

MSIA HARDTALK 12/2026

**BICARA PANEL PENILAI SIA (PART 1):
PEMANTAPAN METODOLOGI DAN
PENDEKATAN KAJIAN SIA**

REGISTER NOW

MODERATOR

DR. AZFIZAN AZIZ
PENGURUS JAWATAN KUASA LATIHAN
DAN PEMBANGUNAN PROFESIONAL
AHLI PROFESIONAL MSIA A028

DR. MOHD SHAHWAHID HJ. OTHMAN
SPEAKER/PANEL 1
MSIA EXCO
AHLI PROFESIONAL MSIA NO A014

DR. KUPPUSAMY SINGARAVELLOO
SPEAKER/PANEL 2
MSIA EXCO
AHLI PROFESIONAL MSIA NO A010

PROF. DR. AZAMI ZAHARIM
SPEAKER/PANEL 3
PENGARAH PERUNDING TAMADUN TERAS SDN BHD
AHLI PROFESIONAL MEMBER A024

Rabu
29 April, 2026 2.30P.M.-4.00 P.M. ZOOM

TERBUKA KEPADA AGENSI-AGENSI
KERAJAAN, PEMAJU/PENGERAK
PROJEK DAN PERUNDING SIA

Pembayaran penuh perlu dibuat kepada "Pertubuhan Penilaian Impak Sosial
Malaysia" melalui online transfer sebelum 28hb April 2026 :

ACCOUNT NO.
5621 5100 7152
Pertubuhan Penilaian
Impak Sosial Malaysia

Imbas QR untuk mendaftar

Bayaran: Ahli MSIA Bukan Ahli MSIA

Kod MFI051
Hubungi Cik Hafizah di talian 013-2532479.

siamalaysia@gmail.com www.msiamy.org Malaysia Association of Social Impact Assessment



MSIA Reading Series No. 31

SIA EVALUATION PANEL DISCUSSION (PART 1): STRENGTHENING OF SIA STUDY METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH

by

**Mohd Shahwahid H.O.¹, Kuppusamy Singaravelloo², Azami Zaharim³
& Azfizan Aziz⁴**

¹ Teaching Fellow, Universiti Putra Malaysia's School of Business and Economics; Fellow, Academy of Science Malaysia (FASc); Director, MSR Inspire Sdn. Bhd.; Registered PLANMalaysia SIA Evaluator and Consultant SIA 019/2022; MSIA Professional Member A014; MSIA EXCO member and Chairperson of Publication Committee.

² Registered PLANMalaysia SIA Evaluator and Consultant SIA 021/2022; MSIA Professional Member A010; MSIA Treasurer and Chairperson of Membership Committee.

³ Honorary Professor UKM, UNISEL, UTHM and UMK, Director Perunding Tamadun Teras Sdn Bhd, Pengerusi Pertubuhan Penyelidikan Sosial & Komuniti, Registered PLANMalaysia SIA Evaluator and Consultant SIA041/2022, MSIA Professional Member A024.

⁴ Registered PLANMalaysia SIA Evaluator and Consultant SIA 045/2022; MSIA Professional Member A028; Chairperson, Training and Professional Development Committee MSIA; IJF Planning PLT.

1. Introduction

This MSIA Hard Talk deliberation revolves around obtaining the opinions from three senior MSIA Professional Members, who have served in many PLANMalaysia SIA Evaluation Panels at both Federal and State levels on the following matters:

- (a) The level of achievement regarding methodology and research approaches in Social Impact Assessment (SIA) Reports prepared by consultants.
- (b) The specific technical problems and issues occurring within SIA reports prepared by consultants, along with proposed solutions/remedies to overcome them.
- (c) In the Question & Answer Session, the invited speakers are given further opportunities to respond to questions and inquiries from the participants with regards to the common issues faced by consultants in their SIA reports, including those often raised during the PLANMalaysia SIA report evaluation meetings.

2. Level of achievement regarding methodology and research approaches in Social Impact Assessment (SIA) Reports prepared by consultants

2.1 Dr Mohd Shahwahid Haji Othman

Overall, there have been vast improvements in SIA Reporting. Previously assessed reports show the following:

- (a) During the process of scoping involving the identification of the potential impacts of proposed project:
 - (i) a checklist of the social impact variables and social change process variables was not provided. Instead, only the issues and potential impacts were listed and described. Nowadays, consultants have a checklist of the identified issues and potential impacts that were categorised into the relevant social impact variables and social change process variables.
- (b) In the process of projection and evaluation of impact significance scores of proposed projects:
 - (i) impacts were not recorded, projected and evaluated for all development phases. Project development phases may involve – the planning, construction and operation phases. Nowadays, consultants are more diligent and have outlined and computed the impact significance scores for each of the project development phases. In certain projects, a fourth phase may be necessary, i.e. in cases of project abandonment in response to concerns raised by affected parties during the public engagement activities.
 - (ii) there was tendency before of computing significance scores for negative impacts only and ignoring that for positive impacts. Nowadays, the need for positive impacts is acknowledged and consultants have computed these significance scores considering the equal importance of the benefits of the proposed project to affected stakeholders.
 - (iii) Furthermore, in the projection and evaluation of impacts, consultants have used mean scores of impact severities and probabilities of

occurrence in impact significance score calculations. Nowadays, there is already a common understanding that the type of data collected on the scale measurements of severity and probabilities are ordinal and not ratio scales. Hence, median scores have to be used and these have been adhered to by all consultants.

- (c) Previously, the Social Impact Management Plans (SIMPs) of the proposed project:
- (i) have been prepared mainly for negative impacts. Perhaps, this occurred with the belief that mainly the negative impacts were the main concerns and they require mitigation measures.
 - (ii) in terms of monitoring, many SIMPs requested various government agencies to conduct the monitoring tasks. This has made many agencies uneasy as they have many other tasks to undertake and may not have sufficient staffing and time to monitor the many new development projects being approved for implementation.
 - (iii) have not organised the SIMPs by phases of development of the project, making it less distinct and perhaps difficult for monitoring of the mitigations to be undertaken.

More recently, SIMPs are being prepared for both negative and positive impacts and by phases of project development, by consultants. Further, in terms of mitigation measures, project proponents and their contractors have been assigned to undertake the monitoring tasks themselves, as part of the policy of Self-Monitoring being promoted by PLANMalaysia.

2.2 Dr Kuppusamy Singaravelloo

It is important that being a panel member to talk the same way we profess. Furthermore, some of us are also MSIA's trainers, thus walking the talk must be seen to be practiced consistently. Dr Kuppusamy has been a panel member for quite some time and has had the experience of evaluating one report which was only approved after the fifth sitting; and another from a particular state at which the consultant submitted a report which was about 30 pages thick. The latter did not even refer to the Second edition Manual (2018). However these were some years ago.

When the headquarters of the Town and Country Planning Department was at Jalan Cenderasari, Dr Kuppusamy stated that the Head of SIA/R & D Unit then Dr Alias who is now the Director General of the Department, pressed on panel members to assist the department to ensure the reports submitted are of good standard, and the panellists are to evaluate the reports thoroughly. Since then, a lot have been seen in the quality of reports, and that reports have witnessed a lot of improvement in its quality. It is hard to hear now of any report being rejected, or being presented more than twice.

2.3 Prof. Dr. Azami Zaharim

Over the years of SIA report submissions to PLANMalaysia, the quality of the SIA reports has improved. This SIA technical forum arranged by MSIA in this Hard Talk

served as a high-level strategic dialogue between academic experts and field practitioners, aiming to refine further the standards of social reporting. The session centred on the necessity of balancing theoretical rigour with practical application, with panelists identifying a common divide: while academic panels often emphasize theory, consultants prioritize field utility. It is concluded that a successful report must bridge this gap by strictly adhering to the "8 standard chapters" while ensuring the content remains an authentic reflection of the community.

3. Specific technical problems and issues occurring within SIA reports prepared by consultants, along with proposed solutions/remedies to overcome them.

3.1 Dr Mohd Shahwahid Haji Othman

Despite the improvements observed, there are lingering technical problems and issues that consultants are still facing in the **SIA reports** prepared and presented to PLANMalaysia SIA Report Evaluation Panels. These problems and issues are highlighted below along with proposed solutions and remedies to overcome them.

- (a) Although the write ups on scoping have improved, they are still technical and problems issues in the SIA reports prepared by consultants.
 - (i) There are insufficient descriptions on the sources of information on how the issues and potential impacts have been derived from. Consultants are recommended to provide the processes involved in obtaining the lists of issues and potential impacts of the proposed development project by describing the initial public engagements made in terms of:
 - How the issues and potential impacts are obtained? Are these information and inputs obtained from site visits and interviews, or a review of the literature, or from analysis of minutes of meetings such as from Terms of Reference Adequacy Check (TORAC) presentations as organised by the Department of the Environment during the preliminary environmental impact assessment (EIA) meeting to endorse the potential issues and impacts to investigate by the EIA consulting team that have to include a socio-economic analysis consultant.
 - Who among the stakeholders are engaged? Do they include responsible and reliable direct representatives of residential and business communities such as the village headman or business association committee members or representatives of political and non-governmental organisations? It is essential to also meet with officers of technical agencies having responsibilities and interests in managing the surrounding areas where the proposed project are located.
 - Information on when and where the public engagements are undertaken are also relevant as these information would raise the validity and believability of the issues and potential impacts reported in scoping report.
 - (ii) In several SIA reports, a checklist of the social impact variables and social change process variables with the relevant issues and potential impacts

were provided but cross-tabulated with the ZOI and stakeholders. This indeed is the social impact matrix. The irony is this cross-tabulated matrix is provided too early on in the scoping reporting section, after just describing a checklist of the issues and potential impacts. Yet, at this stage of reporting the write up on the ZOI and detailed identification of stakeholders.

It is recommended that the cross-tabulated matrix of social impact variables and social change process variables with the ZOI and stakeholders should be delayed until the full description of the ZOI and stakeholders have been completed later on in the scoping process.

- (iii) The identification of all relevant stakeholders is enormously important which is not taken into consideration by many consultants. It is recommended that the consultants should include the various classified stakeholders:
- Affected group that have the potential to receive direct impacts,
 - Interested parties not physically close to the project site but have an interest or responsibility for the social and welfare of the local community
 - Stakeholders in one way or another whose livelihood or interests are affected, and.
 - Relevant Government agencies that have jurisdiction over the implementation of the project and able to influence the direction of a development project.
- (iv) In some SIA reports, consultants have left out including the Authority – Interests Quadrant. The listing of stakeholders in each of the quadrants are essential, as it would provide suggestions which stakeholders to be given ample attentions. Stakeholders who are in the
- High Authority – High Interest Quadrant;
 - Low Authority – High Interest Quadrant;

Special attention has to be given to these stakeholders so that being potentially affected, their concerns have to be given considerations.

- (b) In projection and evaluation of impacts, a few consultants have provided and reported the probability of occurrence level of impacts (P). Yet the source of the probability of occurrence level information is never provided. It became suspicious when there are no questions asking the level of probability of occurrence of impacts in the questionnaire used during the survey. Upon inquiry by the PLANMalaysia SIA Report Evaluation Panellists, the response given was that the probability levels were from consultants' own judgement. This is not well accepted, given that there were opportunities to obtain such information directly from the respondents during the stakeholder community surveys, and during the series of focus group discussion (FGD) sessions undertaken.

The consultant is recommended to either conduct a re-survey using a complete questionnaire. Or at least conduct a special FGD inviting the stakeholders involved in the previous FGDs to be given a special presentation

on the impact frequency findings from the previous survey and then conduct a Delphi Technique discussion to obtain the probability of occurrence levels for each impact parameter

- (c) Also, in projection and evaluation of impacts, there were many cases of expected impact significance score calculations using a simple average of median of severity and probability of occurrences of overall information from survey respondents and FGD participants, not a weighted average of median scores of all stakeholders. Yet, the median score of severity and probability of occurrences of different stakeholder groups, locations of the zones of influence (ZOI) and sources of data collected would vary. These variations are not sufficiently acknowledged if a simple average of median values of the severity and probability of occurrences are used. Nowadays many consultants have begun to evaluate and calculate the expected impact significance scores using a weighted average of median scores of all stakeholders using
- (i) weights for information gathered from questionnaire survey, focus group discussion (FGD) and from in depth interviews
 - (ii) weights for FGD participant's categories from resident, business and Government representatives
 - (iii) weights for respondent's categories during questionnaire survey - resident versus business and
 - (iv) weights for inputs obtained from direct versus indirect zone of influence (ZOI).
- (d) Recent presentations by certain consultants have further expanded the reporting on SIMPs of the proposed project. The SIMPs are not only provided separately for both positive and negative impacts, and by the phases of project development (planning, construction and operation) but also have been further separated by the monitoring parties. These SIMPs have been separated into –
- (i) project proponents and their contractors under the self-monitoring mechanism; and by government agencies such as local authorities. This is an innovation which is useful for the purpose of verifications of compliance by the project proponents.

3.2 Dr Kuppusamy Singaravelloo

Of late, as a non-town planner, it was found that the first three chapters in most SIA reports are already quite comprehensive.

(a) Risk assessment

The variables in the formula of risk assessment depends very much on median measures. Unfortunately, the median calculations are still found to be incorrect in some reports.

- (i) There have been some consultants who have assigned median values on each issue after assuming post mitigation measures. This is simply incorrect because no one could guarantee that all mitigation measures will be carried out by the project proponent. In other words, the median value to be

assigned should be an assessment of what it would be without any mitigation measures, i.e. current scenario.

- (ii) There has also been attempts to avoid assigning '5' against some critical issues (such as land acquisition), with the view that in any case severity being '5' x probability being '5' would produce a score of 25, i.e. red in the risk assessment colour scheme. Red is feared to be interpreted as 'project has to be redesigned or not approved'.
- (iii) Assigning median value for probability of incident. In most cases, SIA consultants still assign such median values as they deem fit, but this invites questions on the integrity of the consultants. In its place, many other consultants have started incorporating ways to extract the value directly from the respondents using the questionnaire, not only for severity values.

(b) Sampling

- (i) One situation that causes uneasiness in evaluating the quantitative analysis is when the consulting team has included foreigners, or foreign workers. This is to be avoided as it is observed that no mitigating measure is introduced to address the issues often raised by them. This often involves commercial surveys, and worse the interviews were done on general staff of the premises or foreign workers. One needs to ask if including them to represent the business operators is appropriate.
- (ii) There is no point in carrying out a full-scale sample (say up to 384) on transient population such as tourists, especially day trippers. Suffice to use a margin of error raised to 10% instead of the usual 5%.
- (iii) On fishermen, there are different views:
 - obtain the list of registered members under a particular *Persatuan Nelayan Kawasan* (PNK); or
 - consider only the active fishermen; or
 - involve all categories of fishermen – active, inactive, registered, unregistered, and so on.
- (iv) On Orang Asli, whether it is appropriate to conduct a questionnaire-based survey. Unlike in some areas in Selangor, conducting a questionnaire survey should be avoided as they may not comprehend the terminologies and the terms used in the questionnaire – leading to questions on reliability of the results.

(c) Zone of Influence

One common problem observed with consultants who carry out both EIA and SIA studies for the proposed project is the assignment of ZOI up to 5km. While this is common in EIA studies, taking up to 5km radius in SIA studies tend to obtain more positive results as stakeholders at faraway places are often very positive to the proposed project. As SIA wishes to explore the issues arising from the project, it is necessary to draw the primary and secondary ZOIs closer to the project site.

(d) Socioeconomic Data

It is important to present some basic demographic and socioeconomic data at the Mukim level, as this would reflect more about where the respondents come from, and to reflect whether the survey too produce similar demography and socioeconomic representation. Most SIA reports fail to present this data which is

easily available from Department of Statistics publications. Instead they present state and district level data only.

3.3 Prof. Dr Azami Zaharim

Technical problems and issues occurring within SIA reports prepared by consultants, along with proposed solutions/remedies to overcome them are provided as follows:

- (a) A primary theme of concern is the preservation of data integrity.
 - (i) It is emphasised that consultants must act as neutral facilitators rather than "data contributors." They cautioned that injecting personal bias or "adjusting" scores to avoid negative impact indicators (such as "red" risk levels) undermines the report's credibility and could lead to legal liabilities.
 - (ii) The reliability of data collection methods was another critical takeaway. It is strongly advocated for face-to-face interviews over digital surveys, arguing that physical interaction provides the highest level of "trustworthiness" and accountability. Furthermore, the importance of scoping and triangulation using multiple sources, such as Focus Group Discussions and secondary data, to validate findings, are highlighted.
 - (iii) The critical balance between technical rigour and the "human soul" of SIA reporting is important. It is emphasised that while a report must strictly adhere to procedural standards to be successful, its true value lies in its authenticity and the integrity of its data.
- (b) Methodological Standards and Practical Application
 - (i) There exists a fundamental divergence in how SIA reports are evaluated, noting that academic panels often prioritise theoretical frameworks (weighted at approximately 70%), whereas consultants focus predominantly on practical application (up to 80%). It is argued that a successful report must bridge this gap by fulfilling the "8 standard chapters" and mandatory requirements precisely. However, it is cautioned that professionalism goes beyond just checking boxes; it requires the consultant to understand the underlying "why" of the panel's questions, which is often a skill developed through extensive field experience.
- (c) Data Integrity and the Consultant's Role
 - (i) A recurring theme of concern is the maintenance of neutrality and data accuracy. It is strongly advised against consultants becoming "data contributors" themselves. Instead, he views the consultant as a facilitator who must ensure that their own biases do not alter the patterns derived from the community's primary data. He further emphasizes the technical necessity of distinguishing between the "intensity" of an impact and its "probability". By training enumerators to help respondents make this distinction, consultants can reach a more accurate "Expected Value" rather than relying on skewed or emotional perceptions.
- (d) Reliability through Human Interaction
 - (i) Traditional, face-to-face interviews is advocated firmly over digital surveys. He contends that physical interaction provides the highest level of "trustworthiness" and reliability, noting that digital responses lack

accountability as they can be completed by anyone. While it is acknowledged that methods like benchmarking are vital for providing professional justification, colleagues are reminded that a report can be technically perfect yet remain "dry" or lack "spirit". The ultimate goal of the panel and the consultant alike should not be to merely search for weaknesses, but to collaboratively improve the report to truly reflect the community's situation.

Finally continuous improvement is called for. Consultants are urged to look beyond technical templates and capture the "spirit" of the community to produce reports that are both technically sound and socially meaningful.

4. Question & Answer (Q&A) Session

The Hard Talk Session received several questions from the participants from the floor.

Question 1: Ms Gan – Dr Shah, please elaborate further on how to conduct weighted average scoring of impact significance?

Dr. Mohd Shahwahid Haji Othman: The interest on how to conduct weightage average scoring of impact significance is truly very relevant in order to obtain an unbiased estimate of significance score of an impact. I would suggest Ms. Gan and other interested participants to refer to the calculation of the weighted average of impact significance equation provided in (Mohd Shahwahid et al.'s Chapter 7 in MSIA book edited by Kuppusamy et al. (2025) **Social Impact Assessment Methodologies: Practical Applications in Malaysia**).

Question 2: Ms Gan – This question is directed to all the speakers.

- (i) It is felt that when enumerators are asking villagers in rural areas about the intensity level of benefit or severity of negative impact, and the likelihood of occurrence of that impact during the questionnaire survey, the villagers do not understand why one question concerning an impact, is being asked twice? The villagers have difficulty in understanding the difference.
- (ii) Is a qualitative method such as through a FGD, more suitable for determining the probability or likelihood of occurrence of the impact?

Dr. Mohd Shahwahid Haji Othman: The query on (i) the lack of understanding of villagers on the difference between level of intensity of positive impacts or level of severity of negative impact with the probability level of occurrence of such impact, is one of preparedness of the enumerators in conducting the questionnaire survey, in the first place. The consultants have to conduct dedicated internal course for their enumerating team to ensure that:

- the field team truly understand and provide a clear and illustrative description of the project
- the field team truly understand the difference between the meaning of intensity of beneficial impacts or the severity of negative impacts and that of the probability of occurrence of such impacts. The earlier concerns the depth or scale of the intensity / severity of the impacts, while the later concerns the frequencies of occurrence – how often or number of the event within a time

period for e.g. of a year or the duration of the occurrence or how long within that time period. Only after the enumerating team have been well-briefed, provided with appropriate illustrative project description kit and undergone a rehearsed interviewing approach suitable and befitting to the level of the villagers, would the team be sent to undertake the questionnaire survey. Without a proper briefing and enumerating course, the survey would only generate a biased and inaccurate data base.

- To the query on (ii), the qualitative method such as through a FGD in particular using the Delphi Technique approach could play a supporting role to enrich and verify the data and information on the probability of occurrence of the impacts gathered from the survey. Not using the questionnaire survey to seek the necessary information on the probability of occurrence of the impacts, is a mis-opportunity.

Dr Kuppusamy Singaravelloo:

There is always a need to ensure that segments on probability are included in the questionnaire straightaway. For effectiveness, ask for the response on severity and probability for each issue left to the right for each issue before moving on to the next issue. Also, it is also important that enumerators are well trained who are able to convey the question/statement without losing the essence intended by the question or the statement in the questionnaire.

Prof. Dr Azami Zaharim:

To ensure accuracy, the experts advocated for a "weighted average" approach to scoring and stressed the importance of training enumerators to help respondents distinguish between the "intensity" of an impact and its "probability".

Question 3: Khairul Arifin – Assalammualaikum and glad tidings. The question relates to the fact that the main basis of the methodology and research for the report preparation is guided by the manual. However, there are situations when facing the panellist representing the academics, unreasonable aspects outside that provided in the manual have been requested from the consultants. Examples are requesting to add social indexes and sub-indexes of the impacts.

Answer:

Dr. Mohd Shahwahid Haji Othman: The query on how to deal with requests that are deemed outside of the guidelines given in the manual, is not necessarily a straight answer. Panellists are given the responsibilities to ensure that a complete and accurate SIA report has been prepared and presented to the PLANMalaysia SIA Report Evaluation Panel. Reasonable questions could be asked, even if not directly stated in the manual but are viewed necessary by the panellist to enhance quality reporting. The consultants are provided the opportunities to rebut the questions in a justifiable and respectful manner. Ample opportunities exist to counter the queries but have to be supported by solid arguments and evidence, not necessarily during the evaluation panel session, but in writing in the responses to

be provided back to the Evaluation Panel Secretariat at either PLANMalaysia @ Federal or State level.

Dr Kuppusamy Singaravelloo: This problem arises when the academic representative has not been, or hardly been involved in any SIA studies. When this form of inappropriate questions or comments arise, the role of the Chairperson is highly important to discard the request.

Question 4: Nai Chun Wei – The 'severity' & 'probability' questions in the questionnaire are intended to determine the 'level of significance'. Would it be better if the question directly asked respondents' perceptions of the 'level of significance' of an impact?

Dr. Mohd Shahwahid Haji Othman:

As the method is already suggested and guided under PPSIA, it is most important that the expected value for severity and probability is asked separately each using scales of 5. It is not appropriate to ask the value of Significance straight away because respondents may not understand that Significance is a function or multiplication between severity and probability. It is important that the enumerator is well-versed with the meaning of severity and probability so that each issue is conveyed carefully and accurately.

Question 5: Moderator - Dr Shahwahid, looking at SIA reports, do you feel that the reports at current times are very technical or reflect the values of communities?

Dr. Mohd Shahwahid Haji Othman: Unlike EIA, standalone SIA is only below 10 years in practice in Malaysia. Currently, everything depends on what is presented in the report. It would be best if in the future the evaluating panel and committee makes a visit to the site prior to convening the Panel meeting.

Suggestion: Khairul Arifin – A suggestion is provided that MSIA may want to prepare a mini publication on Frequently Asked Question (FAQ) SIA for Consultants.

Dr. Mohd Shahwahid Haji Othman: MSIA has been very responsive to cater for the needs of its members including from those who are consultants. As you have known, knowing that members need to be conversant with the manner to conduct proper impact identification, data collection, computations of impact significance and preparation of SIMP, MSIA has published a SIA methodology book - edited by Kuppusamy et al (2025) Social Impact Assessment Methodologies: Practical Applications in Malaysia. In the next Annual General Meeting in June 2026, a new book will be launched dedicated to providing the best practices in SIA reporting that are in-line with the common comments and recommendations from the PLANMalaysia SIA Report Evaluation Panels. This book is edited by Mohd Shahwahid et al (2026) Social Impact Assessments: Best Practices and Professional Insights.

The above suggestion to publish a new book on “Frequently Asked Question (FAQ) SIA for Consultants” is worthy to be taken up by the Publication Sub-Committee and God willing I would take the lead with the support of experienced SIA consultants within MSIA.

Question 6: Puan Sri Jahara Yahaya – Of late most chapters in reports reviewed are already good except on the methodology which is often found to be weak. In such cases, what recommendations should be given on the report in ensuring our conscience is clear.

Dr Azfizan Aziz: Consultants spend 5-6 months on site but at the panel meeting, the panellists who are not well-versed of the project site raised questions that sometimes look unjust.

Dr Kuppusamy Singaravelloo: Methodology is most important base in any study especially when the results of the study are used to make decisions on the project at the next level. Wrong methodology would produce unjust results, and if the panellists could not detect these slants, then it may be unfair to the stakeholders out there when the report is approved.

Everyone may still remember the Highland Towers incident that claimed many lives many years ago. It is said that the foundation at the base of the buildings became weak due to water movements from heavy rainfalls and improper drainage system. SIA reports too must reflect to have undertaken strong methodological foundations. For SIA reports, one may use any method possible as long as these can be justified. Given the methodology used is not justifiable or have failed to convince the panellists or the committee members, it is often difficult to make a decision whether the report can be approved or otherwise. If there is any need for additional sample size, or to include another (formerly omitted) target group, then it would warrant for the report to be presented again as new findings may arise.

5. Lesson Learnt

The MSIA Hard Talk deliberation underlines the critical evolution of Social Impact Assessment (SIA) methodologies in Malaysia, moving away from rudimentary checklists toward rigorous, multi-phased evaluations. An essential lesson is that while data collection structures have improved—such as using ordinal median metrics of the impact scores of severity and probability of occurrences, rather than inappropriate simple mean scores—the integrity of an SIA report relies heavily on the transparency of its data sources. Consultants must shift from relying on arbitrary "expert judgments" for impact probability scores to executing deliberate field team briefings that effectively educate enumerators on the structural differences between impact severity and occurrence frequency. Furthermore, mitigating bias requires a transition toward weighted average scoring that accounts for variations across different stakeholder groups, locations within the Zone of Influence (ZOI), and data collection instruments (surveys vs. FGDs). Finally, navigating evaluation panels demands academic and practical flexibility; consultants must look beyond rigid manuals to incorporate sophisticated tools like the Authority-Interest Quadrant and multi-tiered Social Impact Management Plans (SIMPs), while remaining prepared to justify their methodologies with robust, evidence-based counterarguments.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, SIA reporting in Malaysia has achieved commendable milestones under the governance of PLANMalaysia, marked by an industry-wide adoption of comprehensive scoping, balanced evaluations of both positive and negative impacts,

and the integration of progressive self-monitoring mechanisms. However, resolving lingering technical gaps—specifically regarding the arbitrary assignment of impact probabilities and the early misplacement of cross-tabulated social impact matrices—remains imperative for elevating the standard of practice. As the Malaysian Social Impact Assessment Association (MSIA) actively addresses these gaps through targeted training and authoritative publications, the pathway forward necessitates bridging the divide between academic expectations and practical consultancies. Ultimately, by standardizing best practices, incorporating rigorous weighted calculations, referring to the upcoming new book on SIA best practices and profession insights, and formalizing ongoing initiatives like the proposed FAQ guide, the SIA framework can seamlessly transition into a reliable, legally robust tool for sustainable development and authentic community empowerment.

Acknowledgement

The Publication Committee members wish to express our gratitude and appreciation to Dr Mohd Shahwahid Haji Othman, Dr Kuppusamy Singaravelloo, Professor Dr. Azami Zaharim and Dr Azfizan Aziz for their fruitful deliberations and sharing of knowledge and insights into the panel discussions above.

Disclaimer

In the spirit of inclusivity and transparency, MSIA is open and frequently invites experts of various fields and stakeholders to share their perspectives on how the SIA processes can be more effective. Their views are analysed and reported. Any views and assumptions expressed however are solely those of the panelists and editors and do not necessarily reflect that of MSIA.