Members of the Batwa community, Mgahinga Gorilla National Park, Uganda. Photo by Jason Houston for USAID.

GRIEVANCE AND REDRESS MECHANISM FOR USAID PROTECTED AREA ACTIVITIES:

Guidelines and Principles for Design and Integration

March 2022

CONTENTS

PREFACE

Beginning in FY20, the Joint Explanatory Statements or Statement of Managers accompanying the Appropriations Act began to direct the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) to incorporate several new requirements, as applicable, into contracts and assistance awards for programming in national parks and other protected areas. USAID interprets parks and protected areas to include all six [International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) categories for parks and protected areas](#).

1. Strict Nature Reserve/Wilderness Area

2. National Park

3. National Monument or Feature

4. Habitat-Specific Management Area

5. Protected Landscape/Seascape

6. Protected Area with Sustainable Use of Natural Resources

This document, along with several others, have been developed to provide guidance to Missions and other USAID operating units to meet the directive from Congress. The four requirements enumerated within the Statement of Managers are noted below:

1. Information detailing the proposed project and potential impacts is shared with local communities and the free, prior, and informed consent of affected indigenous communities is obtained in accordance with international standards;

2. The potential impacts of the proposed project on existing land or resource claims by affected local communities or Indigenous Peoples are considered and addressed in any management plan;

3. Any eco-guards, park rangers, and other law enforcement personnel authorized to protect biodiversity will be properly trained and monitored;

4. Effective grievance and redress mechanisms for victims of human rights violations and other misconduct exist.

INTRODUCTION

This document provides principles for consideration in the development of a USAID implementing partner's activity- or project-level Grievance and Redress Mechanism (GRM) in national parks and other protected areas.

For USAID, activity- or project-level GRMs play an important role in the Agency's commitment to meaningful stakeholder engagement and belief that informed decision-making leads to better and more sustainable actions. Requiring an activity- or project-level GRM reflects not only a congressional directive but also USAID's belief that activities and projects need and benefit from meaningful ways for project-affected communities to raise any concerns that they are experiencing or fear that they will experience. To comply with the requirements of the Joint Explanatory Statement or Statement of Managers that began for FY2020 and accompany the Appropriations Act[1]), all USAID awards concerning national parks and other protected areas should have a requirement for a GRM.

USAID recognizes the important role that a GRM plays across the project lifecycle and as part of stakeholder engagement. A GRM is a transparent tool and process that allows project-affected community members (individuals or their authorized representatives) to bring environmental and social grievances (including economic grievances) caused by USAID projects or activities to the implementing partner or a third-party organization. Put another way, a GRM is a mechanism for implementing partners to receive, assess, and resolve grievances related to a particular active activity or project. Having a process such as an activity- or project-level GRM, through which project-affected community members or their authorized representatives can express environmental and social (including economic) harms, either real or potential, helps USAID and its implementing partners better understand how impacts are perceived and felt locally and address them in a contextually appropriate manner. That increased understanding and knowledge in turn leads to better planning. Not only is this approach strongly following "do no harm" principles, but it also ultimately leads to stronger, more effective programming and implementation. Activity- or project-level GRMs build trust and should be an integral part of how USAID's international development work is implemented in national parks and other protected areas.[2] A GRM also serves to identify potential concerns early in the activity or project.

This guidance document was specifically designed in consideration of the special requirements for Agency awards in national parks and other protected areas. The good practices and principles described, however, may be broadly applicable to other sectors of USAID programming.

This document aims to:

- Provide USAID principles on GRMs.

- Summarize the expectations regarding GRMs across the program lifecycle.

- Lay out an approach that implementing partners can contextualize to put a GRM in place.

---

[1] National Parks and Protected Areas. "In lieu of the requirement under this heading in the Senate report, funds made available for national parks and protected areas should only be made available if agreements for the obligation of funds between implementing partners and the Department of State and USAID include provisions requiring that...(4) effective grievance and redress mechanisms for victims of human rights violations and other misconduct exist." Joint Explanatory Statement to the FY 2020 Statement of Managers, p. 61.

[2] USAID defines terrestrial and aquatic parks and protected areas to be inclusive of all six International Union for the Conservation of Nature protected area categories. Please see https://www.iucn.org/theme/protected-areas/about/protected-area-categories.

- Outline mitigation, resolution, and monitoring procedures relating to GRMs.

- Delineate the roles for staff from implementing partners and USAID relating to GRMs.

This document provides an overview of principles that should be considered when establishing an activity- or project-level GRM. The country context, design, and goals of USAID activities are highly varied. As a result, there are myriad ways to set up an activity- or project-level GRM. USAID welcomes activity-, project-, and context-specific variation and innovation for GRMs.

THIS GUIDELINE'S RELATIONSHIP TO USAID AWARDS

This document was drafted to provide a job aide to USAID activity managers, Contracting and Agreement Officer's Representatives (CORs/AORs), and implementing partners, as applicable. The information contained herein reflects good practices and is intended to function as a reference document and job aide for designing and implementing activities in parks and other protected areas. USAID should not become involved in the adjudication of individual grievances as part of a GRM.

Implementing partners are encouraged to consult this guidance when carrying out the activities described in their USAID award, but this document does not, in and of itself, impose binding obligations on any party unless incorporated into an award. The design and implementation of a GRM, while informed by the principles set out below, is ultimately the responsibility of each implementing partner and subject to the terms and conditions specified in the relevant contract or assistance award. A process for receipt, adjudication, and resolution of grievances should be made available by the implementing partner (with the support of a third-party mediator, if applicable).

CONSIDERATIONS FOR NATIONAL PARKS AND OTHER PROTECTED AREAS

WHAT FACTORS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED?

In determining whether the requirement applies to a specific activity or project, activity planners must consider the following non exhaustive factors, including whether the project or activity:

- Involves work with park rangers, ecoguards, or similar personnel authorized to enforce laws associated with a national park and protected area.

- Affects Indigenous Peoples or other local communities.

- Has impacts on local land and resource claims, protected area access, or natural resource use rights and practices.

- Involves legislation, regulatory, or policy work that impacts specific national parks or other protected areas and communities near or in the park or protected area.

PRINCIPLES OF A USAID ACTIVITY- OR PROJECT-LEVEL GRM

WHAT ARE THE PRINCIPLES OF A GRM?

USAID seeks to ensure that its investments benefit all members of society, with particular attention to the marginalized and disenfranchised, in alignment with "do no harm" principles.[3]

The definition of a GRM bears in mind these points:

Designed to be fit for purpose through community engagement: Design and implementation of a GRM should be done in consultation with project-affected communities. It is important that each activity- or project-level GRM be tailored to the activity or project and align with the country and local context. If a GRM serves multiple areas or has funding from multiple sources, implementing parties may want to consider using a third-party mediation mechanism for the GRM.

Clearly structured and transparent process: The implementing partner should clearly establish a process that indicates, from complaint to resolution, roles and responsibilities, procedures, and timelines for each step of the GRM. It is critical that all parties have a clear understanding of the resolution and any follow-up actions. The GRM should record and document every step of the process for each grievance. The system should prioritize confidentiality and allow for appropriate reporting to USAID. The GRM should have a clearly identified point of contact and implementation team.

Grievance eligibility defined: The focus of a GRM is to identify and address environmental and social harms (including economic harms) caused by active USAID projects or activities. USAID encourages all project-affected parties to make liberal use of the GRM disclosure process. This includes human rights violations committed by rangers, ecoguards, or similar personnel authorized to enforce laws associated with a national park or protected area working on active USAID-funded activities or projects.

GRIEVANCE ELIGIBILITY

A grievance should be considered eligible when it articulates an environmental or social harm (including economic harm) or potential harm to the project-affected community, vulnerable populations, or Indigenous Peoples that has occurred or may occur due to an ongoing USAID activity or project. Eligible grievances under GRMs do not include procurement complaints, allegations of fraud, waste, or abuse, or allegations of illegal activity. Consistent with the terms and conditions of the award, the implementing partner must report allegations of fraud, waste, and abuse to the USAID Office of the Inspector General (OIG). The GRM managing organization must report allegations of sexual exploitation and/and or abuse of beneficiaries to the OIG and to the relevant USAID Agreement Officer or Contracting Officer AOR/COR.[4] Illegal behavior and human rights violations reported through a GRM may be referred to the USAID Office of the Inspector General (OIG).

Clearly conveyed to the community: A GRM must be **well-communicated** to the project-affected community in a manner that is **linguistically and culturally appropriate** for all parts of the community. Communication about a GRM should consider differences within the community and how those differences might impact access to the information about a GRM. A GRM must be well-publicized to the project-affected community. A dissemination plan tailored to each activity will make affected

---

[3] For example: https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/donoharm_pe07_synthesis.pdf

[4] Additional information on reporting sexual exploitation and abuse can be found in the terms and conditions of your award and on the USAID website.

parties aware of the existence and purpose of the GRM, eligible complaints, confidentiality, and the modes and means of reporting.

Methods of filing a grievance: A GRM is a means for giving the project-affected community and all individuals therein a voice. Methods of filing a grievance should include **multiple modes of communication.** The method of filing a grievance must be appropriate to communication modes, literacy constraints, diversity of local languages, logistics, and other factors affecting accessibility and the perception of risk. Modes of filing should consider gender differences and the access and needs of vulnerable populations. A GRM should have multiple means for the intake of grievances such as mail, email, in person, verbally, or online, all via a secure means of communication.

In defining eligible grievances, implementing partners should also consider the minimum information required from aggrieved parties. For example, the following are illustrative of data elements that may be required in an initial submission:

- Identity and contact information for the aggrieved party

- A description of the harm

- A reference to the project or activity

- The date and location of the harm (if applicable and appropriate)

- Desired outcome or remedies

Confidentiality: The identity of the aggrieved party should be protected and kept confidential once the grievance is filed and throughout the review, reporting, dissemination, and archival process, and it should not be disclosed without the aggrieved party's consent. Protection of confidentiality refers to the protection of the person and personal information that can be used to distinguish or trace an individual's identity, such as their name or address or location.[4] Confidentiality plays an important role in reducing the risk of retaliation. Anonymous grievances will not be eligible; such grievances should be documented and considered by the implementing partner.

Protection against retaliation: A GRM must be a safe, confidential space for project-affected individuals and communities to raise their concerns without fear of identification or retaliation. Aggrieved parties that use the GRM must not be subject to retaliation because they submitted a complaint. USAID considers retaliation a grave incident; therefore, it is incumbent on the implementing partner to address the risks of retaliation in the design and implementation of a GRM.

Timely resolution: The affected individual or community must be able to submit a grievance with confidence that their concerns will be addressed in a prompt and professional manner. It is incumbent on the implementing partner to establish and communicate clear and transparent procedures and reasonable timelines for the submission of and response to a complaint or concern through the GRM.

Judicial rights are not displaced: A GRM is not a court, and the use of a GRM does not supersede, displace, or obstruct any legal rights or judicial remedies available to any of the parties

---

[4] Confidentiality considerations in a GRM do not displace and must be implemented consistent with any reporting and disclosure requirements contained in the terms and conditions of the USAID award.

involved in national courts or before international human rights bodies. GRMs do not adjudicate land or other rights. Beneficiaries are not required to use the established GRM as a means to resolve harms. By addressing emerging concerns early, however, the implementing partner can prevent them from reaching a level that warrants judicial or administrative proceedings.

Lessons learned: A GRM must be adaptive and document its process and findings. Implementers should use the GRM to focus energy and resources on **making changes that emerge from the lessons learned.** To this end, the implementing partner is responsible for amending or creating (as needed) an environmental mitigation and monitoring plan that includes these requirements. An environmental mitigation and monitoring plan outlines a process to identify mitigation measures and monitoring procedures for potential impacts to communities, individuals, and the environment.

WHY IS A THIRD-PARTY GRM A GOOD PRACTICE?

A GRM can be designed, implemented, and managed by an independent third party. Separating the GRM from the implementing partner signals to the project-affected community that grievances will be received, reviewed, and adjudicated by a neutral and independent organization. When project-affected community members feel that an intervention from external actors is going to create a negative impact or even cause harm, it is important that they feel safe to raise their concerns and confident that they will not face retaliation.

No one size fits all: The best model for a GRM depends on the sector, design, size, and structure of the activity or project. Project-affected communities may require different GRM structures, depending on their relationship to the implementing partner. For USAID, a third-party activity- or project-level GRM is a good practice and an option for all activities, particularly those that involve working in, establishing, or expanding national parks and other protected areas, including community-managed conservation areas. Third-party administration of a GRM can be an important step to establish its trust and independence.

AN ACTIVITY- OR PROJECT-LEVEL GRM ACROSS THE PROGRAM CYCLE

The following table divides the program cycle for an activity or project into four phases and summarizes the roles and key considerations for USAID and implementing partners in relation to an activity- or project-level GRM.

> **WHERE CAN THE PROJECT-AFFECTED COMMUNITY REPORT INELIGIBLE GRIEVANCES?**
>
> Crimes and other illegal activity should be reported to local authorities as appropriate
>
> Procurement complaints allegations of fraud, waste, and abuse related to USAID's activities and allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse should be submitted to USAID via its confidential phone line at 1-800-230-6539
>
> Other violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms are investigated by cognizant international tribunals, such as the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Human Rights Council Complaint Procedures (more information about that body, including instructions for submitting a complaint, can be found below)

TABLE 1. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF USAID AND IMPLEMENTING PARTERS

ACTIVITY OR PROJECT LIFECYCLE PHASE	ROLE OF USAID AND IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS	POTENTIAL CONSIDERATIONS
Concept development	USAID considers how a GRM can be incorporated into the project concept.	• What is the local standard and expectation? • How will the activity benefit from a GRM? • What are the potential identifiable risks? • What community engagement and consultation has already occurred?
Design	USAID considers the scope of work, statement of objectives, program description, etc.	• How can a GRM complement the design? • How will the GRM work logistically and financially? • What characteristics are important for a sound GRM (including consideration for third-party GRM implementation)? • How will the activity adjust and adapt when grievances are reported? • How will USAID monitor the effectiveness of the GRM?
Solicitation and award	USAID ensures that a GRM is included in the award.	• What specific requirements are tied to specific types of activities, such as engagement with project-affected communities and Indigenous Peoples? • How will GRMs be considered in cases where it is not required?
Implementation	Implementing partner leads with USAID oversight.	• Is the GRM effective? • Does the GRM align to international standards?[5] • Does the implementing partner have a plan to design, implement, and monitor the GRM?

---

[5] For example, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees principles: https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/GuidingPrinciplesBusinessHR_EN.pdf

PUTTING AN ACTIVITY- OR PROJECT-LEVEL GRM IN PLACE

WHAT ARE THE COMPONENTS OF AN ACTIVITY- OR PROJECT-LEVEL GRM?

Building and implementing a strong activity- or project-level GRM requires establishing and following a consistent process organized around components, including the following:

Delineate Eligibility Criteria	Clear guidelines delineating who is eligible to file grievances, who is not, and why.
	Clear guidelines delineating what counts as a grievance, what does not, and why.
Process to File	Forms and systems for eligible project-affected communities or individuals to file a grievance and be kept abreast of the status of their submission.
Process to Act	Roadmap of the steps to take when a grievance is filed, including deadlines and the grievance assessment system.
Review and Mediate	Processes to hear grievances, achieve resolution, and monitor and document outcomes.
Process to Appeal	System for aggrieved parties to appeal decisions if they are unsatisfied with the outcome.
Report and Document	System to document, analyze, and disseminate information about the grievance received, including public disclosure as appropriate.
Monitor	System to ensure that the GRM is effective and that agreements are implemented.

MITIGATION AND MONITORING UNDER AN ACTIVITY- OR PROJECT-LEVEL GRM

Under an effectively designed GRM, the cognizant USAID AOR/COR must: (1) receive notification of grievances, and (2) ensure that implementing partners have systems in place to respond to grievances and achieve agreement.

The implementing partner, working with the activity- or project-level GRM managing body, must submit all grievances filed to the AOR/COR no more than 72 hours from the time the grievance is reported. The information should protect the confidentiality of the requester and should include the date and location of the harm, a description of the harm, the award number, and an award point of contact. Project-affected community member names should not be provided. The AOR/COR should notify by email the Agency Environmental Coordinator (AEC) and OIG, Office of Acquisition and Assistance (OAA), and Office of the General Counsel, as necessary, of all significant environmental, social, and economic grievances, within five business days of receipt of the grievance notification. The email should include the point of contact for the award (AOR/COR, etc.), the nature of the complaint, and the proposed resolution strategy. The AEC will maintain a system to record all grievances submitted. A grievance tracking system functions as a knowledge management tool to ensure that lessons learned from the grievances filed, reviewed, and resolved are applied and that programming is adapted both for the specific activity and for future activities. The AOR/COR should also be notified of any concerns raised by the project-affected community regarding the administration of the GRM.

The implementing partner is responsible for amending or creating (as needed) an environmental mitigation and monitoring plan[6] that includes social and economic impacts and identifies the components and implementing partner-designed aspects of the GRM. This report will be reviewed and approved by the AOR/COR. The environmental mitigation and monitoring plan documents mitigation measures (the GRM), while the environmental mitigation and monitoring report documents the implementation of the GRM. In addition, as part of environmental mitigation and monitoring report, a detailed description must be included regarding the grievance reporting criteria, grievances filed, the review process followed by the activity- or project-level GRM managing body, the agreed-upon resolution, and the process for disseminating the resolution, including who was informed.

---

[6] The environmental mitigation and monitoring plan and environmental mitigation and monitoring report are required for almost all USAID-funded activities with a governing initial environmental examination or environmental assessment requiring mitigation of environmental or social risks. The environmental mitigation and monitoring report is the basis for systematic implementation and monitoring of these requirements. Information about environmental mitigation and monitoring plans can be found at: https://www.usaid.gov/environmental-procedures/environmental-compliance-esdm-program-cycle/mitigation-monitoring-reporting.

ROLES UNDER AN ACTIVITY- OR PROJECT-LEVEL GRM

WHAT IS USAID'S ROLE?

The USAID project design team, AOR/COR, or activity manager should:

- Consider GRMs during the conceptualization and design phases of an activity or project for parks and protected areas.

- Ensure that implementing partners consider past experiences of the beneficiaries and the broader community when they are designing GRMs.

- Include the requirement for a GRM in the program description, statement of work, statement of objectives, or other definition of scope.

- Ensure that a GRM is identified and budgeted in the offeror's submission and is, ultimately, part of the award.

- Ensure that the GRM is appropriately designed and established using international standards.

- Track, record, and appropriately report all grievances from the implementing partner in consultation with the AOR/COR, Mission Environment Officer, or Regional Environment Advisor, and other relevant officers from the USAID legal team such as the Resident Legal Officer.

- Report any instance of fraud, waste, and abuse to the OIG, OAA, and the Compliance Division in the Bureau for Management.

WHAT IS THE IMPLEMENTING PARTNER'S ROLE?

Establishing and maintaining an activity- or project-level GRM is the responsibility of the implementing partner. Each GRM must adhere to relevant activity or project obligations as well as country legal, regulatory, policy, or treaty requirements, as appropriate.

Implementing partners (and sub-awardees) are the key to strong community relationships and satisfactory resolution of any issue, harm, or grievance. Community engagement, as part of design and implementation, is a key part of any GRM because it builds community trust, support, and project or activity relevance. Implementing partners should work with sub-awardees to determine the most appropriate implementation of a GRM for each sub-awardee.

TABLE 2. MODEL ROLES OF THE IMPLEMENTING PARTNER AND THE AOR/COR

USAID IMPLEMENTING PARTNER	USAID AOR/COR
Design of the GRM	
• Design activity- or project-level GRM, including approach to operate independently from the implementing partner and activity implementation team	• Actively provide design input and include USAID contracting, technical, and other experts, as appropriate
• Consult with project-affected community members on local issues to inform the design of the GRM	• Coordinate to ensure that relevant activity- and project-affected community members have an opportunity to be consulted
• Ensure that GRM operating procedures are submitted with the work plan	• Review operating procedures
• Designate a team to be the managing body for the activity- or project-level GRM	• Provide input on the composition of the managing body for the activity- or project-level GRM • Create GRM monitoring indicators to assess implementation and effectiveness
Routine Management of the GRM	
• Hold outreach events to raise awareness about the existence of the activity- or project-level GRM (at project initiation and biannually, at a minimum)	• Discuss and coordinate with the implementing partner the outreach plan and approach for outreach events
• Convene quarterly oversight meetings for the AOR/COR, implementing partner, activity team, and managing body	• Attend quarterly oversight meetings (by phone if not co-located with the activity or implementing partner)
• Convene regular managing body meetings (without AOR/COR, implementing partner, or activity team)	• Ensure that the GRM is effectively implemented by using the indicators for monitoring
• Submit annual environmental mitigation and monitoring report, including status of grievances and lessons learned	• Review and approve annual environmental mitigation and monitoring reports, and follow USAID procedures for dissemination
Key Steps When a Grievance is Filed	
• Receive grievance submission and notify AOR/COR within 72 hours	• Receive notification of the grievance submission and submit to the AEC and any other appropriate USAID staff, such as OIG, OAA, and Office of the General Counsel. Include the point of contact for the award (AOR/COR, etc.), the nature of the complaint, and the resolution strategy.
• Convene a meeting of the managing body within 72 hours of a grievance being filed	• Review notes from managing body meeting pertaining to the grievance
• Investigate per the GRM-established process, and identify options for resolution	
• Conduct deliberations regarding the grievance that was filed, and work with the third-party GRM team if part of the GRM process	
• Achieve an agreement and follow procedures for reporting on and disseminating the agreement	• Inform the necessary USAID contracting, legal, and technical experts
• Report the ruling to the AOR/COR	• Report the decision to the USAID AEC for input into the tracking system • Note any unresolved grievances or grievances that were not actioned when completing an evaluation through the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System

RESOURCES

USAID Development Policies, Strategies, and Visions

- USAID. 1997. _Disability Policy Paper_. Washington, DC: USAID.

- USAID. 2012. _Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy_. Washington, DC: USAID.

- USAID. 2012. _ADS Chapter 205, Integrating Gender Equality and Female Empowerment in USAID's Program Cycle_. Washington, DC: USAID.

- USAID. 2012. _Global Health Strategic Framework: Better Health for Development_. Washington, DC: USAID.

- USAID. 2012. _Youth Policy: Youth in Development: Recognizing the Demographic Opportunity_. Washington, DC: USAID.

- USAID. 2013. _Strategy on Democracy Human Rights and Governance_. Washington, DC: USAID.

- USAID. 2014. _LGBT Vision for Action: Promoting and Supporting the Inclusion of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Individuals_. Washington, DC: USAID.

- USAID. 2014. _Maternal Health Vision for Action_. Washington, DC: USAID.

- USAID. 2020. _Policy on Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA)_. Washington, DC: USAID.

- Stevens, Caleb, and Chad Dear. 2016. _Guidelines on Compulsory Displacement and Resettlement in USAID Programming_. Washington, DC: USAID.

- USAID. 2020. _Policy on Promoting the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (PRO-IP)_. Washington, DC: USAID.

Grievance and Redress Mechanisms

- Accountability Counsel. 2015. _Accountability Resource Guide: Tools for Redressing Human Rights and Environmental Abuses in International Finance and Development._ Eighth Edition. San Francisco: Accountability Counsel. https://www.accountabilitycounsel.org/accountability-resources/guides/.

- Genovese, Kristen, Caitlin Daniel, Sarah Singh, and Mariëtte van Huijstee, eds. 2016. _The Glass Half Full? The State of Accountability in Development Finance_. Amsterdam: SOMO. https://www.somo.nl/glass-half-full-2/.

- International Finance Corporation (IFC). 2021. _Good Practice Note for the Private Sector: Addressing the Risks of Retaliation Against Project Stakeholders_. Washington, DC: IFC. https://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/topics_ext_content/ifc_external_corporate_site/sustainability-at-ifc/publications/publications_gpn_reprisalrisks.

- International Finance Corporation (IFC). 2009. _Addressing Grievances from Project-Affected Communities: Guidance for Projects and Companies on Designing Grievance Mechanisms_. Washington, DC: IFC. https://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/topics_ext_content/ifc_external_corporate_site/sustainability-at-ifc/publications/publications_gpn_grievances.

- IPIECA. 2015. *Community Grievance Mechanisms in the Oil and Gas Industry: A Manual for Implementing Operational-Level Grievance Mechanisms and Designing Corporate Frameworks*. London: IPIECA. https://www.ipieca.org/resources/good-practice/community-grievance-mechanisms-in-the-oil-and-gas-industry/.

- Office of the Compliance Advisor/Ombudsman. nd. *Grievance Mechanism Toolkit: A Practical Guide for Implementing Grievance Mechanisms in Different Sectors*. https://www.cao-grm.org/.

- Office of the Compliance Advisor/Ombudsman. 2008. *A Guide to Designing and Implementing Grievance Mechanisms for Development Projects*. Washington, DC: CAO. https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/598641478092542645/pdf/108864-WP-CAO-ENGLISH-Implementing-Grievance-mechanisms-PUBLIC.pdf.

- Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS). 2020. *Global Grievance Redress Mechanism*. New York: WCS. https://c532f75abb9c1c021b8c-e46e473f8aadb72cf2a8ea564b4e6a76.ssl.cf5.rackcdn.com/2020/12/09/25ipape4kr_WCS_GrievanceRedressMechanism_EN_FINAL_2020_12_09.pdf.

- World Bank. 2018. *Grievance Redress Mechanism Checklist*. New York: World Bank. https://www.worldbank.org/en/projects-operations/environmental-and-social-framework/brief/environmental-and-social-framework-resources.

- United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (UN-REDD). 2015. *Joint FCPF/UN-REDD Programme Guidance Note for REDD+ Countries: Establishing and Strengthening Grievance Redress Mechanisms*. New York and Geneva: United Nations. https://www.unredd.net/documents/global-programme-191/grievance-and-compliance-1455/national-grievance-mechanisms-3390/14201-joint-fcpfun-redd-guidance-note-for-redd-countries-establishing-and-strengthening-grievance-redress-mechanisms-1.html?path=global-programme-191/grievance-and-compliance-1455/national-grievance-mechanisms-3390.

- United Nations. 2011. *Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights*. New York and Geneva: United Nations. https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/GuidingPrinciplesBusinessHR_EN.pdf.

International Standards Examples

Numerous practitioner networks and global scorecards exist, often cast in terms of accountability mechanisms, compliance, corporate social responsibility, grievance mechanisms, due diligence, governance, human rights protections, stakeholder management, and sustainability.

- Independent Accountability Mechanisms Network

- Corporate Human Rights Benchmark

- Voluntary Principles Initiative

- Global Reporting Initiative

Private sector companies with grievance mechanisms that have been highly ranked on global scorecards include Adidas, BHP, Chevron, Intel Corporation, and The Coca-Cola Company.

Globally, most bilateral donors and multilateral organizations have accountability frameworks and project-level GRMs. The following websites contain valuable information:

● [French Development Agency: Environment and Social Complaints Mechanism](#)

● [Japan International Cooperation Agency: Secretariat of The Examiner for the Guidelines](#)

● [United Nations Development Programme: Social and Environmental Compliance Review and Stakeholder Response Mechanism](#)

● [World Bank Inspection Panel](#)