

## **Port of Buenos Aires, a competitive port.**

This time Mr. López Saubidet reported that the "plan" has been developed only with the people of the Port of Valencia, and did not name the Port of Rotterdam, as Mr. Gonzalo Mórtola usually does.

My first observation: The huge total investment of the project has a lot to do with the competition because even if the whole investment will be paid by the future concessionaire, it will have an effect on the competitiveness.

Although he did not say so in this presentation, it was previously reported that an expenditure of over a billion US dollars is estimated.

AN INVESTMENT OF THIS AMOUNT, JUSTIFIES TO MAKE A WELL ORGANIZED DEBATE, WHICH IS SOMETHING THAT WAS CONSIDERED BETWEEN 2011 AND 2015 IN THE WORKING GROUP "PENSAR" ("THINK"), WHERE I PARTICIPATED ACTIVELY.

Mr. Juan Larrague of this group prepared a memorandum in May 2014 and made a PPT in November 2014 for the presidential candidate, Mr. Mauricio Macri.

In these studies, the plan for the Port of Buenos Aires was part of the Ports Plan for the whole country.

The first thing that the new government should do, would be a SWOT- analysis. (Strengths and Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) of each of the "metropolitan ports", from La Plata to Zárate.

It is always cheaper for the very large ship to go to a port near the sea, but it can be much cheaper for the "community", if the ship goes, for example, to Zárate. And the cost to the "community" includes studies of infrastructure costs, internal transport and also congestion in urban areas.

(There are several presentations in this blog, where you can find extensive details).

This has led me in January 2016 to give the authorities long explanatory notes, since none of the new AGP officials had participated in those studies of the PENSAR Foundation.

Many of the "stakeholders" who since September 13 received my set of notes will have asked themselves the question: Why did Antonio Z. give a folder with long old notes now?

All that was to remind the A.G.P.-staff that many things had been studied in the W.G. of PENSAR where none of the new officials of the A.G.P. has participated.

I think none of them can show that they have experiences in the subject.

With this reasoning, I made a first verbal and written question: Mr. Lopez Saubidet, according to information from the A.G.P.this Modernization project requires an investment of more than one billion US dollars.

Does this not deserve a DEBATE?

The verbal response of Mr. Lopez Saubidet was that my way of asking the questions did not seem to be correct, but that Mr. Mortola had already studied them with the officials of the A.G.P.

(Observation: I know that many times my way of presenting questions in conferences, has deserved "observations".

This was very well recorded in an interview that Mr. Emiliano Galli of Tradenews made, which can be found in this blog. I think it's because my training took place in a very different country).

But I have never received an answer to my question and neither did I receive one in this case:

Again Mr. López Saubidet DID NOT ANSWER if the PLAN deserves a debate or not.

I insisted that he give me an answer, clarifying that I thought I was entitled to this.

A reason I gave, was the fact that I had participated in the PENSAR working group between 2011 and 2015, which had delivered a "plan" to the government.

Apparently, this was considered by mr. Lopez Saubidet as "improper" and the conversation was cut, without an answer of López Saubidet.

Then I just handed the second written question, along with the folder with old notes: Mr. López Saubidet, on November 23rd of 2016 Mr. Mortola granted me a hearing for 20 minutes, along with you.

I had prepared some very important long notes for that meeting. Can you briefly report what the A.G.P. did with those 3 notes and send me some details in a timely manner by mail to my email-address? azuidwijk@yahoo.com.ar.

Nor did this question receive any answer.

For the "stakeholders" I want to repeat that in December 2015, advise had been given to start this difficult task under the responsibility of a trained Under-secretary of Ports and W.W., who is THE AUTHORITY OF APPLICATION ACCORDING TO THE PORT-LAW 24093.

The S.S.P. and V.N. should resume the Plan for the Navigation System of former undersecretary R. Lujan, which until 2008 was well on track, but was diverted by the cold war with Uruguay about the "paper-mill Botnia".

And only after having drawn those guidelines, work should have started on the Plan for the Port of B.A.

At this point, I request people to pay close attention to an article in this blog that says: What lessons can be found in the unsuccessful attempt of the S.S.P. and Waterways of January 2016 to form his Advisory Board?

I believe that there you can find proofs of what I am saying and the reason that I keep insisting that a DEBATE should be organized.

I know that this is again a strange procedure, but I think that the difficult situation of the country justifies it.

I remain available to anyone interested in the subject.

Greetings, Antonio