

Tabled information
reference 169/12P(a)

Sub number: 1562



Sport Wellington
Level 2, 113 Adelaide Road
PO Box 24 148, Manners St,
Wellington, New Zealand
T. 64 4 380 2070 F. 64 4 801 8976
www.sportwellington.org.nz

Submission to Wellington City Council (WCC) Draft Long Term Plan (LTP) 2012-22

SPORT WELLINGTON Sport Wellington is the independent organisation for sport and physical recreation covering the Greater Wellington Regional Council area – working alongside the eight local authorities.

VISION Everyone, everyday experiencing the force of sport and physical recreation.

PURPOSE To promote and support sport and recreation in our region.

REGIONAL VALUE OF SPORT AND RECREATION In 2011 Sport NZ (previously SPARC) published a series of reports on the economic and social value of sport and recreation to New Zealand at a national and regional level. This information alongside previous participation surveys shows that sport and recreation's contribution is far reaching.

Sport and recreation activities are highly valued by people in the Wellington region:

- 9 out of 10 (90%) young people (5 – 17 yrs) take part in at least one sport or recreation activity over a year (with 66% taking part with family and friends).
- Over 8 out of 10 (84%) of adults take part in at least one sport or recreation activity over a year.
- These are supported by over 76,000 volunteers

Sport and recreation volunteers contribute valuable services to the Wellington region:

- Volunteers contributed 4.5 million hours to sport and recreation in 2007/08
- The estimated market value of these volunteered services is \$64 million at 2009 values

Sport and Recreation is an important economic sector in the Wellington region:

- The contribution of sport and recreation to GDP (including volunteered services) in 2008/09 is estimated to have been \$514.6 million, or 1.9%.

Sport and Recreation is an important vehicle for expressing Maori and Pacific Island culture from traditional activities and mainstream sports to national representative level (e.g. waka ama, netball, rugby league).

Source: SPARC, 2011. *The Economic Value of Sport and Recreation to the Wellington Region*. Wellington: SPARC

**DRAFT LONG TERM
PLAN COMMENTS**

Sport Wellington would like to acknowledge the important investment that WCC continues to make in sport and recreation in Wellington City. Local authorities throughout New Zealand are the largest investors by far in sport and recreation, and are critical and essential to its delivery.

Overseas research shows that participation in sport and recreation benefits communities by contributing to:

- Pride in the community and a sense of identity
- Increased community involvement
- Reduced anti-social behaviour
- Less crime, vandalism and substance abuse.

Additionally, participation in sport benefits educational outcomes. A new NZ study shows that school attendance and students' connectedness with their school are positively linked to secondary school students' participation in school sport.

Participation in sport improves employment prospects also. In the recent case study completed of Norths Rugby Club, Porirua, a coach stated: *"A lot of the guys have gained employment because of who they play for, because it's on their CV. Your profile, yes it does help. It show that you're committed, dedicated"*.

This same study also underlines the important role sport plays in creating opportunities for family time, creating a sense of belonging, positive community identity and a sense of pride.

Source: Research NZ (commissioned by SPARC), 2010. *Value of Sport and Recreation; Case Study of Northern United Rugby Football Club*. Wellington: SPARC

Long Term Vision

Sport Wellington suggests inclusion in the Long Term Vision for a people centred city, the words "an active and healthy population who feel safe".

Although it might be considered implicit in the present statement, inclusion of the word "active" clearly signals that participation in sport and recreation or other physical activities is important to the health of the city and its people and ensures this intent is explicit in the vision statement.

Clyde Quay Marina

Sport Wellington supports the investment into the improvement of the Clyde Quay Marina (public access improvements currently in the draft LTP). We understand that there is further development work proposed (Clyde Quay Boat Harbour Restoration Project) which could become a key strategic aspect of Wellington City development and contribute to both social and recreation, and economic development outcomes. We would support the inclusion of this project into the LTP and support the suggestion of the Royal Port Nicholson Yacht Club (RPNYC) (in their submission to WCC) that the Financial Sustainability Working Party collaborate with RPNYC to endeavour to secure funding as a means to reduce the WCC contribution to the project.

Sport Wellington has invested (via KiwiSport) \$38,000 with the RPNYC since

	<p>September 2010 to achieve increased participation by children in sailing and other water sports. We have been impressed with the quality of their delivery and the participation numbers they have been able to achieve thus far.</p>
Park Structures	<p>Sport Wellington supports the additional funding to construct a stream bund at the Prince of Wales Park which will help prevent flooding of the sports field.</p>
Lyll Bay Surf Club	<p>Sport Wellington supports the deferring of funds for the Lyall Bay Surf Club new clubhouse and public toilets to 2013/14.</p>
Sportsfields	<p>Sport Wellington does not support the deferring of investment into grass sportsfields, and the installation of concrete based artificial wickets. The population growth predictions, the Wellington weather, and the 27% growth of football since 2005 (as one example of a high user) are indications of the importance of the investment in these facilities. We urge WCC to improve these facilities as soon as possible and therefore budget for this from the 12/13 year.</p> <p>We are very supportive of the continuation of the roll-out of more artificial surfaces throughout Wellington City. We note that this work programme has been deferred slightly and as mentioned above, the current demands on sportsfields and the amount of cancellations experienced, particularly by junior teams, indicate that the sooner these facilities can be built the better it will be for our community.</p> <p>Whilst we understand and support the policy of user pays (10% of the costs of running the sportsfields are to be covered by users), this must be balanced against removing the well reported obstacles to participation. Sport Wellington would like to see more people participating in sport and recreation and accessibility, availability and affordability are all very important in being able to achieve this. Increasing charges for sportsfields (including synthetic turf sportsfields such as the National Hockey Stadium) may result in increased income but it may also result in less people participating in sport and recreation because of the cost barrier.</p>
Cycle Networks and Cycle Safety	<p>Sport Wellington supports the proposed new cycling routes across the city and the projects including general safety improvements. Cycling as both a recreational activity and as a commuter option is likely to increase if the current safety concerns are addressed.</p>
Swimming Pools	<p>Sport Wellington supports the improvements proposed for the Keith Spry Swimming Pool. We are particularly impressed with WCC considering the 'teaching' pool space as it continues to be an area of concern for parents of school aged children. Sport Wellington recently consulted the community on barriers for children participating in sport and children's fundamental movement skills were a key area of concern. In particular, we are aware that learning to swim is important for schools and families.</p> <p>There continues to be pressures on current pool facilities and it's important for WCC to find solutions for this demand. Sport Wellington supports the work that WCC is doing with schools and other organisations to encourage greater use of school pools and encourages the continued implementation of the Wellington City Aquatic Facilities Implementation Plan.</p>

Sport Wellington supports the proposal to reduce the opening hours at the Spray facility in the Wellington Regional Aquatic Centre.

Sport Grants

Sport Wellington supports the purpose of the Sports Development Grants being *“To help fund professional advice and support for enhancing the strategic management of sports and recreation organisations”*. We understand that this scheme may not have been fully subscribed but Sport Wellington is asked on a daily basis to help sport and recreation organisations with issues such as strategic and business planning, marketing planning, volunteer management etc. Sport Wellington would strongly suggest that investment in our organisation would assist us to be able to help more Wellington City based sport and recreation organisations.

We are already assisting 11 organisations that cover the Wellington City area with a combined membership/participation of over **35,000 people** on the type of support detailed above (*note: membership is not Wellington City residents only in some cases*).

Sport Wellington regularly directs applicants to the Sporting and Cultural Representatives Grants, mostly from non-traditional sports. We strongly suggest that this grant remain available.

**FIFA Under 20 Mens
World
Championships 2015**

Sport Wellington supports the proposed bid for this event. Events such as this, as well as having an economic benefit for Wellington City, can result in increased participation in sport and recreation. If this bid is successful, WCC will need to consider the potential additional demand on sportsfields by the community as a result of an increased popularity of football.

Hockey Turf Support

Sport Wellington supports the submissions of the National Hockey Stadium Trust and Wellington Hockey for a third hockey turf at the National Hockey Stadium (NHS) and to fulfil the national tournament ‘gaps’ as identified by Hockey New Zealand.

The Regional Infrastructure Plan for hockey in Wellington indicates the current turf facilities are constrained with 4,000 players using 4 fields (NHS x 2, Porirua and Lower Hutt). The nationally agreed sustainable number of players per turf is in the range of 600 – 850. As a result of steady growth, the Wellington Region is currently over capacity at 896 per turf, with Wellington City estimated at over 1,000 players per turf (based on Open Grade registrations). Although a 5th regional turf is now completed in Upper Hutt, 57% of senior hockey players are based in Wellington City. Therefore, to increase the opportunities for senior players to compete locally and to ensure the future development of hockey in Wellington City a third turf is necessary for Wellington City.

Additionally, the hosting of national and international tournaments can have significant economic benefits for Wellington City and can also have the impact of increasing participation in this sport.

**STRATEGY
DEVELOPMENT AND
SUPPORT**

Sport Wellington supports the need to update the Social and Recreation Strategy 2006 to reflect the growth-related demands and pressures on existing and future sport and recreation facilities and programmes.

The Social and Recreation Strategy 2006 focuses on building strong, safe and healthy communities for a better quality of life. This document identifies a number of capital projects including aquatic facility upgrades and renewals, sport field upgrades and renewals, a community indoor sports centre and recreation centre upgrade.

Sport Wellington believes this document needs to be comprehensively reviewed and updated to include detailed planning which is required to ensure the growth-related demands and pressures on existing and future sport and recreation facilities are planned in partnership with other providers. Sport Wellington is willing to work in partnership with WCC on this work.

Sport NZ recently funded the development of National Sport Facility Plans for Athletics, Football, Hockey, Bike and Netball and more are currently underway. With reduced funding available, it will be important for WCC to seek opportunities to work with both Sport NZ and Sport Wellington in order to align the Wellington City Social and Recreation Strategy with national and regional facility plans.

Providing adequate facilities is fundamental to encouraging and supporting young people to participate in sport and recreation, and this lays the foundation for potential life-long participation. There is evidence that current facilities are not adequate to meet the needs of sports groups, and that demand is exceeding supply for grassroots sport in Wellington City.

AMI Round the Bays

Sport Wellington provides the annual AMI Round the Bays Fun Run/Walk. The community considers this event to be an iconic regional event which provides opportunities for achievement for the elite athlete through to the recreational participant.

In 2013 the ISC Lenco Half Marathon (as part of AMI Round the Bays) will be the Athletics New Zealand National Half Marathon Championships. This is an acknowledgement of the quality, growth and status of this event. This is an excellent opportunity for Wellington to be promoted as an event destination to the national and international running community and for WCC to leverage off media and promotional opportunities which highlight the unique waterfront location of AMI Round the Bays.

Sport Wellington requests WCC continues to recognise and further support AMI Round the Bays as the premier running and participation sports event in the Wellington region and to enable Sport Wellington to grow and develop this event to its full potential. This would result in a more dynamic and connected central city. With WCC's support, this event will continue to promote the Wellington waterfront as an attractive and accessible community recreation resource.

With the benefits to WCC outlined above, Sport Wellington strongly suggests the inclusion of AMI Round the Bays be included in the Long Term Plan.

We would like to speak to our submission.

Phil Gibbons
Chief Executive Officer
Sport Wellington

May 2012

Tabled information
reference 169/12P(b)

Sub #1350

[« Return to Contents](#)

[Subscribe to Newsline](#) | [NZCS Website](#)

NZCS Newsline

31 May 2012

Is the Government RFP process broken?

[« Return to Contents](#)

By Software vendor CEO

[Tweet](#)

In last week's Newsline Juha Saarinen discussed an article from TradeMe's Mike O'Donnell about the RFP process. We were contacted by a number of New Zealand vendors with similar concerns. This commentary outlines in detail some of the problems from the perspective of a CEO of a medium-sized company with a history of dealing with Government. For obvious reasons the author has chosen to remain anonymous.



I read and agree with both Juha and Mike O'Donnell's comments about the RFP process. I also believe that, while the problems aren't confined solely to government projects in their many forms, which are where much of the difficulty lies.

It isn't just a question of whether they're paying too much or getting value, it's also very much about whether they're getting the right solution - a point you made when referring to the number of smaller vendors who aren't prepared to jump through the many hoops to get to a sale.

Speaking as a small-medium vendor with many government clients, but not many new ones in the last two years, it isn't that we're lazy or can't be bothered. It's that we recognise the futility of playing that game. I suggest that the RFP model is broken and that it not only doesn't guarantee that a client will get the best product, vendor and value; it almost guarantees that they won't.

I won't bore you with tales of woe from a disappointed vendor that was found wanting by a robust process - I haven't got any. I do have plenty of cautionary tales about the process government departments use to identify, evaluate and select technology solutions in our space; each of them represents a huge amount of wasted time and effort and in the majority of cases no solution was purchased or implemented.

In our business we now almost never choose to respond to an RFP, even when directly asked to and even when we can see that there's a really good fit between the stated requirements and our product.

We've seen a number where the consultant writing the RFP document almost certainly based their requirements on our product, and where we have a number of good reference clients with nice stories to tell and a clear value proposition.

Why don't we reply? Because it's a complete waste of time and effort, and now when my BDM suggests we respond to one that looks right in our sweet spot, I tell him to simply bang his head against the wall for half an hour, while cutting up \$20 notes. It's invariably cheaper and the pain stops much sooner.

Enough grizzles - what's wrong with the RFP process?

Disconnect between user and consultant

In our particular sub-vertical, the business unit is almost never skilled or experienced enough to write its own RFPs. So, a consultant is employed, usually an external one but sometimes internal and in those cases almost always from IT.

The consultant invariably knows very little about the business unit's requirements, so the stated requirements are either far too general or far too detailed. The general ones contain a wish-list of

Other stuff



- » Email NZCS
- » Email Newsline editor

Want to contribute?

Newsline is collaboratively written and we're always looking for new material to publish. Whether it's your views in a guest editorial or "in depth" expert detail, please send your 750-1200 word piece to the editor above.

Advertisement



ITCP Certification

ITCP, or Information Technology Certified Professional, is the professional accreditation of ICT professions in New Zealand

[Click here](#) for more info

Advertisement

everything they want and have ever dreamed of, the lists come out of the bottom drawers and you end up with a requirement that can be summarised in one word: everything.

The detailed ones show clearly that either there's an amateur BA in the business unit (or it's the consultant) that is designing the solution they want you to build, or else they want their new system to look and behave just like their old system.

Process too long, unsuitable players enter and cause confusion

In many cases the consultant is unaware of the key players in the market, so they start with an EOI or RFI to identify who might have a solution. Often they will write the RFP based on what they've seen and think they like, rather than what the business unit needs.

This gets the process off on the wrong foot, and also lengthens it considerably. It also allows fringe players that troll through GETS and TenderLink every day, the opportunity to submit a response using an international solution that may not be fit for NZ use, or with no other or very few clients in this territory.

Chicanery

Big IT vendors (the ones that usually price-gouge) will have teams of MBAs and response writers to submit highly polished responses with graphs and charts and value propositions for Africa. Most times they will tell lies in the RFP response, playing the eternal game of bluff and double-bluff.

This game is where, at the product demonstration, the vendor really hopes the client doesn't refer to the RFP response and ask to see function points demonstrated that don't exist, even though they ticked Yes - fully complies.

Then, once the sale is made and the first workshop is about to start, the client really hopes the vendor doesn't refer to the client's RFP where it stated what they wanted - because what they really want is something else entirely.

Uselessness

Lack of commitment and follow-through by the client, caused by a range of things - laziness, inertia, incompetence, changing budgets or priorities, change of staff, change of circumstances, consultant got called off on something else, late intervention by IT who decide they can build it quicker and cheaper (ha!). I believe this is the most significant factor in the recent RFPs I've been involved in.

Complexity

I agree that RFPs are becoming too prescriptive, even though a lot of them contain more boiler-plate terms and conditions than actual requirements. There are so many assumptions that a potential vendor has to make (and isn't allowed to seek clarification on) that any pricing is often a complete guess.

Because there is so much complexity (trust me, 88 pages is not long at all), vendors of all sizes have to perform a balancing act where they don't want to sell themselves short by pitching too low and getting stung when the workload turns out to be much higher, and they don't want to go too high and risk being eliminated on price.

The other problem with complexity is that it's just too hard to see the value. When you have 280 function points to respond to and another 100 or so non-functional requirements, how can the consultant or steering committee discern the value of one solution over another?

Risk

You're spot on when you say that clients want to be part of a big-budget long-term project, rather than a low-budget short-term one. They also often prefer to deal with big-name suppliers and products rather than the smaller guy.

They're less concerned about the right fit for the business and the best value than they are about backing the wrong horse or not getting to work with the latest technology.

What's the alternative? Amongst all the horror stories I have some success. A prospective client contacted me a while ago to get some information and indicative pricing for one of our products. I qualified them in the usual way and spent some time understanding their requirements before

Facebook Social Plugins
LinkedIn Widgets
Twitter Button

RECOVERY
for your business

But what about
your software?



**SOFTWARE
ESCROW**
NEW ZEALAND

www.escrow.co.nz

Quick Links

- » [NZCS Website](#)
- » [ITCP Website](#)
- » [KiwiSkills Website](#)

doing a high-level overview of the solution, triggering further positive discussions about how it might help their organisation in a range of different ways.

[Facebook Social Plugins](#)
[LinkedIn Widgets](#)
[Twitter Button](#)

My heart sank when they emailed some time later to say that the information was very useful and would definitely help them to write the RFP which was expected to come out in several months' time. I took a punt and told them that running an RFP was a really bad idea and that I knew a much better way that would help them get to the point where they knew if they had the right vendor and product much earlier.

They asked what it was and I told them to run a pilot. Agree on the dates, timing and scope of the pilot, establish the desired outcomes and how they would be measured, and agree responsibilities and costs. The client is paying for the costs of the trial - we're supplying trial licences for free but charging for set-up, training and hosting costs for the two-month trial period. It makes so much more sense to identify a product and vendor that you feel comfortable working with, and then let the rubber hit the road.

There's no quicker way to find out if the product is going to meet your needs than to start using it.

Asking a consultant to write a long and complex RFP document (or EOI, RFI, RFT) and then having an arm's length evaluation where you're only seeing what the vendor wants you to see, and you're not putting your hands on the solution, produces the predictably poor results we've seen time and time again.

And don't get me started on the large percentage of government organisations that run these RFP projects and end up doing nothing. Sometimes on more than one occasion, as in the case of one government department which ran an almost-identical RFP process three times in six years and still did nothing.

Another large government department is on its second attempt to find a solution in six months, two other departments ran a huge combined RFP that went nowhere, and I still have the letter from a local authority advising that we have won the contract to supply them with our software just as soon as the full Council rubber-stamps it.

The letter is over eight years old. The local authority still does not have a solution, but has wasted hundreds of thousands of dollars in the meantime trying to firstly adapt a solution totally unsuited for the purpose, then develop their own.

In the meantime the business unit struggles with the wrong tools to do their jobs, and the ratepayers foot the bills.

I seriously believe the RFP process is broken, wasteful and ineffective, and that much better alternatives exist. I'm not crying sour grapes because we missed out on the business - as long as the end users get the tools and systems they want then I don't mind who they buy them from (to a point, of course).

I firmly believe organisations end up with the systems they deserve.

Kind regards

Frustrated CEO (and tax-payer)

We'll continue to explore this issue next week, with an opinion piece from NZRIse Co-Chair Don Christie.

[« Return to Contents](#) [« Previous Article \(Cloud Computing Code of Practice released\)](#)
[Next Article \(Is the Government RFP process broken?\) »](#)

Contributed content is the opinion of the author only, and not necessarily the view of NZCS.

[Tweet](#)

Comments:

You must be logged in in order to post comments. [Log In](#)

Posted by Perce Harpham 9:47pm 1st Jun 2012

In the Conference book "Return to tomorrow" I have made some referrence to the skulduggery

surrounding the award of the software contract for the Wanganui Computer System. It was a long time ago (1976) but the technical framework had much to commend it.

The RFP was an excellent specification of what the users wanted. Our proposals in response showed how we would meet those requirements and what we would deliver but stopped short of being a detailed specification.

We gave a fixed price for developing a detailed specification in a nine month time frame. State Services then had two weeks in which to accept or reject the specification (which they were given in installments anyway). If they chose to reject the specification, with particularity, then they paid us a fixed sum and we went away. They could then go to tender with that spec or however they chose to modify it. If the spec was accepted with our time frame then we would deliver for a fixed sum.

This system worked well. In some cases requested changes in the deliverables could be incorporated. Some were discussed and abandoned as undesirable or better left for later implementation but in other cases we gave costs in time and money for the requested changes. Changes were then almost always rejected.

As a result we delivered on time, on budget, exceeded the specification, made a profit and paid tax.

In spite of this success I do not know if any other Government procurement has ever followed this model.

I am, incidentally, continually bemused at the costs of Government systems, their overruns and inadequacies in many cases.

[Facebook Social Plugins](#)
[LinkedIn Widgets](#)
[Twitter Button](#)

SUBMISSION # 1565

Tabled information
reference 169/12P(c)

Notes to oral submission from Forest & Bird Wellington Branch
These are additional points to compliment the written submission:

- As with any operation the Sanctuary incurs costs and this is the main thrust of the review. Its focus is to bring about business efficiency gains through re-organisation specifically to reduce costs and increase revenue. However the working party report states a change in governance structure will not of itself bring about a material change in the financial position.
- The language of the proposal discusses the Sanctuary as "a small business" that needs to focus on "improving financial performance"... "Without change in the business model; to reduce costs; increase revenue opportunities; and to improve efficiency and effectiveness, then the *financial cost* to Council and ratepayers....etc.
- The report of the working group is clear that the cost structure is too high for the size of business. Fundamentally the revenue is insufficient to cover their operating costs (5).
- In summary the present arrangement is never going to succeed as a business. However it was *never set up as a business*.
- The Sanctuary is no more a business than the Botanical Gardens, Otari/Wilton Bush, Parks and Gardens, Capacity and many other Council financed operations. These are 'business units' set up to supply a *service*, they are not trading entities with a profit motive, however they are expected to operate efficiently and deliver an appropriate quality. The Sanctuary is a conservation project.
- Whilst the documents make mention of the Sanctuary as a valuable asset to Wellington they fail to provide the monetary value of this asset. In accounting terms this would be itemised as an intangible benefit with a \$ figure.
- By way of example the rugby world cup made a whopping loss yet it was within budget and considered to be a success! How can that be?..... clearly the government believes the *intangible benefit* for the country was greater than the direct monetary loss of running the event. So too with the Sanctuary, it is providing an economic benefit to the wider Wellington economy as well as being beneficial to New Zealand biodiversity.
- The Sanctuary project is providing a direct benefit to the community by the development of a KNE; it supports the objective of the WCC Biodiversity Plan. It is contributing to the outer green belt and adding value to Wellington as a whole. If the Sanctuary had not been built the land would still exist and require resources to develop and maintain it. This has not been factored into the financial equations.
- Biodiversity in NZ is in a critical state the Council's own document identifies the problems. The Sanctuary, Parks & Gardens and Otari/Wilton bush all contribute to rectifying this situation but under different conditions and purposes. Otari has a remnant forest with a native botanical interest, Parks and Gardens is not location specific but provides the broader services for maintaining the natural infrastructure of our City. The Sanctuary is building a functioning forest habitat for its native New Zealand inhabitants.

- These entities operate at different scales and perform different functions, Otari and the Sanctuary are specialists whilst P & G is more general however they are complimentary. Whilst P&G deals with quantity (100's pests) the Sanctuary is at the other end of the scale tracking down single pest animals with specialised methods.
- Synergy exists between what happens inside the perimeter fence at the Sanctuary and what happens outside through P&G but the operational focus is quite different.
- The Visitor Centre is an anomaly. It is a major cost burden to the Sanctuary and peripheral to the purpose of the Sanctuary. Its primary function as a revenue source for the Sanctuary is negated by its costs partly due to its scale and location although it is becoming popular as a function centre unrelated to conservation.
- We suggest the Visitor Centre best fits with Te Papa as an exhibition piece. It could expand its function to serve as a New Zealand biological history and reference resource centre. There may be an opportunity to partner with Vic.
- The visitor experience within the Sanctuary fence is a service the Sanctuary provides but the marketing could be left to a third party agency. This is a routine business practice.

Summary of points

- The Sanctuary is not a viable trading business it is a specific project gaining and employing specialist knowledge of our fauna and flora. It has engaged the community in its vision and provides practical experience as a hands-on learning centre.
- Like all projects it should retain its own project team with its own management, governance and charter to focus on its vision and purpose of bio-diversity restoration, research of native plants and animals and the re-introduction and breeding programmes of native bird and invertebrates. The current arrangement is functioning and should remain.
- It can forge stronger ties with Vic, P&G, Otari and Botanical Gardens.
- It is funded as a service provider on the basis of its true economic and environmental value to the community and New Zealand.
- As a service provider it should be required to meet specific quality standards relevant to its function as a learning centre and the project conservation objectives.
- The Visitor Centre facility to be managed and run by WCC or agent and be considered part of the Birdwood Reserve complex with a working arrangement with Te Papa.