

an apparent lack of unified approach.

- there is a need for more linkage and interplay of the various parts of Pacific 2000. For instance the Industry Component of the JSTF has had low up-take, partly because of a slow transfer of delivery responsibilities to Industry Canada, due to the hindrance of traditional government financial management regulations. Disbursement could be enhanced by closer coordination of planning with the Pacific Business Strategy and other trade development planning (e.g. PEMD). Also while the JSTF provides for funding of Japanese language training, this has not been exploited extensively in the initial years for individual projects - only for the Coop Japan Program and the recently introduced Japan Manufacturing Engineers Program. There is a need to actively promote linkages with the Asian Language and Awareness Fund initiatives;
- in the past five years the APFC has expanded its activities dramatically, partly because it has been chosen to deliver government programs. This rapid growth has resulted in a continuous need to reassess priorities and activities, since the availability of funding can sometimes drive priorities;
- the APFC is needed more than ever in a more comprehensive role as an intellectual leader vis-a-vis Asia Pacific, and as a change agent in the areas of education, business practices, culture, visits management, and media. These long term activities are entirely compatible with the present mission statement. "Competitiveness" in both the short-run and the longer term must remain the prime focus, if the APFC is to relate effectively to the business community and Canada's economic and trade objectives;
- CIDA, DFAIT, and the APFC all have programs directed to serving Canadian interest vis-a-vis Asia Pacific. There are opportunities to ensure these are mutually reinforcing in order to serve Canada's interests in this very competitive region. Though CIDA has programs to support industrial cooperation, Canadian business people interviewed in the course of the evaluation questioned whether other competitor countries linked development cooperation efforts more closely to their trade and business interests. APFC's non-governmental status offers both CIDA and DFAIT advantages, if roles are clearly defined;
- both the Pacific 2000 program and the APFC are innovative and somewhat experimental, but both need to be able to explain better what is being attempted, and what is being done. Both are operating in a very restrictive fiscal climate, where cost-effectiveness must be clearly demonstrated:
- in the case of Pacific 2000 it was implemented with no provision for necessary administrative resources. As a result it is still "rough around the edges" in terms of the detailed, consistent records which would be desirable. The program was implemented as speedily as possible, and those on the receiving end have expressed satisfaction with the non-bureaucratic delivery, i.e. empathy and speedy responses. However, until recently, the people necessary to ensure comprehensive record keeping and program analysis have been lacking. As a result planning, monitoring, performance measurement, and evaluation systems are still weak.