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# Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bappenas</td>
<td>National Planning Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bappeda</td>
<td>Local Planning Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Central Business District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDIA</td>
<td>Cities Development Initiative for Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIM</td>
<td>Centre for International Migration and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIY</td>
<td>Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemprov DIY</td>
<td>Pemerintah Provinsi DIY / Provincial Government of Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemkot</td>
<td>City Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpres</td>
<td>Presidential Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-FS</td>
<td>Pre Feasibility Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>Pekerjaan Umum / Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Public Private Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTRW</td>
<td>Rencana Tata Ruang Wilayah / Spatial Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUTIP</td>
<td>Sustainable Urban Transport Infrastructure Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Surat Keputusan / Decree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKPD</td>
<td>Satuan Kerja Pemerintah Daerah / City Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timko</td>
<td>Tim Kota / City Coordination Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URDI</td>
<td>Urban &amp; Regional Development Insitute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIPD</td>
<td>Yayasan Inovasi Pemerintahan Daerah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yogyakarta GUA</td>
<td>Yogyakarta Greater Urban Areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

Foreword

The purpose of this report is to give documentation on the Pre-Feasibility Study (Pre-FS) process in the Province of Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta (DIY) and the City of Banda Aceh. These Pre-FS are the supports provided by Cities Development Initiative for Asia (CDIA) to 4 cities in Indonesia during the period of 2009 to 2011 including DIY and Banda Aceh. The report focuses on the process of Pre-FS particularly the involvement of the city administration and stakeholders. This report explains the whole process from the beginning of the process to ToR preparation, project selection, reporting as well as the current status of the project and lessons learned.

The report is jointly prepared by URDI and YIPD, the National Partner Organizations of CDIA to be submitted to UN Habitat as the deliverables of Contract Small Scale Agreement of Cooperation SAoC11-011.

Executive Summary
Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta

Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta (DIY) is one of the popular tourist destinations in Indonesia. It is also known as the city of education. Both these roles have an impact on the development of the city of Yogyakarta that brings about urban sprawl which in turns put pressure on the urban road network. To that end, CDIA helps the Provincial Government of Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta (hereinafter referred to as Pemprov DIY) and the City Government of Yogyakarta to develop an integrated urban transport strategies and forms of investment. CDIA assistance is manifested in the preparation of Pre-Feasibility Study (Pre-FS) for transportation in the city of Yogyakarta and its surrounding areas. Activities undertaken, among other, are in-depth study of the condition of the city and the transport sector, evaluation the needs and opportunities, strategy formulation to project the future development and formulation of investment priorities.

Provincial Government of DIY knew CDIA program through a program which was supported SUTIP GIZ. Before the implementation, the terms of reference (TOR) of Pre-FS was prepared by the Provincial Government of Yogyakarta outlining the Pre-FS activities to be performed. The TOR stated that Pre-FS should examine several transportation studies ever conducted in Yogyakarta since 2001 through cooperation with academics as well as with donor agencies like GIZ, Aus-AID etc, and then formulate recommendations based on the results of those studies.
Through the assistance of GIZ, the TOR included some additional ideas namely addition and development of pathways, study of the feeder network, institutional forms, park and ride system, and urban pedestrian. Based on this, Pre-FS was then named Urban Transport Yogyakarta.

Early findings showed that the issue of the Urban Transport Yogyakarta was improvement in urban transport services. Communities often complained about poor transport facilities, especially from the old city bus conditions, distance and tariffs. This main issue was then developed into a more detail and comprehensive urban transport issues which included the route evaluation, management Transjogja, bus stops, ticketing system, to the revitalization of the area of the Central Business District (CBD), namely Jalan (road) Malioboro and Jalan Solo. Overall, the Provincial Government of DIY appreciated these ideas. But everything needed to be adjusted according to the situation of DIY and required more in-depth study because it will directly impact the community.

Sufficient data and good communication become the key factor in the preparation of the Pre-FS Yogyakarta Urban Transport. The process was also more effective due to the results of previous studies. But for the implementation, clarity on who the responsible or person in-charge was crucial. In terms of capacity development, Provincial Government of DIY and City of Yogyakarta benefited from the Pre-FS process. They learned a lot from the experiences on urban transport in other countries although not all of those ideas and experiences can be adopted by Yogyakarta.

**Executive Summary**

**Banda Aceh**

Great efforts were made to bring Banda Aceh rising up from one of the worst tragedy ever in the history. The City Government tried so hard to bring Banda Aceh back to normal since two third of the area were affected by tsunami. One of the efforts was to create city coordination team (Timko). TimKo was established by Mayor of Banda Aceh, Vice Mayor of Banda Aceh and Secretary of Banda Aceh as an anticipatory response to the need of Banda Aceh to partner with other stakeholders and donor in supporting the City rehabilitation and reconstruction efforts. Timko members consist of SKPD (the city agency) staffs.

Timko then was introduced to CDIA with the help and information from CIM experts, a joint operation of GIZ and the German Federal Employment Agency which had previously cooperated with Timko. As a follow-up, CDIA sent a consultant to Banda Aceh for a fact finding mission on May 2008. This mission aimed to identify the City needs for assistance and to find out about the assistance that CDIA could provide. CDIA then decided to support Banda Aceh in preparing the Pre-FS and assisting the project prioritization. Timko was asked to create a list of potential projects and with the help of CDIA conducted prioritization from that list. The output was a list of prioritized project.

Throughout the Pre-FS process, CDIA assisted Banda Aceh not only by conducting the technical assistance for Pre FS but also by strengthening the capacity of the City staffs. This capacity
development was aligned with the process of Pre-FS which began to be implemented in November 2008. In April 2009, the Pre-FS result was submitted as an application to Bappenas to attract investors to finance the project through public private partnership scheme.

After the completion of Pre-FS, the ADB setup an Infrastructure Project Development Facility (PDF) at Bappenas to support the preparation of feasibility studies (FS) and public private partnership procurement up to the signing of the contractual arrangements with the private investors. CDIA asked the City to submit an application to Bappenas for grant funding by PDF to support the feasibility study and assist the City for bidding preparation documents, bidding process and financing the Banda Aceh Integrated Urban Renewal Program. The City was currently waiting for Bappenas to provide necessary supporting documents as required by Perpres 56/2011. The City was also invited to submit a project proposal to the Provincial Public Works agency (DPU) for grant funding to access the remaining tsunami funds from Multi Donor Trust Fund (MDF) managed by World Bank. The City submitted the wastewater treatment and drainage projects, as part of the Pre-FS to DPU prov.

Pre-FS has given the City administrations the experience to prepare Pre-FS, to identify source of financing, and to prepare project programming to create better investment project. The CDIA Pre-FS document was put as an example for other planning documents to meet one of the prerequisites in Bappenas. The City also realizes that other alternative source of financing are available to the City. They also learned how to create a better investment package for project development proposal, through assessments and valuation on the social aspects. This packaging aimed at attracting investors by making the social oriented projects to be economically feasible.
1. CITY PROFILE

Yogyakarta Special Region Province, one of Special Region in Indonesia, is located in southern part of central Java and adjacent to Central Java Province and Indian Ocean. DIY is subdivided into four regencies (Bantul, Sleman, Kulon Progo, Gunung Kidul) and one city (Yogyakarta). In addition to getting reputation as unique domestic tourist destination after Bali, Yogyakarta is also known as icon of education city in Indonesia. However, both of the roles bring consequences to City of Yogyakarta (hereinafter referred to Yogyakarta) development that has outgrown the administrative boundaries thus forming Yogyakarta Greater Urban Areas (consist of Government of Yogyakarta Cities and the adjoining of Regencies of Sleman and Bantul). As the result, main road network to and from Yogyakarta becomes increasingly dense. Those conditions are worsened by inconvenient and inadequate public transportation and lack of effort to improve the facilities, which causing the increasing use of private vehicle. This leads to congestion in Yogyakarta. On the other hand, Pemprov DIY is lack of capacity to manage the urban sprawl because the infrastructure provided by the City has not met the spatial planning or transportation infrastructure plan.

Population of DIY is about 3,457,391 (2010) of which approximately 69% is the population of Yogyakarta Greater Urban Areas (GUA). Average population growth is 1.3% per year. Yogyakarta GUA population is shown on Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/ Regency</th>
<th>Population 2005</th>
<th>Population 2010</th>
<th>Growth Rate (%)</th>
<th>Density (inhabitants/km²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yogyakarta</td>
<td>439,393</td>
<td>388,627</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>14.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleman</td>
<td>999,586</td>
<td>1,093,110</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>1.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bantul</td>
<td>871,203</td>
<td>911,503</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>1.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,310,182</td>
<td>2,393,240</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>1.845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. INVESTMENT PROJECT PROFILE

Just like other cities, economic and population growth in Yogyakarta affects its traffic conditions, especially along the connecting road to Yogyakarta, and increases daily commuter trip which slowly adds to congestion. These conditions have been observed by Pemprov DIY and Pemko Yogyakarta, whom then collaborating with CDIA to develop an “integrated mass transit service and its investments strategy”.

The strategy to handle the transportation issue was to improve public transport services rather than reducing private vehicles number. By improving mass transport system, the use of private vehicles are expected to decline and new roads construction was able to be controlled. This strategy was realized by integrating corridors strategy between Transjogja condition and bus route network. The investment (financing) package aimed to improve the three highest priorities of the seven corridors.

The improvements for the corridors included:

1. Improvement of the bus, terminal, and facilities;
2. Setting up of on-street parking;
3. Provision for parking spaces and bicycle paths;
4. Adding the bus fleet; and
5. Adding bus shelter more conveniently.

Furthermore, the strategy also included the provision of Automatic Traffic Control Systems (ATCS), a control room, passenger information system in real time, and on-board bus ticketing. Those strategy was going to change Transjogja services particularly in the 3 (three) corridors and provided basis for investment for corridors improvement and future enhancement. The aim was to introduce to the public a new paradigm about using sustainable public transports rather than private vehicles.

Urban Transport Project in Yogyakarta was trying to adress three main issues: development of network structure and planning guidelines of TransJogja; facilitation of non-motorized vehicles; and comprehensive reformation of public transport.

3. PRE-FS PROCESS

3.1 Preparation of Term of Reference (ToR)

Pemprov DIY was introduced to CDIA through SUTIP (Sustainable Urban Transport Infrastructure Project) program which was supported by GIZ. However, since the Urban Transport Pre-FS scope is involving other cities or districts, CDIA decided to sign the contract with Pemprov DIY. The Pre-FS was focusing on developing an integrated urban transport strategies and exploring the financing.

Pemprov DIY prepared the term of references (ToR) that described all the activities of Pre-FS. The main objective of the ToR was to examine several transportation studies in Yogyakarta and formulate recommendations based on those study results. The topics of the studies were scoping on urban transportation, parking systems, pedestrian, and route network planning. Those studies recommended to shift utilization of private vehicles into public transportation. Those studies were
conducted by Pemprov DIY since 2001, either in cooperation with university or donor agencies. Some of the results are in the form of academic reports, not urban policy, thus still needs legitimation and support from the citizen or socially being accepted.

In the beginning, the ToR substance focussed on how to reduce operating cost, to generate income from operational activities, and to formulate institutional framework to manage TransJogja and DIY transportation. When preparing the ToR, Pemprov DIY has been advised by GIZ with some other ideas namely the need to add and develop more bus lane, study of feeder network, study of institutional management, park and ride system, and urban pedestrian. The discussion with CDIA resulted in some suggestions to conduct social survey to determine the travel type, need for public transport facilities, willingness to pay, parking system, shelter design, and also ticketing methods. This social survey has been done in February 2011.

“At that time transportation in Jogja has several problems and the Provincial Government has some ideas to improve, develop, and make it efficient”

Tri Harjun, Former Secretary of DIY

“In formulating the ToR, DIY focusses on how to improve public transportation services including it technical and policy aspects, and hope that there is a development of the policy substance such as increased parking charges policy”.

Sigit Haryanto,
Head of Public Relations and Protocol Bureau of DIY
(Former Head of Public Transport, Transportation Department DIY)

The Pre-FS formulation used participatory approach by involving various stakeholders, conducting in-depth study about urban transportation, evaluating the passengers’ needs and the opportunities, develop an integrated strategy to predict future developments, and formulate priority investment package that has been agreed by stakeholders to be implemented.

The objectives of Urban Transport Pre-FS in Yogyakarta as laid out in ToR are:

1. To establish an urban transport sector strategy in Yogyakarta, and recommend necessary policy and regulatory frameworks to implement the strategy;
2. To identify priority and bankable transport investments that either minimize environmental impacts, or actually improve environmental conditions and climate change mitigation;

3. To strengthen the capacity of urban transport institutions involved in management and service delivery, including local and provincial level agencies as applicable

3.2 Issues Found

The issue of urban transport in Yogyakarta was the improvement of public transportation services. The citizens often complain about poor transportation facilities, particularly about the bus conditions, lack of route coverage, waiting time, and tariffs. Additional issues for the Pre-FS were taken from academic papers and suggestions from CDIA such as route evaluation, Transjogja management, shelter facilities, ticket selling, as well as the revitalization of CBD in Jalan Malioboro and Jalan Solo. Other emerging issues raised by social observers were on-street parking and informal vendors which required delicate handling because involve complex issues concerning cultural, social and economic.

3.3 Mobilization of Pre-FS

Mobilization of Pre-FS process began with the establishment of Technical Team, which was a part of Urban Transport Team formed in 2008 by the Governor’s Decree. Urban Transport Team for Pre-FS consisted of two committees: Steering Committee (SC) which were mainly the policy makers, and Operational Committee (hereinafter referred as Technical Team) which consisted of Pemprov DIY (DIY Transportation Agency, DIY Planning Agency, DIY Public Works), Pemko Yogyakarta (Yogyakarta Transportation Agency, Yogyakarta Planning Agency), and communities (Organda, UGM, and Indonesia Transport Society/ MTI). The Technical Team was established by Decree from DIY Transportation Agency.

Table 2 Pre-FS Technical Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Role in TimKo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ir. Sigit Haryanta, MT.</td>
<td>DIY Transportation Agency</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rizky Budi Utomo, ST, MT</td>
<td>DIY Transportation Agency</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ir. Sofyan Azies CES</td>
<td>Bappeda DIY</td>
<td>Team Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ir. Agus Minang SN</td>
<td>DIY Transportation Agency</td>
<td>Team Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sumaryoto, SE, M.Si</td>
<td>DIY Transportation Agency</td>
<td>Team Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Drs. GM. Suwartono, M.Si</td>
<td>DIY Transportation Agency</td>
<td>Team Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bobby Prasetyo, SE</td>
<td>DPPKAD DIY</td>
<td>Team Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wahyu Handoyo HP, ST, MT, MA</td>
<td>Bappeda Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Team Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Drs. Hary Purwanto</td>
<td>Dishub Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Team Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ana Rina Herbranti, ST, MT</td>
<td>Diskimpraswil</td>
<td>Team Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Prof. Dr-Ing. Ir. A. Munawar, M.Sc</td>
<td>UGM</td>
<td>Team Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ir. Muslimh Zainal Askin,</td>
<td>MTI DIY</td>
<td>Team Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre-FS development required intensive communication between the CDIA Consultant Team and the Technical Team. Therefore DIY Transportation Agency gave the Consultant Team a workspace in DIY Transportation Agency office. The regular communication was held weekly between the Consultant Team and Technical Team, while discussion with SC was held monthly. From those discussions, some ideas about Pre-FS methodology, expected results and outcome were collected. One of the ideas was that Pre-FS needed to conduct social survey to gather the public perception and the level of social welfare, to determine the willingness and ability to pay for the bus tariff.

In general, Pre-FS mobilization went quite smooth without any significant obstacles. The Team (both Consultant Team and Technical Team) approached the Pre-FS with both formal and personal approach. However regardless of the approach, the Team members were intensively informed with detail information of Pre-FS. This required intensive communication among the Team members as it was confirmed by team members from DIY and Yogyakarta Transport Agency. Nevertheless, another officer from Bappeda DIY and Yogyakarta suggested that the Pre-FS socialization and distribution roles of the technical team should have been clearer.

3.4 Data Collection

With Technical Team, data collection process was made easier as they instructed to all agencies relevant to Pre-FS to help provide necessary data. The data required among others are traffic volume, study of parking, transportation policy, public transport route, urban transport management, Regional Transportation Planning (Tatrawill) document, inter-regional public transportation performance study, annual taxi data, feeder network study, customer-based urban transport studies, spatial planning document, southern network road, ring road network study, and also others data related to transportation in Yogyakarta. Most of the data came from Transportation Agency of DIY and Yogyakarta. The rest was from Bappeda DIY, Bappeda Yogyakarta, Public Works of DIY, and UGM.

“In the implementation of this program (Urban Transport Pre-FS), Bappeda DIY should have been fully involved - not only related to transportation sectors. About the ToR contents, Bappeda has been involved and has known the substance but not the whole picture. And I, personally, was not part of the team. The communication that involved stakeholder should have been more intensive.”

Ni Made Dwipanti, Head of Transportation, Spatial Planning, Settlement, Energy and Human Source – Bappeda DIY
CDIA Consultant Team visited the agencies mentioned above, especially the DIY Transportation Agency that conducted research and annual ata collection of urban transportation. Most of the relevant agencies have understood the transportation problems in Yogyakarta so that the consultant only needed to ask for the data and information related to Pre-FS.

Besides the secondary data, the Consultant Team also conducted a primary household survey to gain additional information from various citizens about their needs and aspirations regarding public transport. The survey had captured various perceptions about trips and found out about the social phenomena faced in developing mass transit system in Yogyakarta such as parking management, informal vendors management, thugs issue and other findings related to economic growth in Yogyakarta, especially in Malioboro area.

3.5 Prioritization and Project Elaboration

Prioritization process in determining Urban Transport Project was undertaken in a workshop by selecting 6 (six) urban transport projects. The six projects were:

1. Development of Network structure and planning guidelines of TransJogja;
2. Development of inter-mode facilities such as terminal, shelter, transfer and TOD;
3. Bus Lanes, Parking Management and “Steps on Demand”;
4. Road Network development
5. Comprehensive Reformation of Public Transport

The workshop was attended by 80 participants from various elements such as government, NGOs, community groups (like parking, rickshaws, bicycles), Chamber of Commerce, Organda, Rotary Club, academics and transportation observers in Yogyakarta. The workshop began with the Consultant Team’s presentation about the Pre-FS and the Six Urban Transport Projects. In the presentation, the Consultant Team used visual graphic to illustrate each project including the background, the benefits, and the investment of financing needs. For the prioritization process, participants were divided into 8 groups of 10 people in which each group ought to select top three projects from the existing Urban Transport Projects. The Consultant Team Leader emphasized that the participants should ignored the amount of financing and instead focused on the community needs.

The result of each group discussion was then processed by integrating the results from all of the groups to arrive at the 3 priority projects. These priorities were:

1. Development of Network structure and planning guidelines of TransJogja;
2. Facilitation of Non-Motorized Vehicles;

Choosing the top project out of those three priorities was the last step in prioritization process. The Consultant Team and the Technical Team then decided that TransJogja was the top priority in Urban Transport Project in DIY. The result of the prioritization received quite good responses particularly concerning the prioritization process where the consensus was built among the participants. The Team was fully aware that the selected project was less promising as a prospect of investment. This
view was expressed by Mr. Sigit Haryanto, Head of Public Relations and Protocol Bureau of DIY who is formerly Head of Public Transport, Transportation Department DIY (see box).

The prioritization was implemented using participatory approach. High participation rate and active involvement of participants in discussions provided good inputs to the Technical Team.

Transjogja was chosen as the Pre-FS project to be followed up with the CDIA support. Pre-FS preparation was carried out for three months (from March 2011 to June 2011). The process began with discussion on some technical issues regarding the urban transport based on the recommendations from the workshop, recommendation from Tatrawil, and the existing urban transport grand design. Those recommendations were restriction for on-street parking and providing some pocket park/parking lots as the solution, contra flow for Transjogja, dedicated lane for Transjogja, design shelters, ticketing system, Transjogja routes evaluation, and institutional arrangement i.e. how to manage Transjogja through a Project Implementation Unit (PIU). Those recommendations were discussed by the Technical Team to identify the possibility of implementation amidst the political, social and economic situation of Yogyakarta. For some reasons, not all of the recommendations were accepted because it would have needed significant adjustment process. Nevertheless DIY agreed that Consultant should do social survey and evaluation of Transjogja route.

In addition to the discussions about the recommendations, the Consultant Team and the Technical Team also discussed other relevant issues such as environmental, climate change, reduction to urban poverty and good governance. Related to climate change issue, the Consultant calculated GHG emission reduction with the improvement of public transport especially with rejuvenation of existing public transport vehicles. It was assumed that a Transjogja bus replaced two old buses. However, the calculation was still a preliminary one and needed specific study to examine the impact of climate change in Yogyakarta.

Technical issues discussions in the Pre-FS urban transport are as follows:

1. Transjogja Route Evaluation

Based on the discussions between the Consultant and the Technical Team, it was proposed to have route improvement because of the current ineffectiveness due to the length of travel that affected the travel time. Therefore the Consultant proposed shorter routes to downtown so that the trip became more efficient and passengers’ waiting period got shorter. The Technical Team was still examining the possibility of shorter
routes because it needed to take a new node in order to facilitate passengers when they wanted to change the route. The nodes that were examined located in Giwangan shelter. The Technical Team was also preparing for Bus Information System (BIS).

2. **TransJogja Management**

The Consultant proposed to establish new institutions, namely Project Implementation Unit (PIU) or Project Management Unit (PMU) as an independent body and under direct coordination of the Governor of DIY. This proposal got a serious response from DIY related to government structure. The new institutions still needed time to be established because it would need a comprehensive evaluation on organizational structure and nomenclature related with its role and authority. There would be a transfer of authority from one agency to another.

Another thing to consider was about budget allocation and implementation for the PIU activities. In relation with the budget, Pemprov DIY was very cautious especially to face financial audit by BPKP. Pemprov DIY then considered another option which was to establish UPT and then managed it as Public Service Board (BLU) under the management of the DIY Transportation Agency.

3. **Shelter Design**

The existing shelter was high deck with a certain height. The consultant suggested to redesign it to be a low deck shelter i.e. in the same level as the sidewalk. This suggestion was debated by the Technical Team because they were concerned that with low deck shelter, passengers can stop anywhere they like. This condition might adversely affect the efforts to have a disciplined public transportation system and better services and facilities.

4. **Contra Flow System**

According to the Consultant Team, contra flow system was closely related with the condition of parking management. The on-street parking using Transjogja lanes was increasing travel time. Therefore the Consultant Team suggested to remove on-street
parking and providing parking lot instead. However, this system was still debated by the Technical Team because considering the current traffic habits and road safety factors.

5. Ticketing system
Ticketing system was suggested to use a debit card system whose credit can be obtained from counters in shopping malls using voucher, and not only at the ticket booth. There are also some scanners in the TransJogja to scan the ticket so that the passengers know their remaining funds to ride TransJogja.

6. Central Business District (CBD) Revitalization
Yogyakarta CBDs was located at Jalan Malioboro and Jalan Solo. Both CBDs are less attractive because there was interconnections or not connected by any public transport routes. In the Yogyakarta transportation studies, both of the CBDs were recommended to be connected with TransJogja route.

Pemprov DIY appreciated the recommendations from Pre-FS even though these recommendation still needed to be adapted and required an in-depth study for their implementation. These recommendation will also require intensive socialization process in order to be accepted and implemented by the citizens.

3.6 Capacity Development
Through the preparation of Yogyakarta Urban Transport Pre-FS with CDIA, Pemprov DIY and Pemko Yogyakarta were brainstorming, discussing and sharing experiences with the Consultant, and had an opportunity to join the training on urban transport management in Singapore. Brainstorming, discussion and sharing experience with the Consultant was performed during regular meeting throughout the Pre-FS process. Meanwhile the training in Singapore provided an overview and lesson learned about urban transportation management and how to resolve social problems.
3.7 Finalizing Reports and Recommendations

According to the Technical Team, Pre-FS results was effective because it took into account the previous transportation studies. However, the implementation still needed huge efforts and attention, especially from Pemprov DIY to assess the financing needs. The report of Pre-FS stated some conclusions and recommendations to be followed up by Pemprov DIY. These include the need for feasibility study in specific corridors, getting the financing, evaluation for the involvement of private sector to manage Transjogja, and also about PIU that the Governor of DIY has instructed Pemprov DIY and UGM to realize it. In the matter of evaluation of private sector involvement, Pemprov DIY was expected to play their role in policy making while private sector operates the Transjogja activities. However this recommendation was hard to implement because it would require new policy and interests from private sectors.

Hopefully the Feasibility Study, as a continuation of Pre-FS, could elaborate benefits and cost for Transjogja development such as how to finance and benefits over Transjogja in the next few years. Pre-FS implementation is supposed to give benefits for the community, not only for certain parties.

4. LESSONS LEARNED

The key success to Pre-FS implementation were good communication, high public participation, and elaboration of urban transport management in Yogyakarta. Good communication was a crucial factor in Pre-FS preparation. It was important for collecting data and information, analysis, and submission and discussion of ideas and recommendations. Communication was not only through formal but also informal ways.

The public participation was also quite high particulary during the prioritization process. Various community groups actively participated. The opinions and views were conveyed openly. The material was presented in good visual graphic for participant to understand.

Urban transport management in Yogyakarta has been an issue for quite some time. Pre-FS did not really identify new ideas. Instead, Pre-FS was elaborating existing urban transport management issues, ideas, and recommendations. Pre-FS also took into account the existing transportation grand design and used Tatrawil as one of the reference. Pre-FS was trying to support and assist Pemprov DIY in the urban transport management in a realistic way.

What to do after Pre-FS? This is as important as the Pre-FS itself. Good communication between the Consultant Team and the Technical Team, particularly Transportation Agency during the Pre-FS process was not sufficient to do the follow up for recommendations of the Pre-FS. The follow-up of Pre-FS needs intensive involvement of the agencies that have authority to develop urban transport programs and good relationship with both Pemprov DIY and Pemko Yogyakarta.

5. STATUS OF THE PROJECT

Pre-FS report was presented to Governor of DIY in September 2011. Until now (2 months after presentation when this documentation prepared), there was still no follow up by Pemprov DIY and
Pemko Yogyakarta. They still do not know their roles to implement the Urban Transport Pre-FS recommendations, including the financing.
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CASE II  
Banda Aceh

1. CITY PROFILE

Banda Aceh lies between 050 16' 15" - 050 36' 16" North Latitude and 950 16' 15" - 950 22' 35" East Longitude above sea level 0.8 meters in average. Banda Aceh consists of 9 districts and 90 villages with total population 223,446 people in 2010 according to Central Bureau of Statistics Banda Aceh Municipality. The districts in Banda Aceh are Meuraxa, Jaya Baru, Banda Raya, Baiturrahman, Lueng Bata, Kuta Alam, Kuta Raja, Syiah Kuala, and Ulee Kareng. On the Northern border of Banda Aceh is the Malacca Strait, Aceh Besar regency on the southern and eastern borders, while west Samudera Indonesia on the west.

Banda Aceh and the surrounding areas are in Krueng Aceh floodplain while 70% of its territory is less than 5 meters above sea level. Topography of the land greatly affects the drainage system. Drainage conditions in Banda Aceh is quite vary, rarely inundated as in the eastern and southern cities, occasionally flooded and flooded continuously as in the area of the marsh/salt water flood, fishpond and/or on land with an elevation below sea level that is not only during tide but also during ebb. Spatial structure of Banda Aceh shows a "radial symmetrical pattern" in terms of concentration of activity with the concentration of density in the center, and extends almost linear with the main road network pattern, relatively radial with Baiturrahman Grand Mosque and its surroundings as a major hub supported by Aceh Market and Peunayong Market.

Since the tsunami in 2004, considerable efforts were made to reconstruct and rehabilitate Aceh urban infrastructure. Significant developments that took place with large financing projects of rehabilitation and reconstruction induced improvement of Banda Aceh conditions to improve, although still somewhat patchy. However, this financing was coming to an end along with expiration of task of the Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of Aceh - Nias (BRR NAD-Nias) that handed over its responsibilities to the National Government, Provincial and Municipal Government. The challenges now faced by Provincial and City Government are how to create sustainable urban and economic development with a solid yet flexible planning to overcome the uncertainties that exist in the future comes from next elections and the change in financial support for Provincial and City Government.

According to the Spatial Plan 2002-2010 development strategy of Banda Aceh combined the development of "multi-center" and "linear-growth" concept. The structure of urban activity centers can be categorized as follows:

1. Main Centre (City Center - City Region Section/BWK) with the service area of Aceh and Peunayong Market which are administratively located in District Baiturrahman and Kuta Alam.
2. West BWK (Bagian Wilayah Kota = part or the city), East BWK and South BWK with Ulee Lheue, Ulee Kareng and Mibo as the center service areas.

Each BWK is subdivided into several Sub BWK namely Sub BWK P1 (Peunayong), P2 (Kuta Alam), B1 (Ulee Lheue), B2 (Ulee Pata), T1 (Ulee Kareng), T2 (Jeulingke), T3 (Kopelma Darussalam), S1 (Mibo) and S2 (Lueng Bata). The development of urban centers is supported by a network development plan, mostly primary and secondary road network. The primary arterial network connects outer region of Banda Aceh (Meulaboh, Medan, Aceh Besar/Jantho, Malahayati harbor, Iskandar Muda Airport) with City Center region while secondary arterial network connects City Center to BWK centers.

2. INVESTMENT PROJECT PROFILE

The city government, the provincial NAD government and BRR all recognize the economic importance of such a programme and its improvements into adjacent local government areas. The environmental protection of water intake, quality of water, flood control, and adequate drainage must all be taken into consideration. Similarly, household and industrial solid and waste management are important features of life along the river and cause for environmental concern. The consolidated investment programme around river based development and urban transport have been identified as being critical to the river based urban development and potential to support river based economies and inter-regional cooperation. This consolidated urban development programme is called The Urban Development Consolidation in Krueng Aceh, Banda Aceh.

The Urban Development Consolidation in Krueng Aceh, Banda Aceh, was designed to meet this challenge, focused on three important projects to be implemented in integrated with the project as follows:

a. Development of Keudah Terminal Site

The previous – Keudah Terminal Site development within this project is not similar to the development of the terminal as existing function but will be converted to public facility and infrastructure as multifunction areas. The Keudah Terminal Site will no longer be a terminal as originally intended. The site will be converted into a multifunction public facility and infrastructure.

b. Wastewater treatment and drainage in CBD area

The project focused on drainage on Kampung Baru, since the surrounding areas has already been provided by the Sea Defense and Muslimaid. The project was designed to improve drainage line at the CBD.

c. Rehabilitation of the Old CBD

The project mainly focused on pedestrian access improvement and “in and out” road access to Banda Aceh old CBD. Other components also include improvement of vegetables market, Kartini Mall, landscaping and urban infrastructure development.
Among other 2 projects, only the development of Keudah Terminal Site is considered as the income generating project, while the other two rely on central government transfers, funds from Public Works and donors. In light of this, the 3 projects should only be packaged as one to ensure the sustainability of all projects.

The complete project component and objectives can be seen on the next table:

**Table 3. Project Components and Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Components</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Development of Keudah Terminal site | Public Facilities | • As catalyst to quality improvement for public facility, business, commercial and tourism in the future  
• Landmark of city development on city improvement across Krueng Aceh river to support “Riverfront City Development” strategy of Banda Aceh  
• As support project for Banda Aceh as tourist destination |
| Wastewater treatment and drainage in CBD area | Drainage | • Improvement of sanitation and drainage quality for business, settlement, market, hotel and hospital  
• Ecology and environmental improvement at Krueng Aceh area  
• Health condition/quality improvement  
• As supporting project for Banda Aceh as tourist destination |
| Rehabilitation of the Old CBD. | Sanitation | • As supporting project for riverfront city development strategy  
• Urban quality and ecology |

- Women’s Economic Production and Promotion Centre (WEPP)
- Meeting room/exhibiton hall
- Public library
- Tourism management office
- Public park and children playground
- Hotel
- Shopping mall
- Office
- Interchange/small terminal
- Parking for automobile and motorcycle
- Design only for Kampung Baru since primary and secondary design mostly already been provided by the Sea Defense Consultant dan Muslimaid.
- Implementation by Public Works by standard tertiary design by Public Works.
- Sanitation treatment plant design by GTZ, excluding pipelines
- Implementation of sanitation by KLH
- Pedestrian area Jl. Kartini
- Kartini mall
- Increasing utilization of vegetable market at Jl.
### Project Components

- **Kartini**
  - High pedestrian cross from parking lot to market at Jl.Supratman
  - Improvement and rehabilitation of Jl. Ahmad Yani
  - Access improvement at project area
  - Access improvement to pedestrian area along the river including on front of the military base.
  - Pedestrian bridge crossing Krueng Aceh River
  - Landscaping and urban infrastructure improvement
  - Parking management and traffic improvement
  - Parking building facility at Jl. Ahmad Yani and Jl. WR. Supartman
  - Drainage and sanitation system improvement

- **Objectives**
  - To strengthen and guard the heritage of historical and culture through physical facility development
  - As supporting project for Banda Aceh as tourist destination
  - As trigger/catalyst to business and tourism at the center of the city
  - To provide facilities for recreational area, culture and culinary

Source: Consolidated Urban Development Programme for Krueng-Aceh River, Banda Aceh.

### 3. PRE-FS PROCESS

#### 3.1 Preparation of Term Of Reference

The Coordination Team in City Government (TimKo) was established by Mayor Decree No.284 Year 2008 about Coordination Team in City of Banda Aceh to cooperate with other stakeholders/donor was signed on October 9th 2008 with Mayor/Vice Mayor and City Secretary as CEO and 2 experts from Centre for International Migration and Development (CIM), which were a joint operation of GIZ and the German Federal Employment Agency, as advisor. All of the TimKo members were from Banda Aceh City staff and CIM Experts only acts as advisors.

TimKo was established as an anticipatory response to the need of Banda Aceh to partner with other stakeholders and donor in supporting City rehabilitation and reconstruction effort. TimKo had received technical mentoring and capacity building from Centre for International Migration and Development (CIM), which was a joint operation of GIZ and the German Federal Employment Agency.

As a practitioner of TimKo, Drs. Said Yulizal, M. Si was appointed as Chairman and M. Nurdin, S. Sos as Vice Chairman with executor as follows:
Table 4. Member of TimKo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Role in TimKo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Drs. Said Yulizal, M.Si</td>
<td>Assistant of Economic and Development</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M. Nurdin, S. Sos</td>
<td>Head of Development Division at Secretary of Banda Aceh</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ir. Syukri</td>
<td>Bappeda Staff of Banda Aceh</td>
<td>Core Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Drs. Marwan</td>
<td>Bappeda Staff of Banda Aceh</td>
<td>Core Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ramos Kam, ST</td>
<td>Dinas Tata Kota dan Perkim Kota Staff of Banda Aceh</td>
<td>Core Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dra. Santi Melvita</td>
<td>Head of Foreign Partnership Subdivision, Development Division at Secretary of Banda Aceh</td>
<td>Core Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wahyuni Wahfar, S. Pt.</td>
<td>Head of Mining and Energy Subdivision</td>
<td>Core Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Parmakope, SH, M.E</td>
<td>Head of GIS Team at Bappeda of Banda Aceh</td>
<td>Core Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Evi Marlina, SE</td>
<td>Staff of Programme at Bappeda of Banda Aceh</td>
<td>Core Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Desi Yusfriani, ST</td>
<td>Staff of Public Division at Secretary of Banda Aceh</td>
<td>Core Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Maulidar, SP, M.E.</td>
<td>Staff of Development Division at Secretary of Banda Aceh</td>
<td>Core Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hery Syahputra, SE</td>
<td>Staff of Development Division at Secretary of Banda Aceh</td>
<td>Core Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Staff of Municipality</td>
<td>Staff of Municipality Information Systems (MIMS) of Technical Team</td>
<td>Technical Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Systems of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Staff of Capacity Building</td>
<td>Staff of Capacity Building of Technical Team</td>
<td>Technical Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Technical Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Staff of Development</td>
<td>Staff of Development Division</td>
<td>Technical Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Staff of each related SKPD</td>
<td>Staff of each related SKPD</td>
<td>Technical Team Members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mayor Decree No.284 Year 2008 about Coordination Team in City of Banda Aceh.

As we can see from the list of members, all the TimKo members were from SKPD and within city staff and none from NGOs or University.

TimKo’s responsibilities are:

- **To the Mayor**
  - Facilitate and organize discussion meetings between the Mayor/Vice Mayor/ Secretary with other stakeholders and related SKPD on development priority activities;
  - Provide input and recommendations to Mayor/Vice Mayor/Secretary, stakeholders and SKPD toward solutions to problems that occur in the field;
  - Inventory and follow up Mayor/Vice Mayor/Secretary policies to other stakeholders and related SKPD;
  - Compile and make a report of implementation and development of TimKo to Mayor/Vice Mayor/Secretary;
- In performing its duties, TimKo is responsible to Mayor/Vice Mayor/Secretary

- To SKPD
  - Facilitate and organize stakeholders meetings with SKPD;
  - Inform Mayor / Vice Mayor / Secretary policy to the related SKPD;
  - Inventory and compile the latest data related to activity of across-SKPD and stakeholders;
  - Coordinating and synchronizing the gender mainstreaming activities program;
  - Coordinate and follow up the work plan program, development priority activities and improving quality of human resources in Banda Aceh Government

- To Stakeholders
  - Facilitate stakeholder on formulation of MoU/Memorandum of Understanding with Banda Aceh Government
  - Coordinate and mapping stakeholders program and activities;
  - Sharing information related to the stakeholder activities;
  - Monitoring and evaluation of stakeholder activities on partnership implementation of Banda Aceh development.

In order to facilitate cities on rehabilitation and reconstruction and establish sustainable development of Banda Aceh, and trying to tap other source of funding to overcome limited resources of Banda Aceh, TimKo was introduced to CDIA through proposals as recommended by GIZ. CDIA then welcomed this effort by supporting TimKo in the form of technical assistance to formulate, identify the necessary steps for Banda Aceh together with TimKo. TimKo then prepare the ToR to be submitted as proposal to CDIA.

One of the focuses for CDIA is to provide a Pre-FS document which can be used as an early planning document. Since the city had never before prepared a Pre-FS to determine the feasibility of projects in Banda Aceh and it is a relatively new thing for Banda Aceh, the proposal was to ask assistance for Pre-FS in Banda Aceh.

The Pre-FS objective was to formulate ideas and to identify and assess feasible and bankable infrastructure investment projects for Banda Aceh. A specific objective of the study was to strengthen the city’s newly established coordination team Tim Kordinasi (TimKo) during the Pre-FS preparatory process by providing support in identifying possible projects and financiers for the implementation of the selected projects.

A person in-charge in each SKPD in the TimKO would conduct and heavily involved in preparing Pre-FS. These persons in-charge would be receiving technical assistance and capacity building from the CDIA. In turns, Banda Aceh also provided supports for CDIA Consultant team by providing a place to work at the Mayor’s house and the equipment needed. Coordination and communication between TimKo and CDIA consultants were intensively conducted on daily basis.

In May 2008, CDIA Fact Finding Mission and TimKo collected project proposals from various parties including SKPD to later on compiling them into findings. The assessment team was appointed by CDIA and proposed by TimKo. TimKo also received capacity building from CDIA in parallel with the Pre-FS assistance.
3.2 Issues Found

In conducting the Pre-FS process, TimKo and CDIA Consultant had identified several issues to be handled, and they were:

1. How to determine the scope of the Pre-FS?
   The riverfront city concept from the RPJMD used as the focus of the Pre-FS. All projects should support or is related to this concept. Therefore, Krueng Aceh River was chosen as an area scope of the study.

2. How to decide which project goes into nomination or prioritization since Kota Banda Aceh has only limited financial capacity?
   There was a need to develop capacity building for TimKo and City staffs to recognize the alternatives financing and sources available and how to tap them.

3. What is the capacity of the City staffs or TimKo in preparing the Pre-FS document?
   There was a need to develop capacity building for TimKo and city staff to be able to handle the Pre-FS process, manage and implement them. TimKo needed the technical skills and methodology to turn the wishlist into shortlist which later on packaged as priority project, to develop Pre-FS on their own. Therefore, CDIA capacity building consultant was also sent in parallel to CDIA Pre-FS consultant to help TimKo.

3.3 Mobilization of Pre-FS

There were two teams sent to assist TimKo, which are CDIA capacity building consultant and CDIA Pre-FS consultant. The two team was working in parallel to enable the preparation process follows the schedule planned by the CDIA from the beginning, which can be seen in the following timeline diagram:
Diagram 1. CDIA Schedule for Pre-FS

The process was scheduled from the beginning and shared within TimKo, which benefits TimKo by valuable lesson of time management and discipline in the scheduled implementation of the project so that every job could be better achieved at the right time.

TimKo and CDIA consultant had a weekly meeting to share information and progress about the project. Since the CDIA consultant was provided an office and staff by the Mayor, also they often communicate and coordinate with TimKo informally. In the coordination meeting held once a week usually only some relevant SKPD consulting with Bappeda and consultant related to the topics focused at that moment. But more SKPD were involved on the monthly and progress meeting.

3.4 Data Collection

TimKo together with CDIA consultant had collected a variety of project ideas from SKPD. There were about 49 projects collected, and basically was the City wishlist. This was the first time the TimKo created a wishlist from SKPD and later can be prioritized as project shortlist. Some of the projects in the wishlist were SKPD driven project or sectoral but some were multisectoral projects. During this data collection, TimKo had identified the need for capacity building both technically and managerial to improve the skills and knowledge on how to work together with various stakeholders including NGO partners and how to contact and access a variety of alternative sources of financing (eg, the use of CSR program from BUMN) and other parties so that the City can be less dependant on the Central Government’s funding and thus allow other non-government and private sector to contribute more.

Data for the Pre-FS was acquired from SKPD such as Bappeda and Public Works. Some other data such as Detail Engineering Design were acquired from other implementing donor such as Sea
Defense Consultant and Muslimaid consultant on Drainage. CDIA and TimKo didn’t find difficulties on gathering the data since they were fully supported by the SKPD.

3.5 Prioritization and Project Elaboration

With 49 project ideas collected from SKPD, TimKo with the help of CDIA had narrowed down the number, turning wishlist to shortlist, and later prioritized them as Pre-FS. The assessment used criteria which were agreed by TimKo members and of which some were recommended by the CDIA. The CDIA Consultant had provided tools to eliminate some of the project ideas on the wishlist and selected some projects to be in the shortlist. TimKo realized that the key point of the criteria selection method was that the criteria were easy to understand and agreed by all.

Timko member had finalized the project prioritization easily using the criteria based on the previous settlement. This tool was used and developed the TimKo capacity, and helps them decide which project can be selected as part of shortlist and later on chosen to be in the priority package. The benefit in turning them into a package was that it had created a more efficient budgeting and helped less economically feasible projects that provide necessary public services supported by other projects in the package that were more economically feasible. Finally all TimKo had agreed to choose 3 projects and package them as Indonesia Consolidated Urban Development Programme for Krueng Aceh River, Banda Aceh. This had become the focus of CDIA Pre-FS. All the prioritization process had involved TimKo as Mayor’s executing team which consists of SKPD as members of TimKo and facilitated by the CDIA consultant.

“Technical skills becomes important in selecting and prioritizing the projects while maintaining objectivity to fulfill the required standard and criteria”

M. Nurdin S.Sos
Head of Development Division, Setda Banda Aceh

In general, the prioritization process can be seen on the following diagram:
Diagram 2. Prioritization Process

To create shortlist from 49 projects in the wishlist, the following criteria were used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Criteria</th>
<th>City Criteria from RPJM</th>
<th>CDIA Criteria</th>
<th>Other Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Project has not been funded yet</td>
<td>The project contributes to the improvement of the physical environment</td>
<td>The project is related to Krueng Aceh</td>
<td>The project can be financed over a 5 year period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project is an investment project</td>
<td>The project contributes to improvement in public health</td>
<td>The project contributes to the improvement of the ecological environment</td>
<td>The project can be financed over a 20 year period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project is river-related</td>
<td>The project supports tourism development</td>
<td>The project contributes to economic development of the city</td>
<td>The project is compatible with the City Master Plan (RTRW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Banda Aceh as Islamic City, Orderly, Beautiful and Comfortable</td>
<td>The project area is within the city boundary</td>
<td>The project is compatible with the Subdistrict Plan (RDTR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project addresses gender issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>The city is willing to honour the loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project</td>
<td></td>
<td>The city is able to honour the loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The projects idea receives support by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Criteria</td>
<td>City Criteria from RPJM</td>
<td>CDIA Criteria</td>
<td>Other Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributes to improvement of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relevant stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The project does involve the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The projects has potential for Public-Private Partnership (PPP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The project improves the capacity of the human resources (tourism sector)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The project has synergy potential with other group(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The project contributes to the economic development of the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The institution in charge to provide O&amp;M of the asset is willing to do so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Technical Information for the project is available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation can start without much additional information/planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The project could generate direct revenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Some of the remarks for the criterias as follow:

1. One of the other criteria above was "The city is willing to honour the loan" which acts as reminder for the city and as suggested by the CDIA to help secure/convince any potential partner/investor.

2. The other criteria was that “The projects has potential for Public-Private Partnership (PPP)” also comes as criteria for introducing financing option to the city as advised by the CDIA consultant.

3. The institution in charge to provide O&M of the asset is willing to do so. Institution here means sectoral ministry or SKPD.

4. Some of the criteria used on the preliminary selection of the project here were used to identify and describe the nature of the project. Based on that, some criteria can be used again to elimination or the selection process as killer criteria. The preliminary selection of the project can bee seen on the annex.

After creating a shortlist, TimKo and CDIA had determined the priority projects from the shortlist by using the following criteria:

**Table 6. Shortlist to Project Selection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Killer Criteria</th>
<th>General Criteria</th>
<th>Selection Criteria for Donor Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The project has not been funded yet</td>
<td>- The project supports the vision &amp; mission</td>
<td>- Project in line with donors’ country strategy / program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killer Criteria</td>
<td>General Criteria</td>
<td>Selection Criteria for Donor Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The project is an investment project</td>
<td>• The projects contributes to the improvement of the ecological environment</td>
<td>• Investment volume significant enough to attract donor funding OR possibility to include project into a larger package (i.t.o. investment volume)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The project is river-related</td>
<td>• The project generates revenue – cost recovery</td>
<td>• Investment is core task of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The project contributes to poverty alleviation – generates income for population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Some of the criteria explained as follows:

1. Some of the criteria was similar to the previous wishlist to shortlist because the previous criteria used to describe the nature of the project, while in the shortlist to prioritized projects, the selection criteria were used as killer criteria or a “must have” criteria. For instance, the project is river related, has not been funded yet and investment project. Some were used again also to emphasis the importance of that criteria to meet the city objective.

2. Investment is core task of Government means that Investment is mainly City’s responsibility (i.e. not project of which the costs are largely or completely carried by higher levels in the administration or central Government. One of the criteria was wheter the projects generate revenue or cost recovery. To create the priority project/program packaging, some of the previous criteria are used to group/package some program so it would interest investor more as a package not as individual project.

The main issue during the process was how to assess and value social aspects of projects which were not cost recovery in order to make projects with heavy public or social purpose still attractive enough for private sectors and package them as a favorable project package, in other words, how to make social oriented projects bankable. The option was to package the project into an investment package.

From the waterfront city concept and killer criterias related to the donor and funding, finally the project focused into 3 project component which became the investment project package: 1) Development of Keudah Terminal site, 2) Wastewater treatment and drainage in CBD area, 3) Rehabilitation of the Old CBD. The criteria used during the process were agreed by the TimKo member and SKPD to be used objectively in structuring the options for the City. Overall the prioritization process went well and without major disputes between participants. The selected 3 projects from the shortlist by using criterias and then chosen as one package to be supported in one Pre-FS package (can be seen on the annex).

Once these components were selected, the CDIA consultant drafted the Pre-FS taking into consideration the technical and financial aspects and communicated with various stakeholders. City
of Banda Aceh plays a role in facilitating data collection by providing contact persons from the various agencies who can be contacted anytime by the CDIA consultant directly if necessary.

### 3.6 Capacity Development

As previously mentioned, CDIA sent a capacity development consultant to aid TimKo on the Pre-FS process. CDIA’s capacity development consultant was given task to empower the TimKo to develop the capacity of the City staffs. Some of the capacity development in form of workshop was proposed by TimKo to enable them to improve knowledge on financing and making of proposal. This was identified by TimKo during data collection.

During and on the earlier preparation process of Pre-FS on Consolidated Urban Development in Krueng Aceh Area, Banda Aceh, TimKo with funding from donors organized a workshop to strengthen the technical knowledge and skills of TimKo. The knowledge gained enabled TimKo to cooperate with various parties, both from fellow ranks of Local Government or with other parties, including donor.

“Capacity Building is crucial to gain knowledge and cooperate with other stakeholders, such as NGOs, to know other financing sources and how to access them.”

Maulidar, SP, ME
Head of Infrastructure Sub Division, Setda

The TimKo had learned from the capacity building process to achieve the objectives designed within Term of Reference, in which the City staffs were able to determine the development priorities in their region, aligned with choices and strategic aspects of the project itself. In addition, the City can do surveys or studies from social, transportation and economic aspects themselves to identify the City needs.

The training by the CDIA focused on finding financing alternative innovatively within the framework of Banda Aceh development, so that the City does not rely solely on funding from the Central Government or its own APBD which was very limited. These trainings also explained how to create a bankable business plan, negotiate, including procedures for project proposals application to Bappenas. CDIA also trained the City staffs how to make project preparation and offer viable projects to investors by working with private sector outside of government.

The ability to build networks and awareness was one of the main benefits gained from the Pre-FS process. This was essential for the City of Banda Aceh in the future since the City staffs are now becoming confident to communicate with the donor and participate on the capacity building programs by donor.

“City staffs were trained to access funding from other financing sources, to link with donors, thus City staffs are the local asset that should always be innovative enough to develop the city.”

Maistijk
CDIA Capacity Building Consultant
“From good networking by City leaders, City staffs gain the opportunity to build their capacity from trainings and seminars by other party and become effective to administer the city affairs”

Arlandi Syahputra
Program Staff, Bappeda Banda Aceh

Based on the the capacity building had been provided by CDIA and experience of networking with donors, City of Banda Aceh succeeded to find funding sources for additional activities which was “Government of Banda Aceh Development Guidelines” in cooperation with GTZ, Government of Indonesia and Government of Federal Republic of Germany in May 2009.

3.7 Finalizing Reports and Recommendations

Information required by CDIA consultant was provided by TimKo with contact persons from the City to ensure the smooth project reporting. The reports itself was developed as scheduled for almost 4 months, but the whole process took almost a year from CDIA first engagement to handover to Bappenas. There were some changes on the preliminary report to final report in The Programme Component, and explained as follows:

1. Development of the Ex-Keudah Terminal Site
   Within the overall Urban Renewal Programme the main objective of this component is to develop the Ex-Keudah-Terminal Site to provide the city with public and private facilities ensuring a long-term economic benefit for the city and its population. The proposed development of the Ex-Keudah terminal is NOT a public transport terminal development project. The title of this Programme component refers to a geographical location and the current use of the site. The proposed Programme component is a social infrastructure project which will also contain a small public transport measure.

   a. New zoning for Ex-Keudah Terminal site

   The zoning of the subject site has recently been changed from kawasan terminal angkutan kota (public transport terminal) to kawasan perdagangan dan jasa (trade and service area). After having discussion with the City Development Planning Agency, it was suggested that the KDB for the Ex-Keudah Terminal Site development could be raised to 70%, the KLB increased to 3.5 and the maximum number of stores could be raised to 5. The development parameters for the new zoning and the proposed development parameters, which still need to be approved by the PemKo, are summarised in Table below.

| Development parameters for trade and service area as per current RTRW (previously) |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Function and Classification     | KDB max. (%)| KLB max. (%)| KDH min. (%)| Number of floors max. | GSB front min. (m) | GSB sides min. (m) | GSB back min. (m) |
| Development parameter           | 60          | 2.4         | 10         | 4            | ½ ROW       | 0            | 2            |

Table 7. Changes and Inputs in RTRW from Pre-FS Process
b. Adjustment to floor areas and estimated development costs

Several test designs for the Ex-Keudah Terminal Site development have been prepared to further verify the technical and financial recommendations and assumptions made in the Pre-FS. The designs and financial calculations are based on the revised development parameters as discussed above. Based on the assumptions made in the PPS the estimated overall cost of the Ex-Keudah Terminal site development has increased by USD 1.51 million to USD 12.66 million. The cost was increasing because of some adjustments and changes which have been made for the proposed facilities, also adding some facilities/ usages and it impacted the changes for some of the unit prices from the Timko proposal.

Items which have a significant bearing on the overall cost have been discussed below:

- A semi basement parking area for the shopping mall of 2,264 sqm at a cost of IDR 1.7 billion has been added.
- The number of hotel rooms on the 2nd and 3rd floor has been reduced and placed on the fourth floor due to the increased allowable building height as recommended by the city department.
- Four public transport bus stops and signage at a value of IDR 0.7 billion have been provided.
- The design consultant fee has been increased from 2.72% to 2.9% and the construction management consultant fee from 2.13% to 2.30%

In addition to the relevant planning rules and regulations the requirements listed below, there are some flexiblility for further development such as public facilities, business facilities and designs. These designs are approximate only and can be modified.

2. Wastewater Treatment and Drainage in CBD area

Within the overall Urban Renewal Programme the main objective of this component is to provide the densely populated inner city areas with improved wastewater treatment and stormwater drainage systems to improve the public health situation and the environment of Krueng Aceh. The existing sanitation task force from Bappeda and public, reffered as “Tim Sanitasi” already completed a draft of the ‘White Book’ which is the City Sanitation Strategy (CSS) and is the guiding document regarding water supply, solid waste management, micro drainage and sanitation of Banda Aceh. The CSS was then used as inputs for TimKo to design the communal anaerobic wastewater treatment systems as proposed in the Pre-FS for Peuniti, Kampung Baru, Peunayong, Kampung Keuramat and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development parameter</th>
<th>KDB max. (%)</th>
<th>KLB max.</th>
<th>KDH min (%)</th>
<th>Number of floors</th>
<th>GSB front min (m)</th>
<th>GSB sides min (m)</th>
<th>GSB back min (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development parameter</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>½ ROW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Rehabilitation of the Old CBD
Within the overall Urban Renewal Programme the main objective of this component is to improve public inner city infrastructure facilities with focus on riverfront areas in Peunayong to boost the attraction of this area which will be leading to an economic stimulus of the area. The rehabilitation of the old CBD is still similar to the early draft report without any major change.

During the report finalization, the programme component budget estimation changes in measures which have a significant bearing on the increased cost of the Programme Component. These changes were discussed among the TimKo members and resulting the following:

- Infrastructure and urban facilities
The size of the pedestrian bridge between the markets has been increased by almost double due to a change in design of the bridge and additional stairs. The volume and the cost for the pedestrian bridge across Krueng-Aceh has been revised based on a detail design by the Public Works department. The cost increased by an estimate of IDR 9.35 million.

- Traffic, transportation and parking
During the review of the location for the proposed car parking facility at Jl. W.R. Supratman it became apparent that an additional storey would be required to provide the 100 car spaces due to the confined urban space available. The total floor area has increased and the construction cost is estimated at a total of IDR 13.3 billion. The proposed number of shops in the car parking facility next to Hotel Medan in Jl. Ahmad Yani is 8 compared to 10 in the Pre-FS. The size of the site for the parking facility which has to be acquired by the city has been increased to 2,628 sqm.

After going through technical process in preparing the Pre-FS on Urban Development in Consolidation Krueng Aceh Area, Banda Aceh, and because of fairly intense informal socialization with DPRD (the local legislative body) and other stakeholders, validation process of reports was not difficult because various parties and SKPD have been involved since the beginning, and well informed of the process and document. DPRD was also quite familiar and supported that this Pre-FS could be implemented. DPRD had provided some input and support during public hearings conducted to follow up the proposed scheme of Public Private Partnership (PPP). However, during the process, new members of DPRD were elected in early 2010. Therefore, dissemination of Pre-FS would have to be repeated. But basically, there were no objections from the legislation body in implementing this project.

On March-July 2009, the final report was presented three times to Mayor, Vice Mayor and Secretary of Local Government. Two initial presentation received input from Mayor and also CDIA to ensure the results of Pre-FS meet the standards and requirements of Banda Aceh. The third presentation that was the final version had been presented to the Mayor of Banda Aceh as well as to the Governor of NAD as well as representatives of related ministries such as Mendagri, Menkeu, PU and
Bappenas. This was done to introduce the Pre-FS to a wider audience and stakeholders who will follow it up.

In 31 March, 2009, Development Steering Committee of Banda Aceh in cooperation with CDIA had agreed to support the "Consolidation of Urban Development for Krueng Aceh Area" by signing an endorsement letter (see annex for details). Development Steering Committee of Banda Aceh chaired by Mayor of Banda Aceh with Vice Mayor and Secretary of Banda Aceh as vice chairman, and the members are representatives from Bappenas, BRR, Secretary of Province Government, Bappeda of NAD Province and Bappeda of Banda Aceh, Dinas PU of Banda Aceh, GTZ and CDIA. The City was committed to ensure the plan has necessary supports to be implemented as shown by the leadership role of Mayor of Banda Aceh.

“Leadership from Mayor becomes very important and necessary to ensure the process working well and to build communication and networking with central Government and other stakeholders”

Ir. Bahagia, Dipl. SE
Head of Bappeda Banda Aceh

4. LESSONS LEARNED

Things that can be learned by the City of Banda Aceh and other stakeholders who participated in the preparation of Pre-FS on Urban Development Consolidation in Krueng Aceh Area, Banda Aceh are:

1. How Banda Aceh could independently creates Pre-FS documents that could serve as an example for other planning documents, at least in determining the steps needed, consultation and public sharing, and workshops. Preparation of Pre-FS documents in addition to being a prerequisite in Bappenas also gives an example that in every stage of process and a certain period evaluation is conducted in order to improve the planning process. The lesson learned is that this approach in preparing the Pre-FS can be applied for other projects in future.

2. The City now realizes that there are alternatives sources of financing and mechanisms. The City have high borrowing capacity, (CDIA estimates that city government’s current potential borrowing capacity for a loan from a multilateral and/or bilateral financial institution would be approximately IDR290 billion or US$ 26.36 million), the anticipated revenue for 2010 the borrowing capacity would be IDR 300 billion or approximately USD 27.27 million and for 2012 it would be IDR 430 billion or approximately USD 39.09 million. However at this time, the city government does not have any loans and the Mayor of Banda Aceh prefers other financing alternatives. As suggested by CDIA, Public Private Partnerships (PPP) in this matter can become another source of financing that hasn't been tapped yet. It should also made known to other local governments that PPP is one good option to have.
3. The Pre-FS process rose awareness of the importance of planning documents such as Pre-FS. In addition, the Pre-FS process allow the city staff to learn about project management, time management, and discipline in project implementation schedule which enable them to administer their daily business better.

4. The main issue during the process is how to assess and value social aspects of projects which are not contributing to the cost recovery. The trick is how to make projects with heavy public or social purpose still attractive enough for private sectors and package them into a favorable project package. In other words, how to make social oriented projects to be economically feasible.

“Experience and lessons learned from this Pre-FS process and capacity building enable Bappeda to develop Banda Aceh Integrated Urban Renewal Programme, Banda Aceh Government Development Guide with GTZ”

Evi Marlina
Program Staff, Bappeda Banda Aceh

The keys to the entire implementation process of Pre-FS preparation are:

- The supports of the CDIA’s consultant were quite good, in which consultant did not work exclusively but in cooperation with TimKo to meet the needs of City of Banda Aceh. The City of Banda Aceh also welcomed the support of consultant by providing office space and equipment at the Mayor’s own house.

- Because of the measurability of the criteria used and agreement based on existing standards and parameters, objectivity was maintained so as not to accommodate only one SKPD with their needs but for the good of the City.

- Good communication from the Mayor to various parties, such as the Central Government, Provincial Government, other institutions and also donors help create mutual benefits for Banda Aceh, from the planning process, coordination, good networking, and also promoting of the city.

- Improved staff capacity in project development and process is a result of effective capacity building.

5. **STATUS OF THE PROJECT**

The Asian Development Bank (ADB) has setup an Infrastructure Project Development Facility (IPDF) at the National Development Planning Agency (Bappenas). The Project Development Facility (PDF) will not finance any investments for project implementation, as it will only support the preparation of feasibility studies and Public Private Partnership (PPP) procurement up to the signing of the contractual arrangements with the private investor(s).
CDIA proposed that PemKo submitted an application to Bappenas for grant funding by the PDF to undertake the required feasibility study and assisted the City in preparing the bidding documents and during the bidding process until financial closure for the implementation of the Banda Aceh Integrated Urban Renewal Programme. It was submitted on April 2009. Because the city of Banda Aceh needs further references on how to implement a successful PPP in Indonesia to be implemented in Banda Aceh, the Mayor expected assistance from PDF Bappenas to 1) develop Business Plan and Strategic Plan for Pre-FS Krueng Aceh Package and 2) develop ToR for PPP bidding to the private sector.

The City of Banda Aceh is currently waiting for the Bappenas to provide necessary supporting documents as regulated on Perpres 67/2005. PJPK which is Banda Aceh Government will be responsible to monitor the Bappenas’ consultant through technical team in role of PPP Project Implementation Unit. Project Management Unit (PMU) would be formed to do the monitoring and evaluation.

On the other hand, the City had been invited to submit project proposals to the provincial Public Works Office to be considered for grant funding from remaining tsunami funds out of the Multi Donor Trust Fund (MDF) managed by World Bank. Following initial talks by PemKo with representatives of the World Bank CDIA recommends that documents prepared for the wastewater treatment and drainage Project in this Pre-FS should be submitted to PU. Funding obtained could be used as public Government equity in a corporation with the private sector.

The Indonesian Government with the support of some multi-and bilateral donors is about to set-up the Indonesia Infrastructure Financing Facility (IIFF) to provide long-term debt and equity financing to both public and private sectors in cooperation with local financial institutions through credit enhancements for infrastructure development. The Government expects the IIFF to provide equity and to finance infrastructure projects under the tried and practiced PPP mechanism. It appears that financing the implementation of the proposed Pre-FS Programme through the IIFF could be an interesting option as it is expected that financing through IIFF will be made available in Indonesian Rupiah rather than in a foreign currency and that the interest rate might be below a commercial bank rate. CDIA recommends that PemKo assesses financing options for the Pre-FS Programme through the IIFF once it is up and running.

Basically, Banda Aceh is quite satisfied with the process and learns a lot in the process of developing this Pre-FS and expects the project can be implemented without further delay utilizing the PPP concept. Because of the time gap between the completion of the Pre-FS and further action from the Bappenas, it seems the Pre-FS should be adjusted with the latest conditions and accommodates new ideas, such as the construction of multifunction building on Keudah Terminal Site to increase revenue for the city.

Since November 2009 until now, the request from Banda Aceh to PPP division in Bappenas is still on hold, because currently the project seen lacked of strategic value for national level to handle. Bappenas recommended the City to process the project at the city level in partnership with Local Corporation.
ANNEX
## SOURCE PERSON BANDA ACEH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ir. Mawardi Nurdin, M.Eng, Sc.</td>
<td>Mayor of Banda Aceh</td>
<td>(0651) 3980, 21855</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mawardi_bna2005@yahoo.co.uk">mawardi_bna2005@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td>Interviewed by phone and email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir. Bahagia, Dipl. SE</td>
<td>Head of Bappeda Banda Aceh</td>
<td>0811682504</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bahagia_hady@yahoo.com">bahagia_hady@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Interviewed at Banda Aceh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evi Marlina, SE</td>
<td>Program Staff Bappeda Banda Aceh</td>
<td>081360871691</td>
<td><a href="mailto:evie.bappeda@gmail.com">evie.bappeda@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Interviewed at Banda Aceh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arliandi Syahputra</td>
<td>Program Staff Bappeda Banda Aceh</td>
<td>08126927354</td>
<td><a href="mailto:arliandi_s@yahoo.com">arliandi_s@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Interviewed at Banda Aceh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardalena</td>
<td>Ksb Perencanaan Prasana Bappeda Banda Aceh</td>
<td>081264117299</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mardalena87@yahoo.com">mardalena87@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Interviewed at Banda Aceh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Nurdin, S. Sos</td>
<td>Kabag Adm Pembangunan</td>
<td>08126969820</td>
<td><a href="mailto:m_nurdin68@yahoo.co.id">m_nurdin68@yahoo.co.id</a></td>
<td>Interviewed at Banda Aceh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maulidar, SP, ME</td>
<td>Ksb Adm Infrastruktur Adm Pembangunan Setdako</td>
<td>081362139111</td>
<td><a href="mailto:moli_74@yahoo.co.id">moli_74@yahoo.co.id</a></td>
<td>Interviewed at Banda Aceh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hery Syahputra, SE</td>
<td>Ksb Tata Ruang Adm Pembangunan Setdako</td>
<td>082166288981</td>
<td><a href="mailto:heri_sy@yahoo.co.id">heri_sy@yahoo.co.id</a></td>
<td>Interviewed at Banda Aceh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dra. Santi Melvita</td>
<td>Kabid Promosi &amp; Pemasaran</td>
<td>081360944490</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sanmel_hasan@yahoo.com">sanmel_hasan@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Interviewed at Banda Aceh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maistjik</td>
<td>Konsultan Pengembangan Kapasitas</td>
<td>08129457672</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mas_tjik07@yahoo.com">mas_tjik07@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Interviewed by phone and email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Sinaga</td>
<td>Konsultan penyusun Pre-FS</td>
<td>081362453880</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gsh_sinaga@yahoo.com">gsh_sinaga@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Interviewed by phone and email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Nama</td>
<td>Jabatan</td>
<td>Institusi</td>
<td>Telepon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bahagia</td>
<td>Kep.</td>
<td>Bappeda Kota Banda Aceh</td>
<td>0811682504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ENI MARTINA</td>
<td>STAF PROGRAM</td>
<td>Bappeda Barom Aceh</td>
<td>081360871681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arlindo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>08124927350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Monialena</td>
<td>Kasiwil. Perenc. prosram</td>
<td></td>
<td>08136917299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M. HURDIN, S.Sos</td>
<td>KABAG KOM.PKM</td>
<td>Bag. Admn. Perub.</td>
<td>08126968820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MAULIDAR, S.PJ</td>
<td>KSI Adm. Informasi</td>
<td>Bag. Admn. Perub.</td>
<td>08362139111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sami Melvita</td>
<td>Kabid. PRONING-Penasaran</td>
<td>Disbansipar</td>
<td>081360944400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEMBARAN PENGESAHAN

HASIL PRE-FEASIBILITY STUDY
CONSOLIDATED URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
FOR KRUENG ACEH – BANDA ACEH

Pada hari ini, Selasa tanggal 31 Maret 2009 bertempat di Banda Aceh, Komite pengarah Pembangunan Kota Banda Aceh bekerjasama dengan City Development Initiative for Asia (CDIA) dengan ini menyatakan setuju dan akan mendukung program "Konsolidasi Pembangunan Kota Untuk Kawasan Krueng Aceh" sesuai dengan Hasil Pre-feasibility study yang telah dilaksanakan oleh GOPA Consultant.

KOMITE PENGARAH

Ketua,

(Mawardy Nurdin)
Wakil Ketua I,

(Illiza Sa’aduddin Jamal)
Wakil Walikota Banda Aceh

Sekretaris,

(Said Yulizal)
Asisten II Sekda Kota Banda Aceh

Wakil Ketua II,

(T. Sufuddin)
Sekretaris Daerah Kota Banda Aceh

Wakil Sekretaris,

(M. Nurdin)
Kabag. Adm Pembangunan
Setda Kota Banda Aceh

ANGGOTA

BAPPENAS
Direktur Perkotaan dan Pedesaan,

(Hayu Parasati)

BBR-NAD-NIAS
Deputi Operasi

(Eddy Purwanto)

Setda Provinsi NAD
Ka. Biro Adm Pembangunan,

(Izhar)

Kepala BAPPEDA Prov. NAD,

(Munirwarsyah)

Kepala BAPPEDA Banda Aceh,

(Syukri)

Kepala Dinas PU Banda Aceh,

(Zahiruddin)

Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ)

City Development Initiative for Asia

(Evriq Wanaolin)
Preliminary Selection for 49 projects based on criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description of potential projects</th>
<th>Preliminary Score</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Final Project List with Criteria - 12.02.09

| No. | Description of Project | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 |
| 1   | Water treatment in SGD area | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2   | Development for tourism / Heritage site rehabilitation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3   | Development of Natural Tourism | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Notes:**
- Project singkatan (abbreviation) = memberikan pengaruh positif (The project provides a positive impact)
- Project singkatan (abbreviation) = memberikan pengaruh negatif (The project provides a negative impact)
- Project tidak memberikan pengaruh (The project has no impact)