Evaluating a Grievance Redress Mechanism

Questions to Consider	
Design Stage	
Why did you include a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) in your project? Where/how did you locate the GRM? How did you determine it would be effective? Was the GRM designed with participation from the communities it is intended to serve?	
Implementation Stage	
1. Organizational Commitment	Do the project's management and staff recognize and value the GRM process as a means of improving public administration and enhancing accountability and transparency? Is grievance redress integrated into the project's core activities? Is grievance redress integrated into staff job descriptions and responsibilities? Is it appropriately resourced and monitored?
2. Principles:	
2.1 Legitimacy	Does the GRM operate independently of interested parties? Is the GRM widely-perceived as independent?
2.2 Accessibility	Is the GRM accessible to all stakeholders, irrespective of their remoteness, language, education or income level? Are procedures to file grievances and seek action easily understood by project beneficiaries? Can grievances be filed anonymously? Are there a range of contact options? Is the GRM appropriately advertised and communicated to project-affected people?
2.3 Predictability	Is the GRM responsive to the needs of all complainants? Does the GRM offer a clear procedure with time frames for each stage and clarity on the types of results it can (and cannot) deliver?
2.4 Fairness	Are grievances treated confidentially, assessed impartially, and handled transparently?
2.5 Rights Compatibility	Are the GRM's outcomes consistent with applicable national and international standards?

	Does it restrict access to other redress mechanisms?	
2.6 Transparency	Are the GRM's procedures and outcomes transparent enough to meet the public interest concerns at stake?	
2.7 Capability	Do GRM officials have the necessary technical, human and financial resources, means and powers to investigate grievances?	
3. Staff	Are there dedicated and trained staff available to handle the GRM? Are they given learning opportunities and do they receive any systematic reviews of their performance?	
4. Processes:		
4.1 Uptake	Do multiple uptake channels exist?	
4.2 Sorting and processing	Is there a system to categorize, assign priority, and route grievances to the appropriate entity?	
4.3 Acknowledgement and follow-up	Are complaints acknowledged in writing? Does the acknowledgement outline the GRM process, provide contact details and indicate how long it is likely to take to resolve the grievance? Are there clear timetables that are publicly available?	
4.4 Verification, investigation and action	Is the merit of each grievance judged objectively against clearly defined standards? Are investigators neutral or do they have a stake in the outcome? Is action taken on every grievance?	
4.4 Monitoring and Evaluation	Is there a process to track grievances and assess progress being made to resolve grievances? Are there indicators to measure grievance monitoring and resolution? If there is data being collected, is this data used to make policy and/or process changes to minimize similar grievances in the future?	
4.6 Feedback	Does a user survey exist to get feedback on the credibility of the process? Is such feedback publicly available? Is there right to appeal? If yes, are GRM users informed about this right?	
4.6. Analysis	Is there a process to analyze the effectiveness of the GRM? Is there a timeframe?	

Dispute Resolution
&Prevention