

IGAD identifies common issues and problems related to development in Africa and includes: Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Sudan, and Djibouti. It has a subcommittee devoted particularly to the peace process in Sudan, chaired by Kenya. IGAD was established in 1994 when the conflict in Sudan involved only two key actors: the Sudanese Peoples Liberation Movement/Army – SPLM/A and the government of Sudan. Since then, the conflict has become more national in scope. Today it encompasses diverse groups and actors, including the new National Democratic Alliance. The growing diversity of actors, the lack of desire for peace, as well as the nature of issues key to moving peace forward makes the IGAD peace process exceedingly cumbersome and slow.

Core issues for negotiation in the Sudan conflict are outlined in the **Declaration of Principles** (negotiated in 1994 and finally agreed to in 1997). The government of Sudan is reluctant to address these issues and is only willing to perceive the Declaration as a loose framework for negotiation. The most difficult issues to move on are the secularisation of the state and the question of self-determination for the South. The conflict in Sudan appears intractable because the government is unwilling to reverse the monolithic imposition of Islam on diverse religious and social groups. Moreover, while the South is unwilling to transfer its resources (i.e., water and oil) to the North (read the government in Khartoum), the North is unwilling to relinquish its control over these resources.

IGAD countries have other interests besides peace and development in Sudan. For instance, **Eritrea, Ethiopia and Kenya** suffer consequences of the conflict's spill-over (i.e., refugees). Their position is influenced by their interests in water resources and trade. They share common history, perceive themselves as a buffer zone against Arab expansionism and their governments fear the growth of political Islamic groups and the military support such groups receive. It is unlikely they would dramatically challenge the U.S. position. **Kenya**, moreover, appears to be possessive of the IGAD peace process and is inflexible on expanding the IGAD membership. It is also suspicious of IPF's (IGAD Partners Forum) "interference." Doubt about the capacity of the morally corrupt Kenyan government to lead the peace process was expressed. Egypt would be perhaps better suited to lead the process. Other African countries involved in the conflict include: Egypt, Libya, Algeria (as a president of OAU), Nigeria, and South Africa. The Arab League, Iran, China and Malaysia are also players.

2) Egypt and Libya

In addition to the IGAD peace process, **Egypt and Libya** have had their own peace initiatives. Egypt has been monitoring the developments in Sudan for a long time but its involvement has been negligible until the IGAD process gained momentum and the question of self-determination of the South became a real option a year ago. The reason behind the Egyptian reconciliation initiatives is to prevent the disintegration of Sudan. Other interests include: water resources, the control over Sudanese affairs, Arab solidarity, Egypt's relationship to Ethiopia, loyalty to certain political parties, as well as the continuing financial and political support from the U.S. The governments of Egypt and Libya met in **Tripoli** last summer to set the framework