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Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AusAid</td>
<td>Australian International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESAT</td>
<td>Environmentally Safe Aggregates for Tarawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOK</td>
<td>Government of Kiribati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAO</td>
<td>International Civil Aviation Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>Japanese International Cooperation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAIP</td>
<td>Kiribati Aviation Investment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCTTD</td>
<td>Ministry of Communications, Transport and Tourism Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELAD</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agricultural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWPU</td>
<td>Ministry of Works and Public Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZCAA</td>
<td>New Zealand Civil Aviation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAIP</td>
<td>Pacific Aviation Investment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPF</td>
<td>Resettlement Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRW</td>
<td>IATA code for Bonriki International Airport – Tarawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USP</td>
<td>University of the South Pacific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 Introduction

This report documents the findings of the Social Safeguards Specialist’s (Nick Taylor) engaged to consider and progress the Resettlement Policy Framework (2011) prepared for the Bonriki Airport development, which is part of the Kiribati Aviation Investment Program (KAIP). This social specialist input is in respect to Bonriki International Airport (TRW) on Tarawa, one of just two international airports in Kiribati. As it is on the main island for population and government administration, TRW\(^1\) is a vital part of the country’s transport infrastructure.

The overall goal of KAIP is for air services and infrastructure to meet international standards critical to Kiribati national development objectives. It is a project of the Government of Kiribati with assistance from the World Bank, Government of Taiwan and other funding sources. It is part of a wider World Bank assisted programme to improve aviation infrastructure in several Pacific Island nations. The implementing agency in Kiribati is the Ministry of Communications, Transport and Tourism Development (the Ministry, or MCTTD). The KAIP has been assessed as a category B project for the purposes of World Bank environmental and social impact classification. The KAIP has four components:

- International airport infrastructure.
- Domestic airport infrastructure.
- Airport management and operations.
- Project Support Team to assist MCTTD with KAIP implementation.

An additional component is the provision of community facilities, at present comprising a sports area and a number of public toilets. While these facilities to some extent provide mitigation of social impacts, they also are intended as part of a set of social benefits for the wider Bonriki area. Funding for the community facilities is sourced from multiple donors including the Government of Kiribati, World Bank and the local community through provision of labour and meals for workers.

AECOM New Zealand Limited were engaged as the design consultant for developing detailed designs and procurement documentation for the construction phase for the TRW redevelopment. The main components of the TRW redevelopment on the main island of South Tarawa comprise:

- Runway pavement rehabilitation.
- Perimeter security fence.
- Terminal improvement.
- Upgraded navigational aids.

Overall the negative social impacts of KAIP were expected to be few in number, site-specific, mainly temporary, relatively minor and readily addressed through avoidance, mitigation and resettlement measures. This report examines this assumption in respect to Bonriki Airport and confirms the overall expectation in respect to Bonriki Airport regarding social issues given current design specifications and successful implementation of the proposed mitigation and enhancement measures as well as follow-up to the recommendations outlined in this report.

An initial Safeguards Appraisal (ISDSA189) concluded most impacts will be construction related and temporary. Longer term impacts, themselves reflecting some long-term local issues, were not noted at that time although subsequently following a social assessment (due diligence) report in 2011 it became clear that social issues for the Bonriki Airport are notable and there are a number of longer term issues to address.

This report documents the social safeguards work programme since late 2012, and it confirms and elaborates, where appropriate, on the social assessment findings. This report is not a resettlement plan as there is no forced resettlement planned at this point. This report is a “social safeguards” report, which is set within the Resettlement Policy Framework. This report is based on a review of key documents, communications and discussions with the aviation design engineers and in particular the Environmental Specialist, and a visit to Kiribati in August 2013 (see Appendix A and Appendix B).

This report outlines the social assessment and resettlement policy framework process. It provides a summary of the social background and key social issues and then discusses the role of consultation in development of the project and identifies matters remaining to be resolved in the design from a social perspective. Recommendations are provided throughout and then brought together in the concluding section in the form of an action plan.

\(^{1}\) Note in this report TRW is generally referred to as Bonriki Airport.
2.0 Social Assessment and the Resettlement Policy Framework

2.1 Social Assessment Report

The social assessment (due diligence) report was completed in 2011 by Dr Ueantabo MacKenzie. His assessment was based on a strong methodology that included secondary data as well as interviews, focus groups and consultation with village leaders and project stakeholders. The assessment provides the social baseline, including information on social organisation and the historical context of the airport, including grievances over land tenure and compensation. Key points about the social background are discussed, with some updated information, in my social background summary below. Physical and social features are shown in Appendix C.

The 2011 social assessment noted a number of potential social impacts. Several of these potential impacts were triggers for OP4.12. They included, at that point, land that could be taken for the airport extension necessitating compensation and appropriate resettlement actions. This potential social impact subsequently has been avoided through design measures, primarily location of the airport fence in areas that are regarded as part of the airport land, most importantly airside of the existing perimeter road.

OP4.12 (Involuntary Settlement) was in fact triggered by outstanding land-lease disputes, not the loss of residential and other land due to the proposed security fence and possible realignment of roads. This position seems to reflect a lack of development of the project design/scope at the time of the Appraisal.

There is, however, also a clearly stated issue in the social assessment involving a request from Bonriki people for a longer term solution to their village crowding issues as part of the project, requesting a resettlement option for all or part of the village. This issue is also a trigger for OP14.2 as it suggests that ideally a key element of any longer-term airport development plan would be the reclamation or development of new residential areas nearby along with necessary urban infrastructure, including facilities for sport, recreation and improved sanitation.

The remaining social impacts identified in the social assessment and confirmed during the site visit appear largely to be community wide effects rather than impacts on particular individuals or property owners. These are:

- Loss of access ways across and around the airport.
- Loss of areas for sport and recreation.
- Loss of areas for defecation.
- Effects of airport pumping on village groundwater.

The villagers have made it clear during the social assessment and early project consultation that they will support an airport project that addresses the longer-term development issues and impacts that they have raised during consultation (as summarised in section 12 of the social assessment).

“... it was pointed out that the people of Bonriki are willing to cooperate with the Project, and whatever the plan and design for the Project they cannot do anything to change it. But in return to their willingness to cooperate they would like the Project and the Government of Kiribati to take on board their interests, and to the extent possible incorporate them in the Project design...[sic]”

In addition to the social assessment report, consultation was undertaken for the project in August 2009. The records identified a number of local concerns then about construction and operational environmental effects of the Airport.

---

3 The World Bank’s operational policy on resettlement.
4 The Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet Appraisal Stage, 8 November 2011. Note this appraisal screened the project as Category B for Environmental Assessment, under OP 4.01.
5 Records of this consultation are available in the Consultation report “Records of the minutes of public consultations for World Bank Funded Project on PAIP” (Kiribati National Task Force, 2011).
6 An Environmental Management Plan was prepared in 2012 by AECOM.
After preparation of the social assessment and the Safeguards Appraisal, a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF)\(^7\) was prepared\(^8\). The RPF report addressed potential impacts of the proposed improvements to Bonriki International Airport in Tarawa to meet International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) standards, and in particular the location of a security fence at a minimum of 75m from the centre of the runway (the 150m runway strip in compliance with NZCAA), which would require resettlement planning for a small part of the Bonriki village adjacent to the road along the runway strip flank. At the time the RPF was prepared it was not clear the extent to which the airport development would require any new land as this was dependent on agreement about the position of the new fences. The NZ standard of 150m runway strip would involve considerably less resettlement than the international 300m runway strip standard, which would in effect remove about a third of Bonriki Village. The World Bank uses an RPF as a flexible instrument instead of preparing a Resettlement Plan, when, as in this case, a project may involve involuntary resettlement but uncertainty about the need for resettlement prevails due to design work still required - although, as outlined, there were additional triggers for OP 4.12.

As discussed below in Section 4.0 regarding the evolving design for the location of the new fence component, a compromise position has been reached that will result in no forced resettlement as the fence through the village will lie airside of the current road. Refer Appendix D for the latest fence alignment drawing.

The Government of Kiribati has formed an interagency committee known as the KAIP Task Force that is implementing the RPF including undertaking project consultation and other tasks. The KAIP Task Force committee is convened by MCTTD and includes representatives from MELAD, MWPU, Health and Internal Affairs (youth and local government). Consultation with Bonriki village representatives have also been undertaken by the KAIP Task Force to identify sites for the community facilities and toilet blocks, as discussed below.

---

\(^7\) As the project stands at this point, there is no need for involuntary resettlement and the RPF was the appropriate tool to use.

\(^8\) London - Cassidy Airport Road Kirimitati, Bonriki Airport Tarawa Investment Sub-Projects; Resettlement Policy for the Ministry of Communications, Transport and Tourism Development, 16 May 2011, Document No. P124363.
3.0 Key Features of the Bonriki Community

3.1 General Description

The social assessment report by Dr. Mackenzie provides a detailed social background to the people and communities of the affected area. The following key points draw largely on the useful description in the 2011 social assessment, which should be referred to for extra detail.

The social assessment used a mixed method approach including secondary data and reports including census data, consultation with government officials and other experts, focus groups with leaders of the Bonriki community and a number of in-depth, unstructured interviews with household members.

The Republic of Kiribati\(^9\) comprises a number of distinct groups of islands, comprising 32 atoll formations and one raised coral island. South Tarawa is comprised of a string of atolls linked by causeways. Of the population of around 103,060 in 2010, a third (34,400) lived on South Tarawa, which is the main political, administrative and commercial centre\(^10\). The great majority of the total population (89%) are Ni-Kiribati. In addition to shipping, the Republic depends heavily on air services, both domestic and international. The main airport is on South Tarawa at Bonriki and it caters for domestic and international flights.

The Bonriki area comprises a number of discreet settlements identifiable in relation to the airport (see aerial in Appendix C). These are the main village of Bonriki to the south and west of the terminal building and New or East Bonriki from the terminal to the eastern end of the runway. Visually, this second village is less densely settled than main Bonriki and is an area that contains a number of food trees (primarily breadfruit and coconut, as well as pandanus). To the north, from the north west corner of the runway, Anraei village runs along the coast linking by road through a less densely settled area to the new settlement (last ten years) of Te Kawai ae Boou (otherwise known as New Road), which runs back along the coast to the north east corner of the runway. Settlement along this area is obviously recent and includes a number of traditional dwellings. To the north of the runway between the runway and the settlements lies the water reserve. Water is both piped and trucked from the reserve to points in Tawara, complementing rainwater supplies and local wells to make up the water supply. The New Road village has caused issues for management of the water reserve with intrusion by housing, domestic livestock and small agricultural plots\(^11\).

In the Bonriki villages, leadership and social capital lie in the churches and associated maneaba, as the large number of recent settlers in the area, including people from outer islands, means that traditional leadership functions are relatively weak. Family groups are the principal basis for social relationships. The main churches are present in the area, including Protestant, Catholic, and Latter Day Saints (Mormon) but they do not have a church or maneaba in every village. Bonriki School is located in the main Bonriki village, west of the airport terminal.

3.2 Survey of Properties Potentially Affected by the Airport

Staff from the MCTTD and Lands Division of MELAD measured and conducted a visual survey of the houses, shops, graves and food trees along the existing road between the airport area and the villages out to the 150m runway strip (conducted during May and June 2013). The results are summarised in Table 3-1 and Table 3-2. It is noticeable that a low proportion of the houses (40%) are “permanent” in description, i.e. compared to those made primarily of traditional materials\(^12\). Fruit trees are dominated by coconuts, pandanus and breadfruit, as they are throughout the villages. The question of a full survey of these households is dealt with below.

Land pressures in the villages are such that people have built on land inside the 150m runway strip of the old fence (marked by fence remnants) since the early 1990s. They have done so in the absence of any building controls and by means of a variety of tenure arrangements including by agreement of family members and by leasing\(^13\).

---

\(^9\) Formerly the Gilbert Islands.
\(^12\) The 2010 Census (Table H3) shows that 45% of houses on South Tarawa were described as “permanent”.
\(^13\) While some of the arrangements for these houses may be short-term in nature they cannot be defined as “squatting”.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number houses &amp; maneaba</th>
<th>Bonriki side</th>
<th>East Bonriki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local House</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent House</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Permanent House</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maneaba</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graveyard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-2: Tree crops from the perimeter road out to 75m from the runway centre line (150m runway strip)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of tree</th>
<th>Bonriki side</th>
<th>East Bonriki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coconut Tree bearing fruit</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uto (Young shoots)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandanus tree fruit bearing</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandanus Not bearing fruit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banana</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadfruit bearing</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawpaw (Papaya)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of a recent airport visual obstruction survey and earlier report by Beca, a number of fruit trees were removed in the areas alongside the runway over the last two years, particularly in East Bonriki. Trees were also removed along the north side of the runway, mainly comprising pandanus trees. Removal of the trees was documented by Department of Lands, who also provided cash compensation to the households affected. Along the two villages (south side of runway) most of these trees appear to have been within the 150m runway strip.

### 3.3 Household Survey (Census)

The RPF Appendix E contains an example social-economic survey form for a census of affected persons (AP) for project safeguards personnel to use. There is no reason for the project to undertake such a census at this point given there is agreement amongst authorities on the location of the fence airside of the current road, not necessitating any resettlement action. To make such a survey would be inherently stressful (and therefore potentially harmful) for participants, which could only be justified in the context of preparing a full resettlement action plan. As discussed below in Section 4.4, this may well have to be done in the future and in the meantime there are less intrusive ways, as already used, of assessing the scale of possible future resettlement.

### 3.4 Visitor Survey and Information

Appendix H of the RPF report also specifies the form of a Passenger Attitude Survey. To be effective, such a survey would have to be completed with departing passengers by trained personnel with adequate resources to both implement the survey and analyse the survey results so they are useful to the airport and tourism sector on an on-going basis. On discussing the need for such a survey with MCTTD staff, it was evident that a similar survey known as the Kiribati Air Visitor Survey is already in operation. Preliminary results show that the average length of stay is 11 days, most passengers are male (68%) and they come mostly from Australia (24%), Fiji (19%).

---

14 Visual inspection by author.
15 A draft entitlement matrix is also provided and unnecessary at this point. Note that any further removal of trees would be formally documented by Department of Lands as a basis for cash compensation using standard Government rates of compensation.
16 The cabinet of the Kiribati Government has approved the fence alignment that does not require physical resettlement action.
17 From 52 interviews.
and New Zealand and USA (12% each). By far the main purpose of visit is “business” (76%) and most accommodation is in hotels and resorts (66%). Much other useful information for the visitor sector will be obtained from the survey when it is possible to monitor trends over time. It would be relatively easy to insert a question specific to people’s satisfaction with the airport experience as part of monitoring the outcomes of the airport upgrade for passengers. No further surveying is recommended here as part of the RPF implementation.

3.5 Social Severance

The runway at present (without fences) creates a degree of social severance. This is overcome by local residents simply crossing (largely on foot) when flights are not operating. A number of well-trodden/driven paths cross the runway linking people in the four settlements. The main reasons for crossing the runway on foot include:

- To collect firewood and traditional building material (pandanas and coconut leaves) from the water reserve, where traditional land rights persist but the land cannot be occupied due to the reserve status.
- For social connections - to link socially to relatives and other households north/south.
- To access social and community facilities such as churches, maneaba, health clinics, the school and facilities which are not available in all the villages. The school (in main Bonriki village), for example, estimated 100 of the 300 pupils that attend live on the north side of the runway and these pupils have to cross twice a day.
- To access an informal (rough) recreation area used by youth to play football. The area lies between the runway and water reserve a short distance west of the control tower, on the north side in line with Bonriki village.

Vehicles are observed frequently driving along the runway between the settled areas as a short cut (east/west) given the degraded pavement and unformed surfaces of the roads. There is also some local use of the runway by residents’ vehicles for short distances, again primarily due to the poor condition of the road linking the villages on the south side, and also as a short cut across rather than around the runway at either end.

All these physical connections mean that the current settlements effectively straddle the airport. It is important to note that community facilities are distributed across the settled areas so that for many to access them, they must cross or go around the airport at some point. To this extent the airport is a latent source of social severance as, with a little inconvenience in timing to wait for planes and only a few planes per day, it is possible to move around the area. Social connections are relatively unaffected in the absence of security fencing or strict policing of people movements. Manifest social severance is therefore a major potential social impact from the proposed security and safety measures and this effect requires appropriate avoidance or mitigation including the design and management of the fence, incorporating gates and pedestrian access.

3.6 Airport Employment and Businesses

The airport employs 67 people in a mix of casual and permanent positions. The management makes it a priority to employ local residents for casual positions in particular, as shown in Table 3-3.

Table 3-3: Employment at Bonriki Airport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casual Security</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bonriki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaners</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bonriki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runway Security</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bonriki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Non-Bonriki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 Using a basic five-point scale. The question should be inserted prior to any construction work commencing.
19 Residents are alerted to incoming aircraft by the hoisting of a red flag on the control tower, the fire engine siren or security vehicles and personnel.
20 Meeting at school, 9-8-13.
21 The Social Safeguards Specialist was also told how some vehicle owners use the runway to give their engines a good run at speed, which is otherwise impossible on Tarawa roads, and to conduct driving lessons.
22 Data from Airport Management.
Casual positions, especially casual security, are required for the twice-weekly international jet services in particular.

In addition, there is employment in associated businesses and organisations including the airlines, Police, Customs and Immigration. An estimate of these additional positions is around 35, not counting people such as hotel drivers.

There are a number (10) of small businesses (stall holders) operating around the airport car park and just outside the terminal area, serving passengers, airport visitors, buses, workers and so on. Most of these were reported to be run by Bonriki residents and at busy times they can have two or more people attending to the stall. The KAIP Task Force Committee could consider ways to support these businesses operating in the airport precinct to develop, such as market development for serving airport visitors, including any related training. Provision will also be needed for them to continue operating while the car park is redeveloped.

To the south of the airport are a series of fish ponds easily identifiable in Appendix C that were constructed by the government with Japanese development assistance in order to farm milkfish, regarded as a delicacy by the Kiribati. It appears the fish are not growing well due to feed issues. Another Japanese project in the fishponds area has introduced an integrated farming system that is producing pigs and eggs for sale. To the south of the fishponds a number of maneaba have been built for outer islands residents as cultural centres and accommodation for visitors. The nearest business centre to the airport is the commercial activity around the hospital (Nawerewere).

### 3.7 Land Tenure/Issues

Land tenure is described in detail in the social assessment report. The social assessment raises concerns about weaknesses in the administration of land.

The Bonriki Airport includes 310 narrow plots of land that generally extend into the water reserve. These are customary titles under the Native Lands Ordinance. Land owners, either individuals or kin groups, have rights to plant, harvest and build on their land.

The Government has the ability to compulsorily acquire land through The State Acquisition of Land Ordinance but must pay compensation. The Bonriki Airport land was taken during the Second World War and cash compensation was later paid by the colonial government. Since then, after lengthy dispute, landowners have also been paid a lease payment for their land. Airport land is, however, treated as residential land as it is used for “civic” purposes. Whereas, the water reserve land is paid at a higher, “commercial” rate. The level of payment is revised every three years and remains a sensitive political issue. Landowners are represented by the Tokatarawa Association (under the Local Government Act) and the Tarawa Association Inc. (under the Incorporated Societies Act) in negotiations with the Government.

There has been an on-going land dispute (between the Government and owners) over a strip of land underlying the airport terminal and car park and this dispute moved through different levels of court to the High Court and is now resolved. Pressures of population and income could well see further disputes in the future, as owners contest rights for the airport land and associated lease income.

### 3.8 Social Vulnerability

The social assessment provides information pointing to a number of reasons why the whole affected area should be regarded as a vulnerable population:

23 The Government has the option of compulsorily acquiring this land if necessary, although the outcome to date is that the Government will be paying the lease including arrears to landowners.

24 Noting many of these characteristics would apply to Tarawa as a whole.
- There has been rapid population growth for at least 10 years, 24% from 1995-2000, 32% from 2000 to 2005, and 25% from 2005 to 2010. The current population is 2,635. A large proportion of the population are housed in “traditional” or semi-permanent dwellings.
- There is clear physical overcrowding.
- The population is predominately youthful (estimated at over 50% under 20 years) with a high dependency ratio.
- There is high youth unemployment and associated social issues such as drinking and vandalism.
- There is a high proportion of new settlers and weakened traditional leadership plus no village maneaba\(^{25}\) (church maneaba are used).
- There are low incomes and shortages of food and cash for households.
- There are underlying land issues generally around leases, access rights and monies.

\(^{25}\) Traditional meeting house.
4.0 Project Development and Recent Consultation with Stakeholders and Affected People

4.1 Key Stakeholders

Key stakeholders for the project are identified in the social assessment as:

- Government of Kiribati and agencies.
- Landowners of Boniki Airport lands (as leased to GOK).
- Residents of Boniki, East Boniki, Anraei and Te Kawai ae Boou...

One could add the airlines, airport employees, tourism interests and businesses operating in and around the airport.

Appendix B of the RPF sets out a detailed Stakeholder Matrix and Engagement Plan including suggested methods for consultation with directly and indirectly affected people and stakeholders as listed above. The main suggested techniques for consultation were interviews and meetings with key officials, plus maneaba meetings in the villages. These methods have been used by project personnel, as outlined below, and also by the Social Safeguards Specialist during the site visit.

4.2 Iterations between Consultation and Design

While it sounds simple, the first step in dealing with environmental and social impacts is to avoid them in the first place. To do so requires constructive interactions between the design team, environmental and social impact assessments, and consultation with communities and stakeholders. As the RPF (para 90) points out: The planning phase is the most important and intensive period of engagement with APs [affected people], and sets the agenda for ongoing meaningful consultation and participation through to and including post-project monitoring. Development of the Boniki airport development project (under the KAIP) and associated consultation and assessments are described here.

Because the final design and infrastructure requirements had still to be determined at the time of project appraisal, the Resettlement Policy Framework was selected as the appropriate social safeguard instrument, as guided by OP14.2. No physical displacement was envisaged then. The principal objective was to avoid and, if that is not possible, minimise any social impacts, especially forced resettlement. As noted above, the RPF provides a flexible approach that can accommodate an evolving design and provide a basis for social impact management.

For meaningful (informed) consultation on any project it is important that full information is available on the physical dimensions of the project prior to key design and other decisions taking place. A major concern raised in the social assessment is that in order to avoid a repeat of previous vandalism of a new fence then the project will need to work closely with, and build support of, the people directly affected. The social assessment recommended that the full project concept be made available to the Boniki people early in the design process. It was clearly stated that the concept should include responses to the issues raised to date or people would quickly become disillusioned with the process.

“The location of the fence is a matter of concern for the people of Boniki, and something that needs to be clarified and explained to them during the design phase of the project.” – Section 8.1 of the RPF.

It was accepted by the project that along with other stakeholders the villagers affected by the airport development must be consulted fully. The consultation process in fact started with the consultation undertaken in 2009 and then continued with the social assessment (in 2011) as reported by Dr MacKenzie. Further consultation took place, led by the KAIP Task Force committee in April 2013. This later consultation (April 2013) was focused on the people (Boniki village residents) believed to be most affected by the airport perimeter fence. During this consultation the community were shown fence designs and alignment details. The community are accepting of the fence and support the use of pedestrian gates to allow crossing of the runway. The community are also in support of the community facilities and toilet blocks. They have requested a soccer field to replace the area that will be lost, given the popularity of the sport with youth.
As it turned out, development of the fence alignment and agreement on its footprint saw numerous delays including the timing of social safeguards activities and community consultation. The agreed project footprint at the time of the social safeguards site visit had included input from aviation experts, airlines, key government agencies and other stakeholders, and Bonriki leaders and residents. During discussions the parties had access to working drawings of possible locations of fences, paths, gates and roads. The design was adapted in response to a mix of technical and social issues. The result was location of the perimeter fence airside of the perimeter road, with access gates for pedestrians. The agreed footprint therefore represents the results of an iterative design process including community input as recommended by the social assessment report.

The whole point of an iterative and consultative process of project development is that the resulting fence and gates, plus operating procedure, do not result in the fence being damaged again, and trespass issues are managed well, while maintaining village movement and access overall. The solution needs to be locally acceptable, socially and culturally appropriate, ideally with agreed control mechanisms that are backed up by informal social control, i.e. family and village leaders provide and reinforce messages of safe behaviour to all residents, especially youth, with a sense of pride in the airport as a national facility that the villagers have an “ownership” stake in.

There needs to be a clear line of communication for residents to an accessible project office (i.e. not requiring access to secure airport areas) and to airport management (at present located in the isolated control tower). During construction and then operation there needs to be a public complaints mechanism and register (recorded for monitoring purposes) for local residents and airport visitors.

### 4.2.1 Bonriki Ongoing Representation on Key Committees

The Social Assessment Report recommended that a Bonriki village representative should be represented on the Airport Safety Committee. Furthermore, in my discussions with the KAIP Task Force committee, and at a maneaba meeting, it was suggested that the village should be represented on the Airport Safety Committee, especially for input to planning and implementation of the community facilities.

The recommendation is that these two representations for Bonriki residents should be followed through. There is also opportunity for the KAIP Task Force Committee to continue beyond the life of the KAIP and evolve into a committee of airport stakeholder representatives that could be the avenue for addressing longer term management and development of the airport. Membership of this stakeholder committee should include representation from local stall holders and airport businesses. A longer term airport stakeholder committee provides the channel for communication on aviation issues as they arise as well as encouraging empowerment of the local community in issues which would likely have national benefits.

### 4.3 Other Issues Raised Regarding Project Development

#### 4.3.1 Aggregates

A particular issue raised when preparing this report is the source of aggregates for the runway resurfacing and associated new road. Mining of aggregates from the lagoon has the potential to cause environmental impacts with social consequences for livelihoods and food sources. In consultation for the social assessment in 2011, villagers raised their concerns about the long-term effects of previous mining of “mud” from the lagoon and asked that this not take place close to the villages and associated livelihood activities such as collection of shellfish.

Furthermore, there is likely to be considerable pressure on aggregate supplies as a result of the South Tarawa road project. Bonriki airport project aggregates are expected to be sourced from Fijian imports appropriately treated for biosecurity. There is a project called Environmentally Safe Aggregates for Tarawa (ESAT) but this is not expected to be the source. The ESAT project might, however, help to alleviate the effects of informal aggregate mining for cash income by households in the New Road village area and further south, an activity that

---

26 Dr Nick Taylor’s visit to Tarawa in June was aborted due to aircraft difficulties. Subsequent travel obligations by the project team and Dr Nick Taylor further delayed the visit until August. The benefits of these delays were progress on the technical design work including consultation with key stakeholders.

27 A Project Information Bulletin was not prepared, but information was provided verbally by project personnel. Note that a community-government committee set up to manage the Bonriki water reserve met just once and is now defunct. The lack of engagement and cooperation between the local landowners and communities and government agencies, was found to have led to the continued decline in the health of the water reserves, despite the existence of strict regulations. Ian White, Tony Falkland and Marella Rebegetz (nd). Report on the protection and management of water reserves, South Tarawa. Preparation of Water Master Plan for Tarawa, KAPII Component 3, Freshwater resources, Project 3.2.1.
is accelerating coastal erosion on the ocean side. The ESAT aggregates project might also be a source of fill for the community facility discussed below.

4.3.2 Construction Areas

At the time of the social assessment and resettlement policy framework reports there was no detail on possible construction support areas, which will be required for storing materials, equipment and so on.

A number of construction laydown areas have been proposed, with some being ruled out and some still under consideration. These are:

1) At the north western end of the runway, northern side, adjacent to a pond (possibly an old borrow pit). Most of the land is government owned, and it lies primarily within the water reserve. There are likely to be issues with approvals for the water reserve land. In reality only a small area will be available here at best. There are no houses at present. This site has been ruled out due to the proximity to the water reserve.

2) Some government land is available adjacent to the control tower. Activity here could not encroach on the water reserve or pollute it in any way. There are no houses but the site is constrained by size. Closer to the runway activities such as heaps of material could cause issues with visual obstacles. This site has been ruled out due to the proximity to the water reserve.

3) There is some land at the south eastern end of the runway, north side, an old site used by the Chinese. It is government land and there are no houses. The site is constrained by size and proximity to the runway, and by an area of contamination of bitumen from rotted barrels left in the early 1990s. This contaminated area needs to be cleaned up. This site has been ruled out due to the proximity to the water reserve.

Alternate sites proposed by some officials are between 1km and 2.5km from the southeast corner of the runway along the road to the south. The fourth proposed site is at the end of two large borrow bits left from the last airport runway upgrade (1990s). These are saline ponds with no obvious use to anyone. There is some government land at the end of these ponds that appears unoccupied and could be used for storage despite distance from the actual works. The land-tenure status needs to be checked as there is a large, lightly settled area that lies to the west. There might be potential to reclaim some land from the old pit and to leave the used part of the site (government land) for future airport resettlement under an airport master plan. It is close to an area previously considered for a “model” urban development by NZAid and it is also not far from a series of island maneaba being funded by the Taiwanese Government. The fifth proposed site is south west of the ponds in the Temaiku subdivision on land zoned for industrial use and Government owned.

Further investigation and confirmation of the availability of the proposed sites is still forthcoming so no decisions have been reached yet.

4.3.3 Noise

At the maneaba meeting attended (9 August 2013), operational aircraft noise was raised as a significant social issue for Bonriki residents. This issue was also raised during previous project consultation. Construction noise is specifically addressed in the EMP. The scope of work for the Bonriki airport upgrade is general maintenance and improvement with a view to ensuring the continued operation of the airport, not increasing capacity and frequency of flights or vehicle traffic. So there will be no increase in noise or vibration levels during operation and only potentially small decreases due to improved pavement surfaces. Traditionally noise and vibration impacts from airport operations are managed by land use and town planning to limit development around an operational airport. Due to the serious land availability issues in South Tarawa, encroachment and increased density of housing has occurred around the airport. Operational mitigation measures for noise and vibration can include noise abatement operational procedures (e.g. departure and approach procedures) and operating restrictions on aircraft (e.g. curfews).

4.4 Community Benefits

In addition to avoiding and mitigating social impacts, such as the maintenance of physical access as discussed above, it is important to consider that community members are negatively affected in a general way by the airport’s presence, so it is important to consider the principal of wider community benefits as signalled in the RPF (para 60). Such an approach is common in infrastructure projects. To some extent the proposed community

29 Stricter controls on small-scale coastal mining will affect household incomes and should ideally be linked to a livelihood component.
facilities (detailed below) are mitigation, in that users of the airport space for recreation and sanitation are directly affected, although it is appropriate to deal with this issue at a community level.

4.4.1 Community Facilities

A number of community facilities have been investigated by the KAIP Task Force committee convened by the Ministry. Present thinking about these community facilities is based on consultation in April and on-going discussions with community leaders. Facilities were also discussed at the maneaba meeting on 9 August 2013.

It is currently proposed that the facilities comprise two toilet blocks in East Bonriki and four in Bonriki main village plus a recreation facility. The latter would comprise a soccer pitch, hard court (volley ball/basketball) and a maneaba for shelter and meetings. Presumably one of the toilet blocks would be sited there as well. At meetings attended during the site visit it was pointed out that once the facilities are underway, it should be possible to attract additional funding for support such as sporting equipment (nets etc.) and playground equipment. There was also some discussion of the need for an office/base for youth development that could be sited at the sports ground. The community facilities will require funding from multiple donors including the World Bank (under social mitigation), the GOK, other donors for specific components (e.g. the maneaba, youth development office, equipment) and the local community.

The Committee is still investigating possible sites for the sports facility. The current, preferred site is a small inlet directly east of Bonriki School. Development at this site is central, would be government land and could be operated and maintained in collaboration with the school. However, to reclaim the inlet to a sufficient height, including any dredging, would require sign off for any environmental issues. The Committee asked if the reclamation would fit with project aggregate demand/supply. They pointed out community support might be greater for local dredging if it involved an improved boat channel. The school could be involved in planting mangroves on the lagoon side to offset those lost during reclamation. The Committee asked if development of the site would trigger World Bank requirements for a separate Environmental Impact Assessment. They noted that the toilet facilities’ septic tanks would require local government/MELAD sign off. As part of the assessment of potential sites it is important to consider the environmental impacts and any additional investigations that may need to be undertaken to secure approvals (both funding and regulatory).

A further point made in the village meeting was that site preparation and building of community facilities should commence early in the airport construction works schedule, giving the villagers confidence that the benefits will be provided. Both the Committee and the village leaders suggested that villagers could be employed in construction activities, giving them a stronger sense of ownership.

4.4.2 Airport Ring Road

The question of a “ring” road was raised in terms of social benefits/mitigation – to facilitate public transport around the airport perimeter given vehicle crossings-traverses are lost. To improve the road along the south side of the runway and around each end should be regarded as a project component for social mitigation. Current understanding is that this will be done as part of the World Bank funded30 Tarawa Roads project.

The social rationale for allowing a road to pass both ends of the runway is simple. A ring road is a far different proposition to forcing residents at the east end to drive all the way to the west end in order to access the New Road area. No road bypass of the runway at the east end would be unacceptable for the social severance imposed. Furthermore, a number of people, including speakers at the village meeting, have called for the provision of a ring-road bus service as social mitigation. Given there are active local, private-sector bus companies operating on Tarawa, a much simpler option is to ensure that the roading system is of a standard that attracts operators to provide the services.31

One outstanding issue at the time of the site visit was uncertainty around the configuration of roads and fences at the eastern end of the runway. The strong consensus from those met with was that the road at this end should be outside the fence if at all possible, avoiding security gates and the possibility of excursions onto the runway. Concerns were raised about the seawall partially completed at the eastern end and the “hole” left between the wall and the runway land. If at all possible this hole should be filled as part of the airport project so the road can be shifted as far seaward as possible. Further engineering assessment is therefore needed at this eastern end.

30 With AusAid and JICA.
31 Any additional subsidy of the services would be complex to operate.
4.4.3 Local Employment and Business Opportunities

Local employment opportunities in construction and operation of the airport are noted as social benefits in the social assessment report and the RPF report. As noted above, locals are already employed in casual work in particular. To gain further benefits will require a procurement strategy backed by appropriate training to up-skill people into the more permanent and skilled positions.

Similarly, local people are already engaged in businesses such as stalls at the airport. To extend these benefits would require a well-focused business development strategy.

4.4.4 Long-Term Settlement Planning

The parallel airport master planning process seems to provide the opportunity to achieve longer term benefits for both the airport and the surrounding Bonriki communities. In many ways the airport project preceding the master plan is around the wrong way.

The boundaries of an airport master plan should be set to include all or parts of Bonriki Village (as agreed by key stakeholders). In the context of this master plan any consideration of reclamation required for the airport longer term should include consideration of the needs for urban land. Requirements of the urban area include the needs for future resettlement housing, and business activity and services typically found in conjunction with an airport, along with appropriate, community facilities, sport and recreation, and sanitation and any other activities displaced by the airport. The principles and scope of urban development should be part of a longer-term Bonriki community benefits agreement, i.e. benefits that extend beyond direct impact mitigation and the community facilities described above.

As noted above, to develop a full Resettlement Plan at this point would require household surveys and community consultation at a level of detail that would cause considerable and unnecessary stress for individuals, families and the community. However, the community should be involved in longer-term planning and related community agreements. As part of this longer term planning, an approach is needed for building controls. Ideally, such an approach would be developed in consultation with residents, for controls on new buildings within the 150m runway strip. An unspoken issue (not specifically voiced during the site visit) is the possibility that there will be opportunistic building in anticipation of future resettlement options or financial compensation. It would be useful to maintain a record of all new buildings (residential, shops, etc.) within the 150m runway strip with GPS mapping.
5.0 Conclusions and Recommendations for RPF Implementation

The key findings from this work are as summarised here. The design and location of the airport security fence has obviated the need for any resettlement of residents or businesses in the Bonriki community. The fence could, however, cause definite social severance for residents. This severance largely will be mitigated by including a number of pedestrian gates for pathways across the airport. Additional mitigation will be provided by road access around the runway at each end. A community facility is planned to provide some mitigation of wider community effects and loss of the airport space.

The Resettlement Policy Framework provides a flexible tool for managing other social impacts. Recommendations are provided in Table 5-1 as a plan for implementing the RPF.

The MCTTD is the principal implementing agency for social safeguards. However, as is often the case with managing social effects and maximising social outcomes for affected people, a number of Government agencies will be involved. This report therefore endorses strongly the initiative of the MCTTD to set up an inter-agency committee known currently as the KAIP Resettlement Task Force, although as noted the name could be misleading. Although this Committee is tasked primarily with implementing the RPF, it is suggested that the Committee be renamed the Social Safeguards Committee and operate within the existing terms of reference (or drafted to reflect the intended function of the Committee).

On-going stakeholder engagement and consultation has been an important aspect of developing the current design through an iterative design process. Continuing with the consultation and village representation on the committees provide an opportunity to raise issues and discuss any grievances arising from the project implementation. Therefore an important component in the implementation plan below is to continue this effort. Suggestions are made for including Bonriki representation in key committees. An education programme will be a further important part of building social support and informal social control of future airport trespass and also control of further building developments on properties too close to the runway (i.e. within the 150m runway strip).

Basic records of all discussions with key stakeholders and minutes of village meetings should be maintained. The records should include the date, who was consulted, their organisation, the issue or issues discussed, and the key points people have made. These are important records to be included in the RPF implementation monitoring.

Table 5-1: Recommendations and Action Plan for Implementation of the RPF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
<th>Proposed responsibility</th>
<th>Proposed Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete/confirm</td>
<td>Fences and gates – Obtain official sign off. Feedback information on the final design in the next phase of community consultation</td>
<td>MCTTD, KAIP Task Force Committee</td>
<td>September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project design elements</td>
<td>Perimeter road – complete engineering design for the location of the road and fence at the runway east end, including the possibility of filling the hole behind the sea wall. Confirm that the road along the south side of the runway will be upgraded as part of the Tarawa Road project.</td>
<td>AECOM, MCTTD</td>
<td>September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction sites – complete assessment of any land tenure issues or social and environmental concerns for all proposed sites</td>
<td>AECOM, MCTTD</td>
<td>September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community benefits</td>
<td>Sports area – complete investigations of site adjacent to the primary school and confirm in the planned community consultation.</td>
<td>KAIP Bonriki RPF Committee, AECOM</td>
<td>September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports ground and toilets – confirm sites, design and a process for contracting and utilising local labour.</td>
<td>KAIP Task Force Committee, MWPU</td>
<td>Further consultation, September 2013. Building should commence early in airport works schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Recommended Action</td>
<td>Proposed responsibility</td>
<td>Proposed Timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>- identify ways to include local labour in procurement of the construction contracts, including any necessary training(^{32}). Assess training needs for operational staff and encouraging local employment in airport operations.</td>
<td>KAIP Task Force Committee</td>
<td>Assessment underway. Implement in procurement phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business development – investigate ways to support businesses operating in the airport precinct, such as market development and training</td>
<td>KAIP Task Force Committee</td>
<td>Prior to terminal reconstruction activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build community support</td>
<td>Further consultation – a further maneaba meeting in Bonriki and continuing consultation as the project proceeds.</td>
<td>KAIP Task Force Committee</td>
<td>September 2013 and at least twice a year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonriki representation</td>
<td>- establish representation of the area on the Airport Security Committee and the KAIP Resettlement Task Force Committee.</td>
<td>MCTTD</td>
<td>As soon as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education programme</td>
<td>- establish a public information and education programme in support of the new security fence and gates.</td>
<td>KAIP Task Force Committee, Bonriki school, Churches.</td>
<td>Start prior to the fence going up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Master Plan</td>
<td>Urban planning – undertake urban planning including future resettlement needs in the airport master planning process.</td>
<td>Airbiz</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building controls</td>
<td>- establish an approach, in consultation with residents, for controls on new buildings within the 150m runway strip.</td>
<td>MCTTD, MELAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project monitoring</td>
<td>New buildings – maintain a record of all new buildings (residential, shops, etc) within the 150m runway strip with GPS mapping.</td>
<td>MELAD, MCTTD</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain records of any property affected, such as by removal of trees, and any compensation paid.</td>
<td>MELAD</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish a complaints mechanism and register for local residents and airport visitors – accessible both during construction and operation.</td>
<td>Project office, MCTTD/Aviation/Airport Management</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visitor attitudes – insert a question on visitor satisfaction with their airport experience in the ongoing visitor survey. Include reporting of survey results to KAIP Task Force Committee for information and action if required.</td>
<td>MCTTD/Kiribati Tourism</td>
<td>Prior to redevelopment starting and ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{32}\) Registration of local contractors interested in participating in the KAIP development programs is now being processed following approval by MCTTD in September 2013.
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In the process of undertaking the Social Safeguards Specialist assignment, a number of key issues formed as questions were noted for project staff to address, and these provided a framework for this social safeguards investigation.

A number of people on Tarawa helped provide answers to these questions and their assistance is acknowledged.

Land ownership
An important feature of the design, as it currently stands, is the location of the fence on the airside of the road. Questions about the alignment were:
1) Who owns the land the fence will be on? Identify if there are going to be any anticipated land ownership issues for the airside fence through the village, i.e. as it is drawn at present.
2) Is the area actually free of houses and buildings (as indicated in the aerial photography) and far enough from the water reserve?
3) What is the proximity of houses and community facilities that may be in this area?
4) Confirm outcome of High Court decision regarding land ownership details and any remaining issues for the terminal and car park.
5) What are the ownership issues, if any, related to alternative construction sites?

Community access
1) Will proposed fence gates and crossing points, for pedestrians, resolve access issues for the wider community between areas of land that they own either side of the runway and for members of the Bonriki community to access facilities such as the school and churches/maneaba?
2) Are there any community access issues from the design at this point?

Community benefits
1) What are community expectations and the level of support for a community facility that could include recreation and sanitation facilities?
2) Have the components and site/s for the community facility been tested with the community and officials during consultation?
3) What is the level of Bonriki village residents’ involvement in employment opportunities either during construction or operation (e.g. managing gates/ fence over time) and also any local business opportunities at the airport (such as stalls)?
4) Discuss the potential local employment and business opportunities with the relevant stakeholders and identify any steps (e.g. training) for achieving them, including airport management (15 May).
5) Who currently runs the stalls at the terminal; what approximate percentage of these stalls are operated by Bonriki people?

Surveys
1) Investigate and confirm if a survey is necessary to identify and record any people who should be compensated for land, or is it simpler to document any necessary compensation on a case by case basis in a basic project record.
2) Is the proposed passenger attitude survey required and are there adequate resources and allocation of responsibility to a particular department to implement it? Discuss the survey with the relevant people in the Ministry (airport management, tourism) and Air Fiji.
Consultation with stakeholders

1) What further consultation is needed for the fence design (the fence, gates, paths, etc.) - liaise with Kristina and the design team.

2) What consultation has taken place on the proposed community facility and employment benefits, and any other outstanding project issues?

3) Consider the information (plans and any text) for undertaking consultation activities and request any necessary material from AECOM (e.g. project description, diagrams, EMP). If necessary have any required text translated.

4) List any further consultation activities for the Bonriki community, e.g., school, church/s, youth, women’s group, village leaders.

5) Describe and record all consultation activities that take place, attendance, etc.
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Sunday 4 August – arrived Tarawa

Monday 5 August (public holiday)
- Met project staff and reviewed programme for week.
- Site visit to airport and surrounding villages.

Tuesday 6 August
- Met Dr Ueantabo Mackenzie (USP Kiribati Campus Director) and discussed his social assessment report and related questions.
- Courtesy call, Secretary MCTTD, Betio
- Met with MCTTD project staff and Aviation personnel at Betio including Ms Reina Timau (project manager/World Bank coordinator), Ms Taare Aukitino (Senior Assistant Secretary), Mr Benitera Tabekai (Dir Civil Aviation), Ms Ruta Ioata (KFSU Manager). Discussed progress on a series of action points sent earlier in the year (see also list of key questions in Appendix A).

Wednesday 7 August
- Met with Ms Ruta Ioata (KFSU Manager) and Ms Aako Teikake (Deputy Director Civil Aviation) at Bonriki Airport.
- Inspected location of proposed fences through villages, paths, roads and gates, and areas where trees have been removed as visual obstacles along East Bonriki, also possible construction depot areas.
- Met KAIP Sub Committee on Resettlement/Social Safeguards in Betio, including
- Representatives from MCTTD (as above), Aviation (as above), Lands Division of Ministry of Environment and Lands (Ms Reei Tioti), Environment and Conservation Div. (Ms Taovea Reihe), and MWPU (Mr Moina Arotio and Mr Peter Taboia). Note Health, Youth and Island Council representatives absent.

Thursday 8 August
- Met Ms Reei Tioti (Lands Division, Bairiki) and courtesy call with Mr Tebutonga (Director of Lands) re airport land issues and to view cadastral maps.
- Worked on draft report.

Friday 9 August
- Met Aviation staff at Bonriki Airport, discussed strategy for village meeting.
- Village meeting in Bonriki at Catholic Maneaba (Attended by 35 men and 3 women) with Ms Ioata and Ms Teikake.
- Met with Deputy Principal Bonriki school and 8 teachers (all women),
- Inspected proposed site for Bonriki community recreation facility adjacent to school grounds.
- Reviewed village meetings with Aviation staff.
- Debrief with Project Manager, Ms Reina Timau.
- Report drafting.

Saturday 10 August
- Report drafting
- Attended Aviation social function at Bonriki in afternoon, also revisited key sites.
- Attended team dinner in evening.

Sunday 11 August and Monday 12 August
- Travel back to NZ, overnight in Auckland.
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Latest Proposed Fence Alignment Drawings