



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

FSC.AIAM/52/05
16 March 2005

ENGLISH only

Conference Services

Please find attached the Chairperson's Report and reports of the Working Session Rapporteurs of the 2005 Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting.



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

FSC.AIAM/52/05
16 March 2005

ENGLISH only

Conference Services

**2005 ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION
ASSESSMENT MEETING**

Vienna, 8 and 9 March 2005

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.....	7
WORKING SESSION 1, Part A.....	9
— Annual exchange of military information.....	10
— Defence planning	11
— Risk reduction	11
— Military activities.....	11
(i) Prior notification of certain military activities.....	11
(ii) Annual calendars.....	12
(iii) Constraining provisions	12
(iv) Observation of certain military activities.....	12
WORKING SESSION 1, Part B	13
— Contacts	13
— Inspection and Evaluation.....	15
WORKING SESSION 2, Part A.....	17
— Regional measures	17
— OSCE Communications Network	19
WORKING SESSION 2, Part B	21
— Principles governing conventional arms transfers.....	21
— Principles governing non-proliferation.....	21
— Stabilizing measures for localized crisis situations	22
— Global exchange of military information.....	22
— Questionnaire on Anti-Personnel Landmines	22
— Questionnaire on the process of ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention.....	23
— Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security.....	23
— OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons	23
— OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition.....	24
ANNEX: AGENDA AND MODALITIES OF THE FIFTEENTH ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING (FSC.DEC/1/05)	

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

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

Vienna, 8 and 9 March 2005

Mr. Chairperson,

Having chaired the closing plenary session of the fifteenth Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting (AIAM), held in Vienna on 8 and 9 March 2005, the Principality of Andorra has the honour of reporting to the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) on the proceedings, discussions and results of this meeting.

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. In open and constructive discussions, the experts exchanged experiences, made suggestions, and gave their assessments of the implementation of the OSCE commitments in the field of CSBMs. Several delegations emphasized the importance of the AIAM in contributing to the enhancement of security and stability in the OSCE area. Partners for Co-operation had been invited to attend the whole AIAM.

The agenda and modalities of the fifteenth AIAM had been agreed upon in FSC.DEC/1/05. In accordance with the modalities, several delegations distributed written national statements to be discussed during the AIAM. Two delegations delivered statements asking for better follow-up to proposals made at AIAM meetings. The meeting consisted of two working sessions, each subdivided in two parts. The opening plenary meeting and the working sessions were chaired by the United States of America, while the closing plenary meeting was chaired by the Principality of Andorra.

1. Opening plenary meeting: In her opening statement (FSC.AIAM/22/05), the Chairperson of the opening plenary meeting and of the working sessions stressed the importance of the AIAM as an opportunity for the participating States to reflect on the implementation of agreed CSBMs, and on the relevance and validity of the commitments embodied in VD 99 and other FSC agreements; it furthermore prepared fertile ground for continuing work in the FSC. She encouraged delegations to engage in a productive and lively discussion by raising their concerns, offering constructive suggestions and noting positive achievements. In his report (FSC.AIAM/17/05), the current Chairperson of the FSC highlighted the importance of the AIAM in enhancing confidence and security in the OSCE area, preventing conflict, and managing crises. He reminded delegations of issues related to the implementation of CSBMs by participating States since the last AIAM. He encouraged delegations to use this year's AIAM to discuss the possibility of holding a seminar on military doctrines. He summarized the major focuses of the FSC's work during the past year as follows:

— FSC contributions to the OSCE Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the Twenty-First Century, proving the continued relevance of the politico-military *acquis*;

- FSC decisions to strengthen security in the OSCE area, in particular those addressed at combating terrorism (Decision on Export Controls of MANPADS, Decision on Standard Elements of End-User Certificates for SALW Exports, and the OSCE Principles of Brokering in SALW);
- FSC's measures for the further implementation of Article V of the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons;
- the FSC's steps in implementing the OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition;
- the increasing of FSC effectiveness within the overall OSCE through better co-ordination with the Permanent Council.

The Director of the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) then reported on the main activities of the CPC in support of the FSC during 2004 (FSC.AIAM/13/05). He underlined the efforts undertaken by the CPC to assist participating States in the implementation of agreed CSBMs, such as regularly providing surveys on information exchanges, and organizing regional or national seminars and training workshops. He paid special attention to the implementation of the Code of Conduct by intensifying co-operation between the CPC and the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly and other relevant organizations and institutions. He expressed the CPC's readiness, within its capacity, to give further assistance to the work which emerged from the SALW assistance mechanism and the adoption of the Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition (SCA). He pointed out the need to increase human and financial resources devoted to the support of politico-military programmes in the OSCE. The Director of the CPC asked delegations to indicate possible areas in which the CPC could provide more support.

2. Working Sessions: The following report on the Working Sessions summarizes key elements which may guide future work in the FSC. Detailed and comprehensive information about the debates in each session can be found in the reports of the respective working session rapporteurs (FSC.AIAM/38/05 OSCE+, FSC.AIAM/32/05 OSCE+, FSC.AIAM/36/05 OSCE+ and FSC.AIAM/47/05 OSCE+).

In Working Session 1, delegations discussed the implementation of the Vienna Document 1999. Many delegations expressed their general satisfaction with the implementation of the Vienna Document, even though certain deficits remained. One delegation suggested that the FSC should arrange a specific meeting of Heads of Verification Units or Heads of Arms Control Agencies or experts from those participating States which do not have verification units or arms control agencies. Some delegations welcomed this idea, one delegation however pointed out that the AIAM was the appropriate place for them to meet. The first part of Working Session 1 focused on annual exchange of information, defence planning, risk reduction and military activities. Issues raised included the following:

- Regarding the annual exchange of military information, those delegations that had not done their exchanges were asked to explain why not and, if necessary, use the available support from the CPC. Concern was expressed about the lack of progress in implementing FSC.DEC/6/01. Two delegations mentioned an example of bilateral assistance in the elaboration of the CD-ROM, highlighting how bilateral assistance

can work in a specific case. It was proposed that hard copy information exchange should be replaced by CD-ROM exchange, and it was suggested that a decision might accelerate this process. However, one delegation expressed its preference for receiving the information in both formats. One delegation recalled that the number of units should be included in the information exchange in order to get the resultant evaluation quota;

- Defence planning, one delegation spoke out for the holding of a military doctrine seminar later in 2005;
- Risk reduction: Although the mechanism was not used during 2004, one delegation pointed out its usefulness in the event of unforeseeable developments;
- Military activities: One delegation recalled its proposal made in 2004 on notification on a voluntary basis that had received positive reactions. One delegation expressed its disappointment that this and other similar proposals had not been followed up in last year's work of the FSC, and urged participating States to deal with this issue in the adequate working group of the FSC. One delegation suggested taking into account qualitative structural criteria and the level of the intended exercise. One delegation held that fewer notifications demonstrated the increase of confidence and security in the Euro-Atlantic area. One delegation recalled its earlier analysis of these proposals.

The second part of Working Session 1 focused on contacts, evaluations and inspections. Delegations explored each other's concerns and tried to find ways of enhancing implementation of the above-mentioned issues. The following issues were raised:

- On the subject of contacts, 16 delegations announced their intent to arrange an airbase visit or a visit to military facilities or a combined visit in 2005 or 2006. Some delegations announced their intention of inviting Partners for Co-operation to these joint visits. Many delegations expressed concern about the large number of visits expected in 2006 and the problems this might create. The following possible solutions were proposed:
 - Developing a plan of visits for 2005 and 2006 in order to avoid overlapping;
 - Modelling the active quota distribution mechanism of the Treaty on Open Skies;
 - Extending the five-year period of conducting visits to 2007;
 - Giving priority to those participating States that have never conducted visits;
- Several delegations commented that it was advisable to send combined teams to the visits (including personnel from verification centres, MoD and HQ);
- One delegation proposed that the FSC should compose regulations and modalities on the conducting of demonstrations of major equipment and weapon systems;

- Regarding inspections and evaluations, several delegations suggested a food-for-thought paper aimed at reaching a standard interpretation of VD 99 para 81. One delegation suggested that the FSC should follow up the implementation assessment after an inspection or evaluation visit. Several proposals were made regarding a better and more balanced distribution of evaluations/inspections and quotas;
- The Chairperson's statements on interpreters as auxiliary personnel (2004) and on Transit (2003) were assessed positively;
- To make inspections and evaluation visits more effective, one delegation proposed the use of a stopwatch mechanism in evaluating units and formations located in a large area; one delegation suggested that inspectors should submit a draft report before leaving the country, but other delegations expressed concern at this proposal; several delegations emphasized the importance of the provision of a helicopter/fixed-wing aircraft for an overflight during a specified area inspection; to avoid misunderstandings, some delegations urged participating States to give briefings and debriefings during the inspection; and one delegation recommended decreasing the size of the specified area;
- *Force majeure*: one delegation offered bilateral assistance to deal with the exact definition of *force majeure* with the concerned participating States. Several delegations supported this approach.

3. Working Session 2 was dedicated to discussing the operation and implementation of other FSC-agreed measures and documents. Delegations noted that there was still room for improvement in the implementation of some commitments. The first part of Working Session 2 focused on regional measures and the OSCE Communications Network:

- With regard to bilateral and regional agreements, delegations provided information on activities as compiled in the updated CPC overview (FSC.GAL/4/05). Delegations agreed that these agreements promoted the principles of transparency, mutual confidence and co-operation between participating States. Some delegations announced the recent or forthcoming termination of such agreements due to changes in the European security architecture. One delegation gave a short presentation about Black Sea CSBM regimes and BLACKSEAFOR. Others gave information about new agreements with neighbouring States. One delegation suggested that the RACVIAC could serve as a model for practical regional co-operation in other parts of the OSCE area. With regard to further strengthening co-operation with Partners for Co-operation, one delegation noted that with the distribution of PC.DEL/366/04/Rev.1, the Partners for Co-operation should identify which options they would like to follow up. The importance of interaction in this sphere was stressed;
- On the OSCE Communications Network, one delegation commented positively on the migration of the operating system to Windows XP. The same delegation urged those participating States not yet connected to the Network to join as soon as possible. One delegation announced its plans to upgrade to the new system and its associated

training requirements. One delegation invited those States in close regional proximity to consider contributing to putting on a training event.

The second half of Working Session 2 was dedicated to further FSC-agreed measures and documents. Delegations noted the operation and application of these documents with satisfaction and welcomed efforts being made to use the existing toolkit. In this regard, special mention was made of the ongoing work on Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) and the requests for assistance received pursuant to the Document on Conventional Ammunition. The updated Questionnaire on Anti-Personnel Landmines was welcomed and several delegations stated that they were in the process of ratifying the different protocols. The following other issues were raised:

- Principles of conventional arms transfers: one delegation noted that the experiences of participating States that have issued annual reports on national practices on arms controls could be useful for others that have not done it yet;
- Principles governing non-proliferation, some delegations emphasized that the document did not reflect such recent developments as United Nations Security Council resolution 1540, substantial progress with regard to the Chemical Weapons Convention, reference to the comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and recent developments in radiological weapons. One delegation questioned the continued validity of the Principles. Another delegation stated that the principles were still valid. One delegation noted that three participating States had not yet ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention. One delegation suggested that the FSC should pursue the implementation of United Nations Security Council resolution 1540;
- Global exchange of military information. One delegation announced its next GEMI exchange electronically, with a paper copy to participating States upon request. The same delegation announced that it would also provide its answers to the APL Questionnaire electronically;
- Code of Conduct. One delegation offered assistance to national parliaments in adopting new legislation to implement the Code. One delegation suggested that the CPC or the Action against Terrorism Unit (ATU) should review the responses to Question 1 of the revised Questionnaire regarding terrorism;
- OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons: the FSC co-ordinator presented a comprehensive status report on the requests for assistance received by the FSC from three participating States. Two delegations involved in the assistance described initial steps at the staff assessment level, also inviting the participating States seeking assistance to visit their own SALW military facilities. One delegation stated that three participating States were providing training in export controls. There was no common agreement on a possible review of the SALW document;
- OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition: the FSC co-ordinator presented a comprehensive status report on the requests for assistance received by the FSC from five participating States. Two other participating States have requested assistance in disposing of rocket fuel. One delegation noted that few concrete steps had been taken in response to its requests, and added that another international

organization was implementing a related project in its country. The delegation also informed the delegates of the distribution of other project proposals. One delegation emphasized the need to destroy dangerous stockpiles first before constructing new infrastructure.

3. Closing plenary meeting: In the closing plenary meeting, the four rapporteurs delivered their reports on the proceedings and results of the working sessions. No delegation expressed disagreement with the reports.

In his summary, the Chairperson of the closing plenary meeting confirmed that the exchange of views during the fifteenth AIAM had taken place in an atmosphere of confidence, and that the discussions on improving implementation had been constructive. It had been an open, sincere, transparent meeting, rich in substance. This showed that debate was itself a tool for building confidence and strengthening co-operation. He stated that 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 present the proposals made in food-for-thought format and place them in Working Group A to allow follow-up.

It was agreed that the sixteenth AIAM would be held in the first half of March 2006; the FSC would determine the exact date, 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, the United States of America 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 fifteenth AIAM.

Mr. Chairperson, this is a synopsis of the two days of discussion at the fifteenth 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, 8 March 2005

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
-

Introduction

Working Session 1, part A, was co-ordinated by Colonel Giuseppe Cornacchia, Military Adviser in the Permanent Delegation of Italy to the OSCE; the rapporteur was Captain Thomas Schmidt, AIAM Delegation of Switzerland. The Co-ordinator based his introduction on his Food-for-Thought paper (FSC.AIAM/6/05), proposing guidelines for discussion, raising questions and encouraging the delegations to offer factual contributions. In conformity with the aim of the meeting, he expected participants to provide clarifications on the implementation of the agreed measures, to express their own assessment of that implementation and to suggest possible solutions.

Starting with the debate, one delegation welcomed the AIAM as an event, where participating States were able to gather, meet to discuss and finally assess what and how they had contributed to the strengthening of security and confidence in Europe. It underlined the need to respect the quite different conditions in quite different regions where the CSBMs are to be implemented. Patience was the way to trust and confidence; there should be no time limitation set on reaching a comprehensive solution. Invoking the analogy of constructing a bridge for strengthening co-operation and communication, this delegation proposed that the FSC should arrange a meeting of the Heads of verification units or arms control agencies from those participating States which do not have such institutions; it could be held in September/October 2005 in Vienna, and elaborate “Best Guides for Implementation of CSBMs”.

Some delegations welcomed this idea as a contribution to constructive dialogue and would consult their capitals. However, one delegation recalled, that it was precisely one of the purposes of the AIAM to bring together verification and implementation experts from the capitals. Another delegation recognized the importance of respect for the differences and

characteristica of the participating States. However, this argument could not serve as a pretext for incorrect implementation and non-compliance of agreed, politically binding commitments.

1. Annual exchange of military information

The Co-ordinator recalled that although some improvement had been made compared to the previous reporting year, not all participating States with armed forces had participated in the automated exchange. The same applied to the one-off information exchange in electronic form (FSC.DEC/6/01, 14 November 2001) and the hard copy exchange. Recalling the implementation improvement, he recalled the need to comply providing complete answers in a timely fashion.

One delegation confirmed the slight improvement (2004: 48 submissions; 2005: 52 submissions). Those participating States which had not handed in their exchanges were requested to explain the reasons for not complying, whether it was caused by lack of resources, lack of awareness, or by other hindrances. However, no progress had been achieved in implementing FSC.DEC/6/01, as 12 participating States had not submitted the data exchanges relating to major weapon and equipment systems. This delegation, already assisting bilaterally another participating State with the elaboration of the CD-ROM, suggested that these participating States address themselves to the CPC or the FSC for further support. The delegation being assisted expressed gratitude for the support, and encouraged other participating States either to offer or to seek assistance in order to produce this information co-operatively.

Attention was also paid to the question whether a hard copy, a CD-ROM or both should be submitted. Delegations agreed upon the trend, triggered by technical progress, towards CD-ROM/digital information exchange and considered that this should be the future standard. One delegation in favour of CD-ROM exchange pledged for the abolition of hardcopy exchange by offering assistance to any delegation in need of help in speeding up the transition. Another delegation recalled budget restraints and the need to streamline, and to foster efficiency in exchanging information. Maybe a decision to abolish hard copies could accelerate this process in the long run. Another delegation stated its preference for receiving a hard copy as well as a CD-ROM.

One delegation explained a lack of information in the "Annual CPC Survey on CSBM Information exchanged in 2004 (FSC.GAL/4/05/Rev.1/Corr.1, Table 1b, 7 March 2005), by the fact that the CPC was not provided with a copy of information exchanged.

A further question addressed, was whether the annual exchange of military information (AEMI) was still a useful and adequate instrument which reflected the changing security environment since its adoption. One delegation underlined the necessity of the AEMI on one hand as a means of fostering transparency and openness as well as a tool to be informed about changes on command organization, structures and strengths of the armed forces. Another delegation suggested that rather than overvaluing timeliness, it would be better to focus on the improvement of the quality and substance of this information exchange. One delegation also recalled that the number of units should be included in the information exchange in order to get the resultant evaluation quota according to paragraph 109 of the VD 99.

2. Defence planning

The Co-ordinator recalled that the overall picture concerning defence planning exchanges looked good. However, some deficiencies about compliance and timeliness still persist.

One delegation spoke out for the military doctrine seminar which was originally planned for May 2005. It should be organized later in 2005, but should in no circumstances be forgotten.

3. Risk reduction

This mechanism was not used during 2004. One delegation agreed about the non-use of this mechanism during the previous year and underlined its potential usefulness in the case of unforeseeable developments.

4. Military activities

(i) Prior notification of certain military activities

The Co-ordinator mentioned that three participating States have notified military activities in 2004. Without calling into question the VD 99, proposals had been made in the last year's AIAM and thereafter presented to the FSC to consider lowering the threshold, or providing voluntary information on the largest national military exercise.

Two delegations said that they consider notifying their largest national military exercise as an act of good will.

One delegation pointed out that such a proposal of notification on a voluntary basis had already been made in the past (Proposal for a draft FSC decision on prior notification of certain military activities, FSC.DEL/342/04, 21 July 2004). The overall reactions were mainly positive, while the consultations were still ongoing.

Another delegation pointed out the similarity of this proposal to ones made by two other delegations during last year's AIAM. The same delegation, after having examined the initial proposal, had issued "proposed amendments" (FSC.DEL/497/04, 24 November 2004), while still awaiting results. The same delegation stressed that the mechanism of prior notification of certain military activities was simply not working at all, mainly because the thresholds were too high. As this issue should not be rolled from one AIAM to the next and so forth, the delegation requested the attribution of the proposal to the competent working group of the FSC.

One delegation drew a positive conclusion about the dropping of notifications, stressing that the decrease of military activities with large numbers of troops was to be seen a sign of an increase of confidence and security in the Euro-Atlantic area. However, in order to maintain the usefulness, by all recognised, of the measure, one solution would be to take into account qualitative structural criteria and the level of the intended exercise, instead of simply considering the number of troops, always bearing in mind the steady progress of armed forces

technology and the possibility of conducting virtual exercises without troops. Some delegations announced that they would consult with their capitals on this issue.

Yet another delegation doubted the value of the approach to achieve significant transparency throughout the OSCE area by the principle of voluntariness. Notifying on a voluntary basis would in any case require the same information as that given through the existing notification format. It recalled its analysis of the proposals (FSC.DEL/496/04, 24 November 2004).

(ii) Annual calendars

One delegation apologized for an inspection scheduled on a national holiday.

(iii) Constraining provisions

No remarks.

(iv) Observation of certain military activities

One delegation recalled that it had invited 78 countries in 2004, including 36 OSCE participating States, for the observation of a military exercise. In 2005, 77 countries (including nine Asian and Mediterranean Partners for Co-operation) were to be invited for six military exercises, one of them to be held in May 2005.

Summary of the Co-ordinator

The Co-ordinator classified the discussion and the clarifications as satisfying, underlining however that there is naturally always room for improvement. The proposals dealt with in this session needed to be addressed in the appropriate forums or working groups, bearing in mind that some of them were leftovers from past AIAMs. The Co-ordinator concluded with the hope that the delegations which remained silent could also align themselves with the conclusions reached.

WORKING SESSION 1 Part B

Tuesday, 8 March 2005

Report of the Working Session Rapporteur

- Contacts
 - Inspection
 - Evaluation
-

Introduction

In his opening remarks, the Co-ordinator, Colonel Anders Gardberg, introduced his food-for-thought paper (FSC.AIAM/3/05/Corr.1) where the assessment of overall situation is outlined, possible shortcomings are initially identified, and several questions for consideration are asked concerning contacts, inspections, and evaluations. When outlining the topics for discussion he invited the participants to ask questions, make comments and suggestions, and engage in a debate.

Contacts

The Co-ordinator highlighted the fact that up to 33 participating States would have to arrange an airbase visit or a visit to a military facility in the year 2006. The following participating States announced their intent to arrange a visit either in 2005 or 2006:

Participating State	Time	Visit to
Norway	June (week 24), 2006	
Belarus	2006 (date TBD)	
Bulgaria	week 44, 2006	22nd AB and 5th Mech Brg
Russian Federation	September 2006	AB, MF and demonstration of new types of equipment and weapon systems
Germany	week 20, 2006	AB and MF
Kazakhstan	At the end of 2005	AB and MF
Belgium	23-27 October 2006	
France	2006	AB combined with a presentation of Rafallo plane
Poland	3-6 October 2005	21st AB and 1st Mech Brg. A new type of equipment and weapon systems will be presented.
Turkey	20-24 June 2005	AB and MF (Military Infantry School and Training Centre) and major equipment. Mediterranean and Asian Partners will also be invited. Ladies programme!
Sweden	2006 (date TBD)	AB
Switzerland	In the week of 26-30 June 2006	AB (Payerne) and MF (Thun)

Participating State	Time	Visit to
Slovakia	First week of September 2006	AB and MF
Romania	2006 (date TBD)	AB, MF and demonstration of major equipment and weapon system
Ukraine	2006 (date TBD)	
Slovenia	Middle of 2006 (June?)	

The Co-ordinator drew attention to the example of some participating States in inviting Partners for Co-operation to attend these visits. One Partner expressed appreciation for invitations to inspections/evaluations already extended. It was asked whether some copies of visit reports would be made available for Partners as examples.

A number of delegations emphasized that the VD 99 provisions on visits to air bases, military formations, and observation of certain military activities were not to be perceived as voluntary, but as mandatory.

Several delegations expressed their concern about the large number of visits to air bases and military formations (VD 99, Chapter IV, paragraphs 30.3 and 30.4) expected in 2006. In addition greater effort should be made to achieve a more balanced distribution of evaluation/inspection quotas over the year.

It was acknowledged that thought should be given early on to how to avoid clashes in 2006. Several suggestions on way forward were outlined:

1. Several delegations proposed that the OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre and the Forum for Security Co-operation should work out the plan of visits for 2005 and 2006 in order to avoid clashes and overlaps and facilitate proper planning. This plan should be assessed and solutions should be found.
2. One delegation suggested following the example of the Treaty on Open Skies annual active quota distribution mechanism.
3. One delegation proposed that where there is no other way of avoiding clashes, the five-year period for conducting the visits should be extended to 2007.
4. One delegation had the idea of prioritizing, and involving in particular those participating States that have never conducted visits. These States were urged to consider the concept of joint visits.

Some delegations expressed their concerns about the tremendous workload for inspectors and verification centres, and the burden on financial resources for 2005 and 2006. Several delegations pointed out that it was advisable not only to send personnel from verification centres. Several delegations acknowledged that combined teams including personnel from verification centres, MODs and HQs would be welcome.

One delegation pointed out that there were neither regulations nor modalities on conducting demonstrations of major equipment and weapon systems. It was suggested that

modalities could usefully include common elements such as briefings, technical data, demonstration, combat capabilities, etc. The delegation proposed that the FSC consider this issue.

One delegation indicated that several VD 99 provisions regulating the duration of visits differ from what is done in practice. The participating States should reach agreement on this matter.

Inspection and Evaluation

The Co-ordinator invited participating States to discuss three issues: VD 99, paragraph 81 (sensitive points), paragraph 82 (third party) and paragraph 98 (briefings).

Several delegations drew attention to different interpretations of VD 99, paragraph 81. It was suggested that a food-for-thought paper should be prepared in order to achieve a standardized approach in this regard.

One delegation considered that minimal interpretation of VD 99, paragraph 81 was acceptable. As regards VD 99, paragraph 98 and paragraph 82, it was a matter of communication between inspection team and unit commander.

One delegation emphasized the importance of maximum openness and transparency when hosting an inspection or evaluation visit. It was suggested that the FSC should pay more attention to the implementation assessment.

One delegation outlined lessons learned from its activities, such as the importance of the timely provision of annual military information and reports on the conducted evaluations/inspections. It was stated that the VD 99 provided minimum standards for conducting the Section IX activities.

According to one delegation, since 2000 there had been a progressive drop in evaluation visits. The delegation outlined possible reasons, e.g., a decrease in troop formations, but also acknowledged that a change of quotas would not be the solution.

Additional topics

Interpreters

It was stated that the experience of the FSC Chairperson's statement (FSC.JOUR/434, 21 July 2004) on interpreters as auxiliary personnel during verification activities had so far been positive. It allowed for the inclusion of larger numbers of full time experts in the teams.

Transit

The experience of the FSC Chairperson's statement on Transit (FSC.JOUR/408/Corr.1, 3 October 2003) was deemed to have been very positive. The request for assistance in transit had been put into practice and was working very well. As a result there had been no cases of difficulty in transits to or from verification missions.

How can inspections and evaluation visits be made more effective?

A number of delegations considered that there was a need to make inspections and evaluation visits more effective, and that ways could be found to do this. During discussions several suggestions were made.

One delegation proposed making the 12-hour period more efficient, and introducing a “stop-watch mechanism” to the evaluation of units and formations located in a large area. The FSC could work on a Chairperson’s statement on this matter. This proposal was supported.

It was suggested that inspection teams should submit inspection draft reports before leaving the country. Some delegations expressed concerns about this suggestion.

The importance of the provision of a helicopter/fixed-wing aircraft for an overflight during a specified area inspection was underlined. One delegation pointed out security aspects that restricted the use of helicopter/fixed-wing aircraft during inspections. The issue on covering the costs for helicopter/fixed-wing aircraft was raised during discussions. There were some difficulties in this field, and it was suggested that the issue should be looked at by the FSC.

Some delegations emphasized the importance of doing briefings and de-briefings during inspection in order to avoid misunderstandings.

One delegation suggested seeking ways of increasing the numbers of guest inspectors during inspection.

The issue of the size of the specified area was raised during the discussions. It was acknowledged by several delegations that the specified area could be decreased in size. However, that should be discussed bilaterally on a case-by-case basis, or could be addressed through the additional CSBM agreements.

Force majeure

Several delegations had learned from experience that the issue of *force majeure* should be looked at more closely. One delegation offered to address this issue and assist in resolving it by discussing possible ways forward on a bilateral basis with participating States concerned. It was supported by other delegations.

Conclusions

The working session was characterized by a desire among delegations to engage in constructive discussion, to seriously explore each other’s concerns, and to find the best ways of improving contacts, inspections and evaluation. The Co-ordinator closed the session by reminding delegations to turn their ideas into substantive suggestions for discussion in the FSC.

WORKING SESSION 2

Part A

Wednesday, 9 March 2005

Report of the Working Session Rapporteur

- Regional measures
 - Communications network
-

Mr. Thomas Wuchte of the Delegation of the United States was the Co-ordinator of the first part of Working Session 2, and Mr. Helmut Kulitz of the Delegation of Germany was the rapporteur. The Co-ordinator had circulated an introductory paper on the working session in advance (FSC.AIAM/4/05), and also a presentation on the OSCE Communications Network (FSC.AIAM/5/05).

1. Regional measures

Introduction

The Co-ordinator opened the session with an overview of the number of inspections and evaluations carried out in 2004 in a bilateral, multilateral, or regional context on the basis of separate agreements concluded by OSCE participating States. He referred to the compilation prepared by the Conflict Prevention Centre (FSC.GAL/4/05) for a more detailed overview of regional measures. The Co-ordinator stated that Chapter X of Vienna Document 1999, "Regional Measures", provided a useful instrument and encouragement to further increase the transparency afforded by the Vienna Document. He also stated that the conclusion of such agreements might be of interest for the OSCE Partners for Co-operation, to raise levels of transparency and confidence in their regions.

The Co-ordinator proposed the following topics for discussion: how regional measures could continue to promote greater security in the future; whether they have potential applicability between OSCE participating States and Partners for Co-operation or other States; whether the OSCE should do more to promote regional measures in subregions where they do not exist; and what lessons can be learned from the agreements contained in the Black Sea CSBM regime.

Discussion

In the lively discussion that ensued, delegations underlined the usefulness of complementary confidence- and security-building measures for promoting transparency and security in the bilateral, multilateral or subregional contexts. Several delegations gave information about the ongoing operation of activities carried out on the basis of such agreements (evaluation visits, joint exercises and training etc., FSC.AIAM/15/05 *et al.*), concerning various branches of the armed forces including naval and air forces. Some delegations informed about the recent or forthcoming termination of such agreements that had become obsolete in the wake of changes in the European security architecture, i.e., with the accession of a number of States to multilateral treaty organizations. On the other hand, some delegations informed about the imminent conclusion or entry into force of new agreements with neighbouring States. One delegation noted that most bilateral agreements were concluded between Central and Northern European States, and that it was inviting South Caucasus and Central Asian States to participate in model exercises and training measures organized by its own State, which is situated in the Nordic region.

One delegation described the Black Sea Co-operation as a particularly useful and successful multilateral agreement whose mandate covered not only CSBMs in the naval field, but also joint measures to combat terrorism and potentially measures against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. It was pointed out by several Black Sea Co-operation Partner States that the agreement and the institutions created on the basis of this agreement, operational since the beginning of 2003, made a significant contribution to a climate of confidence in the region, complementary to other international agreements and efforts.

Another delegation recalled that the Regional Arms Control Verification and Implementation Assistance Centre (RACVIAC), located in Croatia, was an important, well-established regional institution that could serve as a model for practical regional co-operation in other parts of the OSCE area. The delegation recommended that the OSCE should keep close contact with RACVIAC in order to mutually reinforce their contributions to security and stability.

On the issue of the wider sharing of OSCE norms, principles and commitments beyond the OSCE area, one delegation recalled the efforts made in the OSCE in 2004 to explore the scope for “outreach” activities (FSC.AIAM/33/05), in particular with the OSCE Partners for Co-operation. The delegation recalled that the Forum for Security Co-operation had contributed to the report presented to the Sofia Ministerial on this issue (PC.DEL/366/04/Rev.4), and that this report contained a broad set of suggestions that could serve as a practical basis for deepening co-operation with Partner States. The delegation noted that the Sofia Ministerial had tasked both the Permanent Council and the Forum for Security Co-operation with maintaining their involvement in this matter. Another delegation stated that the Partners for Co-operation should now identify — individually or collectively — which options they would like to follow up. The delegation also stressed that interaction with the Partners should be a “two-way street”, and that in this regard the OSCE-Japan and OSCE-Korea conferences were particularly valuable. The delegation suggested that the results of these conferences should be presented and discussed in the FSC, and that the FSC might consider a more involved FSC role in future conferences.

One Partner for Co-operation commented that some progress had been achieved among regional neighbours in the period 1991 to 1995 in the fields of maritime co-operation, the establishment of an early warning system, a communication network, and a conflict prevention centre similar to or modelled on OSCE patterns. However, no further progress had been achieved due to disagreements on political priorities. Another delegation commented that bilateral agreements modelled on the Open Skies or Vienna Document regimes could be emulated by States outside the OSCE area, with an emphasis on those bordering on the OSCE area.

Conclusions

There was consensus that regional measures and agreements based on the provisions of Vienna Document 1999 Chapter X were a valuable additional tool for reinforcing trust, transparency and stability in the OSCE area. There was agreement that the potential for developing these measures further should be fully exploited. There was also agreement that the principles of Chapter X carried significant potential for neighbour countries and regions as a means of easing existing tensions and conflicts.

2. OSCE Communications Network

Introduction

The Co-ordinator drew attention to the significant improvements made to the Network over recent years. He mentioned, inter alia, the installation of the secure Virtual Private Network, the assimilation and testing of the Integrated Notification Application software for the Vienna Document, CFE and Open Skies notifications and the recent decision to migrate to a new operating system and simplified network architecture. The Co-ordinator also pointed to the further increase in the number of States connected to the Network, now totalling 48 participating States.

The Co-ordinator proposed the following topics for discussion: what steps could be taken to ensure that all 55 participating States are enabled to be connected in 2005; how participating States assess the improvements made to the communications system; what conclusions participating States come to after discussion of training and training options; and whether there are new issues to consider to ensure smooth implementation of the Network, e.g., end-user station configuration management and other upgrades.

Discussion

The discussion which followed concentrated on the overall improvements to the Communications Network system, with one delegation commenting positively on the migration of the operating system to Windows XP, which has been well received. The same delegation urged those participating States not yet connected to the Network to join as soon as possible.

General satisfaction with the Network was expressed by another delegation, which described the significant progress made in its development over the past eight years; the Network now delivered an effective and speedy means of enhancing stability and security

amongst the participating States. The speed of communication transfer was seen as a great advantage and often as superior to that achieved by traditional diplomatic channels.

One delegation referred to its own plans to upgrade to the new system and the associated training requirements. The delegation invited those States in close regional proximity to consider contributing to putting on a training event. The Co-ordinator commented on the importance of considering the request of this delegation for training provision.

Conclusions

There was general agreement that the OSCE Communications Network was an efficient tool serving the needs of the participating States with regard to the rapid communication of messages and information, and was seen as a most important confidence-building measure, which helps to increase transparency and openness.

WORKING SESSION 2

Part B

Wednesday, 9 March 2005

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
 - Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security
 - OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons
 - OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition
-

Co-ordinator: Brigadier General Dr. Heinz Vetschera of Austria
Rapporteur: Karl Olson of the United States of America

The Co-ordinator opened the Working Session by asking delegations to discuss not just implementation statistics, but also issues of substance as part of the assessment of implementation.

Principles governing conventional arms transfers

One delegation announced the release of its third annual report on its national practices on arms export controls and noted that other participating States had issued similar reports in various forums; their experiences might be useful to those participating States that had not yet produced such a report.

Principles governing non-proliferation

One delegation noted that the Principles constituted a political declaration, rather than a document that could be implemented, and continued that they mostly concern work done in other forums and do not reflect such developments as United Nations Security Council resolution 1540, which have taken place since the principles were adopted in 1994. This delegation questioned whether the Principles were still relevant today. Another delegation

responded by noting that the OSCE Strategy on Threats to Security and Stability in the Twenty-First Century did review the Principles in 2003 and reaffirmed their value within the OSCE. Other delegations cited additional changes since 1994: changes in UN standards, substantial progress towards ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention, lack of reference to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and the recent development of radiological weapons. Responding to the Co-ordinator's request to focus on implementation, another delegation noted that the Principles did include provisions that had not been implemented (e.g., Chapter 3, on Security Dialogue discussion). This delegation also noted that three participating States had not ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention. Another delegation concluded the discussion by suggesting that the FSC press for implementation of United Nations Security Council resolution 1540, and take measures to raise awareness of the matter.

Stabilizing measures for localized crisis situations

One delegation mentioned the Open Skies Treaty Review Conference, which took place in February 2005, and suggested some sort of link between the document under discussion and the Open Skies Treaty.

Global exchange of military information (GEMI)

One delegation announced that it would exchange information under the GEMI electronically, with a paper copy available to participating States upon request. This delegation also submitted its Annual Exchange of Military Information electronically and expressed appreciation that two other participating States had also done so.

The Co-ordinator praised the step as environmentally sensitive, but, taking into account the fate of his Food-for-Thought paper for the session, noted that some situations did exist in which hard copy exchange was more reliable.

Questionnaire on Anti-Personnel Landmines (APL)

One delegation welcomed the FSC's adoption of the new and updated Questionnaire on Anti-Personnel Landmines and urged all participating States to take note of the new deadline for submission: 31 May of each year.

One delegation announced its ratification of the Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW) Protocol V, Explosive Remnants of War, and mentioned that two other participating States had also ratified the Protocol.

One delegation presented a comprehensive and detailed report on its compliance with its obligations under the Ottawa Convention. This delegation announced that it had ratified CCW Protocol II in November 2003 and had presented reports beginning in 2004; the delegation would also submit the updated APL Questionnaire in May 2005.

Another delegation announced its ratification of CCW Protocol II as of January 2005; the Co-ordinator asked the CPC to amend its survey to this effect.

Questionnaire on the process of ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention

No delegation took the floor.

Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security

One delegation announced that it would distribute its Code of Conduct Questionnaire electronically; hard copies would be available to any participating State upon request. This delegation also had expert trainers on the Code of Conduct available; it urged all participating States to use the updated Questionnaire this year.

Another delegation praised the 28 January 2005 seminar on the Code of Conduct and expressed the hope that these discussions would increase transparency in national responses. This delegation also offered assistance to national Parliaments in preparing new legislation to implement the Code.

One delegation asked for clarification regarding the legal basis for the stationing of foreign forces on its territory; the delegation of the participating State in question will query its capital to provide an answer. The Co-ordinator praised this example of the spirit of discussion.

Another delegation provided a detailed report on its legal framework as related to both the Code of Conduct and to the membership requirements of other international organizations.

One delegation suggested that the CPC or the Action against Terrorism Unit (ATU) review the responses to Question 1 (concerning terrorism) of the revised Code of Conduct Questionnaire. This delegation also provided a detailed report of actual implementation of the Code in a real-life situation. The Co-ordinator praised this delegation for its candour in conducting an honest and transparent "lessons learned". The Co-ordinator cited this as an excellent example of serious implementation assessment.

OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons

The FSC Co-ordinator presented a comprehensive status report on the requests for assistance received by the FSC from three participating States. The FSC Co-ordinator's paper on this subject was distributed.

Two delegations assisting a third participating State presented comprehensive reports on initial steps at the staff assessment level. They had also taken the initiative of inviting military officers of the third participating State to visit SALW-related military facilities in their own participating States. They reported with satisfaction that these two processes, both the staff assessment visits and the military exchange visits, had, in and of themselves, become CSBMs which had greatly increased understanding between the countries concerned. The third participating State thanked the three participating States which had provided assistance in this respect.

Another delegation reported on its engagement with a regional arms control verification and implementation assistance centre on SALW issues. This delegation also reported that two other participating States had provided training in export controls as part of qualifying for membership in an international export control arrangement. The Co-ordinator noted that this went beyond implementing “classical” arms control.

One delegation reported on its progress in preparing for a possible review of the SALW Document. Another suggested that this review consider all SALW-related instruments together. A third delegation cautioned that such a review should not excessively burden experts in capitals now preparing for major SALW events such as the UN Biennial Meeting in July.

OSCE Document on Stockpiles of Conventional Ammunition

The FSC Co-ordinator presented a comprehensive report on the status of the five requests from participating States. Two additional participating States had requested assistance in disposing of rocket fuel (melange). The FSC Co-ordinator’s report was distributed.

The FSC Co-ordinator emeritus suggested some additional steps: Best Practice Guides, a centralized archive, contact with other international organizations regarding requests for assistance that may partially overlap, and asking the OSCE Press and Public Information Officer to raise international awareness of the severity of the stockpiles problem.

One delegation noted with satisfaction the steps taken in response to several of the requests. That delegation also noted few concrete steps on its requests. It cited several reasons, including lack of substantive information (including requests made to other international organizations), the extremely large amount of excess stockpiles in the requesting State, and the absence of administrative/managerial mechanisms within the OSCE for such projects. Another international organization has, however, begun to implement a closely related project in that requesting State. Given the large amount of excess stockpiles on its territory, this delegation has distributed other project proposals including physical security, hexogen-containing munitions, rocket fuel (melange) and remediation from an explosion in 2004.

The response of another delegation was that destruction of dangerous stockpiles should have a higher priority than construction of new infrastructure. This delegation also announced its intention to circulate a Food-for-Thought paper on stockpiles management best practice guides.

At the conclusion of the Working Session, the Co-ordinator thanked the delegations for their interventions.



442nd Plenary Meeting

FSC Journal No. 448, Agenda item 3

**DECISION No. 1/05
ON THE AGENDA AND MODALITIES OF THE FIFTEENTH
ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT MEETING**

8 and 9 March 2005

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, 8 March 2005

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).

10.45 a.m. – 6 p.m. Working Session 1: Implementation of the Vienna Document 1999:
(to be continued, clarification, assessment and conclusions
if needed)

- Annual exchange of military information;
- Defence planning;

FSC.DEC/1/05
2 February 2005

- 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.

1–3 p.m. Lunch break

Wednesday, 9 March 2005

10 a.m. – 4.30 p.m. Working Session 2: Operation and implementation of other
(continuation of FSC-agreed measures/documents: clarification, assessment and
Working Session 1, conclusions
if needed)

- Regional measures;
- Communications network;
- 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.

5–6 p.m. Closing plenary meeting

- Working sessions reports;
- Discussion;
- Concluding remarks;
- Date of the 2006 AIAM;
- Closure.

1–3 p.m. Lunch break

FSC.DEC/1/05
2 February 2005

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 7 March 2005 at 3 p.m. The working hours of the AIAM will be 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. and 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 2004 AIAM by Germany. The chair of the opening plenary meeting and working sessions will be held by the United States of America, while the chair of the closing plenary meeting will be held by Andorra.
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 2004 Survey of Suggestions by the middle of February. These will serve as a basis for preparatory work by delegations and co-ordinators.
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.
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

FSC.DEC/1/05
2 February 2005

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 9 February 2005. The names of the co-ordinators and rapporteurs for each working session will be made known to all delegations not later than 11 February 2005.

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 2005, 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 2005 AIAM.