From: s 22
To:
Cc:
Subject: Re: Makin [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Monday, 15 February 2016 10:17:40 AM

Ok but a bio and one of his papers would be good

Just google

Sent from my iPhone

> On 15 Feb 2016, at 10:15 am, s 22 @TREASURY.GOV.AU> wrote:
>
> Sorry we chatted about this last week and asked if you wanted briefing and you indicated you didn't.
>
s 22

>
> I suggest you can say that through the Antioch Institute we might be able to find some way to engage him on this.
>
>s 22
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From:s 22
> Sent: Monday, 15 February 2016 10:09 AM
> To:s 22
> Subject: [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED] Makin
>
>
> Assume I have briefing
>
> Sent from my iPhone

s 22

s 22

From: s 22
Sent: Thursday, 19 May 2016 4:48 PM
To: s 22
Cc:
Subject: RE: Contract again [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Thanks,

I will get back to him on that basis.

s 22

From: s 22
Sent: Thursday, 19 May 2016 4:18 PM
To: s 22
Cc:
Subject: RE: Contract again [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

s 22

I too assume that ISBN will be fine – I have no idea how we go about it.

On the refereeing, I think that we should proceed on the basis that it is refereed and that you would be the arbitrator if that became necessary. I'd prefer us to be able to say that "the paper has benefitted from comments from two anonymous referees" or some such; ie, I am not sure that we want to publish dissent. Let's not pre-empt either the paper or the reactions. Having referees is good practice and should help Tony – as you know, refereed work has much higher status.

s 22

From: s 22
Sent: Thursday, 19 May 2016 3:02 PM
To: s 22
Cc:
Subject: FW: Contract again [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

And on his second point on ISBN I assume that won't be a problem as we do this for our working papers …

From: s 22
Sent: Thursday, 19 May 2016 3:01 PM
To: s 22
Cc:
Subject: FW: Contract again [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

s 22

I suggested a peer review of Tony Makin's paper to him. He seems fine with that but wants to know if I would act as editor or arbitrator.

I imagine that the "peer review" you are thinking about is not about whether the paper is published by us or not – that decision's been made -- but rather as a vehicle to publish something alongside Makin's paper that may have an alternative view. I have set it up that way in my e-mail to him, suggesting that his paper and the response is a platform for us to encourage some independent policy debate. In that case, we don't need an editor/arbitrator to determine publication of the document.

I'm interested in your thoughts before I get back to him. If we are working with the model suggested above I could, of course, provide some linking commentary between the two responses but that diminishes the "independence" of the exercise.

s 22

s 22

s 22

From: s 22
To:
Subject: s 22 EC=UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Thursday, 2 June 2016 5:18:01 PM

s 22

s 22

Tony Makin has a contract for his paper. The completion date is 31 August.

s 22

From: s 22
To: Executive Committee
Cc:
Subject: Update on s 22 and Tony Makin Paper [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, 7 June 2016 11:00:30 AM

s 22 ,

s 22

Tony Makin has agreed to write a paper to be published by Treasury. It will review macroeconomic policy lessons from the period from the financial crisis and contain a forward-looking view of policy issues raised by the current economic environment. He has proposed a completion date of 31 August and has agreed to have the paper peer-reviewed by a member of Treasury's external panel of modelling and macroeconomic experts. He has been issued a contract. This is being reviewed by Griffith University.

s 22