

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

- vi. Include a very short chapter four consisting of a simple diagram and short description that shows how all this material feeds into scenario development.
- vii. Print the following figures on a whole A4 page: 18, 75, 77, 78, 80 and the new base map.
- viii. At section 2.1.2 of Vol 4 make explicit the regulations relied upon by cross-referencing to Vol 1.
- ix. In a new appendix to Vol 4 provide the workings and scores that support creation of Fig 19 on page 75.
- x. Before section 3.4 add a short analysis that identifies the most severe impacts across the KTAs and relate the discussion to chapter 2.
- xi. 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.
- xii. At page 70 review statement about multi-criteria assessment as this does not appear to be an MCA.
- xiii. 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.
- xiv. 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.

Section #1: ASSESSMENT SUMMARY:		Assessment	
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	Adequate
	Task B	Work required	Adequate
	Task C	Work required	Adequate
	Task D	Work required	Adequate +
➤	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
----------------------------------	-------------------------------

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.
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.
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.	➤ Satisfactory
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.	➤ Satisfactory
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.	➤ Satisfactory
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

Documents dated 12 December 2019		Documents dated 22 March 2019
		<p>construct this at the start of Task E and in doing so identify the issues the forthcoming plans need to address.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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.
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
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
i	<p>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:</p> <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. 	<p>➤ Adequate</p> <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.
	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.	<p>➤ Satisfactory</p> <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.

Section #2

PART A

EVALUATION MATRIX AGAINST TASKS

Task (see Terms of Reference)	Page/para in report (insert ref.)	Assessment (see above)	Comments (for partially and not met assessments, state what is required to achieve satisfactory completion of the task) (green shading indicates comment previously advised)		
			12 December documents	22 March 2019 documents	Action
D. Articulation of environmental, social, socio-economic and cultural heritage opportunities and constraints					
TASK OVERVIEW					
		TOR requirement partially met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Review material against terms of reference to ensure all requirements are covered. b. How would this section be used in the preparation of growth projections and development scenarios? c. Assess how tourism development would avoid social impacts. d. The description of sensitivities and potential aspects, impacts and mitigation is comprehensive; relate this to the spatial tourism development areas and to extract impacts that are most severe across the various tourism areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Adequate + 	
d.1	Collect and interpret the relevant baseline data and develop maps and reports of challenges, opportunities, and constraints for environmentally and socially sustainable growth and for the various types of tourism facilities and supporting infrastructure. Potential environmental and social impacts and risks of tourism development in general, and of the proposed infrastructure development and other activities specified in the Master Plan, will be assessed.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Include a very short chapter four consisting of a simple diagram and short description that shows how all this material feeds into scenario development. o Print the following figures on a whole A4 page: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 18, 75, 77, 78, 80 and the new base map. o At section 2.1.2 of Vol 4 make explicit the regulations relied upon by cross-referencing to Vol 1. o In a new appendix to Vol 4 provide the workings and scores that support creation of Fig 19 on page 75. o Before section 3.4 add a short analysis that identifies the most severe impacts across the KTAs and relate the discussion to chapter 2. o 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Done

Task (see Terms of Reference)		Page/para in report (insert ref.)	Assessment (see above)	Comments (for partially and not met assessments, state what is required to achieve satisfactory completion of the task) (green shading indicates comment previously advised)		
				12 December documents	22 March 2019 documents	Action
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At page 70 review statement about multi-criteria assessment as this does not appear to be an MCA. ○ 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. ○ 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. 	
d.2	For the assessment of heritage impacts, the Consultant will use as a reference the "Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties".				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ - 	
d.3	<p>Aligned with any bylaws/codes of protected area or WHS's core and buffer zones, maps should present "no development" zones, zones suitable only for certain types of development, zones with little or no restriction on type of development, and any recommended building regulations, etc.</p> <p>The World Bank safeguards policies would be taken into account in this task, following guidance as presented in detail in the Environmental and Social Management Framework. Elements of the policies that guide development toward positive outcomes on environmental, social (including gender), socio-economic and cultural heritage conditions will be taken into account in identifying opportunities, and prohibitions and restrictions presented in some of the policies will become parts of the</p>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ See above. 	

Task (see Terms of Reference)	Page/para in report (insert ref.)	Assessment (see above)	Comments (for partially and not met assessments, state what is required to achieve satisfactory completion of the task) (green shading indicates comment previously advised)		
			12 December documents	22 March 2019 documents	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Tourism and Hospitality Development ii. Waste Management Facilities iii. Water and Sanitation iv. Ports, Harbours and Terminals v. Airports vi. Toll Roads vii. Electric Power Transmission and Distribution 					

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
-	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
D. Articulation of environmental, social, socio-economic and cultural heritage opportunities and constraints			
D	2. Environmental, Social, Socio-Economic, and Cultural Heritage Opportunities and Constraints	1. How would this section be considered in the preparation of growth projections and development scenarios?	1. Satisfactory a. See comment d.1 in Part A.
D	2.1 and 2.2 Development Sensitivity and Impact Assessment	2. The description of sensitivities and potential aspects, impacts and mitigation is comprehensive; which makes it difficult to ascertain where the priority focus should be in impact management and mitigation, both from aspect and geographical approaches. It would, for example, be good to relate this to the spatial tourism development areas and to extract impacts that are most severe across the various tourism areas.	2. Satisfactory a. See comment d.1 in Part A.
D	2.2.3 Social Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures	3. Please assess how tourism development would avoid social impacts	3. Satisfactory a. See comment d.1 in Part A.