

Team Project: Attracting International Competitions to New Zealand

Lecture 15

Amanda



UNIVERSITY OF
AUCKLAND
Waipapa Taumata Rau
NEW ZEALAND

ENGINEERING

Lecture Outline



ENGINEERING

- 1.Introduction
- 2.Team Project Background
- 3.Your Brief
- 4.Some Points to Consider
- 5.Logistics
- 6.Team Peer Review

Assignment Objectives



ENGINEERING

- 1) To practice business case analysis
- 2) To discover which online collaboration tools work best for your team

Background

In 2021, Emirates Team New Zealand successfully defended their title at the 36th America's Cup

Estimate net benefit: -292.7 Million (NZD)

Team NZ: Host of 37th America's Cup
Barcelona



Image: <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/sailing/2021/03/17/americas-cup-2021-team-new-zealand-won-auld-mug-having-built/>

The Brief



ENGINEERING

Public-private Interest Group
NZ government officials
NZL Sailing
The Royal Yacht Squadron
Other private investors

Bring back the competition to NZ

Use at least two of the following case studies to:

Identify two problem statements that Aotearoa New Zealand must address

Return a short list of options to the public-private Interest Group for further investigation

2014	Sochi	Winter	
2016	Rio de Janeiro	Summer	
2018	Pyeongchang	Winter	
2020	Tokyo	Summer	
2022	Beijing	Winter	
2014	Sochi	Winter	
2016	Rio de Janeiro	Summer	
2018	Pyeongchang	Winter	\$3.4B
2020	Tokyo	Summer	\$13.7B
2022	Beijing	Winter	\$8.7B
2024	Paris	Summer	\$8.7B

PREDICTED ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF THE OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES



Not to scale/comparative because of the different methodologies/timings of each study, in most cases carried out before host election.
Paris 2024 study updated 2024, covering the period 2018-2034.

*Including benefits of new venues that will be used for the Games, and are planned to serve the long-term needs of local residents.

Olympics.com

Birmingham to host 2022 Commonwealth Games

Australia Commonwealth Games 2026:
Victoria cancels event after costs blow
out to \$7bn

Canadian province Alberta cancels bid
for 2030 Commonwealth Games

FIFA Women's World Cup economic, social impact 'exceeded expectations' - report

MBIE: “hugely successful across all key measures”

~\$109.5 million return

America's Cup



ENGINEERING

America's Cup: Barcelona on track to hit billion-dollar positive economic impact from hosting regatta

Strategic case

- Project background
- Problem spaces
- Stakeholder analysis
- Requirements and KSFs
- Assumptions and constraints

Economic Case

- Long list options assessment
 - DFV
 - Problem statements and KSFs
- Shortlisted option justification

Financial Case

- Economic / social impact assessment
- Preferred way forward

Management Case

- Implementation plan and timeline
- Outcomes and measures of success

Recommendations

1. Define and analyse a **problem**
2. Identify the **users/stakeholders**
3. Figure out the **requirements** of the users/stakeholders
4. Select the **key success factors (KSFs)** that a solution must meet
5. Come up with different **options** that are potential solutions to the problem
6. **Assess** those options against the DFV, KSFs and problem statements and determine the **shortlist**
- ~~7. Carry out **economic analysis and societal impact** of the shortlisted options~~
7. Identify, quantify, and monetise **One** major impact as a result of impacting your solutions. Identify and qualify other major impacts.

Submission



ENGINEERING

Due 23/08/2023 5pm

One report per group

Submit via Canvas as a PDF (<500MB)

Reports will be assessed via Turn-it-in.

1. Executive summary
2. The Strategic case
 - 2.1. Project background
 - 2.2. Problem Space
 - 2.3. Stakeholder analysis and their requirements
 - 2.4. Key assumptions
3. The Economic Case
 - 3.1. Long-list option assessment
 - 3.2. Recommendations of the short-listed options
4. Appendix of supporting figures
 - 4.1. Requirements table

10 page report

5 page appendix

Outside of Page limits:

References

Coversheet

Title page

Declaration

Team Structure

Three Exemplars available

Executive Summary



ENGINEERING

Stand Alone

Background 1-2 sentences

Case Studies analysed

Problem Statements

Key Stakeholders & KSF

The Shortlist & Why

Will have multiple problem statements!

Iterate through Stakeholders,
Requirements, and then options

Stakeholder Analysis: You may use
multiple tools

ID 4-6 most important requirements
(KSFs). You may have different KSFs
for different problem statements

Table 13: Golden Mile Problem Statements²⁹

Problem Statements	Weighting
Problem 1 Slow and unpredictable bus travel times reduce the attractiveness of travel by bus	50%
Problem 2 Inadequate provision for pedestrians along and across the Golden Mile reduces convenience of walking	30%
Problem 3 Street layout limits the attractiveness of the Golden Mile as a place in which to spend time and move through	20%

Economic Case: 2 tools

Longlist Option	CSF 1	CSF 2	CSF 3	CSF 4	CSF 5	Viability	Feasibility	Desirability
Do nothing	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red	Green	Green	Green	Red
Reflux valves	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green
Reshape terrain	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Red
Permeable surfaces	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green
Storm surge barriers	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Red
Reclaimed land	Green	Green	Red	Green	Red	Red	Green	Green
Managed retreat	Green	Green	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Red
Reservoir	Green	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green
River modification	Green	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Yellow
Seawalls/stopbanks	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Orange
Coastal reinforcement	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Red	Green	Green	Yellow
Floodplains	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Green	Green
Storm protection in houses	Yellow	Green	Red	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green
Mangroves/Trees	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Orange
Marina Barrage	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Green	Green

Economic Case: Short-list

Describe the options & provide reasoning for carrying the option forward

Identify, quantify, and monetise 1 major impact

Identify and qualitatively discuss other major impacts with respect to the 4 Capitals

Description		Option 1 - Do nothing	Option 4 - Lectures online, labs compulsory in person	Option 8 - Shift towards more labs and workshops (in person)	Option 10 - Increased support for online tools and exams	Option 8 + 10 More labs and workshops in person and increase online support
Cost	Upfront	-	-	1M+	1M+	1M+
	Annual	-	1.5M+	1.5M+	-	1.5M+
Desirability		Low	Medium	High	Medium	High
Viability		High	Medium	Medium	High	Medium
Feasibility		High	Medium	Medium	High	High
Societal considerations		Low	High	High	Medium	High

Now until Monday 8am

- Review supporting material

- Make Plan/ ID Sub teams

Monday 8 am to Friday 5 pm: 8 to 10 hrs of work per student

Monday 11 am – Team Leaders only

Tuesday 11 am – Open Zoom Webinar for Q & A

Thursday 12 pm – Open Zoom Webinar for Q & A

Be sure you are active on team comms and management platforms

A few notes to help you succeed



Read the brief and rubric carefully and check it regularly to ensure you are on track – particularly towards the end.



We are looking for depth of consideration, good credible judgement, and development of logic.

Don't be vague, make stuff up, or gloss over the facts.



There is no single 'right' answer. Everyone will come up with something different.

As long as we can follow your logic and find credibility in your conclusions.



We award marks for critical thinking

How you came up with your answer is more important than the answer itself.



No matter what sources you use, be sure to cite them (properly!)

There is a 'Supporting Material' section

- Some articles, reports, and references have been provided to aid your research.

You are not necessarily all expected to read these in their entirety

These will help to provide some foundational context

They are not hints to a solution; just information to get you started

You can do other research, but this is ***not*** a research project – analysis, synthesis, and a compelling and innovative recommendation

Team Peer Review



ENGINEERING

TEAMMATES

Scale from 1-10

Scale:

5 < Degree of failing

7 – Below expectations

8 – Meets expectations

9 – Exceeds expectations

10 – Project fails without them

Only mark those members you work with. Average mark should be 8 ± 0.5

Teams need to decide on what is “meets expectations”

Each score needs to have a 20+ word comment providing constructive feedback

Every score ≤ 5 needs both justification & provide constructive feedback

Questions?



UNIVERSITY OF
AUCKLAND
Waipapa Taumata Rau
NEW ZEALAND

ENGINEERING