

The draft report makes clear that the Productivity Commission has a relatively pre-determined stance on the issues considered. This is deeply regrettable and does not cast the Commission in a favourable light. I hope, but maybe do not expect, that the Commission has the temerity to consider in a more balanced manner the submissions made in this second round of consultation. I support comments made in other second-round submissions suggesting the need for a more sophisticated understanding of urban productivity and of the need for engaged, progressive responses to the challenges found in places such as Auckland.

I also expect the Commission to present facts more fully and fairly.

To give one specific instance - the graph in Box 18 of the draft report should present the full data included in the original Australian report by Mailiza and Gallo. The version presented in the draft NZ report has been edited to omit the element of developer profit, which clearly highlights that greenfield development is significantly more profitable for developers. While this fact may be no bad thing in itself (the Report should have highlighted and debated important productivity factors such as this), the deliberate omission of the data is extremely questionable. This type of selective reporting suggests that the Commission is not conducting an objective inquiry.