



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

FSC.AIAM/46/00

9 March 2000

ENGLISH only

---

**Conference Services**

Please find attached the Chairman's Report and reports of the Working Group  
Co-ordinators of the 2000 Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting.



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

FSC.AIAM/46/00

9 March 2000

ENGLISH only

---

**Conference Services**

2000 ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION  
ASSESSMENT MEETING

Vienna, 28 February to 1 March 2000

SUMMARY

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

REPORTS OF THE WORKING GROUP CO-ORDINATORS

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Chairman's Report .....	1
 <u>Reports of the Working Group Co-ordinators:</u>	
Working Group I: Agenda item 2(a).....	6
Working Group II: Agenda item 2(b) .....	7
Working Group III: Agenda items 2(c) .....	9
Working Group III: Agenda items 2(d) .....	11
Working Group IV: Agenda items 2(e) .....	13
Working Group IV: Agenda items 2(f).....	14
Working Group V: Agenda item 2(g).....	15
Working Group VI: Agenda item 3(a).....	16
Working Group VI: Agenda items 3(b) to 3(f).....	18
 Annex: Agenda, timetable and other organizational modalities (FSC.DEC/3/00)	

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT TO THE FORUM FOR SECURITY CO-OPERATION ON  
THE ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING

Vienna, 28 February to 1 March, 2000

Mr. Chairman,

As Chairman of the Closing Plenary of the tenth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting, in accordance with the FSC decision No. 3/00, it is an honour to me to report to the Forum for Security Co-operation on the proceedings, discussions and results of that meeting.

The aim of the meeting was, in accordance with Chapter XI of the Vienna Document 1999, to discuss the present and future implementation of agreed CSBMs. The participating States in open discussion exchanged their views on implementation, operation and application of OSCE commitments in the field of CSBMs and of other important documents agreed in the framework of the FSC. The common goal of participants was to assess the record of implementation and thus to contribute to enhancement of confidence and security in Euro-Atlantic-Central Asian area.

The Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation as well as Japan and the Republic of Korea have been invited to attend the opening and closing plenary meetings by the FSC decision.

The AIAM had two plenary sessions, the opening one chaired by the Russian Federation and the closing session chaired by the Slovak Republic, and six working groups, in which nine designated co-ordinators facilitated the discussion. Also this year Sweden organized workshop at the margins of the meeting on Defence Planning.

Each co-ordinator presented at the closing plenary session a report on the results of the discussion held in his/her working group. These reports will be attached to this statement. My following comments are based on those reports.

The discussion in the Working Group I on annual exchange of military information confirmed that these provisions constituted a basis for all other CSBMs and were a stabilizing factor in the OSCE area. Delegations had only a limited discussion on the quality of information exchange. It was underlined that a vast majority of participating States had provided information required under the Vienna Document 1994 on time and two-thirds of the participating States had used automated information exchange. At the same time, however, it was noted that some participating States had failed to comply with their commitments to send information. Those States were encouraged at the meeting to explain the reasons for the delay. A group of States offered them assistance in order to implement those provisions. Appeals for explanation were partly responded at the closing plenary. Delegations suggested to provide incomplete information rather than none, and to assist the States without armed forces to prepare their information.

There was a call for a review of the Vienna Document's provisions regarding regularly updating information in cases of military activities of long duration. This idea was also discussed within working group on military activities.

In the Working Group II on defence planning it was noted that more participating States had completed defence planning returns for last year and the returns had been of a

better quality. A number of ideas was put forward in order to improve the quality of information exchange. A general support for a regular dialogue on defence planning returns was expressed, especially on those related to defence and military doctrines. In this regard some delegations were of the opinion that it would be appropriate to organize a follow-up to the last seminar on defence policy and military doctrines to assess changes to defence structures resulting, for example, from CFE Treaty adaptation.

A need for information on how the defence plans of the participating States were affected by the planning processes was highlighted, and in this regard the elaboration of compendium on national planning processes was suggested. The participating States emphasized the importance of the information exchange on military budgets in which the figures should be for easy reference expressed as a percentage change. Finally, it was noted that the three-month deadline might cause difficulties in completing returns following approval of national military budgets because the impact of the budget on some aspects of a return only became clear over a period longer than three months.

The lively discussion in the Working Group III on military activities focused on prior notification and observation of certain military activities. Delegations addressed the issue of application of the Vienna Document in crisis situations and conflicts, and how the regime of notifications, observations of military activities, and inspections was affected. There was general agreement that the Vienna Document should be an “all weather” document, applicable in all relevant circumstances, especially in the times of crises and conflicts. This issue was discussed frequently also in other working groups. Some delegations described as problem the absence of existing appropriate provisions in the Vienna Document, other considered the possible improvement through a better use of the existing CSBMs. The importance of further discussion of these problems within the FSC was stressed.

There was discussion on the issue of time-frames for carrying out observation of notified military activities in cases the thresholds established by the Vienna Document have been exceeded. Furthermore, discussion was held on the mutual complementarity of CSBMs and political efforts to ensure conflict prevention, conflict settlement and post-conflict rehabilitation. It was also mentioned that confidence-building measures should do more to embrace those military activities that do not fall within the range where notification and observation are required. Information on voluntary arrangements for observation by participating States of military activities that do not reach the Vienna Document notifiable levels was positively welcomed.

In the same Working Group III on compliance and verification delegations extensively shared their views and experience about the evaluation visits and inspections carried out in 1999 and at the beginning of 2000. A general improvement of implementation was highlighted.

It was noted that in 1999 there was the highest number of inspections and evaluation visits. Also the number of inspections and evaluations visits based on regional voluntary agreements increased significantly. Delegations welcomed that some countries had voluntarily offered extra passive quotas. Nevertheless, the quota system was described as ongoing problem, in particular the rapid exhaustion of quotas at the beginning of the year. There was discussion on the clarification of “auxiliary personnel” and whether or not the “auxiliary personnel” or interpreter belonged to the inspection team. Some delegations raised the issue of the further clarification of “a single working day”.

A number of suggestions was made concerning implementation of the Vienna Document 1999. The rule on receiving only two evaluation visits in one calendar month was emphasized and it was agreed that the responsibility in this regard belonged to the receiving State since it was best positioned to respond to incoming requests. Furthermore, delegations were encouraged to continue and widen the scope of the multinational inspections, evaluation visits and bilateral measures and to provide detailed verification reports, including the relevant figures.

In the Working Group IV on risk reduction delegations discussed the development of mechanism for consultations and co-operation as regards unusual activities. There was general agreement to enhance and improve “all-weather capability” of the Vienna Document, however, delegations hesitated as to whether it was possible to develop the mechanism further against the background of the results of recent negotiations. At the same time some delegations maintained that the Vienna Document contained a number of measures which, properly used, could considerably contribute to risk reduction. The importance of integrating CSBMs into the political context and the goal to gain “insight on site” were noted.

The issue of possible limitations of risk reduction measures during a conflict was raised. A few practical examples were given on the application of the regime in 1999. The importance of functioning communications in this context was underlined. Exchange of views on provisions related to voluntary hosting of visits to expel concerns showed that delegations were hesitant to make this regime more similar to that for evaluation visits. It was suggested that any possible changes should rather resemble the inspection regime, however, at the end of discussion there was general understanding that a stricter regime might be less attractive for voluntary hosted visits. There was limited discussion on provisions for co-operation as regards hazardous incidents.

Discussion in the same Working Group IV on contacts was based on the Conflict Prevention Centre’s survey being used as a valuable reference in the assessment. Delegations shared experience they had gained from the visits they had hosted in 1999. Some delegations announced planned air base visits in the years 2000 - 2001. It was also noted that not all the participating States with air combat units had yet arranged air base visits and those States were called upon to fulfil their commitment in this five-year period that had began in 1997. In this connection one delegation explained that, despite the existence of some air bases on its territory, this provision was not applicable because its armed forces did not include any air combat units.

With regard to the programme of military contacts and co-operation delegations expressed the need for synchronization of the five-year periods envisaged for visits to military facilities and formations with the calendar adopted for air base visits. In addition one delegation provided information on a training programme and another announced, on a voluntary basis, an invitation for observers from neighbouring countries to a military exercise.

On the demonstration of new types of weapon and equipment systems some delegations were encouraged to improve their performance and an assistance was offered to them. Delegations also raised the issue of financing hosted activities under various provisions of the Vienna Document and called for the reduction of related costs.

For the first time we had an opportunity to discuss the regional measures in the separate Working Group V. A number of delegations very lively exchanged their experience with implementing various additional measures on bilateral or regional level, referring to non-exhaustive list of regional measures set up in a new Chapter X of the Vienna Document 1999. Discussion confirmed that many of the existing regional initiatives went much further than the measures listed in the Vienna Document 1999. With regard to this rich and successful bilateral and regional co-operation it was suggested to delegations to inform the Conflict Prevention Centre on the texts of their relevant agreements. At the same time, however, it was mentioned that in certain regions the political situation still did not allow this kind of voluntary co-operation.

It was also noted that although the Vienna Document referred to CSBMs in the specified zone of application, the Central Asian initiative, which included also many other OSCE non-participating States in Asia, was the important contribution to cross border measures.

In the Working Group VI on communications delegations discussed the current communications network status, operations and connectivity, and future network and notification application enhancements. The functioning of the upgraded communications network in the 2000 was confirmed. There were some information and suggestions concerning the future state of the network, in particular on the evaluation of alternative means for secure communications. The development of a new integrated notification application, which will replace the current CFE and OS NoFES, and CSBM macros, was announced.

It was regretted that several participating States were yet not connected to the network. Discussion confirmed that non-connected status of some participating States was not caused by the lack of interest. Some delegations were not connected due to high price of an EUS, in other cases a reliable means of communications was difficult to establish, not available or was too expensive. Some practical suggestions were made in order to connect all participating States to the OSCE network before next AIAM.

Finally, the last Working Group VI dealt with the operation and implementation of other FSC agreed measures and documents. Discussion centred on the Code of Conduct on politico-military aspects of security. Several delegations raised the question of the application of the Code in the challenging circumstances of 1999 and the first months of 2000. Similarly to the “all-weather capability” of the Vienna Document, all delegations agreed on the importance of abiding by principles of the Code in all circumstances. There was unanimous agreement on the importance of continuing to openly question and to probe each others’ implementation of the Code. There was suggested to include an information on dissemination of the Code of Conduct and, possibly, its implementation in the reports of the evaluation visits.

The usefulness of the Stabilizing Measures for Localized Crisis Situations together with regional measures in Chapter X of the Vienna Document in regional situations both pre- and post-conflict was underlined. The potential value of these measures in current crises was also noted.

Mr. Chairman,

This report should be considered as a short overview of the discussion in the working groups of the AIAM. Further details could be found in the reports of the co-ordinators and in the summary of the suggestions to be made by the Conflict Prevention Centre in one month time. It is my conviction that all proposals made at the AIAM 2000 will be carefully studied and addressed in the Forum for Security Co-operation and its Working Group A. In addition I would like to refer to the report on the work of the Forum in 1999 presented by that Chairman of the Forum (United Kingdom), the report on implementation of agreed measures presented by the CPC and also its updated survey on CSBM information exchanged. These reports served as good basis for the discussion in the working groups.

Let me briefly touch upon the goals of the Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting. The primary goal is to assess implementation record of CSBMs and other FSC agreed measures and documents. I have already at the closing plenary expressed my view that the gathering of experts as this one was the best opportunity how to assure that the aims of negotiators and implementers of discussed measures and documents were the same. Exchange of views on implementation, practices, experience but also on problems and shortcomings was, is, and will be the core of the AIAM's success. Therefore the agenda is divided in numerous informal working sessions. When starting preparations on next AIAM we should consider the ways how to focus on practical implementation and assistance, avoiding exchange of political statements in working groups. Suggestion to combine some closely related working groups should be further discussed too.

The full implementation of the Vienna Document, the Code of Conduct and other FSC documents is the basis for enhanced confidence and security in the OSCE area. The AIAM has confirmed the increased quantity in implementation. In the coming days and months we should further focus on a "quality over quantity". Applicability and operability of existing measures in all-weather situations was the key issue in our discussion. Many delegations expressed concern over insufficient compliance with the Vienna Document and the Code of Conduct during the ongoing conflict in Northern Caucasus and some delegations questioned compliance during the military operation in FRY. It is my view that all crisis situations are a challenge for improving implementation of existing measures or developing, if necessary, new ones.

Before concluding this report I would like to inform the FSC that the AIAM agreed on a date for the next AIAM to be held from 5 to 7 March 2001. The agenda and modalities will be finalized in this Forum.

And finally let me express my thanks and appreciation to all participants of the AIAM, and particularly to the co-ordinators, the CPC, to the previous FSC Chair (United Kingdom) and the Chair of the opening sessions (Russian Federation).



WORKING GROUP I

Monday, 28 February 2000

Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

Agenda item 2: Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the Vienna Documents 1994 and 1999: clarification, assessment and conclusions:

(a): annual exchange of military information

---

There was agreement that the annual exchange of military information was a cornerstone for all other CSBMs and a stabilizing factor in the OSCE area. The Working Group had a limited discussion on the quality of information exchange. It was noted that a vast majority of participating States had provided information required under the Vienna Document 1994 on time and two-thirds of the participating States had used automated information exchange. Four participating States had failed to comply with their commitment to send information although they had received reminder letters. Those States were encouraged at the meeting to explain the reasons for the delay. A group of States offered them practical and technical assistance tailored to their needs in order to improve the implementation. Regrettably, both appeals for explanation and offers of assistance received no response. One delegation recommended providing incomplete information rather than none. Assistance to the States without armed forces to prepare their information was also mentioned.

One delegation inquired about the status of notification provided by another delegation regarding armed forces on the territory of North Caucasus and put forward the idea of regularly updating information in cases of military activities of long duration, especially in crisis situations and multinational peace-keeping operations. This proposal was further discussed in other Working Groups.

## WORKING GROUP II

Monday, 28 February 2000

### Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

Agenda item 2: Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the Vienna Documents 1994 and 1999: clarification, assessment and conclusions:

(b): defence planning

---

The Co-ordinator opened the session by offering those participating States which had not provided a return under defence planning an opportunity to explain the delay and to provide a timetable for when their return might be forthcoming. The Co-ordinator noted that a number of States had offered assistance to those that were having difficulties in completing their returns and suggested that the Working Group might endeavour to match up those needing assistance with those offering it. There was no response.

The Co-ordinator then turned to her food-for-thought paper which had considered suggestions made at the Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting in 1999 and asked if there was any scope for taking these forward and on which areas the Working Group might concentrate.

There was a limited exchange of views, though a number of comments and ideas were put forward:

- More countries had completed defence planning returns for last year and the returns had been of a better quality. One delegation noted that it hoped to supply further details on the restructuring of its armed forces in due course;
- Support was expressed for a regular dialogue on defence planning returns, especially one which focused on defence and military doctrine. Significant changes to defence structures, resulting, for example, from the CFE Treaty adaptation, provided a good basis for a seminar;
- It was suggested that, while there was interest in the defence plans, the participating States also needed to know how they were affected by the planning process. It was important to separate the two, perhaps through a process involving a compendium on national planning processes;
- That year on year changes in military budgets were of particular interest to many. These figures might, for easy reference, be expressed as a percentage change;
- Adhering to the three month deadline caused difficulties in completing returns following approval of national military budgets. The impact of the budget on some aspects of a return only became clear over a period longer than three months.

The Swedish delegation noted that they would be hosting a defence planning workshop the following day. They had also produced a compendium, which would be circulated.

The Co-ordinator closed the Working Group by suggesting that delegations might like to use the workshop to consider further the issues raised in the Working Group once they had had time to consider the information provided in the compendium.

## WORKING GROUP III

Tuesday, 29 February 2000

### Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

Agenda item 2: Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the Vienna Documents 1994 and 1999: clarification, assessment and conclusions:

- (c): military activities:
  - prior notification of certain military activities;
  - observation of certain military activities;
  - annual calendars;
  - constraining provisions.

---

Original: RUSSIAN

The Working Group held a fruitful and constructive discussion on a number of questions, primarily matters relating to implementation of the provisions of the Vienna Document 99 on prior notification and observation of certain military activities.

- The discussion revealed a problem of “grey areas” as regards application of the Vienna Document in crisis situations. This concerns the provisions of the Vienna Document that regulate notification and observation of military activities, and also the conduct of inspections.

Those who spoke supported in principle the idea that the Vienna Document should be an “all weather” document, applicable in all relevant circumstances, but noted that the existing provisions of the document do not allow this to be done in full measure. The importance of further discussion of these problems within the FSC, with a view to working out approaches that would meet the objectives of further consolidating confidence and security building in the OSCE area, was noted. The opinion was expressed that such an approach should take account of the specifics of the situation in the area where observation or inspection is to be carried out, and also of the need to ensure “operational security”.

Also broached was the matter of timeframes for carrying out observation of notified military activities in circumstances where the notifiable levels established by the Vienna Document have been exceeded.

- A number of more general problems were also raised, relating in particular to the role and place of politico-military instruments in political processes at the regional level. On this point, discussion centred on the mutual complementarity of CSBMs and political efforts to ensure conflict prevention, conflict settlement and post-conflict rehabilitation.

- It was also mentioned that confidence-building measures should do more to embrace those military activities that do not fall within the range where notification and observation are required – an aim that could be accomplished by adjusting the levels set out in the Vienna Document. Information on voluntary arrangements for observation by participating States of military activities that do not reach the Vienna Document notifiable levels was given a positive welcome.

## WORKING GROUP III

Tuesday, 29 February 2000

### Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

Agenda item 2: Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the Vienna Documents 1994 and 1999: clarification, assessment and conclusions:

(d): compliance and verification

---

The Working Group discussed the evaluation visits and inspections carried out in 1999 and at the beginning of 2000. As the revised Vienna Document had caused some new situations and items for consideration to arise, delegations used this opportunity to share their views and experience on the implementation of the Vienna Documents 1994 and 1999.

The Co-ordinator's food-for-thought paper had encouraged delegations to study the revised Vienna Document and also the experience gained by participating States since the document came into existence. In addition to this, some data and statistics were provided on the verification measures conducted during the first two months of the year 2000. As one delegation stated, the amendments contained in the Vienna Document 1999 were small but they nevertheless needed to be followed.

The delegations found it positive that:

- In 1999, there had been a record number of inspections and evaluation visits;
- The regional measures, based on bilateral agreements, had increased significantly. In addition, some countries had voluntarily offered extra passive quotas; and
- The countries having bilateral agreements on extra quotas were using their bilateral quotas when carrying out verification measures on each other's territory and by doing so did not fulfil their "normal" quota as provided for in the Vienna Document.

The delegations found some items which needed deeper examination or clarification such as:

- The determination of "auxiliary personnel" in paragraphs 92 and 125 of the Vienna Document 1999 and the question of whether or not the "auxiliary personnel" or interpreter belonged to the inspection team;
- The determination of "a single working day" as stated in paragraph 126 of that document; and

- The format of the report distributed by participating States via the OSCE network. The reports of the verification measures should be clearer and follow an agreed and more informative and more detailed format.

The delegations encouraged participating States to:

- Examine the amendments of the Vienna Document 1999 carefully and take the implementation of the new paragraphs seriously. One delegation raised the issue of the rule on receiving only two inspections or evaluation visits in one calendar month and it was agreed that the responsibility belonged to the receiving State since it was best positioned to respond to incoming requests;
- Continue and widen the scope of the multinational inspections, evaluation visits and bilateral measures; and
- Accurately express in the report the information, including the relevant figures, that had been verified during the evaluation visit.

In conclusion, this Working Group provided clear input on the future work of the FSC, especially with regard to Working Group A. In addition, the discussion provided a good basis for establishing common best practices for the verification centres in terms of implementing the revised Vienna Document 1999. Although non-compliance with the Vienna Document 1999 is relatively minor, the Working Group had a common understanding that the document's provisions should be literally adhered to in order to increase its credibility.

## WORKING GROUP IV

Tuesday, 29 February 2000

### Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

Agenda item 2: Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the Vienna Documents 1994 and 1999: clarification, assessment and conclusions:

(e): risk reduction

---

The Co-ordinator first raised questions about the need for and possibilities of developing the “Mechanism for consultation and co-operation as regards unusual activities”.

The subsequent discussion related to previous deliberations on enhancing the “all-weather capability” of the Vienna Document and there was general agreement that this capability should be improved. There was, however, general hesitation as to whether it was possible to develop the mechanism further against the background of the results of recent negotiations.

One delegation maintained, on the other hand, that the Vienna Document nevertheless contained a number of measures which, properly used, could help to attain considerable results concerning risk reduction.

Another delegation stressed the importance of integrating CSBMs into the political context. In the concrete situation the most important goal should be to gain “insight on site”, regardless of measures resorted to.

Yet another delegation underlined the limitations of risk reduction measures when a conflict was premeditated and the political will to find a solution, other than on the party’s own conditions, did not exist.

A few practical examples were given of the application of the regime in 1999. One delegation pointed to the importance of well functioning communications in this context.

On the Co-ordinator’s question as to whether the provisions for “Voluntary hosting of visits to expel concerns...etc.” should be made more similar to those for an evaluation visit, one delegation was sceptical. There were fears that a stricter regime might be less attractive to apply. Another delegation was hesitant, but thought that possible changes should be made in the direction of an inspection.

Delegations had no experience to share on the provision for “Co-operation as regards hazardous incidents”.



## WORKING GROUP IV

Tuesday, 29 February 2000

### Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

Agenda item 2: Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the Vienna Documents 1994 and 1999 - clarification, assessment and conclusions:

(f): contacts

---

The working session assessed the yearly implementation of various provisions contained in the Chapter III of the Vienna Document 1994. The Conflict Prevention Centre's survey was used as a valuable reference in this assessment. In this context, the historical overview of implementation reflected in the Centre's surveys was recognized as a useful supplement to the annual data.

During the discussion on air base visits, some delegations shared the experience they had gained from the visits they had hosted in 1999. Five delegations informed the participants of air base visits they would be organizing this year, while another delegation signalled its intention to invite participating States for such a visit in 2001. During the deliberations, it was noted that not all participating States with air combat units had yet arranged such visits and those States were called upon to fulfil their commitment in the coming period, taking into account that a new common schedule of five-year periods to arrange air base visits had begun on 1 January 1997. One participating State explained that, despite the existence of two air bases on its territory, this provision was not applicable in its because its armed forces did not include any air combat units.

In the course of the debate on the programme of military contacts and co-operation, delegations pointed to the need to synchronize the five-year periods envisaged for visits to military facilities and formations by taking the calendar adopted for air base visits as a basis. There was an understanding that this issue could be addressed later at the relevant working group. One delegation provided information on a training programme to be offered this year within the spirit of the section on military contacts. Another delegation announced its decision to invite this year, on a voluntary basis, observers from neighbouring countries to a military exercise in accordance with the relevant provision on observation visits.

The discussion related to the provisions on the demonstration of new types of weapon and equipment systems pointed to the fact that certain participating States were expected to improve their performance in this regard. Some delegations declared their intention to take up this issue with concerned parties on a bilateral level. One delegation touched upon the financial aspect of hosting activities under various provisions of the Vienna Document and called for the reduction of related costs.

## WORKING GROUP V

Monday 28 February 2000

### Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

Agenda item 2: Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the Vienna Documents 1994 and 1999: clarification, assessment and conclusions:

(g): regional measures

---

In his introduction, the Co-ordinator described the process that had led to the adoption of Chapter X in the Vienna Document 1999. He emphasized that the list of possible regional measures in that chapter was not exhaustive and invited delegations to share their experience with already existing agreements. This led to a large number of interventions in which delegates reported on bilateral agreements and on agreements in which more countries were involved. It appeared that many of the existing regional initiatives went much further than the measures listed in Chapter X of the Vienna Document 1999. Moreover, a number of States appeared to have agreed on additional CSBMs, such as inspections and evaluation visits, in addition to the measures mentioned in the Vienna Document.

Examples of existing regional agreements are:

- An agreement for co-operative security in the Baltic Sea region;
- The South Eastern Defence Ministerials, in which eight countries co-operate in order to achieve a co-ordinated approach towards regional politico-military problems;
- The co-operation in the Black Sea region, in which six countries co-ordinate a number of maritime operations;
- A substantial number of bilateral agreements in which participating States agree on additional CSBMs with neighbouring countries.

It is obvious that the Vienna Document applies to CSBMs in the area of application. However, the Central Asian initiative, which included also many other countries in Asia, shows the importance of cross-border measures.

In summary, it may be stated that it is useful to share experience gained in bi- and multilateral co-operation, so that delegations can learn from existing complementary measures. In view of this, it is recommended that participating States inform the Conflict Prevention Centre of the texts of their agreements. Notwithstanding the encouraging number of examples of existing agreed CSBMs, however, one should bear in mind that today in certain regions the political situation does not (yet) allow this sort of voluntary co-operation.

## WORKING GROUP VI

Tuesday, 29 February 2000

### Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

Agenda item 3: Operation and implementation of other FSC agreed measures/documents: clarification, assessment, and conclusions:

(a): communications

---

The communications working group covered the topics of current communications network status, operations and connectivity, and future network and notification application enhancements.

The network is operating and survived the year 2000 rollover as a result of the Phase I upgrade effort. Activities leading to the future state of the network include the Phase II efforts of the project management team (PMT) to evaluate alternative means of secure communications. The PMT recommendation will be presented to the 29-30 March 2000 Configuration Control Board (CCB) meeting. If approved by the CCB, the recommendation will be forwarded to the Communications Group (CG) for a decision to proceed with implementation efforts. Actual implementation date for migration to an alternate means of communications will depend to the means and technological approach selected, and the source of the implementation effort be it accomplished by OSCE technical resources or a private contractor. The development of a new Integrated Notification Application (INA), that will replace the current CFE and OS NoFES, and CSBM Macros will be developed by the United States. The INA delivery date will be determined during contract negotiations.

The group was reminded of the importance of timely and complete responses to network management requests, a key element in insuring successful and efficient network operations.

Discussions emphasized the importance of the network to proper and timely exchange of notification information in accordance with the governing documents of the CSBM regime. The unfortunate fact that several countries are not connected to the network is a great concern that should be addressed and rectified. Thirty-four countries are currently connected, five have new end user stations (EUS) but have not connected, four sponsored EUS are waiting to be delivered, and twelve countries have yet to order new EUS. It is to everyone's best interest that all participating States are connected to the network.

There are countries that cannot afford the price of an EUS, and in some cases a reliable means of communications is difficult to establish, not available and/or is too expensive. Many find it difficult to imagine in the quickly evolving field of information technology that there are locations on earth that do not have Internet access. The area in which I live allows me to have 120 hours (per month) of Internet access for USD 9.95, with no installation fees. Yet some of our colleagues are faced with installation fees ranging from USD 3,500 to USD 7,000 and a per month fee of USD 350 to USD 400, that is if you can obtain this service. This revelation is sobering to me and places emphasis on how fortunate

many of us are. I believe that in many cases the non-connected status of participating States is due to affordability and/or availability issues, and not a lack of interest or desire to be a non-co-operating participant.

Our challenge – to connect all participating States to the OSCE network, and maintain these connections. The Way Ahead:

- Co-ordinate with all non-connected countries to determine why they are not connected;
- Take action to rectify the cause of the non-connected status:
  - If EUS are needed; help facilitate purchase, delivery, installation and training;
  - If EUS affordability is an obstacle; seek EUS sponsorship;
  - If communication affordability is an obstacle; seek means of underwriting those costs;
  - If communications infrastructure is an obstacle; identify viable options to provide communications.

Let us make it a priority to have all participating States connected to the Network as soon as possible, and when we meet again for the 2001 AIAM, be in a position to report that all States are connected and participating in the OSCE network.

## WORKING GROUP VI

Wednesday, 1 March 2000

### Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

- Agenda item 3: Operation and implementation of other FSC agreed measures/documents: clarification, assessment, and conclusions:
- (b): Code of Conduct on politico-military aspects of security;
  - (c): Principles Governing Conventional Arms Transfers;
  - (d): Principles Governing Non-proliferation;
  - (e): Stabilizing Measures for Localized Crisis Situations;
  - (f): Global Exchange of Military Information.
- 

Working Group VI dealt with the operation and implementation of other agreed measures and documents - the session on communications is reported separately. Discussion centred on the Code of Conduct on politico-military aspects of security. Several delegations raised the question of the application of the Code in the challenging circumstances of 1999 and the first months of 2000. A number of delegations raised questions about implementation in specific circumstances - issues which are being dealt with in other fora. All agreed on the importance of abiding by principles of the Code in all circumstances. There was some philosophical discussion about internal tensions in the document and their effect on implementation. Further thought could usefully be given to the concept of full implementation. There was unanimous agreement on the importance of continuing to question and to probe each others' implementation and of nations responding forthrightly to the questions posed. We were reminded that early identification of potential conflicts and joint efforts by the participating States in the field of conflict prevention, crisis management and the peaceful settlement of disputes were at the heart of the Code.

One delegation asked whether evaluation visits could report on the dissemination of the Code of Conduct and, possibly, its implementation.

Ukraine announced the disbandment of the Ukrainian National Guard by 1 July 2000. All material from the Guard would be passed to the reserves of the Ministry of Defence or the Interior Ministry. There would be no net increase in the armed forces. An update would be provided in due course.

One delegation noted that the Stabilizing Measures for Localized Crisis Situations together with the Regional Measures in Chapter X of the Vienna Document made a good package of measures which had the potential to be of real use in regional situations both pre- and post-conflict. Another delegation noted the potential value of these measures in current crises.



---

**276th Plenary Meeting**

FSC Journal No. 282, Agenda item 3

**DECISION No. 3/00  
ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING  
28 February - 1 March 2000**

I. AGENDA

1. Opening of the Meeting by the Chair

- Report of the Chair of the FSC on CSBM implementation issues discussed in the FSC during 1999
- Situation report by the Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre
- General remarks

2. Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the Vienna Documents 1994 and 1999: clarification, assessment and conclusions:

- (a) annual exchange of military information;
- (b) defense planning;
- (c) military activities:
  - prior notification of certain military activities;
  - observation of certain military activities;
  - annual calendars;
  - constraining provisions;
- (d) compliance and verification;
- (e) risk reduction;
- (f) contacts;
- (g) regional measures.

3. Operation and implementation of other FSC agreed measures/documents: clarification, assessment, and conclusions:

- (a) Communications;
- (b) Code of Conduct on politico-military aspects of security;
- (c) Principles Governing Conventional Arms Transfers;
- (d) Principles Governing Non-proliferation;
- (e) Stabilizing Measures for Localized Crisis Situations;
- (f) Global Exchange of Military Information.

FSC.DEC/3/00  
2 February 2000

4. Closure of the Meeting

- Working Group Summaries and concluding remarks
- Date of the 2001 Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting

II. TIMETABLE AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL MODALITIES

1. The AIAM will be organized into opening and closing plenary meetings, and Working Group meetings to address different portions of the agenda. The indicative timetable in the Annex provides more detail.

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

Interpretation into the OSCE official languages will be provided.

2. The Chair for the meeting will be held in rotation among the delegates in French alphabetical order, proceeding from the Chair for the last day of the 1999 AIAM (Romania). On 28 February the Chair will be the Russian Federation; on 1 March the Chair will be the Slovak Republic.

3. There will be no formal statements in the Working Groups.

All delegations are strongly encouraged to provide experts to participate in these informal meetings. The more experts present from a variety of countries, the more useful and informative the AIAM will be. Working Groups are designed to be very informal sessions with the dual objective of answering questions and exchanging information between participating States.

4. Each Working Group will have a designated Co-ordinator. The Co-ordinator's duties will be to facilitate the discussion and to make an oral report during the closing plenary.

If possible, the Co-ordinator will circulate a list of discussion questions or topics prior to his or her session to help guide the discussion and ensure that all relevant areas are addressed.

During the first part of the closing plenary meeting, the Co-ordinator of each Working Group will provide a short oral report to the delegates on the issues that the Working Group has addressed, including problem areas, improvements achieved, suggestions for further improvement and any other pertinent information. After each oral report, the Co-ordinator will answer questions. Delegations are encouraged to comment on or add to the Co-ordinator's reports.

The Co-ordinator is also strongly encouraged to provide written input to the CPC for inclusion in its survey of suggestions.

FSC.DEC/3/00  
2 February 2000

Delegations that have volunteers for the role of Working Group Co-ordinator should provide the name of the individual and Working Group number to the Chair of the FSC as soon as possible, but not later than 9 February 2000. A Working Group may have more than one Co-ordinator. The Co-ordinator for each Working Group will be made known to all delegations not later than 16 February 2000.

5. Pertinent additional areas relating to CSBMs can be considered for discussion. Delegations that wish to suggest additional areas for discussion in the Working Groups should contact the Chair of the FSC not later than 9 February 2000.

Delegations are strongly encouraged to provide detailed explanations and concrete examples of their own implementation procedures as appropriate.

6. Within one month of the conclusion of the AIAM, the CPC will provide a written survey of suggestions made during the Meeting aiming at improvement of the implementation of CSBMs.

7. During the first FSC plenary meeting after the conclusion of the AIAM, the Chair of the closing plenary will submit a report to the FSC on the AIAM.

8. The Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation (Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia) and the Partners for Co-operation (Japan and the Republic of Korea) are invited to attend the opening and closing plenary meetings of the 2000 Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting.

9. Indicative timetable

Monday, 28 February

9 a.m.	Organizational meeting (for Chairmen, Co-ordinators, CPC)
10 a.m.	Opening plenary
	- Report of the Chair of the FSC on CSBM implementation issues discussed in the FSC during 1999
	- Situation report by the Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre
	- General remarks
1 p.m.	Lunch break
3 p.m. - 4 p.m.	Working Group I - Agenda item 2(a)
	- annual exchange of military information



FSC.DEC/3/00  
2 February 2000

4 p.m. - 5 p.m. Working Group II - Agenda item 2(b)

- defence planning

5 p.m. - 6 p.m. Working Group V - Agenda item 2(g)

- regional measures

6 p.m. Meeting adjourns

Tuesday, 29 February

10 a.m. Working Group III - Agenda items 2(c) and 2(d)

- military activities

- compliance and verification

1 p.m. Lunch break

3 p.m. Working Group IV - Agenda items 2(e) and 2(f)

- risk reduction

- contacts

5 p.m. Working Group VI - Agenda item 3

- Operation and implementation of other FSC agreed measures/documents

- (a) Communications

6 p.m. Meeting adjourns

Wednesday, 1 March

10 a.m. Working Group VI - Agenda item 3 (continued)

- Operation and implementation of other FSC agreed measures/documents

- (b) Code of Conduct on politico-military aspects of security.

- (c) Principles Governing Conventional Arms Transfers;

FSC.DEC/3/00

2 February 2000

- (d) Principles Governing Non-proliferation;
- (e) Stabilizing Measures for Localized Crisis Situations.
- (f) Global Exchange of Military Information;

1 p.m.

Lunch break

3 p.m.

Closing plenary

- Summary of working group meetings
- Discussion
- Concluding remarks
- Date of the 2001 AIAM
- Closure

6 p.m.

2000 AIAM adjourns