

**From:** [WDC Information Request](#)  
**To:** [whanganui.ratepayers](#)  
**Subject:** Decision on your request for official information : WRRPA [REDACTED] : 3rd request rebranding  
**Date:** Friday, 17 April 2026 4:42:00 pm  
**Attachments:** [Decision on your request for official information Council re-brand costs Whanganui Residents and Ratepayers Association .msg](#)  
[Current Assets Jan 2024 V3.pdf](#)

---

Dear [REDACTED]

I refer to your official information request dated 18 March 2026 seeking further information relating to the Council rebranding. LGOIMA exists to enable members of the public to access official information held by Council. The majority of your request below is not for official information, but for explanation. Given the time spent collating the information, and for transparency, we are sharing the questions and responses with the community by publishing them on the Whanganui District Council website at the following link.

<https://www.whanganui.govt.nz/Your-Council/About-Whanganui-District-Council/Our-brand/Your-questions-our-answers>

The information you have requested is as follows.

*Thank you for providing the information requested. Having reviewed the material, it has as expected, raised a number of further questions which we outline below.*

*The most significant concern relates to the statement that “we do not have an estimated total lifecycle cost.”*

*From a ratepayer perspective, this raises concerns from a governance perspective. It is difficult to understand how a project of this nature could be approved without an overall cost estimate or defined financial parameters. We would appreciate clarification on why this was the case.*

### **Asset Replacement Strategy**

*To properly understand the scope of the project, we request:*

- *A full list of all assets requiring rebranding. We do not hold a ‘list of all assets requiring rebranding’. Assets have not been identified as ‘requiring rebranding’. While assets are still fit-for-purpose, they will continue to be used. They will be updated over time using existing budgets.  
In the very early stages of this project staff compiled a basic list of Council assets that have an existing Council brand or logo and some very basic ‘back of the envelope’ estimates for potentially replacing those. That document is **attached**. This list was not utilised, nor was it further refined to what asset branding would, or would not be, replaced. As explained below it was decided that there would be no ‘forced replacement’ of assets.*
- *Which assets are unlikely to naturally reach end-of-life and may therefore require forced replacement under the new branding We do not currently have this information. There will be no ‘forced replacement’ of assets. Items that are still fit-for-purpose will continue to be used.*

In addition please provide expected cost ranges (or estimates where available) for the above assets including but not limited to:

- Vehicle wraps
- Signage
- Uniforms
- Public infrastructure (including bins, parks and facilities)  
As above.

### **Budget and "Savings"**

Council response outlines that the Logo rebrand project was funded using savings that were achieved through staffing reductions and operational efficiencies. Please provide clarification on why these savings were not returned to ratepayers through rates relief or not reinvested into core infrastructure and community services (eg Whanganui East Pools, Pensioner housing upgrades etc) The brand identity project was undertaken as a directive from the Chief Executive and was assigned to the communications and marketing team as it aligned with the team's business-as-usual purpose

### **Business Case**

It is noted that the previously referenced \$120k in savings over the next 2-5 years is not directly related to the rebrand. Given this please advise what specific financial benefit this project is expected to deliver to council and to ratepayers. Further to our earlier explanations on this question, having a modern, flexible council brand system is expected to reduce costs by streamlining the way materials are produced – cutting design time, duplication, and rework.

### **Procurement Process**

We would appreciate further clarity around the procurement process:

- In the Evaluation Criteria Matrix, 'Meeting budget' and "Track record in delivering similar goods/services" both held a 30% weighting. Given that the successful design company exceeded the budget, please explain why Whanganui design agencies were not invited to respond to the RFQ? We conducted an initial online evaluation of existing creative agencies within and outside of Whanganui and then approached a shortlist of three that met our criteria. We followed a Request for Quote process in line with our procurement guidelines, before making a decision based on the proposals received. We did not find a Whanganui agency with experience in delivering a brand system for an organisation such as a council.
- Please explain how the shortlisting, evaluation and final selection processes were completed within what appears to be a very short timeframe (approximately 24 hours) ? All three agency proposals were presented and evaluated on the same day. The panel thoroughly evaluated the presentations and reconvened the next day to make a final decision. This is not unusual.
- What conflicts of interest were declared as part of this process? None

### **Online Survey Consultation**

*To better understand the online survey data outcomes we request an anonymised dataset, separated to identify respondents who do not live in Whanganui or did not provide a location.*

*We are particularly interested in understanding how results differ when non-resident responses are excluded. A small number of respondents could be considered from outside Whanganui (35 in total). However, in reviewing this group, the majority do in fact live in or are connected to the Whanganui district but did not identify with the provided categories – for example, those who are retired or who live rurally and use Whanganui as their main town (e.g. Waverley). Respondents who were clearly visitors totalled 11, representing 1.83% of responses*

### **Brand Governance**

*Council has referenced the existence of multiple “brands” as part of the justification for this work. On review, many of these appear to relate to CCOs and affiliated entities (eg: The Port, Town Centre Regeneration, venues and events, NZ Glassworks, Sports grounds and other council-controlled organisations). It is unclear how this position has developed over time and what governance controls are now in place?*

*We would also like to know under the new branding framework what is the plan to align:*

- CCOs
- Venues
- Council-owned entities

*Where CCOs, venues or council-owned entities have existing budget for asset replacement or marketing, they will be able to align with the council brand. Where the existing branding does not need changing in the immediate future, an endorsement tab (in most cases this will be applied digitally or as a sticker) can be added to connect it with the council brand. Where council-owned entities have a distinct commercial identity, such as the Sarjeant Gallery, their branding won't change, but again, the endorser tab can be used where appropriate.*

You have the right to seek an investigation and review by the Ombudsman of this decision. Information about how to make a complaint is available at [www.ombudsman.parliament.nz](http://www.ombudsman.parliament.nz) or freephone 0800 802 602.

If you wish to discuss this decision with us, please feel free to contact me on 06 349 0001 or by return email.

Yours sincerely



**Whanganui Information Request | LGOIMA Request**

P: +64 6 349 0001 | M: +64 6 349 0001

[www.whanganui.govt.nz](http://www.whanganui.govt.nz)