

PEER REVIEW OF INFRASTRUCTURE VICTORIA'S SECOND CONTAINER PORT ADVICE - EVIDENCE BASE Discussion Paper

Reviewed by: Bill Scales AO, B Ec. (Monash) FIPAA, FAICD

As requested by Infrastructure Victoria, I have peer reviewed Infrastructure Victoria's *SECOND CONTAINER PORT ADVICE - EVIDENCE BASE Discussion Paper (DRAFT) (the Discussion Paper)* to determine its even-handedness and to provide any general observations, advice or feedback on the draft Discussion Paper.

Executive Summary

I have thoroughly read the draft Discussion Paper and have provided to Infrastructure Victoria general observations, advice and feedback on a draft of the Discussion Paper provided to me.

In addition I have thoroughly read and reviewed responses to my general observations, advice and feedback to Infrastructure Victoria on the draft Discussion Paper, and have found that the draft Discussion Paper has been appropriately revised to take into account my observations, advice and feedback.

I have assessed that the revised draft Discussion Paper's framing, description and presentation of the evidence is even handed in the way that it addresses all appropriate options in relation to the timing and location of Victoria's second container port, and in particular the Bay West and Hastings options.

I have also come to the considered view that the revised draft Discussion Paper appropriately and thoroughly covers all of the principal issues required for informed community feedback in relation to the principal matters associated with the timing and location of a second container port for Victoria and related matters.

Background

On 24 February 2017, I was approached by Infrastructure Victoria to peer review a draft of Infrastructure Victoria's *SECOND CONTAINER PORT ADVICE - EVIDENCE BASE Discussion Paper*.

In conducting this peer review I was required to consider and provide:

- a. My assessment of the even-handedness of the draft Discussion Paper's framing, description and presentation of the evidence regarding when a second port will be needed and where it should be located;
- b. Any general observations, advice or feedback I had on the draft Discussion Paper;
- c. Feedback to Infrastructure Victoria regarding my initial findings;
- d. A written report summarizing my assessment and general observations, which is suitable for publication.

In conducting this peer review I first, and without reading the draft Discussion Paper:

- Constructed what I assessed as a model set of criteria for determining what would constitute better practice for content and analysis in such a draft Discussion Paper, given the complexity of the topic.

Having established what I assessed as a better practice criterion for content and analysis, I then:

- Thoroughly analysed the Terms of Reference (ToRs) provided to Infrastructure Victoria by the Victorian Government in relation to this matter.
- Thoroughly read the draft Discussion Paper.
- Compared the content, data and analysis in the draft Discussion Paper against the model set of criteria and the ToRs and noted all areas where I came to the view that the draft Discussion Paper was deficient in its content or analysis, or did not adequately or appropriately address matters contained in the ToRs.
- Provided observations, advice and feedback to Infrastructure Victoria on the content and analysis in the draft Discussion Paper.
- Received from Infrastructure Victoria a revised draft Discussion Paper, which according to Infrastructure Victoria took into account my initial observations, advice and feedback.
- Thoroughly read the revised draft Discussion Paper to determine if my observations, advice and comments had been appropriately taken into account.
- Provided further observations, advice and feedback on the content and analysis in the revised draft Discussion Paper.

Conclusion

Taking all these matters into account, I am satisfied that my observations, comments and feedback on the draft Discussion Paper, and subsequently the revised draft Discussion Paper have been taken into account by Infrastructure Victoria.

I have also assessed that the revised draft Discussion Paper's framing, description and presentation of the evidence is even handed in the way it addresses all appropriate options in relation to the timing and location of Victoria's second container port, and in particular the Bay West and the Hastings options.

I have also come to the considered view that the revised draft Discussion Paper appropriately and thoroughly covers all of the principal issues required for informed community feedback in relation to the principal matters associated with the timing and location of a second container port for Victoria and related matters.