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Foreword

The first draft of the St. Patrick Anglican School ARAP was first consulted on in February 2014.

The census was undertaken with March 31, 2015 as the cutoff date. Following consultations on a number of alternatives, a total of 249 students and 29 teachers and other staff were temporarily relocated to an Annex of the St. Patrick’s Roman Catholic School (200 meters away) on 20 – 31 July, 2015. The Ministry of Education (MOE) coordinated and supervised the relocation. The school undertook the relocation activities.

Between February 20, 2014 and February 19, 2015 three consultations were held with the Ministry of Education, the School Management team, Parent Teacher committee and the Clergy of the Anglican Church. On 20th February, 2014, 4th May, 2014 and 19th February, 2015 these consultations/meetings/discussions were held with the PAPs’ and all other stakeholders, including the Ministry of Education, the School Management team, Parent Teacher committee, community members, the Clergy and Principal and teachers of the St. Patrick Anglican School. On each occasion information about the sub project was shared and several concerns, comments and suggestions were raised. The school population was relocated back to the new school in February 2017.

In December 2017, two visits were made to the school to undertake a detailed school tour and enquire into the general state of settling-in by the staff and students nine months after the school’s relocation back to their refurbished facility. The principal said they were extremely happy with their refurbished school. The principal further indicated the comments from members of the community are positive. The most common commentary heard from members of the school community is that the refurbished school raised the architectural profile and aesthetics of the community and town of Sauteurs. The Principal however pointed out a number of outstanding defects.

A walkthrough of the school was undertaken by the Ministry of Education and the PCU to ascertain the extent of the defects. Annex 8 of the ARAP provides a time-bound action plan for the remediation of the defects. The contractor is bound to undertake remedial work prior to contract warranty period or defects liability period expires in March 2017. (See Appendix 1 B for photos of the refurbished school).

Further follow-up consultations were undertaken on 16 December 2017, January 8 and 31, and February 6, 15 and 23, 2018. See Appendix 9 for the Summary of these consultations. The ARAP was finalized in February 2018.
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Abbreviated Resettlement Action Plan (ARAP)

ST. PATRICK ANGLICAN PRIMARY SCHOOL REFURBISHMENT SUB-PROJECT
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February 24, 2018

1.0 PREFACE

This Abbreviated Resettlement Action Plan (A-RAP) has been prepared for the St. Patrick’s Anglican School Refurbishment Sub-Project under the Disaster Vulnerability Reduction Project (DVRP) in accordance with the World Bank’s (WB) Involuntary Resettlement Policy (OP 4.12). It intends to address OP 4.12’s objectives to assist affected persons in their efforts to improve their standards of living or at least to restore them, in real terms, to pre-displacement levels or to levels prevailing prior to the beginning of project implementation, whichever is higher. The policy specifically covers direct economic and social impacts that both result from Bank assisted investment projects that are caused by:-

(a) The involuntary taking of land resulting in:
   1. Relocation or loss of shelter
   2. Loss of assets or access to assets
   3. Loss of income sources or means of livelihood, whether or not the affected person must move to another location

(b) The involuntary restriction of access to legally designated parks and protected areas resulting in adverse impacts on the livelihoods of the displaced persons.

This Abbreviated Resettlement Action (ARAP) Plan provides details on the likely impacts resulting from the relocation for the construction of the proposed works and the mitigation measures that will be implemented to address any potential adverse impacts.

Specifically, the objective of this Abbreviated RAP is to provide:

- Details of events leading to activation of OP 4.12 and results of census survey of project affected people (PAP);
- Inventory of adverse impacts on PAP’s assets;
• Description of compensation packages offered to PAP and option selected by PAP;
• Consultations with PAP about acceptable compensation alternatives;
• Institutional responsibilities for implementation of ARAP and timetable for implementing ARAP;
• Arrangements and timetable for monitoring and implementation of ARAP;
• Procedures for grievance redress;
• Source of funding and estimated cost for implementation of ARAP.

2.0 BACKGROUND

The Government of Grenada (GoG) has entered into financing arrangements with the World Bank, the proceeds of which are allocated towards the financing of the Regional Disaster Vulnerability Reduction Project (RDVRP).

The Support from Pilot Program for Climate Change (PPCR) and World Bank under the RDVRP is aimed at providing Grenada with financial and technical assistance to reduce vulnerability to natural hazards and climate change impacts. Among the specific aims of the project are the goals to integrate disaster vulnerability reduction and climate resilience in national development strategies and management of public infrastructure. As such, a significant proportion of the project addresses selected engineering works around the country in support of building climate resilience and reducing climate change vulnerability.

The Disaster Vulnerability Reduction Project (DVRP) was assessed and approved by the World Bank as a Category B project. This indicates that works proposed under the project primarily involve rehabilitation works and any anticipated potential impacts are considered short term, not significant and readily preventable with standard measures. Although the Project was classified as a Category B Project, it was assessed as having triggered social safeguards, specifically Bank’s Operational Policy 4.12, Involuntary Resettlement, as planned works could lead to public acquisition of private property and subsequently impact beneficiary assets or access to assets.

In light of this, a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) was developed and published to serve as a guide for the project. The purpose of an RPF is to clarify resettlement principles, organizational arrangements, and design criteria to be applied to subprojects to be prepared during project implementation. A social Assessment also was undertaken during the project preparation stages of the DVRP.

In order to ensure that the RDVRP take social concerns into account, a Social Assessment (SA) was undertaken during the project preparation stage. A Social Assessment (SA) is principally a
study that reviews the likely benefits and possible adverse effects of the DVRP activities on people, land and infrastructure at the respective project sites before, during and after project implementation.

In the case of the St. Patrick Anglican Primary School Refurbishment Sub Project the entire school population including teachers and staff will be required to relocate. This is to facilitate the construction works that will be required in keeping with the developmental objectives for the school infrastructure.

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The St. Patrick’s Anglican School is located on Main Street in Sauteurs which is the town of the northern most Parish of St. Patrick in the state of Grenada. With a population of 249 students and 29 teachers including ancillary staff and trainees experience a range of inconveniences and vulnerabilities associated with the schools infrastructure. These are primarily associated with the physical state of both the external and internal sections of the building. This includes limitations of space, disrepair to various parts of the flooring on the first floor and an inefficient design of an added wing to the school in 2006.

The external edifice is ‘porous’ at some points causing rainwater to seep through the actual surface walls and into the building flooding some parts of the first floor and disrupting classroom activity whenever this occurs. The classrooms have to be temporarily relocated to the rear first floor veranda. This can be a frequent occurrence and inconvenience during the rainy or hurricane seasons (usually June to November) each year. Rainwater also comes through the window sills which were apparently not properly done when installation of the metallic louver type windows on the front of the building were done.

Internally, the ground floor is extremely small and cramped for the size of the school population occupying and operating there. The classrooms are separated by small chalk boards in restricted surroundings. On some days when outside temperatures are hot and humid, the internal heat and humidity on the school population can be intolerable for the teachers, students and auxiliary staff in the adjoining kitchen. Ground floor ventilation is inadequate and this show up other concerns for the ground floor population associated with the heat and food preparation in the adjoining kitchen which is small and congested. (See Annex 1, Photograph of the original St. Patrick Anglican School Building)

3.1 SCOPE OF WORKS
The construction works entails the following:
Complete rehabilitation, refurbishment and retrofitting of the main school building, together with the construction of a new annex in order to provide additional floor space to enable the overall facility to better accommodate current school requirements. The works will be done on the existing main school building; a new two story annex; finishing works including rendering, painting, terrazzo work and tiling and all external works.

3.2 BENEFITS

Some of the immediate benefits the school population and wider community can anticipate include the following:
1. More spacious classrooms for teachers and students
2. The relative comforts necessary to conducive teaching and learning.
3. Reduced risks of illness for teachers, staff and students associated with the damp and frequently cold sections of the first floor
4. Adequate lighting associated with the ineffective designed first floor of the school.
5. The availability of an appropriate, reliable and certified emergency shelter for the community in accordance with the infrastructural standards for such facility.
6. Teachers and staff having their separate lunchroom, bathrooms and staffroom facilities.

3.3 PERSONS AFFECTED BY THE PROJECT

For the St. Patrick Anglican School rehabilitation Sub Project the PAPs have been identified as that population geographically in the Project Affected Area (PAA) and its immediate surroundings. The PAPs have been found to be the students attending the school, the teachers, trainees and ancillary staff working at the school. This ARAP is a due diligence instrument required under WB OP 4.12 in order to document the process and ensure that the safety and welfare of the school population is safeguarded.

4.0 CENSUS SURVEY OF PROJECT AFFECTED PEOPLE AND VALIDATION OF ASSETS

The census survey was conducted on March 31, 2015 and this was established as the cutoff date. The entire school population including students, teachers and ancillary staff were physically relocated as of 31st September, 2015 to a temporary location at the St. Patrick RC School.

A one (1) page questionnaire was used to collect the information on the PAP’s from the school Principal and the school management team who identified the Project Affected Persons (students, staff and ancillary workers). The questionnaire inquired about the number of students,
staff and ancillary workers, number of students by grades, gender and ages, number of class rooms and to ascertain ownership of the land occupied by the school.

It also helped in providing a clearer understanding about the geographic characteristics of the PAPs and the potential impact on relocation of the school. In terms of relocation the main issue that was raised pertained to proximity of proposed site (s) to school’s present location. The view was that the school should not be relocated too far away from its present location. It was felt that if the relocation is too far away, parents and or guardians of students may think of transferring students to another school in the vicinity. It may also mean incurring additional cost in sending students to school if school is further away (See Annex 2, PAP Survey Form)

In summary, the research carried out revealed 278 people to be directly affected by the project as indicated below:

- 119 male students between the ages of 5 to 16
- 130 female students between the ages of 5 to 16 years
- 10 female teachers between the ages of 20 to 60 years
- 6 male teachers between the ages of 20 to 60 years
- 7 female trainee teachers between the ages of 20 to 35 years
- 3 males trainee teachers between the ages of 20 to 35 years
- 3 ancillary staff

While the number has not been quantified, persons from within the community who from time to time uses the school to hold meetings and other activities would be indirectly impacted.

Table 1 below provides a summary of the census findings and the results of the consultations held with St. Patrick Anglican Primary School, the outcome of the consultations, mitigation options discussed and suggested by the PAPs and the mitigation options considered and discussed with the project affected persons. However the mitigation measure to be selected will entail further discussion with the Ministry of Education, the owners of the project and the PAPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Assets Affected</th>
<th>Asset Ownership Status</th>
<th>Amount of Land to be Acquired for Project</th>
<th>Who will be Impacted – Category of Impacts (How)</th>
<th>Consultations (who? When?)</th>
<th>Consultations Outcomes</th>
<th>Mitigation Options Considered</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Summary of Census Findings of PAPs
The entire school building will have to be vacated for refurbishment/renovation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(%) of Asset Represents</th>
<th>Affected Persons</th>
<th>Support for the project in its entirety. See Annex 3 (Minutes of Consultations)</th>
<th>Relocation to Fond community center about 800 meters away.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church, GoG: Church own land and school built by Government of Grenada (GoG)</td>
<td>None Students, teaching and ancillary staff, community residents PAPs deprived of use of the school during entire construction period, approximately 12 months. Community deprived of venue for hosting various community activities such as workshops, public consultations, and cultural activities during the July and August carnival period.</td>
<td>School management team, MOE, Parent teacher committee and clergy 20 February, 2014, 4 May, 2014 and 19 February, 2015</td>
<td>Relocation to Rose hill community center approx two and a half miles away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation to “de Plaza”, a mall about 400m away.</td>
<td>Relocation to one wing of the Roman Catholic school approx. 200 meters away. This is because of the relatively short distance between the two schools. Additionally, there would be no cost involved for renting because the school building is owned by the Government of Grenada.</td>
<td>Relocation to one wing of the St. Patrick’s Roman Catholic (RC) school. This is because of the relatively short distance between the two schools.</td>
<td>Relocation to one wing of the St. Patrick’s Roman Catholic school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 CONSULTATIONS WITH DISPLACED PEOPLE ABOUT ACCEPTED ALTERNATIVES

Public consultation and participation is an essential feature of the World Bank financed project and are used as a platform for providing an opportunity to inform project beneficiaries and other key stakeholders about the particular sub project, solicit their preferences and ensure their project buy-in. These consultations provide the PAPs an opportunity to contribute to both the design and implementation of the project and resettlement activities.

Public consultation under this sub project will be carried out on an ongoing basis throughout the entire life of the sub project, particularly through the implementation and construction phases. The public consultations for St. Patrick’s Anglican School Rehabilitation Sub Project saw different approaches and communication techniques, including meetings, discussions and suggestions and will continue to be a significant aspect of this sub project until its completion.

The St. Patrick Anglican Refurbishment School sub project engaged a participatory process involving the PAPs who are impacted by the project (and are to be relocated). The participatory process took the format of the Social Development Specialist giving a backdrop of the importance of the consultations and the fact that it is a requirement of the World Bank that all stakeholders...
must be consulted and air their concerns, suggestions or apprehension about the project. The project consultant and his team presented the technical details and allowed the participants to determine where different classrooms would be positioned in the new and refurbished buildings.

The participants were concerned about the relocation options and were all in favour of the option closest to the location of the St. Patrick Anglican School, namely, the St. Patrick RC School. Participants acknowledged yet preferred some amount of crowding at the site chosen as opposed to a relocation site further away from the school which would incur additional transportation cost. Only two female teachers of the primary department opposed. The Social Development and Communication Specialist of the DVRP spearheaded these consultations, while observing the process very carefully and allowing participants to openly express their views, give their suggestions or make comments. The process was supported by the Project Engineer of the DVRP and the Project Consultant who were both able to answer and clarify questions pertaining to the sub project.

Between February 20, 2014 and February 19, 2015 three consultations were held involving the key stakeholders namely the Ministry of Education (MOE), the School Management team, Parent Teacher committee and the Clergy of the Anglican Church. On 20th February, 2014, 4th May, 2014 and 19th February, 2015 these consultations/meetings/discussions were held with the PAPs’ and all other stakeholders, including the Ministry of Education, the School Management team, Parent Teacher committee, community members, the Clergy and Principal and teachers of the St. Patrick Anglican School. On each occasion information about the sub project was shared and several concerns, comments and suggestions were raised. Questions raised included clarifications on the start date of the project to possible relocation sites with regard to distance from original school building and adequate playing space for the students of both schools. The Social Development and Communication Specialist stressed the importance of settling on the best possible site for the relocation of the school as early as possible. Through the consultations, a suitable relocation site was chosen to the satisfaction of the majority of PAPs (teachers, ancillary staff and parents).

It should the pointed out that the Church authorities endorsed and demonstrated commitment to the project (See Annex 4 for letter of support). Importantly, the Ministry of Education together with the school’s management took the responsibility of finding an appropriate relocation site taking into consideration the Principal’s, the Teachers’ and Parents’ concerns.

An important outcome of the consultation of 20th February, 2014 was the input by the School’s Principal in which she indicated that her staff had identified some concerns with the overall proposed layout of the various classrooms and other facilities for the upgrade of the school. It was agreed that the consultant and his team will address the designs taking into consideration what the teachers had proposed. It was also agreed the principal would acknowledge the changes on behalf of the PAPs (see Annex 5, Agreed Changes to Final Design)
6.0 DESCRIPTION OF COMPENSATION AND RESETTLEMENT ASSISTANCE OFFERED AND OPTION SELECTED

Following are the relocation assistance considered:

1. Relocation to Fond community center about 800 meters away.
2. Relocation to Rose hill community center approx. two and a half miles away.
3. Relocation to “de Plaza”, a mall, about 400m away.
4. Relocation to one wing of the St. Patrick’s Roman Catholic (RC) School approx. 200 meters away.

Option 4 was selected. The entire school population including teachers and ancillary staff were physically moved to the St. Patrick’s Roman Catholic School situated approximately 200 meters away. One wing of the Roman Catholic school was occupied for the entire twelve months duration of the sub project (see Annex 6, Relocation Site).

The potential impacts will see students, teachers and staff being deprived of their normal place of assembly, teaching, learning and professional engagements for the duration of the sub project which is approximately twelve months based on the project completion time as stipulated in the contract. Additionally, parents of students may seek transfer for their sons and or daughters for a perceived safer, less crowded environment. Finally, there is a possibility of a smaller school population returning to the St. Patrick Anglican School after the completion of the new school because some parents/guardians may have opted to transfer their children to other schools during the construction of the new school but, this impact could be temporary as parents would be enticed to return their children to the school after it has been completed with upgraded facilities and improved amenities that will be more conducive to learning.

The temporary relocation was from September 2015 to February 2017.

In December 2017, two visits were made to the school to undertake a detailed school tour and enquire into the general state of settling-in by the staff and students ten months after the school’s relocation back to their refurbished facility. The principal said they were extremely happy with their refurbished school. The principal further indicated the comments from members of the community are positive. The most common commentary heard from members of the school community is that the refurbished school raised the architectural profile and aesthetics of the community and town of Sauteurs. The Principal however pointed out a number of outstanding defects.
Following the site visits and review of defects addressed and defects still outstanding, it was agreed that a site visit will be undertaken in February 2018 consisting of representatives of the PCU, contract supervising consultant, architect, contractor, principal and vice principal to review the list of defects to ensure they are consistent with the contract. The site visit was undertaken in January instead. Meanwhile, defects consistent with the contract are expected to be addressed by the contractor. The contractor is bound to undertake remedial work on all outstanding defects consistent with the contract should such defects remain outstanding after the contract warranty period or defects liability period expires in March 2018, the Government must assure that they are addressed. A time-bound action plan was developed in this regard and is seen at Annex 8. Also, see Appendix 1 B for photos of the refurbished school.

6.1 Follow-up Resettlement Site Visits and Consultations

Follow-up site visits and consultations were undertaken in January and February to review and to discuss the status of remedial works consistent with contract and in accordance with the remedial works time-bound Action Plan at Annex 8. The defect with respect to the leech field was addressed to the total satisfaction of the principal. The defect with respect to the staff bathroom was in progress and progressing with the input and total satisfaction of the principal and male staff. The repairs and stability of the three doors on the main building were significantly strengthened and far sturdier. The principal expressed total satisfaction with the remedial works on the main doors of the main building. Other defects being addressed included sealing off an area of the veranda on the second floor of the main building where leaks were detected to be passing through and into lamp holders on the ground floor and repairs to leaks in the roof of the Annex building.

On February 15 and 23, the consultation was to follow-up progress with ongoing remedial works. The principal expressed delight and conveyed the delight of the staff regarding the redesign/reconstruction and finishing works of the male and female staff bathroom. During discussions with the principal on February 15, the principal indicated she was informed of planned resurfacing of the court yard to be undertaken on the weekend of February 17 – 18. A detailed report of the follow-up site visits and consultations on the remedial works undertaken is seen at Annex 9.

7.0 INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND ORGANIZATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

This section describes the institutional arrangements for the implementation of the ARAP. Like all of the other sub projects, the St. Patrick Anglican School Rehabilitation sub project is relatively simple and does not necessitate a complex institutional arrangement that may be required in larger or more elaborate sub projects. Thus this sub project will rely on mechanisms and
institutions that are already in place. See Table 2 below showing summary of the agency roles and responsibilities.

The PCU is responsible for the implementation of the ARAP. The Social Development and Communication Specialist within the PCU is directly responsible for coordinating with relevant institutions and with guidance from the World Bank Social Development Specialist ensures compliance with the requirements of the RPF and the WB OP/BP 4.12. The institutions responsible for the implementation of this ARAP are:

The PCU – Overall coordination and monitoring
MOE – Relocation of School
MOF – Budget and compensation payment
Design and Supervision Consultant – development of engineering work site plans that provided information on persons that will be affected by the project.

Table 2: Institutional Responsibility for Implementation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Responsible Agency/Person</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pre-Construction | Project Coordination Unit (PCU) / Social Development and Communication Specialist | Identify the affected persons, consult and advise them on their rights as per WB OP/BP 4.12 and to address their concerns, suggestions, comments and complaints. | Consultations with the school management team, parent teacher committee and clergy on  
• 20 February, 2014  
• 4 May, 2014 and  
• 19 February, 2015 |
| Pre-Construction | PCU / Social Development and Communication specialist | Follow up on site issues and matters related to any complaint/concerns which PAPs may have during relocation. | As of 22nd September, 2015 two (2) weeks after the new school term began, with respect to temporary relocation to the St. Patrick RC school |
| Pre-Construction | Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Education and the School Management team | To relocate all students, teachers and ancillary staff to the lower wing of the St. Patrick Roman Catholic school | Effective September 1st, 2015, 249 students, 26 teachers including trainees and 3 ancillary staff relocated. |
| Pre-Construction | Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Education | Relocate PAPs and furnishings to the agreed relocation site i.e., the lower wing of the St. Patrick’s Roman Catholic School | PAPS have been relocated during the period July 20 – 31, 2015 to the lower wing of the St. Patrick’s Roman Catholic School. This will allow the contractor the time needed to engage in pre-construction set up/preparation activities. |
| During and Post Construction | PCU / Social Development and Communication Specialist | Check-up on PAPs after relocation would have occurred. Monitor settling-in of PAPs in new temporary location to address any discomforts / concerns / comments. | On Monday 8 September and Wednesday 10 December, 2015 the Social Development and Communication Specialist consulted with principal and staff at the school. All is well at the new relocation building with students, teachers and ancillary staff. |

**8.0 PROCEDURES FOR GRIEVANCE REDRESS**

A grievance redress mechanism (GRM) is necessary for addressing eligible concerns of affected individuals and groups who may consider themselves deprived of appropriate treatment under the project. Redress of grievances will be facilitated through the Grievance Appeal Committee.
8.1 Grievance Appeal Committee Roles

1. The Grievance Appeal Committee comprise the following persons:
   a. The Head of the Project Coordinating Unit Ministry of Finance
   b. The Head of the Physical Planning Unit Ministry of Works
   c. The Head of Lands Department Ministry of Community Development
   d. The Comptroller of Inland Revenue Department Ministry of Finance and
   e. The Social Development Specialist (RDVRP)

2. All Committee deliberations and decisions must be properly documented and preserved for records.

3. The Committee through the Social Development Specialist will receive and register all appeals and complaints by consulting with the complainant. The Committee will respond to all complaints with a rational justification describing the date by when the complaint will be responded to, the process with which the complaint will be considered and explaining the reason for the decision reached by the Committee.

4. The Appeals Committee will meet as required to review complains which have been received.

5. The Committee may call on witnesses, a facilitator or expert to provide additional information, testimony or opinion. These individuals act in an advisory capacity only and their input, advice or opinion will not be binding on the Committee.

6. The Committee will consider each complaint on a case by case basis. The facts surrounding the particular complaint will be examined to determine whether the case constitutes a valid complaint. If a complaint is valid, the Committee is required to find fair, timely and just solution to the claim/complaint.

7. All complaints and requests for information must be recorded and filed appropriately.

The Appeals committee will be chaired by the head of the Project Coordination Unit and therefore, the PCU will provide all the necessary support to enable the committee to assume its role including clerical work and budget support. The Committee must be based in a location that facilitates easy access to PAPs and other persons who may raise any claims or complaints during the implementation of the project. This will ensure that the PAPs with their grievances are not placed in a disadvantaged position regarding access if called to appear before the committee when their issues are discussed. Claims and complaints will be submitted to the Committee for thorough assessment and further required actions. The maximum time to solve a grievance or complaint is three (3) months (see Annex 7 for Grievance Redress Form).

Table 3: Grievance Redress Procedures
### Grievances from Project Affected Parties (PAPs)
- Grievances made verbally or in writing to the Social Development Specialist / PCU

### Access Point
- The PCU serves as the access point for grievances

### Grievance Log
- Grievances received verbally or in writing are documented, verified and signed by both parties.
- Grievances will be copied to the relevant authority as defined in the Land Acquisition Act.

### Assessment
- Grievances categorized by type. Determination of eligibility of grievance.
- The first assessment of the grievance conducted by a Grievance Committee comprising persons drawn from the PCU and technical officers from the MOW and MOF.
- Letters acknowledging grievance relating to resettlement issued by the PCU to the aggrieved persons.
- The Social Development Specialist to provide assistance dealing with conflict resolution and grievances. The Specialist will communicate all disputes and grievances to the PCU immediately when received. Should a dispute arise, and not resolved via this GRM, the applicable Laws of Grenada will prevail.

### Resolution and Follow-up
- Development of Implementation Plan for resolution of grievances.

---

### 9.0 MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF THE ARAP

The ARAP will be monitored and implemented by the PCU with the Social Development Specialist directly responsible for ensuring that WB OP/BP 4.12, the Bank safeguard on Involuntary Resettlement, is carried out.

#### 9.1 Internal Monitoring

The PCU through the Social Development and Communication Specialist is responsible for monitoring and implementation of the ARAP against predetermined targets and to facilitate the work of any external monitors through effective record keeping and preparation of periodic Project Progress Reports. This will include discussing contents / outcomes of these reports in consultation meetings with stakeholders, minutes of which will be recorded.

#### 9.2 Bank Monitoring

The World Bank supervision mission will regularly and systematically review the progress of the ARAP implementation and reference their findings in an Aide Memoir.

### 10.0 TIMETABLE AND BUDGET

This section presents a sum up of all the estimated costs (if any) to implement mitigation measures for social impacts related to rental of appropriate building to relocate school
population during construction/refurbishment, including all costs for transporting school furniture. In this case all cost has been borne by the Ministry of Education and by extension the Government of Grenada the owners of the sub project.

**Table 4: Resettlement Time Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inform Affected Person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducted Census Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; stakeholders Consultations Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date when relocation took place</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date when sub-project started</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled completion date of sub project</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10.2 RESETTLEMENT BUDGET**

**Cost estimate for the St. Patrick Anglican Primary School Refurbishment Sub-Project for the Implementation of the ARAP:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Relocation Cost</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Administration / Transportation Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ministry of Education (MOE) coordinated and supervised the schools relocation. The school undertook the relocation activities and associated cost.

The project was not required to provide any assistance in this regard and therefore no assistance was given. The relocation of the school was done during the July/August 2015 vacation period; hence, there was no disruption of school activities.
A report on the schools relocation activities was prepared by the School’s Principal and Vice Principal which provides additional details on relocation assistance received and relocation support provided.
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Annex 1 A: Photograph of the original St. Patrick Anglican School Building
Annex 1 B: Photographs of the Refurbished St. Patrick Anglican School Building

New Wing across the Courtyard
Front of main building facing the Courtyard

Back of main building showing new building housing male and female student bathrooms
Annex 2: PAPs Survey Form

Census Survey for the St. Patrick Anglican School Rehabilitation Sub Project

February, 2014

Objective is to determine location, number and type of persons affected

1. Name of school
2. Location of school
3. Contact numbers
4. Number of teachers
5. Total number of students
6. Grades of students
   (a) Infant
   (b) Primary
   (c) Juniors
   (d) Seniors
7. Any vulnerable students (e.g. disabled)
   (a) Who
   (b) How vulnerable
   (c) Special consideration
8. Could the project lead to other impact on PAPs
9. Do you have any other concern(s) about the potential impacts of the project that you would like to share
10. Ownership status of land
   (a) Formal legal rights
   (b) No formal legal rights but have claim
   (c) No recognizable legal right
11. Relocation options
   (a) Rose Hill Community Centre
   (b) De Plaza
   (c) Fond Community Centre
   (d) St. Patrick Catholic School
Annex 3: Minutes of Consultations

Consultation held on the 20th February, 2014 at the St. Patrick Anglican School Staff Room

In attendance were

Rev. T. Meyers – Anglican Church
Ms. W. Alexander – Principal
Mr. R. Nicholas – Vice Principal
Ms. J. Smith – Junior School
Ms. Samuel – Special Education
Mr. D. John – Technical Studies
Mr. S. Woodroffe – Lead Consultant
Mr. L. Archibald – Project Architect
Ms. Michelle Forbs – Area Education Officer
Mr. Gabriel Henry – PCU
Mr. Eon Mars – PCU
Mr. Adam Andall – Community Representative
Mr. Anthony Boatswain – Parliamentary Representative

- The consultation started at 9:30 am with prayer followed by introductory remarks by the Principal.
- The Social Development and Communication Specialist of the DVRP stressed the importance of this aspect of the project and encouraged all participants to ask questions and ensure that their respective constituencies are adequately represented and informed about the project.
- The Consultant give an in-depth overview of the project highlighting that the input of each group represented will determined to a great extent the final designs.
- The Consultant noted that CEP had prepared conceptual designs for the project at St. Patrick Anglican School and that meeting was called to get feedback from all stakeholders on the initial proposals for renovation and rehabilitation.
- Following this meeting CEP will implement where practicable any changes requested by stakeholders. CEP will also address any other concerns stakeholders might have prior to the completion of the preliminary designs.
At the end of the preliminary process CEP another meeting will be setup through the Social Specialist to (a) present the designs to the stakeholders (b) to ensure that all requirements have been met and (c) to receive final request if any for changes/amendments.

A preliminary conceptual layout for each floor of the building was presented for comments, suggestions and adjustments.

There were comments and suggestions from the stakeholders present which called for some adjustments

**Adjustments**
The following adjustments were suggested by the stakeholders who were present.

1. **Lower Floor of Main Building**
   - Include one additional bathroom for staff
   - Provide lock-off gates at both staircases to prevent entry from the upper floor during use of the building as an emergency shelter.
   - The kindergarten classrooms will require some form of artificial ventilation-air conditioning or mechanical exhaust fans.
   - Each classroom should have its own storage cupboard.
   - Try to maintain a Science Lab.

2. **Upper Floor of Main Building**
   - A separate washroom for the Principle is not required. Convert that bathroom for the female teachers.
   - Maximize the size of the auditorium- ensure that all classroom dividers can be folded against wall or temporarily remove so that there are no obstructions in the area and the full width of the hall can be utilized.

3. **Students’ Washroom Block**
   - No changes requested.

4. **New Extension-Existing derelict buildings**
   - Adjust the washroom to include a shower stall for the female teachers
   - Relocate the Church Offices from the upper to lower level and the Computer Lab from lower to upper. If necessary the size of the Library may be reduced.

5. **Requested**
   - The Principal is requested to confirm that the above notes accurately reflect the deliberations by providing in writing this confirmation.

The participants all agreed that the project was in the best interest of the community and will support the project.
The consultation ended at approximately 12:15 pm

**Consultation held on the 4th May, 2014 at the St. Patrick Anglican School Computer Room**

In attendance were

Mr. Eon Mars – PCU  
Mr. D. John – Technical Studies  
Ms. Samuel – Special Education  
Mr. Adam Andall – Community Representative  
Mr. L. Archibald – Project Architect  
Ms. Michelle Forbs – Area Education Officer  
Rev. T. Meyers – Anglican Church  
Ms. W. Alexander – Principal  
Mr. R. Nicholas – Vice Principal  
Ms. J. Smith – Junior School  
Mr. D. Alexis – Member of the PTA  
Ms. Y. Jones – Member of the PTA  
Mr. S. Woodroffe – Lead Consultant  
Mr. Gabriel Henry – PCU  
Mr. Anthony Boatswain – Parliamentary Representative  
Mr. S. Woodroffe – Lead Consultant

The consultation started at 9:30 am with prayer from the Principal. The Social Development and Communication welcomed all present and encouraged participants to air their concerns that will help in coming up with the best designs for the school.

The Principal expressed that her staff had identify some concerns with the proposed layout of the various classrooms and other facilities for the upgrade of the school.

The main concern was the lack of ventilation at the lower level of the main building and also the ingress of dust on the lower level presented very uncomfortable conditions for the juniors and kindergarten students and staff.

The Consultants were requested to see whether the kindergarten and junior students could be relocated to a friendlier environment for early education.

After much discussion, it was agreed in principle that several of the facilities in the new wing (in the area of the derelict buildings) that would require air-conditioning, such as the Library and Computer Room, could be relocated to the ground floor of the existing building. The kindergarten Students and the Junior School could then be located in the new wing.
In addition to the air conditioned spaces, the School’s Management Team approved the relocation of the Kitchen/Lunch Room and the Guidance /Counseling Room to the main school building.

They also suggested that the Church Offices be relocated to the lower level of the derelict buildings. The lower level of the derelict buildings (adjacent to Sauteurs Main Road) is not being used in the School Rehabilitation Project. The lower level of the derelict building was investigated and the available spaces proved to be more than adequate to house the Church Offices.

The above changes are required in order to provide the additional space required to accommodate the relocation of the Kindergarten and the Junior School. The Management Team also requested that the Shower areas within the Student Washrooms be arranged as individual shower stalls, and not open shower areas.

The Consultant will re-arrange the floor layouts in an attempt to accommodate all the Stakeholder requests.

The Consultants presented a solution that enables the provision of separate entrances to each classroom, while maximizing the assembly space on the upper floor of the existing building. The solution involves provision of continuous steps and landing along the entire front of the building. New doors will be provided to each classroom. This solution also enables the new steps to be used as “bleachers” for viewing games or other activities on the netball court.

The staff indicated their full approval of this solution, which is considered to be a significant improvement to the general access to the building. A sketch showing the change is attached.

There was the issue of relocation raised by several of the stakeholders. The preference is that the closest location to the existing school would be most suitable because it would not cost parents /guardians. The likely relocation sites looked at was Rose Hill Community Centre, Chantimelle Community Centre, D Plaza and St. Patrick Catholic School.

The participants all agreed that the project was in the best interest of the community and will support the project.

The consultation concluded at 12:39 pm.

**Final Drawing Consultation held on the 19th February, 2015 at the St. Patrick Anglican School Computer Room**
In attendance were

Mr. R. Nicholas – Vice Principal
Mr. D. Alexis – Member of the PTA
Mr. S. Woodroffe – Lead Consultant
Ms. Michelle Forbs – Area Education Officer
Rev. T. Meyers – Anglican Church
Mr. Adam Andall – Community Representative
Mr. L. Archibald – Project Architect
Ms. J. Smith – Junior School
Mr. D. John – Technical Studies
Ms. Samuel – Special Education
Ms. W. Alexander – Principal
Ms. Y. Jones – Member of the PTA
Mr. Eon Mars – PCU

The consultation started at 10:00 am with prayer. The Lead Consultant did a review of the revised designs with stakeholders to confirm the changes proposed by the School which is summarized below.

**Re-Assignment of Rooms by St. Patrick's Anglican School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What was shown as</th>
<th>On</th>
<th>Will now be occupied by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2B</td>
<td>Ground Floor - Main Building</td>
<td>Staff Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2A</td>
<td>Ground Floor - Main Building</td>
<td>Multi-Purpose Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Ground Floor - Main Building</td>
<td>Creative Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Room</td>
<td>First Floor - Main Building</td>
<td>Grade 4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts</td>
<td>First Floor - Main Building</td>
<td>Grade 4B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Purpose Room</td>
<td>First Floor - Annex Building</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4A</td>
<td>First Floor - Annex Building</td>
<td>Grade 2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4B</td>
<td>First Floor - Annex Building</td>
<td>Grade 2B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a result of these re-assignments, the stakeholders agreed that the Staff, now located on the Ground Floor of the Main Building, will utilize the washroom located in the corridor between the Lunch Room and the Science Room.

The above changes accurately reflect the stakeholders’ final request, since they will form part of the documents that will be issued for tendering.

The issue of relocation was raised by the stakeholders again except this time the representative from the Ministry of Education assured the participants that the Ministry will do all in their power to ensure that their relocation option is consented.

The participants all agreed that the project was in the best interest of the community and will support the project.

The consultation concluded at 12:00 noon.
Annex 4: Permission Letter from the Anglican Church

ST. PATRICK'S ANGLICAN CHURCH PARISH
St. Patrick's, Sauters, St. Mary's Hermitage and St. Francis, Mt. Rich
Tel. (473) 642-9249 www.stpatricksanglican.org P.O.Box 2817 St. Patrick's, Grenada
The Rev'd Dr. Thomas W. O. Meyers, Rector

September 5th, 2013

The Permanent Secretary
Ministry of Education
Botanical Gardens
St. George,
GRENADA

Dear Madam,

I hereby write to grant permission for you to undertake the necessary repairs and construction of our school — St. Patrick’s Anglican School, Sauters, St. Patrick.

This much needed work and your contribution is a very vital undertaking which will assist us in our efforts to provide improved conditions and services for our community and beyond.

If there is anything more that we can do, please let us know as we continue to make a collaborative contribution to a better education service.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Rev. Dr. Thomas W. O. Meyers
Manager of St. Patrick’s Anglican School
Annex 5. Agreed Changes to Final Design

REPORT ON DRAWINGS SUBMITTED TO ST. PATRICK’S ANGLICAN SCHOOL

Based on the drawings that were submitted to the school the following were noted:

Drawing 3

1. Grades 2 which were on the ground floor of the main building were relocated to the annex building as was decided at the last consultation meeting.
2. The Special Education Needs (SEN) class which was on the ground floor of the main building was also relocated to the first floor of the annex building.
3. The Multi-purpose Room and the Staffroom were relocated from the annex building to the ground floor of the main building.

Changes were made on the drawings and were re-submitted to the principal.

Drawing 4

Again, the principal noted that the offices of the secretary and principal were located at the back of Grades 4. A request was made to bring forward the offices to the front of the building.

Drawings were again submitted with the changes made regarding the offices of the secretary and principal.

However, the matter of a ramp on the annex building is of concern. If a student is physically challenged, will there be a ramp for easy access to the different classes in the annex building?

There is a need for addressing that concern.

Wilma Alexander (Principal)

The Special Education Needs Classroom is located on the second floor of the new annex building and not the first floor. This decision is based on the size of the classrooms in the annex building and other factors necessary to facilitate the convenience and best accommodation of the student and teaching staff. The Ramp is no longer required based on the Principal’s determination of the present and future needs of the school population and the principal’s proposed approach to supporting students with physical disabilities when required. See Annex 9 for details on the abandonment of the requirement of a ramp derived from consultations with the principal.
Annex 6. The St. Patrick Roman Catholic Primary School Buildings and Site where the St. Patrick Anglican Primary School will be temporarily relocated

Photo below shows adequate Playing Space for both Schools. Note that this was not a concern raised during consultations, however from a social standpoint there is adequate playing space for both schools.
Photo below shows the wing that will be occupied by St. Patrick Anglican Primary School
Annex 7: Grievance Redress Form

Indicate the Nature of Grievance(s)  Name…………………………………………………..

1. ...........................................................................................................  Address.....................................................
.................................................................................................  ............................................................

2. ...........................................................................................................  Contact....................................................
.................................................................................................  Name of Sub Project

3. ...........................................................................................................  ............................................................
.................................................................................................  Date and registration of grievance

4. ...........................................................................................................  ............................................................

I agree that the duration of time to solve this grievance will be no longer than three (3) months unless the Grievance Appeal Committee sees otherwise.

I agree that the Grievance Appeal Committee is the final forum for decisions on any claim for compensation of any sort and that all decisions will be guided by the applicable laws.

I will abide by the ruling of the Appeal Committee on the outcome of the grievance/complain.

----------------------------------  --------------------  -----------------------
Signature of Complaint    Signature of Agent    Signature of Grievance Officer

OFFICIAL USE

The outcome of the claim is in favour of the complainant .......

The outcome of this claim is in favour of the defendant........

The outcome of this claim requires further research...........

----------------------------------------------------------
Signature of Chairperson
### Annex 8: Defects Remediation Action Plan

**ST. PATRICK’S ANGLICAN PRIMARY SCHOOL DEFECTS REMEDIATION**

**Action Plan**

#### MAIN BUILDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES/DEFECTS</th>
<th>INCLUDED IN CONTRACT</th>
<th>PROPOSED SOLUTION</th>
<th>STATUS AS AT FEBRUARY 25, 2018</th>
<th>END DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The teachers washrooms  
The washrooms continue to be defective and the space is indeed uncomfortable. The locks used in the male washroom can be scary as it can be locked automatically when you are inside. Someone on the inside if locked will be unable to exit without the key. | YES | The toilets were replaced. The contractor would change the orientation of the toilets and abandon one toilet to make the space more accommodating. The locks on the doors would be changed to include more user friendly locks | Completed. The two (2) toilets spaces/rooms were remodelled and both saved. The Principal and staff are totally satisfied with the redesign of both rooms which are both sufficiently spacious | Completed |
<p>| 2. The type of toilets used becomes defective after a number of flushes. Maintenance must be frequent for effective use. | YES | The issue has already been resolved by the contractor | Regular or routine maintenance required by MOE or school | |
| 3. The screens in the auditorium are yet to be installed. | YES | The screens were ordered in November, 2016. However, the supplier did not deliver as promised. Communication from the Supplier indicates that the screens would arrive in Grenada in the month of March, 2018. Installation would commence immediately after. | Status remains the same i.e., screens to be installed | March, 2018 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES/DEFECTS</th>
<th>INCLUDED IN CONTRACT</th>
<th>PROPOSED SOLUTION</th>
<th>STATUS AS AT FEBRUARY 25, 2018</th>
<th>END DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. There seems to be a problem with the floor in the veranda as water seeps into the lamp holders downstairs whenever the floor is being washed. To date water was observed in two of these lamp holders. The amount of water inside of the fixture is baffling to us. From a recent investigation, we observed that twenty five LED bulbs are dysfunctional throughout the school.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>The contractor to have an electrical engineer to check the electrical for high voltage/overload and source of water seepage.</td>
<td>Completed. The area identified as source of seepage sealed off. Test to be done by workers to determine effectiveness of sealing.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ventilation in the Library downstairs is a challenge. Storage of books inside the space is a grave concern. The air in this area is very oppressive.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Two (2) A/C units were installed in the library. However, the library association proposed to install windows to allow for circulation of air. Also, it is suggested that the location of the AC vents be changed to minimize the concern (contractor).</td>
<td>Incomplete / not addressed. The status remains the same</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The sink in the tuck shop is extremely small and is certainly inadequate for proper usage.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>The sink installed is based on specifications as per the contract. However, a bigger sink would be installed.</td>
<td>Incomplete / not addressed. The status remains the same</td>
<td>March, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. One of the classrooms on the top floor of the main building on the weather side (Grade 6) is extremely hot as there are insufficient widows for proper ventilation. The class teacher and the students can be seen sweating on sunny days.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>This room was originally designed for the Principal’s office which would have been outfitted with an A/C. During construction the principal requested that her office be switched with the classroom. There was no accommodation for additional windows in this room. Given the fact that there are no funds remaining under the contract, special consideration would have to be</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES/DEFECTS</th>
<th>INCLUDED IN CONTRACT</th>
<th>PROPOSED SOLUTION</th>
<th>STATUS AS AT FEBRUARY 25, 2018</th>
<th>END DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. The class on the stage is already hot and there is much concern of the outcome when the screens are installed. The lighting there is also very poor.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>given on a possible alternative after all other defects has been addressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The entrance doors and the locks used are indeed a great challenge. One of the doors could not have withstood the bursts of a gust of wind recently as a result, it fell down. It leaves us to predict the possible outcome of storm or hurricane force winds.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>The design of the stage is in accordance with the contract. The issue if additional window space would only be possible based on funds availability.</td>
<td>Completed. Principal and staff totally satisfied.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The type of locks used in the auditorium leaves us with insecurity during any type of fund raiser as the locks can be opened from any side to allow persons to enter and leave the auditorium.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Entrance locks would be changed. After careful investigation and observation it was realised that the door fell down because it was not properly bolted. Additional bolts and door jabs would be installed.</td>
<td>Completed. Principal and staff totally satisfied.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The kitchen is an uncomfortable area with the extensive heat generated while cooking. There is no exit for the heat and as a result an extractor was necessary. However, the tiny extractor installed is inadequate for the purpose which it was intended.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Lock would be addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The absence of a proper sink to wash large amounts of meat is indeed a great challenge.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>The sink installed in the kitchen is in accordance with the contract. There was no allocation for a commercial sink in the contract. The school advised to liaise with the Ministry of Education to explore the option of obtaining one from them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES/DEFECTS</td>
<td>INCLUDED IN CONTRACT</td>
<td>PROPOSED SOLUTION</td>
<td>STATUS AS AT FEBRUARY 25, 2018</td>
<td>END DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The height of the steps on the side close to the church needs to be addressed. The yard is hazardous as a result of the material used. Some of our students have already fallen and hurt themselves.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Contractor would adjust the height accordingly. The yard would be screed to provide an even finish.</td>
<td>The height of the step not addressed / status remains the same. Resurfacing of the court yard Completed. Principal and staff not satisfied with the court yard surface finishing. Principal indicated she communicated the dissatisfaction to the project supervising consultant and invited the consultant to undertake a site visit on the matter.</td>
<td>March, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAFF BATHROOMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>INCLUDED IN CONTRACT</th>
<th>PROPOSED SOLUTION</th>
<th>STATUS AS AT FEBRUARY 25, 2018</th>
<th>END DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The children’s bathrooms remain a challenge as there are no roofs to exit from the main building on rainy days.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>This item cannot be accommodated under the contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX BUILDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>INCLUDED IN CONTRACT</th>
<th>PROPOSED SOLUTION</th>
<th>STATUS AS AT FEBRUARY 25, 2018</th>
<th>END DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There is no wheel chair access to the top floor of the annex.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Given the location of the school and the space that exist, it is not possible to provide same.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The absence of a roof from the top floor to the main building is certainly a challenge. You are considered trapped during heavy rains if an umbrella is not available.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Given the location of the school and the space that exist, it is not possible to provide same.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Access to the bathroom from the top floor during a rainy spell can also be a serious challenge without an umbrella.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Given the location of the school and the space that exist, it is not possible to provide same.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>INCLUDED IN CONTRACT</td>
<td>PROPOSED SOLUTION</td>
<td>STATUS AS AT FEBRUARY 25, 2018</td>
<td>END DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The small size of the classrooms in the annex is something to be reckoned with. The space is now limiting the intake of the number of students who wish to enter our institution. Presently some of the classes are overcrowded. Reading, Math and Science corners cannot be set up as a result of the inadequate space. It’s unfortunate as concerns were raised from the onset but were ignored.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>The classrooms were built in accordance with the specifications in the contract. Given the limitations with space, there is no possibility of resolving this issue at the moment.</td>
<td>Principal acknowledges the inability to resolve this issue but questions the research that went into the specifications of classroom sizes having raised the concern of the small size of the classes during construction.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There are also two leaks in the roof of the annex building; Grade 3 to be specific.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Contractor would address same with urgency</td>
<td>Completed. Principal and staff totally satisfied.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 9: Summary of Follow-up Consultations, December 2017 – February 2018
(with Principal and Vice Principal)

December 16 and 30, 2017

In December 2017, follow-up meetings with the Principal of the school continued on December 16th and 30th. These meetings reviewed outstanding issues mainly associated with the school’s relocation from its temporary accommodation at the St. Patrick RC School during the period July 2015 to relocation to its newly refurbished facility in February 2017. Follow-up meetings and consultations provided opportunity walk-through of the facility and ascertain those areas of improvement such as the added Annex Building, new expanded bathroom facilities, new and expanded computer room, a library resource room. The walkthrough and consultations also highlighted defects which the contractor were expected to undertake and which the contractor did undertake to various degrees and satisfaction. These consultations provided an opportunity for key project stakeholders such as the contractor, contract supervising consultant, architect and the PCU to continue to address defects in construction at the school. Defects are expected to be completed in March 2018. The remaining defects to be completed and the timetable for completion is shown in Annex 8.

January and February 2018

On January 8 a site visit was made to review defects manifested on the site. These included looking at water gathered in ceiling lamp holders, several blown bulbs and leaks in the roof of the Annex Building. On January 31, the consultation included discussion about the relocation experience and guidance to prepare a relocation report.

Relocation

Initial comments regarding the relocation experience are that the Ministry of Education (MOE) coordinated meetings between the staff of the St. Patrick Anglican School and the St. Patrick Roman Catholic (RC) School to enable the St. Patrick Anglican School temporary relocation to the St. Patrick RC School to be as smooth and accommodating as possible. Other than coordinating the meetings, and the supervision of the relocation to the St. Patrick RC School in July 2015 by the Area/District Education Officer, no other institutional support or financial assistance was provided by the MOE to the school for its relocation. The financial cost of relocation was borne by the school.

Private assistance was received for payment of transportation via a truck of one trip. Meals were paid for on one occasion by school stakeholder. Assistance with packing and loading of books, furniture and equipment was received from the Ministry of Youth through its IMANI programme i.e., the IMANI Trainees attached to the school. The school as asked to prepare a relocation report. Guidance regarding the details of the report was provided to the school. The report was submitted in February 2018.

The principal noted that due to the relocation and the inadequacy of the space relocated to, not unexpectedly, there were impacts on the teaching learning environment. Those impacts were reflected in the student performance at the end of the school year. The principal reported that students’
performance were lower across the board, regardless of grade. The principal indicated that teachers explained the cramped space and overall uncomfortable environment was responsible for inadequate teaching aids used and the discomfort made learning difficult for students. The principal however confirmed that teacher and student performance improved markedly across grades upon return to their refurbished school. The difference in performance between the period spent in the temporary facility and the performance since their return to the refurbished school is seen in the student report books, when a comparison is made between the two periods.

Special Needs Classroom

The special needs education classroom remains on the second floor of the annex building. There are no physically handicapped students among the student population. Because there are no physically challenged students currently in the student or staff population, the space initially intended for physically challenged students is now used for children with special education needs. These include students who are mainly slow learners needing special individualized attention such as with reading or comprehension or arithmetic. Such students are brought to that classroom and given one-on-one attention by teachers. In the last school year, since returning to the refurbished school, nine (9) special needs students were supported using the special education needs class. These students were able to successfully pass the CPEA exams and gain entry into secondary schools because of the support provided in the special education needs class.

Ramp

The Ramp was not built. The Principal confirmed that the space utilized for the Annex building left no space for the ramp to be built from the second floor to the ground level. The space requirement to construct such a ramp is not available.

There are no physically challenged students among the student population at this time. However, based on the history of attendance of physically challenged students attending the St. Patrick Anglican School, it is not anticipated that there will be an increased number of physically challenged students attending the school in the future. This is also because most physically challenged students attend the purpose built and operated school for special education in the nearby parish of St. Mark’s. However, the principal concludes that should the school receive an increase in the number of physically challenged students; the school will shift the grades 2 and 3 to the ground floor of the Annex building or main building to accommodate and support these students. Based on this confirmation by the principal, there is no need for the ramp to be constructed during the period that the contractor undertakes the remediation of defects. The principal has formally abandoned this requirement and communicated this to the PCU.

Progress of Remedial Works

On February 6, a site visit was undertaken to review progress with remedial works on the defects being addressed and to have overall discussions with the principal and vice principal regarding the relocation report. The defect with respect to the leech field was addressed to the total satisfaction of the principal. The defect with respect to the staff bathroom was in progress and progressing with the input and total
satisfaction of the principal and male staff. The repairs and stability of the three doors on the main building were significantly strengthened and far sturdier. The principal expressed total satisfaction with the remedial works on the main doors of the main building. Other defects being addressed included sealing off an area of the veranda on the second floor of the main building where leaks were detected to be passing through and into lamp holders on the ground floor and repairs to leaks in the roof of the Annex building.

On February 15 and 23, the consultation was to follow-up progress with ongoing remedial works. The principal expressed delight and conveyed the delight of the staff regarding the redesign/reconstruction and finishing works of the male and female staff bathroom. During discussions with the principal on February 15, the principal indicated she was informed of planned resurfacing of the court yard to be undertaken on the weekend of February 17 – 18.

However, during those discussions, the principal expressed uncertainty with other remedial works. The principal said she was uncertain about the quality of work done or the status of effectiveness of such works. These include work on the area sealed off in the veranda of the second floor of the main building to prevent seepage of water into two lamp holders in the ceiling of the first floor/ground floor. Her uncertainty of the effectiveness was because the testing to ensure the sealing was effective was not done by the workers. Those two lamp holders have not been put back into use after the water that seeped into them was drained. Uncertainty was also expressed by the principal regarding the electrical wiring of the ground floor of the main building because of the frequency with which energy saving bulbs blow out. This is despite the electrical test by an electrician showed the electrical wiring was not defective; electrical problems persist. Three (3) energy saving light bulbs have blown out within the last couple weeks. The principal informed that overall, 25 energy saving bulbs have blown out over the 12 months since the school relocated to the new facility. This has left the ground floor of the main building with significantly inadequate lighting. The ground floor does not have sufficient natural light sources.

During the February 23 consultations, the principal expressed dissatisfaction with the finishing works of the resurfaced court yard which was undertaken over the weekend of February 17 – 18. The concern was the materials used to resurface the court yard did not leave a sufficiently even or smooth surface for the proper utilization of the court yard for the various sporting activities that the school is well known for especially netball. Two of the most celebrated national netballers currently are students from the St. Patrick Anglican Primary school whose netball skills were shaped and developed on the school’s court yard. The courtyard is normally painted to serve as a netball court, but the court yard also is marked for use as a basketball court and the plans are to include markings to facilitate the use of the court yard for lawn tennis, badminton and volley ball. The court yard is also ordinarily used for playing cricket and football. The principal indicated that her dissatisfaction with the resurfaced court yard was conveyed to the project supervising consultant who was invited to undertake a site visit to witness the nature of the court yard surface works. The principal hoped the site visit would occur during the week of February 26 to March 2nd.
In light of the discussions with the principal on February 23, a site visit was undertaken on February 24 to look at the principal's concern with regard to the court yard surface and the concern regarding inadequate lighting on ground floor due to the blown out light bulbs.