

The first section of the paper is descriptive, providing a glossary of terms, some reference to types and a brief summary of the relative merits of technology consortia. With regard to typologies, it is important to note that selecting an appropriate typology, which in the author's opinion is more art than science, does not assist us in answering the fundamental questions of this paper.<sup>8</sup>

The second section provides a brief overview of policy trends in the Triad which underlie the phenomenon of international technology consortia. The objective of this section is to highlight some of the positions taken by various stakeholders in Canada and the Triad with a view to understanding how the rules of participation may be affected by competing interests.

The next section is a compilation of documentary and anecdotal evidence gathered from various sources, together with some case histories and commentary received from Canadian companies and industry associations. Finally, the paper concludes with some general comments and a number of recommendations for future study.

---

<sup>8</sup> Selecting a typology would only improve the analysis if it were to illuminate some distinguishing characteristics of how certain "types" of technology consortia are treated under various trade policy regimes. However, research has indicated that distinguishing characteristics are more likely to be found along industry sectoral lines and in the degree of government involvement. Furthermore, it has been observed by some authors that the formal structure of collaborative ventures often has little to do with either their management or their success and there are indications that the difference between a contractual and an equity relationship is highly exaggerated. "Sophisticated 'cooperators' seem to downplay the importance of ownership control as compared to management control or control through other means.": Gullander (1976), p. 86, cited in David C. Mowery and Nathan Rosenberg, *Technology and the Pursuit of Economic Growth*, (Cambridge University Press: 1989), p.242.