



A Study of the Effectiveness of the Tourism Development Grand Plan (RIPPARKAB) Sumenep Regency for Coastal Area Potential Development

Tolib Effendi¹(✉) and Himawan Tri Yudha Perwira²

¹ Faculty of Law, Universitas Trunojoyo Madura, Bangkalan, Indonesia
te.effendi@trunojoyo.ac.id

² Faculty of Law, Universitas Darul Ulum, Lamongan, Indonesia

Abstract. Madura is a large island in the East Java region that has various potential for marine tourism, with a long coastline and abundant distribution of small islands. RIPPARKAB Sumenep has been prepared with the aim of improving the quality and quantity of tourism destinations while maintaining environmental and socio-cultural sustainability to encourage regional development and increase people's income. The formulation of the problems that will be studied in this research are: 1) Is the existence of RIPPARKAB Sumenep 2018–2025 effective in increasing the potential of coastal tourism in Sumenep Regency? and 2) What are the steps that must be taken by the Sumenep Regency Government to increase the potential of coastal tourism based on the evaluation of the effectiveness study of the 2018–2025 Sumenep RIPPARKAB? The research method in this paper is empirical research, in this study will be studied about the influence of regional regulations on tourism master plans in increasing tourism potential and taking an inventory of steps that must be taken by local governments to increase coastal tourism potential. The socio-legal approach is used by using a community approach in studying the problems that develop in the community. The existence of RIPPARKAB has not been effective enough in increasing the potential of coastal tourism caused by several factors, and efforts that can be made are by sharpening indicators so that they can be evaluated better in determining the effectiveness of RIPPARKAB on tourism potential, especially coastal areas.

Keywords: Effectiveness · Grand Plan · Potential Development · Tourism

1 Introduction

The Human Development Index (HDI) is a critical indicator for measuring success in the efforts to develop humans' quality of life. The HDI may determine the level of development conducted by a region or country. In Indonesia, this index provides strategic data not only as a measure of government performance, but also as a determinant of the allocation of the General Allocation Fund for a region [1].

© The Author(s) 2023

A. F. Wijaya et al. (Eds.): AICoBPA 2022, ASSEHR 764, pp. 732–742, 2023.

https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-090-9_58

At provincial and regency levels, East Java ranks the 15th on the HDI of Indonesia. Within the last decade, Surabaya Regency tops the HDI of East Java, while, contrarily, Sampang Regency occupies the bottom. As specified by the UNDP, measurement of the HDI is performed in the dimensions of a long and healthy life, knowledge, and a decent standard of living that include such indicators as poverty rate, employment rate, open unemployment rate, and income per capita, among others [1]. In addition to Sampang Regency, three other regencies in Madura are also among the ten regions with the lowest HDI scores in East Java.

Madura Island is one of the large islands off Java Island that still belongs to the territory of East Java Province. In Sumenep Regency alone, there are approximately 126 small islands scattered around. Being entirely bordered by the sea, Madura Island has an indisputable potential for coastal tourism. Every regency in Madura has nature tourism potential that needs to be optimized. However, the wealth of tourism in Madura does not stop at nature; Madura is also rich with historical, cultural, and religious tourism. Such tourism wealth perhaps is only a miniscule of the extensive tourism potential that remains unexplored massively. It requires constructive measures to manage and develop such potential in order to meet the goals of the central government that intends to strengthen local wisdom and cultures as the local riches of Indonesia that need preservation [2].

Based on the data from the Culture and Tourism Offices of the four regencies in Madura, there are a total of 77 tourist destinations in Madura that have acquired official licenses from the Culture and Tourism Offices, including 16 coastal tourist destinations and 18 religious tourist destinations. The tourist destinations in these two categories alone have accounted for 44% of the tourism potential in Madura. These data reveal that nearly half of the tourist destinations in Madura represent coastal and religious tourism. These two categories are differently conceptualized, hence needing two different tourism potential development concepts.

Of the 16 coastal tourist destinations in Madura, seven are situated in Sumenep Regency, five in Bangkalan Regency, two in Sampang Regency, and another two in Pamekasan Regency, all of which are officially registered with the Culture and Tourism Office of respective regency. Of them, Lon Malang Beach of Sampang Regency is the most frequented coastal tourist destination. Sumenep Regency as region with the highest coastal tourism potential of all regencies in Madura Island is unable to attract tourists to make the beaches there their priority destinations. The three tourist destinations with the most numbers of visitors in Sumenep Regency during the period 2017–2019 were 1) Asta Tinggi Tomb, with 23% of total visitors, 2) Asta Sayid Yusuf, with 17% of total visitors, and 3) Asta Panaongan, with 8% of total visitors to Sumenep Regency.

Of the four regencies in Madura, only Sumenep Regency has a Tourism Development Grand Plan (RIPPARKAB) as regulated under the Regional Regulation of Sumenep Regency No. 4 of 2018. Article 13 of the RIPPARKAB of Sumenep Regency stipulates the development of three tourist attractions, namely, a) nature tourist attractions, b) cultural tourist attractions, and c) manmade tourist attractions. Referring to the visit data of 2017–2019, the fact that potential coastal tourism as part of nature tourist attractions hardly attracts interest although it has become a priority in the tourism attraction development in Sumenep Regency leaves the regional government with an impotent task.

Indeed, the potential of nature tourism is widely open for increased local income. In 2021, the HDI score of Sumenep Regency was the third highest in East Java, with a growth rate of 0.91%, but overall, Sumenep Regency was still ranked the 32nd of 38 regencies/cities in East Java [3]. Therefore, the fostering efforts of the coastal tourism potential in Sumenep as one of the priority attractions in the RIPPARKAB of Sumenep Regency are expected to increase the per capita income and the HDI score of Sumenep Regency.

The RIPPARKAB of Sumenep Regency also stipulates the tourism development zoning in Sumenep, which includes eight Regency Tourist Destinations (RTDs) and 13 Regency Tourist Strategic Estates (RTSEs).

Based on Table 1, there are islands and coastal Tourist Strategic Estates in the regency. Therefore, considering that the RIPPARKAB of Sumenep Regency has entered its second stage, it is deemed necessary to conduct an effectiveness study of the RIPPARKAB to evaluate and enhance the coastal tourism potential as part of the Tourist Strategic Estates of Sumenep Regency.

This review is focused on the following two problems: 1) Is the RIPPARKAB of Sumenep Regency of 2018–2025 effective in enhancing the coastal tourism potential in Sumenep Regency? and 2) What steps must the Government of Sumenep Regency take to enhance the coastal tourism potential based on the evaluation of the effectiveness of the 2018–2025 RIPPARKAB of Sumenep Regency? This work aimed at 1) encouraging new policies for optimized tourism potential in Sumenep Regency, 2) improving the quality

Table 1. Data on the RTDs and RTSEs in Sumenep tourism development.

No	DPK	No	KSPK
1	Batang-Batang, Dungkek and the surrounding	1	Lombang and the surrounding
		2	Gili Iyang and the surrounding
2	Dasuk, Ambunten, Pasongsongan and the surrounding	3	Pantai Slopeng, Panaongan and the surrounding
3	Talango, Gili Genting and the surrounding	4	Asta Sayyid Yusuf, Gili Labag and the surrounding
		5	Gili Genting and the surrounding
4	Pragaan, Guluk-Guluk and the surrounding	6	Prenduan and the surrounding
		7	Guluk-guluk and the surrounding
5	Kota Sumenep, Kalianget and the surrounding	8	Kraton Sumenep, Asta Tinggi, Kalianget and the surrounding
6	Kepulauan Kangean, Sapeken and the surrounding	9	Arjasa, Kangean and the surrounding
		10	Sapeken and the surrounding
7	Pulau Ra'as, Sepudi and the surrounding	11	Ra'as and the surrounding
		12	Sepudi and the surrounding
8	Pulau Masalembu and the surrounding	13	Masalembu and the surrounding

and competencies of researchers at Universitas Trunojoyo Madura, and 3) encouraging the establishment of a research group to accommodate researchers of various scientific backgrounds to solve the problems in society.

Several prior research works reviewed the evaluations of the tourism grand plans of various regions. For instance, Rachmat Ashari evaluated the Regional Tourism Development Grand Plan (RIPPDA) of Bontang City, East Kalimantan, with an emphasis of the discussion in the evaluation stage. Somewhere else, Dwi Yuly Sulistyorini reviewed the Tourism Development Grand Plan of Banyuwangi Regency for the increase of the regency's locally derived income. Compared to the two previous research works above, this research certainly differs as it has a different research scope and a different research location.

2 Research Method

This research is a socio-legal research work that used an alternative approach to doctrinal studies into law [4]. This research studied the role of the regional regulation on tourism grand plan in enhancing tourism potential and inventorizing the steps the regional government must take to enhance coastal tourism potential. Socio-legal research uses a social approach in examining the problems arising in society.

The data collected in this research were primary data especially from empirical research that was directly conducted in society [5]. The methods employed in the collection of the primary data were interview, observation, and questionnaire methods. The location where the research was conducted was Sumenep Regency. Sumenep Regency was selected as the research location because it has the highest coastal tourism potential of all the regencies on Madura Island and because it is the only regency in Madura to have a RIPPARKAB.

The data collected were analyzed evaluatively, Fajar [5], where the researchers were to justify the research results obtained. In this research, the data collected were to be used to justify the significance of the effectiveness study of the RIPPARKAB of Sumenep of 2018–2025 to evaluate the effectiveness of the RIPPARKAB in enhancing coastal tourism potential.

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 The Effectiveness of the RIPPARKAB of Sumenep Regency of 2018–2025 in Enhancing Coastal Tourism Potential

The vision of local tourism development of Sumenep Regency is to render Sumenep Regency an excellent tourist destination that is cultured, sustainably competitive, and able to encourage local development for the welfare of the people. To realize this vision, four tourism development missions must be fulfilled, that is, by developing a) tourist destinations that are locally unique, safe, comfortable, interesting, and environmentally friendly, hence able to drive local development for the welfare of the people, b) effective, synergic, and responsible tourism marketing to increase the number of domestic and international visits, c) a tourism industry that is competitive, credible, able to

drive business partnerships, and responsible in terms of nature and sociocultural environments, and d) tourism institutionalization related to local government, private, and community organizations, human resources, regulations, and effective and efficient governance to encourage the development of tourist destinations that are excellent, cultured, competitive, and sustainable.

The vision and missions of local tourism development of Sumenep Regency are included in the RIPPARKAB of Sumenep Regency of 2018–2025 under the Regional Government of Sumenep Regency No. 4 of 2018. The RIPPARKAB is executed in three stages: stage I in the period 2018–2020, stage II in the period 2021–2022, and stage III in the period 2023–2025. The execution of the RIPPARKAB is to be evaluated or reviewed at least once every five years. According to the abovementioned, then, the execution of the tourism development of Sumenep Regency is currently in stage II, and an evaluation is set to be performed in 2023.

An evaluation process seeks something that is considered to be of value, which may take the form of information on production, process, or certain procedural alternatives. Such a notion is as cited by Rachmat Ashari from Worthen and Sanders.[7] Evaluation is one of the procedures to find out the success of a plan. It is used to measure whether or not a regulation is effective in achieving a planned goal.

The review conducted in this work was focused on measuring the effectiveness of the RIPPARKAB of Sumenep Regency in enhancing coastal tourism potential. Coastal tourism potential is used as a benchmark in the evaluation of the effectiveness of the RIPPARKAB as coastal tourism represents the nature tourism in Sumenep Regency. Sumenep Regency has 29 tourist destinations officially registered with the Culture and Tourism Office, 17 of which, or 58% of the tourism potential in Sumenep Regency, are nature tourist destinations. Of the 17 nature tourist destinations, 41% are coastal tourist destinations. Based on these data, coastal tourism makes up 41% of the nature tourism in Sumenep Regency besides cave and hill tourism.

Article 13 of the RIPPARKAB of Sumenep Regency stipulates that tourist attraction development should include a) nature tourist attractions, b) cultural tourist attractions, and manmade tourist attractions. Since Sumenep Regency has 58% nature tourism potential, it is only fitting that the tourist attraction development plan gives priority to nature tourist attractions over cultural tourist attractions and manmade tourist attractions.

The measurement of the effectiveness of the RIPPARKAB of Sumenep Regency in enhancing coastal tourism potential can be performed using several indicators that are established as limits. In most cases, indicators are to be found in the RIPPARKAB instrument itself, but if no instrument is available to serve as indicators, then a separate instrument is to be developed for the purpose of measuring effectiveness, which can be derived from field observations. The indicators included in the RIPPARKAB for the development of tourist attraction are identified by determining the direction of the tourist attraction initiation and development policy for driving tourist destination growth and local development. The strategy established is to develop tourist attractions that are not developed optimally, and the fulfilment is indicated by facilitation of basic facility and infrastructure planning and development at the premises of the tourist destinations, especially those that have not been developed optimally.

There are three stages of the strategy execution, namely stage I in 2020, stage II in 2021–2022, and stage III in 2023–2025. However, with the indicators established in the RIPPARKAB, it is difficult to measure the effectiveness of the RIPPARKAB in enhancing coastal area potential. The strategy for the development of tourist destinations in general, whether they be nature, cultural, or manmade tourist destinations, is to build basic facilities and infrastructures at the premises of the tourist destinations, especially those that are underdeveloped. Pertaining to the target achievement indicator, there is no standard as to which tourist destinations have not been optimally developed. Besides, there are discrepancies in the establishment of tourist destinations based on the Tourism, Culture, Youth, and Sports Office (Disparbudpora) of Sumenep Regency and the RIPPARKAB. According to Disparbudpora, Sumenep Regency has 29 official tourist destinations, while according to the RIPPARKAB, there are 13 Regency Tourist Strategic Estates (RTSEs), each of which has varied Tourist Attractions (TAs), with a total of 13 RTSEs and 99 TAs.

The measurement of the achievement of the indicators has faced several obstacles: there is no clear information as to development progress and amount of development, whether a tourist destination has not been developed optimally is not clearly established, and it is not clear as to whether to use the TAs data of the RIPPARKAB or the official tourist destinations data of the Disparbudpora of Sumenep Regency. These obstacles are addressed by limiting the tourist destinations measured to those that are released by the Disparbudpora of Sumenep Regency. The data referred to here were the lowest number of visits data of Sumenep Regency within the period 2017–2019, keeping in mind that the first-stage evaluation was performed in 2020 and that the second-stage evaluation was performed in 2022. Based on these data, the tourist destinations with visit percentages less than 2% within the period 2017–2019 are presented Table 2.

Thirteen of 29 tourist destinations had visit percentages less than 2% during the period 2017–2019, meaning that 44% of tourist destinations in Sumenep Regency were weak in attracting visitors. Of the 13 tourist destinations, eight were nature tourist destinations and four were culture tourist destinations. Hence, almost all of those tourist destinations were a priority in the development of tourist attractions according to the RIPPARKAB. Accordingly, the indicator of the attainment of the RIPPARKAB should be the development of basic facilities and infrastructures at the 13 underdeveloped tourist destinations above. The attainment indicator is the construction of basic facilities and infrastructures as well as increases in the numbers of visitors after those basic facilities and infrastructures are in place.

Based on the indicator above and based on the numbers of visitors recorded for the years 2017–2019, six tourist destinations were on an upward trend for the visitor counts, four were on a downward trend, and three were unmeasurable in their trend as they were not opened until 2019. These data revealed that building basic facilities and infrastructures at underdeveloped tourist destinations was not necessarily followed by increases in the visitor counts, as shown by four tourist destinations dropping in the visitor count trend in the period from 2017 to 2019.

Another indicator constructed in this work is the measurement of community perceptions, whether they be the perceptions of the Sumenep community, the perceptions of the Madurese community, or the perceptions of communities outside Madura Island. This

Table 2. Tourist destinations in Sumenep regency with < 2% visit percentages in 2017–2019

No	Tourist destinations	Number of visitors				%
		2017	2018	2019	Total	
1	Badur Beach	13.760	12.349	22.160	48.269	1.3
2	Asta Jokotole	8.316	7.109	28.894	44.319	1.2
3	Wisata Batu Kapur	12.939	10.319	12.398	35.656	1
4	Asta K. Faqih	8.323	5.663	10.191	24.177	0.7
5	Asta Katandur	6.216	7.473	8.955	22.644	0.6
6	Gili Iyang	7.666	5.695	4.840	18.201	0.5
7	Situs Batugong	3.399	5.735	5.917	15.051	0.4
8	Asta Gumuk	7.311	935	1.770	10.016	0.3
9	Wisata Telaga Kirmata	-	-	7.184	7.184	0.2
10	Wisata Bukit Kalompek	-	-	7.116	7.116	0.2
11	Situs Benteng	2.484	2.081	1.111	5.676	0.2
12	Wisata Sarkampong	-	-	3.758	3.758	0.1
13	Rumah Kasur Pasir	527	791	1.773	3.091	0.1

perception measurement was conducted involving 350 respondents, including 50 respondents from Sumenep, 200 respondents domiciled on Madura Island except Sumenep, and 100 respondents from outside Madura Island, with an average age of 24 years. Of the 350 respondents, 61% had visited Sumenep Regency at some point in time, and of the remaining 39% who never visited Sumenep Regency, 56% were domiciled on Madura Island. These data unveil an unfavorable condition because the respondents who never visited the tourist destinations in Sumenep Regency (56%) were from three other regencies in Madura, namely, Bangkalan, Sampang, and Pamekasan.

The data collected also showed the locations visited in Sumenep Regency. The places visited by visitors to Sumenep Regency (61% of all respondents) in the order from the most frequently visited were 1) Asta Tinggi Tomb (29%), 2) Lombang Beach (25%), 3) Jami Mosque of Sumenep (23%), 4) Asta Sayid Yusuf (13%), and 5) Sembilan Beach (13%). These questionnaire-based perception data supported the visit data provided by the Disparbudpora of Sumenep Regency, according to which Asta Tinggi Gomb was the most frequently visited destination and Asta Sayid Yusuf was also among the most frequently visited.

Other questionnaire results that could serve as important data for the RIPPARKAB evaluation were that the three locations or types of tourist destinations those who never visited the tourist destinations in Sumenep Regency most desired to visit were 1) cultural tourist destinations (61%), 2) coastal tourist destinations (45%), and 3) culinary tourist destinations (44%). The sum of these percentages exceeded 100% because the respondents were allowed to choose more than one type of tourist destinations. Finally, the questionnaire results unveiled the top three sources from which respondents who visited the

tourist destinations in Sumenep Regency gained knowledge, namely, 1) peers/relatives (59%), 2) social media (47%), and 3) the government's official website (13%). As was the case with the types of tourist destinations most often visited by visitors, the sum of percentages exceeded 100% because the respondents could have more than one choice.

Based on the analysis of the questionnaire results, the main tourist destinations chosen by those who were visiting or would be visiting Sumenep Regency were history- or culture-themed tourist destinations. Nature tourism was a second choice, leading it to the government's priority to improve nature tourism potential, in this case coastal tourism, as planned under the RIPPARKAB. Tourist destination information dissemination or publication process also supported the introduction of the tourism potential in Sumenep Regency. Fifty-six percent of respondents domiciled anywhere in Madura other than Sumenep never visited Sumenep. This should certainly be a consideration for the Government of Sumenep Regency to engage other local governments in Madura in a cooperation to improve the tourism potential in Madura.

The results of the evaluation of the RIPPARKAB's effectiveness in improving coastal tourism potential showed that the RIPPARKAB was ineffective due to the following factors: 1) the indicators in the RIPPARKAB are unmeasurable, so the policies and strategies implemented missed the target and 2) there are a number of other factors in the improvement of coastal tourism potential than the facility and infrastructure development factor, one of which is tourism potential information publication through various digital and non-digital platforms that can reach various community segments.

3.2 Steps to Improving Coastal Tourism Potential Based on the Results of the Evaluation of the Effectiveness Study of the 2018–2025 RIPPARKAB of Sumenep Regency

The scope of the RIPPARKAB arrangement is as follows: 1) tourist destination development; 2) tourism marketing development; 3) tourism industry development; and 4) tourism institution development. Based on the evaluation results with the indicators as set out in the RIPPARKAB, the tourist destination development process is undertaken involving regency tourism development (RTDs and RTSEs), tourist attraction development, tourism accessibility development, and development of public infrastructures, public facilities, and tourism facilities. This work did not evaluate the entire scope of the RIPPARKAB, but it did see that the end point of the RIPPARKAB is to improve the quality and quantity of tourist destinations while still maintaining environmental as well as sociocultural preservation to drive local development and the people's income.

The indicators of each strategy are not discussed in detail due to their vastness. Therefore, in the earlier part of this work some simple indicators were developed by taking part of the tourism development scope, that is, tourist attraction development, which in this case is the development of nature (coastal) tourism, and measuring it using the community's perceptions of the tourism in Sumenep Regency.

Based on that instrument, the RIPPARKAB was found to be not sufficiently effective in improving coastal tourism potential due to the following factors: 1) the indicators set out in the RIPPARKAB are unmeasurable, leading to the policies and strategies implemented missing the target and 2) there are numerous other factors in the improvement of coastal tourism potential than the facility and infrastructure development factor, one

of which is tourism potential information publication via various digital and non-digital platforms that can reach various community segments.

Such factors in RIPPARKAB's ineffectiveness in improving coastal tourism potential can be anticipated gradually with the employment of some steps and/or procedures. First, as previously stated, the indicators in the RIPPARKAB are unmeasurable, so the policies and strategies implemented could not reach the target. For instance, in tourist attraction development, the indicator established is to determine the direction of tourist attraction initiation and development policy to encourage tourist destination growth and local development. The strategy that is set is to develop tourist attractions that are not developed optimally, and the strategy fulfilment is indicated by facilitation of basic facility and infrastructure planning and development at the premises of the tourist destinations, especially those that have not been optimally developed. To measure the attainment of the RIPPARKAB target, a tick box is provided on the side of evaluation year. The tick mark given indicates that the strategy has been executed, but there is no indicator as to the measurement, whether it has been executed at several tourist destinations and whether it has been executed at all or some TAs with sub-optimal criterion.

The indicators are unmeasurable, and, thus, it cannot be evaluated well. Therefore, the attainment target in stages I, II, and III only has the status of being executed. The evaluation of the implementation of the strategy established cannot be measured. This unclear indicator establishment has an effect on the measurement of the implementation and effectiveness of the RIPPARKAB. The means of measuring attainment is data, and the data of the success of tourism potential improvement can be clearly measured with the increases in the numbers of visitors to featured tourist destinations.

In this research, the featured destinations referred to previously were coastal tourist destinations, with considerations as described above. Based on the data from the Disparbudpora and the community's perceptions, coastal tourist destinations had not been the main tourist destinations in Sumenep Regency despite their being priority in the nature tourist attraction development. A clear indicator in the RIPPARKAB by appointing one or a number of priority tourist destinations according to some reasonable considerations will make it convenient to measure the success and attainment of the RIPPARKAB in the attempt to improve certain tourism potential.

Second, as revealed by the results of the community's perception questionnaire survey, the tourism information publication or tourism marketing factor is also less than optimal. Tourism marketing development is part of the scope of the RIPPARKAB, which means that it is also included in the tourism development plan of Sumenep Regency. The direction of the tourism marketing development is as follows: 1) developing the region as a featured destination for international and domestic markets; 2) securing the mass tourist market segment and developing the market niche segment to optimize tourist destination development; 3) improving, developing, and securing the local tourism image as tourist destinations that are safe, comfortable, competitive, and sustainable; and 4) developing integrated, synergic, and sustainable marketing partnerships.

The policy direction above can be fulfilled using the following strategies: 1) creating tourism perceptions and identities for local tourism; 2) taking advantage of mass media and local, national and international institutions in tourism marketing; 3) building human

resources in the tourism marketing field; 4) improving marketing and promotion to support tourist destination development; 5) improving marketing and promotion acceleration to increase the number of visits; 6) fostering tourist mobility acceleration; 7) improving the region's image as a tourist destination; 8) developing and securing the local tourism position; 9) developing consumer rights protection programs; 10) increasing media presence in enhancing the positive image of local tourism; 11) developing promotional synergy between local tourism stakeholders; 12) developing responsible marketing towards the community, environmental resources, and tourists; and 13) developing marketing communication strategies in a clearly graduated manner.

The indicators under the RIPPARKAB for the attainment of the strategies to meet the tourism marketing development policy direction above have been developed in great detail, but as with other indicators, they are unmeasurable. For instance, the strategy to foster tourist mobility acceleration, the program indicator to measure attainment is to intensify tourism promotion and marketing programs based on community meetings, journalists meetings, school alumni meetings, and religious and community figures meetings. The second indicator is to intensify tourism promotion and marketing programs for adolescents and children. The measurement of these indicators is based on the activity implementation. These indicators are unmeasurable in terms of their impacts on the increase of visit count; hence, the success of the strategies cannot be measured against the indicators.

4 Conclusion

The RIPPARKAB is ineffective in improving coastal tourism potential due to the following factors: 1) the indicators in the RIPPARKAB are unmeasurable, leading to the strategies and policies implementation missing the target and 2) there are other factors in the improvement of coastal tourism potential than the facility and infrastructure development factor, one of which is tourism potential information publication through various digital and non-digital platforms that can reach various community segments.

The effort one may perform is to sharpen the indicators so that the evaluation for the purpose of determining the effectiveness of the RIPPARKAB in improving tourism potential, especially in coastal areas, can be conducted better.

Acknowledgment. Our gratitude is due to the Research and Community Service Institution of Universitas Trunojoyo Madura for funding this research and the opportunity to be of greater benefit through publication in a scientific journal.

References

1. Statistik, B.P.: Indeks pembangunan manusia. Retrieved Februari. 18, (2020).
2. Arifin, S.: Digitalisasi Pariwisata Madura. *J. Komun.* 11, 53–60 (2017).
3. Mansur, A.H., Rahman, M., Tang, M.: Peningkatan Indeks Pembangunan Manusia (IPM) Melalui Pendekatan Pendidikan Responsif Gender di Kabupaten Sumenep. *FIKROTUNA J. Pendidik. dan Manaj. Islam.* 15, 2222–2241 (2022).

4. Bedner, A.W., Irianto, S., Otto, J.M., Wirastrri, T.D.: *Kajian Sosio-Legal*. Denpasar: Pustaka Larasan. (2012).
5. Fajar, M., Achmad, Y.: *Dualisme Penelitian Hukum Normatif & Empiris*, Penerbit. Pustaka Pelajar, Yogyakarta. (2013).

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

