

Supplementary  
Submission  
No 142h

**INQUIRY INTO INQUIRY INTO MUSEUMS AND  
GALLERIES**

**Name:** Ms Jennifer Sanders

**Date Received:** 31 January 2019

---

The Hon Robert Borsak MLC  
Committee Chair,  
General Purpose Standing Committee No. 4,  
Legislative Council  
Parliament House  
Sydney NSW 2000

Upper House Inquiry into museums and galleries No. 4

**Submission from Jennifer Sanders, 30 January 2019:** Terms of reference: 1e)

**With Appendices from former MAAS employees:  
Brad Baker; Judith Coombes; Christina Sumner; Robert Webb.**

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE MAAS 2014 FINAL BUSINESS CASE FOR RENEWAL OF THE  
POWERHOUSE MUSEUM:**

**A. INTRODUCTION:**

I thank the Inquiry for securing the release of the **MAAS 24 Oct 2014 Final Business Case for the Renewal of the Powerhouse Museum (FBCRPM)** prepared for renewal of the Powerhouse Museum, Ultimo.

This submission includes analyses of the MAAS Oct 2014 FBCRPM by myself and four former senior staff at the Powerhouse Museum with a total of 133 years of knowledge and experience of the Powerhouse Museum, plus further careers and experience in the cultural sector. See Appendices 1-4

It is apparently this Oct 2014 FBCRPM bid for \$350.4 million which **spurred former premier Baird's announcement on 26 Nov 2014** to do the impossible - 'move the Powerhouse Museum to Parramatta' for **\$200 million – now at a cost of at least \$1.2 billion and closer to \$1.5bn.**

Commissioned in March 2014, the Oct 2014 FBCRPM was developed in the context of the government's June 2014 announcement that it would **spend \$600m on cultural infrastructure** – as well as \$600m on stadia – using funds from the long term lease of NSW's poles and wires – its Rebuilding NSW infrastructure program. This \$600m dangled like **a carrot on a stick** before NSW's cultural entities, vying **to maximise \$\$ for their bailiwick** with little thought given to a coherent, holistic, value for money approach.

The preparation of the 2014 FBCRPM was driven by an executive group who had **very little experience of museums and of museum planning and exhibition development.** They apparently also had next to no knowledge of the Powerhouse Museum – of its history, achievements as a leading State cultural institution and, its international standing.

The result is a litany of ignorant assertions, unsubstantiated claims, exaggerations and superficial analyses resulting in grandiose schemes. A key manager who provided information for the case, has told me that they were instructed by the executive to exaggerate any minor problems so that the case could be made for as much money as possible.

The FBCRPM is dismissive, perhaps due to ignorance, of the outstanding record of the Powerhouse Museum, its staff and the professionals who delivered the award winning museum in 1988 followed by **25 years plus of successful exhibitions and programs** attracting over **19.5 million visitors – to the Powerhouse alone**. This is despite the introduction of general admission charges in September 1991 under a Liberal government which saw admissions drop by around half. The Case also fails to properly acknowledge one of the main causes for the lack of patronage – a 40% decrease in the number of permanent exhibitions since the Powerhouse opened in 1988.

In essence, the FBCRPM largely ignores or dismisses the distinctive **strengths of the Powerhouse Museum in Ultimo**:

A landmark heritage adaptation; award winning contemporary design; the 1800sqm exhibition space in the Wran building; the huge display spaces and volumes with no columns; exhibition spaces of 21,800m<sup>2</sup> (compared with 11,500m<sup>2</sup> for the NMWS); and, the proximity of the Harwood building collection store resulting in more efficient operations, safe object movement, better care and access to the Collection, workshops, library and archives, not just for staff but for researchers and for public programs.

The Powerhouse Museum at Ultimo can be renewed through a considered program of staged capital works, an invigorated audience focussed exhibition program and, a long overdue maintenance program for less than a quarter of the \$500m the government asserted that renewal of the Museum would **now** cost. (Daily Telegraph, Wed 18 April 2018).

Percy Allan, former NSW Treasury Secretary recently said he 'just wants politicians to return to the old way of doing things, committing to an evidence-based policy making process run more by public servants and less by "political cabals"'.

*"That involves establishing the known facts and stakeholder views about a situation, identifying alternative policy options, weighing up pros and cons, sharing it with the public and inviting its reaction, after which finalising a policy position to put before Parliament or effect by regulation."* (Interview with Allan in SMH, The Future Fix: The policy chaos sparking new ideas for democracy in Australia, 15 Nov 2018).

Instead, the Baird government's response to this 'pie in the sky, rolled gold' MAAS Oct 2014 FBCRPM was to announce **an uncosted, massively dislocating and destructive project** affecting one of the most significant of NSW's cultural institutions, with no checking of facts, no seeking of stakeholder views, no exploration of options, no public transparency – a policy fiasco.

**No case can be made for spending upwards of \$1.5 billion on the misnamed 'move' of the Powerhouse Museum to a flood prone riverbank at Parramatta** given all the wasteful expenditure and unnecessary and risk that such a move would entail. This means that the monies and effort which would be wasted on the 'move' plan can **be redirected** to **renewing the Powerhouse Museum at Ultimo** and, **to cultural infrastructure projects** which bring **cultural, tourism and education dividends** for communities across **Western Sydney and NSW**, preserving and promoting NSW's cultural heritage rather than trashing it.

## **B. SUMMARY:**

The MAAS 2014 FBCRPM concluded that MAAS' renewal '**requires**' **\$350.4m over 7 years** of which \$70m was to be 'sourced from the divestment of the Harwood site and adjoining car-park', the rest from the NSW Government. (FBCRPM, Oct 2014, p3). This is an over the top figure, the outcome of **an undisciplined, uninformed and biased process**.

In brief, the MAAS 2014 FBCRPM makes a swathe of claims (in italics) about the Powerhouse Museum including:

- *Since 1988, the Museum has not had a significant upgrade or capital investment.*

**This is not true.** As detailed in the following Appendices, the Museum has made significant changes to its permanent galleries; added new temporary galleries and education spaces by reconfiguring internal spaces; built new cafés in the lower courtyard and next to the upper courtyard; and undertaken a major reworking of entry, shop, café and circulation paths.

- *The current site was developed from a disused heritage listed Power Station and has never met Museum environment and collection management standards due to the unique challenges the original building presents.*

**This is nonsense.** At the time of design and construction, the Powerhouse Museum at Ultimo was **beyond state-of-the-art:** Sea-water heat exchange and cooling system; 24hour AC 60% +/- 5% humidity, 22deg C +/- 1deg C; Low UV lighting and glass systems; High filtration micro dust & gases; Heavy loadings and power systems; Steam boilers and bespoke reticulated steam supply system etc. With a sustained maintenance and upgrading program, this foundation is designed to last the 100year lifespan of the Powerhouse Museum.

**This FBCRPM assertion is an insult** to the highly professional team of architects, engineers, designers, and museum professionals who worked for a decade from 1978 – 1988 to ensure that the Powerhouse Museum was a fit for purpose museum, capable of presenting one of the most world's most diverse and challenging collections in world class exhibitions and environments.

- *The Museum's existing infrastructure has either reached the end of its useful life or is no longer fit for purpose.*

**This is a misrepresentation of the situation.** The Powerhouse Museum was purpose built as a museum and has an outstanding record of success as one of the world's leading museums.

The most pertinent comment comes from the NSW Government's own report commissioned by Infrastructure NSW in June 2012: on the very same subject, *NSW Infrastructure Recreation and Arts Baseline Report* by PricewaterhouseCoopers Australia June 2012 which identified that:

'The Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences has an estimated **backlog maintenance of \$1.8m**. The average condition of the facilities of the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences built assets and infrastructure were ranked as good with moderate deterioration.' p35.

- The **inexperience and unimaginativeness of the FBCRPM authors** is further highlighted by the claims that the Museum's exhibition and public spaces are inflexible and that the Museum cannot meet its responsibilities because of *Compromised core functions* and not being *Fit for purpose*.

**This is also nonsense.** The Museum's exhibition spaces are unusually flexible and have a record of presenting all manner of exhibitions and experiences, with galleries with high floor and ceiling loadings and soaring spaces capable of enormous digital projections, suspended aircraft, steam operated engines and even aerial acrobatics.

For example: the Switch House galleries, even with standard ceiling heights, have 'taken' visitors to The Great Wall of China with an immersive sound and image installation of panoramas recording sections of the Wall from sea to desert.

The now closed Level 5 gallery in the now blacked out Wran exhibition hall has presented exhibitions ranging from priceless Faberge Eggs from the Kremlin Museum, spectacular BMW racing cars painted by famous 20<sup>th</sup>c artists, Christian Dior fashion; and innovative exhibitions presenting Asian cultures

from Central to South East Asia to Japan and China. This same gallery hosted the first public experience of Virtual Reality technology.

In the Space exhibition in the Boiler Hall, visitors could watch direct screenings of close-up views of the planet Neptune from the spacecraft Voyager. Not to mention the Wran gallery's *Olympic Treasures of Ancient Greece* exhibition for the Sydney 2000 Games which included virtual tours of the exhibition and of ancient Olympia, panoramic photos of modern Olympia and a 360 degree 3D view of the statue of Zeus, c460BC to give context to the magnificent antiquities from the Ancient Olympics. The examples are many.

- *Substandard facilities have impacted on MAAS' ability to effectively collaborate with domestic and international institutions including international loans and blockbuster or exclusive exhibitions.*

This is clearly not the case as recorded in **Appendix 6: Powerhouse Museum: Exhibition Partners/Lenders: 1988 – 2018**. As recently as last year, the Powerhouse presented 'Reigning Men', an exhibition of men's dress from Los Angeles County Museum of Art and is now presenting Star Wars: Identities from Lucasfilm Archives.

**Note in particular:** In 2000, **Bill and Melinda Gates** lent to the Museum **Leonardo Da Vinci's original hand written scientific notebook, the Codex Leicester**, a priceless and fragile work by Da Vinci written in his mirror handwriting and illustrated with his drawings. To borrow this work, the Museum had to meet stringent environmental standards, object handling conditions and display requirements which it did with bells on.

This same unique and valuable object is being lent this year by the Gates to the Uffizi Gallery, Florence to mark Da Vinci's 500<sup>th</sup> anniversary. The building housing the Uffizi Gallery was commissioned in 1560 by Cosimo 1 de 'Medici and opened to the public as a gallery in 1769. I doubt that it was considered unfit for purpose a mere 30 years after opening! Nor is the Powerhouse Museum - a youngster by comparison.

- *The Museum is unable to fulfil its requirements to provide a comprehensive and appropriate education program in support of state and national curriculum in STEM and the arts.*

One of the main reasons for the decline in education visits is **the lack of professional staff resources** to service this important audience combined with the sharp **decrease of exhibition content** on which to base education programs. In 2014-15 there were 3 Education staff and 57,073 student visits to all sites. In 1988-89, the Powerhouse alone had 98,721 school student visits and proportionally more education staff. While education facilities need regular updating and have been since 1988, the key attractor is the exhibitions - in 1988 - **25** Permanent exhibitions – there are now **15**.

- *Sub-optimal onsite storage facilities and OH&S issues are resulting in additional costs being incurred...*

**This is an overstatement.** The Museum's Harwood Building Collection storage is of high quality and any recent problems are due mainly to maintenance issues and the need for improved risk management. See Appendix 2.

**The decline in Visitor Numbers:** The decline in visitor numbers over the last decade is largely due to a decrease in programs and exhibitions targeting family audiences and, a decrease in the number of exhibitions overall.

As questionable physical alterations were made within the Museum, exhibition galleries were removed and not replaced. As programming favoured events and installations, exhibitions were depleted and objects removed and stored. Furthermore, the Museum has increasingly presented exhibitions focused on an art based interpretation of the collection instead of exhibitions telling the stories of the

collection – the established direction with more appeal to the Museum’s core audiences of families and education groups.

The following have been removed:

- The Asian gallery
- The Indigenous gallery
- Social History permanent exhibitions
- The Australian Communities gallery
- The popular children’s interactive experience, ‘Zoe’s House’ and ‘Cog’s Playground’ were taken out and not replaced.
- Interactive elements in exhibitions were taken out and not replaced as the specialist staff were restructured out of the Museum.
- ‘Inspired – design across time’ the major design and decorative arts exhibition which introduced the visitor to the Museum was removed
- In addition, galleries used for temporary exhibitions were converted into general public space eg café.

Essentially, there are less exhibitions, permanent or temporary; less interactives, especially those aimed at the family audience and, less of the collection on display. This is largely the result of weak governance, poor leadership, poor programing and poor decisions regarding the use of museum spaces.

When the **Powerhouse opened in 1988**, there were **25 permanent exhibitions** and for the first two decades this number was relatively stable and these were updated with a program of partial or complete changes of content. **The Powerhouse now has 15 permanent exhibitions – 40% less.**

**Critically missing** from the **MAAS Oct 2014 FBCRPM** is an analysis of the deleterious impacts on the Museum’s performance that flowed largely from **externally driven factors which negatively affected** the Museum’s performance hence, its sustainability, especially over the last decade:

- **Admission charges:** Introduced in Sept 1991 under a Liberal government when Peter Collins was Arts Minister, the Museum’s attendance figures then decreased by about half and subsequent variations were largely driven by the touring and temporary exhibition program.

In June 2015, free admission was introduced for children under 16 which increased attendance numbers but not to the pre Sept 1991 levels.

General admission charges have had a significant impact on attendance levels and the decrease also meant decreased revenue from visitor spending during visits.

Visitors to the Powerhouse Museum:

Opening 10 March **1988** to 30 June 1988 - **800,000 in 3 months**

1988 – 1989 - **2,120,000**

1989 – 1990 – **1,805,096**

1990 – 1991 – **1,541,472**

September 1991: introduction of **admission charges**

1991– 1992 – **744,403**

1992– 1993 – 588,744 et cetera – down to an average of **560,000** per year....

- **Efficiency dividends** introduced in 2006 at 1% and now at 3% have resulted in the steady erosion of the Museum’s capacity to deliver programs to the public at a level which ensured its sustainability and a wide engagement.

- Cuts to the Museum's recurrent budget has resulted in a **serious depletion of staff with specialist knowledge, expertise and experience** – many at a management or leadership level. The estimated loss of experience and knowledge over the last decade is around 500 years with 3 rounds of redundancies since 2007. In 2002-3 there were 448 staff – now 202.4 in 2017-18; In 2004-5 there were 21.1 education staff and 32.9 curatorial; in 2017-18 there were 5 education staff and 20.8 curatorial staff.
- This was followed by a 2014-15 **restructure** which saw further numbers of experienced staff leave replaced by less staff to positions at a relatively junior level. Pre restructure staff levels were 243 and post restructure 188. Staff levels at June 30 2018 were 202.4.

Despite assurances by senior managers that no positions would be declared redundant until their necessity to the Museum's functions had been assessed, such assessment was minimal and the overwhelming driver was meeting the required budget savings. Consequently, many specialist positions, demonstrably essential to maintain the Museum's functions and reputation, were perfunctorily deleted. See below.

- **Education staff were reduced** from 17.8 staff in 2006-2007 to just 3 staff in 2014-15. This was an untenable reduction of a professional resource focussed on developing one of the Museum's most important audiences. At June 30 2018 there were 5 staff in Education and Digital. Attracting school audiences requires both curriculum relevant exhibitions **and** trained education staff.
- **Capital and recurrent budget cuts** further eroded the Museum's capacity to fulfil its core responsibilities in particular the delivery of exhibitions and associated programs. Over the last decade, the program of replacement of long term temporary exhibitions and permanent galleries has been repeatedly postponed due to budgetary constraints. To offset this, more touring exhibitions, peripheral events and non-collection installations have been put in exhibition spaces, leading to relatively less exposure of the Museum's own collections.
- Since the Baird announcement, there has been a noticeable **reduction of the numbers of exhibitions**, hence the number of museum objects on display – the Museum is being emptied ahead of its planned closure – a strategy that supports the MAAS 2014 FBCRPM claim that less of the collection is on display
- **Collection acquisitions have significantly declined** as the Museum's acquisitions budget has been drastically reduced from almost \$400,000 which makes it difficult for the Museum to continue its role as a key collecting institution for NSW.
- The **Maintenance program was delayed** and has been slowed to an unacceptable rate – hence the recent assessments of the condition of the Museum stating that the Museum requires the resumption of a robust maintenance program.

In recent years, permanent plant maintenance staff were either not replaced or made redundant, requiring maintenance to be carried out by contractors who do not possess the detailed knowledge of the buildings and their facilities and in whose increased fees (against the "saving" of salaries) lies a false economy.

- From 2010 to 2013, a **wasteful and questionable 'revitalisation' capital program** was undertaken which did little to improve the facilities of the Museum nor its capacities, and in

fact, turned the museum into a building site over 3 years significantly reducing attendance levels.

Excluding the 382,565 extra visitors to the Harry Potter exhibition in 2011-12, visitor numbers over these **3 years of building works in the Powerhouse** averaged **345,469**, well below the yearly average of 522,166 over 20 years from 1991-92 when admission charges were introduced to 2010-11, the year before the Harry Potter exhibition.

**Ironically**, given the consequences of the MAAS 2014 FBCRPM bid, the **only relatively accurate statement** in the Executive Summary, FBCRPM is:

#### **1.1.7 Site significance:**

*MAAS maintains a strong and important historical connection to the Ultimo and Pyrmont precincts as well as the City of Sydney. The Museum first opened in a purpose-built Technological Museum in Harris Street, moving to its current location in 1893. The Museum's relationship with university, digital and technological partners has strengthened over time, and is **central to the Museum's core functions** as a Museum of technology and learning.*

*The Museum provides **important connectivity for the Cultural Ribbon** through Darling Harbour and the Goods Line while consolidating cultural heritage within the Ultimo precinct.'* (p 6)

The Powerhouse Museum at Ultimo can be renewed through a considered program of staged capital works, an invigorated audience focused exhibition program and, a long overdue maintenance program for a quarter of the \$500m the government asserted that the renewal of the Museum would now cost. (Daily Telegraph, Wed 18 April, 2018)

A considered program of renewal would also be far better value than the **\$387.5m** capital funding sought by the Minister for 'the development of a Creative Industries Hub.....in the heritage buildings currently occupied by the Powerhouse Museum in Ultimo' (Ultimo Investment Case, The Ultimo Presence Project 8 January 2018, p1).

This is a misguided proposal – the **Powerhouse Museum has been the catalyst and anchor for the creative, education and tourism precinct of Ultimo since 1893**. The change of name and focus on fashion and design does nothing to enhance or strengthen this recognised precinct. The proposed unlikely addition of a lyric theatre only underscores the hollowness of this option. An option which involves a demolition plan - '*a site wide development strategy encompassing the 1988 Wran building, the Harwood building (former Tram Depot) and forecourt*' (op cit, p1).

No doubt if this 'cultural presence' scheme was pursued, the Powerhouse Museum site would soon be back on the Arts Cultural Ribbon!

The **Achilles heel** for this Ultimo Presence Project is the claim that, '*There is however no dedicated museum for design and creativity*' (op cit p2). This is *exactly* the areas of human endeavour which the Powerhouse Museum has been responsible for since its founding in 1880 to the present day. The language may have changed but the substance remains the same – Design and Creative Industries!

Irrespective, now it seems that for the government, it is '**action stations**' implementing an outrageously expensive, risky and ill-informed strategy of 'moving the Powerhouse to Parramatta' with undue haste which only highlights the apparent eagerness with which the Government is pursuing **the real estate values** of the Powerhouse Museum's Ultimo home.



### C. BACKGROUND:

The 2014 FBCRPM papers reveal the **shaky foundations of former premier Baird's November 26<sup>th</sup> 2014 announcement** of the move of the Powerhouse Museum to Parramatta. It also draws attention to the government's **lack of a NSW cultural plan**, and no cultural policy, no museum plan, nor a strategic review of NSW Cultural Infrastructure to identify gaps and opportunities - the missing foundations for a considered and strategic approach to developing the State's cultural capacity and reach.

Disturbingly, the MAAS Oct 2014 FBCRPM reads more like a document designed to wring maximum \$ from the government and extract **maximum real estate dollar value** from key elements of the Powerhouse Museum's buildings and site with no regard for the completeness and functionality of the Museum, for the architectural and heritage value of these elements – indeed, **no regard for the Powerhouse Museum as an entity.**

The papers make a series of unwarranted criticisms of the physical and museological capacities and, the condition of the Powerhouse Museum making the sweeping conclusion that it is not 'fit for purpose'. I and my colleagues, with our deep knowledge and long experience of working at the Powerhouse Museum, were always puzzled and perturbed by the criticisms of the Museum and its infrastructure which were made during the Inquiry. When asked specifically, we were readily able to correct and debunk these misconceptions during the sessions. (Inquiry transcript Sept 6 2016, pp59 - 61).

Then Sydney's Daily Telegraph (Wed 18 April 2018) launched a barrage of criticism of the Powerhouse Museum as debate about the Baird plan heated up. Quoting extensively from 'a secret report' – as it turns out, the flawed and misleading MAAS 2014 FBCRPM – the Daily Telegraph asserted that **the government has said the 2014 \$350m renewal plan would now cost \$500m.**

A logical explanation for the feverish tone of the multi-page spread about the Museum's falsely-claimed calamitous state, is that it served the interests of the Daily Tele to promote their "Go West" campaign, underpinned by their assertion that the West of Sydney had always been denied its fair share, including of the cultural pie. This claim appealed to the dominant readership in Western Sydney who would be easily fired up in righteous indignation by more claims – **false claims** - that the inner-city so-called 'elitist' view was that that the treasures of the state's cultural institutions were not to be shared beyond the 'eastern harbour city' as the Greater Sydney Commission unilaterally classified Sydney's CBD. (Greater Sydney Region Plan: A Metropolis of 3 Cities 2016, <https://www.greater.sydney/metropolis-of-three-cities>

The newspaper's editorial concludes that *'the Powerhouse Museum is no longer a fixer-upper. Matters have moved beyond that point.'*

This conclusion is **not credible** because the MAAS 2014 FBCRPM is built on misinformation and exaggeration – apparently **untested by any due process, expert scrutiny and consultation.** Yet it appears the 24 Oct 2014, FBCRPM was the trigger for Baird, advised by his Cultural Ambassador to Western Sydney, Ms MacGregor, to make the surprise announcement on Nov 26, 2014 to move the Powerhouse Museum to Parramatta – thus freeing up the Ultimo site for property development, the proceeds of which Baird stated would pay for the new 'Powerhouse Museum' at Parramatta, then a wildly optimistic \$200m project.

**Nor is the claimed \$500m renewal cost supportable** when PwC's NSW Infrastructure Recreation and Arts Baseline Report, June 2012 states that the Powerhouse Museum's backlog maintenance requirement is **\$1.8m.** Allowing for an accelerated maintenance program addressing lack of action and ongoing requirements and, adding an invigorated exhibition program and staged capital projects

to renew the Powerhouse on its site, then a figure of say a quarter of the government's overstated \$500m is closer to the mark.

Furthermore, following close examination of the released papers, coupled with the analysis by experts in museum planning and, especially with knowledge of the Powerhouse Museum and its collection of 500,000 objects, **the costs of this planned 'move' to Parramatta – with all its flow-on costs – will be closer to \$1.5 billion to 'move the museum' 23kms to what has been revealed to be a building half the size of the Powerhouse, showing less of the collection and on a flood-prone riverbank.** (Final Business Case papers: Project Concept: New Museum in Western Sydney, Options 03 SK230 – SK235 plus Table 20/09/2017)

As quoted in Building Services Masterplan Assessment, 8 August 2018, Steensen Varming, the combined floor area of the PHM buildings is approximately **42,594 m<sup>2</sup>** (p13, 3.2) **which exceeds** Government's smaller footprint at **Parramatta (Option 3) by over 20,000m<sup>2</sup>** thus refuting the Government's claim that it is 'moving the PHM to Parramatta' and that it will be bigger than the Powerhouse Museum. Nor will there be **the 60,000 cubic m of display volume** the Powerhouse has in its Boiler and Turbine Halls, Galleria and the vast vault of the Wran building.

There cannot be more of the Collection on exhibition unless the number crunchers are counting 'thimbles in drawers' – hardly an exhibition with storyline, interpretation and labels.

The FBCRPM takes an approach which can be characterised as alarmist, dismissive and indeed destructive. In the guise of **a rolled-gold, unnecessary rebuilding of an award-winning Museum**, the FBCRPM proposes a demolition and selling off strategy, more like a real estate deal than the renewal of the 135 year old world class Powerhouse Museum. Talk about throwing the baby out with the bath water!

There is a case to be made for **renewal of the Powerhouse Museum and its exhibitions at Ultimo** and my colleagues and I have made it during this Inquiry, and in discussions with various government representatives. However, our case builds on the **strengths of the Museum and its Ultimo site, renews its unique and much valued historic and contemporary buildings through staged developments and a robust maintenance program and, maximises the unique opportunities afforded by its site with multiple public access points and, relationships with one of the most exciting precincts in Sydney** – a precinct built on the achievements and presence of the Museum since 1893. Estimated expenditure for the repair and renewal of the Powerhouse Museum **is less than half** the MAAS Oct 2014 FBCRPM ask of \$350.4m.

The case to renew the Powerhouse at Ultimo has also been made by the **many people in the museum profession and the wider community** who are opposed to the plan to wreck the Powerhouse and, are supportive of cultural development for Parramatta, Western Sydney and across NSW, based on community consultation.

The release of the **Oct 2014 FBCRPM** goes a long way to explaining why the hare-brained idea to move the Powerhouse Museum to Parramatta ever saw the light of day.

As outlined above, the 2014 FBCRPM was prepared in the context of a funding feeding frenzy. As the 2012 PwC report pointed out:

*Although the institutions have plans for their sites (developed to varying degrees), there is no overarching strategic plan in place for Arts venues in NSW and a variable approach to assessing individual proposals for government funding. (p3).*

The Oct 2014 FBCRPM bid by MAAS for \$350.4m is an unsubstantiated and poorly scrutinised claim for a share of the honey pot with little regard for building on the foundations and achievements of the Powerhouse Museum. Instead, **a grandiose scheme was put forward, dressed up with hysterical and farfetched claims.** This FBCRPM backfired when the ask became the glib price for moving the

Powerhouse Museum to Parramatta - **an announcement bereft of any robust costing, consultation or transparency.**

To further refute the negative and unsubstantiated assertions attacking the Powerhouse Museum's reputation and capabilities, appended are three key documents:

- **Appendix 5: Powerhouse Museum Project 1988:**  
Key designers, engineers and director  
Awards: Powerhouse Museum 1988
- **Appendix 6: Powerhouse Museum: Exhibition Partners/Lenders: 1988 – 2018** from across Australia and the world who have worked closely with the Powerhouse Museum since 1988 to contribute to the Museum's record of outstanding exhibitions and associated events.

**As an example,** the Powerhouse Museum's **Sydney 2000 Olympics** program included *1000 years of the Olympic Games: treasures of Ancient Greece*, co-curated with the Benaki Museum, Athens; *Earth, spirit, fire: Korean masterpieces from the Chosun dynasty* co-curated with the National Museum of Korea; and *Leonardo da Vinci: the Codex Leicester – notebook of a genius*. Curated by the Powerhouse, the Codex Leicester was lent by **Bill and Melinda Gates**. To mark this significant event in the Museum's and Sydney's history, the Gates hosted 'A Renaissance Dinner' at the Powerhouse Museum attended by the Murdoch family as well as leading international and Australian cultural, corporate, government and figures.

- **Appendix 7: The Powerhouse Museum: an exhibition archive 1988 - 2018:** This listing demonstrates the diversity, depth and scholarship of the Museum's exhibition program which includes complete replacements, changeovers and section replacements of the Powerhouse Museum's **permanent galleries** as well as an active and strategic **temporary and touring exhibition program**.

This document, collated by Christina Sumner, former Principal Curator, Design and Society, lists all the exhibitions the Museum has presented since 1988 at all its sites – Powerhouse; The Mint and The Hyde Park Barracks, Macquarie Street; the Harwood Building gallery; Sydney Observatory; the Powerhouse Discovery Centre and **its NSW, national and international touring exhibitions**. Also listed are its web based exhibitions and associated exhibition publications.

Finally, there is a listing the NSW Migration Heritage Centre's collaborative exhibition, web and publication projects delivered **across NSW and especially Western Sydney**, whilst the MHC was part of the Powerhouse Museum from 2003 until it was closed by the Museum in 2013.

#### **D. CONTEXT:**

As stated by Ms McGregor in her evidence to the Inquiry on 5 September 2016, she supported the move of the Powerhouse Museum to Parramatta as former premier Baird's Cultural Ambassador for Western Sydney. One of the main reasons McGregor gave was that she learnt from the PwC's 2012 report, which **she admitted she hadn't seen** (Inquiry transcript 5 Sept 2016, p31), that *'it actually requested \$200 million from the Government by the Powerhouse to make good or improve or make better fit for purpose the site at Ultimo. So it became, I think, almost **an inexorable logic the idea to relocate the Powerhouse would be made by the Western Sydney lobby group and me.**'* (Inquiry transcript 5 September 2016, p28).

In fact, McGregor is mistaken or perhaps just careless about her stated source for hers and the Western Sydney lobby group's big idea to move the Powerhouse Museum. The **2012 PwC report did not request \$200m for the Powerhouse Museum.**

Instead, **PwC's NSW Infrastructure Recreation and Arts Baseline Report, June 2012** said that:

- Capital investment in the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences is projected to be approx. \$41.4million from 2012 – 2015. (bar chart, p33)
- *The Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences has estimated backlog maintenance of \$1.8m. The average condition of the facilities of MAAS built assets were ranked as **good with moderate deterioration.*** (p35)
- *The cultural institutions, the planned Sydney International Convention Exhibition and Entertainment Centre and the Walsh Bay Arts precinct form **a ribbon of cultural venues in prime locations around Sydney Harbour and the CBD.*** (p 12)

In the '**arts ribbon**' map, the Powerhouse Museum is highlighted in Ultimo with the 'cultural ribbon' sweeping round via Walsh Bay, the Opera House onto the Australian Museum then across the city back to the Powerhouse. (p12)

As the 2012 PwC report goes onto say:

- *This configuration of NSW's world class cultural facilities presents an opportunity to continue to target **investment in these iconic venues, build on their strengths and promote access to them as part of the visitor economy.***

In a surprise move, in June 2014, the Rebuilding NSW State Infrastructure Strategy, recommended 'Develop a Parramatta cultural precinct, and **investigate moving Powerhouse Museum collections to that site.**' (p6). The report also said '**CBD collections will be shared with new facilities in Parramatta and across Western Sydney**'.....so that more people will experience the State's art and cultural collections.' (p20). Where are the plans for this strategy?

Then, in November 2014, the 2014 State Infrastructure Update **removed the Powerhouse Museum from the 'arts cultural ribbon'**, saying that 'The Powerhouse Museum is site constrained and located remotely from other key cultural institutions.' (p121). What a load of rubbish!

The Powerhouse has defined and anchored in the **cultural and education precinct of Ultimo since 1893** – it **is not remote** from other cultural institutions: 23 mins walk to the Australian Museum; 16 mins walk to the Australian National Maritime Museum **which compares favourably** to 26 mins walk between Walsh Bay and the Sydney Opera House; and 29 mins between the Australian Museum and the still non-existent Barangaroo Indigenous Cultural Centre. (Nov 2014 State Infrastructure Update, p122 plus Google maps).

In 2015 the Sydney Business Chamber, with the support of the cities of Parramatta, Penrith and Liverpool, commissioned a report from Deloitte Touche Tomatsu, *Building Western Sydney's Cultural Arts Economy*. While there is **widespread support for increased cultural funding across Western Sydney and indeed, across NSW**, methodology of this report was biased in favour of figures that would support the case in a way which misrepresented both the role of museums – in this instance the Powerhouse Museum – and their audience reach.

The result is that the comparisons are between apples and pumpkins and, that **the contribution of the Powerhouse Museum to NSW** is not represented. As an example, in a table comparing state and local funding, (p19) the year referred to is 2012-2013 but the figures used for the Powerhouse are 2011-2012. The full number of visitors to the Museum – on site and off site - is 1,400,896 NOT 917,833

which is only to the Powerhouse, Sydney Observatory and the Museums Discovery Centre, Castle Hill. Therefore, the actual subsidy per attendee is **\$27.69 NOT \$42.27** as represented by Deloitte. The important point is that this table does not acknowledge the NSW-wide audience reach which has long been a distinguishing and core program of the Powerhouse Museum. **The Powerhouse is not an 'eastern Sydney museum.'**

Nor did this study make reference to the Collection responsibilities of a major museum like the Powerhouse Museum with its **500,000 collection objects** which the Museum makes accessible to a worldwide audience through its website. In **2011-2012 the Museum engaged 4,562,819 million** visitors to its website. Much of this traffic is driven by the high standard of collection documentation, the result of decades of research and scholarship by curators and other collection professionals.

To say that **level of analysis in this report was wanting is an understatement** – it was in many instances mediocre – but that suited the aims of the study's commissioners and, to my knowledge, no one in the cultural or arts bureaucracy has attempted to provide a more balanced view that would better serve the development of arts and cultural policy in NSW.

In my opinion, Ms McGregor's evidence to the Inquiry (5 September 2016, pp 28 – 36) shows a misplaced self-confidence and irresponsibility with limited understanding of the deleterious effects of her 'idea'. It is an idea based on woefully slight, indeed inaccurate evidence and specious logic combined with ignorance of the financial and cultural consequences and, the impact on the wider community, of her advice to the then premier.

The deficiencies of the processes and studies bolstering the decision to 'move' the Powerhouse Museum are manifold. They have been demonstrated in the mountain of evidence to the Inquiry from a range of expert museologists, individuals, organisations and associations in the form of submissions, witnesses' testimony and, the revelations contained in the unimpressive Business Cases the Government has been forced to release to the public in the interests of transparency and due diligence.

## **E. CONCLUSION**

Even in a redacted state, the government's Extended Final Business Case papers reveal a project which, for the Government's preferred Option 3:

- Will require **at least 6 times the Government's initial budget of \$200 million** given all the flow on expenses as a consequence of the 'move';
- Will result in a building – ostensibly a museum – on a flood prone riverbank that will in total be **half the size of the Powerhouse Museum** at Ultimo.  
As quoted in Building Services Masterplan Assessment, 8 August 2018, Steensen Varming, the combined Floor area of the PHM buildings is approximately **42,594 m<sup>2</sup>** (p13, 3.2) **which exceeds** Government's smaller footprint at **Parramatta (Option 3) by over 20,000m<sup>2</sup>** thus refuting the Government's claim that it is 'moving the PHM to Parramatta' and that it will be bigger than the Powerhouse Museum.
- Nor will there be the more than **70,000cubic m of display volume the Powerhouse has just in its Boiler and Turbine Halls, Galleria and the vast vault of the Wran building**. Parramatta plans list 3 galleries – 2 x 1000m<sup>2</sup> and 1 x 800m<sup>2</sup> with a double ceiling height of 12m. This amounts to only 33,600cubicm. This is **less than half the display volume of the Powerhouse Museum's display spaces for large objects. No wonder far fewer of the large objects can be accommodated at Parramatta**. The Boiler and Turbine Halls are each 20m high, the Galleria and the Wran building are higher again and together have a far bigger footprint.

- The Parramatta building will have **less of the Museum's collection on display as the Powerhouse has 21,800 m2 of exhibition space while the NMWS has 11,500 m2 of exhibition galleries.**
- The Extended Final Business Case only scrapes through to a BCR over 1 by **paring back expenditure on long term galleries** displaying the Museum's collection and increasing the proportion of temporary galleries – less expensive up front but a higher recurrent cost.
- The BCR is also manipulated by **sheeting related costs home to separate but in fact indivisible projects** such as the expensive major move and re-housing of the Collection at Ultimo to the Museum's store at Castle Hill.
- This Collection move to Castle Hill also requires the **emptying out and rebuilding of a relatively new store** to accommodate the Collection evicted from the Harwood Building and Museum exhibitions at the Powerhouse Museum at Ultimo. This will be a long and expensive project – expensive in capital costs and also in specialised staff resources.
- Most irresponsibly, the Business Case has revealed that **a group of Very Large Objects** – specifically the Catalina flying boat – the largest and heaviest plane to be hung in any museum in the world, the 1785 Boulton & Watt beam engine, No 1 Locomotive - the first train to run in NSW - around 30 significant and valuable objects - **will be removed from safe and secure display** in the Museum and put into **temporary leased** as yet unidentified store(s). This is one among the many consequences of this ridiculous project which are completely unacceptable in terms of the proper custodianship of the State's collection held in trust for the people of NSW.

The list of deleterious outcomes goes on, as evidenced in submissions to the Inquiry about this benighted and foolhardy project.

This agglomeration of complex, costly, risky and wasteful consequences of Baird's announcement has been compounded by the Berejiklian government through Arts Minister Harwin's **refusal to critically review the Baird 'solution'**. The starting point for Harwin's EFBC was the decision to move the PHM to the Parramatta flood prone riverbank - there was **no review of options or alternatives**. No channelling of Percy Allan here – not even lip service.

Instead, the Powerhouse Museum is being put through **further damaging, biased processes and wayward speculation** as the Minister's 'captains pick' of big ideas for the Powerhouse's future are ground out with a turgid desperation to somehow satisfy all the 'political cabals' and, one might as well add, 'business interests' and 'property developers'.

All this waste of money and effort rather than acknowledge and implement any of the knowledge-based, consultative, measured, optimistic, considered and visionary - not destructive, not risky, not ridiculously costly - proposals we and others have put forward for **the renewal of the Powerhouse Museum @Ultimo** and, as importantly, **the development of cultural infrastructure in consultation with the people of Parramatta, Western Sydney and, NSW.**

Fiasco indeed!

Jennifer Sanders

Brief Resume: Jennifer Sanders BA Hons Anthropology, USyd

Jennifer Sanders had a long and distinguished career at the Powerhouse Museum where she was Deputy Director, Collections, Content Development and Outreach from 2001 to February 2009. Appointed to the Powerhouse in 1978, Jennifer was a curator then senior curator, decorative arts and design for a decade.

A key member of the team for the Powerhouse redevelopment, in 1988 Ms Sanders was appointed Assistant Director Collections responsible for the Museum's curatorial, registration, preservation and regional NSW outreach programs and, for several years, exhibitions, education, publications and library services as well. In 2001 Ms Sanders was given responsibility for the NSW Migration Heritage Centre and later also Sydney Observatory and the Powerhouse Discovery Centre. Ms Sanders regularly deputised for the Museum's Director.

From 1999 to 2008 Ms Sanders was a member of the National Cultural Heritage Committee and, in 2001 she was a member of the NSW Centenary of Federation Committee (archiving, cataloguing, and preservation of historical materials). From 2007 to 2012, Ms Sanders was a member of the External Advisory Panel, Design Research Institute, RMIT University, Melbourne and Chair, Design Archives Advisory Panel, RMIT University.

From 2009, Ms Sanders has undertaken range of heritage, museum and curatorial consultancies.

1981 Churchill Fellowship: public access to museum collections, North America and Europe

1987 Museum Management Institute, Berkeley, CA, USA. Getty Leadership Institute.

In 2003 Jennifer was awarded a Centenary of Federation Medal.

## Appendix 1

### RESPONSE FROM BRAD BAKER:

**29 Jan 2019**

Industrial Designer graduated Sydney College of the Arts 1977

Retail Design Consultant Centron Projects 1977-1983

MAAS - Powerhouse Museum Project, Co-ordinator for Design 1983 – 1989

Powerhouse Museum Manager Exhibition Development and Design 1989 – Dec 2012

Freelance consultant 2013 -2015

Museum of Australian Democracy Old Parliament House Canberra – Manager of Exhibitions and Events 2015 -2018

#### 1. Summary:

In my opinion the 2014 Business Case document contains many inaccurate assumptions.

There have been **significant government capital works funds allocated and spent on permanent gallery refurbishment since opening in 1988** - I know because I managed most of the projects until 2012. The original galleries that we opened in 1988 have very little in common with the existing galleries beyond the large object displays that have remained but all of the fabric around them has changed.

The significant failure of the report is that it does not address the fact that **several major rounds of redundancies since 2007** devastated the staffing capacity and the museum's skill set through the loss of corporate knowledge, technical skills, and national and international museum connections of the organisation.

**It is not about ageing infrastructure.** In fact, the 2014 report **significantly underestimates the value of the Powerhouse Museum's distinctive building volumes** – the unique combination of enormous industrial heritage spaces and, the imposing contemporary volumes of the Wran Building and Galleria. This is a **Sulman and national award winning** building – recognition of its outstanding architectural merit as a Museum – for the integration of the heritage buildings within and as part of a contemporary Museum. You cannot display locomotives or suspend aircraft with 70 foot wing spans in just any building.

All the Museum's exhibition galleries **met the highest museum standards** for environmental conditions, including temperature, humidity, particulate control, light, UV and vibration control to meet international conservation standards. The galleries also meet security requirements. There is no reason for this capacity and functionality to have changed unless programmed maintenance has not been carried out and/or operational maintenance has been inferior.

The Powerhouse Museum has **incredibly flexible museum and exhibition spaces** and its distinguishing capabilities have been ignored in the 2014 document.



## 2. Comments and Analysis:

### 2.1: Overview:

- The Report undervalues the deleterious impact of **several rounds of redundancies**, which resulted in a very significant number of key staff being lost over a short period. This has meant the significant loss of the technical capability of the museum.
- It also ignores **poor decisions made** over recent years. For example the decision not to continue the Deputy Director role meant the loss of 30 years of experience in the collection leadership and national and international networks. This was then followed by the loss of several highly experienced and knowledgeable curators. The net effect of this and the redundancies meant the museum lost crucial corporate support and significant capability of the organisation.
- There were similarly poor decisions re staffing when the Education staff numbers as well the Exhibitions team were reduced to skeleton staff numbers. The Design department was slashed losing experienced and highly trained designers familiar with the building and its capabilities; the Interactives department virtually closed – thereby losing a signature feature of the Museum’s exhibitions and highly specialised corporate knowledge
- The **exhibition program** between 2009 and 2013 was significantly affected by management turning large areas of the Museum into **a building site**, requiring the closing of many gallery spaces by undertaking an expensive and disruptive project of building changes and alterations – few of which directly attracted new visitors.

Exhibitions were taken out and not replaced, existing escalators removed and then replaced; a new industrial lift put in and the existing lift, which was a signature architectural feature, removed. The significance of the Wran building entry and exhibition gallery, which hitherto had presented a series of blockbuster exhibitions, was hugely diminished when it was boxed in and its ceiling painted black - all changes which are reversible.

The building project also deleted key architectural features and greatly affected gallery access and visitor circulation paths in the building. Thankfully, **these errors and disadvantages can be remedied with a sound program of renewal** developed by an informed and experienced team.

- It is completely confusing and unfathomable that the 2014 Business Case would keep recommending **the demolition of the Wran Building which has been one of the most successful major exhibition galleries in any Australian museum**. It has hosted a series of international and Museum generated blockbuster exhibitions within a uniquely powerful and exciting volume – right up front in the Powerhouse Museum.

### 2.2: Responses to specific assertions in the 2014 Business case:

#### Re **Capital Expenditure and replacement of Permanent Galleries:**

It is **simply not true** that there has been no capital expenditure on the Museum’s Exhibitions Infrastructure since opening in 1988. Within 5 years of the 1988 opening, the Museum had

successfully bid for a program of funding to replace or refresh the Museum's permanent galleries in a cyclical program. **The Permanent Galleries Exhibition Program was funded around \$1m a year over many years.**

This was complemented by the **Total Asset Management Plan** for the Museum's infrastructure developed and implemented by Rob Webb when Property Manager – see Comments by Rob Webb.

This **Permanent Gallery Program** ensured that the Museum strengthened its reputation, established when it opened in 1988, for a high degree of interactivity in all its exhibitions – this was absolutely revolutionary in 1988 and was a distinguishing attraction of the Powerhouse, however in recent times with the loss of experienced staff and limited exhibition program diminishing the impact of this distinctive characteristic.

Since opening in 1988 **all the major galleries were refurbished**, some several times, and new exhibitions ranging from permanent to museum generated temporary exhibitions to external travelling temporary exhibitions were presented in all the Powerhouse Museum's gallery spaces. Even the permanent major object installations were refreshed and updated: the Strasburg Clock was moved to a better position; new interpretation was presented for the 1785 Boulton and Watt Beam engine and Locomotive No 1.

In the **Wran Building**, on level 5, a new temporary gallery was opened showing the first Christian Dior exhibition in Australia. A range of exhibitions followed including the hugely popular *Treasures from the Kremlin: the world of Faberge*. From 1997, the gallery became the Asian Gallery devoted to exhibitions promoting a greater awareness of Asian cultures in Australia. These included *Evolution and Revolution: Chinese dress 1700 - 1990s*; *Rapt in colour*; *Korean costumes and textiles from the Chosun dynasty*; *Beyond the Silk Road: Arts of Central Asia*; *Earth, Spirit, Fire: Korean masterpieces of the Chosun dynasty* for the Sydney 2000 Olympics Games; and *Bright Flowers: Textiles and ceramics of Central Asia*.

The magnificent **Wran Gallery** on the entry level is the premium gallery for the Museum's international and museum generated blockbuster exhibitions.

The Transport exhibition in the unique **Boiler Hall** was refurbished including *Space, beyond this world* and *Ecologic*. As well the Signal Box, Governor-General's carriage and all the Transport themes were updated. The most significant 'experience' refresh was the *Sound and Light* show installed in the Boiler Hall to enhance all the exhibits including the Museum's unique 'flight of planes' – from the Catalina to the Bleriot to the Royal Flying Doctor Services Beechcraft Queenair air ambulance.

Other capital improvements were the **bridge link** across from the Turbine Hall to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor in the Transport Hall and a **new Members Lounge** built on the top floor looking out onto the magnificent display in the impressive volume of the Boiler Hall.

All the **Switch House** galleries were **renewed** and were used for a series of temporary exhibitions ranging from Powerhouse generated exhibitions to touring exhibitions from Australian and international museums. These included the international blockbusters *Diana: A Celebration* and *Star Wars* as well as the enormously popular museum-generated *Real Wild Child - Australian Rock Music* and the family exhibition *Circus! 150 years in Australia*. Conservation standards were never an issue as all the galleries met conservation standards. Nor were there any issues with security standards.

In 2010 the Switch House ground floor was converted to the semi-permanent *Wiggles* exhibition.

In the **Turbine Hall**, the popular Social History exhibitions were refreshed and later two were replaced with new Social History exhibitions. These exhibitions were all taken out bar one when the 2009/2013 building program commenced and the Switch House Level 4 exhibition gallery deleted to make way for a shop and café, both relocated. The *Steam Revolution* was updated and a sequence of exhibitions about successful Australian innovation in design, technology and engineering was displayed over the years on the top floor of the Turbine Hall.

On the ground floor, a sequence of long term exhibitions was presented on the theme of information technology, robotics and the history of computing. Much of this exhibition theme has been removed recently. The second major long term exhibition is *Experimentations* which has had whole sections updated as well as favourite interactives refurbished.

A major capital investment was the **children's playground** in the Grace Bros Courtyard which significantly extended the family offering with an outdoor activity for children. The **Goods Line Café** building was also a post opening capital works project to replace the 1988 Courtyard café which was too small for the numbers of visitors.

### **2.3: The Museum's Temporary Exhibition Program: Museum-generated and Touring exhibitions:**

In addition, for the first 5 years after 1988, and **every year thereafter**, the Museum presented a **diverse and popular program of temporary exhibitions**, not only at the Powerhouse but also at Sydney Observatory and The Mint and Hyde Park Barracks in Macquarie St which were both part of the Museum's portfolio of sites. The Museum interpreted the significant history of the sites and presented Australian Decorative Arts in The Mint as well as the Museum's Numismatics and Philately Collections. (Opening in 1982). The Hyde Park Barracks was opened in 1984 and was Australia's first museum of Social History. Both were award winning museums and were the Museum's responsibility until 1997 and 1990 respectively when they were transferred to The Historic Houses Trust of NSW.

The **Wran Gallery is the premium gallery** for the Museum's international and museum generated blockbuster exhibitions. It is flexible and capacious and has worked brilliantly for exhibitions ranging from science fiction to ancient Greek cultures to decorative arts and design to Australia's *Festival Records*, Australian automotive history, Austrian arms and armour and blockbuster films such as *Lord of the Rings* and *Harry Potter*. These were complemented by an active and diverse temporary exhibition program in galleries.

**I repeat - conservation and environmental standards were never an issue as all the galleries met required standards. Nor were there any issues with security standards.**

The Museum's exhibition program since opening (and including exhibition publications) is described in the attached document: **The Powerhouse Museum: an Exhibition Archive 1988 – 2018** collated by Christina Sumner, former Principal Curator, Powerhouse Museum. Nov 2018.

The Museum's **Exhibition Design staff** were highly skilled, experienced and creative and made great use of the Powerhouse's flexible and adaptable display galleries and magnificent spatial volumes. Virtually all these staff, with years of experience, have left and many are now leaders in museums and exhibition design consultancies in Australia and in some cases, internationally.

### **2.4: Re Reduction in Education audience:**

A major cause for the decline in the Museum's education audience was the **significant reduction in the number of Education staff**. Attracting and keeping the Education audience is like a business – the museum has to convince the teachers that it is worth the cost and effort of taking the students to the museum. The Powerhouse had specific packages for every age group. When staff numbers were cut so drastically, the experienced staff resources which developed and promoted the education packages were lost.

While numbers are now increasing, the staff reductions have had a long term impact.

The sustaining of education audiences is not a problem of building infrastructure. In fact, there has been investment in new teaching spaces and specific museum school experiences since the 1988 opening including the Sound House.

## 2.5: Re Reduction in General Visitors:

The decline in visitor number pre 2014 started with the management decision to remove *Inspired*, a major exhibition of the Museum's Decorative Arts and Design collection to carry out the **highly disruptive building works**. The Museum was a building site for a very long period of time, which discouraged visitors, especially families, from repeat visits. A particular loss was the removal of the children's interactive exhibition, *Zoe's House* which was a great favourite with young families. *For years there was a 'Bring back Zoe's House' site on Facebook.*

Decline in audience numbers from 2009 was not a failure of building infrastructure. **Major capital resources were allocated to the building works instead of to an audience development program** of exhibitions and continued permanent gallery refurbishment.

## 2.6: Re the Powerhouse Museum's Site and Location:

Although there have been a number of unfortunate changes to aspects of the Museum's surrounds, these are more than **mitigated by the positive impact** of the Goods Line walkway, the Light rail, and the regeneration of Darling Harbour. These benefits can be further enhanced to the Powerhouse Museum's advantage by developing museum/public interaction opportunities in the Goods Line precinct.

Furthermore, there are a number of car parks with which the Museum can negotiate a visitor parking deal – as it did with the previous Entertainment centre car park operators.

It would be the **non productive to close the Museum's main entry on Harris Street**. It is not simply a busy thoroughfare – it is a major pedestrian and transport route linking the Ian Thorpe pool and Ultimo Community Centre with the Museum, the ABC, the UTS, the Broadway/Chippendale precinct and the communities of Ultimo, Pyrmont and Glebe. The Goods Line, the Light Rail and the Darling Harbour/Chinatown thoroughfares all provide greatly enhanced links to the City, and to Central for visitors arriving by train from across Sydney and NSW.

**Many major museums** across the world have **two or more entries** including the Louvre, the British Museum and the Victoria & Albert. The mooted changes to relocate the Museum's entrance lacks vision and experience.

The proposed **demolition of the Wran Building**, one of the most successful major exhibition galleries in Australia, would be a completely retrograde step. It would destroy the Museum's grand public entrance and its **signature gallery** which has hosted exhibitions ranging from *Knights from Imperial Austria* to *1000 years of the Olympic Games: treasures of Ancient Greece*, *Lord of the Rings*, *Harry Potter*, *Star Wars* etc. There are inconsistencies regarding this argument on every page.

## 3. Conclusion: The Future for the Powerhouse Museum in Ultimo:

The Powerhouse Museum belongs **in Ultimo where it has been since 1893. It is a fit for purpose building with an outstanding building capability and identity**. The co-location of Museum, accessible Collection storage and back of house facilities is far more efficient than any other model.

This is an assertion in the MAAS 2014 Business Case which is correctly founded in fact and history. It is also a correct assessment of the position of the Museum in the Cultural Ribbon through Darling harbour and the Goods Line. (see 1.1.7 p.6)

The Powerhouse Museum in Ultimo requires a commitment **to properly fund the Museum so it can reach a sustainable level of operations and increase its income to fund key programs**. This will

require **staged capital funding of say \$150m and an increase in recurrent funds commensurate with the level of specific specialist staff resourcing and core programs** required for the Museum to thrive.

This action needs to be undertaken by **knowledgeable and experienced museum professionals** in order to:

- address the changes which have been made in **the precinct** – maximise the positive outcomes and minimise any negative effects.
- resolve issues created by the misconceived **alterations to the building**, especially visitor circulation and gallery capacities.
- re-commence the **building maintenance program** and address any legacies from the stalled and underfunded maintenance work.
- ensure that the Museum has the **specialist and knowledgeable staff** to deliver the high quality programs for which it is renowned.

The Powerhouse Museum's outstanding international reputation and successful record over the past 30 years has clearly demonstrated that the Museum is effectively located and, well positioned in terms of infrastructure, to build on its manifold achievements since opening in 1988.

The last few years have been **most adversely affected by the confusion surrounding plans to 'move the Powerhouse Museum to Parramatta'** – a nonsensical decision. Many major cities around the world, **cluster their tourist attractions and cultural centres** in a precinct that attracts high visitation. Sydney CBD has the Australian National Maritime Museum, Sydney Opera House, NSW Art Gallery, Museum of Sydney, State Library of NSW, the Mint and Hyde Park Barracks, the Australian Museum and the Powerhouse Museum (MAAS). It makes no sense to separate the Powerhouse Museum to Parramatta.

The visionary solution to both strengthening the Powerhouse Museum's role in Ultimo and, renewing its long established programs which reach across NSW, is **to strengthen its capabilities and renew its Ultimo home**. The Powerhouse is quite capable of playing an even greater role in reaching audiences across Sydney and all NSW, as is evident by its track record to date.

Brad Baker,

## Appendix 2

### COMMENT FROM JUDITH COOMBES

10 January 2019

The former Head of Strategic Collections, responsible for collection management, storage, documentation, conservation, libraries and archives, I held this position from mid2014 to December 2018. Prior to this, I was Manager of Registration and Collections from 2002 - 2014. I have worked in a range of other collection and exhibition roles at MAAS since 1986. I am currently a member of the Executive Board of ICOM Australia.

This 2014 MAAS Business Case report is **highly misleading**. It uses visitor figures and comments from the long period under former director Dawn Casey where it was virtually a building site. Half the building was closed, noisy and dusty due to her 'refresh' which cost tens of millions of dollars for no beneficial effect.

Connectivity of the Powerhouse Museum to the city and Darling Harbour has already been achieved through completion of the Goods Line and renewal of the Haymarket, Ultimo and Convention Centre precinct.

Despite the changes to the public areas around the Museum, there have never been any issues moving the collection between buildings. Fears we had re security when the lower entrance opened were not realised – it was always safe and dry under the awning.

The air-conditioning systems were well maintained until 18 months ago when maintenance staff roles were deleted. There has only been that one instance of mould outbreak in thirty years of onsite storage and never in the Powerhouse building.

The Museum has continued to partner with major international museums to bring high quality blockbusters to Sydney - Egyptian mummies from British Museum, Reigning Men from LACMA, Underwear from V and A. - all containing highly sensitive significant objects that we cared for to best international practice in environments that met best practice.

The Museum's Harwood building Basement storage still admired by international specialists as meeting best practice plus the already built beautiful new additional storage at CH. Many more objects are now on display due to the large new 'Recollect' – the visible display store in the Powerhouse Museum and additions to the Display Store at the Museums Discovery Centre at Castle Hill.

Schools and tertiary audiences are now very high at Ultimo.

As Head of Collection Management, I had very little input into this report and was not asked to comment on drafts. The authors **have vastly exaggerated the minor difficulties** we have encountered over thirty years. Leaks are a problem in every major building in heavy rain and many have now been fixed!

Judith Coombes

I am happy to appear as a witness before the Inquiry, I am happy for my submission to be made public.

### **Appendix 3**

#### **Final Business Case for the Renewal of the Powerhouse Museum, 24 October 2014**

##### **COMMENT: CHRISTINA SUMNER OAM**

Former Principal Curator Design & Society  
Powerhouse Museum career: 1985 - 2013

As a member of the MAAS curatorial staff for nearly thirty years, from 1985 to 2013, I approached reading this Business Case with interest and deep unease. I loved the Museum while I worked there, and still do, and am disgusted by the demolition job on it that is currently proposed, in large part because of the case for renewal outlined in this a Business Case. While I support the basic vision expressed in it, the directions outlined for the Museum and the emphasis placed on its quite extraordinary collection, the reasons given for the proposed renewal are both insulting to its creators, staff and stakeholders and blatantly untrue.

The Powerhouse building was in 2014 and still is today absolutely fit for purpose, as absolutely and creatively fit for purpose as any of the many other heritage buildings worldwide which have been given a new, museological lease of life through inspired, sensitive and skillful repurposing. The Powerhouse building is a perfect, award-winning example, having itself been repurposed magnificently to international museological standards in the 1980s. The varying scale and height of its internal spaces are ideally suited to the radically broad nature of the collection, from aeroplanes and steam engines to ceramics and violin bows, from the soaring vastness of the Boiler Hall to the intimate scale of the Switch House. While the ongoing need for maintenance will always be necessary, this is a requirement common to all buildings, old and new and no rationale for demolition.

It is outrageous to say that the Museum's core functions were compromised by the building, which has in fact been a huge part of its appeal since it opened at great taxpayer cost and to international fanfares in 1988. I am reminded of the conserved original features and supreme functionality of the Engine House and the post-modern charm of the Boardroom perched at an angle at one end of the lovely Galleria. It is simply not true to say it lacks presence and is uninviting, although the conversion of the glorious Wran Building into a large black display space is deeply regrettable.

I was there for the three highly stimulating years of development that immediately preceded the opening in 1988 and can personally vouch for the impeccable museological best-practice curatorial standards we were always expected to work to. In the 1980s, collection management expanded into a highly professional museum discipline of its own. It is untrue and highly insulting to the Museum's professional collection managers to say that collection management did not meet international standards.

I was there for more than two packed decades after the opening in 1988 and it is a matter of great personal pride to have contributed as a curator to the wonderfully full and varied program of exhibitions and publications we conceived, developed and installed. It is outrageous to read how the achievements of those rigorously-researched and well-received programs have been minimised and belittled in this Business Case.

The calculated untruths and misrepresentations on which this Business Case has been constructed are a disgrace to its authors, the worst and most damaging of these being that the building was no longer fit for purpose. The Powerhouse is in fact superbly fit for purpose.

Christina Sumner OAM



## **Appendix 4**

### **COMMENT BY ROB WEBB,**

4 November 2018

Building Services Co-ordinator

Property Development Co-ordinator

Powerhouse Museum 1992 – 2005

#### **1. Summary:**

The Powerhouse Museum is an outstanding museum with fit for purpose infrastructure and facilities.

If a small fraction of the funds required for the proposed relocation was given to the Museum on a progressive annual basis to appropriately fund staffing levels, exhibition and public programs, maintenance, upgrades to facilities, etc, the Museum would be able to regain its position and place with the public.

In my opinion, it appears that new management regimes have focused on schemes to unnecessarily expand the Museum's buildings infrastructure rather than consolidating and renewing the existing Powerhouse Museum. Yes, there were minor deficiencies with some aspects but solutions seemed to argue for a need to expand facilities to cater for these rather than see how they could be addressed within the existing buildings.

The current issues facing the Powerhouse Museum are not the consequence of a less than fit for purpose building but of insufficient funds and poor management decisions which, in the last 5 years or so, have made it difficult to sustain and deliver an exciting exhibition program.

While I didn't want to dwell on the latest (2018) Business Case, it appears that the analysis of future funding for operating the new Museum(s) is based in recent current funding levels. This hasn't worked for the Powerhouse Museum so how could this work for a new relocated Museum?

Again, the focus of this 2018 'plan' is the edifice and the perceived political benefits of the move rather than understanding the business of a Museum.

#### **2. Maintenance of the Powerhouse Museum**

- Until recently, the Powerhouse Museum was properly maintained - in so far as funding permitted the necessary programs to be carried out.

- Plans for an appropriate maintenance program (TAM), which identified future needs for life cycle replacement and ongoing routine maintenance were prepared during my time at the Powerhouse, but the ability to implement the program was subject to success in obtaining additional funding.
- There appears that there has been a progressive decline in funding which has resulted in a loss of staff numbers, drop in maintenance levels, inability to fund a proper exhibition development and replacement program, all of which meant that the ability of the Museum to operate at a sustainable and appropriate level all but evaporated.

These issues facing the Museum are not the consequence of a less than fit for purpose building but, of insufficient funds and poor management decisions, which make it difficult to sustain and deliver an appropriate maintenance program.

### **3. Specific comments on the 2014 Final Business Case**

#### **3.1: The 1988 Powerhouse project:**

The base building works were done well. There were a few minor issues such as glazing seals (around the Loco No 1 / Boulton and Watt area), and a few leaks, which given the size and complexity of the building, were considered relatively minor.

Following the opening, there were issues around building compliance with the change from Ordinance 70 to the Building Code of Australia (BCA) which progressively came into effect from 1988 and has been subject to regular revision since.

Apart from the BCA changes, there were issues arising out of the works compliance (WorkCover), disability access etc, which had to be progressively addressed. All major public buildings of any age have faced these issues which are readily fixed with careful planning.

The Newcastle earthquake also changed the structural engineering requirements which had a particular impact on masonry buildings. The earthquake upgrade works in the Boiler hall which were only partially completed due to the inability to undertake these works in the northern portion as unable to access due to the exhibitions in this zone.

#### **3.2: Building maintenance:**

What became evident during my time at the Powerhouse was that there didn't appear to be any funding from Day 1 for a properly planned building maintenance program in the recurrent funding allocation, so it progressively became an issue to find funding for maintenance.

From the mid 1990s, the need to manage maintenance of the building was acknowledged and the Museum was successful over a number of years until the late 90's, in getting funding through the NSW Total Asset Management (TAM) programme for a combination of backlog maintenance, routine maintenance (painting, carpets, emergency repairs etc), infrastructure

upgrades, escalators,, lifts, mechanical plant etc. Funds were also provided for chiller replacements in response to a combination of a need to improve energy efficiency, and cyclic mechanical and essential services replacement.

Total Asset Management bids were further developed to include Collection Maintenance (in response to the 'proper' Valuation of the collections), and exhibition gallery replacement, although funds provided were limited – see comments by Brad Baker.

The funding position gradually deteriorated through 'efficiency dividends', partially funded salary agreements made by Government, reduction in funding due to several rounds of redundancies, and a general reduction in overall funding levels.

### **3.4: 2014 Final Business Case for the renewal of the Powerhouse Museum: The Case for Change: 1.2 pp7 - 9**

In my opinion, **The Case for Change is flawed and overstated** and in just about every point, the issues raised directly relate to **a lack of funding and suitable resourcing**.

1.2 I personally don't have a problem with the need for 'renewal'.

1.2.1 Financial unsustainability:

\*The BC states that current museum operations are unsustainable and that patronage has deteriorated. But why is this? Isn't this the position the Museum has been placed in due to a lack of suitable funding and neglect by Government. If the Museum isn't provided with appropriate resources, how can they conduct their business in a manner that maintains the interest of the public? Visitation alone shouldn't be the only measure of success for a museum.

\*Deteriorating patronage is a result of declining interest due to a lack of 'change' in exhibitions, programs and perceived 'bad experience' due to maintenance issues. It simply is tired. Of course, Museum generated income will decline if the number of visitors declines, but the question again is, why is this? Museum generated income declines when the museum is not presenting great exhibitions.

\*I don't agree with this dot point regarding updates to exhibitions. In spite of funding constraints, there was a very active program of permanent exhibition gallery replacements up to the mid – late 2000's. Options for renewal of the more challenging permanent exhibitions, such as Transport, were constrained due to funding, but the exhibition has seen numerous updates as funds permitted. Iconic exhibits such as Locomotive 1 and Boulton & Watt didn't need replacement.

The continued meeting of 'Industry benchmarks' can only be achieved with an appropriate level of funding.

\*It is no surprise that revenues from commercial and sponsorship operations has declined. If you have a tired and outdated venue, engagement from external parties

would decline. Again, this is directly related to resources being available to properly maintain the Museum.

\*And ditto re user charges, sponsorship, donations and rental streams.

\*And ditto re capacity to fund capital renewal and refurbishment.

\*Organisational restructure, or redundancies driven by financial constraints, remove the resources required to deliver all programs and services within the Museum. Without staff and funding, how can sustainable exhibition and public program be delivered? Isn't this again an issue created through **lack of funding**?

\*The 'fundamental change' should focus on the core business of the Museum in its current configuration and not require any investment in any substantial building replacement. The 'fundamental change' should be in providing adequate levels of recurrent funding to properly resource staffing levels, exhibition replacement or upgrades, education and public programs, as well as building maintenance.

#### 1.2.2 Compromised core functions.

\*The Statement around the Museum's infrastructure having reached the end of its life or no longer fit for purpose, is **a bold and misleading statement**. Of course some aspects of the Museum's components will need to be replaced or upgraded after 30 years. For example, 30 years for mechanical plant is an industry standard.

Given the Museum's obligation to provide a suitable environment for its collections, as well as for staff and visitors, the condition and status of its plant and equipment should be regularly assessed and maintenance / replacement programs identified, funded and implemented. This had been the case up to when I left in 2005, but I have no knowledge as to what has since incurred.

\*Not sure what the issue is with the onsite storage. The Stage 1 Basement Collection Store had its minor issues but when maintained, **provides a secure and good environment for the collections**. It seemed to work for 30+ years so all I can think of is that if there are problems, it is probably due to missing maintenance.

\***Substandard facilities????** There were some concerns about the Museum's ability to attract large exhibitions due to the lack of space for decanting etc. However, the Museum's record of international and major in house show facilities have worked well for 20 odd years. I don't understand why this is linked to WC premiums.

\*Again, what are the substandard facilities?

\*Education programs – surely there isn't a shortage of space, but a need to repurpose/upgrade some of the existing facilities. The ability to deliver these, as well as the relevant exhibitions is **a funding issue**.

#### 1.2.3 Substandard facilities

Again I don't have a problem with the opening paragraph. The Casey/Edwards 'improvements' were opportunistic at best and failed to consider a proper integration with the rest of the Museum. The ability to deliver an inviting and contemporary cultural experience is directly related **to funding**.

\*With the removal of the Darling Harbour walkway bridge and recent changes in Darling Harbour, I agree that there is an opportunity to look at the approach to the Museum. But surely the history of the place is that when you present dynamic and engaging exhibitions and programs, people will come regardless of how the approach looks.

\*I don't agree that the existing infrastructure/facilities are not fit for purpose. Maybe some updates and/or upgrades are appropriate after 30 years, but **what is the issue** with a mix of heritage and newer structures? We are dealing with spaces here and these can be reconfigured if there is a good case to do so.

\*Building orientation is not an issue but a perception. The Museum doesn't rely on passing trade but **is a destination in its own right**. See the first dot point above.

\*Existing infrastructure /services may well be reaching the end of its useful life but the base building isn't. Let's not toss the baby out with the bathwater.

\*If there are inefficiencies and non-secure BOH facilities that don't meet current standards, then these **can be upgraded**. Again, this is a funding issue and recognition that museums evolve and, like all businesses, need to be able to respond to 'market' trends. Just look at the way in which the Australian Museum has been expanded.

Finally, there is a lot of money in the 2014 B/C for new works, particularly around the Harwood Building Tower which is unnecessary and which inflates the capital cost over and above what is required. This would colour the opinion of anyone looking at this document.

Robert Webb

4 November 2018

## **Appendix 5**

### **POWERHOUSE MUSEUM PROJECT 1988**

Director: Dr Lindsay Sharp

#### **Designers and Engineers**

Architect: Lionel Glendenning, Principal Architect, Public Buildings, Government Architect's Office, NSW Public Works Dept

Structural Engineer: Ian Norrie, Bond James Laron

Services and Mechanical: Dave Rowe, NSW Public Works Dept

Lighting Design: Barry Webb

Acoustic Design: Wilkinson Murray

Interior Design: George Freedman

Exhibition Design: Richard Johnson, Denton Corker Marshall

Iain Halliday, David Katon, Neil Burley, Burley Katon Halliday

Desmond Freeman, Desmond Freeman and Associates

Powerhouse Museum Exhibition Design Dept led by Brad Baker with Susan Freeman.

Graphic Design: Garry Emery, Emery Vincent

Boardroom Furniture: Iain Halliday, Burley Katon Halliday

Executive Offices curtains: Glenda Morgan, Reptilia Design

## **AWARDS: POWERHOUSE MUSEUM 1988**

### **RAIA Architectural Awards NSW 1988**

Sir John Sulman Award for Public Buildings: Powerhouse Museum (Government Architect's Office, Lionel Glendenning, principal architect)

ACROD Award for barrier free circulation: Powerhouse Museum

### **RAIA National Architectural Awards 1988**

RAIA Belle Award for Interiors

RAIA President's Award for the recycling or new use of a building

RAIA Sir Zelman Cowen Award: finalist

### **Awards:**

1988 Illuminating Engineering Society of Australia's Meritorious Award for display lighting in NSW

Westpac Museum of the Year Award 1988

Australian Tourism Commission's Best Tourist Attraction in Australia Award for 1988

Jennifer Sanders 26 Nov 2018

## **Appendix 6**

### **POWERHOUSE MUSEUM**

#### **EXHIBITION PARTNERS/LENDERS: 1988 – 2018**

##### **SUMMARY STATEMENT**

The Powerhouse Museum's exhibition program has always been supported by a diverse range of cultural institutions from across the world, across Australia and across NSW. Partners and lenders who are completely confident in the Powerhouse Museum's acknowledged high standards of curatorship, conservation, collection registration and management and, exhibition design, development and delivery.

Below is list of organisations and individuals who have worked closely with the Powerhouse Museum since 1988 to ensure the Museum presents scholarly, cutting edge and blockbuster exhibitions to audiences of all ages -family to students to older visitors – from a broad demographic.

This list, incomplete as it is, is evidence that the Powerhouse Museum, from its opening in 1988, has been a significant player in Australia's cultural landscape and a leading partner in the world of international exhibitions and cultural exchange.

The 2014 MAAS FBCRPM is a grossly misleading document which does not represent the Powerhouse Museum's leadership in museums, exhibitions and cultural exchange.

Jennifer Sanders

20 November 2018

##### **MUSEUMS, ART GALLERIES AND UNIVERSITIES**

A Donish Institute of History, Archaeology, and Ethnography, Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tajikistan

The A K Margulan Institute of Archaeology, Academy of Sciences, Almaty, Kazakhstan

The A Kasteev State Museum of Arts, Kazakhstan

Althorp Estate, UK

Alvar Aalto Museum, Finland

Archives de France, Paris

Art Gallery of South Australia

Art Institute of Chicago, Illinois

Art Museum of the China Millennium Monument, Beijing



Australian Centre for the Moving Image (ACMI)  
Australian Gallery of Sport and Olympic Museum, Melbourne  
Australian Jockey Club  
Australian Museum  
Australian National Maritime Museum  
Australian Racing Museum and Hall of Fame  
Avery Architectural and Fine Arts Library, Columbia University, New York  
Benaki Museum, Athens  
Berndt Museum of Anthropology, Western Australia  
Bukhara State and Architectural Museum, Uzbekistan  
Campbell Museum, New Jersey  
Central State Museum, Kazakhstan  
Centre des Archives d'Outre Mer, Paris  
Centre National du Costume de Scene, Moulins, France  
Changsogak Collection, The Academy of Korean Studies, Korea  
Design Museum, London  
Gansu Provincial Museum, China  
Gansu Provincial Research Institute of Archaeology, China  
Geelong Art Gallery, Vic  
Institute for Social History, Amsterdam  
Heide Museum of Art, Vic  
Hellenic Ministry of Culture, Athens  
Historic Houses Trust of NSW, Sydney  
Ho-Am Art Museum, Yongin, Korea  
Ivan Dougherty Art Gallery, Sydney  
IV Savitsky State Museum of Art of the Republic of Karakalpakstan, Nukus  
Jam Factory, Adelaide  
James Cook University, Townsville  
Jewish Museum, Prague  
Kyoto Costume Institute, Japan

Los Angeles County Museum of Art  
Memphis Brooks Museum of Art  
Mitchell Library, State Library of NSW  
Moscow Armoury Museum  
Musee de Chartres, France  
Musee de St Denis, France  
Museo Salvatore Ferragamo: Audrey Hepburn exhibition  
Museum and Art Gallery of the Northern Territory  
Museum of Ethnography, Dushanbe,  
Museum of Korean Embroidery, Seoul  
Museum Victoria  
Municipal Museum of Dunhuang, China  
NASA, Houston, USA  
National Archives of Australia  
National Art School, Sydney  
National Gallery of Australia  
National Gallery of Victoria  
National Library of Australia  
National Museum of Antiquities, Dushanbe, Tajikistan  
National Museum of Australia  
National Museum of Australian Pottery, Wodonga  
National Museum of China  
National Museum of Ireland  
National Museum of Korea  
Naval Heritage Museum, Garden Island  
New England Regional Art Museum, Armidale  
New York Historical Society  
Northwestern University, Illinois, USA  
NSW Migration Heritage Centre  
Palace Museum, Beijing

Performing Arts Museum, Melbourne  
Photographies de Collection, Paris  
Pioneer Women's Hut, Tumberumba  
Queensland Art Gallery  
Royal Botanic Garden, Sydney  
Royal Collection Trust, UK  
Samarkand State Museum of History and Architecture, Uzbekistan  
Science Museum, London  
Scienceworks, Victoria  
SciTech Discovery Centre, Perth  
Screen Sound Australia, Canberra  
Shanhaiguan Great Wall Museum, China  
Smithsonian Air and Space Museum  
Songam Archives of Classical Literature, Korea  
South Australian History Trust, Adelaide  
State Library of Queensland  
State Library of Victoria  
State Museum of History and Architecture, Uzbekistan  
State Records NSW  
Steiermaerkisches Landesmuseum, Austria  
State Museum of Applied Arts, Tashkent, Uzbekistan  
State Museum of Temurid History, Tashkent, Uzbekistan  
Tareq Rajab Museum, Kuwait  
Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery  
Tasmanian School of Art  
Te Papa Tongawera Museum, New Zealand  
The Australiana Fund  
Tjibaou Cultural Centre, New Caledonia  
The Central State Museum of the Republic of Kazakhstan  
Union Francaise des Arts du Costume, Paris

University of Adelaide Art and Heritage Collections

University of New England

University of Sydney

University of NSW

Victoria & Albert Museum, London

Vitra Design Museum, Germany

Wellcome Collection, London

Western Australian Museum

Wollondilly Heritage Centre, NSW

**PRIVATE, GOVERNMENT AND CORPORATE COLLECTIONS:**

Aardvark: Wallace and Gromit

Aboriginal Childrens Service

ABBA Collection, Sweden

Ah Xian

Alick Tipoti

Ali Kazak, Head, General Palestinian Delegation to Australia

Anne Frank House, Amsterdam

Anne Schofield AM: Collection of Jewellery

Arnotts Collection

Art and Exhibitions International

Australian Publishers Association

Australian Wool Innovation

Australian Craftspeople and Designers

Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation (ANSTO)

B'Nai B'rith, Sydney

Balarinji Indigenous Design Studio

Bavarian Arts and Crafts Association

Baz Luhrman and Catherine Martin

Bill and Melinda Gates: Leonardo da Vinci's Codex Leicester, 2000

Bombay Sapphire  
Boomali Aboriginal Artists  
British Council  
Broken Hill City Council  
Buda Historic Home and Garden, Castlemaine, Vic  
Ceramic Collectors Society  
CGC Gold Pty Ltd  
Chong Sohyon Collection, Korea  
Christian Dior Archives, Paris  
Consulate General of Italy  
Cruising Yacht Club of Australia  
Darrell Sibisabo  
David Malin  
Department of Immigration  
Department of Mineral Resources  
Defence Science and Technology Organisation  
Design Council, London  
Dress Collectors, China  
Ermenegildo Zegna, Italy  
Festival Records  
Fred Hollows Foundation  
Game Fishing Association of Australia and Australian Game Fishing Museum  
Glenn R Cooke  
Government House New South Wales  
Greenaway Gallery  
Hand and Lock Embroidery Co, London  
Harley Davidson Club  
Harry Vatiliotis  
Hayman Design  
Holmes a Court Collection

James Wilson-Miller  
Japan Foundation  
John Houstone  
Ken Done  
Kozminsky Melbourne  
Kumsung Publishing Cultural Foundation, Korea  
LEGO Australia  
Lord Alastair McAlpine  
Lucasfilm Ltd: Star Wars Collection  
Macedonian Welfare Association  
Manly Bowling Club  
Marc Newson  
Mardi Gras Workshop  
Martyn Cook  
Northcott Society  
NSW Parliamentary Archives  
Oakbank Racing Club  
the Onus family  
Oriental Rug Society of NSW  
Palestinian Costume Archive  
Parliament House Art Collection, Canberra  
Cahn Family Foundation: Collection of Paul de Lamerie Silver, USA  
Peter Rushforth  
Phillip Treacy, London  
Pierre Cavalan  
Polly Rickard  
Potters Society of Australia  
Regina Saunders/r e a  
Roslyn Packer, Sydney  
Royal Agricultural Society of Western Australia

Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Surgeons

Shoichi Aoki

Speedo Australia

St David's Anglican Cathedral, Hobart

St Jude's Church, Brighton, Vic

Star Trek Collection, USA

Stills Gallery

Svensk Form

Swarovski

Swedish Institute

Sydney Town Hall Collection

The Sydney Morning Herald

The Wiggles

Victorian Parliamentary Library

Vision Australia

Warner Bros: Harry Potter

Weta Workshop, Peter Jackson: Lord of the Rings

W J Sanders & Co

Yothu Yindi

Jennifer Sanders 20 November 2018