**PREPARATORY CHECKLIST: PROVINCIAL SITE ASSESSMENTS (DRAFT)**

*(for inclusion in RFP Scope of Services for each site)*

 Prepared by: PMU Palu Date: 26-July 2019.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PROVINCE** | Central Sulawesi | KABUPATEN | **Donggala** | KECAMATAN | **Balaesang Tanjung** |
| **SCHOOL FACILITY?** |  |  | **GoI Facility name** |  |
| **HEALTH FACILITY** | Yes |  | **GoI Facility name** | **Puskesmas Malei** |
| **Street Address** | Desa Malei, Balaesang Tanjung | Postcode |  |

***SITE DATA ASSESSMENT***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ITEM#** | **ATTRIBUTE** | **VERIFIABLE EVIDENCE** | **YES** | **NO** |
| 1 | **Geographical positioning** | GPS Coordinates  | Yes |  |
|  |  | Cadastral Map[[1]](#footnote-1) | Yes |  |
|  |  | Technical description: boundary alignments; adjoining lots. | Yes |  |
|  |  | Survey boundary monuments located & clear of debris/ vegetation. |  | No |
| 2 | **Ownership** | Certificate of Title copy attached |  | No |
|  |  | Clear and Clean title guaranteed by Provincial Government (#5) | Yes |  |
|  |  | Acquisition of new site if high risk is apparent on existing site? |  | No |
|  |  | Enlargement or realignment of site boundaries required? |  | No |
| 3 | **Agency Commitment** | Proposed works are Included in RENAKSI? (#1) | Yes |  |
|  |  | Buildings certified as government owned with major damage (#2) | Yes |  |
|  |  | Funds are not duplicating other budget sources (#3) | Yes |  |
|  |  | There is a safe & secure location (#4) Subject to Geological Survey |  |  |
|  |  | Willingness for removal of asset to be reconstructed (#6) | Yes |  |
|  |  | Local authority willing to receive & maintain rebuilt buildings (#7) | Yes |  |
|  |  | Development approval and permit costs by local authority (#8) | Yes |  |
| 4 | **Site Assessment**  |  |  |  |
|  | DPU Assets Inspection | Serviceability & forensic assessment certification?  | Yes |  |
|  | Geophysical Assessment | Report on fissures, faults/ fault lines, landslip, liquefaction risks? |  |  |
| 5 | **Site/ structures plans** | Original as built site layout plan available in digital form? |  | No |
|  |  | Current as built site layout plan available in digital form? |  | No |
|  |  | Original as built structures plans available in digital form? |  | No |
|  |  | Updated as built structures plans available in digital form? |  | No |
|  |  | Each structure has digital general arrangement & detail drawings? |  | No |
|  |  | Each structure type can be identified by drawing no. and/ or code? |  | No |
| 6 | **Electrical Mains** | Inspected and rendered functional & safe by power authority? | Yes |  |
| 7 | **Potable water** | Reticulated water with ample flow & operational service points? |  | No |
|  |  | Rainwater storage collection and storage? |  | No |
| 8 | **Sewerage & Septic Tanks** | Adequately functional with no health hazard? |  | No |
|  | **Telephone land lines** | Connections are in working order and cables well secured? | Yes |  |
| 9 | **Road access** | External access road is trafficable and in fair to good condition? | Yes |  |
| 10 | **Demolition & Clean up** | Most site areas have not been cleaned up/ are not trafficable |  | No |
| 11 | **ESM Framework** | Draft document circulated to Pemda /local agencies for comment? |  | No |
| 12 | **Disabled Users** | Building users have cited special needs for handicapped persons? |  | No |
| 13 | **Cultural Identifiers** | Stakeholders request cultural character in building design? |  | No |
| 14 | **Site Greening** | Stakeholders request guidance on shade trees &food gardens? |  | No |
| 15 | **Alternative Energy** | Stakeholders OK with solar panels & battery storage? | Yes |  |

***GUIDANCE***

1. The above checklist and the attached graphics has the purpose of ensuring that (a) we in PETRA have been thorough and diligent in producing a “3600“assessment of each site (a) National, Provincial and community stakeholders have provided initial consensus input to the design process, which will be augmented by the DCS consultants’ working engagement, and (c) consultant responses to the RFP shall be well informed
2. We need to have site plans in a common format, with a common numbering convention and reference to parent agency drawing numbers or type designation. Numbering shall go anticlockwise from the bottom LH corner
3. All site plans shall be presented in the same format as PUSKESMAS MALEI
4. Please delete this “GUIDANCE” to add brief clarifying remarks on the above responses, particularly any “NO” responses which are not self-evident. Please also where appropriate state what further actions will be taken by you.

***RENAKSI DATA \_ from Intervention Matrix UNDP***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **GPS COORDINATE** |   0° 7’ 26.03” S 119° 4’ 14.92” E |
| **Damage Severity**  | **HEAVY** | **X** | **MODERATE** |  | **LIGHT** |  |
| **BUDGET IN RENAKSI (IDR)** | **3,000,000,000 (for all buildings. This package only for inpatient building)**  |
| **Summarized description – main repair tasks** : **MUST ACCURATELY REFLECT TASK BREAKDOWN IN BILL OF QUANTITIES**Design of the inpatient building at Puskesmas Malei should be in accordance with Minister of Health’s Regulation No. 75 of 2014 concerning the Puskesmas construction.  |

***SITE PLAN – Please make sure every site for both Education, Health & Environment contexts are uniformly presented***

|  |
| --- |
| Please see Annex 4.3 |

**PHOTOGRAPHS OF DAMAGE TO BE ADDRESSED THROUGH RFP DCS CONSULTANTS & LATER ITB WORKS**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**PREPARATORY CHECKLIST: PROVINCIAL SITE ASSESSMENTS (DRAFT)**

*(for inclusion in RFP Scope of Services for each site)*

 Prepared by: PMU Palu Date: 26-July 2019.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PROVINCE** | Central Sulawesi | KABUPATEN | **Sigi** | KECAMATAN | **Kulawi** |
| **SCHOOL FACILITY?** |  |  | **GoI Facility name** |  |
| **HEALTH FACILITY** | Yes |  | **GoI Facility name** | **Puskesmas Kulawi** |
| **Street Address** | Desa Bolapapu, Kulawi | Postcode |  |

***SITE DATA ASSESSMENT***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ITEM#** | **ATTRIBUTE** | **VERIFIABLE EVIDENCE** | **YES** | **NO** |
| 1 | **Geographical positioning** | GPS Coordinates  | Yes |  |
|  |  | Cadastral Map[[2]](#footnote-2) | Yes |  |
|  |  | Technical description: boundary alignments; adjoining lots. | Yes |  |
|  |  | Survey boundary monuments located & clear of debris/ vegetation. |  | No |
| 2 | **Ownership** | Certificate of Title copy attached |  | No |
|  |  | Clear and Clean title guaranteed by Provincial Government (#5) | Yes |  |
|  |  | Acquisition of new site if high risk is apparent on existing site? |  | No |
|  |  | Enlargement or realignment of site boundaries required? |  | No |
| 3 | **Agency Commitment** | Proposed works are Included in RENAKSI? (#1) | Yes |  |
|  |  | Buildings certified as government owned with major damage (#2) | Yes |  |
|  |  | Funds are not duplicating other budget sources (#3) | Yes |  |
|  |  | There is a safe & secure location (#4) Subject to Geological Survey |  |  |
|  |  | Willingness for removal of asset to be reconstructed (#6) | Yes |  |
|  |  | Local authority willing to receive & maintain rebuilt buildings (#7) | Yes |  |
|  |  | Development approval and permit costs by local authority (#8) | Yes |  |
| 4 | **Site Assessment**  |  |  |  |
|  | DPU Assets Inspection | Serviceability & forensic assessment certification?  | Yes |  |
|  | Geophysical Assessment | Report on fissures, faults/ fault lines, landslip, liquefaction risks? |  |  |
| 5 | **Site/ structures plans** | Original as built site layout plan available in digital form? |  | No |
|  |  | Current as built site layout plan available in digital form? |  | No |
|  |  | Original as built structures plans available in digital form? |  | No |
|  |  | Updated as built structures plans available in digital form? |  | No |
|  |  | Each structure has digital general arrangement & detail drawings? |  | No |
|  |  | Each structure type can be identified by drawing no. and/ or code? |  | No |
| 6 | **Electrical Mains** | Inspected and rendered functional & safe by power authority? | Yes |  |
| 7 | **Potable water** | Reticulated water with ample flow & operational service points? |  | No |
|  |  | Rainwater storage collection and storage? |  | No |
| 8 | **Sewerage & Septic Tanks** | Adequately functional with no health hazard? |  | No |
|  | **Telephone land lines** | Connections are in working order and cables well secured? | Yes |  |
| 9 | **Road access** | External access road is trafficable and in fair to good condition? | Yes |  |
| 10 | **Demolition & Clean up** | Most site areas have not been cleaned up/ are not trafficable |  | No |
| 11 | **ESM Framework** | Draft document circulated to Pemda /local agencies for comment? |  | No |
| 12 | **Disabled Users** | Building users have cited special needs for handicapped persons? |  | No |
| 13 | **Cultural Identifiers** | Stakeholders request cultural character in building design? |  | No |
| 14 | **Site Greening** | Stakeholders request guidance on shade trees &food gardens? |  | No |
| 15 | **Alternative Energy** | Stakeholders OK with solar panels & battery storage? | Yes |  |

***GUIDANCE***

1. The above checklist and the attached graphics has the purpose of ensuring that (a) we in PETRA have been thorough and diligent in producing a “3600“assessment of each site (a) National, Provincial and community stakeholders have provided initial consensus input to the design process, which will be augmented by the DCS consultants’ working engagement, and (c) consultant responses to the RFP shall be well informed
2. We need to have site plans in a common format, with a common numbering convention and reference to parent agency drawing numbers or type designation. Numbering shall go anticlockwise from the bottom LH corner
3. All site plans shall be presented in the same format as PUSKESMAS KULAWI
4. Please delete this “GUIDANCE” to add brief clarifying remarks on the above responses, particularly any “NO” responses which are not self-evident. Please also where appropriate state what further actions will be taken by you.

***RENAKSI DATA \_ from Intervention Matrix UNDP***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **GPS COORDINATE** |   1° 26’ 35.705” S 119° 59’ 7.156”  |
| **Damage Severity**  | **HEAVY** | **X** | **MODERATE** |  | **LIGHT** |  |
| **BUDGET IN RENAKSI (IDR)** | **1,640,000,000**  |
| **Summarized description – main repair tasks** : **MUST ACCURATELY REFLECT TASK BREAKDOWN IN BILL OF QUANTITIES**Design of the inpatient building at Puskesmas Kulawi should be in accordance with Minister of Health’s Regulation No. 75 of 2014 concerning the Puskesmas construction.  |

***SITE PLAN – Please make sure every site for both Education, Health & Environment contexts are uniformly presented***

|  |
| --- |
| Please see Annex 4.3 |

**PHOTOGRAPHS OF DAMAGE TO BE ADDRESSED THROUGH RFP DCS CONSULTANTS & LATER ITB WORKS**

|  |
| --- |
| IMG_20190522_164537.jpg |

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)