PEACE BUILDING
AND RECONSTRUCTION

A Review of the PBR
Program Initiative of IDRC

Review Team

David Gillies
Hal Klepak

1 July 1999

KNOWLEDGE AS PEACEBUILDER

AN EXTERNAL REVIEW

OF THE

PEACE BUILDING AND RECONSTRUCTION PROGRAMME INITIATIVE

BY

DAVID GILLIES & HAL KLEPAK*

FOR

THE EVALUATION UNIT, INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE

JULY 1, 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.

SECTION A - THE PBR PI REVIEW IN CONTEXT

Scope and Limitations of the Review. This report is a partial review of the peace building and reconstruction programme initiative. It is one independent and external input to other internal stock-taking activities enabling IDRC and its programme staff to chart the next phase in the development of the PBR PI.

For several reasons, this report is not an evaluation in the sense of a comprehensive assessment of performance and outcomes relative to objectives and intentions. First, the review relies very largely on the interpretation of secondary materials in the form of project summaries, annual PI reports, limited direct contact with programme staff, and corporate policy statements. Second, time and financial constraints have prevented any field work or systematic social science survey methods, such as questionnaires of 'customer satisfaction' by the end users of IDRC-supported research. These include researchers, local communities, donors, and national and sub-national governments. Third, the PBR PI is still in its infancy, while development results are often long-term where 'results measurable today may be the products of research decisions taken ten or more years ago.'[1] Fourth, the breadth and number of sub-project activities has required a limited sampling to illustrate the scope and content of the PI. These constraints reduce the capacity of the review to address the higher order development results implied by the term 'impact.' It is worth noting that some operational donor agencies increasingly acknowledge that results-based management should focus on outputs and outcomes, and that impact-level results are problematic to identify and achieve within the time frame of most development projects and programmes. This limitation can also be found in research-led processes where counterfactuals, such as the role of other actors, can make it difficult to link cause and effect in any clear linear fashion. In the absence of extensive interviews with end users, the review largely avoids definitive conclusions on issues of research impact.

In view of the diversity of projects supported by the PI, the review examines seven interventions in more detail. The selection was influenced by a need for representation of projects that are national, regional, and global in scope and address different kinds of primary end-users, for example the international donor community in the case of WSP and PCIA, or service delivery organizations in the case of sexual violence in Soweto and South Johannesburg. The preponderance of projects concerning South Africa and Southern Africa reflects the current centre of gravity of the PI.

SECTION B - SUMMARY OF THE PBR PROGRAMME INITIATIVE

Genesis. The programme documentation setting out a rationale for establishing a PBR PI is sound and indeed impressively coherent. For too long, development research and indeed discussion of development as a whole, took place as if there were hardly any such thing as conflict or its often devastating impact on the goals of sustainable development. For reasons

largely of political sensitivity, development research took as a given that dealing head-on with questions of conflict, or the relationship between conflict and development, was simply not part of the subjects deemed 'treatable.'

With the explosion of civil and other conflicts in the post-cold war world it has become much more difficult to turn a blind eye to conflict. In society after society wracked by war, national development has been stalled or shattered. The Cold War had at least kept the lid on many potential conflicts. In its aftermath, old enmities have re-surfaced. In the 1990s, it is no longer possible to ignore the effects of conflict on development. On the positive side, the new international context prompted donor agencies to engage the security dimensions of development.

Given IDRC's intellectual leadership in a number of fields and its presence in numerous violence- prone regions, notably sub-Saharan Africa, a peace agenda is a logical complement to its development mandate. Such a focus was reinforced by the enormous Canadian experience in peacekeeping, preventive diplomacy, and conflict management, a role that acquired new prominence with global demands for human rights, democracy and good governance, and a national determination to respond to successive humanitarian emergencies in the 1990s, from the former-Yugoslavia to the Great Lakes region of Africa. At the global level, Canadian interests were reinforced by the tabling of the UN's *Agenda for Peace* and an *Agenda for Development.*

Taking the concept of a multi-disciplinary approach to development problems set out forcefully in *Empowerment through Knowledge,* the PBR PI is quintessentially in the business of inter-disciplinary, inter-national, and inter-agency linkages. The PI can combine Canada's reputation as a peacebuilder with IDRC's reputation as an independent and global knowledge builder to speak with authority and legitimacy on the complex tasks of post-conflict reconstruction.

Scope. The scope of the PI is daunting in view of the centrality of peacebuilding to development in so many countries. The PI mission is to 'support research, policy development and capacity building as tools to assist countries emerging from violent conflicts to make the difficult transition to peace, reconciliation, social equity and sustainable development.' this is of course a huge undertaking, even when the verb 'help' provides a measure of modest ambition.

Peace, reconciliation, social equity, and sustainable development are gigantic notions fraught

2

with difficulty and disappointment. Especially in the context of civil strife, social inequality, distrust, and the lack of development have been closely linked to the reasons behind the outbreak of fighting and elusive goal of a final peace acceptable to all parties.

But given the enormity of the peacebuilding agenda, IDRC in accepting the importance of the challenge must also acknowledge the scope of the agenda. Modest priorities in the midst of such huge goals are crucial to success. The PI's response is three priorities for a limited number of country-specific projects, cross-country of regional projects, and projects related to a global agenda of peacebuilding research, policy and action.

The second and third agendas nevertheless throw up a bewildering array of research questions so that the priorities do not immediately solve the problem of focus or niche. This structural problem of scope is perhaps reflected in the PI's desire for ever-increasing connections with other contributors to PBR research and practice. Institutional connections are important, especially in a new PI establishing its credentials and building its knowledge base. But over time, there needs to be a strategic and selective approach if the PI and IDRC is to avoid being seen as a gadfly by other research institutions or by operational agencies. Beyond money and a seat at the table of global knowledge, the PI needs to begin thinking through what intellectual value-added it is bringing to these global fora, and how it can best disseminate its own learning and the micro-experiences from other overlapping PI's. IDRC could play a very useful convening role in helping the international PBR community think through the basic issues of who does what best.

Equally, peacebuilding must encounter enormous obstacles, given the precariousness or hostile nature of conflict-prone settings, for attracting and maintaining highly skilled professionals. Over the long haul, there is enormous potential for IDRC to leverage the fruits of research findings and the talents of its researchers in the service of professional development for peacebuilding professional in donor agencies and national institutions. This goes beyond the necessary but not sufficient need to build local peacebuilding research capacities, which is what capacity building appears to encompass in the PI rationale to date.

Empowerment Through Knowledge underlines the importance of the need for 'fresh thinking about social, economic, and political institutions.' Recent experience does suggest that reconstruction, peacebuilding in the wider sense of addressing the root causes of conflict, can indeed transform over the long run central perceptions of key elements in a society. And this can help to build confidence in a new environment that peace is indeed possible without excessive injustice perceived by many of the major social actors. And while this has hardly proven easy in any of the cases where it has been attempted, the approach has proven itself to varying degrees in a number of settings.

Conflict has a tendency to make research, especially, research related to central political issues, a risky business. By its very nature, this kind of research will be *political* and its conclusions will

3

have real importance to political forces at play. And therefore there will be those who are pleased with such research and others likely to be more unhappy. These verities require the PI to have the courage to take responsible risks where there is a reasonable expectation of beneficial social change.

In view of the above context, it is felt that the genesis of the PBR PI has been based on a solid analysis of where research is essential in much of the developing world. It is difficult to imagine an agency such as IDRC not engaging in this type of research given the central influence of conflict on the prospects for development in so many countries. IDRC's own assessments of its strengths in the development research area are essentially correct and it should capitalize on them.

The issue of regional focus also deserves attention. The geographic focus on Africa which commands over 70% of resources is at odds with the scope of the PBR problematic which is truly global. While Africa is wracked by terrible civil strife, so too are parts of the Middle East and Latin America. The outcome of these conflicts have implications for Canadian development and foreign policy that are as, or more, compelling than Africa. This is not to argue against a priority for Africa post-conflict settings. It is merely to suggest that in future decision-making on project balance, this obvious imbalance should be addressed. The issue of regional scope is addressed again in the conclusion.

Objectives. If overall objectives such as social equity and sustainable development are daunting, there are more modest process objectives that may be attainable. These are to 'stimulate dialogue, consensus and coalition building, and policy development,' and are seen as 'common challenges' to which a 'global research platform' might contribute dramatically. The more global and regional objectives may be more fruitful priorities at this early stage of the PI, including the problems of inter-agency co-ordination. In terms of objective 2 in the 1998-99 it will be important to fill more general statements with more direct objectives which broaden the scope of the PI, as discussed above. In essence, the objectives are sound, if vast. And the key to their success will be careful choices about strategic niches for the IDRC, and even Canada as a whole, and balancing the work done as well as possible between the various tensions mentioned in corporate documents.

Expected results. There is repeated discussion in the IDRC literature on the need for the organizations and its programs to be results-oriented. It is important to suggest that great care must be taken with this notion when dealing with post-conflict reconstruction, and even more dramatically with peacebuilding, in many developing countries. Hatreds that have stymied great diplomatic minds and in some cases repeated efforts at solution in the past, and been seemingly at the heart of unending conflicts, cannot be expected to disappear overnight. Rather, like 'track two' diplomacy, peacebuilding and reconstruction can take a great deal of time and patience before they show any results. And, in IDRC's own words, research to 'provide the necessary

knowledge base to guide policy and action' will require a great deal of time, as well as concerted and patient effort.

The research questions in the prospectus are well thought out and focus on truly crucial matters. The working papers series appears well-suited to the dissemination of results so necessary to success in the global problems area of interest. The interest in the problem of civil violence is surely long overdue, given its immense impact on all developing countries and its frequently shattering effect on civil society, domestic peace, civil-military and military-police relations. The area of research thus has immediate practical implications.

The objective of the creation of core centres of excellence and advisory groups are welcome ones as is the special emphasis on international initiatives acting as catalysts bringing together researchers, government and NGO representatives, and showing how knowledge can be helpful, especially to governments. These ideas underscore well the drive for results of the two kinds put forward: to deepen understanding of the research questions themselves; and to assist with policy development, the creation of new mechanisms, and the establishment of new policy dialogue platforms to further peacebuilding and reconstruction goals. This drive, accepted as a correct emphasis in PBR research, will face human resources and funding issues of importance.

Human resources. This is surely one of the most problematical factors in peacebuilding and reconstruction research, although IDRC is well placed to address these issues. Building capacity to do PBR research in countries wracked by violence will be troubling for entrenched interests and thus potentially dangerous for the individuals concerned and ethically challenging for the funding agency. In the words of Guatemala's best known security studies researcher, Gabriel Agiulera, 'in the past in Central America, the normal destinations of students of security studies were exile or the grave.' In many conflict-prone societies, a national base for the study of peace, violence, peace and civil-military relations simply has not developed. Given the weakness of national networks, the political and sometimes unpopular nature of the PBR research agenda, and the real dangers that face some researchers, IDRC's commitment to build networks of mutual support is a vital contribution to the national reconstruction, professional development and perhaps even the personal security of isolated researchers that toil in hostile social and political environments.

Financing. PBR research is clearly a costly enterprise especially in contexts where the national resources are fragmented by civil strife. IDRC's comparative advantage is to financially support frayed or nascent national research communities that would otherwise wither in resource-scarce environments. As operational aid agencies and other major research institutions recognize the strategic importance of PBR research for global practice and national reconciliation, there will be reasonable prospects for IDRC to leverage its limited funds through parallel and co-financing arrangements. This will perhaps require more aggressive marketing strategies than the current levels of financial partnerships suggest. And it may be that such financial partnerships are best pursued by expertise elsewhere among corporate resources.

SECTION C - REVIEW OF THE OVERALL RESEARCH APPROACH

Peacebuilding is a keystone in the architecture of contemporary international relations. The theory and practice of peace building is inevitably fluid as nations, donors, researchers, protagonists and combatants, NGOs, media, and mass publics, wrestle with the brutal facts of civil wars, regional instability, and human misery that now challenge the cardinal principles of state sovereignty and non-intervention.

This PI is contributing to a global effort to deepen what former-UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar described as the 'irresistible shift in public attitudes toward the belief that the defence of the oppressed in the name of morality should prevail over legal borders.'[2] The PI team has responsibly chosen to focus limited resources on post-conflict and reconstruction settings in a

spectrum of humanitarian and development actions that include the pre-cursors and violent phases of protracted social conflicts. Its multi-faceted interventions tackle some of the key problems of post-conflict recovery. These include fostering the re-emergence of civil society, demilitarization and demobilization, and the clearing of land mines. Interventions like WSP are a modest contribution to the reconstruction of relationships in post-conflict settings. There is less emphasis on infrastructure or other key reconstruction issues, such as reintegrating uprooted populations or restoring the capacity for economic management. It is worth noting here that before the PBR PI was established, ROSA made a strategic innovation to help strengthen the macro-economic planning capacity of a post-apartheid South African government.

The PI is making a difference by demonstrating that peace building is central to the development challenge in countries making the transition from war to peace. Peacebuilding requires carefully calibrated judgements of the needs of a society. This means listening to ordinary people as well as elites, something IDRC-supported interventions have done well. The PBR team is also to be commended for creatively engaging practitioners and policy makers and bringing the results of research and the voice of local communities in war-torn countries to bear on operational policy and practice. A good example is the Mines Action Program which builds on Canadian diplomatic leadership (the Ottawa Process) and IDRC field depth in ROSA to bridge the gap between the lift and ban constituencies, draw in local communities, and promote collective action on land mines.

IDRC's use of the term 'peacebuilding' appears to follow the UN Agenda for Peace of the early 1990s, with its emphasis on the post-conflict phase. However, there is a growing recognition that peacebuilding needs to begin *before* violent conflict breaks out. Operational agencies are placing increasing attention on early warning and interventions which address the root causes of violence and the need to identify a repertoire of tools and approaches to conflict prevention as a central

development goal.[3] While initiatives such as PCIA will assist operational agencies ensure that they 'do no harm' in conflict and post-conflict settings, the PI could contribute more directly to the search for interventions that help reduce communal tensions and build confidence, trust and tolerance before protracted violence sets in.[4] An explicit focus on human rights and good governance can complement the PI's comparative advantage of facilitating multi-stakeholder dialogues that give citizens a say in public policy.[5] The repertoire is potentially vast, including decentralization, access to justice and the rule of law, human rights and peace education in schools and public institutions, the media as peace builder, and mediation and negotiation to promote dialogue and co-operation in divided societies. This theme of conflict prevention is taken up in the conclusion to this report.

Stakeholders. In relatively short order, the PI has reached out to most of the key institutions active at the international level in advancing the theory and practice of peacebuilding. The PI team have also adeptly supported numerous multi-stakeholder fora at the national and regional level. Indeed, multi-stakeholder dialogues appears to be the primary modus operandi of the PI, a feature that perhaps sets IDRC apart from other international research organizations working on PBR issues. In view of this approach where process is often the primary product and interim development result, IDRC staff interact with a diversity of organizations ranging from bilateral and multilateral donors, to research institutions, NGOs, local communities, specialized professionals, such as demining personnel, and national and sub-national governments. This is an impressive degree of 'reach' leveraged from relatively modest human and financial resources.

The PI team are skilled and energetic networkers. The PI is connected to most of the key international thinkers and funders, including the Carnegie Commission, IDEA, Brown University's Humanitarianism and War Project, the Office of Transition of US A.I.D., the World Bank's Post- Conflict Unit, the Overseas Development Institute, UNRISD, and the Development Co-operation Committee of the OECD. These linkages may over the long haul enable IDRC to shift from merely occupying a seat at the table to productive collaboration and financial partnerships. In Canada, there may be untapped potential to work with such institutions as the International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development, the North-South Institute, and the Lester B. Pearson Peacekeeping Centre. PPC has been leading its counterparts in other parts of the world in the inclusion of peacebuilding in its research and teaching curriculum. Both IDRC and PPC share similar advantages in terms of convening, outreach, and legitimacy. These are natural grounds for a shared working agenda on selected problems where training, research, and curricula needs overlap with the training needs of military and humanitarian professionals. Especially in the prickly area of civil-military relations, PPC is well placed to assist the PI's objectives.

SECTION D - REVIEW OF SELECTED PBR PROJECT ACTIVITIES

War-torn Societies Project (Global)

General. IDRC's support for the UNRISD-designed and led War-torn Societies Project (WSP) has been a flagship for the PBR PI although it began as a pre-PI project. Institutional support for the WSP substantially shaped IDRC's own investments in PBR and provided a rationale for the development of a distinctive PI. The WSP is a joint project of the UNRISD and the Geneva Graduate School for International Studies. It was launched in 1994 as a four year project to pilot multi-stakeholder consultations on rehabilitation priorities in countries emerging from violent conflict. The four pilot countries were Eritrea, Guatemala, Somalia, and Mozambique. Drawing on and helping strengthen indigenous research capacity, the WSP relied on an action-research methodology to prompt dialogue and co-ordination among a disparate group of donors, social actors, and national or sub- national authorities. A single conceptual framework was used in all four countries, adapted to local conditions.

This enabled some generic lessons to be shared on such problems as rebuilding trust, understanding the incentive and disincentives for social actors to co-operate in re-building, affirming the role of women as a social force for reconciliation, and re-framing a more positive image of the role of the state in national development.

Reach. The WSP has attracted global interest from the donor and academic community. It is one of a select group of global efforts to address the practical problems of peace building.[6] IDRC made a good judgement to buy into a process with considerable global limelight, as demonstrated by the range of other donors who supported the UNRISD initiative. At the national level, the WSP pilot studies helped to draw in some of the key social actors in post-conflict settings. For example, the Puntland, Northeastern Somalia, WSP drew participants from government, such as Directors General, Directors, and Governors, District Commissioners, MPs, police and health officers, as well as NGOs, and increasing numbers of women.. In Puntland, WSP saw improved government participation towards the end of the research period.[7]

Impact. Arguably, the clearest impact of the WSP has been on IDRC itself. Assumptions underpinning WSP are also reflected in the conceptual framework for the PBR programme initiative.[8] Moreover, by leveraging relatively modest financial investments, IDRC has gained practical knowledge, international kudos, and access to an elite global discourse on the problems and practice of peacebuilding in war-torn societies. The donor community widely endorsed the WSP methodology both in country and in international fora. WSP has potential for replication or adaptation given an action research methodology with generic application. Ironically, however, UNRISD initially opted not to extend the approach to other countries, despite considerable demand, or to deepen its investments in the four pilot countries. This was at odds with the claim of building local capacity, necessarily a long term commitment, and reinforces a perception that

WSP has not helped build durable local capacity. At the national level, there appear to be no lasting institutional homes for the project, and no indication that local philanthropy or other donors will provide follow-up support. One exception is Somaliland, where the WSP assisted in the launch of the Somaliland Centre for Peace and Development

WSP's own impact statements are somewhat unrealistic given the short time frames of the project and the weakness of NGOs and research communities in war-torn societies without deeply rooted traditions of consultation and public participation. These constraints work against early evidence of policy change, consensus on alternative paths to development, or durable shifts in mind set or organizational cultures. One notable exception appears to have been the WSP Somalia programme which succeeded in convening the first meeting of the Periodic Donor Consultation Process in February 1999. In Mozambique, by contrast, it is reported that senior government participation waned, thus illustrating the limits of a research-driven approach to policy access and policy-formulation.[9] It may be that the absence of a real-world public policy issue (a service delivery issue, for example) may have worked against the policy impact of the WSP experiments. Because everything was on the table, nothing really helped to concentrate the minds of all players to seek a solution to one concrete policy problem.

The most important development 'result' has been to create opportunities for dialogue, if not always consensus, in settings marked by hostile or tense state-society relations. As process, the participatory action research underpinning WSP points the way towards a more democratic political culture in violence-prone societies. Neutral spaces to test ideas and assumptions, and to confront entrenched and unproductive stereotypes are opportunities for citizen diplomacy, and useful building blocks to construct common ground, public-private partnerships, and more productive government-civil society relations. One value added by WSP forums was to 'depoliticize' issues by framing them in a problem-solving, technical and scientific lens. This enabled the definition of 'optimal policy mixes' and of strategic frameworks for action. To do this well, WSP fora were non-binding private discussions that complimented rather than competed with formal processes of representation and re-building. WSP fora also required researchers to mediate among antagonistic groups, and prompted numerous researchers to reflect on the need to develop their skills in conflict resolution.[10] This may provide IDRC and its partners an opportunity to build on these mediation experiences to offer training modules on conducting research-led citizen diplomacy in post-conflict settings.[11]

Sustainability. While the PI is committed to the corporate objective of building capacity of Southern institutions, local capacity building and sustainability appears to be problematic in the case of WSP. First, a Phase II called the WSP Transition Project will prepare for the mission and structure of a 'longer-term exercise.' It is supported by UNDP and UNOPS among others. But it remains unclear whether the four original country pilots will continue to be supported in Phase II. Second, the WSP methodology was designed in the North and appears to be fundamentally non-negotiable. For reasons of quality control and consistent cross-country comparison, WSP

products and processes appear to have been managed through Geneva with only limited autonomy for the national teams. Third, WSP kick started participatory governance processes and multi-stakeholder consultation in settings without deeply rooted democratic traditions and weak civil societies. Fourth, the WSP national teams have no institutional depth. The institutional legacy is really the methodological process, and the sustainability of such processes may now depend on institutional and staff development beyond the role of charismatic leaders. The guru syndrome has been an asset for WSP where led by locally credible and relatively neutral players in the policy process. It can also be a liability where individuals harbour political aims of their own, are distracted by other demands, or brook no dissent and nurture no successors. It is to be hoped that IDRC will maintain links with the WSP project and build on the action research process, which is novel. One valuable contribution, consistent with agency and PI capacity building objectives, could be a longer-term commitment to support WSP activity (with or without UNRISD) in one or more of the four pilot countries.

Mine Action Programme 98-8908 (Southern Africa)

General. The Mine Action Programme is a regional activity to improve the monitoring and delivery of mine action programmes. This includes demining, mine awareness and victim assistance programs.

It is also intended to assist in the development of benchmarks to measure treaty compliance. The programme is unusual for the PI in the degree to which it engages operational realities.

Results. At the level of outputs, MAP is already demonstrating a capacity to network both in southern Africa and at the global level. It has partnered seminars with the Ministry for the Co-ordination of Environmental Affairs in Mozambique, with PRIO in Norway, and with the International Campaign to Ban Landmines. An HMA-ICT Website has been established in Mozambique and plans are underway to replicate in Angola and to establish a regional ICT node at ROSA.

While it is premature to assess the developmental results of the programme, the full achievement of three ambitious objectives (monitoring and delivery, co-ordination, research capacity) may be problematic within a single program, unless there is a significant expansion of resources. It will be interesting to learn from MAP's efforts to enhance co-ordination among demining professionals, governments, NGOs, donors, and local communities. Experience from other PBR sectors, such as humanitarian aid delivery or refugee assistance, suggests that the multitude of actors can cause technical problems for co-ordination, especially where there are sharply divergent interests among actors. Co-ordination among donors and professionals seems to work best at the level of information-sharing or on very specific local projects but becomes more diffuse at higher policy- making levels.[12]

Reach. The Mine Action Programme has the potential to emerge as a flagship of the PI's next phase. The activity brings together a number of IDRC and PI assets. At one level it can be regarded as a confidence-building mechanism with the potential to create a regional network of professionals and policy makers that will draw on best practices developed in one local setting for adaptation or replication in other settings. At another level, MAP serves as a bridge-builder to span the emerging divide between the regulatory and practical dimensions of the mine action problematic; a divide that threatens to separate the ban and lift communities. At a third level, there is a commitment to draw in and develop the skills of local communities in mine-affected areas. In this sense, local ownership and capacities become part of the process of peacebuilding and reconstruction. Fourth, the MAP draws on another IDRC asset, expertise in ICTs, as the vehicle for regional networking. Finally, the MAP represents opportunism in the best sense of the word, and demonstrates that the PI has the strategic vision to address breaking issues that are now front and centre of Canadian foreign policy (the Ottawa process) and global PBR practice. It is in this sense, that the experiences emerging from the MAP exercise in southern Africa may be relevant to CIDA and DFAIT mine action programmes in other parts of the world. Given these kinds of success factors, it comes as no surprise that the MAP and Bellanet partnership has been able to attract funds from IDRC's special partnership, DFAIT and the UN Foundation.

Violence as a peacebuilding problem. IDRC (ROSA) has made a welcome and strategic decision to address the problems of violence that are central to the peace building agenda.[13] This is politically charged and ethically complex terrain. Understanding the incentives and

11.

disincentives for violence is key to the prospects for sustainable peace. The social sciences can make a practical contribution to PBR by helping identify, test, and evaluate a repertoire of approaches to conflict prevention and reduction. IDRC could thus play a pivotal international role in supporting fundamental research into the root causes and paths out of violence in conflict-prone societies. Supporting researchers from violence-prone societies develop approaches to violence prevention or reduction will add to the credibility of such tools as tried and tested ways to address the problems of violence before, during and after armed conflicts.

Transition, Violence and Reconstruction 98-8909-01 (South Africa)

General. This project supports the work of a premier South African research organization, CSVR. It will break new ground by gathering comprehensive data on the nature, extent, and possible solutions to the 'culture of violence' in South Africa. The decision to support the work of the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation in South Africa may have far reaching implications for the evolution of the PBR programme initiative. Although the problem of violence is at the heart of the peacebuilding agenda, there appears to be relatively little systematic research that links the root causes of violence to the goal of conflict prevention or sustainable peace in post-conflict settings.

By supporting the CSVR studies, IDRC is well placed to deepen its agency knowledge of the role of violence in conflict-prone societies. This knowledge base could serve as a spring board for IDRC to support a more systematic examination of the causes, consequences, and solutions to violence in other 'societies in transition.' The recommendation by IDRC that CSVR combine two separate studies of the pre-transition phase (1980-1994), and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) is conceptually sound. The decision highlights peace building as a policy and programmatic continuum and 'good practice' as interventions that draw links across the pre-conflict, violent conflict, and post-conflict dimensions of a transition.

Results. The project Appraisal is less convincing in explaining how the stated the shift from political to criminal violence is reflected in the two phases examined in this project, namely the six groups of perpetrators and victims in the pre-transition phase, and the evaluation of the TRC and other violence-prevention strategies. The discussion of risk factors could be strengthened; it relies on the CSVR analysis alone and would have benefitted by considering the risks in the light of IDRC's own ethical guidelines on confidentiality and vulnerability. What is being done to reduce the possible risks faced by the subjects of interviews? Are their social groups who will use published information on the extent of violence to undermine peace? It will be helpful to know the hypotheses underpinning each of the separate studies in the pre- transition phases and the TRC. Are there generic assumptions about the incentives and disincentives for violence? Are there lessons from the South African TRC that have general application for transition governments seeking to strike a balance between the demands of justice and the imperative of political stability? Finally, while the Appraisal notes that violence affects the investment climate and weakens the economic foundations of peace, there is no discussion of the business community (domestic and international) and philanthropy to economic reconstruction and social healing. Is this an aspect that IDRC and CSVR will explore?

Action Research for Sexual Violence Prevention 803864-97-8907 (South Africa)

General. This innovative project combines a methodologically sophisticated mapping of sexual violence in Soweto and South Johannesburg with a series of multi-stakeholder dialogues that assist communities identify needs and consider solutions. The sub-project brings, researchers, communities, and service providers together for fact-finding, information sharing, and problem solving. There are two novel aspects. First, unlike many development co-operation programs that address violence against women, the focus here is on the men. Second, the approach is preventative and healing in the widest sense. The approach of 'primary prevention' builds on the fact that many men are not sexually violent, and tries to draw out the features of personal resilience that can serve as a role model for men and as a touchstone for healthy gender relations in Soweto.

Results. The findings have immediate relevance to both service providers (schools, police, local government) and policy makers. For example, the evidence highlights under reporting of rape

and the tendency for many cases to be filtered out of the crime management system. The social audit also underlined the importance of an interdisciplinary approach to sexual violence. If AIDS is a prime trigger of sexual violence, then preventive health strategies can play a prominent role in reducing sexual violence. An important marker of reach is that the CIETafrica process received widespread local media coverage. IDRC is working with a high quality international NGO, CIETafrica, which has permitted the application of an internationally-known research methodology, the Sentinel Community Surveillance.

On the debit side, the link to be peacebuilding is not sharply drawn. How is the specific phenomenon of sexual violence, and rape as a domestic phenomenon, linked to the larger social problem of maintaining peace and promoting communities that work. The absence of a clear link to peace building could reflect a larger problem of the PBR PI framework which does not explicitly integrate the manifold 'non-military' threats to peace and security which mark pre- and post-conflict settings. Criminality (including sexual, communal, or sectarian violence) brutal or ineffective policing, and a weak or corrupt judiciary are part and parcel of what Indian social psychologist, Ashis Nandy, describes as societies marked by an excess of 'free floating violence in search of a target.' This sub-project underscores the potential value of recognizing human rights and governance as cross-cutting themes in the PBR framework. In this case, women's rights, freedom from fear, and participation in local governance are cross-cuts that may resonate with lessons learned from other projects.

Impacts. The project summary impact statements look ambitious. At least two of the expected impacts appear difficult to achieve within the time frame of IDRC support. These are a demonstrable reduction in the scale of sexual violence in the project area; and stronger community institutions and community cohesiveness. The project will have left its mark if it helps shift mind sets among the key service providers, both in defining the problem and organizing a more strategic way to deliver services. Given that influencing mind-sets is one of the most challenging aspects of any change management agenda, CIETafrica and IDRC should provide candid reflections on the scope and limits of a research-driven approach to organizational change in the absence of other investments, such as training. (There may indeed be opportunities to incorporate some of the learning produced by the social audit into training curricula for the police and other service providers). Have any of the proposed police policy changes (zero tolerance, performance linked promotion) been taken on board. If not, what were the institutional road blocks to policy change. Finally, there is no description of the strategy by which CIETafrica will strengthen local community institutions, or the indicators used to assess the impact of such interventions.

Like the WSP and the companion CSVR social violence project, the CIETafrica intervention is an excellent example of the role of research as a tool for participatory governance, and the value of knowledge as a relatively neutral 'public space' to promote dialogue, shared responsibility, and problem solving on pressing social problems. In this sense, the CIET methodology can be

13

read as a confidence-building mechanism in deeply divided communities. At a corporate level, IDRC could disseminate the project approach and findings to a wide Canadian and international audience. And at the level of international policy and practice, IDRC should consider listing both the CIETafrica and CSVR interventions with the DAC data collection effort on ODA-eligible peace related expenditures.[14]

Peace and Conflict Assessment (PCIA) of Development Projects in Conflict Zones

General. This project may well be the most ambitious of the often very demanding series being undertaken by the PBR PI. It can be considered as a *sine qua non* project in the sense that it is the result of increasing questioning of the actual results of the deployment of development funds for research and other peacebuilding activities. The PI was well advised to begin to deal with what will doubtless become growing criticism if there are not some answers to the questions of those who see with scepticism the use of significant funds for these research objectives. Results are notoriously difficult to assess and it is difficult to imagine more trying circumstances for such endeavors than those dealing with development research. When one adds to this objective the need to make such assessments of development research in post-conflict zones, the problems become legion. This is a sub-project which shows that IDRC is taking risks and demonstrating courage.

Results. The main visible results of the first phase of this project are the development of a conceptual framework for the assessment tools looked to as final results of this effort, and the publication of that framework and related work in the working paper entitled 'A Measure of Peace: Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment of Developing Projects in Conflict Zones.' this publication is itself in part the expression of a further result of the project: two workshops to permit the governmental, NGO and academic communities to learn about the PCIA and to discuss its relevance to them.

Relevance to Objectives, Quality and Nature of Results. It is felt that the results mentioned are of the highest relevance not only to the objectives of the objectives of the project but also to those of the overall PI. This project is trying to produce a tool, which if successfully developed, will be a major leap in analytical capacity for evaluators where development research and peacebuilding practice is concerned. It was essential to bring together the main researchers in order to work out conceptually how to proceed with such a dramatically challenging task.

At the level of *outputs,* there has only been one paper written and no formal training programme undertaken in the first phase of the project. The latter was not the intention of this first phase. Instead, there has been developed a tool which will now be debated, improved upon, tested for relevance and applicability. The working paper will serve this role. But it would appear that the workshops did bring together enough people to begin the establishment of something which could well turn out to be a proper network of researchers, as well as government and NGO

14

representatives, and those of funding agencies working in the field. A proposal for a multi-year, multi-donor activity has been finalized. However, until there is further input from implementing agencies and other experts, it would be daring indeed to suggest that one could judge the final value of the product as it now stands. What is clear is that an original, serious and convincing effort was made to produce something which could act as the base for further development of a tool which could be of very great interest to those in the development field as a whole, and particularly those in development research. The only caveat is that IDRC is no longer the only game in town, and in this fast moving sub-sector of the PBR field, the Centre will need to respond to the impact assessment systems also being developed by its knowledge competitors, such as the Overseas Development Institute. Importantly, the whole effort including the paper is suffused with a sense of modesty which well becomes the researchers involved in its preparation and is appropriate in any attempt to address so vast, complex, and important a subject.

Reach. It is still too early to discuss reach. The workshop participants are a first element in this. But the working paper which has been widely distributed is clearly an even more important one. It is to be hoped that the interest which would naturally be present where such a toll is concerned will ensure that there is a wide reading of the paper and with some luck, good feedback.

Impact. Here again it is rather early to know very much about the impact of this study. Since the first phase naturally did not intend to deliver a final product but rather to provide something of use conceptually which could then be improved upon, the question of impact is not as relevant here as elsewhere. However, the fact that the project is tackling something so long troubling the development research field is an impact in itself and has elicited what is obvious interested participation and wider commitment to the objective and how it is being reached. It is our view that the anticipated impact will be significant give the originality of the exercise, the demand from implementing agencies, and its inherent value. The litmus test will be whether the tool is used or adapted by end users, in this implementing agencies. A means for the real assessment of the impact of development project on the conflicts in which they take place would be such a breakthrough that the impact would hardly be questioned.

Resources on Palestine Refugees: Placing Research and Policy on the Agenda

General. This began as a one year project but there are plans to develop a major fund-raising strategy, including Arab donors, that will permit a long-term project with potential to influence national policy. The initial one year project aimed at providing a number of outputs in the context of the winding down of the UNRWA archives on Palestine. It is a difficult project to assess. However, there are some points about the project which are worth mentioning. The project deals with an important topic for the PI, namely refugees, and involves ICTs. The project shows a courageous decision by the PI team in an area of the world where that quality is often not rewarded or even appreciated. The Palestinian people are essential to peace in the Middle East as is well known from the unfortunate history over the past five decades at least. Their

leadership will need access to that people's history and overall situation in order to move forward with decision making and other essential elements of national life. This project showed originality in scope in its mere granting. Even 'Palestine' being taken as a 'nation' for administrative purposes within IDRC shows laudable risk taking as called for repeatedly in the Centre's discussion of its way forward in the 1990s and beyond. However, there appear to be no development results to demonstrate as the project is currently on hold.

Relevance to Objectives, Quality and Nature of Results. There would doubtless be those who felt this project is rather far from then objectives of the overall PI. This is not the view here. While there may have been other projects more relevant than this one, it is nonetheless fair to say that a project helping to empower Palestinians in their dealings with development and other national issues of the near future can hardly be considered without relevance to a programme on peacebuilding and reconstruction. Indeed, for many researchers this is one of the most intractable and long-lasting PBR contexts available and its progress is worthy of the closest study and considerable support.

At the level of *outputs*, the expected outputs included: an edited report on the condition of the UNRWA archives, a technical report on the transfer of the archives to electronic medium, an announced bibliography on the palestinian refugee question, a proposal and plan to raise for a workshop, a workshop programme, and a proposal to raise funds for the electronic coding of the archives. None has been achieved for the reasons given. It is not possible to comment on reach or impact. However, there is little doubt that its political and social impact could have been important.

Demilitarization and Peacebuilding in Southern Africa

General. This project sought to support and facilitate sustainable peace and development in Southern Africa. It aimed to do this through the identification of practical policies and actions which would be underpinned by electronic data bases of military and economic information, with a view to sharing such information and ideas with researchers and policy makers in Southern Africa. It has the obvious advantage of moving forward not only in the PBR PI but also in others aiming to use technologies to advance research in meaningful ways. It also fits smoothly into wider Canadian government concerns about non-compliance of many states with arms registers

and other means of providing further confidence building among states of conflict zones. The project also aims to pull together research in both cross-country and country-specific areas of endeavour within the PBR PI.

Results. Potential researchers from the region were identified and took part in a workshop to design the research proposal. This was followed by a further workshop where different versions of the proposal were debated. Research papers on the differing proposal ideas were then prepared

by contributing scholars, databases were established, a press clipping service was launched, and further research was commissioned. A *Defence Digest* was also launched.

Relevance to Objectives, Quality and Nature of Results. The project is reasonably relevant to the PBR PI and its results to date appear to be well attuned to the objectives set for it. It suffers from being one of rather too many projects dealing with PBR in Africa. But it does bring together a number of IDRC and PI objectives in a useful fashion. The founding of the different elements of a Southern African Centre for Defence Information (SACSI) would appear to be especially interesting.

At the level of *outputs* a fairly large number of research papers have been prepared. One can now speak of a network of researchers developing as a result of this project, one much needed in the region. And while in a formal sense has not formed part of the objectives, the workshop series and exchanges of papers and ideas and views has doubtless had some effect on capacities and training. As it has not proved possible to see these papers it is difficult to judge their quality.

At the level of *reach*, a large number of people by regional standards have become involved in the process. And more still are affected by the project moving on to make defence and economic information of interest to peacebuilding and reconstruction available to the public through electronic means.

At the level of *impact*, this is the first time Southern Africa has had anything like the services and information available to its researchers that it has now and will have an increasing measure of as a result of this project. It will be much more difficult for regional governments to lag behind other areas of the world in providing defence information to the United Nations and other bodies that have registers and similar documents whose purpose is to reduce misconceptions and misinformation about potential rivals in order to underpin peace.

SECTION E - CONCLUSION

Overall Approach. In less than three years, the PBR PI has begun to acquire an international reputation in the field of peacebuilding research and practice. Support for projects such as WSP and PCIA demonstrate several of IDRC's comparative advantages. These include:

- scanning the research environment to pick out important but neglected issues;
   - administrative flexibility to be proactive or respond to emerging challenges;
- leveraging IDRC's neutrality and convening power to act as a knowledge broker;
- comparative approaches and the search for best practice; and a
- long-term commitment to building local research capacities.[15]

These strengths enable IDRC to facilitate or participate in local, national, regional, and global policy dialogues. Networking at the global level and within Canada is well developed. The PI also underscores the corporate philosophy that single approaches do not yield results, that complex problems require a multi disciplinary (or multi-stakeholder) approach, and that clear problem definition is the basis for determining what disciplines can contribute to a solution.[16]

One unavoidable shortcoming is that IDRC does not directly deliver development or humanitarian services. Research-led dialogues can be vulnerable to a level of abstraction that can act as a disincentive for participation in contrast, for example, to user groups that convene to resolve immediate problems of, say, natural resource management or income generation. The absence of a strong grounding in field project realities can also be a handicap to influencing donors because the operational issues of program design, delivery and co-ordination are foremost in the field of complex humanitarian emergencies and post-conflict re-construction. Even here, however, PBR staff have energetically involved themselves in a global practitioner group (Conflict Prevention and Post-Conflict Reconstruction Network) and have seized an opportunity to influence practice (land mines).

The focus on Africa, particularly South and Southern Africa, and the breadth of small project initiatives, may at first sight undermine the PBR objective of global reach and policy relevance. However, sub-project breadth reflects historical antecedents to the PI and the need for flexibility to experiment in the early phase of any new area of agency concentration. There are indications that the next phase of PBR will show more discipline and less of a tendency to be 'pulled in a number of directions.'[17]

On one reading, the African focus is consistent with IDRC's centre of gravity and with the reality of a high concentration of internal and regional conflicts coupled with the pervasive weakness of research communities in the sub-Sahara. It is thus appropriate that the PI focus on Africa and proceed cautiously to engage the PBR challenges in just one or two other settings, such as Guatemala and Palestine. The decision to explore programming in West Africa is welcome,

although given the spill-overs in complex humanitarian emergencies and Canadian political and development interests, it is surprising that IDRC is not more active in the Great Lakes region. On another view, the PI is totally skewed in favour of Africa and the preponderance of human resources in ROSA is unfortunate and should be reviewed. The need to change this geographic emphasis, at least in part, should be stated more clearly and inform decisions about the future. The present emphasis on Africa may seem to some so extraordinary as to bring into doubt the solidity of the PI as a whole.

Constraints, Gaps and Opportunities.

1. *Strategic niches.* This is a pressing issue for the PI. So far, strategic niches are not very visible. The analysis in *Empowerment through Knowledge* may be appropriate, namely to *'devote relatively more resources to a few, carefully selected global and inter-regional problems.'*

2. *Governance and peacebuilding.* Poor governance is at the heart of some of the most complex problems of peace building and social and economic reconstruction. Violent conflicts are sometimes the final outcome of failures of governance or discriminatory systems of governance. Ineffective or malevolent governance can be marked in states that have yet to descend into widespread internal violence but face deepening communal divides, high criminality, the breakdown of law and order, and low public confidence in crumbling, opaque, or corrupt governing institutions. This scenario of human insecurity in 'failing states' or mega-cities that barely work underscores the potential for IDRC to contribute to peace and confidence building in the widest sense by supporting innovative conflict prevention strategies in vulnerable states and conflict-prone communities. PBR documents do sometimes make an implicit reference to governance noting, for example, that 'violent conflict is the extreme expression of the failure of the state'[18] but good governance is not typically articulated as a key objective or result.

The reviewers are conscious of the dangers of programme 'drift' by grafting on new issues, countries or regions in a PI with limited human and financial resources. Equally, however, a focus on post-conflict settings is only one part of the peacebuilding spectrum. Donor governments, and multilateral institutions are increasingly recognizing the importance of preventing complex humanitarian emergencies that divert national and international development resources. By adding an explicit governance or human rights lens, IDRC could legitimately and creatively extend beyond the post-conflict settings by exploring the root causes of violence and a variety of preventive actions, including citizen diplomacy, research-led confidence building and policy development, human rights and peace education, and the role of non-traditional actors in peace building, including the private sector and the vernacular media. The PCIA initiative is a strategic investment in this respect and IDRC is well placed to respond to the analytical training needs of the operational donor agencies who recognize a need for multi-disciplinary conflict assessments as a tool to programme in conflict-prone societies.

Some donors are experimenting with interventions which explicitly address the root causes of violence, including for example employment opportunities for educated youth in Sri Lanka.

3. *Southern PBR research.* The PI is well placed to facilitate a uniquely Southern approach to the thinking and practice of peacebuilding. This 'reverse agenda' may require some risk tolerance if local institutions and networks critique a largely Northern policy and research agenda. At the level of research, IDRC could draw on ICTs to convene a regional or global network of southern researchers that critically review peacebuilding terminology and build an alternative or modified lexicon that fits southern realities. In this regard, in much of Asia, the failed states approach that underpins many peacebuilding assumptions does not apply. However, in South and Southeast Asia, a functional approach to regional co-operation on specialized and technical issues appears to be an indirect contribution to regional peace and security.[19] Given the PI's strong regional focus, regionalism as a confidence building mechanism could be a fruitful area for primary research which adds a rationale for convening and sustaining all manner of research-driven networks and encourages fresh thinking on ways to share knowledge from the grass roots with inter-governmental fora and non-official or Track II dialogues.

The projects examining violence in South Africa underscore a creative tension between the need to respect the very practical problems that are priorities for Southern project proponents, and the imperative of PI to advance epistemology on the conceptual underpinnings of the PBR problematiqie. The PI will be effective if it can facilitate, nurture and enhance a process where it is possible to situate research results, and in some cases research designs, examining real world problems to the higher order debates on conceptual frameworks, such as 'human security.'

4. *Results-based programming.* The language of 'results' is being applied, albeit with some difficulty, to the peacebuilding agenda. This is one area where the PBR PI is somewhat weak, both in the unrealistic ambition of some outcome and impact statements, and in the need to develop indicators to draw out subtle shifts or signs of progress in what are inevitably protracted processes of social reconstruction with a variety of intervening factors that confound simple cause-effect statements. All donor agencies are struggling with demonstrating a return on investment in very fragile post-conflict environments and there may be scope for the PI to learn from and contribute to this emerging donor agenda.

5. *Capacity building.* It is not always clear what the PI understands by capacity building. The unit of change is also not always clear. Is it the individual researcher, the research institution, the policy process, or policy implementation? Is capacity built by convening and sustaining more participatory decision-making, by promoting higher quality research, more pro-poor development outcomes, better managed, financially sustainable research institutions, or a combination of all these? IDRC has at least two potential strengths in this area. First, the PI could, over the long haul, build on its experiments in supporting participatory action research by adding on conflict resolution and mediation skills training for its southern based researchers.

20

Second, as a convener, IDRC appears to be well placed to focus on the higher order capacity problems facing post-conflict transitions. These typically involve a network of organizations that must work together to carry out complex tasks, such as national budgeting, or where the inter-relationships among actors must be re-shaped to deliver services more effectively. Given the weakness of research infrastructures in war-torn societies, one of the most difficult challenges for the PBR team is to identify and strengthen a pool of peacebuilding researchers and institutions. It may be helpful for PI partners if the team consciously articulates the many kinds of capacities to be built in a post-conflict setting where knowledge is expected to add developmental value.

6. *International conflict.* Inter-state conflicts are given quite short shrift in the PI. It is true that most conflicts occur within countries. However, inter-state conflicts can have a huge impact on sustainable development, social equity, civil-military relations, and peace as a whole. It may be an error to relegate inter-state conflicts and its impacts as far down the PI agenda as currently appears to be the case.

7. *Risk management and quality controls.* The principle of delegating to field staff and local institutions primary decisions about project design, content, and sequencing is a sound one. However, this needs to be balanced by the recognition that PBR research projects inevitably touch on political issues of national importance and with implications for other Canadian foreign policy and development interests. These verities suggest that the IDRC may on a selected basis need to apply a corporate lens to planned PBR interventions both to ensure quality control and to safeguard against any possible risks that Canadian-supported initiatives may be misinterpreted or become politicized and counter productive. The PI team may wish to explore the development of a more comprehensive 'risk analysis' at the design stage and factor in opportunities to engage other Canadian government and internal IDRC resources as appropriate during the project decision-making process.

8. *Levels of Intervention.* One of the real strengths of the PI is a commitment to engage local communities and assist in the development of local PBR capacities. The 'local capacities for peace' approach can help communities survive large-scale violence and become buildings blocks for a durable peace. However, long-term investments appear essential for durable development results and there are real questions to be posed about the macro-impacts of micro-level interventions. Given IDRC's commitment to disseminating development knowledge, the PI is well placed to market local success stories to wider audiences in societies emerging from prolonged violent conflict.

ENDNOTES

[1]IDRC, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation of Programme Performance, December 1997. p.39.

[2] United Nations, 'Secretary General's Address at the University of Bordeaux,' New York: United Nations, 1991.

[3]For example, the CIDA aid program in Sri Lanka is built around the principle of addressing root causes, while preventive action is an important priority in the work of the DAC Task force on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation.

[4] William Zartman is one scholar who suggests that promoting 'early awareness' is as important as early warning.

[5]The 1999 Annual Report does make a passing reference to human rights programming as a potential new sector for the PI but is strangely silent on governance.

[6]Others include the Carnegie Commission's work on the prevention of deadly conflicts, the DAC Task Force on Peace, Conflict and Development Co-operation, and the Brown University Humanitarianism and War Project.

[7]UNRISD, Update and Reflections: An Information Bulletin of the WSP Somalia Programme, March 1999.

[8] For example, the IDRC Abstract for WSP underlines themes that surface in the PBR framework including, participatory action research methods, structured multi-stakeholder dialogues, and enhanced local research capacity.

[9]Comments of Dr. Kenneth Bush, based on field interviews in Maputo, 1997.

[10] Matthias Stiefel, Rebuilding after war: a summary report of the war-torn societies project. UNRISD, December 1998.

[11] The concept of 'third-party neutrals,' for example. It is interesting to note that PI staff (Dr. Tschirgi) have recognized the potential training implications. See the paper comparing PAR with third party neutral techniques in, Fen Osler Hampson and Necla Tschirgi, 'The War-Torn Societies project and Third Party Neutral models of Conflict Management,' IDRC Working paper No. 3. May 1999.

[12] This is one of the more depressing findings of the draft synthesis report of the DAC Task Force on Conflict, peace and Development Co-operation which examined the influence of aid as an incentive or disincentive in conflict and conflict-prone situations. OECD, Paris. June 2-3, 1999.

[13]Initiatives to decrease the likelihood of the outbreak, recurrence, or continuation of violence as the mirror image of efforts to foster peaceful co-existence. Both are essential to peace building. See Kenneth Bush, 'Towards and Balanced Approach to Rebuilding War-Torn Societies,' Canadian Foreign Policy (Winter 1996).

[14] See DAC Informal Task Force on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation, DCD (99)5.

[15]Empowement Through Knowledge, IDRC 1993, p.24.

[16]IDRC Corporate program Framework to the Year 2000, March 1997.

[17] IDRC internal review of the PBR Annual Report.

[18]WSP Absract.

[19]See Chris Cooter, 'Unfinished Business' a report on regional co-operation in South Asia commissioned by the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, 1988.