DRAFT FINAL
The first draft of the Holy Cross Roman Catholic School (HCRC) ARAP was first consulted on in February 2014.
The census was undertaken with May 31, 2014 as the cutoff date. Following consultations on relocation options, and in view of the limited options available to accommodate the school population in the Munich community and other surrounding communities, a total of 70 students and 10 teachers and other staff were temporarily relocated to the Holy Cross Roman Catholic (RC) Church Parish Hall in December 2004 and January 2005 (the Parish Hall is about one mile away from the destroyed school, in Munich, St. Andrew). The Ministry of Education (MOE) coordinated and supervised the relocation together with inputs from the staff, church management board, members of the school PTA and members of the community.

Between February 20, 2014 and February 19, 2016, three consultations were held with representatives from the Ministry of Education (MOE), the School Management team, Parent Teachers Association (PTA) and the Holy Cross R.C. Church Management Board involved in these consultations. On 20th February, 2014, September 9th, 2014 and February 19th, 2016 these consultations/meetings/discussions and decisions included ideal and final location for reconstruction of the new school and information about the Holy Cross RC School reconstruction sub project was shared. Several concerns, comments and suggestions were raised and addressed. The project is expected to be completed on June 19, 2018 following which hand over is expected thereafter in June and relocation is expected to occur in June/July during the school vacation period. The school population is expected to start its new school term in September 2018 at its brand new facility.

In December 2017, January and February 2018, discussions, project site visits and visits to the school at its temporary facilities were undertaken. Discussions and visits occurred with the school Principal and Vice Principal at the temporary facilities about the facilities and about the progress of work on the reconstruction of the school. The project site visits were to look at progress with the school reconstruction project. Annex 3 provides a summary of notes of the meetings, discussions, site visits and some dates when these were undertaken. At Annexes 4 A and B, photographs of the progress of the school reconstruction can be seen. The Principal is generally satisfied with progress of construction and is satisfied that all issues that arise related to the reconstruction of the school are addressed by the project team during regularly scheduled and held project site meetings. The contractor, architect, PCU, MOE, Project Supervising Consultant, Principal and Vice Principal of the school and representative of the school PTA attend these meetings. Minutes of the meetings are prepared and circulated to attendees and constitute project records at the PCU.

The principal, school population, PTA and community are eagerly looking forward to relocation to the new school. The Principal, PCU and MOE are notified of the best practice to prepare and implement a relocation plan for the relocation of the school population after June 19, 2018. This notification is contained in Table 3: Institutional Responsibility for Implementation of ARAP, page 24 and in Table 4: Resettlement Timetable on page 25. On February 24, the Principal was advised...
to commence dialogue with the MOE about relocation preparation including preparation of a relocation plan which will outline responsibilities and provisional costs/budget which such relocation may incur/entail. The principal was advised to draw upon the PCU for guidance such as with the preparation of the relocation plan if needed. Follow-up meetings/discussions/consultations are ongoing.
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GRENADA
DISASTER VULNERABILITY REDUCTION PROJECT
HOLY CROSS RC SCHOOL
Abbreviated Resettlement Action Plan (ARAP)

1.0 PREFACE

This Abbreviated Resettlement Action Plan (ARAP) has been prepared for the Holy Cross R.C. School 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 project 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 INTRODUCTION

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.

3.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION

The Holy Cross RC School is located in Munich in the Parish of St. Andrew and formerly housed approximately 200 students. The school was destroyed by hurricane Ivan in September 2004. Later in 2004, the school population was relocated to its present location about a mile away in the RC Church Parish Hall which also serves as a community centre for the Munich and surrounding communities. According to the Social Assessment done for this project (DVRP) in 2011 in addition to information more recently collected by the Social Development and Communication Specialist
from the principal and staff of the school in May of 2014, the building temporarily housing the school is small and inadequate for the seventy (70) students, ten (10) teachers, two (2) administrative staff and five (5) auxiliary staff. Toilets are shared by adults and students as young as five (5) years old. The library is grossly inadequate and can only accommodate a few students at a time. The teachers do not have a staff or computer room and the principal initially shared the same room with the secretary.

Additionally, the Parish Hall (the building temporarily housing the school) is in a state of disrepair including leaking roof, walls and shelves needing surface repairs. Because of the prevailing conditions of the school there is a migration in the student population from Holy Cross to other schools as far as Grenville approximately seven (7) miles away even by parents who may have financial difficulties providing transportation cost are moving their children to schools outside the community. It is generally felt by parents that the physical structural condition of the school is used to determine whether or not the child is attending a “better school” or an “old school”. Additionally, there are concerns by members of the community that because of the inadequacy of the current structure it cannot serve as an emergency shelter.

3.1. Condition of the School in Temporary Facilities (at Roman Catholic (RC) Church Parish Hall) following relocation in 2004

The Holy Cross RC School was temporarily moved to its present location in the Roman Catholic Church Parish Hall in December 2004 after its original two storied school building was completely destroyed during Hurricane Ivan in September 2004.

From the preliminary Social Assessment which was conducted in 2011 at which time the school was already relocated to the Church’s Parish Hall, three (3) community consultations were conducted in the school between January 2014 and February, 2016 by the Social Development and Communication Specialist, at its present location. The inadequacy of the Parish Hall to accommodate the school population was pointed out.

The consultations involved teachers, parents and clergy and it was revealed that after the Hurricane the school was initially housed under tents on the playing field until it became necessary to move to its current location. At the current location, the school occupies a main building (the Parish Hall) which is a single floor building which accommodates classrooms for Grades 1, 2 and 3, the principal and secretary offices, small library and small storage room where mainly sports gears are stored. An adjoining small annex to the main building with its own roofing houses the student’s toilets and kitchen. A temporary wooden structure built in the yard accommodates classrooms for

---

1 From this information, it is deduced to be the date/month the Census of PAPs began and or completed. It is therefore interpreted to be the Cut Off date as per WB OP 4.12, footnote 22 (OP 4.12, Rev. April 2013). The last day in the month of May is used as the Cut Off date since the collection of information commenced before the end of May as indicated.
Grades 4, 5 and 6. Since relocation to these temporary buildings, the school has experienced the following problems:

- crowded and poorly ventilated makeshift classrooms with poor lighting
- Termites infested the walls and ceiling of the school building
- Flying bats (mammals) uses the school as a sleeping place during the nights and creates “droppings” all over the school especially during the fruit bearing season which can be all year around.
- Shaking of the floor when teachers and students move from one place to the next.

The Parish Hall which currently house the school was more frequently used by the community residents and Parishioners necessitating teachers having to regularly remove their charts, school aids and others teaching paraphernalia which is very burdensome.

This current location also does not allow the students any outdoor playing area which is compounded by the fact that the entire surrounding is of concrete and when rain falls the surface becomes slippery. The prevailing situation of the school undermines the quality of teaching and learning possibilities. Besides the accommodation (main building with adjoining annex and wooden structure in the yard) being manifestly inadequate for the school population, the implications on the teaching and learning environment is considerable particularly with respect to use of the church’s parish hall for both school and community activities. It was pointed out that the school uses less teaching aides than it would otherwise use because of the frequency with which the aides have to be taken down to avoid them being damaged during community use of the hall such as during community fund raising events including parties. This frequency has resulted in less use of teaching aides as well as easy and quick deterioration of such aides due to the regular taking down and putting back up before and after community events.

Additionally, the existing situation of the school has led to a small exodus of the student population from the Munich community to other schools as far as to the town of Grenville, St. Andrew’s seven miles away. Even parents who may be having difficulty financially to cover transportation cost associated with transfers to schools outside the community have been doing this. Such actions by some families are helped by an interpretation that their child is attending a ‘better school’ i.e., a better physical structure which may be seen by some parents and guardians as better opportunities for learning and student identity with the particular school. A sense of the child attending an “old” school may be factors associated with the migration.

It has been observed that when parents cannot find the bus fare to cover transportation costs, their children can be seen aimlessly wondering about the community during school hours.

In addition to truancy associated with economic circumstances these are deemed to be part of the reasons for the declining numbers in the school population.
Finally, the structure of the present school is grossly inadequate to serve as an emergency shelter for the community and hence the need for reconstruction of the school so that the church’s parish hall will return to its varied community uses while the school can serve its primary purpose of teaching and learning, occasional meetings as well as provide the community with an appropriate temporary emergency shelter.

3.2 Improvements in Conditions of Temporary Facilities (RC Church Parish Hall) since Social Assessment of 2011

From consultations with the principal and vice principal in December, 2017 and in January/February 2018, several improvements in the conditions of the school have been undertaken over the past five years. These improvements include the following:

(a) **The roof (rafters and zinc) on the main building which houses grades 1, 2, and 3 was changed in 2005** through resources provided by the Roman Catholic Church Management Board. This significantly removed the problem of bat droppings and other roof related problems associated with the replaced roof of the main building.

(b) **A number of sheets of ply wood on the wooden building in the yard which houses grades 4, 5 and 6 were replaced. The wooden building was also painted and the electrical wiring in the building was also replaced** with new wiring including replacement of all incandescent bulbs with energy saving bulbs. These improvements occurred during the July/August school vacation in 2017. The resources to facilitate this improvement were provided by the Member of Parliament for Munich and the PTA through its fund-raising activities.

(c) On an ongoing basis during the July/August vacation period and during the Easter and Christmas vacation periods, the school PTA raised funds and used those funds to change sheets of ply wood which serves as partitions separating class rooms in the main building. Also changed were sheets of ply wood in various parts of the flooring of the main building as well as flooring board was also changed in the main building. The PTA also painted parts of the main building. Funds raised were also used to finance termite treatment on the main building and wooden building in the yard especially during July/August 2015/2016.

(d) **Plumbing was improved by the Ministry of Works (MOW).** The MOW continues to provide a maintenance plumber who visits the school once per month. The MOW pays for the service. The principal signs and dates the maintenance plumbing visitation log after each visit.

(e) **The Principal no longer shares the same space with the secretary.** Principal and secretary both have separate office spaces in the main building.

(f) **The staff and student have separate toilets**.

(g) **A summary report of follow-up consultations with the Principal and Vice Principal including additional details of the current conditions of the temporary facilities** (as at
as well as other institutional support received and related information is seen at Annex 3.

4.0 SCOPE OF WORKS – CONSTRUCTION OF NEW HOLY CROSS R.C. SCHOOL

The sub project will see the construction of a new complex to house the Holy cross R.C School. The facility comprises a two-story main building with a single-story annex linked by a covered walkway. The main building will be of reinforced concrete and block work construction, with a mix of reinforced concrete roofs and timber framed roofs covered with profiled pre-painted metal sheeting. The main building comprises of eight (8) classrooms on the upper floor and three (3) classrooms on the lower, a pre-primary school, computer and audio visual laboratory, home economic center, staff room and library. The annex comprises a student washroom, kitchen and lunch rooms, woodwork shop and storage and janitorial facilities. The school property will be fenced.

5.0 PROJECT BENEFICIARIES AND BENEFITS

Two (2) groups of project beneficiaries will benefit from the project:

1. The school population (includes students, teachers and staff of the school). Benefits will include but not limited to the following:
   a) the restoration of health and safety requirements associated with the sub project
   b) the reduced risks of illness associated with inadequate bathroom facilities shared by adults and children associated with the sub project
   c) the likely increase in enrollment at the school from within the community and surrounding areas
   d) Boost in morale of the teachers and staff in a new school environment.
   e) More spacious classrooms for teachers and students
   f) The relative comforts necessary to conducive teaching and learning
   g) Teachers and staff having their separate lunchroom, bathrooms and staffroom facilities.

2. The entire community of Munich. The new school building will provide the availability of an adequate emergency shelter and the subsequent removal of the school from the Parish Hall will free up that building where community activities can then take place uninterrupted.

6.0 PERSONS AFFECTED BY THE PROJECT (PAPs)

For the Holy Cross RC School reconstruction Sub Project, the PAPs have been identified as the school population and the community geographically in the project area (the project area delineated as the temporary school buildings and the site of the construction of new school) and its immediate surroundings. The direct PAPs are the students attending the school, the teachers,
trainees and ancillary staff working at the school. The indirect PAPs are the parents of children attending the school and members of the community.

7.0 CENSUS SURVEY\(^2\) OF PROJECT AFFECTED PEOPLE AND VALIDATION OF ASSETS

The Census Survey of PAPs commenced on May 31, 2014. May 31, 2014 is the Cut-off date for determining PAPs. The entire school population including students, teachers, trainees and ancillary staff were physically relocated as of 1\(^{st}\) January, 2015 to a temporary location at the Parish Hall, Holy Cross Roman Catholic (R.C.) Church, Munich, St. Andrews. This location is approximately 1 mile away from the original school location.

An open ended questionnaire was used to collect information on the PAP’s from the school Principal and the school management team who identified the Project Affected Persons as the students, staff, trainees and ancillary workers. Data collected included the number of students, staff and ancillary workers, number of students by grades, gender and age range, number of class rooms and to ascertain ownership of the land occupied by the school.

The information gathered also helped to provide a clearer understanding about the geographic characteristics of the PAPs and the potential impact of relocation of them. In terms of relocation, the main issue that was raised pertained to lack of access to recreational spaces for the students and community and ensuring the new school will have a range of facilities and amenities, exercise of due care regarding natural water resource at the site of the construction of the new school and employment of local labour.

In summary, the information gathered revealed 94\(^3\) persons are directly affected by the project as indicated below:

- 72 students between the ages of 5 to 14
- 33 male students
- 39 female students
- 1 Principal (female aged between 40 and 50 years old)
- 7 teachers
- 4 female teachers between the ages of 20 to 60 years
- 3 male teachers between the ages of 20 to 60 years

---

\(^2\) This Census Survey is derived from examination of Section 3 above, examination and utilization of information in Annexes 1, 2 and 3 and discussions with the Principal/Vice Principal of the school. Further research may be needed

\(^3\) Population as at February 2018. This figure is up by 7 to 94 from the 87 persons affected in 2014. The increase in 2018 is due small addition of 2 students, and increases in the number of trainees while a small reduction in the number of teachers and other staff.
• 10 trainees (5 are training in the classroom, the other 5 are training in other areas of the school such as sports, kitchen, administration)
• 10 trainees are female aged 20 to 35 years
• 0 trainees are males
• 0 administrative staff (secretarial/administrative roles performed by Principal and one Trainee)
• 3 auxiliary staff, all females (1 cleaner, 2 cooks aged between 50 and 60 years old)

While the number of direct PAPs is quantified above, a number of persons from within and outside the immediate community who from time to time uses the school to hold meetings and other activities would be indirectly impacted.

Table 1 below provides a indicative summary of the census findings and the results of the consultations held with Holy Cross RC 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.

Overall, the school population did not have any other option to be temporarily relocated after hurricane Ivan destroyed their school building in 2004. Following several months under tents on the playing field adjacent to the old school building, the school relocated to the only available building that could have accommodated the school population, the RC Church Parish Hall. The use of the Parish Hall for the school had to be negotiated with the community and church as it was the main community resource for holding community meetings and cultural and public education activities.

There was also debate among community members and PAPs regarding the preferred location to rebuild the school. There were those who preferred rebuilding the school at its original site but that site was regarded as unsuitable because it may be unstable. It was eventually agreed that a parcel of government land located about 40 meters from the old school location would be used to build the new school. The advantage of this option is that it puts the playing field adjacent to the old school within immediate access to the new school. That playing field is currently used by the school and community to host the school’s annual sports meet and other sporting and cultural activities.
Table 1: Summary of Census Findings of PAPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Assets Affected</th>
<th>Asset Ownership Status</th>
<th>Amount of Land to be Acquired for Project (% of Asset this Represents)</th>
<th>Who will be Impacted – Category of Affected Persons</th>
<th>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>The entire school building which housed the original Holy Cross RC primary school was destroyed.</td>
<td>The Church and Government of Grenada (GoG): The Church own the temporary buildings where the PAPs are temporarily housed. The government owns the land where the new school is being built.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>The school population of Students, teachers, trainees, admin and auxiliary staff (94 in total) will be affected. Also, members of the community and residents of Munich will be indirectly affected.</td>
<td>PAPs deprived of use of the school during entire construction period of approximately 12 months. The community is deprived of a venue for hosting various community activities such as workshops, public consultations, and cultural activities during on evenings after school and during the Easter, July / August and Christmas school vacation periods.</td>
<td>School management team, MOE, Parent teacher association (PTA), the clergy and members of the community on February 20th, 2014, September 9th, 2014 and February 19th, 2016.</td>
<td>Support for the project in its entirety. See Annex 1 and 2: minutes of consultations in which support for the project is expressed by stakeholders including members of the community</td>
<td>The PAPs had very limited relocation options to choose from. Initially, immediately after the hurricane, the school occupied tents on the playing field adjacent to the destroyed school building. After several months, they relocated to the RC Parish Hall. They had no other options from which to choose. With respect to alternative sites for construction of the new school, the community and PAPs discussed options included building on the site of the destroyed school but that option was contested and deemed unsuitable due to potential land instability. Eventually, the community identified government land which was confirmed to be government owned and is the land on which the new school is being built.</td>
<td>Relocation to RC Church Parish Hall. This was and remains the only relocation option available to the school population. The Parish Hall is about 1 mile away from the original school building. The Parish Hall is available at no rental cost or other fees to the school. The MOE pays for the utilities used by the school. School responsible for basic repair and maintenance of the buildings and upkeep of the grounds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8.0 CONSULTATIONS WITH COMMUNITY AND PAPS

In keeping with the Bank’s policy, consultations involving the Project consultant, Project owners, implementation agency, beneficiaries and stakeholder communities were conducted with the aim to foster a better understanding of the project and to get early “buy in” from all parties. The consultations also sought to provide an opportunity for the community residents and other stakeholders to contribute to the design of the new school building and community emergency shelter. They were also able to share their concerns, suggestions and fears of various aspects of the proposed designs.

To date there were three (3) community consultations that have taken place on February 20th, 2014, September 9th, 2014 and February 19th, 2016. See Annex 1 for notes/minutes of community meetings and consultations.

8.1 Suggestions from Community Consultations

In keeping with the Bank’s policy of having consultations; consultations involving the Project consultant, Project owners, implementation agency, beneficiaries and stakeholder communities occurred. There were three (3) consultations that took place on the 20th February, 2014, 9th September, 2014 and 19th February, 2016 respectively. The consultations aimed at fostering a better understanding of the project and to get early “buy in” from all parties.

The Ministry of Education, the project owner and Consulting Engineers Partnership Limited, the Project consultant played key roles in the consultation process. Beneficiaries had the opportunity to make suggestions and comments on the designs and scope of works for the reconstruction of the school as well as to express concerns they may have with respect to the proposed new school. As a consequence, several suggestions were taken into consideration in the final design. For example, the inclusion of a home economic centre, computer lab and wood workshop within the new school building to be used to extend skills training to young adults and students who would have recently left the school. The positioning of the various classrooms including the principal’s office on the ground floor and having wheelchair accessibility including toilet facilities were all suggestions made by participants during the consultations.

The new school is also designed with amenities to be used as an emergency centre and in this regard participants were vocal in determining which part of the school building will be used for such and the location of the male and female bathroom and toilet facilities among others for more orderliness. Furthermore, the water tank and stand by generator that is now a part of the project was a direct suggestion coming out of the consultations for Holy Cross RC School rebuilding project.

In December 2017, visits were made to the school and to the new project site (one visit each respectively) to monitor progress of construction of the new school and to hold discussions with
the principal (and vice principal who was present at both visits) on progress and other matters such as whether complaints from the community or other stakeholders were received. There were no complaints. The principal reported overall satisfaction with progress of construction of the new school as at December 2017.

Consultations and visits were also undertaken during the months of January and February 2018. These consultations and site visits were to research relocation information experienced by the school, and ongoing review of the conditions of the temporary facilities currently housing the school and to monitor progress of the reconstruction of the new school. Summary report of the consultations and site visits are undertaken in December 2017, January and February 2018 is seen at Annex 3. Also, photos of the current state of construction of the new school as at December 2017 and February 2018 is seen at Annexes 4 and 5.

9.0 DESCRIPTION OF COMPENSATION AND RESETTLEMENT ASSISTANCE OFFERED AND OPTION SELECTED

The school population did not have relocation alternatives from which to choose. The Parish Hall was the only available option that could have accommodated the school population.

The entire school population including teachers, trainees, administrative staff and students were physically relocated to the RC Church Parish Hall situated approximately 1 mile away from the old school location from January 2005 to present (February 2018), which is approximately twelve (12) years so far.

The potential impacts will see students, teachers and staff being deprived of their normal place of assembly, teaching, learning and professional engagements until the new school is completed and handed over to the principal in June 2018. Additionally, parents of students attending the school and members/residents of the community are also denied use of the temporary facilities that they were accustomed to using for community meetings, social and cultural activities.

During the relocation of the school in December 2004/January 2005, the school was supported with its relocation to the RC Church Parish Hall by the MOE, the church board, the community, students, teachers and staff of the school. However, between 2005 and 2017, the current principal and vice principal (the vice principal has served in the Holy Cross RC school for more than 25 years to present) indicate that of the school expected more relocation assistance and support to have been provided to make the current temporary facilities more comfortable for the teachers, staff and student population.

9.1 Follow-up Resettlement Site Visits and Consultations

In December 2017, and in January and February 2008, project site visits and consultations to the school continue and are ongoing. The visits and calls are primarily to see and discuss ongoing
efforts by the school to make the schools temporary accommodation more comfortable and to visit and monitor progress of the reconstruction of the new school.

The picture below shows the RC Church Parish Hall where the school is currently temporarily located for the past twelve (12) years. The Parish Hall is the building the school has been temporarily relocated to since the passage of hurricane Ivan in September 2004.

The school management team frequently participates in scheduled site visits with project stakeholders including representatives of the PCU, contractor, project architect and project supervising consultant. At those site meetings, project related questions and concerns are expected to be reviewed and addressed. Site meeting minutes are also provided for the review of project stakeholders. The site meeting minutes identify various issues that the meetings will monitor and address with the project contractor at the project site meetings.

In light of the pending completion of the project in June 2018 (approximately four (4) months away), it is expected that the PCU, the MOE, the RC Church Board, the school management and staff and the school PTA would begin the preparation of the relocation plan for the relocation of the school to its new facilities during the July/August 2018 vacation period so that the school could start its September 2018 term in the new school facilities.

**10.0 ANTICIPATED SOCIAL IMPACTS – CONSTRUCTION OF HOLY CROSS RC SCHOOL**

The social impact of this sub project is limited to some noises during the excavation and construction phases of the project, and some dust pollution when the weather is extremely dry and muddy when the rain falls. The new school building will be constructed on unoccupied lands that belong to the Government of Grenada. As such there will be no private land acquisition. There are
no crops or economic activities taking place on the land on which the new school will be built. At present the land is covered with wild undergrowth and shrubs.

11.0 MITIGATION PLAN

The mitigation plan takes into consideration the following:

1. Noise Control

The noise emissions generated on the sub project site must be controlled at all times by the contractor. All equipment used during the construction must be in proper working condition at all times. Depending on the particular activities to be undertaken the contractor will give three (3) days public notification to the community in advance. The Social Development and Communication Specialist will be responsible for arranging a town hall or otherwise convenience meeting place for the community residents and stakeholders to share, discuss and decide on the best approach for going forward.

2. Management of Dust Pollution

All trucks and other vehicles transporting debris away from subproject site and materials to the site will be covered at all times. This will limit dust pollution in a significant way for the residents in the communities. Additionally, when the roads and construction site becomes dusty a sprinkler will be used to lessen the effect of dust pollution. If in the event of rain and the community road become muddy the contractor will be responsible to have the road washed to the satisfaction of the community residents and the Social Development and Communication Specialist of DVRP.

3. Worker Sanitation

Sanitation shall be provided to site workers in a manner that is satisfactory to the Social Development and Communication Specialist of DVRP, the Project Engineer and the Portfolio Manager, including lunch and change room and toilet facilities.

4. Workers Safety

All workers at all times on the construction site will have protective gears including safety boots, hard hats and transparent vests making them easily identifiable at all times.

---

4 WB STC visited the site of Holy Cross RC School in December 2017 and confirmed that toilets are formally enclosed on the compound of the old school a few feet away from the project site. The toilets are maintained by the contractor and secured to prevent unauthorized access. Additionally, workers were seen wearing protective head gear and boots during site visits.
12.0 LAND OWNERSHIP STATUS

The land is owned by the Government of Grenada since 1995. The plan below showing the parcel of land upon which the new school will be built is provided by the Government’s Lands and Surveys Department.

The land measures 3 acres, 24 poles (134,214 Sq. Ft) and is seen in the illustration below. The school will not be rebuilt on the original location but instead will be built in close proximity to the original school on lands owned by the Government of Grenada. This came about during the first consultation held with the stakeholders and beneficiaries on 20th February, 2014 at the temporary school premises. The decision behind the change of location for the new school came about when it became clear that:

a) The current playing area for the school/community was too small
b) It was identified that the Government had unoccupied lands in the vicinity which was considered ideal for a new school structure and
c) The Government of Grenada bought this land from its owner in 1995. Because this piece of land was sold to the Government of Grenada in 1995 and all transaction and compensation matters were settled prior to the DVRP coming on stream there was no necessity for a compensation plan. A topographic survey of new site for Holy Cross RC School is also seen below.

This illustration below is the parcel of land where the new school will be rebuilt.
Plan of a parcel of land containing 3 Acres 24 Poles (134,214 Sq. Ft.) being part of a larger lot situate at Munich in the parish of St. Andrew. Compiled from the survey performed by Guy Alexander (L.I.S.) sold to Government of Grenada by ESTATE OF MR. ISRAEL BUDHOO.

Surveyed by:

00/09

Director of Lands & Surveys
This illustration above shows topographical survey of new site for construction of the Holy Cross RC School
13.0 GRIEVANCE REDRESSES MECHANISM

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

13.1 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 case

7. 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.

8. 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 lends for 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 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).
## Table 2: Grievance Redress Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grievances from Project Affected Parties (PAPs)</th>
<th>• Grievances made verbally or in writing to the Social Development Specialist / PCU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Point</td>
<td>• The PCU serves as the access point for grievances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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. |

14.0 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 Holy Cross RC Reconstruction 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 3 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:

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

<p>| Table 3: Institutional Responsibility for Implementation of ARAP | 24 |</p>
<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 Association and clergy on the respective dates:  
• 20 February, 2014  
• September 9th, 2014 and  
• February 19th, 2016. |
| 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 20th February 2014, following first PAPs and community consultation respect to ongoing temporary accommodation at the RC Church Parish Hall. |
| Pre-Construction | Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Education and the School Management team | To relocate all students, teachers, trainees and auxiliary staff to the lower wing of RC Church Parish Hall. | Effective January 2005, students, teachers and auxiliary staff relocated to RC Church Parish Hall and continue to be accommodated at this facility. |
| Pre-Construction | Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Education (MOE) | Relocate PAPs and furnishings to the agreed relocation site i.e., RC Church Parish Hall. | PAPS have been relocated during the period December 2004 to January 2005, to the RC Church Parish Hall. |
| During and Post Construction | PCU / Social Development and Communication Specialist, and AEO/DEO of the MOE, Holy Cross RC School Management Team | Prepare and implement relocation plan for the relocation of PAPs to the new school. Monitor accommodation in temporary accommodation and support efforts to make temporary accommodation comfortable. Participate in project site meetings. Monitor settling-in of PAPs in new school and to address or support the resolution of any discomforts / concerns that arise. | Effective February 20, 2014 and ongoing effective February 2018, continue participation in project site meetings, visits to the school’s temporary facilities, undertake site visits to project site of construction of new school, consultations with principal and staff at the Holy Cross RC school. |

### 15.0 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.

#### 15.1 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.

15.2 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.

16.0 RESETTLEMENT TIMETABLE

This section presents a general timetable for supporting the resettlement activities of the Holy Cross RC School before, during and after relocation to and from temporary facilities to the newly constructed school, the latter which is expected to occur in June 2018.

Table 4: Resettlement Time Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform Affected Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducted Census Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; stakeholders Consultations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date when relocation took place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date when sub-project started</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and implementation of relocation plan for relocation to new school facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled completion date of sub project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17.0 RESETTLEMENT BUDGET
Relocation to of the Holy Cross RC School to the new facility in July 2018 is expected to be undertaken with resources provided by the MOE. In this case, all direct cost such as transportation and labour would have to be borne by the Ministry of Education and by extension the Government of Grenada for the implementation of this ARAP. Costs cannot be estimated for inclusion into the budget below until the preparation of the relocation plan.

It is also likely that the school may opt to make provisional budget to support the relocation exercise by providing snacks for the team of persons undertaking the packing and lifting of the books, furniture and equipment for moving to the new school facility especially if this activity is undertaken on evenings and weekends.

Cost estimate for implementation of the Holy Cross RC School ARAP in respect of the Construction of the new school:

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $0
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ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: Minutes/Notes on Community Meetings and Consultations

1. Briefing notes on First stakeholder Meeting held at Holy Cross R.C, February 20\textsuperscript{th}, 2014.

In attendance were stakeholders including the teaching staff, Parent Teachers Association (PTA), Clergy, the DVRP, Ministry of Education, the Consulting Firm CEP and wider community of Munich.

1. Meryl Lord Principal
2. Gabriel Henry DVRP Engineer
3. Alphansus Gooding Procurement Officer
4. Claudine Paul Teacher
5. Rev Loftus Joseph Clergy and School Management Board
6. Mary Joseph PTA
7. Valda Langdon PTA
8. Susan Mc Sween Teacher
9. Pearls Peters Roberts Community resident
10. Petlyn George Community resident
11. Maurisa Jackson PTA
12. Kenrick Alexander Community resident
13. Deron Paul Community resident
14. Marva Harford PTA
15. Ina Belfon Teacher
16. Tessa Francis Teacher
17. Lisa Roberts Teacher
18. Cynthia Isaac Community resident
19. Eon Mars DVRP Social Development and Communication Specialist
20. Peron Johnson Ministry of Education Representative
21. Selwyn Woodruff Sub project Consultant
22. Ronnie Theodore DVRP Portfolio Manager

Rev Loftus Joseph, who represented the School’s Board of Management said the opening prayers and later applauded the gathering of persons at a meeting of this nature.

The meeting was informed that a former Minister of Government had purchased lands in 1995 adjacent to where the old school is located and was laying idle (said piece of land above) and that this should be looked at in terms of making more facilities available for the use of a playing field to be used by both the school and the entire community.

The meeting suggested the following for inclusion in the new project:

- A wooden elevated stage to be included
• The soon to be gazette standard and policies for pre-schools should be consulted for the design for pre-school department
• The provision of recreational facilities
• Hurricane resistant materials and standards are used
• Sinks and washing facilities should be provided outside
• 7 standard size class rooms (24*24) should be provided.
• One (1) Large pre-school classroom with moveable partitions (24*36) be provided
• Provision of Computer and Audio Visual Room
• Provision of Home Economic Room
• Provision of Sick Bay
• Provision of Guidance and Counseling Room
• Provision of Kitchen and Lunch Room
• Removable screens
• Provision of Library
• Provision Store Room
• Provision Spanish Room
• Provision Principal Office
• Provision of Staff Room with toilets, showers and kitchen
• Ground floor to house technical areas and pre-school department
• Upper floor to house Principal Office
• Adequate access for physically challenged
• Water tank and generator to be considered also
• No vent blocks to be used in the development

Provision of Other Pertinent Information

During the meeting there were also the provision of other pertinent information provided and requests made which are listed below:

• The meeting was informed that there exist underground water tank near the area where the project will be located. The school has requested that same be preserved.
• Consideration be given to the use of local labour in the development of the Project
• The suggestion of a day-care be attached to the school should be consider

The meeting requested continued stakeholder’s involvement in the development and execution of the Project. This will be facilitated through ongoing consultations with the teachers of the school, the parents and the community members whenever necessary. Note any stakeholder group can call a consultation to satisfy their concerns. The Social Development and Communication Specialist of the DVRP will play the lead role in facilitating any such meeting(s).

Prepared by:
Peron Johnson
Project Manager and liaison between PCU and Educational projects under the DVRP
Ministry of Education (projects)
ANNEX 2: Notes of Consultations on Final Drawings/Designs for Holy Cross RC Primary School Construction

Briefing Notes on Consultation on Final Drawing/Designs for Holy Cross R.C Primary School Construction held on 19th February, 2015.

The consultation started at approximately 10:15 am in one of the school’s classroom.

What transpired?

1. Principal’s remarks (welcome)

2. DVRP Social Development and Communication Specialist remarks (reminder of Bank’s policy on consultations with stakeholders and beneficiaries)

3. DVRP Portfolio Manager remarks (overview of DVRP and projects)

4. Design Consultant (step by step explanation of the actual designs with the audience). He stressed that the designs are in accordance with the Grenada building code and that the building is designated as a hurricane shelter and will include the following:
   - Water storage tank
   - Water pump
   - Stand-by generator

5. Questions and responses (in bold):
   There were many questions about the sub project that were all answered by the Consultant.
   - Whether the back of the new school would have a veranda. No
   - Whether the school compound would be fenced: Yes
   - It there a library and on which floor? Yes, on the ground floor.
   - How would the stand-by generator be maintained? A plan will be put in place when the school will be handed over by the Consultant.
   - Will there be air conditioned units and where? Yes in the library and computer rooms
   - Is there special provision for special needs children and where? Yes, ramps
   - What is the present capacity of the school? 200 students
   - Would local persons be employed by the project? Yes
   - When would the project start? Early in 2016
   - Would there be external access to the home economic room? Yes
   - Would the old water tank be used? Yes but only in emergency
   - Would the project come on stream? Yes monies are already there.

All questions and concerns were answered by the Consultant, Selwyn Woodroffe of Consulting Engineers Partnership Limited, the Project Engineer DVRP Gabriel Henry, Portfolio Manager DVRP Ronnie Theodore and the Social Development and Communication Specialist DVRP Eon Mars.

6. Observations: - these were pointed out to the audience.
• Project doesn’t cater for furniture
• Fix furnishing will be provided during construction example cupboards.
• The Ministry of Education and the Catholic Church are aware that no furniture will be provided by the project.
• Project time line... design 100% completed; tendering (one month); appraisal (three months); construction earliest start will be June, 2015 and one year to complete construction of project.

7. **Concern:** - There is an existing spring on the new location where the school will be built. This was raised as a concern. However, water will be channel and controlled into original water course. The Project Consultant Selwyn Woodroffe of Consulting Engineers Partnership Limited explained the construction process that will be used to control and channeled this water safely.

8. **Advertising:** - the use of social media and poster type adverts will be used by the principal and staff to inform and attract students about their new school.

9. **Satisfaction:** - All participants were satisfied with the final design drawings produced by the consultant including the number of classroom and the position of the other rooms.

10. **Participants:** - Below is the list of all participants and their contact info. Although some of the names are different the group is from the same beneficiary community of Munich who attended the consultation in February of 2014.

**Attendance Register – Final Drawings/Design Consultations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of Participants</th>
<th>Organization Represented</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Mason</td>
<td>Munich Pre-School</td>
<td>442-7818 (W17791)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ina Beilin</td>
<td>Holy Cross R.C School</td>
<td>442-5404 (C1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Barrfield</td>
<td>Holy Cross R.C School</td>
<td>532-3520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerna Roberts</td>
<td>Holy Cross R.C School</td>
<td>443-1044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editha Batha-Hoddek</td>
<td></td>
<td>416-971E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maudlyn Ferguson</td>
<td>Sacred Heart, B.A. Haggs</td>
<td>440-2542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issa Francis</td>
<td>Holy Cross R.C School</td>
<td>414-9798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaare Harford</td>
<td>Holy Cross R.C School</td>
<td>449-1549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valda Langdon</td>
<td>Holy Cross R.C School</td>
<td>442-6819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eun Mus</td>
<td>DUR</td>
<td>410-7218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enmore Bean Hugford</td>
<td>Parish Council for Hugos</td>
<td>524-5166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel Harney</td>
<td>PCU</td>
<td>533-852D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Theodore</td>
<td>PCU</td>
<td>451-4042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Beery</td>
<td>Parish for Minister</td>
<td>457-6494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn Woodroffe</td>
<td>Consultant- CEP</td>
<td>440-2233/01-972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 3: Summary of Notes of Follow-up Consultations (December 2017, January / February 2018)

December 2017

Calls and visits to the school during the period December 11 to 21 were primarily to discuss status of work regarding construction of the new school and make site visit to the project site to view progress being made with construction of the new school. Overall, the Principal was pleased with progress based on the updates she receives from the contractor and project personnel during the various project team meetings.

The principal also asked for guidance regarding her and the Vice Principal role where the school’s reconstruction is concerned and regarding their role at the project team project site meetings. The principal was advised to become familiar with the school design / architectural drawings, be clear about the layout and location of various rooms and other aspects of the school building layout, to be clear about what the eventual school will look like, consistently monitor progress of the construction of the school by making regular visits to the project site, ask questions and raise concerns if any at the project team site meetings and formally with the PCU while also alerting the Project Supervising consultant accordingly.

From questions and observations of progress being made with the school’s reconstruction during project site visit made in the week of December 19 – 22, the contractor indicated the project is on course for its June 2018 completion.

January, February 2018

Sunday January 7, Tuesday January 30th, Friday February 2nd, Sunday February 11

On the dates listed, visits have been made to the school at its temporary location and to the project site of the construction of the new school. On other occasions calls have been made to the principal for follow-up discussions on progress regarding construction of the new school and on matters related to accommodation of the school at its temporary facilities. Information provided drew upon observations, form the principal who drew upon the knowledge of the Vice Principal who has been a teacher at the Holy Cross RC Primary School for more than twenty-five (25) years.

At the current location, the school occupies a main building (the Parish Hall) which is a single floor building which accommodates classrooms for Grades 1, 2 and 3, the principal and secretary offices, small library and small storage room where mainly sports gears are stored. An adjoining small annex to the main building with its own roofing houses the student’s toilets and kitchen. A temporary wooden structure built in the yard accommodates classrooms for Grades 4, 5 and 6.

It was also learned that the school population did not have any other option to be temporarily relocated after hurricane Ivan destroyed their school building in September 2004. Following several months under tents on the playing field adjacent to the old school building, the school relocated to the only available building that could have accommodated the school population, the RC Church Parish Hall. The use of the Parish Hall for the school had to be negotiated with the community and church as it was the main community resource for holding community meetings and cultural and public education activities.
There was also debate among community members and PAPs regarding the preferred location to rebuild the school. There were those who preferred rebuilding the school at its original site but that site was regarded as unsuitable because it may be unstable. It was eventually agreed that a parcel of government land located about 40 meters from the old school would be used to build the new school. The advantage of this option is that it puts the playing field adjacent to the old school within immediate access to the new school. That playing field is currently used by the school and community to host the school’s annual sports meet and other cultural activities.

*Current Status of Physical Conditions in Temporary Facilities*

The Wooden building in the yard which houses grades 4, 5 and 6 and the Main Building which houses grades 1, 2, and 3 need a number of repairs to the roof, step guard railings, and door and window replacements. These have been reported to the MOE. The PCU will take up these issues with the Ministry of Education.

*Improvements*

1. The roof (rafters and zinc) on the main building which houses grades 1, 2, and 3 was changed in 2005 through resources provided by the Roman Catholic Church Management Board. This significantly removed the problem of bat droppings and other roof related problems associated with the replaced roof of the main building (some repairs/replacement of the roof on the small adjoining annex is needed. Some repairs also needed on the roof of the wooden building housing grades 3, 4 and 5).

2. A number of sheets of ply wood on the wooden building in the yard which houses grades 4, 5 and 6 were replaced. The wooden building was also painted and the electrical wiring in the building was also replaced with new wiring including replacement of all incandescent bulbs with energy saving bulbs. These improvements occurred during the July/August school vacation in 2017. The resources to facilitate this improvement were provided by the Member of Parliament for Munich and the PTA through its fund-raising activities.

3. On an ongoing basis during the July/August vacation period and during the Easter and Christmas vacation periods, the school PTA raised funds and used those funds to change sheets of ply wood which serves as partitions separating class rooms in the main building. Also changed were sheets of ply wood in various parts of the flooring of the main building as well as flooring board was also changed in the main building. The PTA also painted parts of the main building. Funds raised were also used to finance termite treatment on the main building and wooden building in the yard especially during July/August 2015/2016.

4. Plumbing was improved by the Ministry of Works (MOW). The MOW continues to provide a maintenance plumber who visits the school once per month. The MOW pays for the service. The principal signs and dates the maintenance plumbing visitation log after each visit.

5. The Principal no longer shares the same space with the secretary. Principal and secretary both have separate office spaces in the main building.

6. The staff and student have separate toilets.

As of February 2018, there are 72 students attending the school. There are 7 teachers, plus the principal. There are 10 trainees in the school engaged in various activities and roles throughout the school with only 5 in the classroom. The school does not have a secretary. A trainee and the principal carry out the secretarial and administrative functions of the school. The school also does not have a security officer however in the
12 years the school has been accommodated at the Parish Hall, there have never been a break in or robbery. The school has 3 auxiliary staff (1 cleaner, 2 cooks).

The project completion date is June 19, 2018. Relocation commences once the project is formally handed over to the principal, which is expected to by the end of June or early July. The principal was advised to begin dialogue with the MOE for the preparation of a relocation plan and to draw upon the PCU for guidance as necessary.

The principal indicated that other than existing issues associated with the school’s accommodation at its temporary facilities, all issues related to the project are usually addressed at project team meetings. Other than issues which are raised at those meetings, the principal and vice principal who normally attends the meetings do not have other issues. The principal indicated they are generally satisfied that issues are addressed at the stakeholders’ project site meetings.

The Institutional Responsibility for Implementation of the ARAP Table on page 24 and the Resettlement Time Table on page 25 identifies preparation of a relocation plan between the PCU, MOE and the school management as a required activity which should commence in this current quarter (January – March, 2018)
Annex 4 A: Photograph of Holy Cross RC School Construction at 40% Completion (January 2018)

Annex 4 B: Photographs of Holy Cross RC School Construction (February 11, 2018)