

and why there is a potential for escalation. Providing this type of analysis is the first step to identifying priority areas for preventive engagement.<sup>5</sup> This then raises the second broad aspect of response-oriented analysis, apart from strategic targeting: the *process link*.

What is meant by this process link in analysis? Two elements are important here: 1) analysis should be able to provide dynamic conflict profiles which explain indicators of political instability in relation to existing priority focal points (i.e. thematic sectors such as human rights, political participation, humane governance, democratic development) in conflict prevention policy mechanisms; 2) such profiles should be suggestive of logical operational responses, along various interacting sectors, which could form the basis of an integrated program for preventive peacebuilding. There should therefore be an interactive "meshing" of the analytical framework with the operational response policy-making mechanism. This clearly demands a higher level of coordination between early warning analysts and governmental/IO officers responsible for conflict prevention programs. Some discussions of this are starting to unfold within certain foreign ministries, and considerable advances are being made at the UN Secretariat in linking the Humanitarian Early Warning System (HEWS) into the interdepartmental decision-making structure.<sup>6</sup> But where analysis and operations are carried out at different levels by different actors (either in the classic division between governmental intelligence and foreign policy departments, or analysis by NGOs rather than governments), such processual coordination becomes more difficult. In this way, then, strategic targeting and process link in analysis are really interdependent.

In the Canadian policy context, we are currently proceeding in the reverse order, due to the paucity of response-oriented conflict early warning analysis. Operational priority issues are highlighted for specific situations, and options for peacebuilding support are framed accordingly. This involves a very time-consuming process of "joint" analysis of current conflict zones between functional divisions in the DFAIT Global and Human Issues Bureau (which are concerned with thematic policy development), and DFAIT and Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) geographic divisions responsible for bilateral relations and country programs. This process, largely reactive in nature, itself represents a major step forward in (at a minimum), taking a systematic look at peacebuilding priorities and response options on a global scale. The dilemma referred to above, classic for any foreign ministry or aid agency around the world, is exacerbated by the deficit in analysis. The challenge now is to front-load better dynamic, response-oriented analysis into the nascent operational mechanism of the Canadian Peacebuilding Initiative.

Conflict is a dynamic process in which stages of escalation may be identified.<sup>7</sup> The *dynamic interaction* of factors which cause escalation from one phase to the next demands that priority factors for preventive action (the areas of greatest near-term danger in the interaction dynamic) be identified. Analysis must avoid the tendency to