

Sport and Recreation New Zealand: Improving how it measures its performance

This is an independent assurance
report about a performance audit
carried out under section 16 of the
Public Audit Act 2001.

December 2010

ISBN 978-0-478-32681-9 (online)

Contents

Auditor-General's overview	3
Part 1 – Introduction	5
The purpose of our audit	5
How we carried out our audit	6
What we did not audit	6
Part 2 – Statutory functions and changing priorities	7
Delivering statutory functions	7
Changing strategic priorities	8
Part 3 – Improving performance measurement	11
Limited information on overall effectiveness	11
Introducing better performance measurement for well-informed decisions	13
Ensuring robust and reliable data collection	15
Creating standardised measures	16
Integrating ways to gather information	18
Our views on work to improve performance measurement	18
Appendix – Functions under the Sport and Recreation New Zealand Act 2002	21
Figures	
1 – Performance measurement framework	14
2 – Criteria for assessing data collection options	15
3 – Example of linking individual measures to strategic goals	17

Auditor-General's overview

Sport and physical recreation is an important part of New Zealand life. During any week, more than three-quarters of adults participate in at least one sport or physical recreation activity. There are an estimated 15,000 clubs and gyms, and 500,000 volunteers in sport and physical recreation.

Sport and Recreation New Zealand (SPARC) is the government agency responsible for promoting, encouraging, and supporting sport and physical recreation. It invests more than \$70 million for this purpose. Under the Sport and Recreation New Zealand Act 2002, SPARC has 14 functions that support its overarching responsibility (see the Appendix).

My staff carried out preliminary work as part of a performance audit to examine whether SPARC was delivering these 14 functions and how effectively SPARC's activities contribute to increasing participation in sport and physical recreation.

Overall, SPARC had a range of activities that fulfilled its statutory functions. However, my staff were unable to assess how effectively these activities were contributing to increasing participation because the quality of the information about the relationship between SPARC's work and its broader outcomes was limited. SPARC had already identified this as an area for improvement. It was establishing a comprehensive performance measurement framework to provide better information about progress in achieving the outcomes it sought. This work was well under way at the time of our audit.

There was little value to be gained from us continuing to examine the effectiveness of SPARC's activities in increasing participation. Instead, my staff looked at SPARC's work to improve its performance measurement. Better performance measurement is needed for SPARC to give a complete and accurate account of how it uses public funds, to show how its funding investments contribute to its outcomes, and to be accountable for its performance.

Because SPARC was still introducing its new measurement framework at the time of our audit, it was too early to assess the framework's effectiveness. However, it was clear that SPARC knew what its information needs were, had thoroughly considered how to meet these information needs, and was setting up systems to provide the information it needed. Because other government agencies may find it useful, this report describes SPARC's approach to improving its performance measurement.

My staff did not make any recommendations for improvement, but I remain interested in the results of SPARC's improved measurement framework. Within an appropriate timeframe, I plan to follow up on SPARC's efforts to improve how it measures its performance.

I thank SPARC's staff for the information and valuable assistance they provided throughout the audit.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lyn Provost', written in a cursive style.

Lyn Provost
Controller and Auditor-General

1 December 2010

Part 1

Introduction

- 1.1 In this Part, we discuss:
- the purpose of our audit;
 - how we carried out our audit; and
 - what we did not audit.

The purpose of our audit

- 1.2 We carried out a performance audit to examine the effectiveness of Sport and Recreation New Zealand (SPARC) in improving New Zealanders' participation in sport and physical recreation.
- 1.3 SPARC is the Crown entity responsible for sport and physical recreation. It was set up to promote, encourage, and support sport and physical recreation. SPARC supports high performance sport, but it also has strong interests in supporting community sport and physical recreation. Under the Sport and Recreation New Zealand Act 2002 (the Act), SPARC has 14 functions that support its overarching responsibility (see the Appendix).¹
- 1.4 We were interested in SPARC's effectiveness in increasing participation because this receives less public attention than SPARC's role in supporting high performance sport. SPARC's work in community sport and increasing participation has the potential to have the greatest effect on the public.
- 1.5 SPARC promotes, encourages, and supports sport and physical recreation by:
- providing policy advice on sport and physical recreation;
 - “investing” (this is SPARC's term for the funding it provides) in sports and physical recreation organisations, local authorities, schools, and iwi-based organisations;
 - providing capability support and resources to sport and recreation organisations;
 - working with other government agencies; and
 - providing research, education, and examples of good practice to organisations it works with, as well as to the public.
- 1.6 In 2009/10, SPARC invested more than \$70 million to promote, encourage, and support sport and physical recreation. SPARC invested \$35 million in community sport and recreation programmes, and \$38 million in high performance sport. Current areas of focus include creating opportunities for young people, supporting clubs, and improving resourcing of high performance sport. Recently, the Government announced further funding for high performance sport. Over the

¹ Further information on the range of SPARC's work is available at www.sparc.org.nz.

next three years, the annual funding for high performance sport will increase to more than \$60 million.

How we carried out our audit

- 1.7 We planned to assess SPARC's delivery of its statutory functions and then examine relevant programmes and activities to see whether they were effective in increasing participation in sport and physical recreation.
- 1.8 We assessed whether SPARC was carrying out its 14 functions under the Act using a mix of document review, interviews with SPARC staff, and observation of SPARC's contract management system.
- 1.9 As our work progressed, it was clear that SPARC's changing strategic priorities and delivery model altered what SPARC did to fulfil its functions. We also identified that there was limited information on the broader effect of SPARC's activities on participation levels. This combination of changing strategic priorities and lack of information about the effectiveness of SPARC's activities meant there was little value in us further assessing SPARC's programmes to determine their effectiveness in increasing participation.
- 1.10 SPARC was already aware of the need to improve its performance measurement work and was introducing improvements. We considered that this work was critical for SPARC to demonstrate its effectiveness. We decided to focus on this, and report on it in more detail, because it supports our focus on this aspect of transparency and accountability, and because it could be useful for other government agencies.
- 1.11 Our views on SPARC's work to improve its performance measurement were informed by further discussion with SPARC staff, examining relevant documentation, and considering good practice guidance on performance measurement and reporting.

What we did not audit

- 1.12 The audit did not examine:
- specific programmes provided by SPARC because, due to changing strategic priorities, several programmes were cancelled, transferred to other government agencies, or on hold pending decisions about the programme's future delivery;
 - whether SPARC's activities supported other government agencies in achieving their outcomes, such as improved health or reduced crime; and
 - SPARC's priorities for funding or decisions on funding allocations.

Part 2

Statutory functions and changing priorities

- 2.1 In this Part, we describe SPARC’s delivery of its statutory functions and how changing strategic priorities altered what SPARC did to deliver these functions.

Delivering statutory functions

- 2.2 SPARC provided adequate evidence to demonstrate that it was carrying out its functions² under section 8 of the Act to promote, encourage, and support physical recreation and sport. Since it was set up in 2003, SPARC has carried out a range of work to fulfil its statutory functions. In the past seven years, SPARC has targeted different functions at different times.
- 2.3 Two of SPARC’s functions under the Act are promoting and encouraging participation from specific demographic groups. Under the Act, SPARC is expected to encourage participation in physical recreation and sport by Pacific peoples, women, older New Zealanders, and people with disabilities.³ It is also expected to promote and support physical recreation and sport in a way that is culturally appropriate to Māori.⁴
- 2.4 Although these functions have guided SPARC’s work with different demographic groups, SPARC has not limited its work to these groups – for example, young people are a current focus. SPARC had a broad focus on encouraging sport and physical recreation opportunities for all. SPARC considered that this inclusive approach would cover the groups specified in the Act.
- 2.5 Our assessment of SPARC’s performance against these functions found that Māori and people with disabilities had been the focus for much of SPARC’s work with the groups specified in its Act.
- 2.6 At the time of our audit, SPARC did not have any specific work targeting the other groups mentioned in the Act, such as women, older New Zealanders, and Pacific peoples. However, SPARC was planning some work on women and sport. It had invested in research examining Pacific peoples’ perceptions and experiences of sport, and barriers and enablers for participation, to better promote and target sporting opportunities to meet needs. The Push Play programme (on hold at the time of our audit) has also included some targeting of different groups mentioned in the Act at various times.
- 2.7 SPARC told us that it will be working with the organisations it funds to ensure that community programmes encourage participation from the groups specified in the Act.

2 The Appendix lists SPARC’s functions under the Act.

3 Section 8(g) of the Act.

4 Section 8(f) of the Act.

- 2.8 It is appropriate that SPARC prioritises how it delivers its functions and the groups it targets through its work. However, if SPARC is relying on mainstream programmes to meet the needs of groups specified in the Act, it needs to be sure that these programmes meet the needs of these groups. This means ensuring that it has adequate information on the participation rates of these groups. We noted that SPARC's information on the participation rates of different groups was variable. Some information was available from national surveys but SPARC did not have data to understand its influence on longer-term trends in participation. This situation was similar for the general population as well. SPARC did, however, plan to improve its information.
- 2.9 At the time of our audit, SPARC was introducing a performance measurement framework (discussed further in Part 3). As SPARC's new performance measurement framework matures, SPARC should have a better range of information to understand trends in participation. We encourage SPARC to ensure that its performance measurement framework will provide useful information about how well the needs of targeted groups are being met so it can adapt and refine its work accordingly.

Changing strategic priorities

- 2.10 Changing strategic priorities meant that some functions had become less of a focus. Therefore, the work SPARC did to deliver these functions was also changing.
- 2.11 Until recently, promoting the health benefits associated with sport and physical recreation activity was a priority for SPARC. Its work on promoting health benefits was linked to two of its statutory functions.⁵ SPARC's 2009 strategic plan noted that, since 2003, SPARC had worked in the wider physical activity and health space. The strategic plan refocused SPARC's work on to core sport and physical recreation activity. This change of strategic direction meant that SPARC's health promotion work became less of a priority. Several programmes were cancelled, some were transferred to other government agencies, and others were on hold pending decisions about the programme's future.
- 2.12 These changes aligned with other strategic changes occurring at SPARC – in particular, SPARC's delivery model. Increasingly, SPARC was moving away from providing programmes for other organisations to deliver. Instead, SPARC was using a more indirect, devolved approach of funding other organisations to achieve SPARC's outcomes. SPARC expected that the organisations it funded would demonstrate a clear focus on sport and physical recreation activity, and that the programmes they provided would support SPARC's functions and outcomes.

⁵ Section 8(c) and 8(k) of the Act.

- 2.13 SPARC told us that, as its delivery model and strategic direction changed, it still had to consider how it fulfilled its statutory functions. It considered that it could deliver these in different ways. For example, funding arrangements could allow for sport and recreation organisations to continue promoting physical activity objectives for other government agencies such as the Ministry of Health. SPARC had work under way examining the value of sport and the potential benefits from sport. This was a more indirect way of promoting the benefits of physical activity.
- 2.14 Although we were satisfied that SPARC was fulfilling its statutory functions, we noted some tension between some functions (specifically those related to promoting health benefits associated with physical activity) and Government priorities. We encourage SPARC to be mindful of this and to ensure that it continues to adequately deliver its statutory functions.

Part 3

Improving performance measurement

- 3.1 In this Part, we describe:
- limitations in the information SPARC had to assess its effectiveness; and
 - how SPARC planned to address these limitations with an improved performance measurement framework.
- 3.2 We then discuss important aspects of what SPARC did to create its performance measurement framework. These included:
- ensuring robust and reliable data collection;
 - creating standardised measures; and
 - integrating ways to gather information.
- 3.3 Finally, we provide our views on SPARC's work to improve its performance measurement.

Limited information on overall effectiveness

- 3.4 Since SPARC was set up in 2003, it has had a strong focus on evaluating its performance, building progress reviews into its programmes, and examining how it delivered its work. This evaluation work helped SPARC identify how it could improve its performance. However, the work focused on evaluating SPARC's processes or performance in delivering work rather than progress with increasing participation or building capability within the sport and recreation sector. This meant that SPARC had limited information on its effectiveness in achieving its broader strategic outcomes. There was a clear need for SPARC to improve how it assessed and evaluated its performance so that it had a better understanding of what it was achieving.
- 3.5 SPARC was already aware of this need at the time of our audit. It was introducing a comprehensive performance management framework to help it demonstrate its achievements and to inform decisions about its work.

How SPARC evaluated its work

- 3.6 SPARC used a mix of formal and informal evaluation activities to assess the value of its work, identify improvements, and better target its work. SPARC's evaluation activities included strategy reviews, programme evaluations, surveys of sector organisations, surveys of those using SPARC resources, and reviews of its own systems and processes.
- 3.7 It used the results of these activities to refine and better target delivery. For example, an evaluation of a leadership development programme found that it

was valued by the participants, identified that the coaching component of the programme had not worked well for participants, and made recommendations to improve the programme design.

- 3.8 Although SPARC had a strong evaluation focus for individual activities, little work was done to combine the results of individual activities into an overall view of progress and increases in participation. Because SPARC's evaluation activities tended to focus on processes or its performance in delivering programmes, it had only basic information about the effectiveness of SPARC's activities in increasing participation. SPARC did not have any long-term trend data on participation rates from the groups specified in the Act, and acknowledged that it had limited evidence of its influence in changing participation for the general population.

Challenges for SPARC in evaluating its effectiveness

- 3.9 We recognise that measuring the effect of SPARC's activities is a complex exercise. Behavioural change – in this case, influencing participation in sport and recreation – is a gradual process, and a long period of time can be needed to see results. Participation rates will also be influenced by factors outside SPARC's control. Many of SPARC's activities have indirect links to increasing participation, so it can be difficult to quantify the effect these activities have.
- 3.10 An example of this is SPARC's work to support and build capability in the sector. Research shows that people look for quality engagements with sports clubs and organisations. Clubs with adequate organisational capability are more likely to provide a positive experience for people and either maintain or grow their membership.
- 3.11 SPARC can measure its work in building organisational capability – for example, how participants experience or value its leadership development programmes or how many organisations use its organisational development tool. However, it is much harder to link improvements in organisational capability to increases in participation.
- 3.12 SPARC acknowledged that its ability to demonstrate the effect of its funding activities was mixed. Its agreements with the organisations it funded contained measures for assessing performance. We were told that the quality of these had been poor (for example, the number of measures bore little resemblance to the amount of funding invested), that measures provided minimal information about actual achievements, and that there was minimal monitoring of whether organisations were achieving their targets.
- 3.13 The complexities involved in quantifying the effect of SPARC's activities account, to some extent, for the process and performance focus of SPARC's evaluation. However, this focus meant that there was limited information on

the effectiveness of SPARC's activities in increasing participation in sport and recreation. SPARC recognised that it needed better information to demonstrate the value of its work and account for its performance.

Introducing better performance measurement for well-informed decisions

- 3.14 SPARC wanted to demonstrate measurable achievements from its work and to gather robust information to inform policy, investment decisions, and business development. To do this, SPARC needed an information-gathering framework that would enable it to assess progress and to identify changing needs.
- 3.15 SPARC created a performance measurement framework so that it could assess its achievements using a solid evidence base and make well-informed decisions about its work. In creating this framework, SPARC:
- linked its work to its strategic goals;
 - identified the information it needed to demonstrate performance against strategic goals and how it could collect this;
 - planned to measure progress at various intervals;
 - proposed to use different ways to measure progress at these various intervals;
 - established how it would set baselines as a starting point for measuring against; and
 - integrated ways to gather information about challenges and issues in the sport and recreation sector and how to address these.
- 3.16 Figure 1 sets out SPARC's framework for measuring its performance.

Figure 1
Performance measurement framework

SPARC's strategy: More kids, more adults, more winners				
What SPARC needed to know	When	Collecting information in different ways	Linking information to strategic goals	Using information for decision-making
Strategic information				
Achievement of strategic goals and outcomes	Assessed at 4-5 year intervals	Surveys	Surveys selected to provide specific information about individual strategic goals Earlier survey data established baselines	Strategic planning Assessing SPARC's performance
⇕		⇕		
Operational information				
Progress towards achieving strategic goals and outcomes	Assessed at 1-2 year intervals	Reporting from sport and recreation organisations SPARC performance information	Standardised measures linked to strategic goals incorporated reporting requirements for sport [and] recreation organisations	Evaluating investment decisions Assessing progress towards strategic goals and where changes are needed
⇕		⇕		
Contextual information				
Understanding the sport and recreation environment	Ongoing	Research SPARC work with the sport and recreation sector	Research programme informed by strategic goals	Identifying emerging issues and challenges Understanding what works Informing strategy, policy, and research Identifying where changes are needed

Source: SPARC.

Ensuring robust and reliable data collection

- 3.17 Good practice guidance on performance measurement considers data quality to be the most important factor in creating an effective measurement framework. SPARC had thoroughly considered its information needs. SPARC established what information it needed, how it would collect this information, when the information would be collected, and who was responsible for collecting it.
- 3.18 SPARC identified that it needed different ways to assess whether it had achieved its strategic goals and to assess how well its work was contributing to achieving these goals. These assessments needed to occur at different times. SPARC selected different ways to get information that would enable it to:
- monitor its strategic goals on a four-yearly basis;
 - track progress towards meeting strategic goals annually; and
 - collect information for business and policy development and investment decisions.
- 3.19 In selecting the ways it would collect information, SPARC considered different options such as national surveys, other agencies' surveys, market research, applied research, information from sports clubs, data from other government agencies such as Statistics New Zealand, and information from its funding arrangements.
- 3.20 It used criteria to assess how well the different options would meet its needs. Figure 2 describes the criteria that SPARC used. SPARC assessed each option for the quality and relevance of the data it would provide, its availability, how often data could be collected, and the cost-effectiveness of collecting the data. From this assessment, SPARC identified existing ways to collect information that would meet its needs, where it needed to create its own way to get the data it needed, and where alternatives might be needed if there was uncertainty about the ongoing use of a particular option.

Figure 2
Criteria for assessing data collection options

Criterion	Considerations
Quality	Will information be robust? For what purposes will it be suitable?
Relevance	Can the information provided be used to measure goals, targets, and objectives in the strategic plan? Does it provide information to track progress, measure performance (internally/externally), and/or provide information on where improvements or changes might be needed?
Availability	Can the tool be used over time and in time periods when information is needed?
Frequency	How often will information be collected?
Cost-effectiveness	Is the data provided worth the investment to collect it?

Source: SPARC.

- 3.21 SPARC identified that it should maintain responsibility for collecting monitoring information so that it could ensure that robust information was available when it needed it.
- 3.22 As SPARC decided how and when it would collect the information it needed, it established where its baseline data would come from. SPARC planned to use data from national surveys (1997/98, 1998/99, 2000/01, and 2007/08) on New Zealanders' sport and recreational activity for this. Having a baseline was important so that SPARC could assess more current information against this starting point and identify longer-term trends or changes. It could then use this information with the other information it gathered to understand whether its work was achieving the desired results.
- 3.23 In assessing its information needs, SPARC recognised that information from the sport and recreation organisations it funded was a crucial part of its performance measurement framework. SPARC needed consistent information from the organisations it funded and a way of linking this information to its strategic outcomes. To get this, SPARC created standardised measures for use in its funding contracts (see paragraph 3.25).
- 3.24 A challenge for SPARC in getting better information from the organisations it funded was that these organisations did not always have the information technology capability and data collection systems to provide robust and reliable information on participation. At the time of our audit, SPARC was designing a database to improve this. SPARC considered that important factors in designing an appropriate system for data collection were having a person with the right design skills and a good understanding of how the sector worked. At the time of our audit, SPARC's database design work was still in the early stages. We will maintain an interest in the progress of this work.

Creating standardised measures

- 3.25 SPARC created standardised measures linked to strategic goals so it could compare results between programmes and over time. SPARC did this so it could make well-informed decisions about the results of its investments and understand how well these investments supported progress towards longer-term goals.
- 3.26 SPARC designed standardised outcomes and measures for use in its funding arrangements. SPARC structured its outcomes and measures so that it could see the relationship between inputs, outputs, and programme results, and the link to SPARC's longer-term goals. Figure 3 illustrates these relationships using one of SPARC's outcomes for increasing participation.

Figure 3
Example of linking individual measures to strategic goals

Strategic goal	More kids in sport and recreation (by 2015)
Detailed outcome	More young people participating in organised sport through primary schools and secondary schools
Expected change or improvement	Increase in primary-aged students participating in physical education and co-curricular sport Increase in secondary-aged students participating in physical education and co-curricular sport
Inputs	Investment in strategies and programmes to increase participation in schools
Outputs	Strategies and programmes delivered in schools
Measures	X* increase in the number of young people participating in organised sport through primary schools X increase in the number of young people participating in organised sport through secondary schools

* Note: Actual figures agreed with SPARC and funded organisation to take account of individual factors.

Source: SPARC.

- 3.27 This system of linking outcomes and measures supported effective measurement because SPARC identified expected changes or improvements, the target population where change was expected, and the amount of change expected. With this information, SPARC could examine programme efficiency (comparing inputs to outputs), the quality of programmes that were being delivered, and whether the intended programme outcomes had been achieved.
- 3.28 Having a standard system was important for consistency and to allow results to be compared. SPARC created a standardised list of outcomes and a format for measures for staff to use in investment contracts. At the time of our audit, SPARC was introducing these standardised measures. Recently negotiated contracts with regional sports trusts included these standardised measures, and SPARC told us that its contracts with national sports organisations were going through a similar process.
- 3.29 SPARC commented that checking the quality of measures through its routine quality assurance checks and staff training on writing measures were important for ensuring that measurement information requirements in the contracts were robust and would provide the information SPARC needed.

Integrating ways to gather information

- 3.30 SPARC integrated ways to gather information about challenges and issues in the sector. SPARC did this so it could refine its work to better meet sector needs and adapt to changing needs or emerging issues.
- 3.31 Integrating ways to gather information about sector issues was an important part of SPARC's framework. SPARC recognised that it needed information and evidence to understand emerging sector issues to inform its policy, research, and business development work. Demonstrating the value of sport and recreation activities was also important for SPARC.
- 3.32 SPARC's research function was a core component of its performance measurement framework. To gather information on the sector, SPARC planned to use its research grants programme, commissioned research, evaluation and environmental scans, and other information sources.
- 3.33 SPARC refocused its research grants programme to get better alignment with its strategic goals. In making decisions about research grants, SPARC was looking for projects that met SPARC's needs as well as those of the wider sector. SPARC focused this research grants programme on community sport and recreation. Some examples of current research included:
- identifying drivers for, and barriers to, participation in grassroots football and what these meant for increasing participation in the sport;
 - examining factors influencing participation in outdoor recreational activities and how SPARC could use this information to increase participation in outdoor recreation; and
 - examining how volunteers' experiences can influence long-term intentions to volunteer.
- 3.34 SPARC intended that the results of its research would feed back into considering ways to better meet sport and recreation needs and the longer-term strategic direction of SPARC.

Our views on work to improve performance measurement

- 3.35 Because SPARC's performance measurement framework was new, it was too early for us to assess its effectiveness. However, we consider that SPARC has created a comprehensive framework that, when fully established, should provide SPARC with robust information to inform its decision-making and enable SPARC to account for its performance with a solid evidence base.

- 3.36 It was clear that SPARC knew what its information needs were, had considered how to meet these information needs, and was establishing systems to provide the information it needed to evaluate progress.
- 3.37 We identified several elements of SPARC's framework that should support effective performance measurement. These include:
- linking activities to strategic outcomes;
 - establishing a base to measure against;
 - ensuring that robust and reliable data is collected;
 - planning for measurement at various intervals (shorter and longer term);
 - creating standardised measures so SPARC can compare results between programmes and over time;
 - using measures that provide information about the relationship between investments and programme results, and the quality of programme results, so that SPARC can assess what has been achieved;
 - incorporating ways of monitoring environmental factors so SPARC can adapt and refine its work in response to changing needs; and
 - considering the cost-effectiveness of measurement activities.
- 3.38 We support SPARC's efforts to improve its monitoring of progress and consider that this is useful work for SPARC to demonstrate the effectiveness and value for money of its investments. We consider that this information is critically important for SPARC to be accountable for its performance, give a complete and accurate account of how it uses public funds, and demonstrate the contribution its funding investments make to its outcomes.

Appendix

Functions under the Sport and Recreation New Zealand Act 2002

The purpose of the Sport and Recreation New Zealand Act 2002 is to promote, encourage, and support physical recreation and sport in New Zealand. SPARC's functions are to:

- a) develop and implement national policies and strategies for physical recreation and sport;
- b) allocate funds to organisations and regional bodies in line with its policies and strategies;
- c) promote and advocate the importance of participation in physical activity by all New Zealanders for their health and well-being;
- d) promote and disseminate research relevant to physical recreation and sport;
- e) provide advice to the Minister [for Sport and Recreation] on issues relating to physical recreation and sport;
- f) promote and support the development and implementation of physical recreation and sport in a way that is culturally appropriate to Māori;
- g) encourage participation in physical recreation and sport by Pacific peoples, women, older New Zealanders, and people with disabilities;
- h) recognise the role of physical recreation and sport in the rehabilitation of people with disabilities;
- i) facilitate the resolution of disputes between persons or organisations involved in physical recreation and sport;
- j) work with schools, regional, central, and local government, and physical recreation and sports organisations to ensure the maintenance and development of the physical and organisational infrastructure for physical recreation and sport;
- k) work with health, education, and other agencies to promote greater participation in physical recreation and sport through policy development, advocacy, and support, in line with the objectives of the New Zealand health strategy;
- l) provide advice and support for organisations working in physical recreation and sport at national, regional, and local levels;
- m) facilitate co-ordination between national, regional, and local physical recreation and sport organisations; and
- n) represent the Government's policy interests in physical recreation and sport internationally.