

She then identified four "new concerns" which are germane to the debate about sanctions reform. First, state and non-state actors have become more concerned with the humanitarian impact of sanctions. Second, there has been growing interest in fine-tuning targeted sanctions so that they produce concrete effects on target elites. Third, UN sanctions committees have come under criticism because of their secrecy, inexpediency, and the amount of work which they produce for non-permanent Council members. Fourth, non-permanent members of the Council have become increasingly restive concerning the dominance of the P-5 over issues pertaining to sanctions. That notwithstanding, Prof. Doxey stressed that reform efforts must have the approval of the P-5, and must address the fundamental problems of a lack of funding and personnel at the UN level.

The floor was then opened for a general discussion of sanctions. Picking up on the themes of legitimacy and resources, David Malone noted that the UN Security Council does not have a monopoly on the "legitimate" imposition of sanctions: organizations such as the Commonwealth can be viewed as legitimate under certain circumstances. Furthermore, he noted, regional organizations have a valuable role to play in monitoring sanctions.

Prof. Richard Garfield (Columbia University) argued that, obstacles to reform notwithstanding, the current period favours attempts to establish general principles guiding the imposition of sanctions. Errol Mendez (Ottawa University) agreed, but urged participants to adopt a broader perspective, by seeking to develop principles of crisis management and pre-emptive peacebuilding.

Carolyn McAskie (VP Multilateral Programs CIDA) asked how we ought to define "success" in the context of discussions about sanctions. Prof. Doxey, while noting the