

and of client capacity to contribute. Cost recovery targets were inappropriate due to the pre-commercial and/or long-term nature of the PBS and JSTF programs and were justifiably dropped.

6. **Duplication and Overlap.** There are no glaring examples of duplication and overlap, however there is a desire for a more coordinated approach both at home and abroad. The need for a "Team Canada" approach has been expressed.

Federal and provincial departments and agencies, the APFC business program, chambers of commerce and business councils are perceived to be tripping over each other in providing services in some areas, e.g. business. This has been a lesson learned in the case of the ACBC.

The CBEF key sector initiative demonstrates how a Team Canada approach can be attained in a very common-sense and pragmatic way. The latter initiative shows that funding mechanisms such as Pacific 2000 are a valuable tool to bring about "concertation" of action between the different players.

Within Pacific 2000 there appear to be opportunities for further integration of the four major components to realize potential complementarities. For instance the possibility of providing for greater linkage between the Pacific Business Strategy and the presently under-utilized Industry Component of the JSTF might be explored.

7. **Program delivery.** Pacific 2000 is in many ways an experimental program, and managers are constantly exploring more cost-effective approaches to delivery in somewhat unknown territory. Before the advent of single operating budgets, the scope for innovation had been restricted. For example the JSTF was ham-strung in its early years by under-resourcing for delivery of the program. The necessary person-years for delivering the program that were requested were never granted.

Much of Pacific 2000 has been delivered by intermediary organizations such as the APFC. Results of the background studies indicate that the APFC has played a very effective role in delivering the language and awareness components it is responsible for. It has been advantageous to use an organization of this type, since it is capable of taking initiatives in areas that are difficult for DFAIT to operate, and it has its own networks at home and abroad, which have amplified the effectiveness of Pacific 2000.

8. **Program Alternatives.** No program alternatives have been suggested.
9. **Evaluation Needs.** Although matching contributions are a measure of effectiveness, (and targets have been met), Pacific 2000 does not have an evaluation framework, including performance indicators, particularly at the effectiveness and impacts levels. These are no