

government capacity was one of the key reasons for the failure of the Paris agreements. Similarly in Sierra Leone that limited capacity of the Kabbah government made it a relatively easy target for the ARFC. Clearly the demand for more peacebuilding focus on Tier 2 initiatives exists.

In terms of Canadian capacity, its most important asset is its reputation as one of the most stable and successful democratic societies in the world. For Canadians involved in peacebuilding initiatives this provides them with a certain operational credibility and national actors are more likely to respect peacebuilders which come from a country with a proven track record. This credibility is complemented by the fact that the preliminary results of peacebuilding capacity in Canada suggests that developing government and NGO capacity in other states is where many Canadian organizations have experience. It would seem appropriate then to encourage the expansion of this role, matching the international demand with the skills and expertise of Canadian organizations in order to improve a Tier of peacebuilding initiatives which has been underdeveloped in the past despite its importance.

This does not mean that other Canadian peacebuilding initiatives in other Tiers should be ignored. Canada will undoubtedly continue to play an important role in peacekeeping, and in the provision of humanitarian relief. Similarly, Canadian agencies have expertise in the field of economic reconstruction and social rehabilitation. However, it is desirable to orientate Canadian peacebuilding policy in a direction which recognizes the demands of current international peacebuilding efforts and meets these demands by utilizing the expertise and capabilities available within Canada. In this way Canada can make a substantial contribution in assisting war-torn states to continue on the path towards democratic and peaceful development.