new product to the market. Making business contacts, maintaining market presence, meeting regular customers were other highly rated results among both types of participants.

The link between performance and trade mission participation was established in other evaluation studies. Nine out of ten participants made important contacts and five out of ten attributed these fully to the trade mission. Interestingly, one half of participants received a customer order within nine months. One-third of companies realising such sales attributed them fully to the mission[48]. Another study reports that about one-third of sales reported (within 12 months and 'committed' sales beyond such period) are attributed to either the fair or mission by participants. It is noteworthy that sales by mission participants were double those of fair participants. This, coupled with the fact that mission participants were mostly experienced exporters, often with prior mission and/or market experience, clearly raises the issue of targeting.

When programs are made available to established exporters they deprive first-time exporters who more acutely need assistance. The unassisted company may then opt not to export or enter export markets ill-prepared. Conversely, encouraging companies to export before they are ready, wastes program and company resources and may retard export efforts because of an initial bad experience[49].

Program effectiveness has been analyzed by relating costs to commercial results. An interesting measure of *hard* performance is the ratio of average government cost per company and event to average export sales (within 12 months or committed to beyond) which companies related to the event: trade fairs generated 28 times and trade missions 84 times government costs in export sales. This result must be refined to reflect only those sales which a company attributes to the event. The ratios thus are lowered to 9.6 for fairs and 21.7 for missions (the sales-cost ratio at the company level is similar)[50]. This, however, is still misleading, since the government-supported event is but one part of a company's export marketing effort - as noted above. A more realistic view must consider the likelihood of a company's sales without participation in the event, which reduces the ratio further to 6.7 for fairs and 11.9 for missions[51].

The implication is that even with *hard* results, isolating the true impact of government support on performance, and thus aggregation of results to show program performance, is difficult and most probably questionable. Establishing the impact of a single event (fair or mission) on behavioural dimensions of participants, and then to develop aggregate indicators to evaluate the