

***SUMMATIVE EVALUATION  
of the  
ASIA PACIFIC FOUNDATION OF CANADA  
(APFC)***

Asia Pacific    Fondation  
Foundation    Asie Pacifique  
of Canada    du Canada



**Final Report**

**May 2005**

**Foreign Affairs Canada (FAC)  
Office of the Inspector General (ZIG)**

Evaluation Division (ZIE)



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>LIST OF ACRONYMS.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1 Background .....	6
1.2 Purpose of the Evaluation.....	9
General and Specific Objectives.....	9
Focus and Scope .....	10
1.3 Evaluation Approach and Methodology .....	11
Overall Evaluation Approach.....	11
Data Gathering Methods .....	11
Limitations and Constraints.....	12
Rigour of the Evaluation .....	12
<b>2.0 MAJOR FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1 Relevance .....	13
2.2 Success.....	16
2.3 Cost Effectiveness .....	21
<b>3.0 LESSONS LEARNED.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>4.0 CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>ANNEX 1: SURVEY DATA.....</b>	<b>30</b>

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

<b>ABAC</b>	<b>APEC Business Advisory Council</b>
<b>APBN</b>	<b>Asia Pacific Business Network</b>
<b>APEC</b>	<b>Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation</b>
<b>APFC</b>	<b>Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada</b>
<b>APIP</b>	<b>Asia-Pacific Initiatives Program</b>
<b>CAPRN</b>	<b>Canada-Asia Pacific Research Network</b>
<b>CIDA</b>	<b>Canadian International Development Agency</b>
<b>FAC</b>	<b>Foreign Affairs Canada</b>
<b>ITCan</b>	<b>International Trade Canada</b>
<b>NGO</b>	<b>Non-Governmental Organization</b>
<b>PBEC</b>	<b>Pacific Basin Economic Council</b>
<b>PECC</b>	<b>Pacific Economic Cooperation Council</b>
<b>RMAF</b>	<b>Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework</b>
<b>TORs</b>	<b>Terms of Reference</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Context

The Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada (APFC) was established under federal legislation in 1984 to develop closer ties between the peoples and institutions of Canada and the peoples and institutions of the Asia-Pacific region. It is addressing this objective through a combination of products ranging from daily news reports to analytical studies on specific topics, through provision of expert services, and by hosting different types of networking and information events such as the annual Asia Pacific Summit. It makes many of its products available to interested parties electronically and maintains a strong web presence.

Most of the Foundation's funding has come from Government of Canada sources. Foreign Affairs Canada (FAC) (formerly Foreign Affairs and International Trade) has been a principal funder throughout APFC's existence, most recently through a 5-year, \$5 million funding authority from Treasury Board under the Asia Pacific Initiatives Program.

As a condition of Treasury Board funding, FAC is obligated to undertake a Summative Evaluation of the APFC. This Evaluation was designed to inform both FAC/ITCan and APFC on the impact of the current five year funding program in three broad areas: relevance, success and cost effectiveness.

The Evaluation was carried out through: document and file reviews; structured individual and group interviews with 73 stakeholders, APFC management and staff; and, two surveys, one of subscribers to APFC's products and services, and a control group of businesses and individuals with an interest in Asia Pacific who are subscribers to ITCan's Virtual Trade Commissioner system. The surveys achieved a 99% confidence level with a 5.3% margin of error.

### Findings

The information collected in the course of the Evaluation led the Evaluation team to the following findings:

*Relevance:*

Finding #1: APFC has not articulated a collective vision, niche and strategic focus.

Finding #2: There is a mixed review on the extent to which APFC activities have been relevant to FAC/ITCan and Government of Canada priorities.

Finding #3: APFC is a provider of unique products and services relating to Canada's relations with the Asia Pacific region, primarily with respect to the business sector, with several other stakeholder priorities not being met.

*Success:*

Finding #4: Overall, there is a high level of satisfaction by stakeholders with the outputs of the APFC (products and services).

Finding #5: APFC is not focusing directly on enhancing awareness and understanding of the Asia Pacific region by the general public in Canada.

Finding #6: APFC receives mixed reviews with respect to the support it has given Canadian businesses in exploring opportunities to enter or expand in Asia Pacific markets.

Finding #7: The Foundation's traditional strength in networking is at risk.

Finding #8: APFC's products and services complement and have stimulated academic research in the Asia Pacific.

Finding #9: Canada's presence and influence at PECC and ABAC are greater than would be warranted by the size of Canada's economy.

*Cost Effectiveness:*

Finding #10: There are significant opportunities for APFC to improve its cost effectiveness, efficiency and effectiveness by adopting results-based management systems for regular and systematic priority-setting, monitoring and reporting for results.

Finding #11: The Board of APFC has been weak in fulfilling the full range of its obligations.

Finding #12: APFC has been weak in meeting some of its external and internal accountability obligations.

Finding #13: The Foundation produces a wide array of products and services from a limited resource base.

## **Conclusions**

*Relevance:* APFC is having a positive impact and making an important contribution to satisfying FAC/ITCan's needs, along with those of other knowledgeable stakeholder groups. However, the APFC does not have a clear vision, niche and strategic focus and as a result has neither fully met the needs and expectations of its stakeholders, nor fulfilled its full statutory mandate. There is a need for clear strategic direction from the Board.

In areas where the Foundation does have a positive impact, its reach is limited. It is clear that the number and distribution of potential beneficiaries is much larger than APFC is now reaching, and that it could have a much larger impact by addressing itself to making these potential stakeholders aware of the Foundation and its programs and

by ensuring its programs are directed to the needs and interests of the broad stakeholder population that are within the Foundation's formal mandate. This includes a larger national presence and delivery of services in both Official Languages.

*Success:* The products and services of the APFC are generally well regarded by their users/recipients. The Foundation is not working in all the areas in which it was originally mandated to be active, and is not able to track the impacts and effects of its activities and outputs in those areas where it is presently active. There are indicators that some of the desired results of the APFC's programs are being achieved, but related information is not being collected on a systematic basis.

*Cost Effectiveness:* While the current funding formula can make the APFC relevant and responsive to FAC/ITCan priorities, the funding arrangement for the APFC is at variance with its broader statutory mandate. The APFC cannot respond to all of the demands of its broader stakeholder base while much of its funding source is tied to particular, prescribed outcomes and outputs.

APFC has been limited in its effectiveness by failures of governance. It needs to renew its governance framework, including board structure and operation, management and accountability processes, performance-oriented program planning, budgeting and work planning and monitoring and evaluation.

## Recommendations

1. The APFC should make recommendations to the Government on the legislation, mandate and focus of the Foundation, in light of Canada's current and future interests in the Asia Pacific.
2. If the Government establishes a new funding model for the APFC, the model should provide a stable and long term funding environment consistent with the mandate of the APFC.
3. As part of a new funding model, Government must establish an accountability framework consistent with the need for independence of the Foundation, along with benchmarks, reviews and clear standards of performance.
4. An appropriately balanced Board of Directors comprised of individuals from a broad base with good knowledge of the Asia Pacific region should be appointed and mandated to exercise a stronger strategic role in an independent Foundation and be more engaged in oversight functions.
5. A broadly-based, stakeholder inclusive strategic planning process should be institutionalized by APFC to guide its future vision, niche and programs and activities.
6. The APFC should undertake a program of active outreach to maximize the benefits of the newly-mandated Foundation to Canadians.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background

The Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada (APFC) was established by an Act of the Parliament of Canada in 1984 to develop closer ties between the peoples and institutions of Canada and the peoples and institutions of the Asia-Pacific region which would be achieved by:

- “Promoting mutual awareness and understanding of the cultures, histories, religions, philosophies, languages, life styles and aspirations in the Asia-Pacific region and Canada and their effects on each other’s societies;
- Supporting development cooperation between organizations institutions and associations in Canada and in the Asia-Pacific region;
- Promoting collaboration among organizations, institutions and associations in private and public sectors in Canada and in the Asia-Pacific region;
- Promoting closer economic and commercial ties between Canada and the Asia-Pacific region;
- Promoting, in Canada, scholarship in and expertise on economic, cultural, social and other subjects relating to the Asia-Pacific region, and, in the Asia-Pacific region, scholarship in and expertise on economic, cultural, social and other subjects relating to Canada; and
- Collecting information and ideas relating to Canada and the Asia-Pacific region and disseminating such information and ideas within Canada and the Asia-Pacific region.”

The APFC was created as a non-governmental, non-profit organization in the expectation that it would be able to offer flexibility and independence in the delivery of certain programs in a way that government cannot.

The Foundation presently describes itself as a “Think Tank” on Asia Pacific issues. It brings together people and knowledge to provide the most current and comprehensive research, analysis and information on Canada’s transpacific relations. It promotes dialogue and debate on economic, security, political, and social issues to foster informed decision-making in the Canadian public, private and non-governmental sectors. APFC houses the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Study Centre in Canada, and the Canadian secretariats of the Pacific Basin Economic Council (PBEC), the Pacific Economic Cooperation Council (PECC) and the Asia-Pacific Business Advisory Council (ABAC). APFC also manages the Asia Pacific Business Network (APBN) and the Canada Asia Pacific Research Network (CAPRN).

APFC’s range of products includes:

- A significant web presence offering a large body of information for reading and downloading;
- An electronic news service which is available on a free subscription basis;
- Different series of analytical papers, backgrounders and reports covering various aspects of the Canada-Asia Pacific relationship, some of which are published in French as well as English;



- Annual summits, meetings and roundtables which are also extensively reported on through the web site;
- Special services (mainly reports and information sessions) for Asia Pacific Business Network members;
- Some op-ed articles published in Canadian media;
- Annual reports on the Foundation (in English and French).

Since its founding in 1984, the APFC has received over \$32 million through FY 2003/04 from the Federal Government mostly core funded and divided almost equally between FAC/ITCan and CIDA. The current Treasury Board authority provides for \$5 million to the APFC under the Asia-Pacific Initiatives Program (APIP) over a 5 year period ending March 2005.

The following table shows the FAC/ITCan contributions over the past five years. In 2001/2002, only \$750,000 of the authorized \$1M was actually spent as a result of the recommendations of a financial audit conducted by FAC/ITCan to reduce the level of the Foundation's reserves. The practice of splitting FAC/ITCan's contributions into "core" and "project" funding started the following year, as a result of the recommendations of the Audit.

#### FAC/ITCan Funding Contribution to APFC, 2000/2001-2004/2005

Fiscal Year	"Core" Funding (Actual)	Project Funding Budget (Actual)	TOTAL Budget (Actual)
2000/2001	\$1 Million (\$1 Million)	--	\$1 Million (\$1 Million)
2001/2002	\$1 Million (\$750K)	--	\$750K
2002/2003	\$600K (\$600K)	\$250K (\$232K)	\$850K (\$832K)
2003/2004	\$500K (\$550K)	\$500K (\$404K)	\$1 Million (\$954K)
2004/2005	\$500K (\$500K)	\$500K (\$185K))	\$1 Million (\$685K)

Up to 2004/05, APFC also received funding from the Canadian International Development Agency approximately equal to the contributions from FAC/ITCan. Other sources of funding include Western Economic Diversification program funding (for the 2004/05 fiscal year only) and those funds generated from APFC's memberships, sponsorship and events, and contracts for special services.

Under the current arrangement for funding for APFC from FAC/ITCan, over the last two fiscal years, several contribution agreements are signed each year; one for core funding and the others for the specific projects FAC/ITCan and APFC have jointly identified and agreed to for that fiscal year. In general, the APFC's work will complement

FAC/ITCan's priorities and strategic objectives in the Asia-Pacific region, in particular:

- establish Asia-Pacific in Canada as a region that matters to Canadian interests,
- provide a non-government focal point for the policies and programs of the entire gamut of Canadian Asia-Pacific stakeholders,
- strive for maximum leverage from government funding to stimulate and attract funding from other Canadian sources to meet the objectives of the APFC

For 2004/05 the activities agreed to include the following:

- Reach out to the Canada-wide community of individuals and institutions with an interest in Canada's relations with Asia-Pacific, and develop a program of projects and events designed to promote greater awareness in Canada of this region;
- co-ordinate a media campaign with other stakeholders designed to give Asia-Pacific the positive profile that it warrants in as diverse a range of Canadian media outlets as possible;
- deliver a range of information products primarily focussed on macroeconomic and broad political issues in the Asia-Pacific region;
- in conjunction with the academic community and other Asia Pacific experts develop and formulate policy position papers on the region;
- provide secretariat support for major Asia Pacific organizations in which Canada has membership with a view to maximizing the benefits to Canada of participation;
- seek out funding partners for APFC activities that promote Canadian awareness and understanding of the Asia Pacific region.

These activities are expected to result in the following long term, intermediate and short term outcomes articulated below which are more or less in line with those in the Results-based Management Accountability Framework (RMAF) finalized in January 2002 as part of the Treasury Board submission approving this funding.

### **Long Term Outcomes**

- Increased activity of Canadian business in the Asia-Pacific region
- Enhanced Canadian public awareness and understanding of the Asia-Pacific region

### **Intermediate Outcomes**

- Increased networking, information exchange, and cooperation among Canadian academics, business, NGOs, policy makers and research institutions
- Canadian business better positioned to identify and explore opportunities to enter or expand their presence in Asia Pacific markets
- Increased capacity of Canadian academics, research institutions and NGOs to undertake research related to the region, particularly in areas of priority concern for Canada
- Canada to maintain an appropriate profile in Asia Pacific regional institutions such as PBEC, PECC, etc.

### **Short Term Outcomes**

- Increase in number of events across Canada which promote awareness of the importance of Canada's relations with the Asia-Pacific region

- Increased volume of Canadian media attention to the Asia Pacific region
- Series of alerts to Canadian business and government on macroeconomic and major political issues with potential implications for Canada
- Enhanced fund raising capacity for the APFC arising from strengthened linkages with other stakeholders, particularly in the Canadian Asian ethnic community

As defined in the **Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada Act**, the beneficiaries of FAC/ITCan funding can be considered to include the following:

- Canadian and Asian Publics
- Development Organizations, Institutions and Associations
- Private and Public Sector Organizations, Institutions and Associations
- Canadian and Asia Pacific Business Communities
- Canadian and Asia Pacific Academic Communities

The Government of Canada can be considered an indirect beneficiary insofar as its objectives for the region are served by APFC's activities which benefit the named stakeholders.

## 1.2 Purpose of the Evaluation

### General and Specific Objectives

As required by Treasury Board, following the Government of Canada's Transfer of Payment Policy, FAC/ITCan contracted GeoSpatial/SALASAN to conduct an independent third party summative evaluation of the APFC. This evaluation covered the contributions to the APFC from FAC/ITCan for the period FY 2000/2001 to FY 2004/05 and involved a structured review of files and documents relating to APFC, interviews with key stakeholders and a major survey of APFC stakeholders and others with an expressed interest in the Asia Pacific region. Through these various methods, the evaluation generated data and findings leading to conclusions and recommendations related to the APFC prior to expiry of Treasury Board authority for this program in March 2005. The evaluation focussed on the issues of relevance, success and cost-effectiveness.

The key question guiding this Evaluation was: **Has APFC achieved what it set out to accomplish according to the terms and conditions of its contribution agreements with FAC/ITCan?**

The objectives of the Evaluation were:

- To determine the extent to which APFC's programs and policies are congruent with its mission, meet the needs of its partners, develop closer ties between the peoples and institutions of Canada and the peoples and institutions of the Asia-Pacific region and are relevant to FAC/ITCan's priorities and strategic objectives in the Asia-Pacific region;
- To assess APFC's achievement in meeting its program/project objectives and expected results as detailed in its contribution agreements with FAC/ITCAN;

- To assess the cost-effectiveness and efficiency of the management approach and program design for achieving the desired results; and
- To determine lessons learned from the implementation of APFC's program.

## Focus and Scope

The Evaluation covered the current 5-year Contribution Agreement which ends March 31, 2005, and encompassed three specific questions and nine sub-questions as follows:

### RELEVANCE:

- 1. To what extent are APFC's programs and policies relevant to FAC/ITCan's priorities and strategic objectives in the Asia-Pacific region?**
  - a. How effectively has APFC adapted its collective vision, niche, and strategic focus based on evolving external conditions?
  - b. Do APFC's programs respond effectively to Government of Canada needs in both the Asia-Pacific region and in Canada? What is the value added to FAC?
  - c. Is the APFC creating unique public goods? Do they serve the public interest?

### SUCCESS:

- 2. To what extent has APFC achieved its stated objectives to increase activity of Canadian business in the Asia Pacific region and enhance Canadian public awareness and understanding of the Asia Pacific region?**
  - a. Are Canadian businesses better positioned to identify and explore opportunities to enter or expand their presence in Asia Pacific markets because of APFC products and services?
  - b. Is there evidence of increased networking, information exchange, and cooperation among Canadian academics, business, NGOs, policy makers and research institutions among themselves and with their Asia-Pacific counterparts because of APFC products and services?
  - c. Is there evidence of increased capacity of Canadian academics, research institutions and NGOs to undertake research related to the region, particularly in areas of priority concern for Canada because of APFC products and services?
  - d. Has Canada been able to maintain an appropriate profile in Asia Pacific regional institutions such as PBEC, PECC, etc?

### COST EFFECTIVENESS:

- 3. To what extent has APFC implemented cost-effective approaches/methods for achieving the desired results and whether alternatives exist that would make APFC's programs more effective and efficient?**
  - a. Has APFC established systems to adequately ensure results-based and performance-oriented programme planning, monitoring, reporting and management? To what extent have these systems been institutionalized?
  - b. Is the value received from APFC commensurate with its expenditures? What is the value that Canadians have received from APFC activities?

### 1.3 Evaluation Approach and Methodology

#### Overall Evaluation Approach

The evaluation was summative in nature, and examined actual results against the inferred short-term, intermediate and long-term outcomes originally identified, according to the lines of enquiry defined by the questions in the previous section.

All approaches, methodologies and data collection tools adhered to an evaluation framework which clearly outlined all of the questions, performance indicators and sources of data for each question. Wherever possible, the evaluation team triangulated and verified data.

#### Data Gathering Methods

Given the nature and parameters of the evaluation, the evaluation team employed primarily qualitative research methods. The key data collection methods used were:

- In-depth interviews of stakeholders;
- Surveys of stakeholders; and
- Literature, document and file review.

A total of 73 interviewees representing a wide range of APFC stakeholders were identified and interviewed. The list was developed in conjunction with FAC/ITCan and with input from APFC. Interviews were conducted in person where possible (in Vancouver, Victoria, Toronto and Ottawa), and by telephone (with respondents in Atlantic Canada and Asia and other cities across Canada), and took between 30-60 minutes. All interviews were based on the Interview Guide which was based on the major questions and sub-questions outlined in the evaluation framework.

The survey was sent to two groups of persons: those persons registered with the Virtual Trade Commissioner Service who had expressed an interest in the Asia Pacific region and persons who subscribed to the Asia Pacific News service, a service provided by the Asia Pacific Foundation to anyone who requests it. Data for the two groups was collated both separately and together. The former group, who would not necessarily have a vested interest in APFC's activities or products, served as a control group and basis for comparison for the results obtained from respondents to the APFC subscriber group.

The survey design was also derived from the evaluation framework, with key input from FAC/ITCan. FAC/ITCan sent the invitation to participate in the survey to persons on the Trade Commissioner Service data base with a stated interest in the Asia Pacific region. APFC sent the survey invitation to its online subscribers. The survey was open for a two-week period.

Finally, the evaluation team reviewed a range of documentation and literature including: published articles, papers, reports, files, financial records and audits.

## Limitations and Constraints

A significant challenge was the lack of documentation, monitoring and reporting of results within APFC. The material provided to the Board was primarily activity-based and not based on a performance framework. Similarly the reporting to CIDA was reported to be minimal. Reports to FAC under the Contribution Agreements provided basic information and reporting, but reports against the criteria established for the annual contribution agreements were virtually non-existent.

The APFC collects certain information on use of its products and services, but does not examine the impacts of these outputs. While the survey offered a solid basis for exploring relevance and extent of use of APFC's products across a wide spectrum of stakeholders, it was necessary to rely in the survey and in the structured interviews on stakeholder perceptions rather than quantifiable data. This in turn made it difficult to quantify the cost effectiveness of the work carried out by APFC.

## Rigour of the Evaluation

The survey enjoyed a high confidence level, given its response rate of 17.3%. With a 4.1% margin of error, 480 respondents provided a 95% confidence level, given the sample size of 2777. With a 5.3% margin of error, the confidence level rises to 99%.

The Evaluation team undertook a comprehensive review of:

- APFC printed and web based products as well as internal documents made available by APFC management and staff, including work plans and selected related documents and reports;
- FAC/ITCan files relating to both program funding and to specific projects, audit reports and related management documentation;
- sample press coverage of APFC and APFC authored articles;
- external documents and web based information relating to APFC's networking and representational activities (e.g., PECC, ABAC); FAC/ITCan regional programming information;
- event programs and related reports.

The structured interview program was undertaken to supplement the information collected through the surveys and to allow specific questions to be explored in greater depth. The interview program touched on all current stakeholders with the exception of the members of the general public, and included:

- APFC staff, management and current and former Board members;
- FAC/ITCan executives, program managers and representatives overseas;
- Representatives of other federal funding Departments (CIDA and WED) as well as Departments with related interests, including Agriculture, Fisheries, NRC, and ITCan);
- ABAC appointees;
- Provincial government representatives;
- Academics;

- Representatives of research institutions and NGOs;
- Representatives of business associations, representative institutions and of individual businesses.

The interview program ensured that the views of all stakeholder communities were represented as fully as possible within the limits of available resources. While structured interviews do not provide the same degree of rigour as a broadly based survey, they do offer a complementary opportunity to explore specific issues in greater depth and to verify the broad conclusions of the survey.

## **2.0 MAJOR FINDINGS and ANALYSIS**

### **2.1 Relevance**

#### **Finding #1**

#### **APFC has not articulated a collective vision, niche and strategic focus.**

The lack of clarity and consensus on the Foundation's role and mandate is the most significant issue identified by the evaluation, and lies at the heart of many of the issues identified during the course of the review.

The original intent of APFC was to develop closer ties between the people and institutions of Canada and those of the Asia Pacific region through a variety of means. In the early years, this included educational programming and exchange programs, research and seminars, and business services. The Foundation claims to have moved since 2000 increasingly in the direction of being a research and analysis organization, but has also attempted to maintain many business services and keep their involvement alive in a number of other areas. While a few very successful programs (such as the Media Fellowship program) have been cut, most have been kept alive on a limited basis.

This has resulted in stakeholders having widely different perspectives on the focus of the APFC. The evaluation survey showed that respondents were equally split on what the APFC focus is. Over one third of respondents identified "Providing information to Canadians on the Asia Pacific region" as the most accurate definition. Nearly 30% felt it was promoting trade and investment with the region, and nearly 20% saw the Foundation's role as providing independent commentary on regional issues. A smaller number chose the Foundation's role in supporting research or developing academic and professional exchanges as representative.

The diversity of opinion as to the focus of the APFC was confirmed in interviews, with some interviewees describing the Foundation as an economic think tank; others as a policy advisor to government; and still others as a business services organization. The Evaluation results demonstrate that there is no common understanding of what APFC is, or does. The APFC has not taken the initiative to develop a detailed understanding of

the needs and interests of its stakeholders in a way that would inform its direction. There is no evidence of ongoing self assessment that would provide similar feedback.

The relationship with FAC/ITCAN has emphasized this. In an effort to meet the needs of FAC/ITCAN for greater accountability in its funding relationship with APFC, and a desire by the Department to enhance focus on the activities of the APFC as specified in the **Act**, contribution agreements have become more specific and tied to specific deliverables in the past few years.

The Foundation has produced several Vision documents which were reviewed as part of the Evaluation, but we were informed that they had not received formal approval by the Board and that many were prepared in anticipation of future proposed funding models and arrangements for the Foundation.

Furthermore, while it can be argued that the current funding mechanism for APFC makes it difficult to carry out a number of functions in the way that stakeholders and the APFC would like, there is no evidence that the Board has set priorities and strategic directions within its financial limitations. It has, instead, focused on funding and financial issues, allowing the Foundation itself to continue to try to fulfill multiple objectives in a non-focused way.

## **Finding #2**

**There is a mixed review on the extent to which APFC activities have been relevant to FAC/ITCan and Government of Canada priorities.**

The **Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada Act** makes no reference to Government of Canada priorities. Contribution agreements until 2003 did not specifically refer to the priorities of FAC/ITCan and the Government of Canada. The reference in recent Contribution Agreements to FAC/ITCan and Government priorities developed as a result of a need by FAC/ITCan for greater accountability and focus. As a result, APFC feels that it is required to be relevant to FAC/ITCan priorities in its work.

Overall, government respondents to the survey rated the utility of APFC's products and services higher than the average. Survey results show that government respondents were the most positive about APFC products and services, with more than 60% either very or extremely satisfied.

Some products and services of APFC respond directly to FAC/ITCan needs, for example, the Asia Pacific Summit at which profile is given to the regional heads of post. Other APFC products are used as background to FAC/ITCan decision-making, but are not directly relevant to FAC/ITCan priorities, being largely designed specifically to serve the needs of business or other stakeholders. The studies and events provided through specific funding agreements received high praise from FAC/ITCan officials and are used directly in decision-making.



The Evaluation found limited systematic exchange between APFC and FAC/ITCan on FAC/ITCan priorities, except when FAC/ITCan sought to use that portion of the Contribution funds set aside for specific projects. Few in the Department felt that the APFC was a source of general information that they would rely on exclusively. The availability of funding through a dedicated program was clearly a strong attraction, as it meant that policy staff could commission projects or analytical studies without affecting their own budgets. Several indicated that if they could no longer access these dedicated funds they would probably look at a broader range of prospective suppliers of these services, although they might well return to APFC in light of its high level of expertise.

The evaluators found no evidence of formal consultation between FAC/ITCan and the Foundation on the full spectrum of FAC/ITCan's priorities in the Asia Pacific region. While there were discussions between various officials at various levels of the organizations and the ADM sat on the Board of APFC, many respondents expressed concern that there are significant gaps in APFC's understanding of FAC/ITCan programming. For example, even though both the Department and APFC have agreed that India is a priority area and have begun to provide analysis and services in relation to India, there is a continuing perception in some quarters that APFC remains too much China-focused, and that it should be paying more attention to other geographic areas, issues and priorities.

The real crux of the issue in determining the Foundation's relevance to government comes in considering how much the Department relies on and uses APFC's advice. While individual products—analytical studies, news summaries, networking events—are generally seen as useful, they appear to be given little direct weight in formulating the Department's approach to the region. To some extent, APFC is perceived by the Department as spending too much effort commenting on the government's efforts in Asia Pacific and too little in addressing its own obligations under the **Act** to be working to raise the public profile of Asia Pacific in Canada.

### **Finding #3**

**APFC is a provider of unique products and services relating to Canada's relations with the Asia Pacific region, primarily with respect to the business sector, with several other stakeholder priorities not being met.**

The APFC Legislation contemplates a broad mandate to develop closer ties between the people and institutions of Canada and those of the Asia Pacific, including, but not limited to, economic and commercial ties. However, most of the activities of the Foundation in recent years have focused on the business sector.

The Evaluation considered key indicators of relevance to include the perceived utility and degree of use of the Foundation's products and services. The Evaluation found a fairly high level of reliance on APFC's outputs across the stakeholder community. While just over half of the respondents to the survey said they would use sources other than the APFC, one quarter of them said that they were unaware of any other source like it.

Less than 10% of respondents preferred to get information and services from sources other than APFC.

APFC is seen by stakeholders as gathering information from places that others do not, and as providing in its analysis a unique Canadian perspective on the Asia Pacific. The Evaluation also showed that a large majority of users believe that the APFC keeps up with changes in Asia Pacific very well. Academic and government respondents were particularly complimentary in this regard.

Three-quarters of those surveyed in the control survey were not familiar with APFC, though, as expected, there was a much higher level of familiarity among British Columbia respondents than those located elsewhere. Many of the control survey respondents who did not know of the APFC indicated a strong interest in receiving more information, an indication that the Foundation has the potential to significantly increase its relevance and profile among those who are active in the Asia Pacific region.

Certain elements of the APFC mandate are not being covered well, if at all. This is explained by APFC as due largely to funding shortfalls and is also due to the lack of clarity and consensus on the Foundation's role and mandate (see Finding #1). Several respondents felt that social and political issues are not sufficiently covered by the Foundation. Broadly-based public awareness programming is practically non-existent at present, with the Foundation relying on whatever impact it can have in the published press through articles or opinion editorial pieces. The cancellation of the successful Media Fellowship program is widely seen as a significant loss, both inside and outside the Foundation.

The failure of the Foundation to systematically reach outside British Columbia in a significant way is also seen as a major limitation in the Foundation's ability to meet stakeholder needs, especially in Ontario and Quebec. Few of the products and services are provided in French, which is also seen as a significant limitation on the Foundation's ability to serve as a truly national organization.

Some bilateral trade organizations saw APFC as potentially treading on their territory and competing with them on an unequal footing, given APFC's government funding and access to excellent resources throughout Asia. Several of these organizations felt that APFC should use this relative advantage to assist and coordinate the activities of the bilateral organizations.

## **2.2 Success**

### **Finding #4**

**Overall, there is a high level of satisfaction by stakeholders with the outputs of the APFC (products and services).**

The products and services of the APFC include a broad range of newsletters, special reports and daily news updates, as well as hosted forums such as the Asia Pacific

Summit and smaller events that are mainly open to members of the Asia Pacific Business Network. There is an increasingly wide variety of information available to the general public and experts through its website publications.

The Evaluation shows that these existing products and services are seen as meeting geographic and subject matter needs of a majority of its current users, including government. Over 90% of stakeholders on APFC's survey list were found to be satisfied with APFC products and services they used. Of those respondents to the control survey who claimed that they used APFC's products and services (30.9%), just under 80% expressed satisfaction.

Stakeholders consider that APFC is able to bring in a wide variety of expertise to support its analysis. In its capacity as manager of business, research and academic networks, APFC is able to act as an information link and to increase the level of networking between them.

While there is clearly a high regard on the part of stakeholders for the Foundation's products and services, the Evaluation was challenged to make an assessment of the resulting impact or outcomes. Since the APFC has not developed or implemented any results based management systems, there is no systematically collected information available to provide insights as to whether, for example, the overall level of business or trade between Canada and Asia Pacific actually increased directly as a result of APFC's work. The Evaluation survey did find indications that this is probably the case, given the claims of successful networking and relationship building at APFC events, the level of use made of the Foundation's products, and the high level of satisfaction with specific studies undertaken in areas of defined interest to FAC/ITCan. However, in the absence of any means of systematic collection of related information, APFC is unable to demonstrate the impacts its products and services are having on the development of the relationship between Canada and the Asia Pacific.

#### **Finding #5**

#### **APFC is not focusing directly on enhancing awareness and understanding of the Asia Pacific region by the general public in Canada.**

The APFC legislation directs the APFC to "promote mutual awareness and understanding of the cultures, histories, religions, philosophies, languages, life styles and aspirations in the Asia-Pacific region and Canada and their effects on each other's societies". In its early days, the APFC did focus directly on this aspect of their mandate, providing cultural and language training. School programs and exchange programming were also part of the Foundation's early range of activities.

Over the years, the APFC moved away from this, as bilateral organizations were created, training was provided through other organizations, and the general level of sophistication in Canada-Asia Pacific relations grew. As well, many businesses and individuals became established in the Asia Pacific region and gained their own expertise in basic involvement in the region.

The present focus on business and economic issues which has evolved over the Foundation's life leaves it now having only indirect impacts on the public's awareness and understanding of the Asia Pacific region. While the availability of the Foundation's publications at its website has made access to their material easier, most respondents are of the view that APFC should be playing a larger role in building awareness in Canada of the Asia Pacific and vice versa.

The cancellation of the Media Fellowship program was seen as an especially significant loss of what had been regarded as a very successful element of APFC's portfolio of activities. The only remaining initiatives that can be broadly accessed by the general public are the Foundation's public commentaries and opinion editorials. However, these are infrequent and depend on the willingness of the media to publish them.

### **Finding #6**

#### **APFC receives mixed reviews with respect to the support it has given Canadian businesses in exploring opportunities to enter or expand in Asia Pacific markets.**

The **Act** contemplates that APFC will promote closer economic and commercial ties between Canada and the Asia-Pacific region. Therefore, a role in supporting Canadian business to enter the Asia Pacific market should be one of the priorities of the APFC.

Over the past few years, the Foundation has dedicated a significant portion of its resources to producing products and services especially designed for that market.

The Evaluation showed that APFC's products and services are useful in business planning and operation. Overall, 44% of respondents who used the products and services reported them to be very or extremely useful, with 41% finding them "somewhat useful" but only 30% of business respondents found them very or extremely useful. Business participants reported that they developed business or professional relationships at APFC events.

Despite the relatively good level of satisfaction, the Evaluation also demonstrated that the proportion of the Canadian Asia Pacific business community that the APFC serves is small. Its (paying) APBN membership remains under 40 companies and has not grown significantly in recent years. Participants at the business-oriented Summit have expressed concern over the limited number of new faces at these events. In the control survey with the persons from the Virtual Trade Commissioners Service who have expressed an interest in the Asia Pacific region, three-quarters of the respondents had never heard of the Asia Pacific Foundation. However, these persons were extremely interested to learn more about the Foundation.

## **Finding #7**

### **The Foundation's traditional strength in networking is at risk.**

One of the Foundation's traditional strengths that relates to all aspects of its mandate under the *Act*, and one that is repeatedly noted as a priority in the FAC/ITCan funding Contribution Agreements, is networking among and between stakeholder groups. The Foundation has created several networks, including its virtual community of researchers and academics who cooperate through CAPRN and the business-oriented APBN. In addition, events sponsored or supported by APFC offer a unique opportunity for personal networking. The APFC functions as a link between these different constituencies with a shared interest in the Asia Pacific Region.

Both interviews and surveys show that stakeholders place a high degree of emphasis on the importance of these networking opportunities. Participants at the annual Summits, for example, ranked networking opportunities as their top priority and reason for attendance, and the majority of participants expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the outcomes of these events. A majority of those who attended further indicated that they had developed business or professional relationships at the Summits.

At the same time, the Evaluation team received many qualifying comments from interviewees reflecting a broadly-held view that the participant lists for these networking events, particularly the Summit, tend to be much the same year after year, and that the value of participation is therefore declining. APFC has not worked aggressively to extend its networks through marketing and outreach. The stakeholder network at the Summit is not expanding because some stakeholders are not interested in attending what they view as "closed events". In recent years, the Summit also has had a fairly high proportion of complimentary, rather than paying participants. Our control survey of subscribers to the Virtual Trade Commissioner service also showed a surprisingly high number of respondents who were not even aware of APFC or its products and services. This represents a significant opportunity of which APFC has not taken advantage to grow its existing networks.

In 2003, the Summit was held outside Vancouver for the first time, in Toronto, and focused on Canada-India relations. This innovation was viewed very favourably by participants, especially those from Toronto, but disappointment was expressed by the same commentators at APFC's failure to follow up on the issues raised and contacts made. This was clearly seen as a missed opportunity to strengthen and extend the Foundation's networks and contacts.

In 2004, through the initiative of the Trade Commissioner Service in Vancouver in conjunction with the APFC, the Summit included small group meetings on specific topics which were attended by a number of people who would not otherwise have attended the Summit. This might provide a new model that could be used effectively by the Foundation for greater outreach.

## **Finding #8**

### **APFC's products and services complement and have stimulated academic research in the Asia Pacific.**

APFC's products and services were seen by the academic and research-oriented respondents and interviewees in a very positive light. The Foundation tends to be regarded as a catalyst for academic research, particularly on those occasions when the Foundation has collaborated with other institutions to bring together different perspectives, contacts and capacities to achieve results beyond those that would have been achievable were the institutions to be acting individually. This synergy is viewed as benefiting all partners in such ventures.

More than half of the members of CAPRN surveyed claimed to be using APFC generated information and research materials very often. Many respondents said APFC's materials serve as building blocks for their own research, and those in the academic community often refer their students to the APFC website for statistics or information on the Asia Pacific region.

Many commented on the importance of APFC as both a producer and as a disseminator of research results. The niche the Foundation occupies is seen as unique in that it cuts across business and political interests in a way which academics do not and cannot, but is nonetheless able to produce good quality research products. Some of the areas that were noted by academics as examples of successful collaboration or support are high priority for FAC/ITCan: for example, Canada-Japan relations and China energy issues. Several academics commented that they felt this relationship could be enhanced if APFC were in a position to provide direct funding to academics for specific studies or research on elements of APFC's larger program areas of interest.

## **Finding #9**

### **Canada's presence and influence at PECC and ABAC are greater than would be warranted by the size of Canada's economy.**

PECC is the only private observer body to the ministerial forum, APEC. APFC's Vice President and Chief Economist acts as the Chair of the Canadian Committee for Pacific Economic Cooperation and is the overall coordinator of the Pacific Economic Outlook task force, which is responsible for developing annual regional economic forecasts for PECC. This leadership role gives Canada high visibility in a key task force of PECC and hence at APEC.

Canada also enjoys a high profile at ABAC through the leadership on several different committees provided by Canada's appointed representatives. APFC renders secretariat and related support services to Canada's ABAC representatives. ABAC members have a high regard for the quality of support provided, although they indicated that the level of support is significantly less than that available to most other country delegations, and is inadequate to fully respond to the heavy demands placed on them as a result of their committee leadership positions. FAC is satisfied with the support provided by APFC on Canada's behalf to PECC and ABAC, and Canada is highly regarded at both bodies.

## 2.3 Cost Effectiveness

Successful program delivery in a cost effective manner requires a coherent, comprehensive and strong framework for governance. It is also facilitated by open and clear communications and reporting between the institution and its key stakeholders, including funders. This is particularly important in the case where the funder is a public sector agency, like FAC/ITCan, which faces its own stringent standards for oversight, accountability and management of public funds.

Overall, many of the elements of APFC's governance framework have tended to be implemented in an ad hoc fashion or not at all. In addition to the lack of clear direction from the Board on the Foundation's vision, niche and strategic focus, the Evaluation also found:

- An absence of comprehensive and detailed strategic planning processes that include consultation with key stakeholders, including FAC/ITCan;
- Few systematic, regular results-based and performance-oriented systems for program planning, monitoring or reporting;
- Only sporadic review of the utility and relevance to users of the full range of outputs the Foundation produces, and limited assessment of the level of satisfaction of the broader stakeholder community.

Of particular importance to FAC/ITCan, in light of its own standards for performance reporting and the specific requirements for a performance reporting framework outlined in Treasury Board's authorization for FAC/ITCan program funding, is the need for reporting of outcomes attributable to program spending. As noted in Chapter 1 of this report, FAC/ITCan's expected outcomes are outlined in the RMAF. APFC has never put into place any means of measuring or reporting on these outcomes or on any others that may be oriented to the organization's own needs or priorities.

These circumstances led us to three specific findings relating to the overall picture of governance and consequently the extent to which APFC is able to deal systematically with cost effectiveness issues.

### **Finding #10**

**There are significant opportunities for APFC to improve its cost effectiveness, efficiency and effectiveness by adopting results-based management systems for regular and systematic priority-setting, monitoring and reporting for results.**

A results-based approach to management is a standard for managers in both the public and private sectors. Implementation of a full suite of results-based management tools would afford the Foundation a more reliable means of: setting goals that relate to stakeholder priorities; managing the cost and quality of its portfolio of products and services; and, making available to management and to the Board the feedback necessary to guide operations in a consistent and responsive fashion.

The Foundation claims to be moving toward being able to track costs of individual products, something which its current systems do not permit it to do at present. This will provide a sounder base for management decision making on pricing and resource utilization. There was no evidence of other related initiatives which would move the APFC toward a more coherent and regularized form of results-based management.

### **Finding #11**

#### **The Board of APFC has been weak in fulfilling the full range of its obligations.**

The Board of a publicly -funded Foundation should reasonably be expected to be broadly representative of Canadians and the priority stakeholder communities the institution serves. They could also be expected to provide clear strategic direction to the organization, and to exercise careful, systematic oversight on the full range of the institution's activities on behalf of the public.

The Board of APFC has declined significantly in size in recent years in response to what was perceived as threats to the survival of APFC. It has focused substantially on financial matters at the cost of providing guidance in other critical areas such as strategic direction of the Foundation.

To fulfill its mandate and provide the appropriate guidance, the Board needs regular and accurate information on costs and results. The Evaluation found that in certain areas, there has been a lack of transparency and exchange of information between the Board and Foundation management. It has already been noted that the Board has neither demanded nor received systematic reporting on performance against expected results; nor has it provided adequate formal guidance regarding vision, niche or strategic focus. Even some of the basic information required under the **Act** has not been shared: for example, the Board is required by Article 23 to fix the President's remuneration and expenses, but the evaluators were informed that this information was not even made available to the Board.

The Evaluation team was told that the Board is beginning to demand better reporting of financial performance, but this does not yet appear to be happening to a significant extent. It would, in any case, respond only partially to the broader need for a performance-based management framework.

The need for APFC's Board to become more representative of all the communities and regions that are important to the Foundation's mandate has been noted earlier in this report.

### **Finding #12**

#### **APFC has been weak in meeting some of its external and internal accountability obligations.**



As a publicly-funded Foundation, APFC embodies several dimensions of accountability. It is of course accountable to the Canadian public through the **Act**, first and foremost. It is also accountable to its funders according to the provisions of individual funding agreements. Internally, APFC is accountable for providing its Board with timely, accurate and complete information that would allow the Board to fulfill its governance obligations.

The Evaluation found that, in general, APFC's work does fall within the broad bounds of the range of activities authorized under the **Act**. The Foundation is legally required to make available to the public an annual report and has done so since 2001/2002. This was the first annual report produced since 1997 that was made broadly available. Reports for 1998 and 1999 were in house productions and even the Auditor was not aware of their existence when he filed his audit report.

APFC provides its funders with the most basic of information as required by the agreements. Its reporting is mainly financial in character and output (product) oriented, with nothing that provides results-based or outcome-related information in a way that would reassure funders that they are receiving value for the money directed to the Foundation. The performance-based strategies and reporting frameworks developed by FAC/ITCan as a condition of Treasury Board's approval for Asia Pacific Program funding include outcome and performance based reporting, but there was no evidence that any discussion of related reporting requirements took place between the Foundation and FAC/ITCan. The Foundation's management information collection and reporting systems provide almost none of the information required by the FAC/ITCan framework.

With respect to internal accountabilities, some Board members have expressed concern about a lack of transparency in certain financial reporting to the Board. It has been noted elsewhere that the Board does not receive regular, comprehensive reporting on performance which would enable it to meet its own obligations regarding guidance and oversight. Evaluators were also told that the Board did not even consider and approve a work plan for the 2001 year. These lacunae make it very difficult for the Board and Foundation management to hold to a clear internal accountability relationship.

### **Finding #13**

#### **The Foundation produces a wide array of products and services from a limited resource base.**

In general, the Evaluation found that the Foundation is producing a large volume of material with a relatively small number of staff who are working in a productive and dedicated fashion. The support being provided to ABAC representatives is very limited in comparison to other delegations; nonetheless, it has been noted that Canada enjoys a strong presence in this forum. The Foundation has a strong web presence and is making very good use of technology to ensure its products and services are widely available and accessible at minimal cost. There is evidence of good leverage being achieved through collaborative initiatives with Universities, research organizations and

NGOs to reach audiences and cover topics that the Foundation might not otherwise be able to on its own.

APFC also refers to its production of opinion editorial pieces for the media as a means of raising regional matters to the public eye at minimal cost.

### 3.0 LESSONS LEARNED

The Evaluation findings suggest some clear lessons that may be of benefit to Foreign Affairs (and possibly other Departments) in future relations with APFC, and relationships with similar organizations in other fields. These are also noteworthy for the Government's institutional partners in these arrangements.

1. A clear vision, niche and strategic focus are vital to the effective and efficient functioning of an organization like APFC. These must guide the activities of the organization and must be informed by regular performance-based feedback.
2. Regular renewal and enhancement of the stakeholder community through outreach is essential to the long term health of the organization and to its ability to maintain its relevance to its stakeholders.
3. The structure of the funding mechanism can directly affect the ability and independence of an organization to achieve its functional mandate by "pushing" the organization in a particular direction, or by limiting the scope of its activities if the funding mechanism is too focused. At the same time, an independent status does not remove accountability obligations to funders, or the general public.

### 4.0 CONCLUSIONS

*Relevance:* APFC is having a positive impact and making an important contribution to satisfying FAC/ITCan's needs, along with those of other knowledgeable stakeholder groups. However, the APFC does not have a clear vision, niche and strategic focus and as a result has neither fully met the needs and expectations of its stakeholders, nor fulfilled its full statutory mandate. There is a need for clear strategic direction from the Board.

In areas where the Foundation does have a positive impact, its reach is limited. It is clear that the number and distribution of potential beneficiaries is much larger than APFC is now reaching, and that it could have a much larger impact by addressing itself to making these potential stakeholders aware of the Foundation and its programs and by ensuring its programs are directed to the needs and interests of the broad stakeholder population that are within the Foundation's formal mandate. This includes a larger national presence and delivery of services in both Official Languages.

*Success:* The products and services of the APFC are generally well regarded by their users/recipients. The Foundation is not working in all the areas in which it was originally mandated to be active, and is not able to track the impacts and effects of its activities and outputs in those areas where it is presently active. There are indicators that some of the desired results of the APFC's programs are being achieved, but related information is not being collected on a systematic basis.

*Cost Effectiveness:* While the current funding formula can make the APFC relevant and responsive to FAC/ITCan priorities, the funding arrangement for the APFC is at variance with its broader statutory mandate. The APFC cannot respond to all of the demands of its broader stakeholder base while much of its funding source is tied to particular, prescribed outcomes and outputs.

APFC has been limited in its effectiveness by failures of governance. It needs to renew its governance framework, including board structure and operation, management and accountability processes, performance-oriented program planning, budgeting and work planning and monitoring and evaluation.

## 5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Irrespective of the decisions which will be made on whether and how to fund the APFC's future activities, the Evaluation points to a number of actions which will benefit both the Government of Canada as the primary funder and the Foundation itself. They address the limitations identified in the course of the Evaluation and outlined in the findings and conclusions above.

1. The APFC should make recommendations to the Government on the legislation, mandate and focus of the Foundation, in light of Canada's current and future interests in the Asia Pacific.

### APFC Management Response and Action Plan

The Foundation has received a renewed mandate from the Government of Canada, as part of a contribution grant agreement that provides for an endowment to support the Foundation's activities. As part of the agreement, the legislation governing the Foundation will be amended, as will the by-laws of the Foundation. The agreement does not change the overall mandate of the Foundation but it sets out a number of specific requirements and activities that will influence the broad future direction of the organization.

As articulated in its 2005-08 strategic plan, the Foundation will continue to function as a "knowledge-based" organization, with core activities around the provision of specialized information and analysis on Canada-Asia relations that is not found elsewhere. The Foundation will, however, give more emphasis to its role as a "value multiplier", by more actively engaging stakeholders in its work and by supporting Asia Pacific policy research and business networks in Canada. The three priorities set out in the strategic

plan are *Strengthening Networks in Canada and Across the Pacific, Producing Knowledge that Matters, and Increasing Public Awareness.*

### **FAC Management Response and Action Plan**

The APFC has had a significant number of opportunities to provide input to the Government on the mandate and focus of the Foundation. Over the past six months, in particular, regular discussions have taken place between FAC, the Foundation, and other stakeholders on the role of the Foundation and funding model that should underpin that role. The Government has taken those views into account in structuring the legislative and funding arrangements that underpin the Budget 2005 commitment to provide the Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada with a \$50 million endowment.

2. If the Government establishes a new funding model for the APFC, the model should provide a stable and long term funding environment consistent with the mandate of the APFC.

### **APFC Management Response and Action Plan**

This has been achieved through the establishment of an endowment for the Foundation.

### **FAC Management Response and Action Plan**

The funding model established by the Government (i.e., an endowment) is aimed specifically at providing a stable and long term funding environment consistent with the mandate of the APFC. According to the conditional grant agreement governing this funding arrangement, the endowment fund is to be prudently invested and the principal is not to be drawn down. The returns of the endowment fund are to be used to support the activities of the Foundation. The conditional grant agreement also stipulates that the endowment fund may be supplemented at any time by additional amounts raised by the APFC.

3. As part of a new funding model, Government must establish an accountability framework consistent with the need for independence of the Foundation, along with benchmarks, reviews and clear standards of performance.

### **APFC Management Response and Action Plan**

The contribution grant agreement spells out an accountability framework consistent with the need for independence of the Foundation. This framework for performance measurement, audit, and external evaluation is also spelled out in the Foundation's 2005-08 Strategic Plan.

### **FAC Management Response and Action Plan**

The conditional grant agreement governing the endowment fund establishes a clear set of accountability requirements that are consistent with the independence of the

Foundation. Among other things, it requires the Foundation to develop Strategic Plans every 3-5 years and to base its annual corporate plans on these. The agreement also includes audit and evaluation requirements for both the Foundation and the Minister of Foreign Affairs. In addition, the Foundation must produce an Annual Report, the required contents of which are spelled out in detail in the conditional grant agreement.

4. An appropriately balanced Board of Directors comprised of individuals from a broad base with good knowledge of the Asia Pacific region should be appointed and mandated to exercise a stronger strategic role in an independent Foundation and be more engaged in oversight functions.

### **APFC Management Response and Action Plan**

With secure, long-term funding in place, the current Board of Directors will be looking to add to their numbers by appointing a number of qualified individuals as non Order-in-Council members. It is hoped that the Government of Canada will also be making a number of Order-in-Council appointments in the near future. The Chairman of the Board has been consulting with the Government leader of the Senate to coordinate these appointments.

### **FAC Management Response and Action Plan**

The amendments to the Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada Act as included in Bill C-43 deal in large part with the governance of the Foundation. A number of the amendments address the qualifications of Board members, requiring that “at least one half of the membership has experience or expertise concerning relations between Canada and the Asia-Pacific region”, that the membership “has sufficient knowledge of corporate governance, investment management, auditing and evaluations” and that it be “representative of Canadian society”. The amendments also require Board members to “act honestly and in good faith with a view to the best interests of the Foundation”. The conditional grant agreement expands upon the role of the Foundation’s Board, requiring the establishment of an investment committee, an audit and evaluation committee, a compensation committee, and a governance committee; all of these are aimed at strengthening the oversight function of the Board.

5. A broadly-based, stakeholder inclusive strategic planning process should be institutionalized by APFC to guide its future vision, niche and programs and activities.

### **APFC Management Response and Action Plan**

A process of broad stakeholder consultation has been incorporated into the Foundation’s 2005-08 Strategic Plan, and is currently being implemented. In particular, the Foundation will introduce a system of internal planning and external consultation in the formulation of its work plans. The internal planning process will involve board members and senior staff, who will meet on an annual basis to discuss the work plan.

External consultations will also take place annually, to help the Foundation identify policy, research, conference, and funding priorities of major stakeholders. On an annual basis, the Foundation will prepare corporate plans that reflect the conditional grant agreement, strategic plans, and consultations.

### **FAC Management Response and Action Plan**

The conditional grant agreement governing the funding arrangement with the Foundation requires the Foundation to develop a results-based Strategic Plan in consultation with clients and stakeholders every 3-5 years. That plan is to include, among other things:

- A list of the Foundation's priorities for the following 3-5 years;
- Expected short, medium and long term results; and
- A description of the anticipated benefits to Canadians.

The Foundation must also develop and implement results-based annual corporate plans that reflect the strategic plan. In its first strategic plan, the Foundation has committed to giving more emphasis to its role as a "value multiplier", by more actively engaging stakeholders in its work and by supporting Asia Pacific policy research and business networks in Canada. The Foundation has also committed to annual external consultations, to help the Foundation identify the policy, research, conference, and funding priorities of major stakeholders.

6. The APFC should undertake a program of active outreach to maximize the benefits of the newly-mandated Foundation to Canadians.

### **APFC Management Response and Action Plan**

In the 2005-08 Strategic Plan, the Foundation has identified "Increasing Public Awareness" as one of its three major priorities. Given limited resources, the outreach strategy will be based on leveraging our access to the media, supporting selected Asia awareness activities that have a broad reach, and producing analysis on issues that are of immediate interest to the general public. Our new grants program will, for example, include a media component that is designed to improve the quality of Canadian reporting on Asia. The Foundation will also investigate the feasibility of establishing an office or other form of representation outside of British Columbia.

### **FAC Management Response and Action Plan**

The Government has proposed legislative amendments and put in place funding requirements that will support an active program of outreach by the APFC. The amendments to the Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada Act as included in Bill C-43 have clarified and expanded the purpose of the Foundation to include the promotion of "capacity development in persons and entities that share an interest in the Asia Pacific region and the building of networks between them...". The conditional grant agreement governing the \$50 million endowment also stipulates that the Foundation "continue and seek to expand its public diplomacy and outreach initiatives, including, but not limited to periodic consultation with key stakeholders from across Canada on public diplomacy

and outreach needs...". Finally, it should be noted that the Foundation is required under the terms of the conditional grant agreement to develop a granting program (using revenue from the endowment fund) to build capacity through research, conference or initiative funding, accessible on a competitive basis. The details of the granting program are to be developed in consultation with a broad range of stakeholders, but the conditional grant agreement stipulates that the program must disburse a minimum of 25 percent of the endowment fund's revenue to recipients by 2010/2011.

In its 2005-08 Strategic Plan, the Foundation identified "Increasing Public Awareness" as one of its three major priorities. Given limited resources, its outreach strategy will be based on leveraging access to the media, supporting selected Asia awareness activities that have a broad reach, and producing analysis on issues that of immediate interest to the general public. The new grants program will, for example, include a media component that is designed to improve the quality of Canadian reporting on Asia.

## ANNEX 1: SURVEY DATA INCLUDING CROSS TABS BY SECTOR

The following collates all survey responses, and includes cross-tabs of responses by sector. Given the sample size of 2,777, and providing a 4.1% margin of error, the 480 respondents constitute a 95% confidence level in survey results.

**Total number of respondents: 480**

The numbers in parentheses represent the total number of respondents to which the percentage figures correspond.

### 1. What is your primary affiliation? (474)

43.9%	Business
20.5%	Government
18.3%	Academic or Research Institution
5.7%	Non-Governmental Organization (NGO)
11.6%	Other

#### *Description by those who marked "Other" category:*

- Production de spectacles canadiens
- Théâtre jeune public
- Journalisme
- Aide au developpement
- Société de la couronne
- Retraité
- International Consultant
- Freight forwarding
- Film Production
- Travel
- Information Service
- Education marketing
- Media
- Media - print and online
- Financial institution
- Media
- Student
- Education
- Independent Researcher
- Global logistics
- Media
- Board Member
- Money management
- Media
- Crown Corp
- Media
- Newspaper
- Artist
- Business Media
- Crown-Corporation
- Crown corporation
- Consulting
- Personal interest
- General Interest
- Individual



- Personal interest
- Interested citizen
- Personal
- All of the above
- Legal services
- Media
- Media
- Consultancy
- Secondary school
- Media
- Crown Corporation
- Media
- Student
- Personal interest

**2. What country are you based in?**

	Average <sup>1</sup> (470)	Business (208)	Government (96)	Academic / Research (83)	NGO (26)	Other (55)
	83%	89.9%	71.9%	77.1%	65.4%	92.7%
<b>Other</b>	17% <b>Breakdown:</b> .2% Argentina .6% Australia 4.7% China .9% Hong Kong .9% India .2% Indonesia 2.3% Japan .9% Mexico .2% New Zealand .6% Philippines 1.5% Singapore .4% South Korea .2% Spain .6% Taiwan 1.3% Thailand .2% United Kingdom .9% United States .4% Viet Nam	10.1% <b>Breakdown:</b> 4.3% China 1% Hong Kong 1.9% Japan 1% Singapore .5% Thailand .5% United Kingdom 1% United States	28.1% <b>Breakdown:</b> 1% Argentina 2.1% Australia 5.2% China 1% India 1% Indonesia 4.2% Japan 1% New Zealand 2.1% Philippines 1% Singapore 2.1% South Korea 3.1% Taiwan 4.2% Thailand	22.9% <b>Breakdown:</b> 1.2% Australia 4.8% China 2.4% Hong Kong 1.2% India 3.6% Japan 4.8% Mexico 2.4% Singapore 2.4% United States	34.6% <b>Breakdown:</b> 7.7% China 3.8% Hong Kong 7.7% India 3.8% Philippines 3.8% Singapore 3.8% Thailand 3.8% Viet Nam	7.3% <b>Breakdown:</b> 1.8% China 1.8% Singapore 1.8% Spain 1.8% Viet Nam

<sup>1</sup> Please note that the total number of respondents representing the various sectors does not add up to the total number of respondents on average, as all respondents did not answer the question asking them to identify their primary affiliation (question #1). As a result, these respondents' answers are not reflected in the sectoral cross-tab figures.

3. If based in Canada, which province or territory are you based in?

	Average (396)	Business (188)	Government (69)	Academic/Research (67)	NGO (19)	Other (51)
(1) AB	6.5%	6.4%	7.2%	7.5%	5.3%	5.8%
BC	36.9%	34.6%	33.3%	37.3%	63.2%	37.3%
MB	2.3%	1.1%	1.5%	4.5%	5.3%	3.9%
NB	.8%	.5%	1.5%	0%	0%	2%
NFLD	.3%	.5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
NWT	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
NS	1.3%	.5%	0%	4.5%	5.3%	0%
NU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
ON	34.6%	33.5%	46.4%	26.9%	21.1%	0%
PEI	.3%	.5%	0%	0%	0%	39.2%
QUE	14%	17.1%	10.1%	17.9%	0%	7.8%
SK	1.5%	3.2%	0%	0%	0%	0%
YT	1.5%	2.1%	0%	1.5%	0%	2%

4. Please identify which of the following geographic areas is of interest to you in the Asia Pacific region. Please check all that apply.

\* Please note that because respondents could check more than one reply, none of the totals for this question add up to 100%.

- South Pacific includes: Australia, New Zealand, Pacific Islands, Papua New Guinea
- Central Asia includes: Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan
- North and Northeast Asia includes: China, Japan, North and South Korea, Hong Kong, Macau, Mongolia, Philippines, Taiwan
- South Asia includes: Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka
- Southeast Asia includes: Brunei, Burma (Myanmar), Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Vietnam

	Average (471)	Business (208)	Government (96)	Academic/Research (85)	NGO (26)	Other (54)
Entire Asia Pacific Region	43.7%	37.5%	45.8%	55.3%	38.5%	46.2%
South Pacific	14.2%	15.4%	14.6%	12.9%	7.7%	14.8%
Central Asia	4%	3.8%	4.2%	4.7%	0%	7.4%
North and Northeast Asia	57.7%	60.6%	61.5%	60%	46.2%	53.7%
South Asia	20%	20.2%	19.8%	14.1%	30.8%	24.1%
Southeast Asia	33.3%	34.6%	30.2%	34.1	26.9%	37%

5. Please identify if there is any single country of particular interest to you within the Asia Pacific region.

	Average (364)	Business (161)	Government (69)	Academic/Research (71)	NGO (21)	Other (41)
Australia	4.1%	4.3%	7.2%	2.8%	4.8%	0%
Bangladesh	1.1%	1.2%	0%	2.8%	0%	0%
Cambodia	.3%	.6%	0%	1.4%	0%	0%
China	48.9%	49.7%	42%	52.1%	42.9%	52.4%
Hong Kong	3.8%	3.1%	1.4%	7%	9.5%	2.4%
India	7.1%	6.8%	4.3%	7%	9.5%	12.2%
Indonesia	.5%	4.3%	5.8%	0%	4.8%	4.9%
Japan	15.4%	18%	18.8%	12.7%	4.8%	9.8%
Laos	.3%	0%	1.4%	0%	0%	0%
Malaysia	1.1%	1.9%	0%	1.4%	0%	0%
New Zealand	.3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2.4%
North Korea	.8%	.6%	1.4%	0%	0%	2.4%
Pakistan	.3%	.6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Philippines	1.4%	.6%	2.9%	1.4%	0%	2.4%
Russia	.3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
South Korea	4.1%	3.1%	7.2%	1.4%	4.8%	7.3%
Sri Lanka	.3%	0%	0%	0%	4.8%	0%
Taiwan	1.6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Thailand	3.3%	2.5%	5.8%	2.8%	9.5%	0%
Vietnam	2.7%	2.5%	1.4%	4.2%	4.8%	2.4%

6. How familiar are you with the APFC's mandate, activities, products and services?<sup>2</sup>

	Average (474)	Business (208)	Government (96)	Academic/Research (86)	NGO (27)	Other (55)
Not familiar at all	9.5%	17.3%	1%	3.5%	7.4%	5.5%
Not very familiar	22.4%	25%	17.7%	24.4%	22.2%	18.2%
Somewhat familiar	34.4%	33.7%	38.5%	31.4%	33.3%	36.4%
Very familiar	27.6%	20.7%	35.4%	32.6%	25.9%	32.7%
Extremely familiar	6.1%	3.3%	7.3%	8.1%	11.1%	7%

<sup>2</sup> Any respondents that stated that they were "not familiar at all" with APFC's mandate, activities, products and services, were skipped to the end of the survey.

7. From your perspective, which of the following most accurately defines APFC's focus? Please rank the following from least accurate to most accurate. Please note that you cannot give the same ranking to more than one option.

For the purpose of recording data for this question, a scale of 1-5 is used, with 1 representing the least accurate and 5, the most accurate.

**Overall:**

Ranking:	1 (least accurate)	2	3	4	5 (most accurate)
Response total:	265	321	359	372	387
Promoting trade and investment between Canada and the Asia Pacific region	23%	17.8%	18.9%	16.9%	28.2%
Developing academic and professional exchanges between Canada and the Asia Pacific region	32.9%	34.6%	20.9%	10.5%	5.2%
Providing information to Canadians on the Asia Pacific region	7.9%	11.8%	15.9%	26.9%	36.7%
Supporting research on the Asia Pacific region	21.9%	20.6%	22.9%	21%	10.6%
Providing independent commentary on Canada-Asia Pacific issues	14.3%	15.2%	21.4%	24.7%	19.3%

**Business:**

Ranking:	1 (least accurate)	2	3	4	5 (most accurate)
Response total:	98	130	149	151	154
Promoting trade and investment between Canada and the Asia Pacific region	22.4%	11.5%	17.4%	19.9%	33.8%
Developing academic and professional exchanges between Canada and the Asia Pacific region	29.6%	36.9%	20.1%	11.3%	5.2%
Providing information to Canadians on the Asia Pacific region	7.1%	12.3%	14.8%	33.1%	36.4%
Supporting research on the Asia Pacific region	23.5%	23.8%	23.5%	15.9%	7.8%
Providing independent commentary on Canada-Asia Pacific issues	17.3%	15.4%	24.2%	19.9%	16.9%

**Government:**

Ranking:	1 (least accurate)	2	3	4	5 (most accurate)
Response total:	61	72	77	81	84
Promoting trade and investment between Canada and the Asia Pacific region	41%	22.1%	14.3%	16%	17.9%
Developing academic and professional exchanges between	26.2%	29.2%	32.5%	9.9%	7.1%

Canada and the Asia Pacific region					
Providing information to Canadians on the Asia Pacific region	9.8%	18.1%	14.3%	17.3%	35.7%
Supporting research on the Asia Pacific region	11.5%	15.3%	18.2%	30.9%	16.7%
Providing independent commentary on Canada-Asia Pacific issues	11.5%	15.3%	20.7%	25.9%	22.6%

**Academic / Research:**

Ranking:	1 (least accurate)	2	3	4	5 (most accurate)
Response total:	61	63	74	74	78
Promoting trade and investment between Canada and the Asia Pacific region	13.1%	22.2%	27%	8.1%	30.8%
Developing academic and professional exchanges between Canada and the Asia Pacific region	39.3%	31.7%	12.2%	10.8%	5.1%
Providing information to Canadians on the Asia Pacific region	21.3%	11.1%	17.6%	29.7%	38.5%
Supporting research on the Asia Pacific region	26.2%	20.6%	28.4%	17.6%	7.7%
Providing independent commentary on Canada-Asia Pacific issues	16.4%	14.3%	14.9%	33.8%	17.9%

**NGO:**

Ranking:	1 (least accurate)	2	3	4	5 (most accurate)
Response total:	14	15	16	19	21
Promoting trade and investment between Canada and the Asia Pacific region	28.6%	26.6%	18.8%	5.3%	19%
Developing academic and professional exchanges between Canada and the Asia Pacific region	21.4%	60%	18.8%	10.5%	0%
Providing information to Canadians on the Asia Pacific region	0%	6.7%	6.3%	26.3%	52.4%
Supporting research on the Asia Pacific region	35.7%	6.7%	18.8%	42.1%	4.8%
Providing independent commentary on Canada-Asia Pacific issues	14.3%	0%	37.5%	15.8%	23.8%

**Other:**

Ranking:	1 (least accurate)	2	3	4	5 (most accurate)
Response total:	30	39	42	46	44
Promoting trade and investment between Canada and the Asia Pacific region	10%	10.3%	19%	26.1%	31.8%
Developing academic and professional exchanges between Canada and the Asia Pacific region	43.3%	28.2%	19%	8.7%	4.5%
Providing information to Canadians on the Asia Pacific region	16.7%	12.8%	23.8%	19.6%	29.5%
Supporting research on the Asia Pacific region	23.3%	20.5%	21.4%	17.4%	18.2%
Providing independent commentary on Canada-Asia Pacific issues	6.7%	28.2%	16.7%	28.3%	22.7%

**II. APFC Products and Services**

**8. Do you use any APFC products or services (including making use of APFC website, attending conferences, etc.)?<sup>3</sup>**

	Average (427)	Business (171)	Government (91)	Academic/Research (83)	NGO (22)	Other (52)
Yes	78%	67.8%	90.1%	81.9%	72.7%	82.7%
No	22%	32.2%	9.9%	18.1%	27.3%	17.3%

**9. Which of the following APFC products and/or services do you use? Please check all that apply to you.<sup>4</sup>**

	Average (396)	Business (150)	Government (89)	Academic/Research (78)	NGO (21)	Other (49)
Subscribe to free e-mail products	92.4%	89.3%	98.9%	91%	100%	89.8%
APFC-organized events	27.3%	23.3%	32.6%	21.8%	28.6%	30.6%
APFC website	61.4%	54.7%	66.3%	61.5%	57.1%	67.3%

<sup>3</sup> Please note that there is a discrepancy between questions 8 and 9, which challenge the statistical accuracy of question 8: If 78% of 427 respondents make use of APFC products or services, then only 333 respondents stated that they do. However, based on the following, 396 respondents identified that they used one or more of APFC services. The discrepancy either relates to the fact that some respondents that answered question 9 skipped question 8 and/or that respondents did not sufficiently understand the meaning of question 8 – i.e. that APFC “products and services” was intended to also include the APFC website, APFC-organized events, etc. Thus, the findings from question 8 have been disqualified as inaccurate.

<sup>4</sup> Please note that because respondents could check more than one reply, none of the totals for this question add up to 100%.

**10. Are you a member of the Asia Pacific Business Network (APBN) - paid service?**

	Average (427)	Business (171)	Government (91)	Academic/Research (84)	NGO (22)	Other (52)
Yes	4.9%	5.8%	4.4%	4.7%	0%	5.8%
No	95.1%	94.2%	95.6%	95.3%	100%	94.2%

**III. APBN members (The questions in the following questions were asked of APBN members only.)**

**11. How satisfied are you with the APBN service?**

	Average (20)	Business (8)	Government (4)	Academic/Research (4)	NGO (0)	Other (3)
Not satisfied at all	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Not very satisfied	5%	0%	25%	0%	0%	0%
Somewhat satisfied	35%	37.5%	25%	75%	0%	0%
Very satisfied	40%	62.5%	25%	0%	0%	33.3%
Extremely satisfied	20%	0%	25%	25%	0%	66.7%

**12. If you attend any APBN events (roundtables, etc), how satisfied are you with these events?**

	Average (18)	Business (8)	Government (2)	Academic/Research (4)	NGO (0)	Other (3)
Not satisfied at all	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Not very satisfied	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Somewhat satisfied	11.1%	12.5%	0%	25%	0%	0%
Very satisfied	83.3%	87.5%	100%	75%	0%	66.7%
Extremely satisfied	5.6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33.3%

IV. APFC services

13. How well do you feel the APFC covers the geographic areas of interest to you?

	Average (400)	Business (154)	Government (89)	Academic/Research (78)	NGO (21)	Other (50)
Not well at all	1.3%	2.6%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Not very well	4.8%	4.5%	2.3%	10.3%	0%	4%
Somewhat well	32.4%	34.5%	38.2%	29.5%	19%	30%
Very well	52%	51.9%	44.9%	52.6%	66.7%	54%
Extremely well	9.5%	6.5%	14.6%	7.7%	14.3%	10%

14. How well do you feel the APFC covers the sectors and/or subject matters of interest to you?

	Average (399)	Business (154)	Government (88)	Academic / Research (78)	NGO (21)	Other (50)
Not well at all	2.5 %	3.9%	0%	2.5%	0%	4%
Not very well	10.3%	14.3%	5.6%	10.1%	9.5%	8%
Somewhat well	41.6%	43.5%	44.9%	41.8%	33.5%	28%
Very well	38.8%	33.8%	41.6%	36.7%	52.4%	52%
Extremely well	6.8%	4.5%	7.9%	8.9%	4.8%	8%

15. How useful have APFC's products and services been in your business planning, operations and/or research activities in the Asia Pacific region?

	Average (398)	Business (154)	Government (88)	Academic/Research (76)	NGO (22)	Other (50)
Not of any use	4.3%	5.2%	1.1%	3.9%	4.5%	4%
Not very useful	13.6%	16.2%	5.7%	14.5%	18.2%	10%
Somewhat useful	40.7%	40.9%	46.6%	28.9%	31.8%	38%
Very useful	31.7%	33.2%	34.1%	42.1%	31.8%	38%
Extremely useful	9.7%	4.5%	12.5%	10.5%	13.6%	10%



**16. On average, how satisfied have you been with the APFC's services and products?**

	Overall (404)	Business (151)	Government (88)	Academic/Research (76)	NGO (22)	Other (49)
Not satisfied at all	.7 %	1.3%	0%	1.3%	0%	0%
Not very satisfied	6.9%	7.9%	4.5%	9.1%	13.6%	4.1%
Somewhat satisfied	38.2%	42.4%	33.7%	31.2%	31.8%	30.6%
Very satisfied	44.2%	41.7%	48.3%	44.2%	50%	51%
Extremely satisfied	10%	6.6%	13.5%	14.3%	4.5%	14.3%

**17. From your perspective, how well has the APFC kept pace with changes in the Asia Pacific region over the past five years?**

	Average (388)	Business (151)	Government (84)	Academic/Research (75)	NGO (22)	Other (49)
Not well at all	.5 %	1.3%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Not very well	5.2 %	6%	4.8%	6.6%	4.5%	2%
Somewhat well	34%	39.1%	34.5%	27.6%	22.7%	30.6%
Very well	46.6%	46.4%	40.5%	44.7%	59.1%	55.1%
Extremely well	13.7%	7.3%	20.2%	21.1%	13.6%	12.2%

**18. From your perspective, how well does the APFC's focus and programs reflect the current reality of Canada's business and political relationships with the Asia Pacific region?**

	Average (389)	Business (152)	Government (84)	Academic/Research (76)	NGO (22)	Other (47)
Not well at all	1 %	2%	0%	1.3%	0%	0%
Not very well	8.5 %	9.9%	12.9%	5.2%	4.5%	4.3%
Somewhat well	40.9%	48%	30.6%	39%	36.4%	40.4%
Very well	42.2%	33.6%	47.1%	48%	54.5%	46.8%
Extremely well	7.5%	6.6%	9.4%	6.4%	4.5%	8.5%

**19. Is the range of information and services you require available from other sources?**

	Average (405)	Business (155)	Government (89)	Academic / Research (79)	NGO (21)	Other (50)
Yes, and I prefer them to APFC products and services	9.9%	12.3%	8.9%	7.6%	14.3%	6%
Yes, and I use them	54.8%	51.6%	60%	60.8%	33.3%	58%

in addition to APFC products and services						
Yes, but I prefer APFC products and services	12.3%	10.3%	11.1%	10.1%	19%	18%%
Not that I am aware of	23%	25.8%	22.2%	21.5%	33.3%	20%

**20. Have you attended the APFC's annual Asia Pacific Summit since 2000?**

	Average (411)	Business (163)	Government (89)	Academic/Research (79)	NGO (22)	Other (50)
Yes	21.9%	30%	24.7%	22.8%	31.8%	22%
No	78.1%	133%	75.3%	77.2%	68.2%	78%

**V. APFC Annual Summit (The questions in the following section were asked of those who answered affirmatively in question #20 – ie. only of those who had attended the APFC annual summit since 2000.)**

**21. In your experience, what are the most valuable aspects of the annual Asia Pacific Summit? Please rank the following from least to most important. Please note that you cannot give the same ranking to more than one option.**

For the purpose of recording data for this question, a scale of 1-5 is used, with 1 representing the least important and 5, the most important.

**Average:**

Ranking:	1 (least important)	2	3	4	5 (most important)
Response total:	70	76	77	79	84
Networking with other Canadian business, institutions or individuals interested in the Asia Pacific region	11.4%	14.5%	14.3%	29.1%	32.1%
Meeting individuals, institutions or businesses based in the Asia Pacific Region, for prospective future business relationships	22.9%	15.8%	19.5%	24.1%	20.2%
Exchanging knowledge about sectors and/or issues of relevance to you	15.7%	23.7%	20.8%	20.2%	16.7%
Becoming more knowledgeable about the Asia Pacific region	14.3%	18.4%	27.3%	12.7%	25%
Becoming more knowledgeable about your area of expertise or focus	35.7%	27.6%	18.2%	13.9%	6%

**Business:**

Ranking:	1 (least important)	2	3	4	5 (most important)
Response total:	23	26	27	27	29
Networking with other Canadian business, institutions or	13%	15.4%	3.7%	44.4%	27.6%

individuals interested in the Asia Pacific region					
Meeting individuals, institutions or businesses based in the Asia Pacific Region, for prospective future business relationships	21.7%	7.7%	33.3%	18.5%	17.2%
Exchanging knowledge about sectors and/or issues of relevance to you	17.4%	26.9%	22.2%	14.8%	13.8%
Becoming more knowledgeable about the Asia Pacific region	8.7%	15.4%	29.6%	11.1%	34.5%
Becoming more knowledgeable about your area of expertise or focus	39.1%	34.6%	11.1%	11.1%	6.9%

**Government:**

Ranking:	1 (least important)	2	3	4	5 (most important)
Response total:	19	19	18	20	22
Networking with other Canadian business, institutions or individuals interested in the Asia Pacific region	5.3%	10.5%	16.7%	15%	54.5%
Meeting individuals, institutions or businesses based in the Asia Pacific Region, for prospective future business relationships	21%	10.5%	11.1%	35%	22.7%
Exchanging knowledge about sectors and/or issues of relevance to you	15.8%	31.6%	33.3%	20%	0%
Becoming more knowledgeable about the Asia Pacific region	15.8%	31.6%	16.7%	20%	13.7%
Becoming more knowledgeable about your area of expertise or focus	42.1%	15.8%	22.2%	10%	9.1%

**Academic / Research:**

Ranking:	1 (least important)	2	3	4	5 (most important)
Response total:	16	17	17	17	16
Networking with other Canadian business, institutions or individuals interested in the Asia Pacific region	12.5%	23.5%	17.6%	17.6%	31.3%
Meeting individuals, institutions or businesses based in the Asia Pacific Region, for prospective future business relationships	31.3%	35.3%	17.6%	5.9%	6.3%
Exchanging knowledge about sectors and/or issues of relevance to you	12.5%	11.8%	0%	41.2%	31.3%
Becoming more knowledgeable about the Asia Pacific region	12.5%	11.8%	41.2%	11.8%	25%
Becoming more knowledgeable about your area of expertise or focus	31.3%	17.6%	23.5%	23.5%	6.3%

**NGO:**

Ranking:	1 (least important)	2	3	4	5 (most important)
Response total:	6	6	5	5	6
Networking with other Canadian business, institutions or individuals interested in the Asia Pacific region	16.7%	16.7%	0%	60%	0%
Meeting individuals, institutions or businesses based in the Asia Pacific Region, for prospective future business relationships	16.7%	16.7%	20%	20%	33.3%
Exchanging knowledge about sectors and/or issues of relevance to you	16.7%	16.7%	40%	0%	33.3%
Becoming more knowledgeable about the Asia Pacific region	16.7%	16.7%	20%	0%	33.3%
Becoming more knowledgeable about your area of expertise or focus	33.3%	33.3%	20%	20%	0%

**Other:**

Ranking:	1 (least important)	2	3	4	5 (most important)
Response total:	5	7	9	9	10
Networking with other Canadian business, institutions or individuals interested in the Asia Pacific region	20%	0%	33.3%	22.2%	20%
Meeting individuals, institutions or businesses based in the Asia Pacific Region, for prospective future business relationships	0%	14.3%	0%	55.6%	40%
Exchanging knowledge about sectors and/or issues of relevance to you	20%	28.6%	22.2%	11.1%	20%
Becoming more knowledgeable about the Asia Pacific region	40%	14.3%	22.2%	0%	20%
Becoming more knowledgeable about your area of expertise or focus	20%	42.9%	22.2%	11.1%	0%

**22. Have you developed a business or professional relationship through contacts at an Annual Asia Pacific Summit?**

	Average (88)	Business (30)	Government (22)	Academic/Research (17)	NGO (7)	Other (11)
Yes, for a single business activity or professional purpose	20.5%	20%	22.7%	11.8%	0%	45.4%
Yes, on an ongoing basis	35.2%	36.7%	36.4%	41.2%	14.3%	27.3%
No	44.3%	43.3%	40.9%	47.1%	85.7%	27.3%

**23. On average, how satisfied have you been with the Annual Asia Pacific Summit?**

	Average (90)	Business (30)	Government (22)	Academic/Research (18)	NGO (7)	Other (11)
Not well at all	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Not very well	12.2%	13.3%	13.6%	16.7%	14.3%	0%
Somewhat well	30.1%	33.3%	27.3%	38.8%	28.5%	18.2%
Very well	45.5%	36.7%	45.5%	44.5%	42.9%	72.7%
Extremely well	12.2%	16.7%	13.6%	0%	14.3%	9.1%

**VI. CAPRN**

**24. Are you a member of the Canada-Asia Pacific Research Network (CAPRN) database of Canadian specialists on Asia?**

	Average (406)	Business (162)	Government (87)	Academic/Research (78)	NGO (22)	Other (49)
Yes	10.1%	1.9%	3.4%	37.2%	0%	10.2%
No	89.9%	98.1%	96.6%	62.8%	100%	89.8%

**VII. CAPRN (The question in the following section was asked of CAPRN members only.)**

**25. How often do you use information and research materials produced by the APFC?**

	Average (40)	Business (4)	Government (3)	Academic/Research (29)	NGO (0)	Other (5)
Not at all	7.5%	0%	33.3%	6.9%	0%	0%
Not very often	17.5%	25%	0%	17.2%	0%	20%
Somewhat often	20%	25%	33.3%	20.7%	0%	40%
Very often	47.5%	50%	33.3%	44.8%	0%	40%
Extremely often	7.5%	0%	0%	10.3%	0%	0%