

Cities: Who Decides?

Jane-Frances Kelly

19 October

Transcript

Grattan Institute's second Cities program report is "Cities: Who Decides?".

The report investigates decision making in eight of the world's most successful cities, and asks what governance arrangements accompanied their broad-based improvement.

Every city has a different story, but among these differences a number of common themes emerged. These included the importance of public engagement, consistent strategic direction, cross-sectoral collaboration, and regional cooperation.

The report's findings have a number of implications for Australian cities, but two stand out. First, residents must be involved in decisions. The cities that made, and implemented, tough choices, had early and deep public engagement – an order of magnitude different from what often happens in Australia. Second, changing structures does not, in itself, result in success. No one particular type of governance structure was associated the cities' improvement. Changing structures has the danger of being a distraction.

Speaker: Jane-Frances Kelly, Program Director – Cities, Grattan Institute

Moderator: John Daley, CEO, Grattan Institute

AUDIO: This is a podcast from Grattan Institute, www.grattan.edu.au

JOHN: Yeah, but the definition of engagement is one in which you are prepared to say well I started with point of view A and as a result of the engagement I wound up with point of view B.

JANE-FRANCES: Yeah. Well I mean there's ... it's fascinating and we've been ... made quite a lot of effort to kind of sort of put kind of verbatim quotations into the report to kind of try and bring it alive a little bit more. But they were sort of saying that, you know, when residents got involved in this kind of stuff they started saying things like, look, we are all ... we are all in different boats, but I've kind of realised through this that we're in the same sea. And that kind of realisation is the kind of thing that can really progress the situation as opposed to resulting in conflict.

JOHN: We talked earlier about the need in many of ... or not a need but the fact that in many of these cities you could identify a trigger. Do you think there needs to be a full blown crisis?

JANE-FRANCES: No, because we were saying, you know, in Vancouver and Portland and so on there wasn't. I mean I actually think that the level of anxiety that there is or that we've seen in Australia over the past year around population growth and you sort of ... people feel like there's a lot of strained infrastructure and so on, that's enough of a trigger. It won't become a trigger if it's not then kind of acted upon, but that's more than enough.

JOHN: You've spoken about one of the dogs that didn't bark. We should probably talk about the other in terms of structure, you know, is there a structure that really makes a difference?

JANE-FRANCES: Yes, though the other dog that didn't bark was that there was no government structure that was dominant among these successful cities. There was really a wide range of government structures in the different cities. So in the report we've laid out a little diagram of what the formal governance arrangements were in these cities. And even in one country, for example in Canada, in Vancouver and in Toronto it was completely different. So, in Vancouver there were 22 local municipalities which were brought together under a regional collaborative organisation called Metro Vancouver which brokered agreements and allocated responsibilities among them, versus Toronto where in 1998 there was an amalgamation of six local councils in Toronto to make one larger City of Toronto. And so what we found was ... so there was ... it was possible to be successful with a range of these things and when we asked people about that they kind of said things like no, it's a culture and a collaboration that's much more important. And so we thought that that was particularly interesting given the calls for, for example, a metropolitan authority in Melbourne. And so that's why we've kind of said in the

report that, you know, that's not going to solve our problems on its own, and could even kind of potentially be a distraction.

JOHN: Yeah. So I guess that leads us to talk about okay, you've done all this work, you've looked at lots of cities, we've said that we're not going to apply it all simply mindlessly to Australian cities, what should we do in Australia as a result of all of this?

JANE-FRANCES: Mindfully.

JOHN: Mindfully, thoughtfully, carefully.

JANE-FRANCES: Yeah, yeah. Well I just think that we've got these sort of ... we've got these big decisions coming up, that we've sort of learned quite a lot about what works elsewhere, we've made quite a lot of effort in here to be quite specific about the kinds of things that they were doing, and I think we need to take that really seriously in Australia because what we found worked in those cities was, as we said, a whole level, a whole order of magnitude different from what happens in Australia today, and to not kind of get distracted by changing government structures for the sake of it. I mean there may be cases in Australia where you might need to do, or want to do that for other reasons, but what these kind of successful cities show is that there is no one dominant structure and you can do it with a range of them.

JOHN: But it does sound like we're going to have to spend some serious money on these kind of engagement processes.

JANE-FRANCES: Well, yes, and people kind of say they're expensive but we'd argue that getting them wrong is even more expensive.

JOHN: Yeah, absolutely.

JANE-FRANCES: And most of that money goes to lawyers.

JOHN: Indeed.

AUDIENCE: Nothing wrong with that.

JOHN: I'm a lapsed lawyer. Thank you for that exposition of the report. It's clearly a fascinating piece of work and one that's ... you hear a lot about these cities but to actually get this kind of really detailed discussion and description based on people who were actually there and involved in all of it, I think is very unusual and I hope will be a real contribution to the Australian debate. With that, we should probably throw it open to the floor.

JANE-FRANCES: And just before we do that ...

JOHN: We'll do that at the end, if we can. Okay. So let's throw it open to the floor and ask if there are some questions. We have a roving microphone up the back. If you'd like to just state your name as you ask your question, that would be terrific. If I can ask you to keep the questions short, and if I can remind you, but I can guarantee there'll be a whole bunch of questions at the end that we don't get to, so get in early.

AUDIENCE: Thank you. Paul Monk is my name. I was fascinated by that and I look forward to reading the report. I trust I can get hold of a copy this evening. My question ...

JANE-FRANCES: We've got some ...

AUDIENCE: Okay.

JANE-FRANCES: ... printed out here. I should just clarify this. We publish online ...

AUDIENCE: Okay.

JANE-FRANCES: ... in the carbon friendlier way but we've got some high carbon copies over there. I think there's about eight of them, so ...

JOHN: Otherwise it's on the website.

JANE-FRANCES: Yeah, it's on the website.

AUDIENCE: Alright. I'll bear both those things in mind. My question, and I hope it's not too broad, is this. Given what you were exploring in those different foreign cities and given the shared observation at the podium that we need to look at moving in some of those directions in Australia, what could be a catalyst in a city like Sydney or Melbourne for the kind of consultative process you're talking about? How can you, as it were, trigger that thing? You were talking about trigger point.

JANE-FRANCES: Well I think lots of different things can be a trigger. As I was saying I don't think that you need to have a crisis although sometimes obviously it can be helpful. I think a journalist, I'll not name which paper, who said to me last week, not a crisis is like that, doesn't sell newspaper. And I'm like, I'm sorry, I said it's raining outside and I'm about to go out for my lunch, is that a crisis? The ... there's, you know, even just sort of realising how much challenge is coming up in Australia could be enough of a trigger in itself, it just depends whether it's reacted to. I mean that's the difference between whether something is a trigger or not as whether it's pulled or ... I think I'm stretching this metaphor too much.

JOHN: Well I guess it ultimately requires political will, it will require some politicians to decide that they want to go down this road and this process.

JANE-FRANCES: And it requires leadership. And the other thing that this shows is that leadership doesn't have to come from government. There were some of the cities where it wasn't government who kind of, sort of you know, laid it off, although government obviously has to get involved eventually, they're a primary actor, but it doesn't have to start from there.

JOHN: I mean, does that imply that we would be looking to business groups amongst others to sort of start calling for this kind of engagement?

JANE-FRANCES: Well it could be business groups but the other thing that this report shows is that the kind of organisations which seem to be a real benefit to cities are more representative. So maybe business groups in concert with others, or organisations which within themselves are more representative than just of business.

JOHN: Yeah, thank you. Do we have another question? This one here.

JANE-FRANCES: And I think Lucy has one down here as well.

JOHN: Oh, sorry, okay.

JANE-FRANCES: After.

AUDIENCE: Rod Keenan, University of Melbourne. You talked about needing to involve people early in the process, right at the beginning, but you also talked about presenting them with real choices.

JANE-FRANCES: Yeah.

AUDIENCE: At what stage are the choices developed compared to when you involve the people?

JANE-FRANCES: Okay. Well, I mean every process is different in different cities and in Australia we should develop our own, obviously. But one example would be Vancouver where the first two steps in the ... so they went through a kind of a four step process and putting together their city plan in the mid '90s and it's laid out in a box in here. So the first two steps

were actually just sort of gathering ideas from people and doing that in a well managed way. And it was then that the choices were kind of crystallised. And what that meant, that once they crystallised the choices there was a lot of content that they could put underneath them. And it's absolutely critical that the consequences of each choice are always laid out in a neutral manner, but you know, 'cause every choice has a consequence, so my mother kept telling me and it turns out she was right.

JOHN: Thank you. Next question?

JANE-FRANCES: Did you have ...

AUDIENCE: Yeah, I ...

JANE-FRANCES: The ...

AUDIENCE: I think ...

JANE-FRANCES: The microphone's on its way to you.

AUDIENCE: This is a terrific report and it's really interesting and I don't want to dwell on the issue of structure, however, can I point out that all the city councils in those eight successful cities for consultation and collaboration actually have populations much greater than any metropolitan city council, city centre council in Australia with a possible exception of Brisbane? I'll just leave that out there.

JANE-FRANCES: Most of the cities are also a bit bigger.

AUDIENCE: Exactly. Well, not all of them but ...

JANE-FRANCES: But I mean in Greater Vancouver there are 22 ...

AUDIENCE: ... but say, but they've all ... the city council as a subset of the total metropolitan population, the lowest one is Seattle with 17%. That's much bigger than say Melbourne City Council, Sydney City Council, Adelaide and Perth.

JANE-FRANCES: Yeah.

AUDIENCE: So the structure is markedly different from Australian cities. I'll just make that observation.

JANE-FRANCES: We thought that what was more interesting was that there were many local councils within what you could call the real economic area of a city. So I know that in Adelaide they have 31, for example, councils in greater Adelaide, but in Vancouver it was 22 and in many of the other cities it went up into the tens and the twenties in terms of how many councils there were.

JOHN: And all of those councils were involved in the kind of the process?

JANE-FRANCES: Yeah, yeah. And I mean the regional collaboration point was really interesting in here about kind of where that worked, because where it didn't work, it was identified by the interviewees as a challenge for that city. And the one thing that really kind of boggled my mind slightly is that in Copenhagen they have cross national co-operation that works because they have the bridge that goes between Copenhagen and Malmö.

AUDIENCE: Yeah.

JOHN: Thank you. Thank you, a question over there and then we'll head over to that side of the room.

AUDIENCE: Craig Allchin. I'm interested in ...

JANE-FRANCES: The microphone records your question.

AUDIENCE: Oh, sorry.

JANE-FRANCES: No, it's alright.

AUDIENCE: Craig Allchin. I'm interested in the ... I think in our cities the model of the state government, it actually acts as a big metropolitan government, really, and so in these cities was there an absence of that role that you're saying? So was it a bottom up process that got a lot of the good results with the council, the local governments collaborating? Or was there also the top down state coming in and that missing level was taken up by the two?

JANE-FRANCES: Yeah. Well one really example ... really interesting example was Seattle where the Growth Management Act was passed in 1992 I think. It's in there. They ... that was passed by the state of Oregon. And so we thought as though, ah-ha, this is an example of where the kind of state has come in. But the people that we talked to and the literature that we looked at said no, actually what it came ... it was passed at state level because that's where the legislation had to take effect. But it actually grew out of quite a bottom up process of kind of citizens saying we need a framework in which this is going to work and they talk about the thousand friends of Oregon and other kind of organisations that were kind of representative of a whole bunch of different interests and being really involved in that. So again, you know, it differed in different places. It could sort of start from different places. But obviously each kind of level of government has its role and certain things have to be done at certain levels of government because of legislative arrangements.

JOHN: Thank you.

AUDIENCE: Hi Jane-Frances, Sek Tan. My question's really got two parts. The first is you talked about what makes cities successful. So what do you define as a successful city? And the second part ...

JANE-FRANCES: Can I refer you to page 10 of The Cities We Need.

AUDIENCE: Okay.

JANE-FRANCES: No, actually partly 'cause it's not a short answer.

AUDIENCE: Okay.

JANE-FRANCES: Which I don't know off by heart.

AUDIENCE: Okay. The second part of my question is, given that by most international rankings, four or five, or four out of 10 cities, top cities in the world are Australian cities, what do you think, you know, are dominant or successful features of Australian cities which other cities could learn from us?

JANE-FRANCES: Well the first think I'll say is just a kind of ... I sort of just invite you to take the fact that I came to Melbourne six and a half years ago for nine months as an indicator of what I feel about, personally, about Australian cities. The ... having said that, the rankings that you're talking about, rankings like The Economist, Liveability Index, the Mercer Quality of Life survey and so on, we took a look at the methodology of those rankings and I guess unsurprisingly when you think about it, what they are really kind of focusing on is what that city delivers for highly educated, globally mobile professionals.

JOHN: Who read The Economist.

JANE-FRANCES: Who read The Economist. And in fact if you take a look at the Mercer website where they take a look at that, they actually ... they design it as a product for use by the human resources departments of multinational companies to calculate the hardship allowances that

multinational, you know, executives need to be paid in order to be willing to live in a particular city. And presumably you could imagine it's an argument that once you get a certain amount up their rankings, the executive should be paying them. So yes, Australian cities do very well on those rankings which means that they are great places for those kind of people to be. Now that's no bad thing at all. We just don't think that it's good enough that our cities do a good job just by a small group of its population, so we're interested in a much broader kind of ... a broader definition of success. And so, you know, the amount of inequality, for example, would then be kind of one. I'm afraid I don't have with me, I mean the ... I didn't bring The Cities We Need report, but I would take a look at that section because we very deliberately, and we've had some ... had some analytical fights with John about this in the last week, we really deliberately don't have a kind of a set definition of exactly the indicators or the things that you would look at because our argument is that it's across a range of things. I was talking about earlier, how well do they meet the needs of the cities' residents. And some of those needs that we were talking about we don't even measure at the moment. So we have a discussion in that report of what a successful city is and that's what we used as a basis for this. But as I also mentioned, there's not data available for a whole bunch of it. I mean cities are actually kind of a really notorious kind of topic of study for even decent data on really basic stuff because often places don't break down to the city level various things, and you can only get them at country level and all that kind of stuff.

JOHN: I mean presumably there's an issue there which is even if Australian cities were in the top 10, there's a question of what can we learn to make them even better than they are.

JANE-FRANCES: Yeah.

AUDIENCE: What were the processes used to decide who should manage the participatory process? And who decided what the choices should be in the tradeoffs?

JANE-FRANCES: Yeah. Well the ... I'd say it was different in each case because actually sort of different people led the processes in different cities. So in the city of Vancouver it was the planning department, for example, led it. And in that case as well, what ... the thing that determined the choices was an enormous exercise that they went through in asking people what was it that mattered to them about Vancouver and for ideas about kind of you know, ways of making Vancouver better. So that's described in here. In Seattle they went through ... or it might have been Portland, one of those two, they went through ... it's in there, they went through a process of ... through lots of kind of survey and other work, through a process of ... and this was the ... in Portland it was ... it was Portland, it was the metro area which, if you take a look at the formal governance thing for Portland, shows that it's ... that's the thing that covers all of the municipal council areas. I can't remember the number off hand, that there are in there. They did a big exercise on what the values were that people had for ... they were expecting population growth and then kind of decided what the choices were based on the challenges from the population growth and preserving those values. So it was different in each case.

JOHN: Thank you. Have got one up the back there and then we'll come up the front here and see if we can ...

JANE-FRANCES: There's Brian down here and down here.

JOHN: ... squeeze in Brian.

AUDIENCE: Oh, hi. Just interested, Jane-Frances, in the range ...

JANE-FRANCES: Hi. Who are you?

AUDIENCE: Phil Harbutt, how are you going, Jane? Yes, one of the things I'm interested in is the range of choices that were offered to communities in those public engagement exercises. You gave the example of the housing and how increased housing could be accommodated, so there was a very local level engagement around that. I'm wondering, are there metropolitan-wide as well as local engagement issues?

JANE-FRANCES: Yeah, yeah, so that actually started at a metropolitan level. So that example you're talking about was Vancouver where there was a certain amount of population growth that was expected and that was, you know, a national issue and they said it's really important to kind of be clear about what is and what isn't on the table. You know, it wasn't up to Vancouver as to whether Canada was going to close its doors to migration, for example. So they kind of took that population growth and at a metropolitan level the choices were about, you know, well whether to ... whether Vancouver might be interested in accepting more than its pro rata share of that growth or not, and then that exercise was repeated at a more local level. And then at the local level the thing ... the stuff that was talked about was well how are we going to manage that in our local area? And at the City of Vancouver level, for example, which is a local municipal council, they had the choice as to whether to take their pro rata share, whether to take less than their pro rata share, whether to take more than it or to say no altogether. And so those were the kind of ... you know, the things that were on the table, and they decided after a whole bunch of engagement to take more than their pro rata share.

JOHN: Thank you. I think there was ...

JANE-FRANCES: But that needn't have been the outcome, right.

AUDIENCE: Hi, my name is Carlos, I work for Sustainability Victoria, and I did some research like five years ago on Australian cities. And I also found that the key component that was not included when developing strategic plans were the actual tradeoffs. In the cities that you looked at, that ... was there a clear ... a timeframe in terms of the tradeoffs? Were population shown the impact of the tradeoffs in the short term, medium term or long term? Or was just showing them short term tradeoffs?

JANE-FRANCES: Okay, the first thing I have to say is you asked of our level of detail about these things that we don't actually have. We've spoken to these people, we haven't seen the materials, for example, 'cause some of these exercises were taking place in the mid '90s and we've read literature about it, we've looked at the data and we've talked to the people who were there and so on, but we ... we weren't there, if you know what I mean. We don't ... they didn't have a lot of the materials left over and so on. So we don't have the kind of level of detail that you know, might be desirable and I'm not sure. There's a book being written about Vancouver at the moment which is interesting. So I mean the answer is it's been different in every city, right. It's ... that's kind of the first thing. I don't have a precise answer about the number of years over which they were talking about, but various plans that, you know, were being kind of drawn up over, you know, sort of through these processes would look out 10, 20, 30 years, sometimes longer. Actually I was checking this afternoon what the Vancouver city plan framework time was and someone said to me, presumably neither five years nor a thousand years because sort of slightly more intimidating governments than Vancouver's tend to choose those timeframes.

JOHN: Thank you. There's one up the front here.

AUDIENCE: Yeah.

JOHN: Thank you.

JANE-FRANCES: And then down here. Five-year plan, thousand-year plan (whispered).

AUDIENCE: My name is Allie Levine. I've got a question with two parts. The first one is how much consideration did you pay to the cities' existing trajectories in terms of land use planning and things when you decided whether they were comparable to Melbourne? And secondly, it seems ... look, maybe this is wrong, but it seems like these kind of triggers could only actually be acted on when there is an absence of some sort of existing plan, like strategic plan in terms of how planning is going to happen in the city. Like I can't imagine it happening in Melbourne, for example, even though we may be facing the same issues, we have ... we've already decided our strategic plan, I guess.

JANE-FRANCES: But, you know, I mean luckily, like ...

AUDIENCE: We don't have any plans. We have a series of actions.

AUDIENCE: Yeah, but there's ...

JANE-FRANCES: No, no, okay, hold on. The ... in these cities ...

AUDIENCE: Yeah.

JANE-FRANCES: ... generally plans did exist.

AUDIENCE: Yeah.

JANE-FRANCES: And either they were being revisited or refreshed, so the existence of something is not ... was not a handicap to them. Right, right, okay. The other thing about when you were talking about the comparable trajectories, I'm not sure how you mean about that just now but we can talk about that afterwards. Sorry. I'm just ... I'm just aware I want to fit in a couple of people over here. We chose cities which were sizes and with population growth rates to reflect the range of Australian cities. So some of them were smaller because some Australian cities are smaller, and some of them were larger and one of them in particular was, I think Chicago, was about twice the size of a lot of Australian cities. But then again, you know, some of our bigger Australian cities are projected to be twice their size in 20 to 30 years, so we thought it would be very interesting to kind of take a look at that. So there was a range. Sorry, thanks.

JOHN: Cheers. One here, thank you.

JANE-FRANCES: Brian, and then ...

JOHN: Just one here and then at the back and ...

AUDIENCE: Oh, thanks. Well I thought this was all very '70s really. I mean Vancouver and Habitat One.

JANE-FRANCES: You said that at the last seminar.

AUDIENCE: All of that maximum pleasurable participation ...

JANE-FRANCES: Is it my hairstyle?

AUDIENCE: ... etc, etc. I just wondered, I mean Vancouver does sound very interesting because of the regional focus, so together with some devolution in terms of municipalities and some municipal power, I wondered whether there was devolution of kind of infrastructure budgets. I mean whether this was really a matter of not just planning some responsibility but actually shifting resources to sort of an element of devolution, is that kind of part of that model?

JANE-FRANCES: The ... I'm just trying to remind myself which one I was trying ... so the ... well transport infrastructure for example in Vancouver is managed at a regional level, which kind of makes sense because it's that level that it makes sense to make the decisions about transport infrastructure investments which are often kind of quite big. So there was a thing called TransLink formed in 1999 to see ... to kind of oversee that. And in some ways it's working well and in some ways it's not yet, it's a bit of a kind of a work in progress. Again, that was sort of slightly different between different cities. And I'm trying to remember the first part of your question, sorry. Something else that was in my head to say.

AUDIENCE: I'll try ...

JANE-FRANCES: I don't know whether it's very '70s or not, I was a toddler.

(Laughter)

JANE-FRANCES: Oh, I didn't mean that in a bad way. I mean ...

(Laughter)

JOHN: And I'm afraid this will have to be the last question 'cause we ...

JANE-FRANCES: Sorry.

JOHN: ... need to get out on time.

AUDIENCE: Harmut Fuenfgeld from RMIT. Jane-Frances, you mentioned developers briefly in one of your comments. One thing I feel like you often come across in an Australian context is critical discussions around the role of developers in city decision making processes. And I just wondered, do you come across any sort of examples or lighthouses of how developers are engaged in city decision making and planning that are different from the way it's done in Australia?

JANE-FRANCES: Well Texas is an interesting example. I mean one of the things that they said in Texas was there are people who felt ... and again, you know, not every interviewee said this, and where you stand depends on where you sit, often. But they were talking about the incredibly low local election turnout rates in Texas which can be like 8% sort of sometimes, and you know, in a country with compulsory voting that's kind of hard to kind of think about. But they really felt that that meant that kind of ... sort of economic interests like developers had too much of a ... of an influence on the process. I mean Austin and Dublin were two really interesting cities in this because they were two cities where the public engagement was not a big feature. They were also the two cities where the story seemed to be that they rode an economic wave, if you like. Now, very different things have happened in Dublin since to do with their kind of financial crisis, but what's interesting with Austin is that they now think that Austin is facing some of the kind of tough decisions that we are facing here in Australia where they hadn't had to before. And it will be really interesting to see how Austin deals with that, given that you know, the success so far has been kind of broadly without that kind of public engagement and with a kind of a set of governance arrangements that, you know, sort of people tended to despair of rather than to kind of ascribe any of the success to.

JOHN: Thank you. Time as always has marched along, so we should probably draw it to a close there. Can I congratulate you on a terrific report and we should probably also thank the others from Grattan Institute who were involved.

JANE-FRANCES: So, Helen Morrow in particular who's down here at the front shouldered a great deal of the ... the research and I saw Helen in a meeting of the energy team at Grattan this afternoon because she's now moved on to energy and I had a complete panic because I don't know whether the Cities Program works or not with Helen ... without Helen because she's been working on this for months now. There's also Caitrin Davis, Owen Probert, Ben Weidmann and Amelie Hunter, they were involved and they ... we should recognise them too. And there are long versions of those city case studies that are going to be available on the web by the end of the week. We're just having some formatting hoo-hars with them at the moment.

JOHN: But in the meantime you can get the main report from the web, from www.grattan.edu.au. And now if I could call on our host from Middletons, Dudley Kneller, to give a vote of thanks. Dudley is a partner here at Middletons where he specialises on a series of things but particularly I noticed Dudley has advised clients and deals in The Hague, Amsterdam, Bangalore, London, Manila, Moscow, Mumbai and across South America, so we can probably count at least three or four cities in South America, so I'm sure has a perspective on some of the things we've been talking about. Thank you very much.

JANE-FRANCES: Thanks.

(Applause)

DUDLEY: Thanks very much, John. On behalf of the partners and staff at Middletons, I'd just like to give a vote of thanks and take this opportunity to thank Jane-Frances for her presentation this evening. I think we'll all agree it's been very thought provoking, very interesting, given the numbers of questions that you've received also, and I assume you'll be hounded as you get up to leave as well. Can I also take an opportunity to thank the Grattan Institute for organising the event this evening. The Institute seeks to promote public debate on important and key issues for Australia. Again, given the turnout we've got tonight and the questions that we received, I think you very much achieve that aim. It's been a pleasure hosting the event at Middletons and I hope to see you at a future event. Thank you again.

(Applause)

AUDIO: This has been a podcast from Grattan Institute. Want to hear more? Check out our website, www.grattan.edu.au.

End of recording