more knowledgeable about HR processes, having greater access to HR policy information and resources, and being able to intervene if requested.

Program Updates

**Nominations and Program Scope.** An increase in demand for the RWA Program has been evident in Bank units in Washington, DC, as well as in IFC country offices, resulting in 13 additional RWAs in Bank units in Washington, DC, and 14 additional RWAs in IFC country offices since December 31, 2010. As a result of staff movements in FY12, 17 new RWAs were nominated (see table 8 for FY 12 RWA numbers). Another 37 completed their four-year term or left the organization and were replaced. Based on the increased interest in the RWA Program, it is expected that the program will continue to grow over the next few years.

**Training.** Newly selected RWAs are required to attend a four-day basic training before they can take on the role. Roughly halfway through their four-year term, RWAs are expected to attend a three-day training session. The basic training focuses on the role of the RWA, influence of behaviors on culture and values, WBG policies and procedures; communication and helper skills, conflict dynamics and in-depth information about the IJS, and avenues of assistance for staff. The mid-term training provides more advanced helper skills and knowledge building, but more importantly, a chance for RWAs to share experiences and work on more challenging conflict cases. Both training sessions concentrate on the oppor-
Six training sessions were held in FY12 in Dakar, Nairobi, Washington, DC, and Bangkok (see table 9). A total of 97 RWAs were trained: 56 attended the basic training, and 41 fulfilled the required mid-term training. Five IJS colleagues also attended the basic training sessions. Between FY08 and FY12, the RWA Program has trained 398 RWAs and 15 non-RWAs, an average of 100 participants per year.

Feedback is requested from participants after each training session, and as in previous years,
the training was rated very positively. Participants evaluate the training on key areas of learning using a 1–5 rating scale, where 5 is the most positive response (see table 10).

It is worth noting that the overall rating of all the FY12 face-to-face RWA training averaged 4.89, compared to the 2012 Bank Group training evaluation overall average rating of 4.22.

As seen above in table 10, “identifying WBG policies and procedures” received the lowest ratings. This could be due to the RWAs’ anxiety around their ability to provide expert advice to the staff that consult them. RWAs are not expected to be experts but rather be knowledgeable of where to find support and information. This message is emphasized during training and coaching.

The RWA training team continues to see the benefits of having RWAs take the RWA Basic e-Learning. They are required to get a passing score of 80 percent or higher before attending the basic training. This exercise brings participants to a higher level of engagement, thus allowing the RWA team to go more in depth during the face-to-face training. The RWA team also continues to partner closely with the office of Ethics and Business Conduct, Human Resources, and other services to ensure that the training material is up-to-date and content validated by the experts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>RWAs</th>
<th>non-RWAs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dakar, Senegal</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi, Kenya</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangkok, Thailand</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Evaluation: To what extent did the training help you achieve the following learning objectives?</th>
<th>Dakar Mid-Term N=8</th>
<th>Nairobi Mid-Term N=18</th>
<th>Nairobi Basic N=20</th>
<th>Annapolis Basic N=21</th>
<th>Bangkok Mid-Term N=15</th>
<th>Bangkok Basic N=20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify the role and responsibilities of the RWA</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase awareness of culture and personal values’ influence on behavior</td>
<td>n/a*</td>
<td>n/a*</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase awareness of conflict dynamics and how to deal with them more effectively</td>
<td>n/a*</td>
<td>n/a*</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify WBG policies and procedures on building ethical and respectful work environment</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify people and resources to use to assist someone who believes s/he has been the recipient of disrespectful behaviors</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply specific helping skills to assist a staff member who believes s/he has been the recipient of disrespectful behaviors</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance your conflict resolution skills</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.83</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.78</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.61</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.65</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.60</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate the overall quality of the training</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The training feedback form was updated in November 2012 to add questions on awareness of culture, values, and conflict dynamics.
**Newsletter and Book Review.** Volume 8 of the *RWA Network News and Views* newsletter was published in May 2012. The newsletters keep RWAs, IJS, HR staff, and management abreast of issues and developments and provide information on conflict resolution and resources. The newsletter distribution continues to grow in response to requests—including the Staff Association Counselors—and is being forwarded by RWAs to their colleagues. The book, *Nonviolent Communication: A language of life* by Michael B. Rosenberg, was reviewed and distributed to all RWAs.

**Quality Control.** Given the confidential and informal guidance RWAs provide to staff, monitoring performance in this area is difficult, but there have been a few indications of progress in 2011, and even more in 2012.

First, the number of RWA contacts with the RWA Program Team has greatly increased again this year, putting the team in a better position to provide guidance to RWAs. Coaching from the ombudsman and the RWA Program Team is available and encouraged. The increased utilization of this resource indicates that the RWAs are taking the time to seek help when needed.

Several new initiatives mentioned in last year’s report also provided more training and information to the RWAs. The e-learning course added another layer of training, while the Case and Tip of the Month provides RWAs with ongoing practice and serves as outreach as RWAs forward the monthly quizzes to their colleagues and builds capacity for the organization. RWAs reported that the website material and resources were very useful.

Following the launch of the Activity Form System created in 2010, it has become easier for RWAs to report the types of issues and trends. The RWA Team has been more systematic in encouraging RWAs to submit their activity forms, resulting in a 12 percent submission increase. Given the necessary informality of interactions between RWAs and staff, the issues discussed with RWAs are underreported in the RWAs’ activity forms. Although no identifying information is entered in the activity forms, some RWAs and staff feel that they should not “record” issues. It is important for staff and RWAs to understand that recording issues on which they are consulted does not compromise confidentiality as it is completely anonymous and seen only by OMB. It is important to track the issues in order to be able to work toward solving systemic problems in the organization. Additionally, if the types of issues staff deal with are not known to OMB, addressing and making progress with workplace issues in general will not be possible. The activity forms (see annex 7) help the ombudsman in their discussions with management when reporting on institutional issues in general and are a particularly important source of information for country office management. The information in the activity forms also helps the RWA Program Team design and improve training to better address the real problems staff are facing.

“To me the RWA services are an oasis in the turbulent work environment, since our RWA is someone who is always willing to listen to staff concerns, provides suggestions, and follows up under WBG policy best practice. Our RWA encourages respect in the workplace; she is easily accessible, reliable, neutral, and able to empathize. I think that this is one of the WB internal services that works best at the institutional level. It is a tool that supports the most vulnerable in the workplace.”

Massiel López Martínez,  
IFC Dominican Republic  
Email sent to RWA, August 22, 2012
Value Added/Impact of Program

A number of developments occurred this year that expanded the reach of the RWAs:

Critical Local Resource. RWAs are an essential gateway to the IJS services for staff, particularly in the country offices. Many staff in the country offices feel very distant from Washington, DC (where the majority of conflict resolution resources are housed), may have little or no information on the services, and don’t know where to go with an issue. Having RWAs in their office addresses this need. In FY12, RWAs made 529 referrals to IJS and other services (see graph 8). The number of RWA referrals to other IJS services, HR and management increased from FY 2011 to FY 2012 (graph 9).

RWAs are an integral part of the overall IJS outreach and have increased their outreach efforts. In FY12 alone, they made 194 presentations to staff on respectful workplace behavior and the IJS. In addition, many RWAs share the “RWA Case of the Month” with their colleagues as a way to increase their understanding of the different services.

New Staff Orientation. RWAs are increasingly asked to participate in new staff orientation in their location, where they have an opportunity to talk about their RWA role and the Internal Justice System, as well as other avenues of assistance to resolve workplace issues within the WBG. The RWA Program encourages RWAs to partner with HR and ask to be included in presentation and new staff orientation sessions.

Quarterly Meetings with Management. As noted in previous reports, another important value of the RWA Program is the RWAs’ discussions of issue trends with the head of the office. Many RWAs have cited the ability to bring general issues to their vice president’s, country manager’s, or country/regional directors’ attention as extremely helpful in improving the work environment, particularly since RWAs are limited in their ability to take action on issues. Often times, management is not aware of the issues their staff are experiencing. RWAs’ quarterly briefs with management on systemic issues provide an opportunity for management to address issues that may otherwise not be brought forward by staff directly. These briefs are done without attribution (graph 10).

As part of the overall RWA Program Evaluation process, management was asked to identify how many briefings they received from the local RWAs in a 12-month period: 32 percent of country managers responded that there had been two or more briefings, while 58 percent stated that there were only one or none at all. A concerted effort will be made to understand the reasons for the low compliance as well as to provide RWAs with the needed tools and empower them to have positive and successful interactions with management.

IJS Day. Every year in Washington, DC, an IJS Day is held to raise awareness of the IJS services. The IJS offices distribute informational materials, host interactive games about the services, and have representatives present to answer questions staff members may have. The goal is to keep increasing the participation of country offices and reach out to all staff. The RWAs are an obvious resource for this. For FY12 IJS Day, the country office

---

RWAs were given a toolkit containing three different presentations they could use to encourage staff to participate in the IJS event. On or around November 16, 2011, 46 RWAs from 38 countries were able to set up an event in their own offices, attended by an estimated 1,140 staff members. The IJS and, specifically, OMB will continue to include and encourage all RWAs to take part in this outreach event. The Conflict Resolution Coordinator’s office was able to provide some funds to RWAs to serve refreshments during the event.

**IJS Staff Meeting RWAs on Location.** As the IJS staff from each service visits the country offices, they are increasingly meeting with the RWAs on location and sometimes partner with them in giving presentations to all staff. OMB staff have witnessed this partnership between regional Mediators and local RWAs deliver successful presentations. Additionally, when an ombudsman is travelling to any country, the RWAs are notified of their visits and meet with them one-on-one.

**Positive Workplace E-Learning.** In FY12, the RWA team partnered with the Office of Ethics and Business Conduct (EBC) to create a new e-learning course to strengthen awareness of WBG expectations around respectful workplace conduct, ensure that key groups of staff learn what they can do to foster a positive workplace, provide skills to help staff successfully address and manage inappropriate or unwelcome behavior, and educate staff on relevant WBG resources. EBC and OMB are working together to develop a communication strategy to deploy the e-learning in the near future.
In September 2011 OMB engaged two external evaluators, David Miller and Richard Williams, to conduct an evaluation of the RWA Program. This was the first thorough evaluation of the program since OMB started administering it in 2000. Since then the RWA Program has grown in size and scope. The purpose of the evaluation was to assess progress toward achieving the RWA Program’s objectives, as stated in the program’s terms of reference; provide recommendations to strengthen and to improve the program; raise awareness of the program; and develop a baseline for future evaluations. This was, therefore, a formative evaluation. A draft report of the finding was submitted in March 2012 and the final evaluation report was submitted in June 2012.

**Design and Methodology.** The inputs of the evaluation included a survey to all country office staff in offices with RWA programs—2,047 staff, or 35.4 percent, participated—as well as telephone interviews with 50 randomly selected stakeholders, a 2011 Staff Association survey, WBG 2009 staff survey results, RWA communication and program materials, RWA training evaluation results, and aggregated RWA reported issues since 2006. The survey and the interview questions were tested in focus groups composed of members of IJS, HR colleagues, and RWAs from Washington, DC. Both the online survey and the telephone interview protocols were piloted before they were launched with introductory emails from MDM and OMB, respectively. The evaluation sought to collect and analyze data in the following three categories: (1) Organizational and Program Environment, to determine the level of management support and whether the organization promoted an environment that is respectful and free from retaliation; (2) Program Effects, to determine how the RWA program has benefited staff and the organization and to capture stakeholder satisfaction with the program outcomes; and (3) Program Management and Development, to ascertain how well the program is administered and communicated and how well the program is keeping up with the needs of the organization.

**Findings.** The evaluators concluded the following:

The Respectful Workplace Advisors (RWA) Program, based on the evaluation findings, is an effective, well conceived, well designed, well administered program with some Program elements needing improvement. The Program is a unique workplace alternative dispute resolution program and one formulated to meet the particular needs of the WBG. The Program is fulfilling a vital need within the WBG: it is especially relevant and beneficial for staff located in Country Offices. The Program is basically sound. There are no major problems with the Program and no recommendations for significant change, though there are recommendations for improvement.”

The evaluation results indicate that there is wide support for the program by country office management and HR staff and that staff are encouraged to consult an RWA in their office if needed. The organizational climate was found to be open to the use of RWAs. However, the evaluators found that there are mixed feelings regarding the WBG’s respectful workplace environment, although there
was agreement among those surveyed and interviewed that the RWA Program contributed to a respectful workplace.

The evaluators also reported that more than three quarters of the stakeholders indicated that the RWA Program helps staff who have consulted an RWA informally resolve concerns and informs staff of institutional resources and promotes better understanding of relevant policies. The program received high marks for maintaining and sustaining a respectful work environment but that it should not be the only one doing so. The stakeholders gave strong overall satisfaction ratings on the interactions with RWAs and outcomes, program administration, and people’s willingness to consult an RWA and recommend doing so to others (see graph 11). While a majority of the evaluation participants said that the program has a positive influence on morale, they also indicated that there was little evidence regarding the effect on productivity and cost savings.

The report makes note that the RWA program takes exceptional efforts to communicate the program and RWA services to country office staff and that these communications are effective. Those who responded were fully aware of the program and could describe the programs’ purpose accurately. A significant number of them could correctly identify at least four of the five RWA responsibilities, but at the same time, identified functions that are not part of the RWA mandate with the role. There was also recognition that the RWA training prepared the RWAs sufficiently to fulfill their RWA role. The RWAs themselves rated the training very highly. The evaluators also noted that the program development objectives outlined in the 2004 RWA Program review have been achieved and exceeded, highlighting the fact that the number of RWA visitors has increased 454 percent since 2004 and that 94 percent of all eligible country office have RWAs. The RWA Program is recognized as one element in the CRS and widely publicized as such, including on the WBG website and the WBG’s Code of Conduct. The nomination process for RWAs has been revamped and has been effectively nominating staff who are successfully fulfilling the RWA role.

**Recommendations:** Although the evaluators found the program to be “effective, well conceived, well designed and well administered,” they have identified several areas of developmental opportunities. Program administrators should do the following:

- Encourage and enable management (vice presidents, country/regional directors, and country managers) and human resources staff (particularly human resources officers/account managers) to be more visible to the staff in their support of the RWA Program and their encouragement for staff to use it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRAPH 11</th>
<th>Staff Survey Respondents Who Consulted an RWA Rated the RWAs Operational Behaviors Positively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was easy to contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“RWAs are essential in our commitment to foster a positive and motivating work environment. I am personally grateful for their voluntary contribution to us all and for the support afforded to them by our senior management.”

Bob Zoellick

Today’s Article – May 1, 2012

➤ Encourage and enable management and human resources staff to be more visible in their support of the program because management’s support is the antidote for fear of retaliation

➤ Identify program indicators that may be used to measure the effects and utility of the RWA Program as well as the quality of its implementation and functioning

➤ Increase communication and education about the RWA’s role and responsibilities, the nomination process, the benefits to the staff member who consults an RWA, and the outcomes of the program for the WBG

➤ Review the frequency and modalities of RWA in-service training opportunities and invite more management and HR staff to attend the training

➤ Examine and reconsider the role and responsibilities of the RWAs (Some staff and some of the RWAs would like the role of the RWAs to be more proactive in a variety of ways.)

➤ Adopt a standards of practice statement for the program both to illuminate the principles on which the program operates and to be a set of performance indicators for future program evaluation.

These and other recommendations will be discussed with management to identify areas that the program should focus on to improve its administration. Resources will also have to be identified and allocated.

As a consequence of the overall evaluation, and prior to the implementation of the recommendations, program staff have developed the program’s objectives, updated the terms of reference for the RWA, and produced standards of practice. These documents will help guide and evaluate the program and the RWAs themselves.
## Annex 1 Definitions of Issue Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entering Employment</td>
<td>Used to capture information regarding terms of a “contract” and interpretation of those terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassignment and Selection Process</td>
<td>Re-entry and external assignment/leave without pay (LWOP) concerns. Job-posting, short-listing, interview process, and selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Includes performance evaluations, Performance Improvement Plan (PIP), or any issue concerning performance emanating from staff member or supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Clearance by Sector Board, management recommendation/approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>Including salary review increase (SRI) and job grading/description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Application of benefits policies including medical, home leave, education, disability, relocation, pension, and other benefits issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Employment</td>
<td>Historically referred to as “termination,” redundancies, mutually agreed separation (MAS), or separation for cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Criticism of existing policy, recommendation for new or changed policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Conflicts</td>
<td>Cultural misunderstandings and any other communication problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Skills and Behaviors</td>
<td>Includes a supervisor’s deficiencies in people management skills and behavior that is perceived to be destructive, disrespectful, or otherwise problematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>Any unwelcome verbal or physical behavior that interferes with work or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>The unjustifiable differentiation between individuals or groups within staff: Discrimination can be based on one or more characteristics,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including but not limited to, race, caste, color, culture, ethnic background, religion, age, gender, disability, marital status, political views, or sexual orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliation</td>
<td>Harm done to an individual in retribution for raising good faith concerns in the workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of Interest</td>
<td>A situation in which an individual faces conflicting or dual loyalties: It can arise when personal best interests are, or appear to be, in conflict with the person’s duties to another party, such as the Bank Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Operations</td>
<td>Application of WBG quality standards regarding professional decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Issues</td>
<td>Child support, domestic abuse, divorce, G-5 domestic employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Issues</td>
<td>Personal legal obligations, investigation, personnel record</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recruitment, Reassignment and Promotion Processes

- Confusion around the role of the Sector Boards (SBs).
- Lack of consistency and transparency around selection and promotion criteria and decisions.
- Lack of feedback to unsuccessful candidates.
- Perception of arbitrary or unfair processes and decisions.
- Frequent perception of pro forma processes where candidate has already been selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• SBs should harmonize and communicate processes and criteria used for decision making.</td>
<td>• Confusion around role of SBs in HR matters still exists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SBs and interview panels should clearly identify who will provide feedback to unsuccessful candidates.</td>
<td>• Feedback still often perfunctory or nonexistent. Particular problem for short list panels; challenge for HR when faced with large number of applicants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Managers should avoid sudden changes in direction in selection processes (i.e., from competitive to strategic assignment, or downgrading of positions).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Treatment of Contractor Employees in Country Offices

- Contractor employees have few or no options if they feel they are mistreated or wish to report a perceived contract violation—many of their employers don’t have a conflict resolution system and they are often unaware of the WBG CRS.
- Compensation and benefits packages are set according to local labor market conditions leaving contractors in some countries without adequate insurance coverage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improve contract design and supervision (GSD).</td>
<td>• GSD has established a hot line for contract employees who have concerns about possible contract violations. However, most contract employees in fragile states do not have access to a telephone nor do they have English language skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide information on WBG including RWA and OMB role for contractor employees (Mgs, GSD).</td>
<td>• Reputational risk that WBG will not hear about contract violations or mistreatment of staff particularly great in post-conflict countries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Guide COs on managing contractor employees so as to take into account Bank’s reputational risk as well as legal risks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Guidelines for Authorship and Attribution

- A number of junior staff or consultants complain each year about more senior staff taking credit for their work.
- Lack of training and management skills of untagged managers who supervise vulnerable junior staff, ACS staff and consultants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provide guidelines to staff which clarify Bank policy on taking authorship and attribution.</td>
<td>• A task force consisting of reps from DEC, PREM, EXT, OPCS, LEG and EBC has recommended appropriate language (see annex 3). Next step is review by MDs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Untagged managers should go through leadership development programs before being permitted to hire or manage staff and consultants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use already developed IFC courses as a basis to develop a cost effective e-learning course for untagged managers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
### Annex 2 Issues Matrix (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terms of Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased use of shorter term contracts leading to greater sense of job insecurity among staff and consultants</td>
<td>• Continued monitoring of the impact of the increased use of shorter term contracts on recruitment competitiveness</td>
<td>• Continued concerns from staff on term contracts, especially of one to two years, around difficulty of getting mortgages or loans, and instability for families. Some managers indicate term contracts have reduced competitiveness for WBG. HR notes that 86.2% of term contracts ending this year were extended. Recommend fuller evaluation of pros and cons of term contract use in FY12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater amount of time required by staff to secure their next contract</td>
<td>• Inclusion of a more specific definition of “reasonable notice” if a contract is to be interrupted or not renewed</td>
<td>• New HR website has relevant information (emergency, CRS, values, health services, etc.) for new staff by appointment type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• STCs and some CO ETs aren’t eligible for orientation and don’t have access to Bank systems they need to be effective</td>
<td>• All consultants should receive orientation information (on Bank values/mission and the CRS/US) as well as access to necessary Bank systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continued concerns from staff on term contracts, especially of one to two years, around difficulty of getting mortgages or loans, and instability for families. Some managers indicate term contracts have reduced competitiveness for WBG. HR notes that 86.2% of term contracts ending this year were extended. Recommend fuller evaluation of pros and cons of term contract use in FY12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New HR website has relevant information (emergency, CRS, values, health services, etc.) for new staff by appointment type.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retaliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General fear of retaliation for using the CRS/US among staff.</td>
<td>• Ombudsman need to emphasize to management the importance of encouraging staff to use CRS services</td>
<td>• This will always remain a concern to a certain extent. Managers need to provide more leadership; CRS can do a better job by emphasizing the role of CRS services in management training and other opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Several staff have dropped pursuit of an issue after being warned by managers or other staff that using the services could damage their career</td>
<td>• Orientation and training segments on CRS should explain how these services can be useful to management and communicate that the institution sees the CRS as a recommended and legitimate resource.</td>
<td>• Recommendations stand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exit survey data suggest that some staff believe they have experienced retaliatory measures</td>
<td>• Training in conflict competency should be mainstreamed to staff and managers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exit survey data suggest that some staff believe they have experienced retaliatory measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Draft Guidelines for Authorship and Attribution

World Bank Group – August 2012

Introduction. Given the large volume of research undertaken in the World Bank Group (WBG) and the numerous resulting publications, these guidelines have been developed to promote fair authorship and attribution practices. They are meant to provide a framework for staff (by definition staff includes consultants) on how authorship and attribution decisions should be made, thereby reducing confusion, conflict, or disappointment surrounding credit for work at the publication stage.

Scope. Some World Bank Group publications are authored by the WBG, such as standard analytical work (Country Economic Memorandums (CEM), Country Assistance Strategy (CAS), sector reviews, and so forth) or the World Development Report. Individual authors are not normally named in these reports, although individual team members are often noted and credited for their contributions. The following guidelines are applicable to all working papers and publications to which authorship or acknowledgment of individuals applies.

Communicating Responsibilities and Expectations. Authorship, acknowledgment, and expectations for each publication should be discussed at the earliest possible stage of the research project and renegotiated throughout as necessary. Such communication is designed to clarify roles. The task team leader or equivalent should initiate this discussion at the beginning of a project, addressing the following questions, among others:

1. Who will be named as an author or acknowledged contributor if the work is published?
2. Who will be the corresponding author or authors, that is, the person or persons who could respond to inquiries about the report?
3. What are the responsibilities and expectations for each contributor?

Recommended Principles of Authorship. Authorship guidelines vary markedly among disciplines. In economics, the normal practice is for authors to be listed alphabetically and for a corresponding author (who is not necessarily the senior person) to be identified as a contact for those interested in asking questions about the product. We are recommending that this model be followed for Bank publications. In addition, there are several general principles that should apply to all authorship decisions made across the Bank Group:

1. Authorship should be restricted to only those individuals who
   a. made a significant contribution to the conception or design of the project or analysis and interpretation of data and
   b. participated significantly in the drafting, reviewing, or revising of the work.
2. The task team leader, or equivalent, has responsibility for selecting report writers, deciding about authorship within the context of these guidelines, and arranging for appropriate quality control (peer review and any internal Bank processes). Task leadership alone does not qualify an individual for authorship unless the above two criteria are met.
3. The corresponding author (or authors) should be established who would be responsible for communication and follow-up to inquiries about the report.
4. Order of authorship: Names of authors should appear alphabetically with an asterisk or footnote to indicate the corresponding author and contact information.
5. The number of authors should be no more than six.
6. Those who do not meet authorship criteria but made a significant contribution to the project should be acknowledged in the final product (for example, individuals who collected data, acquired funding, provided financial support, supervised a research team, and provided technical, writing, or editing assistance). These contributions alone do not warrant authorship unless the criteria in (1) above are met.
7. The WBG does not support the use of ghost or courtesy authorships. Ghost authorship is defined as the failure to give credit to or acknowledge a significant contributor to the product. Courtesy authorship is defined as naming an author or individual who did not contribute significantly, or at all, the product. In order to maintain the integrity of WBG research and publications, all those and only those who qualify as authors should be named as authors.

8. Contract status (whether an individual is an STC, ETC, or term appointment or has an open-ended contract) should not be taken into account in determining authorship.

**Dispute Resolution.** Whenever possible, disputes over authorship or attribution should be resolved at the unit level by the authors and contributors themselves or relevant managers as appropriate. In the event that resolution cannot be achieved, issues can be brought to the WBG Conflict Resolution System.
Annex 4: Respectful Workplace Advisors (RWA) Program:
Terms of Reference

The World Bank Group recognizes the right of every staff member to be treated fairly, with respect and dignity, and to work in a respectful workplace free of harassment, discrimination, and intimidation. To support this policy, the Bank Group has set up several avenues through which individuals can seek advice and assistance or to register a complaint. One of the informal avenues of assistance is the Respectful Workplace Advisors (RWA) Program.

RWAs are a network of peer volunteers in World Bank Group country offices and in some work units in Washington, DC. RWAs are nominated by staff members in their offices and serve a four-year term. The goal of the RWA is to help colleagues help themselves by listening and providing problem-solving guidance in confidence. The program is administered by the Ombuds Services.

The role of the RWA is to provide:
1. An informal, confidential, trustworthy, and readily accessible source of early assistance for staff who have questions or concerns regarding a respectful workplace or who want information about where to seek assistance. Issues might include interpersonal conflicts, unfair treatment, harassment, disrespectful and unethical behaviors, employment or performance, misconduct, and other workplace stresses; and
2. Brief management on general respectful workplace trends while maintaining confidentiality.

In fulfilling this role, the responsibilities of RWAs are to:
- Help colleagues help themselves by listening and providing problem-solving guidance in confidence
- Coach colleagues in conflict resolution skills, when appropriate, to enable them to help themselves in the future
- Guide colleagues to appropriate institutional sources of information and support, including the Internal Justice System
- Provide colleagues with information about relevant policies and procedures
- Model the WBG Code of Conduct and other organizational statements of standards and values
- Ensure colleagues understand how to contact them confidentially
- Respond to requests for assistance promptly
- Meet with the country manager/director/VP periodically to discuss trends and the general office environment without providing information about specific cases or divulging the names of staff involved
- Give periodic presentations to all staff in the office/unit as well as briefings to new staff on their RWA role
- Send quarterly confidential Activity Forms to Ombuds Services on the types of issues brought to their attention, with no information that could identify a staff member, in order to safeguard absolute confidentiality

RWAs DO NOT intervene, investigate, mediate, or participate in resolving issues. They do not represent staff or carry a staff member’s issue to a higher authority. They do not choose a course of action for staff members.

At all times RWAs must follow the RWA Standards of Practice, by being confidential, respectful, ethical, informal, trustworthy, independent, impartial, and competent. (The RWA Standards of Practice and RWA contact details can be found on the RWA website.)
Annex 5: Respectful Workplace Advisors (RWA) Program:  
Program Objectives

The RWA Program is one of a range of informal services available to staff within the Internal Justice System (IJS) of the World Bank Group. This program supports the World Bank Group’s commitment to fostering a positive and motivating workplace environment in which all staff can work together with openness and trust, in ways that demonstrate respect and value differences. All workplace issues regarding respectful and ethical behaviors and other sources of stress at work will be taken seriously.

**RWA Program Responsibilities**

The responsibilities of the RWA Program are to build capacity within the WBG by the following:

1. **Raising awareness about respectful and ethical behaviors** at the World Bank Group through
   a. Regular program communications
   b. Updated presentations to staff and management
   c. Regular reports on RWA Program activities
2. **Contributing to the informal resources** available to staff by ensuring that
   a. All staff have information available to enable easy and early access to RWAs
   b. All eligible country offices have RWAs
3. **Facilitating the nomination and selection of appropriate staff** to the RWA role by ensuring that
   a. WBG staff nominated to be an RWA do not have other commitments that might lead to a conflict of interest
   b. Nomination and selection processes are fair and understood by staff
4. **Training nominated colleagues to an effective standard** to meet their RWA responsibilities so that all RWAs have:
   a. A basic understanding of the dynamics of a culturally diverse environment and workplace problems, including various forms of disrespectful and unethical behaviors
   b. A comprehensive awareness of the Bank Group’s policies and procedures on appropriate behaviors and for addressing conflict
   c. Familiarity with the services of the different units within the Internal Justice System
   d. The ability to perform basic helping functions such as active listening
   e. An understanding of their roles and responsibilities, including how to handle and respond to workplace problems and how to refer staff members to appropriate resources in the Bank Group
5. **Adhering to the RWA Standards of Practice** by ensuring the program is organized, efficient, visible, accessible, competent, of high-quality, coordinated, effective, and impactful. (The RWA Standards of Practice can be found on the RWA website.)
6. **Ensuring that the process of providing assistance** through the program should also be voluntary, accessible, informal, effective, empowering, and satisfactory.
Annex 6: Respectful Workplace Advisors (RWA) Program: Standards of Practice

The standards of practice for the Respectful Workplace Advisors (RWA) Program include the following:

1. Standards of conduct for the RWA
2. Standards for the process by which RWA assistance is provided
3. Standards for the RWA Program itself

I. Standards of conduct for the RWA

The RWA shall be:

➤ Confidential
  - Holds all communication with those who consult him or her in strict confidence as per Staff Rule 9.02
  - Keeps no official records that identify individuals who may have consulted him/her
  - Prepares informal activity forms in a manner that protects the confidentiality and anonymity of individuals
  - Provides feedback, such as trends, to management in a way that protects the anonymity of staff who use the service
  - Does not provide notice to nor accepts notice on behalf of the organization

➤ Respectful and Ethical
  - Acts in a professional, dignified, and respectful manner to all, particularly to colleagues who consult with him/her
  - Acts with integrity and honesty

➤ Neutral and Independent
  - Does not take sides; is equitable, unbiased, fair, and just in the performance of his/her RWA responsibilities
  - Does not have an interest in or advocate for a particular outcome or resolution
  - Does not make decisions, intervene in disputes, advocate for individuals, investigate, adjudicate, mediate, or represent individuals or issues
  - Holds no position that might compromise his/her impartiality and neutrality
  - Does not report to line management in his/her RWA role

➤ Informal
  - Does not make decisions, mandate policies, or adjudicate issues for the organization in his or her RWA role
  - Does not participate in any investigations as an RWA
  - Functions on an informal basis by such means as listening, providing information about resources, identifying issues, helping to develop a range of responsible options, and, when possible, helping people develop ways to solve problems themselves

➤ Exemplary and Trustworthy
  - Models the appropriate management and resolution of their own disputes and treats colleagues with respect and integrity
  - Adheres to the parameters of their role and responsibilities
  - Is honest, reliable, and honorable in his or her dealings with colleagues

➤ Competent
  - Participates in all appropriate program training
  - Seeks to learn relevant knowledge and skills in order to provide quality service
  - Understands the role and responsibilities of the RWA in order to effectively help colleagues address conflict and encourage a respectful work environment

2. Standards for the process by which RWA assistance is provided

The process of providing RWA assistance shall be:

➤ Voluntary
  - Use of the program is voluntary
  - Staff must be able to understand the RWA process and the options available to them and give voluntary and informed consent to any resolution reached
• Staff who consult RWAs are informed of other available options and are free to choose those that best meet their needs

➤ Accessible and Informal
• The program is available to all staff
• Assistance is available when needed
• RWAs are easy to contact and respond in a timely manner to requests for assistance
• Assistance is provided in an open and accessible manner

➤ Effective
• Staff who consult RWAs are enabled to resolve their disputes themselves
• Staff who consult RWAs are enabled to resolve their disputes informally whenever appropriate
• Staff are enabled to consider and select options that meet their interests
• Staff who consult RWAs are enabled to resolve their disputes early and at the most appropriate level
• Staff who consult RWAs are enabled to reach resolutions that suit their individual circumstances and with which they are satisfied

➤ Empowering and Satisfactory
• Staff who consult RWAs have the opportunity to acquire useful information
• Staff who consult RWAs have the opportunity to learn basic dispute resolution and communication skills
• Staff who consult RWAs are satisfied with the RWA process
• Staff who consult RWAs recommend the program to others

➤ Nonretaliatory
• Retaliation by a staff member against any person who uses the services of a RWA is expressly prohibited and shall result in proceedings under Staff Rules 03.00.

3. Standards for the RWA Program itself
The RWA Program shall be:

➤ Organized and Efficient
• The program’s design and process are consistent with the program’s objectives and WBG’s code of conduct
• The program complements other WBG dispute resolution avenues
• There is sufficient staff to effectively administer the program and RWAs to provide assistance to staff who need the services
• The responsibilities of the program’s administrator are clearly delineated and are consistent with the program’s mission
• Staff have an opportunity to provide feedback regarding program operations
• The program’s budget is managed prudently
• The costs of dispute resolution to the organization and to the individual are minimized

➤ Visible and Accessible
• Staff are aware of the program, understand the program’s purpose, and have at least a basic understanding of the RWA’s role
• Program operations, accomplishments, and progress are regularly communicated
• Staff know how to access the program
• It is easy to access the program

➤ Competent
• The RWAs have sufficient skills and training to fulfill their role
• OMB staff develop, guide and support the RWAs

➤ High Quality
• Standards are set for the program, services, and any training program
• Evaluation is periodically conducted to maintain program quality

➤ Coordinated
• The program coordinates its efforts with other staff resources, particularly the Internal Justice System, management, and human resources staff
• Participants are informed of other resources and referred as appropriate
• The program ensures that staff are aware of and understand the program and trust and respect the RWAs
• Systemic issues are identified and brought to management’s attention
• Compliance with the organization’s standards of behavior is heightened
• The program models best practices and continues to be a leader in the field of dispute resolution

• Retaliation for use of the program is prevented when possible and addressed if needed
• Management support at all levels is built and sustained
• Staff support is cultivated and sustained
• The program contributes to the overall well-being of the organization and individual staff members
Annex 7: Respectful Workplace Advisors (RWA) Activity Form
Ombuds Services
Confidential, Impartial, Independent, Informal

The World Bank Group’s Ombuds Services (OMB) office has three major functions:

1. To help staff and managers resolve workplace problems
2. To alert management to trends and issues that should be addressed to improve the working environment and make recommendations for change in policy or practice
3. To administer the Respectful Workplace Advisors (RWA) Program

Key Characteristics

Confidential
Under Staff Rule 9.02 and the office’s professional standards, communications with Ombuds Services are private and absolutely confidential. An Ombudsman does not divulge any information told to him or her that might reveal a staff member’s identity, unless authorized by the staff member (except if there appears to be imminent risk of serious harm). It is a safe place for staff to discuss any conflict, concern or dispute outside formal communication channels, without fear of retaliation.

Impartial
An Ombudsman is impartial and does not serve as an advocate for a particular point of view or for any of the parties involved. The office strives for solutions that are consistent with fairness and respectful treatment.

Independent
Ombuds Services is not part of the formal organizational structure. Each Ombudsman is appointed by the President on the advice of staff selected by the Staff Association. An Ombudsman is not subject to annual performance reviews, receives a nominal salary increase, serves a five-year term which may be renewed one time and may not accept a position elsewhere in the World Bank Group for a period of two years after completing their term.

Informal
Ombuds Services is focused on problem-solving and encourages informal resolution of problems at the lowest level possible in a way that minimizes harm to relationships. Contacting Ombuds Services is not the same as reporting an issue to the organization and does not place the WBG “on notice”. The office does not register complaints, perform investigations, or keep formal records for the Bank Group, but an Ombudsman can provide advice about the Bank Group’s formal grievance system.

How Can We Help?
The office’s objective is to facilitate resolution to workplace issues. An Ombudsman does not make decisions or mandate actions, and the staff member remains in full control of any actions that would be specific to him/her.

An Ombudsman can:
• Hold confidential discussions to listen to staff’s concerns or inquiries
• Analyze the facts of a given situation and provide an impartial perspective on the issue(s)
• Help identify and evaluate options for the staff to consider
• Help staff decide which option makes the most sense
• Provide advice on how to implement the selected option(s)
• Coach staff on how to deal with the problem directly
• Provide informal intervention, only if requested by staff
• Provide information on policies and procedures
• Explain other available resources and refer staff to other units in the WBG that may help

Contacts: Internal Web Page: http://ombudsman
Internal Email: Ombudsman@worldbank.org
External Email: wbgombuds@gmail.com
Appointments: Call 202-458-1056 (collect calls accepted)

An Ombudsman can call staff at home, at night or during the weekend, providing added assurance of confidentiality and privacy. Offsite visits are also possible.

Ombudsman: Thomas Zgambo 202-473-3043
Ombudsman: Constance Bernard 202-458-5175
Ombudsman: David Talbot 66-2-686-8338

All categories of current and former WBG staff and consultants—including those from International Finance Corporation (IFC), Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA), Global Environment Facility (GEF) and International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID)— are welcome to consult OMB regarding any work related issue.
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