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In past years, an extensive range of journals and reports has been produced about Langkawi becoming the national face of tourism. There is no denying that Langkawi is a success story worth retelling. At the same time, its growth has generated concerns among its stakeholders in the public and private sectors on over-development and poor governance. With it comes the possibility of corruption and degradation of the environment.

For the past three decades, the civil society components of Langkawi have been engaging the media and other like-minded quarters to express their concern that Langkawi was not progressing on a sustainable trajectory. Among those they engaged was the Center to Combat Corruption and Cronyism (C4 Center). C4 Center was invited to the island in the early and later part of 2017 by a handful of non-governmental organisations, business operators, as well as concerned individuals for a study of issues afflicting the governance and sustainable facets of Langkawi.

The objective of this study was to monitor, to dialogue with the stakeholders, and to pour over allegations of inappropriate development and projects, which have led to allegations of corruption, croniyism and environmental degradation. From early interim observations, interviews and dialogue sessions, C4 Center has felt compelled to conduct an independent assessment of the litany of complaints. Hence, three field trips were conducted by C4 Center to identify the problems and root causes of these complaints.

A position paper by C4 Center was born as a result of trips and interviews done with a broad spectrum of people in the public and private sectors. The result was an eye-opening account and the never-before published tales revealed a range of ill-advised activities which, if left unchecked, can threaten the tourism treasures of
Langkawi.

This is the first report of its kind: an on-the-ground take from local players, extracted directly from stakeholders. Interviewees ranged from local villagers, elected representatives, public officers, travel trade community leaders, and business operators, speaking on the rapid changes affecting one of Malaysia's prized island.

The complaints lodged to C4 Center were based on the fact that Langkawi is a recipient of the Unesco Global Geopark status (geology) since 2007. Langkawi is part of an international network of 127 Geopark status territories, and it represents a milestone for this resort island to be part of this collection.

Many stakeholders here have invested large amounts of money and time to grow their businesses. Transforming away from an agro–based economy of paddy and rubber as well as fisheries, the lives of every islander here has been largely impacted by rapid changes and the growth of the tourism industry.

This report is concerned with how sustainable development issues feature in the rapid promotion and growth of the tourism industry in Langkawi. The report aims to highlight the challenges faced by stakeholders and aims to investigate if the environment and standard of living has been compromised to meet the demands of tourism.

It also highlights the weaknesses in the various governing structures and whether agencies are adequately equipped to manage the issues and challenges raised. Our report also includes suggestions for improvement from various stakeholders in the industry.

We hope that this report will spur on change in the right direction towards better governance, a deeper commitment towards sustainable development, and for a better Langkawi where all Malaysians can prosper, free from corruption.

Ian MacIntyre
February 2018.
**Background Information**

**GEOGRAPHY**

Langkawi is an archipelago of 102 islands off the Andaman Sea, situated some 16.2 nautical miles (30km) from the main land mass of Kedah in Peninsular Malaysia. It is an island synonymous with tourism since the Federal Government granted it a duty-free port status in 1987. Its Global Positioning System coordinates is Latitude 6°20'59.99” N and Longitude 99°47'59.99”E.

Out of the 102 surrounding isles, the only other inhabited island is the Tuba Island, which can be accessed by a tiny jetty off the main ferry terminal in Kuah.

The total land mass of the Langkawi district is 47,848 hectares. Two-thirds of the main island is dominated by forest-covered mountains, hills and natural vegetation as well as the island's oldest geological formation—the Gunung Matchincang range.

The range was the first part of Southeast Asia to majestically grow from the seabed in the Cambrian period of more than half a billion years ago, as noted by renowned geologist Professor Emeritus Datuk Dr Ibrahim Komoo. It is now certified as the oldest peak in Malaysia, and was bestowed with the status as a United Nations (UNESCO) Geopark heritage in 2007.

As for the weather, Langkawi receives an average of more than 2,400 mm (94 in) of rain annually, according to the national meteorological department. It is usually dry from December until February with rainfall from March until November.

The district has six subdistricts (mukims): Ayer Hangat, Bohor, Kedawang, Kuah, Padang Matsirat and Ulu Melaka. The last is the largest, and is where the tomb of the fair maiden, Mahsuri, is located.

Out of some 100,000 inhabitants, 90% are Malays while the rest are mainly Chinese, Siamese, Indians and other minority groups. 70% are local and foreign migrants, who
are heavily invested in the leisure industry.

There are a sizeable number of expatriates comprising retirees under the "Malaysia My Second Home" scheme, yachting community members and foreign entrepreneurs. There are also are pockets of migrants from Myanmar, who were resettled by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). They live mostly in Bukit Malut.

**DEVELOPMENTAL HISTORY**

Langkawi remained as a quiet backwater until 1987, when the then-Prime Minister Tun Dr Mahathir Mohamad pitched for it to be a leading tourist destination. It rapidly grew following the granting of the duty-free port status and through the injection of investments. By 2012, it started to take in over three million tourists a year.

The duty-free exemptions allowed investors a leverage to pump in what is believed to be billions in free capital to transform the island’s infrastructure, social amenities and housing to accommodate the tourism gold rush in the 1990s. The Northern Corridor Implementing Authority (NCIA) reported that annual tourist expenditure was targeted to increase from RM9 billion in 2005 to RM21.8 billion in 2012 and it should breach RM64.5 billion by 2020.
Among the public listed companies who have interests here include: YTL Corporation Berhad, Berjaya Group Berhad, Tropicana Corporation Berhad, Khazanah Nasional Berhad (investment arm of the Federal Government) Kedah Mentri Besar Incorporated, Boustead Holdings Berhad, and Tradewinds (M) Berhad, who has since gone private.

Among tycoons and local entrepreneurs here are owners of the Langkawi Ferry Services Sdn Bhd, Haji Ramli Enterprises, Teo Soon Huat Sdn Bhd, Tan Sri Vincent Tan, Tan Sri Halim Mohamed, and Tan Sri Syed Mokhtar Al-Bukhary.

There are also several foreign investors, who are involved in maritime activities such as boat charter services, restaurants, resorts, healthcare and other services. According to data from the Langkawi Development Authority (LADA), listed companies, tycoons and foreign direct investors have poured in over RM5 billion in the past two decades to tap the tourism potential here.

There seems to be a intersection of politics and business, demonstrated by the elected politicians controlling the one parliament seat and two state seats in Langkawi. The P4 Langkawi parliament seat is held by Datuk Ir Nawawi Ahmad, who is also the Keretapi Tanah Melayu (KTM) Berhad chairperson. For state seats, the N1 Ayer Hangat assemblyman is Datuk Mohd Rawi Abdul Hamid, who is also the state executive councilor from Kedah, in charge of tourism. The N2 Kuah assemblyman is Nor Saidi Nayan, who is also a LADA board member.
STATISTICS

3.8 million tourists
Projected Arrivals 2018

9000 rooms
in 500 registered accomodation providers

500 people
Working as Farmers & Fishermen

10 thousand
Est. Civil Service Office Bearers

280 travel agents
Est. Working on the island

5,000 vehicles
Available for Rental

100 thousand
Population Base

1000,500 vehicles
Tour buses & taxis on the island

500 vehicles
Left Abandoned
What is a UNESCO Geopark?

The UNESCO Global Geopark initiative was established in 1998, which seeks to not only conserve but also promote the planet’s geological heritage. That is to say, recognised geoparks are not simply just about the conservation of geology of a region. It incorporates the communities and socio-economic activities in it, especially those related to tourism.

The Geopark Status award is not a permanent recognition. The award goes through a revalidation process every 4 years. During this process, the functioning and quality of the Geopark is thoroughly re-examined. If the Geopark’s administration, functioning and quality meets the required standards, it will continue as an UNESCO Global Geopark for a further 4 years, also known as a green card. On the other hand, if it fails to meet the required standard, a yellow card will be given, warning the authorities to take appropriate steps to address the issue within 2 years or risk losing the status.

Criteria for Recognition as Geopark

(i) Geographic Unity - UNESCO Global Geoparks must be single, unified geographical areas where sites and landscapes of international geological significance are managed with a holistic concept of protection, education, research and sustainable development. A UNESCO Global Geopark must have a clearly defined border, be of adequate size to fulfil its functions and
contain geological heritage of international significance as independently verified by scientific professionals.

(ii) **Promotion of Issues** – UNESCO Global Geoparks should use that heritage, in connection with all other aspects of that area’s natural and cultural heritage, to promote awareness of key issues facing society in the context of the dynamic planet we all live on, including but not limited to increasing knowledge and understanding of: geoprocesses; geohazards; climate change; the need for the sustainable use of Earth’s natural resources; the evolution of life and the empowerment of indigenous peoples.

(iii) **Empowered Management** – UNESCO Global Geoparks should be areas with a management body having legal existence recognised under national legislation. The management bodies should be appropriately equipped to adequately address the area of the UNESCO Global Geopark in its entirety.

(iv) **Value–add to the Brand** – In the case where an applying area overlaps with another UNESCO designated site, such as a World Heritage Site or Biosphere Reserve, the request must be clearly justified and evidence must be provided for how UNESCO Global Geopark status will add value by being both independently branded and in synergy with the other designations.

(v) **Community Involvement** – UNESCO Global Geoparks should actively involve local communities and indigenous peoples as key stakeholders in the Geopark. In partnership with local communities, a co-management plan needs to be drafted and implemented that provides for the social and economic needs of local populations, protects the landscape in which they live and conserves their cultural identity. It is recommended that all relevant local and regional actors and authorities be represented in the management of a UNESCO Global Geopark. Local and indigenous knowledge, practice and management systems should be included, alongside science, in the planning and management of the area.

(vi) **Knowledge Sharing** – UNESCO Global Geoparks are encouraged to share their experience and advice and to undertake joint projects within the GGN. Membership of GGN is obligatory.

(vii) **Protecting Geological Heritage** – A UNESCO Global Geopark must respect local and national laws relating to the protection of geological heritage. The defining geological heritage sites within a UNESCO Global Geopark must be legally protected in advance of any application. At the same time, a UNESCO Global Geopark should be used as leverage for promoting the protection of geological heritage locally and nationally. The management body must not
participate directly in the sale of geological objects such as fossils, minerals, polished rocks and ornamental rocks of the type normally found in so-called “rockshops” within the UNESCO Global Geopark (regardless of their origin) and should actively discourage unsustainable trade in geological materials as a whole. Where clearly justified as a responsible activity and as part of delivering the most effective and sustainable means of site management, it may permit sustainable collecting of geological materials for scientific and educational purposes from naturally renewable sites within the UNESCO Global Geopark. Trade of geological materials based on such a system may be tolerated in exceptional circumstances, provided it is clearly and publicly explained, justified and monitored as the best option for the Global Geopark in relation to local circumstances. Such circumstances will be subject to approval by the UNESCO Global Geoparks Council on a case by case basis.

(viii) **Evaluation** – These criteria are verified through checklists for evaluation and revalidation.

**LANGKAWI’S STATUS AND HERITAGE**

The term ‘Geopark’ is extracted from a Greek meaning of earth: the geology of it, is a study of how rocks are formed, its composition, structure and its accompanying landscape as well as the evolution process.

The Langkawi geopark is an all-encompassing status. Its status as geopark not only includes the preservation and conservation of this natural rock heritage for posterity, but also to promote eco-tourism. It includes every island in the archipelago, the surrounding waters and marine ecosystems, the forests, villages and countryside. As a member of the UNESCO Geoparks Network, Langkawi is part of some 150 other landmasses which come under the scope of conservation and protection.

Langkawi was awarded with the UNESCO Global Geopark (geology) status ten years ago, in 2007. But unlike their state counterparts in Penang and Malacca, who celebrated their UNESCO World Heritage Site status with aplomb, it was largely a small scale event in Kedah due to the lack of public awareness about it.

The guardian of the status is the Langkawi Development Authority (LADA), a federal statutory organisation, entrusted to oversee the development and promotion of the island resort into a world-class tourism destination. LADA formed a Geopark division to catapult Langkawi into one of the better Geopark destinations in the world.

A few years ago, Langkawi almost lost its status with UNESCO due to failures in management. The reasons cited by an UNESCO international audit team were the lack of attention and prominence given to the status during their visit in 2014. However, the last inspection exercise conducted last year was a success. UNESCO has since then extended Langkawi’s international accreditation status to 2019.

Following the warning, LADA has put in greater determination to preserve and promote the Geopark award, especially with the formation of a division to oversee the management of it. Also, a nongovernmental organisation called the Friends of Langkawi Geopark (FLAG) was formed. It comes under the leadership of Datuk Kamarulzaman Abdul Ghani, who was also a former general manager of LADA before his retirement from public office. FLAG acts as a watchdog on the Geopark status, often liaising with the private sector to generate public awareness on what the status should mean to Langkawi.
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM) also played a significant role in Langkawi becoming a Geopark, giving Langkawi’s bid the academic support it needed. UKM’s former prominent geologist, Professor Emeritus Datuk Dr Ibrahim Komoo was a key player as an international expert on the UNESCO geoparks movement.

LADA, UKM and FLAG have been coordinating on the way forward. But as Datuk Kamarulzaman puts it, there is now a need for action rather than just words.

He wants the 35 years of research and data unearthed by UKM and Professor Ibrahim to be put into practice and for the island to embrace its Geopark heritage. He wants Geopark to be branded in tandem with Langkawi’s tourism potential, and on the same token for it to act as a gambit or a standard bearer for a need to preserve and conserve the island resort.

“We want quality living for both the inhabitants and the tourists coming here. The Geopark status can deliver it if we pursue its ideals,” said Kamarulzaman.

To perpetuate awareness about the Geopark, Datuk Kamarulzaman has recommended the extensive marketing of its attractions and guidelines as tools; starting with the pillar of the geopark here; the Machinchang GeoForest Mountain and Park is estimated to be between 450 and 550 million years old.

It contains the oldest known rocks in the region and there is also scientific evidence that the geological origins of Malaysia and the region may have begun from the island. There is also the Kilim Karst GeoForest Park which features a limestone landscape and a mangrove forest system.

Dayang Bunting’s GeoForest Park on Dayang Bunting Island is a setting for one of Langkawi’s well-known attractions: an enormous freshwater lake perched on the edge of the ocean.

Langkawi is also the world’s first duty-free geopark and the only one that is an archipelago, or island cluster. There are over 90 geology sites around Langkawi from caves to sea arches, fossils and waterfalls. Another aspect is the culture of the Langkawi inhabitants, especially with its ancestry coming from the Thai-Muslim empire of Pattani, the ancient kingdom.

Moving forward, Datuk Kamarulzaman is seeking for more effort from LADA, the Kedah government and the local authorities in realising the aims of the Geopark. As the Geopark status espouses good governance, the adoption of its principles can reduce corrupt practices and promote a low level of tolerance on parties or individuals, who belittle the rule of the law, he noted.

He wants the local communities to benefit from the status by exploring jobs which can be created along the enclave of geology, similar to how Penang and Malacca are developing their respective heritage sites.

But as what Datuk Kamarulzaman outlines looks good on paper, a tourism writer has also given a grim description of the status through her reporting.

Leisa Taylor’s article tells a tale that, as much as the officials advocate about the Geopark status, the ethos of the geopark status has not sunk in with the travel trade and local surrounding community, who largely remain ignorant or carelessly dismiss it. And the end result is apathy towards pollution and damages to the ecology while there are even worries that the island is overcrowded with tourists.

There are such evidence as mooted by Eric R. Sinnaya, the Malaysian Nature Society vice-chairperson and Irshad Mubarak, a naturalist and eco-guide.
TRAVEL TRADE ADMINISTRATION

Langkawi predominantly attracts tourists, who come to linger on its beaches, drink its duty-free booze and explore its exquisite nature. But, the question is, do they end up contributing to a rise in pollution and corruption?

For the travel trade community, it is true that pollution and corruption has increased to an extent, as they cited incidences where poor governance which has given rise to the scourge of pollution. In this chapter, we explore the alleged malpractices which have come up, while also recording insightful comments from the travel trade individuals of Langkawi. They have come to regard the resort island as their home; hence there is a genuine sense to seek solutions to the issues.

“

But, the Malaysia Association of Hotel’s chief executive officer Yap Lip Seng has brought to attention on a need to tabulate the tourism arrivals efficiently at the entry points in the airport and the ferry terminal besides the cruise line depot.

The lack of synergy at the ferry terminal has given rise to suspicions that workers who commute daily were also counted as tourists as they also come ashore as ferry passengers.

Tourists to Langkawi were projected to be around three million annually over the period of 2011 to 2015 based on the Langkawi Tourism Blueprint 2.0 report. The blueprint was drafted and prepared by LADA, and its former CEO Tan Sri Abdul Khalid Ramli was quoted as saying the target was actually exceeded.
To complicate things, there is Airbnb, an online marketplace for all forms of accommodation. Many of the good deals offered concerned properties which are not licensed as hospitality properties, said Yap.

“We are not saying that if we compute better the arrivals are lower; it may actually be higher if we include all forms of accommodations,” Yap said.

“Veteran travel trade practitioner P. Nadarajah believes that the statistics are largely inaccurate as the authorities cite the number of passengers arriving at the ferry and airport terminals rather than outright tourists. They should use other mechanisms to check; such as hotel occupancy rates or asking tourists to fill up forms at arrival points.”

Veteran tourism activist Ahmad Pishol Isahak said that a proper calculation of tourism figures was needed to reflect the true impact of the leisure industry.

Research done online revealed that arrivals in Langkawi have steadily risen from 3.06 million in 2012 to 3.62 million in 2015, while investment rose from RM5.08 billion to RM11.9 billion during the same period. The duty-free status of the archipelago since 1987 has helped to boost tourist numbers and LADA is looking to increase it further via several initiatives. New high–end hotels have been built, and others are in the pipeline to cater for high–net–worth tourists, which are low in number now.

Hence, the luxurious St Regis Hotel, which was partially owned by the Finance Ministry, was opened in 2016, and Teluk Datai will be ready to welcome guests before the year end. In 2018, there will be a Parkroyal hotel.

Another report states that in 2015, the Langkawi International Airport handled 2.336 million passengers, but only 176,000 of these were international passengers, mostly from China and Singapore. The island sees a mix of budget day travelers all the way to top spending tourists. However, the spread is not even.

Here, LADA through its chief executive officer Datuk Azizan Noordin, wants to capture more high end tourists as the Return on Investment (ROI) would be greater to investors and the local authorities in terms of taxes from hotels. In 2014, there were 9,000 rooms, only 40% of which were in the 4- and 5-star categories, compared with 55% in Hawaii, 48% in Mauritius and 44% in Bali.

The blueprint specifies that Langkawi can be comparable to the likes of Hawaii or Phuket as it is one of the Top 50 island resorts in the world. The supply of five-star rooms is set to increase with several luxury hotels like the Ritz Carlton, Parkroyal and The Burau expected to open in the pipeline. It is estimated that by 2018, the number of rooms will rise from 9,000 to 15,000.

A study by Universiti Putra Malaysia found that the biggest group of tourists were in the 26 to 35 age group, the second biggest ranged from 18 to 25 years in age, and the smallest group were those 46 years and above.

This is worrying as people of the older age are usually more established in their careers and are the big spenders. Failure to attract people of this age group would mean that Langkawi stands to lose out on a major potential source of revenue.

Hotels in Langkawi recorded occupancy rates of 75% for 2016. To boost occupancy rates, LADA has been organising many international and regional events – with an average of three in a month for this year. Other projects in the pipeline, is the Langkawi Water Kingdom.
The blueprint also suggests a zoning system based on supply, branding and resources. For instance, the northwest could be designated for luxury stay, and the Chenang beach area for family activities. Healthcare infrastructure and personnel also needs to be improved to cater to the increase in tourists, who may need medical attention. At the moment, there is “no medical evacuation possible by air to a better equipped hospital”.

“It is laudable to expand tourism here but not at the expense of cutting down trees to build more resorts or to construct along the fragile coastal line,” says Malaysia Nature Society’s Eric Sinnaya.

It looks well on paper but in reality, many things are not moving in the right direction, namely in conservation and preservation. Langkawi needs to coexist with nature and to underline its Geopark status which called for conservation and preservation, said Sinnaya.

A NATIONAL CONTEXT

Under the National Tourism Transformation Plan 2020, the Government envisions developing tourism by increasing arrivals as well as receipts. An eight-year strategic plan started in 2012, whereby Malaysia aims to attract 36 million visitors with an annual receipt of RM168 billion.

In 2016, the target was 30.5 million visitors and tourist receipts of RM103 billion. To achieve a higher mark for this year, Tourism Malaysia has marketed the country to China and India while the Middle East continues to hold strong.

One of Malaysia’s leading technocrats, Dato’ Seri Idris Jala, penned a piece last year on tourism as a key economic sector at these difficult times in the country. He wrote that this year (2017), we (the federal government) is aiming to attract 30.5 million tourists to our shores from 25.7 million, contributing RM103 billion worth of tourist receipts from RM69.1 billion.

When times are tough (global economic uncertainties), some industries can be more resilient than others. Tourism is one such sector.

But for Veteran Activist Pishol, “Langkawi needs to go back to the basics of tourism; of the need to ensure that they protect the environment and to give a sense of security and safety to the tourists. It is no point in drumming up talk about developing tourism and citing arrival figures when the authorities cannot enforce legislation and bylaws. Only through the upholding of the law, then the island resort will have a consistent level of quality control so tourists can come at any time of the year and they will feel welcome,” he said.
LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

One of the more telling examples of how poor enforcement has come to bear on the island resort is the plight of chalet owner Karina Bahrin. She has revealed her deep and unrestrained frustration with the local authorities.

From the inability to obtain proper licensing for her chalet and restaurant to the lack of consistency in maintaining public cleanliness, Bahrin is frustrated with the local council here. She is the epitome of local small medium enterprise owners, who have registered their frustration at the lack of synergy between the public and private sectors in enforcing legislation.

While she wants to be fully recognised by the local authorities, the operators of enterprises along Pantai Chenang, prefer to remain anonymous. Their choice is driven by the fact that they are not fully licensed, and there are suspicions that they also pay temporary licensing to the local authorities.

Malaysia Association of Hotel’s Yap Lip Seng has underlined the concerns of the hoteliers over the proposed RM3 surcharge for tourists staying in registered hotels.

“We hope the additional fund can be paid to good use for the industry, such as providing better public services and higher levels of cleanliness.”

Langkawi has become the third destination after Penang and Malacca to impose a token surcharge for tourists staying overnight in hotels.

The Langkawi Municipal Council (Tourism City) began in 1945 as a town board management during the British occupation. In 1987 with the advent of a duty free status however, the board was upgraded to become a district council with powers vested to conduct planning, licensing, building approvals, cleanliness and landscaping in lines with the by - laws

The gazette area of administration totaled 47,848 hectares (478.48 sq. km). It later became known as the Langkawi Municipal Council, (the City of Tourism) on December 16, 2000, followed by a royal proclamation by His Royal Highness the Sultan of Kedah on March 24, 2001.

In 2001, the Council was awarded ISO status pertaining to planning and buildings. The scope has also increased to provide social amenities, solid waste management, town planning and physical development. It implements the functions through Local Authority Act 1976 (Act 171).
Governance Issues in the Auditor General’s Report

The Auditor’s General Report 2016 for Kedah did not focus much on Langkawi. However, one can generally conclude that the overall financial and governance practices of the state of Kedah was less than satisfactory. The report listed down many unsound financial practices, wastage of public funds and engagement of unsatisfactory services. To be specific, the Audit on the State Secretariat Department is a prime example.

The State Secretariat is one of the main departments that is responsible in ensuring that the management of the state by the government is smooth and functions efficiently. To meet this objective, the secretariat is responsible in acquisition to provide supplies and offering of various services. This is done by the way of tender, quotations, direct negotiations and direct purchasing.

**SPLITTING THE CONTRACTS**

From the year 2014 to 2016, the office of the state secretariat has spent a total of RM110.78 million.

In that period, only 10 acquisitions amounting to RM27.05 million were done by the way of tender.

A total of 139 acquisitions amounting to RM44.20 million was done through direct negotiation, 101 transactions amounting to RM11.49 million was done through quotations and 8,887 acquisition amounting to RM28.13 million was done through direct purchase. See Table 1 for reference.

Although the state circular (IPP) PK 2, states that any acquisition or engagement of tender through direct purchase should not exceed RM20,000, there have been instances where large purchases or projects were divided into smaller amounts so
as to avoid the tender or quotation process which includes the acquisition to supply and fix furniture, billboards and toilet maintenance.

These acquisitions should have been done through open tender or quotations as the amount exceeds RM20,000 and the projects were mostly in the same area.

Table 2 shows some of the projects that were of concern.

According to the Auditor’s Report, this sort of unsatisfactory practices is detected in various other departments and districts including:

1. Majlis Daerah Yan
2. Majlis Daerah Padang Terap
3. Majlis Daerah Bandar Baharu

**DUBIOUS FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT PRACTICES**

In 2016, the Auditor’s office also conducted 12 surprise visits to various government departments in Kedah, including the Land and District office of Langkawi. Many issues and irregularities were found during these visits. Below are some of the issues that were found in the various departments:

There are structural weaknesses towards the management of the revenue, such as the lack of attention given towards ensuring that the contract work meets the initial specifications, as well as the negotiated tenders.

A spot check at the Langkawi Land and Mines Department found discrepancies in bank-in slips as well as the safeguarding of safe deposits, while payment vouchers were not all handed over for audit.

Also some vouchers submitted did not have the necessary office’s rubber stamps and supporting documents to demonstrate transparency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIL.</th>
<th>NO PESANAN TEMPATAN</th>
<th>TARIKH PESANAN TEMPATAN</th>
<th>KERJA DAN LOKASI</th>
<th>JUMLAH (RM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>JUMLAH</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,745</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>JUMLAH</strong></td>
<td><strong>39,895</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>JUMLAH</strong></td>
<td><strong>59,850</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>JUMLAH</strong></td>
<td><strong>39,034</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>JUMLAH KESELURUHAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>196,524</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Baucar Bayaran Pejabat SUK

Table 2: Projects of Concern as Found in the Auditor General’s Report

---

**JADUAL 5.3**

**PENEMUAN AUDIT HASIL PENGAUDITAN MENGEJUT BAGI TAHUN 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIL.</th>
<th>JABATAN/PEJABAT</th>
<th>PENEMUAN AUDIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Lembaga Baisiswa Negeri Kedah</td>
<td>i. Tiga Sijil Simpanan Tetap Bank Rakyat tidak dapat dikomersalikan untuk pengesahan Audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Baki sebenar sebelum berbeza dengan baki di Daftar Seken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Pengesahan rekor termam dan pengekstensi sebelum disahkan oleh Kepala Pejabat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Baucar Bayaran dan dokumen sokongan tidak ditebuk/ dicopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. Pesanan Kerajaan tidak dicetak tanah lain dikeluarkan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vi. Buku Vot tidak disahkan untuk pemakai Audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Porakan ros tetapi tidak dibuat di bulanan kepada setiap jawatan polis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Baki stok borang hasil di Daftar Borang Hasil (Kaw.67) berbeza dengan baki sebenar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Baucar bayaran dan dokumen sokongan tidak ditebuk/ dicopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. Pesanan Kerajaan tidak dicetak tanah lain dikeluarkan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vi. Bilamanya tidak dibayar dalam tempoh 14 hari dan tanah lain diterima.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vii. Buku Vot tidak disahkan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Baki stok borang hasil di Daftar Borang Hasil (Kaw.67) berbeza dengan baki sebenar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Buku Tunai Panjat Wang Runcit tidak dikomersalikan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. Pedoman keupayaan untuk menyimpan wang kuliah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vi. Daftar Pemerkasaan Mengikut tidak disahkan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Dubious Financial Management Practices as Found in The Auditor General’s Report (continued next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Majlis Perbandaran Kulim</th>
<th>i. Tanda semakan dibuat ke atas slip bank/penyata pemungutan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
ii. Kulipan tidak disedap dengan segara ke dalam Buku Tunai.  
iii. Perakuan resit rasmidi dibuat di belakang helaian pertama salinan pejabat.  
iv. Stok Borang Hasil yang belum digunakan tidak disimpan dalam peti besi.  
v. Notis pembentukan awam untuk mendapatkan Resit Rasmidi setepas pembayaran dibuat tidak dipamerkan.  
vi. Wang kulipan tidak disimpan dalam peti besi.  
vii. Peti besi tidak digunakan untuk menyimpan wang kulipan.  
viii. Pemerkasian mengijit tidak dilaksanakan.  
ix. Daftar Pemeriksaan Mengijit tidak diselenggarakan.  
x. Had Kualsa tidak dinyatakan dalam Surat Perumpunan Kualsa.  
xii. Buku Vot tidak disemak pada setiap bulan oleh penyia. |
ii. Anak kunci dan kod kombinasi dipanggung oleh pegawai yang tidak diberi kuasa.  
iii. Pemerkasian mengijit tidak dilaksanakan mengikut tempoh yang ditetapkan.  
iv. Daftar Pemeriksaan Mengijit tidak disedap dengan segara.  
v. Had Kualsa tidak dinyatakan dalam Surat Perumpunan Kualsa.  
vi. Buku bayaran dan dokumen sokongan tidak dibebaskan untuk pembayaran.  
ix. Buku Vot tidak disemak pada setiap bulan oleh penyia. |
| 7.   | Majlis Daerah Kubang Pasu | i. Buku Daftar kad kredit tidak diselenggarakan.  
ii. Buku Daftar kad kredit tidak diselenggarakan.  
iii. Buku Tunai Panjar Wang Runcit tidak dikemas dalam helaian.  
vi. Pemerkasian mengijit tidak dilaksanakan mengikut tempoh yang ditetapkan.  
ix. Buku Vot tidak dikeluarkan dan disemak oleh pegawai yang bertanggungjawab. |
| 8.   | Pejabat Agrama Daerah Kuala Muda | i. Tanda semakan dibuat ke atas slip bank/penyata pemungutan.  
ii. Perakuan resit rasmidi tidak dibuat di belakang helaian pertama salinan pejabat.  
iii. Surat Perumpunan Kualsa tidak dikolok untuk kepada pegawai yang memerintah hasil di Kuariter Bayaran.  
iv. Anak kunci dan kod kombinasi peti besi dipanggung dan disimpan oleh pegawai yang sama.  
v. Pemerkasian mengijit tidak dilaksanakan mengikut tempoh yang ditetapkan.  
ix. Pemerkasian mengijit tidak dilaksanakan mengikut tempoh yang ditetapkan.  
ix. Buku bayaran dan dokumen sokongan tidak dibebaskan untuk pembayaran. |
ii. Pengesahan rekod termna dan pengeluaran setem tidak dibuat oleh Ketua Pejabat.  
iii. Pemerkasian mengijit tidak dilaksanakan. |
iii. Pemerkasian mengijit tidak dilaksanakan mengikut tempoh yang ditetapkan. |
| 11.  | Mahkamah Syariah Daerah Bandar Baharu | i. Pemerkasian mengijit tidak dilaksanakan mengikut tempoh yang ditetapkan. |

**Table 3: Dubious Financial Management Practices as Found in The Auditor General's Report (continued next page)**
OTHER GOVERNANCE PROBLEMS

The Auditor’s report also listed various other unsatisfactory practices by the state departments. Some of the issues are for example:

1. The cleaning services acquired are incompetent
2. Security services acquired are incompetent
3. Certain services and goods acquired were not done through the Price Negotiation Committee (Jawatankuasa Rundingan Harga)
4. Works carried out by the contractors did not follow the specifications agreed
5. Repair work and installations carried out in wrong locations
6. Some council premises were not rented out and there is a high amount of arrears in unpaid rent
7. Food courts were built in non – strategic locations
8. Important assets such as land for water dams were not gazetted
9. Certification in completion of work issued before work was completed and full payment made
10. Public facilities built were left unutilised by public and unmanaged
11. Proper maintenance of government vehicles uncarried out, and no proper record of mileage and petrol usage.

It is evident from the report that poor management issues exist in the state government. These are found to occur in various state agencies including in
In 2013, business weekly The Edge highlighted that the Langkawi Municipal Council broke procurement procedures to avoid open tender. The report stated that in the Auditor-General Report 2012, a total of six procurement deals worth RM1.91 million were offered via six quotations. Also checks revealed that two procurement deals with RM658,800 in total were offered to different contractors to conduct the same upgrading works, and it was offered during the same time as suggested by the date of advertisement.

The government and local council in the state of langkawi needs to give urgent attention to these bad practices that are found to occur in the many departments. As a result of these practices, the state government and local council lose millions of Ringgit to irresponsible employees and contractors that seems to be ignorant on the principles of good governance and sound financial practice.

The authorities should ensure that agencies strictly adhere to federal policies on financial management in regards to acquisition and projects. Where an acquisition or project costs more than RM20,000, it should be acquired by way of quotations or tender.

Serious attention also needs to be given on wastages. For example the building of food courts in non–strategic locations was a wastage of public funds.

Strict action should be taken against government employees and contractors found to be complicit in mismanagement of funds and fraudulent claims, which can include dismissal and filing criminal charges against them.

The Malaysian Anti–Corruption Agency (MACC) should monitor and put its resources into ensuring that government employees adhere to these strict rules. Constants checks and inquiries should be made on suspicious projects and acquisition.

Langkawi cannot afford the mismanagement of government funds as its revenue is very low. Therefore, best financial practices are key so that funds can be channeled where it is needed the most.
A cross-section of community leaders, travel trade members and politicians were interviewed by the C4 Center team in a quest to provide a balanced account of tourism and governance in Langkawi.

The individuals interviewed in preparation for this report were:

1. Anthony Wong Kim Hooi (Langkawi Businesses Association president)
2. Datuk Alexander Issac (Langkawi Businesses Association deputy president)
3. Ahmad Pishol Isahak (Langkawi tourism activist)
4. Eric R. Sinnaya (Malaysian Nature Society vice-chairperson)
5. Karina Baharin (Chalet owner)
6. Isahak Mubarak (Naturalist)
7. Baskaran Kosthi (Businessman)
8. P. Nadarajah (Veteran tourism activist)
9. Nan Hassan (Fisherman)
10. Irone Palani (Langkawi Tourist Association former president)
11. Zainuddin Kadir (Langkawi Bumiputra Travel Agents Association president)
12. Yap Lip Seng (Malaysian Association of Hotels chief executive officer)
13. Eugene Dass (Malaysian Association of Hotels Kedah / Perlis chairperson)
14. Tayfun Koksal (Langkawi Yacht Club general manager)
15. Wicky Sundram (Langkawi Yacht Club former general manager)
16. Oli Khalid (Restaurant operator)
17. Norsidah Ahmad (Hotelier)
18. Benny Khoo (Retiree)  
19. Senior Royal Customs and Excise officer  
20. Rosli Ibrahim (Padang Matsirat community leader)  

Most of them were frank in their feedback, although there were also concerns that there might be a subtle form of retaliation by the authorities, such as the possibility of their licenses being revoked or being blacklisted. But due to their adoration of Langkawi, and the compelling need to bring about sustainable practices against poor governance, they offered their opinions.  

There is a widespread admission of issues, which is best described as a form of growing-up pains of Langkawi’s progress as a tourism destination. Although issues were brought up, an equal number of suggestions and solutions were also proposed as well as clarifications from community leaders.  

Our heartfelt gratitude goes out to every single stakeholder, who was willing to share their input on what makes Langkawi tick as a tourism destination. Some stakeholders preferred to be anonymous, of which we have duly noted.  

To simplify the interviews, we have divided them according to issue area and present them in point form.  

- There are over 260 species of birds, 510 species of butterflies, 45 species of mammals, 63 species of plants and 47 species of snakes.  
- The biodiversity is under threat due to deforestation as since 1987, 50% of the green cover in Langkawi has been lost to rapid development.  
- There are suspicions that the wildlife is hunted as the rangers in the district wildlife and national parks department is under – staffed.  
- A lack of enforcement prevails at the Sungai Kilim mangrove swamp system—the main water catchment area for the island.  
- Speedboats are speeding through the mangrove, undermining the fertility of the area.  
- The IWK sewerage treatment plant was struggling to cater to the needs of the businesses along the Chenang and Tengah beach stretches.  
- There is inadvertent and intermittent discharge of waste into the seas, with evidence emerging of a higher jellyfish population and waste debris.  
- Better water safety awareness campaigns need to be mooted.
• Red tape continues to hinder relations between the public and private sectors.
• It has led to slowness in reacting and in providing solutions.
• Inconsistent enforcement has to lead to claims that many enterprises have yet to be fully licensed even when they are willing to pay the fees, or have offered to register themselves through the one-stop center of the council.
• There is a lack of coordination between the various government agencies.
• Langkawi has built public bus stands but no bus service has been provided.
• Public tourism landmarks such as the Eagle Square and CHOGM Park are left underutilised and neglected in some cases.
• Public beaches are littered with waste due to the tide effect and apathy.
• Poor enforcement has also led to profiteering among errant traders.
• Living costs are relatively high due to import of goods, food and services.
• No proper sanitation facilities at fishing villages, especially in Bukit Malut. It can lead to spread of diseases.
• LADA is a paper tiger with no teeth as they do not have enforcement powers vested to them for the island.
• Almost 50% of the hotel structures here are illegal.
• Since 1995, there has been no enforcement over watersports.

• Corruption comes in many forms on the island.
• Upgrading work for the Pantai Chenang road was delayed three times.
• Suspicion that the contractor of the project got it not through open tender.
• Need for transparency on how public funds are distributed.
• Suspicions that new enterprises may be a conduit for money-laundering.
• Enforcement tends to be selective
• The 20-year old solid waste incinerator which costs the taxpayers RM12 million is now allegedly under a state of disrepair.
• Cars, particularly of the local makes were abandoned by the wayside because the owners could not afford to pay the excise duty when they wanted to ship back to the mainland.

• Estimates of over several dozens were abandoned, or sold at a huge loss to the owners of not fully licensed car lease operators.

• No display list at Royal Customs and Excise office on the quantum of excise duty that one is required to pay if the vehicle is to be shipped out.

• Owners of luxurious duty free vehicles flout regulations by taking their cars out for more than 60 – days in a year. By law, their unpaid duty cars are only allowed on the mainland not more than 60 – days.

• Major loss of excise duty on tobacco and alcohol beverages; for some reason, the losses are reportedly up to RM1 billion annually.

• The authorities have invoked a new policy to guard against smuggling of contraband items such as alcohol but many cases go undetected.

• It is an organized crime – syndicated style operations for such smuggling.

• Logging rights were accorded to community leaders, who then proceed to sell the permits to outsiders to log.

• People seemed to enjoy connections with the cream of society and they have access to land which have dubious land titles. They then leased it out to foreigners at exorbitant rates.

• The municipality’s enforcement and policies are structurally weak; it has allowed room for cronyism or nepotism to prevail.
There are often two sides to an issue and the C4 Center makes a distinctive effort to be balanced in our presentation about Langkawi. Our heartfelt gratitude goes out to every single public officer, who was willing to share their input on the policies and issues in Langkawi.

The individuals in public office interviewed for this report were:

1. Past Langkawi District Officer Datuk Isahak Murat
2. LADA CEO Datuk Azizan Noordin
3. Kuah state assemblyman Datuk Nor Saidi Nanyan
4. An IWK spokesperson
5. Langkawi Businesses Association deputy president Datuk Alexander Issac
6. Kedah Tourism committee chairperson Datuk Md Rawi Abdul Hamid
7. Langkawi Member of Parliament Datuk Nawawi Ahmad

To simplify the interviews, we have divided them according to issue area and present in point form,
• More efforts are underway to curb indiscriminate littering.
• Beaches are now cleaned up daily while hoteliers are urged to keep the beaches at their properties in a presentable state.
• The IWK waste treatment plant in Pantai Tengah has been upgraded to cater to the needs of tourism; no open discharge anymore as of 2017.
• If there is seepage, it came from other parties and no longer IWK.

• Enterprises in Pantai Tengah and Chenang are not fully licensed because the landowners and business operators are not working well to convert the land title from agriculture to commercial.
• Some 70% of land along the tourism belts remained as agriculture status.
• It is a complicated issue as the local authorities need time to re-educate the landowners and tenants about land titles and the local bylaws.
• Many times, the owners and tenants are at fault in terms of legalising their businesses because they only opt for temporary permits, such as temporary occupational licenses.
• Landowners like to lease their land to tenants, who can further lease it to subtenants so enforcement action is difficult as the local authorities cannot determine who the rightful owners (culprits) are.
• The Langkawi ferry terminal management and marine authorities are now working to ensure the proper tabulation of ferry passenger arrivals and to determine if they are entering as tourists or workers.
• Guidelines on watersports have been drawn up and they are in the midst of being enforced.
• A new Pantai Chenang is proposed called Chenang 2, which is located off Padang Matsirat.
• Both the District Office and LADA practice an open-door policy.
• Enforcement is meted out. However on occasion, there is a leeway given to enable the owners to find time to legalise themselves as they are small-scale enterprises with no recourse but to pay the fines.
• Work to develop tourism continues unabated.
• LADA wants greater community participation in tourism.
• Despite their shortcomings, policies on tourism will continue to be progressive.
• LADA will train local communities to become entrepreneurs in tourism.
• Registered hotel rooms should reach 14,000 by next year, as more properties are opening up on the island resort.
• There are issues of polemic nature can be resolved as when the revenue from tourism goes up, the people will be less inclined to complain.
• LADA is planning to capture the millennials for the next growth of tourism.
• There is a need to find new tourism products.
• There is a need to tap social media and online opportunities in tourism.

• There is a Malaysian Anti-Corruption Commission (MACC) district office in Langkawi. It illustrates the commitment to fight the scourge.
• There may be allegations of wrongdoing but hardly anyone has been found guilty of corrupt practices on the island resort.
• The authorities also encourage anyone with information on corrupt practices to come forward.
• The national whistleblower legislation is also applicable in Langkawi.
• Smuggling is common at border areas; the only way is to constantly improve the surveillance and enforcement in this area.

• There is a one-stop center (OSC) which processes all applications for development and for major projects; they are discussed at the local councillor levels.
• There are 24 councillors, including political and government appointees.
• The OSC online is an electronic system for submission and processing of all applications for development.
• It is also a platform to obtain information and for bilateral communications.
• LADA has a planning and development division, who is responsible for the island resort’s status as a tourism destination.
• Poor enforcement of public vehicles such as rental cars and cabs. Allegedly, there are more illegal vehicles than licensed vehicles on the island.
• Poor enforcement of building permits and certificates of fitness, as well as local government licensing such as liquor permits and operating hours.
• Haphazard planning for car parking, resulting in traffic congestion.
• Alleged cronyism taking place in the public sector.
• Poor enforcement of water sports activities.
• Rampant littering at the township and housing areas, as well as coastlines.
• Environment degradation at Sungai Kilim, coastline, beaches and beach erosion; this is made worst from reclamation.
• Maintenance of the breakwater infrastructure.
• **Wastage:** public bus stops erected with no services provided.
• **Wastage:** Former tourism products left to rot. For example, the Book Village and the Aqua Water Theme Park.
• Alleged smuggling of duty free products: alcohol, tobacco and vehicles.
• Narcotics trade in view that Langkawi borders Thailand.
• Alleged growing social ills among the local communities.
• Poor enforcement until there is allegedly more illegal travel trade agents than those who obtained the necessary operating permits.
• IWK has taken steps to improve the sewerage system in the island and currently there are no direct discharges from IWK plants. However, there are still properties which remain unconnected to IWK system, posing a threat of untreated discharges to the environment.
• Poor fire safety management at Chenang Beach.
• Alleged mismanagement of the solid waste collection system at Kilim.
• Lack of enforcement on controlled food items such as rice, flour and vegetables.
• Alleged high presence of illegal labour.
Pantai Chenang has mushroomed into a colony of tourism attractions from accommodations to restaurants and retail outlets as well as recreational spots. The problem is as many as 70% are not fully licensed.

Several hotels were built and operated but suffered losses. Their fate remains uncertain as their closure remains an eye sore.

From grousers to allegations, it has led to physical examples of how poor governance breeds apathy and ignorance and leads to wastage and corrupt practices.

There is a glut of office units where many remain partially completed or unoccupied.

The abandoned Water Theme Park, “Aqua Beat”, near the proposed new Chenang area remains an eye sore as the owner, who is believed to be the timber tycoon Tan Sri Ting Pek Kiing does not have plans for it.
Conclusion

TAKING STOCK

The socio-economic issues which dominate the landscape in Langkawi mirror the same fate which has befallen many other growth localities of the country.

It is often a challenge to find balanced development without ignoring the need for conservation and preservation of nature’s treasures. The price that we must pay for quenching the thirst for development is no different for Langkawi as it is for the likes of Penang or other island resorts such as Tioman, Pangkor, Perhentian or Sipadan.

However, Langkawi stands apart from the others, namely because of the sheer choice of investments poured in by both local and foreign investors or capitalists and the mere fact that this island resort has grown the fastest in terms of social amenities and the inflow of tourists compared to the other habitats.

It is clear from our meetings with stakeholders that there are many issues here in Langkawi that needs to be addressed. The main issue is on good governance. The lack of enforcement, guidelines and action by the local government is dragging Langkawi to the worse. Urgent and serious attention needs to be given to this area. The local government should be transparent in managing the state. The expertise of locals and stakeholders should be taken seriously and these plans should be put into action effectively.

The apathy toward regulating enterprises properly gives rise to a notion that the local authorities are not stringent in enforcement because it may reduce their prospects of getting kickbacks.
The average person here knows that rapid growth brings along new challenges. For a good part of the last two decades, Langkawi has wobbled in the face of such challenges—on how to find the desired balanced of things.

Based on the testimonials of the travel trade community, more must be done to preserve and conserve mother nature here. The government is not paying enough attention to the environment. The rise of the tourism industry in Langkawi has caused a negative impact to the environment.

**ACTION PRINCIPLES**

There is a clear mandate of having secured the global status as an UNESCO Global Geopark, but sadly, its guidelines and recommendations does not seemed to resonate enough within the public and private sectors here.

Locals and businesses here are not educated well on the importance of preserving the geopark. Strict enforcement of regulations should be carried to ensure that these sites are well maintained and preserved.

Langkawi should take pride in advertising its tourism on the basis of a world geopark site. Locals should be roped in to contribute to the growth and development of the tourism industry and more opportunities and structures should be created to help them take part in these developments.

Licensing also needs to be done effectively, once and for all, to curb this long standing dilemma among the business community on how best to regulate themselves—with the full cooperation of the local authorities.

There is also a need to rethink at how the main tourism hub of Pantai Chenang has evolved, as is dangerously becoming a colony of haphazard development. This gives rise to fears about safety, especially if a fire breaks out in the heart of this nest of wooden chalets and restaurants.

The Langkawi community is grateful for the growth experienced by the island but on the same token, they want better economic prospects, which can only come via the way of transparency and an efficient public delivery system.

**TOWARDS THE FUTURE**

Neighboring Penang island serves a dire warning to Langkawi. It was reported during the height of the massive thunderstorm, the state recorded 131 incidents of landslides and landslips. History will repeat itself in Langkawi if we do not subscribe to sustainable tourism.

The signs are all here in Langkawi: There are many examples of how the yearning for development has become counter productive to the sustainable growth of a place. Tropicana Cenang, a massive 40-storey seaside resort-type condominium, with a projected total gross development value (GDV) of RM1.55 billion, has been proposed. Penang, Highland Towers or Genting Highlands are among places where nature’s pitfalls have come back to haunt us—soon, it could be Langkawi.

It is time for Langkawi islanders to take the destiny of their own island back by advocating for good governance, and with it, a degree of quality living which can only come with effective sustainable policies.

Let us work to ensure that the legendary curse of Mahsuri does not return!
http://www.thestar.com.my/~media/online/2016/04/10/18/47/bizd_p4a_1104_jy_1.ashx/?w=620&amp;h=413&amp;crop=1&amp;hash=E8AB9A894B32EAB64DC7821291E596E5AF670D10


Laws Applied

APPENDIX I

BY LAWS (MAIN ACT)

1. Local Government Act 1976 ( Akta 171 )
2. Street, Drainage and Building Act 1974 (Act 133)
3. Town and Country Planning Act 1976 ( Akta 172 )
4. Control of Rent Act 1966 ( Akta 363 )

TOURISM BYLAWS

1. Tourism Industry Act 1992 (Act 482) and Regulations: & Malaysia
3. Tourism Vehicles Licensing Act 1999

LAWS USED (SUPPLEMENTARY ACT)

1. Road Act 1987 ( Akta 333 )
2. Food Act 1983 ( Akta 281 )
3. Akta Keterangan ( Akta 281 )
4. Public Authorities Protection Act 1948
6. Penal Code
7. Criminal Procedure Code
9. Cows and Buffaloes Regulation Enactment 1971
10. Limitation Act
11. General Order
By-Laws Applied

1. Uniform Building Bylaws 1984
2. Advertisement (Local Authorities) Kedah State Bylaws 1982
3. Kedah Local Authorities (Compounding of Offences) Bylaws 1983
4. Kedah Local Authorities (Park) Bylaws 1983
5. Kedah Hawker (Local Authorities) Bylaws 1983
6. Anti-Littering By-Laws (Local Authorities) Kedah State 1983
8. Kedah Local Authorities Trade, Business and Enterprise Licensing Bylaws 1985
10. Langkawi District Council Public Toilets Bylaws 1991
11. Langkawi District Council Building (Fees) Bylaws 1991
12. Massage Parlours (Langkawi District Council) Bylaws 1991
13. Langkawi District Council (Compounding of Offences) Bylaws 1992
14. Barber Shop and Hairdresser (Langkawi District Council Bylaws 1992
15. Market (Langkawi District Council) Bylaws 1992
16. Earthworks (Langkawi District Council) Bylaws 1993
17. Guest house Control and Supervision (Langkawi District Council) Bylaws 1993
18. Building (Parking Facilities For Cinema, Theatre and Other Large Buildings (Langkawi District Council)) Bylaws 1992
19. Private Car Parks Licensing (Langkawi District Council) Bylaws 1995
20. Vandalism (Langkawi District Council) Bylaws 1995
21. Order of Langkawi District Council Car Park of Kedah 1995
24. Food Establishment Licensing (Langkawi District Council) Bylaws 1990
25. Rules of Langkawi District Council Officer (Conduct and Discipline) 1995
26. Stray Animals (Langkawi Municipal Council, the City of Tourism) Bylaws 2002
27. Enactments Cow and Bull State of Kedah 1971

The police also has a range of legislation under the Police Act and Criminal Procedures Code to maintain order and to protect law abiding citizenry as well as tourists.
The Center to Combat Corruption and Cronyism (C4 Center) is a policy advocacy, non-profit center, dedicated to fighting corruption, cronyism and its related problems at all levels of government.

We seek to open up governments and change the culture of governance by placing accountability, transparency and integrity at the heart of public policy and administration.

C4 Center works with public institutions, governments, political parties, and civil society organisations to build our vision of a corruption-free and open society.

MAJOR ADVOCACY AREAS

Political Financing and Cross-Border Corruption: We initiate political-legal research to publicly publishing reports on public mismanagement, push government agencies to be independent and accountable, and spearhead a good governance agenda programme.

Freedom of Information (FOI): We work towards embedding the culture of transparency in government, establishing a Federal FOI Law, increasing the proactive publication of data, strengthening whistleblower rights and aiding communities in using their rights to access public information.

Forest Governance and Sustainable Development: Recognising graft and abuse of public office within municipal councils and land administration, we put in effort to reach out to communities and to champion sustainable development as a anti-corruption issue.

Closing Civic Spaces: Authorities are increasingly narrowing civic spaces where citizens are free to exercise their right to demand accountability. We take on digital, alternative and innovative methods to engage with publcs to ensure their voices are heard – through board games, apps and websites.

International Initiatives: We work with the UNCAC Coalition and the Conference of State Parties in support of the UN Convention Against Corruption, and are driving asset recovery advocacy for laundered funds originating from Malaysia.
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