



City Benchmarking: An Overview of Auckland's Rankings in the Global Context

November 2015

Technical Report 2015/027

Auckland Council
Technical Report 2015/027
ISSN 2230-4525 (Print)
ISSN 2230-4533 (Online)

ISBN 978-0-908320-67-7 (Print)
ISBN 978-0-908320-68-4 (PDF)

This report has been peer reviewed by the Peer Review Panel.

Submitted for review on 17 June 2015

Review completed on 5 November 2015

Reviewed by two reviewers

Approved for Auckland Council publication by:



Name: Dr Lucy Baragwanath

Position: Manager, Research and Evaluation

Date: 5 November 2015

Recommended citation:

Meares, C., Owen, P., Murray, C., Mohammadzadeh, M and Rohani, M (2015). City benchmarking: an overview of Auckland's rankings in the global context. Auckland Council technical report, TR2015/027

© 2015 Auckland Council

This publication is provided strictly subject to Auckland Council's copyright and other intellectual property rights (if any) in the publication. Users of the publication may only access, reproduce and use the publication, in a secure digital medium or hard copy, for responsible genuine non-commercial purposes relating to personal, public service or educational purposes, provided that the publication is only ever accurately reproduced and proper attribution of its source, publication date and authorship is attached to any use or reproduction. This publication must not be used in any way for any commercial purpose without the prior written consent of Auckland Council. Auckland Council does not give any warranty whatsoever, including without limitation, as to the availability, accuracy, completeness, currency or reliability of the information or data (including third party data) made available via the publication and expressly disclaim (to the maximum extent permitted in law) all liability for any damage or loss resulting from your use of, or reliance on the publication or the information and data provided via the publication. The publication, information, and data contained within it are provided on an "as is" basis.

City Benchmarking:

An Overview of Auckland's Rankings in the Global Context

Original version prepared by Dr Carina Meares and Paul Owen with the assistance of Dr Catherine Murray, February 2012.

This version updated and revised by Dr Mohsen Mohammadzadeh and Mehrnaz Rohani, November 2015.

Research and Evaluation Unit (RIMU)
Auckland Council

Contents

Summary of key points	4
Introduction	6
What is city benchmarking?	6
Why benchmark?	7
Types of benchmarking studies.....	8
Interpreting the results of benchmarking studies.....	15
Conclusion	17
References.....	18
Appendix: Benchmark studies	20

Summary of key points

Benchmarking is a process of measuring performance using specific indicators that are comparable across different entities – in this case, cities. The international benchmarking of cities can provide useful metrics and indicators for local and central government policy development and decision-making. Benchmarking studies allow policy makers to identify aspects of a city in which improvement can be made, facilitate comparisons between cities and assist policy makers to monitor the performance of their city over time. In addition, international benchmarking studies can be used to develop and promote a city's image and thus attract tourists and new residents, including highly skilled mobile professionals who are integral to the growth of contemporary cities.

A number of benchmarking studies measure various aspects of city performance and functioning. In this report, we use Taylor's (2011) typology as a useful way of understanding the different approaches. These are:

- Business cost-oriented studies,
- Liveability-oriented studies,
- Performance-oriented studies, and
- Sectoral studies.

It is increasingly recognised, however, that city comparisons are complex and that the processes and systems within a city require significantly more analysis than that which can be captured in a single headline indicator. Critics of benchmarking argue that a 'one-size-fits-all' methodology is inappropriate because it does not take into account the distinct elements of individual cities. They claim that the method is too simplistic to establish the desirability of a city for those looking to relocate, reside or establish and operate a business. There are also a number of methodological complexities and limitations involved in benchmarking studies, including the following:

- The availability of consistent datasets across cities. For example, datasets used as evidence for the same component may differ from city to city, even if they all measure similar factors;
- The development of composite indicators that obscure the complex processes operating beneath them. The validity and relevance of composite indicators are limited because their component measures have lost their separate meaning through aggregation. In addition, the components are weighted subjectively and reflect the preferences of a specific audience;
- The use of singular attributes that do not reveal anything about the flows, connections and linkages of goods, services, ideas, money or other intangibles between cities, all of which contribute significantly to the success or otherwise of contemporary cities;
- Volatility in exchange rates can affect price structures in comparisons of costs across different cities. Similarly, the way that inflation is incorporated may affect overall rankings;
- Data comparability can also be affected by large differences in the geographic size of cities;

- The details of inequalities and differences across cities are lost in benchmarking studies;
- Aspects of a city such as its history, politics, communities, people and environment are unique and thus not captured in benchmarking studies;
- The indexing of cities shows their relative rank. Very small changes, for example in the weights used or in the ranking of another city, can impact the ranking order significantly even though the city itself may not have changed;
- Liveability-oriented studies such as Mercer Consulting's 'Quality of Living Survey' and the Economist Intelligence Unit's 'Quality of Life Ranking' examine quality of life for expatriate employees rather than the quality of life of a city's own residents.

It is, therefore, critical to consider the following issues when assessing the relevance and validity of benchmarking studies: comparison by whom, for what audience and for what motives. In addition, a thorough understanding of the datasets underpinning each index is required, including how categories and factors are chosen and weighted, as these can significantly change the outcome of the study.

This technical report updates the February 2012 technical report, *City benchmarking: a technical report*. Nonetheless, this report also includes new analysis to provide a better understanding of Auckland's current rankings.

Introduction

The aim of this report is to investigate the range of international studies that include Auckland in their ranking of cities and to indicate Auckland's relative ranking across these studies.

International benchmarking surveys can provide useful metrics and indicators for local and central government decision-making. These processes of decision-making are predicated on a set of desirable outcomes, which in turn are based on appropriate data and information on how those outcomes can be reached. Measurement remains the basis for policy makers' decision support tools, and a pragmatic approach to measurement is required, including availability and affordability of data. Some benchmarking top-line figures relating to Auckland are readily available free of charge from the internet. However, their use can result in oversimplified interpretations of how a particular city compares to others as well as the ways in which it changes over time. To paraphrase Aaron Levin, 'statistics are like a bikini. What they reveal is suggestive, but what they conceal is vital.'

This technical report explores some of the key issues that arise in the interpretation and use of benchmarking studies. It describes and evaluates the most commonly used international benchmarking surveys that include Auckland, highlighting the advantages and disadvantages of different studies. The methodologies used in respective studies are not examined in detail; however, the methods behind each are reviewed and some generalisations regarding overall benchmarking processes are made.

To organise the array of benchmarking studies, four approaches are presented, including: business cost studies; liveability studies; performance studies; and sectoral studies. A useful checklist for evaluating the benchmarking studies is presented, and the report concludes with a summary of the benefits and limitations of benchmarking studies. A brief overview of over 20 benchmarking exercises in which Auckland is rated, and Auckland's latest rating, is included in Appendix 1.

What is city benchmarking?

Benchmarking is a process that measures performance using specific indicators that are comparable across different entities – in this case, cities. With its origins in company management and industry performance, benchmarking is increasingly being used by policy makers to compare the performance of cities, regions and even nations. This represents an interesting change from understanding cities as locations in which competitive forces operate to viewing them as competitive places in and of themselves.

A city's image is important because it affects its desirability as a tourist destination, as a choice of residence and as a desirable place for investment. Moreover, the city's image is also a key part of attracting internationally mobile skilled professionals into a city's labour force. According to Florida (2005), creative immigrants play an important role in a city's economic growth. The city's ranking also attracts the flow of capital to the city. The flows of capital and skilled immigrants are vital to achieve economic growth in late capitalism. Thus,

the city benchmarking is largely used as part of the city-marketing policies. In this context, the image of a city can emphasise the unique characteristics of that city-region: its history; its natural environment; its built environments; its people and its less tangible characteristics such as its social, economic and political institutions.

The process of benchmarking involves the ranking of cities on a scale - a hierarchical ordering that leads us to view cities as 'better' or 'worse' than each other, according to measured criteria. Proponents of benchmarking exercises argue that it is an essential prerequisite for informed and strategic policy-making¹, because it allows policy makers to identify aspects of a city in which improvement can be made. Theoretically, policy makers can monitor performance over time through comparative studies. However, critics of benchmarking argue that a 'one-size-fits-all' methodology is inappropriate as it does not take into account the distinct elements of each city. They claim that the method is too simplistic to establish the desirability of a city for those looking to relocate, reside or establish and operate a business. There are also a number of methodological complexities involved in benchmarking studies, including the availability of consistent datasets across all cities. In addition, benchmarking reduces datasets into an easily understood rank order of cities which obscures the complex processes operating beneath the indicator (Casey, 2011). Despite these limitations, however, benchmarking is often used. In the following section we outline why.

Why benchmark?

The tendency to make comparisons is not new. In 1954, Festinger developed a formal theory to explain the way that individuals evaluate their lives by comparing themselves to others. Festinger (2015) argued that people have an innate drive to look beyond themselves and examine others in order to assess their situations. This, he says, is a natural process of self-realisation or self-awareness. The comparison of places is not an entirely new exercise either; the oral and written histories of explorers and travellers documented the ways in which the new destination differed from their places of origin – culturally, physically and socially.

In mid-2009, for the first time, more than half the world's population lived in urban areas. The trend towards greater urbanisation is predicted to continue in both the developing and the developed world, with just under 70 per cent of the world's population predicted to live in cities by 2050 (UNDP, 2009, p. 1). Alongside this growth, there is an increasing awareness of the economic role of cities within nation states (Castells, 1996). As a consequence of globalisation, cities are conceptualised as dominant economic actors, described in competitive terms and ranked according to their perceived economic success. Success is measured using many metrics, including ability to attract labour and capital, levels of innovation and reputation. From a policy perspective, it is considered that intervention can

¹ See Huggins (2010) for a review of arguments for and against city benchmarking.

alter the social and economic pathways of city-regions and thus improve their overall competitiveness. As a consequence, data is required to track how that progress is made.

With regard to benchmarking, it is increasingly recognised that city comparisons are complex and that the processes and systems within a city require significantly more analysis than that which can be captured in a single headline indicator (Casey, 2011, see also Clark, Moonen and Courtier, 2015). Furthermore, the process of comparison can itself exert an influence on the way that cities operate and thus impact its development. Being aware of what happens in other cities is an integral component of benchmarking, and this awareness has expanded under the influence of globalisation and increased levels of connectivity, both virtual and otherwise, between cities. This represents a movement away from introspection and an insular perspective. Using Plato's allegory of the cave, perception and reality can change dramatically once a person operates outside their familiar environment.

Furthermore, increased migration can result in people becoming connected to more than one city through their business and personal networks² and as a consequence forging relationships between cities. Taylor Catalano and Walker (2002) criticise the dominance of *attribute* measures over *relational* measures in social science in general, and in the study of cities in particular. Their focus is on the study of cities within a global system, where it is the relationships between cities that are important, in terms of trade, exchange of ideas and people.

This leads us to a number of key questions about benchmarking studies: comparison by whom, for what audience and for what motives? In the following section, we discuss these questions in relation to existing benchmarking studies that include Auckland, and indicate how and in what ways the studies are relevant to the local government policy making process.

Types of benchmarking studies

International benchmarking studies have been used for economic development policy purposes in Auckland by local and central government, and previous studies use benchmarking indicators to explore and track the relative position of Auckland with comparator cities.³ There are many benchmarking studies, all of which measure various aspects of city performance and functioning, and were established for a variety of audiences.

For this updated overview we retain Taylor's (2011) typology of benchmarking studies, as it is a useful way of understanding the different approaches, namely:

- Business cost-oriented studies,
- Liveability-oriented studies,
- Performance-oriented studies, and
- Sectoral studies.

² This process is called transnationalism (Glick-Schiller, N., Basch, L., and Blanc-Szanton, C., 1992). For a discussion of transnationalism in relation to cities, see Glick-Schiller and Caglar (2009).

³ See for example Market Economics (2011) for selected indicators and SGS (2008) for a comprehensive description of indicators.

The first benchmarking studies were business-cost studies for specific cities and were produced for private firms in the 1970s. The Swiss Bank UBS tracked the relative cost of doing business and maintaining employees in different cities in the ‘Prices and Earnings Survey’. Similarly, Mercer Consulting’s ‘Cost of Living Survey’ and the Economist Intelligence Unit’s ‘Cost of Living’ database were intended to guide companies on remuneration rates for employees that moved abroad, to ensure that there was equalisation in their purchasing power and living standards in their new country of work (Taylor, 2011).

Moving on from viewing employees as labour units, the benchmarking process began to focus on the quality of life that employees would experience in different destination countries/cities. These liveability-oriented studies began from the perspective of multinational firms, and examined the quality of life for expatriate employees rather than the quality of life of a city’s residents. International studies that fall into this category include Mercer Consulting’s ‘Quality of Living Survey’ and the Economist Intelligence Unit’s ‘Quality of Life Ranking’.

The performance-oriented international studies attempt to assess the relative position, competitiveness or importance of cities and countries in the global economy. There are many of these studies including: Transparency International’s ‘Corruption Perceptions Index’ (in which New Zealand ranks highest in terms of perceived lack of corruption); Global Metro Monitor which looks at the performance of cities in the wake of the global financial crisis of the late 2000s; and PricewaterhouseCooper’s (PwC) global ‘Cities of Opportunity’ exercise (note however, that this does not include Auckland).⁴

Sectoral benchmarking studies focus on the competitiveness of a particular industrial sector within a city. Examples of such benchmarking include 2ThinkNow’s ‘Innovation Cities Top 100 Index’, which looks at overall innovation levels and RMIT’s ‘Global University City Index’ which examines the attractiveness of studying in a city. Auckland was excluded from the latter index because the city’s population was less than the threshold of two million people. Other sectoral benchmarking studies, such as Times Higher Education’s ‘World University Rankings’ rate particular institutions located within cities. In this study, The University of Auckland was ranked 175 among 800 universities in 2015. There are also numerous travel and tourism related studies, such as Euromonitor’s ‘Top City Destinations Ranking’, in which Auckland was ranked 81 in 2013.

The above benchmarking studies measure various attributes of cities, often incorporating subjective assessments. By contrast, the Globalisation and World Cities Research Network⁵ attempts to measure the relational aspects of cities (how they interact with one another), recognising the limitations of measuring only attributes. This involves measuring a broad range of economic and private sector indicators to determine the commercial interconnectedness of large cities and ranking them as ‘alpha’, ‘beta’ or ‘gamma’ regions. It

⁴ In 2012, the PwC Auckland office prepared a special report that analysed the social and economic performance of Auckland, based on the Global Cities of Opportunity indicators, to assess Auckland’s competitive advantage. Auckland was ranked 16th when assessed against the 27 other cities in the Cities of Opportunity programme at that time. Refer to Table 1 and to the Appendix of this report for further details.

⁵ For more information on the Globalisation and World Cities Research Network see www.lboro.ac.uk/gawc/.

is a means of assessing the global hierarchy of urban areas. This is a different classification taxonomy based on a network analysis of flows between cities and the clustering of similar cities in terms of number, strength and frequency of flows. Auckland is classified as a ‘beta’ region, and rather than give a rank order, the cities are clustered in groups of cities with similar characteristics relating to interconnectivity. This is a different way of presenting data on cities, moving from a hierarchical classification to a network or clustering of attributes. The impetus for this change came from the recognition that significant developments had been made in measuring urban performance, but the ranking approach (which gets the most media attention) often suffers from serious methodological shortcomings (Taylor, 2011).

Auckland’s relative ranking and changes over time

Table 1 shows a summary of selected international benchmarking studies which feature Auckland, listed according to Taylor’s (2011) classification outlined earlier. Although we have tried to include all those in which Auckland features, we acknowledge that the list may not be exhaustive. It is important to note that Auckland does not feature in some of the most commonly used benchmarking studies, such as the MasterCard Worldwide Centres of Commerce, and also that the results for Auckland are not always reported when it does not feature in the top ranks, for example the Anholt-City Brands Index.⁶

As JLL and The Business of Cities Ltd point out in their recent review of over 200 city indices, ‘as rapidly as the world is urbanising, with cities morphing, transforming, and reinventing so the field of city indices and benchmark creation multiplies at pace’ (Clark, Moonen, and Couturier, 2015, p 3).

There have been several changes to this list since the previous version of this report. The City Comparison Toolkit developed by JLL Global has been added to the list of business cost-oriented studies, and the Quacquarelli Symonds (QS) World University Rankings have been added to the list of sectoral studies. A report prepared by PwC in 2012 that assessed how well Auckland ranked against the criteria used in their Global Cities of Opportunity framework has been added to the list of performance oriented studies. The People Risk Index by AON, the City Governance Index prepared by Jones Lang LaSalle and the Global Urban Competitiveness Project have been removed from the table. See Appendix 1 for detailed information on each of the benchmarking studies included in Table 1.

⁶ It is possible to contact these information providers and access the Auckland data, as Brand Capital did when creating the Auckland Inclusive City Brands Index. This customised data usually has a cost as it has to be purchased from the providers.

Table 1 - Selected international benchmarking studies featuring Auckland

	Title of study (latest year) and provider	Number of cities	Auckland current ranking	Auckland previous ranking (and year)
<i>Business cost-oriented studies</i>				
1	Price and Earnings Survey (2015) UBS • Price level • Wage level	71	12 17	25 out of 72 28 out of 72 (2012)
2	Cost of Living Survey, (2015) Mercer Consulting	211	61	118 out of 221 (2011)
3	Worldwide Cost of Living Survey (2015) Economist Intelligence Unit	140	n/a	n/a
4	International Housing Affordability (2015) Demographia	86	78	71 out of 82 (2012)
5	City Comparison Toolkit (2015) JLL Global • Commercial Attraction • Real Estate Investment • Cross-Border Real Estate Investment • Economic Size	300	114 66 63 212	n/a
<i>Liveability oriented studies</i>				
6	World's Most Liveable City (2015) Economist Intelligence Unit	140	9	10 out of 140 (2011)
7	Worldwide Quality of Living Survey (2015) Mercer Consulting	230	3	4 out of 221 (2010)
8	Most Liveable City Index (2015) Monocle Magazine	25	17	13 out of 25 (2011)
<i>Performance oriented studies</i>				
9	Corruption Perceptions Index (2014)* Transparency International	174	2	1 out of 183 (2010)
10	City Brands Index (2011) Brand Capital (using Anholt City Brand Index)	50	36	19 out of 30 (2007)
11	Global Metro Monitor (2014) Brookings and LSE Cities	300	145	91 out of 150 (2010)
12	Auckland: The City of Opportunity (2012) PwC	28	16	n/a
13	State of World Cities (2012) Globalisation and World Cities (GaWC) Research Network	526	72	40 out of 525 (2008)
<i>Sectoral studies</i>				
14	Innovation Cities, Top 100 Index (2012-13) 2ThinkNow	100	91	70 out of 100 (2010)
15	World University Ranking (2014-15) Times Higher Education	400	175	173 out of 400 (2011-12)
16	The Quacquarelli Symonds (QS) World University Rankings (2015-16)	800	82	92 out of 800 (2014-15)
17	Top 100 City Destination Ranking (2015) EuroMonitor International	100	-	62 out of 100 (2011)

Notes: the numbers of cities included in each study and criteria employed to compare across cities may change over time.

* this study is at a national level, not city level.

Auckland ranked 3rd, 9th and 17th respectively in 2015 in the three liveability oriented studies listed above. These disparate rankings are a consequence of different methodologies used in each study, and an understanding of these is critical for interpreting the results. Moreover, the datasets used as evidence for each component may differ across the studies, even if

they all measure similar factors, such as levels of crime. These components are listed in Box 1.

Box 1: Further detail on liveability oriented studies

The **Economist Intelligence Unit's 'Most Liveable City'** index assigns a rating of relative comfort for 140 cities, over 30 qualitative and quantitative factors. These are ranged into five broad categories: stability; healthcare; culture and environment; education; and infrastructure.

Mercer's annual 'Quality of Living Survey' collects data on 39 criteria for a target audience of expatriates. The criteria fall into the following categories (the number of criteria appears in brackets): political and social environment (5); economic environment (2); socio-cultural environment (2); medical and health considerations (8); schools and education level (1); public services and transport (7); recreation (4); consumer goods (5); housing (3); and natural environment (2). The categories are weighted, based on perceived relative importance. Categories that have a high rating relative to others are: political and social environment; medical and health considerations; public services; and transport.

Monocle's (the lifestyle magazine) 'Most Liveable Cities Index' has components that measure safety/crime; international connectivity; climate/sunshine; quality of architecture; public transportation; tolerance; environmental issues and access to nature; urban design; business conditions; pro-active policy developments; and medical care.

While each of these studies aims to benchmark cities on the quality of life of residents, the different measures, datasets and scope of the various components leads to differences in a city's perceived performance across studies.

It is also important to note that volatility in exchange rates can affect price structures in comparisons of costs across different cities. Similarly, the way that inflation is incorporated may affect the overall ranking, for example whether prices are used for the components measured within the survey or whether a more general consumer price index (CPI) is chosen. If a city experiences a housing boom with high inflation in housing and rental prices, this can have a significant impact on the cost of living in that city, whereas if this housing boom is not reflected in the CPI for the whole country, such inflationary pressures are not picked up. Demographia ranks cities based on housing affordability in both national and international levels. Demographia International Housing Affordability 2015 ranks Auckland as 9th least affordable city among 86 metropolitan cities around the world.

The details of inequalities across the city are lost in benchmarking studies. This is a problem associated with aggregation of data in general, but the problem becomes more pronounced for local governments that are planning and managing trade-offs at a local level where differences in conditions matter in the provision of services to communities.

The performance and sectoral benchmarking studies are usually focused on a particular characteristic of a city, such as the ease of doing business, or how the city is perceived (its status, brand or image). These studies are relatively specific in terms of subject matter but they do not overcome the problems associated with integrity and compatibility of data. Moreover, there is a danger in assuming that because data is used in an international context it is, therefore, more reliable.

The creation of composite measures and indicators masks detailed data that can be checked and verified at a local level. Composite indicators are created by aggregating a range of indicators that represent complex and multi-faceted issues. Both the Mercer Quality of Living Survey and the Economist Intelligence Unit's Liveability Rankings use composite indicators. The validity and relevance of composite indicators are limited as their component measures have lost their separate meaning through aggregation. In addition, the components are weighted subjectively. In some cases, a city with good scores across all indicators and dimensions may not rank as highly as a city that has performed exceptionally in some indicators or dimensions and poorly in others. Lastly, composite indicators do not adequately measure a city's liveability because the composition of the indicators reflects only the preferences of a specific audience.

Burton and Woolcock (2010, p. 10) summarise the methodological limitations of indices in the following way: 'the integrity and compatibility of data among cities; the overstatement of the cause and effect relationship between indicators and city outcomes, and the subjectivity of the analysis and conclusions.' A report on international city comparisons by the city of Melbourne came to very similar conclusions, arguing that although many benchmarking studies suggest that it is possible to assess complex issues and policy responses by reducing them to a single indexed score or rank, such an approach is flawed. There are two key reasons for this: firstly, the aims and audience are often narrow, biasing the selection of indicators; and secondly, small survey samples and subjective measures are used which means that the results do not reflect the quality of life of the majority of a city's residents (Casey, 2011).

The Auckland's ranking is a good example for demonstrating the limitations the prevalent city benchmarking and their indexes, particularly regarding liveability. Auckland has been ranked as one of the most liveable cities in the world; the city is also ranked as one of the least affordable metropolitans, at least in the context of housing affordability. Housing unaffordability can adversely impact of the quality life of residents, particularly low- and middle-income groups, and subsequently on the city's liveability. Since these residents should pay more for housing, their expenditure for other needs such as education, health and entertainment will be diminished. Thus, the deployed indicators to evaluate the liveability of cities largely cannot address, or neglect, the needs of the disadvantaged groups. For example, in 2009, Auckland was ranked as 20th liveable city based on the Monocle's Most Liveable City Index, and Demographia ranked Auckland as the 26th least affordable city in housing. In the latest rankings, Auckland was ranked as 9th unaffordable city in the housing; but, its liveability ranking has improved to the 17th most liveable city in 2015. Auckland's current housing inflation has adversely influenced on the quality of life of Aucklanders, particularly the low-income groups. The liveability city benchmarking indexes are unable, or at least neglect, these adverse consequences of the housing inflation on the residents' quality of life.

Cities are not only ranked based on their socio-economic and quality of life indexes; but, also ranked based on their areas, population and densities. Decision makers and planners may use these rankings to have a better understanding of the characteristics of the cities. These rankings also assist to evaluate the urban development policies, including intensification or metropolitan extension.

Table 2 shows Demographia World Urban Areas 2015 ranks 1009 cities around the world and its ranking in the 2013 survey. This ranking has used the footprint of a city to define the boundary of analysis, as they see an urban area as a continuously built up land mass of urban development. This may not coincide with the administrative unit, which in Auckland's case consists of the rural and agricultural land (both inside and outside of the metropolitan urban limit). This ranking can be used by planners to evaluate and monitor to what extent the Auckland Council's plans and policies such as the Auckland Unitary Plan and the Special Housing Areas (SHAs) change the rank of the city among other metropolitans.

Table 2 – Auckland's ranking in Demographia World Urban Areas 2013-15

	Auckland Rank 2015	Number of Cities	Auckland Rank 2013
Largest Urban Areas in the World	352	1009	344 out of 875
Urban Areas by Land Area (Urban Footprint)	212	1009	205 out of 875
Urban Areas by Geography (Including Selected under 500,000 Population)	352	1009	344 out of 875
Urban Areas by Urban Population Density	868	1009	747 out of 875

Interpreting the results of benchmarking studies

In order to facilitate an understanding of benchmarking datasets, Taylor (2011) devised a checklist for policy-makers to use when evaluating ranking studies (Box 2). This enables a critical appraisal of the benchmark indicator's suitability and relevance for use as a measure in a policy context. We use this checklist in Appendix 1 to provide detailed information on each of the benchmarking studies listed in Table 1.

Box 2: Checklist for evaluating ranking studies

- 1. Why was it produced and for whom?**
 - To help Human Resource departments develop compensation packages for expatriate employees?
 - To inform makers of economic development policies?
 - As an intellectual exercise?
 - As a commercial exercise in the provision of data?*
- 2. Is it narrowly focused or are different types of information combined into holistic scores and rankings?**
 - What is the rationale for the weighting of different types of data within overall scores?
 - Are scores calculated for different categories of variables? If so, does the city's performance vary from one category to another, or is its performance consistent across different domains?
- 3. Is there a full description of data, information, sources and methods? Is the study therefore replicable and verifiable?**
 - How much of the underlying data pertains to current as opposed to an early stage of the business cycle?
 - What is the rationale for the selection of cities? Does the universe of cases only include cities in wealthy industrialised countries, or also developing areas?
 - Is there a risk of mixing and matching data based on different spatial definitions of metropolitan areas?
 - Are other composite indexes used as input variables? Or does the study rely exclusively on primary data?
 - Are techniques used that may exaggerate or otherwise obscure differences in city performance? – e.g. normalisation, standardisation or aggregation?
 - How do price movements (inflation) and exchange rates affect the ranking?*
- 4. Are previous editions available?**
 - Do they cover an entire business cycle?
 - How volatile are the scores and rankings over time?
 - Are trends or patterns visible?
 - If data sources and methods are described, is there consistency between one edition and the next?

*added by authors.

The process of ranking a city's performance in relation to others is not a trivial task. Aspects of a city and the attributes that make it what it is, such as its history, politics, communities, people and environment are unique and thus not captured in the benchmarking studies identified in Table 1 above. Additionally, consideration should be given to the theoretical underpinning of the measures. Composite measures may not align directly with what the Council is interested in. For example 'safety' may be measured by the number of reported crimes in a city, whereas another perspective on 'safety' may include the number of

pedestrians killed, preventable accidents, or indeed the incidence of, or threat from, a natural hazard such as a volcano.

As with any indicator, simplification of the many factors that influence the quality of a place can lead to very simplistic and/or incomplete analyses that can create misleading perceptions about the city. The misleading perceptions may generate discontent among both the residents and new arrivals, and may increase social contradictions (Mohammadzadeh, 2014). This is also the case for composite measures that are included in most of the benchmarking studies. Indicators are developed to measure what is valued. The choice of an indicator is a critical determinant of the behaviour of a system (Meadows, 1998). In general, indicators are assessed with respect to their relevance to the concept under scrutiny, the frequency of measurement and consistency over time, their availability and their comparability (Statistics New Zealand, 2009; Meadows, 1998). Accounting systems collect and aggregate information for decision-makers, while also influencing behaviour through that process. The things that people value are accounted for, and are usually used to evaluate change or performance. There is a risk in using a specific indicator as part of the policy making process if that indicator is not aligned with the concept that policy makers are trying to measure or if there is a flaw in the methodology of measurement.

The indexing of cities shows their relative rank. Very small changes, for example in the weights used or the ranking of another city, can impact the ranking order significantly even though the city itself may not have changed.

While attracting mobile skilled labour and international investors is important for contemporary cities and their economic growth, it is also critical to account for the perspective and needs of a city's current residents. A city's inhabitants and its policy makers have a rich understanding of how their city functions and operates, including an indigenous knowledge set. Gaps in the knowledge base can be readily identified by local policy makers and it is at this level that indicators and measures should be conceptualised and developed. There is a danger in relying on statistics that are often produced with the same data that policy makers have access to (or generate themselves) and thoroughly understand, but that are analysed aggregately by external agents. Rich detail gets lost in the aggregation process. Auckland Council is currently developing its definition of liveability and a set of measures to enable progress to be monitored over time.

It is difficult to get agreement between international cities on the composition of a comprehensive indicator set that is of direct use and relevance to all participating cities. Although criticized as being anglophile, it is perhaps for this reason that many of the quality of life benchmarking studies choose the factors to measure – as there are cultural similarities across countries that have a shared cultural history (e.g. through colonisation or language).

Conclusion

City benchmarking is useful for establishing the relative attractiveness of a city-region. It is of particular importance for assessing how competitive a place is with regard to attracting skilled labour and investment. In addition, it can also assist in retaining the existing labour force. If there is out-migration of skilled labour from a city, for example from Auckland to various Australian cities, understanding how Auckland compares to those destination cities can assist policy makers to devise appropriate interventions to retain that pool of labour.

City benchmarking data also provides numerical ‘sound bites’ that ambassadors and advocates can use to promote their city as part of city-marketing policies. Beyond this promotional use, however, the validity and usefulness of indicators is questionable. The international benchmarking studies are fraught with methodological issues and data verification problems that are obscured in the composite and indexed indicators.

After reviewing the benchmarking studies that incorporate Auckland, it is important to distinguish between: 1) the development of monitoring tools and theoretical models; 2) research and techniques of measurement; and 3) the operational use of those measurements. The issues are different for all three, ranging from the philosophical to the methodological and the pragmatic.

It is necessary to develop a thorough understanding of those characteristics of the city that should be measured, and also to find the most valid way of accomplishing that measurement. Traditional published statistics are not always sufficient to analyse fully the complex concepts and problems that are experienced and addressed in cities. Although there is a natural tendency to look beyond city limits to see how it compares to others, there is a danger in relying on off-the-shelf benchmarking studies to answer complex questions. These benchmarked studies rely on aggregates and averages that obscure the rich details of the local context.

Rather than relying on the existing indicators and benchmarking studies, and thereby limiting the conceptual framework to available datasets, a comprehensive framework that is devised locally is required. This framework should be populated with data that is aligned to concepts that are valued by residents and policy-makers in that city. The indicators are developed to measure what is valued. The choice of an indicator is a critical determinant of the behaviour of a system. In general, the indicators are assessed with respect to their relevance to the concept under scrutiny, the frequency of measurement and consistency over time, their availability and their comparability. This updated report, together with the Liveability Framework and Chapter 13 of the Auckland Plan (Auckland Council, 2012) comprise useful steps towards addressing these issues for Auckland.

References

- Auckland Council. (2012). *The Auckland Plan*. Auckland: Auckland Council.
- Bell, M. (2002). Comparing population mobility in Australia and New Zealand. *The Journal of Population Research*, Special Issue, September, pp. 169-193.
- Burton, P. and Woolcock, G. (2010). Information Paper 1: Liveability. *Green Star Communities Information Papers*. Urban Research Program, Griffith University.
- Casey, N. (2011). *International city comparisons*. Melbourne City Research, Australia.
- Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Clark, G., Moonen, T. and Couturier, J. (2015). *The Business of Cities 2015*. Prepared for JLL. Available at <http://www.jll.com/Research/jll-business-of-cities-report.pdf?1a3ad2d0-7c0c-44f7-80d7-eeff8996fc84>
- Clark, G. (2011). Comments on the Draft Auckland Plan in November 2011, Unpublished draft.
- The Economist. (2005). The Economist Intelligence Unit's quality-of-life index. The World in 2005. Retrieved from http://www.economist.com/media/pdf/QUALITY_OF_LIFE.pdf.
- Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, 7(2) 117-140.
- Florida, R. L. (2007). *The flight of the creative class*. New York: Harper Business.
- Glick-Schiller, N., and Caglar, A. (2009). Towards a comparative theory of locality in migration studies: Migrant incorporation and city scale. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35(2), 177 - 202.
- Glick-Schiller, N., Basch, L., and Blanc-Szanton, C. (1992). Transnationalism: A new analytic framework for understanding migration. In N. Glick-Schiller, L. Basch and C. Blanc-Szanton (Eds.), *Towards a transnational perspective on migration: Race, class, ethnicity and nationalism reconsidered* (Vol. 645, pp. 1-25). New York: The New York Academy of Sciences.
- Market Economics. (2011). Auckland's Competitive Advantage and Distinctiveness, Final Indicator Report. Report prepared for the Auckland Policy Office of the Ministry of Economic Development.
- Meadows, D. (1998). *Indicators and information systems for sustainable development: a report to the Balatan Group*. The Sustainability Institute, Hartland.
- Mohammadzadeh, M. (2014). The neoliberalised city fantasy: The place of desire and discontent. PhD thesis. The University of Auckland. New Zealand
- PwC. (2012), Auckland - the City of Opportunity. PricewaterhouseCoopers, New Zealand.
- SGS Economics and Planning. (2008). *Auckland city performance analysis*. Final Report June 2008. Report prepared for Auckland City Council.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2009), *Measuring New Zealand's progress using a sustainable development approach*. Wellington, New Zealand.

Taylor, P., Catalano, G. and Walker, D. (2002), Measurement of the world city network, *Urban Studies*, 39, 2367-76.

Taylor, Z. (2011). *Lies, damned lies and statistics*. Research report prepared for the Intergovernmental Committee for Economic and Labour Force Development. Toronto, Canada.

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs/Population Division. (2009). *World Urbanisation Prospects: The 2009 Revision*.

Appendix: Benchmark studies

Benchmark study 1	Price and Earnings Survey, 2012
Provider	UBS
Auckland's current rank	In 2012, Auckland was ranked 25 th for its price levels and 28 th for its wage level out of 72 cities. Changes in inflation and especially in exchange rates are the key factors that bring about shifts in price levels calculated in US dollars for some countries including New Zealand. New Zealand dollars appreciated strongly against the US dollar, leading to a marked rise in US dollar price levels in Auckland.
Why produced and for whom?	UBS has produced a Price and Earnings comparison every three years since 1970. It looks in detail at prices for goods and services, as well as wages and working hours for 14 professions in 72 cities worldwide. New York City is used as a benchmark. The study is produced for business and overseas travellers.
Narrowly focused or uses different types of information?	The Price and Earnings study calculates living cost based on a survey of a standardised basket of goods and services based on European consumer habits and categorised into 122 products. The survey asks eight questions about salaries, taxes and social security contributions as well as working hours for 15 separate occupations. A fact that should be taken into account when comparing this report with previous editions of Prices and Earnings is that in 2012 edition, the weighting of the individual occupational profiles was adjusted in line with the latest Eurostat figures on the working population share by sector. This impacted the weighting of the service sector in particular and thus in some cases directly affected the corresponding data series.
Data sources described?	An overview of the methodology is given.
Frequency	Biennially (every 2 years)
Previous editions available?	Yes, dating back to 2006.
Limitations	The UBS Report on Price and Earnings uses a 'common' European basket of goods and services to reflect costs of living across all cities. This could cause an upward bias for cities in the East as Western goods tend to be more expensive in Asian cities. Monthly wage data is based on national statistics, with some adjustments to make them more comparable due to slightly different data definitions. This introduces a level of bias to wage rates as levels tend to be higher in cities.

Benchmark study 1	Price and Earnings Survey, 2012
Provider	UBS
References	<p>Giap, T. K., Yam, T. K., Khuong, V. M., Qiangyang, G. (2011). <i>UBS ACI Wages Comparison Report</i>, Asia Competitiveness Institute, Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore.</p> <p>http://www.spp.nus.edu.sg/aci/docs/20110503_UBS_ACI_Wages_Comparison_report.pdf</p> <p>UBS. (2012). <i>Price and Earnings – A comparison of purchasing power around the globe</i>, UBS AG, Wealth Management Research, Switzerland. Available on UBS website at: http://www.ubs.com/global/en/wealth_management/wealth_management_research/prices_earnings.html</p>

Benchmark study 2	Cost of Living Survey, 2015
Provider	Mercer Consulting
Auckland's current rank	Auckland is ranked 61 out of 211 cities.
Why produced and for whom?	The aim of the Cost of Living Survey is to provide government and the private sector with the information, they need to calculate fair, consistent expatriate compensation packages based on the cost of living in various cities.
Narrowly focused or uses different types of information?	<p>The Cost of Living Survey utilises three indices to accommodate differences in shopping habits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reversible Mean-to-Mean index – Mercer identifies this as the best indicator of overall differences in prices between two locations because it compares the mean prices in the base city to the mean prices in the host city. • The Efficient Index – applies to a relatively experienced shopper and compares the averages of the low mid prices in the base city to the mean prices in the host city. • The Convenience Index – applies to a less-experienced shopper or a newcomer in the location, and compares the average of the low mid prices in the base city to the high prices in the host city (except for selected categories for which it compares mean base prices). <p>These indices are applied to ten categories and are weighted in relation to observed behaviour. Mercer surveys the cost of over 200 items in these categories in 143 different cities to establish the differential cost of living between each city.</p>
Data sources described?	The methodology is only partially explained. Past reports and the usability of 11 different Global HRMonitor Calculators are available through subscription.
Frequency	Annually (financial year)
Previous editions available?	Past reports are available for purchase, but these are possibly limited to those from the previous year.
Limitations	Mercer conducts a Cost of Living survey that is generally similar to the Economist Intelligence Unit's Worldwide Cost of Living Survey in that it collects prices for approximately 200 products and services in more than 140 cities. Mercer's quality of living index is based on a survey of a small number of expatriate workers in each city which has a bias towards narrow aims and samples. Its audience includes companies, expatriates and high income earners. This is not a good measure to use for liveability as it does not apply to residents of a city.
References	<p>Mercers (10 July 2014). <i>2014 Cost of Living Rankings</i>. Available at: http://www.mercer.com/content/mercera/global/all/en/newsroom/cost-of-living-survey.html</p> <p>Mercer (2006). <i>Quality of Living – Explanatory notes</i>, Mercer Human Resources Consulting, Sydney, Australia.</p>

Benchmark study 3	Worldwide Cost of Living Survey, 2015
Provider	Economist Intelligence Unit
Auckland's current rank	Auckland is not ranked in this study.
Why produced and for whom?	The Worldwide Cost of Living Survey is primarily designed for human resource managers and expatriate executives to calculate fair compensation policies for the relocation of employees. The purpose of the cost of living index is so that companies can give employees a premium in locations that present difficult living conditions, physical hardship or unhealthy conditions.
Narrowly focused or uses different types of information?	The Worldwide Cost of Living Survey compares living costs in 130 cities in 90 countries. To assess the cost of living in each of the cities, the survey gathers detailed information on the cost of different items. A total of 167 products and services are assessed in each city. A cost of living index is calculated from the price data to express the difference in the cost of living between any two cities. The cost of living in the base city is always expressed as 100. The cost of living in the destination is then indexed against this number.
Data sources described?	An overview of the calculation of the cost of living index is provided. No details are given about how the survey data was obtained.
Frequency	Annually (financial year)
Previous editions available?	No.
Limitations	Many of the items included in the cost of living index are either not available in the destination or of a quality that does not permit them to be included in the report. This absence of certain items reduces the index comparison to only those items that are available and of reasonable quality. EIU's Worldwide Cost of Living Survey is conducted at selected central shopping locations in the city in question, not in suburban neighbourhoods. EIU mentions in the worldwide cost of living calculations that given these realities, companies should use the cost of living index for such problem cities as only a partial guide to fixing remuneration levels.
References	<p>Economist Intelligence Unit (2014). <i>Worldwide Cost of Living 2014: Which city is the most expensive to live in? Which city is the cheapest?</i>, A summary from The Economist Intelligence Unit. The Economist Intelligence Unit Ltd.</p> <p>Burton, P. and Woolcock, G., (2010). <i>Green Star Communities Information Papers – Draft Final Report</i>, Urban Research Program Griffith University, Australia.</p> <p>SGS Economics and Planning (2008). <i>Auckland City Performance Analysis. Final Report June 2008</i>. Report prepared for Auckland City Council. Economist Intelligence Unit (2012). <i>How is the cost-of-living index calculated?</i> Enumerate Solution, The Economist Intelligence Unit Ltd.</p>

Benchmark study 4	International Housing Affordability Survey, 2015
Provider	Demographia
Auckland's current rank	Auckland is ranked 78 out of 86 cities.
Why produced and for whom?	To provide a comparative analysis of housing affordability across 227 cities worldwide.
Narrowly focused or uses different types of information?	This survey covers 159 cities in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States. The survey uses the median house price to median household income multiple to rate housing affordability. The median house price information is generally obtained from the national industry reporting agencies. In some cases, the survey estimated weighted median prices where available industry data was inconsistent with the geographical market definitions. Where median house price data was unavailable, they were estimated from historic conversion factors. Median household income data was generally estimated using statistics bureau generated base adjusted to a current estimate by the best indicator of median income growth.
Data sources described?	An overview of the methodology is given.
Frequency	Annually (third quarter of the previous year)
Previous editions available?	Yes.
Limitations	Demographia's rankings are based on the theory that urban planning places an unnatural restriction on the supply of land for development, thus putting pressure on housing affordability. This equates to a perspective that planning for growth in many aspects constitutes an artificial restriction on supply of residential land which drives down housing affordability. They do not consider other possible causes of unaffordable housing.
References	<p>Demographia, (2015). <i>11th Annual Demographia International Housing Affordability Survey: 2015</i>. Performance Urban Planning.</p> <p>Burton, P. and Woolcock, G., (2010). <i>Green Star Communities Information Papers – Draft Final Report</i>, Urban Research Program Griffith University, Australia.</p>

Benchmark study 5	City Comparison Toolkit, 2015
Provider	JLL Global
Auckland's current rank	<p>Auckland has several rankings out of 300 cities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial attraction: 114 • Real Estate Investment: 66 • Cross-Border Real Estate Investment: 63 • Economic Size: 212
Why produced and for whom?	To provide a comparative analysis of commercial attraction across 300 cities worldwide.
Narrowly focused or uses different types of information?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This research covers 300 cities around the world. It presents comparisons across four domains: Commercial Attraction: The primary benchmark of the size and strength of a city's economy and real estate market. • Real Estate Investment: The index measures the level of direct commercial real estate investment by value in a city between 2012 and 2014. • Cross-Border Real Estate Investment: The index measures the level of cross-border real estate investment by value in a city between 2012 and 2014. • Economic Size: It estimates annual economic output of the metropolitan area in 2014.
Data sources described?	No
Frequency	This is an online tool and is updated as data becomes available.
Previous editions available?	No
Limitations	The deployed methodology is not clearly explained.
References	http://www.jll.com/cities-research

Benchmark study 6	World's Most Liveable City, 2015
Provider	Economist Intelligence Unit
Auckland's current rank	Auckland is ranked 9 out of 140 cities.
Why produced and for whom?	The Economist Intelligence Unit's liveability index quantifies the challenges that might be presented to an individual's lifestyle in any given location, and allows for direct comparison between locations.
Narrowly focused or uses different types of information?	The ranking scores 140 cities from 0 – 100 on 30 factors spread across five areas: stability, health care, culture and environment, education and infrastructure. These numbers are then weighted and combined to produce an overall figure. The survey gives an overall rating of 0 – 100, where 1 is intolerable and 100 is ideal.
Data sources described?	No, unless you purchase the Liveability Ranking and Overview.
Frequency	Annually (financial year)
Previous editions available?	Yes.
Limitations	A city that has good scores in each of the ranking indicators may not rank as highly as a city that has performed exceptionally in some rankings and poorly in others.
References	<p>The Economist Intelligence Unit, (2015). <i>A Summary of the Liveability Ranking and Overview</i>. August 2015.</p> <p>Burton, P. and Woolcock, G., (2010). <i>Green Star Communities Information Papers – Draft Final Report</i>, Urban Research Program Griffith University, Australia.</p>

Benchmark study 7	Worldwide Quality of Living Survey, 2015
Provider	Mercer Consulting
Auckland's current rank	Auckland is ranked 3 out of 230 cities.
Why produced and for whom?	The Mercer Quality of Living survey is designed to advise governments and major companies on the amount of compensation required to offset expatriates who experience a decline in living conditions in their new host location.
Narrowly focused or uses different types of information?	<p>The Mercer Quality of Living Survey is an index that rates over 380 cities based on 10 key categories and 39 criteria, each with weightings reflecting their relative importance. The 10 key categories along are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political and social environment – e.g. political stability, crime and law enforcement (23.5%) • Economic environment – e.g. banking services (4.0%) • Socio-cultural environment – e.g. civil liberties (6.4%) • Health and sanitation (19.0%) • Schools and education (3.4%) • Public services and transportation (13.0%) • Recreation (9.0%) • Consumer goods (10.7%) • Housing (5.1%) • Natural environment – for example, climate (5.9%) <p>An overall Quality of Life Index is calculated, and New York City is used as the base city with 100 points. Each indicator is given a rating of between one (lowest score) and ten (highest score). These indicators are then weighted to produce an index, the higher the index, the better the quality of living. Compared to the base city (i.e. New York), an overall ranking is then produced.</p>
Data sources described?	An outline of the methodology is given. No detail is provided on the data collection, how the data is reviewed or how it is analysed. Without knowing this, it is difficult to determine the validity and consistency of the reporting of results between individual cities.
Frequency	Annually (financial year)
Previous editions available?	No.
Limitations	The introduction to the methodology section in Mercer's explanatory notes on the Quality of Living Survey stresses that cultural differences are avoided and comparisons are only made of factors that are of basic concern to all international employees. Mercer claims that this removes biases towards American, European or Asian standards, but in doing so neglects 90% of the target population. It should be noted that the target population of this study is aimed at high-income earners.
References	<p>Mercer website (7 April 2015): http://www.imercer.com/uploads/GM/qol2015/q3971qol2015/index.html</p>

Benchmark study 8	Quality of Life Survey, 2015
Provider	Monocle Magazine
Auckland's current rank	In 2015, Auckland was ranked 17 out of 25 cities.
Why produced and for whom?	First launched in 2007, the Quality of Life survey uses a combination of scientific data and subjective opinion to come up with a list of the top 25 most liveable cities in the world.
Narrowly focused or uses different types of information?	In 2015, Monocle reviewed the metrics behind their Quality of Life list, and added 22 new metrics.
Data sources described?	No methodology is available.
Frequency	Annually (financial year)
Previous editions available?	Some information is available free of charge on the Monocle website. Detailed information available by subscribing to Monocle Magazine.
Limitations	The website pitches its Most Liveable Cities Index to individuals on a personal level, rather than to international companies. The magazine, however, provides a global perspective on international affairs, business, travel, culture, fashion and design to wealthy, mobile, cosmopolitan readers, so the target audience is still selective.
References	Monocle Website: http://monocle.com/film/affairs/the-monocle-quality-of-life-survey-2015/

Benchmark study 9	Corruption Perceptions Index, 2014
Provider	Transparency International
Auckland's current rank	In 2014, New Zealand was ranked 2 out of 175 countries.
Why produced and for whom?	Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index ranks almost 200 countries by their perceived levels of corruption, as determined by expert assessments and opinion surveys.
Narrowly focused or uses different types of information?	<p>The Corruption Perceptions Index ranks countries according to their perceived levels of public-sector corruption. The index draws on different assessments and business opinion surveys carried out by independent and reputable institutes.</p> <p>The surveys and assessments used to compile the index include questions relating to the bribery of public officials, kickbacks in public procurement, embezzlement of public funds, and questions that probe the strength and effectiveness of public-sector anti-corruption efforts.</p> <p>The Corruption Perceptions Index ranks countries/territories based on how corrupt their public sector is perceived to be. A country's or territory's score indicates the perceived level of public sector corruption on a scale of 0 - 10, where 0 means that a country is perceived as highly corrupt and 10 means that a country is perceived as very clean. A country's rank indicates its position relative to the other countries/territories included in the index.</p>
Data sources described?	A standardised ranking system is used to determine the Corruption Perceptions Index. The source information comes from outside expert assessment and surveys targeted at businesses.
Frequency	Annual (calendar year)
Previous editions available?	Yes, dating back to 2002.
Limitations	Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index is an average of several other country measures. Some of these examine the frequency of corruption and others measure quantity i.e. the amount of money involved. Since the measuring of sources changes, comparing corruption between countries and over time with the Corruption Perceptions Index is inappropriate.
References	Transparency International, (2014). <i>Corruption Perceptions Index</i> , Transparency International, International Secretariat, Germany.

Benchmark study 10	Anholt GfK-Roper City Brands Index, 2011
Provider	Simon Anholt
Auckland's current rank	In 2011, Auckland was ranked 36 out of 50 cities.
Why produced and for whom?	<p>Simon Anholt developed the City Brands Index in 2006 as a way to measure the image and reputation of the world's cities, and to track their profiles as they rise or fall. Now, in partnership with GfK Roper Public Affairs and Media, one of the world's leading research firms, Simon Anholt has launched an expanded City Brands Index.</p> <p>The Anholt City Bands Index assesses how people perceive the image of cities using a survey of nearly 20,000 consumers in 20 countries.</p> <p>Anholt-GFK Roper also produces an annual nation brand index. In 2014, New Zealand ranked 15 out of 50 nations.</p>
Narrowly focused or uses different types of information?	<p>To measure the strength of a city's band, the city's Brand index is based on the following six components:</p> <p>The presence – city's international status and standing The place – people's perceptions of the physical attributes of the city The potential – the economic and educational opportunities the city offers The pulse – the appeal of a vibrant urban lifestyle The people – how the people of the city are perceived The prerequisites – the basic qualities that the city should have.</p> <p>In order to rank cities, information was derived for these six components using an online survey.</p>
Data sources described?	No information on the methodology is provided.
Frequency	Annually (financial year)
Previous editions available?	Yes.
Limitations	City Brand indices measure perceptions of cities by panellists living in other countries and is highly subjective. The rankings are based on scores that are 'averages' of averages, which can also introduce a degree of subjectivity to the ranking process.
References	<p>http://www.simonanholt.com/Research/research-city-brand-index.aspx</p> <p>2011 data extracted from a presentation at: http://www.slideshare.net/joemacnichol/city-brands-index-2011101311bodpresentation</p>

Benchmark study 11	Global Metro Monitor, 2013- 2014
Provider	Brookings and LSE Cities
Auckland's current rank	Auckland is ranked 145 out of 300 metropolitan economies.
Why produced and for whom?	The fourth edition of the Global Metro Monitor employs the size of each metropolitan economy as the main selection criterion, given the focus on metropolitan economic performance. The Global Metro Monitor evaluates 300 of the largest metro largest metropolitan areas for which economic and industrial data were available.
Narrowly focused or uses different types of information?	<p>This Global Metro Monitor employs several key variables to assess the economic performance of metropolitan areas:</p> <p>Gross Domestic Product (GDP), employment, population, and GDP per capita, all from 2000 to 2014. In addition, the study uses gross value added (GVA) and employment by major industry sector.</p> <p>For static analysis, this study employs nominal GDP and GVA data at purchasing power parity rates. For trends analysis, it uses GDP and GVA data at 2009 prices and expressed in U.S. dollars. Data availability and comparability at metropolitan level precluded expanding the economic analysis to other indicators of interest, such as housing prices, employment rates, unemployment rates, and income distributions.</p> <p>This edition employs two main databases for analysis: Moody's Analytics for metropolitan areas in the United States and Oxford Economics for the rest of the sample.</p> <p>For industry analysis, this report collected industry-level data and estimates for metropolitan employment and GVA.</p>
Frequency	Annually
Data sources described?	A comprehensive outline of the methodology is provided, including the make-up of formulae and the way that rankings are determined. Data is provided by a range of statistical agencies.
Previous editions available?	Yes
Limitations	While every effort is made to keep data conceptually consistent across countries, the study is still limited by the data collection and statistical methods utilised by each country's statistical agencies. Consequently, each indicator may be calculated slightly differently on a country by country basis.
References	<p>http://www.brookings.edu/research/reports/2015/01/22-global-metro-monitor</p> <p>The Metropolitan Policy Program, (2014). <i>Global Metro Monitor</i>, The Brookings Institution, London School of Economics and Political Science, London.</p>

Benchmark study 12	Auckland: The City of Opportunity
Provider	PwC
Auckland's current rank	In 2012, Auckland was ranked 16 when assessed against the 27 other cities in the Global Cities of Opportunity study.
Why produced and for whom?	<p>PwC has produced a Cities of Opportunities city ranking every year from 2007. They rank cities across ten indicator categories. Their measures are designed to favour holistic capital market centres with vibrant economies and strong quality of life.</p> <p>The Auckland, City of Opportunity report provides the opportunity to see where Auckland sits against these 27 comparator cities and in doing so reflect on its agreed strategic direction. This was a specific report prepared for Auckland.</p>
Narrowly focused or uses different types of information?	<p>The analysis metric areas include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intellectual capital and innovation • Transportation and infrastructure • Health, safety and security • Sustainability and the natural environment • Economic clout • Ease of doing business • Cost • Demographics and liveability • City gateway.
Data sources described?	An overview of the methodology is provided.
Frequency	<p>This was is a one-off report for Auckland.</p> <p>A follow-up report titled <i>Cities of Opportunity: Towards Auckland's Future</i> was released in Feb 2014. This report examines the relationship between infrastructure and urban life through the lens of the broader Cities of Opportunity study, but is not a further benchmarking exercise.</p>
Previous editions available?	No.
Limitations	
References	<p>PwC Global Cities of Opportunity website: http://www.pwc.com/us/en/cities-of-opportunity.html</p> <p>PwC (2012). PricewaterhouseCoopers, New Zealand.</p> <p>PwC (2014). PricewaterhouseCoopers, New Zealand.</p>

Benchmark study 13	State of World Cities 2012
Provider	Globalisation and World Cities Group, (GaWC) Research Network
Auckland's current rank	Auckland is ranked Beta, 72 nd out of 526 cities.
Why produced and for whom?	The study provides figures for the comparative density of business firm networks, based on a benchmark of 100 for the most connected city (historically either London or New York).
Narrowly focused or uses different types of information?	<p>The GaWC Research Network ranks cities based on their connectivity through four "advanced producer services": accountancy, advertising, banking/finance, and law. The GaWC inventory identifies three levels of global cities and several sub-ranks. This roster generally denotes cities in which there are offices of certain multinational corporations providing financial and consulting services rather than denoting other cultural, political, and economic centres.</p> <p>GaWC Research Network assesses each city in terms of their advanced producer services using the Interlocking Network Model (developed by GaWC). Indirect measures of flows are derived to compute a city's network connectivity that measures a city's integration into the world city network. The connectivity measures are used to classify cities into levels of world city network integration. These levels are interpreted as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • alpha++ cities • alpha+ cities alpha and alpha- cities • All beta level cities All gamma level cities • Cities with sufficiency of services
Data sources described?	Background about how the Interlocking Network Model operates is provided. It includes information about the equations used.
Frequency	Biennially (every 2 years).
Previous editions available?	GaWC Research Network has published summary findings for 2000, 2004, 2008 and 2010.
Limitations	GaWC Research Network note that the telecommunications data has a regional rather than global focus, which means that in this case, the study is only able to obtain European or North American sections of networks, rather than global networks.
References	<p>Globalization and World Cities group (2012), 'The World According to GaWC 2012'. Available on GaWC website at: http://www.lboro.ac.uk/gawc/world2012t.html</p> <p>Globalization and World Cities group (2011), 'The World According to GaWC 2010'.</p>

Benchmark study 14	Innovation Cities, Top 100 Index (2012-13)
Provider	2ThinkNow
Auckland's current rank	Auckland is ranked 91 st out of 100 cities.
Why produced and for whom?	2ThinkNow is an Australian based agency that focuses on urban innovation. The Top 100 Index ranks cities according to levels of innovation.
Narrowly focused or uses different types of information?	<p>The Innovation Cities Global Index classifies 445 benchmark cities across several continents. Cities are selected from a list of 1,540 cities worldwide based on basic factors of health, wealth, population, geography as well as potential relative to peers. All benchmark cities are classified into the five classifications. There are also a limited number of unranked cities published for comparative purposes.</p> <p>The five classifications are assigned based on index scores. These are explained under each index. They are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NEXUS: Critical nexus for multiple economic and social innovation segments. • HUB: Dominance or influence on key economic and social innovation segments, based on global trends. • NODE: Broad performance across many innovation segments, with key imbalances. • INFLUENCER: Competitive in some segments, potential or unbalanced. • UPSTART: Potential steps towards future relative performance in a few innovation sectors. <p>Nexus and hub cities are best for innovation across multiple economic sectors, based on their three-factor index scores: The index score for each city is derived using 162 city indicators across 31 industry and community segments. They are weighted and summed up into three factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural Assets of a city from arts to sports industries. • Human Infrastructure, from mobility to start-ups, health, finance and more. • Networked Markets, the power of a city in a networked world. <p>The analysts release an index score out of 30 for top cities.</p>
Data sources described?	The 2011 methodology is explained for each index. This can be reproduced or quoted in any articles or research on the topic. The Innovation Cities Analysis Report can also be purchased.
Frequency	Annually
Previous editions available?	Yes.

Limitations	Previously 2Thinknow sent requests to the administrators of major cities around the world to participate in its annual innovation cities study. In effect it invited city administrators to score their own cities, introducing a potential source of bias. 2Thinknow has now changed this methodology and is using external personnel as analysts, rather than city administrators.
References	http://www.innovation-cities.com/innovation-city-classifications/333

Benchmark study 15	World University Ranking (2014-2015)
Provider	Times Higher Education
Auckland's current rank	The University of Auckland is ranked 175 out of 400 universities.
Why produced and for whom?	<p>The World University Rankings are used by undergraduate and postgraduate students to help select degree courses, by academics to inform career decisions, by research teams to identify new collaborative partners, and by university managers to benchmark their performance and set strategic priorities.</p> <p>This study measures the best universities by subject rank area, and the best universities as voted by employers.</p>
Narrowly focused or uses different types of information?	<p>The World University Ranking is based on 13 performance indicators, grouped into five areas (weighting in brackets):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching — the learning environment (30%) • Research — volume, income and reputation (30%) • Citations — research influence (30%) • Industry income — innovation (2.5%) • International outlook — staff, students and research (7.5%).
Data sources described?	An extensive breakdown on how the rankings are determined and how information is gathered for rankings is provided with the methodology.
Frequency	Annually (financial year)
Previous editions available?	Yes, dating back to 2004.
Limitations	Times Higher Education bases their data on a global scale to compare universities fairly across international borders. The drawback of global ranking is that it does not capture comparative and performance information between institutions and countries.
References	<p>The 2014-2015 data is available on The World University Ranking website at: https://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/2014-15/world-ranking/range/001-200</p> <p>Times Higher Education (2011) <i>World University Rankings 2011 – 2012</i>, Times Higher Education, TSL Education Ltd, London.</p>

Benchmark study 16	QS World University Rankings 2015
Provider	The Quacquarelli Symonds
Auckland's current rank	The University of Auckland is ranked 82 out of 800 universities. The Auckland University of Technology was ranked 481-490.
Why produced and for whom?	<p>The primary aim of the QS World University Rankings is to help students make informed comparisons of leading universities around the world. Based on six performance indicators, the rankings are designed to assess universities in four areas: research, teaching, employability and internationalisation.</p> <p>Each of the six indicators carries a different weighting when calculating the overall scores (see below). Four of the indicators are based on 'hard' data, and the remaining two are based on major global surveys – one of the academics and another of employers – each the largest of their kind. This study measures the best universities by subject rank area, and the best universities as voted by employers.</p>
Narrowly focused or uses different types of information?	<p>The QS World University Rankings is based on six performance indicators (weighting is shown in brackets):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Academic reputation (40%) 2. Employer reputation (10%) 3. Student-to-faculty ratio (20%) 4. Citations per faculty (20%) 5. International faculty ratio (5%) 6. International student ratio (5%)
Frequency	Annually (financial year)
Data sources described?	An extensive breakdown on how the rankings are determined and how information is gathered for rankings is provided with the methodology.
Previous editions available?	Yes
Limitations	The QS World University Rankings bases their survey on a global scale to compare universities fairly across international borders. The drawback of global ranking is that it does not capture comparative and performance information between institutions and countries.
References	http://www.topuniversities.com/student-info/qs-guides/qs-world-university-rankings .

Benchmark study 17	Top City Destination Ranking 2015
Provider	Euromonitor International
Auckland's current rank	Auckland is not listed in top 100 city destinations.
Why produced and for whom?	Euromonitor International, an independent provider of business intelligence on industries, countries and consumers, releases an annual City Destinations Ranking, covering over 230 of the world's leading cities in terms of international tourist arrivals.
Narrowly focused or uses different types of information?	Euromonitor International's Top City Destinations Ranking is built from the results of the global travel research programme conducted in 58 core countries by in-country analysts. City arrivals data was sourced directly from national statistics offices, airport arrivals, hotel/accommodation stays or other methods for all 58 core countries and 150 market insight countries under review.
Frequency	Annually (first quarter)
Data sources described?	Only a brief explanation is given.
Previous editions available?	Yes.
Limitations	The rankings focus on capital city hubs and tend to exclude beach and ski resorts that may enjoy high volumes of international visitors.
References	The 2015 data is available on the Euromonitor International website at: http://blog.euromonitor.com/2015/01/top-100-city-destinations-ranking.html