

Comments on  
**SCRIBAL CONSULTANCY'S SECOND INTERIM REPORT**  
The Institutional Development Plan

This report is generally quite good, in both its recommendations and supporting logic. Several items need **emphasizing**, but a couple are **unacceptable**.

**Page 10**, re Min. Tourism, it needs to be clear that Forestry and Natl Parks are the final arbiters in the Mgt of the Gdns. If by error Tourism has been given the money to fund the Gdns Plan, the error should not be compounded by giving Tourism a critical role in execution. In fact, one can make a good case for the present funding arrangement to be modified so that Agric & Parks are the funding recipients, not Tourism, to eliminate the administrative and technical bottlenecks involved (eg Forestry personnel seconded to Tourism). The current arrangement is **unacceptable**.

**Pg 11, item 2.3**, the Board should be "independent" but definitely "with ultimate responsibility (ie authority) residing in the Min of Agric..." That needs to be **emphasized**.

**Pg 28, 5.3.3: Solid and liquid waste disposal – It must be *emphasized* that an interim plan for this needs to be given *super urgent attention* - STAT.**

**Pg 28, 5.3.3 #8:** Much of this nursery development should be off Gdns, eg at GrdBay or Layout Ctr, where production will take place, with only minimal depot type facilities at Gdns where customers can pick up/buy plants, but not where the plants are actually produced. The real estate in the Gdns is too limited and too valuable compared with Grd Bay and Layout. **Nursery development should NOT be in the Gdns.**

**Pg 35, 5.7:** Re **dual pricing arrangement. The argument is sound.** Locals must understand that the Gdns is a valuable asset and we have to be prepared to support and maintain it financially. We need to implement this ASAP, for enhanced income and traffic control; but it has to be done diplomatically and sensitively; even if in the beginning there is a zero price for locals. **But locals must know that this is coming before too long; again, even if at a much reduced price.**

**Pg 37:** Event Management: All good points, but the type of event must be scrutinized to eliminate events that are destructive to Gdns plants and facilities. In fact, Agric should develop a list of acceptable functions **and** one of **unacceptable** functions, so admin time is not wasted dealing with unacceptable requests. In addition, the waste issue must be resolved unambiguously, with Gdns taking the responsibility for providing these services and charging the organizers for these facilities.

**Pg 41: 7.3.1** The concluding para is absolutely correct. It is an error for an economy to depend exclusively on eco-tourism with its small market, low occupancy rates, and with several other significant players in that field with much better facilities. In that regard, **Bullets #2&3 are particularly appropriate.**

**Pg 45, 7.4.1. & 7.4.3:** Product and product quality cannot be **emphasized** enough; so also should effective marketing; and that applies to the Gdns product as well.

**Pg 46, 7.4.4:** The report says, "... enhance the accommodation sector, not necessarily with well-known large hotel chains .." **However, one would argue just the opposite - we desperately need a large hotel from a well-known hotel chain.** It will put Dca's tourist industry in dynamic equilibrium - with aggressive advertising, new products and services, return visitors for smaller hotels, upgraded management practices defusing thru tourist sector, etc, etc. **A large hotel from a well-known hotel chain is a must.**

**Pg 46, 7.4.5:** We definitely need tourist industry training, but that should be accommodated **within our current tertiary educational structure**, not by creating a separate Tourism Training Institute, unless this is an institute within our Dca State Col structure. A separate Institute is **unacceptable**.

**Davison Shillingford**  
August 2006