- 3) To rebuild political and economic infrastructures, as well as civil society/ social institutions. This can involve identifying and working with local peace groups.
- 4) To effect long-term reconciliation that deals with the collective traumas of war, these being potential seeds for future violent conflict.

All these challenges are interlinked and must be approached simultaneously. Complex interactions are involved, and our understanding in this regard is deficient. For example, aid projects which target only one side of a conflict may thereby favour that actor and complicate the prospects for a sustainable peace.

This means that peace-building must be pursued along different sectoral "tracks", as well as at the levels of society, state/government, and international/global interventions. The pressing need is to come up with an overall *strategic framework* with minimum contradictions. One suggestion in this regard was to form working groups for sectors such as health, education, and humanitarian relief, which can produce practical guidelines for peace-building, liaise with local contact organisations, and share information and evaluation.

At the level of coordinating the international actors, there is a need for strategic policy integration. This will require a different approach for each case. Consultations at the highest level for the donor actors will be needed in order formulate a cooperative mechanism for assistance and to determine comparative advantage. This will lead to a coordinated policy response - a more integrated approach that is translated into an operational reality. This is a priority area in the work of the UN Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD). Canada can also play a considerable role in this area as a major actor in international development with no legacy of great power political domination. We have an almost unique potential to promote a progressive policy approach, given that the like-minded European actors (such as Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, Ireland) are increasingly bound by common EU policies. It was also argued that there are potential opportunities for collaborative initiatives to be pursued with such like-minded European partners.

Finally, the *balance* between the interaction of external (donor) actors and internal (conflict) actors is not right. Solutions cannot be imposed from outside but rather must be developed from the cooperative interaction of the local conflict actors and their society. Yet external assistance is still selective and politicised, and fails to build on local resources and dynamics. So there is a need to "map" local actors and their dynamic interaction. 80% of reconstruction is done by local people at the local level, and based