



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

REF.FSC/128/97

14 March 1997

ENGLISH only

Department for Conference Services

Please find attached the Chairman's Report and Summaries of the Working Group
Co-ordinators of the 1997 Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting.



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

REF.FSC/128/97

14 March 1997

ENGLISH only

Department for Conference Services

1997 ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION
ASSESSMENT MEETING

Vienna, 3-5 March 1997

SUMMARY

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

Vienna, 3-5 March 1997

Dear Colleagues,

As Chairman of the closing session of the Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting, I have the honour, in accordance with well-established practice, to inform the Forum for Security Co-operation on the proceedings and results of this year's AIAM, which took place from 3 to 5 March.

In accordance with Chapter 10 of the Vienna Document 1994, this year's meeting brought together several experts from capitals and once again provided an opportunity for a thorough exchange of views on the implementation and possible improvement of this important document. The discussions covered all the major provisions of the Document and resulted in a large number of interesting and thought-provoking proposals. In addition, our deliberations also covered other documents adopted by the Forum, such as the Code of Conduct and the Global Exchange of Military Information.

The debates focused both on the broad principles underlying the confidence- and security-building measures and on matters related to their daily application. It is my clear impression that the deliberations and the proposals put forward were both interesting and useful, and it seems fair to conclude that there is now a tangible momentum that could lead to more concrete results in our future work here in the FSC.

The work at this year's meeting was divided by subject into nine different sections, involving seven co-ordinators. In addition, at the opening session the Italian Chairmanship of the Forum presented a substantive report on the implementation aspects of confidence- and security-building measures discussed within the FSC in 1996.

In this report to the Forum, I shall base my conclusions on the excellent reports of the co-ordinators, which will be formally transmitted to the FSC as annexes to my statement.

The discussions in the working groups indicated the following:

As has been the case in previous years, this year also there was a general consensus that the annual exchange of military information on organization, manpower and equipment forms the basis for all other confidence- and security-building measures. Although there was general agreement that the provisions are working well, the failure of a number of participating States to submit information, as well as delays in the submissions, were causes for concern. A number of delegations expressed the need for the early establishment of a clear system for reminding participating States that have not provided information on time. This proposal has also been discussed at previous meetings, and this year there seemed to be a preference for the FSC Chair to issue such reminders, working on the basis of information received from the Conflict Prevention Centre. The importance of offering assistance as a part of a reminder was also underlined.

With regard to defence planning, the importance of this mechanism was emphasized by several delegations, both in the context of transparency and as an element of democratic control over armed forces. However, despite continued efforts to improve the situation, the

number of participating States actually submitting this document is not satisfactory. Reasons for this lack of implementation were discussed at some length, and several delegations favoured issuing reminders to the participating States, possibly prior to the holding of the Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting.

In the working group on communications, one important part of the discussion focused on the problems arising from the fact that not all participating States were connected to the network. A number of delegations underlined the benefits that would accrue from having all OSCE participating States connected to the network, but the number of States actually connected had not increased since last year's meeting. Several delegations recognized that the FSC decision to use the CPC as a nodal point for transmitting messages to States not connected to the network was beneficial, but acknowledged that difficulties in terms of the timeliness of delivery to capitals still existed. Delegations welcomed the establishment of the Configuration Control Board, which had been prepared at last year's meeting, as a further step towards ensuring technical review of the software and systems used for the network.

As has been the case at previous meetings with regard to military activities, there was also at this year's AIAM a thorough debate on the question of whether there was a need to lower the thresholds for prior notification and observation. However, no consensus emerged on this issue. Another important question in this same working group was the transmission of annual calendars and information regarding constraining provisions, the importance of which was emphasized by several delegations. There seemed to be a general understanding on the "all-weather" nature of the Vienna Document, and a number of speakers proposed that the Document should be revised to ensure coverage of not only military exercises but also military activities. Agreement on this was, however, not reached at this meeting.

As far as provisions relating to compliance and verification are concerned, one of the main topics discussed was that of quotas for inspections and evaluation visits. Several delegations focused on what they perceived as too few evaluation visits and on organizational shortcomings as regards the distribution of these visits. Several proposals were put forward in this regard, among them an increase of quotas for evaluation visits and the establishment of a mechanism for redistribution of quotas during the year. Modalities for inspections and evaluation visits were also discussed, and a number of proposals were put forward in this regard. The importance of verification of tension situations as well was underlined by some delegations, and the idea of making use of the document on Stabilizing Measures in Localized Crisis Situations was discussed. There were also deliberations on subregional verification measures.

Several delegations referred to the importance of the provisions relating to risk reduction in the Vienna Document as a means of conflict prevention. There was an exchange of views on the reasons why this mechanism was not being made use of. On the one hand, this might be seen as a good sign, reflecting more stable conditions in the OSCE area, while, on the other, questions were raised as to the failure to use this mechanism in situations of crisis or conflict that were still continuing. The working group dealing with this issue also considered a proposal to further strengthen the consultation mechanism of the relevant chapter in the Vienna Document, through the establishment of a multinational inspection team to clarify the situation in a crisis area. This proposal found some support, but some delegations were of the opinion that the existing measures were sufficient.

In the working group dealing with contacts, it was found that not all participating States that had undertaken to organize an air base visit had honoured their commitment in this regard. This was also true of the demonstration of new types of major weapon and equipment systems. These participating States were called upon to fulfil their obligations under these provisions. It was further stressed that during air base visits the visitors should have an adequate opportunity to evaluate the efficiency of the air base. A considerable amount of time in this working group was devoted to reports of participating States on experiences from contacts with neighbouring countries. There was general agreement that this kind of strengthening of contacts on a subregional or bilateral basis constituted a valuable contribution to the building of confidence and security within the terms of the Vienna Document.

The issue of implications of the implementation of global, regional and subregional CSBMs for the process of confidence- and security-building, early warning and conflict prevention, gave rise to a lively debate as well as to two non-papers. Several delegations stressed the importance of integrating subregional arrangements into collective OSCE measures and the possibilities for making greater use of existing provisions. It was noted with satisfaction that the Vienna Document had served as a model for Article II under Annex 1-B of the Dayton Agreement, and several speakers expressed a wish to see the envisaged negotiations under Article V begin. Some delegations pointed out that, when assessing possibilities for further regional co-operation and evaluating existing arrangements, the focus should be not only on areas of tension or on politico-military measures. Another subject discussed in this same working group was the question of increased synergy in the relationship between the Permanent Council and the FSC.

Finally, we had a very useful discussion on the implementation of the Global Exchange of Military Information, Principles Governing Conventional Arms Transfer, and other documents dealing with closely related politico-military issues, such as the Code of Conduct. Some delegations favoured a *rapprochement*, but not a merger, of the Global Exchange of Military Information and the Vienna Document in order to rationalize the work related to exchange of information. As was also true in the FSC, the proposal on the holding of a separate conference on the follow-up of the Code of Conduct received broad support, although some delegations expressed a wish for more information on the purpose and nature of such a conference. A wish was also expressed to have a debate and an agreement on methods for measuring implementation of the Code before the holding of such a conference.

I would also like to make the point that, in addition to the discussions generated within the working groups, a number of delegations expressed their views during the opening plenary session and at the closing session of this year's meeting.

Dear Colleagues,

This has been a survey of the questions dealt with at the seventh Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting. I make no claim to have treated the proceedings of the meeting exhaustively, nor have I wished to go beyond my mandate of impartiality. Let me, before I conclude my briefing, express my appreciation of the importance assigned to the question of the implementation of the Vienna Document by all participating delegations. This is in accordance with the instruction from our Heads of States, who, in Lisbon, emphasized that the strong pledge of all OSCE States regarding full implementation of all arms control measures was essential for further improvement of security and stability in the

OSCE area. I am confident that the FSC will give the work done by this year's meeting the appropriate follow-up in accordance with the prescribed modalities.

I am pleased to report that participation at the Annual Implementation Assessment Meetings seems to improve further every year. An increasing number of experts are taking the trouble to come to Vienna. This is a good sign: Let us hope that those who for one reason or another were absent this year will take an active part at next year's meeting.

Let me finally inform the Heads of Delegations of the participating States about the understanding reached last Wednesday at the closing session, namely that we should expect to hold a three-day meeting at approximately the same time in 1998. It will be for the Forum for Security Co-operation to draw up an agenda for next year's meeting.

Dear Colleagues,

All that remains for me is to express my gratitude to all those who took part in this year's Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting, in particular to the co-ordinators and the Conflict Prevention Centre, and to thank you all for your attention.

WORKING GROUP I

Monday, 3 March 1997

Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

- Agenda item 2: Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the calendar year 1996 - assessment, clarification and conclusions:
- (a): Provisions relating to annual exchange of military information
-

In the course of a full discussion, many views were expressed on these provisions. Some familiar proposals were recalled, and several new proposals made.

There was again a general consensus that the annual exchange of military information formed the basis for all other confidence- and security-building measures. In general, the provisions functioned well, though there was still some room for improvement. The importance of providing the information on time was reaffirmed. Explanations for delays in providing the information were encouraged; explanations which had been made were welcomed.

Many delegations felt that a clear system should soon be set up in order to remind participating States which had not provided information on time, including those which would be submitting a nil report. There seemed to be a balance in favour of the suggestion that it should be the FSC Chair who should issue such reminders, working on the basis of the CPC's information. The importance of offering assistance as part of the reminder was mentioned. Some delegations suggested that an initial letter might be sent to all participating States before the December deadline.

The need for information to be complete, as well as on time, was mentioned; one delegation proposed that the provisions for clarification of the defence planning submissions might be extended to cover the provisions on information exchange, to be used in cases where information was deemed to be possibly incomplete.

Also mentioned was the need to encourage all participating States to take part in the automated exchange of data.

The Delegation of Estonia introduced a proposal concerning the requirement under paragraph 10.3.1 of the Vienna Document 1994 to report planned increases in personnel strength. The proposal would set the threshold number of troops at 1,000 for each active combat unit and 3,000 for each active formation, rather than 1,500 troops and 5,000 troops, respectively, as now, and would also shorten the time period from 21 to 14 days.

The proposal to combine the Vienna Document 1994 data exchange with the Global Exchange of Military Information (GEMI) was favourably recalled by several delegations - although it was noted that lengthy discussions had failed to produce consensus on the issue. The possibility of a single exchange in January and subsequent verification in February was mentioned.

There was some discussion on whether information on paramilitary forces should be included in the annual exchange.

WORKING GROUP II

Monday, 3 March 1997

Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

- Agenda item 2: Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the calendar year 1996 - assessment, clarification and conclusions:
- (b): Defence planning
-

1. Frank and open discussion as well as a number of concrete proposals showed the vital interest of the participating States in ensuring the proper implementation and possible further development of the defence planning instruments.
2. The important role of the Defence Planning Document was stressed in the context of transparency and openness of the military policies of participating States and as an element of democratic control over the armed forces.
3. The opinion was expressed by several speakers that there was a lack of improvement in the number of participating States exchanging annual information on defence planning. This unsatisfactory situation could also be observed in the quality of the information submitted.

Some problems were also mentioned as regards the comparability of all the material gathered from the submissions by the participating States.

4. The clear necessity for full compliance by all participating States was highlighted in this regard as a basis for further discussion on future development of defence planning. Several delegations called for sending reminders (e.g., in the form of letters) to the States behind in their submission of the Defence Planning Document, possibly prior to the AIAM, including a request for explanations about the reasons for the delay.
5. In order to remedy situations where cases of non-compliance are observed, the necessity was stressed of receiving clear signals and indications of existing problems from the States concerned. Such information might help in providing proper assistance, at least of a technical nature.
6. A number of proposals were put forward on how to cope with shortfalls and how to develop the measure in future, e.g.:
 - to make better use and provide more coherence in implementing paragraphs 15.1.2, 15.2, 15.4 of the Vienna Document;
 - to enhance paragraphs 15.8 and 15.9;

- to encourage participating States to provide explanations as well as - on a voluntary basis - additional data on defence planning, in order to make the entire information more readable and comparable;
- to establish one date for submission of the Defence Planning Document;
- to make better use of the UN “Instrument for Standardized International Reporting of Military Expenditures”;
- to deliver copies of the OSCE Defence Planning Document to the UN;
- to provide information to all participating States about the expected time of submission of the Defence Planning Document;
- to eliminate the voluntary nature of information concerning paramilitary forces;
- to devote a separate session (one day) during the AIAM for discussing defence planning.

7. The Delegation of Sweden invited all other delegations to attend the informal meeting on technical aspects of annual exchange of information on defence planning (on 4 March in the Hofburg). Sweden also extended an invitation to participate in the course “Management of Budgeting Systems and Democratic Control” to be held in June 1997 in Sweden.

8. Some delegations pointed out that there was clearly room for strengthening the dialogue on defence planning. Additional opportunities for more structured exchange of views and ideas, beyond the scope of the AIAM, were stressed.

9. There were divergent views on possibilities to seek a kind of standardized formats or data base for preparing and submitting the Defence Planning Document: some delegations argued that such a way would make for better readability and comparability of national documents; others spoke in favour of keeping the existing practices owing to the variety of national procedures and legislative processes.

10. General understanding emerged to the effect that there was a possibility to consider additions and changes in the content of the Defence Planning Document. This may also apply to better effectiveness in ways of submission.

11. In total, the need for further and more detailed discussion of defence planning instruments was underlined, including the future work of the Forum for Security Co-operation.

WORKING GROUP III

Tuesday, 4 March 1997

Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

- Agenda item 2: Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the calendar year 1996 - assessment, clarification and conclusions:
- (c): Provisions relating to military activities
 - (d): Provisions relating to compliance and verification
-

There was a rather lively debate in the working group. Delegations put forward a number of useful suggestions. There seemed to be general approval of some of them, while others were deemed to be more controversial. In the view of the co-ordinator, there seemed to be general acceptance of the need for adaptation.

Provisions relating to military activities

Several delegations underlined the importance of transmitting annual calendars and information regarding constraining provisions. It was underlined that there is an obligation to give a NIL report if no notifiable activities were planned. However, there were no explanations given in this regard according to § 147.3.

There seemed to be a general understanding that the Vienna Document 1994 was an “all-weather” document. Consequently, it covered not only exercises but also activities. Some delegations proposed that the document be revised in this regard. Other delegations, however, were more prudent. One delegation explicitly stated that this question could be “examined”. Another delegation pointed out that if peacekeeping was to be seen as a notifiable activity, then the constraining provisions might need some adaptation.

As during previous AIAMs, there was a lively debate about the possible need to change and/or lower the thresholds for prior notification and observation. One delegation proposed that if a participating State did not plan to carry out a notifiable exercise, it should nevertheless notify its biggest planned exercise. However, at least one delegation felt that the present provisions were working well and that possible changes should be dealt with primarily in subregional contexts.

Among other views expressed were:

- the need to include multinational activities in the provisions;
- provisions for the assessment of a visit according to § 30.3 - 30.6 in line with § 55.9 including the elaboration of criteria;
- voluntary observations cannot be a substitute for mandatory observations;

- § 136 should be expanded into a chapter on regional confidence building.

Provisions relating to compliance and verification

Several delegations addressed the question of quotas for inspection and evaluation. Among the ideas for changes of the document in this regard were the following:

- a general increase of quotas for evaluation visits;
- unused inspection quotas should be changed into evaluation quotas;
- full utilization of quotas at the beginning of a year should be avoided by a mechanism of redistribution of quotas during the year (*inter alia*, maximum one visit/month and State, maximum of 50 per cent of visits during the first half of the year);
- a yearly meeting within the FSC in order to co-ordinate national plans for verification.

Modalities for inspections and evaluation visits were also discussed:

- § 79 should not be interpreted in such a way that access to garrisons is impeded;
- § 89 should be interpreted so that interpreters are not counted within the limit of four members of a team;
- clarification of the maximum inspection area in § 78; 100*120 km was proposed;
- modern equipment as SATCOM and GPS should be allowed;
- reports should be more detailed and give relevant information on possible problems, actual numbers in comparison to notified numbers, etc.
- messages exchanged on the communications network in the context of verification activities should include information stating whether the activity is to be carried out according to VD 94 or according to a subregional agreement.

Two delegations underlined the importance of verification in situations of tension and crisis as well. The document on Stabilizing Measures in Localized Conflict Situations could perhaps be of use in this regard.

Some delegations proposed that participating States should give information regarding significant changes of annual information.

Several delegations stressed the need to develop subregional verification measures. One delegation, however, expressed the need for caution in this regard.

WORKING GROUP IV

Tuesday, 4 March 1997

Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

- Agenda item 2: Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the calendar year 1996 - assessment, clarification and conclusions:
- (e): Provisions relating to risk reduction
-

The working group on risk reduction considered a proposal to enhance the consultation mechanism contained in Chapter II of the Vienna Document 1994, with a verification procedure involving a multinational inspection team with a view to clarifying the situation in a crisis area in an impartial manner. The purpose of the proposal was to develop CSBMs and extend their applicability in crisis situations. The modalities for such a multinational inspection regime were suggested, including the implications on inspection quotas, the exclusion of *force majeure*, and the number of participants in the inspection team.

The proposal found some support, but stress was laid on the perception of a security concern by the relevant participating State.

A divergent view - which also found some support - was, however, expressed to the effect that the procedures already contained in the mechanism for consultation and co-operation as regards unusual military activities in the risk reduction chapter, and which had not been used in the past year, were already sufficient and that there was no need to introduce superfluous inspection regimes.

The importance of the mechanism as a tool in conflict prevention was highlighted, together with mixed feelings on the reasons why the mechanism had not been used. There was a general agreement that the current mechanism was still useful. The fact that it had not been used recently was a good sign in itself and reflected the more co-operative developments and situation in the OSCE area. Still, doubts were expressed as to why this mechanism was not being resorted to by the relevant participating States in those cases where crisis or conflicts were still continuing.

A partial explanation for the failure to use the mechanism was attributed to the fact that many crisis situations differed from each other, and that in the majority of the current cases the crisis was not between States but within the national territory of particular participating States.

The notification of a "concentration of troops" that was, in a sense, an unusual and unscheduled military activity, but that was evidently of no security concern to any participating State, was mentioned. In the light of this fact, as well as the notion concerning activities of "military forces outside their peacetime locations", the view was expressed that the implications of peacekeeping operations on certain sections of the Vienna Document could be considered. The opinion was expressed that these issues could be addressed, but not necessarily in the context of Chapter II.

Reference was made to the “stabilizing measures for localized crisis situations”, which could support the political process of crisis resolution by supplementing OSCE arrangements for risk reduction, conflict prevention and crisis management. It was agreed that this issue should be discussed further in the working group dealing with that topic.

Considerations on “good weather” and “bad weather” application of the Vienna Document were also raised, given Chapter II’s element of a “weather forecast”.

An appeal was also made to the participating States that had not already done so to comply with the provisions concerning the submission of information on points of contact.

WORKING GROUP IV

Tuesday, 4 March 1997

Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

Agenda item 2: Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the calendar year 1996 - assessment, clarification and conclusions:

(f): Provisions relating to contacts

Original: GERMAN

1. The task of Working Group IV 2(f) was to work on Section III "Contacts" of the Vienna Document. The basis of the discussions was, first of all, the drawing up of a balance sheet reflecting the application of these provisions during the past year. It emerged, in this connection, that not all States that, under paragraph 19 of the Vienna Document, were obliged to arrange an air base visit, had as yet complied with this requirement.

An appeal was made to the States to remedy that situation as quickly as possible in the second five-year period that has now commenced.

2. Several countries again made the point that, when carrying out an air base visit, the question of the purpose of the visit should not be disregarded, and that visitors should be given the opportunity to form an impression of the capabilities of the base.

3. The combining of an air base visit with other measures provided for in the section "Contacts", or other combinations of measures, were generally described as appropriate and cost-effective. Each measure, however, should be sufficiently independent of the others in terms of its purpose and significance.

4. It was pointed out that there were no implementation-related provisions with respect to the measures "visits to military facilities or military formations" and "demonstration of new types of major weapon systems". Experience has shown that, in these cases, 24 hours are needed to achieve the purpose of the event. Similarly, a period of 24 hours should also be scheduled in the case of "visits to a military facility" when such visits are conducted as a single measure.

5. On the question of the measure "demonstration of new weapon systems", it was again pointed out that a number of countries had not yet complied with their obligations in this respect. It was proposed that the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) should be instructed to write to countries that, according to the "information on armed forces" they had submitted, had in fact introduced new major weapon systems but have not yet demonstrated them.

6. The Working Group listened at length to reports from States regarding their experience and programmes in the area of bilateral and/or multinational contacts with neighbouring States. Important efforts were being made by many States through these initiatives, in the spirit of the Vienna Document, to strengthen regional confidence- and security-building. Portugal reported on the first, concrete experiences involving the

combining of various measures, and emphasized that combinations of this kind had demonstrated their usefulness. Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Turkey and Poland spoke of their programmes and positive experience as regards bilateral contacts with neighbouring States.

7. A proposal was made that the CPC should be instructed to maintain statistics on bilateral contacts and visits. In this connection, however, other States pointed to the large number of such measures, which, in their view, would make the implementation of this scheme impractical.

8. The United Kingdom emphasized the need for close co-operation between the verification organizations. Such contacts and training programmes would ensure that the persons responsible for applying the Vienna Document share the necessary identical understanding of its contents.

9. The following were further concrete proposals of the Working Group:

- Supplement to Annex II of the Vienna Document: "Two days after the deadline for replies, the State arranging the event will distribute, to all participating States, a summary of the received replies." This provision could ensure that invitations that have possibly been lost can be recognized and a notification repeated.
(Slovak Republic)
- In order to prevent unhelpful overlapping of measures by different countries, as occurred in 1996, planning arrangements for contacts should be communicated to the CPC in advance. This will enable the Centre to call attention in good time to overlapping schedules.

Communications of this kind should be provided earlier than within the prescribed 42 days. An extension of this period would be desirable.

- In the case of notifications, the relevant sections of the Vienna Document should be cited (in the space for "Comments") in order to make clear the purpose.

10. Invitations were announced in connection with the following:

- An air base visit by Norway from 3 to 5 June 1997;
- The observation of a military formation by the United Kingdom in the first week of July 1997;
- A combined measure by Hungary in 1998;
- Germany referred to an invitation, which had already been conveyed at the beginning of the year, to an air base visit in conjunction with a visit to a military formation in 1997:

(Air base visit: 6 to 7 October 1997);

(Visit to a military formation: 8 to 10 October 1997).

WORKING GROUP V

Monday, 3 March 1997

Report of the Working Group Co-ordinators

Agenda item 2: Operation and implementation of CSBMs with focus on the calendar year 1996 - assessment, clarification and conclusions:

(g): Provisions relating to communications

Several delegations spoke in support of the need for all OSCE participating States to be connected to the network. The more States connected to the network, the better for all States.

The Netherlands Delegation, on behalf of the Network Management Team, reported on the status quo with respect to the number of States connected from last year.

Furthermore, several delegations emphasized the need for States to follow the Standard Operating Procedures, especially with respect to the 24-hour timeframe.

Delegations recognized that the FSC decision to use the CPC as a nodal point for transmitting messages to States not connected to the network was beneficial, but acknowledged that difficulties in respect of the timeliness of delivery to capitals still existed.

Delegations welcomed the creation of the Configuration Control Board as another step towards ensuring technical review of the software and systems used for the network.

Several delegations requested that the issue of weekly and monthly summary reporting of messages be reviewed once again in Working Group A.

There were no suggestions offered with respect to ideas for encouraging non-connected States to join the network or regarding the means of financial assistance that might be provided. The absence of discussion may have indicated that delegations preferred to consider this issue further on a national basis, rather than as a group.

Although specific operational questions were not raised during this working group, I would note that a number of comments were made during other AIAM working group sessions concerning improvements in transmitting and receiving messages. These include, for example, the recommendation, made by the Slovak Delegation during the discussion on Military Contacts, that a list of replies to certain events should be reported.

Overall, the implementation assessment of the OSCE Communications Network must be high, since the number of substantive recommendations in this area was relatively small.

WORKING GROUP VI

Wednesday, 5 March 1997

Report of the Working Group Co-ordinator

- Agenda item 3: Implications of the implementation of CSBMs, including those stemming from regional and subregional arrangements, for the process of confidence- and security-building, early warning and conflict prevention
- Agenda item 4: Discussion of the 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
-

Original: FRENCH

Several delegations took up the question of the use and effectiveness of confidence-building measures for conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation.

A number of concrete measures were cited and were dealt with in documents that were circulated. By way of example, one might mention, among others, the possibility of "collective measures" that would enable the OSCE, as representative of the international community, to intervene in situations fraught with tension.

There was an exchange of views on Stabilizing Measures for Localized Crisis Situations. While it was noted that certain of those measures had been used in particular cases, the overall view appeared to be that not enough use had been made of the measures in question.

Some delegations wondered about ways in which the synergy between the Forum for Security Co-operation and the Permanent Council could be improved. That question underlies the entire issue of the use of CSBMs in conflict prevention.

It was pointed out that the Vienna Document - along with other measures - had provided a model for the confidence-building measures within Bosnia and Herzegovina that had been adopted within the framework of the agreement signed at Vienna on 26 January 1996. Some delegations expressed their satisfaction that it had been possible to adapt measures of a general nature to a particular case.

Some delegations wanted to see the continuation of the process contemplated under the peace agreement for Bosnia and Herzegovina, and recalled the envisaged holding of negotiations under the auspices of the Forum, pursuant to Article V of Annex 1-B of the peace agreement.

Several delegations made the point that the regional approach was not limited to crisis situations or situations of tension, but was also applicable to co-operation under normal

conditions. Similarly, the regional approach was not limited to political and military measures alone.

A number of delegations called for a closer linkage between the Global Exchange of Military Information and the Vienna Document, while making it clear that that did not imply a fusion of the two. It was noted that those two documents had neither the same scope nor the same objectives. Subject to closer examination, a linkage of that kind could make it possible to streamline the work of collecting and processing information.

There was general consensus regarding the usefulness of the planned follow-up Conference on the Code of Conduct. One delegation requested that the purpose of that Conference should be spelt out.

Some delegations requested that, since they represented a balanced whole, all aspects of the Code of Conduct should be taken into account. One delegation underscored in particular the importance of the Code in general thinking regarding security in Europe.

Certain delegations called for more stress on the implementation of the Code. They expressed the wish that methods should be devised, if need be within the FSC and in advance of the follow-up Conference, to permit a study of the implementation of that document. One delegation proposed that a questionnaire should be prepared; others suggested that the implementation of the Code of Conduct might be monitored, using various mechanisms, under the overall supervision of the Conflict Prevention Centre or at the time of the evaluation of the Code itself.

Some delegations spoke of the importance of the Principles Governing Conventional Arms Transfers, and one expressed the wish that that document should be further developed.

* * * * *

It seems to the Co-ordinator that it would be wise to use the next AIAM to review the assignment of topics between agenda items 3 and 4. It might be possible to group together, on the one hand, those documents setting out precise measures (CSBMs, Stabilization Measures for Localized Crisis Situations, and the Global Exchange of Military Information) and, on the other, measures dealing with standards of behaviour (Code of Conduct, Principles Governing Conventional Arms Transfers, Principles Governing Non-Proliferation, etc.).