Pre-event evaluation of the FIFA Women's World Cup 2023

NOVEMBER 2019

FRESH INFO

Contents

1 Executive summary

New Zealand is considering a bid to host the FIFA Women's World Cup 2023. This opportunity was first explored in 2014 and revisited in 2016.

The success of the FIFA Women's World Cup 2019 has radically altered the credibility and significance of this event and FIFA has responded by expanding the 2023 event to a full 32-team draw (the same as the Men's World Cup). This has a material impact on venue and hosting requirements that New Zealand would be unable to meet on its own. A co-hosting arrangement has therefore been negotiated with Australia which would see group and playoff matches divided between the two countries.

This report evaluates the potential costs and benefits to New Zealand and the combined host regions[1] of co-hosting the FIFA Women's World Cup 2023 to help inform public sector investment decisions. The key results for New Zealand are:

- 687,324 event attendees[2]
- 22,706 international visits caused by the event
- 335,090 international visitor nights caused by the event
- Average length of stay in New Zealand of 14.76 nights
- $101.5 million of international visitor spend excluding money spent by FIFA to organise and deliver the event
- Benefit-cost ratio of 1.20 based on quantified benefits and costs. We would expect unquantified benefits to outweigh unquantified costs, which means that the estimated benefit-cost ratio is likely to be conservative.

More detail on the visitation and cost-benefit outcomes is provided in the sections below.

Table 1 Summary of results for New Zealand

Measure	Value
Event attendees	687,324
Host regions	509,318
Domestic	155,300
International	22,706
International visitation caused by the event	22,706
International visitor nights caused by the event	335,090
Average length of stay in New Zealand (nights)	14.76
Spend by international visitors (incl. GST)	$101,532,250
Net benefit	$44,192,607
Gross benefit	$268,282,998
Gross cost	-$224,090,390
Benefit-cost ratio	1.20

---

[1] Auckland, Hamilton, Wellington, Christchurch, Dunedin

[2] Gross attendance for New Zealand residents and unique attendance for international visitors

The key results for the host regions are:

- 687,324 event attendees[3]
- 178,006 domestic and international visits caused by the event
- 371,367 domestic and international visitor nights caused by the event
- Average length of stay in the host regions of 2.09 nights
- $103.1 million of domestic and international visitor spend excluding money spent by FIFA to organise and deliver the event
- Benefit-cost ratio of 1.29 based on quantified benefits and costs. We would expect unquantified benefits to outweigh unquantified costs, which means that the estimated benefit-cost ratio is likely to be conservative.

Table 2 Summary of results for the host regions

Measure	Value
Unique attendees	687,324
Host regions	509,318
Domestic	155,300
International	22,706
Visitation caused by the event	178,006
Visitor nights caused by the event	371,367
Average length of stay in host regions (nights)	2.09
Spend by visitors (incl. GST)	$103,064,360
Net benefit	$46,334,837
Gross benefit	$206,901,220
Gross cost	-$160,566,383
Benefit-cost ratio	1.29

---

[3] Gross attendance for New Zealand residents and unique attendance for international visitors

2   Introduction

New Zealand is considering a bid to host the FIFA Women's World Cup 2023. This opportunity was first explored in 2014 and revisited in 2016. At that time the Women's World Cup had a relatively low profile and was expected to deliver modest benefits. The success of the FIFA Women's World Cup 2019 has radically altered the credibility and significance of this event and FIFA has responded by expanding the 2023 event to a full 32-team draw (the same as the Men's World Cup). This has a material impact on venue and hosting requirements that New Zealand would be unable to meet on its own. A co-hosting arrangement has therefore been negotiated with Australia which would see group and playoff matches divided between the two countries. A preliminary match allocation for the event is shown in the table below.

Table 3 Preliminary match allocations for New Zealand and Australia

Stage	Period	New Zealand	Australia	TOTAL
Opening match	20 Jul	1		1
Group matches	20 Jul – 3 Aug	23	24	47
Round of 16	5 – 8 Aug	3	5	8
Quarter finals	11 – 12 Aug	1	3	4
Semi finals	15 – 16 Aug	1	1	2
Bronze medal	19 Aug		1	1
Final	20 Aug		1	1
TOTAL		29	35	64

Previous analysis assumed that New Zealand would be responsible for organising and delivering the event with financial assistance from FIFA as required. It also assumed that the host of the Women's World Cup 2023 would be required to host the FIFA U20 Women's World Cup 2022. Recent discussions with FIFA indicate that these assumptions are no longer valid.

Our understanding is that FIFA would be responsible for organising, delivering and funding the 2023 event. This is a material change from the LOC model assumed in previous evaluations. We also understand that the obligation to host the FIFA U20 Women's World Cup 2022 no longer exists. The analysis presented herein is based on these updated conditions.

This report evaluates the potential costs and benefits to New Zealand and the combined host regions of co-hosting the FIFA Women's World Cup 2023 to help inform public sector investment decisions.

2.1 Host regions

The proposed host regions and venues for matches held in New Zealand are:

- Auckland (Eden Park)
- Hamilton (FMG Stadium Waikato)
- Wellington (Westpac Stadium)
- Christchurch (Christchurch Stadium)
- Dunedin (Forsyth Barr Stadium)

A preliminary match allocation is shown in the table below.

Table 4 Preliminary allocation of matches hosted in New Zealand

Stage	Auckland	Hamilton	Wellington	Christchurch	Dunedin	TOTAL
Opening match	1					1
Group matches	5	5	5	4	4	23
Round of 16	1		1	1		3
Quarter finals	1					1
Semi finals			1			1
TOTAL	8	5	7	5	4	29

2.2 Methodology

The analysis presented in this report aligns with the economic evaluation framework for MBIE's Major Events Fund (MEF). The methodology is based on cost-benefit analysis (CBA) which is a well-established evaluation framework that government agencies and businesses use to make investment decisions. MBIE has designed its economic evaluation framework for the MEF with four key objectives in mind:

1. Develop a best-practice approach that can include, and value, the wide range of costs and benefits major events confer upon the host city and country. This includes values that are revealed by observable prices like ticket revenues (market values) as well as things that do not have an observable market price like personal enjoyment (non-market values). The inclusion of non-market values is particularly important because they are absent from traditional event evaluation frameworks, or appear as unvalued addenda, and have therefore typically received little consideration in the decision-making process.

2. Enhance the accuracy and integrity of the event evaluation process. Until recently almost every event evaluation reported a positive economic impact, usually denominated in Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The numbers in these reports are regularly accused of being overly optimistic, as well as being based on naïve assumptions about how economies work. This criticism is generally justified and is discussed further below.

3. Provide a transparent and repeatable event evaluation process that can be applied to different types of events. This addresses a major consistency problem that has previously existed in New Zealand by allowing like-for-like comparisons across a diverse range of events.

4. Create alignment between national and regional event evaluation methodologies. In the past, the evaluation methods used by regions have differed from those used by MBIE. This resulted in inconsistencies between regional and national evaluation results and added cost because two separate evaluation processes were required. Having a single evaluation methodology that meets both regional and national evaluation requirements resolves these issues.

2.2.1 Why MBIE uses CBA to evaluate major events

CBA is based on welfare economics, which is concerned with maximising social wellbeing in the broadest possible terms. What this means in practice is that any type of cost or benefit can be included in a CBA if it can be given a credible value. This is highly attractive because it allows the analyst to design an appropriate evaluation process for each event, rather than trying to fit an event into a restrictive and/or partial evaluation framework.

The main benefit of CBA is that it treats market and non-market costs and benefits equally, which means that social outcomes are given the same status as economic outcomes in the evaluation process. This allows a community festival to be evaluated in the same way as a major concert or sports event.

There are three broad steps in the CBA process:

1. Identify all the relevant costs and benefits associated with the event. In the first instance, this just requires a brief description of each cost and benefit. There are no restrictions on what can be included, but for practical reasons only material costs and benefits should be carried forward to the next stage.

2. Assign a monetary value to each of the relevant costs and benefits. This should be relatively easy in cases where there is an observable market price or financial transaction. It will be more difficult when there are no market valuations to take guidance from, but there is an extensive body of academic literature devoted to the valuation of non-market costs and benefits. It is generally accepted that a rough estimate of value is better than no estimate at all - arguing about the value of something is more constructive than being criticised for omitting it.

3. Add up all the costs and benefits and if the gross benefit exceeds the gross cost then the event is viable. In practice this means that investing in the event will increase societal wellbeing, relative to the counterfactual[4] of not investing in the event.

The benefits in a CBA are defined as "surpluses". A surplus is created when the benefit derived from an activity exceeds the cost incurred. CBA recognises two types of surpluses: consumer surplus and producer surplus.

---

[4] The scenario in which the event doesn't exist and the resources that would have been consumed by the event are utilised for another purpose.

Consumer surplus allows us to recognise and assign value to activities that consumers engage in. These could be priced activities (e.g. buying a ticket to an event) or unpriced activities (e.g. the enjoyment derived from attending a community festival). In either case, the consumer incurs a cost to engage in the activity i.e. the price of the ticket, and/or the opportunity cost of the time they spent at the event. If the activity meets or exceeds the consumer's expectations, then it is reasonable to assume that they derive a benefit equal to or greater than the cost incurred. The amount by which the benefit exceeds the cost is defined as the consumer surplus.

Producer surplus allows us to recognise and assign value to activities that producers (businesses) engage in. These are generally priced activities that the producer is on the sell-side of e.g. selling goods and services to event visitors. In this case the producer generates revenue by selling some of its product but incurs a cost in servicing this demand e.g. cost of goods sold, staff costs, overheads. The difference between revenue and cost is defined as the producer surplus, which also matches the definition of profit.

All CBAs have a built-in counterfactual, because the opportunity cost of the resources consumed by the event are always factored into the analysis. This ensures that the results of a properly conducted CBA can be interpreted as an estimate of net benefit.

By providing a balanced and robust evaluation framework for events, CBA overcomes several weaknesses of alternate measurement frameworks like Economic Impact Assessment (EIA) which is still applied to events in many countries. EIA is based on national accounting principles and seeks to estimate the impact of an event on key economic metrics like gross output, GDP, household income and employment. Despite its widespread use EIA has several weaknesses that limit its value as an evaluation tool:

- EIA doesn't consider the value, or opportunity cost, of the resources required to deliver the increase in GDP. This causes net benefits to be overstated.
- GDP impacts are often interpreted as benefits which is incorrect - only a percentage of GDP can be considered a benefit.
- EIA can only assign value to financial transactions. This is a major constraint that often results in material costs and benefits being excluded from the evaluation process.

Using CBA ensures that MBIE captures a more accurate and comprehensive view of the costs and benefits of events supported by the MEF.

2.2.2   What is being valued?

The table below provides a summary of the things that are being valued within MBIE's economic evaluation framework. The following abbreviations are used in the table:

- PS = Producer surplus
- CS = Consumer surplus
- ROI = Return on investment

Table 5 Components of MBIE's economic evaluation framework

	Cost	Benefit
Local government investment (includes 20% deadweight loss)	120%	0%
Central government investment (includes 20% deadweight loss)	120%	0%
Attendance fees paid by NZ resident consumers	100%	100% + CS
Value of NZ resident consumer time devoted to the event	100%	100% + CS
NZ resident consumer spend on event-related goods & services	100%	100% + CS
Value of NZ resident business time devoted to the event	100%	100% + ROI
NZ resident business spend on event-related goods & services	100%	100% + ROI
Attendance fees paid by NZ resident businesses	100%	100% + ROI
New money spent in NZ through event budget	100% x (1-PS)	100%
International consumption of NZ goods & services	100% x (1-PS)	100%
Commercial sponsorship by NZ resident companies	100%	100% + ROI
Other event income derived from NZ resident sources	100%	100%
Locally sourced event income spent in NZ through event budget*	0%	10%
Media exposure	As measured	As measured
Disruption to BAU activities	100%	0%
Other costs and benefits	As measured	As measured
Event profit accruing to NZ	0%	100%
Non-user benefits	0%	100%

*Included to make domestic expenditure more desirable than offshore expenditure

3 Modelling assumptions

This section presents the assumptions that were used to populate MBIE's economic evaluation framework. The values in red are assumptions and the values in black are calculated numbers.

3.1 Match allocation and attendance

The proposed co-hosting model would see 29 matches hosted in New Zealand across the 4-week tournament period including:

- 24 group matches (including the opening match)
- 3 round of 16 matches
- 1 quarter final matches
- 1 semi final match

Preliminary match allocations and attendance estimates are shown in the table below.

Table 6 Preliminary match allocations and attendance estimates

	Auckland	Hamilton	Wellington	Christchurch	Dunedin	New Zealand
Number of matches	8	5	7	5	4	29
Venue capacity	48,276	25,111	39,000	22,556	28,800	34,922
Available seats	386,208	125,555	273,000	112,780	115,200	1,012,743
Local	188,044	54,772	138,950	68,940	58,512	509,218
Domestic	56,483	26,367	37,050	19,173	16,128	155,200
International	13,750	6,750	9,250	7,750	6,000	43,500
TOTAL	258,277	87,889	185,250	95,863	80,640	707,918
Seat occupancy	67%	70%	68%	85%	70%	70%

3.2   Tournament attendance

In addition to spectators, a large number of people will be directly involved in the FIFA Women's World Cup 2023 before (FIFA staff/contractors, team representatives, and draw[5] participants) and during the event (FIFA and guests, teams, and international media). The table below shows the estimated unique attendee counts for each attendee segment, including where we think they will come from.

Table 7 Tournament attendance forecasts

	Host regions[6]	Domestic visitors[7]	International visitors[8]	TOTAL
FIFA workforce (pre-event)			76	76
Pre-event inspections & site visits			480	480
Draw	100	100	800	1,000
FIFA and guests			1,950	1,950
Teams			950	950
International media			450	450
Spectators	509,218	155,200	18,000	682,418
TOTAL	509,318	155,300	22,706	687,324

3.3   Visitor activity

Overnight visitors behave differently from day visitors, so it is important to divide each attendee segment accordingly. The table below shows the assumptions that have been applied to each attendee segment.

Table 8 Share of visitors caused by the event that stay overnight in the host regions

	Domestic visitors	International visitors	TOTAL
FIFA workforce (pre-event)		100%	100%
Pre-event inspections & site visits		100%	100%
Draw	100%	100%	100%
FIFA and guests		100%	100%
Teams		100%	100%
International media		100%	100%
Spectators	59%	100%	65%
TOTAL	61%	100%	66%

---

[5] It is assumed that the draw will be hosted in New Zealand

[6] These are gross counts i.e. if a host region spectator attends two matches then they will be counted twice

[7] These are gross counts i.e. if a visiting spectator attends two matches then they will be counted twice

[8] These are unique counts i.e. if a spectator from overseas attends two matches then they will only be counted once

The table below shows the average length of stay assumptions that have been applied to each overnight visitor to the host regions within each attendee segment. The average length of stay in the host regions is estimated to be 2 nights for domestic visitors and 8.24 nights for international visitors.

Table 9 Average nights spent in the host regions per overnight visitor

	Domestic visitors	International visitors	TOTAL
FIFA workforce (pre-event)		355.39	355.39
Pre-event inspections & site visits		6.00	6.00
Draw	1.50	2.50	2.39
FIFA and guests		10.47	10.47
Teams		18.74	18.74
International media		18.17	18.17
Spectators	2.00	6.04	2.66
TOTAL	2.00	8.24	3.23

The table below shows the average length of stay assumptions that have been applied to each international visitor to New Zealand (including the host regions) within each attendee segment. Previous event research shows that:

- Some event attendees will extend their stay beyond the period of the event
- Some event attendees will travel outside the host regions between match days

This is reflected in higher average length of stay estimates for New Zealand compared with the host regions (14.76 nights for New Zealand and 8.24 nights for the host regions).

Table 10 Average nights spent in New Zealand per international visitor

	Domestic visitors	International visitors	TOTAL
FIFA workforce (pre-event)	n/a	355.39	355.39
Pre-event inspections & site visits	n/a	6.03	6.03
Draw	n/a	2.50	2.50
FIFA and guests	n/a	10.47	10.47
Teams	n/a	19.47	19.47
International media	n/a	18.94	18.94
Spectators	n/a	14.21	14.21
TOTAL	n/a	14.76	14.76

3.4   Visitor expenditure

The table below shows the average spend per night assumptions that have been applied to each overnight visitor within each attendee segment. The average spend per night in the host regions is estimated to be $175 for domestic visitors and $362 for international visitors. These estimates exclude ticket purchases which are counted elsewhere.

The high spend rates for those involved in the event reflect the standards outlined in FIFA's hosting requirements document. Among other things, FIFA requires and pays for exclusive access to hotel accommodation for the duration of the event. Some of this accommodation will be under-utilised which pushes the average spend per visitor night up e.g. teams will consume hotel rooms in two destinations when they attend matches outside the regions they're based in.

Table 11 Average tourism spend in the host regions per visitor night (incl. GST)

	Domestic visitors	International visitors	TOTAL
FIFA workforce (pre-event)		$200	$200
Pre-event inspections & site visits		$450	$450
Draw	$350	$700	$676
FIFA and guests		$766	$766
Teams		$760	$760
International media		$721	$721
Spectators	$175	$225	$194
TOTAL	$175	$362	$269

The table below shows the average spend per person assumptions that have been applied to each domestic day visitor to the host regions.

Table 12 Average tourism spend in the host regions per day visitor (incl. GST)

	Domestic visitors	International visitors	TOTAL
FIFA workforce (pre-event)			$0
Pre-event inspections & site visits			$0
Draw			$0
FIFA and guests			$0
Teams			$0
International media			$0
Spectators	$50		$50
TOTAL	$50	$0	$50

The table below shows the average spend per night assumptions that have been applied to each international visitor to New Zealand within each attendee segment. These estimates exclude ticket purchases which are counted elsewhere.

Table 13 Average tourism spend in New Zealand per international visitor night (incl. GST)

	Domestic visitors	International visitors	TOTAL
FIFA workforce (pre-event)	n/a	$200	$200
Pre-event inspections & site visits	n/a	$450	$450
Draw	n/a	$700	$700
FIFA and guests	n/a	$764	$764
Teams	n/a	$752	$752
International media	n/a	$720	$720
Spectators	n/a	$225	$225
TOTAL	n/a	$302	$302

3.5 Government investment

Discussions with MBIE and New Zealand Football indicate that New Zealand will include s 9(2)(j) in its bid. This includes $14.2 million from central government and s 9(2)(j) from local government. s 9(2)(j) to partially offset the estimated s 9(2)(j) of organising and delivering the New Zealand components of the event.

In addition to s 9(2)(j) it is assumed that local and central government would spend a further s 9(2)(j) on other event-related items including leverage, internal staff time and overheads and other local government services required to deliver the event.

Table 14 Preliminary estimates of government investment

Type of funding/support	Local government	Central government	TOTAL
Direct funding	s 9(2)(j)	$14,200,000	s 9(2)(j)
Other investment[9]	s 9(2)(j)	$10,800,000	s 9(2)(j)
TOTAL	s 9(2)(j)	$25,000,000	s 9(2)(j)

[9] Assumed to be equivalent to around 75% of direct funding. Includes leverage, internal staff time & overheads, and other government services.

3.6 Non-user benefits

Non-user benefits are benefits that accrue to people who don't attend the event but gain value from it in other ways. This includes indirect user benefits (taking advantage of the atmosphere/vibrancy created by the event), and non-use benefits (option and existence values).

The table below shows the assumptions that have been used to derive the estimated non-user benefits of $838,844 for the host regions and $1,077,877 for New Zealand.

Table 15 Preliminary estimates of non-user benefits

	Host region	Rest of NZ	New Zealand
Population			
Direct users[10]	509,318	155,300	664,618
Indirect users[11]	56,936	0	56,936
Non-users (value)[12]	284,680	97,345	382,025
Non-users (no value)[13]	1,995,866	1,694,255	3,690,121
TOTAL	2,846,800	1,946,900	4,793,700
Share of population			
Direct users	17.89%	7.98%	13.86%
Indirect users	2.00%	0.00%	1.19%
Non-users (value)	10.00%	5.00%	7.97%
Non-users (no value)	70.11%	87.02%	76.98%
TOTAL	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Consumer/producer surplus per person			
Direct users	$12.28	$74.46	$26.81
Indirect users	$2.46	$0.00	$2.46
Non-users (value)	$2.46	$2.46	$2.46
Non-users (no value)	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
TOTAL	$2.49	$6.06	$3.94
Consumer/producer surplus			
Direct users	$6,253,197	$11,564,242	$17,817,439
Indirect users	$139,807	$0	$139,807
Non-users (value)	$699,037	$239,032	$938,069
Non-users (no value)	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	$7,092,042	$11,803,274	$18,895,316

---

[10] Direct users are people who attend the event.

[11] Indirect users are people who don't attend the event but gain value from it through the atmosphere/vibrancy/sense of occasion it creates.

[12] Non-users (value) are people that are not direct or indirect users but nevertheless gain some form of value from the event e.g. option value, existence value, prestige value, liveability value etc.

[13] Non-users (no value) are people who gain no actual or perceived value from the event.

3.7   Media exposure

The value of media exposure has been estimated using a conversion-based model developed by Fresh Info. The model considers:

- The markets that the media exposure occurs in
- The underlying probability of someone in that market visiting New Zealand (based on observed visitation/population ratios)
- The value of an additional visitor from that market to New Zealand and the host regions (based on MBIE expenditure statistics)
- The extent to which the media coverage showcases New Zealand and the host regions
- The level of viewer engagement with the content.

The size of the media audience has been estimated as 125% of the level achieved by the 2019 event. This allows for reasonable growth in the FIFA Women's World Cup 2023 audience and is consistent with the current upward trend.

Table 16 Size of media audience

	Total views	Average views per person	Unique viewers
2019 event	1 billion	3.00	333 million
2023 event	1.25 billion	3.00	417 million

The table below provides a preliminary estimate of the location of the media audience. It is estimated that 35% of the media audience will reside in Asia (including New Zealand and Australia), 29% in the Americas, 21% in Europe, and the remaining 15% elsewhere.

Table 17 Location of media audience

Market	Share of audience
New Zealand	0.75%
Australia	1.25%
China	15.00%
Japan	1.50%
South Korea	1.50%
Rest of Asia	15.00%
United States	12.00%
Canada	2.00%
Rest of Americas	15.00%
United Kingdom	3.00%
Germany	3.00%
Rest of Europe	15.00%
Rest of World	15.00%
TOTAL	100.00%

Based on the assumed size and composition of the audience it is estimated that the value of the media exposure generated by the FIFA Women's World Cup 2023 would be $7.57 million for the host regions and $8.41 million for New Zealand.

Table 18 Estimated value of media exposure

	Value of media exposure
Host regions	$7,572,944
New Zealand	$8,414,382

3.8   Unquantified benefits

Other potential benefits of hosting the FIFA Women's World Cup 2023 that have not been formally quantified in this study include:

- The event being used as a platform for sports diplomacy
- The event driving the promotion of soccer and women's sport in New Zealand
- The event providing an opportunity to develop trade and investment relationships, with a particular focus on tourism
- The event enhancing New Zealand's reputation as a major event destination
- The event enhancing New Zealand's capability to deliver world-class events

4 Results

This section presents the results of the economic evaluation for New Zealand and the host regions. All monetary values are expressed in real 2019 dollars.

4.1 New Zealand

The key results for New Zealand are:

- 687,324 event attendees[14]
- 22,706 international visits caused by the event
- 335,090 international visitor nights caused by the event
- Average length of stay in New Zealand of 14.76 nights
- $101.5 million of international visitor spend excluding money spent by FIFA to organise and deliver the event
- Benefit-cost ratio of 1.20 based on quantified benefits and costs. We would expect unquantified benefits to outweigh unquantified costs, which means that the estimated benefit-cost ratio is likely to be conservative.

More detail on the visitation and cost-benefit outcomes is provided in the sections below.

Table 19 Summary of results for New Zealand

Measure	Value
Event attendees	687,324
Host regions	509,318
Domestic	155,300
International	22,706
International visitation caused by the event	22,706
International visitor nights caused by the event	335,090
Average length of stay in New Zealand (nights)	14.76
Spend by international visitors (incl. GST)	$101,532,250
Net benefit	$44,192,607
Gross benefit	$268,282,998
Gross cost	-$224,090,390
Benefit-cost ratio	1.20

---

[14] Gross attendance for New Zealand residents and unique attendance for international visitors

4.1.1　Visitation

It is estimated that 22,706 international visitors will attend the FIFA Women's World Cup 2023 in New Zealand. These visitors will spend 335,090 nights in New Zealand at an average of 14.76 nights per visitor. Average spend per international visitor is estimated at $4,472 and average spend per visitor night at $303.

Table 20 Summary of visitation outcomes for New Zealand

Measure	Value
International visitation caused by the event	22,706
International visitor nights caused by the event	335,090
Average length of stay in New Zealand (nights)	14.76
Spend by international visitors (incl. GST)	$101,532,250
Average spend per international visitor (incl. GST)	$4,472
Average spend per international visitor night (incl. GST)	$303

4.1.2　Cost-benefit analysis

The cost-benefit analysis estimates the value of the resources consumed by the event (costs) and compares this with the value that is created. Government costs are inflated by 20% in the analysis to reflect the inefficiency involved in collecting and redistributing public funds, as per Treasury guidelines. Consumer costs measure the value of the time and money New Zealand residents commit to the event. Producer costs measure the value of the time and money New Zealand businesses commit to the event as well as the value of the resources that need to be consumed to service increased levels of consumption generated by the event e.g. additional tourism activity. The quantified cost to New Zealand of hosting the FIFA Women's World Cup 2023 is estimated at $224.1 million.

The consumer benefits measure the expected value New Zealand residents will derive from attending the event. Producer benefits measure the value New Zealand businesses will derive from sponsoring, attending or otherwise being impacted by the event e.g. as a recipient of additional tourism expenditure. Media benefits, non-user benefits and other benefits are explained in more detail in the modelling assumptions section. The quantified benefit to New Zealand of hosting the FIFA Women's World Cup 2023 is estimated at $268.3 million.

The net benefit of $44.2 million is calculated as the quantified benefit of $268.3 million less the quantified cost of $224.1 million. Dividing the quantified benefit by the quantified cost produces a benefit-cost ratio of 1.20. This means that each dollar of quantified cost will yield a quantified benefit of $1.20.

We would expect unquantified benefits to outweigh unquantified costs, which means that the estimated benefit-cost ratio of 1.20 is likely to be conservative.

Table 21 Cost-benefit analysis for New Zealand

Measure	Value
Government costs	-$38,321,542
Consumer costs	-$89,087,197
Producer costs	-$96,681,652
Media costs	$0
Disruption costs	$0
Other costs	$0
Total cost	-$224,090,390
Consumer benefits	$106,904,636
Producer benefits	$151,886,103
Media benefits	$8,414,382
Non-user benefits	$1,077,877
Other benefits	$0
Total benefit	$268,282,998
Net benefit	$44,192,607
Benefit-cost ratio	1.20

4.2   Host regions

The key results for the host regions are:

- 687,324 event attendees[15]
- 178,006 domestic and international visits caused by the event
- 371,367 domestic and international visitor nights caused by the event
- Average length of stay in the host regions of 2.09 nights
- $103.1 million of domestic and international visitor spend excluding money spent by FIFA to organise and deliver the event
- Benefit-cost ratio of 1.29 based on quantified benefits and costs. We would expect unquantified benefits to outweigh unquantified costs, which means that the estimated benefit-cost ratio is likely to be conservative.

More detail on the visitation and cost-benefit outcomes is provided in the sections below.

Table 22 Summary of results for host regions

Measure	Value
Event attendees	687,324
Host regions	509,318
Domestic	155,300
International	22,706
Visitation caused by the event	178,006
Visitor nights caused by the event	371,367
Average length of stay in host regions (nights)	2.09
Spend by visitors (incl. GST)	$103,064,360
Net benefit	$46,334,837
Gross benefit	$206,901,220
Gross cost	-$160,566,383
Benefit-cost ratio	1.29

---

[15] Gross attendance for New Zealand residents and unique attendance for international visitors

4.2.1 Visitation

It is estimated that 178,006 visitors will attend FIFA Women's World Cup 2023 matches in the host regions. These visitors will spend 371,367 nights in the host regions at an average of 2.09 nights per visitor. Average spend per visitor is estimated at $579 and average spend per night at $278.

Table 23 Summary of visitation outcomes for the host regions

Measure	Domestic visitors	International visitors	Total
Visitation caused by the event	155,300	22,706	178,006
Overnight visitation	92,196	22,706	114,902
Day visitation	63,104	0	63,104
Visitor nights caused by the event	184,342	187,025	371,367
Average length of stay in the host regions (nights)	1.19	8.24	2.09
Spend by visitors (incl. GST)	$35,441,360	$67,623,000	$103,064,360
Average spend per visitor (incl. GST)	$228	$2,978	$579
Average spend per visitor night (incl. GST)	$192	$362	$278

4.2.2 Cost-benefit analysis

The cost-benefit analysis estimates the value of the resources consumed by the event (costs) and compares this with the value that is created. Government costs are inflated by 20% in the analysis to reflect the inefficiency involved in collecting and redistributing public funds, as per Treasury guidelines. Consumer costs measure the value of the time and money host region residents commit to the event. Producer costs measure the value of the time and money host region businesses commit to the event as well as the value of the resources that need to be consumed to service increased levels of consumption generated by the event e.g. additional tourism activity. The quantified cost to the host regions of hosting the FIFA Women's World Cup 2023 is estimated at s 9(2)(j)

The consumer benefits measure the expected value host region residents will derive from attending the event. Producer benefits measure the value host regions businesses will derive from sponsoring, attending or otherwise being impacted by the event e.g. as a recipient of additional tourism expenditure. Media benefits, non-user benefits and other benefits are explained in more detail in the modelling assumptions section. The quantified benefit to the host regions of hosting the FIFA Women's World Cup 2023 is estimated at s 9(2) (j)

The net benefit of s 9(2)(j) is calculated as the quantified benefit of s 9(2)(j) less the quantified cost of s 9(2)(j) Dividing the quantified benefit by the quantified cost produces a benefit-cost ratio of 1.29. This means that each dollar of quantified cost will yield a quantified benefit of $1.29.

We would expect unquantified benefits to outweigh unquantified costs, which means that the estimated benefit-cost ratio of 1.29 is likely to be conservative.

Table 24 Cost-benefit analysis for the host regions

Measure	Value
Government costs	s 9(2)(j)
Consumer costs	
Producer costs	
Media costs	
Disruption costs	
Other costs	
Total cost	
Consumer benefits	s 9(2)(j)
Producer benefits	
Media benefits	
Non-user benefits	
Other benefits	
Total benefit	
Net benefit	
Benefit-cost ratio	1.29

FRESH INFO