



**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe  
Forum for Security Co-operation**

FSC.AIAM/48/06  
16 March 2006

ENGLISH only

---

**Conference Services**

**2006 ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION  
ASSESSMENT MEETING**

**Vienna, 7 and 8 March 2006**

**CONSOLIDATED SUMMARY**

**CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT**

**REPORTS OF THE WORKING SESSION RAPPORTEURS**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT .....	1
REPORTS OF THE WORKING SESSION RAPPORTEURS.....	5
Working Session 1, Part A.....	7
— Annual exchange of military information.....	7
— Defence planning .....	8
— Risk reduction .....	8
— Military activities.....	9
(i) Prior notification of certain military activities.....	9
(ii) Observation of certain military activities.....	9
(iii) Annual calendars.....	9
(iv) Constraining provisions .....	9
Working Session 1, Part B .....	10
— Contacts .....	10
— Evaluation .....	11
— Inspection.....	11
— Regional measures .....	11
— Communications Network .....	12
Working Session 2, Part A.....	13
— Principles governing conventional arms transfers.....	13
— Principles governing non-proliferation.....	14
— Stabilizing measures for localized crisis situations .....	14
— Global exchange of military information.....	15
— Questionnaire on Anti-Personnel Landmines .....	15
— Questionnaire on the process of ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention ..	16
Working Session 2, Part B .....	17
— Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security.....	17
— OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons .....	18
— OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition.....	18
— Principles for export controls of MANPADS.....	21
— Principles on the control of brokering in SALW .....	21
— Standard elements of end-user certificates and verification procedures for SALW exports.....	22
ANNEX: AGENDA AND MODALITIES OF THE SIXTEENTH ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING (FSC.DEC/1/06)	



## **CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT**



**REPORT TO THE  
FORUM FOR SECURITY CO-OPERATION ON THE  
ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING (AIAM)  
BY THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE CLOSING SESSION OF THE AIAM**

Vienna, 7 and 8 March 2006

Mr. Chairperson,

Last week, on 7 and 8 March, the Sixteenth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting (AIAM) took place in Vienna. In accordance with the decision of the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC.DEC/1/06), Austria, which held the chair of the closing session, is reporting on the AIAM to the FSC and, subsequent to the Meeting, is providing the Chairperson's report together with the reports of working session rapporteurs.

The aim of the Meeting was to discuss the present and future implementation of agreed confidence- and security-building measures (CSBMs), as established in Chapter XI of the Vienna Document 1999. The agenda and modalities of the Sixteenth AIAM had been agreed upon in FSC.DEC/1/06. The Meeting consisted of two working sessions, each subdivided into two parts. The opening plenary meeting and the working sessions were chaired by Armenia, while the closing plenary meeting was chaired by Austria. The discussions in each working session were moderated by a co-ordinator and summarized by a rapporteur.

The Chairperson of the opening plenary meeting and of the working sessions made in his opening statement (FSC.AIAM/47/06) a brief introduction to his perspective on the event. He stated that the outside world did not always have a full understanding of the FSC and said that the very idea behind the FSC was that of building trust through transparency. He encouraged delegations to address items and tools which were working and to look for obstacles. In his perception, the FSC tools were supposed to consolidate the security of States by inducing them to co-operate on instruments, tools and decisions. He encouraged the giving of thought to producing new and effective tools. In concluding, he welcomed the role of the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) as the FSC's institutional memory and support mechanism.

The current Chairperson of the Forum for Security Co-operation provided brief information in his report (FSC.AIAM/9/06) about the activities of the FSC and the implementation of CSBMs since the last Meeting in March 2005. He mentioned only some of the activities and results achieved between the two AIAMs. Among those, he referred to the decision to conduct the OSCE High-Level Seminar on Military Doctrine, the implementation and further building of common criteria and tools for the implementation of the OSCE Documents on Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) and Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition (CA) and the special FSC meeting on non-proliferation of WMD. He also highlighted the approved statement by the Chairperson of the FSC on prior notification of major military activities. Regarding the implementation of CSBMs, he noted that there was still room for improvement. He encouraged participating States which were not meeting their commitments to ask for assistance in overcoming that deficiency.

The Director of the CPC reported on the main activities of the CPC in support of the FSC during 2005 (FSC.AIAM/10/06). He focused on the efforts undertaken by the CPC to assist participating States and categorized the activities into traditional tasks and new types of activities. Under traditional tasks, he referred to the compilation of suggestions in accordance with Chapter XI of the Vienna Document 1999 (VD99), the facilitation of information exchanges, particularly the annual and global exchanges of military information and the provision of assistance to the participating States with the aim of improving implementation standards for CSBMs in the OSCE region. In addition, he referred to the completion of the modernization and upgrading of the OSCE Communications Network.

As new types of activities he mentioned the reduction of stocks and improvement of stockpile security of SALW and conventional ammunition, the workshop on destruction techniques and stockpile security of SALW and CA and a technical workshop on disposal of rocket fuel component melange.

Looking to the future, he emphasized that the CPC would continue to provide every support required for the FSC and its chairmanship. The CPC would remain the focal point for monitoring the implementation of existing commitments and of any new undertaking in the politico-military dimension of security. Furthermore, it would continue to support and co-ordinate the activities of OSCE field missions.

Working Session 1, part A, was co-ordinated by Colonel Anders Gardberg, Senior Military Adviser in the Permanent Mission of Finland to the OSCE. The rapporteur was Dubravka Plejić-Marković, Deputy Head of the Permanent Mission of Croatia to the OSCE. Working Session 1, part B, was co-ordinated by Mr. Milan Jazbec of the delegation of Slovenia. The rapporteur was Mr. Korkut Güngen, delegation of Turkey. Working Session 2, part A, was co-ordinated by Mr. V. Pavlov of the delegation of Belarus. The rapporteur was Mr. Ricardo Mor of the delegation of Spain. Working Session 2, part B, was co-ordinated by Mr. J. Cox of the delegation of the United States of America. The rapporteur was Ms. Y. Filipenko of the delegation of Ukraine. All the co-ordinators had circulated introductory papers in advance (FSC.AIAM/3/06, FSC.AIAM/6/06, FSC.AIAM/7/06, FSC.AIAM/4/06). In general, the introductory papers were designed to stimulate and encourage discussion about the topics covered in the sessions.

At the closing plenary meeting, the four rapporteurs delivered their reports on the proceedings and the results of the working sessions (FSC.AIAM/27/06, FSC.AIAM/28/06, FSC.AIAM/29/06, FSC.AIAM/30/06). Only one delegation expressed disagreement with one report. The proposed changes were made and the report was updated.

Under the item "general discussion", several delegations took the floor and commented on the Sixteenth AIAM. One delegation stated that the Meeting had been useful and recommended addressing new threats. Another delegation noted the changed circumstances and proposed that the Vienna Document 1999 should be updated. Other delegations made proposals for changing the modalities of the AIAM and inserting parallel sessions in order to strengthen the focused discussion.

In his summary, the Chairperson of the closing plenary meeting noted that the review of implementation of confidence- and security-building measures (CSBM) was an important annual event. In his view, the implementation of those measures remained the main priority



for the FSC. Some issues had been discussed in a very lively manner, while others had not received as much attention. The preparation of the next AIAM could take into account the experience gained at the current Meeting. A revitalization of the agenda and the modalities of the AIAM could have a positive impact on its efficiency. The CPC would compile and distribute the suggestions made during the AIAM as a basis for further work in the FSC. He reminded national delegations to pursue their recommendations as appropriate.

It was agreed that the Seventeenth AIAM would be held in the first half of March 2007; the FSC would determine the exact dates, agenda and modalities.

In closing, the Chairperson expressed his appreciation to the Partners for Co-operation for participating in the whole Meeting. He also thanked the current FSC Chair, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Armenia as the Chair of the opening plenary meeting and the working sessions, the co-ordinators and rapporteurs of the working sessions, the experts from capitals and the CPC, as well as the interpreters and conference services for their invaluable support during the Sixteenth AIAM.

Mr. Chairperson, this is a brief abstract of the Sixteenth AIAM. More detailed information can be found in the documents referred to in this report.



**REPORTS OF THE WORKING SESSION RAPPORTEURS**



## **WORKING SESSION 1**

### **Part A**

Tuesday, 7 March 2006

### **Report of the Working Session Rapporteur**

- Annual exchange of military information
  - Defence planning
  - Risk reduction
  - Military activities
    - (i) Prior notification of certain military activities
    - (ii) Annual calendars
    - (iii) Constraining provisions
    - (iv) Observation of certain military activities
- 

Working Session 1, part A, was co-ordinated by Colonel Anders Gardberg, Senior Military Adviser in the Permanent Mission of Finland to the OSCE; the rapporteur was Dubravka Plejić-Marković, Deputy Head of the Permanent Mission of Croatia to the OSCE. The co-ordinator structured his introduction around his food-for-thought paper (an advance copy of which was distributed under the reference FSC.AIAM/3/06), intending to promote discussion by assessing facts and identifying possible shortcomings in implementation. Delegations were encouraged to comment on the views and facts expressed.

#### **Annual exchange of military information (AEMI)**

Initiating the debate, the co-ordinator recalled that the AEMI was considered to be one of the most significant elements of transparency and confidence-building. Recalling a statistic, he pointed out that some reports were outstanding, whereas some States had replied after several reminders had been sent to them. One delegation asked whether it would be advisable to utilize more modern approach to exchanging the information. A related matter was what assistance could be offered and how the AEMI exchange in December could be energized and what were advantages/disadvantages concerning paper-based, as opposed to, electronic distribution.

In particular, the issues of a constantly changing environment and the emergence of new challenges to security as well as, the concern as to whether the AEMI's were responding to the security concerns of the participating States, were addressed.

Concerning submissions, one delegation suggested that reaching out to higher political and military levels in those States that had encountered problems in the exchange might be a way ahead.

Almost all the participants underlined the importance of the AEMI; they only differed on how to structure future deliberations concerning exchanges of military information. One delegation noted that, unfortunately, in the recent years, the annual exchanges of military information under Chapter I of the Vienna Document did not reflect the structural changes in the armed forces of many countries which take part in the military activities in the OSCE area. Special emphasis was put on the emergence of large-scale multinational joint increased preparedness forces, so-called NATO rapid reaction forces, comprising land, airborne and marine components. That delegation called for closer consideration of adjustment of the existing format for the exchange of military information, as well as possibility of provision of notifications regarding the changes in the deployment sites of weapons and equipment within a calendar year. The same delegation reminded of the earlier proposal to set up the exchange of information on rapid reaction forces between OSCE participating States.

Several delegations called for a strengthening of distribution via electronic means, leaving open the possibility of a “paper exchange”. One delegation proposed that a meeting in December be used to bring together technical experts and called for a more direct approach and dialogue among them on particular issues looked upon as important, the debate on paper-based as opposed to electronic distribution being of lesser significance for them. That view was supported by another delegation. One delegation warned that, in that context, the attitude of experts was of the greatest importance. In the light of proposals for better utilizing the December meeting as a forum for a meeting of heads of verification centres, this proposal received considerable support.

## **Defence planning**

The co-ordinator said that the overall trend in replies on defence planning seemed to be downward, and that the participating States were submitting their information either late or retroactively. The Seminar on Military Doctrine was seen as complementary to the efforts to establish predictability and transparency regarding armed forces. The co-ordinator also pointed out that, in previous years, there had been more analytical reporting and that the utilization of the defence planning reports needed to be further improved.

One delegation stated that problems in meeting reporting deadlines might be addressed in the submission of information on adoption of budgets in national parliaments. A few called for a better flow of information in general and through delegates websites, with a view to making documents more public, bearing in mind the sensitivity of their content. Some delegations gave information on their domestic practices, including the publication of documents.

## **Risk reduction**

The co-ordinator recalled that particular circumstances in the aftermath of Kosovo crisis had influenced deliberations on this Chapter of the Vienna Document 1999. However, the article had not been referred to. One delegation questioned the term “militarily significant” and suggested that a standard of a brigade level and above be introduced to indicate activities of military forces which were militarily significant and gave rise to a security concern. The same delegation suggested that the PC and the FSC joint meeting at short notice be convened at the request of any delegation in case of deployment of foreign

forces of such strength on the territory of a participating State. Both the deploying and receiving States were to provide explanations on the reasons for such deployment.

## **Military activities**

### **(i) Prior notification of certain military activities**

The co-ordinator said that there had been no prior notifications in 2005. However, since the adoption of the FSC Chairperson's statement on voluntary submission of prior notifications of major military activities conducted below the threshold of the Vienna Document 1999 (FSC, 461st meeting, 5 October 2005) 12 participating States had voluntarily notified or announced activities through the annual calendar mechanism, and three participating States have provided information on activities above the threshold.

One delegation gave a presentation on a combined observation and observation flight conducted during a military exercise on its territory. Several more delegations provided information on upcoming military exercises in accordance with the Chairperson's statement of 5 October 2005. Another announced its intention to conduct an exercise falling within the ambit of the new measure and praised it as a noteworthy step. Two delegations called for a new approach to be taken vis-à-vis steady progress in armed forces and their technology and proposed to update the Vienna Document accordingly. The same delegations proposed that, in order to ease the situation in the OSCE region, which was still affected by persisting conflicts, and to dispel mistrust, one measure might be a prior notification of large-scale transit in the area of application of CSBM's and suggested that this measure be activated where strength of transiting troops exceed a brigade. In such cases, prior notification should be provided on the purpose, destination and planned duration of the transit. One delegation pointed out that not all the participating States possessed forces which exceeded the strength of a brigade, so some measures were not applicable to them.

### **(ii) Observation of certain military activities**

### **(iii) Annual calendars**

One delegation indicated that the new measures could well serve to revitalize the basic idea of inspections, namely, that military activities should be inspected if they were conducted. The other one pointed to the value of the new measures in relation to planning of inspections as a mean to enhance their efficiency.

### **(iv) Constraining provisions**

The co-ordinator noted that no activities had been communicated.

## **Summary of the co-ordinator**

The co-ordinator pointed out that 2006 would be a crucial year for deciding whether the Chairperson's statement of 5 October 2005 on voluntary prior notifications would stand the test of a time. In that respect, other participating States were also encouraged to submit voluntary notifications concerning their significant military activities.

## **WORKING SESSION 1 Part B**

Tuesday, 7 March 2006

### **Report of the Working Session Rapporteur**

- Contacts
  - Evaluation
  - Inspection
  - Regional measures
  - Communications Network
- 

Mr. Milan Jazbec, of the delegation of Slovenia, was the co-ordinator of the second part of Working Session 1, and Mr. Korkut Güngen, of the delegation of Turkey, was the rapporteur. The co-ordinator had circulated a food-for-thought paper on the working session in advance (FSC.AIAM/6/06).

#### **Contacts**

Various delegations provided information on planned visits to air bases as well as military facilities. Some delegations also announced their intention to carry out demonstrations of new types of major weapons and equipment systems. One delegation stated that it would extend an invitation for a combined event to the Mediterranean and Asian Partners for Co-operation as well.

One delegation announced that, as a result of the ongoing reorganization of the country's air force and reconstruction work at its air base, it would not be able to conduct a visit in 2006, but said that the visit would take place in 2007.

Some delegations drew the attention of the participants to the large number of visits to air bases and military facilities in 2006. They pointed out that organizing so many visits constitutes a demanding task and put strain on some participating States. In that context, one delegation suggested measures such as joining efforts and pooling costs. It was stressed that resources available to small States could be an issue for further discussion. The same delegation also stated that it did not prefer an extension of the five-year period to seven years, even though not all participating States would meet their obligations by the end of 2006.

One delegation referred to paragraph 26 of the Vienna Document, which stated that the visit to the air base would last for a minimum of 24 hours, and reminded the participants of their previous suggestion to agree on a Chairperson's statement stipulating that the air base visits would take place during a normal working day and last up to 12 hours.



## **Evaluation**

One delegation reiterated two proposals it had previously made and stated that they would be followed up in the appropriate fora. The proposals mentioned were a “stopwatch mechanism” for the evaluation of units/formations located in a large area and submission to host States of draft inspection reports by inspection teams before leaving the country.

One delegation made an offer to accept interpreters as auxiliary personnel in line with the FSC Chairperson’s statement dated 21 July 2004.

Another delegation provided statistical information on inspections and evaluation visits conducted and received.

## **Inspection**

One delegation brought to the attention of the participants a new practice of sending transit requests to all the participating States before the inspection requests, and strongly suggested that transit requests should be sent only to the country to which travel would take place. The same delegation also expressed concern over repeated refusals of their inspection requests by one participating State, without the provision of good reasons, and stressed that such an attitude was unacceptable.

One delegation, referring to paragraph 80 of the Vienna Document 1999, called attention to the organizational and financial difficulties resulting from the ambiguous approach to the size of the “specified area”, especially when helicopter overflights were involved, and inquired about the possibility of establishing a clear definition of this area. One delegation, supported by other delegations, stated that there should be no arguments concerning restrictions on the size of the “specified area”. One delegation stated that interpretations regarding the size of the said area did not pose many problems and such practical issues could be addressed in a different manner.

One delegation stated that the country’s passive quota under the Vienna Document usually is exhausted at the beginning of the year, and the inspections/visits are conducted practically at one and the same time or after a very short interval. In this regard, the delegation called the participating States’ attention to the difficulty that that constitutes for the receiving State, with limited resources within its verification unit. The same delegation stressed the practical importance of not sending requests for inspections during official holidays.

## **Regional measures**

One delegation made a presentation on a bilateral arrangement in south-eastern Europe which had been prepared jointly with the other party. It was stated that the arrangement could serve as an example for other participating States.

Various delegations also shared positive experiences and information on bilateral and regional measures in south-eastern Europe, central Europe and the Nordic and Baltic region, as well as Central Asia. Satisfaction was expressed regarding the implementation of agreements. One delegation introduced a conceptual document in that regard. Various

inspections and evaluations conducted on the basis of bilateral agreements were also mentioned.

## **Communications Network**

The representative of the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) made a presentation on the current status of the OSCE Communications Network. He stated that the Communications Group had undertaken to further upgrade the Network in 2005, and the modernization project had been successfully completed on time and within budget. He also stated that, currently, 48 participating States were connected to the Network and one additional State planned to join in the near future, bringing the total to 49. The Network had expanded to allow more States to connect their ministries of foreign affairs and defence, and that made possible better co-ordination, not only between, but also within the capitals. He stressed that the Network was now faster, more secure, more capable, and more reliable than ever before; however, further work remained to be done to monitor and optimize the system.

The representative of the CPC, responding to a question by one delegation, confirmed that acknowledgement of receipt of notifications was part of the OSCE Communications Network standard installation, although only a few States had not yet activated that function.

One delegation expressed satisfaction with the Network and called upon the participating States that were not connected to it to take the necessary steps to join the system as soon as possible. One delegation proposed that a format should be prepared for notifying bilateral and regional inspections and inquired about the possibility of notifying points of contact as well. Responding to a remark by the same delegation, the CPC representative said that the Network, generally speaking, did have additional capacity, and therefore could be used not only for notifications, but also for additional exchange of information.

## **Conclusions**

The discussion at this session was constructive and demonstrated the willingness of the participating States to improve the implementation of the relevant provisions of the Vienna Document 1999. In this context, views were exchanged and some specific suggestions were made. The delegations were reminded that they should follow up their proposals in the FSC.

## **WORKING SESSION 2**

### **Part A**

Wednesday, 8 March 2006

### **Report of the Working Session Rapporteur**

- Principles governing conventional arms transfers
  - Principles governing non-proliferation
  - Stabilizing measures for localized crisis situations
  - Global exchange of military information
  - Questionnaire on Anti-Personnel Landmines
  - Questionnaire on the process of ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention
- 

Mr. V. Pavlov, of the delegation of Belarus, was the co-ordinator of the first part of Working Session 2, and Mr. Ricardo Mor, of the delegation of Spain, was the rapporteur. The co-ordinator had circulated an introductory paper in advance under the reference FSC.AIAM/7/06. That paper was intended to stimulate and encourage discussion about the topics concerning the operation and implementation of other measures agreed by the FSC.

### **Principles governing conventional arms transfers**

One delegation welcomed the fact that, in 2004, almost 50 per cent of all reports sent to the UNROCA (United Nations Register of Conventional Arms) had been submitted by OSCE participating States. However, some inconsistencies concerning import-export data had been detected. The same delegation called upon all participating States to improve the information relating to import-export data and, at the same time, suggested taking into account that the purpose of the FSC Decision No. 8/98 was not to limit the information on conventional arms transfers within the OSCE area. Concerning the CAT (Conventional Arms Transfers) questionnaire, this delegation said that it was surprising that some participating States do refer to the information exchanged in previous questionnaires instead of submitting updated information. Additionally, that information sometimes was only partially covered. The same delegation said that the questions in the questionnaire consisted of a variety of different aspects and that, unfortunately, not all participating States covered all these aspects in their answers.

Finally, the co-ordinator concluded that an updating of FSC Decision No. 13/97 would probably be necessary, since substantial variations had been occurring in specific equipment systems such as artillery systems or man-portable air defence systems.

## **Principles governing non-proliferation**

One delegation recalled that, following the FSC Chair Report on the Special FSC Meeting on 15 June 2005, his delegation drafted an update of the 1994 OSCE principles governing non-proliferation, but a consensus on the issue had not been reached before the Ministerial Council meeting in Ljubljana. Participating States were invited by the same delegation to consider it in future discussions.

The co-ordinator had posed a question in his introductory paper, asking whether the principles in their present form were still relevant in the current international security setting. In that respect, one delegation made its strong point answering “no”, and supported the suggestion made by the previous delegation to let all the participating States discuss the issue jointly, trying to overcome the existing divergences. Concerning the second question posed by the co-ordinator in his paper, the same delegation expressed its hope that the recommendations coming from the 1540 Committee, established pursuant to United Nations Security Council resolution 1540, would help to determine the measures to be implemented in the framework of such a resolution.

Another delegation stated that the OSCE principles governing non-proliferation constituted an important tool that had helped the participating States to implement their commitments in that area. Nevertheless, that delegation believed that, after the discussions at the meetings of the FSC, it had become clear that it would not be practical to reopen those principles at this time. On the contrary, the time seemed to be ripe to take practical steps in support of the work of the 1540 Committee. Working together with the UN, OSCE participating States would be able to determine what added value the Organization could contribute in the implementation of the recommendations of the 1540 Committee.

Finally, one delegation made a statement on the serious concern that the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) represented for its country. For that reason, that participating State attached great importance to arms control and non-proliferation treaties and also to export-control regimes as means to prevent such proliferation. That participating State had declared its support for the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI). The same delegation announced that a PSI exercise called “Anatolian Sun” would take place in Turkey in May 2006. 30 countries have already expressed their interest that they would like to participate or observe the exercise.

In his final remarks, the Chairperson of the AIAM concluded that the issue of a possible update of the principles governing non-proliferation was indeed a matter that deserved particular attention.

## **Stabilizing measures for localized crisis situations**

The co-ordinator recalled in his paper that the document on stabilizing measures for localized crisis situations had been adopted in 1993, and had never been applied since that time. In that respect, one delegation stated that there was in fact a serious problem because that document had been agreed among participating States, and it was impossible to discuss those measures with non-State actors. That was perhaps the reason why the document was never applied.

In his concluding remarks, one delegate recalled that there was no universally agreed definition of a non-State actor. The application of those measures in the conflict areas were mostly conditioned to conflict-resolution processes.

### **Global exchange of military information**

One delegation recalled its point made at Working Session 1 on the efficiency of the electronic exchange of military information. The same delegation strongly believed that electronic exchanges were more effective than paper-based ones, and obviated a number of complications caused by ordinary paperwork.

Another delegation proposed that the deadlines for the annual and the global exchanges of information should be aligned. That delegation suggested that a FSC Chairperson's statement could introduce a common deadline for both exchanges of military information. That common deadline could be on 15 December.

A representative of the CPC informed the participants that, on 15 December 2005, eight participating States had provided the data for both the annual and the global exchanges at the same time.

One delegation added that unifying the deadlines would also help to improve the consultations among the experts who came to Vienna from the capitals and help national verification units with some staff constraints.

One more delegation supported what had been put forward by the previous delegates.

### **Questionnaire on Anti-Personnel Landmines**

One delegation expressed its satisfaction concerning the high rate of response to the Questionnaire on Anti-Personnel Landmines, but said that improvement was needed. For the first time, questions on explosives remnants of war had been included in the Questionnaire in 2004, and that was satisfactory. The same delegation asked those participating States that had not yet completed that section of the Questionnaire to do so, and proposed that some clarifications should be introduced into questions 2 and 3 in order to help the participating States to fully complete the Questionnaire.

One delegation provided information about an international project on disposal of 300,000 anti-personnel mines launched in its country, and expressed gratitude to the governments of those participating States that had made practical contributions to the project which was to be implemented in the coming months. Destruction of the most dangerous PFM-1 mines with liquid explosives, totalling over 3 million, was also planned to start in 2006. A press release on the issue had been distributed under the reference SEC.DEL/61/06.

Finally, one delegation drew the participants' attention to the fact that Protocol V had not yet entered into force.

## **Questionnaire on the process of ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention**

The co-ordinator recalled that all 55 participating States had ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention. That could be considered as a good example of dealing with the commitments made by the OSCE. The current AIAM would be the last one to include the item in its agenda.

## **Food-for-thought paper on the United Nations electronic database on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms**

Before concluding the first part of the working session, the co-ordinator proposed to introduce for discussion the food-for-thought paper distributed under the reference FSC.AIAM/2/06 on the United Nations electronic database on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms.

The delegation that had produced the paper took the floor and introduced its content, in particular its recommendation that the CPC be mandated to notify information on confidence-building measures to the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs on behalf of all 55 participating States. Such a joint notification by the CPC would help not only to enhance visibility of the OSCE, but also to overcome some so-called notification fatigue on the part of national notification bodies, caused by the growing number of notifications with diverging deadlines and certain duplications.

In this regard, the CPC could for instance notify on behalf of all 55 participating States the existence of confidence-building measures in the OSCE area without specifying the confidential substance of these confidence-building measures.

Three other delegations supported the proposal, and the co-ordinator concluded that that could be considered a good start, with a view to submitting the initiative to the FSC. In his final remarks, the Chairperson of the AIAM also concluded that the food-for-thought should be included in the discussions of the FSC.

## **WORKING SESSION 2**

### **Part B**

Wednesday, 8 March 2006

### **Report of the Working Session Rapporteur**

- Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security
  - OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons
  - OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition
  - Principles for export controls of MANPADS
  - Principles on the control of brokering in SALW
  - Standard elements of end-user certificates and verification procedures for SALW exports
- 

In opening the session, the co-ordinator referred to his food-for-thought paper on the subject, which had been distributed in advance (FSC.AIAM/4/06). He urged delegations to be prepared to discuss not just implementation statistics, but also the practical experiences of implementation, in particular, the steps taken to overcome shortcomings or problems, and to consider possible ideas for future work of the FSC.

### **Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security**

The representative of the Conflict Prevention Centre provided a summary of activities for the year 2005, which outlined the status of responses submitted by participating States to the OSCE questionnaire assessing the implementation of the Code of Conduct at the national level. To date, 52 participating States had exchanged their responses regarding national policy, practice and regulations in the areas related to the democratic control of armed forces and internal security forces.

A reference was made to the seminar organized in Vienna by the Geneva Centre on Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF) to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the entry into force of the Code.

He brought to the attention of delegations the project launched by the OSCE Office on Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) in conjunction with the DCAF, the outcome of which would be publication of a handbook of best practice on human rights and fundamental freedoms of armed forces personnel. In that regard, the participating States were requested to provide their responses to the ODIHR's questionnaire by 15 April 2006, when the information for the FSC Questionnaire should be exchanged.

The co-ordinator suggested discussing the forms of assistance or other efforts that might be considered in order to support the Code's implementation.

With regard to the ODIHR's project, one delegation pointed out that, although there was some linkage between the subject of the ODIHR's initiative and the FSC's activities, no formal links had been established between the ODIHR and the FSC on the matter, as it was envisaged by existing rules and procedures. Therefore, any reference to the FSC in the ODIHR's project would be incorrect until such formal contacts were established.

Another delegation noted the deficiency in the quality of the information exchanged and welcomed the efforts of the DCAF and the FSC to improve the reporting. The same delegation provided information about national initiatives in support of the implementation of the Code of Conduct and invited participating States to take part in the forthcoming event dedicated to the topic.

One delegation supported the ODIHR initiative, noting that the project was not aimed at setting new standards but rather at elaborating best practices. Several other delegations spoke in favour of the ODIHR's project as an important contribution to the implementation of the Code of Conduct.

In response to the co-ordinator's proposal that the meeting should assess the levels and types of activities in support of the Code's implementation, in particular, in connection with the requests for assistance visits, one delegation provided information about its recent assistance projects, which entailed sending trainers and instructors to requesting participating States. The same delegation expressed its readiness to continue to provide such support upon request.

## **OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons**

### **OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition**

At the suggestion of the co-ordinator, the discussion of the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons and on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition was restructured in order to allow consideration of the assistance projects under the two documents, to be followed by other aspects of implementation of the documents.

#### **Requests submitted pursuant to the OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition**

The FSC co-ordinator for requests submitted pursuant to the OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition provided a status report on the requests for assistance from participating States and outlined the lessons learned from those activities. He highlighted the fact that, since the adoption of the OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition, ten requests for assistance had been submitted to the OSCE. In addition, since the last AIAM there had been three additional requests for assistance on elimination of liquid rocket fuel "melange" to the OSCE.

He acknowledged the progress achieved in the implementation of projects on conventional ammunition and "melange" in specific countries. He thanked the donor



countries which had donated or pledged funds in response to requests and invited participating States and partner to consider donating funds for the implementation of the project. In that regard, he referred to the Synopsis of Status of SALW and Conventional Ammunition Requests for Assistance in the OSCE (FSC.GAL/24/06), prepared by co-ordinators and the CPC and distributed in advance, which outlined stages of the projects' implementation and funding requirements.

### **Requests submitted pursuant to the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons**

The FSC co-ordinator responsible for requests submitted pursuant to the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons presented a detailed update of the implementation of SALW projects in three States arising out of their requests pursuant to the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons. He mentioned the lack of funding and some administrative obstacles as lessons learned and invited interested States to consider the possibility of making contributions for project implementation.

He gave information on the status of implementation of projects in specific countries, noting with regard to one project the assurances from the Government of its contribution to the project, openness, transparency and the role of the United Nations Development Programme as a potential project manager. He also underlined the need for enhancing co-ordination and co-operation with other international organizations, on a case-by-case basis, in order to provide a more solid, in particular, financial, ground for dealing with requests and the implementation of projects.

The co-ordinator suggested discussing what could be improved from the perspective of assisting States, requesting States and the CPC, and how to achieve co-ordination with international organizations.

One delegation thanked those States which were providing assistance for the implementation of the project in its country, expressed satisfaction with the work done and invited participating States to provide further support for the implementation of the next stages of the project.

Another delegation provided information on the implementation of the project on rehabilitation of the area affected by unexploded ordnance in its country, and on the disposal of "melange", noting the national efforts and underlining the importance of further support from participating States for the project's implementation. The same delegation provided information about the ongoing joint project with NATO concerning the destruction of SALW and man-portable air defence systems (MANPADS), which it regarded as a contribution to the implementation of the OSCE Document on Small Arms Light Weapons. In that connection the question of the need to discuss a definition of a MANPAD was raised.

One delegation provided information about the latest developments in the implementation of the project in that country and expressed the readiness of the government to contribute to the project and to arrange a visit to a destruction facility. The importance of co-operation with another international organization in that particular project was also emphasized.

With reference to the same project, another delegation welcomed the assurances given by the requesting State and expressed interest in having further discussion of the subject. It also supported the enhanced co-operation with another international organization in that project.

The co-ordinator brought to the attention of the participants the Synopsis of Status of SALW and Conventional Ammunition Requests for Assistance in the OSCE and urged delegations to promote consideration in the capitals of possible concrete tangible contributions as donors to security, co-operation and confidence-building measures.

One delegation pointed out the existence of numerous projects of other international organizations, for which funding was needed. The importance for requesting countries to acknowledge the problems of donor countries related to annual budget planning was stressed.

### **Other aspects of implementation of the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons and the OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition**

In the course of the discussion of other aspects of implementation of the OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition, the Chairperson of the Editorial Review Board provided a summary on the status of preparation of best practice guides. He referred to the preparation of the best practice guide on stockpile management, which was currently with the FSC moment, and the guide on transportation, prepared by one delegation, which was under review by the Board. Continued participation of States in those projects was encouraged.

One delegation provided information about its intention to draft a best practice guide on the destruction of conventional ammunition.

The Chairperson of the Informal Group of Friends on Small Arms and Light Weapons provided a summary report about the Group's activities and outlined the tasks for the future. Among the Group's main achievements the preparation of the FSC Chairperson's report on the implementation of the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons to the Thirteenth Ministerial Council in Ljubljana was mentioned. Three priority tasks for the current year were identified: a special FSC meeting on reviewing the implementation of the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons and SALW-related issues; the OSCE contribution to the United Nations Conference to review the progress made in the implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action on SALW and preparation of the FSC progress report on the implementation of the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons. It was noted that the suggestions and recommendations of the AIAM could be used for the discussions in the FSC special meeting and the OSCE contribution to the UN Review Conference.

One delegation noted the SALW-related efforts of the OSCE and recalled its country's initiative at the UN Preparatory Committee for the Review Conference to call for convening an inter-sessional meeting, for which a food-for-thought paper had been distributed.

A concern was voiced by one delegation about inconsistencies in export/import figures provided by States, which might be due to problems of definitions. It also suggested

that the issue of improvement of quality of the data exchanged be addressed during the review process.

One delegation gave information about a number of regional events that had been organized at his country's initiative in support of the implementation of the UN Programme of Action on SALW.

Another delegation announced the adoption of new national legislation which introduced strict internal licensing procedures for private industrial enterprises producing war weapons, vehicles, equipment and ammunition.

One delegation stressed the importance of capacity building on SALW and of using the full range of tools available within the OSCE, such as information exchange, best practice guides and questionnaires, as well as specific projects. That delegation encouraged States requesting assistance to focus on the projects of highest priority and to design them to ensure their sustainable development.

One delegation proposed a follow-on discussion on SALW after the United Nations Review Conference.

Another delegation recalled its previously submitted proposal concerning controls over transportation of illicit SALW with the use of airports and airlines of OSCE participating States.

One delegation brought to the attention of delegations the draft best practice guide on the stockpile management and security of MANPADS, sponsored by nine delegations. It was noted that the guide would constitute an Annex to the Handbook of Best Practices on SALW and could become an OSCE contribution to the UN Review Conference on the Programme of Action. Delegations were invited to discuss and support the document in the FSC.

Another delegation drew the participants' attention of to the food-for-thought paper on the preparations for the 2006 Review Conference on the UN Programme of Action on SALW, prepared by two delegations, which dealt with the negative humanitarian and development impact of the illicit manufacture, transfer and circulation of SALW and their excessive accumulation. It was suggested that the document be considered at one of the next FSC meetings. The concept of that paper was supported by one delegation.

## **Principles for export controls of MANPADS**

There were no requests for the floor.

## **Principles on the control of brokering in SALW**

One delegation applauded the efforts by the OSCE to support national implementation of the principles on brokering and referred to the upcoming workshop on control over brokering in small arms and light weapons. That delegation suggested that a more comprehensive OSCE document on transportation and financing with regard to brokering activities would help to better address the problem of illicit brokering. It gave also information about its country's initiative taken together with another participating State

concerning the role of transporters in illicit brokering. It supported the document prepared by two delegations on the humanitarian and development impact of illicit small arms and noted its own initiative to hold an expert seminar on small arms and development.

### **Standard elements of end-user certificates and verification procedures for SALW exports**

One delegation suggested that questions regarding end-user certificates could be discussed at a special FSC meeting on SALW among experts.

One delegation was pleased to see the adoption of the document as a contribution to overall MANPADS efforts. It provided information about its country's active assistance programmes on physical security, stockpile management and destruction of MANPADS and expressed its interest in learning more about national activities in other participating States.





---

**473rd Plenary Meeting**

FSC Journal No. 479, Agenda item 3

**DECISION No. 1/06**  
**AGENDA AND MODALITIES OF THE SIXTEENTH**  
**ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING**

7 and 8 March 2006

*Vienna Document 1999:*

*(148) The participating States will hold each year a meeting to discuss the present and future implementation of agreed CSBMs. Discussion may extend to:*

- (148.1) — Clarification of questions arising from such implementation;*
- (148.2) — Operation of agreed measures, including the use of additional equipment during inspections and evaluation visits;*
- (148.3) — Implications of all information originating from the implementation of any agreed measures for the process of confidence- and security-building in the framework of the OSCE.*

**I. Agenda and indicative timetable**

**Tuesday, 7 March 2006**

- 10–10.45 a.m.      Opening plenary meeting
- Opening of the meeting by the Chairperson;
  - Remarks by the Chairperson of the Forum for Security Co-operation;
  - Situation report by the Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC).

FSC.DEC/1/06  
1 February 2006

10.45 a.m.–6 p.m. Working session 1: Implementation of the Vienna Document 1999: clarification, assessment and conclusions

- Annual exchange of military information;
- Defence planning;
- Risk reduction;
- Military activities:
  - (i) Prior notification of certain military activities;
  - (ii) Annual calendars;
  - (iii) Constraining provisions;
  - (iv) Observation of certain military activities;
- Contacts;
- Evaluation;
- Inspection;
- Regional measures;
- Communications Network.

1–3 p.m. Lunch break

**Wednesday, 8 March 2006**

10 a.m.–4.30 p.m. Working session 2: Operation and implementation of other FSC-agreed measures/documents: clarification, assessment and conclusions

- Principles governing conventional arms transfers;
- Principles governing non-proliferation;
- Stabilizing measures for localized crisis situations;
- Global exchange of military information;
- Questionnaire on Anti-Personnel Landmines;
- Questionnaire on the process of ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention;
- Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security;
- OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons;
- OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition;
- Principles for export controls of MANPADS;
- Principles on the control of brokering in SALW;
- Standard elements of end-user certificates and verification procedures for SALW exports.

5–6 p.m. Closing plenary meeting

- Working sessions reports;
- Discussion;
- Concluding remarks;

FSC.DEC/1/06  
1 February 2006

- Date of the 2007 AIAM;
- Closure.

1–3 p.m. Lunch break

## **II. Organizational modalities**

1. The Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting (AIAM) will last two days and will be organized in the form of opening and closing plenary meetings together with working sessions dealing with all the topics contained in the agenda (I). The indicative timetable provides more detail.

2. The organizational meeting of chairpersons, co-ordinators, rapporteurs, and the CPC will be held on 6 March 2006 at 3 p.m.

The working hours of the AIAM will be from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. and from 3 to 6 p.m.

3. Interpretation into the OSCE official languages will be provided.

4. The meeting will be chaired by participating States, in rotation in accordance with the French alphabetical order, following on from the chairing of the closing plenary meeting of the 2005 AIAM by Andorra. The chair of the opening plenary meeting and working sessions will be held by Armenia, while the chair of the closing plenary meeting will be held by Austria.

5. Debates in the working sessions will be oriented to problems and solutions and there will be no formal statements. Possible national statements for the opening plenary should only be presented in written form and are to be distributed in advance. The working sessions are designed to be very informal meetings of national experts with the objectives of answering questions, exchanging information and allowing for constructive debate between participating States. Delegations are strongly encouraged to provide detailed explanations and concrete examples of their own implementation experiences. Delegations are welcome to distribute written contributions in advance of the meeting, both on agenda points and on related matters for possible discussion. All delegations are strongly encouraged to provide national experts to participate in the AIAM.

6. The CPC will circulate the revised Annual Survey on CSBM Information Exchanged and the AIAM 2005 Survey of Suggestions by the middle of February. These will serve as a basis for preparatory work by delegations and co-ordinators. In particular, the co-ordinators should focus on suggestions which might get the support of delegations.

7. Each working session will have two designated co-ordinators and two rapporteurs. The task of the co-ordinators will be to facilitate the discussion, while the task of the rapporteurs will be to present an oral report to the closing plenary meeting.



FSC.DEC/1/06

1 February 2006

8. The co-ordinators will circulate a list of topics and questions for facilitating the discussion in their working sessions. They will be supported by the CPC in this regard. They will ensure that all relevant areas are addressed.

9. During the first part of the closing plenary meeting, the rapporteur from each working session will give an oral report to the delegates on the issues that were addressed during the working session. This report should include problem areas, improvements in implementation accomplished by OSCE participating States, suggestions for further improvement, and any other relevant information. After each oral report, the rapporteur will answer questions. Delegations are encouraged to comment on or add to the reports presented by the rapporteurs.

10. Delegations with volunteers for co-ordinators or/and rapporteurs for the working sessions should provide the names of the individuals and working session to the Chairperson of the FSC as soon as possible, but not later than 8 February 2006. The names of the co-ordinators and rapporteurs for each working session will be made known to all delegations not later than 10 February 2006.

11. During the first FSC plenary meeting following the AIAM, the Chairperson of the closing plenary meeting will report on the AIAM to the FSC and provide the Chairperson's report together with the reports of working session rapporteurs. Not later than 6 April 2006, the CPC will provide a written report of suggestions made during the meeting aimed at improving the implementation of CSBMs.

12. The recommended approach, to ensure the most productive discussion in the FSC as participating States consider, as required, suggestions made during the meeting aiming at the improvement of the implementation of CSBMs, is for delegations to bring forward suggestions or topics of interest by means of food-for-thought papers. Discussions on initial papers could lead to further work in the FSC.

13. The Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation (Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia) and the Partners for Co-operation (Afghanistan, Japan, Mongolia, the Republic of Korea and Thailand) are invited to attend all meetings of the 2006 AIAM.