GIS-based Sustainability Assessment for Palm Oil Industry

Hakara Warid, Muhammad Asrol

Industrial Engineering Department, BINUS Graduate Program –Master of Industrial Engineering, Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, 11480, Indonesia

Abstract – The palm oil industry has its own issues, and one of them is related to sustainability issues. This paper aims to analyze and visualize the sustainability performance of the palm oil industry with Geographic Information System (GIS). The sustainability of the palm oil industry has three main dimensions, which are Economic, Social and Environmental. In this paper, 7 sustainability indicators were used in each of these dimensions. The results provide the sustainability performance measurement of the palm oil industry on several locations in Sumatra & Borneo islands, and have been visualized using the QGIS application.

Keywords – sustainability performance, palm oil industry, geographical information system.

1. Introduction

Palm oil is one of the raw materials that are required to produce variety of products that are commonly consumed by the public. That includes food, cosmetics, perfume, to vehicle fuel. Palm oil is considered to be more productive, when planted in same field size, compared to other commodities such as soybean and sunflower oil [1].

DOI: 10.18421/TEM114-02 https://doi.org/10.18421/TEM114-02

Corresponding author: Muhammad Asrol,

Industrial Engineering Department, BINUS Graduate Program –Master of Industrial Engineering, Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, 11480, Indonesia. Email: muhammad.asrol@binus.edu

Received:28 May 2022.Revised:16 August 2022.Accepted:08 September 2022.Published:25 November 2022.

© BYENCE-NO © 2022 Hakara Warid & Muhammad Asrol; published by UIKTEN. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 License.

The article is published with Open Access at https://www.temjournal.com/

In Indonesia, the oil palm industry continues to grow followed by the increase of the land size which is prepared for oil palm plantations. In 2019, the area size of oil palm plantations in Indonesia was 14,46 Million Ha and 14,59 Million Ha in 2020. In total, 26 provinces in Indonesia have oil palm plantations with Sumatra Island being the largest oil palm plantation in Indonesia at 7,663,246 Ha and followed by Borneo Island with a plantation area of 5,990,789 Ha [2].

In its development process, there are various issues faced by this industry, especially environmental issues. Some of the environmental issues faced by the palm oil industry are the reduction of natural forests area and the conversion of forest functions from natural into man-made plantation which are the cause of the reduction of wildlife, greenhouse gas emissions, and other issues such as social issues around the palm oil industry. The increasing demand for biofuels produced from palm oil in the European market also raises issues related to the negative impacts of oil palm production [1], [3].

Along with this information and issues, the palm oil industry in Indonesia is trying to make improvement by implementing various sustainability standards to resolve emerging issues. In this case, the palm oil industry in Indonesia refers to several standard criteria in terms of sustainability, which are the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) and Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil (ISPO). The RSPO is aimed to minimize the negative impact of the palm oil industry on the environment or communities around oil palm production area by focusing on 3 structures: prosperity, society and the planet, along with a total of 7 principles and 40 criteria in it [4]. On the other hand, ISPO has the same goals as the RSPO in terms of sustainable palm oil industry with the principles and criteria written in Articles 3 & 4 of the Regulation of the Minister of Agriculture (Permentan) RI No. 38 of 2020. ISPO has 7 principles & 30 criteria for plantation companies and 5 principles and 13 criteria for Planters [5].

Sustainability means sufficient resources for current needs without disturbing the needs of future generations [6]. Specifically, sustainability is a condition of balance, resilience and engagement that allows humans to meet their needs without exceeding the capacity of existing ecosystems, where the ecosystem will continue to regenerate to provide what is needed for humans without reducing biodiversity [7]. The United Nations (UN) has targeted the overall implementation of sustainable development goals (SDGs) by 2030 and this development has been implemented in various areas, such as the sustainability of a country or region, industrial development, companies, and cities [6], [8]. Based on the various issues of the palm oil industry that have been written before and referring to the idea of sustainability, this paper is aimed to analyze the sustainability of the palm oil industry, started by determining the dimensions and indicators of the industry. Then, the analysis will be conducted and the results will be visualized through a Geographic Information System (GIS), based on the dimensions and indicators performance value.

There are several advantages of using GIS. In terms of landslide disaster research by [9], GIS can help analyze various data such as geological data, soil elevation, rainfall, vegetation, land use and population density. In addition, the data update process can be conducted quickly and is a comprehensive tool so that the level of accuracy can be recorded properly. In addition, the use of GIS can help to make the sustainability changes that occur in some places, more understandable [10].

In terms of research, sustainability is a topic that continues to increase and is discussed in various fields. In addition, there is also a lot of literature on sustainability topic implemented into research. Sustainability has 3 main dimensions: economic, social and environmental [11]. The results of this research are addressed to relevant decision makers, to help develop some strategies to improve the sustainability of the palm oil industry.

2. Research Methods

The stages of the research can be seen in Figure 1. The process begins by determining the main dimensions and indicators in the palm oil industry. These parameters and indicators were obtained based on the literature review of previous research with topic of the palm oil industry. These parameters and indicators were then reidentified and used as part of this research.

After the dimensions and indicators are determined, the data collection process is carried out based on the operational conditions of PT. ABC (one of Indonesian palm oil company) and questionnaires given to respondents with a knowledge or work in palm oil industry. Then, the performance of each location is carried out based on the data obtained. The focus area of this research is plantation/palm oil which is part of the palm oil industry.



Figure 1. Overall Framework

2.1. Dimension & Indicator Determination

Based on several literatures and papers that discussed the sustainability indicators of the palm oil industry, the dimensions and indicators that will be used in this paper are as follows in Table 1.

Table 1.Sustainability Dimensions & Indicators

| Dimension | Code | Indicator | | | |
|-------------|------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | E1 | Cargo Loss | | | |
| | E2 | Cargo Quality | | | |
| | E3 | Field Productivity | | | |
| Economy | E4 | Average salary (in IDR) | | | |
| | E5 | Company's document validity | | | |
| | E6 | Worker's document validity | | | |
| | E7 | Company's procedure | | | |
| | S1 | Fatality rate while working | | | |
| | S2 | Fatality rate while not working | | | |
| | S3 | Incident rate | | | |
| Social | S4 | Worker's personal rights | | | |
| | S5 | Worker & local community's life | | | |
| | S6 | Work Safety | | | |
| | S7 | CSR | | | |
| | L1 | Waste management | | | |
| | L2 | Water consumption | | | |
| | L3 | Water contamination found | | | |
| Environment | L4 | Water contamination above | | | |
| | L5 | Soil Condition | | | |
| | L6 | Frequency of fires | | | |
| | L7 | Use of fire usage for land | | | |

2.2. Data Collection

The process of collecting data in this study will be divided to the primary and secondary data. Primary data is obtained by using the questionnaire and using the operational data of PT. ABC. The process of obtaining primary data begins with field observation at PT. ABC receive relevant data from the company. The questionnaire contains the question of operational data of oil palm companies and operational information that is required for the research. Qualitative data will be collected using a questionnaire method and given to experts/related parties who have a knowledge of the sustainability indicators used in this paper, or those who have a good background in the palm oil industry. The secondary data will be obtained from the results of the previous research with relevant topics.

2.3. Data Analysis

Indicator data that obtained will be calculated using the multi criteria analysis (MCA) method. This method is used in complex decision making to achieve predetermined goals. The criteria and subcriteria that used in this paper will be weighted according to the importance of these attributes and will be compared with other criteria [12].

In order to calculate the weight of the criteria in the study, a questionnaire survey method will be conducted with related experts. The results of the questionnaire survey will then be used to determine the weight of each criterion. These criteria will be divided into groups and assessed using a certain rating scale. These values are known based on the priority values of the criteria between one another and their relationship to the goals to be achieved [12]. Each criterion will then be examined using a pairwise comparison matrix which is described in Table 2 [12].

Table 2. Pairwise comparison matrix

| C | 1 | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Criteria | 1 | a12 | a13 | a14 |
| Criteria | a21 | 1 | a23 | a24 |
| Criteria | a31 | a32 | 1 | a34 |
| Criteria | a41 | a42 | a43 | 1 |

The value of a12 is the comparison value of the value of criterion 1 (row) with the value of criterion 2 (column). This comparison is conducted to find out the importance value between criterion 1 and criterion 2 [13], [14]. After the pairwise comparison matrix is completed, the priority value of each criterion will be compared between one correspondent and another respondent using the

geometric multiplicity method using the following equation:

Geometric Multiplicity = $\sqrt[n]{X_{1,1} \times X_{2,1} \times \dots \times X_{i,j}}$

With:

- $X_{i,j}$ = Value of row *i*, column *j* in matrix
- n^{\prime} = the quantity number of data

Then, the data processing process will be carried out using the normalization method and the each indicator are to be weighted to finally get the order of importance for each alternative that used in this research [13]. Normalization process will be conducted by finding the lowest and highest values of a data, and then calculations are carried out using the actual value of the data, with the following equation:

$$Normalization = \frac{Actual \, Value - Min \, Value}{Max \, Value - Min \, Value}$$

2.4. Visualization

Visualization stage with GIS (Geographic Information System) using the QGIS application will be conducted after the analysis process completed. Each location of the oil palm industrial area where the research placed will be depicted on a map. There is a scale used in the visualization process, ranging from red to green, as described in Table 3.

If the value of a location category is low or unsustainable, a scale color that tends to be red will appear. However, if the performance of oil palm is good or sustainable, it tends to be depicted in green. In the final stage, based on the results of the GIS, the actual conditions of sustainability of each place will be obtained as well as recommendations for practitioners.

| Table 2. Sustainability Scal | Table 2 | . Su | stainabi | ility | Scale |
|------------------------------|---------|------|----------|-------|-------|
|------------------------------|---------|------|----------|-------|-------|

| Ν | S | Scale | Category | Color & | |
|---|----------|-----------|---------------|----------|--|
| 1 | 0 | - <10 | Very | #ff0101 | |
| 2 | 10 | - <30 | Unsustainable | #ff7c01 | |
| 3 | 30 - <50 | | Less | #ffc001 | |
| 4 | 50 - <70 | | Quite | #ffff00 | |
| 5 | 70 - <90 | | Moderate | #ffff66 | |
| 5 | /0 | .90 | Sustainable | # IIII00 | |
| | | 90 to | | #ccff99 | |
| | 90 | 92 to | | #99ff99 | |
| 6 | s/d | 94 to | Sustainable | #00ff01 | |
| | 100 | 96 to | | #33cc33 | |
| | | 98 to 100 | | #009901 | |

3. Results and Discussions

The process begins by obtaining data from each respondent and calculating the weights by performing a pairwise comparison matrix, geometric multiplicity for each respondent and then normalizing each of these indicators. The example results of pairwise comparison matrix and geometric multiplicity from one of the location and dimension of these calculations are written in the following Table 4 and Table 5.

The next step is to divide each value in the table by the total in each column. The result data in matrix will be calculated as shown in Table 6.

Finally, priority of each indicator is then divided by the total that contained in Table 6, (example in Table 6 for E7 = 1.07) and divided by the total of the indicator itself (in this study, for E7 = 1.07/7 =0.153). The result of this calculation is the priority of each indicator, as shown in Table 7.

In this paper, the level of importance of each dimension: Economic, Social and Environmental, will be referenced from previous research conducted by [15], with the level of importance of each dimension of Sustainability of Palm Oil Industry Performance of Economic = 0.2770, Social = 0.3184 and Environment = 0.4046.

Table 3. Pairwise comparison matrix

| | E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | E5 | E6 | E7 |
|----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| E1 | 1.00 | 0.50 | 0.44 | 0.67 | 0.44 | 0.40 | 0.40 |
| E2 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 0.89 | 1.33 | 0.89 | 0.80 | 0.80 |
| E3 | 2.25 | 1.13 | 1.00 | 1.50 | 1.00 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| E4 | 1.50 | 0.75 | 0.67 | 1.00 | 0.67 | 0.60 | 0.60 |
| E5 | 2.25 | 1.13 | 1.00 | 1.50 | 1.00 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| E6 | 2.50 | 1.25 | 1.11 | 1.67 | 1.11 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| E7 | 2.50 | 1.25 | 1.11 | 1.67 | 1.11 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Table 4. Average of geometric multiplication

| Economy | E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | E5 | E6 | E7 |
|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| E1 | 1.00 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.96 | 0.85 | 0.84 | 0.83 |
| E2 | 1.14 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.95 |
| E3 | 1.14 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.95 |
| E4 | 1.04 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 1.00 | 0.89 | 0.87 | 0.86 |
| E5 | 1.17 | 1.03 | 1.03 | 1.13 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.98 |
| E6 | 1.19 | 1.04 | 1.04 | 1.14 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 0.99 |
| E7 | 1.20 | 1.05 | 1.06 | 1.16 | 1.03 | 1.01 | 1.00 |
| Sum | 7.88 | 6.91 | 6.92 | 7.59 | 6.72 | 6.63 | 6.56 |

Table 5. Matrix of indicator

| Eco. | E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | E5 | E6 | E7 | Sum |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| E1 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.89 |
| E2 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 1.01 |
| E3 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 1.01 |
| E4 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.92 |
| E5 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 1.04 |
| E6 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 1.06 |
| E7 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 1.07 |
| Sum | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 7.00 |

Table 6. Weight for each indicator

| Criteria | Weight | Criteria | Weight | Criteria | Weight |
|----------|--------|----------|--------|----------|--------|
| E1 | 0.127 | S1 | 0.152 | L1 | 0.145 |
| E2 | 0.145 | S2 | 0.142 | L2 | 0.145 |
| E3 | 0.144 | S3 | 0.148 | L3 | 0.143 |
| E4 | 0.132 | S4 | 0.139 | L4 | 0.145 |
| E5 | 0.149 | S5 | 0.133 | L5 | 0.137 |
| E6 | 0.151 | S6 | 0.150 | L6 | 0.139 |
| E7 | 0.153 | S7 | 0.136 | L7 | 0.145 |
| Total | 1.000 | Total | 1.000 | Total | 1.000 |

After getting the weight of each indicator for indicators E1 and E2, the calculation is continued by using operational data of PT ABC in period of January to April 2022. E1 focuses on the difference of the amount of goods/cargo received by the client/consignee. compared to the amount of goods/cargo sent from the plantation/location of origin. E2 focuses on the decrease/increase in the quality of the goods/cargo received by the client/goods recipient. compared to the value of the quality sent from the plantation/location of origin.

The calculation process for these two indicators is carried out separately compared to other indicators that using a questionnaire. First is to find the maximum and minimum values for each location data, and then the normalization process is carried out from the data as shown in Table 8.

As for other indicators, the performance value is based on the selection of answers of respondent to the questionnaire where each answer choice in each question has its own value with a scale of 20 to 100. The result of respondent response to sustainability performance at East Kalimantan is showed at Table 9.

Each value of these indicators from each respondent is being averaged to get the actual value of each indicator. Then normalization and multiplication by weights of each indicator are carried out with calculations that have been previously written in Tables 4 to Table 7. Finally, the value of each indicator at the location can be obtained as written in the following Table 10, Table 11, Table 12 and Table 13 below.

Table 7. E1 & E2 indicators calculation

| Jak Luay. | T | 055 | QUALITY | | | |
|---------------|--------|---------|---------|--------|--|--|
| Kalimantan | Ľ | 055 | MOIST | DIRT | | |
| Timur | Kg | % | Value | Value | | |
| Min | -300 | -3.097% | -2.680 | -5.090 | | |
| Max | 150 | 1.079% | 3.340 | 1.230 | | |
| Actual | -39.12 | -0.292% | -0.455 | -1.732 | | |
| Normalization | | 67,166 | 36,955 | 53,137 | | |

| Respondent | 1 | 2 |
|------------|----------------|----------------|
| Location | Jak Luay. East | Jak Luay. East |
| Location | Kalimantan | Kalimantan |
| E3 | 100 | 60 |
| E4 | 100 | 100 |
| E5 | 100 | 100 |
| E6 | 100 | 80 |
| E7 | 100 | 100 |
| S1 | 100 | 100 |
| S2 | 80 | 100 |
| S3 | 80 | 80 |
| S4 | 60 | 100 |
| S5 | 100 | 100 |
| S6 | 100 | 100 |
| S7 | 100 | 80 |
| L1 | 100 | 60 |
| L2 | 100 | 100 |
| L3 | 80 | 100 |
| L4 | 100 | 100 |
| L5 | 100 | 100 |
| L6 | 100 | 100 |
| L7 | 100 | 100 |

Table 9. Economy sustainability score

| Code | Min. | Max | Actual | Norm. | Weight | Score | |
|-----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|---------|--|
| E1 | -3.097% | -1.079% | -0.292% | 67.166 | 0.127 | 8.527 | |
| E٦ | -2.680 | 3.340 | -0.455 | 36.955 | 0.145 | 6 5 1 9 | |
| E2 | -5.090 | 1.230 | -1.732 | 53.137 | 0.145 | 0.318 | |
| E3 | 60 | 100 | 80 | 80 | 0.144 | 11.558 | |
| E4 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0.132 | 13.181 | |
| E5 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0.149 | 14.879 | |
| E6 | 80 | 100 | 90 | 90 | 0.151 | 13.569 | |
| E7 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 0.153 | 15.252 | |
| Total Nilai Kineria Ekonomi | | | | | | | |

Table 10. Social sustainability score

| Code | Min. | Max | Actual | Norm. | Weight | Score |
|-----------------------------------|------|-----|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| S1 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100.00 | 0.152 | 15.192 |
| S2 | 80 | 100 | 90 | 90.00 | 0.142 | 12.736 |
| S3 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80.00 | 0.148 | 11.819 |
| S4 | 60 | 100 | 80 | 80.00 | 0.139 | 11.156 |
| S5 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100.00 | 0.133 | 13.337 |
| S 6 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100.00 | 0.150 | 14.993 |
| S 7 | 80 | 100 | 90 | 90.00 | 0.136 | 12.248 |
| Total Social Sustainability Score | | | | | 91.480 | |

Table 11. Environment sustainability score

| Code | Min. | Max | Actual | Norm. | Weight | Score |
|--|------|-----|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| L1 | 60 | 100 | 80 | 80.00 | 0.145 | 11.618 |
| L2 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100.00 | 0.145 | 14.522 |
| L3 | 80 | 100 | 90 | 90.00 | 0.143 | 12.879 |
| L4 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100.00 | 0.145 | 14.522 |
| L5 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100.00 | 0.137 | 13.686 |
| L6 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100.00 | 0.139 | 13.916 |
| L7 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100.00 | 0.145 | 14.522 |
| Total Environment Sustainability Score 95. | | | | | 95.665 | |

Table 12. Final score

| Value | Weight | Overall Score |
|--------|-------------------------------------|---|
| | | |
| 83.483 | 0.405 | |
| 91.480 | 0.277 | 89.577 |
| 95.665 | 0.318 | |
| | Value 83.483 91.480 95.665 | Value Weight 83.483 0.405 91.480 0.277 95.665 0.318 |

This calculation process is carried out for each location in the research. After the overall calculation conducted and all value of sustainability performance from all locations has been obtained, then each score can be categorized with a predetermined scale written in Table 3. The results of the overall sustainability performance and its categories of one of the locations that calculated in this study are written in Table 14.

After all the sustainability value is obtained and each of the value is transformed into a category, it is finally can be visualized by using the QGIS application. The results of the visualization are as follows in Figure 2, Figure 3, Figure 4 and Figure 5.

Table 13. Categorized score

| Lokasi | Score | Category | |
|---------------|--------|----------------------|--|
| Jakluay. Kalt | tim | | |
| Overall | 87.813 | Moderate Sustainable | |
| Economy | 83.483 | Moderate Sustainable | |
| Social | 91.480 | Sustainable | |
| Environment | 95.665 | Sustainable | |



Figure 1. Overall performance visualization



Figure 2. Economy performance visualization



Figure 3. Social performance visualization



Figure 4. Environment performance visualization

4. Conclusion

In this paper an analysis of the sustainability performance of the palm oil industry was carried out in a several operational locations of palm oil companies that are located in Indonesia. The results of this study can provide insight to related parties or decision maker so that palm oil companies can make good strategies in terms of the sustainability of the palm oil industry in Indonesia. It should be noted that the weights of each indicator in each research will have such differences due to differences in opinions from experts and the indicators or parameter used in the research.

For future research, it can be continued by using other relevant indicators and apply in a real time GIS dashboard.

References

- [1]. Pratama, A. D. (2019). Post Truth Dalam Perseteruan Indonesia-Uni Eropa Mengenai Isu Kelapa Sawit [Post Truth in Indonesia-European Union Dispute Over Palm Oil Issue]. Jurnal Politica Dinamika Masalah Politik Dalam Negeri dan Hubungan Internasional, 10(2), 95-112.
- [2]. Badan Pusat Statistik. (2020). Statistik Kelapa Sawit Indonesia [Indonesian Oil Palm Statistics]. Badan Pusat Statistik / BPS-Statistics Indonesia. Retrieved from: <u>https://www.bps.go.id/</u> <u>publication/2021/11/30/5a3d0448122bc6753c953533/</u> <u>statistik-kelapa-sawit-indonesia-2020.html</u>. [accesed: 19 May 2022].
- [3]. Suwarno, W. (2019). The challenge of Indonesian diplomacy against palm oil discrimination. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hubungan Internasional*, *15*(2), 197-212.
- [4]. RSPO. (2018). RSPO Principles & Criteria Certification for the Production of Sustainable Palm Oil. Retrieved from: <u>https://rspo.org/resources/certification/rspo-principlescriteria-certification/rspo-principle-criteria-for-theproduction-of-sustainable-palm-oil-2018</u>. [accessed: 11 May 2022].
- [5]. Indonesia, K. P. R. (2020). Peraturan Menteri Pertanian Republik Indonesia Nomor 38 Tahun 2020 Tentang penyelenggaraan Sertifikasi Perkebunan Kelapa Sawit Berkelanjutan Indonesia. Retrieved from: <u>https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Home/Details/201269/per</u> mentan-no-38-tahun-2020. [accessed: 19 May 2022].
- [6]. Yani, M., Asrol, M., Hambali, E., Papilo, P., Mursidah, S., & Marimin, M. (2022). An Adaptive Fuzzy Multi-Criteria Model for Sustainability Assessment of Sugarcane Agroindustry Supply Chain. *IEEE Access*, 10, 5497-5517.
- [7]. Morelli, J. (2011). Environmental sustainability: A definition for environmental professionals. *Journal of environmental sustainability*, 1(1), 2.
- [8]. Buchori, I., & Sugiri, A. (2016). An empirical examination of sustainable metropolitan development in Semarang City, Indonesia. *Australian Planner*, 53(3), 163-177. https://doi.org/10.1080/07293682.2016.1151905.
- [9]. Kurnianto, F. A., Apriyanto, B., Nurdin, E. A., Ikhsan, F. A., & Fauzi, R. B. (2018). Geographic information system (GIS) application to analyze landslide prone disaster zone in Jember Regency East Java. *Geosfera Indonesia*, 2(1), 45-53.

- [10]. Alshuwaikhat, H. M., Abubakar, I. R., Aina, Y. A., Adenle, Y. A., & Umair, M. (2017). The development of a GIS-based model for campus environmental sustainability assessment. *Sustainability*, 9(3), 439.
- [11]. Lim, C. I., & Biswas, W. (2015). An evaluation of holistic sustainability assessment framework for palm oil production in Malaysia. *Sustainability*, 7(12), 16561-16587.
- [12]. Rosasco, P., & Perini, K. (2019). Selection of (green) roof systems: A sustainability-based multi-criteria analysis. *Buildings*, 9(5), 134.
- [13]. Plakas, K. V., Georgiadis, A. A., & Karabelas, A. J. (2016). Sustainability assessment of tertiary wastewater treatment technologies: a multi-criteria analysis. *Water Science and Technology*, 73(7), 1532-1540.
- [14]. Priangga, P., & Suryani, E. (2019). Decision Analysis of Giving Credit Using Pairwise Comparisons and Scoring Methods (Case Study: Bank XYZ). *IPTEK The Journal for Technology and Science*, 30(1), 1-6.
- [15]. Lim, C. I., & Biswas, W. K. (2018). Development of triple bottom line indicators for sustainability assessment framework of Malaysian palm oil industry. *Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy*, 20(3), 539-560. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10098-017-1453-7</u>.