



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

FSC.GAL/15/97
30 September 1997

ENGLISH only

Netherlands Chairmanship

Follow-up Conference on the OSCE Code of Conduct
on politico-military aspects of security

Vienna, 22-24 September 1997

SUMMARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS^(*)

	<u>Page</u>
CHAIRMAN'S PERCEPTION.....	1
REPORTS BY THE RAPPORTEURS	
<u>First Working Session</u>	
<i>Principles and obligations (Sections I-VI)</i>	
Rapporteur: Mr. Mieczyslaw Kuziński.....	4
<u>Second and Third Working Sessions</u>	
<i>Democratic political control of armed forces (Section VII)</i>	
Rapporteur: Mr. François LaRochelle.....	7
<u>Fourth Working Session</u>	
<i>Norms for the use of armed forces in peace and war (Section VIII)</i>	
Rapporteur: Mr. Patrick Godfrey.....	9
<u>Fifth Working Session</u>	
<i>Implementation (Section IX)</i>	
Rapporteur: Mr. Pierpaolo Tempesta.....	11
Annex A: Agenda.....	14
Annex B: Log of Contributions.....	17

^(*) This summary contains the Chairman's Perception and the Reports by the Rapporteurs in their final versions.

CHAIRMAN'S PERCEPTION

Over the past three days, the first Follow-up Conference on the Code of Conduct on politico-military aspects of security has considered and reviewed the Code of Conduct from all angles - concepts, principles, implementation and its potential for further development. The debates have clearly demonstrated the continued relevance and value of the Code, which is revealing itself more and more as the most comprehensive norm- and standard-setting instrument of the OSCE since the Helsinki Decalogue. With the Code of Conduct, the participating States created in December 1994 a tool that, in addition to the renewed impetus it gave to already accepted inter-State standards, laid down innovative intra-State norms. In doing so, the OSCE may legitimately claim to have advanced beyond the normative accomplishments of other international organizations.

Our Conference has in my opinion revealed an *acquis*, shown widespread efforts directed towards *implementation* and elements pointing to the *way ahead*. On these three aspects I would like to concentrate.

I. THE ACQUIS

It has widely been recognized that the Code represents an *acquis* of norms and values. Concerning the *inter-State* standards formulated in Sections I-VI, several delegations considered that these could in any case be used as by now uncontroversial building blocks of the Security Model for Europe for the twenty-first century. Hence, this statement of norms and values could well serve as a catalyst for perhaps equally important deliberations, the outcome of which was still unclear.

Different views were expressed as regards the relative priority to be attached to the various Sections of the Code of Conduct. For several delegations, Sections VII and VIII, dealing with *intra-State* relations, represented the core elements of the Code. Many emphasized the need to preserve the wide scope of the Code and its overall coherence, including its provisions bearing on arms control and the maintenance of international peace and security. A few suggestions were made with a view to already refining the conceptual structure of the Code or amending some of the provisions. However, a majority of the participating States was of the view that the integrity of the Code in its present form, with its unique comprehensive approach, integrating so naturally elements of inter- and intra-State relations, should be preserved.

II. IMPLEMENTATION

Perhaps the expression used most during this Conference has been "effective implementation". This should come as no surprise. Naturally, without due implementation the Code of Conduct is of little avail.

Many delegations reported extensively on their implementation methods. The Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) indicated that it had received 29 voluntary reports on national implementation programmes. The questionnaire on the implementation of the Code had been received with interest and had now revealed its potential value as an "auto-checklist" for measuring the extent of a country's own implementation of the Code,

providing at the same time a precious instrument for standardizing national reporting on the implementation of the Code. In that connection, suggestions were also made for using the CPC as a central point for the exchange of information on the implementation of the Code. Indeed, the questionnaire, if widely used, would make it possible for the CPC to provide an overview of the state of implementation of the Code of Conduct in the OSCE area.

Attention was drawn to paragraph 38 (Section IX) of the Code of Conduct, which called for the provision of appropriate clarification by participating States regarding their implementation of the Code, including clarification on mechanisms and procedures for the assessment and review of implementation measures. As not much attention had been given to that Section thus far, it was argued that the potential of the Code of Conduct largely remained untapped.

III. THE WAY AHEAD

Out of a rich variety of proposals on possible follow-up, the following suggestions struck me as having a particularly operational character:

- A separate session should be held following the Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting (AIAM), during which progress in implementation of the Code should be reported.
- Regular Follow-up Conferences should be convened - the next one could be in two years' time - for taking stock of implementation patterns, including cases of non-compliance, and also considering the possible introduction of new commitments or the refinement of existing mechanisms.
- Dissemination of the Code of Conduct and its reflection in instruction manuals should be discussed in the context of regular inspections and evaluation visits undertaken on the basis of the Vienna Document.
- Bilateral information exchanges on the subject could also have an added-value function.
- National seminars on the Code of Conduct could likewise have a highly beneficial effect, and here the CPC could play a useful role.
- The possibility of more regular and consistent involvement of the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) in matters related to the implementation of the Code seemed also commendable; the FSC could consider the establishment of a separate Secretariat facility within the CPC for the monitoring of implementation matters.
- Some provisions of the Code of Conduct appeared to have so far received too little attention. In this connection, I have already mentioned paragraph 38 on implementation mechanisms as deserving more attention. In addition, participating States could do more to implement paragraph 22 on the provision of data concerning legislative approval of defence expenditures and the exercise of restraint in military expenditures. Participating States should also ensure the further implementation of

paragraph 26 of the Code, in which we committed ourselves to see to it that paramilitary forces refrained from the acquisition of combat mission capabilities in excess of those for which they were established.

During this first Follow-up Conference on the Code of Conduct, a host of suggestions and proposals have been made to strengthen the implementation of the Code and to enhance its wider and more consistent application. Clearly, this effort to single out some of the Conference's more salient achievements cannot by any means be considered exhaustive. It seems justifiable to recommend, in a more general vein, that the FSC should give more consistent and systematic attention to the implementation of the Code of Conduct as a regular item on its agenda. The Conflict Prevention Centre should be enabled to provide appropriate assistance to the participating States in this worthwhile endeavour.

REPORT BY THE RAPPORTEUR
OF THE FIRST WORKING SESSION

Monday, 22 September 1997

Principles and obligations (Sections I-VI)

Moderator: Mr. Hasan Gögüs (Turkey)

Rapporteur: Mr. Mieczyslaw Kuziński (Poland)

A large number of delegations noted that the value of the Code of Conduct lay in its comprehensive approach to security. The Code formed a confirmation of international norms and obligations and also introduced new standards for States both in their international relations and with regard to their internal policy.

Sections I-VI of the Code could be taken as an affirmation of the Helsinki principles and confirmation of the comprehensive concept of security. The OSCE principles and norms were reaffirmed. The relevance of the concept of solidarity in case of violations, terrorism and non-support for States in violation of OSCE principles, new risks of tension, as mentioned in paragraphs 5, 6, 8 and 17 of the Code, illustrated the extra dimension the Code gives to the existing OSCE principles.

It was emphasized that there was a need for further clarification of the role of States individually as well as in the framework of the OSCE, in implementing these new commitments. According to some delegations, existing instruments at the disposal of the international community, were far from being fully used.

Some delegations questioned the relevance of paragraph 4 of the Code (sovereign equality and a co-operative approach in security relations). Co-operative security should be built upon, *inter alia*, preventive diplomacy, non-coercion and mutual accountability in foreign and domestic policy. On a second issue, one delegate drew attention to the continuing validity and relevance also of Sections VII and VIII of the Code.

Several delegates referred to the significance and relevance of paragraphs 10 and 11 of the Code (freedom to determine security interests and the right to belong or not to belong to international organizations). Others focused attention on paragraphs 12 and 13 (military capabilities commensurate with legitimate security needs, bearing in mind legitimate security concerns of others) in the process of the evolution of politico-military structures on the continent. According to some views, paragraphs 12 and 13 should be taken in conjunction.

Some delegates touched upon the significance of paragraph 14 of the Code (stationing of forces), in the context of its relation to arms control commitments, as well as the need for its full implementation.

The specific problem of terrorism was raised by some speakers, including one delegation from an OSCE partner country. The need to analyse the current situation and to enhance co-operation in this respect was stressed. Concrete steps should be considered by the OSCE, in conjunction with the activities in other forums. The usefulness of the establishment a list of international arrangements to which the OSCE States are parties was underlined.

Much attention was devoted to issues relating to the implementation of the Code and questions regarding political enforcement and implementation control mechanisms were raised.

On the crucial issue of compliance it was stressed that there might be different modalities and national procedures for the implementation of the Code provisions, taking into account national practices and traditions. In addition, a lively discussion took place on the practical problems concerning the implementation of the Code by the relevant State institutions. The importance of adjusting domestic law to the requirements of the Code was stressed. Examples were also given to illustrate different arrangements and levels of implementation. Several delegations presented national experience and practices in this regard.

A number of observations and suggestions were made regarding the need to give the Code its proper place in the politico-military decision-making process and to clarify the impact of the Code on civil-military relations. It was also considered that as far as the implementation was concerned two major areas were to be covered:

1. In the political field, the politico-military decision-making and civil military relations;
2. The relation between the Code and domestic law.

The question of involvement of State and non-State bodies and actors was raised, including in particular, the role of NGOs.

There was a general understanding that the Code's implementation should be dynamic, both on the national and the international level. This called for permanent dialogue and the exchange of views and experience. Some criteria for efficient-review of implementation were mentioned, e.g. exposure of inadequate implementation, learning about problems on the basis of information exchange, identifying "best practice" to clarify and promote implementation, development of mechanisms through which implementation can be addressed.

Some delegations considered that there was a need for the OSCE to assist States to achieve better implementation. On the basis of experience gathered so far, the need to continue special seminars devoted to the Code and for training programmes (with and for military personnel, parliamentarians) was stressed. A number of proposals concerning institutional arrangements were suggested. In that connection, reference was made, *inter alia*, to the institution of a special implementation meeting on the Code following the Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting and to the possibility of holding such implementation meetings separately. It was also pointed out that the Forum for Security Co-operation should more regularly consider the implementation of the Code of Conduct in the framework of its

regular agenda. One delegation suggested that the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE should consider implementation matters as well. In addition, the possibility was also raised that the CPC would be requested to draw up a comprehensive list of proposals aimed at enhancing the prospects of a full implementation of the Code of Conduct.

It was observed that more attention should be paid to implications of the Code for arms control policies (Section V of the Code). The need for full implementation of existing arms control and CSBMs commitments was stressed and one delegate referred to the integration of the Code with arms control through its provisions related to defence doctrines, capabilities and systems. The significance and potential value of the confidence- and security- building function of the Code in the regional dimension was pointed out. The normative role of the Code might facilitate progress in regional arms control and CSBMs. Some verification aspects in relation to the Code and arms control agreements were briefly presented and discussed.

Some delegations called for further reflection on the possible contribution of the Code to the development of a European Security Charter. In that connection, specific reference was made by one delegation to paragraphs 3, 5 and 8. Several delegations called for further elaboration of the concept of solidarity, as well as collective response in the case of non-compliance within the framework of the Security Model. It was furthermore observed that the OSCE should review its relations with other security institutions in the context of the concept of a Platform for Co-operative Security.

REPORT BY THE RAPPORTEUR
OF THE SECOND AND THIRD WORKING SESSIONS

Tuesday, 23 September 1997

Democratic political control of armed forces (Section VII)

Moderators: Mr. Gábor Bródi (Hungary)
Mr. Heinz Vetschera (Austria)

Rapporteur: Mr. François LaRochelle (Canada)

The second working session of this Conference was particularly intense. The various statements confirmed that the Code of Conduct facilitated the task of certain countries in their transition to democracy and that its Section VII was still pertinent and useful, but that its potential had not yet been fully exploited. A number of specific proposals were made for promoting its implementation and follow-up.

For the countries in transition to democracy, the Code had clearly played an important role in public discussion and the establishment of an institutional and legal framework allowing democratic control of military, paramilitary and security forces. It remained as relevant as ever for strengthening and guaranteeing this control. Regarding the use of the Code in the field, one participant stressed the importance of the availability of experts in military matters - both civilians and military personnel - under the present circumstances.

In this context, the importance was stressed of creating a climate of confidence in the armed forces among the population, and ensuring the integration of these forces into civil society. Various means were used to that end, ranging from the utilization of the media to involvement in civic associations or local communities. The media could, moreover, become effective instruments for civilian monitoring of the institutions responsible for formulating security and defence policies. Non-governmental organizations could also perform such a function.

The statements gave prominence to the way in which some countries had established the primacy of civil authority over the military, paramilitary and security forces, or ensured such primacy, under all circumstances. This generally involved external civil control at executive, legislative, judicial or administrative levels. These mechanisms had their distinct characteristics and varied according to national circumstances, but they were all aimed at ensuring that the forces in question became politically neutral pillars of democracy.

The training and education of the military were also discussed. Some participants described how information on the Code of Conduct, international humanitarian law and the law applicable in time of war was disseminated in their countries. Mention was also made of the need for specific training for military personnel called upon to serve in areas of conflict as members of peacekeeping forces. Another participant referred to the useful role played by legal experts within the armed forces.

One speaker noted that an important dimension of the Code related to conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict reconstruction. The case of Bosnia and Herzegovina was discussed in particular as demonstrating the regional potential of the Code. The OSCE would benefit by using it more and giving it wider distribution. One delegation also said that the Code could serve as an example outside the OSCE area.

The place assigned to the human rights and fundamental freedoms of military, paramilitary and security forces personnel was also mentioned. Although some differences may be observed, the delegations that intervened on this point reported that their forces personnel were full citizens, enjoying the same rights and obligations as other nationals. One delegation gave details on the particular situation of conscripts in its country. Another mentioned the expanded role of women in military professions.

One speaker, describing a specific case of international co-operation, suggested that synergy should be intensified between the various international organizations concerned with the promotion and implementation of the Code. The Partnership for Peace and the Council of Europe were mentioned in particular. In another context, the use of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights was suggested.

One delegation, in a statement concerning a situation which it considered representative in this connection, pointed out that nothing was perfect in this world, and suggestions were put forward for promoting the implementation of the Code. It was also proposed that the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) should draw up an exhaustive list of such suggestions.

These suggestions ranged from the preparation of an appropriate questionnaire by the CPC to increased involvement of the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE and the organization of bilateral training seminars. Wider publication of the Code was urged. One speaker expressed the view that the OSCE would do well to improve transparency in the exchange and distribution of information among participating States. The establishment of guidelines for the preparation of various documents could be useful for that purpose.

So that the implementation of the Code of Conduct could be monitored, one delegation proposed that it should be incorporated in the Vienna Document. Another delegation added that the Code should be modernized taking into account the requirements of European security for the next century. Another said that it would welcome a discussion of the concept of "consultations" appearing in paragraph 25 of the Code.

Lastly, delegations concluded that the Code was undoubtedly an important achievement of the OSCE and that it should be taken up in the work proceeding on the establishment of a Charter for European Security.

REPORT BY THE RAPPORTEUR
OF THE FOURTH WORKING SESSION

Wednesday, 24 September 1997

Norms for the use of armed forces in peace and war (Section VIII)

Moderator: Mr. Mario Nobile (Croatia)

Rapporteur: Mr. Patrick Godfrey (Ireland)

This working session envisaged discussion on Section VIII (paragraphs 34-37) of the Code of Conduct. Discussion in the group focused on the normative aspect of the Code of Conduct. It was stated that the Code was the most important normative instrument of the OSCE since the Helsinki decalogue and that the Code has no counterpart in any other organization. While the Code does have shortcomings, it should be seen as a perfectible instrument. In particular, the intra-State norms were considered to be the most original and innovative part of the Code. New commitments in this area are not considered necessary. It would be more appropriate to concentrate on improving implementation. Suggested means to this effect would be to develop a better exchange of information, as this would lead to confidence-building and ongoing co-operative dialogue which would seek clarification on information exchanged. It was thought that a specific implementation procedure could be envisaged and that the Conference should make concrete recommendations in this respect.

One delegation stressed the significance of the normative character of the Code in the overall European security structures and cautioned against any over-operationalization. Its politically binding effect should be seen as a strength and not as a weakness.

The importance of paragraph 34, in relation to the requirement for defence policies and related matters to conform to the principles of humanitarian law was stressed. Delegations gave accounts of how their Governments had adhered to this requirement. The importance of the dissemination of humanitarian law, especially to military personnel, was equally emphasized and details were given of ongoing projects to this effect. This was seen as a supremely important Government responsibility. The importance of including peacekeeping personnel in this process was also highlighted.

One delegation stressed the need for the Code to be incorporated into the minds of all people and cautioned against the dangers which could arise in the absence of any clear command authority at the level of the State. Attention was drawn to recent experience in this regard and to the need for strong mechanisms to be in place to ensure the Code should not be ignored.

The difficulties experienced by the new democracies in coping with the demands presented by the Code were highlighted. The importance of NGOs and non-State actors in the field of humanitarian law was also mentioned.

The relevance of the Code in regional conflict prevention was touched on. The possibility of using the Code as a basis for organizing non-official events which would bring together all parties to a conflict was suggested.

The Session concluded with a discussion as to whether the Code should be part of a new Charter for European Security. The need for a closer linkage between discussions in the FSC and other OSCE bodies in this regard, with a view to enhancing discussions on possible future refinements of the Code was mentioned. Paragraphs 4, 5 and 25 of the Code were highlighted in this respect.

REPORT BY THE RAPPORTEUR
OF THE FIFTH WORKING SESSION

Wednesday, 24 September 1997

Implementation (Section IX)

Moderator: Mr. Mario Nobile (Croatia)

Rapporteur: Mr. Pierpaolo Tempesta (Italy)

During the fifth working session, as many as ten delegations took the floor.

The statements made were not all specifically devoted to the "implementation" issue, but touched upon a broader range of aspects connected with the Code, including comments on interventions made during previous sessions, thus contributing to a lively exchange of views, which was the main aim of the Conference.

Concerning the implementation of the Code, the interventions can be broadly divided into three categories:

1. Interventions of participating States with consolidated democratic systems, sharing their experience in implementing the Code. This is a very important function for the benefit of those participating States that are in the process of translating the Code of Conduct commitments into their national legislation or of making them widely known in their armed forces.

In this connection, a very detailed account was made by one delegation on how its country ensured strict control by the appropriate civil authorities over the use of armed forces to maintain public order in case of absolute necessity and how this use obeyed very precise, restrictive criteria.

In this respect, the Moderator injected a note of caution, expressing the view that only professional soldiers, and not conscripts, should be used for that purpose. The same delegation also explained that, although all the basic principles of the Code were already contained in its country's Constitution, explanatory texts on the Code were published and distributed at all levels and used in training programmes. Troops involved in peacekeeping operations received a special training on the subject. Satisfactory knowledge of humanitarian law was a prerequisite for career advancement and violations were strictly prosecuted.

In the same group of interventions, another delegation put forward the consideration that the publication of the Code, its diffusion and its utilization in training programmes was a necessary first step but did not exhaust the obligations of States, which should conform their behaviour with respect to the politico-military aspects of security to the norms and principles contained in the Code, making sure that they were absorbed in the thinking of decision-makers, commanders, soldiers and citizens.

In other words, a good implementation record in the "external" aspects of the Code was not a sufficient guarantee of real adherence to the principles.

2. Interventions of delegations representing newly democratic States, which clearly demonstrated how actively these States are committed to adopting the principles enshrined in the Code in their national legislation. They have also already set up programmes for the diffusion and teaching of the Code among the armed forces at various levels. This process is at different stages of accomplishment but they all have a clear view of its importance. The support obtained so far through the seminars organized by the CPC is considered of the utmost importance.

3. Another category of interventions was focused on specific proposals to improve implementation.

The interventions were mainly comments on proposals presented in the preceding sessions:

- (a) Use of the evaluation visits to check the level of knowledge of the Code. This is considered by many to be a very effective method. According to others, however, this can only enable awareness of a very limited portion of the Code to be ascertained and therefore has limited value. In addition, the limited number of evaluation quotas available further restricts the value of the spot check, and certainly does not allow definite conclusions to be drawn.
- (b) The idea of having an extra day of the Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting devoted to the Code of Conduct is viewed with favour by many. According to others, however, it would be better to have a separate meeting for the Code.
- (c) The questionnaire prepared by the CPC, perhaps somewhat modified, would appear to have considerable merit. However, one delegation said that in order to prove that the answers provided reflected the truth, ample documentary evidence should be annexed. At any rate, this could not be the only yardstick of implementation .
- (d) It was suggested that synergies should be created to the maximum extent possible, e.g. with combined training programmes.
- (e) The forthcoming seminar on military doctrines should comprise in its agenda a portion devoted to relevant chapters of the Code of Conduct.
- (f) According to one delegation, careful reading of the data contained in the document on defence planning could provide precious information on how participating States implemented the Code, notably in respect to democratic control and the economy.
- (g) The question was repeatedly debated whether a verification regime should be contemplated for the Code of Conduct, as well as some kind of enforcement. The question remains open and no definite conclusion was reached.

- (h) One delegation pointed out that there were many opportunities during the normal activity of the Forum to discuss aspects related to the Code of Conduct, but so far little use, if any, had been made of that option.
- (i) Finally, one delegation remarked that not only the evaluation visits but also inspections, observations, visit to units and air bases could provide an opportunity to check the implementation of the Code.

A request was addressed to the CPC to provide a consolidated list of all suggestions made.

Last but not least, the question was briefly discussed whether it was sufficient for the Code to be politically binding or whether it should become legally binding. In this respect, it was pointed out that the Vienna Document and other relevant OSCE documents, although only politically binding, were being implemented satisfactorily. A legal obligation would somehow detract from the very essence of the Code.

The relationship with the Security Model, and in particular with the Charter, was also discussed. It was stated in this regard that the Code of Conduct could be considered the building block which would guarantee that the new security architecture was stable and democratic.

ANNEX A



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

FSC.DEC/11/97

16 July 1997

Original: ENGLISH

191st Plenary Meeting

FSC Journal No. 197, Agenda item 3

DECISION No. 11/97

**AGENDA, MODALITIES AND WORK PROGRAMME FOR THE
FOLLOW-UP CONFERENCE ON THE CODE OF CONDUCT
ON POLITICO-MILITARY ASPECTS OF SECURITY**

(Vienna, 22 to 24 September 1997)

OBJECTIVES OF THE FOLLOW-UP CONFERENCE

The Conference will assess, review and, where necessary, make recommendations to improve the implementation of the Code of Conduct.

The Conference will consider ways of enhancing the contribution of the Code of Conduct to European security as a whole.

I. DRAFT AGENDA

1. Opening plenary:

Presentation by the Chairman of the Conference

Presentation by a representative of the Chairman-in-Office

Contribution by the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC)

...

General statements

2. Sections I to VI: General Principles, Commitments and Obligations

- concepts guiding security relations;
- preventing and combating terrorism;

- reaffirmation of existing principles and the obligation to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State;
 - rights and commitments in the field of security;
 - arms control, disarmament, confidence- and security-building measures;
 - early warning, conflict prevention, including *inter alia* co-operation on implementation of the commitments in the economic and human dimensions, and crisis management.
3. Section VII: Democratic Political Control
 - democratic political control of military, paramilitary and security forces;
 - integration of the armed forces into civil society;
 - rights and duties of armed forces personnel;
 - dissemination of the principles of the Code of Conduct.
 4. Section VIII: Norms for the Use of Armed Forces in Peace and War
 5. Sections IX and X: Implementation Mechanisms
 6. Closing plenary: Chairman's Summary, including recommendations on future work and suggestions for contributions to the ongoing work on the Security Model.

II. MODALITIES

1. The Conference will be held in Vienna from 22 to 24 September 1997.
2. The working hours of the Conference will be from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. and from 3 p.m. to 6 p.m.
3. The Conference will be organized into opening and closing plenaries as well as consecutive working sessions on agenda items 2, 3, 4 and 5.
4. The Chair will be held by the Chairmanship of the Forum for Security Co-operation. The Chairman may call upon the members of the FSC-Troika and CPC for such assistance and support as may be needed.
5. Each working session will be moderated by a representative of the Chair. The moderator will ensure optimal utilization of the time available for discussion of the various agenda items.

6. The Chairman will be assisted by four Rapporteurs on agenda items 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively. Participating States that wish to nominate volunteers for the function of Rapporteur should submit the names of candidates as well as the preferred sessions to the Chairman not later than 3 September 1997.
7. Prior to the commencement of the Conference the Chairman will circulate a list of items for discussion with a view to providing guidance on the deliberations and promoting full coverage of all agenda items.
8. There will be no formal statements during the working sessions.
9. During the closing plenary, each Rapporteur, upon appropriate consultation with the Chair, will submit a report on the issues addressed during the respective working sessions.
10. On the basis of these reports, the Chairman will present his Summary to the Conference. The Chairman's Summary of the Conference will be brought to the attention of the FSC.
11. OSCE participating States are encouraged to include relevant experts from capitals in their delegations.
12. The Mediterranean partners for co-operation and Japan, as well as the Republic of Korea, are invited to observe the Conference. They will not take part in the preparation or adoption of recommendations, or in the review of the implementation of the Code by participating States. They may contribute to the Conference in areas in which partners' concerns may relate to the implementation of the Code.

WORK PROGRAMME

Working hours: 10 a.m. - 1 p.m.
3 p.m. - 6 p.m.

	Monday, 22 September	Tuesday, 23 September	Wednesday, 24 September
Morning	PL (Item 1)	WS (Continuation of Item 2, if needed) (Item 3)	WS (Items 4 and 5)
Afternoon	WS (Item 2)	WS (Continuation of Item 3)	PL (Item 6)

WS = Working Session
PL = Plenary meeting

ANNEX B



**Log of Contributions to the Follow-up Conference
on the Code of Conduct on politico-military aspects of security
Vienna, 22-24 September 1997**

DOC ID NO.	DATE	AUTHOR	TITLE	LANG.
I. Plenary sessions				
FSC.DEL/19/97	19.09.97	Germany	Opening Statement	E/G
FSC.DEL/20/97	22.09.97	Luxembourg-EU	Opening Statement	E/F
FSC.DEL/21/97	22.09.97	Russian Federation	Opening Statement	E/R
FSC.DEL/22/97	22.09.97	Denmark/CiO	Opening Statement	E
FSC.DEL/23/97/ Corr.1	24.09.97	Netherlands/ Chairman of the FSC	Opening Statement	E
FSC.DEL/24/97	22.09.97	France	Opening Statement	F
FSC.DEL/33/97/ Restr.	22.09.97	Canada	Opening Statement	E
FSC.DEL/39/97	23.09.97	Lithuania	Progress report on the implementation of the Code of Conduct within the armed forces of Lithuania	E
FSC.DEL/58/97/ Corr.1	29.09.97	ICRC	Opening Statement	E/F
FSC.DEL/67/97	24.09.97	Luxembourg-EU	Closing Statement	F
FSC.DEL/69/97	24.09.97	Turkey	Opening Statement	E
FSC.GAL/10/97	22.09.97	CPC	Report on CPC activities regarding the implementation of the Code of Conduct	E
II. Working Sessions				
A. Sections I - VI: General Principles, Commitments and Obligations				
FSC.DEL/30/97	22.09.97	United Kingdom	Developing an effective process for reviewing and promoting implementation of the Code of Conduct	E
FSC.DEL/32/97	22.09.97	Switzerland	Statement	G
FSC.DEL/34/97	22.09.97	Azerbaijan	Statement	E
FSC.DEL/37/97	23.09.97	Finland	Principles and obligations	E
FSC.DEL/60/97/ Rev.2	24.09.97	Egypt	Statement	E
B. Section VII: Democratic Political Control				
FSC.DEL/35/97	22.09.97	United Kingdom	Developing the Code of Conduct and Strengthening Information Exchange on Implementation	E
FSC.DEL/36/97	23.09.97	Finland	Statement	E
FSC.DEL/38/97	23.09.97	Bulgaria	Democratic Control of the Armed Forces	E
FSC.DEL/41/97	23.09.97	Greece	The Greek contribution to the implementation of the Code of Conduct	E
FSC.DEL/42/97	23.09.97	Germany	Armed forces in State and Society	E
FSC.DEL/43/97	23.09.97	Romania	Civil-military Relations within the Romanian Society	E
FSC.DEL/45/97	23.09.97	Italy	NATO, Partners and Allies: Civil-Military Relations and democratic control of the armed forces	E

DOC ID NO.	DATE	AUTHOR	TITLE	LANG.
FSC.DEL/46/97	23.09.97	Russian Federation	Statement	E/R
FSC.DEL/47/97	23.09.97	Slovak Republic	The Democratic Civil Control of the Armed Forces of the Slovak Republic	E
FSC.DEL/48/97	23.09.97	France	Le contrôle politique démocratique des armées	F
FSC.DEL/49/97	23.09.97	France	Droits et devoirs des militaires	F
FSC.DEL/50/97	23.09.97	France	L'usage proportionné de la force pour le maintien de l'ordre	F
FSC.DEL/52/97	23.09.97	Azerbaijan	Statement	E
FSC.DEL/53/97	23.09.97	Switzerland	Statement	G
FSC.DEL/55/97	24.09.97	Ireland	Written contribution	E
FSC.DEL/56/97	24.09.97	Malta	Statement	E
C. Section VIII: Norms for the Use of Armed Forces in Peace and War				
FSC.DEL/54/97	24.09.97	Sweden	Implementation of paragraph 34 of the Code	E
FSC.DEL/61/97	24.09.97	Armenia	Statement	E
FSC.DEL/62/97	24.09.97	United States of America	Statement	E
FSC.DEL/68/97	24.09.97	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Statement	E
D. Sections IX and X: Implementation Mechanisms				
FSC.DEL/29/97	22.09.97	Denmark	Implementation of the Code of Conduct	E
FSC.DEL/51/97	23.09.97	France	Application du Code de Conduite dans les armées	F
FSC.DEL/63/97 Restr.	24.09.97	Switzerland	Statement	G
FSC.DEL/64/97	24.09.97	Poland	Implementation of the Code of Conduct in the Sphere of Paramilitary and Security Forces in Poland	E
FSC.DEL/65/97 Restr.	24.09.97	Slovak Republic	Statement	E
FSC.DEL/66/97	24.09.97	Romania	Measures taken in the field of CSBMs on a sub-regional level	E
III. Other				
FSC.DEL/25/97 Restr.	22.09.97	Poland	Answers to the draft CPC Questionnaire/Text of the Code of Conduct translated into Polish	E
FSC.DEL/26/97	22.09.97	France	Comparative table with regard to the Code of Conduct	F
FSC.DEL/27/97 Restr.	22.09.97	Germany	Answers to the draft CPC Questionnaire	E
FSC.DEL/31/97	22.09.97	Portugal	The Implementation of the Code of Conduct by Portugal in what regards the Democratic Political Control of the Armed Forces	E
FSC.GAL/9/97	22.09.97	Netherlands/ Chairman of the FSC	Annotated agenda	E