

relevant to DFAIT's dichotomous (functional / geographic matrix) operations and the differing interpretations given to the objective.

The department is organized into Geographic Bureaus, who deliver regionally specific programs, often with the consultative support of the 'functional divisions' (such as IDC, AGM etc). This places the Geographics as the client or recipient of the functional divisions' counsel and advice.

However, the functional divisions also provide 'externally delivered' programs in the management of Canadian international relations and participation in multilateral fora. In these cases, to some extent, the Geographics provide consultative (region-specific) support to the functional divisions. The client:provider relationship is thus reversed.

In the case of the AGL initiative, the approach to the objectives situates the players. As described in the section above, seeing the objective as a multinational issue, on African soil places a different lead and organizational dominance than does an African crisis needing international support.

The former places the functional divisions in the lead, with the Geographic supporting the international mobilization effort. The latter, an African crisis, would imply Africa Bureau Leadership, with functional division support.

According to some, the management approach, at first, was towards 'generic' solutions to a multinational issue. Some found the department reluctant to introduce region-specific issues into the day-to-day deployment. Some argued that the initiative was more of a multilateral humanitarian operation than an involvement in the AGL geopolitics, and thus justified recourse to a more "template-like approach."

It is noteworthy that perception of this tension was uneven; most interviewees mentioning it, but to different degrees. Resolution, or at least minimization, of these tensions occurred as the central coordination role was assumed by GGD. This was seen to reflect recognition of the importance of region-specific knowledge and expertise and of contextualizing the issues and decisions. However, this assignment of roles was not formalized until roughly November 18, 1996, approximately one week into the crisis.