

Tropicana Gold Project: Public Environmental Review

12. Peer Review Panel



12. PEER REVIEW PANEL

There is growing acceptance of the importance of peer review to reduce pressure on resources within the regulatory agencies, particularly within the resources sector. In addition, there is a view that environmental documentation should be concise and succinct, as opposed to the precedent of lengthy environmental approval documents.

In recognising the importance of accurate and detailed technical assessments in the overall EIA process, Joint Venture established a Peer Review Panel (the Panel) to contribute to the intellectual rigour of the environmental assessment documentation. A panel of representatives from the community, mining, legal and/ or environmental disciplines has been established to guarantee and provide opportunities to improve the quality of environmental documentation. The Panel is comprised of:

- Kingsley Dixon – Restoration Ecologist;
- Jonathan Majer – Entomologist;
- Tony van Merwyk – Environmental Approvals/ Legal;
- Stephen Tonkin – Pastoralist/ Local Government; and,
- Gail Reynolds-Adamson – Indigenous Interests.

The purpose and role of the Panel is to:

- undertake peer reviews of environmental documentation for the Project;
- provide input and expertise into the draft environmental documentation;
- attend forums seeking comment and input into the environmental process; and,
- provide opportunities to assist in information dissemination for the Project, where appropriate.

To ensure that the Panel has all of the information required to complete their review and effectively contribute to the Project, a support group has been established. The support group is comprised of senior members of the Joint Venture and scientists from 360 Environmental.

The draft ESD and PER have been the subject of review by the Panel and the panel informed with progress of approvals as per the meeting schedule in Table 12.1. In addition, the Panel has conducted a two day site visit to the Tropicana Gold Project (the Project) (refer Plate 12.1) and provides support to the Project team through provision of an independent critique of the proposed Project. The Panel has supporting documents associated with the environmental assessment process and has progressively provided feedback through stakeholder engagement opportunities.

The Panel has contributed to reviewing draft sections of the PER document. A package of work is distributed prior to each meeting, which runs between 3-5 hours and each meeting works to an agreed agenda and is minuted. Panel members review documentation between meetings and provide feedback for incorporation into the documentation.

Table 12.1: Peer Review Calendar

Events	Date
First Meeting and Information	September 2008
Project Overview and Environmental Studies	October 2008
Site Visit to Tropicana	November 2008 (2 days)
Scoping Document Review	October 2008
Project Risk Assessment Review	December 2008 -January 2009
Environmental Offset Meeting	February 2009
Draft Public Environmental Review chapters	January 2009 – February 2009
EPA Guidance/ ESD Final	January 2009
Mine Closure and Rehabilitation/ Consultations	February
Final Draft Public Environmental Review/ Offsets	March/ April 2009
DMA Feedback Discussion	May 2009
Feedback from Additional Studies	June 2009
Public Submission Discussion Meeting	August 2009
Participation in Public Meetings	October 2009
Discussion on Public Comments	December 2009
EPA Response Discussion	January / February 2010

Peer Review Panel members:

- ensure at the first panel meeting that panel members are fully conversant with requirements as necessary;
- carry out a review of the documentation provided and confer with other panel members;
- seek any further information or panel opinions that may prove necessary as a consequence of this consultation;
- participate in community consultation opportunities and seek pro-active means of effectively involving stakeholders;
- provide written feedback on draft reports and ensure that panel members are thorough in their consideration of the material submitted for assessment;
- provide any recommendations for the next phases of the Project for consideration by the Joint Venture;
- provide written comment on the appropriateness or otherwise of the draft work reviewed; and,
- review final versions of documentation and provide final comment.



Plate 12.1: Peer Review Site Visit – November 2008

(Left to Right: Andrea Maxey, Jonathan Majer, John Millikan, Guy Boughton, Felicity Donaldson, Belinda Bastow, Kingsley Dixon, Michelle Rhodes, Tony van Merwyk). Absent Oscar Aamodt, Gail Reynolds-Adamson, Stephen Tonkin.