

involved at all levels in reconstruction efforts. Government institutions, even if ineffectual, must be engaged, as well as militant opposition groups. Civil society does not yet receive the attention it needs during a peace-building process (it must be involved at the project level, both in design as well as implementation). At the international level, a wide variety of organizations and agencies should be involved in the peace process. The example of CIDA's funding for projects implemented by RCMP was cited in this regard. Finally, *donor coordination and collaboration* must be seen as a priority for peace-building activities to be organized for maximum efficiency and effect.

Institutional impediments here are considerable, and will require special efforts to surmount. A *working group of donors* contributing to a peace process should be formed during the negotiation phase in order to develop a *flexible framework* for action and a *division of responsibilities*. A lead donor organization should be identified to head the working group. Where possible, this working group should forge contacts with the government and opposition groups engaged in negotiations. While the UN resident coordinator could act as the lead, some suggested it would be preferable for the World Bank to play this role of coordinating donor initiatives. It was argued that there is no other viable multilateral agency to act in such capacity, and that the World Bank already does perform some aspects of this (such as its management of the Palestine trust fund). Sectoral working groups could also be established to minimize overlap between external donor agencies, and to ensure a code of conduct for NGO activity. Some participants questioned this proposed role for the World Bank, however, noting that the mandate of the Bank prevents it from engaging in "political" activities. But others suggested that it was appropriate for the Bank to evolve to meet the challenges of these new situations, and that member governments could provide some guidance on managing these potential political complications of reconstruction.

In the consideration of these priorities for action and coordination, some participants observed that there can be an incongruence between the reconstruction agenda and the agendas of various *political* actors. Thus our approach needs to be pragmatic as well, helping people at the local level to solve problems and *prevent* a return to violence. This preventive aspect of peace-building is needed in order to stop the cycle of violence. In this regard, it was also noted that what may be needed is a *deconstruction* of conflict-producing practices as much as the (re)construction of a viable political order. To the extent that Canadian foreign aid/trade policies may in fact reinforce such negative conflict-producing elements, adjusting such policies (to take human rights into account, for example) may in fact be necessary for preventive peace-building. It was also noted that there remains significant resistance in donor countries, including Canada, to support for direct funding to be disbursed and controlled by local actors.

---