



Fairfax/NZME: summary of the factual versus counterfactual

Russell McVeagh

22 December 2016

Confidential version

Project Team

James Mellsop

Kevin Counsell

NERA Economic Consulting Level 8, PWC Tower 113-119 The Terrace PO Box 699 Wellington 6111 New Zealand Tel: 64 4 819 2550 Fax: 64 4 819 2552 www.nera.com

		Public version
Con	tents	
1.	Introduction	1
2	Counterfactual scenario	1

Public version

1.	Introduction
----	--------------

1.	In respect of the	proposed	merger	of Fairfax	and NZME,	[].

2. $[]^1$

3. We have been asked by Russell McVeagh to elaborate on the logic underlying this counterfactual, which we do in the remainder of this report. The idea is effectively to identify the link between the PWC analysis and the cost-benefit analysis that the Commission must carry out.

2. Counterfactual scenario

1	Г	1	Thic	analycic	chowe	that	in	the	ahsence	of the	merger.
4.	L].	11118	analysis	SHOWS	mai,	Ш	uie	absence	or the	merger.

a) []; and

b) []

5. $[\].^2$ The proposed counterfactual in our 25 November 2016 report assumes that $[\].$

6. []

7. []

8. []. We report the benefits of the factual relative to the base case counterfactual in the table below.

¹ []

² []

Public version

Table 1^{3 4 5}

9.	The effect of this analysis for the base case counterfactual is that, even assuming that
	plurality effects could be considered a relevant detriment (which the parties submit is not the
	case), for the combined quantified and unquantified effects to not result in a net public
	benefit, [] would need to exceed:

a) The present value of the quantified net benefits, being [] []; and

b) The present value of [].

10. As noted above, the benefits of [].

³ []

^{4 []}

⁵ []



NERA Economic Consulting Level 8, PWC Tower 113-119 The Terrace PO Box 699 Wellington 6111 New Zealand Tel: 64 4 819 2550 Fax: 64 4 819 2552 www.nera.com