

**Evaluation of Canada's Participation in  
EXPO 2000 in Hannover, Germany  
Final Report**

February 20, 2002

**SPR Associates Inc.**

45 Granby Street, Toronto, Ontario, M5B 1H8  
(416) 977-5773; FAX: (416) 977-7747  
275 Slater Street, 9th Floor, Ottawa, Ontario, K1P 5H9  
(613) 236-4384; FAX: (613) 236-3754

## Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	i
<b>1. Introduction</b>	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Canada's Objectives at EXPO 2000	2
1.3 Evaluation Objectives, Issues and Questions	3
1.4 Methodology	3
<b>2. Overview of EXPO 2000</b>	5
2.1 Concept of EXPO 2000	5
2.2 Overall Assessments of EXPO 2000	6
<b>3. The Canada Pavilion</b>	8
3.1 Location and Concept	8
3.2 Components of the Canada Pavilion	9
3.3 Assessments of the Canada Pavilion	9
<b>4. Planning, Objectives and Funding</b>	13
4.1 Planning	13
4.2 Objectives of Partners/Participants	14
4.3 Funding	14
4.4 Views on Planning and Funding	15
4.5 Communications	18
4.6 Contractors	19
4.7 Other Operational Issues	20
<b>5. Objectives Achievement</b>	22
5.1 Cultural Objectives	23
5.2 Images and Values	23
5.3 Business Objectives	24
<b>6. Conclusions and Future Directions</b>	27
6.1 Overall Assessment	27
6.2 Specific Conclusions and Future Directions	30
6.3 Overall Conclusions Regarding the Evaluation Objectives	34
<u>Appendices:</u>	
Appendix A: Study Issues/Questions and Data Collection Activities	36
Appendix B: Purpose, Context and Activities of the Site Visit	39
Appendix C: Survey Methods and Data Limitations	40
Appendix D: Persons/Organizations Surveyed	41
Appendix E: Documents Examined	44
Appendix F: Technical Notes	45
Management Response	48
Action Plan to Section 6.2	

## Executive Summary

**EXPO 2000:** On May 21, 1997, the Minister of the Department of Canadian Heritage announced that Canada would participate in EXPO 2000, the World's Fair planned for June 1 to October 31, 2000 in Hannover, Germany. Canada's Pavilion at EXPO 2000, which had exhibits displaying Canadian cultural, industrial, tourism and other attractions, had an initial budget of \$35 million<sup>1</sup>.

Altogether, over 2.7 million people visited the Canada Pavilion, including over 4,000 dignitaries, officials or leaders in business, the arts, etc. (hereafter referred to as *VIPs*). The theme of EXPO 2000: *Mankind-Nature-Technology*, was intended to address major issues facing the world today and present solutions towards a sustainable balance between economic development and environmental concerns. The event included on-site national exhibitions, a thematic area, cultural events, and about 700 practical projects from around the world, 280 of them from Germany.

**Canada's Objectives** for EXPO 2000 were:<sup>2</sup>

- To present a lasting image of Canada as a highly developed, bilingual, multicultural, technologically and culturally sophisticated and environmentally conscious society;
- To support Canada's economic and trade interests in Germany and in other European countries;
- To portray Canada as a reliable business partner and good investment location;
- To convey Canada's commitment to the pursuit of sustainable development and social equity in close cooperation with other countries;
- To display Canadian experience and leadership on the "big issues" facing the global society in the next century;
- To promote Canada's values and its artistic-cultural achievements and products;
- To correct negative perceptions about Canadian industry practices and to educate foreign audiences on relevant issues; and
- To promote Canada as an ideal travel destination.

---

<sup>1</sup> Some key informants indicated that significant additional but not measured or included in the official budget for the pavilion costs were also incurred.

<sup>2</sup> Taken from the Request for Proposal.

**The Canada Pavilion** was a free-standing exhibition hall of some 7.500 square metres of exhibits and service areas. In addition to the Pavilion, Canada's participation at EXPO 2000 also included a variety of on- and off-site programs and activities to aid social dialogue and international meetings. The pavilion was organized around three themes:

- **Spirit of Community**, evidenced in a multi-media show featuring Canadian culture (presented in the preparatory area of the pavilion);
- **Stewards of the Land**, represented by a film depicting management of resources (presented in the theatre area of the pavilion); and
- **Connecting with the Future**, seen in a cyber lounge and industry exhibits displaying recent technological advances and sustainable resource management practices (presented in a free-flow area which allowed visitors to obtain information on a variety of subjects).

**The Evaluation:** An Evaluation of Canada's Participation at EXPO 2000 was undertaken in 2000-2001 to meet Treasury Board requirements for accountability. The evaluation had four overall objectives:<sup>3</sup>

- to measure the achievement of objectives of Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 and its level of excellence/performance in relation to other countries;
- to assess the contribution of EXPO 2000 to the effectiveness of the International Expositions Program;
- to assess the success of the partnership formula with federal and provincial governments and the private sector; and
- to support/assist the management of the International Events and Promotion Directorate with Canada's participation in future international expositions.

A variety of research methods were used to evaluate the extent to which Canada's participation achieved its goals and to assess lessons for the future, including:

- a review of relevant documents;
- interviews with key informants;
- a ten-day site visit by a member of the evaluation team to EXPO 2000 in Hannover, Germany in October, 2000;
- an on-site survey of general visitors to the Canada Pavilion;
- a survey of VIPs who visited the Canada Pavilion;
- a survey of participants/partners and organizations who were invited to participate in the Canada Pavilion but declined;
- a survey of Europe-based staff of the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade; and
- a survey of German Tourism Wholesalers.

---

<sup>3</sup> Taken from the Request for Proposal.

**Results:** On balance, the evaluation data indicates that Canada was well-represented at EXPO 2000 and that a number of positive results were realized. Some concerns with Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 were noted.

**Overview:** Visitors to the Canada Pavilion were generally very positive about their experience and what they saw. For example, 87.8% of the general public visitors and 87.5% of VIP visitors rated the Canada Pavilion as "good-excellent". Canada was seen by most VIP visitors as a bilingual country, as a multi-cultural country, and as a desirable tourist destination. Visitors rated a number of specific exhibits very positively. Additionally, the hosting staff for the Canada Pavilion were highly praised by the great majority of visitors -- general public and VIP visitors alike.

**Detailed Findings:** Canada was seen by most VIP visitors as a desirable tourist destination (98% of VIPs), as a multi-cultural country which welcomes all cultures (91%), as an environmentally conscious country (89%), and as a bilingual country (79%). As well, the goal of portraying Canada as a country with advanced industry and technology sectors was relatively successful with positive ratings by 78% of VIPs and 72% of partners/participants.

Some other features of Canada as portrayed by the Canada Pavilion were seen less positively by visitors and partners. For example, the goal of showing Canada as a leader in communications/information technology was rated positively by 63% of partners/participants and 39% of VIPs. Mixed assessments were given in some other areas, such as the Canada Pavilion's portrayal of Canada as promoting artistic creativity or practicing sustainable industry management.

The general public visitors rated the *Virtual River* feature of the Canada Pavilion most highly (rated as "good-excellent" by 70% of general public visitors) and the *theatre presentation* was rated as "good-excellent" by 58% of general public visitors. Twenty-nine per cent of general public visitors and 27% of VIPs rated *Whitewater Rafting* as the best or their favourite exhibit while 35% of general public visitors and 25% of VIPs rated the *Gun Sculpture* as the best or their favourite exhibit.

The hosting staff played a significant role in visitors' positive assessments of the Canada Pavilion, with over 77% of visitors reporting that the friendliness and courtesy of the hosting staff was "good-excellent"; over 71% noting that hosting staff helpfulness was "good-excellent"; and over 66% assessing hosting staff knowledge as "good-excellent".

Positive impacts related to tourism were the most prominent with over 85% of general public visitors indicating that they would be "somewhat-very interested" in visiting Canada within the next two years. VIPs were also very interested in Canada as a tourist destination with 47% of VIPs noting this as a secondary interest in visiting the Canada Pavilion (after "an interest in Canada generally"). Indeed, about 95% of VIPs felt that the Canada Pavilion portrayed Canada as an attractive tourist destination and almost 60% of VIPs reported that they would have liked additional information on Canada as a tourist destination.

These positive “tourism” impacts were also evidenced in assessments of the Canada Pavilion by German tourism wholesalers who were surveyed. One of these respondents noted the Canada Pavilion “was one of the highlights of EXPO 2000”. However, not all assessments were positive. German tourism wholesalers had criticisms, many noting that the Canada Pavilion did not place enough emphasis on Canada's natural attractions, which they saw as Canada's greatest asset.

**Areas of Concern:** Although many positive results emerged from Canada's participation in EXPO 2000, participants in Canada's effort (partners/exhibitors) expressed a number of concerns. For example, there was great variation in the extent to which specific business goals of partners/participants were fulfilled.

While nearly all partners and participants (94.1%) reported that participation in EXPO 2000 was effective as a business strategy in enhancing their image, in promoting Canadian artists/culture (86.7%), and in promoting tourism (80.0%), they gave lower ratings for more specific business goals such as developing market entry opportunities (43.8% of partners/participants rated participation in EXPO 2000 as effective as regards this goal), or identifying new markets (33.3% rated effective). Generally, partners reported that they were disappointed to some degree with respect to their participation in EXPO 2000 with only 25% reporting that they were successful in achieving their business goals. Partners also rated the funding and planning elements for the Canada Pavilion as generally poor, and gave negative ratings for aspects such as providing information, time for decision-making, and budgeting.

**Reasons for Non-Participation:** Private sector companies, governments and agencies which were invited to participate in EXPO 2000 but chose not to do so, noted that cost was the most important factor in their decision not to participate and that the potential return on investment had been seen as likely to be low. Federal Government key informants who were interviewed also noted that the approach to recruit sponsors, partners and exhibitors had limited success.<sup>4</sup> A number of key informants suggested that, contrary to the strategy applied for EXPO 2000, it should be the role of the Federal government to present the country abroad in consultation with the provinces/territories, but without financial demands being made on them.

**Communications:** Communications and marketing were weak elements in the overall EXPO 2000 process, within both the broader environment (e.g. the German organizers) and for the Canada Pavilion. Most partners felt that the resources allocated to communications and marketing for the Canada Pavilion, both before and during EXPO 2000, were insufficient given that expositions are “a vast communication campaign” where countries present themselves to the host country and, to a lesser extent, to the nations of the world. As such, it was felt that the \$800,000 communication and marketing budget applied for Canada's participation at EXPO 2000 was inadequate -- far less than a “10% rule” which some key informants suggested is generally earmarked for such projects.

---

<sup>4</sup> Note, however, that staff of the International Expositions Program took a contrary view to these key informants, and reported to the evaluators in December 2001 that “Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 benefitted from considerable financial and in-kind contributions and the largest number of private sponsors ever.”

**Assessments:** The assessments of some partners and key informants suggest that, while Canada was well represented at EXPO 2000 generally, some important factors limited the full achievement of expected results. Identifying the reasons for this cannot be definitive in retrospect. One key factor was that the project was very substantial, requiring the development of extensive programs and retrofitting of a major exhibition facility of over 7,500 square metres, within a very short time. Additionally, a number of were beyond the control of the Department.

**A Challenging Project:** The challenges of implementing Canada's participation at EXPO 2000 should not be taken lightly. This was a major design and development project, and was a major project to implement given its many objectives and components (the Canada Pavilion, the conference centre, the VIP program, cultural program, etc.).

**The End Result:** The evaluation findings suggest that, while Canada was well represented at EXPO 2000 generally, some important factors appear to have limited the achievement of expected results.

**An Analysis of Constraining Factors:** As noted below, there were a number of constraining factors which impacted on Canada's participation in EXPO 2000, many of which were beyond the control of PCH. These constraints made it more difficult to deal with what would have been a challenging project in any circumstance.

**Need for more planning time:** Planning for the Canada Pavilion was only fully operational for a year to a year and a half before the event, leaving little time for project planning and development.

**Need for more buy-in from potential partners:** Many Provincial/Territorial governments, the private sector, and other Federal departments and agencies were unwilling to buy-in, or were slow to buy into EXPO 2000 as partners with the Department of Canadian Heritage, a factor which impeded planning. Also, the Department did not have the broad support of other federal departments.

**Need for more realistic assessment of benefits:** The potential benefits for partners who were being asked to participate in EXPO 2000 could have been presented in a manner that prevented unreasonably high expectations.

**Need for more harmonized goals:** The partnering strategy adopted by the Federal government encompassed too many goals for Canada's participation in EXPO 2000. This strategy of trying to present all of Canada's image, technological achievements, culture, tourism and business/trade opportunities created too many different objectives for the Canada Pavilion.

**Need for better communications:** The Department's communications strategy was limited and did not compensate for other organizational weaknesses such as the lack of a strong team planning base and shared goals with partners/participants.

**Skill and resource gaps:** Implementation of Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 was impacted by staffing and skills shortfalls, resulting from governmental downsizing over the previous decade. For example, the need for additional technical and project management skills may have accounted for cost overruns and also some failures or breakdowns of exhibits.

**Human resources management:** Human resources management shortfalls was a challenge for which managers were not prepared. Issues in this area were evidenced, for example, by dissatisfaction among the hosting staff with operations of the Canada Pavilion. Hosting staff expressed a variety of concerns, in particular that their experience with the visiting public and consequent recommendations for improvements were not valued by the Canada Pavilion management.

**Corporate memory:** It appears that the Department was not able to draw fully from experience gained in prior international exhibitions. A reflection of this is that only in the past few years, under the Department of Canadian Heritage, have more regular evaluations of expositions been undertaken.<sup>5</sup> As a result, a long-term "bank" of historic lessons were not available to be drawn on.

**Over-extension of the Program:** While developing EXPO 2000, the International Expositions Program had to divide its resources between management of EXPO '98 in Lisbon, Portugal, and the planning of EXPO 2000.<sup>6</sup>

**Poor performance of the German EXPO Corporation:** The poor performance of the German EXPO Corporation in many areas (especially communications and marketing) and its failure to live up to planning commitments created many problems, suggesting that Canada should seek a stronger planning role in future expositions.

The above challenges notwithstanding, thousands of people went away from EXPO 2000 with positive views of Canada. Broad conclusions regarding the evaluation objectives, lessons learned, and recommendations for future expositions are noted below and within the report. These should aid Canada's ongoing efforts in this important area of international expositions.

---

<sup>5</sup> Staff of the International Expositions Program were, however, able to draw on reports on EXPO '92 in Seville and EXPO '98 in Lisbon. It was suggested by the evaluation team's site visit researcher, that Canada's work in evaluation of its expositions was generally ahead of other countries (based on key informant interviews with representatives of other pavilions).

<sup>6</sup> Context notes on EXPO 2000, International Expositions Program, November 2000.



**SPECIFIC CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS:** The table below represents key findings and recommendations for the future for specific components of EXPO 2000 such as marketing, planning/implementation, business goals, design issues, evaluations/benchmarks as well as notes on “what worked well”.

FINDINGS	COMMENTARY	FUTURE DIRECTIONS
<p><b>Things that Worked Well:</b> Some aspects of the Canada Pavilion worked very well, even though they were outside of the main thematic focus of EXPO 2000. One example was the “Gun Sculpture”</p>	<p>This specific component of the Canada Pavilion was very well received. This points to the benefits of PCH staff “thinking outside of the box” and pursuing creative components even when they do not exactly match the theme of the Exposition or the pavilion per se.</p>	<p>A key concern for future Canadian pavilions may be – irrespective of the exposition theme or concept -- to identify what will work well for the nation or region where each exposition is being held.</p> <p>For example, irrespective of themes, it might be desirable to ensure that EXPO 2005 in Japan has an “Anne of Green Gables” exhibit, because of the Japanese fascination with this Canadian literary character.</p> <p>Also in Japan in 2005, replicating the Gun Sculpture exhibit while not seeming to be very creative, may be desirable because of popular concern in Japan with peace.</p>
<p><b>Finding Points of Strength:</b> Natural strong points of Canada – Canada’s physical beauty, its Aboriginal heritage etc. were big drawing cards at EXPO 2000.</p>	<p>While these aspects of Canada are not supportive of the high tech goals which are current priorities for promoting Canada as a source of new technology, they are important strengths which should be exploited.</p>	<p>Continuing and perhaps more attention should be given to these aspects of Canada, but in ways that could build other themes into exhibits. For example, looking in depth at how First Nations use high technology, how technology helps preserve heritage, Canada’s beauty (parks, etc.)</p>
<p><b>Federal Planning Time Horizon:</b> The official go-ahead for PCH for Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 was given very late, so that little time was allowed for planning. The lack of time may also have limited the ability of potential federal/provincial and other partners to participate.</p>	<p>A project such as EXPO 2000 called for extensive planning and development which was constrained by the short time allowed by a late "go ahead".</p>	<p>Authorization should be given several years in advance for expositions to allow for sufficient planning and developmental work.</p>

FINDINGS	COMMENTARY	FUTURE DIRECTIONS
<p><b>Dealing with the Host Organization:</b> The German EXPO Corporation did not live up to commitments made to PCH regarding use of the area near the Canada Pavilion, and made some decisions which had specific negative impacts on the Canada Pavilion.</p>	<p>A key change was the failure of the German hosts to produce an expected youth park adjacent to the Canada Pavilion. Also, the Canada Pavilion suffered from the adjacent McDonalds restaurant which created poor environment and much garbage.</p>	<p>Wherever possible, Canada's representatives should negotiate stronger guarantees in site planning for future pavilions. Support from senior government officials might be essential to ensure such guarantees.</p>
<p><b>Planning and Technical Resources:</b> Additional technical resources were needed for project development (e.g. project planning finances etc.).</p>	<p>This lack of technical resources appears to have impeded effective implementation of the Canada Pavilion, and also allowed for insufficiently tested technical exhibits.</p>	<p>A more complete technical team should be put in place for future expositions.</p>
<p><b>Dealing with Business Goals:</b> Partners and VIPs alike expressed concerns that business goals were not well served by the Canada Pavilion.</p>	<p>Many observed that expositions are "not a trade fair" and should not be made to do the work of a trade fair. Yet many of Canada's goals for EXPO 2000 were trade-oriented -- reflecting significant inconsistencies in the Canada Pavilion concept.</p>	<p>In future expositions, the trade or business component should be better situated/supported, with more specific involvement of other appropriate Departments such as DFAIT/ISTC, <u>or</u> if the business agenda is not well supported, it should be removed or reduced.</p>
<p><b>Partnership Issues:</b> It appears that the cost of participation in EXPO 2000 was an obstacle to participation, for example by Provinces/Territories.</p>	<p>A broad participatory base would seem to be a key element of success in Canada's participation in international expositions.</p>	<p>Future planning strategies should allow for partnerships on some minimum cost basis for all Provinces/Territories.</p>
<p><b>Level of Governmental Leadership:</b> Key informants suggested that higher level invitations to participate in EXPO 2000 could have increased partnerships and participation.</p>	<p>This was reflected, for example, in Bombardier's participation in the German Pavilion which was partly as a result of the German Premier's invitation.</p>	<p>Future pavilions should be developed with greater involvement from senior government official, particularly in providing invitations to important partners.</p>
<p><b>Projecting the Market:</b> It appears that Department of Canadian Heritage staff had little advance information as to what would work and what might not, prior to EXPO 2000.</p>	<p>Some advance market research would have provided insights.</p>	<p>For future expositions, advance market research in the region or target country should identify "what people would like to learn about Canada" so that Canada's objectives can be linked to the interests of regional audiences.</p>

FINDINGS	COMMENTARY	FUTURE DIRECTIONS
<p><b>Design Issues/Internal Problem of the Canada Pavilion:</b> In the evaluator’s visit, some features of the Canada Pavilion did not work or have the expected impact. An illustration was the use of “images of 12 people” in the Canada Pavilion to show Canada’s multi-cultural makeup. Many people, including PCH staff, did not understand this concept (some saw them as “job hunters”).</p>	<p>Such imaging may have very different interpretations and meanings, particularly in different cultures.</p> <p>Additionally, pavilions and exhibits may vary in the degree to which they are interesting to different cultural groups or convey the messages desired for Canada’s goals.</p>	<p>Extensive focus testing of concepts, images and exhibits is recommended prior to finalizing the design of future exhibits and pavilions.</p> <p>These could be done in “real life” or “virtual reality”, to test the expected impact of different concepts before final choices of exhibits or designs.</p>
<p><b>Mechanical/Operational Topics:</b> A number of mechanical or technical features of exhibits were found to be “out of order” at the time of the evaluator’s site visit.</p>	<p>This may have been happenstance, but such failures are unfortunate at an exhibition meant to show technical prowess.</p>	<p>PCH should build in back-up systems for future expositions, securing performance guarantees from contractors for mechanical/technical components.</p>
<p><b>Communications:</b> Communications for the Canada Pavilion were limited, with a need for greater marketing, including marketing in Canada (little was done to promote EXPO 2000 through press or other media).</p>	<p>While these efforts must be harmonized with those of the host country, it is important that Canada engage in its own communications and marketing to ensure a good attendance.</p>	<p>A more comprehensive communications and marketing plan should be put in place for future expositions, with a sufficient level of funding to impact on both attendance and media coverage.</p>
<p><b>Marketing:</b> EXPO 2000 was poorly advertised within and outside of Europe. More should have been done by Canada to fill its own marketing needs, through its international representatives, and through domestic marketing (to inform Canadians about EXPO).</p>	<p>This weakness of the German EXPO Corporation limited the entire exposition, and had a negative effect on the Canada Pavilion.</p>	<p>Canada should request that the BIE or national host organizations provide stronger guarantees in the future as to the marketing strategy to be undertaken.</p>
<p><b>Potential for Follow-Up:</b> Surveys indicated that many VIPs wanted more information as a result of visiting the Canada Pavilion.</p>	<p>This is a sign of success – that the Canada Pavilion “worked” for many of its VIP visitors -- but indications are that no simple mechanism was available for follow-up requests for information. Many visitors would also have liked to obtain further information about Canada according to hosting staff.</p>	<p>Future expositions should have a method for providing follow-up information. For example, e-mails or mailing addresses could be captured for visitors (a step which was not completed at EXPO 2000)<sup>7</sup>. Future Canada Pavilions could become a <u>continuous link</u> for persons interested in Canada.</p>

<sup>7</sup> A database was developed and some information provided for perhaps 4,000 VIPs who visited the Canada Pavilion, but complete names and addresses were only recorded for a few hundred.

FINDINGS	COMMENTARY	FUTURE DIRECTIONS
<p><b>HR and Organizational Issues:</b> A number of HR management problems were noted in interviews, and in focus groups with hosting staff. For example, the hierarchical model of organization at the Canada Pavilion was seen as contrary to a strong team effort. Additionally, better preparation for staff regarding living in Germany was needed.</p>	<p>Such human resources issues were detrimental to the human performance aspects of the Canada Pavilion.</p>	<p>A comprehensive human resource plan should be prepared as part of the design and development of future pavilions. This should include a complete assessment of skill requirements (including skills in tourism and hospitality) as well as a model for the organization and management of the entire Canada Pavilion team.</p>
<p><b>Evaluation challenges:</b> The lack of in-depth evaluation benchmarks and data bases on the performance of prior expositions limited the capacity of the evaluation.</p> <p>More generally, the absence of reliable comparison indicators limited the ability to see how EXPO 2000 was developing as compared to previous expositions.</p>	<p>It would be desirable to have complete data on previous expositions such as costs per square metre for exhibits, visitor satisfaction, etc.</p>	<p>A data base should be developed for monitoring performance indicators from one exposition to another.</p> <p>For example, a summary “score card” on pavilions and exhibits could be developed modeled after the Sport’s Canada database on historic performance of Canada’s National Sports Organizations.</p>
<p><b>Assessing ongoing performance:</b> During and after the EXPO 2000, pavilion managers were not able to determine how well the Canada Pavilion was doing compared to other pavilions.</p>	<p>The on-site visitors’ survey did not provide this type of insight, because the group surveyed was already pre-selected (it was comprised of people who wanted to go to the Canada Pavilion). Thus the survey sample was not representative of individuals attending EXPO 2000 generally.</p> <p>This is not just a matter of improving research, but also of providing information to pavilion managers -- e.g. to identify areas in which mid-course corrections might be possible to improve performance.</p>	<p>Future expositions would benefit from <u>ongoing</u> independent surveys to monitor visitor reaction (e.g. exit surveys from the overall exposition, to obtain random sampling assessments of the broader population attending the exposition not just those going to the Canada Pavilion).</p> <p>Additionally, broader market surveys in the region or host country would be useful, e.g., to track attitudes towards Canada before, during and after the exposition.</p>

**Conclusions Regarding the Evaluation Objectives:** Some overall conclusions regarding key objectives for the evaluation of Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 are:

**Objective One was "to measure the achievement of objectives of Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 and its level of excellence/performance in relation to other countries":**

Conclusion: As noted previously, some objectives of Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 were very well achieved. Canada was well-portrayed as a bilingual country, a multi-cultural country, and a tourist destination, but was not strongly portrayed as promoting artistic creativity or sustainability. Nor were other goals, such as business-related goals, fully achieved.

Available data did not allow for a reliable assessment of Canada's performance in comparison to other countries', so that the evaluation could not respond to the second part of this evaluation objective. This points to the need for future evaluations to collect additional types of data.

**Objective Two was "to assess the contribution of EXPO 2000 to the effectiveness of the International Expositions Program (IEP)":**

Conclusion: This objective can only be assessed in a follow-up to the event. As the evaluation results show, many lessons were learned and future directions were indicated. It would appear that many opportunities have been identified for improving the effectiveness of the IEP.

Most importantly, the learning from EXPO 2000 would appear to underline the value of further institutionalizing and refining the exposition planning process, and building corporate memory in a significant way. Clearly, the event's strength and weaknesses all point to the value of having the IEP as a permanent effort.

**Objective Three was "to assess the partnership formula with Federal Departments and agencies, provincial government departments and agencies, and the private sector":**

Conclusion: A number of problems were noted with the partnership formula, but the broader issues in partnering appeared to be the need for a stronger effort to build partner buy-in, ideally with more advance planning and more involvement of senior government officials. Additionally, identifying potential benefits for partners more clearly in the planning stage, and minimizing barriers to participation such as funding requirements, would be key steps.

**Objective Four was "to support and assist the management of the International Events and Promotion Directorate with Canada's participation in future International Expositions":**

Conclusion: Numerous suggestions are noted for future directions within.

***Drawing from the results above, it seems likely that the Department of Canadian Heritage can showcase Canada effectively at future expositions by building on successful aspects of EXPO 2000, developing broader and more effective partnerships, and strengthening future pavilions in the ways noted above.***

# 1. Introduction

On May 21, 1997, the Minister of the Department of Canadian Heritage announced that Canada would participate in EXPO 2000, the World's Fair planned for June 1 to October 31, 2000 in Hannover, Germany. The Canada Pavilion, which had many exhibits representing Canadian cultural, industrial, tourism and other attractions, as well as parallel programming in trade, culture and public affairs, had a \$35 million budget. Canada's participation at EXPO 2000 was managed by the International Events and Promotions Directorate (hereafter IEPD) of Department of Canadian Heritage.

An Evaluation of Canada's Participation at EXPO 2000 was undertaken in 2000-2001 to meet Treasury Board requirements for accountability. A variety of research methods evaluated the extent to which Canada's participation achieved its goals and assessed lessons to be learned for the future. The evaluation was also designed to provide IEPD with information that would be useful for strategizing Canada's participation in future world fairs.

## 1.1 BACKGROUND

World Fairs have existed since the mid-19th century and Canada has participated in every 20<sup>th</sup> Century exposition sanctioned by the Bureau of International Expositions (BIE).

EXPO 2000 in Hannover, Germany, was the biggest world fair to date, with over 180 countries and organizations participating. According to *Time Europe's* reports, organizers at various times projected that 40 million visitors would help to generate revenues of US \$870 million in admission fees, US \$145 million in licenses and US \$460 million in sponsorship. [Note, however, that estimates of 18 million visits were closer to what was actually achieved.]

The theme of EXPO 2000, Mankind-Nature-Technology, was intended to address major issues facing the world today and to present solutions to attaining a sustainable balance between economic development and environmental concerns. EXPO 2000 included on-site national exhibitions, a thematic area, cultural events, and about 700 practical projects from around the world, 280 from Germany.

## 1.2 CANADA'S OBJECTIVES AT EXPO 2000

Canada's objectives for participating in EXPO 2000 were numerous, including<sup>8</sup>:

- To present a lasting image of Canada as a highly developed, bilingual, multicultural, technologically and culturally sophisticated and environmentally conscious society;
- To support Canada's economic and trade interests in Germany and in other European countries;
- To portray Canada as a reliable business partner and an outstanding investment location;
- To convey Canada's commitment to the pursuit of sustainable development and social equity in close cooperation with other countries;
- To display Canadian experience and leadership on the “big issues” facing the global society in the next century;
- To promote Canada's values and its artistic and cultural achievements and products;
- To correct negative perceptions about Canadian industry practices and to educate foreign audiences on relevant issues; and
- To promote Canada as an ideal travel destination.

**Themes:** The Canada Pavilion and its programs were organized around three themes and related presentations:

- **Spirit of Community**, a multi-media show featuring Canadian culture (presented in the preparatory area of the pavilion);
- **Stewards of the Land**, a film depicting management of resources (presented in the theatre area); and
- **Connecting with the Future**, a cyber lounge and industry exhibits displaying recent technological advances and sustainable resource management practices (presented in a free-flow area which included an information area enabling visitors to obtain information on many subjects, such as tourism).

**Obstacles:** The consultants emphasize that the Department's ability to achieve the stated objectives was constrained by numerous factors noted throughout the report, many of which were beyond the direct control of PCH, once the project was under way. Some of these key factors included a need for more planning time, need for more high-level support across the federal government, need for better access to staff resources, and need for greater influence on planning decisions of the EXPO host organization.

---

<sup>8</sup> Taken from the Request for Proposal.

### 1.3 EVALUATION OBJECTIVES, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

This evaluation of Canada's participation at EXPO 2000 had four overall objectives<sup>9</sup>:

- to measure the achievement of objectives of Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 and its level of excellence/performance in relation to other countries;
- to assess the contribution of EXPO 2000 to the effectiveness of the International Expositions Program;
- to assess the success of the partnership formula with federal and provincial governments and the private sector; and
- to support and assist the management of the International Events and Promotion Directorate with planning of Canada's participation in future international expositions.

### 1.4 METHODOLOGY

**Overview:** The evaluation was based on a number of research activities and data collection from a wide variety of sources. These data sources included:

- a review of relevant documents;
- interviews with key informants;
- a ten-day site visit by a member of the evaluation team to EXPO 2000 in Hannover, Germany in October, 2000;
- an on-site survey of general visitors to the Canada Pavilion;
- a survey of a VIPs, mainly in Germany;
- a survey of participants/partners and organizations who were invited to participate in the Canada Pavilion but declined);
- a survey of Europe-based staff of the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade; and
- a survey of German Tourism Wholesalers.

**Document Review:** The document review included an assessment of files and other materials, including planning documents, minutes of meeting, videos, guide books, communications and promotional plans, communications materials, media reports, and attendance reports (see Appendix E).

---

<sup>9</sup> Taken from the Request for Proposal.



**Site Visit:** The site visit to EXPO 2000 was conducted by a member of the evaluation team who observed EXPO 2000 and the Canada Pavilion over a ten-day period in October, 2000. The site visit included meetings with Canada Pavilion managers and staff, hosting staff; and observation of the Canada Pavilion and the pavilions of other countries including Germany, Great Britain, and Japan. The purpose of the site visit was to make site observations of the Canada Pavilion, its overall functioning and the reaction of visitors; to develop an understanding of the overall EXPO 2000 site; and to acquire knowledge on how other countries' pavilions approached their participation at EXPO 2000 and their treatment of the exposition's theme: Mankind-Nature-Technology (see Appendix B).

**Key Informant Interviews:** Interviews were conducted in-person or by telephone with a number of key informants from: the Department of Canadian Heritage; other federal and provincial agencies; Commissioners General of national pavilions; and representatives from other participating countries' pavilions. Key informant interviews also included members of the Steering Committee and Intra-Departmental Advisory Committee (see Section 4.1 for more details on these committees); experts in international events, trade, tourism, media; the Commissioner General and staff of the Canada Pavilion; and consultants and contractors involved with Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 (see Appendix D).

**The Surveys:** Surveys were carried out with a diverse group of persons who were involved with EXPO 2000. These surveys included:<sup>10</sup>

- *An On-Site Visitors Survey*, which was developed by a sponsor in collaboration with the Program and administered by the Canada Pavilion staff using a hand-held computer system, was completed by some 5,000 of the 2.7 million persons who visited the Canada Pavilion;
- *A Survey of VIPs* who visited the Canada Pavilion was completed by fax, e-mail and mail shortly after EXPO 2000 closed, used a brief questionnaire in English, French and German (most of the VIPs (over 80%) were residents of Germany; 154 completed the survey and 23 others provided comments);
- *A Participants/Partners Survey*, also completed shortly after EXPO 2000, used a detailed questionnaire distributed and collected by FAX to all organizations involved in Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 (36 were surveyed);
- *A Survey of Organizations who were Invited to Participate in the Canada Pavilion but Declined* was completed by telephone with Provinces/Territories, businesses, and NGOs who were invited to participate in EXPO 2000 but decided not to do so (10 were surveyed, after EXPO 2000);
- *A Survey of DFAIT Staff Stationed in Europe* (trade and cultural officers) was completed by fax (8 surveys were completed, after EXPO 2000); and
- *A German Tourism Wholesalers Survey* was also conducted, using a brief FAXED questionnaire to travel wholesalers in Germany (12 were surveyed, after EXPO 2000).

---

<sup>10</sup> See Appendix C for additional details on these surveys, and related technical reports.

## 2. Overview of EXPO 2000

### 2.1 CONCEPT OF EXPO 2000

Overview: The overall concept of the EXPO 2000 was based on four pillars: Participating Countries (also corporations); Theme Pavilions; Projects around the World; and the Cultural and Events Program (this Section is based primarily on EXPO 2000 documents).

**Participating Countries:** EXPO 2000 attracted representation from 155 countries, 17 international organizations and 10 non-official participants.<sup>11</sup> Interestingly, EXPO 2000 was the first world exposition held without the participation of the United States. The absence of the U.S., however, was not seen as having a major negative impact on the success of EXPO 2000. In fact, many national and international key informants who were interviewed for this evaluation indicated that the absence of the U.S. may have had a positive impact on the level of participation of Latin American and Caribbean countries, and it also provided new opportunities for Canada as the only participant from North America.<sup>12</sup>

**Theme Pavilions:** Altogether, there were 10 themes presented in 5 pavilions covering a total of 100,000 square metres of floor space. The Pavilion themes were Mobility, Future of Work, Knowledge, Energy, Health, Food, Basic Needs, Environment, Humankind and Planet of Visions. Objectives of the theme pavilions were to stimulate discussion and to combine education with entertainment.

**Projects Around the World:** Eight Canadian projects, the highest number of projects for any country other than Germany, were selected for the Projects Around the World and included Learning for a Sustainable Future; The Canadian Ecology Centre; The Fog-Water Collectors; The WETV TV Network; Smartrisk Foundation; Oujé Bougoumou Cree Nation; Insecticide Treated Bednets; and Mona Lisa Banana.

**Cultural and Events Program:** Some 18,000 performances were offered over the 153 days of EXPO 2000. These included a Dance Festival, a Theatre Festival, a Film Festival and a Festival of Sports. In addition to the cultural activities around the opening and closing ceremonies, countries were invited to present their own cultural program on their National Day. Other programs included conferences related to the Thematic pavilions.

---

<sup>11</sup> According to the German EXPO Corporation web-site. It should be noted that attendance figures from the German Expo Corporation and the BIE may be at variance, depending upon when collected.

<sup>12</sup> The evaluators note that this may have longer term negative impacts on attendance of countries, particularly given the marketing challenges for international expositions, and recent popular questions about the relevance of international expositions in the day of the internet.

**The EXPO 2000 Site:** The EXPO 2000 site was the biggest fairground in the history of international expositions. Spread over 160 hectares (200 hectares with parking included), it consisted of three main areas:

- *The Pavilions West Area* contained exhibits primarily from Latin American, the Near and Far Eastern countries. This area was to be dismantled following the exposition and its pavilions either moved or destroyed.
- *The Centre of the Site* was an existing fairground owned by the Deutsche Messe AG. Five thematic pavilions were located in this area which had 26 halls with a total exhibition area of 121,000 square metres. About 130 countries had their exhibit area in the trade fair halls at this location including the Canada Pavilion which occupied Hall 22. Canada was the only country in this area that occupied an entire hall by itself.
- *The Pavilions East Area* was a 280,000 square metre area which contained about 30 newly-built pavilions, primarily occupied by European countries. This area, including most of its pavilions, was to be turned into a business park following the exposition.

## 2.2 OVERALL ASSESSMENTS OF EXPO 2000

**Visitors:** Organizers projected that 40 million visitors would visit EXPO 2000, however, only about half this number actually came to the event. [Original estimates of 18 million visits were closer to what was actually achieved.] It was expected that 65% of visitors would be of German origin, 30% European and 5% from other countries. However, key informants suggested that as many as 85% to 90% of EXPO 2000 visitors were German or German-speaking. Organizers reported that VIP participation was strong -- 65 heads of state, over 400 government representatives and 30,000 other VIPs (including provincial and municipal representatives, bureaucrats, media and business leaders) visited EXPO 2000. Visitors to the Canada Pavilion, some 2.7 million of the 18 million total, compared favourably with past Canada Pavilions, but attendance for EXPO 2000 as a whole, was seen as poor.

In the view of German organizers, elements that affected the number of visitors were:

- *Marketing Strategy:* The event went almost un-noticed outside of Germany, mainly because of limited marketing. German diplomatic services were generally not involved in the process. EXPO 2000's German organizers suggested that the marketing strategy was too rational in approach, and should have appealed more to emotions.
- *Press Coverage:* The impacts of an inadequate marketing strategy before EXPO 2000 was also compounded by the German organizers' failure to adequately respond to criticisms from the German press during the exposition.

- *Preparation:* Preparations for the event did not generally involve local people or encourage local people to identify with the event. Also, given that the re-unification of Germany had been extremely expensive, the fact that EXPO 2000 turned out to be costly for taxpayers, and that the entrance fee was high were negative factors affecting attendance.
- *Incentives:* From June to September, the large majority of visitors to the EXPO 2000 site were reported to be teenagers and young people. EXPO 2000 organizers had apparently reacted to the low number of visitors by providing various incentives to youth groups to visit the exposition.

**Transportation:** Given the sheer size of the site, transportation was an important issue for visitors to EXPO 2000. Transportation within the site was a problem as the free transportation was unreliable and there were long line-ups. For example, a cable car around the site at a cost of 5 DM had long line-ups. Visitors had to plan on spending significant amounts of time going from one area to another, limiting the number of pavilions they could visit in a single day. These problems appear to have been the responsibility of the German EXPO Corporation, as overseers of the broader exposition, and were thus beyond the control of the Canada Pavilion.

**Financial Issues:** Expectations that EXPO 2000 would break even were not realized. At the time of the site visit, organizers projected a deficit of 2,5 billion DM since revenues had been overestimated by about 3,4 billion DM.

**Discussion:** Various problems with EXPO 2000 including transportation difficulties, poor marketing, poor press coverage and low attendance, were seen as mainly resulting from the weak performance of the German hosts of EXPO 2000. The overall assessment of the Canada Pavilion at EXPO 2000 must be made with these constraints in mind.

## 3. The Canada Pavilion

### 3.1 LOCATION AND CONCEPT

**Location of the Canada Pavilion:** The Canada Pavilion was located in the centre area of the EXPO 2000 site and used a free-standing exhibition hall (Hall 22) which totalled 7,500 square metres. Together with the French Pavilion, the Canada Pavilion was the second largest on the EXPO 2000 site after the German Pavilion.

Canadian organizers originally anticipated that the building would be in an ideal, high-traffic location but a Youth Plaza originally planned for the front of the Canada Pavilion did not materialize, leaving the surrounding area somewhat bare in comparison to other parts of the larger EXPO 2000 site. This impacted on the number of visitors who were drawn to this area of the EXPO 2000 site and affected the potential for visitors to the Canada Pavilion.<sup>13</sup>

**Concept of the Canada Pavilion:** The initial concept of the Canada Pavilion was to present Canada:

- As being linked by water, where visitors experience Canada's landscapes, communities, art, culture and technology through a three-dimensional universe of images, sound and light. State-of-the-art, multimedia exhibits would showcase Canada as a nation that is technologically sophisticated, environmentally conscious and culturally diverse. Canada's story unfolds through the four seasons, and through three integrated themes: Spirit of Community, Stewards of the Land, and Connecting with the Future.
- To show Canada's progress in creating a lasting balance between its people, its land and its industries, and how Canada offers models and hope for successfully managing the relationship between humankind, nature and technology in the 21st century. The pavilion and its programming were intended to support Canada's economic and trade interests and to promote Canada's cultural achievements.
- To reflect Canada in the images of 12 people who would represent Canada's multicultural make-up and associated professions, and to show how they highlight our collective responsibility to protect the environment for future generations.

---

<sup>13</sup> This outcome raised for the evaluators', the question as to what Canada might do in the future to secure better or consistent treatment from the hosts of international expositions.

### 3.2 COMPONENTS OF THE CANADA PAVILION

The Canada Pavilion had numerous components. A unique feature of the Canada Pavilion was the graphic signature on the exterior of the building in the languages of the Rio Declaration, brought together by a 19-metre maple leaf to symbolize Canada in the community of the world. The use of an existing building, in addition to being a cost saving measure, was seen by Canadian organizers as an ecological measure that integrated well with the EXPO 2000 themes.<sup>14</sup>

The Canada Pavilion included a Preparatory Area/The Virtual River which was described in planning materials as: *While walking along a Virtual River, with close to 400 video monitors and 3,000 images, visitors discover the beauty of each season revealed through two and three-dimensional reproductions of paintings by Canadian artists.* The Pavilion continued with a 360-degree multi-sensory theatre presentation which projected high-definition images using a system of multiple, circular screens which highlighted the development of technology and the vastness of Canadian natural resources and concluded with the images of 12 young people representing Canada's multicultural makeup.

A Cyber Lounge provided an opportunity for visitors to use interactive terminals to navigate into cyberspace and broaden the knowledge they acquired in the Pavilion. A Free-Flow Exhibit Area consisted of a number of exhibits paid for by partners of the Canada Pavilion, including a Gun Sculpture, Haida and Inuit artefacts, and an Exhibit showing German migration to Canada. The Canada Pavilion also had a business centre, a reception area, a VIP lounge, a souvenir boutique, a much-used information booth and a machine for stamping visitors' passports.

### 3.3 ASSESSMENTS OF THE CANADA PAVILION

**Overview:** Canada's participation at EXPO 2000 was successful in many ways, but some key objectives and goals were not fully met and the operation of the Canada Pavilion faced certain difficulties. For example, the pavilion preparatory area generally represented all of Canada's provinces and territories, but the exhibit area was not seen as providing a well-balanced view of Canada as a number of provinces did not participate.

Also, the goal of portraying Canada as a technologically advanced country was not entirely successful. For example, general public visitors felt that Canada was portrayed more as an attractive travel destination (45%) than as a country with advanced technology (30%) or a leader in communications and information technologies (10%). Both VIPs and partners also rated the Canada Pavilion as less successful in these areas.

---

<sup>14</sup> International Expositions Program also noted in its comments of December 13, that use of an existing building imposed a number of constraints.

**Overall Assessment:** Overall, the Canada Pavilion was rated highly. For example, 87.8% of the general public visitors and 87.5% of VIPs (see Technical Note #2 for detailed results) rated the Canada Pavilion as being good to excellent.

**Display 1  
General Public's Overall Ratings of the Canada Pavilion\***

<b>Visitors' overall impression of the Canada Pavilion</b>	
Excellent	25.6%
Very Good	39.7
Good	22.5
Fair	5.2
Poor	4.1
No response	2.9
<b>Visitors' rating of the hosting staff at the Canada Pavilion</b>	
	<b>% Positive Ratings**</b>
Friendliness	78.5%
Courtesy	77.0
Helpfulness	71.9
Knowledge	66.9
<b>Canada's rating among the top three Pavilions, by visitors</b>	
First	33%
Second	22
Third	18

\* Data from the on-site visitors survey is based on responses from 525 general visitors who answered this question (of over 5,000 who completed parts of the survey). It is not possible to obtain a full assessment of Canada's rating from this data, as the questionnaire did not ask how many other pavilions the person had visited. Nor were additional data obtained which would have clarified reasons for assessments. See Appendix C regarding limitations of this survey.

\*\* Where "1" = Poor and "5" = Excellent. Percentages indicate visitors choosing good-excellent.

**Ratings of Specific Components of the Pavilion:** The highest rated components of the Canada Pavilion were the *Virtual River*, which was rated as good-excellent by 70% of general public visitors and the theatre presentation (58% of general public visitors rated it good-excellent). General public visitors and VIPs both rated the *Whitewater Rafting* as the best or their favourite exhibit while 35% of general public visitors and 25% of VIPs rated the *Gun Sculpture* as the best or their favourite exhibit.

Less highly-rated components of the Pavilion included the *Boutique*, and the exhibits on *Sustainable Development Education*, *Construction of the Canadian Embassy in Berlin* and the *Tele-health, Nursing and Patient Station*, which were all rated as good-excellent by less than 10% of general public visitors and VIPs.

**Canada as a Tourist Destination:** Over 85% of general public visitors indicated that they would be very to somewhat interested in visiting Canada within the next two years. Of those general public visitors who were not interested in travelling to Canada after visiting the Canada Pavilion, 30% indicated the reason for this was cost, 20.9% indicated distance/access, and 20.5% indicated that they preferred other travel destinations. VIPs were very interested in Canada as a tourist destination with 47% of VIPs noting this as a secondary interest in visiting the Canada Pavilion (after "an interest in Canada generally"). Indeed, 97% of VIPs felt that the Canada Pavilion portrayed Canada as an attractive tourist destination and 57% would have liked to receive more tourism-related information.

Some German tour operators who were surveyed for this evaluation were very positive about Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 -- one noting that the Canada Pavilion "was one of the highlights of EXPO 2000". However, a number of tour operators felt that the Canada Pavilion did not place enough emphasis on Canada's natural attractions, which they saw as the country's greatest assets. As one suggested, "the Pavilion was too technical, with no real sense of Canada's major tourist attractions of the wilderness, hunting, fishing, polar bear watching and the country's vastness". Other comments from tour operators included: "the Canada Pavilion missed the point" and "Germans are willing to spend a lot of money to get away from big cities, industrial complexes, and people living on top of one another"; and "there was too little emphasis on the beauty and the vastness of the land".

**DFAIT Staff Perspectives:** A number of DFAIT staff provided positive assessments of Canada's Pavilion, noting that the Preparatory Area (*Virtual River* and *Spirit of Community*), the overall interior design of the Canada Pavilion, and the hosting staff were highly effective in communicating Canada's goals.

Yet some DFAIT staff observations were very critical of Canada's presence at EXPO 2000: DFAIT personnel we surveyed, noted that "human" goals were lost sight of and that the broad range of goals were not well harmonized. As one DFAIT officer noted, the Canada Pavilion "lacked the warmth" seen in past Canadian Pavilions. Other comments by DFAIT personnel included: "Themes should have been better articulated, and visually been more creative, warm, inviting...it all seemed amateurish, but at a high cost". "The Pavilion was very flashy using existing technology, but was not revelatory about future technologies". "There should have been more originality à la *Virtual River*..." "Visitors still like to take away brochures...this may still be a valid if under-rated channel to get the message across to the visiting public". "My impression as a visitor is that benefits did not justify the major expenditures undertaken for the project".

Several DFAIT staff suggested that the Canada Pavilion should have organized special days to "honour" countries, especially those countries close to Germany. They also suggested that visits by business leaders from countries close to Germany should have been organized by the staff at the Canada Pavilion. Having events such as these, they felt, would have encouraged local media to promote the Canada Pavilion.



**Hosting Staff:** The general public visitor survey results underscore the important role that was played by the hosting staff at the Canada Pavilion. Over 77% of general public visitors felt that the friendliness and courtesy of hosting staff was good or excellent; over 71% felt that the helpfulness of hosting staff was very good or excellent; and over 66% felt that the knowledge of hosting staff was very good or excellent.

These results were supported by the findings from other surveys – partners, VIPs, DFAIT staff all praised the hosting staff. As one VIP visitor commented: “Excellent staff provided on [the] ground support for our presentation. Host and hostess provided informative overview of the multi media and interactive displays”.

**Comparison to Other Pavilions:** Canada was rated as the "best pavilion" by 23% of VIPs, "second best" by 16%, and "third best" by 11%. Overall, these results were somewhat similar to results from the on-site general public visitor's survey where 33% rated Canada's pavilion as the best, 22% as second best, and 18% as third best of all the pavilions at EXPO 2000.

It is noted, however, that Canada's overall performance, compared to other countries', cannot be determined from these data since only those who visited the Canada Pavilion were surveyed. (See *Appendix C: Survey Methods and Data Limitations.*) See *Conclusions* regarding remedies for this problem in the future, noting that it is challenging to identify comparable indicators of pavilion success other than in wide-ranging surveys of the public -- attendees and non-attendees.

## 4. Planning, Objectives and Funding

### 4.1 PLANNING

The Department of Canadian Heritage worked with two internal federal government committees to plan EXPO 2000. One was an interdepartmental committee, and the second was internal to the Department of Canadian Heritage. The first meeting of the Interdepartmental Committee took place in November, 1997 through 1998 and 2000. However, the first meeting of the Intradepartmental Committee did not take place until July, 1999 only 11 months before the start of EXPO 2000. (After this, it met every month until the start of EXPO 2000.)

The Interdepartmental Committee faced a number of challenges, including a high turnover of committee members. With each change, there were adaptations to be made, starting with bringing people up to the same level of information and to adjust to the different visions of new participants. These challenges may have impacted on the overall effectiveness of the management of the EXPO 2000 program.

While key informants generally indicated that the committee worked well, suggestions were made that in the future more effort should go into finding ways to get other Departments to participate more actively. It was also suggested by key informants that the committee may not have been as effective as it could have been, with one key informant commenting that it "required more senior people within departments with the ability to draw more actively upon departmental expertise and resources" and another observing that "there was difficulty in ensuring buy-in within our... Department".

Some key informants suggested that this lack of expertise led to problems in subsequent contracts and the implementation of EXPO 2000. This prompted a suggestion from one key informant that Public Works should be more directly involved in the planning for such events, although a Public Works official who was interviewed indicated that there was no reason to believe that the work and involvement of Public Works should have been any different.

Finally, a number of committee members felt that much of the energy of the Inter-departmental Steering Committee went into looking for additional sources of funding and devising ways of reducing costs, rather than on substantial and effective planning for EXPO 2000.

## 4.2 OBJECTIVES OF PARTNERS/PARTICIPANTS

Most organizations who participated in Canada's efforts at EXPO 2000 were private companies (32.4%), followed by Government departments and agencies (26.5%), non-profit organizations (11.8%) and Crown Corporations (8.8%).

These participants in EXPO 2000 had a wide range of objectives they wished to achieve by participating in EXPO 2000. For example, 69% participated to enhance Canada's image, 67% participated to enhance the image of their organization, and 53% wanted to do their part to participate in an important world class event. Other objectives were: identifying new markets in Europe (reported as a goal by 47% of participants); developing Canada as a travel/tourism market (47%), and promoting Canadian artists/culture (42%). The majority of responding organizations (80.6%) reported having had some past involvement in international affairs or business, but only 14.3% had previous involvement in an international exposition.

## 4.3 FUNDING

The initial budget was to be \$25 million from the federal government plus an additional \$10 million raised from Provincial/Territorial governments and the private sector. Organizers had hoped to have a Conference Centre at the Canada Pavilion that would be rented to businesses for promotional activities. When it appeared that the target of \$10 million from the Provincial/Territorial governments and the private sector would not be reached, despite the efforts of a Commissioner General, the federal government committed to covering the difference. The \$10 million goal was not met, but IEP reported that considerable financial and in-kind contributions -- about \$5 million -- were obtained.

Ultimately, at an official estimated cost of \$38 million, the cost for Canada's participation in EXPO 2000, was about 10% above the originally approved budget. Depending how this total was calculated, and the expenses that were included, some key informants said the total cost might have been higher.

#### 4.4 VIEWS ON PLANNING AND FUNDING

**Partners/Participants:** Provinces and the private sector were invited to be partners in EXPO 2000 with the Federal government but the planning and funding processes which the Department of Canadian Heritage applied for EXPO 2000 were not well communicated to partners/participants, with only 28% of them reporting being familiar with these processes. For those that reported they were familiar with these processes -- about one in three to one in four of partners/participants surveyed -- poor ratings were given as to the adequacy or effectiveness of planning and funding processes. Negative ratings were also given for aspects such as providing satisfactory information, allowing for timely decision-making, allowing for good budgeting or effective coordination.

**Organizations Which were Invited but Declined:** While partners in EXPO 2000 were generally negative about the funding and planning process, those private sector firms, governments, and agencies that were invited to participate in EXPO 2000 but chose not to - had more varied views on the funding and planning process. Generally those organizations who were invited but declined felt that the Department of Canadian Heritage's process had been reasonable, although it was noted that the timing was very tight. However, this did not influence decisions on whether or not to participate in EXPO 2000. Rather, most of the organizations who were invited but declined noted that cost was the key factor in participation decisions and that the potential return on investment was seen as likely to be low.

Many organizations that were invited but declined noted that the return on investment for partners, if any, was not well demonstrated. One reason that some provinces refused to participate in EXPO 2000 was because of the apparent lack of results from previous expositions. The Yukon, British Columbia, Ontario and Québec had participated in previous expositions but declined to do so again. Political constraints were also significant for at least one province, which indicated that EXPO 2000 did not allow for sufficient unique identity to allow it to participate.

Some interviewees also suggested that the level of invitations may have been a factor in decisions as to whether to participate in EXPO 2000 or not – that invitations from higher level officials in the Department of Canadian Heritage or in the Government generally, might have produced in more positive responses. For example, it appears that the decision of Bombardier, one of Canada's premier industrial performers, to participate in the German Pavilion as a German or multi-national firm (not as part of the Canada Pavilion), was influenced by a personal invitation from the German Chancellor, Helmut Kohl.

Echoing the views of partners generally, the majority of Federal government key informants who were interviewed felt that the approach to sponsors, partners and exhibitors had limited success,<sup>15</sup> noting both problems inherent in the strategy itself as well as problems related to its implementation.

---

<sup>15</sup> Contrary to key informant views, IEP has emphasized that some important successes were noted, with "public/private cash and in-kind contributions and the participation of the largest number of private sponsors ever" (commentaries from IEP, December 2001).

While the number of partners/participants responding is small (only 36 partners/participants were surveyed in total), this negative view was generally a consensus among partners/participants, including private exhibitors and federal departments. Additionally, this survey result represents close to a census view of partners/participants not already included in key informant interviews. (See Technical Note #1 regarding statistical details.)

Problems which key informants saw in the planning and funding strategy included the fact that the private sector did not see expositions as the best way to promote their products and services, and that many Canadian multi-nationals did not feel that EXPO 2000 was tied to their specific interests. Also, according to key informants, some companies had difficulties committing their equipment for exhibits for five months and companies in the high-tech field, which tend to be small, indicated they generally need to focus their efforts and resources on research and development rather than "marketing".

It was also suggested that the planning and funding strategy lacked flexibility. For example, it was noted that contributions of \$1 million were asked for, with no room for variation, although this was later made more flexible. Some NGO key informants said the strategy had a negative impact on non-government organizations which depend on corporate donations. For example, some NGO's suggested that the Federal government was "competing against them for sponsors and funding".

A number of key informants suggested that it should be the role of the Federal government to present the country abroad and that this should be done in consultation with the provinces, without financial demands being made. They indicated that the role of the Federal government should be to ensure that there is a balanced representation and that it is not desirable to have only provinces who are financially able, be represented.

Difficulties were also noted regarding the financial participation of other federal Departments. This may have been a result of the widely held view among many key informants that "expositions do not work" (many suggested that the internet was making expositions obsolete generally, and that trade shows constitute better and more cost-effective venues to make Canada known abroad). As an example, one federal Department official indicated: *"we supported a Canadian event rather than an event which met the Department's objective. We did not really feel it was in our interest to participate... even with the best of intentions, the organizers could not give us our money's worth because they have to carry too many messages"*. An official from another Department felt that the Department got more than its money's worth in terms of visibility but that other benefits remain unclear.

It was also suggested that many private sector initiatives in Canada were not presented at Hannover because the organizations did not have the means to participate. As a remedy, one key informant suggested that in the future the strategy to solicit partners should not be based only on raising money, but should be aligned more with objectives of Departments such as Industry Canada. As one key informant emphasized, *"what are the products being developed in which the government or Industry Canada is investing? What objectives can be developed by Canadian organizers that parallel the objectives of other Departments?"*

**Strengths and Weaknesses in the Planning and Funding Strategy:** Key informants identified several strengths in the planning and funding strategy: effective efforts to target specific firms and sectors; a communication strategy which identified precisely the benefits companies could derive from their involvement; and the client approach. A number of problems and suggestions were also noted including the following:

- The strategy was implemented too late in the process, given the fact that most businesses make their marketing plans years in advance;
- The collaboration of senior officials with key industry contacts such as Assistant Deputy Ministers should have been sought from the beginning of the project to identify the best potential contacts; assistance and advice of regional offices should have been solicited before discussions were held with partners;
- The rental fee of \$50,000 per day for the Conference Centre was too expensive;
- Industry Canada could have participated more in soliciting partners; and
- There was some misinformation and a general lack of information about the economic benefits that could be derived from participating in expositions, particularly among some embassy staff.

Several key informants suggested that the heavy reliance on external funding had a negative effect on the organizers' ability to plan Canada's participation in a timely fashion and maximize impacts. It was felt that going in a direction that had not been tested prior to EXPO 2000 ultimately did not work as well as expected, and indeed, a number of key informants indicated that the funding strategy had a negative impact on the recruitment of partners and sponsors.

Some key informants saw having permanent, secured funding for expositions, perhaps for five year terms, as being the solution. However, one key informant suggests that this would be a major challenge, not knowing the future economic conditions and having to operate in the context of government management where it is difficult to transfer funds from one year to another.

**Summary on Planning and Funding:** These results and views of partners/participants, key informants and others all underline the value of a more effective planning process (including a longer planning time horizon), better information on benefits, high level efforts to recruit partners/ participants, and a more flexible funding strategy.

## 4.5 COMMUNICATIONS

Although the communications strategy -- especially that of the German organizers, and to a certain extent the organizers of the Canada Pavilion -- appeared to be a weak element of EXPO 2000, there were positive aspects.

The Canada Pavilion communications strategy in Germany was seen by key informants to have been fairly successful as press coverage about Canada's participation was excellent. [Press coverage focused very much on Native and Inuit related exhibits and presentations rather than high tech.] Other positive highlights of the communications activities in Germany were identified as: *the publicity in Hannover's streetcars*: Canada was the only country which had professional advertising running in the Hannover's public transit; *the Canada bus* (a public transit bus painted with maple leaves in the colors of the Canada Pavilion); and *the teaming of hosting staff with the local media in their home city*.

However, a number of key informants suggested that resources allocated to communications for the Canada Pavilion both before and during EXPO 2000 were insufficient. Many of these respondents indicated that they viewed expositions as "a vast communication campaign" where countries present themselves to the host country and, to a lesser extent, to the nations of the world.

As such, it was felt that the \$800,000 communication and marketing budget allocated for the Canada Pavilion was inadequate -- far less than the "10% rule" which some suggested is generally earmarked for such projects.<sup>16</sup> Also, it was noted that the Canada Pavilion communication strategy was developed and implemented very late. One respondent also indicated that organizers failed to integrate it in the overall planning, presumably because it was developed very late in the preparation process.

Further, not all components of the communication strategy in Canada were implemented. A Canadian media tour had to be cancelled at the last minute, a decision, said one respondent, which reflected a low Federal government priority for the project. Indeed, federal partners were concerned that press coverage about the event in the Canadian media was lacking. As one partner noted: "*if there is no awareness of the event by Canadians, it will be difficult to get support for these kinds of events in the future*".

Publicity about EXPO 2000 was hampered by the lack of promotional activities in Canada by EXPO 2000 organizers who had prioritized Germany, neighboring countries and the rest of Europe for their promotional activities.

---

<sup>16</sup> Within the constraints set by budgets and the limited efforts of the German sponsors, however, some Canadian efforts appeared to be unique and highly effective, for example, Canadian Pavilion advertisements were very prominent on Hanover buses (observation of SPR's site visit researcher).

Only about one in four partners/participants reported being familiar with the communications process (mainly with the Department of Canadian Heritage communications), and among these, ratings of these communications were generally poor. Only 28.6% of partners rated the Department of Canadian Heritage's general communications as somewhat to very effective (see Technical Note #3). A positive feature, however, was ratings of the Canada Pavilion communications with partners/participants, with 80% of them rating these communications as effective (see Technical Note #4).

Overall, it was suggested that the efficiency of Canada Pavilion communications was hindered by the large number of objectives and messages that Canada wanted to put across in Hannover. This problem was exacerbated by the number of partners/participants that the public affairs staff were responsible for. It was felt that it was not realistic to expect the small public affairs team to be responsible for the marketing for all the partners/participants at EXPO 2000.

Also, it was noted that due to limited resources, the public affairs program was limited to press relations. Several key informants recommended that, in the future, the whole organizing team be briefed on public relations and marketing prior to such major events.

#### **4.6 CONTRACTORS**

The development of the Canada Pavilion in Hannover was contracted to a private sector company by the Department of Canadian Heritage. Subsequently, there were a number of problems because of cost increases on site in Germany, which resulted in the Canada Pavilion not being delivered on budget. Remedial action was taken by the Department with the secondment of a staff person with previous contract experience and with more involvement from Public Works. Some suggestions to avoid such problems in the future include:

- Ensuring that the project management expertise required is identified and is made available to the organizing team very early in the process;
- Developing a detailed RFP with clearly identified expectations and performance requirements;
- Ensuring that contractors demonstrate a very good understanding of expositions including such facts as that while the buildings are temporary the volume of visitors is extremely high and that there are significant security and administrative needs; and
- Ensuring that the team has the resources to integrate design and thematic approaches into the overall design of the pavilion.



## 4.7 OTHER OPERATIONAL ISSUES

A number of other issues were identified with respect to the planning, management and administration of Canada's participation at EXPO 2000. These included problems with human resources, overall management, performance of technical components, contractors, sponsors, partners, and the Bureau international des expositions (BIE), as discussed below.

**The Bureau international des expositions (BIE):** A number of key informants indicated that dramatic changes are needed in the Bureau international des expositions if expositions are to continue in the new millennium. It was suggested, for example, that the BIE should define and enforce rules concerning the length of expositions, the international marketing of the events, and the themes. Key informants said that the BIE should undergo a major change in personnel and launch a thorough discussion on the future of expositions. This may be a broader concern for Canada to pursue in the future.

**The German EXPO Corporation:** Overall, key informants felt that EXPO 2000 evidenced many problems which originated with the host organization. These problems included poor communications and marketing and making decisions which were to Canada's disadvantage. For example, the German EXPO Corporation decided unilaterally not to allow the youth-oriented venue originally planned to be adjacent to the Canada Pavilion. A lesson could be that Canada should secure better guarantees from host organizations in the future.

**Contracted Suppliers:** Satisfaction was relatively high with many of the partners, sponsors and contractors who contributed to the Canada Pavilion. This was the case with Kelly Services, GPC (Communications), the National Arts Centre, the Canadian Museum of Civilization and Lambert Multimedia.

**Human Resources:** A number of human resources issues/lessons emerged during the evaluation. These included:

*The importance of having a team of permanent staff* to ensure that corporate memory is passed on from exposition to exposition. It was stressed many times that "without an experienced team, we are condemned to make the same mistakes over and over again". Many key informants felt that a permanent structure should be kept in place for this type of expertise – a view consistent with the creation of a permanent international expositions program.

*Improved training/communication with hosting staff:* While satisfaction with the hosting staff was extremely high, a number of those interviewed felt that training and supervision of and communications with the hosting staff should be improved in the future, for example, as regards crowd control.

The Pavilion management also had difficulty keeping the hosting staff motivated, while hosting staff felt that their training was inadequate, with too much emphasis on private sector exhibits and a lack of training on ways to work with the public and on crowd control.

*Too much pressure being placed on management staff:* During the site visit and interviews, Pavilion staff reported having to regularly work between 12-16 hours per day and working several weeks without a day-off. Another concern was that it was suggested that Canadian cultural diversity was not reflected enough in the make up of the personnel, particularly the administrative staff. Also, staff suggested that there should have been at least a few managers with German language skills as managers did not have the language skills to deal with emergency situations.

*Dissatisfaction with the role played by the Commissioner General:* Key informants suggested that models from other countries for the nomination of Commissioner Generals should be looked at. Some countries named the Ambassador to be the Commissioner General with this person performing official functions such as officiating in opening and closing ceremonies and National Day events. Other countries designated a civil servant who had a good knowledge of the host country. It was also stressed a number of times that the Commissioner General should be bilingual.

**Issues and concerns about the evaluation:** A number of key informants underlined the need for evaluation findings to be fully addressed. Some key informants noted that past recommendations in various operational reviews were not implemented and important decisions have already been made concerning the planning, budget and operational structure for future expositions.

Key informants also emphasized the importance of evaluations providing hard data on the return on investment. *They indicated a desire to see comparative figures on these returns (e.g., comparing the per dollar return between trade shows, expositions, cultural festival, etc.), if not for EXPO 2000, at least for future expositions. It was also noted that "in kind" contributions needed to be measured.* This important concern is reexamined in the concluding section of the evaluation.

All of these findings suggest that, while Canada continues to participate at international expositions, managers across all participating departments should be made accountable for reaching quantifiable results. With the amounts of money involved, many suggested that it is not acceptable to be undertaking such projects without measurable objectives.

## 5. Objectives Achievement

**Overview:** Many of the partners/participants in EXPO 2000 indicated that they had political, cultural or other goals. Of these, 60% rated the Canada Pavilion as effective in aiding the achievement of their other goals (see Display 2, below). A large percentage of the partners/participants surveyed noted that Canada was portrayed as a country that welcomes all cultures (92%); is bilingual (88%); and is an attractive travel destination (84%), but a smaller percentage of partners/participants felt that Canada was portrayed as a country which practices sustainable industry management (43%), is a leader on global issues (46%), and is a good country to buy and sell goods and services from (50%).

Significantly, given the themes of EXPO 2000, goal achievement appeared moderate in portraying Canada as a country with advanced industry and technology sectors (rated positively by 72% of partners and participants), and leaders in communications/information technology (rated positively by 63% of partners/participants) (see Technical Note #5). Similar results were obtained from the Survey of VIPs.

**Display 2**  
**Participants/Partners Views of Goal Achievement**  
**Concerning Images, Values, Business and Culture<sup>17</sup>**

<b>Organizations had specific other goals at EXPO 2000</b> (n = 35)		
Yes		48.5%
No		51.5
<b>Effectiveness of the Canada Pavilion aiding other goals</b> (n = 15)		60%
<b>The Canada Pavilion provided a view of Canada as a country which:</b>	<b>% Positive Rating</b>	
Welcomes all cultures	92.0%	n = 25
Is bilingual (English/French)	88.0	n = 25
Is an attractive travel destination (not culture)	84.0	n = 25
Practices social equality	78.0	n = 25
Has advanced technology and industry sectors (not culture)	71.8	n = 24
Is a good country to invest in (not culture)	68.2	n = 22
Is an environmentally conscious country	66.7	n = 24
Leads in communications/information technologies (not culture)	62.5	n = 24
Is a forward looking country	62.5	n = 24
Promotes artistic creativity	62.0	n = 24
Is a good country to sell goods/services to (not culture)	54.5	n = 22
Is a good country to buy goods/services from (not culture)	50.0	n = 22
Is a leader on global issues	45.8	n = 24
Practices sustainable industry management	42.8	n = 21

\* Percentage choosing "4" or "5" on a scale where "1" = *Strongly Disagree* and "5" = *Strongly Agree*.

<sup>17</sup> Responses are based on data from 35 partners/exhibitors who responded to the partner's/participant's survey, a substantial portion of all partners/participants involved in Canada's participation at EXPO 2000 (see Appendix C for survey details).

## 5.1 CULTURAL OBJECTIVES

**Objectives:** The cultural objective for Canada's participation was to promote Canada's values and its artistic and cultural achievements and products. The Canada Pavilion displays and the Cultural Program showcased well-known Canadian performing artists and productions of visual artists such as the Group of Seven and the Automatists in the preparatory area of the Pavilion. The *Gun Sculpture* was displayed in the free flow exhibit area and ceramics from the Gardiner Museum were displayed in the VIP lounge.

The cultural program also aimed at promoting artists who were starting international careers and artists whose approach was innovative, because the German public is known for its taste for avant-garde arts. Although this strategy was not followed closely, as witnessed by the fact that the only performances held inside the Canada Pavilion were by First Nations artists, most key informants felt that the cultural program, particularly the Canada Day celebration, was a major strength of Canada's participation at EXPO 2000. Additionally, cultural presentations were conducted outside the Pavilion, such as "Blou" and "The Holy Body Tattoo".

**Assessments:** Canada's participation in the cultural area was seen as being hindered by budget constraints, inadequate promotion of cultural programs by German organizers, and the high costs of stages and technical equipment. Key informants indicated that a decision to cut the budget for the cultural program was not sound as this program brought media attention which in turn had a spin-off effect on the achievement of other objectives. Close collaboration with the Canadian Embassy was identified as a positive factor in maximizing the success of the cultural program.

## 5.2 IMAGES AND VALUES

**Objectives:** The objectives for the Canada Pavilion as regards images and values were:

- To convey Canada's commitment to the pursuit of sustainable development and social equity in close co-operation with other countries;
- To display Canadian experience and leadership on the "big issues" facing the global society in the next century; and
- To present a lasting image of Canada as a highly developed, bilingual, multi-cultural, technologically and culturally sophisticated and environmentally conscious society.

**Assessments:** Most of the features of the Canada Pavilion and its programs supported these objectives. For example, the *Gun Sculpture*, one of the most noteworthy and popular exhibits, promoted peace and tolerance as did the Youth Against Racism exhibit.

Other features often mentioned by key informants as being successful at promoting Canadian images and values were the *Youth Forum against Racial Discrimination* and the exhibits of the two *Projects Around the World* which were displayed in the Canada Pavilion.

As regards Canada's presence as a bilingual country, there were some criticisms of the quality of the translation of materials which, it was felt, ran counter to the objective of presenting Canada as a bilingual country. [The extent of this was not measured exactly.] Also, the relative absence of highlighting the French and English cultures given the prominence of Native and Inuit cultures and multiculturalism was seen as a weakness.

Additionally, many key informants felt that the Canada Pavilion displays failed to provide a balance between technology and nature and that the message of technological sophistication could have been presented more subtly, ideally woven into visitors' expectations of a Canadian exhibit emphasizing the country's natural beauty.

These results as regards images and values may be regarded as underlining the challenge of effectively serving so many divergent goals – as the Canada Pavilion was expected to do.

### 5.3 BUSINESS OBJECTIVES

**Objectives:** Three economic objectives were set out for Canada's participation in EXPO 2000: to support Canada's economic and trade interests in Germany and in other European countries; to portray Canada as a reliable business partner and an outstanding investment location; and to promote Canada as an ideal travel destination.

Efforts to meet economic objectives through the Pavilion's displays were complemented by attempts to involve the private sector and the provincial and territorial governments in EXPO 2000, through facilities within the Pavilion such as the Conference Centre and the VIP Lounge, and by the Business and Trade Program.

**Assessments:** For the most part, key informants from the Department of Canadian Heritage and the Canada Pavilion managers felt that they met these objectives. Participating businesses and governments were reported to have received many inquiries. As well, the number of VIP's (business people and national delegations) who visited the Canada Pavilion was high.

While key informants considered that they maximized the potential impacts with participating organizations, they also felt that more could have been achieved had the solicitation of partnerships brought about more of the expected results. For example, when the Minister of Industry Canada traveled to Germany to visit technology and automotive industry people, efforts were made to bring German business people to the Canada Pavilion to use the Conference Centre. This turned out to be a challenge, as business people had little interest in visiting the site as part of their business activities.

The relevance of having a conference centre for trade purposes and of using EXPO 2000 as a venue for reaching trade objectives was questioned. Among Federal Departments, for example, buy-in was reported to be low because trade shows were considered more appropriate and successful venues to do business.

Partners and participants were less positive about the achievement of their business goals. They indicated that they had a wide range of business-related goals for EXPO 2000, from traditional export "market" goals, to tourism goals, to marketing for cultural industries. Altogether, more than half of the participating organizations (60%) reported having some type of business/trade goal at EXPO 2000. Generally, these participants reported poor satisfaction with achievement of their business goals. *Indeed, only 25% of participants with business goals reported that they were successful in achieving their business/trade goals.*<sup>18</sup>

As well, participants reported great variation in the extent to which their specific business goals were fulfilled. For example, nearly all participants (94.1%) reported that participation in EXPO 2000 was effective as a business strategy in enhancing their image, in promoting Canadian artists/culture (86.7%), and promoting tourism (80%). More limited goal achievement was reported in other areas, such as developing market entry opportunities (43.8% rated participation in EXPO 2000 as effective), or identifying new markets (33.3% rated effective) (see Technical Note #6).

Of participants with business goals, 46.7% rated the Canada Pavilion positively for its facilitation of business-related events, and 33.4% rated it positively for its facilitation of business-related information (see Technical Note #7). These findings suggest that for partners/ participants, business goals may have had greater importance than was recognized or responded to by the Canada Pavilion as a whole.

---

<sup>18</sup> International Exhibition Program staff commented on this issue in December 2001, noting that "it was not the mandate of the Program to provide individual goals or objectives" (IEP, December 13, 2001).

**Display 3  
Participants/Partners  
Business/Trade Objectives and Goal Achievement<sup>19</sup>**

	<b>% Rated as Effective</b>	
<b>Overall effectiveness in achieving business goals at EXPO 2000</b> (n = 20)		25.0%
<b>Ratings of Specific Business Goal Achievement*</b>	<b>% Positive Ratings*</b>	
Enhancing image by participating in EXPO	94.1%	n = 17
Promoting Canadian artists/culture	86.7	n = 15
Portraying Canada as a tourist destination	80.0	n = 15
Strengthening relations with business partners	47.1	n = 17
Developing market entry opportunities	43.8	n = 16
Showcasing new products	37.5	n = 16
Identifying new markets	33.3	n = 15
Identifying new business partners	11.8	n = 17
Identifying new suppliers	9.1	n = 11
Identifying investment sources	0.0	n = 10
<b>Participants rating of the Canada Pavilion 's facilitation of*</b>		
Business-related events	46.7%	n = 15
Exchange of business-related information	33.4	n = 18

\* Percentage choosing "4" or "5", on a scale, where "1" = *Poor* and "5" = *Excellent*. Of 37 participants/ partners responding, about half reported business goals.

<sup>19</sup> Responses are based on data from a sub set of 20 of the 35 partners/exhibitors who responded to the partners' survey, who indicated that they had specific business or trade goals. While numerically small, this group represents a substantial portion of all partners/exhibitors to Canada's participation at EXPO 2000 (see Appendix C for survey details).

## 6. Conclusions and Future Directions

### 6.1 OVERALL ASSESSMENT

On balance, Canada was well-represented at EXPO 2000 and a number of positive results were realized. Canada was well-portrayed to visitors as a bilingual country, as a multi-cultural country, and as a desirable tourist destination. Visitors assessments of the Pavilion underlined these successes. Visitors also rated a number of exhibits very positively, including the *Gun Sculpture* and *Whitewater Rafting*. The Canadians who provided the hosting for the Canada Pavilion were highly praised by all.

Indeed, respondents to the general public visitor survey were generally very positive about their experience. For example, 87.8% of the general public visitors and 87.5% of VIP visitors (see Technical Note #2) rated the Canada Pavilion as being "good-to-excellent". The hosting staff were positively rated with over 77% of visitors reporting that their friendliness and courtesy was very good or excellent; and over 71% noting that their helpfulness was very good or excellent. Partners and exhibitors generally agreed with these assessments.<sup>20</sup>

More modest ratings were achieved in the areas of the Pavilion portraying Canada as a country with advanced industry and technology sectors (rated positively by 72% of partners and participants), and portraying Canada as a leader in communications/information technology (rated positively by 63% of partners/participants) (see Technical Note #5). Some overall ratings suggested even softer impacts, for example, in portraying Canada as a country that promotes artistic creativity,<sup>21</sup> or a country that promotes sustainable industry management.

There was also great variation in the extent to which specific business goals of participants/partners were fulfilled: For example, on the positive side, nearly all participants/partners (94.1%) reported participation in EXPO 2000 was effective as a business strategy in enhancing their image. Additionally among those with business goals, high ratings were given to goal achievement in areas such as promoting Canadian artists/culture (86.7%), and promoting tourism (80.0%) (see Technical Note #6). However, lower ratings were given for developing market entry opportunities (43.8% rated participation in EXPO 2000 as effective), or identifying new markets (33.3% rated effective). *Overall, participants and partners tended to be disappointed with the level of achievement of their own business goals with only 25% of participants/partners reporting success in achieving their business/trade goals at EXPO 2000.* (see Technical Note #6).<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Considering that hosting staff were required to do a substantial amount of "crowd control", this was seen by the evaluators as a very high satisfaction rating.

<sup>21</sup> Note, however, that some artistic enterprises with exhibits at the Pavilion reported business successes.

<sup>22</sup> This raises interesting questions" What should a national pavilion's role should be in promoting business and trade goals of exhibitors? Should the pavilion aim to help insure success? Why do some businesses do well at expositions and some not?



**A challenging project:** The challenges of implementing Canada's participation at EXPO 2000, should not be read lightly. Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 was a major design and development project, and a major project to implement once under way, with its many objectives and components (the Pavilion itself, the conference centre, the VIP program, cultural program, etc.).

**The End Result:** The evaluation findings suggest that, while Canada was well represented at EXPO 2000 generally, some important factors appear to have limited the achievement of expected results.

**An Analysis of Constraining Factors:** As noted below, there were a number of constraining factors which impacted on Canada's participation in EXPO 2000, many of which were beyond the control of PCH. These constraints made it more difficult to deal with what would have been a challenging project in any circumstance.

**Need for more planning time:** Planning for the Canada Pavilion was only fully operational for a year to a year and a half before the event, leaving little time for project planning and development.

**Need for more buy-in from potential partners:** Many Provincial/Territorial governments, the private sector, and other Federal departments and agencies were unwilling to buy-in, or were slow to buy into EXPO 2000 as partners with the Department of Canadian Heritage, a factor which impeded planning. Also, the Department did not have the broad support of other federal departments.

**Need for more realistic assessment of benefits:** The potential benefits for partners who were being asked to participate in EXPO 2000 could have been presented in a manner that prevented unreasonably high expectations.

**Need for more harmonized goals:** The partnering strategy adopted by the Federal government encompassed too many goals for Canada's participation in EXPO 2000. This strategy of trying to present all of Canada's image, technological achievements, culture, tourism and business/trade opportunities created too many different objectives for the Canada Pavilion.

**Need for better communications:** The Department's communications strategy was limited and did not compensate for other organizational weaknesses such as the lack of a strong team planning base and shared goals with partners/participants.

**Skill and resource gaps:** Implementation of Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 was impacted by staffing and skills shortfalls, resulting from governmental downsizing over the previous decade. For example, the need for additional technical and project management skills may have accounted for cost overruns and also some failures or breakdowns of exhibits, which were unfortunate in an exposition designed to show Canada's "leading-edge" technology.

**Human resources management:** Human resources management was a challenge for which managers were not prepared. Issues in this area were evidenced, for example, by dissatisfaction among the hosting staff with operations of the Canada Pavilion. Hosting staff expressed a variety of concerns, in particular that their experience with the visiting public and consequent recommendations for improvements were not valued by the Canada Pavilion management.

**Corporate memory:** It appears that the Department was not able to draw fully from experience gained in prior international exhibitions. A reflection of this is that only in the past few years, under the Department of Canadian Heritage, have more regular evaluations of expositions been undertaken.<sup>23</sup> As a result, a long-term "bank" of historic lessons were not available to be drawn on.

**Over-extension of the Program:** While developing EXPO 2000, the International Expositions Program had to divide its resources between management of EXPO '98 in Lisbon, Portugal, and planning of EXPO 2000.<sup>24</sup>

**Poor performance of the German EXPO Corporation:** The poor performance of the German EXPO Corporation in many areas (especially communications and marketing) and its failure to live up to planning commitments created many problems, suggesting that Canada should seek a stronger planning role in future expositions.

The above challenges notwithstanding, thousands of people went away from EXPO 2000 with positive views of Canada. Broad conclusions regarding the evaluation objectives, lessons learned, and recommendations for future expositions are noted below and within the report. These should aid Canada's ongoing efforts in this important area of international expositions.

---

<sup>23</sup> Staff of the International Expositions Program were, however, able to draw on reports on EXPO '92 in Seville and EXPO '98 in Lisbon. It was suggested by the evaluation team's site visit researcher, that Canada's work in evaluation of its expositions was generally ahead of other countries (based on key informant interviews with representatives of other pavilions).

<sup>24</sup> Context notes on EXPO 2000, International Expositions Program, November 2000.

## 6.2 SPECIFIC CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The table below represents key findings and recommendations for the future for specific components of EXPO 2000 such as marketing, planning/implementation, business goals, design issues, evaluations/benchmarks as well as notes on “what worked well”.

FINDINGS	COMMENTARY	FUTURE DIRECTIONS
<p><b>Things that Worked Well:</b> Some aspects of the Canada Pavilion worked very well, even though they were outside of the main thematic focus of EXPO 2000. One example was the “Gun Sculpture”.</p>	<p>This specific component of the Canada Pavilion was very well received. This points to the benefits of PCH staff “thinking outside of the box” and pursuing creative components even when they do not exactly match the theme of the Exposition or the pavilion per se.</p>	<p>A key concern for future Canadian pavilions may be – irrespective of the exposition theme or concept -- to identify what will work well for the nation or region where each exposition is being held.</p> <p>For example, irrespective of themes, it might be desirable to ensure that EXPO 2005 in Japan has an “Anne of Green Gables” exhibit, because of the Japanese fascination with this Canadian literary character.</p> <p>Also in Japan in 2005, replicating the Gun Sculpture exhibit while not seeming to be very creative, may be desirable because of popular concern in Japan with peace.</p>
<p><b>Finding Points of Strength:</b> Natural strong points of Canada – Canada’s physical beauty, its Aboriginal heritage etc. were big drawing cards at EXPO 2000.</p>	<p>While these aspects of Canada are not supportive of the high tech goals which are current priorities for promoting Canada as a source of new technology, they are important strengths which should be exploited.</p>	<p>Continuing and perhaps more attention should be given to these aspects of Canada, but in ways that could build other themes into exhibits. For example, looking in depth at how First Nations use high technology, how technology helps preserve heritage, Canada’s beauty (parks, etc.)</p>
<p><b>Federal Planning Time Horizon:</b> The official go-ahead for PCH for Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 was given very late, so that little time was allowed for planning. The lack of time may also have limited the ability of potential federal/provincial and other partners to participate.</p>	<p>A project such as EXPO 2000 called for extensive planning and development which was constrained by the short time allowed by a late “go ahead”.</p>	<p>Authorization should be given several years in advance for expositions to allow for sufficient planning and developmental work.</p>

FINDINGS	COMMENTARY	FUTURE DIRECTIONS
<p><b>Dealing with the Host Organization:</b> The German EXPO Corporation did not live up to commitments made to PCH regarding use of the area near the Canada Pavilion, and made some decisions which had specific negative impacts on the Canada Pavilion.</p>	<p>A key change was the failure of the German hosts to produce an expected youth park adjacent to the Canada Pavilion. Also, the Canada Pavilion suffered from the adjacent McDonalds restaurant which created poor environment and much garbage.</p>	<p>Wherever possible, Canada's representatives should negotiate stronger guarantees in site planning for future pavilions. Support from senior government officials might be essential to ensure such guarantees.</p>
<p><b>Planning and Technical Resources:</b> Additional technical resources were needed for project development (e.g. project planning, finances, etc.).</p>	<p>This lack of technical resources appears to have impeded effective implementation of the Canada Pavilion, and also allowed for insufficiently tested technical exhibits.</p>	<p>A more complete technical team should be put in place for future expositions.</p>
<p><b>Dealing with Business Goals:</b> Partners and VIPs alike expressed concerns that business goals were not well served by the Canada Pavilion.</p>	<p>Many observed that expositions are "not a trade fair" and should not be made to do the work of a trade fair. Yet many of Canada's goals for EXPO 2000 were trade-oriented -- reflecting significant inconsistencies in the Canada Pavilion concept.</p>	<p>In future expositions, the trade or business component should be better situated/supported, with more specific involvement of other appropriate Departments such as DFAIT/ISTC, <u>or</u> if the business agenda is not well supported, it should be removed or reduced.</p>
<p><b>Partnership Issues:</b> It appears that the cost of participation in EXPO 2000 was an obstacle to participation, for example by Provinces/Territories.</p>	<p>A broad participatory base would seem to be a key element of success in Canada's participation in international expositions.</p>	<p>Future planning strategies should allow for partnerships on some minimum cost basis for all Provinces/Territories.</p>
<p><b>Level of Governmental Leadership:</b> Key informants suggested that higher level invitations to participate in EXPO 2000 could have increased partnerships and participation.</p>	<p>This was reflected, for example, in Bombardier's participation in the German Pavilion which was partly as a result of the German Premier's invitation.</p>	<p>Future pavilions should be developed with greater involvement from senior government official, particularly in providing invitations to important partners.</p>
<p><b>Projecting the Market:</b> It appears that Department of Canadian Heritage staff had little advance information as to what would work and what might not, prior to EXPO 2000.</p>	<p>Some advance market research would have provided insights.</p>	<p>For future expositions, advance market research in the region or target country should identify "what people would like to learn about Canada" so that Canada's objectives can be linked to the interests of regional audiences.</p>

FINDINGS	COMMENTARY	FUTURE DIRECTIONS
<p><b>Design Issues/Internal Problem of the Canada Pavilion:</b> In the evaluator's visit, some features of the Canada Pavilion did not work or have the expected impact. An illustration was the use of "images of 12 people" in the Canada Pavilion to show Canada's multi-cultural makeup. Many people, including PCH staff, did not understand this concept (some saw them as "job hunters").</p>	<p>Such imaging may have very different interpretations and meanings, particularly in different cultures.</p> <p>Additionally, pavilions and exhibits may vary in the degree to which they are interesting to different cultural groups or convey the messages desired for Canada's goals.</p>	<p>Extensive focus testing of concepts, images and exhibits is recommended prior to finalizing the design of future exhibits and pavilions.</p> <p>These could be done in "real life" or "virtual reality", to test the expected impact of different concepts before final choices of exhibits or designs.</p>
<p><b>Mechanical/Operational Problems:</b> A number of mechanical or technical features of exhibits were found to be "out of order" at the time of the evaluator's site visit.</p>	<p>This may have been happenstance, but such failures are unfortunate at an exhibition meant to show technical prowess.</p>	<p>PCH should build in back-up systems for future expositions, securing performance guarantees from contractors for mechanical/technical components.</p>
<p><b>Communications:</b> Communications for the Canada Pavilion were limited, with a need for greater marketing, including marketing in Canada (little was done to promote EXPO 2000 through press or other media).</p>	<p>While these efforts must be harmonized with those of the host country, it is important that Canada engage in its own communications and marketing to ensure a good attendance.</p>	<p>A more comprehensive communications and marketing plan should be put in place for future expositions, with a sufficient level of funding to impact on both attendance and media coverage.</p>
<p><b>Marketing:</b> EXPO 2000 was poorly advertised within and outside of Europe. Canada should have better filled its own marketing needs, through its international representatives, and by better informing Canadians about EXPO).</p>	<p>This weakness of the German EXPO Corporation limited the entire exposition, and had a negative effect on the Canada Pavilion.</p>	<p>Canada should request that the BIE or national host organizations provide stronger guarantees in the future as to the marketing strategy to be undertaken.</p>
<p><b>Potential for Follow-Up:</b> Surveys indicated that many VIPs wanted more information as a result of visiting the Canada Pavilion.</p>	<p>This is a sign of success – that the Canada Pavilion "worked" for many of its VIP visitors -- but indications are that no simple mechanism was available to allow follow-up requests for information. Many visitors would also have liked to obtain further information on Canada according to hosting staff.</p>	<p>Future expositions should have a method for providing follow-up information. For example, e-mails or mailing addresses could be captured for visitors (a step which was not well-completed at EXPO 2000)<sup>25</sup>. Future Canada Pavilions could become a <u>continuous link</u> for persons interested in Canada.</p>

<sup>25</sup> A database was developed and some information provided for perhaps 4,000 VIPs who visited the Canada Pavilion, but complete names and addresses were only recorded for a few hundred.

FINDINGS	COMMENTARY	FUTURE DIRECTIONS
<p><b>HR and Organizational Issues:</b> A number of HR management problems were noted in interviews, and in focus groups with hosting staff. For example, the hierarchical model of organization at the Canada Pavilion was seen as contrary to a strong team effort. Additionally, better preparation for staff regarding living in Germany was needed.</p>	<p>Such human resources issues were detrimental to the human performance aspects of the Canada Pavilion.</p>	<p>A comprehensive human resource plan should be prepared as part of the design and development of future pavilions. This should include a complete assessment of skill requirements (including skills in tourism and hospitality) as well as a model for the organization and management of the entire Canada Pavilion team.</p>
<p><b>Evaluation challenges:</b> The lack of in-depth evaluation benchmarks and data bases on the performance of prior expositions limited the capacity of the evaluation.</p> <p>More generally, the absence of reliable comparison indicators limited the ability to see how EXPO 2000 was developing as compared to previous expositions.</p>	<p>It would be desirable to have complete data on previous expositions such as costs per square metre for exhibits, visitor satisfaction, etc.</p>	<p>A data base should be developed for monitoring performance indicators from one exposition to another.</p> <p>For example, a summary “score card” on pavilions and exhibits could be developed modeled after the Sport’s Canada database on historic performance of Canada’s National Sports Organizations.</p>
<p><b>Assessing ongoing performance:</b> During and after the EXPO 2000, pavilion managers were not able to determine how well the Canada Pavilion was doing compared to other pavilions.</p>	<p>The on-site visitors’ survey did not provide this type of insight, because the group surveyed was already pre-selected (it was comprised of people who wanted to go to the Canada Pavilion). Thus the survey sample was not representative of individuals attending EXPO 2000 generally.</p> <p>This is not just a matter of improving research, but also of providing information to pavilion managers -- e.g. to identify areas in which mid-course corrections might be possible to improve performance.</p>	<p>Future expositions would benefit from <u>ongoing</u> independent surveys to monitor visitor reaction (e.g. exit surveys from the overall exposition, to obtain random sampling assessments of the broader population attending the exposition not just those going to the Canada Pavilion).</p> <p>Additionally, broader market surveys in the region or host country would be useful, e.g., to track attitudes towards Canada before, during and after the exposition.</p>

### 6.3 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

Some overall conclusions regarding key objectives for the evaluation of Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 were as follows:

**Objective One was "to measure the achievement of objectives of Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 and its level of excellence/performance in relation to other countries":**

Conclusion: As noted previously, some objectives of Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 were very well achieved. Canada was well-portrayed as a bilingual country, a multi-cultural country, and a tourist destination, but was not strongly portrayed as promoting artistic creativity or sustainability. Nor were other goals, such as business-related goals, fully achieved.

Available data did not allow for a reliable assessment of Canada's performance in comparison to other countries', so that the evaluation could not respond to the second part of this evaluation objective. This points to the need for future evaluations to collect additional types of data.

**Objective Two was "to assess the contribution of EXPO 2000 to the effectiveness of the International Expositions Program (IEP)":**

Conclusion: This objective can only be assessed in a follow-up to the event. As the evaluation results show, many lessons were learned and future directions were indicated. It would appear that many opportunities have been identified for improving the effectiveness of the IEP.

Most importantly, the learning from EXPO 2000 would appear to underline the value of further institutionalizing and refining the exposition planning process, and building corporate memory in a significant way. Clearly, the event's strength and weaknesses all point to the value of having the IEP as a permanent effort.

**Objective Three was "to assess the partnership formula with Federal Departments and agencies, provincial government departments and agencies, and the private sector":**

Conclusion: A number of problems were noted with the partnership formula, but the broader issues in partnering appeared to be the need for a stronger effort to build partner buy-in, ideally with more advance planning and more involvement of senior government officials. Additionally, identifying potential benefits for partners more clearly in the planning stage, and minimizing barriers to participation such as funding requirements, would be key steps.

**Objective Four was "to support and assist the management of the International Events and Promotion Directorate with Canada's participation in future International Expositions":**

Conclusion: Numerous suggestions are noted for future directions, above and within the report.

***Drawing from the results above, it seems likely that the Department of Canadian Heritage can showcase Canada effectively at future expositions by building on the successful aspects of EXPO 2000, developing a broader and more effective range of partnerships, and strengthening future pavilions in the more detailed ways noted above.***



## Appendix A: Study Issues/Questions and Data Collection Activities

Evaluation Issues and Questions	Data Collection Activities
<b>I. Objectives Achievement</b>	
(a) <i>Has Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 met its objectives?</i>	<p>Review of documents (Program planning documents etc., information from other EXPO 2000 participants, EXPO 2000 Organization, BIE); media coverage; review of documentary videos and official guide book (expected to provide comparative information on pavilion sizes, budgets etc.);</p> <p>Interviews with key informants (Department of Canadian Heritage, DGIE and pavilion staff, relevant Canadian federal and provincial government officials)</p> <p>Survey of Visitors to the Canada Pavilion ; Survey of VIPs; Survey of Partners and Sponsors; Survey of German Travel Wholesalers; and Survey of DFAIT staff stationed in Europe.</p>
<p>(b) <i>Did the three themes chosen for Canada's participation in EXPO 2000, adequately express the concept of the Canada pavilion and programs so that the results expected by Canada could be achieved?</i></p> <p>(c) <i>Did the thematic approach of the pavilion make possible the achievements of these results?</i></p> <p>(d) <i>And programs?</i></p>	<p>Review of documents (Thematic Concept and Work Plan for Canada's Participation in EXPO 2000, Design/Build and AV/Film/Multimedia contracts);</p> <p>Inspection of site and exhibits;</p> <p>Survey of Visitors to the Canada Pavilion and Survey of VIPs</p>
(e) <i>Did the method of funding Canada's participation in EXPO 2000 enable the International Events and Promotion Directorate to deliver the Expositions Program satisfactorily, fulfill its mandate and produce the expected results?</i>	<p>Review of documents (Budgets of the EXPO 2000 project and DGIE, Canada's Participation EXPO 2000-Work Plan, information available from other EXPO 2000 participants, Survey of partners and Sponsors (to identify evidence of benefits); and</p> <p>Interviews with key informants (Director General, International and Intergovernmental Affairs, and Director, College of Commissioners General, DGIE).</p>

Evaluation Issues and Questions	Data Collection Activities
<b>II. Impacts and Effects</b>	
<p>(a) <i>Who were the visitors to the Canada Pavilion at EXPO 2000? What was their level of satisfaction? What were their impressions vis-à-vis the themes? What did they learn about Canada?</i></p>	<p>Survey of Visitors to Canada Pavilion ; Review of media coverage; and Survey of VIPs</p>
<p>(e) <i>Have Canadians benefited from Canada's performance at Hannover?</i></p> <p>(f) <i>What is their perception of Canada's performance at Hannover?</i></p> <p>(g) <i>Was the Communications Strategy effective?</i></p> <p>(h) <i>What factors if any, affected implementation of the communications strategy?</i></p>	<p>No data were collected on these issues, regarding Canadian direct benefits or perceptions.</p> <p>The communications strategy was assessed only in terms of key informant and partner perceptions.</p>
<p><i>The International Expositions Program hopes to find in the partnership formula, a method of funding that would enable Canada to effectively participate with a broader range of stakeholders, in international expositions.</i></p> <p>(i) <i>Did this formula prove effective for EXPO 2000? Did it produce the expected results?</i></p> <p>(j) <i>What are the strengths, weaknesses and limitations of this formula?</i></p> <p>(k) <i>Are there other funding formulas-models?</i></p> <p>(l) <i>What involvement, if any, did you have in the planning process of Canada's participation at EXPO 2000?</i></p> <p>(m) <i>How would you describe the planning process?</i></p> <p>(n) <i>Were the right partners involved in the planning and were their roles and responsibility adequately identified? (Within and outside the Department)?</i></p> <p>(o) <i>Were the necessary technical resources available for planning?</i></p> <p>(p) <i>Was enough time allowed?</i></p> <p>(q) <i>What if anything could have improved the planning process?</i></p>	<p>Review of documents (Sponsorship and Complementary Trade Program Strategy, Roy Woodbridge and Innovitech contracts, Sponsor recruitment campaign, participating departmental programs);</p> <p>Review of the Survey of Partners and Sponsors;</p> <p>Review of previous expositions; and</p> <p>Interviews with government stakeholders</p>

Evaluation Issues and Questions	Data Collection Activities
<b>III. Alternatives</b>	
<p>(a) <i>In the case of EXPO 2000, did the Steering Committee and the Intra-Departmental Advisory Committee achieve the level and type of cooperation expected?</i></p> <p>(b) <i>How did this cooperation manifest itself?</i></p>	<p>Interviews with key informants (Committee members, DGIE staff); and</p> <p>Review of documents relating to the Committees.</p>
<p>(c) <i>Did the services provided by Kadoke Displays Ltd., Lambert Multimedia and Projek contribute to the achievement of the expected results of Canada's participation in EXPO 2000?</i></p>	<p>Review of documents (contracts, Canada's Participation EXPO 2000 Work Plan); and</p> <p>Interviews with key informants (Public Works and Government Services and DGIE staff).</p>
<p>(d) <i>How can the method or style of Canada's participation at expositions be improved to better achieve Canada's objectives?</i></p> <p>(e) <i>Are there other events that could achieve the same objectives?</i></p> <p>(f) <i>Are there other approaches that could achieve the same or better results?</i></p>	<p>Review of literature;</p> <p>Interviews with key informants (experts identified with Program, managers, Federal partners);</p> <p>Surveys of VIPs and Trade Officers; and</p> <p>Delphi Panel to develop strategy models</p>

## Appendix B: Purpose, Context and Activities of the Site Visit

**Site Visit:** The purpose of the site visit was to: make site observations of the Canada Pavilion, its overall functioning and the reaction of visitors; to develop an understanding of the overall EXPO 2000 site; and to acquire knowledge on how other countries' pavilions approached their participation at EXPO 2000 and their treatment of the exposition's themes: Mankind-Nature-Technology.<sup>26</sup>

During the time of the visit, the number of visitors to the site was at the highest since the opening of the site on June 1, 2000. Press coverage was still generally negative about EXPO 2000, although not as vehement as in the first few months. In the evaluation team's view, it was an opportune time to be conducting site observations as the staff at EXPO 2000 had had enough time to develop an overall balanced view of their participation at EXPO 2000 and had had the opportunity to put things into perspective.

The site visit involved data collection over a ten-day period in Hannover, in mid-October 2000. During that time, SPR's researcher:

- met with Pavilion staff and conducted key informant interviews; met with hosting staff;
- conducted interviews with other pavilions' personnel;
- visited a number of the pavilions of other countries; and
- gathered and reviewed documents and other materials.

Also, a review of the steering committee and intradepartmental committee minutes, the communication strategy and interviews with partners from other federal departments.

Prior to the site visit, a number of exploratory interviews had been conducted. Information gathered in the preparatory phase is also included in this report, where pertinent. Overall, key informant and other interviews represented the most important data for this site visit report, with many additional insights derived from observing the Canada Pavilion and the EXPO site overall on a day-to-day basis.

---

<sup>26</sup> It may be desirable for PCH to promote the use of more gender free references ("humankind", instead of "mankind") in these international events.

## Appendix C: Survey Methods and Data Limitations

**General Protocols:** Survey materials were developed in English and translated into French and German, where appropriate. Surveys were provided in the official language of choice based on initial contacts, and a mechanism was in place for respondents to request a survey in another official language where desired. Confidentiality was guaranteed to respondents to encourage honest and forthright answers, and the respondents were assured that responses would only be used in aggregate so that no one could be individually identified.

**The On-Site Visitors Survey** was administered by host staff, when possible, to visitors who were asked to complete it upon leaving the Canada Pavilion. When SPR's researcher was visiting the Canada Pavilion, the computers were used irregularly and there was a tendency for the surveys to be completed by young people. It was suggested that this was because young people have a greater familiarity with computers. Just over 5,000 responses were collected from the over 2.7 million visitors to the Canada Pavilion. Thus, it is noted that the survey result may be highly selective and the representativeness of responses cannot be assured. Future surveys it is recommended should apply a more rigorous sampling procedure, and include surveys of all EXPO visitors, not just those visiting the Canada Pavilion.

**The VIP Survey** was completed by over 75% of the targeted sample. A total of 154 completed surveys were received, with additional qualitative comments provided by another 23 VIPs. Reliabilities were estimated for a number of the scales in the questionnaire and indicated general reliability of 70% or better for scales. Results of this survey may be deemed reasonably reliable as an indicator of the VIP perspective.

**The Partners/Participants Survey** was completed by approximately 80% of partners/participants who were sampled for this questionnaire survey (others were included in key informant interviews). Reliabilities were estimated for a number of the scales in the questionnaire and indicated general reliability of 70% or better for most scales. These results may be deemed very reliable as an indicator of the partner/participant perspective, particularly given that a near-census was achieved.

## **Appendix D: Persons/Organizations Surveyed**

### **Canadian Government Key Informants:**

Paul Bisson, Thematic Coordinator, International Events and Promotion, PCH  
Pierrette Boisvert, Cultural Program Director, International Events and Promotion, PCH  
Claudette Bouffard, Public Affairs Program Director, PCH  
Denis Cuillerier, Embassy Liaison  
Michèle D'Auray, Chief Information Officer, Treasury Board (former ADM, PCH)  
Pauline Doucet, Senior Project Manager, International Events and Promotion, PCH  
Denny Gélinas, Director General, International Affairs, PCH  
Patrick Glorieux, Senior Project Manager, Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Louisa Green, Review Officer, Corporate Review Branch, PCH  
Barbara Helm, Director of Operations, International Events and Promotion, PCH  
Diane Lessard, Financial Management, PCH  
Kevin MacLeod, Director of Protocol and Hospitality, International Events and Promotion  
PCH  
Sylvain Massia, Informatics, PCH  
Louise Morrison, Pavilion Director, PCH  
Bob Myers, Contracting Advisor, PCH  
George Phillips, Trade Program Director  
Carmen Sylvain, Deputy Commissioner General, Canada Pavilion  
Rob Toller, Project Manager, International Events and Promotion, PCH  
Gerlinde Yurkiw, Finance, PCH

### **International Key Informants:**

Norbert H. Bargmann, Deputy Commissioner General of EXPO 2000  
Commissioner General, Norway Pavilion  
Commissioner General, United Kingdom Pavilion  
Commissioner General, Italy Pavilion  
Dep. Director, Public Relations and Protocol Department, Japan Pavilion  
Secrétariat général du Bureau international des expositions  
Commissioner General, China Pavilion  
Pavilion Director, Philippines  
Deputy Chief of Protocol, EXPO 2000 GMBH  
Pavilion Director, Argentina  
General Commissioner, France and First Vice-President of the BIE

**Partners/Participant/Exhibitors Surveyed:**

Reda Antonius, Environment Canada

Gail Bradshaw, International Youth Forum Against Racism

John Dennison, International Youth Forum Against Racism

Jonathan Higdon, Public Works and Government Services

Joseph Kruger, Transport Canada

Elsie Liota, Marketing & Promotional Services, Industry Canada

Kate McGregor, March 21 Secretariat

Cindy Thomas, The Canadian Museum of Civilization

Will Saari, Tourism Timmins

Francis Pelletier, Digital Simulation Lab., Foreign Affairs and International Trade

Brian Tychir, Parks Canada

Maryann Everett, Alberta Economic Development Corporation

Jean-François Martin, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation

**Partners/Participant/Exhibitors Surveyed (cont'd):**

Judy Mahoney, Natural Resources Canada

Tim Hillier, Natural Resources Canada

Michael Tabbitt, National Arts Centre

**Participating Hosting Staff:** A number of the hosting staff (approximately 20, in two sessions) met with the SPR researcher.

**Other Survey Groups:** Smaller, supplementary surveys of a more qualitative nature were conducted with twelve general travel wholesalers/agents, and with eight Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) staff stationed in Europe.



## Appendix E: Documents Examined

Canada @Expo 2000, Communications Strategy, Power Point Presentation, June 1999.

Canada @Expo 2000 Calendar of Events, July 19, 2000.

Canada @Expo 2000 Department of Canadian Heritage Promotional Video.

Canada @Expo 2000, Sponsorship Categories and Benefits, December 1999.

Canada Expo 2000: Diversity Week Package, undated.

Canada Pavilion Visitor Information Survey Report, July 2000.

Canada, Expo 2000, Power Point Presentation, undated.

Canada's Partners @Expo 2000, July 2000.

Department of Canadian Heritage International Events and Promotions: Sponsorship Strategy, February 1999.

Canadian Partners at Future International Expositions: Final Report, February 1998.

Communications July Newsletter, July 2000.

Economic Impacts of the Live Performances of Expo '86, Volume II: Survey Data, January 1987.

Expo '92 Seville in Numbers: How were countries doing? November 1992.

Financial and Cultural Impacts of Expo 86 on the Cultural Community of Greater Vancouver: Background Study, April 1988.

International Expositions Bureau, Bulletin 1996.

International Expositions Program: Expo 2000 Evaluation Framework, November 1999.

In-Touch Survey Systems Users Guide for the Electronic Clipboard, undated.

Minutes of the Intradepartmental Committee (First to seventh meeting).

Minutes of the Steering Committee (First to eighth meeting).

Press Kit, Canada, Expo 2000, undated (Numerous Articles).

Questionnaire Survey on the Impact of International Expositions, BIE 1993.

Review of Operations, Expo '98 Lisbon Portugal: With a view to preparing for Expo 2000, Final Report, March 1999.

The Recommended Partnership Framework, Undated.

Tourism Potential for Canada's Participation in Expo 98 in Lisbon, April 1996.

Various Contracts (Pavilion Suppliers, Partners, etc.).

## Appendix F: Technical Notes

**Overview:** The tables below show details of responses to selected statistical survey questions. Generally, the percentage giving each response is shown adjacent to the answer, with the number of respondents shown after each question or in the right hand column.

**Technical Note #1:** Detailed responses of partners/participants to planning/funding questions: It is emphasized that while survey respondents are small in number for this question, they represent close to a census count of partners/participants surveyed who had opinions on this question.

**To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding Canadian Heritage's partnership approach to funding and planning and how it affected the participation of Canadian organizations in EXPO 2000?**

	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree		# of respondents
	1	2	3	4	5	
	%	%	%	%	%	
<u>Funding</u>						
(a) The overall method of funding was effective	36.3	18.2	27.3	18.2	0.0	11
(b) The range of stakeholders was adequate	25.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	8
<u>Planning</u>						
(c) The planning process was adequate	22.2	22.2	55.6	0.0	0.0	9
(d) The information provided was satisfactory	20.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	5
(e) The planning process allowed for timely decision-making	22.2	33.3	33.3	11.1	0.0	9
(f) The planning process allowed for good budgeting	37.5	25.0	37.5	0.0	0.0	8
(g) The planning process allowed for effective coordination	30.0	30.0	30.0	10.0	0.0	10

**Technical Note #2:** Overall assessments of VIPs: based on a sample of 153, mainly German VIP visitors.

**Please rate your overall impression of the Canada Pavilion:**

Poor				Excellent	
1	2	3	4	5	
0.7%	3.2%	8.6%	40.8%	46.7%	

**Technical Note #3:** Detailed responses of partners/participants regarding the communications strategy:\*

**How effective was the communications strategy that was developed by Canada for Canada's participation at EXPO 2000? (N= 7)**

Not Effective At All					Very Effective	
1	2	3	4	5		
28.6%	0.0%	42.9%	14.3%	14.3%		

**Technical Note #4:** Detailed responses of partners/participants regarding communications with the Canada Pavilion (N = 5):\*

**How effective were the communications between yourselves and the Canada Pavilion?**

Not Effective At All					Very Effective	
1	2	3	4	5		
0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%		

**Technical Note #5:** Detailed responses of partners/participants regarding how Canada was portrayed by the Canada Pavilion:\*

**To what extent do you feel the Canada Pavilion portrayed Canada as a country which:**

	Strongly Disagree					Strongly Agree		n
	1	2	3	4	5			
	%	%	%	%	%			
Has advanced technology and industry sectors	0.0	4.2	25.0	54.2	16.6	n = 24		
Leads in communications/info technologies	0.0	4.2	33.3	45.8	16.7	n = 24		
Is a good country to buy goods/services from	0.0	4.5	45.5	50.0	0.0	n = 22		
Is a good country to sell goods/services to	0.0	4.5	40.9	54.5	0.0	n = 22		
Is a good country to invest in	0.0	4.5	27.3	59.1	9.1	n = 22		
Is an environmentally conscious country	0.0	4.2	29.2	41.7	25.0	n = 24		
Practices sustainable industry management	0.0	14.3	42.9	33.3	9.5	n = 21		
Promotes artistic creativity	0.0	12.5	25.0	50.0	12.5	n = 24		
Welcomes all cultures	0.0	0.0	8.0	52.0	40.0	n = 25		
Is bilingual (English/French)	0.0	4.0	8.0	44.0	44.0	n = 25		
Practices social equality	0.0	4.2	16.7	54.2	25.0	n = 25		
Is a forward looking country	0.0	0.0	37.5	33.3	29.2	n = 24		
Is a leader on global issues	0.0	12.5	41.7	37.5	8.3	n = 24		
Is an attractive travel destination	4.0	4.0	8.0	36.0	48.0	n = 25		

\* It is emphasized that while survey respondents are small in number for this question, they represent close to a census count of partners/participants surveyed who had opinions on this question.

**Technical Note #6:** Detailed responses of partners/participants regarding the Canada Pavilion facilitated key goals:

**How effective do you feel the Canada Pavilion was in facilitating the following goals for Canada and Canadian businesses?**

	Not Effective				Very Effective	
	At All				5	
	1	2	3	4	5	
	%	%	%	%	%	
Identifying new markets	20.0	26.7	20.0	33.3	0.0	n = 15
Identifying investment sources	20.0	40.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	n = 10
Identifying new suppliers	27.3	18.2	45.5	9.1	0.0	n = 11
Showcasing new products	12.5	18.8	31.3	37.5	0.0	n = 16
Developing market entry opportunities	6.3	25.0	25.0	43.8	0.0	n = 16
Identifying new business partners	5.9	29.4	52.9	11.8	0.0	n = 17
Enhancing image by participating in EXPO	0.0	0.0	5.9	64.7	29.4	n = 17
Strengthening relations with business partners	5.9	17.6	29.4	41.2	5.9	n = 17
Portraying Canada as a tourist destination	0.0	6.7	13.3	46.7	33.3	n = 15
Promoting Canadian artists/culture	0.0	0.0	13.3	66.7	20.0	n = 15

**Technical Note #7:** Detailed responses of partners/participants regarding how the Canada Pavilion facilitated business activities:

**Please rate Canada's participation at EXPO 2000 in terms of how well it facilitated the following:**

	Poor				Excellent	
	1				5	
	1	2	3	4	5	
	%	%	%	%	%	
Exchange of business-related information	11.1	16.7	38.9	27.8	5.6	n = 18
Business-related events	6.7	6.7	40.0	40.0	6.7	n = 15

## MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE EVALUATION REPORT ON CANADA'S PARTICIPATION IN EXPO 2000, HANNOVER, GERMANY

---

We welcome the results of the evaluation report on Canada's participation in Expo 2000 in Hannover, Germany. Its overall recommendations are generally consistent with the conclusions reached by the Program management team.

As the report notes, Canada's participation in Expo 2000 was successful on many fronts, as evidenced by the largest number ever of visitors to a Canada Pavilion, the inclusion of a conference facility within the Pavilion which provided a venue for business promotion, and the innovative use of the Pavilion to encourage debate and dialogue on social policy issues such as racism. At the same time, a number of factors and challenges impacted on the delivery of the project. These included the funding strategy adopted at the outset for Canada's participation in Hannover which never materialised, the large number of objectives which resulted in less focussed communications and messaging, and the need for greater lead time to allow for planning and development work and building more effective partnerships.

The Department's detailed response is set out in the attached Action Plan. A number of recommendations have already been implemented. In particular, the approval of a long-term funding framework paves the way for a more strategic and proactive approach to planning and addresses many of the concerns raised in the report. In planning for Expo 2004, the Program has undertaken extensive consultations and focus group testing in order to gain a solid understanding of host country perceptions of Canada. This will assist in clarifying our strategic objectives and messages, in determining target audiences and in developing parallel programs.

It is also a key component in developing a broader evaluation framework for Expo 2004 which will seek to ensure the development of results-oriented performance measurements and indicators, and clear and realistic objectives. Moreover, as evidenced by the number of proposed measures which have already been taken, the Program is committed to implementing the recommendations to maximize the effectiveness and benefits of its participation in future expositions.

Enclosures:

**Action Plan** in response to section 6.2 Specific Conclusions and Future Directions from the Final Report for an Evaluation of Canada's Participation at Expo 2000 in Hannover, Germany, by SPR Associates Inc.

**Annex 1:** 6.2 Specific Conclusions and Future Directions, from the *Final Report for an Evaluation of Canada's Participation at Expo 2000 in Hannover, Germany*, by SPR Associates Inc. (See Report)