

Integrated Tourism Master Plan for Lombok
BASELINE ANALYSIS
Evaluation

Document title:	Vol. 1 Task A - Analysis of the Institutional and Legal, Regulatory and Policy Framework Vol. 2 Task B - Analysis of demand and opportunities for tourism destination area development Vol. 3 Task C - Analysis of baseline conditions of spatial plans, infrastructure gaps and visitor attractions and facilities Vol. 4 Task D - Articulation of Environmental, Social, Socio-Economic and Cultural Heritage Opportunities and Constraints	Date of review completion:	9 May 2019
Document date:	22 March 2019	Consultant name:	AECOM
Version number:	n/a		

Evaluation criteria

- i) Satisfactory for public release: Has met all of TOR to a satisfactory level.
- ii) Adequate: Has met minimum requirements of TOR. Suitable for internal project management and approval system for consultant payments.
- iii) Work Required: Not suitable to meet payment requests – requires more work.
- iv) Substandard: Requires substantial amount of improvement against the TORs.
- v) Not Addressed and explain as appropriate.

This evaluation is in three sections:

- 1) Assessment Summary (page 3)
- 2) Part A against the terms of reference (page 6)
- 3) Part B against tasks by chapters of the draft report (page 28).

NOTE: Green highlight indicates previously advised comments from RIDA to the consultant.

Section #1: ASSESSMENT SUMMARY:**Assessment****OVERALL RATING OF LOMBOK BASELINE ANALYSIS:****Adequate +**

In order to achieve a Satisfactory rating for the March 2019 edition, and thus enable publication, the following is required:

General

- i. All volumes should be subject to grammar, spelling, sense and consistency checks, referencing, acronym definitions and final proof-reading by a native English speaker or someone of similar ability.
- ii. A short overview of the material is required to stitch the four volumes together into a readable 'story' that identifies the issues each of the subsequent plans need to address, perhaps in the form of SWOT analysis. (The physical story is already well told in Vol 4). Please discuss content with RIDA at draft stage.
- iii. Key maps, as a minimum, need the KTA boundaries added.
- iv. Create a separate volume of maps at A3 size to make them easier to read: electronically the reader should be able to re-size maps for ease of reading.
- v. Part B of this review contains 354 detailed technical comments on the previous version: all need to be reviewed to either accept and update the March 2019 draft or be clear where later in the process they can be dealt with.

Task A: Vol 1. Analysis of the Institutional and Legal, Regulatory and Policy Framework

- vi. The Global Geopark and Biosphere Reserve draft management plans should be removed from Vol. 1, created as proper management plans and pursued to completion on a separate track to the Baseline Analysis.
- vii. Incorporate an assessment of the regulatory system, to determine to what extent it is functional, before the Summary (section 3.4) and update the Summary accordingly. This material can then be further developed as part of forming the 'Capacity Building Program'.
- viii. Review and update the material on Peraturan Mentari.
- ix. Update the discussion at chapter 3 of Vol 1 to include missing RTRW documents listed in Section #2 below.
- x. Include an Appendix under Task A that simply lists, by regulation type, the various regulations that have been reviewed: this needs to be a line by line listing so the reader can quickly ascertain the volume and type of regulation reviewed.
- xi. Establish a consistent map base, showing KTAs, for use throughout all four volumes. If this changes later then lead the reader through the rationale for the change.
- xii. At Vol. 1, para 1.2, confirm the baseline year and any assumptions the authors are making concerning if it is 2017 or 2018 selected.

Task B: Vol. 2 Demand and Opportunities for Tourism Destination Area Development

- xiii. Update the demographic discussion (chapter 2) to include, as a minimum, the number of households (which will be required to discuss basic services in Vol. 3 and to establish monitoring criteria for these services) and basic demographic structures.
- xiv. Add IP population size (if not able to provide hard numbers, make a justified assumption) and add to Fig. 4 in Vol. 4.
- xv. Section 4.1: it would help the reader if the discussion identified, if only in a broad sense, those sectors of the economy that are primarily tourism driven (presumably 'Trading, Food and Hotel').
- xvi. Expand the discussion at section 8.4 to provide a more in-depth comparison in terms of attractiveness and competitiveness as island tourism destinations.
- xvii. In relation to tourism contribution to local economy, ask in-house economists if they can produce more comprehensive report based on available data and expand as required. (e.g. simple IO Analysis).
- xviii. Include discussion on how many four- and five-star hotels there are and their locations.
- xix. Vol. 2. Page 161 – Capabilities and skills of local businesses and employees: expand with information that may be available from local educational & research institutions.
- xx. The discussion on tourism facilities (chapter 6) needs expanding (or cross-referencing) to include material on tourism quality assurance, skills and service levels, immigration facilities and clearance systems, tourism investment promotion and incentives, public/private partnerships and the role of the private sector.
- xxi. Augment the discussion at section 3.2 to include a more fulsome discussion of "linkages between the various sector of economy affecting and affected by tourism development". (See comments under b.2 in section #2 below).
- xxii. At section 7.2 I identify the key issues that are likely to hold back local businesses in grabbing new business from tourism growth.

Task C: Vol. 3 Analysis of baseline conditions of spatial plans, infrastructure gaps and visitor attractions and facilitiesTask C.1 ...

- xxiii. The section on Planned New Development (1.2.5) does seem to contain any assessment of other development pressures that may impact on scenario development; this needs augmenting as the knowledge may impact on scenario development.
- xxiv. Ensure the map base used at section 1.2.7 (and subsequently) is consistent with a map base established at Vol. 1, which seems to be Fig. 38: at present these map bases are inconsistent.
- xxv. Accuracy and consistency checks needed throughout Vol 3, some examples.:
 - a. Check Table 19, Total Lombok Island is 102%.
 - b. Total forest area about 27% of Lombok area (Table 19), source JICA 2015. Not consistent, compare with Chapter 1.3.6. Forestry Area (page 104), total forest area in Lombok approximately 163 002 Ha (34,40%), source Environmental Agency of NTB Province, 2016).
 - c. Page 97, Table 15 refers to a "480" slope: explain what this means.
 - d. Page 101 says "... the water source in Lombok Island may have raw water potential ...". Be clear: either there is or is not raw water potential, which needs to be considered in the light of climate change.
- xxvi. At section 1.4.1 in Vol. 3 include a map of the various listed sites of cultural significance.
- xxvii. Page 101 says "... the water source in Lombok Island may have raw water potential ...". Be clear: either there is or is not raw water potential, which needs to be considered in the light of climate change.
- xxviii. Task C.1 (vii) - Areas of environmental concern and/or significance – requires further detail: see table below for specific comment.
- xxix. At section 1.4.1 in Vol. 3 include a map of the various listed sites.

Task C.2 ...Analysis of connectivity

- xxx. Include planned transport investments in the accessibility assessment at page 242.
- xxxi. Include map to illustrate the connectivity figures at page 249.
- xxxii. Add potential catchment population to Fig 130 (4hours direct flight) and cross link text to market discussion in Vol 2, para 5.7.

Section #1: ASSESSMENT SUMMARY:**Assessment***Infrastructure*

- xxxiii. The technical infrastructure material is very dense and does not give the reader any sense of what it all means for tourism development, the KTAs and gaps to be filled for existing residents. This overview needs to be captured.
- xxxiv. Given the size of the infrastructure maps it is difficult to determine how complete they are and whether they provide enough information about current infrastructure (e.g. piped water supply - intake, treatment, production facilities, distribution networks, and other facilities such as IKK and non-piped water supply system such as water well, etc) as well as planned investments: review all maps and ensure they are all in English.
- xxxv. Check the target service levels used in the gap analysis, as they appear to be inconsistent with Peraturan Presiden No. 2 Tahun 2015; if inconsistent re-calculate the gaps.

Transport

- xxxvi. Include a statement about land availability in relation to the airport master plan.
- xxxvii. The discussion of cruise ship arrivals at page 315 needs expanding (or cross-referencing) to include material on cruise ship arrivals, passenger numbers, past trends and better clarity / focus on current facilities.
- xxxviii. At section 2.1.4.3 include a discussion on actual and potential demand for non-motorised transport, with reference to each KTA, and a broad discussion of those sections of road where pedestrian and bicycle traffic is concentrated in order to assess the need for dedicated lanes.
- xxxix. Include a statement about land availability for road schemes under Table 132 at page 369.
 - xl. A clearly identified 'tourism relevant road network', which updates the Project Appraisal Document, is missing. Section 2.1.4 on roads needs the addition of material that clearly defines road sections that are critical for tourism development in combination with a high percentage of tourism traffic.
 - xli. Add information on traffic composition on the key (tourism) road sections.
 - xl.ii. Draw out more explicitly the parameters to be used in traffic growth projection.
 - xl.iii. Add a short section on parking availability at destinations / beaches, with reference to the KTAs.
 - xl.iv. Update the Road Safety section (2.1.4.4) with information on the number of accidents and fatalities.
 - xl.v. Add to section 2.1.5 on public transport a discussion of pricing, ticket packaging and ticket purchase, especially from a tourism perspective.
 - xl.vi. Add to section 2.1.5 on public transport a discussion of the condition of bus terminals, bus stops, and the bus level of service: check number of rental cars on Lombok (table 141). (e.g. More information on the major bus terminals: exact location, lay-out, facilities, current (maintenance) condition, and capacity constraints if any).

Drainage

- xl.vii. The mapping is too small to identify the drainage system: include larger plans.
- xl.viii. Include a discussion (or cross-reference) on drainage issues resulting from tsunamis and heavy rainfall and how this may impact on tourism development.

Water supply

- xl.ix. Specify the national standard used and check to ensure for the key tourism areas access to sustainable water supply is defined and analysed as compliance with the SNI 3-7065-2005 standard.
 - l. The planned investment section at page 500 is thin: can this be expanded?
 - li. The discussion of water supply within the KTAs is thin and needs augmenting given these are the principal points of future investment. Include a description and give analysis about factors that play a significant role in shaping the existing condition. What are the gaps with relevant standards or masterplan, and what are the governing factors?
 - lii. Not clear if the water loss and peak hour period have been used in calculating the water supply gap: check and update if required.
 - liii. At page 500 draw together previous material with that on planned developments to form a conclusion on whether the planned developments will fully address any gaps. (Looking at table 209 and the text below, the reader does not have an idea if "improved cooperation" will fill that gap). The gap analysis needs to consider any sub-standard raw water sources identified earlier the section.

Wastewater management

- liv. At page 523 draw together previous material with that on planned developments to form a conclusion on whether the planned developments will fully address any gaps.
- lv. Include a discussion on treatment of industrial and commercial wastewater.
- lvi. Cross check wastewater demand figures with demand for water to ensure consistency: generally, wastewater is 80% of water demand.

Solid waste

- lvii. Although the material covers solid waste in each KTA, this is mostly at a kabupaten level. Revise the section to more explicitly focus on KTAs, including a description and analysis of existing conditions.
- lviii. Expand the discussion around table 248 to include waste generation by day and overnight visitors; relate to KTAs as well.
- lix. The maps showing collection systems are too small to read and to adequately show the coverage area, especially by KTA; bigger scale map needed.
- lx. Add material on collection fees.
- lxi. At page 556 draw together previous material with that on planned developments to form a conclusion on whether the planned developments in solid waste will fully address any gaps.

Case studies

- lxii. At the end of section 3.1 provide more detailed and practical explanation of best practices in dealing with tourism challenges and opportunities during the various TALC stages and relate these to the situation on Lombok.

Opportunities and constraints

- lxiii. Include the presence of Masyarakat Adat, landownership issues, and historical conflicts.

Task D: Vol. 4 Articulation of Environmental, Social, Socio-Economic and Cultural Heritage Opportunities and Constraints

- lxiv. Include a very short chapter four consisting of a simple diagram and short description that shows how all this material feeds into scenario development.
- lxv. Print the following figures on a whole A4 page: 18, 75, 77, 78, 80 and the new base map.
- lxvi. At section 2.1.2 of Vol 4 make explicit the regulations relied upon by cross-referencing to Vol 1.
- lxvii. In a new appendix to Vol 4 provide the workings and scores that support creation of Fig 19 on page 75.

Section #1: ASSESSMENT SUMMARY:	Assessment
---------------------------------	------------

- lxviii. Before section 3.4 add a short analysis that identifies the most severe impacts across the KTAs and relate the discussion to chapter 2.
- lxix. At table 16 expand the Preliminary Recommendation column to be more detailed in relation to social impacts and their avoidance, as done in table 15.
- lxx. At page 70 review statement about multi-criteria assessment as this does not appear to be an MCA.
- lxxi. In chapter three clearly draw out areas with the KTAs that should not be developed – see mapping earlier in chapter 3 that should be applied to the figures in section 3.2.
- lxxii. At the end of section 3.1 provide a revised base map for future use that takes account of the discussion (over all four volumes) and which clearly identifies no development areas at KTA level.

Reader's note: The comments in section #2 provide further detail as appropriate.

OVERALL SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT:		Work required	Adequate +
➤	Readability and general accuracy: can a lay reader easily follow the document; is the document easy to read; are there spelling or grammatical errors; are there obvious errors of fact; are there words, phrases or sections that do not make sense.	Work required	Adequate
➤	Does the report address the terms of reference, which includes providing relevant information in a manner which is understandable to the lay reader and provides an analysis of that information when required?		Adequate (+)
		Task A	Substandard
		Task B	Work required
		Task C	Work required
		Task D	Work required
➤	Does the report contain enough information to allow the work to proceed to the next task, being preparation of growth projections and development scenarios?	Adequate	Satisfactory
➤	Does the report contain all information necessary to populate the Management Information System and enable project evaluation as set-out in the Pedoman Umum?	Work required	Satisfactory

	Documents dated 12 December 2019	Documents dated 22 March 2019	Action	Action By
ASSESSMENT AGAINST PREVIOUS GENERAL COMMENTS:				
a	The lack of Global Geopark and/or Biosphere Reserve (draft) management plan(s) at Task A is an omission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Substandard ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In order to achieve a Satisfactory rating for the Baseline Analysis, and thus enable publication of it, these two areas require separate draft management plans that should be pulled from Vol. 1 and treated and processed as separate documents. They should be run in parallel with scenario development and selection, as task E may necessitate changes to the draft management plans. After that the management plans could take a different path to Government approval – please discuss. ○ The Consultant should note that removal of these draft plans from the Baseline Analysis does not absolve the Consultant from completing the draft plans to a satisfactory standard. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done - Management plan of Rinjani Global Geopark have been separated from Baseline Analysis Vol. 1 (Task A). • Need further research and discussion with Global Geopark Team on Lombok (under Bappeda) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DPE
b	This report needs to be reviewed against the terms of reference to ensure all requirements are being met, including in sufficient detail to populate the project's forthcoming Management Information System.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Satisfactory <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⊖ Any missing material can be identified as the MIS develops and requested of the consultant for direct input into the MIS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done 	
c	The context and background to the ITMP (including the Tourism Destination Area and Key Tourism Areas), as introduction to the overall documents in Volume 1, deserves more attention.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Satisfactory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done 	
d	Information and data should consistently be related to the Integrated Tourism Development Plan, Tourism Destination Area and Key Tourism Areas, as the case requires: it needs to tell a 'story' for the lay reader.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Satisfactory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done 	
e	In addition to an explanation of the ITMP preparation flow, a clear tourism competitiveness / strategic framework will assist in putting the Baseline Analysis into context and provide the rationale and process for the baseline study and where it fits in the overall ITMP preparation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Satisfactory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done 	
f	It is difficult to get an overall picture and flow of the document due to the sheer volume of information presented and the fact that it is divided in four volumes. It would be sensible to repackage the documents into a single core volume of main findings and to attach analytical and factual information that is largely extracted from existing sources as Appendices. Cross-referencing will be essential.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Adequate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Although the Baseline Analysis lacks a simple unifying 'story' line there is more than enough material in the four volumes to construct this at the start of Task E and in doing so identify the issues the forthcoming plans need to address. ○ In order to achieve a Satisfactory rating, and thus enable publication, the Consultant needs to prepare an overview which may take the form of a written document or the material to be used in developing scenarios with stakeholders may be appropriate – please discuss. A SWOT analysis may be appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done • Overview to support development scenario discussion are available in every summary in each of the chapter. It difficult to use SWOT analysis because the it have many chapter and SWOT is replaced by 	

	Documents dated 12 December 2019	Documents dated 22 March 2019	Action	Action By
			opportunity and constraints overview.	
g	The absence of a tourism strategic framework has the danger of missing some important tourism information like marketing policies / strategies / plan / practices; more detailed assessment of tourism quality assurance, skills and service levels; immigration facilities and clearance systems; tourism investment promotion and incentives; public/private partnerships; private sector role and organisation, etc.	➤ Satisfactory	• Done	
h	Having the analysis of Opportunities and Challenges divided per volume is difficult to follow and detracts from an overall grasp of opportunities and challenges. See point above, regarding condensing core information related to tourism: consider combining all summaries of opportunities and challenges into a single summary. This should flow from the strategic framework.	➤ See comment (f) above	• Done • Overall summary that including the summary for 4 documents is had been done.	
i	Readability - It is appreciated the report is a draft. The final version will need a single editor to work through the Baseline Analysis to ensure internal integrity of the document and, inter alia, look at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ grammar ➤ spelling ➤ sources and references of documents from which findings are derived are properly referenced: improve referencing, footnotes and add a list of references ➤ check consistency of table and figure headings ➤ ensure all maps, figures and diagrams are easy to read, have a legend and north point when required. 	➤ Adequate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Although there are significant improvements on grammar, spelling, sourcing / referencing etc. the documents still contain issues of spelling, grammar and sense. All volumes should be subject to proper checks and final proof-reading by a native English speaker or of similar ability. 	• Task A Done.	
	Baseline date and data currency: please ensure data is up-to-date by including 2018 material including, inter alia, number of tourists to Lombok, attractions, Mt Rinjani access roads, human resource needs at Mandalika. Consider if all data can be updated to a consistent 2018 baseline (including population) in order to provide a direct launch platform in the first five-year plan period of 2019-2023.	➤ Satisfactory <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted that new material not available until May 2019 which can then be incorporated into the Baseline Analysis and/or MIS. 	• Done • The new materials until 2019 is not available. Best available data is ended in 2018.	

Section #2

PART A
EVALUATION MATRIX AGAINST TASKS

Task (see Terms of Reference)	Page/para in report (insert ref.)	Assessment (see above) Based on 12 Dec 2018 documents	Comments (for partially and not met assessments, state what is required to achieve satisfactory completion of the task) (green shading indicates comment previously advised)		Action	Action By
			12 December documents	22 March 2019 documents		
A. Analysis of the institutional and legal, regulatory and policy framework						
TASK OVERVIEW						
		TOR requirement partially met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The lack of UNESCO Global Geopark and/or Biosphere Reserve (draft) management plan(s) for such sites is a serious omission. ➤ Lacks assessment or evaluation of the system to determine to what extent it is functional: does the regulatory system work? What works, what doesn't, why? ➤ Should the opportunities and constraints analysis be a SWOT analysis for Task A to focus on the institutional and legal, regulatory and policy framework? ➤ Mapping: at the very front, and throughout all four volumes, include a map showing the Tourism Destination Area boundary and the Key Tourism Area Boundaries, noting the KTAs may change as the project advances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Adequate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In order to achieve a Satisfactory rating for the Baseline Analysis, and thus enable publication of it, these two areas require separate draft management plans that should be pulled from Vol. 1 and treated and processed as separate documents. They should be run in parallel with scenario development and selection, as task E may necessitate changes to the draft management plans. After that the management plans could take a different path to Government approval – please discuss. ○ The Consultant should note that removal of these draft plans from the Baseline Analysis does not absolve the Consultant from completing the draft plans to a satisfactory standard. ○ Still needs attention: the forthcoming 'Capacity Building Program' will need to be informed by an understanding of institutional capacity within the regulatory framework (see below). See Part B for more detailed comments. ○ In order to achieve a Satisfactory rating for the Baseline Analysis, incorporate an assessment before the Summary (section 3.4) and update the Summary accordingly. This material can then be further developed as part of forming the 'Capacity Building Program'. ○ Vol 1, pp 201 address this issue adequately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done - Management plan of Rinjani Global Geopark have been separated from Baseline Analysis Vol. 1 (Task A). • Need further research and discussion with Global Geopark Team on Lombok (under Bappeda) • Capacity building and institutional plan will be discussed in separate document. • Done • It difficult to use SWOT analysis because the it have many chapter and SWOT is replaced by opportunity and constraints overview 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DPE • ENV
a.1.	Identification of the planning authority/authorities within the destination for the various components; e.g. land use,	25 / 2.1.2	TOR requirement met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Satisfactory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done 	

Task (see Terms of Reference)	Page/para in report (insert ref.)	Assessment (see above) Based on 12 Dec 2018 documents	Comments (for partially and not met assessments, state what is required to achieve satisfactory completion of the task) (green shading indicates comment previously advised)		Action	Action By	
			12 December documents	22 March 2019 documents			
	transport, utilities, and visitor management to main World Heritage Sites (WHSs).						
	Land use	26 / 2.1.2					
	Transport	26 / 2.1.2					
	Utilities	25 / 2.1.2					
	Visitor management to main World Heritage Sites (WHSs)						
a.2	Identification of all stakeholders and collaboration arrangements between them to develop the tourism program; e.g. governments, SOEs, private sector, communities, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs).	33-37	TOR requirement partially met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Community and stakeholder engagement: this is a critical part of the next stage and it is essential that broad cross-section of government, local communities and investors are meaningfully involved in setting evaluation criteria and forming scenarios. A detailed review of what is proposed is needed. AGREED Consultants would discuss separately with PMS and RIDA advised of outcome before any actions are started. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Satisfactory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done 	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Identify existing forums or any collaboration mechanisms in form of regular or ad hoc, formal or informal, that are mainly used at the central, provincial as well as local level to coordinate tourism development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Completed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done 	
	Governments	-				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done 	
	State Owned Enterprises (SOEs)	-		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No specific mention in the report: see Stakeholder Engagement Plan? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Completed Vol 1 – starting page 54 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done 	
	Private sector	-		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No specific mention in the report: see Stakeholder Engagement Plan? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Completed Vol 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done 	
	Communities	-		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No specific mention in the report: see Stakeholder Engagement Plan? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ See also Vol. 2 Task B, pg. 90 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done 	
	Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No specific mention in the report: see Stakeholder Engagement Plan? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Completed Vol 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done 	
a.3	Evaluation of the regulatory framework within which planning implementation will occur.	38, 48	TOR requirement not met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Lacks assessment or evaluation of the system to determine to what extent it is functional: does the regulatory system work? What works, what doesn't, why? ➤ No information nor analysis of issues on role, responsibilities or functions of institutions during planning, programming, implementation, or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Work required <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Still needs attention: the forthcoming 'Capacity Building Program' will need to be informed by an understanding of institutional capacity within the regulatory framework (see below). ○ In order to achieve a Satisfactory rating for the Baseline Analysis, incorporate a short assessment before the Summary (section 3.4) and update the Summary accordingly. This material can then be further developed as part of forming the 'Capacity Building Program'. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done • Capacity building and institutional plan will be discussed in separate document. • Need further analysis regarding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENV

Task (see Terms of Reference)	Page/para in report (insert ref.)	Assessment (see above) Based on 12 Dec 2018 documents	Comments (for partially and not met assessments, state what is required to achieve satisfactory completion of the task) (green shading indicates comment previously advised)		Action	Action By
			12 December documents	22 March 2019 documents		
			<p>operations and maintenance, are they effective or need to be empowered, are there overlapping functions, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The analysis is more on substance of the documents and not about the regulatory framework within which planning implementation will occur. ➤ Provide analysis on strength, weaknesses as well as room for improvements. ➤ UN SDG's are global: guidance should come from best tourism practices, the ESMF and Indonesia's SDGs. 		assessment of the regulatory system	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ It is recognised that throughout the four Tasks there is continual reference to legislation and that this works well. It may be helpful to consolidate under Task A as a schedule and then note these are brought into play as the discussion warrants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In order to achieve a Satisfactory rating, include an Appendix under Task A that simply lists, by regulation type, the various regulations that have been reviewed: this needs to be a line by line listing so the reader can quickly ascertain the volume and type of regulation reviewed. 	• done	• DPE & ENV
	Perundangan	-				
	Keputusan Presiden	49 / 2.2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No specific mention in the report: hard to believe there are none. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Referred to in Vol 1, page 67 and 156 	• Done	
	Peraturan Pemerintah	78-80				
	Peraturan Menteri	78-80 49 / 2.2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ With 12, 831 Peraturan Menteri it is hard to believe that there are only ones relating to water supply: what about: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The absence of a simple list makes it hard to judge if all relevant Peraturan Menteri have been identified and addressed. A simple search for the numbers listed in the adjoining column suggest these have not been included. ○ This requirement is judged Adequate on the basis that a thorough understanding of these regulations is necessary for compiling the "Capacity Building Program". Review and update the material on Peraturan Mentari. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • done • The list for all the regulations is available in appendix documents. • Capacity building and institutional plan (including its regulation framework) will be discussed in separate document. • • 	• DPE & ENV
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Minister of Tourism and Creative Economy Regulation no. 7/2014 > Minister of Tourism and Creative Economy Regulation no. 1/2014 > Minister of Environment Decree no. 05/2012 > Minister of Environment Decree no. 16/2012 > Minister of Environment Decree no. 			

Task (see Terms of Reference)		Page/para in report (insert ref.)	Assessment (see above) Based on 12 Dec 2018 documents	Comments (for partially and not met assessments, state what is required to achieve satisfactory completion of the task) (green shading indicates comment previously advised)		Action	Action By
				12 December documents	22 March 2019 documents		
				8/2013 > Minister of Public Works and Public Housing Decree no. 02/PRT/M/2015 > Minister of Transportation Regulation no. 98/2013 > Minister of Transportation Regulation no. 40/2015 > Minister of Transportation Regulation no. 132/2015 > Minister of Public Works Number: 16 / PRT / M / 2008 > Minister of Public Works Regulation No: 21 / PRT / 2006			
	Peraturan Gubernur/Perda Provinsi	49-52 / 2.2.2				•	
	Peraturan Bupati/Perda Kabupaten	54-60 / 2.2.3				•	
	RIPARNAS/RIPARDA	49-52 / 2.2.2				•	
	RTRW	-		➤ Check to ensure these plans are discussed in the evaluation of the regulatory framework.	○ Update the discussion at chapter 3 of Vol 1 to include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lombok Utara: Struktur Ruang ▪ Lombok Tengah: Struktur Ruang, Pola Ruang, Kawasan Strategis ▪ Lombok Timur: Struktur Ruang, Pola Ruang, Kawasan Strategis ▪ Lombok Barat: Struktur Ruang, Pola Ruang, Kawasan Strategis 	• Done (RTRW discussion has been updated)	• DPE
	RDTR	-		➤ No specific mention in the report.	○ Referenced in Vol. 1 page 178	• Done	
	Local Wisdom			➤ No specific mention in the report.	○ Refer Vol 2. Task B, starts page 94 - still need to include population numbers	• Done • Done • Local Wisdom/Indigenous people had been discussed in vol. 2 and 4 (Task B and D)	
a.4	Review and evaluation of relevant existing spatial and sectoral development plans (including plans for national parks and heritage sites, if applicable), including all regulatory instruments and associated policy documents currently in place to guide and control development.	48-53 / 2.2.2	TOR requirement partially met	a. In Table 4 include summary of the table that identifies list of key strategic areas / designated tourist areas, and main leading sub-sectors. b. Gap analysis: not in relation to this the preparation of the ITMP and thus relevance to ITMP unclear. c. No indication of legal status and status of implementation of documents.	➤ Adequate ○ Establish a consistent map base, showing KTAs, for use throughout all four volumes. If this changes later then lead the reader through the rationale for the change. a. Addressed in Vol 1, page 78 b. Addressed: See section 2.2.3.2 Tourism Policies Gap Analysis (Vol 1, page 94) c. See (a3) above.	• Done • The use of base map is depend on information that map will display. • There are lack of information about monitoring and evaluation about the implementation of the regulations.	
	Relevant existing spatial	75-89 / 2.2.4				• Done	

Task (see Terms of Reference)		Page/para in report (insert ref.)	Assessment (see above) Based on 12 Dec 2018 documents	Comments (for partially and not met assessments, state what is required to achieve satisfactory completion of the task) (green shading indicates comment previously advised)		Action	Action By
				12 December documents	22 March 2019 documents		
	Sectoral development plans	49-50 / para		➤ Include any information to what extent the plans have been materialized or implemented or achieved. Identify gaps between plans and realization, if any.	○ Addressed: Refer Vol 3, page 30	• Done	
	National parks plans	116-117 / para 2.5					
	Heritage site plans	see above					
	All regulatory instruments	-		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Land acquisition regulations are set out but need clear indication whether there are land tenure issues (e.g. duplicated permits, bribery, etc.), especially affecting tourism investment: cross-reference if necessary. ➤ For land acquisition highlight the key differences of the ESMF requirements and Law 2/2012 and its implementing regulations. Establish how these differences should be addressed in the ITMP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Addressed - refer Vol 3, page 82 base data. ○ Refer Vol 3, page 75 and page 84 – land rights of tourism areas – based on best available data. ○ Have addressed law 2/2012 about Acquisition of Land for Development in the Public Interest – Vol 1, page 137 	• Done	
	Associated policy documents currently in place to guide and control development			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Missing are policies and plans for community-based infrastructure and service provision. b. Presentation of policies and plans for post-earthquake reconstruction, including REKOMPAK missing here. Cross-reference if covered elsewhere. c. Tourism crisis management and communication discussion would help. d. Look at how the linkage in the policy on the disaster reduction management and the spatial planning processes interact. Important for forthcoming institutional plan. e. Be clear on role of ESMF in the ITMP and how it is applied. f. Important to understand to what extent local / indigenous community participation is addressed in any of the tourism policies/plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Addressed in Vol 1, page 105, Infrastructure Plan and Policy. b. Addressed Vol 3, page 607, section on case study – Yogyakarta Earthquake 2006. c. Addressed Vol 1, page 125, section on Disaster Mitigation Policy. d. Can be done as part of Capacity Building Program. e. – f. Needs more work under <i>the Capacity Building Program</i>: also refer to Vol 3, page 230 Cultural Tourism Attraction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done • Capacity building and institutional plan (including its regulation framework) will be discussed in separate document. • 	
a.5	Taking into consideration the government's plan to seek status of Lombok as a UNESCO Global Geopark and/or Biosphere Reserve site, there is an urgency to include (draft) management plan(s) for such sites in the analysis. The (draft	32-33	TOR requirement not met	➤ Not in the report: serious omission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Substandard ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In order to achieve a Satisfactory rating for the Baseline Analysis, and thus enable publication of it, these two areas require separate draft management plans that should be pulled from Vol. 1 and treated and processed as separate documents. They should be run in parallel with scenario development and selection, as task E may necessitate changes to the draft management plans. 	• Done - Management plan of Rinjani Global Geopark have been separated from Baseline Analysis Vol. 1 (Task A).	

Task (see Terms of Reference)	Page/para in report (insert ref.)	Assessment (see above) Based on 12 Dec 2018 documents	Comments (for partially and not met assessments, state what is required to achieve satisfactory completion of the task) (green shading indicates comment previously advised)		Action	Action By
			12 December documents	22 March 2019 documents		
management plan(s) will be produced by the consultant under this task.				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ After that the management plans could take a different path to Government approval – please discuss. ○ The Consultant should note that removal of these draft plans from the Baseline Analysis does not absolve the Consultant from completing the draft plans to a satisfactory standard. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Need further research and discussion with Global Geopark Team on Lombok (under Bappeda) 	
UNESCO Global Geopark (draft) management plan	32-33		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Not in the report: omission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The material in Vol. 1 does not contain management proposals. The draft plan should be consistent with the outline given at pg. 187. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Done 	
Biosphere Reserve site (draft) management plan			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Not in the report: omission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This management plan must be provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Included with Geopark Management Plan 	

Section #3:

PART B
EVALUATION AGAINST TASKS BY CHAPTERS

Task	Page/para in report	Comments on 12 December documents	Comments on 22 March 2019 documents	Action	Action By
-	Overall		Adequate		
	1	This report needs proper quality control (inconsistencies and meeting TOR requirements) and editing.	1. This remains an issue to address: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2.		
	2	The context and background to the ITMP (including the Tourism Destination Area, TDA, and Key Tourism Areas, KTAs), as introduction to the overall documents in Volume 1 deserves more attention.	2. Done.		
	3	In addition to an explanation of the ITMP preparation flow, a clear tourism competitiveness/strategic framework will assist in putting the baseline analysis in context and provide the rationale and process for the baseline study and where it fits in the overall ITMP preparation.	3. Done through incorporation into the document rather than a framework diagram at the start of Vol. 1 which would have been preferable.		
	4	It is difficult to get an overall picture and flow of the document due to the sheer volume of information presented and the fact that it is divided in 4 volumes. It would be sensible to repackage the documents into a single core volume of main findings and to attach analytical and factual information that is largely extracted from existing sources as Appendices.	4. This remains an issue to address: see comment (ii) under <i>General Comments</i> at page 2.		
	5	The absence of a tourism strategic framework has the danger of missing some important tourism information like marketing policies/strategies/plan/practices; more detailed assessment of tourism quality assurance, skills and service levels; immigration facilities and clearance systems; tourism investment promotion and incentives; public/private partnerships; private sector role and organisation, etc	5. Done through incorporation into the document rather than a framework diagram at the start of Vol. 1 which would have been preferable.		
	6	Having the analysis of Opportunities and Challenges divided per volume is confusing and detracts from an overall grasp of opportunities and challenges. See point above, regarding condensing core information related to tourism – combine all summaries of opportunities and challenges in a single summary. This should flow from the strategic framework mentioned in the second bullet above.	6. This remains an issue to address: see comment (ii) under <i>General Comments</i> at page 2.		
	7	Form: writing is so poor that it is hard to read, and very far from acceptable as a report. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English spelling and grammar of entire document needs thorough checking to ensure all meaning is clear. English is extremely poor! • Sources and references of documents from which findings are derived need to always and everywhere be indicated. Improve referencing, footnotes and add a list of references. • Check consistency of Table and Figure headings. • Please add a source for every figure and table. • Many of the maps and graphs are very difficult to decipher. 	7. This remains an issue to address: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2.		

Task (adjudged)	Page/para in report	Comments on 12 December documents	Comments on 22 March 2019 documents		
A.	Analysis of the institutional and legal, regulatory and policy framework				
-	1.1 Background (p.9)	<p>1. "Indonesia has been successful in improving its position in all TPCI criteria". This is not correct; in many, but not all. "Indonesia should focus on improving its tourism service infrastructure (96th position on TPCI 2017)." Why? Sounds a little random. There are other issues on which it ranks worse.</p> <p>2. Background (pp.9-11) – should be updated to reflect latest context (SK Bappenas for tourism coordination team; Indonesia Tourism Development Project, P3TB, has been launched). Do not use "project" to describe the preparation of the Integrated Tourism Master Plan (ITMP) as that is confusing. The background and Objectives jump from the Indonesia Tourism Development Project to the different tasks of the ITMP TOR, without describing what you are preparing, i.e. an Integrated Tourism Master Plan for a selected destination (Lombok) as part of the Indonesia Tourism Development Project.</p> <p>3. Add to the introduction, an orientation map of the Tourism Destination Area (TDA, i.e. Lombok) and the Key Tourism Areas (KTAs).</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>3. See comment (iii) under <i>General Comments</i> at page 2.</p>	Done	DPE
-	1.4 Methodology	<p>4. Expand on detailed methodology</p> <p>5. Unclear what word "Survey" implies – explain</p>	<p>4. Done.</p> <p>5. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under <i>General Comments</i> at pg 2. -</p> <p>6.</p>	Done, Vol. 1 (Task A) had been checked	
a.3	2. Institutional and legal, regulatory, policy frameworks and studies	<p>6. Overall for this section: there is no assessment or evaluation of the system to determine to what extent it is functional – does the regulatory system work? What works, what doesn't, why?</p>	<p>7. See comment (vi) under <i>Task A</i> at page 2.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Done - There are lack of information about monitoring and evaluation about the implementation of the regulations. 	
a.3	2.1 Institutional and stakeholders	<p>7. p. 20 Graphics don't have titles and explanations confusing</p> <p>8. The report has identified institutions at national, provincial, and local level and mapped government as well as non-government actors based on planning areas that are relevant for tourism development. However, there is no information nor analysis of issues on role, responsibilities or functions of institutions during planning, programming, implementation, or operations and maintenance, are they effective or need to be empowered, are there overlapping functions, etc. Any changes or additional roles needed to improve the institutions' support for tourism development in the destination? For example, any issues among institutions involved in the management of areas such as the Geopark, Gilis, etc. Such analysis is important as a basis for subsequent recommendations to improve the performance of the institutions through the ITMP.</p> <p>9. For the stakeholder identification at the national level, at least two Ministries must be added i.e. Ministry of Village, Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration and Ministry of Cooperatives, small and medium enterprises because those two Ministries have programs related the tourism; Desa Wisata of Ministry of Village, Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration and One village one product, village cooperative and homestay from Ministry of Cooperatives, small and medium enterprises.</p>	<p>8. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under <i>General Comments</i> at pg 2.</p> <p>9. Not done: see comment (vi) under <i>Task A</i> at page 2.</p> <p>10.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Done Institutional identification about existing condition such as its function during planning, programming, and implementation of the institutions and regulations are has been discussed. There are lack of information about monitoring and evaluation about the implementation of the regulations. All ministries related to tourism activity has been updated. 	
a.3	2.1.1 Tourism governance	<p>10. Add an introduction paragraph/sentence to indicate what the bullets refer to e.g. 2.1.1.1.1 explain why there are 2 bullets that are in bold. Interpretation is totally missing. E.g. 2.1.1.1.3 "Type C" what does that mean? "UPTD" stands for what?</p>	<p>11.</p>	Done UPTD (local technical unit) has	

Task (adjudged)	Page/para in report	Comments on 12 December documents	Comments on 22 March 2019 documents		
				been explained in page 38	
a.3	2.1.1.1 Planning and development	11. More detail on tourism marketing institution and capacity	12.	Done. This chapter has been updated	
a.2	2.1.2 Stakeholder mapping	<p>12. Good that the table is very detailed, but many overlaps and will be important to identify / highlight actions that are required to execute an integrated tourism master plan.</p> <p>13. Page 26: Environmental and social safeguards: some relevant agencies at the national, provincial and local levels missing here.</p> <p>14. The report provides detailed matrix on identification and mapping of several stakeholders, however some of the listed entities in the table are private sector but listed as NGOs. Please also check with the Law 23/2014 on the task and responsibilities of agencies in each level of government. For instance, to my understanding, the district/city has no longer given authority to manage forests, but the provincial has. Similarly, perhaps for marine and fishery sector, please check. Also check the roles of Balai Besar Pelaksanaan Jalan Nasional, which is at the provincial level. Also, Balai Besar Wilayah Sungai. Who is responsible for managing the National Park of Rinjani? At the national level, the review should include DG of Land Acquisition of the Ministry ATR/Land Agency.</p> <p>15. In this section, please also highlights which agencies/NGOs/private sector are the most relevant for Lombok, i.e. for environmental and social management to support the tourism development? This exhaustive list is good, but a highlight would help in the future scenario development</p> <p>16. Lombok International Airport (BIL) is managed by Angkasa Pura I, not Angkasa Pura II. Please revise this information.</p>	<p>13.</p> <p>14.</p> <p>15.</p> <p>16.</p> <p>17. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under <i>General Comments</i> at page.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done • Stakeholder identification function, and its task has been discussed in 2.1.1 tourism governance • Lack of information and supported regulations. Some of the institutions have no documents of its formulations. • The list of stakeholder mapping is only include stakeholder that have relevant impact to Lombok tourism. 	
a.2	2.1.3 Collaboration arrangements	17.	18. -		
a.2	2.1.3.1.1 National level	<p>18. Remove the Figure. This is an old assessment and should be updated.</p> <p>19. The appropriate reference for the coordination arrangements are Presidential Instructions and SK Bappenas (the latter is already mentioned). For implementing arrangements refer to SK Public Works. In addition, the report should be able to identify existing forums or any collaboration mechanisms in form of regular or ad hoc, formal or informal, that are mainly used at the central, provincial as well as local level to coordinate tourism development which cover planning, implementation, as well as operations and maintenance. The report should be able to analyze its formation, leadership, source of financing, effectiveness, factors of success as well as challenges. The report may provide an example of good case as well as bad case for learnings. ITMP should be able to provide recommendations for options of collaboration arrangements, potential improvements, as well as the establishment of collaboration arrangements. It should not only identify collaboration arrangements that involve governmental agencies/ministries, but also those that involve SOEs, private sector, tourism operators, communities, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).</p>	<p>19. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under <i>General Comments</i> at pg 2.</p> <p>20.</p>	Noted	
a.3	2.2 Policy and regulatory review	20. This part provides quite complete information about planning documents, tourism policy, as well as sectoral plans. However, the analysis is more on substance of the documents and not about the regulatory framework within which planning implementation will occur. For example, the report mentioned about RIPPARDA of kota/kabupaten in Lombok. It becomes a main reference for tourism development so far. However, the report was silent	<p>21. Not done: see comment (vi) under <i>Task A</i> at page 2.</p> <p>22. Not done: see comment (vi) under <i>Task A</i> at page 2.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done • Ripparda has been discussed in several capter 	DPE/ENV

Task (adjudged)	Page/para in report	Comments on 12 December documents	Comments on 22 March 2019 documents		
		<p>about the legal status of the plan, which should be Government Regulation (Perda). Please clarify the status of these plans.</p> <p>21. The report should provide analysis on strength, weaknesses as well as room for improvements. Have current regulations been effective for planning, implementation, as well as O&M, how about enforcement, what is the problem? What regulations are missing? Are there overlapping regulations or inconsistencies among regulations? What additional regulations are needed or what regulations need to be improved for better development of the destination area and key tourism area? Etc.</p> <p>22. Part 2.2 should be changed to cover spatial, tourism, and sectoral planning documents.</p>	23.	<p>including in vol 3 (Task C)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are lack of information about monitoring and evaluation about the implementation of the regulations. 	
a.3	2.2.1 National Development Planning documents	<p>23. Table 2 is valuable as it sets out recommendations of various plans by project components, but it would be important to match the strategies to specific documents i.e. to indicate if the strategy applies to the entire area or only to a specific area. Please note that the PAD is not the appropriate reference for the project components; please refer to <i>Pedum</i> and <i>Manual Pengelolaan Program</i> instead.</p> <p>24. Table 3: Synthesis of development direction is too general. These directions could probably apply to many destinations in the world – how can it be made more relevant to the destination area and specific relevance of some points for tourism development needs to be clarified.</p> <p>25. UN SDG's are global – not a very practical guidance for tourism development in Lombok. Guidance should come from best tourism practices, and the ESMF. 2.2.1.1-2.2.1.3 makes you wonder if the Consultant is aware of ESMF and its status in guiding the preparation of the ITMP.</p> <p>26. There is no identification of the challenges related to land status or land ownership; or issues related to land in Table 2? Please add this issue into the table.</p>	24. 25. 26. 27.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done. Pedum and Manual Pengelolaan Program has been discussed in 3.3 • Specific/detailed discussion will be added in next stage • Done and several issues had been discussed on vol. 3 (Task C) 	
a.4	2.2.2. Regional Spatial Planning Documents	27. In Table 4, please put a summary of the table that identifies list of key strategic areas/designated tourist areas, and main leading sub-sectors; also, with the recognized challenges and opportunities for tourism development in reference to the 4 components, if possible.	28.	Done and several parts has been discussed in other chapters/ volume	
a.4	2.2.3 Tourism policy documents	28. Rather replace term “policies” with “policies and plans”?	29. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2.	Done	
a.4	2.2.3.1	29. Explain document’s relationship with ITMP and conduct gap analysis	30.		
a.4	2.2.3.2 Tourism policy gap analysis	<p>30. Documents structure and aspects cover analysis but not in relation to this the preparation of the ITMP. Relevance to ITMP unclear</p> <p>31. No indication of legal status and status of implementation of these documents – are they on shelves or are they being used and implemented?</p>	31. 32.	done	
a.4	2.2.3.3 Delineation of tourism focused areas	32. While this is interesting, it would be good to clarify and present here the area definition of the ITMP is missing (TDA and KTAs, as per TOR).	33.	done	
a.4	2.2.3.4 Lombok other related tourism documents	<p>33. What is the status of implementation of these documents and how do they affect the ITMP?</p> <p>34. For instance, regarding the related environment and social management document in Lombok, we were informed that there is an updated AMDAL document for the Mandalika</p>	34. 35.	Done and several parts has been discussed in other chapters/ volume	

Task (adjudged)	Page/para in report	Comments on 12 December documents	Comments on 22 March 2019 documents		
		Area, also a Master Plan/Detail Plan for this area. Kindly review these Report/Plans. Information provided in these Report/Plans will be useful for developing the ITMP Lombok.			
a.4	2.2.3.5 International Tourism Policies	<p>35. Consider shifting Global and regional guidelines/documents as introduction to 2.2. And specific implications for ITMP are missing.</p> <p>36. Note that for STOs, as part of the Indonesia Tourism Development Project, the Lombok STO will be adjusted to align with the ITMP's key tourism areas and key issues for monitoring.</p> <p>37. Covered in 2.2.1 – there is an overlap</p>	<p>36.</p> <p>37.</p> <p>38. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2.</p>	Done.	
a.4	2.2.4 Infrastructure plans and policies	38.	39. -		
a.4	2.2.4.1-4 Transport, water, wastewater, solid waste	<p>39. (Pages 75-94) on Infrastructure plans and policies: missing are policies and plans for community-based infrastructure and service provision such as PAMSIMAS and KOTAKU. Also, a presentation of policies and plans for post-earthquake reconstruction, including REKOMPAK, is missing in this section.</p> <p>40. Some documents cover the entire Lombok, others only parts.</p> <p>41. Need to understand how they relate spatially to the TDA and KTAs.</p> <p>42. What are implications and relevance of these documents for ITMP?</p> <p>43. Some of the documents are plans: what is the status of implementation of these plans?</p> <p>44. The report mentions some strategies to address issues in solid waste and wastewater sector, such as improving the coordination and consolidation among stakeholders, private sector and community regarding sanitation issues (technical and non-technical issues), as well as raising awareness among communities by campaign or any other information related to sanitation issues. Was there any information to what extent the above plans have been materialized or implemented or achieved? Why there were gaps between plans and realization, if any? Please also review the proposed list of investment 2019 for Lombok under the ITDP. Whether this list (APBN, APBD I, APBD II, WB loan?) is part of the realization of the above plans?</p> <p>45. Page 78: 2.2.4.2: there is no specific assessment of water supply for the islands, it was only for the mainland.</p> <p>46. Page 83: 2.2.4.3: there is no specific assessment of waste water management for the islands, it was only for the mainland.</p> <p>47. Page 88: 2.2.4.4: there is no specific assessment of solid waste management for the islands, it was only for the mainland.</p>	<p>40.</p> <p>41. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2.</p> <p>42.</p> <p>43.</p> <p>44.</p> <p>45.</p> <p>46.</p> <p>47.</p> <p>48.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done and several parts has been discussed in other chapters/ volume • Lack of information and supported regulations. Some of the institutions have no documents of its formulations. • Specific/detailed discussion has been discussed in other volume or it will be added in next stage 	
a.4	2.2.5 Disaster mitigation	<p>48. No specific reference to tourism crisis management and communication – perhaps a gap?</p> <p>49. Page 90: 2.2.5: there is a need to look on how the linkage in the policy on the disaster reduction management and the spatial planning processes.</p> <p>50. Can you explain where are the disaster-prone areas in the key tourism areas in Lombok? And based on the August 2018 disaster, which key tourism areas were affected and what were the nature of the disasters? victims?</p> <p>51. How did the emergency and rehabilitation and reconstruction take place; was there any priority for the emergency/rehabilitation/reconstruction to revive the tourists coming? What and how was it?</p>	<p>49.</p> <p>50.</p> <p>51.</p> <p>52.</p> <p>53.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done and several parts has been discussed in other chapters/ volume • Lack of information and supported regulations. Some of the institutions have no documents of its formulations. 	

Task (adjudged)	Page/para in report	Comments on 12 December documents	Comments on 22 March 2019 documents		
		52. Understanding these aspects will be very important to know what the gaps between the regulations/plans for disaster management were and what happened in reality, also to understand the capacity of the local government (province and districts), and ultimately to develop good strategies in the ITMP to address disaster impacts while achieving each of the objectives of each of the Project's components.			• Specific/detailed discussion has been discussed in other volume or it will be added in next stage
a.4	2.3 Environmental and social management plans	53.	54. -		
a.4	2.3.1 Regulation	54. 2.3.1.1&2 The regulatory and permitting process is well described, however it is important to understand the nature and extent of implementation and effect on tourism of these regulations e.g. bureaucracy, time delays of approvals, environmental and social asset protection and management, etc.? 55. Please include regulations on the KLHS or Strategic Environmental Assessment, which would be relevant for the ITMP into the list of regulations in this section.	55. Not done: see comment (vi) under <i>Task A</i> at page 2. 56.		lack of available data/documents
a.4	2.3.1.2.	56. Page 98: correct error. 57. Page 99: mayor should change to mayor. 58. The report mentions that in June 2018, Indonesia Government issued a new regulation regarding Online Single Submission (OSS) system. The Government Regulation No. 24/2018 on Electronic Integrated Business Licensing Services aims at simplifying the licensing process for investment, including environmental permit. Please explain to what extent this new procedure is different from those required in the ESMF? Please highlights also the requirements of the AMDAL/UKL-UPL as specified in the above regulations.	57. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2. 58. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2. 59.		OSS is a system that makes licensing more simple by online and integrated, thus the time needed is more efficient. The framework dan requirements are still the same with previous AMDAL/UKL-UPL procedures.
a.4	2.3.1.3 Land acquisition	59. Rather follow same format (tabular) as in previous section 60. Repeat comment: Land acquisition regulations are set out but need clear indication whether there are land tenure issues (e.g. duplicated permits, bribery, etc.), especially affecting tourism investment. 61. The report provides Indonesia regulatory frameworks for the implementation of land acquisition relevant to proposed Lombok tourism development. However, it would be good to highlight the key differences of the requirements specified in the ESMF and in the Law 2/2012 and its implementing regulations. And how these differences should be addressed during and for the ITMP? 62. Presidential Regulation No. 62 Year 2018 regarding the management of social impact in the procurement of land for national development (both national and non-national strategic project) was recently issued. Regarding this regulation, what is the assessment of the Consultant in terms of the procedures and requirements specified in these regulations in reference to OP 4.12 or those specified in the ESMF? 63. It is mentioned that the Social Impact Management Plan shall be proposed to the Governor, which subsequently forms an Integrated Team to undertake inventory data collection, compensation appraisal, and to facilitate the grievance management. Please mention who should carry out the appraisal. 64. Should any village asset be affected by the tourism development, land acquisition should refer to the Ministry of Home Affairs Regulation No. 1/2016 regarding Village Asset Management that defines different types of village asset, and mechanism to lease or borrow	60. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2. 61. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2. 62. 63. 64. . 65. 66. 67. 68.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done and several parts has been discussed in other chapters/ volume • Lack of information and supported regulations. Some of the institutions have no documents of its formulations. • Specific/detailed discussion has been discussed in other volume or it will be added in next stage • This section has been discussed in TASK C (chapter 1.2.8 land ownership)

Task (adjudged)	Page/para in report	Comments on 12 December documents	Comments on 22 March 2019 documents		
		<p>and use a village asset as an alternative of its management. This regulation will be used to lease some of the potentially affected government land. What does the government land refer to? What about the village land? Please clarify.</p> <p>65. Based on MAPPI Standard, the appraisal approach will consider physical and non-physical objects. Non-physical aspect should cover also premium/ solatium.</p> <p>66. The OP 4.12 and ESMF are applicable for any physical tourism facilities investment resulting in relocation, or loss of assets, or loss of access to assets, or loss of income sources or means of livelihood whether or not the PAPs must move to another location; or due to the involuntary restriction of access to legally designated parks and protected areas resulting in adverse impacts on the livelihoods of the PAPs. Thus, the ESMF adopted the objectives, principles and requirements of OP 4.12 and Government Regulations on Land Acquisition. Please do not put "and" between the OP4.12 and the ESMF.</p> <p>67. In addition, both documents provide guidance with regards to the eligibility of the affected people, including those with legal rights, non-titled land users, vulnerable and severely impacted people, (e.g., affected indigenous people), the requirements for full replacement cost, and ensuring the livelihood restoration of all affected people. As explained in the above comments, ESMF included the objectives, principles and requirements of OP 4.12. Also OP 4.10.</p>			
a.4	2.3.2 Information on IKPLHD (environmental management)	<p>68. Would be good to have the issues and strategic innovation recommendations for the 4 issues in a single table to see clearly the main issues and strategies</p> <p>69. Which issues and locations are most relevant to tourism development and to the TDA and KTAs – need relevance to the ITMP preparation.</p> <p>70. Page 204: 2.3.2.1.1. point b: referenced to Sumbawa while the baseline focuses on Lombok; point c: Exploitation Mine C should be Exploitation Mine Category C.</p> <p>71. Page 105: illegal gold mining: do they use mercury? If so, there should be stated here.</p> <p>72. Page 109: 2.3.2.5: this section seems incomplete and not consistent with the ones above it.</p>	<p>69.</p> <p>70.</p> <p>71.</p> <p>72. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2.</p> <p>73. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2.</p>	Done. Has been updated	ENV
a.4	2.3.3 ESMF	<p>73. Add the status of the ESMF and when it was adopted by GOI. Clarify that: ESMF belongs to RIDA and must be implemented by all parties involved in the Indonesia Tourism development Project.</p> <p>74. The report mentions that the ESMF will also provide a mechanism to address impacts that could be associated with business development that emerges in response to business licensing simplification and investment promotion supported under Component 3. How would the ESMF explained in this sub-section be applied in the preparation process of ITMP and in the ITMP (including DDPs) itself?</p> <p>75. The report mentions that the ESMF contains frameworks to guide the preparation of LARAP and IPP, and a screening checklist for investments. It also contains negative list, screening approaches, impacts assessment, identification of appropriate instruments, and environmental safeguards instruments (such as AMDAL, UKL-UPL, SPPL),</p> <p>76. Component 4: ITMPs (including the Detailed Development Plans), and downstream sectoral master plans. How would the LARPF be applied in the preparation process of ITMP and in the ITMP (including DDP) itself?</p>	<p>74.</p> <p>75.</p> <p>76.</p> <p>77.</p>	Done 73. refer to Task A page 147 74. refer to Task A page 148 76. refer to Task A page 150	
a.4	2.3.6	<p>77. "Protection forest" is the accepted English translation of <i>hutan lindung</i>, the forest that is designated for watershed protection. "Protected" should be changed to "protection" here and wherever else this error occurs in the draft.</p>	<p>78. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2.</p>	Done	ENV
a.4	2.3.7.3.1.	<p>78. How can mangrove be both "overall in good status" and "moderate in terms of cover" at the same time. The reference for this is undefined – a problem that occurs frequently in the Task A document.</p>	<p>79. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2.</p>	Noted refer to TASK C	ENV

Task (adjudged)	Page/para in report	Comments on 12 December documents	Comments on 22 March 2019 documents		
a.4	2.3.7.3.1 (p. 125)	79. What is the meaning of "While coral-polyp-eating gastropods it is not shown because the bias is so large"?	80. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2.	Noted refer to TASK C	ENV
a.4	2.3.8.1.3 (pp. 138-9)	80. How can dive tourism be a permitted activity in a sustainable fisheries zone whereas swimming and snorkelling are prohibited?	81. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2.	Noted refer to TASK C	ENV
a.4	2.3.9.5 (p. 153)	81. "Spring waste" should be "spring water."	82. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2.	done	
a.4	2.3.10.1.1 (p. 186)	82. Saying that dissolved oxygen (DO) "exceeded" water quality standards is confusing, because DO is supposed to be higher than the standards. Where DO is below the standard as in this case, it would be clearer to say "did not meet" or "fell short of" or "violated" the standard.	83. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2.	Done	ENV
a.4	2.3.10.11 (P. 188)	83. Here in the discussion of water quality and in numerous other places in the draft, there is mention of "T. Coli and E. Coli". <i>E. coli</i> is a species of bacteria and should be written in italics. T. Coli presumably refers to total coliform and is a group of bacteria, not a species. It could be abbreviated as TC after being first introduced as "total coliform".	84. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2.	Done	ENV
a.4	2.3.10.14	84. Groundwater quality in Mataram is "apprehensive"?	85. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2.	Done	ENV
a.4	2.3.11	85. What do the percentages mean in Figure 118?	86. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2.	Revised	ENV
a.4	2.3.11.3	86. Losing 1500m ² of coastal area by 2030 does not seem like much of a problem. Is it supposed to be 1500 km ² ?	87. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2.	Noted refer to TASK C	ENV
a.4	2.3.11.4	87. The first sentence is not clear, and "serve" in Table 35 presumably should be "severe".	88. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2.	Noted refer to TASK C	ENV
a.4	2.4 Indigenous People Framework	88. Would be important to understand to what extent local/indigenous community participation is addressed in any of the tourism policies/plans.	89.	Noted refer to TASK C	ENV
a.4	2.5 Cultural heritage framework	89. Need references to support the differences drawn between various definitions of cultural heritage and cultural conservation 90. Why no reference to Ministry of Culture's classification of cultural heritage? 91. No links between Cultural Heritage laws and tourism? 92. Page 116-117: 2.5.: there should be a discussion on the advertent finding procedure. 93. 2.5. What is the meaning of "Most cases of domestic violence occur in men who are victims of crime"? 94. How would this framework be applied in the preparation process of ITMP and in the ITMP itself (including the DDPs)?	90. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2. 91. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2. 92. 93. 94. Not checked for this: see comment (i) under General Comments at pg 2. 95.	Noted refer to TASK C	ENV
A.	2.6 Opportunities and constraints	95. This section is confusing – should it not be a SWOT of Task A aspects? 96. Most issues highlighted are of a general nature and it is difficult to extract the key SWOT issues related to Task A: Institutional, legal, regulatory and policy framework	96. Not done: see comment (ii) under <i>General Comments</i> at page 2. 97. Not done: see comment (ii) under <i>General Comments</i> at page 1.	Done refer to TASK C Noted refer to TASK C	ENV

Task (adjudged)	Page/para in report	Comments on 12 December documents	Comments on 22 March 2019 documents		
		<p>97. The “main” constraints listed are constraints to sustainable development, not constraints that would serve as guidelines for tourism infrastructure development on Lombok. However, the overall report addresses that latter kind of constraint quite well in Task D, Section 2, “Opportunities and Constraints”, with sensitivity mapping (2.1) and suitability mapping (2.2). The draft meets the TOR requirements on opportunities and constraints because of D.2. This section (2.6) however is confusing and not a good summary of Chapter 2.</p> <p>98. What would be the most appropriate legal status of the ITMP in the current regulation framework explained in 2.2 above? Or, where does the ITMP locate in the current regulatory framework?</p> <p>99. Please also assess or confirm whether the ITMP should be accompanied by a KLHS, and justification for this need or for no need for a KLHS.</p> <p>100. Are the opportunities and constraints mentioned reflected in the above listed laws, regulations and plans, reports?</p> <p>101. Is it possible to map where do these opportunities and constraints belong to for each of the key tourism areas?</p> <p>102. How would the above laws, regulations, and various plans above will guide the projections and development scenarios?</p>	<p>98. Not done: see comment (ii) under <i>General Comments</i> at page 2.</p> <p>99. See comment (vi) under <i>Task A</i> at page 2.</p> <p>100. See comment (vi) under <i>Task A</i> at page 2.</p> <p>101. See comment (vi) under <i>Task A</i> at page 2.</p> <p>102. See comment (vi) under <i>Task A</i> at page 2.</p> <p>103. See comment (vi) under <i>Task A</i> at page 2.</p>		