



Department of
**Creative Industries,
Tourism and Sport**

Valuing Cultural Infrastructure in Western Australia

Discussion Paper (February 2026)

CONTENTS

PURPOSE OF GUIDANCE.....	3
SCOPE.....	3
APPLICABILITY	4
BACKGROUND	4
CURRENT SITUATION.....	7
Total economic value framework	7
Use and non-use values	9
Literature review and common standard values.....	10
First Nations peoples	12
Case study of Perth Cultural Centre	14
<i>Pilot.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Sample</i>	<i>15</i>
APPENDIX A: ECONOMIC VALUATION METHODS FOR CULTURAL ASSETS	16
APPENDIX B: VALUES MEASURED BY EACH ECONOMIC VALUATION METHOD.....	18
APPENDIX C: GRADING QUALITY CRITERIA	19
APPENDIX D: COMPARABLE CULTURAL ASSETS TABLE	21

Purpose of guidance

The purpose of this discussion paper is to support state agencies to develop best-practice proposals to be considered by Treasury.

Culture receives public spending, meaning that it is subject to government budget decisions and business cases must be made to justify financial support.

Valuing cultural infrastructure allows governments to assess the impact of their public spending by comparing the costs and benefits. This requires consideration of the value that culture provides to those who engage directly or indirectly with it, and to wider society.

Recently, there have been increased efforts across the world to quantify the value of cultural activities and investments that go beyond qualitative evidence. This means that cultural policy can be evaluated in the same terms as other policy areas like transport, education, and health.

Current appraisal methods focus on the economic costs and benefits, such as value added, exports, job creation and market benefits. Such emphasis on economic impact does not account for the public value, such as enjoyment and educational value generated more widely.

Ignoring such non-market impacts and values can misrepresent the total public value of cultural infrastructure with the true public value of the asset underappreciated. Over the longer term, this may mean that the arts and cultural sector miss out on necessary funding.

Funding bodies have recognised the need for methods, and guidance, to account for these wider benefits.

Objectives of this guide include:

- Enabling applicants to better articulate the value of cultural infrastructure in applications
- Promoting a consistent approach to valuing cultural infrastructure for business cases in Western Australia
- Supporting access to, and alignment with, where appropriate, best-practice guidance from other jurisdictions.

This document will require future updates to reflect evolving policy and knowledge.

Scope

For the purposes of this discussion paper and the guidelines (Appendix E), cultural infrastructure is defined as physical (and increasingly digital) spaces, for arts and cultural education, creation, production, engagement, collaboration, ceremony, preservation, conservation, interpretation, sharing and distribution.

Cultural infrastructure includes physical infrastructure, our buildings, places, spaces and technology, like performing arts centres, music venues, film and television studios, galleries, collections and digital technology. Integral to these spaces are the staff and volunteers required to operate them.

Cultural infrastructure supports and grows WA's creativity, tangible and intangible culture, and cultural heritage. While tangible culture could be a painting or performance, intangible culture could be a story, songline or practised tradition.

Cultural public value can be defined as the worth attributed to cultural activities (including arts, media and heritage) involving formal and informal, popular and commercial, and digital as well as physical forms of engagement and participation.

Applicability

The methodologies set out in this report can be used to value Western Australian cultural infrastructure to ensure that the full benefits of the site are incorporated into investment decisions. The case study presented for the Perth Cultural Centre presents a scalable methodology for future valuation work in the cultural sector.¹

Background

Valuing cultural infrastructure allows governments to assess the impact of their public spending by comparing the costs and benefits. Many organisations are unsure how to value their assets meaning cultural infrastructure is often undervalued and not prioritised. Indeed, only certain components of the full value of cultural infrastructure initiatives are measured in a way that is consistent with evaluations accepted by government, such as ticket or art sale surplus. Challenges include a lack of necessary data to identify service gap identification and integrate the sector into strategic planning. As was noted by Infrastructure Australia in the Australian Infrastructure Audit 2019,

‘Investment in arts and cultural infrastructure is often not prioritised because the true costs and benefits are not well integrated into government decision making. Without action, arts and cultural infrastructure will not be delivered, reducing access for communities to spaces which enhance liveability, creativity and help to create a sense of identity.’²

Establishing clear methods and guidance to account for these wider benefits and value arts and cultural infrastructure is necessary to recognise the public value provided by these spaces.

Traditionally, when accounting for the benefits of cultural infrastructure, emphasis is placed on economic impact and market value, focusing on information such as tickets purchased, employment or productivity. However, not only do many examples of cultural infrastructure have no entry fees or tickets, many have no market price, with wider benefits not accounted for, such as the educational value of visiting a museum or the value that the public holds for the existence of a library. Such value of cultural infrastructure spans many non-market benefits for individuals and communities. The challenges in monetising intangible goods, should be considered within these non-market methods.

Arts, culture, customs, and places define identity at an individual and community level through

¹ It is worth noting that the Perth Cultural Centre is a physical asset and that there are differences between physical and digital assets. This is not covered by the Perth Cultural Centre case study. If valuing a digital asset, it is worth reviewing research specifically valuing such assets, such as DCMS (2023) ‘Measuring the value of the digital offer of galleries and museums’, accessible at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/measuring-the-value-of-the-digital-offer-of-galleries-and-museums>

² Infrastructure Australia (2019) ‘An Assessment of Australia’s Future Infrastructure Needs: The Australian Infrastructure Audit 2019’, p. 442. Retrieved from [https://www.infrastructureaustralia.gov.au/sites/default/files/2019-08/Australian Infrastructure Audit 2019.pdf](https://www.infrastructureaustralia.gov.au/sites/default/files/2019-08/Australian%20Infrastructure%20Audit%202019.pdf)

the sharing of culture, storytelling by First Nations Elders, entertainment, and arts and cultural facilities. The importance of culture, and its impact on Australians is recognised by the Western Australian Government as well as Infrastructure Australia. Together, these resources will help to tell the full story of the value of culture in Australia, in all its diversity and richness, to a wide audience including economists, practitioners, government officials, decision makers, and the wider public.

Public value benefits of culture can be captured by a framework known as **Total economic value (TEV)**. The TEV framework was first applied to the valuation of ‘non-market’ goods in the environmental sector and subsequently extended to a range of other ‘non-market’ goods such as those in the arts and cultural sector. TEV includes the wider public value held for an asset rather than elements such as income and jobs captured in standard economic impact studies. TEV provides a comprehensive and scalable valuation methodology that is consistent with microeconomic theory and governmental standards.³ Non-market benefits are captured through use and non-use values which are explained further in ‘Current situation’.

In Western Australia, the Department of Creative Industries, Tourism and Sport (CITS) has undertaken a range of research to understand the public value accorded to cultural infrastructure and recognise the cultural, social and economic benefits in its investments. The Public Value Measurement Framework considers instrumental, intrinsic and institutional impacts. While such research has indicated and measured benefits delivered by the arts to areas including health, education and social capital,⁴ there has been a lack of clarity on how to best frame key benefits to align with public funding standards.

Aligned with such research, the value of the arts and cultural sector is widely recognised by the public in Western Australia. The Arts and Culture Monitor 2024 Survey report found that 83% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the Western Australian Government should invest in arts and cultural activities to ensure they are available to the public.⁵

Recent [Strategic Asset Management Framework \(SAMF\) guidance \(December 2024\)](#), notes a need for clear strategic justification with demonstration that the proposed investment represents strong value for money. The globally recognised method for policy evaluation is **Cost benefit analysis (CBA)** which is recommended in WA for high-value, high-risk proposals.⁶ CBA is used within business case assessments by policy makers and arms-length bodies in their funding decision making process, whereby outcomes are valued in monetary terms and compared against the costs of investment to evaluate their value to society (for example, value for money). Within this, it is important to quantify and monetise benefits and costs to the

³ UK HM Treasury Green Book (2022) <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-green-book-appraisal-and-evaluation-in-central-government/the-green-book-2020#:~:text=1,-.Introduction,before%2C%20during%20and%20after%20implementation>

⁴ Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries (2019) ‘Social Impacts of Culture and the Arts’. Retrieved from https://www.cits.wa.gov.au/docs/default-source/culture-and-the-arts/research-hub/public-value/social-impact-of-culture-and-the-arts-wa.pdf?sfvrsn=7599f3fe_2

⁵ Catalyse (2024) ‘Arts and Culture Monitor’ Retrieved from: <https://www.cits.wa.gov.au/docs/default-source/culture-and-the-arts/research-hub/wa-arts-and-culture/arts-and-culture-monitor-survey-report-2024.pdf>

⁶ Department of Treasury (2024) ‘Business Case Guidelines: Strategic Asset Management Framework’. Retrieved from [https://www.wa.gov.au/system/files/2025-01/samf-business-case-guidelines.pdf#:~:text=The%20SAMF%20Business%20Case%20Guidelines%20specify%20the%20structure,Expenditure%20Review%20Committee%20%28ERC%29%20for%20review%20and%20approval;HM%20Treasury%20\(2022\)%20The%20Green%20Book%20Supplementary%20guidance](https://www.wa.gov.au/system/files/2025-01/samf-business-case-guidelines.pdf#:~:text=The%20SAMF%20Business%20Case%20Guidelines%20specify%20the%20structure,Expenditure%20Review%20Committee%20%28ERC%29%20for%20review%20and%20approval;HM%20Treasury%20(2022)%20The%20Green%20Book%20Supplementary%20guidance); HM Treasury (2022) ‘The Green Book Supplementary guidance’. Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1064518/Green_Book_supplementary_guidance_-_Value_for_Money.pdf

community where possible. If impacts cannot be assigned monetary values, they are to be described in quantitative/qualitative terms.⁷ CBA is applied across most policy areas and has a long history in health, transport, employment, and education policy. This ensures that cultural goods and services are evaluated in the same cost-benefit terms as other policy areas.

Economic valuation is grounded in Welfarism, an ethical theory which states that judgements should be made based on the outcomes produced by approaches, and the impact those outcomes ultimately have on social welfare and societal wellbeing.

The benefits derived from participation and engagement with culture can be broken into two:

- Direct benefits to societal and individuals' wellbeing from the arts and culture through engagement or knowing it will exist for the future and others to enjoy
- Spillovers created by cultural infrastructure such as the creation of jobs, tourism, increased retail spending, as well as reduced government costs, such as healthcare cost reductions as result of people engaging with culture.

Such spillovers, secondary and flow-on effects from cultural infrastructure should generally be excluded from CBA. While an economic impact analysis measures gross effects such as employment and GDP, CBA measures changes in welfare. Secondary or spillover impact should only be included when they represent genuine additional benefits. Most job creation and retail spending associated with cultural infrastructure are displacement effects, where jobs increase in one sector but are offset by reductions elsewhere.⁸ An important limitation of economic impact studies in the cultural sector to date is that they have tended to only consider the secondary kind of benefits of culture.⁹

This guidance is concerned with valuing the primary benefits of arts and culture for both those who engage with or visit cultural institutions and those who don't.

The methods used in this guidance can be applied to estimate the value to individuals of a range of forms of engagement including, but not limited to:

- Visiting or attendance at cultural infrastructure (for example, museums, theatre, heritage sites, festivals and concerts)
- Participation in cultural activities (for example, playing music, drawing, producing art in workshops)
- Consuming culture through digital media or other forms (for example, watching films, reading books, accessing digital archives)
- Value held by those who do not visit, participate or consume culture (for example, the value people place on knowing the Perth Cultural Centre exists, is available for others to visit and / or for future generations).

The key to measuring (monetary) public value in economics is to define wellbeing, the metric against which the value is computed. We apply this economic framework here for 2 key

⁷ Department of Treasury (2024) 'Business Case Guidelines: Strategic Asset Management Framework'. Retrieved from <https://www.wa.gov.au/system/files/2025-01/samf-business-case-guidelines.pdf#:~:text=The%20SAMF%20Business%20Case%20Guidelines%20specify%20the%20structure,Expenditure%20Review%20Committee%20%28ERC%29%20for%20review%20and%20approval>

⁸ There may be exceptions to this. For example, there may not be a ready workforce to staff a cultural infrastructure project such as an Aboriginal Cultural Centre where there is a need to grow workforce capacity, and in this case further arguments could be made as to whether this constitutes additional benefits.

⁹ Reeves, M (2002) 'Measuring the Economic and Social Impact of the Arts: A Review'. London, UK: Arts Council England.

reasons:

- This approach has widespread acceptance and support in academia and in government policymaking across the world.
- This is the only approach that allows us to value impacts in *monetary terms* making it amenable to CBA assessments.¹⁰

Current situation

In 2021, Simetrica-Jacobs was commissioned by what was then the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries, now CITS, to establish a methodology that would consider the wider values that people hold for arts and culture.

As is noted in the Total economic value framework section below, there are a range of different methods to measure non-market benefits. In this project, **contingent valuation** was employed to fully capture the wider non-market benefits and values of the Perth Cultural Centre from those who visit and from the wider public. This involved asking both visitors and the wider public what they would be hypothetically willing to pay as a state levy to support the Perth Cultural Centre and the institutions that are within it.

Using best-practice economic techniques, Simetrica-Jacobs determined the non-market value of the Perth Cultural Centre (and the individual cultural infrastructure sites within the Perth Cultural Centre) as a case study. This allowed us to test and develop guidance for future valuations of cultural infrastructure within Western Australia. As the Perth Cultural Centre site is situated on traditional Noongar land, Simetrica-Jacobs worked with Moodjar Consultancy to best understand how to recognise and account for First Nations values in the study.

This report sets out and describes best-practice methods for valuing cultural infrastructure using social cost benefit analysis and includes a case study of the Perth Cultural Centre.

Total economic value framework

The TEV framework¹¹ provides a comprehensive and scalable valuation methodology that can estimate the value of cultural infrastructure and assets. The Australian Government Productivity Commission's guidance¹² recommends that where market prices are not available to infer willingness to pay (WTP), such as for environmental policy, the TEV framework should be used to identify benefits.

Various economic elicitation methods exist to estimate non-market value for inclusion in Cost Benefit Analysis:

¹⁰ Throsby, D (2003) 'Determining the Value of Cultural Goods: How Much (or How Little) Does Contingent Valuation Tell Us?' *Journal of Cultural Economics* 27(3-4): 275-85. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026353905772>. For a discussion of the value of culture see Tusa, J (2000) 'Art Matters: Reflecting on Culture'. Methuen Pub Ltd.

¹¹ Pearce, David, and Ece O'zdemiroglu. 2002. 'Economic Valuation with Stated Preference Techniques'. London, UK: Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/191522/Economic_valuation_with_stated_preference_techniques.pdf

¹² Australian Government Productivity Commission Environmental Policy Analysis: A Guide to Non-Market Valuation Working Paper (2014): <https://www.pc.gov.au/research/supporting/non-market-valuation/non-market-valuation.pdf>

- **Revealed preference:** determining the implicit value placed on a good by consumers by examining their behaviour in a similar or related market.
 - Hedonic pricing is an example of this where values are estimated based on existing data about individual attributes of a product, including external factors, such as the impact of neighbourhood crime levels on the value of a property.
 - Travel cost method is another example, which infers the value of something by calculating visitors' travel costs in time and money.
- **Stated preference:** a research study by professionally designed questionnaire eliciting a monetary value from respondents that shows the amount they would pay ('willingness to pay') to receive or avoid an outcome, or the compensation they would require to accept a loss ('willingness to accept'). There are two methods:
 - Contingent valuation presents a hypothetical scenario to the survey respondent to value
 - Discrete choice presents a series of attributes of the cultural good/service being valued with respondents choosing their preferred scenario
- **Wellbeing valuation:** use of direct wellbeing responses (in existing data or from a research questionnaire) to infer the relative importance of different life features and estimate relative prices of non-market goods¹³

Strengths and weaknesses of these techniques can be found in Appendix A along with considerations when using and applying these methods. Appendix B provides a table showing what values are measured by each economic valuation method.

Benefit transfer methods, the application of values previously elicited through the above methods to a new project, also provides an alternative when it is not practical or possible to complete primary research to determine value.

Contingent valuation is the strongest non-market methodology to apply within the arts and cultural sector, provided the survey accounts for survey bias.¹⁴

Two key factors to avoid survey bias when working with contingent valuation, are to ensure that:

¹³ While a more recently developed method, it is now recognised in various best-practice policy manuals worldwide such as the UK HM Treasury Green Book (2020), the CBA guidelines set out by the OECD (Atkinson, G, NA Braathen, B Groom, and S Mourato (2018) 'Cost-Benefit Analysis and the Environment - Further Developments and Policy Use'. Berlin, Germany: Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD). <http://www.oecd.org/environment/cost-benefit-analysis-and-the-environment-9789264085169-en.htm>), and the New South Wales Treasury policy evaluation and cost-benefit analysis guidelines (New South Wales Government, The Treasury (2017) 'NSW Government Guide to Cost Benefit Analysis'. See https://arp.nsw.gov.au/assets/ars/attachments/TPP17-03_NSW_Government_Guide_to_Cost-Benefit_Analysis_archived.pdf).

¹⁴ Stated preference surveys such as contingent valuation can lead to potential biases. Accuracy is therefore highly dependent on the survey design to account for biases. These biases include:

- Meta-preferences: the preferences people want themselves to have
- Rationalised preferences: more deliberated, internally consistent preferences
- Laundered preferences: for example, omitting "dirty" preferences
- Hypothetical bias: individuals' stated WTP may be significantly larger than actual WTP due to the hypothetical nature of the survey
- Insensitivity to scope: WTP is insensitive to the scope of the proposed change
- Information and framing effects: the type of information and how it is presented can impact on values, for instance, by leading respondents to overstate the importance of the good/service in their lives when focussing on it in the survey
- Strategic bias: Respondents seek to 'game' the study by providing values that they think will influence an actual resource allocation recommendation. That is, they provide very high (low) values for a policy change they would (not) like to see enacted.

- respondents find the hypothetical scenario to be meaningful and realistic
- it reflects as closely as possible a real-life payment decision.

It is also important to recognise that willingness to pay can be impacted by ability to pay and that this may disproportionately impact cultural services with higher proportions of high socioeconomic users.¹⁵ In such circumstances, consideration of potential distributional issues and the application of distributional and equity weights should also be given.¹⁶

Use and non-use values

The key concept underlying the TEV framework is the categorisation of values associated with culture into use values and non-use values.¹⁷

Use values refer to the benefits that individuals gain through engagement with arts, culture and heritage, which are then subdivided into direct and indirect use:

- **Direct use benefits** stem from direct engagement with cultural sites and institutions. For instance, visiting a cultural institution, producing and presenting works of art, visiting a heritage place, or participating in an art class. The direct use of cultural infrastructure provides direct benefits to the individual, such as physical and mental health benefits, recreational, leisure, and entertainment benefits, as well as education, inspiration, and knowledge produced through engagement with culture, and heritage.
- **Indirect use benefits** relate to the presence of a cultural site or institution in the local area as well as its function as a site of social interaction. Cultural institutions may also provide educational opportunities through outreach programmes and encourage social interaction, with people commonly visiting as part of a trip with family or friends. Evidence shows that these forms of social interaction are associated with enhanced quality of life and value for the individuals involved.¹⁸ Cultural sites also provide opportunities for social inclusion by encouraging socially marginalised groups to engage with culture, leading to improved social cohesion.
- **Option value** can also be attached to potential future use of (or having the option to use) collections or the services that cultural infrastructure provide, even if an individual has never visited previously. Individuals may also value retaining the opportunity to experience locally made films, music or other art in the future.

Non-use values refer to the benefits that individuals derive from arts, culture and heritage without them personally engaging directly or indirectly. There are three forms of non-use value:

¹⁵ Atkinson, G, NA Braathen, B Groom, and S Mourato (2018) 'Cost-Benefit Analysis and the Environment - Further Developments and Policy Use'. Berlin, Germany: Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD). <http://www.oecd.org/environment/cost-benefit-analysis-and-the-environment-9789264085169-en.htm>; Watt, W, R Lawton, and D Fujiwara (2018) 'Revaluing Parks and Green Spaces Measuring Their Economic and Wellbeing Value to Individuals'. Field in Trust, UK.

¹⁶ Equity weights reflect the fact that society as a whole has a preference for a more equal distribution. This is different to welfare weights which instead explore distributional impacts arising from the diminishing marginal utility of income – that is, \$1 is worth more to someone on a low income than a millionaire.

¹⁷ Dasgupta, P, and I Serageldin (1999) 'Social Capital. The World Bank'. <https://doi.org/10.1596/0-8213-4562-1>; Mourato, S, and M Mazzanti (2002) 'Economic Valuation of Cultural Heritage: Evidence and Prospects'. In *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage*, edited by Marta de la Torre, 51–76. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Conservation Institute. http://hdl.handle.net/10020/gci_pubs/values_cultural_heritage.

¹⁸ Helliwell, JF, and RD Putnam (2004) 'The Social Context of Well-Being'. *Philosophical Transactions-Royal Society of London Series B Biological Sciences*, pp.1435–46.

- **Altruistic values** – *welfare increases from knowing that others living will benefit from the existence of the cultural asset.* For instance, while an individual may not be personally interested in ballet, they may gain satisfaction in knowing that other people can experience it. As such, being aware of the benefits that others gain from a ballet performance or class contributes to an individual's wellbeing, meaning that they hold a positive value for its use by others.
- **Bequest values** – *welfare increases from knowing that future generations will benefit.* An individual may value the continued existence of a cultural site or institution for the benefit of future generations. An individual may believe that current generations have a duty to leave public value to future generations. For example, people benefit personally from knowing that First Nations culture, language and heritage, and cultural collections will be maintained for future generations.
- **Existence values** – *welfare enhancements from knowing that the cultural institution, its services and collections, exist even if an individual does not benefit from using them now or in the future.* For example, the enhanced civic or regional pride in knowing your city/region has a renowned gallery or high-quality art collection. Individuals may derive value from knowing the State Records Office of Western Australia exists, even if they may never use its services.

Many of the multiple benefits listed above are bundled together. For instance, users or visitors of a cultural good can hold both use and non-use values.

Although it is possible to value these elements together, it may be difficult to meaningfully disentangle the value attached to recreation, to education, to visual amenity, to inspiration, and to non-use. Only by viewing Western Australia's culture through a range of lenses can we understand its full importance to residents and communicate this effectively. These guidelines explain the ways in which the framework underpins the various technical methods available to assess the public value of cultural infrastructure, focusing on how to quantify culture's public value in dollar terms. They are intended as a guide for economists, and to help agencies work with economists to commission economic analysis.

Literature review and common standard values

A comprehensive rapid evidence assessment of valuation in the arts, culture, and heritage sector was undertaken by the UK's Department of Digital, Culture, Media and Sport in 2021¹⁹ and found that stated preference is the most common form of economic valuation in the cultural and heritage sector. Stated preference is a non-market valuation method capable of eliciting both use and non-use values, likely giving reason to its popularity in the literature.

A review of literature and examples of valuation research and studies in culture in Australia has been undertaken. This work has enabled the development of common standard values drawn from existing studies of cultural heritage in Australia, which provides a useful database of publicly available values of cultural and heritage assets that can be used in a social cost benefit analysis if applicable. Each case study has been scored against a set of criteria to help inform good-practice methods in cultural valuation over time (see the quality grading criteria in the Appendix C).

¹⁹ Simetrica Jacobs (2020) 'DCMS Rapid Evidence Assessment: Culture and Heritage Valuation Studies Technical Report'. Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/955142/REA_culture_heritage_value_Simetrica.pdf.

These Australian values can be applied to comparable cultural infrastructure in Western Australia for business case purposes (by using the Individual (annualised) 2021 AUD values or an equivalent), **however, we recommend only the high-quality values be transferred for methodological rigour and that an Economist should be consulted** (see Appendix D). We do not recommend that values taken outside of the geographical scope of Australia or values that do not match the characteristics of your institution should be directly applied. This table should be considered as a starting point, wherein these values should be added to with further research within the Western Australian context.

When looking at the Australian values in the literature, the most common method of non-market valuation was contingent valuation. However, many of these studies were assessed as low quality using the quality grading criteria (Appendix C). Only one of these studies²⁰ was graded highly. The high rating of Tranter reflected the large sample size (877 respondents) and one-off levy for all Queensland residents which, as a compulsory payment vehicle reduced the effect of the free-rider problem, where survey respondents would say they would not be willing to pay because they are not required to. However, there was concern that there were no corrections for consequentiality which means that survey respondents may have stated a willingness to pay value that is biased or that they were unlikely to pay and no attempts to reduce bias were made (for example, reminding survey respondents of other financial commitments).

Using contingent valuation Morrison and Hill estimated the value associated with the redevelopment of the Walsh Bay arts precinct in Sydney, Australia.²¹ Surveying people across NSW they found that willingness to pay for the arts precinct was high in inner Sydney but also covered the other regions. In the hypothetical scenario, respondents were informed that the state government wanted to know whether households were willing to pay for the redevelopment through the payment of a one-off levy on council rates with a range of accounting made for bias. Overall, the total household willingness to pay for the state was estimated as \$30.95 in 2013.

As part of separate valuation of libraries in NSW (2008)²² and Victoria (2011),²³ studies were undertaken to determine user and non-user willingness to pay. In Victoria, people were asked through a Victorian household survey, and through surveys through specific libraries how much they would be willing to pay to maintain community access to current library services, as well as whether their response was affected by their capacity to pay with 82-89%% reporting that what they had offered to pay was all they could afford. While these surveys had less questions to check for hypothetical bias, they had large numbers of participants (Victoria 2,430 and NSW 2,045).

Another paper by Choi, Ritchie, Papandrea and Bennett²⁴ in 2006 valued hypothetical updates to the Old Parliament House in Canberra, using a discrete choice model. This paper was graded as high quality as the questionnaire was developed through focus groups and pilot studies,

²⁰ Tranter, D (2009) 'Valuing the Queensland Museum: A contingent valuation study'. The International Journal of the Inclusive Museum 2(2): pp. 159-176. <https://doi.org/10.18848/1835-2014/CGP/v02i02/44268>

²¹ Morrison, M, and CM Hill (2017) 'Understanding the Non-market Value and Equity Implications of the Walsh Bay Arts Precinct Redevelopment'. Economic Record 93(310): pp. 302-313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-4932.12317>

²² JL Management Services Pty Ltd for the Library Council of New South Wales (2008) 'Enriching communities: the value of public libraries in New South Wales. Retrieved from https://pls.sl.nsw.gov.au/sites/default/files/2023-09/enriching_communities_full_report.pdf

²³ SGS Economics and Planning for the State Library of Victoria and Public Libraries Victoria Network (2011) 'Dollars, sense and public libraries - Technical Report - the landmark study of the socio-economic value of Victorian public libraries'. Retrieved from <https://www.slv.vic.gov.au/sites/default/files/Dollars-sense-public-libraries-technical-report.pdf>

²⁴ Choi, AS, BW Ritchie, F Papandrea, J Bennett (2010) 'Economic valuation of cultural heritage sites: A choice modelling approach'. Tourism Management 31(2): pp. 213-220. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.02.014>

allowing the attributes to be tested as to whether these upgrades seemed realistic. Additionally, use of a mixed-logic model which had five attributes with four to five levels, ensured more robust estimates of value.

The high-quality revealed preference study, conducted by Mwebaze and Bennett,²⁵ valued three Australian Botanic Garden sites. This study was rated high-quality because it had a good sample size (1,139 useable responses), an individual travel cost method was used (rather than a group travel cost), and there was an attempt to deal with multipurpose site visit issues, where respondents may travel on to visit other sites rather than just the site being valued, through inclusion of a dummy variable. While the travel cost method accounts for visitor spend, this method does not account for non-use values. This means that the TEV of the good cannot be estimated.

A review was also undertaken of literature outside Australia, noting that the numbers in this literature could not be applied to the Australian context. Again, stated preference was the most common method of eliciting values for non-market institutions, with 13 values found when looking at high-quality studies conducted in the UK²⁶ and North America.

First Nations peoples

Opportunities to better understand and measure the public value of cultural infrastructure in Western Australia include investigating how best to measure the instrumental, intrinsic, and institutional value of the maintenance of culture, language, and heritage, particularly for First Nations Western Australians. We recommend that future arts, culture, and heritage valuation work should include First Nations cultural experts and Elders from the traditional land on which a site is located and across the wider Nation for sites that hold value for wider groups. These consultants should be informed of the purpose of the research and be consulted on the survey design (if used) to accurately capture the value of First Nations people's culture and heritage.

However, there is a fundamental question whether such economic valuation methods can capture the extent of First Nations values, especially intrinsic values. In a 2022 report on valuing the arts in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand, it was noted that 'rather than ascribing the colonial dichotomy of intrinsic or instrumental value, a decolonial attribution may be more dynamic and inclusive as Indigenous cultural practices 'do more than present heritage. They are sites where cultural processes and politics are negotiated and advanced' (Jones and Birdsall-Jones 2014, p 314).²⁷

Economic valuation processes draw from a Western philosophical framework which puts the individual and their wellbeing at the centre of morality such that the value of a good or service relates to the impact that it has on individual human welfare.²⁸ The Noongar Nation's traditional owners consulted in preparation of this report acknowledge that welfare has a much broader and more holistic definition. We do not suggest that this method fully captures the importance of connection to land and the cultural heritage of First Nations peoples. We recommend that

²⁵ Mwebaze, P, and J Bennett (2012) 'Valuing Australian botanic collections: a combined travel-cost and contingent valuation study'. The Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics 56: pp 498-520. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8489.2012.00595.x>

²⁶ Simetrica Jacobs (2020) 'DCMS Rapid Evidence Assessment: Culture and Heritage Valuation Studies Technical Report'. Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/955142/REA_culture_heritage_value_Simetrica.pdf.

²⁷ Quoted in Queensland University of Technology and The University of Auckland (2022) 'Report: Valuing the Arts in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand', p 25.

²⁸ Freeman, AM (2003) 'Economic Valuation: What and Why'. In A Primer on Nonmarket Valuation, by PA Champ, KJ Boyle, and TC Brown, pp. 1–25. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

future research investigates this matter further, with the guidelines suggested here a starting point.

An important element when considering public value in cultural heritage is the value associated with First Nations communities. This can include ensuring empowerment, education, and that traditions are passed on. Access and connection to Country plays a central role in such cultures, wherein the natural world is intrinsically valuable and must be respected and protected for future generations. Also of note are the cultural and economic benefits generated by First Nations Western Australian artists.²⁹

The Aboriginal empowerment strategy of Western Australia (2021-2029) emphasises the need for all Australian and State Government agencies to recognise and value First Nations culture and languages and to invest in initiatives that support this cultural continuity. These values need to be accounted for so that they are not left behind in the valuation of Western Australia's cultural offering. Culture is placed at the heart of the Aboriginal empowerment strategy of Western Australia and recognised to present a vital asset to providing sustainable economic development opportunities for First Nations while simultaneously being a significant driver in the State's broader tourism and arts sectors. Indeed, comprehensive art sales and cultural tourism indicate the significant instrumental value that Aboriginal art and culture contribute to the economy.

This is in addition to the national agreement on Closing the Gap which established 17 socio-economic targets to focus efforts on improved outcomes for Aboriginal peoples and thus, 'close the gap' between them and wider Australia. One of these outcomes (Target 16), aims to promote Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures and languages so that they are strong, supported and flourishing. Furthermore, Targets 15a and 15b aim for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders to maintain distinctive cultural, spiritual, physical, and economic relationships with their land and waters.

Complexities have been identified in drawing on contingent valuation in relation to First Nations values and culture and TEV using price based non-market valuation techniques may not present the best option for capturing the value of First Nations cultural heritage:

- There can be challenges in eliciting individual valuation responses from First Nations respondents because of reasons including 'lack of substitutability between goods'³⁰
- First Nations peoples may hold more non-use and indirect use values than non-First Nations people.
- Equity weights (whereby impacts on disadvantaged groups are weighted more heavily than impacts on advantaged groups), to account for First Nations weights, may be the best way forward.

In terms of recognising First Nations values, attempts have been made by Government bodies to represent and evaluate First Nations culture and heritage in terms that are informative and beneficial to Government. The Western Australian Cultural Infrastructure Framework 2030+ recommends seeking input from Elders of relevant First Nations groups and notes the diversity of First Nations groups should be considered. Simetrica-Jacobs sought guidance from Moodjar

²⁹ Throsby D, and E Petetskaya for the Government of Western Australia, Department of Culture and the Arts (2016) 'Integrating art production and economic development in the Kimberley: National Survey of Remote Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Artists': https://www.cits.wa.gov.au/docs/default-source/culture-and-the-arts/research-hub/wa-arts-and-culture/kimberley-survey-report-macquarie-university.pdf?sfvrsn=9b6c43bf_2

³⁰ Venn, TJ, and J Quiggin (2007) 'Accommodating Indigenous Cultural Heritage Values in Resource Assessment: Cape York Peninsula and the Murray-Darling Basin, Australia'. *Ecological Economics* 61 (2):334-44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2006.03.003>.

Consultancy, led by Noongar Elder, Emeritus Professor Len Collard for their valuation work. Future projects should similarly seek such guidance and expertise.

Case study of Perth Cultural Centre

The Perth Cultural Centre lies within the heart of Perth and is a key heritage site that houses museums, theatres, art galleries, and more. The site itself consists of several buildings and open spaces that house the seven separate sites in this valuation.

The primary purpose of the contingent valuation study was to:

- Estimate the total public value of the Perth Cultural Centre.
- Estimate the public value of each individual site (total of 8 including the public open space) within the Perth Cultural Centre.
- Estimate the public value associated with the Perth Cultural Centre public realm.

A contingent valuation survey was designed to quantify residents' willingness to pay for continued free entry to the Perth Cultural Centre offerings and continued financial support of Perth Cultural Centre activities.

The survey measured both use and non-use values of the Perth Cultural Centre (see table 1 below).

Table 1: Types of Visitors and Use value definitions

Table 1	Use value	Non-use value
PCC visitor	An individual who has visited any of the Perth Cultural Centre (PCC) sites and may be willing to pay for the services provided by the sites within PCC. Where entry to performances is ticketed, the value elicited is in addition to ticket sales. We classify those that passively use the site, such as walking through, as visitors.	An individual who may be willing to pay for the maintenance and conservation of collections and for its continued existence (civic value, sense of place, bequest, and other non-use elements) for the sites within the PCC.
PCC non-visitor	While non-visitors are primarily expected to hold non-use values, non-visitors may hold elements of use value, such as the option value to visit the PCC sites in the future.	An individual who has not visited any of the PCC sites and who may be willing to pay for the maintenance and conservation of collections and for its continued existence for all sites within the PCC.
[Site] visitor	An individual who has visited the [site] in the past three years. The visitor may be willing to pay for the services provided by one or more sites within the PCC.	An individual who has visited the [site] and may be willing to pay for the maintenance and conservation of collections and for its continued existence for the [site].
[Site] non-visitor	While non-visitors are primarily expected to hold non-use values, non-visitors may hold elements of use value, such as the option value to visit the [site] in the future or having used it online for research or recreational reasons.	An individual who has not visited the [site] and may be willing to pay for the maintenance and conservation of collections and for its continued existence for the [site].

Some respondents may be visitors of some facilities of the Perth Cultural Centre precinct while being non-visitors for others (for example, an individual may use the State Library while having never visited the State Theatre). All respondents were asked to select all the sites they had visited in the last three years to determine the visitor type.

In this study, the WTP estimates were collected from visitors, and non-visitors (including a non-use value from visitors to other PCC sites and non-use value from those who have not visited the PCC site).

The valuation scenario first asked for a **WTP value for the site as a whole**. After providing their WTP value, survey respondents were then asked to **split their WTP value across the individual sites**. Using this method, an average resident's WTP for the Perth Cultural Centre as a whole site can be estimated, while also obtaining values for each individual site as well.

The total public value of an asset (following the TEV framework) is considered the sum of each of its parts (that is, the sum of each Perth Cultural Centre site's value). This approach enabled a direct test as to whether the total Perth Cultural Centre WTP value provided is the sum of the values provided for each of the sites, or whether it is valued greater when split into respective sites.

All respondents were provided with an opportunity to restate their WTP value and split their new WTP value across the sites.

Pilot

An initial survey pilot targeting 75 respondents was undertaken to test the survey design. The aim of the pilot was to inform on the suitability of the experimental design (for example, the appropriateness of the payment cards) and allow potential refinement and the preliminary investigation of hypotheses (for example, whether the total Perth Cultural Centre WTP value is the sum of the values provided for each of the sites, or whether it is valued greater when split into respective sites). The pilot survey also included detailed debrief questions about specific survey elements to provide useful insights into the effectiveness of the survey design (such as plausibility of the scenario, sensitivity of the questions).

Sample

Simetrica-Jacobs sampled using a geographical clustering approach, focused on residents within Western Australia. Quotas were established for each of the nine regions (Gascoyne, Goldfields- Esperance, Great Southern, Kimberley, Mid-West, Peel, Pilbara, South-West, Wheatbelt, and the Perth metropolitan area) to ensure a representative sample based on age, gender, and geographical location.

A minimum sample of 1,000 adult (18 years and over) respondents (roughly 500 visitors and 500 non-visitors) was the target for data collection. This ensured that survey responses collected would be sufficient for use for future valuation work (such as a benefit transfer). The data was collected by Thinkfield. Additionally, member lists of the 8 Perth Cultural Centre sites were used to recruit a visitor sample, while the wider WA State residents constitute a natural candidate for the non-visitor population. This sample was then cleaned to ensure reliable responses, resulting in a smaller final sample size.

1,114 respondents completed the survey, this included 750 responses collected by the panel provider Thinkfield and 364 using the Perth Cultural Centre site member lists.

Appendix A: Economic valuation methods for cultural assets

	Revealed Preference (travel cost method and hedonic pricing method)	Stated preference (contingent valuation method and discrete choice method)	Wellbeing valuation method	Benefit transfer method
Overview	Based on observing behaviour in a similar or related market a to estimate value of the site through: • Travel cost method - prices incurred from cost of travelling to the site • Hedonic pricing (HP) - housing prices surrounding the site	Stated Preference methods require survey respondents to state their value for the site. • Contingent valuation (CV) presents a hypothetical scenario to the survey respondent to value by eliciting a willingness to pay (or avoid). • Discrete choice (DC) presents a series of attributes of the cultural good/service being valued with respondents to choose their preferred scenario.	• Use of direct wellbeing responses (in existing data or from a research questionnaire) to infer the relative importance of different life features and estimate relative prices of non-market goods	• Common in business cases and cost-benefit analysis - analysts transfer and apply values from one study to a new project.
Strengths	• Collect use values (visitors) and indirect use values (local benefits generated by having a site near). • Values are calculated by 'per visit': can easily be aggregated by number of visitors annually to estimate overall annual direct use value for site. • HP allows for collection of indirect use value, but only if nearby site generates measurable local benefits (eg reduced crime).	• Allows for estimation of use and non-use values. Can estimate value of a site people know but haven't visited recently, or at all. • Can measure indirect use values (eg raised pride of site). • CV has decades of research and insights from behavioural economics on survey bias effects. • DC can value multidimensional changes/ where trade-offs between various dimensions are of interest. – Changes can be future benefits (such as mitigating depreciation of archive materials). – Price one of many attributes = reduced protest responses. • DC can provide more detailed info re marginal values of site attributes than CV.	• Only appropriate for visitors who use the site regularly or for a significant cultural event that is life impacting. • This method values outcomes and issues that have a large effect on wellbeing. This includes the perceived benefit of the site on visitors' health from frequent visits to the site, especially if participating in activities, such as theatre workshops.	• Can include use and non-use values. • No new primary research is required. • Can be conducted where direct visitor values are not available and time or financial resource constraints mean that it is impossible to conduct primary research.

Weaknesses	• Methods do not measure non-use values and thus do not account for the wider population which does not directly engage with the site, providing a partial value. • Travel cost method is a burden on respondents as a lot of information is required for an accurate estimate. • Travel cost values are estimated for an entire site rather than specific features of the cultural site and tend to be low for local to the site. • HP requires sufficient data on the house characteristics and house prices surrounding the site.	• Can lead to potential biases, such as meta-preferences, rationalised preferences, and hypothetical bias (eg overstate WTP). • Type of info/ how it is presented can impact values, eg may overstate importance in their lives. Respondents may provide values they think will influence a resource allocation recommendation (very high/ low values). • CV - Large differences between WTP and WTA can occur (eg people averse to loss of something they enjoy). Accuracy dependent on survey design. Can also be costly to get representative survey population. • DC - WTP results are sensitive to the study design elements (number of attributes and levels will influence values). • CV and DC can place cognitive burden on survey respondents leading to data inconsistencies/ fatigue. • Aggregating total value relies on assumption that total value = sum of its parts. Can overestimate WTP for the site.	• Limited research on the wellbeing impact of engagement with cultural assets • Relies on retrospection - life satisfaction responses. Context, including weather, money etc impacts • Order of questions impacts value • Impacted by 'peak': place greatest weight when valuing the experience on the peak (most intense part). Leads to mismatch between people's actual experiences and retrospective evaluations. • Wellbeing valuation methods do not estimate non-use value unless survey designed for non-use values. • Values are inferred statistically - evidence that people would pay	• Values available to be transferred are dependent on the quality of the original research. • Some error is expected in the transfer process itself. • Reliability of transfer lower for more unique cultural assets.
Notes	• HP relies on assumption 'proxy' market is an accurate representation of people's preferences for non-market good. • Property value effects reflect capitalized changes in value. • Estimate bias may occur when variables are omitted, e.g., factors that drive house prices, that are correlated with proximity of a house to the amenity of interest but are not captured within the model.	Stated preference surveys: • ask respondents to state their value of site. • needs to be robustly designed and take into consideration biases • require respondents find hypothetical scenario meaningful and realistic to reflect a real-life payment decision. • Ethical concerns exist about the appropriateness of using CV and WTP to value cultural services, given ability to pay can impact value placed monetarily (higher where high socioeconomic users) and suggest culture is a commodity.	• More suited to valuing outcomes and issues that are known to have a large effect on wellbeing, such as unemployment or health. • Cannot be used for a one-off engagement, unless very important. • Less concern with bias as values based on people's experience of the good/service (context vital). • Early studies of non-market goods returned large (implausible) values.	

Appendix B: Values measured by each Economic Valuation Method

The table below shows the different values that can be measured by each valuation method subject to the valuation method being designed appropriately. The values that can be measured by benefit transfer are subject to what was included in the study(ies) that are being applied to the new project.

	Values measured by revealed preference		Values measured by stated preference		Values measured by wellbeing valuation	Values measured by benefit transfer
	Travel cost method	Hedonic pricing	Contingent valuation	Discrete choice		
Direct use value	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Indirect use value	Maybe	Maybe	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Option use value	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Existence non-use value	No	No	Yes	Yes	Maybe	Yes
Bequest non-use value	No	No	Yes	Yes	Maybe	Yes
Altruistic non-use value	No	No	Yes	Yes	Maybe	Yes

Appendix C: Grading quality criteria

	Robust rating	Values measured by revealed preference		Values measured by stated preference		Values measured by wellbeing valuation	Values measured by benefit transfer
		Travel cost method	Hedonic pricing	Contingent valuation	Discrete choice		
Empirical design	Low	Basic with limited covariates: • Single site visit • Limited set of covariates in function	• Limited empirical strategy	Poor survey design (increasing risk of hypothetical bias): • Good/service not clearly defined • Payment mechanism not clearly defined/relevant to valuation • Payment term not explicitly stated • Household/ individual payment not defined	Simple models w/out consideration of whether models mimic market conditions, including: • A high number (>7) of attributes without partial profiles • Many levels assigned to each attribute	Limited empirical strategy: • Correlational • Equivalent income estimated w/in same model (risk of endogeneity and overstated wellbeing) • Wellbeing scale <7 points • Subjective wellbeing measure not life satisfaction (e.g., happiness, Cantrill Ladder)	No discussion of quality of underlying studies
	Medium	Basic with multiple relevant covariates: • Single site visit • Extensive set of covariates in function	• More advanced empirical strategy estimates implicit price changes through effects on house prices	Survey well designed to reduce hypothetical bias: • Clearly defined good/ service • Explicit payment term • Clearly defined household/individual payment • Voluntary payment mechanism introduces free-ride risk	Simple modelling but with explicit consideration that they are sufficient to mimic market conditions, including: • 4-7 attributes with few levels with a wide range • Simple model (eg multinomial logit)	More advanced empirical strategy: • Correlational • Exogenous instrument for income estimated from separate model • Subjective wellbeing measured as Life satisfaction	Quality of underlying studies reviewed, with conclusion that some studies are of low quality.
	High	Advanced: • Multi site visit • Extensive site characteristics in function • Experimental causality (e.g., recreational demand modelling accounting for substitution effect)	• Advanced empirical strategy estimates full demand function for individuals in housing market • Experimental causality (e.g., temporal effects, control group comparison, randomisation)	Survey well designed to reduce hypothetical bias as in Medium, with inclusion of: • Compulsory payment mechanism (eg tax, entry fee) to overcome free-riding	Advanced modelling to mimic market conditions, including: • 4-7 attributes with few levels with a wide range • Blocking for higher number of attributes • Advanced regression models (e.g., nested logit, mixed logit, latent class model)	Adv empirical strategy: • Experimental causality modelling techniques • Spatial fixed effects • Temporal fixed effects through panel data • Integration w SP or GIS data • Exogenous instrument for income from separate model	Quality of underlying studies reviewed, with conclusion that majority of studies are of high quality.

Method/ Dataset	Low	Zonal models using secondary data	Dataset: Primary data	Simple design, including: • Simple elicitation mechanism (open-ended) • No corrections for consequentiality (e.g., cheap talk or oath script)	Non-welfare consistent: • Contingent ranking/contingent rating choice modelling • No opt out (if relevant) • No focus group/pilot and prior estimate of coefficients • Random design (not orthogonal or efficient)	Inappropriate dataset: • Estimation based on low level of engagement not detected in wellbeing analysis (single site visit) • Primary data used	No testing of transfer errors
	Medium	Choice models using primary data	Dataset: Large databases on real estate transactions and listed prices	More advanced design: • Advanced elicitation mechanism - payment card or dichotomous choice (single or double bounded) • Corrections for consequentiality (e.g., cheap talk or oath script)	Non-welfare consistent: • Paired comparison choice modelling technique • Opt-out option (if relevant) • Design based on focus group/pilot and prior estimate of coefficients • Orthogonal design	Appropriate dataset: • Est based on continuous level of engagement, i.e., Regular visits/engagement (annual or less often)	Transfer errors tested, but error >40% recommended by the literature
	High	Primary data w latent class models, instrumental variables, quasi-experimental designs &/or integration with SP or GIS data	Dataset: Large database using adv modelling techniques e.g., Instrumental Variables, quasi-experimental designs, and/or integration with SP or GIS data	Advanced design, including: • Advanced elicitation mechanism & consequentiality corrections, alongside • Explicit consequentiality Qs to assess whether respondent judges payment context as realistic	Welfare consistent: • Discrete choice w status quo option (if relevant) • Efficient design (“D” or “S” efficient), using software such as NGENE • Opt-out option (if relevant) • Design based on focus group/pilot and prior estimates of coefficients • Orthogonal design	Appropriate dataset: • Estimation based on continuous level of engagement i.e. regular visits/engagement (monthly or more)	Transfer errors tested, with error ≤40% recommended by the literature
QGC3: Sample size (full sample rule of thumb)	Low	< 250	<250	<200	<500	<500	< 3 study sites
	Medium	250-999	250-999	200-500	500-2,000	1,000-10,000	3 study sites
	High	1,000+	1,000+	500+	2,000+	10,000+	4+ study sites

Appendix D: Comparable Cultural Assets Table

	Stated preference: Contingent valuation				Stated preference: Discrete choice model			Revealed preference: Travel cost method
Reference (Author, year, link)	Tranter (2009)	SGS Economics and Planning (2011)	Morrison and Hill (2017)	Library Council of NSW (2008)	Choi, Ritchie, Papandrea, Bennett (2010)	Choi, Ritchie, Papandrea, Bennett (2010)	Choi, Ritchie, Papandrea, Bennett (2010)	Mwebaze and Bennett (2012)
Cultural/ heritage asset	The Queensland Museum	Victorian public libraries	Walsh Bay Arts Precinct Redevelopment	NSW Public Libraries	Old Parliament House	Old Parliament House	Old Parliament House	3 botanic gardens Canberra, Melbourne & Sydney
User groups	Queensland residents	Victorian residents	NSW residents	10 specific library catchment areas	General public across all of AU	General public across all of AU	General public across all of AU	Visitors to the botanic gardens
Location	Queensland	Victoria	Sydney, NSW	NSW	Canberra (ACT)	Canberra (ACT)	Canberra (ACT)	ACT, VIC, NSW
Monetary valuation annual (w currency)	16.43 (AUD)	68AUD (average)	\$30.95 (AUD)	\$58.20 (AUD) per annum (average) for user; \$19 (AUD) per annum average for non-user	0.12, 5.46, 8.38 AUD (average)	4.64 AUD (average)	3.62 AUD (average)	39.00 AUD
Midpoint valuation	16.43				4.65	4.64	3.62	39.00
Data collection date	2008	2010	2013	2006	2006	2006	2006	2010
Adjust for purchasing power parity	\$9.99				\$3.14	\$3.13	\$2.44	\$18.21
Convert to 2021 (AUD)	\$23.25				\$7.76	\$7.73	\$6.03	\$41.10
Individual/household	Individual	Individual	Household	Individual	Household	Household	Household	Individual
Individual value*	\$23.25				\$2.98	\$2.97	\$2.32	\$41.10
WTP range	\$5-\$9.99				\$0-\$2.49	\$0-\$2.49	\$0-\$2.49	\$20-\$29.99

Description of valuation	One-off levy of QLD population to fund additional products & services of QLD museum	Nominate how much they would be willing to pay to maintain community access to current library services.	One-off levy on council rates to pay for the redevelopment of the Walsh Bay arts precinct into a world class facility	If the public library was not funded by government, how much would you be willing to pay to maintain the community's access to the current services?	WTP to have conference rooms, to have a shop, café, fine dining respectively by an increase in the annual household tax	WTP for the hosting of various events in the form of an increase in the annual household tax	WTP to extend the duration of temporary exhibitions by one month in the form of an increase in the annual household tax	Average per-trip consumer surplus for single-site visitors
Valuation frequency**	One-off	Per annum	One-off	Per annum	Per annum	Per annum	Per annum	Per visit
Overall quality rating justification	High quality study but some concerns about consequentiality	Victorian residents (1050, \$65) & library customers from 7 specific services (1380, \$72). Asked whether response is affected by their capacity to pay: 82-89% would pay more but can't afford it. Little checking for hypothetical bias.	Pilot study, questions included to account for bias. Value for the present study is for a redevelopment of an existing precinct into a world-class facility, and not the value for the entire precinct.	Only 55 non-users surveyed. No accounting for hypothetical bias/how would pay. Responses reflect personal usage and public libraries' value to the broader community.	High quality apart from the relatively small sample size.	High quality study apart from the relatively small sample size.	High quality - Good methodology with caveats around the medium sample size.	High quality – Good sample size, individual travel cost method used, and attempt to deal with multipurpose site visit issue through inclusion of a dummy variable.

* annualised 2021 AUD

** individual values are annualised

Department of Creative Industries,
Tourism and Sport
PO BOX 8349
Perth Business Centre WA 6849
Email: info@cits.wa.gov.au
Website: cits.wa.gov.au