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AF FRAMEWORK FOR A GRM

- Redressing grievances of affected people as an integral part of any development project’s design, plan and management
- The aim is to find effective solutions together
- Availability of a GRM to address environmental and social harms caused by projects is a requirement of accreditation under AF
- GRM needs to be accessible, transparent, fair and has an effective process
- GRM can be pre-existing, national, local or institutional or project-specific
CHARACTERISTICS OF A WELL-FUNCTIONING GRM

• Provides an accessible, predictable, transparent, and credible process to all parties, resulting in outcomes that are seen as fair, effective, and lasting

• Builds trust as an integral component of broader community relations activities

• Enables more systematic identification of emerging issues and trends, facilitating corrective action and preemptive engagement
UNITED NATIONS GUIDING PRINCIPLES ON BUSINESS AND HUMAN RIGHTS (RUGGIE PRINCIPLES)

**Three pillars**: Protect, Respect and Remedy created the first global standard for preventing and addressing the risk of adverse human rights impacts linked to business activity.

Effectiveness criteria for non-judicial grievance mechanisms:

- Legitimate
- Accessible
- Predictable
- Equitable
- Transparent
- Rights-compatible
- A source of continuous learning
- Based on engagement and dialogue
DESIGNING A GRM

- Set goals, objective and scope
- Provide structure
- Provide resources
- Establish procedures and time frames
- Create awareness
- Implement and take stock
WORLD BANK ACCOUNTABILITY

THE INSPECTION PANEL
ORIGINS

• Created by the Board of Executive Directors in 1993 to:
  ✓ Provide an opportunity for affected people to complain when World Bank projects cause or can cause harm to them or their environment.
  ✓ Ensure compliance with Bank policies and procedures and Management’s accountability.

• Independent process and findings.
  ✓ Reports directly to Board of Directors.

• First of its kind across IFIs.
  ✓ Today there are 17 mechanisms.

• Has fact finding, not decision-making role.
OVERVIEW

Reports only to the Board of Executive Directors. Independent from Bank Management

Three Panel Members, appointed for five-year non-renewable term. Small Permanent Secretariat at World Bank

Focus on World Bank as institution. Does not investigate governments or implementing agencies

Concerns must have been brought to Management’s attention prior to submission of Request

All reports prepared by Panel and Management as part of Panel process are made public
INSPECTION PANEL PROCESS

Panel Receives Request

Registration of Request

Eligibility Phase
- Management Response
- Board No-Objection

Investigation Phase
- Panel’s Investigation Report
- Management Action Plan

Pilot Approach for Early Solution
With Agreement of Requesters

Proposed Management Steps/ Measures

Registration or Non-Registration

Non-Registration
INDIA IMPROVING LIVELIHOODS THROUGH CARBON SEQUESTRATION PROJECT

Project provided for:
- Farmers to raise trees on degraded farmlands,
- sell the timber to a paper company; and
- receive additional revenue from selling the carbon emission reductions generated under the Project.

The Panel received complaint from farmers, most of whom belonged to Scheduled Tribes and Scheduled Castes

They complained about the delays in receiving their share of the revenue generated by sequestering carbon that would improve their livelihoods.
The Panel found that the delay of payments was due to the complexity of the process and of the methodology to measure and verify the carbon emission reductions, and not due to the lack of World Bank’s supervision.

Although the funds had been transferred to an escrow account, the payments had not been provided to the farmers due to disagreements over the benefit-sharing arrangements.

The Panel supported the Bank and the executing agency to agree on an appropriate benefit sharing arrangement.

In its report the Panel’s case noted problems associated with carbon projects and the process related to benefit sharing, long wait for carbon payments to materialize, complex project designs, and the need for increased information sharing and participation from local communities to avoid confusion over the payments schemes and manage expectations.